



Appendix JJ

Comments and Responses

Contents

APPENDIX JJ. COMMENTS AND RESPONSES	JJ-1
JJ.1 INTRODUCTION	JJ-1
JJ.1.1 Process	JJ-1
JJ.2 COMMENTER IDENTIFICATION	JJ-2
JJ.3 COMMENT CATEGORIES	JJ-2
JJ.4 COMMENTER INDEX	JJ-3
JJ.5 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES	JJ-63
JJ.5.1 Purpose and Need	JJ-63
JJ.5.2 Alternatives Considered	JJ-70
JJ.5.3 Alternatives Related	JJ-291
JJ.5.4 Transportation	JJ-409
JJ.5.5 Economics and Growth	JJ-440
JJ.5.6 Environmental Resources	JJ-455
JJ.5.7 Construction	JJ-503
JJ.5.8 Evaluation of Alternatives	JJ-508
JJ.5.9 Phasing and Implementation	JJ-513
JJ.5.10 Public and Agency Outreach	JJ-532
JJ.5.11 Section 106/Draft Programmatic Agreement	JJ-565
JJ.5.12 Other	JJ-571
JJ.5.13 Patuxent Research Refuge	JJ-615
JJ.5.14 Bicycle Access	JJ-631
JJ.5.15 Old Lyme: Old Saybrook-Kenyon New Segment	JJ-636

Tables

TABLE JJ-1:	COMMENTER INDEX	JJ-1
TABLE JJ-2:	STAKEHOLDER COMMENTS (ELECTED OFFICIALS, TRIBES, FEDERAL AGENCIES, STATE AGENCIES, LOCAL AGENCIES): PURPOSE AND NEED	JJ-64
TABLE JJ-3:	STAKEHOLDER COMMENTS (INDIVIDUALS, SPECIAL INTEREST GROUPS, EDUCATION, OTHER): PURPOSE AND NEED	JJ-66
TABLE JJ-4:	STAKEHOLDER COMMENTS (ELECTED OFFICIALS, TRIBES, FEDERAL AGENCIES, STATE AGENCIES, LOCAL AGENCIES): ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED	JJ-71
TABLE JJ-5:	STAKEHOLDER COMMENTS (INDIVIDUALS, SPECIAL INTEREST GROUPS, EDUCATION, OTHER): ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED	JJ-95
TABLE JJ-6:	STAKEHOLDER COMMENTS (ELECTED OFFICIALS, TRIBES, FEDERAL AGENCIES, STATE AGENCIES, LOCAL AGENCIES): ALTERNATIVES RELATED	JJ-292
TABLE JJ-7:	STAKEHOLDER COMMENTS (INDIVIDUALS, SPECIAL INTEREST GROUPS, EDUCATION, OTHER): ALTERNATIVES RELATED	JJ-310
TABLE JJ-8:	STAKEHOLDER COMMENTS (ELECTED OFFICIALS, TRIBES, FEDERAL AGENCIES, STATE AGENCIES, LOCAL AGENCIES): TRANSPORTATION	JJ-410
TABLE JJ-9:	STAKEHOLDER COMMENTS (INDIVIDUALS, SPECIAL INTEREST GROUPS, EDUCATION, OTHER): TRANSPORTATION	JJ-421

TABLE JJ-10:	STAKEHOLDER COMMENTS (ELECTED OFFICIALS, TRIBES, FEDERAL AGENCIES, STATE AGENCIES, LOCAL AGENCIES): ECONOMICS AND GROWTH	JJ-441
TABLE JJ-11:	STAKEHOLDER COMMENTS (INDIVIDUALS, SPECIAL INTEREST GROUPS, EDUCATION, OTHER): ECONOMICS AND GROWTH	JJ-444
TABLE JJ-12:	STAKEHOLDER COMMENTS (ELECTED OFFICIALS, TRIBES, FEDERAL AGENCIES, STATE AGENCIES, LOCAL AGENCIES): ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES.....	JJ-456
TABLE JJ-13:	STAKEHOLDER COMMENTS (INDIVIDUALS, SPECIAL INTEREST GROUPS, EDUCATION, OTHER): ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES.....	JJ-473
TABLE JJ-14:	STAKEHOLDER COMMENTS (ELECTED OFFICIALS, TRIBES, FEDERAL AGENCIES, STATE AGENCIES, LOCAL AGENCIES): CONSTRUCTION	JJ-504
TABLE JJ-15:	STAKEHOLDER COMMENTS (INDIVIDUALS, SPECIAL INTEREST GROUPS, EDUCATION, OTHER): CONSTRUCTION	JJ-505
TABLE JJ-16:	STAKEHOLDER COMMENTS (ELECTED OFFICIALS, TRIBES, FEDERAL AGENCIES, STATE AGENCIES, LOCAL AGENCIES): EVALUATION OF ALTERNATIVES.....	JJ-509
TABLE JJ-17:	STAKEHOLDER COMMENTS (INDIVIDUALS, SPECIAL INTEREST GROUPS, EDUCATION, OTHER): EVALUATION OF ALTERNATIVES	JJ-511
TABLE JJ-18:	STAKEHOLDER COMMENTS (ELECTED OFFICIALS, TRIBES, FEDERAL AGENCIES, STATE AGENCIES, LOCAL AGENCIES): PHASING AND IMPLEMENTATION	JJ-514
TABLE JJ-19:	STAKEHOLDER COMMENTS (INDIVIDUALS, SPECIAL INTEREST GROUPS, EDUCATION, OTHER): PHASING AND IMPLEMENTATION	JJ-518
TABLE JJ-20:	STAKEHOLDER COMMENTS (ELECTED OFFICIALS, TRIBES, FEDERAL AGENCIES, STATE AGENCIES, LOCAL AGENCIES): PUBLIC AND AGENCY OUTREACH.....	JJ-533
TABLE JJ-21:	STAKEHOLDER COMMENTS (INDIVIDUALS, SPECIAL INTEREST GROUPS, EDUCATION, OTHER): PUBLIC AND AGENCY OUTREACH	JJ-539
TABLE JJ-22:	STAKEHOLDER COMMENTS (ELECTED OFFICIALS, TRIBES, FEDERAL AGENCIES, STATE AGENCIES, LOCAL AGENCIES): SECTION 106/DRAFT PROGRAMMATIC AGREEMENT	JJ-566
TABLE JJ-23:	STAKEHOLDER COMMENTS (ELECTED OFFICIALS, TRIBES, FEDERAL AGENCIES, STATE AGENCIES, LOCAL AGENCIES): OTHER.....	JJ-572
TABLE JJ-24:	STAKEHOLDER COMMENTS (INDIVIDUALS, SPECIAL INTEREST GROUPS, EDUCATION, OTHER): OTHER.....	JJ-584
TABLE JJ-25:	STAKEHOLDER COMMENTS (ELECTED OFFICIALS, TRIBES, FEDERAL AGENCIES, STATE AGENCIES, LOCAL AGENCIES): PATUXENT WILDLIFE REFUGE	JJ-616
TABLE JJ-26:	STAKEHOLDER COMMENTS (INDIVIDUALS, SPECIAL INTEREST GROUPS, EDUCATION, OTHER): PATUXENT WILDLIFE REFUGE	JJ-617
TABLE JJ-27:	STAKEHOLDER COMMENTS (INDIVIDUALS, SPECIAL INTEREST GROUPS, EDUCATION, OTHER): BICYCLE ACCESS.....	JJ-632
TABLE JJ-28:	STAKEHOLDER COMMENTS (ELECTED OFFICIALS, TRIBES, FEDERAL AGENCIES, STATE AGENCIES, LOCAL AGENCIES): OLD LYME	JJ-638
TABLE JJ-29:	STAKEHOLDER COMMENTS (INDIVIDUALS, SPECIAL INTEREST GROUPS, EDUCATION, OTHER): OLD LYME	JJ-642

Appendix JJ. Comments and Responses

JJ.1 INTRODUCTION

As documented in Volume 1, Chapter 11, the FRA released the NEC FUTURE Tier 1 Draft Environmental Impact Statement (Tier 1 Draft EIS) and the Section 106 Draft Programmatic Agreement¹ in November 2015 to the public and established a public comment period that extended from November 13, 2015 to January 30, 2016. The Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) held 11 public hearings throughout the Study Area during the public comment period. During the public comment period, the FRA received requests to extend the public comment period. The FRA accommodated those requests by extending the public comment period to February 16, 2016.

Appendix JJ provides the comments received during the public comment period and the FRA's responses to those comments. It also documents the process to log and identify comments received during the public comment period.

JJ.1.1 Process

The FRA undertook a multistep process to log, parse, and respond to comments. As part of the comment period, the FRA received submissions from individuals, rail operators, agencies, elected officials, and advocacy groups. Submissions included any correspondence received by the FRA specifically on the Tier 1 Draft EIS during the public comment period. Submissions were transmitted to the FRA using various methods:

- ▶ **Web-form** accessed at www.necfuture.com
- ▶ **E-mail** submitted to comment@necfuture.com or info@necfuture.com, which may include attachments
- ▶ **Mail** (Regular, Express, or Priority) sent to One Bowling Green, New York, NY 10004.
- ▶ **Comment Card** submitted via mail or during a public hearing
- ▶ **Hearing Transcripts** of public hearings where the public and stakeholder groups were invited to comment on the Tier 1 Draft EIS (hearing transcripts were provided to the FRA via official transcriber in word format, and divided into multiple PDF documents, one for each speaker/commenter)
- ▶ **Other Hard Copies** included any other materials provided to the FRA, such as materials handed to the FRA during public hearings.

Throughout the comment period, the FRA monitored submissions daily. After the close of the comment period, the FRA continued to monitor for additional submissions. Each submission was logged into a database with a unique submission number and a commenter identification code. Each submission was reviewed for unique comments. Unique comments were then categorized by topic.

¹ The FRA is conducting a concurrent programmatic NEPA/Section 106 process for NEC FUTURE.

JJ.2 COMMENTER IDENTIFICATION

Commenter identifications were generated to identify multiple submissions that came from the same individual or agency. They were generated using the last name or the agency as noted in the examples below:

- ▶ Individuals: Lastname_Firstinitials (Smith_Su)
- ▶ Agencies: Acronym_Lastname (EPA_Jones)
- ▶ Anonymous: Anonymous_Consecutive Number (Anonymous_001)

Commenters were also grouped into the following commenter types:

- ▶ **Elected Officials**
- ▶ **Tribes**
- ▶ **Federal Agencies/Governments**
- ▶ **State Agencies/Governments**
- ▶ **Local/Regional Agencies/Governments** (municipalities, counties, metropolitan planning organizations/Council of Governments)
- ▶ **Passenger Rail/Transit/Amtrak**
- ▶ **Freight Rail**
- ▶ **Organizations/Special Interest Groups**
- ▶ **Education**
- ▶ **Other**
- ▶ **Individuals**

JJ.3 COMMENT CATEGORIES

When processing a submission, it was sometimes necessary to break up a submission into multiple comments. This process (referred to as “parsing”) subdivided the submission into individual comments. This task included identifying all of the unique comments from the submission and assigning one comment category. NEC FUTURE assigned comments to the following comment categories:

- ▶ **Purpose and Need:** policy issues and goals and objectives
- ▶ **Alternatives Considered:** support and opposition for the alternatives
- ▶ **Alternatives Related:** and specific features of the alternatives
- ▶ **Transportation:** other modes and mode choice
- ▶ **Economics and Growth:** jobs, growth, fares, indirect effects

- ▶ **Environmental Resources:** all of the resources addressed in Chapter 7 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS
- ▶ **Construction**
- ▶ **Evaluation of Alternatives:** selection of the Preferred Alternative
- ▶ **Phasing and Implementation:** financing and first phase
- ▶ **Public and Agency Outreach**
- ▶ **Section 106/Draft Programmatic Agreement:** consulting parties and state-specific appendices
- ▶ **Other**
- ▶ **Comments Related to Old Saybrook to Kenyon Bypass (Old Lyme CT)**

The FRA used these categories to organize the comments to identify trends and to develop responses. As explained below, they were also used to organize the responses in this appendix.

JJ.4 COMMENTER INDEX

The commenter index provides a list of all commenters, their stakeholder ID, and where their unique comments can be found. It is sorted by Last Name and/or Agency/Organization.

Individual comments are presented in two groups. The first group includes individual comments and responses and comprises the majority of the topics organized alphabetically by commenter identification (by last name, first name and/or agency).

The second group focuses on comments on three topics: 1) Pautuxent Wildlife Refuge; 2) bicycle access; and 3) the Old Saybrook-Kenyon new segment. The FRA developed a single response for each topic in this group.

Table JJ-1: Commenter Index

Last Name	First Name	Agency/Business/Organization	Stakeholder ID	Page
Aaron	Peter	Westchester Cycle Club	Aaron_Pe	JJ-632
Abagnaro	Sandra		Abagnaro_Sa	JJ-642
Aberbach	Sue		Aberbach_Su	JJ-642
Abrahamsson	Marilyn		Abrahamsson_Ma	JJ-642
Accettullo	Giancarlo		Accettullo_Gi	JJ-642
Aceto	Sharon	University of New Haven	Aceto_Sh	JJ-642
Achorn	Christina		Achorn_Ch	JJ-642
Acosta	Michael		Acosta_Mi	JJ-642
Adam-Kearns	Michael P.	citizen	Adam-Kearns_Mi	JJ-95, JJ-310, JJ-584
Adams	Cathleen		Adams_Ca	JJ-642
Adams	Daniel	University of New Haven Alumni	Adams_Da	JJ-642
Adams	Grace		Adams_Gr	JJ-584
Adams	Matt		Adams_Ma	JJ-95, JJ-632
Addamo	Ni		Addamo_Ni	JJ-96
Adinolfi	Suzanne		Adinolfi_Su	JJ-642
Agarwal	Nitin		Agarwal_Ni	JJ-617
Agenbroad	Michael		Agenbroad_Mi	JJ-642
Ahearn	Donn		Ahearn_Do	JJ-617
Akin	Joseph	UNH	Akin_Jo	JJ-642
Al Arkoubi	Khadija	University of New Haven	Al Arkoubi_Kh	JJ-642
Al Valente	Susan Bailey	Groton Business Association	Bailey_Valente	JJ-102, JJ-444, JJ-473, JJ-518
Alan	David Peter		Alan_Da	JJ-96, JJ-310, JJ-539
Alderson	George		Alderson_Ge	JJ-617
Aldieri	Jane		Aldieri_Ja	JJ-96, JJ-642
Alesia	Rebecca	Town Board of Oyster Bay	OysterBay_Alesia	JJ-303, JJ-470, JJ-579
Alex			Alex	JJ-642
Alexander	Eric		Alexander_Er	JJ-539
Alexander	Linda	Old Lyme - Phoebe Griffin Noyes Library	Alexander_Li	JJ-642
Alexander	Theresa		Alexander_Th	JJ-642
Alfano	Ralph		Alfano_Ra	JJ-642
Alharbi	Abdulsalam		Alharbi_Ab	JJ-642
Alison			Alison	JJ-642
Allen	Milton		Allen_Mi	JJ-97, JJ-642
Allen	Renée		Allen_Re	JJ-642
Allen	Theo		Allen_Th	JJ-97, JJ-310, JJ-311, JJ-473, JJ-505, JJ-584
Allison	Kaye		Allison_Ka	JJ-617
Allyn	Christian		Allyn_Ch	JJ-98, JJ-584
Alsharif	Sarah		Alsharif_Sa	JJ-642
Altamemi	Abdullah		Altamemi_Ab	JJ-642
Alvine	Robert	Chair Emeritus Univeristy of New Haven and Chair and CEO of	Alvine_Ro	JJ-98, JJ-643
Amacher	Charlene		Amacher_Ch	JJ-643
Amarato	Eddie		Amarato_Ed	JJ-539
Amento	Carl	South Central Regional Council of Governments	SCRCOG_Amento	JJ-65, JJ-90, JJ-91, JJ-305, JJ-443, JJ-472, JJ-582
Ames	Steven		Ames_St	JJ-643
Amico	Nicholas		Amico_Ni	JJ-643
Amyot	Leah		Amyot_Le	JJ-99, JJ-643

Table JJ–1: Commenter Index (continued)

Last Name	First Name	Agency/Business/Organization	Stakeholder ID	Page
Anastos	Sally	University of New Haven	Anastos_Sa	JJ-643
Andersen	Jeffrey	Florence Griswold Museum	Andersen_Je	JJ-643
Anderson	Dean	self	Anderson_De	JJ-99, JJ-311
Anderson	Geoffrey		Anderson_Ge	JJ-311, JJ-421, JJ-584
Anderson	Stephen		Anderson_St	JJ-643
Anderson	Sydeny		Anderson_Sy	JJ-643
Anderson-Bays	Janine		Anderson-Bays_Ja	JJ-99
Andrade	Flip		Andrade_Fl	JJ-643
Andres	Geo.		Andres_Ge	JJ-311
Angeles	Eduardo A.	U.S. DOT - FAA	USDOT-FAA_Angeles	JJ-92, JJ-93, JJ-306, JJ-307, JJ-420
Angerame	Erica		Angerame_Er	JJ-643
Angus	Norman		Angus_No	JJ-311, JJ-643
Anne Padullon	Clarena Tolson	City of Philadelphia	Philadelphia_Tolson_Padullon	JJ-84, JJ-304, JJ-536, JJ-580
Annino	James		Annino_Ja	JJ-643
Anthony	Timothy	Univesity of New Haven Alum	Anthony_Ti	JJ-643
Antonellis	Theresa	Gault Art Gallery	Antonellis_Th	JJ-643
Archer	Judith		Archer_Ju	JJ-643
Arena	Richard	Association for Public Transportation	Arena_Ri	JJ-66, JJ-100, JJ-101, JJ-311, JJ-312, JJ-313, JJ-421, JJ-444, JJ-511, JJ-518, JJ-584, JJ-585
Aridas	Donald		Aridas_Do	JJ-632
Arikan	Abdurrahman		Arikan_Ab	JJ-101
Armstrong	Susan		Armstrong_Su	JJ-643
Arneson	Erik		Arneson_Er	JJ-101, JJ-314
Arnold	Amy		Arnold_Am	JJ-643
Arnold	Christopher		Arnold_Ch	JJ-643
Aronow	Alan		Aronow_Al	JJ-102, JJ-540
Aronow	Myra		Aronow_My	JJ-585
Arron	Nina	City of New Rochelle	New Rochelle_Arron	JJ-81, JJ-302
Ascarelli	Silvia		Ascarelli_Si	JJ-102, JJ-421, JJ-632
Ash	Sheryl		Ash_Sh	JJ-643
Ashley	Ashley		Ashley	JJ-644
Astley	Anne		Astley_An	JJ-644
Astuti	Michelle		Astuti_Mi	JJ-102, JJ-540
Athanas	Dan		Athanas_Da	JJ-644
Atkinson	Cheryl		Atkinson_Ch	JJ-314
Austin, Sr.	John	Connecticut Commuter Rail Council	Austin_Jo	JJ-314, JJ-315
Averill	Ann		Averill_An	JJ-585
Avitable	Jay		Avitable_Ja	JJ-644
Ayers	Diane		Ayers_Di	JJ-644
Azar	Robert	City of Providence	Providence_Azar	JJ-84, JJ-85
Azimi	Saman	ConnPING	Azimi_Sa	JJ-585
Babiak	Kathy		Babiak_Ka	JJ-617
Babin	Peter		Babin_Pe	JJ-644
Bachman	Jane		Bachman_Ja	JJ-644
Baehr	Joseph		Baehr_Jo	JJ-617
Baehr	Rebecca		Baehr_Re	JJ-644
Baehr	Susan	Old Lyme Conservation Commission	Baehr_Su	JJ-644

Table JJ-1: Commenter Index (continued)

Last Name	First Name	Agency/Business/Organization	Stakeholder ID	Page
Baehr	Thomas		Baehr_Th	JJ-473, JJ-644
Baffaro	Joan		Baffaro_Jo	JJ-644
Baffaro	Tim		Baffaro_Ti	JJ-644
Bagwill	April		Bagwill_Ap	JJ-617
Bailey	Annor		Bailey_An	JJ-617
Bailey	Donna		Bailey_Do	JJ-315
Bair	Adam		Bair_Ad	JJ-102, JJ-103, JJ-315
Bair, Jr.	Glenn		Bair_Gl	JJ-644
Baker	David		Baker_Da	JJ-644
Baker	Jayson		Baker_Ja	JJ-644
Baker	Jeri		Baker_Je	JJ-644
Baker	Marcus	NARP Member, MBTA Advocate in Boston	Baker_Ma	JJ-315
Baker	Nadine		Baker_Na	JJ-585
Balascio	Laura		Balascio_La	JJ-617
Baldo	Renee	Unlimited Potential skin care studio	Baldo_Re	JJ-644
Ballachino	Mary		Ballachino_Ma	JJ-644
Ballard	Barbara		Ballard_Ba	JJ-644, JJ-645
Balsamo	Diane		Balsamo_Di	JJ-645
Banker	Skippy		Banker_Sk	JJ-645
Bannoura	Michelle		Bannoura_Mi	JJ-315
Banquer	Kyle		Banquer_Ky	JJ-103
Barber	Bruce	WNHU, University of New Haven	Barber_Br	JJ-645
Barclay	Nina		Barclay_Ni	JJ-645
Barker	Diane		Barker_Di	JJ-645
Barlow	Carlton & Leslie		Barlow_Ca	JJ-645
Barone	Richard	Regional Plan Association	Barone_Ri	JJ-103, JJ-104, JJ-105, JJ-316, JJ-444, JJ-445, JJ-519
Barreno	Nancy		Barreno_Na	JJ-105
Barrett	Kathleen		Barrett_Ka	JJ-105
Barri	Anthony		Barri_An	JJ-645
Barsky	Henry		Barsky_He	JJ-645
Bartlett	Stephen		Bartlett_St	JJ-645
Bartolini	Thomas P		Bartolini_Th	JJ-645
Barton	Sharon		Barton_Sh	JJ-645
Bartone	Karen	Eastern CT St University	Bartone_Ka	JJ-645
Bartosiewicz	Justin		Bartosiewicz_Ju	JJ-105, JJ-645
Baudouin	Daniel A.	The Providence Foundation	Baudouin_Da	JJ-106, JJ-317, JJ-445
Bauer	John		Bauer_Jo	JJ-645
Bauer	Kate		Bauer_Ka	JJ-645
Bauer	Laura		Bauer_La	JJ-107, JJ-540
Bauer	Mark		Bauer_Ma	JJ-645
Baummer	Tom		Baummer_To	JJ-617
Bausback-Aballo	Sandra		Bausback-Aballo_Sa	JJ-645
Beal	Barbara		Beal_Ba	JJ-645
Beale	Zoe		Beale_Zo	JJ-107, JJ-317, JJ-473
Bearse	Sherry		Bearse_Sh	JJ-645
Beaudoin	Marth		Beaudoin_Ma	JJ-645

Table JJ–1: Commenter Index (continued)

Last Name	First Name	Agency/Business/Organization	Stakeholder ID	Page
Beaudoin	Susan		Beaudoin_Su	JJ-645
Becerra	Kelly		Becerra_Ke	JJ-645
Becerra	Roland		Becerra_Ro	JJ-645
Bechtel	James		Bechtel_Ja	JJ-645
Beck	Barbara		Beck_Ba	JJ-617
Becker	Bruce	Empire State Passengers Association	Becker_Br	JJ-107, JJ-108, JJ-317, JJ-318, JJ-319, JJ-519, JJ-585
Becker	Carol		Becker_Ca	JJ-645
Becker	Ivan		Becker_Iv	JJ-108, JJ-319, JJ-586
Bedard	Emily	Bedard Studio	Bedard_Em	JJ-645
Beers	Judith		Beers_Ju	JJ-645
Beglin	Cynthia		Beglin_Cy	JJ-646
Behringer	Fred		Behringer_Fr	JJ-109, JJ-586, JJ-646
Belanger	Dennis		Belanger_De	JJ-109
Belemlih	Halima	New Haven University	Belemlih_Ha	JJ-646
Belini	Kyrsten	Alumni of University of New Haven	Belini_Ky	JJ-646
Bell	James Tyler		Bell_Ja	JJ-617
Bell	Wendy		Bell_We	JJ-319, JJ-586
Bellows	Brad	Association for Public Transit	Bellows_Br	JJ-320
Belmer	Merrill		Belmer_Me	JJ-646
Belmer, Jr.	Charles		Belmer_Ch	JJ-646
Belton	Noel		Belton_No	JJ-646
Benbow	Juanita		Benbow_Ju	JJ-646
Benjamin	August		Benjamin_Au	JJ-109
Bennett	Heather S.		Bennett_He	JJ-321, JJ-646
Bennett	Richard		Bennett_Ri	JJ-646
Bension	Rouvain M.		Bension_Ro	JJ-321
Bentley	Kathleen M.		Bentley_Ka	JJ-617
Bentley	Lyn		Bentley_Ly	JJ-617
Bento	Debra		Bento_De	JJ-646
Benyus	Diane	The Anne Arundel Bird Club	Benyus_Di	JJ-618
Berbari	Jillian		Berbari_Ji	JJ-110
Berblum	Bennett		Berblum_Be	JJ-646
Bergami Jr.	Samuel S.		Bergami_Sa	JJ-646
Bergfels	Dorothy		Bergfels_Do	JJ-321
Berglund	Daniel		Berglund_Da	JJ-646
Bergmans	Rudolf		Bergmans_Rud	JJ-646
Bergmans	Ruud		Bergmans_Ruu	JJ-646
Bergquist	Sharon and Carl W.		Bergquist_Sh	JJ-646
Berka	George		Berka_Ge	JJ-421
Bernadzikowski	Frank		Bernadzikowski_Fr	JJ-618
Bernstein	Adele		Bernstein_Ad	JJ-646
Berry	Bill & Bonnie		Berry_BB	JJ-618
Berry	Jeff		Berry_Je	JJ-647
Berry	Katharine & Charles		Berry_Ka	JJ-647
Berry	Loretta		Berry_Lo	JJ-647
Berry	Sarah		Berry_Sa	JJ-110

Table JJ-1: Commenter Index (continued)

Last Name	First Name	Agency/Business/Organization	Stakeholder ID	Page
Berthet	Christine	Manhattan Community Board 4	Berthet_Ch	JJ-586
Bertolini	Maryjane		Bertolini_Ma	JJ-647
Besette	Stephen		Besette_St	JJ-322, JJ-519, JJ-647
Betten	Florence		Betten_Fl	JJ-647
Bettley	Debra		Bettley_De	JJ-647
Bevington	Phyllis		Bevington_Ph	JJ-647
Biagioni	William	Resident	Biagioni_Wi	JJ-111
Bianca	Bianca		Bianca	JJ-647
Bick	Tammy		Bick-Ta	JJ-587
Bidolli	Brian	METROCOG - Connecticut Metropolitan Council of Governments	MetroCOG_Bidolli	JJ-516, JJ-577
Bielski	Diane		Bielski_Di	JJ-647
Bielski	Stanley		Bielski_St	JJ-647
Bienia	David		Bienia_Da	JJ-647
Bieniewicz	Patrica		Bieniewicz_Pa	JJ-647
Bigelow	Cynthia	Bigelow Tea	Bigelow_Cy	JJ-647
Biggart	Joy		Biggart_Jo	JJ-473
Billiau	Christopher		Billiau_Ch	JJ-647
Bilotto	Patty		Bilotto_Pa	JJ-647
Bilumane	Preetham		Bilumane_Pr	JJ-647
Bingham	David	retired	Bingham_Da	JJ-647
Bingham	Lucretia		Bingham_Lu	JJ-647
Bingham	Russell		Bingham_Ru	JJ-647
Birdsell	Regina		Birdsell_Re	JJ-647
Birdsell	William		Birdsell_Wi	JJ-648
Birdsey	David		Birdsey_Da	JJ-474
Birkic	Cristina		Birkic_Cr	JJ-648
Birkic	David		Birkic_Da	JJ-648
Bjerke	John		Bjerke_Jo	JJ-618
Bjorkman	Michelle		Bjorkman_Mi	JJ-648
Black	Peter	Branford RTM	Black_Pe	JJ-111, JJ-112
Blader	Dennis	University of New Haven	Blader_De	JJ-648
Blair	Marie		Blair_Ma	JJ-648
Blake	Chandler		Blake_Ch	JJ-648
Blakeney	Lorraine	Quality Parks Organization	Blakeney_Lo	JJ-474
Blaskovich	Jennifer	Outthink	Blaskovich_Je	JJ-648
Block	Sherry		Block_Sh	JJ-648
Bloom	Tom and Jean		Bloom_To	JJ-648
Bloustine	Karen		Bloustine_Ka	JJ-648
Blume	Frank		Blume_Fr	JJ-112
Boales	Raleigh		Boales_Ra	JJ-648
Boardman	Joseph H.	Amtrak	Amtrak_Boardman	JJ-71, JJ-72, JJ-292, JJ-293, JJ-294, JJ-410, JJ-441, JJ-572
Bocian	David		Bocian_Da	JJ-648
Bocian	Rebecca		Bocian_Re	JJ-648
Bodor	Chris		Bodor_Ch	JJ-648
Bohlander	Jane		Bohlander_Ja	JJ-618
Bombassei	Susan		Bombassei_Su	JJ-112

Table JJ–1: Commenter Index (continued)

Last Name	First Name	Agency/Business/Organization	Stakeholder ID	Page
Bond	Christine		Bond_Ch	JJ-648
Bondarenko	Dorothy		Bondarenko_Do	JJ-648
Bonfiglio	Thomas	University of New Haven Alum	Bonfiglio_Th	JJ-649
Bonomo	Francis	UNH Alumni	Bonomo_Fr	JJ-649
Bonomo	Nick		Bonomo_Ni	JJ-112, JJ-474, JJ-587
Book	Gregory		Book_Gr	JJ-112
Borie Wood	Martha		Borie Wood_Ma	JJ-649
Boro	Gilbert	Studio 80 + Sculpture Grounds	Boro_Gi	JJ-649
Borton	Rebecca		Borton_Re	JJ-113, JJ-649
Bosco	Robert		Bosco_Ro	JJ-649
Bottinelli-Gada	Eloise		Bottinelli-Gada_El	JJ-113, JJ-649
Botzman	Harvey	New York Bicycling Coalition	Botzman_Ha	JJ-445
Bouchard	Joan M.		Bouchard_Jo	JJ-649
Bouchard	Tara		Bouchard-Ta	JJ-649
Bourdon	Robert		Bourdon_Ro	JJ-618
Bourget	Amy		Bourget_Am	JJ-322
Bourgoin	Loree		Bourgoin_Lo	JJ-649
Bourque	Carey		Bourque_Ca	JJ-649
Bourque	David		Bourque_Da	JJ-113, JJ-649
Bousquet	Danielle	University of Connecticut	Bousquet_Da	JJ-114
Bowers	Dana		Bowers_Da	JJ-322
Boyle	Doe		Boyle_Do	JJ-649
Boyle	Roxanne		Boyle_Ro	JJ-618
Bradley	Ched		Bradley_Ch	JJ-618
Brainard	Mary		Brainard_Ma	JJ-649
Brainerd	Wendy		Brainerd_We	JJ-649
Branchini	Ann		Branchini_An	JJ-114, JJ-649
Brash	Alexander R.	The Connecticut Audubon Society	Brash_AI	JJ-474, JJ-475, JJ-540, JJ-649
Brassard	Peter		Brassard_Pe	JJ-114, JJ-115, JJ-116, JJ-322, JJ-323, JJ-324, JJ-325, JJ-445, JJ-519
Brassell, Jr.	Robert	Delois Albert Brassell Estate (CAGE Code 5PAZ8)	Brassell_Ro	JJ-587
Bravo	Cynthia		Bravo_Cy	JJ-618
Breault	Ron		Breault_Ro	JJ-649
Breeding	Anne		Breeding_An	JJ-649
Breeding	Robin		Breeding_Ro	JJ-649, JJ-650
Breen	Rob		Breen_Ro	JJ-650
Brekke	Gail		Brekke_Ga	JJ-650
Bremer	Mark	Resident of CT	Bremer_Ma	JJ-587
Brenda	Brenda		Brenda	JJ-116
Brengel	David		Brengel_Da	JJ-116
Brennan	Timothy W.	Pioneer Valley Planning Commission	PVPC_Brennan	JJ-86, JJ-87, JJ-88, JJ-304, JJ-420, JJ-470, JJ-471, JJ-510, JJ-580, JJ-581
Brennen	Lyle		Brennen_Ly	JJ-116
Brenner	Eric		Brenner_Er	JJ-325
Breunig	Roger	Old Lyme Historical Society Trustee	Breunig_Ro	JJ-650
Breunig	Sandra		Breunig_Sa	JJ-650
Briggs	Nancy		Briggs_Na	JJ-650
Briggs	Thomas	University of Connecticut	Briggs_Th	JJ-117, JJ-422

Table JJ-1: Commenter Index (continued)

Last Name	First Name	Agency/Business/Organization	Stakeholder ID	Page
Brill	Linda		Brill_Li	JJ-650
Briscoe	Chip		Briscoe_Ch	JJ-475, JJ-650
Brock	Alexandra		Brock_AI	JJ-650
Broder	Jonathan M.	Consolidated Rail Corporation	CONRAIL_Broder	JJ-411, JJ-412, JJ-413, JJ-574
Broderick	Deanna		Broderick_De	JJ-650
Bromberger	Lee		Bromberger_Le	JJ-618
Bronk	Paige	Town of Groton	Groton_Bronk	JJ-76, JJ-77, JJ-300, JJ-416, JJ-515, JJ-535, JJ-576
Brown	Christopher		Brown_Ch	JJ-650
Brown	Jessica		Brown_Je	JJ-650
Brown	Judith		Brown_Ju	JJ-325
Brown	Linda K.		Brown_Li	JJ-618
Brown	Mahoganie		Brown_Ma	JJ-650
Brown	Robert		Brown_Ro	JJ-325, JJ-326, JJ-587
Brown	Winston		Brown_Wi	JJ-650
Brown, Ph.D.	B. Ricardo		Brown_Ri	JJ-117
Brubaker	Ann		Brubaker_An	JJ-650
Bruhl	Christopher	The Business Council of Fairfield County	Bruhl_Ch	JJ-118, JJ-326, JJ-540, JJ-587
Brunau	Chris		Brunau_Ch	JJ-118
Bruno	Gwen		Bruno_Gw	JJ-119, JJ-326, JJ-650
Bu Khamsin	Khalid	University of New Haven (Graduate Assistant)	Bu Khamsin_Kh	JJ-650
Bucci	Michael		Bucci_Mi	JJ-618
Buchberger	Irmtraut		Buchberger_Ir	JJ-650
Bucior	Mike		Bucior_Mi	JJ-650
Buckingham	Duanes	Citizen	Buckingham_Du	JJ-650
Bucknall	William	University of New Haven	Bucknall_Wi	JJ-651
Budas	Orest		Budas_Or	JJ-651
Bugarchich	Tamara		Bugarchich-Ta	JJ-651
Bugge	Steven		Bugge_St	JJ-446, JJ-587
Buitron	Shirley		Buitron_Sh	JJ-651
Bukowski	Paul		Bukowski_Pa	JJ-326
Bullock	Charles	NARP - Member	Bullock_Ch	JJ-119, JJ-326, JJ-327
Bulmer	Bill and Lynda		Bulmer_Bi	JJ-618
Bundschuh	Kellie		Bundschuh_Ke	JJ-651
Burdeshaw	Jon		Burdeshaw_Jo	JJ-651
Burgess	Brad		Burgess_Br	JJ-422
Burgess	Todd		Burgess_To	JJ-651
Burghardt	Charles		Burghardt_Ch	JJ-587
Burke	Helen		Burke_He	JJ-119, JJ-446, JJ-651
Burke	Jennifer		Burke_Je	JJ-651
Burnley	Champe	Virginia Bicycling Foundation	Burnley_Ch	JJ-632
Burns	Dolly		Burns_Do	JJ-542, JJ-651
Burns	Mary		Burns_Ma	JJ-327
Burramukku	Naveen	University of New Haven	Burramukku_Na	JJ-651
Burridge	Kellie	UNH	Burridge_Ke	JJ-651
Burt	Harold		Burt_Ha	JJ-651
Burtis	Tara	University of New Haven	Burtis-Ta	JJ-651

Table JJ–1: Commenter Index (continued)

Last Name	First Name	Agency/Business/Organization	Stakeholder ID	Page
Bush	Bambi-Lynne		Bush_Ba	JJ-651
Bushley	David		Bushley_Da	JJ-651
Businger	John	National Corridors Institute	Businger_Jo	JJ-66, JJ-327, JJ-476
Buteau	Gary	DOMUS Realtors	Buteau_Ga	JJ-651
Butler	Karen		Butler_Ka	JJ-119
Butler	Randy		Butler_Ra	JJ-328
Buttrick	Brian		Buttrick_Br	JJ-120, JJ-476, JJ-651
Byrne	Jessica		Byrne_Je	JJ-328
Byron	Daphne		Byron_Da	JJ-618
C	Joseph		C_Jo	JJ-651
C	Paul		C_PA	JJ-120
Cable	Peter		Cable_Pe	JJ-328, JJ-651
Cabral	Michelle		Cabral_Mi	JJ-651
Caccavale	Laura		Caccavale_La	JJ-651
Cadogdazed			Cadogdazed	JJ-618
Cady	James		Cady_Ja	JJ-652
Caffey	Walter	University of New Haven	Caffey_Wa	JJ-652
Cahill	Nancy		Cahill_Na	JJ-652
Cahill	Regina		Cahill_Re	JJ-652
Cahouet	Katherine		Cahouet_Ka	JJ-476
Cahouet Fulreader	Cynthia		Cahouet Fulreader_Cy	JJ-652
Cairns	Kathleen		Cairns_Ka	JJ-652
Calabrese	Paula		Calabrese_Pa	JJ-652
Calatayud	Sarah		Calatayud_Sa	JJ-652
Caldwell	Lauren		Caldwell_La	JJ-652
Callahan	Tim		Callahan_Ti	JJ-652
Callan	Lyn		Callan_Ly	JJ-476
Callicrate	Tayor		Callicrate-Ta	JJ-619
Camean	Holly		Camean_Ho	JJ-328, JJ-652
Camero	Daniel		Camero_Da	JJ-632
Campanelli	Lena		Campanelli_Le	JJ-422
Campbell	Christine		Campbell_Ch	JJ-652
Campbell	Joanne	UNH parent	Campbell_Jo	JJ-652
Campo	Rich		Campo_Ri	JJ-121
Campos	Gabriela		Campos_Ga	JJ-476
Cann	Terry		Cann_Te	JJ-652
Cantner	Shay		Cantner_Sh	JJ-328, JJ-652
Cantrell	Helen		Cantrell_He	JJ-652
Caporale	Lynn		Caporale_Ly	JJ-632
Caporale	Matthew		Caporale_Ma	JJ-652
Cappello	Beverly		Cappello_Be	JJ-652
Cappello	Dominick		Cappello_Do	JJ-652
Caracciolo	Daniel		Caracciolo_Da	JJ-121, JJ-329, JJ-542
Carbone	Vincent		Carbone_Vi	JJ-121, JJ-329, JJ-505, JJ-588
Carella	Richard	New Haven Chamber of Commerce	Carella_Ri	JJ-121, JJ-122, JJ-329, JJ-446
Carey	Dylan	Pratt Institute Graduate Center for Planning and the Environ	Carey_Dy	JJ-122, JJ-329, JJ-446

Table JJ-1: Commenter Index (continued)

Last Name	First Name	Agency/Business/Organization	Stakeholder ID	Page
Carey	John		Carey_Jo	JJ-652
Carignan sr.	Bob		CarignanSr_Bo	JJ-329
Carija	Marie		Carija_Ma	JJ-652
Carija	Suzy		Carija_Su	JJ-122
Carija	Virginia		Carija_Vi	JJ-652
Carley	Robert		Carley_Ro	JJ-123, JJ-330, JJ-542
Carley	William		Carley_Wi	JJ-652
Carlile	Amy	University of New Haven	Carlile_Am	JJ-652
Carlson	Alex		Carlson_Al	JJ-422
Carlson	Carol		Carlson_Ca	JJ-653
Carlson	Izabelle	Lyme Academy	Carlson_Iz	JJ-476
Carlson	Linda		Carlson_Li	JJ-653
Carlson	Zoe	Lyme Academy	Carlson_Zo	JJ-653
Carney	Devin	Twenty-Third Assembly District	CT Representative_Carney	JJ-638
Carolyn			Carolyn	JJ-330
Carosella	Ernest		Carosella_Er	JJ-653
Carr	Jennifer	University of New Haven	Carr_Je	JJ-653
Carreras	Ramon		Carreras_Ra	JJ-123
Cartland	Jennifer		Cartland_Je	JJ-653
Caruso	Joan		Caruso_Jo	JJ-653
Caruso	Nicholas		Caruso_Ni	JJ-330, JJ-477
Carver	Gary		Carver_Ga	JJ-330, JJ-477, JJ-588
Casey	Carolyn		Casey_Ca	JJ-588, JJ-619, JJ-653
Casinghino	Michael		Casinghino_Mi	JJ-653
Caspers	Kyle		Caspers_Ky	JJ-653
Cassella	Pasquale		Cassella_Pa	JJ-653
Cassidy	James		Cassidy_Ja	JJ-123, JJ-124, JJ-125, JJ-330, JJ-331, JJ-423, JJ-477, JJ-542, JJ-588
Castellan	Susan		Castellan_Su	JJ-126, JJ-477, JJ-653
Castellano	Eilen		Castellano_Ei	JJ-126
Castiglioni	Steven	Executive Strategies Group	Castiglioni_St	JJ-331
Castonguay	Chrisitne		Castonguay_Ch	JJ-653
Castonguay	Jack		Castonguay_Ja	JJ-653
Castonguay	Max		Castonguay_Ma	JJ-653
Castonguay	Patrick		Castonguay_Pa	JJ-332, JJ-632
Caulfield	Christopher		Caulfield_Ch	JJ-332, JJ-653
Caulfield	Sharon		Caulfield_Sh	JJ-477, JJ-653
Caulkins	Althea		Caulkins_Al	JJ-653
Cavanaugh	Kenneth		Cavanaugh_Ke	JJ-653
Cdelbuono			Cdelbuono	JJ-653
Cecil	Charles		Cecil_Ch	JJ-588
Celone	Jim	UNH	Celone_Ji	JJ-653
Cephas	Rebecca		Cephas_Re	JJ-653
Cerniglia	Richard		Cerniglia_Ri	JJ-654
Cerrone	Bruno		Cerrone_Br	JJ-126, JJ-423, JJ-588
Cerrone	Mandi		Cerrone_Ma	JJ-126, JJ-543
Ceruzzi	Frank		Ceruzzi_Fr	JJ-654

Table JJ–1: Commenter Index (continued)

Last Name	First Name	Agency/Business/Organization	Stakeholder ID	Page
Cervero	Marie		Cervero_Ma	JJ-654
Chakravaram	Vishnu		Chakravaram_Vi	JJ-654
Chambers	Herb		Chambers_He	JJ-654
Champagne	Maryanne		Champagne_Ma	JJ-126
Chan	Francis		Chan_Fr	JJ-127, JJ-654
Chandra	Barun		Chandra_Ba	JJ-654
Chandy	Binu	Department of Economic and Community Development	CT DECD_Chandy	JJ-74, JJ-415, JJ-416, JJ-514
Chapman	Ha		Chapman_Ha	JJ-654
Chapman	Judith		Chapman_Ju	JJ-654
Chapman	Raphael		Chapman_Ra	JJ-332
Charney	Robin		Charney_Ro	JJ-654
Chartier	Wade		Chartier_Wa	JJ-654
Chase	David		Chase_Da	JJ-127, JJ-128, JJ-332, JJ-520
Chasson	Margaret		Chasson_Ma	JJ-619
Chaucer	Timothy	Milford Marine Institute, Inc.	Chaucer_Ti	JJ-128, JJ-477
Chavent Morgan	Georgia	University of New Haven	Chavent Morgan_Ge	JJ-654
Cherry	Carol		Cherry_Ca	JJ-654
Cheshire	Eva		Cheshire_Ev	JJ-520
Chesmer	Robin	Graywall Farms	Chesmer_Ro	JJ-128
Chesnutt	Jane		Chesnutt_Ja	JJ-654
Chester	Scott	None	Chester_Sc	JJ-543
Chiaraluce	Michele		Chiaraluce_Mi	JJ-446
Childs	Elsie C.		Childs_El	JJ-654
Childs	Hannah		Childs_Ha	JJ-128, JJ-446, JJ-478, JJ-654
Childs	James		Childs_Ja	JJ-654
Childs	Sam		Childs_Sa	JJ-654
Childs	Susan		Childs_Su	JJ-588
Chin	Deborah		Chin_De	JJ-654
Chinatti	MaryAnn		Chinatti_Ma	JJ-129, JJ-654
Chinatti	MaryAnn	Town of Thompson	Thompson_Chinatti	JJ-92, JJ-537
Chmiel	Carol		Chmiel_Ca	JJ-654
Chonka	Melissa		Chonka_Me	JJ-332
Chowdhury	Akmam	University of New Haven	Chowdhury_Ak	JJ-654
Christiano	Catherine		Christiano_Ca	JJ-129, JJ-654
Christiano	John		Christiano_Jo	JJ-655
Christie	Leslie		Christie_Le	JJ-655
Christison	Rosamund		Christison_Ro	JJ-655
Chukwu	Oni		Chukwu_On	JJ-655
Churchill	John B.		Churchill_Jo	JJ-619
Ciaburri	Leonard	UNH Alumni	Ciaburri_Le	JJ-655
Ciaglo	Tadria		Ciaglo_Ti	JJ-655
Cianfaglione	Michael		Cianfaglione_Mi	JJ-655
Ciccone	MaryAnn		Ciccone_Ma	JJ-655
Ciccone	Thomas		Ciccone_Th	JJ-655
Cieplak	Joseph		Cieplak_Jo	JJ-655
Cirone	Carla		Cirone_Ca	JJ-130, JJ-655

Table JJ-1: Commenter Index (continued)

Last Name	First Name	Agency/Business/Organization	Stakeholder ID	Page
Citron	Craig		Citron_Cr	JJ-655
Clark	Annie		Clark_An	JJ-655
Clark	Dawn		Clark_Da	JJ-655
Clark	Deann	University of New Haven Alumni	Clark_De	JJ-655
Clark	Kristen		Clark_Kr	JJ-655
Clark	Lisa		Clark_Li	JJ-333, JJ-655
Clarke	Jeff		Clarke_Je	JJ-333, JJ-655
Clarke	Julie		Clarke_Ju	JJ-655
Clarke	Kay		Clarke_Ka	JJ-655
Clayton	Christina	Old Lyme Land Trust	Clayton_Ch	JJ-655, JJ-656
Cleary	David		Cleary_Da	JJ-130, JJ-656
Clement	Meghan		Clement_Me	JJ-656
Clement	Peter	Clement Architects	Clement_Pe	JJ-656
Clift	Joseph		Clift_Jo	JJ-333, JJ-543
Clinton	Bruce		Clinton_Br	JJ-656
Coady	Roxanne		Coady_Ro	JJ-656
Cocks	Ann		Cocks_An	JJ-656
Cody	Caitlyn		Cody_Ca	JJ-656
Cohen	Avner		Cohen_Av	JJ-656
Cohen	Shlomi		Cohen_Sh	JJ-656
Colangelo	Christopher		Colangelo_Ch	JJ-656
Colberg	James		Colberg_Ja	JJ-656
Colbert	Raymond		Colbert_Ra	JJ-589
Colburn	Robert B.		Colburn_Ro	JJ-656
Cole	Abby Ann		Cole_Ab	JJ-656
Cole	Helena		Cole_He	JJ-656
Cole	Stuart	Citizens for Amtrak	Cole_St	JJ-333, JJ-334, JJ-335, JJ-423
Colin			Colin	JJ-619
Collagan	Pamela		Collagan_Pa	JJ-656
Colley	Barbara		Colley_Ba	JJ-656
Collins	Jack		Collins_Ja	JJ-511, JJ-544, JJ-657
Collins	Jean	University of New Haven	Collins_Je	JJ-657
Collins	Joe		Collins_Jo	JJ-335
Collins	Linda		Collins_Li	JJ-657
Collins	Susan		Collins_Su	JJ-657
Colon	Jose		Colon_Jo	JJ-657
Colten-Carey	Susanne		Colten-Carey_Su	JJ-657
Colvin	Sharon		Colvin_Sh	JJ-130
Colwell	Mona		Colwell_Mo	JJ-657
Comins	Patrick	Audubon Connecticut	Comins_Pa	JJ-335, JJ-478, JJ-479, JJ-505, JJ-589
Condon	Nancy	1951	Condon_Na	JJ-657
Condron	Delphine		Condron_De	JJ-657
Congdon	Robert		Congdon_Ro	JJ-657
Conklin	Edmund		Conklin_Ed	JJ-131, JJ-657
Conklin	Janet		Conklin_Ja	JJ-657
Conlin	Edward		Conlin_Ed	JJ-657

Table JJ–1: Commenter Index (continued)

Last Name	First Name	Agency/Business/Organization	Stakeholder ID	Page
Conlon	Christine		Conlon_Ch	JJ-131
Connolly	Justin		Connolly_Ju	JJ-132, JJ-423
Conoscenti	Paula		Conoscenti_Pa	JJ-619
Conroy	Rich		Conroy_Ri	JJ-632
Cook	Elizabeth		Cook_El	JJ-657
Cooley	Ben		Cooley_Ben	JJ-132
Cooley	Betsey	The Cooley Gallery	Cooley_Bet	JJ-657
Cooper	Robert		Cooper_Ro	JJ-657
Copp	Al		Copp_Al	JJ-619
Copp	Eugenie	Old Lyme Historical Association	Copp_Eu	JJ-657
Corbett	Jen		Corbett_Jen	JJ-335
Corbitt	Bryan		Corbitt_Br	JJ-335
Corcoran	Maureen		Corcoran_Ma	JJ-589
Cordock	Anna		Cordock_An	JJ-657
Cordsen	Richard		Cordsen_Ri	JJ-657
Cornaglia	Francine		Cornaglia_Fr	JJ-132
Cornell	Brian		Cornell_Br	JJ-657
Corrao	Maria		Corrao_Ma	JJ-132
Cosgrove	Judith		Cosgrove_Ju	JJ-133
Coudert	Hobby		Coudert_Ho	JJ-335, JJ-446, JJ-589
Coursey	Calvin E.		Coursey_Ca	JJ-619
Court	Tanya	Business Council of Fairfield County	Court-Ta	JJ-133, JJ-134, JJ-135, JJ-336, JJ-479
Courtney	Timothy		Courtney_Ti	JJ-135, JJ-632
Cowan	Tristan		Cowan_Tr	JJ-657
Cowell	Chrissy		Cowell_Ch	JJ-658
Cox	Alexandra		Cox_Al	JJ-658
Cox	Mary Anne		Cox_Ma	JJ-658
Coyle	Magda		Coyle_Ma	JJ-136, JJ-544
Coyne	Susan		Coyne_Su	JJ-658
Crabb	Andrew		Crabb_An	JJ-619
Crafa	Lorilee		Crafa_Lo	JJ-136, JJ-544
Crail	K		Crail_K	JJ-136, JJ-423
Cramond	Donna	NMH alumna	Cramond_Do	JJ-658
Cremin	Leigh		Cremin_Le	JJ-658
Crisp	Sarah		Crisp_Sa	JJ-658
Critchett	Donald	Retired	Critchett_Do	JJ-658
Critchett	Jane		Critchett_Ja	JJ-658
Crosnier	Andrea		Crosnier_An	JJ-658
Cruz	Enrique	Lambda Alpha Upsilon Fraternity Inc	Cruz_En	JJ-658
Cruz	Kristen		Cruz_Kr	JJ-658
CT Resident	Concerned		CT Resident_Co	JJ-658
Cuddeback	Kevin		Cuddeback_Ke	JJ-520
Cummings	Eileen		Cummings_Ei	JJ-658
Cummiskey	Susan		Cummiskey_Su	JJ-658
Cunningham	Deborah		Cunningham_De	JJ-619
Cunningham	Mack		Cunningham_Mac	JJ-136

Table JJ–1: Commenter Index (continued)

Last Name	First Name	Agency/Business/Organization	Stakeholder ID	Page
Cunningham	Margaret		Cunningham_Mar	JJ-658
Cuozzo	Kathryn		Cuozzo_Ka	JJ-658
Cupper	Dan		Cupper_Da	JJ-336
Curson, Ph.D.	David	Audubon Maryland-DC	Curson_Da	JJ-479, JJ-619, JJ-620
Curtis	William Blair		Curtis_Wi	JJ-620
Curtiss	Alan		Curtiss_Al	JJ-336, JJ-658
Curtiss	Theone		Curtiss_Th	JJ-658
Cuthbert	Mary		Cuthbert_Ma	JJ-136, JJ-590
Cwi	Joan	Baltimore Bird Club	Cwi_Jo	JJ-620
Czepiel	Anne	Florence Griswold Museum	Czepiel_An	JJ-658
Dailey	Jean		Dailey_Je	JJ-659
Daisey	Paula	University of New Haven	Daisey_Pa	JJ-659
Dale	Alexander	Engineers for a Sustainable World	Dale_Al	JJ-137, JJ-336
Dalton	John		Dalton_Jo	JJ-659
Daly	Lorraine		Daly_Lo	JJ-137, JJ-545
Damato	Jennifer		Damato_Je	JJ-659
Damato	Scott		Damato_Sc	JJ-659
Danaf	Aref		Danaf_Ar	JJ-659
Danenhower	Sloan		Danenhower_Sl	JJ-659
Daneshfar	Dr. Alireza		Daneshfar_Al	JJ-659
Dangremond	Mary	Citizen of Old Lyme	Dangremond_Ma	JJ-659
Dangremond	Sam		Dangremond_Sa	JJ-659
Darin	Anita		Darin_An	JJ-659
Darmon	Sue	William Pitt Sotheby's	Darmon_Su	JJ-659
Davey	Nyle		Davey_Ny	JJ-659
Davidson	Abby		Davidson_Ab	JJ-659
Davidson	Nicholas		Davidson_Ni	JJ-659
Davidson	Patricia		Davidson_Pa	JJ-659
Davidson Cragoe	Carol		Davidson Cragoe_Ca	JJ-137, JJ-659
Davie	Michael		Davie_Mi	JJ-620
Davies	Judith		Davies_Ju	JJ-137
Davies Kane	Carol		Davies Kane_Ca	JJ-659
Davis	Caryn		Davis_Ca	JJ-590
Davis	Earl		Davis_Ea	JJ-659
Davis	Harcourt W.		Davis_Ha	JJ-337, JJ-479, JJ-480, JJ-659, JJ-660
Davis	Jeremiah	School of the Art Institute of Chicago	Davis_Je	JJ-660
Davis	John		Davis_Jo	JJ-660
Davis	Karen		Davis_Ka	JJ-620
Davis	Pam		Davis_Pa	JJ-660
Davis	Robert		Davis_Rob	JJ-545, JJ-660
Davis	Ron		Davis_Ron	JJ-620
Davis	Saul		Davis_Sa	JJ-337, JJ-423, JJ-480, JJ-590
Davis	Steven		Davis_St	JJ-137, JJ-138, JJ-660
De Leon	Albert		De Leon_Al	JJ-66
De Loach	Antoine		De Loach_An	JJ-660
de Selding	Ann		de Selding_An	JJ-660

Table JJ–1: Commenter Index (continued)

Last Name	First Name	Agency/Business/Organization	Stakeholder ID	Page
Deak	Kristen		Deak_Kr	JJ-660
Dean	Francine		Dean_Fr	JJ-138, JJ-660
Dean			Dean	JJ-138, JJ-660, JJ-680
DeBernardo	Paul	UNH Class of 1965	DeBernardo_Pa	JJ-138
Debisschop	Mark		Debisschop_Ma	JJ-660
DeBlasiis	Susan		DeBlasiis_Su	JJ-660
DeBruyn	Elissa		DeBruyn_El	JJ-660
DeGray	Ronald		DeGray_Ro	JJ-337
Degray	Ronaldo		Degray_Ro	JJ-337
Deignan	Sarah		Deignan_Sa	JJ-660
Delaney	Maud		Delaney_Ma	JJ-545, JJ-590
Delayo	Anna-Lee	1961	Delayo_An	JJ-660
DeLena	Gennaro		DeLena_Ge	JJ-138
Delgafo	Siciliana	Liana Delgado Art Studio/Gallery	Delgafo_Si	JJ-660
Delinks	Charles		Delinks_Ch	JJ-660
DeLopez	Geraldine		DeLopez_Ge	JJ-660
DeMarco	Joe		DeMarco_Jo	JJ-660
DeMasi	Frank	Association for Public Transportation	DeMasi_Fr	JJ-338
Dement	Don		Dement_Do	JJ-620
DeMent	Tammy Leigh	Pennsylvania Horticultural Society	DeMent-Ta	JJ-480
Demery	Michelle		Demery_Mi	JJ-660
Dempsey	Elizabeth	Lyme Academy Alumni	Dempsey_El	JJ-660
Denkowicz	Stephanie		Denkowicz_St	JJ-660
Denorio	Lawrence		Denorio_La	JJ-446, JJ-480
Denya	Roberta		Denya_Ro	JJ-590
DeRisio	Margaret Jane		DeRisio_Ma	JJ-545, JJ-660
DeRoche	Stephanie	American Institute for Electric Transportation and Graviton	DeRoche_St	JJ-338, JJ-424
DeSantis	Tony		DeSantis_To	JJ-338
Desi	Elizabeth		Desi_El	JJ-661
Desillier	Elene		Desillier_El	JJ-661
DeSimone	Bob		DeSimone_Bo	JJ-139
DesJardins	Zack		DesJardins_Za	JJ-339, JJ-340, JJ-511
Destantis	Tony		Destantis_To	JJ-340, JJ-424
Deutermann	Diana		Deutermann_Di	JJ-661
Deutermann			Deutermann	JJ-661
Devaney	Megan		Devaney_Me	JJ-661
Devins	Mary		Devins_Ma	JJ-591, JJ-661
DeVore	Sadie Davidson		DeVore_Sa	JJ-661
Dharia	Anish		Dharia_An	JJ-139, JJ-140, JJ-340
Di	Paul		Di_Pa	JJ-140
Di Giacomo	Anthony	Cecil County	Cecil County_DiGiacomo	JJ-295, JJ-410, JJ-441, JJ-456, JJ-509
Diamond	Sarah		Diamond_Sa	JJ-661
Diamond	Stephen	Diamond-Wamby Household	Diamond-Wamby_St	JJ-661
Diaz	Ruben	Bronx Borough President	Bronx_Borough President Diaz	JJ-73
DiCamillo	Joanne	Old Lyme Tree Commission	DiCamillo_Jo	JJ-480, JJ-661
DiCamillo	Lewis	Old Lyme Inland and Wetlands and Watercourse Commission	DiCamillo_Le	JJ-661, JJ-662

Table JJ-1: Commenter Index (continued)

Last Name	First Name	Agency/Business/Organization	Stakeholder ID	Page
Dickey	Lauren		Dickey_La	JJ-662
Dickey	Michele	Private life-long resident of multi generations	Dickey_Mi	JJ-662
Dickinson	Constance		Dickinson_Co	JJ-662
Dickinson	David	SiriusXM	Dickinson_Da	JJ-662
DiCristina	Frank	Allnex USA	DiCristina_Fr	JJ-140, JJ-340, JJ-424
DiFazio	Linda		DiFazio_Li	JJ-662
Diggs	Jesse	N/A	Diggs_Je	JJ-340
Dillon, A.A.E.	Kevin A.	Connecticut Airport Authority	CAA_Dillon	JJ-74, JJ-572
Dilone	Odile		Dilone_Od	JJ-662
DiLullo	Kathy		DiLullo_Ka	JJ-341
Dimmling	Leslie		Dimmling_Le	JJ-140, JJ-480, JJ-662
Ding	Jie		Ding_Ji	JJ-662
Dinihanian	Janet		Dinihanian_Ja	JJ-662
Dion	James	NRG INC. retired - Engineer P.E.	Dion_Ja	JJ-662
Distler	Gabriel		Distler_Ga	JJ-341, JJ-424, JJ-591
DiToro	Marie	Rhode Island Public Transit Authority	RIPTA_DiToro	JJ-88, JJ-581
Dittman	Dave		Dittman_Da	JJ-620
Dixon	John	NARP	Dixon_Jo	JJ-520
Dixon	Richard	Groton Democratic Town Committee and atty at law	Dixon_Ri	JJ-545, JJ-662
Dixon	Robert	Univ. of New Haven (1984)	Dixon_Ro	JJ-662
Dixon	Rysheema	South Wilmington Planning Network	Dixon_Ry	JJ-341, JJ-342, JJ-480, JJ-546
Dobi	Hanko	University of New Haven	Dobi_Ha	JJ-662
Doch	Steve		Dosh_St	JJ-342, JJ-591
Dockum	John	Leon's Upholstery (Local Business)	Dockum_Jo	JJ-662
Dodd	Steven		Dodd_St	JJ-632
Dolan	Delisa		Dolan_De	JJ-662
Dolce	Austin	ConnPING	Dolce_Au	JJ-591
Donaghue	Joanne		Donaghue_Jo	JJ-342, JJ-662
Donald	Bruce	Connecticut Greenways Council	Donald_Br	JJ-632
Donaldson	Brian		Donaldson_Br	JJ-620
Donelan	Brett		Donelan_Br	JJ-140
Donovan	James		Donovan_Ja	JJ-342
Dornfried	Maria		Dornfried_Ma	JJ-662
Dorros	Ken		Dorros_Ke	JJ-662
Dougherty	Jack		Dougherty_Ja	JJ-632, JJ-633
Dougherty	Keegan		Dougherty_Ke	JJ-141, JJ-446
Douglas	Scott and Wendy		Douglas_Sc	JJ-662
Douglas	Wendy		Douglas_We	JJ-662
Dounis	Spiro		Dounis_Sp	JJ-141
Dowd	Chris		Dowd_Ch	JJ-662
Dowdye	M		Dowdye_M	JJ-663
Downes	Torrance	Lower CT River Valley Council of Governments	RiverCOG_Downes	JJ-536, JJ-640
Dowty Beech	Rachel	University of New Haven	Dowty Beech_Ra	JJ-663
Doyle	James		Doyle_Ja	JJ-141, JJ-447
Doyle	Patton	Massachusetts Institute of Technology	Doyle_Pa	JJ-141, JJ-142
Driscoll	Riley		Driscoll_Ri	JJ-663

Table JJ–1: Commenter Index (continued)

Last Name	First Name	Agency/Business/Organization	Stakeholder ID	Page
Drown	Baylee	Upper Pond Farm	Drown_Ba	JJ-663
Druding	Jennifer Ann		Druding_Je	JJ-620
Drummond	Joseph		Drummond_Jo	JJ-663
Drummond	Kira		Drummond_Ki	JJ-663
Duarte	Philip		Duarte_Ph	JJ-142, JJ-342
Dubee	Joseph	UNH alumnus	Dubee_Jo	JJ-663
Duffy	Deborah		Duffy_De	JJ-663
Dugas	Al		Dugas_Al	JJ-143
Dunbar	Ju		Dunbar_Ju	JJ-663
Duncan	H		Duncan_H	JJ-143, JJ-342
Dungan	Amelia		Dungan_Am	JJ-620
Dunham	Amy		Dunham_Am	JJ-663
Dunham	Stephan	Va. Assn. of Railway Patrons	Dunham_St	JJ-343
Dunlap	Hollis		Dunlap_Ho	JJ-663
Dunlap	Julie		Dunlap_Ju	JJ-620
Dunlap	Tamara	Concerned citizen	Dunlap-Ta	JJ-663
Dunn	Brian L.	U.S. Coast Guard	USCG_Dunn	JJ-472
Dunn	Derek		Dunn_De	JJ-663
Dunn, III	Henry E.		Dunn_He	JJ-663
Duplessis	Linda		Duplessis_Li	JJ-663
DuPont	David		DuPont_Da	JJ-663
Durant III	Robert	University of New Haven	Durant_Ro	JJ-663
Durel	Anita Nowery	Durel Consulting Partners	Durel_An	JJ-621
Durgin	Scott		Durgin_Sc	JJ-663
Durland	Marybeth		Durland_Ma	JJ-663
D'Urso	Francis		D'Urso_Fr	JJ-663
Dutton	Leila		Dutton_Le	JJ-663
DV	Erika		DV_Er	JJ-143
Dworak	Bruce		Dworak_Br	JJ-663
Dworak	Frank	Hobson and Motzer	Dworak_Fr	JJ-663
Dyczkowski	Ben	UNH	Dyczkowski_Be	JJ-663
Dynes	Elaine		Dynes_El	JJ-621
E	Katherine		E_Ka	JJ-663
Eagan	Owen		Eagan_Ow	JJ-481
Eastman	Ajax		Eastman_Aj	JJ-621
Eder	Eileen	Lyme College of Art	Eder_Ei	JJ-663
Edmondson	Julie		Edmondson_Ju	JJ-664
Edson	Pamela		Edson_Pa	JJ-664
Edward	Alex		Edwards_Al	JJ-664
Edwards	Bruce		Edwards_Br	JJ-546, JJ-591
Edwards	Clare		Edwards_Cl	JJ-144, JJ-343, JJ-424, JJ-447
Edwards	Desiree	University of New Haven Alumni	Edwards_De	JJ-664
Edwards	Erica	ELLE Design Studio	Edwards_Er	JJ-144, JJ-591
Edwards	John V.	Norfolk Southern Corporation	NorfolkSouthern_Edwards	JJ-419
Edwards	Rachel		Edwards_Ra	JJ-664
Eells	Walter	White Sands Beach	Eells_Wa	JJ-664

Table JJ–1: Commenter Index (continued)

Last Name	First Name	Agency/Business/Organization	Stakeholder ID	Page
Ehresman	Joshua		Ehresman_Jo	JJ-664
Ehrlich	Pamela		Ehrlich_Pa	JJ-664
Eilertsen	Edward		Eilertsen_Ed	JJ-664
Eio	Peter		Eio_Pe	JJ-664
Ejara	Demissew	University of New Haven	Ejara_De	JJ-664
Eklof	Estrid	artist	Eklof_Es	JJ-591
Ekram	Khursheed	PepsiCo	Ekram_Kh	JJ-664
Elahi	Ma		Elahi_Ma	JJ-343
Elgart	Matt & Linda		Elgart_Ma	JJ-664
Elhaddad	Karim	UNH Alumni	Elhaddad_Ka	JJ-664
Ellen	Martin		Ellen_Ma	JJ-664
Elliott	Catherine	E F Watermelon gallery	Elliott_Ca	JJ-664
Elliott-Lewis	Dane		ElliottLewis_Da	JJ-144, JJ-343, JJ-447, JJ-592
Ellis	Michael		Ellis_Mi	JJ-145, JJ-481, JJ-546
Ellis	Robin		Ellis_Ro	JJ-664
Elorza	Jorge		Providence_MayorElorza	JJ-85, JJ-304
Elvander	Robert C.		Elvander_Ro	JJ-621
Elvgren	Anne		Elvgren_An	JJ-664
Ely	Dwight		Ely_Dw	JJ-145, JJ-664
Ely	Jonathan	Elyandco	Ely_Jo	JJ-145
Ely	Patrick		Ely_Pa	JJ-145
Ely III MD	Matthew G.	Elyandco (family group)	Ely_Ma	JJ-664
Emblin	Ruth		Emblin_Ru	JJ-665
Embree	Dianne		Embree_Di	JJ-665
Emery	Paula		Emery_Pa	JJ-665
Enak			Enak	JJ-621
Engdall	Candace		Engdall_Ca	JJ-665
Engelke	Jean		Engelke_Je	JJ-146, JJ-621
English	Shaun		English_Sh	JJ-665
Ennico	Dolores	Olin Corporation	Ennico_Do	JJ-665
Ensinger	Bill		Ensinger_Bi	JJ-146, JJ-520, JJ-592
Eppenstein	Madelaine	Scarsdale Forum Inc., Municipal Services Committee	Eppenstein_Ma	JJ-146, JJ-481
Epstein	Alexander		Epstein_Al	JJ-146, JJ-343
Erat	William		Erat_Wi	JJ-147
Erickson	Caryn		Erickson_Ca	JJ-665
Ermler	Patricia		Ermler_Pa	JJ-665
Escopia	Nicholas P.	Village of Garden City	Garden City_Mayor Escopia	JJ-76
Esmailpour	Amir	University of New Haven	Esmailpour_Am	JJ-665
Esposito	Katherine	UNH student	Esposito_Ka	JJ-665
Essue	Hewan		Essue_He	JJ-424, JJ-521, JJ-592
Estepar-Garcia	William	University of Connecticut	Estepar-Garcia_Wi	JJ-147, JJ-447
Esther	Lucia		Esther_Lu	JJ-343, JJ-546
Esty	Janis L		Esty_Ja	JJ-665
Eswood	Alyssa	University of New Haven	Eswood_Al	JJ-665
Eswood III	Louis	University of New Haven	Eswood_Lo	JJ-665
Etherington	Kathless		Etherington_Ka	JJ-665

Table JJ–1: Commenter Index (continued)

Last Name	First Name	Agency/Business/Organization	Stakeholder ID	Page
Etter	Eleanor		Etter_El	JJ-425, JJ-592, JJ-665
Evans	Lisa		Evans_Li	JJ-665
Evans	Tina		Evans_Ti	JJ-665
Evers	Sonia		Evers_So	JJ-665
Facinelli	Jeffrey		Facinelli_Je	JJ-665
Faenza	Tani		Faenza-Ta	JJ-665
Fagan	Kelly		Fagan_Ke	JJ-621
Fahl	Corrinne		Fahl_C	JJ-147
Fahlman	Cheryl		Fahlman_Ch	JJ-621
Fairben	Diane		Fairben_D	JJ-147
Fairfield-Sonn	John T.		Fairfield-Sonn_Jo	JJ-665, JJ-666
Fairfield-Sonn	Lynn G.		Fairfield-Sonn_Ly	JJ-666
Fairfield-Sonn Jr	James W.		Fairfield-SonnJr_Ja	JJ-666
Fairfield-Sonn Sr	James W.		Fairfield-SonnSr_Ja	JJ-666
Fakhoury	Ziad	Connecticut Engineering	Fakhoury_Zi	JJ-666
Fallon	Jen	University of New Haven	Fallon_Jen	JJ-666
Fallon	Jennifer		Fallon_Jenn	JJ-666
Falstrom	Angela		Falstrom_An	JJ-666
Falstrom	John		Falstrom_Jo	JJ-666
Fanelli	Steve		Fanelli_St	JJ-592, JJ-666
Faniola	John and Judith		Faniola_Jo	JJ-666
Farman	Ned		Farman_Ne	JJ-547, JJ-666
Farmer	Bruce		Clinton_Selectman Farmer	JJ-638
Farnham	Kellianne		Farnham_Ke	JJ-666
Farricielli	Joseph		Farricielli_Jo	JJ-666
Farvard	Donna	ConnPING	Faryard_Do	JJ-592
Farwell	Anstress	New Haven Urban Design League	Farwell_An	JJ-481, JJ-592
Faticoni	Barry		Faticoni_Ba	JJ-666
Faugno	John		Faugno_Jo	JJ-666
Faustine	Kenneth		Faustine_Ke	JJ-666
Fauver	Toby	Pennsylvania Department of Transportation	PennDOT_Fauver	JJ-84, JJ-517, JJ-579
Feakins	Kathy		Feakins_Ka	JJ-66, JJ-148, JJ-666
Fearnley	Ken		Fearnley_Ke	JJ-666
Feeney	Austin		Feeney_Au	JJ-667
Feeney	Ma r		Feeney_Ma	JJ-667
Feinberg	Andrea		Feinberg_An	JJ-667
Feliciano	Tris	US Citizen CT resident	Feliciano_Tr	JJ-592
Fenelon	Martin		Fenelon_Ma	JJ-667
Fenn	Andrea		Fenn_An	JJ-667
Fenyk	Heather	Lower Raritan Watershed Partnership	Fenyk_He	JJ-593
Ferdinandsen	Alan	UNH Alumni	Ferdinandsen_Al	JJ-667
Ferguson-5Foxc	Evelyn		Ferguson_Ev	JJ-667
Fernandez	Wendy		Fernandez_We	JJ-148, JJ-344, JJ-481, JJ-593
Ferragamo	J.		Ferragamo_J	JJ-667
Ferrebee	Louise		Ferrebee_Lo	JJ-667
Ferris	Peter		Ferris_Pe	JJ-593

Table JJ-1: Commenter Index (continued)

Last Name	First Name	Agency/Business/Organization	Stakeholder ID	Page
Feuer	Ejlat		Feuer_Ej	JJ-633
Field	Elizabeth		Field_El	JJ-667
Fields	Heidi	Sound View Holdings	Fields_He	JJ-148, JJ-667
Filbert	Jill		Filbert_Ji	JJ-667
Filchak	John	Northeastern Connecticut Council of Governments	NE CT COG_Filchak	JJ-79, JJ-467, JJ-577
Filigenzi	Barbaa		Filigenzi_Ba	JJ-621
Finley	Cynthia		Finley_Cy	JJ-667
Finnegan	Robert		Finnegan_Ro	JJ-344
Finneran	Anne Marie		Finneran_An	JJ-667
Fiorillo	Elizabeth	University of New Haven	Fiorillo_El	JJ-667
Firth	Mathew		Firth_Ma	JJ-593
Fisher	Elizabeth		Fisher_El	JJ-621
Fisher	Emily		Fisher_Em	JJ-667
Fisk	Rich		Fisk_Ri	JJ-148
Fiske	Diana		Fiske_Di	JJ-667
Fiske	Edward D.		Fiske_Ed	JJ-667
Fitton	D. Geoffrey		Fitton_DG	JJ-667
Fitton	Joan		Fitton_Jo	JJ-668
Fitzgerald	Dianne		Fitzgerald_Di	JJ-668
Fitzgerald	Kathleen		Fitzgerald_Ka	JJ-668
Fitzgerald	Kit		Fitzgerald_Ki	JJ-668
Fitzgerald	William		Fitzgerald_Wi	JJ-668
Flaherty	John	Grow Smart Rhode Island	Flaherty_Jo	JJ-344
Flanagan Locke	Kathy		Flanagan Locke_Ka	JJ-668
Flannigan	Lily	Milford Preservation Trust	Flannigan_Li	JJ-149
Flay	Nina	University of New Haven	Flay_Ni	JJ-149
Fleming	Andrew		Fleming_An	JJ-621
Fletcher	Andrew		Fletcher_An	JJ-345
Flinter	Joyce		Flinter_Jo	JJ-668
Fliss	Andrew		Fliss_An	JJ-668
Florio	James		Florio_Ja	JJ-515
Floroff	Paul		Floroff_Pa	JJ-149, JJ-505, JJ-521
Flueckiger	Molly		Flueckiger_Mo	JJ-149
Flynn	Tammi	Florence Griswold Museum	Flynn-Ta	JJ-668
Fochesto	Gary		Fochesto_Ga	JJ-150, JJ-547
Foehr	Alison		Foehr_Al	JJ-150
Foehr	Mary		Foehr_Ma	JJ-150, JJ-593
Foehr	Megan		Foehr_Me	JJ-151
Fogg	Na		Fogg_Na	JJ-668
Fogg	Russell		Fogg_Ru	JJ-668
Fogliano	Susan		Fogliano_Su	JJ-668
Follo	Michael		Follo_Mi	JJ-345, JJ-346, JJ-425, JJ-594
Folta	Edith		Folta_Ed	JJ-668
Fontes	Royce	Alumni	Fontes_Roy	JJ-668
Forbes	Charles		Forbes_Ch	JJ-346
Forbis	Allison		Forbis_Al	JJ-668

Table JJ–1: Commenter Index (continued)

Last Name	First Name	Agency/Business/Organization	Stakeholder ID	Page
Forbis	John		Forbis_Jo	JJ-668
Forester	Georgina		Forester_Ge	JJ-621
Formica	Paul	District 20	CT Senator_Formica	JJ-638
Forte	Steve		Forte_St	JJ-151, JJ-482, JJ-594, JJ-669
Fortuna, Jr.	Carl P.	Town of Old Saybrook	Old Saybrook_Selectman Fortuna	JJ-303, JJ-579
Foster	Aaron		Foster_Aa	JJ-152
Foster	Emilie	Clever Magpie	Foster_Em	JJ-669
Foster	Monique		Foster_Mo	JJ-669
Foster, PhD, P.G.	Ruth	New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection	NJDEP_Fo	JJ-468, JJ-469, JJ-504, JJ-567
Foye	Patrick		PANYNJ_Amtrak_NJT	JJ-303
Frankel	Liz		Frankel_Li	JJ-669
Franzius	Frederic		Franzius_Fr	JJ-669
Frascogna	Marc		Frascogna_Ma	JJ-152, JJ-547
Frazier	Rick		Frazier_Ri	JJ-67, JJ-346, JJ-521, JJ-669
Frederick	Joe	University of New Haven Alumni	Frederick_Jo	JJ-669
Freedman	Samuel		Freedman_Sa	JJ-152, JJ-426
Freidenburg	Kealoha		Freidenburg_Ke	JJ-669
Frentz	Matthew	ConnPING	Frentz_Ma	JJ-67
Friday	Norman		Friday_No	JJ-594
Fried	Gil		Fried_Gi	JJ-669
Friedhoffer	Jeff		Friedhoffer_Je	JJ-621
Friedman	Paul	Member: New York Cycle Club	Friedman_Pa	JJ-633
Friedmann	Laurel		Friedmann_La	JJ-669
Friedrichs	Peter	City of Central Falls	Central Falls_Friedrichs	JJ-410, JJ-442, JJ-456
Fries	Richard	MassBike	Fries_Ri	JJ-633
Frix	Don	Kissingernarian School on Philosophy	Frix_Do	JJ-346
Frost	Susan		Frost_Su	JJ-669
Fry	Donald C.	Greater Baltimore Committee	Fry_Do	JJ-346, JJ-347, JJ-521, JJ-594
Fugger	Brandon		Fugger_Br	JJ-669
Fuller	Andrew		Fuller_An	JJ-153, JJ-347
Fuller	Gail		Fuller_Ga	JJ-669
Fulton	Kathy		Fulton_Ka	JJ-669
Fung	Kevin	University of New Haven	Fung_Ke	JJ-669
Furgueson	Michael		Furgueson_Mi	JJ-548, JJ-669
G	Andrew		G_An	JJ-669
Gaffeney	Ted	Florence Griswold Museum	Gaffeney_Te	JJ-669
Gail			Gail	JJ-482
Galaty	Michael		Galaty_Mi	JJ-594
Galbo	Steve		Galbo_St	JJ-669
Galbraith	Marian	Southeastern Connecticut Council of Governments	SCCOG_Galbraith	JJ-89, JJ-90, JJ-420, JJ-581
Gallagher	Roxannah		Gallagher_Ro	JJ-669
Galli	James		Galli_Ja	JJ-669
Galli	Victor		Galli_Vi	JJ-153, JJ-548, JJ-594
Gallicchio	Judith		Gallicchio_Ju	JJ-549, JJ-669
Gallucci	Theodore		Gallucci_Th	JJ-154
Galvin	Claudia		Galvin_Cl	JJ-426, JJ-594

Table JJ-1: Commenter Index (continued)

Last Name	First Name	Agency/Business/Organization	Stakeholder ID	Page
Gambardella	Robert	graduate of UNH	Gambardella_Ro	JJ-669
Gamboa	Manolo		Gamboa_Ma	JJ-594
Gara	Elizabeth	Connecticut Council of Small Towns	Gara_El	JJ-154, JJ-670
Gardner	Scott		Gardner_Sc	JJ-670
Garrett	Daniel		Garrett_Da	JJ-670
Garrett	Lisa		Garrett_Li	JJ-670
Garrett	Peter	Emery & Garrett Groundwater	Garrett_Pe	JJ-633
Garvey	David		Garvey_Da	JJ-670
Garvin	Sandy	Lyme Art Association	Garvin_Sa	JJ-670
Gaskell	John		Gaskell_Jo	JJ-670
Gaskell	Suzanne		Gaskell_Su	JJ-670
Gasper	John		Gasper_Jo	JJ-154, JJ-347
Gates	Christopher		Gates_Ch	JJ-154, JJ-670
Gatti	Rosa	University of New Haven	Gatti_Ro	JJ-670
Gaudio	Rachel	Connecticut Fund for the Environment	Gaudio_Ra	JJ-155, JJ-156, JJ-348, JJ-482, JJ-505, JJ-549, JJ-595
Gaulin	Roger		Gaulin_Ro	JJ-670
Gauthier	Gretchen		Gauthier_Gr	JJ-447, JJ-482, JJ-670
Gay	David		Gay_Da	JJ-595
Gaynor	Mark		Gaynor_Ma	JJ-157, JJ-670
Geer	George		Geer_Ge	JJ-157, JJ-670
Gendron	Sharynn		Gendron_Sh	JJ-670
Genovese	Carolyn	Univ.of New Haven Alumni Assoc.	Genovese_Ca	JJ-670
Genovese	Linda		Genovese_Li	JJ-621
Gentry	Adam		Gentry_Ad	JJ-157, JJ-448, JJ-670
Geraghty	Philip		Geraghty_Ph	JJ-157
Geran	Timothy		Geran_Ti	JJ-622
Germain	Wilkinson		Germain_Wi	JJ-670
Gerster	Peter		Gerster_Pe	JJ-67, JJ-670, JJ-671
Geshel	Kristin	Resident	Geshel_Kr	JJ-671
Getek	Kendall	University of New Haven Alumna	Getek_Ke	JJ-671
Ghirardi	Lawrence		Ghirardi_La	JJ-158, JJ-671
Gianetti	Ivey		Gianetti_Iv	JJ-671
Giarratana	Gerard	West End Civic Association	Giarratana_Ge	JJ-158
Gibbs	Denise		Gibbs_De	JJ-622
Gibson	John		Gibson_Jo	JJ-671
Gibson	Lorraine		Gibson_Lo	JJ-671
Gilbert	Michael	Society of Gilders	Gilbert_Mi	JJ-671
Gillan	Maria		Gillan_Ma	JJ-158
Gilleran	Timothy		Gilleran_Ti	JJ-671
Gilliland	Richard		Gilliland_Ri	JJ-348, JJ-671
Gilmour	Todd		Gilmour_To	JJ-158
Gingolaski	Margaret		Gingolaski_Ma	JJ-549, JJ-671
Gingras	Katie		Gingras_Ka	JJ-671
Gingras	Patrick		Gingras_Pa	JJ-671
Gingrave	Doug		Gingrave_Do	JJ-426
Gintoff Vautrain, Esq.	Suzann		Gintoff Vautrain_Su	JJ-671

Table JJ–1: Commenter Index (continued)

Last Name	First Name	Agency/Business/Organization	Stakeholder ID	Page
Gionfriddo	DAvid		Gionfriddo_Da	JJ-671
Gionfriddo	Theresa		Gionfriddo_Th	JJ-671
Girasoli	Carl		Girasoli_Ca	JJ-671
Girty	Brooke	brookegirtydesign.com	Girty_Br	JJ-671
Giuffrida	Shannon		Giuffrida_Sh	JJ-159, JJ-550
Givan	Peter	Wild Bird Center of Rockville	Givan_Pe	JJ-622
Glacken	Cynthia		Glacken_Cy	JJ-671
Gladwell	Nancy		Gladwell_Na	JJ-671
Glancy	JoAnn		Glancy_Jo	JJ-622
Glaski	Elaine		Glaski_El	JJ-671
Gleason	Allyson		Gleason_Al	JJ-671
Glennon	Tara		Glennon-Ta	JJ-483
Gniazdowski	Steven		Gniazdowski_St	JJ-159
Goddess	Linnea		Goddess_Li	JJ-595
Godfrey	Cynthia		Godfrey_Cy	JJ-672
Goetsch	Ben	Briarpatch Enterprises, Inc	Goetsch_Be	JJ-483
Goggans	Thomas		Goggans_Th	JJ-672
Golbazi	Ali		Golbazi_Al	JJ-672
Gold	Sam	Lower Connecticut River Valley Council of Governments	LCRVCOG_Gold	JJ-300, JJ-442, JJ-464
Gold	Sam		RiverCOG_Gold	JJ-305, JJ-537, JJ-640, JJ-641
Gold	Tori		Gold_To	JJ-159, JJ-160
Golden	Greg	MD Department of Natural Resources	MDDNR_Golden	JJ-64, JJ-465, JJ-576
Golden	John		Golden_Jo	JJ-672
Goldman	Marilyn		Goldman_Ma	JJ-622
Goldsmith	Ken		Goldsmith_Ke	JJ-483, JJ-596
Goldstein	Jay	Sculptor	Goldstein_Ja	JJ-672
Gonce	Sam		Gonce_Sa	JJ-622
Gonci	Doina		Gonci_Doi	JJ-672
Gonci	Donald		Gonci_Don	JJ-672
Gonzalez	Oscar	Virginia Railway Express	VRE_Gonzalez	JJ-307
Gonzelez	Frank		Gonzalez_Fr	JJ-448, JJ-596
Good	Corinne	Member of first congregational church	Good_Co	JJ-672
Good	The Rev. David W.	First Congregational Church of Old Lyme	Good_Da	JJ-672
Goodrich	Ernest		Goodrich_Er	JJ-672
Gordon	Theodore		Gordon_Th	JJ-672
Gore	Melissa		Gore_Me	JJ-160
Gorin	Thomas B.		Gorin_Th	JJ-672
Gormley	Eloise		Gormley_El	JJ-672
Gorton	Gloria		Gorton_Gl	JJ-672
Gotowka	Christina		Gotowka_Ch	JJ-161, JJ-672
Gotowka	Thomas D.		Gotowka_Th	JJ-672
Gottesman	Jerome	Edison Properties, LLC	Gottesman_Je	JJ-161, JJ-348, JJ-521
Gould	Rita	Senior Citizen	Gould_Ri	JJ-596
Gourlay	Elizabeth		Gourlay_El	JJ-672
Gourlay	Marion		Gourlay_Ma	JJ-673
Gozdz	Henry	NJBWC	Gozdz_He	JJ-633

Table JJ-1: Commenter Index (continued)

Last Name	First Name	Agency/Business/Organization	Stakeholder ID	Page
Grab	Larry		Grab_La	JJ-673
Grace	Patrick		Grace_Pa	JJ-161
Grad	Rima	VCFA	Grad_Ri	JJ-673
Graff	Bryan		Graff_Br	JJ-673
Gragg	Maureen		Gragg_Ma	JJ-673
Graham	Dan	UConn-Storrs	Graham_Da	JJ-162
Graham	Karen	Alumni of University of New Haven	Graham_Ka	JJ-673
Graham	Melanie		Graham_Me	JJ-162
Graham	Ronald		Graham_Ro	JJ-162, JJ-596
Granberg	Al		Granberg_Al	JJ-673
Grande	Shirley		Grande_Sh	JJ-162
Grant	Jane		Grant_Ja	JJ-673
Grant	Jenifer	citizen	Grant_Je	JJ-162
Grant	Ms		Grant_Ms	JJ-673
Grant	Yvonne & Christopher		Grant_Yv	JJ-622
Gravell	Emily		Gravell_Em	JJ-673
Gray	Laurie		Gray_La	JJ-622
Grayson	Sawyer		Grayson_Sa	JJ-673
Graziosi	Tina		Graziosi_Ti	JJ-673
Green	Carol		Green_Ca	JJ-673
Green	Sean-Michael	University of New Haven	Green_Se	JJ-673
Greenawalt	Ann		Greenawalt_An	JJ-622
Greenberg	Alva		Greenberg_Al	JJ-673
Greenberg	Stanley		Greenberg_St	JJ-550, JJ-633
Greene	Vimala		Greene_Vi	JJ-673
Greenho	Brian		Greenho_Br	JJ-673
Greenwald	Philip		Greenwald_Ph	JJ-633
Greenwood	Mary		Greenwood_Ma	JJ-673
Greenwood	Sara		Greenwood_Sa	JJ-673
Gregory	Michele		Gregory_Mi	JJ-673
Gregory	Shelley		Gregory_Sh	JJ-673
Greiner	Diane		Greiner_Di	JJ-673
Greiner	Ted		Greiner_Te	JJ-673
Gresh	John	Old Lyme Town Band	Gresh_Jo	JJ-674
Grethel	David	Emptech	Grethel_Da	JJ-674
Griffin	Peter	NH Railroad Revitalization Assoc.	Griffin_Pe	JJ-348
Griffin	Rebecca		Griffin_Re	JJ-674
Griffis	Andrea		Griffis_An	JJ-674
Griffiths	Matthew		Griffiths_Ma	JJ-674
Griggs, Sr.	Thomas	1966 Graduate of Univ New Haven	GriggsSr_Th	JJ-674
Griswold	David		Griswold_Da	JJ-163, JJ-674
Griswold	Evan	Old Lyme Open Space Commission	Griswold_Ev	JJ-674
Griswold	Jennifer		Griswold_Je	JJ-163, JJ-550
Griswold	John	Regional Plan Association CT Committee	Griswold_Jo	JJ-674
Griswold	Timothy		Griswold_Ti	JJ-674
Griswold	William		Griswold_Wi	JJ-674

Table JJ–1: Commenter Index (continued)

Last Name	First Name	Agency/Business/Organization	Stakeholder ID	Page
Groff	Douglas		Groff_Do	JJ-521, JJ-522
Gross	Michael		Gross_M	JJ-633
Gross	Michael		Gross_Ml	JJ-633
Groth	Andrew		Groth_An	JJ-164, JJ-674
Groth	Kenneth		Groth_Ke	JJ-164, JJ-675
Groth	Mary		Groth_Ma	JJ-165, JJ-675
Groth	Sydney		Groth_Sy	JJ-165, JJ-675
Grundon	Tessa		Grundon_Te	JJ-675
Guerriero	Debra		Guerriero_De	JJ-675
Guizol	Jacqueline		Guizol_Ja	JJ-165, JJ-675
Gumkowsk	Francine		Gumkowsk_Fr	JJ-675
Gundry	Jason	University of New Haven Alumnae	Gundry_Ja	JJ-675
Gunther	Mary Roman		Gunther_Ma	JJ-622
Gurpide	Rosemary		Gurpide_Ro	JJ-675
Haas	Bud		Haas_Bu	JJ-596
Hackenjos	Paula	University of New Haven	Hackenjos_Pa	JJ-675
Hackett	Eileen		Hackett_Ei	JJ-166
Haddad	Susan		Haddad_Su	JJ-675
Haddad	Nazik	The Northeast Maglev	Haddad_Na	JJ-349
Hadlock	Kevin	University of New Haven	Hadlock_Ke	JJ-166, JJ-675
Haff	Catharine		Haff_Ca	JJ-675
Haff	Robert		Haff_Ro	JJ-676
Hageman	Barbara		Hageman_Ba	JJ-676
Haggerty	James	USACE	USACE_Haggerty	JJ-582, JJ-583
Haigh	Valerie		Haigh_Va	JJ-166
Haikalis	George	Institute for Rational Urban Mobility, Inc.	Haikalis_Ge	JJ-166, JJ-349, JJ-448, JJ-522, JJ-596, JJ-597, JJ-676
Haines	Barbara	HainesDesign	Haines_Ba	JJ-167
Hale	Robert		Hale_Ro	JJ-67, JJ-167, JJ-168, JJ-349, JJ-350, JJ-426, JJ-484, JJ-506, JJ-597
Hale, M.D.	Mahlon		Hale_Ma	JJ-676
Halkyard	Rich	Gateway Community College	GatewayCC_Halkyard	JJ-155, JJ-347, JJ-595
Hall	Barbara	AAUW. Garden Club. Florence Griswold	Hall_Ba	JJ-676
Hall	Bruce		Hall_Br	JJ-676
Hallman	Hallie		Hallman_Ha	JJ-676
Hallstein	Patricia		Hallstein_Pa	JJ-633
Hallwood	Barbara		Hallwood_Ba	JJ-676
Hamer	Bruce		Hamer_Br	JJ-484
Hamill	Sterling		Hamill_St	JJ-448
Hamilton	Andy	East Coast Greenway Alliance	Hamilton_An	JJ-350
Hamilton	Elizabeth		Hamilton_El	JJ-676
Hamilton	Frank		Hamilton_Fr	JJ-676
Hamilton	Martina		Hamilton_Ma	JJ-676
Hamilton	Pamela		Hamilton_Pa	JJ-676
Hammerling	Eric	Connecticut Forest and Park Association, Inc.	Hammerling_Er	JJ-484, JJ-485, JJ-597
Hammond	Paulette		Hammond_Pa	JJ-622
Hanasen	S		Hanasen_S	JJ-676
Hancock	Joyce		Hancock_Jo	JJ-676

Table JJ–1: Commenter Index (continued)

Last Name	First Name	Agency/Business/Organization	Stakeholder ID	Page
Hangasky III	John		Hangasky_Jo	JJ-676
Hanna	David	IT	Hanna_Da	JJ-633
Hannifan	Melissa		Hannifan_Me	JJ-676
Hannon	Lorraine		Hannon_Lo	JJ-169
Hansen	Fern		Hansen_Fe	JJ-676
Hansen	Marth		Hansen_Ma	JJ-676
Hanson	Ann		Hanson_An	JJ-622
Hanson	Lisa		Hanson_Li	JJ-676
Harbour	Will	Weight Watchers	Harbour_Wi	JJ-169
Hardwick	Bryant		Hardwick_Br	JJ-633
Hargraves	John		Hargraves_Jo	JJ-351, JJ-677
Harlukowicz	Jim		Harlukowicz_Ji	JJ-677
Harmon	Martha		Harmon_Ma	JJ-169
Harmony	Louise		Harmony_Lo	JJ-622
Harnsberger	James		Harnsberger_Ja	JJ-677
Harp	Toni N.	City of New Haven	New Haven_Mayor Harp	JJ-80, JJ-418, JJ-467, JJ-578
Harra	Brian		Harra_Br	JJ-677
Harris	Donna		Harris_Do	JJ-677
Harris	Edward		Harris_Ed	JJ-677
Harris	Jennifer	Citizens for Jobs and Growth in Palmer	Harris_Je	JJ-351
Harris	Patricia		Harris_Pa	JJ-677
Harrison	Barry		Harrison_Ba	JJ-677
Harrison	Brett		Harrison_Br	JJ-677
Harrison	Kathless		Harrison_Ka	JJ-677
Harritt	John	UNH Alumni	Harritt_Jo	JJ-677
Hart	Alexander		Hart_Al	JJ-677
Hart	Ross		Hart_Ro	JJ-170
Hart	Stephen		Hart_St	JJ-677
Hartley	Patience	Citizen	Hartley_Pa	JJ-171
Hartman	Ken		Hartman_Ke	JJ-622
Hartman	Robert C.		Hartman_Ro	JJ-622
Harty	Lea		Harty_Le	JJ-677
Harvey	Kenneth		Harvey_Ke	JJ-351, JJ-597
Harvey	Marc & Doreen	University of New Haven	Harvey_Ma	JJ-677
Haskell	Suzanne		Haskell_Su	JJ-677
Hatch	Rebecca		Hatch_Re	JJ-677
Hausladen	Doug	City of New Haven	New Haven_Hausladen	JJ-80
Haven	Paul	Environmental and Energy Study Institute	Haven_Pa	JJ-171, JJ-485
Hawkins Lecce	Jenny		Hawkins Lecce_Je	JJ-171
Hayward	Matthew		Hayward_Ma	JJ-550, JJ-677
Healey	Alicia		Healey_Al	JJ-677
Healy	Bridget		Healy_Br	JJ-677
Heather			Heather	JJ-351
Heckman	Jane		Heckman_Ja	JJ-622
Hefler	Peter	Major Trails	Hefler_Pe	JJ-171
Hegarty	David and Regina	Eastern Property Owners Assoc.	Hegarty_Da	JJ-172

Table JJ–1: Commenter Index (continued)

Last Name	First Name	Agency/Business/Organization	Stakeholder ID	Page
Hegger	John		Hegger_Jo	JJ-677
Heinsman	Aaron		Heinsman_Aa	JJ-622
Heiser	John		Heiser_Jo	JJ-677
Heiss	Tom		Heiss_To	JJ-597
Henderson	Joan		Henderson_Jo	JJ-677, JJ-678
Hendryx	Andrew		Hendryx_An	JJ-678
Hendryx	Beverly		Hendryx_Be	JJ-678
Henry	Molly	East Coast Greenway	Henry_Mo	JJ-633
Hepburn	Aile		Hepburn_Ai	JJ-678
Herard	Paul	UNH	Herard_Pa	JJ-678
Hernandez	Laurie	Essex Land Trust	Hernandez_La	JJ-678
Herold	Heather	University of New Haven	Herold_He	JJ-678
Herrick	Sumner		Herrick_Su	JJ-598
Hess	David		Hess_Da	JJ-172
Hewitt	Jessica		Hewitt_Je	JJ-678
Hickman	Mary Lu		Hickman_Ma	JJ-678
Hicks	Linda		Hicks_Li	JJ-172
Hilger	Jennifer		Hilger_Je	JJ-678
Hill	Linda F.	Delaware County Planning Department	Delaware County_Hill	JJ-75, JJ-299
Hill	Pauline	University of New Haven	Hill_Pa	JJ-678
Hill	Raymond	University of New Haven	Hill_Ra	JJ-172, JJ-678
Hill	Wendolyn		Hill_We	JJ-678
Hillman	Taylor	University of New Haven	Hillman-Ta	JJ-678
Hinchliffe	Greg		Hinchliffe_Gr	JJ-426, JJ-633
Hinckley	Charles		Hinckley_Ch	JJ-485
Hincks	Claudia		Hincks_Cl	JJ-678
Hine	Jan		Hine_Ja	JJ-678
Hird	Francis		Hird_Fr	JJ-678
Hirsch	Michael		Hirsch_Mi	JJ-172
Hishmeh	Lili		Hishmeh_Li	JJ-486
Hochman	Jonathan	Hochman Consultants	Hochman_Jo	JJ-173, JJ-351
Hodge	Benjamin		Hodge_Be	JJ-678
Hoff	Walter	University of New Haven Alumni Association	Hoff_Wa	JJ-678
Holder	Judy		Holder_Ju	JJ-678
Holland	Donald	William Pitt Sotheby's Real Estate	Holland_Do	JJ-678
Hollifield	Susan		Hollifield_Su	JJ-678
Holmes	Alan		Holmes_Al	JJ-678
Holmes	Carlton		Holmes_Ca	JJ-351, JJ-426, JJ-448
Holmes	Dawn		Holmes_Da	JJ-678
Holszanska	Malgorzata		Holszanska_Ma	JJ-486, JJ-678, JJ-679
Holt	Linda		Holt_Li	JJ-598
Holt	Paul		Holt_Pa	JJ-486, JJ-679
Holton	Judy		Montgomery County_Holton	JJ-301, JJ-442
Honer	James		Honer_Ja	JJ-351, JJ-352
Honigberg	Jessica		Honigberg_Je	JJ-679
Hood	Ben	Citizens for a Palmer Rail Stop	Hood_Be	JJ-173

Table JJ-1: Commenter Index (continued)

Last Name	First Name	Agency/Business/Organization	Stakeholder ID	Page
Hood	Ed	MassConn Sustainable Forest Partnership	Hood_Ed	JJ-173, JJ-448, JJ-486, JJ-511, JJ-598
Horan-Silva	Karen		Horan-Silva_Ka	JJ-173
Horn	Jane		Horn_Ja	JJ-173
Hornbake	Deborah		Hornbake_De	JJ-679
Horowitz	Matthew		Horowitz_Ma	JJ-174
Horvath	Maria		Horvath_Ma	JJ-174
Hosack	Susan		Hosack_Su	JJ-174, JJ-679
Hoss	Michael	University of New Haven Alumni	Hoss_Mi	JJ-679
Hostetler	Greg		Hostetler_Gr	JJ-679
Houlihan	Lisa		Houlihan_Li	JJ-679
Howat	Cathy		Howat_Ca	JJ-175
Hoy	Anne		Hoy_An	JJ-679
Hoyt	Laurie	VSYMCA	Hoyt_La	JJ-679
Hoyt	Steve		Hoyt_St	JJ-679
Hreha	A Sarah		Hreha_AS	JJ-633
Hubbard	Annette		Hubbard_An	JJ-679
Huck	Sally		Huck_Sa	JJ-679
Hudgins	Derek		Hudgins_De	JJ-623
Hufford	Aoife		Hufford_Ao	JJ-679
Hufford	Eleanor		Hufford_El	JJ-679
Hufford	Fiona		Hufford_Fi	JJ-679
Hufford	Walter		Hufford_Wa	JJ-679
Hughes	Elizabeth	Maryland Department of Planning	MDP_Hughes	JJ-567
Hughes	John		Hughes_Jo	JJ-175
Hughes	Leanne		Hughes_Le	JJ-680
Humphries	John		Humphries_Jo	JJ-67, JJ-176, JJ-448, JJ-487, JJ-511
Hunt	Faulkner		Hunt_Fa	JJ-680
Hunt	Kaitlyn		Hunt_Ka	JJ-680
Hunt	Kelly		Hunt_Ke	JJ-680
Hunt Spak	Terry		Hunt Spak_Te	JJ-680
Hunter-Putsch	Sharon		Hunter-Putsch_Sh	JJ-680
Huntley	Loisann		Huntley_Lo	JJ-680
Huntley	William		Huntley_Wi	JJ-680
Hurley	Patricia	Community Music School	Hurley_Pa	JJ-487, JJ-680
Hurst	Elsa		Hurst_El	JJ-680
Hutchinson	Nancy		Hutchinson_Na	JJ-176, JJ-487, JJ-598, JJ-680
Hyde	Dwight		Hyde_Dw	JJ-352
Hyers	Karen		Hyers_Ka	JJ-352
Hyland	Charlotte		Hyland_Ch	JJ-680
Hyland	Richard		Hyland_Ri	JJ-680
I	Bridget		I_Br	JJ-680
Ierardi	Joseph	UNH Alumni	Ierardi_Jo	JJ-680
Ierna	Allison		Ierna_Al	JJ-680
Igelbrink	Carl		Igelbrink_Ca	JJ-511, JJ-680
Ilardi	Steve		Ilardi_St	JJ-176
Immordino	Peter		Immordino_Pe	JJ-680

Table JJ–1: Commenter Index (continued)

Last Name	First Name	Agency/Business/Organization	Stakeholder ID	Page
Inglis	Allan		Inglis_AI	JJ-177, JJ-680
Inglis	Nicholas		Inglis_Ni	JJ-449
Irions	Amanda		Irions_Am	JJ-623
Irving	Erica	University of New Haven Alumni	Irving_Er	JJ-680
Isaacs	Kathy		Isaacs_Ka	JJ-623
Isaksen	Mark		Isaksen_Ma	JJ-177
Isbell	Mary	University of New Haven	Isbell_Ma	JJ-680
Israel	Andrea		Israel_An	JJ-680
Ivanoff	Alexander		Ivanoff_AI	JJ-178, JJ-352
Jackson	Catherine		Jackson_Ca	JJ-680
Jackson	Charles		Jackson_Ch	JJ-680
Jackson	Katherine		Jackson_Ka	JJ-681
Jackson	M. Thomas		Jackson_MT	JJ-681
Jackson	MaryLys		Jackson_Ma	JJ-178
Jackson	William		Jackson_Wi	JJ-681
Jacob	Richard	Yale University	Yale_Jacob	JJ-279, JJ-280, JJ-406, JJ-439, JJ-454, JJ-563, JJ-612
Jacobs	Mary		Jacobs_Ma	JJ-598
Jacobus	Lee	University of Connecticut	Jacobus_Le	JJ-681
Jacques	Claudia		Jacques_Cl	JJ-681
Jafarian	Ali		Jafarian_AI	JJ-681
James A. Diosa	Donald R. Grebien	City of Pawtucket	Pawtucket Central Falls_Mayors	JJ-83, JJ-304
James-Hart	Diane		James-Hart_Di	JJ-178, JJ-681
Jamison	Amy		Jamison_Am	JJ-681
Jankowski	Bill		Jankowski_Bi	JJ-179, JJ-352
Janzen	Jacob		Janzen_Ja	JJ-179, JJ-427, JJ-598
Jasinski	Kenneth		Jasinski_Ke	JJ-681
Jason	Leigh		Jason_Le	JJ-681
Jasper	Robin-Eve	NoMa BID	Jasper_Ro	JJ-179, JJ-598
Jean Hale	Mary		Jean Hale_Ma	JJ-681
Jean-Baptiste	M		Jean-Baptiste_M	JJ-681
Jennifer			Jennifer	JJ-681
Jermainne	Leslie		Jermainne_Le	JJ-681
Jess			Jess	JJ-681
Jette	Suzanne		Jette_Su	JJ-681
Jewett	Ann Marie		Jewett_An	JJ-681
Jewett	Emily		Jewett_Em	JJ-681
Jibilian	Antonia		Jibilian_An	JJ-179
Jiseph	Elaine		Jiseph_El	JJ-681
Joelson	Christina		Joelson_Ch	JJ-179
Joffray	Donald	Old Lyme resident	Joffray_Do	JJ-681
Joffray	Suzanne	Trustee Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts	Joffray_Su	JJ-681
Johnson	Abby		Johnson_Ab	JJ-681
Johnson	Amy		Johnson_Am	JJ-623
Johnson	Barbara K.	The Anne Arundel Bird Club	Johnson_Ba	JJ-180, JJ-551, JJ-623
Johnson	Daena		Johnson_Da	JJ-682
Johnson	Diana Atwood	Old Lyme Open Space Commission	Johnson_Di	JJ-682

Table JJ–1: Commenter Index (continued)

Last Name	First Name	Agency/Business/Organization	Stakeholder ID	Page
Johnson	Doris		Johnson_Do	JJ-682
Johnson	Glenn		Johnson_Gl	JJ-352, JJ-353, JJ-487
Johnson	Jake		Johnson_Ja	JJ-598
Johnson	Jocelyn		Johnson_Jo	JJ-682
Johnson	Len		Johnson_Le	JJ-598
Johnson	Michael	Novartis	Johnson_Mi	JJ-682
Johnson	Monica	Univ of new haven parent	Johnson_Mo	JJ-682
Johnson	Nancy	Wm. Pitt Sotheby's & OL resident	Johnson_Na	JJ-682
Johnson	Rebecca	University of New Haven	Johnson_Re	JJ-682
Johnson	Roy		Johnson_Ro	JJ-682
Johnson	Scott		Johnson_Sc	JJ-682
Johnson-Ulrich	Lily		Johnson-Ulrich_Li	JJ-623
Johnston	Amy		Johnston_Am	JJ-682
Johnston	Glenn		Johnston_Gl	JJ-353, JJ-449, JJ-522, JJ-599
Johnston	Martha		Johnston_Ma	JJ-623
Johnston	Sherry		Johnston_Sh	JJ-682
Jokl	Todd	Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts of the University of New H	Jokl_To	JJ-180, JJ-682
Jon Cohen	John Stoddard	NAIOP	Stoddard_Cohen	JJ-260, JJ-261, JJ-529, JJ-530
Joncus	Stephen		Joncus_St	JJ-354
Jones	Douglas		Jones_Do	JJ-682
Jones	Jacqueline		Jones_Ja	JJ-682
Jones	Sarah		Jones_Sa	JJ-682
Jonson	Michael		Jonson_Mi	JJ-354, JJ-522, JJ-551
Jose	Kathleen	Democratic Town Committee of Old Lyme	Jose_Ka	JJ-682
Jose	Robert		Jose_Ro	JJ-682, JJ-683
Joseph	Melanie		Joseph_Me	JJ-683
Joy	Melissa		Joy_Me	JJ-683
Judith			Judith	JJ-683
Juliana	Ca		Juliana_Ca	JJ-623
Julius	Adam		Julius_Ad	JJ-180, JJ-181, JJ-522, JJ-523
Junga	Rachel	University of New Haven	Junga_Ra	JJ-683
Jungkeit	Rachel		Jungkeit_Ra	JJ-427, JJ-683
Jungkeit	Steven	The First Congregational Church of Old Lyme	Jungkeit_St	JJ-683
Junyao	Yue	The Henry C. Lee Forensic science Institute	Junyao_Yu	JJ-683
Just	Linda		Just_Li	JJ-623
Kahl	Milton		Kahl_Mi	JJ-683
Kahn	Amy		Kahn_Am	JJ-683
Kalafarski	E.J.		Kalafarski_EJ	JJ-181
Kammrath	Brooke	University of New Haven	Kammrath_Br	JJ-683
Kankanam Kapuge	Tharindu M Premalal	University of Connecticut	Kankanam Kapuge_Th	JJ-182, JJ-487
Kantrowitz	Ralph		Kantrowitz_Ra	JJ-623
Kapinos	Stan		Kapinos_St	JJ-683
Kaplan, Ph.D.	Steven H.	University of New Haven	UNewHaven_Kaplan	JJ-723
Karimi	Bijan	University of New Haven	Karimi_Bi	JJ-683
Karpenski	Marguerita		Karpenski_Ma	JJ-182, JJ-354
Karter	Elizabeth		Karter_El	JJ-683

Table JJ–1: Commenter Index (continued)

Last Name	First Name	Agency/Business/Organization	Stakeholder ID	Page
Kasliw	Diane		Kasliw_Di	JJ-683
Kasmin	Kathleen		Kasmin_Ka	JJ-683
Kassell	Susan		Kassell_Su	JJ-623
Katauskas	Pauline		Katauskas_Pa	JJ-623
Katherine			Katherine	JJ-487, JJ-599
Kaufman	Alan		Kaufman_Al	JJ-683
Kaufman	David		Kaufman_Da	JJ-183
Kautz	Kathy		Kautz_Ka	JJ-683
Kavalgian	Myron		Kavalgian_My	JJ-551
Keeley	Lisa		Keeley_Li	JJ-683
Keenan	Pamela		Keenan_Pa	JJ-683
Keene	John	East Coast Greenway Alliance	Keene_Jo	JJ-67, JJ-354, JJ-355, JJ-427, JJ-428, JJ-633
Kehoe	Patricia		Kehoe_Pa	JJ-183, JJ-355, JJ-552
Kei	Jay		Kei_Ja	JJ-428
Kelleher	Carol		Kelleher_Ca	JJ-683
Kelley	Joan		Kelley_Jo	JJ-183, JJ-683
Kelley	Mike		Kelley_Mi	JJ-183, JJ-599
Kelley	Shannon		Kelley_Sh	JJ-355, JJ-487
Kelly	Beth		Kelly_Be	JJ-683
Kelly	James		Kelly_Ja	JJ-184, JJ-488, JJ-599
Kelly	John		Kelly_Joh	JJ-184, JJ-683
Kelly	Joseph		Kelly_Jos	JJ-683
Kelly	Patrick		Kelly_Pa	JJ-184
Kempf	Lucy	National Capital Planning Commission	NCPC_Kempf	JJ-443, JJ-466, JJ-467, JJ-536, JJ-567, JJ-577
Kennally	Lisa		Kennally_Li	JJ-683
Kennard	M. Elizabeth		Kennard_El	JJ-184, JJ-552
Kennedy	Jerry and Elizabeth		Kennedy_Je	JJ-185
Kennel	John	DE DNREC	DEDNREC_Kennel	JJ-299, JJ-457
Kennie			Kennie	JJ-624
Kenny	Janet		Kenny_Ja	JJ-185, JJ-552
Kenny	Margaret		Kenny_Ma	JJ-683
Kent	E.		Kent_E	JJ-683
Kenyon	Bruce		Kenyon_Br	JJ-683
Keogh	Cissie		Keogh_Ci	JJ-684
Keogh	Thomas F.		Keogh_Th	JJ-684
Kerr	Christopher W.		Kerr_Ch	JJ-684
Kessler	Jeff	SEPTA Youth Advisory Council	Kessler_Je	JJ-185, JJ-428, JJ-552
Kiely	Samantha		Kiely_Sa	JJ-684
Kimbis	Tom		Kimbis_Ti	JJ-624
Kindel	Deborah		Kindel_De	JJ-684
King	Amanda		King_Am	JJ-684
Kirk	Connie		Kirk_Co	JJ-684
Kirkendall-Rodriguez	Brice		Kirkendall-Rodriguez_Br	JJ-185
Kirkland	Thaddeus	City of Chester	Chester_Mayor Kirkland	JJ-296
Kirkos	James	Meadowlands Regional Chamber	Kirkos_Ja	JJ-355, JJ-356
Kirkpatrick	Gavin		Kirkpatrick_Ga	JJ-684

Table JJ-1: Commenter Index (continued)

Last Name	First Name	Agency/Business/Organization	Stakeholder ID	Page
Kirmaier	Ray		Kirmaier_Ra	JJ-449, JJ-553
Klarnet	Katy		Klarnet_Ka	JJ-553, JJ-684
Klein	D		Klein_D	JJ-684
Klemenz	Tina	University of New Haven	Klemenz_Ti	JJ-684
Klimas	Pamela		Klimas_Pa	JJ-684
Klimczak	Jane		Klimczak_Ja	JJ-684
Klinck	Stephen		Klinck_St	JJ-684
Klopp	Edward Jonathan		Klopp_Ed	JJ-624
Knauff	Gretchen		Knauff_Gr	JJ-684
Knight	Melissa		Knight_Ma	JJ-684
Knight	Randy		Knight_Ra	JJ-684
Knight	Wendy		Knight_We	JJ-684
Knobelsdorff	Kara	Lyme Academy alumnus	Knobelsdorff_Ka	JJ-684
Knodel, J.D./MEM	Marissa	Friends of the Earth	Knodel_Ma	JJ-624
Knowles	Terrance A CIV		USCG_Knowles	JJ-583
Knowlton	Drew		Knowlton_Dr	JJ-186, JJ-684
Knueppel	Jeffery	Southeastern Pennsylvania Transportation Authority	SEPTA_Knueppel	JJ-91, JJ-92, JJ-306, JJ-517, JJ-582
Koch	Eric and Julie		Koch_Er	JJ-186, JJ-684
Koenig	Claudia		Koenig_Cl	JJ-624
Koenig	Gabriele		Koenig_Ga	JJ-624
Koestner	Dan		Koestner_Da	JJ-488
Kohan	Cynthia	University of New Haven	Kohan_Cy	JJ-684
Kohan	Tim		Kohan_Ti	JJ-685
Kohrn	Lynn	University of New Haven	Kohrn_Ly	JJ-685
Koif	Nina		Koif_Ni	JJ-685
Koif	Valerie		Koif_Va	JJ-685
Kolber	Stanley		Kolber_St	JJ-356, JJ-685
Kolesinskas	Kip		Kolesinskas_Ki	JJ-186, JJ-488, JJ-599
Komara	Micky		Komara_Mi	JJ-186
Konno-Leonffu	Kattie		Konno-Leonffu_Ka	JJ-685
Koonce	Clayton G.		Koonce_Cl	JJ-624
Koptonak	Imelda		Koptonak_Im	JJ-685
Koral	Jacqueline	University of New Haven	Koral_Ja	JJ-685
Korsmeyer	Renni and Richard		Korsmeyer_RR	JJ-685
Korst	Jim & Hedy		Korst_Ji	JJ-685
Kosmina	Jaroslav	Lyme Academy Alumni	Kosmina_Ja	JJ-685
Kotnik	Morgan		Kotnik_Mo	JJ-685
Koty	Stanley		Koty_St	JJ-187, JJ-685
Kovach, P.G.	David	Delaware River Basin Commission	Kovach_Da	JJ-553, JJ-599
Kozlowski	Ginny	REX Development	Kozlowski_Gi	JJ-187
Krall	Elizabeth		Krall_El	JJ-685
Krall	Phillip		Krall_Ph	JJ-685
Kramer	Michele	Milford Preservation Trust	Kramer_Mi	JJ-188
Krasney	Ellie		Krasney_El	JJ-685
Kratzert	Sean		Kratzert_Se	JJ-685
Krauss	Michael		Krauss_Mi	JJ-188

Table JJ–1: Commenter Index (continued)

Last Name	First Name	Agency/Business/Organization	Stakeholder ID	Page
Krispin	Noreen		Krispin_No	JJ-624
Kruger	Ch		Krueger_Ch	JJ-356
Kuhn	Ashley		Kuhn_As	JJ-685
Kuhn	Lenore		Kuhn_Le	JJ-685
Kulper	Keith	KULPER & COMPANY, LLC	Kulper_Ke	JJ-599
Kunstadt	Carole		Kunstadt_Ca	JJ-685
Kuppelmeyer	Loren		Kuppelmeyer_Lo	JJ-685
Kurimay	Peter		Kurimay_Pe	JJ-188
Kurpaska	Donna		Kurpaska_Do	JJ-685
Kurtz Lansing	Amy		Kurtz Lansing_Am	JJ-686
Laadt	John		Laadt_Jo	JJ-188, JJ-428, JJ-449
Labadia	Cathy	Connecticut State Historic Preservation Office	CT SHPO_Labadia	JJ-566
Labrecque	Dan		Labrecque_Da	JJ-686
Lacari	Mark	High Speed Rail America Club	Lacari_Ma	JJ-67, JJ-68, JJ-599, JJ-600
Lacey	William		Lacey_Wi	JJ-553, JJ-600
LaConti	Candice	Lyme-Old Lyme Public Schools	LaConti_Ca	JJ-686
Lacourciere	Owen	Oakridge Forest Association	Lacourciere_Ow	JJ-686
Lacourciere	Rachel and Tom		Lacourciere_Ra	JJ-686
Lacy	Hugh	Mueser Rutledge Consulting Engineers	Lacy_Hu	JJ-189
LaFarrara	Casey		LaFarrara_Ca	JJ-189
LaGambina	Joseph		LaGambina_Jo	JJ-686
Lahm	David		Lahm_Da	JJ-686
Lamb	Cynthia		Lamb_Cy	JJ-686
Lamberto	Kimberly	University of New Haven	Lamberto_Ki	JJ-686
Lambrecht	Scott S.		Lambrecht_Sc	JJ-686
LaMesa	Salvatore		LaMesa_Sa	JJ-686
Lamothe	Blake	Palmer Rail Coalition	Lamothe_Bl	JJ-357
Lamothe	Scarlet		Lamothe_Sc	JJ-600
Lamperti	Deborah		Lamperti_De	JJ-488
Lander	Ann		Lander_An	JJ-488, JJ-686
Lander	Mark		Lander_Ma	JJ-357, JJ-687
Lane	Ann		Lane_An	JJ-687
Lane	Linda		Lane_Li	JJ-687
Lane	Terri	University of New Haven	Lane_Te	JJ-687
Lang	Susan Ferrier	Ferrier Physical Therapy	Lang_Su	JJ-687
Langley	Chelsea		Langley_Ch	JJ-687
Langlois	Steven	Connecticut College	Langlois_St	JJ-190, JJ-687
Lansdale	Carol		Lansdale_Ca	JJ-190
Lanteri	Michael		Lanteri_Mi	JJ-687
Lantz	Keri		Lantz_Ke	JJ-687
LaRocca	Jack		LaRocca_Ja	JJ-687
Larocca	Katherine	Lyme Academy Alum	Larocca_Ka	JJ-687
Laroche	Danielle		Laroche_Da	JJ-687
Laroche	Kevin	University of New haven	Laroche_Ke	JJ-687
Larsen	Ellen		Larsen_Ell	JJ-624
Larson	Elin		Larson_Eli	JJ-687, JJ-688

Table JJ-1: Commenter Index (continued)

Last Name	First Name	Agency/Business/Organization	Stakeholder ID	Page
Larson	Steven	Class of 2001 Lyme Academy	Larson_St	JJ-688
Lasser	John		Lasser_Jo	JJ-688
Latham	Jeanne	Friends of Patuxent	Latham_Je	JJ-624
Laudano	Dan	University of New Haven	Laudano_Da	JJ-688
Laurence	Christy		Laurence_Ch	JJ-688
LaViola	John		LaViola_Jo	JJ-688
Lavish	Kenneth		Lavish_Ke	JJ-624
Lawless	Cynthia	Resident of Milford	Lawless_Cy	JJ-554
Lawless	David		Lawless_Da	JJ-688
Lawrence	Jeanine		Lawrence_Je	JJ-600
Layton	Sarah	Florence Griswold Museum	Layton_Sa	JJ-688
Lazare	Marilyn	Community Music School	Lazare_Ma	JJ-688
Leach	Genese	Audubon Connecticut	Leach_Ge	JJ-449, JJ-489, JJ-490, JJ-491, JJ-506, JJ-554, JJ-600
Lebel	Ryan		Lebel_Ry	JJ-688
LeBlond	Ted		LeBlond_Te	JJ-357
Lebovitz-Miller	Emily		Lebovitz-Miller_Em	JJ-688
Lechausse	William	University of New Haven	Lechausse_Wi	JJ-688
Lee	Barton		Lee_Ba	JJ-600
Lee	Denise		Lee_De	JJ-600, JJ-688
Lee	Larry		Lee_La	JJ-688
Lee	Ryan		Lee_Ry	JJ-688
Leeson	Peggy		Leeson_Pe	JJ-688
Lefurge	Marguerite		Lefurge_Ma	JJ-688
Leger	Mary		Leger_Ma	JJ-688
Lehman	Eric		Lehman_Er	JJ-688
Leimgruber	Jennifer		Leimgruber_Je	JJ-688
Leistman	Maryclair		Leistman_Ma	JJ-190, JJ-688
Lemaire	Jason		Lemaire_Ja	JJ-688
Lender	Andrea	University of New Haven	Lender_An	JJ-689
Lenhart	Margot		Lenhart_Ma	JJ-689
Lenhart	Tom		Lenhart_To	JJ-190, JJ-357, JJ-512
Lenihan	Patricia	Docent, Florence Griswold Museum	Lenihan_Pa	JJ-689
Lennard	Kate		Lennard_Ka	JJ-689
Leonardo	Stacey		Leonardo_St	JJ-689
Levin	Joan & Ken		Levin_J	JJ-689
Levin	Richard		Levin_Ri	JJ-357
Levitz	David	Hartford Business Park	Levitz_Da	JJ-191, JJ-357, JJ-358
Levy	Eli		Levy_El	JJ-689
Lewandowski	Ann		Lewandowski_An	JJ-428
Lewerk	Joseph		Lewerk_Jo	JJ-191
Lewis	Beverly		Lewis_Be	JJ-601
Lewis	Nathan		Lewis_Na	JJ-689
Lewis	Orville C.		Lewis_Or	JJ-625
Lewis	STacey		Lewis_St	JJ-689
Li	James		Li_Ja	JJ-192, JJ-358
Liang	Jiajuan	University of New Haven	Liang_Ji	JJ-689

Table JJ–1: Commenter Index (continued)

Last Name	First Name	Agency/Business/Organization	Stakeholder ID	Page
Liberton	Denise		Liberton_De	JJ-192
Licht	Nicholas		Licht_Ni	JJ-689
Lidstrom	John		Lidstrom_Jo	JJ-689
Lieberman	Alexandra		Lieberman_Al	JJ-192, JJ-193
Ligon	Laureen		Ligon_La	JJ-689
Linares	Robin		Linares_Ro	JJ-193
Lincoln	Patricia		Lincoln_Pa	JJ-689
Lindblad	Karl		Lindblad_Ka	JJ-193
Lindholm	Elizabeth		Lindholm_El	JJ-689
Linell	Thomas		Linell_Th	JJ-193, JJ-358
Lipeika	Karen	Lyme Art Association	Lipeika_Ka	JJ-689
Lipp	Katen		Lipp_Ka	JJ-689
Listokin	Yair		Listokin_Ya	JJ-193
Listorti	John	Old Lyme Town Band	Listorti_Jo	JJ-689
Little	Gene	KS Engineers, PC	Little_Ge	JJ-601
Littlefield	David		Littlefield_Da	JJ-689
Liversidge	Helen		Liversidge_He	JJ-625
LLanos	Alexis	Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts of the University of New H	LLanos_Al	JJ-689
Lofstad	Laura		Lofstad_La	JJ-689
Logan	Olwen	LymeLine.com	Logan_Ol	JJ-689
Lomasky	Levi		Lomasky_Le	JJ-689
Long	A		Long_A	JJ-689
Long	David	Old Lyme Congregational Church	Long_Da	JJ-689
Long	Mary Louise		Long_Ma	JJ-690
Longobardi	Domonick		Floral Park_Trustee Longobardi	JJ-76, JJ-464, JJ-504, JJ-535
Loper	Deborah		Loper_De	JJ-601
Lopez	Andrew		Lopez_An	JJ-194, JJ-428, JJ-429
Lord	Pauline		Lord_Pa	JJ-690
Louis	John	Sierra Club, MA Greater Boston	Louis_Jo	JJ-601
Lovejoy	Tim		Lovejoy_Ti	JJ-690
Lowe	Donn	B of L.E. retired	Lowe_Do	JJ-194, JJ-359
Lowe	Ed		Lowe_Ed	JJ-625
Lower	William	Harvey, Hanna & Associates, Inc.	Lower_Wi	JJ-359, JJ-690
Loyola	L. Albert	Delaware Transit Corporation	DTC_Loyola	JJ-75, JJ-416, JJ-514
Lu	Max	University of New Haven	Lu_Ma	JJ-690
Lubrano	Linda	UNH	Lubrano_Li	JJ-690
Lucas	Daryl		Lucas_Da	JJ-194
Lucas	Rick		Lucas_Ri	JJ-195, JJ-359, JJ-523
Lucashu	John		Lucashu_Jo	JJ-359
Luce	James		Luce_Ja	JJ-690
Luciani	J		Luciani_J	JJ-195
Ludington	Karen	University of New Haven (retiree)	Ludington_Ka	JJ-690
Ludington	Townsend		Ludington_To	JJ-690
Luering	Erna		Luering_Er	JJ-690
Lukasik	Tanya		Lukasik-Ta	JJ-429, JJ-554, JJ-555, JJ-601
Lukens	Jan	Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts alumni	Lukens_Ja	JJ-690

Table JJ–1: Commenter Index (continued)

Last Name	First Name	Agency/Business/Organization	Stakeholder ID	Page
Lukezic	Craig	State of Delaware Historical and Cultural Affairs	DE SHPO_Lukezic	JJ-75, JJ-298, JJ-457, JJ-504
Luna	Brenda		Luna_Br	JJ-690
Lundy	Jeff		Lundy_Je	JJ-690
Lussier	Karl		Lussier_Ka	JJ-690
Lutmerding	Jo Anna	Patuxent Wildlife Research Center	Lutmerding_Jo	JJ-625
Luttrell	Sarah	University of Maryland - Baltimore County	Luttrell_Sa	JJ-625
Lyman	Charlotte		Lyman_Ch	JJ-690
Lyons	John		Lyons_Jo	JJ-359, JJ-360
M	Carole		M_Ca	JJ-690
M			M	JJ-195, JJ-213, JJ-315, JJ-346, JJ-425, JJ-444, JJ-445, JJ-452, JJ-603, JJ-604, JJ-690, JJ-692, JJ-695
Macbride	David	University of Hartford	Macbride_Da	JJ-633
MacClintock	Dorcas	Yale Peabody Museum	MacClintock_Do	JJ-690
MacDonald	Karen		MacDonald_Ka	JJ-690
MacDonald	Richard	DOD	MacDonald_Ri	JJ-196, JJ-429
Machado	Lauren		Machado_La	JJ-690
Machnick	Darlene		Machnik_Da	JJ-690
Machnik	Joseph	Univ. of New Haven Alumnus	Machnik_Jo	JJ-690
Mackay	Daniel	Connecticut Trust for Historic Preservation	Mackay_Da	JJ-690, JJ-691
Mackey	Catherine		Mackey_Ca	JJ-691
Mackin	Denise		Mackin_De	JJ-691
MacKinnon	Marily		MacKinnon_Ma	JJ-691
Madappanahalli	Akash		Madappanahalli_Ak	JJ-691
Madsen	Erik		Madsen_Er	JJ-196, JJ-360
Maffucci	Janet	Alumni of University of New Haven	Maffucci_Ja	JJ-691
Mager	Guillermo		Mager_Gu	JJ-691
Mager	John		Mager_Jo	JJ-196
Magnussen	Jan		Magnussen_Ja	JJ-691
Magnussen	Kristin		Magnussen_Kr	JJ-691
Mahar	Brian		Mahar_Br	JJ-691
Maher	Stephanie		Maher_St	JJ-360
Mahida	Viraj		Mahida_Vi	JJ-197
Mahida-solanki	Bhamini	University of New Haven	Mahida-solanki_Bh	JJ-197
Mahler	Matthew		Mahler_Ma	JJ-197, JJ-429
Mahlstedt	Dean		Mahlstedt_De	JJ-625
Main	Edith Robert		Main_Ed	JJ-691
Maines	Kat		Maines_Ka	JJ-198
Maits	Scott		Maits_Sc	JJ-198, JJ-199, JJ-200, JJ-201, JJ-360, JJ-361, JJ-362, JJ-363, JJ-364, JJ-365, JJ-366, JJ-367, JJ-368, JJ-429, JJ-430, JJ-431, JJ-491, JJ-523, JJ-524, JJ-601, JJ-602, JJ-691
Maize	Carolyn		Maize_Ca	JJ-625
Majors	Forest		Majors_For	JJ-691
Malaguti	Jen		Malaguti_Je	JJ-202, JJ-691
Malchodi	Thomas	University of New Haven	Malchodi_Th	JJ-691
Malcolm	Deborah		Malcolm_De	JJ-691
Malewicki	Debbie		Malewicki_De	JJ-691
Malhotra	Akshay		Malhotra_Ak	JJ-691
Malicka	Anna		Malicka_An	JJ-202, JJ-691
Mallory	Diane	Historic District Commission	Mallory_Di	JJ-691, JJ-692

Table JJ–1: Commenter Index (continued)

Last Name	First Name	Agency/Business/Organization	Stakeholder ID	Page
Malloy	Dannel	State of Connecticut	Governor CT_Malloy	JJ-515, JJ-576
Malmberg	Barbara	Visit New Haven	Malmberg_Ba	JJ-202, JJ-368
Malon	Kathleen		Malon_Ka	JJ-692
Mandeville	Dominick		Mandeville_Do	JJ-692
Mandeville	Monica		Mandeville_Mo	JJ-692
Mandrile	Cecilia	University of New Haven	Mandrile_Ce	JJ-692
Mangal	Mayra		Mangal_Ma	JJ-203
Mangham	Robert	University of New Haven Alumni	Mangham_Ro	JJ-692
Mango	Sandra		Mango_Sa	JJ-692
Manicastri	Steven	GEU-UAW	Manicastri_St	JJ-431, JJ-449
Manson	Kathryn		Manson_Ka	JJ-692
Maples	Stephen		Maples_St	JJ-203
Marano	James	University of New Haven alumnus	Marano_Ja	JJ-692
Marcus	Susan		Marcus_Su	JJ-203, JJ-368
Marden	Kurt	Association for Public Transit	Marden_Ku	JJ-369, JJ-431, JJ-602
Margaret	Seibert		Margaret_Se	JJ-204, JJ-692
Margules	Howard		Margules_Ho	JJ-692
Margules	Mary Jo		Margules_Ma	JJ-692
Mari	Brian	University of New Haven	Mari_Br	JJ-692
Mark	Jonathan	Village of Scarsdale	Scarsdale_Mayor Mark	JJ-64, JJ-88, JJ-89
Markatos-Soriano	Dennis	East Coast Greenway Alliance	Markatos-Soriano_De	JJ-431
Markmaitree	Tip		Markmaitree_Ti	JJ-692
Markovic	Vesna		Markovic_Ve	JJ-692
Markowitz	Ted	Cognosys LLC	Markowitz_Te	JJ-692
Marks	Barbara		Marks_Ba	JJ-204, JJ-692
Marks	Howard		Marks_Ho	JJ-369, JJ-449
Marmon	Stephen		Marmon_St	JJ-205
Marsh	Allie		Marsh_AI	JJ-692
Marsh	Edward		Marsh_Ed	JJ-205, JJ-692
Marsh	Geoff		Marsh_Ge	JJ-692, JJ-693
Marsh	Linda		Marsh_Li	JJ-693
Marsh	Sophie		Marsh_So	JJ-693
Marshall	Catherine J.	University of New Haven Alumna	Marshall_Ca	JJ-693
Marshall	Robbie		Marshall_Ro	JJ-555
Martel	Julie		Martel_Ju	JJ-693
Martell	Donna		Martell_Do	JJ-693
Martin	Dennis	NJ Transit	NJ TRANSIT_Martin	JJ-83, JJ-302, JJ-419, JJ-468, JJ-579
Martin	Fred		Martin_Fr	JJ-602, JJ-693
Martin	James P.		Martin_Ja	JJ-431, JJ-492
Martin	Marie		Martin_Ma	JJ-693
Martinez	Chris		Martinez_Ch	JJ-693
Martinez	Patricia		Martinez_Pa	JJ-205
Martinez	Tiffany		Martinez_Ti	JJ-693
Masih	Pankhuri		Masih_Pa	JJ-693
Mason	Michelle	University of New Haven	Mason_Ma	JJ-693
Massa	Leslie		Massa_Le	JJ-693

Table JJ–1: Commenter Index (continued)

Last Name	First Name	Agency/Business/Organization	Stakeholder ID	Page
Massa	Mark		Massa_Ma	JJ-206, JJ-693
Massa	Michael		Massa_Mi	JJ-206, JJ-693, JJ-694
Mastanduono	Thomas		Mastanduono_Th	JJ-207
Mastroly	Frank		Mastroly_Fr	JJ-524
Mastromarino	Anthony	University of New Haven	Mastromarino_An	JJ-694
Masucci	Joseph		Masucci_Jo	JJ-207, JJ-602
Matano	Maryann		Matano_Ma	JJ-694
Matarese	Kimberly		Matarese_Ki	JJ-694
Mateer	Judy & Paul		Mateer_Ju	JJ-694
Mathews	Edward		Mathews_Ed	JJ-694
Mathur	Vishal		Mathur_Vi	JJ-694
Matthew	Jill		Matthew_Ji	JJ-694
May	Daniel	University of New Haven	May_Da	JJ-694
May	Joan		May_Jo	JJ-694
Mayer	Philip		Mayer_Ph	JJ-602
Mayoros	Jack		Mayoros_Ja	JJ-694
Maze	Walter		Maze_Wa	JJ-369
Mazerolle	Michelle	Oak Ridge National Laboratory	Mazerolle_Mi	JJ-694
Mazzalupo	Marc		Mazzalupo_Ma	JJ-207, JJ-694
Mazzarella	Briab		Mazzarella_Br	JJ-207
McAdams	Kenneth		McAdams_Ke	JJ-694
McAndrew	Richard	UNH alumni	McAndrew_Ri	JJ-694
McAraw	Tammy	member of town	McAraw-Ta	JJ-694
McArdle	Joseph	Sierra Club	McArdle_Jo	JJ-208, JJ-602
Mcbeth	Pat		Mcbeth_Pa	JJ-694
McCaffrey	Lynn		McCaffrey_Ly	JJ-694
McCall	Kay		McCall_Ka	JJ-694
McCann	Andrew		McCann_An	JJ-208
McCann	Susan		McCann_Su	JJ-492
McCarthy	Dr. Keith		McCarthy_Ke	JJ-208, JJ-695
McCarthy	Hilary		McCarthy_Hi	JJ-694
McCarthy	Judy		McCarthy_Ju	JJ-695
McCarthy	Lisa		McCarthy_Li	JJ-695
McCarty	Anne		McCarty_An	JJ-695
McCawley	Susan		McCawley_Su	JJ-695
Mcclave	James		Mcclave_Ja	JJ-695
McCormack	Virginia		McCormack_Va	JJ-695
McCoskey	Dana		McCoskey_Da	JJ-625
McCreedy	Jacqueline		McCreedy_Ja	JJ-695
McCullough	Fred		McCullough_Fr	JJ-603, JJ-695
McCullough	Karen		McCullough_Ka	JJ-603
McDonald	Helen		McDonald_He	JJ-695
McDonald	Neil		McDonald_Ne	JJ-369
McDonald	William		McDonald_Wi	JJ-208
McDonough	Kathryn		McDonough_Ka	JJ-695
McEnery	Dennis	Floral Park Third Track Task Force	McEnery_De	JJ-603

Table JJ–1: Commenter Index (continued)

Last Name	First Name	Agency/Business/Organization	Stakeholder ID	Page
McFadden	Dana		McFadden_Da	JJ-208, JJ-695
McGee	Glenn		McGee_Gl	JJ-695
McGee	Joseph	The Business Council of Fairfield County	McGee_Jo	JJ-209, JJ-370, JJ-492
McGee	Summer	University of New Haven	McGee_Su	JJ-695
McGill	Paul		McGill_Pa	JJ-370, JJ-492, JJ-695
McGlinchey	Kevin		McGlinchey_Ke	JJ-695
McGlinchey	Tracy		McGlinchey_Tr	JJ-695
McGrath	Susan		McGrath_Su	JJ-603, JJ-695
McGuire	Brendan		McGuire_Br	JJ-209, JJ-695
McGuire	Carolyn		McGuire_Ca	JJ-209
McGurk	Bob		McGurk_Bo	JJ-209, JJ-210, JJ-432
McInerney	Eileen		McInerney_Ei	JJ-695
McInerney	James		McInerney_Ja	JJ-696
McIntyre	Anne-Marie		McIntyre_An	JJ-696
Mckee	Aaron	Synistral writing	Mckee_Aa	JJ-696
Mckee	Jody		Mckee_Jo	JJ-696
Mckee	Mark	MS17 Art project	Mckee_Ma	JJ-696
McKeever	Kathleen		McKeever_Ka	JJ-696
McKeon	Marie		McKeon_Ma	JJ-696
McKeown	Eugene		McKeown_Eu	JJ-370
McKie	Barbara and James McKie		McKie_Ba	JJ-696
McKillop	Peter		McKillop_Pe	JJ-696
Mcknight	Craig		Mcknight_Cr	JJ-210, JJ-696
McKnight	Nicholas	BioBots	McKnight_Ni	JJ-696
McKnight	Robert		McKnight_Ro	JJ-696
McKnight	Susan		McKnight_Su	JJ-492, JJ-696
McKnight	Tory		McKnight_To	JJ-696, JJ-697
McLaughlin	Matthew		McLaughlin_Ma	JJ-210, JJ-555
McLean	Marcia		McLean_Ma	JJ-450, JJ-697
McMahon	Carol		McMahon_Ca	JJ-697
McMullen	Joyce		McMullen_Jo	JJ-697
McNair	Martha		McNair_Ma	JJ-697
McNatt	Kasey		McNatt_Ka	JJ-697
McNerney	Dennis		McNerney_De	JJ-697
McNiff	David		McNiff_Da	JJ-211, JJ-697
McQuade	Judy	town resident, 35 years	McQuade_Ju	JJ-697
McQuade	Susan		McQuade_Su	JJ-492, JJ-697
McQuade	Tracy		McQuade_Tr	JJ-697
Me	Melody		Me_Me	JJ-603
Meghan			Meghan	JJ-697
Mehrotra	Neil	Brown University	Mehrotra_Ne	JJ-371
Melius	Nancy		Melius_Na	JJ-603
Mellos	Georgia		Mellos_Ge	JJ-697
Menges	Richard		Menges_Ri	JJ-603, JJ-604
Menzin	Carlin		Menzin_Ca	JJ-697

Table JJ-1: Commenter Index (continued)

Last Name	First Name	Agency/Business/Organization	Stakeholder ID	Page
Merante	Anthony		Merante_An	JJ-604
Mercado	Melissa		Mercado_Me	JJ-697
Mereday	Meta	Veterans Entrepreneurial Development Initiatives, Inc	Mereday_Me	JJ-555, JJ-604
Mergy	Leroy		Mergy_Le	JJ-698
Merjave	Corinne	University of New Haven	Merjave_Co	JJ-698
Merola	Jill		Merola_Ji	JJ-211
Merrill	Mary		Merrill_Ma	JJ-698
Merrill	Polly		Merrill_Po	JJ-698
Merton	Mimi		Merton_Mi	JJ-698
Mesham	Nancy		Mesham_Na	JJ-698
Metzger	John	IDSNA	Metzger_Jo	JJ-371
Meyer	Carolyn		Meyer_Ca	JJ-698
Meyer	Ma		Meyer_Ma	JJ-634
Meyers	Dave	Tax payer	Meyers_Da	JJ-211
Michel	Brian		Michel_Br	JJ-698
Michelle			Michelle	JJ-211, JJ-555
Michelson	Jennifer		Michelson_Je	JJ-492
Middleton	Taritha L.		Middleton-Ta	JJ-211, JJ-698
Mikki	Said	University of New Haven	Mikki_Sa	JJ-698
Milardo	Michael		Milardo_Mi	JJ-698
Miles	Lorraine		Miles_Lo	JJ-698
Miller	Anne	Citizens for a Palmer Rail Stop	Miller_An	JJ-371
Miller	Colleen		Miller_Co	JJ-698
Miller	Jeremiah		Miller_Je	JJ-698
Miller	Laura Lee		Miller_La	JJ-698
Miller	Libby		Miller_Li	JJ-211
Miller	Pam	SHiFT Cycling	Miller_Pa	JJ-698
Miller-Aird	Cynthia		Miller-Aird_Cy	JJ-211, JJ-698
Miller-Murphy	Richard	Blood, Laboratory and Medical Services	Miller-Murphy_Ri	JJ-698
Millhiser	Virginia		Millhiser_Vi	JJ-698
Mills	Robert		Mills_Ro	JJ-698
Minetti	Travis	University of New Haven	Minetti_Tr	JJ-698
Minkler	Bonnie Gallo		Minkler_Bo	JJ-625
Minkler	Peter		Minkler_Pe	JJ-625
Miragliuolo	Joseph		Miragliuolo_Jo	JJ-212
Miranda	Patrica	Miranda Arts Project Space	Miranda_Pa	JJ-698
Miranda	Stephanie		Miranda_St	JJ-698
Mirmahboub	Pouya	UNH alumni	Mirmahboub_Po	JJ-699
Misiaszek	Arthur		Misiaszek_Ar	JJ-699
Mitchel	Peg		Mitchel_Pe	JJ-699
Mitchell	Alison	Old Lyme Historical Society	Mitchell_Al	JJ-212, JJ-699
Mitchell	Pam		Mitchell_Pa	JJ-699
Mitchell	Sandra		Mitchell_Sa	JJ-699
Mitchell	Steven		Mitchell_St	JJ-634
Mittelman	Dan		Mittelman_Da	JJ-212
Mletschnig	Joyce		Mletschnig_Jo	JJ-699

Table JJ–1: Commenter Index (continued)

Last Name	First Name	Agency/Business/Organization	Stakeholder ID	Page
Mletschnig	Peter		Mletschnig_Pe	JJ-556
Mock	Bradley		Mock_Br	JJ-699
Moeller	Bernecia		Moeller_Be	JJ-493
Mogollon	Mar		Mogollon_Ma	JJ-371
Mol	Nancy		Mol_Na	JJ-699
Moll	Andrew		Moll_An	JJ-212
Monagle	Jessica		Monagle_Je	JJ-699
Monson	Kimberly		Monson_Ki	JJ-699
Montanaro	Jane		Montanaro_Ja	JJ-699
Monteiro	Stasia	Hispanic Association of Contractors and Enterprises (HACE)	Monteiro_St	JJ-371, JJ-556
Moody	Joseph		Moody_Jo	JJ-212, JJ-556
Moore	Lesley		Moore_Le	JJ-699
Moore	Marcia		Moore_Ma	JJ-213
Moore	Stephen	US Taxpayer and Old Lyme Resident	Moore_St	JJ-699, JJ-700
Mora	Suzanne		Mora_Su	JJ-493
Morey	Gabriel		Morey_Ga	JJ-213
Morgan	Danielle		Morgan_Da	JJ-700
Morgan	Margaret		Morgan_Ma	JJ-213
Morgen	Evelyn	Old Lyme Phoebe Griffin Noyes Library	Morgen_Ev	JJ-700
Moriarty	Jim		Moriarty_Ji	JJ-700
Moriarty	Nicholas		Moriarty_Ni	JJ-625
Morris	Barbara		Morris_Ba	JJ-700
Morris	Linda	University of New Haven	Morris_Li	JJ-700
Morris	Michael	University of New Haven	Morris_Mi	JJ-700
Morris	Roy		Morris_Ro	JJ-371
Morrison	Jo		Morrison_Jo	JJ-625, JJ-700
Morrison	John		Morrison_Joh	JJ-700
Morrissey	Christopher		Morrissey_Ch	JJ-700
Morrissey	Jessica		Morrissey_Je	JJ-700
Mosier	Rachel	Power Delivery Consultants	Mosier_Ra	JJ-214
Moulton	Seth	Sixth District - Massachusetts	Congress MA_Moulton	JJ-296
Mountanos	Tristan		Mountanos_Tr	JJ-214, JJ-372
Moye	Paulette	University of New Haven	Moye_Pa	JJ-700
Moylan	Margaret		Moylan_Ma	JJ-604
Mueler	John & Eileen		Mueler_Jo	JJ-700
Mueller	Eileen		Mueller_Ei	JJ-700
Muir	Kathryn		Muir_Ka	JJ-700
Mulcahy	Douglas		Mulcahy_Do	JJ-700
Mullaney	Christine		Mullaney_Ch	JJ-214
Mullen	Patrick	Recumbent riders	Mullen_Pa	JJ-634
Mullen	Peter		Mullen_Pe	JJ-604
Mullen	Steven		Mullen_St	JJ-625
Mulligan	Richard		Mulligan_Ri	JJ-700
Mundy	Ted		Mundy_Te	JJ-700
Munster	Edward		Munster_Ed	JJ-638
Muntz	Eileen		Muntz_Ei	JJ-215, JJ-493

Table JJ–1: Commenter Index (continued)

Last Name	First Name	Agency/Business/Organization	Stakeholder ID	Page
Muntz	Ray		Muntz_Ra	JJ-604
Munukoti	Dinesh		Munukoti_Di	JJ-700
Muratore	Anthony		Muratore_An	JJ-604
Murdocco	Richard	The Foggiest Idea	Murdocco_Ri	JJ-215, JJ-372, JJ-556, JJ-557, JJ-604
Murphy	Dan	Saint Barnabas Hospital	Murphy_Da	JJ-215
Murphy	Karen		Murphy_Kar	JJ-215, JJ-372, JJ-700
Murphy	Kathleen		Murphy_Kat	JJ-700
Murphy	Kevin	University of New Haven	Murphy_Ke	JJ-700
Murphy	M.		Murphy_M	JJ-216, JJ-700
Murphy	Marie		Murphy_Mari	JJ-216
Murphy	Mary	University of New Haven	Murphy_Mary	JJ-700
Murphy	Michael		Murphy_Mi	JJ-216
Murphy	Walter		Murphy_Wa	JJ-68, JJ-216, JJ-604
Murray	Bob		Murray_Bo	JJ-700
Muscato	Nicole		Muscato_Ni	JJ-216, JJ-217, JJ-700, JJ-701
Myers	Daniel		Myers_Da	JJ-701
Myers	Linda R.		Myers_Li	JJ-625
Myers	Robbin		Myers_Ro	JJ-701
Nadler	Jill		Nadler_Ji	JJ-701
Napolitano	Ralph	Retiree LIRR -FRA Manager	Napolitano_Ra	JJ-217, JJ-372, JJ-432
Narkis	Joann		Narkis_Jo	JJ-701
Nash	Elizabeth		Nash_El	JJ-701
Nauta	Andrew		Nauta_An	JJ-217, JJ-372
Nayowith	Maureen	Atkins	Nayowith_Ma	JJ-218
Nazar	Debra		Nazar_De	JJ-218
Nazro	Juliette		Nazro_Ju	JJ-701
Neale	Bill	Radiall New Haven	Neale_Bi	JJ-218, JJ-219
Nealy	Hubert		Nealy_Hu	JJ-372, JJ-373
Neckanoff	Dera		Neckanoff_De	JJ-219, JJ-493, JJ-558
Necklas	Mike		Necklas_Mi	JJ-701
Neef	Natasha		Neef_Na	JJ-219, JJ-432
Neill	Margaret		Neill_Ma	JJ-701
Nelson	David		Nelson_Da	JJ-373, JJ-701
Nelson	Katherine		Nelson_Kat	JJ-219, JJ-373
Nelson	Kaylin	University of New Haven alumni C/O 2012	Nelson_Kay	JJ-701
Nelson	Leslie		Nelson_Le	JJ-701
Nelson	Lindy	U.S. Department of the Interior	DOI_Nelson	JJ-458, JJ-459
Nelson	Paul		Nelson_Pa	JJ-701
Nerlinger	Susan		Nerlinger_Su	JJ-625
nes PE	Frank		Nes_Fr	JJ-524
Nesemeier	Gregg		Nesemeier_Gr	JJ-220
Newbegin	Brenda		Newbegin_Br	JJ-701
Newcombe	Patrick		Newcombe_Pa	JJ-626
Newell	Hazel		Newell_Ha	JJ-626
Newton	Karen		Newton_Ka	JJ-701
Nguyen	Be	University of New Haven	Nguyen_Be	JJ-701

Table JJ–1: Commenter Index (continued)

Last Name	First Name	Agency/Business/Organization	Stakeholder ID	Page
Niblack	Heidi		Niblack_He	JJ-701
Nichols	Emily		Nichols_Em	JJ-634
Nichols	William		Nichols_Wi	JJ-605
Nickerson	Colleen		Nickerson_Co	JJ-701
Nicosia-Rusin	Ralph		Nicosia-Rusin_Ra	JJ-525, JJ-605
Nielsen	Heather		Nielsen_He	JJ-220, JJ-558, JJ-605
Niichel	Carmen		Niichel_Ca	JJ-701
Nilsson	Leif		Nilsson_Le	JJ-701
Nocito-Gobel	Jean		Nocito-Gobel_Je	JJ-701
Noda	Michael		Noda_Mi	JJ-373, JJ-374
Noniewicz	Elizabeth		Noniewicz_El	JJ-701
Norris	John	AREMA	Norris_Jo	JJ-605
Norris	Laura		Norris_La	JJ-701
Norris III, P.E.	Edward O. (Ted)	South Central Connecticut Regional Water Authority	SCCRWA_Norris	JJ-90, JJ-582
Northrop	Willard		Northrop_Wi	JJ-220, JJ-221
Nosal	Mary Jo		Old Lyme_Selectwoman Nosal	JJ-64, JJ-640
Noujaim	Nazih		Noujaim_Na	JJ-701
Novack	Kate		Novack_Ka	JJ-701
Novick	Barbara		Novick_Ba	JJ-701
Novorio	Dana		Novorio_Da	JJ-702
Nowak	JR		Nowak_JR	JJ-374
Noyes	Barbara		Noyes_Ba	JJ-702
Noyes	Ellen		Noyes_El	JJ-702
Noyes	John		Noyes_Jo	JJ-702
Nucifora	Dominic		Nucifora_Do	JJ-626
Nucifora	Sal		Nucifora_Sa	JJ-374
Nunn	Ryan		Nunn_Ry	JJ-493, JJ-702
Nystrom	Britt		Nystrom_Br	JJ-702
Oberg	Kara		Oberg_Ka	JJ-221
O'Brien	Ann		O'Brien_An	JJ-221
O'Bryan	Eric		O'Bryan_Er	JJ-702
O'Connor	Helene		O'Connor_He	JJ-375
Odeh	Sam	Design America Engineering	Odeh_Sa	JJ-221
O'Dell	Dawn		O'Dell_Da	JJ-702
Offringa	Reid		Offringa_Re	JJ-634
Ofsharick	Morgan	Senior at Lyme Academy	Ofsharick_Mo	JJ-702
Ogden	Denise TK		Ogden_De	JJ-702
Ogety	Bharath	UNH	Ogety_Bh	JJ-222
Ogorzalek	Margarita	Private Home Owner	Ogorzalek_Ma	JJ-702
Olanoff	Steve		Olanoff_St	JJ-222
Oleksy	Ed	University of New Haven	Oleksy_Ed	JJ-222
Oles	Mark		Oles_Ma	JJ-223, JJ-375
Ollinger	Derrick		Ollinger_De	JJ-626
Olsen	Janet		Olsen_Ja	JJ-702
Olsen	Kathleen		Olsen_Ka	JJ-702
Olson	Cynthia		Olson_Cy	JJ-702

Table JJ-1: Commenter Index (continued)

Last Name	First Name	Agency/Business/Organization	Stakeholder ID	Page
Olson	Matt		Olson_Ma	JJ-702
Olsson	Wendy B.		Olsson_We	JJ-626
O'Malley	Brian	Central Maryland Transportation Alliance	O'Malley_Br	JJ-223, JJ-375
O'Marra	Sean		O'Marra_Se	JJ-702
O'Meara	William	Old Lyme Economic Development Commission	O'Meara_Wi	JJ-702
Opila	Jeff		Opila_Je	JJ-702
Oppelt, Jr.	Frederick		Oppelt_Fre	JJ-702
O'Reilly	Jim		O'Reilly_Ji	JJ-223
Oresky	Alan		Oresky_Al	JJ-626
Orlando	Danielle		Orlando_Da	JJ-702
Orleans	Bill		Orleans_Bi	JJ-375
Oros	Raymond		Oros_Ra	JJ-702
Ortiz	Louis	AECOM	Ortiz_Lu	JJ-224
Ortoleva	Tracie	Resident of Old Lyme	Ortoleva_Tr	JJ-702
Oryani	Kazem		Oryani_Ka	JJ-450, JJ-493
Orzech	Judith		Orzech_Ju	JJ-702
Orzech	Marsha		Orzech_Ma	JJ-703
Osborne	Ben		Osborne_Be	JJ-432
O'Shea	Margaret		O'Shea_Ma	JJ-703
Osler	James		Osler_Ja	JJ-506
Ossmann	Eric		Ossmann_Er	JJ-493, JJ-703
Ossmann	Frank		Ossmann_Fr	JJ-224, JJ-703
Ossmann	Marilyn		Ossmann_Ma	JJ-703
Ostapeck	Gary		Ostapeck_Ga	JJ-703
Ostering	Cynthia		Ostering_Cy	JJ-703
Ouellette	Theresa		Ouellette_Th	JJ-703
Overend	Gregory		Overend_Gr	JJ-703
Overton	Richard	UNH Alumni Association	Overton_Ri	JJ-703
Owens	Elizabeth		Owens_El	JJ-224
Owens	Kimberly		Owens_Ki	JJ-605
Oz	Arieh		Oz_Ar	JJ-703
P	Esther		P_Es	JJ-703
Pacelli	Darlene	University of New Haven	Pacelli_Da	JJ-703
Pacheco	Adam		Pacheco_Ad	JJ-225
Pacheco	Joseph		Pacheco_Jos	JJ-225
Padgett III	John B.		Padgett_Joh	JJ-703
Padgette	Rob	Northeast Corridor Infrastructure and Operations Advisory Co	NEC Commission_Padgette	JJ-80, JJ-418, JJ-517
Painter	Robert		Painter_Ro	JJ-225, JJ-525
Palmer	Peter S.	Raritan Valley Rail Coalition	Palmer_Pe	JJ-376, JJ-525
Pantuso	Helen		Pantuso_He	JJ-703
Papowitz	Melinda		Papowitz_Me	JJ-703
Papp	Al		Papp_Al	JJ-226, JJ-376, JJ-525, JJ-605
Pappalardo	Frank		Pappalardo_Fr	JJ-703
Paradine	Brian		Paradine_Br	JJ-226
Paradis	Angela		Paradis_An	JJ-703
Parillo	Tony	Somers HS Art Dept	Parillo_To	JJ-703

Table JJ–1: Commenter Index (continued)

Last Name	First Name	Agency/Business/Organization	Stakeholder ID	Page
Park	Euna	UNIVERSITY OF NEW HAVEN	Park_Eu	JJ-703
Parkinson	Ann		Parkinson_An	JJ-703
Parks	Melissa	University of New Haven	Parks_Me	JJ-703
Parmelee	Kathryn		Parmelee_Ka	JJ-703
Parodi	Susan		Parodi_Su	JJ-703
Parrara	Carl		Parrara_Ca	JJ-226
Parry	Rebecca		Parry_Re	JJ-703
Pasay	Amanda		Pasay_Am	JJ-704
Pasquini	Mario		Pasquini_Ma	JJ-227
Passero	Michael E.	City of New London	New London_Mayor Passero	JJ-81, JJ-302, JJ-468, JJ-578
Passero	Michael E.	City of New London	New London_Mayor Passero	JJ-81, JJ-302, JJ-468, JJ-578
Passoni	Robert	Lexington Green Homeowners Assoc.	Passoni_Ro	JJ-605
Pastel	Kathleen		Pastel_Ka	JJ-704
Patelunas	Anthony		Patelunas_An	JJ-227, JJ-376
Paterson, Esq.	Amy Blaymore	Connecticut Land Conservation Council	Paterson_Am	JJ-493, JJ-494, JJ-606
Patlolla	Raghavender reddy	Yale	Patlolla_Ra	JJ-704
Paulis	Marie		Paulis_Ma	JJ-704
Pazzano	Priscilla		Pazzano_Pr	JJ-227, JJ-376
Pearce	Bruce		Pearce_Br	JJ-228
Pease	David		Pease_Da	JJ-704
Pecka	Pauline	Lyme Academy University of New Haven	Pecka_Pa	JJ-704
Peitrowski	Stephen		Peitrowski_St	JJ-228
Pellett	Ocean	docent at Florence Griswold Museum	Pellett_Oc	JJ-704
Pelliccia	Joe		Pelliccia_Jo	JJ-228, JJ-526
Peltenburg-Brechneff	Christian		Peltenburg-Brechneff_Ch	JJ-704
Penfield	Thomas		Penfield_Th	JJ-704
Pennie	Kirsten & William		Pennie_Ki	JJ-704
Penniman	Chris		Penniman_Ch	JJ-704
Penniman	Clayton		Penniman_Cl	JJ-704
Percy	Marilyn	Florence Griswold Museum	Percy_Ma	JJ-704
Pereira	Mary		Pereira_Ma	JJ-606
Peresman	Claudia		Peresman_Cl	JJ-229
Perks	Michael		Perks_Mi	JJ-704
Perks	Sandra		Perks_Sa	JJ-704
Perl	Susan and Michael		Perl_Su	JJ-704
Perlini	Paula		Perlini_Pa	JJ-705
Perreault	Mark		Perreault_Ma	JJ-230, JJ-377
Perreten	Sarah		Perreten_Sa	JJ-558, JJ-705
Perry	Ann Marie		Perry_An	JJ-705
Perry	Barbara		Perry_Ba	JJ-705
Perry	Kristian		Perry_Kr	JJ-626
Perry	Nathan	Lyme Academy Alumni	Perry_Na	JJ-705
Perry	Raymond J.	JRM Architectural Partnership	Perry_Ra	JJ-230
Persson	Jon		Persson_Jo	JJ-230, JJ-377
Perugini	Teresa		Perugini_Te	JJ-705
Perumalla	Ram		Perumalla_Ra	JJ-705

Table JJ-1: Commenter Index (continued)

Last Name	First Name	Agency/Business/Organization	Stakeholder ID	Page
Peruzzotti	Carl		Peruzzotti_Ca	JJ-495, JJ-705
Peruzzotti	Stella		Peruzzotti_St	JJ-705, JJ-706
Petaja	Theresa		Petaja_Th	JJ-231, JJ-558
Peter			Peter	JJ-231, JJ-450, JJ-559
Peters	Donna		Peters_Do	JJ-705
Petersen	Rose		Petersen_Ro	JJ-705
Peterson	Charles	University of New Haven	Peterson_Ch	JJ-705
Peterson	Erik		Peterson_Er	JJ-705
Peterson	Pete		Peterson_Pe	JJ-705
Petition		Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts	LACFA_Petition	JJ-686
Petrecca	Marie	UNH Bookstore	Petrecca_Ma	JJ-705
Petrella-Wilson	Rose		Petrella-Wilson_Ro	JJ-705
Petrides	Peter		Petrides_Pe	JJ-378, JJ-495
Petrone	Scott		Petrone_Sc	JJ-705
Pevzner	Nicholas	University of Pennsylvania, School of Design	Pevzner_Ni	JJ-231
Pezzo	Cara		Pezzo_Ca	JJ-231
Pfeffer	Jane		Pfeffer_Ja	JJ-705
Pfeiffer	John	Old Lyme Historic District Commission	Pfeiffer_Jo	JJ-705
Phelps	Harriett		Phelps_Ha	JJ-231
Phelps	Larry		Phelps_La	JJ-232
Philapavage	Dennis		Philapavage_De	JJ-606
Phillips	David		Phillips_Da	JJ-232
Piasio	C.		Piasio_C	JJ-705
Picard	Gail		Picard_Ga	JJ-705
Piersall	Abby	Town of Waterford	Waterford_Piersall	JJ-93, JJ-308, JJ-538
Pierson	Robin	Griswold Point Association	Pierson_Ro	JJ-232, JJ-705
Pietrangeli	Jeff	University of New Haven	Pietrangeli_Je	JJ-706
Pillari	Allison		Pillari_Al	JJ-706
Pine	Martha		Pine_Ma	JJ-626
Pinn	Edward		Pinn_Ed	JJ-706
Pinn	Linda		Pinn_Li	JJ-706
Pinney	Ellen		Pinney_El	JJ-706
Pinney	Nancy		Pinney_Na	JJ-706
Pinto	Julie		Pinto_Ju	JJ-706
Piros	Jean	Concerned Citizens Unite!	Piros_Je	JJ-706
Piscitelli	Michael	City of New Haven	New Haven_Piscitelli	JJ-443, JJ-578
Pitruzzello	Carl		Pitruzzello_Ca	JJ-706
Plante	Sara		Plante_Sa	JJ-706
Plato	Barry		Plato_Ba	JJ-626
Platt, Jr.	Richard N.		Platt_Ri	JJ-559
Plaugher	Danny		Plaugher_Da	JJ-232, JJ-378, JJ-433
Ploof	Cheryl		Ploof_Ch	JJ-378
Plouffe	Donald		Plouffe_Do	JJ-378
Plumley	Christopher		Plumley_Ch	JJ-706
Poglitsch	Robert		Poglitsch_Ro	JJ-706
Poirier	Alan		Poirier_Al	JJ-706

Table JJ–1: Commenter Index (continued)

Last Name	First Name	Agency/Business/Organization	Stakeholder ID	Page
Pollack	Stephanie	Massachusetts Department of Transportation	MassDOT_Pollack	JJ-78, JJ-79, JJ-417, JJ-465, JJ-516
Pompea	Charles E.		Pompea_Ch	JJ-706
Popper	Stuart	East Coast Greenway	Popper_St	JJ-634
Porto	Rebecca		Porto_Re	JJ-706
POST	NANCY		Post_Na	JJ-706
Post	Robert		Post_Ro	JJ-606
Pote	Aditya	University of Connecticut	Pote_Ad	JJ-233
Potter	Bob		Potter_Bo	JJ-706
Pough	Dennis	Pough Interiors	Pough_De	JJ-233, JJ-706
Powell	Brett		Powell_Br	JJ-606
Prael	John		Prael_Jo	JJ-378
Pranulis	Susan	University of New Haven	Pranulis_Su	JJ-706
Prater	Bob		Prater_Bo	JJ-626
Pratt	Diane		Pratt_Di	JJ-706
Prentice	Jan		Prentice_Ja	JJ-707
Prestia	Gary	UNH Alumni	Prestia_Ga	JJ-707
Preston	Barbara	Old Lyme resident of over 45 years	Preston_Ba	JJ-707
Preston	David	Long time resident of Old Lyme	Preston_Da	JJ-707
Preston	Evan	ConnPING	Preston_Ev	JJ-68, JJ-233, JJ-433
Previdi	Bob	Bicycle Coalition of Greater Philadelphia	Previdi_Bo	JJ-433
Price	Myra		Price_My	JJ-626
Price	Nancy		Price_Na	JJ-707
Proctor	Alan	Alumnus of Lyme Academy College	Proctor_Al	JJ-707
Proctor	Robert		Proctor_Ro	JJ-707
Proestakis	Gus		Proestakis_Gu	JJ-707
Prophet	Gary	Empire State Passengers Association	Prophet_Ga	JJ-234, JJ-379
Prowell	Mary		Prowell_Ma	JJ-626
Przyborski	Kristen	University of New Haven	Przyborski_Kr	JJ-495, JJ-707
Przybylek	Lukasz		Przybylek_Lu	JJ-707
Pucciano	John	Mountainside POA	Pucciano_Jo	JJ-234, JJ-707
Pullen	Mary		Pullen_Ma	JJ-707
Pulvirenti	Diana	Le' Fleur Interiors by Diana, LLC	Pulvirenti_Di	JJ-606
Puryear, PHD	Melanie	Graduate, University of New Haven	Puryear_Me	JJ-707
Pusateri	Paul	Self Employed	Pusateri_Pa	JJ-707
Putney	Mary Ann		Putney_Ma	JJ-707
Puzone	Joseph		Puzone_Jo	JJ-707
Qua	Sara		Qua_Sa	JJ-707
Quagliani	Ronald	University of New Haven	Quagliani_Ro	JJ-707
Quarto	James	dtc	Quarto_Ja	JJ-235
Quigley	Sam		Quigley_Sa	JJ-235, JJ-707
Quinn	Justina		Quinn_Ju	JJ-707
Quinn	Kevin		Quinn_Ke	JJ-235, JJ-559
Quinn	Ryan		Quinn_Ry	JJ-707
Quinn	Tony		Quinn_To	JJ-707
Rabus	Barbara		Rabus_Ba	JJ-707
Raday	David	Metro State	Raday_Da	JJ-495, JJ-606

Table JJ-1: Commenter Index (continued)

Last Name	First Name	Agency/Business/Organization	Stakeholder ID	Page
Radcliffe	George		Radcliffe_Ge	JJ-626
Radowiecki	Kim		Radowiecki_Ki	JJ-708
Raff	Paul		Raff_Pa	JJ-708
Raffile	Barbara		Raffile_Ba	JJ-708
Ragsdale	John		Ragsdale_Jo	JJ-708
Rahaman	Saddia	Hunter Moore & Stearns	Rahaman_Sa	JJ-708
Raible Birth	Susan		Raible Birth_Su	JJ-235, JJ-708
Raimondo	Gina		Governor RI_Raimondo	JJ-300
Rajbhandary	Jasmine	University of Maryland - College Park	Rajbhandary_Ja	JJ-627
Ralph	Karen	University of New Haven	Ralph_Ka	JJ-708
Ramella	Sherri		Ramella_Sh	JJ-708
Ramsay	Debra		Ramsay_De	JJ-235
Randall	Roy		Randall_Ro	JJ-379
Rane	Alexander		Rane_Al	JJ-708
Ranelli	J.		Ranelli_J	JJ-379, JJ-606, JJ-708
Rapp	Jim		Rapp_Ji	JJ-627
Rapport	George		Rapport_Ge	JJ-708
Rapport	Jane H.		Rapport_Ja	JJ-708
Rapuano	Mark	University of New Haven Alumni	Rapuano_Ma	JJ-708
Rasie	Sylvia		Rasie_Sy	JJ-708
Raslavsky III	John	Univ of New Haven Alumni	Raslavsky_Jo	JJ-708
Rathkey	Julia		Rathkey_Ju	JJ-708
Rau	David	Florence Griswold Museum	Rau_Da	JJ-708
Ravi	Janani	Rutgers University	Ravi_Ja	JJ-606
Rayel	Barbara		Rayel_Ba	JJ-708
Reaback	Roslyn		Reaback_Ro	JJ-708
Read	Judith		Read_Ju	JJ-708
Reardon	Anne		Reardon_An	JJ-708
Reardon	Barbara		Reardon_Ba	JJ-709
Reardon	Cristina	Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts	Reardon_Cr	JJ-709
Recchia	Theresa	University of New Haven	Recchia_Th	JJ-709
Rechter	Mark		Rechter_Ma	JJ-235
Records	Beth		Records_Be	JJ-709
Redeker	James	CT DOT	Connecticut_Redeker_Barnes	JJ-573
Redlich	Karen	University of New Haven and resident of the Shoreline area o	Redlich_Ka	JJ-236, JJ-709
Reed	Eunice		Reed_Eu	JJ-709
Reed	Marie	Southbridge Civic Association	Reed_Mar	JJ-236, JJ-496
Reed	Matthew		Reed_Mat	JJ-495
Reeds	Phyllis		Reeds_Ph	JJ-236
Reemsnyder	Bonnie A.	Town of Old Lyme	Old Lyme_First Selectwoman Reemsnyder	JJ-470, JJ-579, JJ-639, JJ-640
Refici	Brian		Refici_Br	JJ-709
Regan	Nina	University of New Haven Alumni	Regan_Ni	JJ-709
Reid	Rosemary		Reid_Ro	JJ-709
Reilly	Ursula		Reilly_Ur	JJ-709
Reim	Brandon	University of New Haven	Reim_Br	JJ-709
Reis Lishing	Joann		Reis Lishing_Jo	JJ-709

Table JJ–1: Commenter Index (continued)

Last Name	First Name	Agency/Business/Organization	Stakeholder ID	Page
Reiss	Barry		Reiss_Ba	JJ-236
Reiss	Brenda		Reiss_Br	JJ-236
Remond	Cheryl	Remond Enterprises	Remond_Ch	JJ-709
Remond	Wayne		Remond_Wa	JJ-709
Renault	Tallmadge	LACFA	Renault-Ta	JJ-709
Reneson	Lisa		Reneson_Li	JJ-709
Renkavinsky	Aron		Renkavinsky_Ar	JJ-237
Renn	Daniel		Renn_Da	JJ-496
Rescigno	Anthony P.	Greater New Haven Chamber of Commerce	Rescigno_An	JJ-237, JJ-380, JJ-496, JJ-607
Reuter	Robert		Reuter_Ro	JJ-237, JJ-380, JJ-381, JJ-559
Reynolds	Hayden	Reynolds Subaru	Reynolds_Ha	JJ-709
Reynolds	Lester		Reynolds_Le	JJ-709
Reynolds	Thomas	University of New Haven	Reynolds_Th	JJ-709
Rhian	Glenn		Rhian_Gl	JJ-709
Rhodes	James		Rhodes_Ja	JJ-433
Rhum	David		Rhum_Da	JJ-238, JJ-382
Rice	Jeff		Rice_Je	JJ-238, JJ-709
Rice	Kimberly		Rice_Ki	JJ-709
Rich	Ann		Rich_An	JJ-451, JJ-607, JJ-709
Richard	Beth		Richard_Be	JJ-710
Richards	Jean		Richards_Je	JJ-238
Richards	Meredith	Virginia Rail Policy Institute	Richards_Me	JJ-238, JJ-239, JJ-382
Richardson	Derek		Richardson_De	JJ-627
Richardson	Lynn		Richardson_Ly	JJ-710
Richardson	Sarah		Richardson_Sa	JJ-239, JJ-710
Richardson	Thomas		Richardson_Th	JJ-710
Richman	Winifred		Richman_Wi	JJ-240, JJ-433, JJ-496
Richmond	Clint		Richmond_Cl	JJ-240, JJ-241, JJ-383, JJ-496, JJ-526
Rickard	Cecilie		Rickard_Ce	JJ-241
Rickard	Jonathan	Florence Griswold Museum	Rickard_Jo	JJ-710
Rickey	Sandra		Rickey_Sa	JJ-710
Ridel	Ellen		Ridel_El	JJ-710
Ridgway	William		Ridgway_Wi	JJ-383, JJ-710
Rieder	Wendy		Rieder_We	JJ-710
Riggio	Michael	TelTech Communication Services Inc	Riggio_Mi	JJ-710
Riley	Corrin		Riley_Co	JJ-242
Ringquist	Christopher		Ringquist_Ch	JJ-710
Riodriguez	Paco	White Gate Farm	Riodriguez_Pa	JJ-607, JJ-710
Riordan	Dennis	Menunkatuck Audubon Society	Riordan_De	JJ-242, JJ-496
Rivera	Shannon	UNH student	Rivera_Sh	JJ-710
Rivers	Patricia		Rivers_Pa	JJ-383, JJ-710
Rivers	Yevgeniya		Rivers_Ye	JJ-710
Robb	Eric		Robb_Er	JJ-560, JJ-710
Robbins	John		Robbins_Jo	JJ-607
Robbins	Sheldon		Robbins_Sh	JJ-710
Roberts	Bill		Roberts_Bi	JJ-710

Table JJ-1: Commenter Index (continued)

Last Name	First Name	Agency/Business/Organization	Stakeholder ID	Page
Roberts	Carl		Roberts_Ca	JJ-383
Roberts	Kelly		Roberts_Ke	JJ-710
Roberts	Susan		Roberts_Su	JJ-710
Robillard	Robert		Robillard_Ro	JJ-710
Robins	Martin		Robins_Ma	JJ-242, JJ-434
Robinson	Eleanor	Connecticut Audubon Society Roger Tory Peterson Estuary Cent	Robinson_El	JJ-710, JJ-711
Robinson	John		Robinson_John	JJ-242, JJ-711
Robinson	Joyce C.		Robinson_Joyce	JJ-627
Robinson	The Rev Cn Mark K J	Rector, Saint Ann's Parish	Robinson_Rev Mark	JJ-711
Robles	Luisa F.	City of Greenbelt - Public Works	Greenbelt_Robles	JJ-616
Roche	Jesse		Roche_Je	JJ-496, JJ-711
Roche	Michael		Roche_Mi	JJ-711
Rockwell	Cynthia and Philip		Rockwell_Cy	JJ-711
Rodgers	Beckett		Rodgers_Be	JJ-711
Rodgerson	Keith	Neighborhood District Economic Development Corporation	Rodgerson_Ke	JJ-711
Rollins	Michelle		Rollins_Mi	JJ-711
Romaine	Edward	Town of Brookhaven	Brookhaven_Supervisor Romaine	JJ-73, JJ-441, JJ-456
Roman	Evelyn		Roman_Ev	JJ-711
Romano	M		Romano_M	JJ-711
Romano	Mary Ann		Romano_Ma	JJ-711
Romulo	Chelsie		Romulo_Ch	JJ-627
Rooney	Tammey		Rooney-Ta	JJ-243, JJ-711
Roosevelt	Rosalind		Roosevelt_Ro	JJ-711
Root	Thomas		Root_Th	JJ-711
Roper	Amy		Roper_Am	JJ-711
Rose	Christy		Rose_Ch	JJ-383
Rosenberg	David		Rosenberg_Da	JJ-243
Roser	Nancy		Roser_Na	JJ-711
Ross	Carolyn		Ross_Ca	JJ-243, JJ-711
Ross	Stephen		Ross_St	JJ-711
Ross	Wendyl		Ross_We	JJ-711
Rossen	Kathy		Rossen_Ka	JJ-627
Rossi	Michael		Rossi_Mi	JJ-243, JJ-711
Roth	Emery		Roth_Em	JJ-711
Roth	Thomas		Roth_Th	JJ-712
Roy	Joanne	University of New Haven	Roy_Jo	JJ-712
Roy	Nancy		Roy_Na	JJ-384
Royston	Richard		Royston_Ri	JJ-712
Royston	Tricia		Royston_Tr	JJ-712
Ruane	Kevin		Ruane_Ke	JJ-384
Rubenstein	Alister A.		Rubenstein_Al	JJ-627
Ruble	Barb		Ruble_Ba	JJ-627
Rucker	Joel		Rucker_Jo	JJ-712
Rudnick	Stacey		Rudnick_St	JJ-712
Rudnick	Zack		Rudnick_Za	JJ-384
Rudolph	Richard	Rail Users' Network	Rudolph_Ri	JJ-385, JJ-527

Table JJ–1: Commenter Index (continued)

Last Name	First Name	Agency/Business/Organization	Stakeholder ID	Page
Rueb	Bill and Sandra		Rueb_Bi	JJ-712
Rueb	Sandra		Rueb_Sa	JJ-497, JJ-712
Rumm	Heather		Rumm_He	JJ-712
Rumm	Philip		Rumm_Ph	JJ-712
Rummel	Sue		Rummel_Su	JJ-712
Rumskas	Martha	Former town employee, former member of Town Committee. Lived	Rumskas_Ma	JJ-712
Rupp	Tina	Photographer/Realtor	Rupp_Ti	JJ-712
Russell	Pam		Russell_Pa	JJ-712
Russell	Shelley		Russell_Sh	JJ-712
Russin	Alissa	RPI	Russin_Al	JJ-497
Russo	Debra		Russo_De	JJ-712
Russo	Frank		Russo_Fr	JJ-712
Ryan	Eileen		Ryan_Ei	JJ-560, JJ-712
Ryan	James		Ryan_Ja	JJ-385
Ryan	Lindsey	UNH	Ryan_Li	JJ-712
Ryan			Ryan	JJ-244, JJ-385, JJ-560, JJ-712
Ryan, Ph.D.	William	University of New Haven	Ryan_Wi	JJ-712
Ryder	Jeff	University of New Haven	Ryder_Je	JJ-712
Rye	Rebecca		Rye_Re	JJ-713
Ryland	Carol		Ryland_Ca	JJ-713
Rynne	Mary		Rynne_Ma	JJ-713
Rysz	Ronnie	Lyme Academy College Alumnus	Rysz_Ro	JJ-713
S	Paul		S_Pa	JJ-713
Sabatini	Kenneth		Sabatini_Ke	JJ-244
Sabbatino	Lisa		Sabbatino_Li	JJ-713
Sackville	Doretta		Sackville_Do	JJ-497, JJ-560
Sadlon	Paula		Sadlon_Pa	JJ-713
Sadowski	Susan		Sadowski_Su	JJ-713
Sadowski	Vladimir		Sadowski_Vl	JJ-713
Sagalski	Daniel	Silver Spring CC	Sagalski_Da	JJ-713
Salafia	Jennifer		Salafia_Je	JJ-713
Saliby	Lori		Saliby_Lo	JJ-713
Salk	Gil		Salk_Gi	JJ-713
Salm	Joan		Salm_Jo	JJ-713
Salomone	Pete		Salomone_Pe	JJ-634
Sam			Sam	JJ-244, JJ-452, JJ-497, JJ-713
Sampara	Karen		Sampara_Ka	JJ-713
Sanders	William		Sanders_Wi	JJ-385, JJ-607
Sanderson	Edward	Rhode Island Historical Preservation and Heritage Commission	RIHPHC_Sanderson	JJ-569, JJ-570, JJ-581
Sandor	Manette		Sandor_Ma	JJ-245
Sandora	Shelley		Sandora_Sh	JJ-713
Sanket	Aarti		Sanket_Aa	JJ-713
Sankow	Elizabeth		Sankow_El	JJ-713
Santacroce	Katie	University of New Haven	Santacroce_Ka	JJ-713
Santangelo	Gary		Santangelo_Ga	JJ-245

Table JJ-1: Commenter Index (continued)

Last Name	First Name	Agency/Business/Organization	Stakeholder ID	Page
Santiago	Giuliana		Santiago_Gi	JJ-560, JJ-607
Santos	Albert	Town of Kearny	Kearny_Mayor Santos	JJ-77, JJ-442, JJ-464, JJ-535, JJ-536
Santos	Gloria		Santos_Gl	JJ-713
Santucci	Gina	NYC Landmarks Preservation Commission	NYCLPC_Santucci	JJ-469, JJ-569
Saparamad	Sujee	OrangeHRM Inc	Saparamad_Su	JJ-713
Sardo	Bryan		Sardo_Br	JJ-713
Sargent	John	Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts	Sargent_Jo	JJ-714
Sarisley	Dr. Edward	CCSU	Sarisley_Ed	JJ-246
Sarisley III	Edward		Sarisley_III_Ed	JJ-246
Sarlin	Michael		Sarlin_Mi	JJ-246, JJ-497, JJ-714
Sarno	Domenic	City of Springfield	Springfield_Mayor Sarno	JJ-92, JJ-306, JJ-472, JJ-582
Saulnieer	Susan		Saulnier_Su	JJ-714
Saunders	Daniel	NJDEP	NJDEP_Saunders	JJ-568, JJ-569
Saunders	David	NARP	Saunders_Da	JJ-246
Saunders	Diane		Saunders_Di	JJ-385, JJ-498, JJ-527, JJ-560
Saunders	Kathleen		Saunders_Ka	JJ-714
Sausville	Kristin		Sausville_Kr	JJ-247
Savino	Daniel		Savino_Da	JJ-714
Sbeglia	Candace		Sbeglia_Ca	JJ-247, JJ-561
Scaife	Gary	University of New Haven Alumni	Scaife_Ga	JJ-714
Schaefer	Diane		Schaefer_Di	JJ-247
Schaefer	Eleanor		Schaefer_El	JJ-248
Schaefer	Laura M	Nassau County Legislature	Nassau County_Legislator Schaefer	JJ-536
Schaffer	Michael		Schaffer_Mi	JJ-248, JJ-386, JJ-528
Schavoir	Susanna		Schavoir_Su	JJ-714
Schechtel	Robin		Schechtel_Ro	JJ-714
Scheibner	Anne		Scheibner_An	JJ-714
Scheinblum	Brian		Scheinblum_Br	JJ-714
Schellends	Kathleen		Schellends_Ka	JJ-248
Schellens	Jane		Schellens_Ja	JJ-714
Scherer	Thomas	Old Lyme Conservation Commission	Scherer_Th	JJ-714
Schiff	Karen	Rhode Island School of Design	Schiff_Ka	JJ-248, JJ-714
Schiller	Barry	RIPTA Riders Alliance	Schiller_Ba	JJ-386, JJ-452
Schiller	Karla		Schiller_Ka	JJ-714
Schirmeiet	Beverly		Schirmeiet_Be	JJ-714
Schmeelk	Elizabeth		Schmeelk_El	JJ-498, JJ-607
Schmidt	Matthew		Schmidt_Ma	JJ-714
Schneider	Ellen	Graduate of University of New Haven	Schneider_El	JJ-714
Schoen	Clasina		Schoen_Cl	JJ-249
Schoenfeld	Robert		Schoenfeld_Ro	JJ-387, JJ-388, JJ-528, JJ-607
Schoman	Jeff		Schoman_Je	JJ-249
Schonberger	Robin		Schonberger_Ro	JJ-714
Schreter	Carol	Baltimore Bird Club	Schreter_Ca	JJ-627
Schroeder	David	UNH	Schroeder_Da	JJ-714
Schroeder	Nancy		Schroeder_Na	JJ-714
Schuh	Steven R.	Anne Arundel County	Anne Arundel County_Schuh	JJ-72, JJ-294, JJ-295, JJ-572

Table JJ–1: Commenter Index (continued)

Last Name	First Name	Agency/Business/Organization	Stakeholder ID	Page
Schwartz	Donald R.		Schwartz_Do	JJ-627
Schwartz	Richard		Schwartz_Ri	JJ-714
Schwarz	Kurt R.	Maryland Orinthological Society	Schwarz_Ku	JJ-627
Schwarzwalder	James	Retired	Schwarzwalder_Ja	JJ-388, JJ-389, JJ-434
Schweizer-Kaplan	Anemone		Schweizer-Kaplan_An	JJ-714
Schwenker	Dave		Schwenker_Da	JJ-627
Sciocchetti	Jules		Sciocchetti_Ju	JJ-714
Scott	Helen		Scott_He	JJ-714, JJ-715
Scott	Richie	University of New Haven Alumni	Scott_Ri	JJ-715
Scranton	Emily	University of New Haven	Scranton_Em	JJ-715
Scranton	Lisa	University of New Haven	Scranton_Li	JJ-715
Scrivens	Ot		Scrivens_Ot	JJ-389
Seaman	Sally	former Dean of the Lyme Academy of Fine Arts.	Seaman_Sa	JJ-715
Seaver	Cheryl		Seaver_Ch	JJ-249, JJ-715
Sedgwick	Henry D.	M.C.C.D.	Sedgwick_He	JJ-249
Sedgwick	Robin	Old Lyme Historical Association	Sedgwick_Ro	JJ-715
Seene	Sarah		Seene_Sa	JJ-715
Seip	Polly		Seip_Po	JJ-250
Seligson	Karen		Seligson_Ka	JJ-250, JJ-715
Semeraro	Michael		Semeraro_Mi	JJ-250, JJ-251, JJ-389, JJ-390, JJ-452, JJ-506
Semple	Joseph		Semple_Jo	JJ-715
Senejani	Ali	University of New Haven	Senejani_Al	JJ-715
Senning	John	Essex Law Group	Senning_Jo	JJ-715
Sexton	George	UNH Alumni Association	Sexton_Ge	JJ-715
Shah	Mihir		Shah_Mi	JJ-715
Shamansky	Cara		Shamansky_Ca	JJ-715
Shannehan	Don	William Pitt Sotheby's	Shannehan_Do	JJ-715
Shannehan	Kathy		Shannehan_Ka	JJ-715
Shapiro	Paul M.	Town of Mansfield	Mansfield_Mayor Shapiro	JJ-78, JJ-300, JJ-301, JJ-417, JJ-465, JJ-576
Sharma	Ramesh	University Of New Haven	Sharma_Ra	JJ-715
Shaw	Lawrence	Boston Light & Sound, Inc.	Shaw_La	JJ-251
She	Benjamin		She_Be	JJ-390
Shea	Georgiana	Seaview Productions	Shea_Ge	JJ-715
Shea	Thomas	University of Connecticut	Shea_Th	JJ-715
Sheehan	John	Private Citizen	Sheehan_Jo	JJ-715
Shehu	Peter	Alumni	Shehu_Pe	JJ-715
Sheldon	Gary		Sheldon_Ga	JJ-390
Shensie	Ed and Joyce		Shensie_Ed	JJ-715
SHEPARD-TAMBINI	Phyllis	retired member of the RTC	Shepard-Tambini_Ph	JJ-715
Shepherd	EmmaLadd		Shepherd_Em	JJ-251
Sheridan	Philip		Sheridan_Ph	JJ-715, JJ-716
Sherman	Claudia		Sherman_Cl	JJ-716
Sherrick	Virginia		Sherrick_Vi	JJ-252
Shields	Eric		Shields_Er	JJ-252, JJ-391, JJ-498, JJ-507, JJ-528, JJ-561, JJ-608
Shinkle	Jack & Csilla		Shinkle_Ja	JJ-716

Table JJ-1: Commenter Index (continued)

Last Name	First Name	Agency/Business/Organization	Stakeholder ID	Page
Shippee	Patricia		Shippee_Pa	JJ-716
Shippen	Gerald		Shippen_Ge	JJ-716
Shirer	Donald		Shirer_Do	JJ-716
Shirley	Cheryl		Shirley_Ch	JJ-716
Shivers	Thomas		Shivers_Th	JJ-498
Shorette	Rebecca		Shorette_Re	JJ-391
Shorris	Anthony E.	New York City Mayor's Office	New York City_Shorris	JJ-82, JJ-536
Shriver	Richard		Shriver_Ri	JJ-716
Shugrue	Mike		Shugrue_Mi	JJ-716
Shyloski	N		Shyloski_N	JJ-716
Sibley	Skip		Old Lyme_Selectman Sibley	JJ-640
Sicilia	James		Sicilia_Ja	JJ-716
Sicuranza	Kirsten		Sicuranza_Ki	JJ-716
Siddique	Omar		Siddique_Om	JJ-627
Siemon	Derek		Siemon_De	JJ-627
Sigman young	Lois		SigmanYoung_Lo	JJ-716
Signora	Kyle		Signora_Ky	JJ-716
Signora	Mc		Signora_Mc	JJ-716
Signora	Walter		Signora_Wa	JJ-716
Silber	Irwin		Silber_Ir	JJ-627
Silk	Ed	Private Property Owner	Silk_Ed	JJ-716
Simerson	Gordon		Simerson_Go	JJ-716, JJ-717
Simler	Susan		Simler_Su	JJ-561, JJ-717
Simmons	Hugh		Simmons_Hu	JJ-628
Simon	Brona	Massachusetts Historical Commission	MAHistoricalCommission_Simon	JJ-566
Simon	Ellis		Simon_El	JJ-253, JJ-391
Simpson	Donna		Simpson_Do	JJ-392
Simpson	James	University of New Haven - 1973	Simpson_Ja	JJ-717
Sims	Victoria		Sims_Vi	JJ-717
Sinay	Majbritt		Sinay_Ma	JJ-717
Sinclair	Lisa		Sinclair_Li	JJ-717
Sirota	Stu	Maryland Department of Planning	MDP_Sirota	JJ-79, JJ-536
Skahan	Sheila		Skahan_Sh	JJ-717
Skeen	Douglas		Skeen_Do	JJ-253
Skomorucha	Robert		Skomorucha_Ro	JJ-253
Skwarek	Andrea		Skwarek_An	JJ-717
Slaney	Heidi		Slaney_He	JJ-254, JJ-717
Slater	Janet		Slater_Ja	JJ-717
Slater	Wayne	University of Maryland	Slater_Wa	JJ-608
Slattery	Frank		Slattery_Fr	JJ-392, JJ-608
Slenker	Jamie		Slenker_Ja	JJ-717
Sloane	David		Sloane_Da	JJ-254, JJ-717
Sloat	Caroline	Trustee--CT Trust for Historic Preservation	Sloat_Ca	JJ-498
Smari	Peter		Smari_Pe	JJ-254
Smith	Damon and Patricia		Smith_Da	JJ-717
Smith	Frederick		Smith_Fr	JJ-717

Table JJ–1: Commenter Index (continued)

Last Name	First Name	Agency/Business/Organization	Stakeholder ID	Page
Smith	Karen1		Smith_Kar1	JJ-717
Smith	Karen2		Smith_Kar2	JJ-717
Smith	Kathryn		Smith_Kat	JJ-717
Smith	Kelly		Smith_Ke	JJ-255, JJ-562
Smith	Laird		Smith_La	JJ-392, JJ-434
Smith	Phillip R.		Smith_Ph	JJ-392
Smith	Roger		Smith_Ro	JJ-717
Smith	Scott A.	Maryland Department of Natural Resources	MDDNR_Smith	JJ-616
Smith	Sharon		Smith_Sh	JJ-255
Smith	Terry		Smith_Te	JJ-717
Smith	Tia	Tia Smith Studiio	Smith_Ti	JJ-717
Smith, AICP	Bradley M.	Maryland Department of Transportation	MDOT_Smith	JJ-79, JJ-301, JJ-418, JJ-516
Smolinski	Joseph	University of New Haven	Smolinski_Jo	JJ-717
Snitkin	Michele		Snitkin_Mi	JJ-255, JJ-717
Sno	Cynthia		Snow_Cy	JJ-634
Snow	Carol		Snow_Ca	JJ-717
Snurkowski	Jamie		Snurkowski_Ja	JJ-718
Sola	Margaret		Sola_Ma	JJ-255, JJ-256
Solanki	Mayur	University of New Haven	Solanki_Ma	JJ-256, JJ-718
Solari	Sheila		Solari_Sh	JJ-718
Somers	William		Somers_Wi	JJ-718
Somerville	Donejia	University of New Haven	Somerville_Do	JJ-718
Somppi	Jamess	University of New Haven	Somppi_Ja	JJ-718
Sonusi	Ope		Sonusi_Op	JJ-718
Soos	Anita		Soos_An	JJ-718
Sorbello	Sam	Atlantic Coast Freezers, LLC	Sorbello_Sa	JJ-718
Sorenson	Parker	University of Connecticut	Sorenson_Pa	JJ-257
Soroko	Bernard		Soroko_Be	JJ-718
Sorrells	Daniel		Sorrells_Da	JJ-718
Sorrentino	Christine		Sorrentino_Ch	JJ-718
Soucy	Susan		Soucy_Su	JJ-718
Spall	Mary		Spall_Ma	JJ-718
Spall	Rachel	Student	Spall_Ra	JJ-718
Sparkman	Amy		Sparkman_Am	JJ-718
Speirs	Michellee		Speirs_Mi	JJ-718
Speirs	Samantha		Speirs_Sa	JJ-257, JJ-499, JJ-718
Spence	Alton		Spence_Al	JJ-718
Spencer	Scott	Delmarva Rail Passenger Association	Spencer_Sc	JJ-392, JJ-393, JJ-453, JJ-528
Spina	Mark		Spina_Ma	JJ-718
Spina	Suzanne		Spina_Su	JJ-718
Spinato	Diane		Spinato_Di	JJ-718
Spoltore	Janet		Spoltore_Ja	JJ-719
Spooner	Christopher		Spooner_Ch	JJ-719
Spratt	Jack		Spratt_Ja	JJ-719
Sreebhashyam	Sai Kiran	University of Nee Haven	Sreebhashyam_Sa	JJ-719
St. Germain	Kristen		St. Germain_Kr	JJ-68, JJ-608, JJ-719

Table JJ-1: Commenter Index (continued)

Last Name	First Name	Agency/Business/Organization	Stakeholder ID	Page
Stamm	Linda		Stamm_Li	JJ-499
Stanard	Tammy		Stanard_Ta	JJ-719
Standart	Clinton		Standart_Cl	JJ-257, JJ-608, JJ-719
Standart	Joe		Standart_Jo	JJ-719
Stanley	Janie	Florence Griswold Museum	Stanley_Ja	JJ-719
Stanton	Andrea		Stanton_An	JJ-719
Stanton	Daniel		Stanton_Da	JJ-394
Stanton	Eric		Stanton_Er	JJ-258
Stanzione	Kenneth		Stanzione_Ke	JJ-258
Stanzione	Ralph		Stanzione_Ra	JJ-259
Stanzione	Susan		Stanzione_Su	JJ-628
Starr	Leslie		Starr_Le	JJ-628
Steadman	Bernard		Steadman_Be	JJ-259, JJ-719
Steed	Roxanne		Steed_Ro	JJ-719
Steeves	Tanner		Steeves_Ta	JJ-259, JJ-499
Steiner	Cyndi	New Jersey Bike & Walk Coalition	Steiner_Cy	JJ-634
Steiner	Rebecca		Steiner_Re	JJ-719
Steiner	Traver		Steiner_Tr	JJ-719
Steinman	Lois		Steinman_Lo	JJ-719
Stephens	Brian		Stephens_Br	JJ-259
Stephenson	Kathy		Stephenson_Ka	JJ-719
Stephenson	Susan	Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts of the University of New H	Stephenson_Su	JJ-719
Stevens	Barbara		Stevens_Ba	JJ-719
Stevens	Sean	University of New Haven	Stevens_Se	JJ-260, JJ-608, JJ-720
Stevenson	Mimi		Stevenson_Mi	JJ-720
Stewart	Robin		Stewart_Ro	JJ-720
Stillwaggon	Jack		Stillwaggon_Ja	JJ-394
Stitely	Suzette		Stiteley_Su	JJ-628
Stock	Mary Louise		Stock_Ma	JJ-720
Stockmal	Julie		Stockmal_Ju	JJ-720
Stoddard	Eric		Stoddard_Er	JJ-720
Stokes	Abigail		Stokes_Ab	JJ-720
Stolle	Fredrick		Stolle_Fr	JJ-394
Stoller	Mark A.	University of New Haven Alumni	Stoller_Ma	JJ-720
Storer	Stephanie	University of New Haven Alumni	Storer_St	JJ-720
Strano	Rider		Strano_Ri	JJ-394
Stratman	Robert	University of New Haven Alumni	Stratman_Ro	JJ-720
Strauss	Steve		Strauss_St	JJ-261, JJ-262, JJ-562
Straut	Ann		Straut_An	JJ-720
Strehlow	Kristin		Strehlow_Kr	JJ-720
Stroli	Allison		Stroli_Al	JJ-720
Strome, III	Charles B.	City of New Rochelle	New Rochelle_Strome	JJ-82, JJ-638
Stroud	Gregory		Stroud_Gr	JJ-720
Struwas	David		Struwas_Da	JJ-720
Stubbs	Anne D.	CONEG Policy Research Center, Inc.	CONEG_Stubbs	JJ-74, JJ-533, JJ-572, JJ-573
Stula	Nancy		Stula_Na	JJ-720

Table JJ–1: Commenter Index (continued)

Last Name	First Name	Agency/Business/Organization	Stakeholder ID	Page
Stutzman	Marcia A.		Stutzman_Ma	JJ-628
Sullivan	Celine		Sullivan_Ce	JJ-562, JJ-720
Sullivan	Jeanine		Sullivan_Je	JJ-720
Sullivan	Mary		Sullivan_Ma	JJ-499
Sullivan	Roger		Sullivan_Ro	JJ-720
Sullivan	Sally		Sullivan_Sa	JJ-499, JJ-721
Sullivan	Virginia	Adventure Cycling Association	Sullivan_Vi	JJ-434, JJ-499
Sulmasy	Lori		Sulmasy_Lo	JJ-262, JJ-721
Sumoski	Danielle		Sumoski_Da	JJ-721
Sun	Hung-Ying	University of New Haven	Sun_Hu	JJ-721
Sundack	Bruce		Sundack_Br	JJ-262, JJ-395
Sutherland	Alan		Sutherland_Al	JJ-721
Sutherland	Russell		Sutherland_Ru	JJ-262
Sutson	Athina		Sutson_At	JJ-721
Sutton	Robert		Sutton_Ro	JJ-395, JJ-530, JJ-608
Svigals	Philip		Svigals_Ph	JJ-721
Swangler	John		Swangler_Jo	JJ-609
Swarts	John	William Pitt Sotheby's	Swarts_Jo	JJ-721
Swarts	Maureen	Realtor	Swarts_Ma	JJ-263
Sweeney	Joseph		Sweenwy_Jo	JJ-263, JJ-395, JJ-499, JJ-530, JJ-721
Sweeney	Kathleen		Sweeney_Ka	JJ-263
Sweet	Deb		Sweet_De	JJ-721
Sweryda	Beth		Sweryda_Be	JJ-395
Syracuse	Michael		Syracuse_Mi	JJ-634
Szarkowicz	Jim		Szarkowicz_Ji	JJ-721
Szymczyk	Donna		Szymczyk_Do	JJ-721
Szymczyk	Eric		Szymczyk_Er	JJ-721
Tafoya	William	University of New Haven	Tafoya_Wi	JJ-721
Taggart	Jack		Taggart_Ja	JJ-396
Tagliatela	Stephen	Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts	LACFA_Tagliatela	JJ-686
Talerico	Linda	Administrator	Talerico_Li	JJ-721
Tambis	Chris	University of New Haven	Tambis_Ch	JJ-721
Tannen	Erica		Tannen_Er	JJ-721
Tarr	Jonathan		Tarr_Jo	JJ-263, JJ-562
Taylor	Anne		Taylor_An	JJ-721
Taylor	Craig		Taylor_Cr	JJ-453, JJ-721
Taylor	Cynthia		Taylor_Cy	JJ-721
Taylor	Marilyn Jordan	PennDesign	Penn Design_Taylor_Yaro	JJ-229, JJ-376, JJ-377, JJ-433, JJ-450, JJ-451, JJ-494, JJ-512, JJ-526, JJ-606
Taylor	Winthrop		Taylor_Wi	JJ-721
Teller	Carole		Teller_Ca	JJ-721
Tellier	Lisa		Tellier_Li	JJ-721, JJ-722
Terhune	Andrew		Terhune_An	JJ-530
Terrana	Rich		Terrana_RI	JJ-264
Terry	Robert	1982	Terry_Ro	JJ-722
Terwilliger	Mark		Terwilliger_Ma	JJ-396, JJ-722
Tetu	Emrys		Tetu_Em	JJ-722

Table JJ-1: Commenter Index (continued)

Last Name	First Name	Agency/Business/Organization	Stakeholder ID	Page
Thereault	Edward		Thereault_Ed	JJ-396, JJ-722
Thibodeau	Deborah		Thibodeau_De	JJ-634
Thiyagarajan	Nellichery	Electric Boat Corporation	Thiyagarajan_Ne	JJ-722
Thomas	John		Thomas_Jo	JJ-264
Thompson	Brett		Thompson_Br	JJ-722
Thompson	Claudia		Thompson_Cl	JJ-722
Thompson	Geoffrey		Thompson_Ge	JJ-722
Thompson	Tanya	141 Boston Post Road	Thompson-Ta	JJ-722
Thorton	Beverly		Thorton_Be	JJ-563
Thurber	Christine	MA ALB Eradication Program	Thurber_Ch	JJ-628
Tiano	Robert		Tiano_Ro	JJ-722
Tichy	Karen	Attorney-at-Law	Tichy_Ka	JJ-722
Timpanelli	Carol		Timpanelli_Ca	JJ-722
Tisch	Raphael		Tisch_Ra	JJ-628
Toce	Richard		Toce_Ri	JJ-722
Todd	Joan		Todd_Jo	JJ-722
Todd	Robin	Howard County Bird Club	Todd_Ro	JJ-264, JJ-628
Todisco	Louis	University of New Haven Alumni Board of Directors	Todisco_Lo	JJ-722
Toler	Frances		Toler_Fra	JJ-628
Toscano	Chris		Toscano_Ch	JJ-628
Toth	Chris		Toth_Ch	JJ-722
Tozzi	Teri	University of New Haven	Tozzi_Te	JJ-722
Tracy		Van Vliet	Van Vliet_Tr	JJ-724
Tran	Elvis		Tran_El	JJ-722
Traversa	Mark		Traversa_Ma	JJ-628
Tremaglio	Raymond		Tremaglio_Ra	JJ-723
Trentacoste, Esq	Peter S.	Spellman Rice Gibbons Polizzi & Truncale, LLP	Mineola_Trentacos	JJ-466, JJ-577
Trentacoste, Esq	Peter S.	Spellman Rice Gibbons Polizzi & Truncale, LLP	New Hyde Park_Trentacos	JJ-467, JJ-578
Trigiani	Adriana		Trigiani_Ad	JJ-723
Troy	Ron		Troy_Ro	JJ-396
Truax	Andrea		Truax_An	JJ-397
Tuchmann	David		Tuchmann_Da	JJ-265
Tucker	Albert	The Friends of Jug Bay	Tucker_Al	JJ-628
Tupper	Tracy		Tupper_Tr	JJ-723
Turkowski	Al		Turkowski_Al	JJ-723
Turner	Bill		Turner_Bi	JJ-723
Turner	David		Turner_Da	JJ-265
Turner	Jeffrey		Turner_Je	JJ-397, JJ-628
Turner	Molly		Turner_Mo	JJ-266
Turner	Susan		Turner_Su	JJ-723
Turon	Benjamin		Turon_Be	JJ-266, JJ-267, JJ-397, JJ-398, JJ-609
Turra	Marco		CSX_Turra	JJ-64, JJ-414, JJ-415, JJ-442, JJ-456
Tuttle	Josephine		Tuttle_Jo	JJ-723
Tweedy	Thomas J.	Incorporated Village of Floral Park	Floral Park_Mayor Tweedy	JJ-75
Twining	Ed		Twining_Ed	JJ-723
Twining	Edie	Clarks Americas	Twining_Edi	JJ-723

Table JJ–1: Commenter Index (continued)

Last Name	First Name	Agency/Business/Organization	Stakeholder ID	Page
Twohill	Catherine		Twohill_Ca	JJ-723
Tycz	Michele		Tycz_Mi	JJ-723
Tyler	Jason and Meredith		Tyler_Ja	JJ-629
Tyler	Kel		Tyler_Ke	JJ-723
Tzanavaris	Christopher		Tzanavaris_Ch	JJ-267, JJ-435
Ullrich	Tim		Ullrich_Ti	JJ-723
Untermeyer	Adrian		Untermeyer_Ad	JJ-398, JJ-609
Urbach	Allison		Urbach_Al	JJ-723
Urbanski	Elizabeth		Urbanski_El	JJ-723
Ursini	Karen	Wm Pitt Sotheby's International Realty	Ursini_Ka	JJ-723
Vachon	Todd	GEU-UAW Local 6950	Vachon_To	JJ-268
Vaillancourt	Stefani		Vaillancourt_St	JJ-723
Valdata	Patricia		Valdata_Pa	JJ-629
Valentin	Peter		Valentin_Pe	JJ-723
Valles	Danielle	University of New Haven	Valles_Da	JJ-724
Vallombroso	Anthony & Irene		Vallambroso_An	JJ-723
Valudes	Heather	The Lancaster Chamber of Commerce & Industry	Valudes_He	JJ-268, JJ-399, JJ-609
Van Der Aue	Kathleen M.	Connecticut Ornithological Association	Van Der Aue_Ka	JJ-500, JJ-507, JJ-724
Van der Veer	Lynn	Creative Services	Van der Veer_Ly	JJ-629
Van Ness	Addison		Van Ness_Ad	JJ-399, JJ-724
Van Wagner	Trisha		Van Wagner_Tr	JJ-629
Vanasse	Paul		Vanasse_Pa	JJ-724
Vanden Heuvel	Liz		Vanden Heuvel_Li	JJ-629
Varano	Sal		Varano_Sa	JJ-269
Varano	Yvonne		Varano_Yv	JJ-269, JJ-435, JJ-500
Varga	Bruce	University of New Haven	Varga_Br	JJ-724
Various	Various		CT_Congress_Senate	JJ-533, JJ-534, JJ-574, JJ-575, JJ-638
Various			Petition_Various	JJ-705
Various	Various		CT_Congress_Senate2	JJ-533, JJ-534, JJ-638
Varley	Rita		Varley_Ri	JJ-609, JJ-634
Varner	Charles		Varner_Ch	JJ-629
Varona	Joyce		Varona_Jo	JJ-629
Vasiloff	Jesse		Vasiloff_Je	JJ-724
Vasko	John S.		Vasko_Jo	JJ-269
Vautrain	Eddie		Vautrain_Ed	JJ-724
Vavasour	Robert		Vavasour_Ro	JJ-500
Vecchio	Robert		Vecchio_Ro	JJ-724
Velez	Mark		Velez_Ma	JJ-724
Velez	Roberta		Velez_Ro	JJ-724
Vella	Angelica		Vella_An	JJ-270
Venable	Barbara		Venable_Ba	JJ-724
Verille	Paul		Verille_Pa	JJ-724
Veronneau	Patrick		Veronneau_Pa	JJ-724
Verweij	Vincent		Verweij_Vi	JJ-629
Vesga	Damaris	Barclays	Vesga_Da	JJ-724
Villanova	Anne		Villanova_An	JJ-724

Table JJ–1: Commenter Index (continued)

Last Name	First Name	Agency/Business/Organization	Stakeholder ID	Page
Villanova	Ron		Villanova_Ro	JJ-724
Vinci	Keith		Vinci_Ke	JJ-270, JJ-271
Violette	Loretta		Violette_Lo	JJ-724
Visgilio	John	Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts	Visgilio_Jo	JJ-724
Visgilio	Wendy		Visgilio_We	JJ-725
Vita	Patricia	none, a lover of art, history & the environment.	Vita_Pa	JJ-725
Vitale	Marie		Vitale_Ma	JJ-271
Vitale	Paul		Vitale_Pa	JJ-68, JJ-271, JJ-272, JJ-399, JJ-453, JJ-500
Vlock	Jim	Vlock Family Foundation	Vlock_Ji	JJ-725
Voboril	William		Voboril_Wi	JJ-399
Vogel	Kenneth		Vogel_Ke	JJ-272, JJ-399, JJ-400, JJ-453, JJ-531, JJ-609
Volpe	Bruce		Volpe_Br	JJ-725
von Reichenbach	Susan	The MetaWay	von Reichenbach_Su	JJ-725
Votto	Diane		Votto_Di	JJ-272, JJ-725
Waaser	Carol		Waaser_Ca	JJ-634
Wagner	Florence		Wagner_Fl	JJ-629
Wagner	Marye		Wagner_Ma	JJ-400, JJ-609
Wagner	Tom	Maglev 2000, Incorporated	Wagner_To	JJ-401, JJ-610
Wahab	Lizzie		Wahab_Li	JJ-725
Wakeman	Carolyn		Wakeman_Ca	JJ-725
Waldman	Roger		Waldman_Ro	JJ-629
Waldron	Lisbath		Waldron_Li	JJ-401, JJ-725
Waldron	Mary		Waldron_Ma	JJ-725
Walewski	Thaddeus	University of New Haven Alumni	Walewski_Th	JJ-725
Walker	Jen	ASID	Walker_Je	JJ-610
Walker	Markesha	Grad Student	Walker_Ma	JJ-725
Wallace	Bruce		Wallace_Br	JJ-725
Wallman	Michael E.		Wallman_Mi	JJ-629
Walsh	Donald P.	Self, Retired Construction Mngr.	Walsh_Do	JJ-725
Walsh-Rogalski	William	EPA New England - Region 1	EPA_Walsh	JJ-299, JJ-416, JJ-442, JJ-459, JJ-460, JJ-461, JJ-462, JJ-463, JJ-464, JJ-504, JJ-510, JJ-514, JJ-534, JJ-575
Walters	Barbara		Walters_Ba	JJ-725
Walters	Scott		Walters_Sc	JJ-272
Walton	Daniel		Walton_Da	JJ-610
Warburg	Michael		Warburg_Mi	JJ-725
Ward	Richard		Ward_Ri	JJ-725
Ward	Spencer	University of Connecticut	Ward_Sp	JJ-273, JJ-725
Wardman	Sarah		Wardman_Sa	JJ-273, JJ-563
Wargo	Mary Ann		Wargo_Ma	JJ-725
Warner	Timothy		Warner_Ti	JJ-610
Warren	Daniel		Warren_Da	JJ-274, JJ-501
Warren	Laurie		Warren_La	JJ-725, JJ-726
Warren	Thomas		Warren_Th	JJ-726
Wassmer	Karen	CT Civil Group	Wassmer_Ka	JJ-726
Waters	Richard		Waters_Ri	JJ-610
Watson	Suzanne		Watson_Su	JJ-401, JJ-726

Table JJ–1: Commenter Index (continued)

Last Name	First Name	Agency/Business/Organization	Stakeholder ID	Page
Watts	Doug	UNH alumni	Watts_Do	JJ-726
Wayner	Claire		Wayner_Cl	JJ-629
Waytkus	Liz		Waytkus_Li	JJ-726
Weatherby	Susan		Weatherby_Su	JJ-726
Weaver	William		Weaver_Wi	JJ-726
Webster	Steve		Webster_St	JJ-401, JJ-453
Weeden	David	Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe	MashpeeWampanoag_Weeden	JJ-566
Weeks	Joan		Weeks_Jo	JJ-726
Weeks	Sara		Weeks_Sa	JJ-610, JJ-726
Weicker	Claudia		Weicker_Cl	JJ-726
Weicker	Lowell		Weicker_Lo	JJ-641
Weimann	Peter		Weimann_Pe	JJ-274, JJ-402
Weinmann	Leon	University of New Haven	Weinmann_Le	JJ-610
Weinstein	David		Weinstein_Da	JJ-402, JJ-436, JJ-453
Weinstein	Mark	Law Offices of Mark Weinstein, P.C.	Weinstein_Ma	JJ-726
Weiss	Bob	CBSBoston.Com	Weiss_Bo	JJ-402, JJ-611
Weiss	Jerry		Weiss_Je	JJ-726
Weiss	Sharon		Weiss_Sh	JJ-726
Weissman	Neile	New York Cycle Club	Weissman_Ne	JJ-68, JJ-437, JJ-611, JJ-635
Weller	Maureen M.		Weller_Ma	JJ-629
Welles	Deborah		Welles_De	JJ-725
Wells	Betty		Wells_Be	JJ-726
Wells	Lark		Wells_La	JJ-630
Wells	Maurice		Wells_Ma	JJ-403
Wells	Priscila		Wells_Pr	JJ-403, JJ-726
Wenck	M		Wenck_M	JJ-274
Wenck	William		Wenck_Wi	JJ-275
Wenzel	David		Wenzel_Da	JJ-726
Wenzel	Mark		Wenzel_Ma	JJ-275, JJ-563
Werner	Stuart		Werner_St	JJ-403, JJ-437
Wertheimer	Sheila	Private citizen	Wertheimer_Sh	JJ-726
West	Hosin		West_Ho	JJ-726
Weymouth	Charlie	Weymouth Architects and Planners	Weymouth_Ch	JJ-404, JJ-405
Wheeler	William	MTA	MTA_Wheeler	JJ-516, JJ-517
Whelan	David		Whelan_Da	JJ-727
Whelan	Rosemary		Whelan_Ro	JJ-727
Whellan	Michael		Whellan_Mi	JJ-437
Whipple	Timothy		Whipple_Ti	JJ-727
Whisker	Patricia		Whisker_Pa	JJ-405
White	Kathryn		White_Ka	JJ-727
White	Merle		White_Me	JJ-727
Whitehead	Faith		Whitehead_Fa	JJ-727
Whiting	Ryan		Whiting_Ry	JJ-727
Whitley	Joseph		Whitley_Jo	JJ-727
Wholean	Nicole	Florence Griswold Museum	Wholean_Ni	JJ-727
Widham	Kristen		Widham_Kr	JJ-727

Table JJ–1: Commenter Index (continued)

Last Name	First Name	Agency/Business/Organization	Stakeholder ID	Page
Widmann	Christopher	University of New Haven	Widmann_Ch	JJ-727
Wierzbicki	Sarah		Wierzbicki_Sa	JJ-275
Wieting	Scott		Wieting_Sc	JJ-438, JJ-501, JJ-635
Wiggin	Joelle		Wiggin_Jo	JJ-727
Wilcox	Adeline		Wilcox_Ad	JJ-405
Wilcox	Jacqueline		Wilcox_Ja	JJ-727
Wilder	Jonathan		Wilder_Jo	JJ-727
Wildey	Annie		Wildey_An	JJ-727
Wilkins	Andrew		Wilkins_An	JJ-275, JJ-405, JJ-438, JJ-453, JJ-611
Wilkinson	Jim		Wilkinson_Ji	JJ-630
Willauer	George	Florence Griswold Museum	Willauer_Ge	JJ-727
Williams	Jackson		Williams_Ja	JJ-68, JJ-275
Williams	Mark		Williams_Ma	JJ-501, JJ-611
Williams	Michael		Williams_Mi	JJ-276, JJ-438
Williams	Sheila	Compassionate CT Citizen	Williams_Sh	JJ-501, JJ-612
Williams	Sydney		Williams_Sy	JJ-69, JJ-727
Williamson	Cari		Williamson_Ca	JJ-727
Wilmerding	Gay		Wilmerding_Ga	JJ-276, JJ-438, JJ-439, JJ-612, JJ-727
Wilson	Dave		Wilson_Da	JJ-630
Wilson	Jennifer		Wilson_Jen	JJ-727
Wilson	Jeremy		Wilson_Jer	JJ-728
Wilson	Joseph		Wilson_Jo	JJ-728
Wilson	Melinda		Wilson_Me	JJ-277
Wilson	Robert		Wilson_Ro	JJ-277
Wilson	Tracey	Trinity College	Wilson_Tr	JJ-439, JJ-635
Winiger	Brook	Art Allure FB blog	Winiger_Br	JJ-728
Winnick	Jerome		Winnick_Je	JJ-728
Winston	Frederick	Univ of New Haven	Winston_Fr	JJ-728
Wiswell	James		Wiswell_Ja	JJ-728
Withers	Carol		Withers_Ca	JJ-728
Wizeman	Katherine		Wizeman_Ka	JJ-728
Wnek	Suzanne		Wnek_Su	JJ-728
Wojcik	Charlene		Wojcik_Ch	JJ-728
Wolde	Dibu		Wolde_Di	JJ-612
Wolf	Leslie	I-Park Foundation, East Haddam	Wolf_Le	JJ-728
Wolf	Stacie		Wolf_St	JJ-728
Wolman	Martin		Wolman_Ma	JJ-728
Wood	Peter	Univ. Of New Haven Graduate	Wood_Pe	JJ-728
Woods	Barbara	Black Hall Grille	Woods_Ba	JJ-728
Woods	Harry		Woods_Ha	JJ-635
Wooley	Jonathan		Wooley_Jo	JJ-277, JJ-278, JJ-406, JJ-563
Woolfson	Mariette	WPSIR	Woolfson_Ma	JJ-728
Woolley	David	Old Lyme Democratic Town Committee	Woolley_Da	JJ-501, JJ-728
Woolridge	Ginger		Woolridge_Gi	JJ-630
Wormser	Richard		Wormser_Ri	JJ-728
Worsham	Richard		Worsham_Ri	JJ-630

Table JJ–1: Commenter Index (continued)

Last Name	First Name	Agency/Business/Organization	Stakeholder ID	Page
Wray	Lyle D.	Capitol Region Council of Governments	CRCOG_Wray	JJ-74, JJ-297, JJ-298, JJ-413, JJ-456, JJ-574, JJ-638
Wright	Carol	Resident	Wright_Ca	JJ-612
Wright	Gary		Wright_Ga	JJ-728
Wright	William	Alumni of University of New Haven	Wright_Wi	JJ-728
Wurst	Steven		Wurst_St	JJ-728
Wyman	Doug		Wyman_Do	JJ-279
Xenikakis	Demetrios		Xenikakis_De	JJ-728
Yale	Siobhain	University of New Haven	Yale_Si	JJ-728
Yao	Lin	University of New Haven	Yao_Li	JJ-728
Yasuhara	Kento		Yasuhara_Ke	JJ-728
Yawman	Dana		Yawman_Da	JJ-728
York	Janet		York_Ja	JJ-729
You	Yuan	University of New Haven	You_Yu	JJ-729
Young	Hamish		Young_Ha	JJ-406
Youngs	Ralph		Youngs_Ra	JJ-630
Youngs	Susan		Youngs_Su	JJ-630
Yourke	Kate	Make: STEAM	Yourke_Ka	JJ-729
Yu	Tianyin	University of New Haven	Yu_Ti	JJ-729
Yuste-Alonso	Ruth Z.	University of Connecticut	Yuste-Alonso_Ru	JJ-280, JJ-439
Zabilansky			Zabilansky	JJ-729
Zajac	Roman	University of New Haven	Zajac_Ro	JJ-281, JJ-729
Zamora	Lauren		Zamora_La	JJ-630
Zande	Wendy		Zande_We	JJ-729
Zankowska	Izabela		Zankowska_Iz	JJ-729
Zatorski	Ray		Zatorski_Ra	JJ-281
Zavatone	Maureen		Zavatone_Ma	JJ-729
Zawacki	Gary		Zawacki_Ga	JJ-729
Zdonek	Angelica		Zdonek_An	JJ-729
Zegeye	Tigist	WILMAPCO	WILMAPCO_Zegeye	JJ-94, JJ-308, JJ-309, JJ-472
Zeller	James		Zeller_Ja	JJ-281
Zelson	Steve		Zelson_St	JJ-612
Ziaks	David	F. A. Hesketh & Associates	Ziaks_Da	JJ-282, JJ-729
Ziehmayer	Katja		Ziehmayer_Ka	JJ-729
Zielinski Meffert	Jessica		Zielinski Meffert_Je	JJ-729
Zingre	Shreyas	General Electric Company	Zingre_Sh	JJ-612
Zint	Michele	University of New Haven Alumni	Zint_Mi	JJ-729
Ziolkovski	Jennifer		Ziolkovski_Je	JJ-729
Zipprich	Bernard	The Wharton School	Zipprich_Be	JJ-282, JJ-612
Zissimos	Brian		Zissimos_Br	JJ-612
Zito	Christina		Zito_Ch	JJ-282, JJ-729
Zoghb	Nicolas	UNH	Zoghb_Ni	JJ-282
Zott	Robert	Unaffiliated	Zott_Ro	JJ-729
Zrenda	Joe		Zrenda_Jo	JJ-729
Zumpano	Helen		Zumpano_He	JJ-612
Zygnerski	Eva		Zygnerski_Ev	JJ-729
	Anonymous			Comments received anonymously are included at the end of each comment topic.

Source: NEC FUTURE team, 2016

JJ.5 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

The FRA identified the Preferred Alternative based in part on the feedback provided during the Tier 1 Draft EIS public comment period. The following tables present each unique comment identified with a response. The FRA considered comments on all topics for the alternatives considered in the Tier 1 Draft EIS and focused the responses on the Preferred Alternative. As described in Chapter 2, Readers' Guide, the FRA used the same methodologies, data sources, and data sets presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS to evaluate the No Action Alternative and Preferred Alternative in the Tier 1 Final EIS. To maintain consistency between the Tier 1 Draft EIS and Tier 1 Final EIS, the FRA did not replace the 2012 data sets used for analysis with more current data sets. However, the FRA updated some data calculations between the Tier 1 Draft EIS and Tier 1 Final EIS to respond to comments received during the public comment period and to address inconsistencies or omissions in data.

JJ.5.1 Purpose and Need

The following tables contain comments on the Purpose and Need for the NEC FUTURE program, described in Volumes 1 and 2, Chapter 3. The Purpose and Need has not changed between the Tier 1 Draft EIS and Tier 1 Final EIS. The comments focused primarily on the importance of addressing regional needs of the Study Area with proposed improvements to the NEC, NEC freight rail service needs and goals, connectivity and speed in evaluating and identifying the Preferred Alternative, and the importance of addressing and prioritizing state-of-good-repair needs on the NEC.

Table JJ–2: Stakeholder Comments (Elected Officials, Tribes, Federal Agencies, State Agencies, Local Agencies): Purpose and Need

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
CSX_Turra	We recommend that FRA revise the text in the Final EIS to include a statement that many of the nine goals of the Commission have equal application to freight rail service on the Corridor.	NEC FUTURE is a passenger rail study; however, the FRA recognizes the importance of shared access to the NEC and the importance of accommodating existing and future freight rail traffic. The FRA has noted the nine goals of the Northeast Corridor Commission (including those that reflect the importance of freight rail) in Volume 2, Chapter 1. Volume 2, Chapter 3, includes a cross-reference to that chapter for more information regarding the Northeast Corridor Commission.
CSX_Turra	We recommend that FRA amend the stated purpose and need for this project to include the express recognition that continued economic growth in the corridor is, at least in part, dependent upon allowing for existing and future growth in freight rail service on the NEC.	The FRA acknowledges the importance of freight rail service to the economy of the Study Area. Language has been added to Volume 1, Chapter 3, to clarify the role of freight rail.
MDDNR_Golden	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.	The FRA appreciates the shared focus on the importance of the NEC to regional environmental sustainability and economic growth. These elements were important factors in the FRA's decision-making on a Preferred Alternative. The FRA remains committed to ongoing collaboration with regional stakeholders moving forward toward implementation of a Preferred Alternative
Old Lyme_Selectwoman Nosal	It appears that [Alternative 1] focuses on meeting some of the regional goals of the NEC by addressing the chokeholds along the southern part of the existing route. However, by adding new track through the heart of our town our local needs are not addressed and therefore the objectives of the Tier are not met.	<p>The alternatives development process evaluated separate service, infrastructure, and route options that could be crafted into different alternatives that meet the needs of various markets along the NEC. The FRA took a market-based approach that incorporated analysis of current travel demand, population growth projections, ridership projections, data from states and planning organizations, and public and agency comments. Although the visions of the Action Alternatives are unique, all Action Alternatives fulfill the goals, and meet the Purpose and Need of the NEC FUTURE program as described in Volume 1, Chapter 3. Alternative 1 includes new rail services and commensurate investment in the NEC to expand capacity, add tracks, and relieve key chokepoints. Alternative 1 includes new segments parallel to and outside of the existing NEC right-of-way where the railroad is capacity-constrained, or where expanding capacity within the existing right-of-way is difficult or impractical.</p> <p>The goals and scope of the NEC FUTURE Tier 1 EIS support a regional perspective on addressing the needs of the Study Area and proposed improvements to the NEC. Routes and service plans are representative of the markets served, routings and possible construction types. In defining the Preferred Alternative, the FRA reviewed specific local concerns and subsequently refined representative routes and construction types to balance the concerns with broader regional travel needs. However, local issues will be given full consideration as part of Tier 2 environmental reviews when decisions are made about specific routes, service plans, and construction types. Volume 1, Chapter 1, includes information regarding level of detail and decisions made at Tier 1 and Tier 2.</p>
Scarsdale_Mayor Mark	The future-serving new spine is also terribly costly, diverting necessary investment from other local, regional and national passenger rail, commuter rail, heavy rail, and other public transit assets. The overwhelming backlog of state of good repair needs, both regionally and nationally, should be fully funded prior to entertaining construction of costly new lines, including the proposed NEC spine through Scarsdale. ... While we do need to plan for future needs, our expenditures must first meet the needs of the present. Alternative 3's ambitious goal of transforming the role of rail by having it become the dominant mode choice for travel in the Northeast, relies on costly overbuilding to support future demand. In the process, it sacrifices \$155 billion in funding otherwise available to meet the overwhelming existing needs of our Nation's aging and outdated passenger rail and public transit infrastructure while also generating significant adverse impacts to the residents of Scarsdale. Therefore, I strongly urge the Federal Railroad Administration to prioritize regional and national state of good repair ahead of costly major expansions targeting projected future growth...	The Action Alternatives include investments necessary to bring the NEC to a state of good repair; in addition, the FRA proposes operational enhancements to improve the overall performance of the NEC. The No Action Alternative fails to upgrade the NEC to a state of good repair and to create opportunities for operating enhancements (e.g., integrated scheduling and improved service connectivity). The FRA's Preferred Alternative reflects the importance of committing to improvements to the existing NEC; the FRA further clarifies the importance of improving the existing NEC by highlighting those improvements in the proposed First Phase for the Preferred Alternative.

Table JJ–2: Stakeholder Comments (Elected Officials, Tribes, Federal Agencies, State Agencies, Local Agencies): Purpose and Need (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
SCRCOG_Amento	Because the DEIS looks broadly over the entire system, no single alternative truly captures the essence of our region's core objectives, namely dramatically improved commuter travel time to New York City together with improved travel time and more frequent service to Washington and Boston. We feel strongly that the DEIS should address those areas that must be addressed to meet these objectives.	As described in Volume 2, Chapter 3, Purpose and Need, the purpose of the NEC FUTURE rail investment program is to upgrade aging infrastructure and to improve the reliability, capacity, connectivity, performance, and resiliency of passenger rail service on the NEC. The FRA considered improved connectivity and improved travel times in developing the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative would improve travel time to New York City and would provide more-frequent service to Washington, D.C., and Boston. Volume 1, Chapters 5 and 9, provide more detail on travel-time improvements for the Preferred Alternative.

Source: NEC FUTURE team, 2016

Table JJ–3: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Purpose and Need

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Arena_Ri	a poor decision was made when the decision was taken to drop the top speed of the NEC from 220 down to 160.	<p>The purpose of NEC FUTURE is to address not only compromised performance on the NEC but also overall travel needs in the Study Area, including aging infrastructure, insufficient capacity, gaps in connectivity, and lack of resiliency. Consistent with NEC FUTURE goals, each Action Alternative also includes necessary improvements to the existing NEC, which is and will continue to be an important transportation link for several major metropolitan areas, including those along the shoreline. The Preferred Alternative reflects the importance of improving the existing NEC while also improving performance.</p> <p>The FRA has focused on improving performance and travel times throughout the NEC rather than on track design speeds themselves. Targeted trip-time reductions between markets were balanced with cost and potential ridership increases. As described in Volume 1, Chapter 4, as part of the analysis of Alternative 3, the FRA evaluated service plans that supported speeds up to 220 mph between major NEC markets along a second spine between Washington, D.C., and Boston, MA. Based on the evaluation, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative that includes, where practical, opportunities to operate at speeds up to 220 mph, and a design speed for the existing NEC of 160 mph where possible considering physical constraints. Performance criteria may be considered as part of the FRA's decision making for NEC FUTURE, and site-specific design speeds will be further evaluated in Tier 2 project reviews.</p>
Businger_Jo	The whole objective of our environmental, transportation and economic policy should be to have as much intercity passenger rail service as possible, to stress connectivity, and to get rid of the artificial constraints that our system now has. ... If we're going to do nothing, let's be very clear to the public we intend to leave the dead ends at North and South Stations and to condemn our area here to a system where in Boston, which is supposed to be the Hub, it's a wheel that the spokes don't connect. That one-mile gap should be filled.	<p>The proposed Action Alternatives do not preclude the future planning for or implementation of a link between North Station and South Station (referred to as the North South Rail Link). As a currently unfunded initiative, the North South Rail Link was not included in the No Action Alternative Project List (see the No Action Alternative Report contained in Volume 2, Appendix B). The FRA limited consideration of improvements to the NEC to the current NEC, as defined, from Washington, D.C., Union Station to Boston South Station; however, markets and service connections beyond these physical limits were considered in developing representative service plans. The FRA will continue to coordinate closely with Massachusetts on any potential future plans for expansion of the NEC beyond South Station.</p>
De Leon_Al	I think future plans should focus on improving infrastructure, including tracks and bridges, with a goal of establishing high-speed trains between Boston, New York and DC. It will be better for the environment and and for customers.	<p>The FRA's focus for NEC FUTURE is to meet both current and future passenger rail transportation needs. The overall needs addressed include aging infrastructure, insufficient capacity, gaps in connectivity, compromised performance, and lack of resiliency. Bringing the NEC to a state of good repair and meeting current and forecast needs are fundamental requirements for the identified Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>The FRA did not focus on high-speed rail as a singular priority. All Action Alternatives demonstrate the prioritization of improving the existing NEC, and all include a range of service types, each with varying travel times, frequencies, and stopping patterns (from express service with short travel times and reduced stops to regional service, with longer travel times but increased number of station stops) . Performance was only one of numerous evaluation factors (Volume 1, Chapter 9) that the FRA considered in recommending the Preferred Alternative.</p>
Feakins_Ka	I do not understand why this project of high priority-high speed rail (aka AmtraK) is a high priority. Amtrak doesn't currently work and is expensive.	<p>The FRA considered overall travel needs in the Study Area, and while it did find that improvements in travel time, among other indicators of performance, were needed in order to make passenger rail competitive with other modes of transportation, the FRA did not focus on high-speed rail as a singular priority. All Action Alternatives demonstrate the prioritization of improving the existing NEC, and all include a range of service types, each with varying travel times, frequencies, and stopping patterns (from express service with short travel times and reduced stops to regional service, with longer travel times but increased number of station stops) . Finally, performance was only one of numerous evaluation factors (Volume 1, Chapter 9) that the FRA considered in recommending the Preferred Alternative.</p>

Table JJ–3: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Purpose and Need (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Frazier_Ri	The basic premise of Northeast population growth that underlies the potential need for additional track routes is suspect from the start. The Northeast is the most child-free region in the U.S. This fact, combined with consistent population departure rates, means Northeast population growth is projected to be among the slowest in the nation.	The FRA considered population and employment forecasts to 2040 from multiple commercial sources as well as available metropolitan or regional planning organizations. In all cases, population and employment in the Study Area are forecast to increase. While some parts of the region will see slower growth rates than others, when considered as a whole, growth will exceed the capacity of the existing NEC for both intercity and regional travel.
Frentz_Ma	We have an amazing opportunity to link these communities together to get our dependency off of automobiles, to lower our environmental impact. By doing that, we can expand rail here in the Northeast and make connections even better.	The purpose of NEC FUTURE is to address not only compromised performance on the NEC but also overall travel needs in the Study Area, including aging infrastructure, insufficient capacity, gaps in connectivity, and lack of resiliency. Consistent with NEC FUTURE goals, each Action Alternative also includes necessary improvements to the existing NEC, which is and will continue to be an important transportation link for several major metropolitan areas. The Preferred Alternative reflects the importance of improving the existing NEC while also improving performance.
Gerster_Pe	Having read the report, it is very difficult to find a simple definition of the purpose of the study	The purpose for NEC FUTURE is stated in Volume 1, Chapters 1 and 3. The purpose of NEC FUTURE is to upgrade aging infrastructure and to improve the reliability, capacity, connectivity, performance, and resiliency of future passenger rail service on the NEC for both Intercity and Regional trips, while promoting environmental sustainability and economic growth.
Hale_Ro	...the lack of a similar plan for our highways or for our airports at this point should serve as a testament to the public and to the officials making decisions of the importance of rail and how it will be able to serve a role that simply cannot be served simply by upgrading our roads or our airports alone.	The FRA considered the role of passenger rail in the context of the multimodal transportation system, including transit, air and highway (including intercity bus). As the commenter notes, the focus of NEC FUTURE is on the passenger rail network and what role that network should have in serving the current and future travel needs of the region.
Hale_Ro	In particular, I offer a rebuttal to the many environmental interest groups that sent representatives who spoke against Alternative 3 at that meeting. Their reasoning for favoring Alternatives 1 or 2 was to minimize the immediate impacts of new right-of-way on habitat, and I respect their positions. Indeed, I share the broad goal of protecting the environment, and I contend that anything other than proceeding with Alternative 3 would be shortchanging our environmental health. Unfortunately, a narrow focus on habitat destruction due to a new rail right-of-way misses the far greater environmental consideration of emission reduction.	As described in Volume 1, Chapters 3 and 9, the FRA evaluated how well all the alternatives for NEC FUTURE addressed both current and future passenger rail transportation needs (aging infrastructure, insufficient capacity, gaps in connectivity, compromised performance, and lack of resiliency) while promoting environmental sustainability and continued economic growth. In evaluating alternatives against their ability to promote environmental sustainability, the FRA considered the extent to which an alternative resulted in a change in greenhouse gases, other criteria pollutants, and energy use, and was compatible with appropriate land development plans; the FRA also considered the magnitude of effects of each alternative on various environmental resources. The FRA considered these and other benefits and effects of all alternatives, including off-corridor representative routings included in Alternative 3, in identifying the Preferred Alternative; the FRA did not solely focus on immediate impacts of new off-corridor routes.
Humphries_Jo	...recognize that if we are going to meet our climate goals and transform our economy for a clean energy future, we're going to have to increase [investment in rail service].	As described in Volume 2, Chapter 3, Purpose and Need, the purpose of the NEC FUTURE rail investment program is to upgrade aging infrastructure and to improve the reliability, capacity, connectivity, performance, and resiliency of passenger rail service on the NEC. The FRA considered improved resiliency in future climate conditions in developing the Preferred Alternative.
Keene_Jo	The Northeast Corridor is recognized as increasingly critical to the provision of passenger transportation services throughout the region. In addition, its infrastructure is in critical need of repair, replacement and expansion to insure reliability and meet current demands of intercity and commuter rail services. Any alternatives implemented beyond these goals will benefit the entire region economically and will provide varying degrees of redundancy to the transportation system.	The FRA's focus for NEC FUTURE is to meet both current and future passenger rail transportation needs. The overall needs addressed include aging infrastructure, insufficient capacity, gaps in connectivity, compromised performance, and lack of resiliency. Bringing the NEC to a state of good repair and meeting current and forecast needs are fundamental requirements for the identified Preferred Alternative.
Lacari_Ma	The Northeast Corridor, as we all know, is one of Amtrak's busiest corridors. However, the current system is a shadow of its former self. The infrastructure is worn out and needs massive replacement of outdated signals, outdated bridges, which in some cases as we all know, are more than or at least over 100 years old. And also the replacement of outdated rolling stock...	The commenter supports the FRA's Purpose and Need to address aging infrastructure and unreliable performance of aging infrastructure. As described in Volume 2, Appendix B, the FRA made assumptions in the service plans about various types of rolling stock and associated traction power. Volume 1, Chapter 4, discusses rolling stock assumptions made for the Preferred Alternative. The ultimate decisions about rolling stock procurement, including the configuration and maximum speed of trainsets, will be made subsequent to the completion of the Tier 1 EIS.

Table JJ–3: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Purpose and Need (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Lacari_Ma	Our corridor right now can't even handle, you know, a single draw bridge incident, as we all know with Portal Bridge. So if we have a breakdown, we're in deep trouble. If no action is taken immediately, we risk having to run an outdated system that will not be able to handle such growth in the future.	The FRA's focus for NEC FUTURE is to meet both current and future passenger rail transportation needs. The overall needs addressed include aging infrastructure, insufficient capacity, gaps in connectivity, compromised performance, and lack of resiliency. Bringing the NEC to a state of good repair and meeting current and forecast needs are fundamental requirements for the identified Preferred Alternative.
Murphy_Wa	It is time that our rail infrastructure be upgraded to 21st Century needs.	The FRA's focus for NEC FUTURE is to meet both current and future passenger rail transportation needs. The overall needs addressed include aging infrastructure, insufficient capacity, gaps in connectivity, compromised performance, and lack of resiliency. Bringing the NEC to a state of good repair and meeting current and forecast needs are fundamental requirements for the identified Preferred Alternative.
Preston_Ev	from ConnPIRG's perspective, our status quo on transportation priorities is unacceptable for solving the problem that Connecticut has for consumers, for our economy and for our environment here.	The FRA's focus for NEC FUTURE is to meet both current and future passenger rail transportation needs. The overall needs addressed include aging infrastructure, insufficient capacity, gaps in connectivity, compromised performance, and lack of resiliency. Bringing the NEC to a state of good repair and meeting current and forecast needs are fundamental requirements for the identified Preferred Alternative.
St. Germain_Kr	Why should any town sacrifice it's soul for a project that is not necessary to begin with.	<p>The alternatives development process evaluated separate service, infrastructure, and route options that could be crafted into different alternatives that meet the needs of various markets along the NEC. The FRA took a market-based approach that incorporated analysis of current travel demand, population growth projections, ridership projections, data from states and planning organizations, and public and agency comments. Although the visions of the Action Alternatives are unique, all Action Alternatives fulfill the goals, and meet the Purpose and Need of the NEC FUTURE program as described in Volume 1, Chapter 3.</p> <p>The goals and scope of the NEC FUTURE Tier 1 EIS support a regional perspective on addressing the needs of the Study Area and proposed improvements to the NEC. Routes and service plans are representative of the markets served, routings and possible construction types. In defining the Preferred Alternative, the FRA reviewed specific local concerns and subsequently refined representative routes and construction types to balance the concerns with broader regional travel needs. However, local issues will be given full consideration as part of Tier 2 environmental reviews when decisions are made about specific routes, service plans, and construction types. Volume 1, Chapter 1, includes information regarding level of detail and decisions made at Tier 1 and Tier 2.</p>
Vitale_Pa	With the recent blizzard that hit the east coast and resulting impact on rail service, it is clear that rail systems need improvement.	The FRA's focus for NEC FUTURE is to meet both current and future passenger rail transportation needs. The overall needs addressed include aging infrastructure, insufficient capacity, gaps in connectivity, compromised performance, and lack of resiliency. Bringing the NEC to a state of good repair and meeting current and forecast needs are fundamental requirements for the identified Preferred Alternative.
Weissman_Ne	...expanding roll on/roll off access is fully consistent with the five goals developed during the IES scoping process, meet growing demand, strengthen intermodal passenger connections, address near and long term mobility solutions, promote environmental sustainability, enhance the economic viability of the region.	The FRA has expanded the discussion of connectivity in Volume 1, Chapter 5, to better describe the range of intermodal connections necessary to address long-term mobility needs, including local transit, bicycle, and pedestrian access.
Williams_Ja	I'm alarmed there is no discussion in the report of redundant alternative routings in the NEC to protect service against terrorist attacks or other disasters... New routings that are redundant yet open new communities to service are two-fers that deserve greater consideration.	The FRA considered alternative routing off the existing NEC in all three Action Alternatives evaluated in the Tier 1 Draft EIS (Volume 2), in the context of serving new markets as well as creating redundancy to the existing NEC. While not specifically considered in the context of terrorism, these routings were evaluated with regard to their ability to provide redundancy and to create a more resilient passenger rail network.

Table JJ–3: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Purpose and Need (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Williams_Sy	The Acela averages about 84 miles per hour between New work and Boston, less than half the speed of modern trains in Japan. The argument for resetting the tracks is two-fold: One, it would straighten the line, allowing for higher speeds, and, two, it would take the path away from the shoreline, an area subject to tidal floods	<p>The purpose of NEC FUTURE is to address not only compromised performance on the NEC but also overall travel needs in the Study Area, including aging infrastructure, insufficient capacity, gaps in connectivity, and lack of resiliency. Consistent with NEC FUTURE goals, each Action Alternative also includes necessary improvements to the existing NEC, which is and will continue to be an important transportation link for several major metropolitan areas, including those along the shoreline. The Preferred Alternative reflects the importance of improving the existing NEC while also improving performance.</p> <p>The FRA has focused on improving performance and travel times throughout the NEC rather than on track design speeds themselves. Targeted trip-time reductions between markets were balanced with cost and potential ridership increases. As described in Volume 1, Chapter 4, as part of the analysis of Alternative 3, the FRA evaluated service plans that supported speeds up to 220 mph between major NEC markets along a second spine between Washington, D.C., and Boston, MA. Based on the evaluation, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative that includes, where practical, opportunities to operate at speeds up to 220 mph, and a design speed for the existing NEC of 160 mph where possible considering physical constraints. Performance criteria may be considered as part of the FRA's decision making for NEC FUTURE, and site-specific design speeds will be further evaluated in Tier 2 project reviews.</p>
Anonymous_001	Notes: Currently, train travel across the country is painfully slow, unreliable and inconvenient. I do not consider rail as an alternative mode of transportation in its current state. The two biggest issues that need to be addressed are connectivity and speed.	As described in Volumes 1 and 2, Chapter 3, the purpose of the NEC FUTURE rail investment program is to upgrade aging infrastructure and to improve the reliability, capacity, connectivity, performance, and resiliency of passenger rail service on the NEC. Improved connectivity and performance (including maximum speed) were two evaluation factors that the FRA considered in developing and evaluating Action Alternatives and in selecting a Preferred Alternative.
Anonymous_001	If the system is upgraded, maintained, and operated well, it would become a revenue generating machine rather than a chronically sick liability.	The NEC FUTURE Purpose and Need includes bringing the NEC to a state of good repair and improving performance. Each of the proposed Action Alternatives addresses these specific needs, as well as includes enhanced service concepts aimed at increasing the efficiency of operations. The No Action Alternative does not sufficiently improve the NEC to bring it to a state of good repair, nor does it propose any concepts to change how the NEC is operated.
Anonymous_055	The basic premise of Northeast population growth that underlies the potential need for large scale, costly alternatives is suspect from the start. The northeast is the most child-free region in the U.S. This fact, combined with consistent population departure rates, means northeast population growth is projected to be among the slowest in the nation.	The FRA considered population and employment forecasts to 2040 from multiple commercial sources as well as available metropolitan or regional planning organizations. In all cases, population and employment in the Study Area are forecast to increase. While some parts of the region will see slower growth rates than others, when considered as a whole, growth will exceed the capacity of the existing NEC for both intercity and regional travel.

Source: NEC FUTURE team, 2016

JJ.5.2 Alternatives Considered

The following tables contain comments on the No Action Alternative and Action Alternatives, described in Volume 2, Chapter 4, Alternatives Considered. The majority of the comments assigned to the category express support or opposition for one or more of the Action Alternatives, express support or opposition for the NEC FUTURE program, or express support or opposition for specific route options. The process that the FRA undertook to identify the Preferred Alternative, based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, stakeholder input, and the FRA's policy objectives, is described in Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative. Evaluation of the Preferred Alternative is presented in Chapter 9, Evaluation of the Preferred Alternative.

Table JJ-4: Stakeholder Comments (Elected Officials, Tribes, Federal Agencies, State Agencies, Local Agencies): Alternatives Considered

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Amtrak_Boardman	<p>However, Alternatives 1 and 2 fall far short of creating a world-class rail transportation system that will meaningfully impact the region's global competitiveness. These Alternatives do not provide sufficient infrastructure to support the service frequencies and travel times proposed, nor are the service plans designed to accommodate major disruptions to ongoing operations necessary for asset replacement on the existing Corridor. Alternatives 1 and 2 offer only minimal capacity for growth beyond the horizon year, leaving the region facing major costs to keep the NEC relevant past 2040. Alternative 3 is closest to Amtrak's long-term vision for passenger rail in the Northeast.² Not only does it provide stakeholders flexibility to choose from the largest menu of infrastructure investment options, it preserves the opportunity to invest in multiple improvement programs within the region. Alternative 3 also provides the following critical benefits: - Necessary capacity and trip time improvements... - True high-speed rail service... - Additional capacity to expand freight, regional and commuter rail services on the existing spine... - Capacity to support robust service levels between major city pairs on a new alignment while the decades-long effort to rehabilitate the existing NEC is underway; - Expanded commercially viable services that likely won't require large operating subsidies; - Improved connectivity between Regional and Intercity services; - Capacity expansion within the corridor with fewer disruptions to ongoing service during construction; - Greater shifts in travel... - Tremendous transit-oriented and sustainable development opportunities... - Major community regeneration opportunities for existing NEC-served communities... Alternative/Complementary Investment Scenarios: Amtrak recognizes that given the NEC Future's 2040 time horizon, less intensive (and comprehensive) investment scenarios than Alternative 3 may be deemed supported as the Preferred Alternative, especially in light of anticipated funding, environmental and constructability factors. Under such scenarios, short of a transformative approach, Amtrak would prefer Alternative 2 as the next-best outcome to advance toward a Record of Decision. We specifically recommend including in the Preferred Alternative a new alignment in the I-95 corridor between Kingston, Rhode Island and New Rochelle, New York, and other high-performance infrastructure improvements elsewhere along the NEC spine (as examples, Alternative 2's New Haven-Hartford, Philadelphia International Airport and northeastern Maryland express alignments, as well as curve modifications at select NEC-spine locations) aimed at substantial intercity rail trip-time improvements that could significantly narrow the gap between the maximum incremental benefits delivered by the Alternative 3 and those of other alternatives.</p>	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives, including Alternatives 2 and 3, to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative brings the existing NEC to a state of good repair, replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates almost 200 miles of new segments that, together, provide a high speed, conflict-free route, and expand capacity to grow the role of rail, and have great potential for operational efficiencies. The Preferred Alternative utilizes features of Alternative 3 to best meet the service needs of specific markets and avoid environmental constraints. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the identification of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative does not include a second spine end-to-end along with NEC improvements, as proposed by Alternative 3. In addition to the FRA decision to prioritize the existing NEC, the cost of a second spine was high relative to the travel-time savings and other benefits. Much of the benefit of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While the analysis for NEC FUTURE did not justify advancing a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The North End Route Options connecting through New Haven would be most compatible with the Preferred Alternative. Those routing concepts (including sections of a second spine) and future commercial opportunities are not included in the Preferred Alternative but could be pursued separately.</p>
Amtrak_Boardman	<p>Before discussing Amtrak's Preferred Alternative, we must be clear why certain alternatives are not acceptable. The No Action Alternative would have serious repercussions for passenger and freight rail service and infrastructure. Investment levels under this Alternative would not even achieve a state-of- good-repair, let alone provide opportunities for growth. The network's degraded conditions would cause passengers to experience declining service reliability and longer travel times due to necessary speed restrictions to safely operate over deteriorating infrastructure. Customer demand -- given the expected demographic growth in the Corridor -- could not be met under this scenario.</p>	<p>As described in Volume 1, Chapter 9, Evaluation of the Preferred Alternative, the No Action Alternative inadequate to meet the needs of the Northeast. The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrades to the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment. By replacing aging infrastructure and eliminating chokepoints, train service will be faster and far more reliable. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.</p>
Amtrak_Boardman	<p>Amtrak generally finds the specific infrastructure and routing elements included in Alternative 3 to be reasonable... Alternative 3 includes most of the improvements contained in Alternatives 1 and 2, dictating major upgrades to the existing NEC spine occur in tandem with developing a new high-speed alignment. This practical requirement results in significant capital costs for this Alternative. This choice effectively subordinates the introduction of world-class high-speed rail in the NEC to the rehabilitation and improvement of the conventional NEC and obscures the consideration of the trade-offs that should be analyzed between various investments in the two systems. For instance, a new alignment could mean certain improvements to the existing NEC spine may not be necessary or could be delayed. Similarly, developing a new alignment may only be appropriate within the horizon period for certain portions of the network. Variants of Alternative 3 should be developed and analyzed to achieve a state-of-good-repair for the existing NEC and focus capital expenditures on improvements that drive intercity rail performance and strong financial outcomes, as any rail operator and public and private investors seeking to carry out such a program of improvement would.</p>	<p>The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While the analysis for NEC FUTURE did not justify advancing a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. Those routing concepts (including sections of a second spine) and future commercial opportunities are not included in the Preferred Alternative but could be pursued separately.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative is further described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.</p>

Table JJ-4: Stakeholder Comments (Elected Officials, Tribes, Federal Agencies, State Agencies, Local Agencies): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Amtrak_Boardman	Amtrak makes the following observations and recommendations regarding specific options for Alternative 3: - The New Haven-Hartford-Providence-Boston route presents an alignment with more commercial activity within the proposed markets than the alternative New England routes evaluated. - The Long Island route option within the New York to New Haven segment presents an opportunity to tap into a mature, dense market with relatively quick modal shift opportunities. - The option for new alignments along the Interstate Highway 95 corridor between Rhode Island and New York State, inclusive - found in the other alternatives but not in Alternative 3 - should be included in the New England route options for service along the current NEC spine. While this option does not replace the need for a new high-speed alignment, introducing a higher speed rail alignment along the I-95 Corridor would offer significant mobility and resiliency benefits for services utilizing the current NEC spine, including current Northeast Regional services. These services include the growing number of off-corridor, state-supported route extensions that could greatly benefit from improved trip times on the NEC spine.	<p>The Preferred Alternative does not include a full length high-speed second spine; however analyses completed by the FRA for NEC FUTURE do demonstrate future potential of new passenger rail services via Long Island or New Haven-Hartford-Providence-Boston. The FRA did, however, focus on improvements to the existing NEC and strengthening connections to urban centers. Considering the Tier 1 EIS evaluation, public and stakeholder comments, and overarching policy objectives, the FRA developed a Preferred Alternative that achieves some of the benefits of these new routes at a lower cost. The Preferred Alternative adds over 200 miles of new segments adjacent to the existing NEC to add capacity and improve travel times. The Representative Route of the Preferred Alternative provides an envelope within which the feasibility of utilizing the I-95 corridor could be explored. These new segments along the length of the NEC would improve the resiliency and flexibility of the NEC - creating opportunities for a mix of services to share the NEC in an efficient manner.</p> <p>The FRA also received feedback about the importance of connectivity - in terms of station access, service frequency, integrated scheduling, and reliability. The Preferred Alternative incorporates features that facilitate the goal of creating an integrated rail network with initial emphasis on the NEC Spine and the Hartford/Springfield Line creating the capacity for future improvements for connecting corridors.</p> <p>While the analysis for NEC FUTURE did not justify advancing a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative is further described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The FRA values the on-going collaboration with Amtrak and its role as owner of the NEC and will continue to work closely with Amtrak and other stakeholders to define specific projects to implement the Selected Alternatives as adopted with a Record of Decision subsequent to the Tier 1 Final EIS. The FRA will not make location or site-specific decisions in this Tier 1 EIS, those decisions are made in subsequent Tier 2 project studies.</p>
Anne Arundel County_Schuh	... we offer the following comments on all of the alternatives and would suggest a modified approach. The Purpose and Need statement of the study ... addressing failing infrastructure or poor service and only secondarily refers to increasing new service as a way of promoting economic growth and environmental sustainability."	The Preferred Alternative combines key elements of all three Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate future growth in Northeast population and employment. The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. The Preferred Alternative brings the existing NEC to a state of good repair and maximizes its capacity through alleviation of chokepoints, addition of new tracks and segments at targeted locations, and implementation of service operational efficiencies. The Preferred Alternative also removes speed restrictions where practical and safe, reduces trip times, offers frequent Metropolitan and enhanced express Intercity services, and allows substantial growth for all Regional rail markets. The Preferred Alternative also incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line as part of the NEC, providing one-seat ride service to and from the NEC and Springfield. See Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Anne Arundel County_Schuh	...we do not recommend the dramatic increase in new high speed rail service to new markets. The high speed rail corridor should be limited to the dense major urban downtowns currently on the mainline."	As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure or alignments in the Tier 1 Record of Decision. Such decisions are made as part of the Tier 2 project studies, which would include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate. Consistent with this process, the FRA developed Representative Routes for the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative, which provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the effects of each Alternative. Representative Routes define an envelope within which improvements might occur and whose location and construction type could change during subsequent Tier 2 project analysis.

Table JJ–4: Stakeholder Comments (Elected Officials, Tribes, Federal Agencies, State Agencies, Local Agencies): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Bronx_Borough President Diaz	alt 2 at an absolute minimum and alt 3 makes the best economic sense for making rail impt and reducing pollution &traffic!!	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives, including Alternatives 2 and 3, to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.
Brookhaven_Supervisor Romaine	As the supervisor of the largest town in Suffolk County, and one that will be most affected by the proposed new segment of Alternative 3 to connect New York City to New Haven County, CT via Long Island, I have strong reservations with this \$300 billion alternative as proposed.	The Preferred Alternative does not include the new segment routing option on Long Island, as proposed in Alternative 3. The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative.
Brookhaven_Supervisor Romaine	I recommend Alternative 3 not be considered unless the proposed segment through Long Island is eliminated entirely. Any improvements to rail transportation on Long Island should first serve to benefit the residents of the region. Proposals, such as electrification of the main line east of Ronkonkoma and the addition of a third track to the west, should be seriously considered before any proposal to use Long Island as a transportation bridge between New York and Boston.	<p>The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative does not include new segments between NYC and Long Island and Long Island and Connecticut via the Long Island Sound or a new Segment via Central Connecticut, as proposed in Alternative 3.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.</p>
Brookhaven_Supervisor Romaine	Additionally, the FRA should generally consider upgrading capacity and improvements utilizing existing right-of-ways throughout the corridor to the maximum extent possible to minimize the impact on residents and the environment.	Consistent with the Tier 1 NEPA process, the FRA developed Representative Routes for the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative, which provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the effects of each Alternative. Representative Routes define an envelope within which improvements might occur and whose location and construction type could change during Tier 2 project analysis. These representative routes utilized existing transportation corridors to the maximum extent practicable. Nevertheless, the Preferred Alternative includes the potential for acquisition or displacements within areas of existing transportation use. As part of the Tier 2 project analysis, socioeconomic effects and any necessary acquisitions, temporary easements, and displacements would be identified, and compliance with the Uniform Relocation Act will be required.

Table JJ-4: Stakeholder Comments (Elected Officials, Tribes, Federal Agencies, State Agencies, Local Agencies): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
CAA_Dillon	Unfortunately, the CAA is unable to endorse any of the provided alternatives at this time. In the spirit of enhancing Connecticut's intermodal transportation system, the CAA asserts that any final enhancements must address the inland route seNing New Haven - Hartford - Springfield. Rail connectivity to Bradley International Airport, New England's second largest airport, must be emphasized in the plan, and the CAA was disappointed to find a relative lack of attention to the inland route and Bradley Airport in the current alternatives presented. We look forward to the FRA studying both of these issues in order to maximize safety and reduce capacity constraints for commuters and travelers in Connecticut and beyond.	The Preferred Alternative extends service via the Hartford/Springfield Line between New Haven and Springfield, as described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative would significantly relieve capacity constraints along the NEC and accommodate increases in types and volumes of passenger rail service. The Preferred Alternative does not connect to Bradley International Airport. In the Hartford area, the Preferred Alternative Representative Route via New Haven to Hartford and Springfield includes a station stop at Windsor Locks, which is only 2.5 miles from Bradley Airport and accessible with a quality transit or shuttle bus connection. The FRA will not decide specific details for this type of connecting service. However, those decisions would be the subject of subsequent Tier 2 project studies which would include public and stakeholder outreach, as appropriate. The rail-air connections and the Preferred Alternative are further described in Volume 1, Chapter 4 and Chapter 5.
CONEG_Stubbs	The No Action Alternative identified in the NEC FUTURE study, as the base line for comparative purposes, is not an acceptable outcome for the Northeast Corridor and would lead to network failure. Although the No Action Alternative presumes funding levels far higher than historic investment levels - and far higher than any currently available level of Federal and other funding is likely to produce, it would still fail to achieve a state-of-good-repair, eliminate capacity constrained chokepoints and replace aging infrastructure. The No Action Alternative would guarantee a continued erosion of service quality and service reliability and fail to meet the most basic increased travel demands in a growing economy. The No Action Alternative would cause increasingly overcrowded trains, less reliable service and threaten growth prospects for the region and nation, damaging a globally competitive economic environment.	As described in Volume 1, Chapter 9, Evaluation of the Preferred Alternative, the No Action Alternative inadequate to meet the needs of the Northeast. The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrades to the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment. By replacing aging infrastructure and eliminating chokepoints, train service will be faster and far more reliable. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.
CRCOG_Wray	Aside from our support of reinstating the existing Inland Route between New Haven, Hartford, and Springfield as part of the NEC FUTURE project under the No Action Alternative, CRCOG is unable to endorse a Preferred Alternative at this time.	The Preferred Alternative includes the Hartford/Springfield Line. The Rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative is provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line into the NEC, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield. The NEC FUTURE program is focused on corridor-wide solutions for passenger rail improvements, and the selection of the Preferred Alternative does not preclude future consideration of transit or fixed guideway improvements to meet other transportation needs across the Study Area.
CT DECD_Chandy	Connecticut welcomes and is highly supportive of the idea of a high-speed rail corridor through Connecticut, connecting our major economic centers, including our Capital City, Hartford. Availability of high-speed service connecting our major economic centers to Boston and New York will help transform the economic environment in Connecticut.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative includes upgrading the existing NEC shoreline route and the addition of a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line into the NEC, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield. It does not include a line connecting Hartford and Providence. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.</p> <p>The FRA noted views expressed about connections to UCONN and Hartford. However, the Preferred Alternative does not include the route to UCONN as envisioned in Alternative 2 and 3. The rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative is provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative. The NEC FUTURE program is focused on corridor-wide solutions for passenger rail improvements, and the selection of the Preferred Alternative does not preclude future consideration of transit or fixed guideway improvements to meet other transportation needs across the Study Area.</p>

Table JJ-4: Stakeholder Comments (Elected Officials, Tribes, Federal Agencies, State Agencies, Local Agencies): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
DE SHPO_Lukezic	Alternative 3... The atlas appendix portrays this option as a new alignment cutting through Wilmington, but no information is presented on the nature or scope of the undertaking, or the resources affected by it.	The Action Alternative Representative Route description is described in Volume 2, Chapter 4. The cultural resource analysis is located in Volume 2, Chapter 7.9. Consistent with the Tier 1 NEPA process, the FRA developed Representative Routes for the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative, which provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the effects of each Alternative. Representative Routes define an envelope within which improvements might occur and whose location and construction type could change during subsequent Tier 2 project studies. Cultural resources for the Action Alternatives are identified in Volume2, Appendix E.09; for the Preferred Alternative, cultural resources are identified in Volume 1 Appendix EE.09.
Delaware County_Hill	The County supports the proposal for a Baldwin regional rail station. This station could have direct access to and from 1-95 and, with a large parking facility, provide a means for automobile commuters into downtown Philadelphia to park here and take a SEPTA regional rail train into Philadelphia. A station and parking lot here will assist with 1-95 construction mitigation in South Philadelphia when that construction occurs. There currently are no stations adjacent to the NEC and I-95 in Delaware County with large park and ride lots to serve this function.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The FRA noted interest regarding a new Baldwin regional rail station as proposed in Alternatives 2 and 3. The Preferred Alternative includes this proposed new station. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
DTC_Loyola	The Newark Regional Transportation Center will expand services, and relieve rail traffic congestion in the state's second largest city. The new facility is adjacent the developing 422-acre Science, Technology and Research campus affiliated with the University of Delaware. This \$40 million project will be completed in late 2018. The Claymont Regional Transportation Center is in the design phase, and is planned to be on line by 2020. There are also active plans for a Newport train station in the future. These investments reflect Delaware's commitment to expand capacity, increase customer convenience and enable system growth on its contracted regional rail system, and should be acknowledged in the EIS.	As described in Volume 2, Appendix B.1, No Action Alternative Report, The No Action Alternative assumes completion of planned and programmed improvements to highway, freight rail, transit, air, and maritime modes by 2040. The No Action Alternative in the Tier 1 EIS represents a "snapshot in time." The FRA developed it using available information regarding which projects are funded. This approach avoids being speculative since there is uncertainty in economic conditions, available funding, and political support for transportation projects. The FRA will continue to work with project sponsors to ensure that subsequent Tier 2 project studies to advance the Preferred Alternative reflect on-going initiatives such as the Newark and Claymont Regional Transportation Centers. As a funded on-going project, the Newark Regional Transportation Center is included in the No Action Alternative (Volume 2, Appendix B.1, No Action Alternative Report).
DTC_Loyola	Finally, additional consideration should be given to Options 2 and 3 of the EIS that suggests a planned alignment of new tracks south of the Wilmington Biden Station. We take exception to this plan, and believe that a thorough review of the historic Wilmington station should be undertaken, as well as possible design of new approaches to the station before planning a new alignment. It is assumed that the suggested alignment would be on or near the Norfolk Southern Shellpot Branch. These tracks cross environmentally sensitive areas. We recommend further investigation of this alignment prior to adopting these options.	As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, and will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure in the Tier 1 Record of Decision. Such decisions would be made as part of the Tier 2 project processes, which would include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate. Consistent with this process, the FRA developed Representative Routes for the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative, which provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the effects of each Alternative. Representative Routes define an envelope within which improvements might occur and whose location and construction type could change during subsequent Tier 2 project analysis.
Floral Park_Mayor Tweedy	The Incorporated Village of Floral Park must vigorously object to the Alternative 3 concept of the Plan, as it would cause irreparable harm and damage to our Village both physically and financially. This New York City-Connecticut via Long Island route will cause more harm than good, not only to the Village of Floral Park, but also to every Long Island community through which it passes... the land needed to erect structures to carry the rail system will require the loss of property within the Village... The loss of real property to residents and businesses could have a devastating effect on the future of the village, not only physically, but financially as well... construction operations near the Village's business district where Alternative 3 is contemplated will cause major issues resulting in limited access to our local businesses...it is doubtful our business district would survive an extended construction period that would have to accompany a project such as Alternative 3...the location of an aerial structure throughout the heart of the Village will provide for the elimination of properties, a major decrease in remaining property values, harm to local businesses, disruption to two (2) public grammar school operations, disruption of Village operations, traffic congestion throughout the Village and safety concerns for increased traffic and crime around the structure.	<p>The Preferred Alternative does not include the new segments on Long Island, as proposed in Alternative 3. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative</p> <p>As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure or alignments in the Tier 1 Record of Decision.</p>

Table JJ-4: Stakeholder Comments (Elected Officials, Tribes, Federal Agencies, State Agencies, Local Agencies): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Floral Park_Trustee Longobardi	The Village of Floral Park objects to the difficulty of access to details pertaining to Alternative Three: Transformation, in particular, its impact on Floral Park and the surrounding communities. While the NEC Future website is very comprehensive, it is difficult to find specific details about the Alternative Three scope as it impacts on specific areas of Long Island. The online Mapping Atlas is difficult to read because the print is so small, and readers do not appear able to enlarge or print the maps to determine the precise paths of the projects under consideration.	<p>The Preferred Alternative does not include the new segments between NYC and Long Island and Long Island and Connecticut via the Long Island Sound, as proposed in Alternative 3. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>Consistent with the Tier 1 NEPA process, the FRA developed Representative Routes for the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative, which provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the effects of each Alternative. Representative Routes define an envelope within which improvements might occur and whose location and construction type could change during subsequent Tier 2 project studies. Maps of the Representative Routes are available in the Mapping Atlas, Volume 1, Appendix AA and Volume 2, Appendix A which can be downloaded from the Tier 1 EIS page of the website.</p> <p>As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure or alignments.</p>
Floral Park_Trustee Longobardi	The Incorporated Village of Floral Park must vigorously object to the Alternative 3 concept of the Plan, as it would cause irreparable harm and damage to our Village both physically and financially. This New York City-Connecticut via Long Island route will cause more harm than good, not only to the Village of Floral Park, but also to every Long Island community through which it passes.	The Preferred Alternative does not include the new segment routing option on Long Island, as proposed in Alternative 3. The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative.
Garden City_Mayor Escopia	There are clear advantages in the first two and if implemented properly should improve passenger service between Boston MA & Washington DC.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers.
Garden City_Mayor Escopia	The third alternative, a plan for a new high speed rail line starting in Floral Park and running straight down Stewart Avenue through Eisenhower Park and east through Nassau and Suffolk, ending with a tunnel to New Haven CT is totally unacceptable to our community. Stewart Avenue is one of the main residential thoroughfares in Garden City and a train line on this street would require the demolition of numerous homes and the destruction of many businesses. It would literally destroy Garden City. We respectfully ask that you eliminate Alternative 3 from your improvement plan.	The Preferred Alternative does not include the new segment routing option on Long Island, as proposed in Alternative 3. The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative.
Groton_Bronk	At this time we are leaning towards Alternative 1. Our hope is that there will be more done than simply the no-change alternative. However, Alternatives 2 and 3 seem fairly costly at this given time. Our view is that the cost/benefit ratio for Alternative 1 may be the most reasonable. It builds upon the existing infrastructure and serves to try and bolster your existing system.	<p>As a result of the Tier 1 Draft EIS and the public comment process, the FRA has identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1 Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative brings the NEC to a state-of-good repair, but does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.</p>

Table JJ-4: Stakeholder Comments (Elected Officials, Tribes, Federal Agencies, State Agencies, Local Agencies): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Groton_Bronk	As a result, we believe the most pressing issues are the preservation of the existing infrastructure line including needed repairs, upgrades, and operations. The No Action Alternative has seemingly been dismissed as a non-option by many, but unless a practical approach can be developed and approved by the federal government, then the No Action alternative might indeed become reality. Even the No Action alternative has a \$9 billion base cost which, basically only addresses deferred maintenance.	<p>The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrades to the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment. By replacing aging infrastructure and eliminating chokepoints, train service will be faster and far more reliable. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative. As described in Volume 1, Chapter 9, Evaluation of the Preferred Alternative, the No Action Alternative inadequate to meet the needs of the Northeast.</p> <p>The FRA developed a representative service plan for the Preferred Alternative, which demonstrates that revenues from Intercity operations would exceed the cost to operate and maintain Intercity service. However, revenues from operations would remain insufficient to cover the capital cost of implementing the Preferred Alternative. Funding and financing Tier 2 projects will be an incremental process for the federal government, Amtrak, the NEC states and stakeholders, and the entire region. This process will require the commitment of both the public and private sectors over a long period of time. The FRA and the NEC Commission will take a leading role in working with project sponsors to support the federal financial assistance necessary to advance implementation, including existing and future grant and other financing programs and options. The FRA and other NEC stakeholders will also engage the private sector to explore options for commercial funding or financing to advance Tier 2 projects. Funding and financing options will be further detailed in the Service Development Plan.</p>
Groton_Bronk	As a result of fiscal constraints and Groton's desire to promote the existing infrastructure, we believe that Alternative #1 is the best option for the NEC. Alternative #1 addresses the needed level of rail service required to support projected growth in population and employment. This alternative inherently supports improvements to the existing and primary rail line connecting coastal metropolitan areas. Alternative #1 expands capacity, adds tracks, relieves key chokepoints, and serves the future of Connecticut well. This option is also by far the least expensive of the three options that would advance the NEC. It also supports the existing infrastructure line without comprising its integrity through planned reductions in service or investment. Specific to Groton, we also support Alternative #1 because it proposes new investment including a new segment and potential new station somewhere between New London and Mystic. We envision this new segment and station as a potential economic development opportunity.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives, including Alternative 1, to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. Between New Haven and Providence, the existing NEC shoreline route will be upgraded with a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience. In addition, the Preferred Alternative includes electrification of the Hartford/Springfield Line between New Haven, Hartford and Springfield. This will facilitate direct service to Hartford and Springfield from the NEC without an engine change. Economic effects of the Preferred Alternative are described in Volume 1, Chapter 6.
Kearny_Mayor Santos	...the investment in the Northeast Corridor is very much needed. Modernization of this corridor is needed. The times that are required to get from one city to another along the Northeast Corridor in 2016 is just remarkable, and remarkable not in a good way. So without commenting as to which of the specific alternatives would be the best investment for the corridor, I will say that it's much needed.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative to improve passenger rail service on the NEC in a manner that will enhance mobility options and expand passenger rail service in support of future population and employment growth in the Study Area. The Preferred Alternative reduces trip time from Washington, D.C. to Boston. The Preferred Alternative is further described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Kearny_Mayor Santos	I think this investment is sorely needed. We need to modernize our rail corridor.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative to improve passenger rail service on the NEC in a manner that will enhance mobility options and expand passenger rail service in support of future population and employment growth in the Study Area. The Preferred Alternative, described in Volume 1, Chapter 4, improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail, improve reliability, and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects.

Table JJ-4: Stakeholder Comments (Elected Officials, Tribes, Federal Agencies, State Agencies, Local Agencies): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Mansfield_Mayor Shapiro	The Town of Mansfield is cautiously optimistic at the possibility of introducing passenger rail service to our community as part of the proposed Hartford to Boston via Providence routes as described in Alternatives 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS. While Mansfield remains largely a rural community, there is strong interest in having local access to a multi-modal transportation system that will provide residents with options to use public transportation to travel around New England and along the east coast. The Town has long supported the restoration of passenger rail service from New London to Vermont along the existing north-south rail corridor and plans for an east-west corridor are encouraging.	The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. The FRA noted views expressed about connections to UCONN and Hartford. However, the Preferred Alternative does not include the route to UCONN as envisioned in Alternative 2 and 3. The rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative is provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative. The NEC FUTURE program is focused on corridor-wide solutions for passenger rail improvements, and the selection of the Preferred Alternative does not preclude future consideration of transit or fixed guideway improvements to meet other transportation needs across the Study Area. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions. The Preferred Alternative is further described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
MassDOT_Pollack	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.	One of the key goals of NEC FUTURE, as articulated in the Purpose and Need, is to improve the NEC by providing sufficient capacity to accommodate future ridership demand generated by growth in regional population and employment. This includes both achieving a state of good repair and expanding capacity to accommodate growth. Each of the Action Alternatives would bring the existing NEC to a state of good repair. This is clarified in Volume 1, Chapter 4 of the FEIS. Each Action Alternative was also developed with the goal of expanding the capacity of the rail line to support additional intercity and regional rail service. The elements of each Action Alternative specifically tied to state of good repair are not differentiated given the broad, corridor-wide considerations for this Tier 1 analysis. The FRA did not identify an alternative that would achieve a state of good repair but not expand capacity to accommodate growth, as this would not be consistent with or meet the Purpose and Need. The Preferred Alternative is a re-packing of elements of the Action Alternative to best meet the service needs of specific markets and avoid environmental constraints. The Service Development Plan will more fully describe the specific projects included in the Preferred Alternative, including the steps necessary to achieve a state of good repair.
MassDOT_Pollack	There is no clear connection between NEC Future's high level plans and the ongoing planning undertaken by the corridor's host communities. ... 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.	Throughout the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA has coordinated with individual State Departments of Transportation, including the Massachusetts Department of Transportation, transit authorities and regional or metropolitan planning organizations. That on-going collaboration process has afforded the FRA with the opportunity to reflect state and regional planning initiatives in the development of the Preferred Alternative. Although the Tier 1 considers land use and planned land use at a broad level, the FRA considered to the extent practical existing land use planning documents in their deliberation on a Preferred Alternative. The consideration given to land use and regional and state plans is more clearly discussed in the Tier 1 Final EIS and the Land Cover methodology is included in Volume 2, Appendix E.02. It should also be noted that as part of Tier 2 project analysis, environmental effects of projects will be fully assessed. At that time, there would be additional opportunity to ensure coordination with individual community, regional, and state planning initiatives.
MassDOT_Pollack	The clearest need for the Northeast Corridor is achieving a State of Good Repair (SOR). 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 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. 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 SOR - a threshold that the Corridor states have traditionally identified as a starting point for further state investment.	One of the key goals of NEC FUTURE, as articulated in the Purpose and Need, is to improve the NEC by providing sufficient capacity to accommodate future ridership demand generated by growth in regional population and employment. This includes both achieving a state of good repair and expanding capacity to accommodate growth. Each of the Action Alternatives would bring the existing NEC to a state of good repair. This is clarified in Volume 1, Chapter 4 of the FEIS. Each was also developed with the goal of expanding the capacity of the rail line to support additional intercity and regional rail service. The elements of each Action Alternative specifically tied to state of good repair are not differentiated given the broad, corridor-wide considerations for this Tier 1 analysis. FRA did not identify an alternative that would achieve a state of good repair but not expand capacity to accommodate growth, as this would not be consistent with or meet the Purpose and Need.

Table JJ-4: Stakeholder Comments (Elected Officials, Tribes, Federal Agencies, State Agencies, Local Agencies): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
MassDOT_Pollack	Massachusetts is therefore very disappointed that Alternatives 2 and 3 exclude any route that would include Springfield, Massachusetts. ...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.	The Preferred Alternative incorporates the Hartford/Springfield Line and includes complete double tracking of that rail line connecting to the existing NEC at New Haven. With the Preferred Alternative, Regional and Intercity service frequencies would increase beyond those service levels proposed in the CT rail initiative. The incorporation of the Hartford/Springfield Line reflects feedback received from numerous stakeholders as well as the public. The service characteristics for both Regional and Intercity services to Springfield are described in Volume 1, Chapter 4 and 5. More through service connecting Hartford and Springfield to New Haven and points west and east along the NEC will further improve travel times and service frequencies for markets both north and east of Springfield. Further details on the representative service plans are provided in Volume 1, Chapters 4 and 5 and Appendix BB.
MDOT_Smith	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 described in Volume 1, Chapter 9, Evaluation of the Preferred Alternative, the No Action Alternative inadequate to meet the needs of the Northeast. The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrades to the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment. By replacing aging infrastructure and eliminating chokepoints, train service will be faster and far more reliable. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.
MDP_Sirota	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.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative to improve passenger rail service on the NEC in a manner that will enhance mobility options and expand passenger rail service in support of future population and employment growth in the Study Area. The Preferred Alternative, described in Volume 1, Chapter 4, improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects.
NE CT COG_Filchak	We have concerns regrading the impacts to our region in the Tier 1 Draft Environmental Impact Statement... Our concern relates directly alternatives 2 and 3. The alternatives traverse areas of our region that are currently in a rural condition as compared to using existing rail corridors...	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. The Preferred Alternative does not include the referenced routing through Central Connecticut as proposed in Alternatives 2 and 3. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.

Table JJ–4: Stakeholder Comments (Elected Officials, Tribes, Federal Agencies, State Agencies, Local Agencies): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
NEC Commission_Padgett	While additional work is required to complete the EIS and the SDP, the No Action Alternative is not an acceptable outcome. A misnomer, the No Action Alternative presumes funding levels far higher than historic investment and yet still fails to achieve a state-of-good-repair. Even with these funding assumptions, the No Action Alternative would cause degraded conditions across the transportation network due to the system 's failure to accommodate new travel demand in a growing economy. The Commission's recently completed study Investing in the Northeast Corridor: Advancing the American Economy concludes that the national economy stands to gain between \$4 and \$8 billion per year by expanding rail capacity and performance to keep pace with population growth. These productivity gains result from congestion avoided on the highway and aviation networks. The total benefits, however, could be significantly higher. That figure does not account for additional investment benefits such as jobs created by the construction industry and business activity attracted to a more globally competitive region. In addition to worsening congestion on the region's highway and aviation networks, the No Action Alternative would cause increasingly overcrowded trains and continued reliability challenges. Notably, the study finds that Corridor delays due to infrastructure failures and rail congestion already cost the U.S. approximately \$500 million annually in lost productivity.	As described in Volume 1, Chapter 9, Evaluation of the Preferred Alternative, the No Action Alternative inadequate to meet the needs of the Northeast. The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrades to the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment. By replacing aging infrastructure and eliminating chokepoints, train service will be faster and far more reliable. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.
New Haven_Hausladen	...possibly the most interesting that we have seen is the redundancy of the third alternative. This alternative provides redundancy in the southerly and a northwesterly route, all of which expanding our competitiveness as we try to compete globally, not just nationally...	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. However, the Preferred Alternative addresses resiliency issues in some parts of the Study Area by improving existing infrastructure, and adding new tracks to allow for increased operational flexibility, and increased system resiliency and redundancy. New segments constructed adjacent and connecting to major markets in the Study Area also provide redundant network connections to markets.
New Haven_Mayor Harp	The DEIS Central Connecticut alignment, if it were to move forward, would have a deleterious effect on our responsible growth trajectory and damage our shared-vision with the Partnership for a more sustainable future.	The FRA noted concerns regarding the route through Central Connecticut as proposed in Alternatives 2 and 3. In light of these and other considerations, the Preferred Alternative does not include the referenced routing through Central Connecticut as proposed in Alternatives 2 and 3. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.
New Haven_Mayor Harp	The final EIS can set forth a pathway for achieving enhanced service to New York City and Washington, which is to say that we must go beyond the No Build state-of-good- repair projects and instead fully explore solutions to chokepoints along the NEC, particularly in Connecticut where the basics alignment is already in place, and where the cost-effective application of capital will have the greatest beneficial impact on current and (as a result of the capital investment) induced users of the NEC.	The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrades to the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment. By replacing aging infrastructure and eliminating chokepoints, train service will be faster and far more reliable. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative. As described in Volume 1, Chapter 9, Evaluation of the Preferred Alternative, the No Action Alternative inadequate to meet the needs of the Northeast.
New Haven_Mayor Harp	The City further supports the State of Connecticut in its efforts to develop the Hartford-Springfield Line, which will open up a high-speed connection to Hartford on an existing rail corridor.	The FRA noted concerns regarding the Hartford/Springfield Line. In light of these and other considerations, the Preferred Alternative includes electrification of the Hartford/Springfield Line. This will facilitate direct service to Hartford and Springfield from the NEC without an engine change, providing one-seat ride service to and from the NEC and Springfield. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.

Table JJ–4: Stakeholder Comments (Elected Officials, Tribes, Federal Agencies, State Agencies, Local Agencies): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
New London_Mayor Passero	In Alternative 2, a new route is proposed that would run northerly from New Haven through Hartford to Providence with a potential stop at UCONN (Mansfield/Storrs). The Tier 1 EIS identifies this route being provided to serve Intercity-Express, but again we are concerned that if constructed, it could result in less regional trains running along the shoreline route having stops in New London. On the other hand, if there are concurrent efforts to add passenger service to the New England Central Railroad (NECR) line from New London to Brattleboro, Vermont, known as the Central Corridor Rail Line, with a stop at or near Mansfield/Storrs then it is possible that Alternative 2 may be an opportunity for future economic growth in New London and the region.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative includes upgrading the existing NEC shoreline route and the addition of a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line into the NEC, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield. It does not include a line connecting Hartford and Providence. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.</p> <p>The FRA noted views expressed about connections to UCONN and Hartford. However, the Preferred Alternative does not include the route to UCONN as envisioned in Alternative 2 and 3. The rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative is provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative. The NEC FUTURE program is focused on corridor-wide solutions for passenger rail improvements, and the selection of the Preferred Alternative does not preclude future consideration of transit or fixed guideway improvements to meet other transportation needs across the Study Area.</p>
New London_Mayor Passero	In Alternative 3... we are deeply concerned about the negative impacts it could have for the future level of investment in the existing line through southeastern Connecticut and the number of trains that would pass through and stop in New London. Alternative 3, unequivocally the most ambitious and financially monumental action alternative of the three, will in all likelihood sacrifice essential and sustaining funding for the current Connecticut rail line from New Haven to Providence, R.I. While planning for future growth is prudent, sacrificing and diverting the necessary investment from the existing local and regional rail lines is simply a bad idea. Such as it is, we encourage the Federal Railroad Administration to remove Alternative 3 from further planning objectives.	The Preferred Alternative, described in Volume 1, Chapter 4, combines elements of the Action Alternatives and improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. In Connecticut, in addition to improving the existing NEC, the Preferred Alternative includes a new supplemental segment in Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, and electrifies the Hartford/Springfield Line. The Preferred Alternative expands the level of service on the existing NEC between New Haven and Boston, resulting in increased intercity and regional service at the existing New London Union Station. In addition, a new supplemental segment will be added between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as considered under Alternative 1. Trains using the new segment would serve the New London/Mystic station.
New Rochelle_Arron	The City of New Rochelle is committed to Transit Oriented Development and Amtrak is an important partner for us. Amtrak's regional Boston to New York service stops in New Rochelle and we are in strong support of bringing existing infrastructure into good repair and growing Amtrak's services in our region.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative to improve passenger rail service on the NEC in a manner that will enhance mobility options and expand passenger rail service in support of future population and employment growth in the Study Area. The Preferred Alternative, described in Volume 1, Chapter 4, improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail, improve reliability, and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. The NEC States and railroads, as well as local communities such as New Rochelle, are critical partners in the future of the NEC and ultimately will be responsible for advancing many of the individual projects necessary to achieve the objective of a reliable and safe NEC capable of accommodating future ridership demand. The FRA is committed to working with these stakeholders throughout this process.
New Rochelle_Arron	Alternative Two - Grow - is our Preferred Alternative as it goes beyond just keeping pace with expected growth. It adds capacity to accommodate demand at the Hudson River and encourages substantial transport mode change, an estimated 93 annual trips, to passenger rail, a much more sustainable option than private vehicles in an area with already congested highways and bridges.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives, including Alternative 2, to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers.

Table JJ-4: Stakeholder Comments (Elected Officials, Tribes, Federal Agencies, State Agencies, Local Agencies): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
New Rochelle_Strome	Alternative Two - Grow is our Preferred Alternative as it goes beyond just keeping pace with expected growth. It adds capacity to accommodate demand at the Hudson River and encourages substantial transport mode change, an estimated 93 million annual trips, to passenger rail, a much more sustainable option than private vehicles in an area with already congested highways and bridges.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives, including Alternative 2, to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative includes new third and fourth Hudson River tunnels, beginning on embankment east of Secaucus Rail Station, terminating south of the existing NEC and Penn Station New York, under West 31st Street. The location and design of the Hudson Tunnel new tracks is part of a separate environmental process now underway.</p>
New York City_Shorris	While Alternative 1-Maintain makes some additional investments in the corridor, including the vital additional Hudson River crossings, your own analysis indicates that it will be insufficient in providing for increased demand after 2040. Given the long lead time inherent in planning, funding and building these improvements, more must be done.	The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit. It brings the existing NEC to a state of good repair and maximizes its capacity through alleviation of chokepoints, addition of new tracks and segments at targeted locations, and implementation of service operational efficiencies while minimizing impacts to local communities and resources corridor wide. The Preferred Alternative also removes speed restrictions where practical and safe, reduces trip times, offers frequent Metropolitan and enhanced express Intercity services, and allows substantial growth for all Regional rail markets. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.
New York City_Shorris	We strongly support a long-term vision for true high-speed rail for the NEC. Trains are currently operating at speeds of 220 mph and above throughout the world, and that goal should not be merely aspirational in the NEC but attainable. We are very supportive of the concept of developing capacity for a system that as you put it ... becomes the dominant mode of travel in the NE, with the capacity to support the regional economy well into the future. To that end speeds must be improved along the entire corridor, so that travel from New York to Boston is just as competitive as travel from New York south to Washington D.C.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. The Preferred Alternative reduces trip time along the corridor, including from New York to Boston and from New York to Washington, D.C. Trip time savings between Boston and New York City would be 2 hours 45 minutes for the fastest, Intercity-Express service, a savings of 45 minutes compared to existing or No Action Alternative trip times. Between Washington, D.C. and New York, the fastest Intercity-Express trip times are 2 hours 15 minutes, savings of 30 minutes when compared to existing or No Action Alternative trip times. (See Volume 1, Chapters 4 and 5).
New York City_Shorris	As a result, we support further consideration of Alternatives 2 and 3, which provide the strongest pathways for future growth of the NEC corridor and the region. We recognize that Alternative 3 in particular would provide for the most robust network and preserves the broadest set of options for the region to explore in the years to come.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives, including elements of Alternative 3, to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.

Table JJ–4: Stakeholder Comments (Elected Officials, Tribes, Federal Agencies, State Agencies, Local Agencies): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
NJ TRANSIT_Martin	Due to those and other factors, NJ TRANSIT cannot endorse Alternative 3 and its project elements. Alternative 3 would cause the greatest impacts along the NEC in New Jersey, while providing the least benefits to our state. Greatly expanding the width of the NEC across New Jersey, going from the 150 foot wide existing right-of-way to one that is 280 feet, and creating whole new rail lines on new rights-of-way within this densely developed state cannot be supported given that the other alternatives examined provided evidence of much greater benefits.	The FRA acknowledges that specific Action Alternatives may be preferable to different rail service providers within the corridor. As such, the FRA appreciates that NJTransit has elevated their concerns related to the Action Alternatives. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Action Alternatives and improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. In New Jersey, the Preferred Alternative Representative Route is similar to the Representative Route of Alternatives 2. The FRA developed Representative Routes for each Alternative that included prototypical construction types. Subsequent Tier 2 project analysis will involve more-detailed service development planning and detailed engineering to further define the proposed infrastructure.
NJ TRANSIT_Martin	We are anxious to have further discussions about Alternatives 1 and 2 and those portions of the NEC where specific projects can be mostly accommodated within the existing NEC right-of-way. We also are interested in discussing projects which can progress by utilizing vacant or underutilized property next to the existing right-of-way... There is also a need to take further steps in future analyses to lessen the need to construct additional parallel track in those areas where the existing physical envelope of the current NEC right-of-way is constrained. For instance, an examination should be undertaken to determine whether more advanced signal system technology could permit more trains to operate on the existing NEC tracks; thus, reducing the need for adding additional parallel tracks.	<p>The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrades to the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment, as described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative brings the NEC to a state of good repair, replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. Based on the evaluation of alternatives and guidance provided by stakeholders and the public, the FRA determined that the adoption of the 'grow' vision, as represented by Alternative 2 with modifications, best meets national and regional goals for passenger rail transportation in the Northeast.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Action Alternatives to bring the NEC to a state of good repair, replace aging infrastructure, eliminate chokepoints and provide additional capacity to support a faster and far more reliable railroad. The Preferred Alternative includes improvements within the representational route of the Existing NEC and where necessary does propose some new segments adjacent to but outside the Existing NEC. The FRA will not make location-specific decisions with this Tier 1 EIS as those decisions are made during subsequent Tier 2 project studies. At that time, the FRA expects that stakeholders and the public will consider options to meet the service objectives while addressing existing operations, as well as property and community effects. The FRA has focused on operating efficiencies as an overarching policy for the implementation of the Preferred Alternative; therefore, identifying ways to create more capacity and improve performance along the NEC will be a shared priority with NJ TRANSIT. The FRA will continue to work closely with NJ TRANSIT and each of the stakeholder railroads and states as individual projects or groups of projects are advanced to address local concerns in a way that is consistent with the Preferred Alternative vision. See Volume 1, Chapters 4 and 10 for additional discussion.</p>
Pawtucket Central Falls_Mayors	Providence, and by extension Pawtucket and Central Falls, should be, for the population and employment levels to be served, the preferred high-speed route for the Northeast Corridor Future Rail Investment.	The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. The Preferred Alternative expands the level of service on the existing NEC between New Haven and Boston, resulting in increased intercity and regional service at the existing New London Union Station. In addition, a new supplemental segment will be added between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as considered under Alternative 1. Trains using the new segment would serve the New London/Mystic station. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line into the NEC, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield. It does not include a line connecting Hartford and Providence. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. NEC FUTURE is utilizing existing rail corridor as it did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions. The Preferred Alternative is further described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.

Table JJ-4: Stakeholder Comments (Elected Officials, Tribes, Federal Agencies, State Agencies, Local Agencies): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
PennDOT_Fauver	The No Build Alternative is not a prudent alternative. In fact, the No Build Alternative has essentially been the operating model on the NEC which has allowed the overall system to enter in to the state of disrepair in which it currently exists.	As described in Volume 1, Chapter 9, Evaluation of the Preferred Alternative, the No Action Alternative inadequate to meet the needs of the Northeast. The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrades to the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment. By replacing aging infrastructure and eliminating chokepoints, train service will be faster and far more reliable. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.
Philadelphia_Tolson_Padullon	Philadelphia does not support a "No Action" approach.	As described in Volume 1, Chapter 9, Evaluation of the Preferred Alternative, the No Action Alternative inadequate to meet the needs of the Northeast. The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrades to the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment. By replacing aging infrastructure and eliminating chokepoints, train service will be faster and far more reliable. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.
Providence_Azar	We are very enthusiastic about the possibility of improved high-speed connections to Providence in the Northeast Corridor. Whatever can be done to improve rail connections through Providence would be very helpful to our economy and to improved transportation in the region.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers.</p> <p>In Rhode Island, the Preferred Alternative includes improvements to the existing NEC and a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative would result in a nearly fourfold increase in daily Intercity service to/from Providence, from 19 daily trains in the No Action to 89 in the Preferred Alternative (see Chapter 6, Table 6-12).</p>
Providence_Azar	We're particularly enthusiastic about Alternatives 3.1 and 3.2 that would bring high-speed rail directly to Providence. We do have concerns about Alternatives 3.3, 3.4 that would bypass Providence with high-speed rail	The Preferred Alternative does focus on the existing NEC through Providence; however it does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions. The Preferred Alternative is further described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.

Table JJ–4: Stakeholder Comments (Elected Officials, Tribes, Federal Agencies, State Agencies, Local Agencies): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Providence_Azar	... rail is absolutely critical to the economy of Rhode Island and to the City of Providence, so we support this effort and once again encourage alternatives that bring more high-speed rail to Providence.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers.</p> <p>In Rhode Island, the Preferred Alternative includes improvements to the existing NEC and a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1 to improve performance between New York City and Providence, RI, and enhance system resilience. The Preferred Alternative includes several improvements that improve service between Providence, RI, and Boston, MA, including track and junction improvements from Caton Junction to Readville; new track improvements to provide four tracks from Pawtucket, RI, to Sharon, MA; and new two-track infrastructure from Sharon to Hyde Park in Massachusetts. The Preferred Alternative would result in a nearly fourfold increase in daily Intercity service, from 19 daily trains in the No Action to 89 in the Preferred Alternative (see Chapter 6, Table 6-12).</p>
Providence_MayorElorza	If Alternative 3 is to be selected, we strongly urge the selection of either Alternative 3.1 (Washington, D.C., to Boston via Central onnecticut/Providence) or Alterative 3.2 (Washington, D.C. to Boston via Long Island/Providence). Either of these two options would improve interaction with the existing northeast corridor at major hubs, including Providence, while still providing service to new markets that would provide a boost to the metropolitan Providence region.	<p>The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative does not include new segments between NYC and Long Island and Long Island and Connecticut via the Long Island Sound or a new Segment via Central Connecticut, as proposed in Alternative 3.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.</p>
Providence_MayorElorza	I support the FRA's efforts to grow and transform the role of passenger rail service and am particularly enthusiastic about improved high speed connections to Providence. The inclusion of an additional two-track segment between Washington, D.C., and Boston in Alternatives 3.1 and 3.2 would support high speed service connecting directly to Providence at speeds up to 220 miles per hour, reducing overall travel time to and between Washington, D.C. and Boston by as much as three hours.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The Preferred Alternative achieves many of the benefits of Alternative 3 with extensive the new segments, conflict free express tracks, and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost than a full second spine. Limited-stop Intercity-Express service envisioned for the Preferred Alternative would offer very competitive trip times at a substantially smaller investment than the capacity necessary to provide for non-stop high-speed rail service on a dedicated second spine. Furthermore, the Preferred Alternative includes increased service and shorter trip times to Providence from various locations.
Providence_MayorElorza	I strongly oppose any alternative that excludes Providence from critical future investments, resulting in high-speed rail service bypassing our city. The selection of Alternatives 3.3 (Washington, D.C. to Boston via Long Island/Worcester) or 3.4 (Washington, D.C. to Boston via Central Connecticut/Worcester) have the potential to be disastrous for Providence, eliminating the possibility of high speed rail and other passenger rail upgrades in our city and bypassing a critical connection to the existing northeast corridor in Providence.	The Preferred Alternative continues to use the Existing NEC through Providence, RI. The routing options considered in Alternative 3, including the routing option on Long Island and the routing option via Central Connecticut/Worcester, are not included in the Preferred Alternative. Providence station is considered a major hub in the Preferred Alternative, described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. Intercity rail service will grow at Providence to up to six round-trip trains per hour and regional rail service will also expand under the Preferred Alternative. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative.

Table JJ-4: Stakeholder Comments (Elected Officials, Tribes, Federal Agencies, State Agencies, Local Agencies): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
PVPC_Brennan	<p>In the Initial Alternatives Report (Appendix 82), we do not find a clearly stated rationale for FRA's dismissal of the initial alternatives for high quality service along the New Haven/Hartford/Springfield/ Worcester/Boston alignment (Alternative IDs North 32, 33, and 34 New Haven Line via Springfield). The report makes the general statement that these initial alternatives ... underperformed when compared to the other route options and were not advanced for further consideration ... However, there is no scoring or further narrative rationale presented to justify their rejection. Generally, there does not appear to be a clear prioritization or weighting of the metrics for FRA's preliminary alternatives evaluation criteria (Table 4-3).</p>	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative brings the NEC to a state of good repair and replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers.</p> <p>The FRA’s development of the NEC FUTURE investment program began in 2012 with nearly 100 initial alternatives for improving the NEC. These alternatives were consolidated to 15 Preliminary Alternatives that reflected a full spectrum of possibilities for the NEC.</p> <p>For the 15 Preliminary Alternatives, the FRA evaluated options for delivering Intercity service-including the analysis of a new service type called Metropolitan service which would provide frequent, high-quality, affordable intercity service to major hub station and hub or intermediate stations along the NEC. The FRA also evaluated the opportunities to expand the reach of the NEC – including service to new markets within the NEC and off-corridor from the NEC – with a second spine connecting markets between New York City and Boston.</p> <p>After extensive analysis and public dialogue on the Preliminary Alternatives, the FRA developed a No Action and three Action Alternatives for evaluation in the Tier 1 Draft EIS. See Volume 2, Appendix B for additional information on the Alternatives Development Process.</p> <p>The FRA considered existing and new markets served, overall ridership, cost, and environmental effects, as well as public and stakeholder feedback, in shortlisting from 15 to 3 alternatives.</p> <p>The FRA noted concerns about service on the Hartford-Springfield line. In light of these and other considerations, the Preferred Alternative includes an enhanced, electrified Hartford/Springfield Line, leveraging recent and future investments to create intermodal connections and strengthen existing urban centers. Further details are included in Volume 1, Chapter 4. With the incorporation of the Hartford/Springfield Line into the Preferred Alternative, connections would be possible north and east of Springfield Union Station. Improved service between Worcester and Boston are being evaluated as part of a separate study effort that was considered in the definition of the Preferred Alternative.</p>
PVPC_Brennan	<p>We agree with FRA that the success of the NEC Future program depends on a think big perspective and the serious consideration of a range of approaches for improving rail service throughout the study area. Unfortunately, we find that the Tier 1 DEIS does not fully achieve this goal, primarily because it does not include an alternative or variant to evaluate high quality service along the New Haven/Hartford/Springfield/Worcester/Boston Inland Route Rail corridor; nor does it fully account for significant current and planned transportation investments that will occur as part of the No Action Alternative. Because of these omissions, the Tier 1 DEIS does not appear to evaluate all of the potential benefits that improved rail connectivity contemplated by NEC Future would bring to this corridor and the broader New England region, particularly in the City of Springfield, where public and private investments in new and recently completed projects now tops \$2.7 billion.</p>	<p>The FRA’s development of the NEC FUTURE investment program began in 2012 with nearly 100 initial alternatives for improving the NEC. These alternatives were consolidated to 15 Preliminary Alternatives that reflected a full spectrum of possibilities for the NEC. After extensive analysis and public dialogue on the Preliminary Alternatives, the FRA developed a No Action and three Action Alternatives for evaluation in the Tier 1 Draft EIS. See Volume 2, Appendix B for additional information on the Alternatives Development Process.</p> <p>The FRA noted concerns about service on the New Haven-Hartford-Springfield line. In light of these and other considerations, the Preferred Alternative includes an enhanced, electrified Hartford/Springfield Line, leveraging recent and future investments to create intermodal connections and strengthen existing urban centers. Connections north and east of Springfield would be possible. Further details are included in Volume 1, Chapter 4.</p>
PVPC_Brennan	<p>In the event that FRA chooses not produce a Tier 1 S/DEIS or comparable remedy, PVPC can only lend its support the No Action Alternative, which we're convinced includes several actions that can advance the goals of the NEC Future program in our region.</p>	<p>The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrades to the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment. By replacing aging infrastructure and eliminating chokepoints, train service will be faster and far more reliable. The Preferred Alternative also incorporates enhanced electrified service along the Hartford/Springfield Line in order to strengthen service to Central New England and leverage existing investments and identified market opportunities. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative. As described in Volume 1, Chapter 9, Evaluation of the Preferred Alternative, the No Action Alternative inadequate to meet the needs of the Northeast.</p>

Table JJ-4: Stakeholder Comments (Elected Officials, Tribes, Federal Agencies, State Agencies, Local Agencies): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
PVPC_Brennan	<p>The No Action Alternative should be revised to better reflect committed and planned transportation improvements in the interstate Knowledge Corridor region. The No Action Alternative apparently omits or gives limited consideration to significant transportation projects and other public and private developments in Springfield that are occurring-and which now exceed \$2.7 billion-that will enhance and benefit from rail and transit connectivity. ... We disagree with the assumption asserted throughout the DEIS that Improvements included in the No Action Alternative will not greatly change the services provided along the existing NEC, as stated in Section 7.11.4.1 No Action Alternative. For example, NHHS service from New Haven to Springfield will greatly change services available at the NEC's New Haven hub. (To better clarify the purpose of the No Action alternative to the reader, we suggest that its name be changed from No Action to Existing Actions or Transportation Demand Management ... Actions that we're convinced merit more robust description and analysis as part of the No Action Alternative include: -Springfield Union Station -New Haven/Hartford/Springfield (The Hartford Line) commuter rail service from Springfield to Hartford and New Haven. -Northern New England Intercity Rail Initiative. -Springfield Bus Rapid Transit. -Springfield-Greenfield Passenger Rail.</p>	<p>For the purposes of comparison against the Action Alternatives and Preferred Alternative, the FRA used the Existing NEC + Hartford/Springfield Line as a point of reference for understanding potential footprint-related effects of the rail projects included in the No Action Alternative because the physical footprint of improvements associated with rail projects included in the No Action Alternative will occur primarily within the physical footprint of the Existing NEC and Hartford/Springfield Line. This approach to the analysis of the No Action Alternative is consistent with National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) practice, particularly where the projects included as part of the No Action Alternative are an integral component of the Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative incorporates the Hartford/Springfield Line as part of the NEC, facilitating one-seat service from Hartford and Springfield onto the NEC. The Hartford/Springfield Line would be electrified to support faster and more convenient service. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative. As described in Volume 1, Chapter 9, Evaluation of the Preferred Alternative, the No Action Alternative is inadequate to meet the needs of the Northeast.</p> <p>It does not include a line connecting Hartford and Providence. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.</p>
PVPC_Brennan	<p>...this key initiative [passenger rail service along the Inland Route corridor (Hartford/Springfield/Worcester/Boston)] receives little consideration in the subject DEIS. It appears to be referenced only once, briefly on page 4-19, and is not included in Section 7.20 Cumulative Effects. We believe the NNEIRI project is highly relevant to the NEC Future effort, especially given that the Inland Route was designated as an additional part of the Northern New England High-Speed Rail Corridor, along with the route between Springfield and Albany, under the provisions of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2005 (PL 108-447) of 2004. The Inland Route merits inclusion as an NEC Future Tier 1 alternative or variant for a variety of other reasons, as well. Chief among these are: ... -The Inland Route offers greatly improved intermodal connectivity to our region's major airport, Bradley International in Windsor Locks, CT, and associated parking and car rental facilities. A high capacity rail connection to Bradley would close an existing gap in current and planned rail services between Hartford and Springfield and allow the airport to function better as a congestion reliever to the major airports in the New York City and Boston markets. -The Inland Route would provide critical redundancy and function as the second spine of the NEC north of New York City, which is cited as an urgent need in Section 3.4.5; in fact, Amtrak already uses the Inland Route during service disruptions on portions of the Connecticut Shore Line. -Upgrading the Inland Route to high capacity rail service would likely involve fewer land takings and environmental impacts than the Alternative 2 cross-Connecticut alignment. -Improvements to the Inland Route and its existing stations would support greater transit-oriented development and infill, ... -The Inland Route would offer greater sustainability, as it would leverage many existing and planned transportation investments in Connecticut and Massachusetts... -Improvements to the Inland Route would add redundancy and interconnectivity for regional and national freight rail...</p>	<p>In developing the Preferred Alternative, the FRA focused on the existing NEC and identified ways to achieve the 'grow' service vision while staying within the existing NEC. The Preferred Alternative includes not only upgrades to the existing NEC but also incorporates the Hartford/Springfield Line, upgrading it to a two-track, electrified corridor and building on the on-going improvements being advanced by Connecticut DOT. The additional improvements to the Hartford/Springfield Line for the Preferred Alternative are broadly consistent with the types of improvements considered as part of the No Action Alternative and two of the Action Alternatives in the DEIS. The incorporation of the Hartford/Springfield Line emphasizes the FRA's recognition of the importance of connectivity to the Inland Route (also included in the Northern New England Intercity Rail Initiative or NNEIRI) and other proposed investments in the Springfield area. On-going and planned transportation and development initiatives in Springfield are expanded on in Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative.</p>

Table JJ-4: Stakeholder Comments (Elected Officials, Tribes, Federal Agencies, State Agencies, Local Agencies): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
PVPC_Brennan	A new alternative or a variant to Alternative 2 should be added that evaluates high quality passenger rail service along the Inland Route (Hartford/Springfield/Worcester/Boston) corridor. In our initial project scoping comments submitted in 2012, as well as our comment letter of April 24, 2014 submitted jointly with CRCOG following the NEC Future agency meetings, we emphasized the importance of evaluating high quality rail service on the Inland Route rail corridor and specifically to Springfield. We again refer FRA to these submissions and ask that their recommendations be fully addressed in the Tier 1 S/DEIS. We believe that the omission of an alternative or variant with direct high capacity service to Springfield will not allow the NEC Future project to meet FRA's overall goals, particularly to enhance economic competitiveness of the Northeast Region, expand rail's market share, and enhance the integration between transportation investments and local development.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines key elements of all three Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate future growth in Northeast population and employment. The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. The FRA noted concerns about service on the New Haven-Hartford-Springfield line. The FRA received many comments about including the Hartford/Springfield Line in the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative includes an enhanced, electrified Hartford/Springfield Line, leveraging recent and future investments to create intermodal connections and strengthen existing urban centers. With the incorporation of the Hartford/Springfield Line into the Preferred Alternative, connections would be possible north and east of Springfield Union Station. The FRA is coordinating with Massachusetts and Vermont on the Northern New England Intercity Rail Initiative, a separate study, to explore options for improved intercity rail service in New England. Further details are included in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
RIPTA_DiToro	we could be supportive of any of the three Action Alternatives. We would not support a no-action alternative due to the strong demonstrated need for additional corridor capacity.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers.
RIPTA_DiToro	Action Alternative One leaves significant sections of the Northeast Corridor in Rhode Island without additional track. We appreciate that additional train slots can be created without a contiguous additional track across the entire state, but we are also aware that this approach may constrain the number of trains which can be added. For this reason we would be concerned about the utility of Alternative One.	The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit. The Preferred Alternative brings the existing NEC to a state of good repair and maximizes its capacity through alleviation of chokepoints, addition of new tracks and segments at targeted locations, and implementation of service operational efficiencies. The Preferred Alternative also removes speed restrictions where practical and safe, reduces trip times, offers frequent Metropolitan and enhanced express Intercity services, and allows substantial growth for all Regional rail markets. Providence station is considered a major hub in the Preferred Alternative, described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. Intercity rail service will grow at Providence to up to six round-trip trains per hour and regional rail service will also expand under the Preferred Alternative. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative.
RIPTA_DiToro	We are concerned that some route options under Alternative Three would build a new high speed route between Hartford and Boston which bypasses Rhode Island entirely. We would not support a routing alternative which bypasses Providence.	The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrading the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment. It also incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line to provide one-seat ride service to and from the NEC and Hartford and Springfield. The Preferred Alternative does not include a second spine, as considered in Alternative 3. More information on the Preferred Alternative can be found in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
RIPTA_DiToro	Action Alternative Two and those routing alternatives of Action Alternative Three which pass through Providence are most appealing to RIPTA as they will create an entirely separate second spine for high speed trains through the state while simultaneously freeing up significant capacity on the current Northeast Corridor for commuter rail service.	The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrading the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment. It also incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line to provide one-seat ride service to and from the NEC and Hartford and Springfield. The Preferred Alternative does not include a second spine, as considered in Alternative 3. More information on the Preferred Alternative can be found in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Scarsdale_Mayor Mark	...we are deeply concerned about the new spine included in Alternative 3. As proposed, the new spine would branch off from the existing NEC at New Rochelle, NY, and pass through the Village of Scarsdale primarily in tunnel or aerial structure. A new rail spine through Scarsdale, whether it be by tunnel or aerial, would result in significant adverse impacts to our residents, their homes, their property values, their quality of life and the character of the Village.	The Preferred Alternative does not include the new segment routing option on Long Island, as proposed in Alternative 3. The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative.

Table JJ-4: Stakeholder Comments (Elected Officials, Tribes, Federal Agencies, State Agencies, Local Agencies): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Scarsdale_Mayor Mark	... request that Alternative 3 of the NEC Tier 1 Draft Environmental Impact Statement be removed from further consideration.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Action Alternatives and improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and provides additional capacity to support a faster and far more reliable railroad. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3.
SCCOG_Galbraith	In Alternative 1, a new segment would be constructed through our region (Old Saybrook, CT to Kenyon, RI) and we are concerned about how this new segment would relate to/disrupt existing land uses in this corridor; its impacts on environmental resources; and the potential for fewer trains having stops in New London, both intercity and regional, to be scheduled in the future along the existing shoreline route.	<p>The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrading the existing NEC to accommodate projected growth in regional population and employment. With replacement of aging infrastructure, elimination of chokepoints, and addition of capacity, rail service can be significantly expanded and made more reliable. The Preferred Alternative does not alter the route of the existing NEC through Southeastern Connecticut, as it serves local stations and provides access for freight service to businesses along the line. However, it does include a new 50-mile segment between Old Saybrook CT and Kenyon RI that provides significant travel time benefits for trains using the new segment. It also bypasses the movable bridges and the 11 remaining at-grade crossings on the NEC Shoreline route. While the location for and design of the segment would be determined during subsequent Tier 2 project studies, the FRA proposes a commitment to avoid use of an aerial structure through the historic district of Old Lyme, CT.</p> <p>As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure or alignments. Such decisions are made as part of Tier 2 project studies, which will include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate. Consistent with this process, the FRA developed Representative Routes for the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative, which provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the effects of each Alternative. Representative Routes define an envelope within which improvements might occur and whose location and construction type could change during subsequent Tier 2 project analysis.</p> <p>The Tier 1 NEPA process analyzes the environmental effects, both adverse and beneficial, associated with the Action and the Preferred Alternatives, including land use, transportation, and environmental resources. (See Volumes 1 and 2, Chapters 5, 6 and 7).</p>
SCCOG_Galbraith	In Alternative 2, a new route is proposed that would run northerly from New Haven through Hartford to Providence. The Tier 1 EIS identifies this route being provided to serve Intercity-Express, but again we are concerned that if constructed, it could result in less regional trains running along the shoreline route having stops in New London.	The FRA noted concerns regarding the Representative Route through Central Connecticut as proposed in Alternatives 2 and 3. In light of these and other comments, the Preferred Alternative does not include this route. The Preferred Alternative includes electrification of the Hartford/Springfield Line. The Preferred Alternative does not alter the route of the existing NEC through Southeastern Connecticut, as it serves local stations and provides access for freight service to businesses along the line. However, the Preferred Alternative does include a new 50-mile segment between Old Saybrook CT and Kenyon RI that provides significant travel time benefits for trains using the new segment. It also bypasses the movable bridges and the 11 remaining at-grade crossings on the NEC. The Preferred Alternative expands the level of service on the existing NEC between New Haven and Boston, resulting in increased intercity and regional service at the existing New London Union Station. Trains using the new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, R would serve the New London/Mystic station.

Table JJ–4: Stakeholder Comments (Elected Officials, Tribes, Federal Agencies, State Agencies, Local Agencies): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
SCCOG_Galbraith	In Alternative 3, four new route options are being considered for north of New York City, all of which would travel through Hartford before continuing to Boston via either Providence or Worcester. As all of these options would create a new rail line north of the existing shoreline route, we are concerned about the impact it could have in the future on the level of investment in the existing line through southeastern Connecticut and the number of trains that would stop in New London.	The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. The Preferred Alternative expands the level of service on the existing NEC between New Haven and Boston, resulting in increased intercity and regional service at the existing New London Union Station. In addition, a new supplemental segment will be added between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as considered under Alternative 1. Trains using the new segment would serve the New London/Mystic station. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line into the NEC, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield. It does not include a line connecting Hartford and Providence. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions. The Preferred Alternative is further described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
SCCRWA_Norris	I call your attention to Alternative 3 that re-aligns much of the existing NEC. This alternative is, by far, the most costly of the alternatives at an estimated cost of \$267-\$308 billion dollars. I urge you to reject Alternative 3 which, in our opinion, will negatively impact the economics of New Haven and other urban centers. It also has the largest environmental impacts and highest costs of the three alternatives.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Action Alternatives and improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and provides additional capacity to support a faster and far more reliable railroad. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3.
SCCRWA_Norris	I encourage you to support Connecticut's center cities by focusing your recommendations on the existing coastal corridor and the Hartford-Springfield line. New Haven, and the other cities on these existing routes, need higher-speed, higher-frequency service in order to support economic development efforts and access to jobs... I encourage you to issue a final EIS that recommends: (1) dramatically improved commuter travel time from New Haven to New York City on the coastal route; (2) improved travel time and more frequent service to and from Washington and Boston on the coastal and Hartford-Springfield routes; and (3) a final decision that keeps urban areas, like New Haven, on the primary alignment.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative includes upgrading the existing NEC shoreline route and the addition of a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line into the NEC, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield. It does not include a line connecting Hartford and Providence. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.
SCRCOG_Amento	I wanted to commend you too for including in all of the alternatives, really, except the no-build one, the importance of the state of good repair in the area between New York City and New Haven. That is where the demand is.	The Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative include investments necessary to bring the NEC to a state of good repair; in addition, the FRA proposes operational enhancements to improve the overall performance of the NEC. As described in Volume 1, Chapter 9, Evaluation of the Preferred Alternative, the No Action Alternative is inadequate to meet the needs of the Northeast. The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrades to the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment. By replacing aging infrastructure and eliminating chokepoints, train service will be faster and far more reliable. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.

Table JJ–4: Stakeholder Comments (Elected Officials, Tribes, Federal Agencies, State Agencies, Local Agencies): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
SCRCOG_Amento	... we really favor both Alternatives 1 and 2. They both seem to be really getting at a sweet spot...	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives, including Alternatives 1 and 2, to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers.
SCRCOG_Amento	...Alternative 3, which seems like -- it's very visionary, and I commend you for that, but it would be extremely expensive, and also the new development in new areas would involve really a lot of impact on the environment.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Action Alternatives and improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and provides additional capacity to support a faster and far more reliable railroad. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3.
SCRCOG_Amento	some ofthe alternatives presented still present new alignments which bypass New Haven and/or the entire coastal corridor of Connecticut. These bypass routes do not support the knowledge based and innovative economies of southern Connecticut, nor do they merit further consideration by the FRA based on the technical analysis presented in the DEIS.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative includes upgrading the existing NEC shoreline route and the addition of a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line into the NEC, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield. It does not include a line connecting Hartford and Providence. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.</p> <p>The FRA noted views expressed about connections to UCONN and Hartford. However, the Preferred Alternative does not include the route to UCONN as envisioned in Alternative 2 and 3. The rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative is provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative. The NEC FUTURE program is focused on corridor-wide solutions for passenger rail improvements, and the selection of the Preferred Alternative does not preclude future consideration of transit or fixed guideway improvements to meet other transportation needs across the Study Area.</p>
SEPTA_Knueppel	Of primary importance to SEPTA is that the Northeast Corridor attain a state of good repair so that existing service can continue to be provided with increased safety, performance, and reliability. The No Action Alternative within the DEIS fails to bring the NEC into a state of good repair which is not an acceptable outcome. Continuing to let the NEC deteriorate, which has been the inevitable practice through under-investment over many years, would degrade SEPTA service significantly impacting our customers and the economy of Southeastern Pennsylvania.	As described in Volume 1, Chapter 9, Evaluation of the Preferred Alternative, the No Action Alternative inadequate to meet the needs of the Northeast. The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrades to the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment. By replacing aging infrastructure and eliminating chokepoints, train service will be faster and far more reliable. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.

Table JJ-4: Stakeholder Comments (Elected Officials, Tribes, Federal Agencies, State Agencies, Local Agencies): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
SEPTA_Knueppel	Alternative 2 contemplates a new ten mile segment of the Northeast Corridor directly serving Philadelphia International Airport. This concept requires significant integration of long range planning with the Airport, the City of Philadelphia, Delaware County and SEPTA, so that intercity, regional passenger and freight rail service can co-exist.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. It includes new connections to airports to improve regional connectivity, as discussed in Volume 1, Chapter 4 and 5. A new Philadelphia airport station has been identified as part of the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative does not include the new segment routing option to the Market East Station. The FRA has been coordinating with the City of Philadelphia and SEPTA about the proposed Philadelphia Airport Station through the NEC FUTURE process. Engineering solutions to achieve the objectives for each project will be developed during subsequent Tier 2 project analysis
Springfield_Mayor Sarno	Because the Draft EIS evaluation precludes an alternative for service along the Hartford/Springfield/Worcester/ Boston inland corridor, an already established corridor, we believe it falls short of its intended goals. The benefits that improved rail connectivity would bring to this corridor and New England -- particularly to the City of Springfield where public and private investments in new and recently completed projects, including our new intermodal station, now top \$2.7 billion -- must be taken into consideration.	The FRA identified a Preferred Alternative that focuses on leveraging the investment in the existing NEC and Hartford/Springfield Lines over the proposed Hartford-Worcester routing. FRA considered travel time improvements, connectivity, environmental benefits and effects and overall mobility benefits when deciding on a Preferred Alternative. Improved service between Worcester and Boston are being evaluated as part of a separate study effort that was considered in the definition of the Preferred Alternative. This could play a significant role in enhancing the competitiveness of the central Connecticut and western Massachusetts region as well as provide sources for jobs and growth across the Northeast.
Thompson_Chinatti	...Thompson, CT commissioned CME Associates, a local engineering firm, to provide a Passenger Rail Study in 2010. That document, attached to this Comments Memorandum, is extremely thorough, and cites not one, but three alternatives for passenger rail. There are existing rail lines running through Thompson, currently used solely for freight, which were also formerly used for passenger rail. The passenger rail station also still exists, though has since been repurposed. The Providence & Worcester map is attached, showing Thompson's central location on its currently active lines. With improvements, those lines again could carry passengers from New London, CT to the South, to Worcester, MA, to the North, traveling from New London, through Norwich, Griswold, Killingly, Putnam, Thompson, and on into Worcester, and the station could be reactivated. This alternative was not even considered when the Plan was written, and it should be. It is a viable alternative, and one that would be far less expensive than creation of new rail lin 3s to accommodate passenger rail, as the existing lines would only need k be improved. It seems that the Commission has not examined this possibility, and it is formally requested that the option be fully vetted by the Commission prior to a final decision regarding routes/lines being made.	<p>The FRA's development of the NEC FUTURE investment program began in 2012 with nearly 100 initial alternatives for improving the NEC. These alternatives were consolidated to 15 Preliminary Alternatives that reflected a full spectrum of possibilities for the NEC. After extensive analysis and public dialogue on the Preliminary Alternatives, the FRA developed a No Action and three Action Alternatives for evaluation in the Tier 1 Draft EIS. See Volume 2, Appendix B for additional information on the Alternatives Development Process.</p> <p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. The Preferred Alternative does not include a second spine or segment that would connect to Thompson, CT. However, the FRA recognizes it is possible that in future decades there may be need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of expansion. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude options for new connecting service to and from the NEC, such as the suggestion to use the P&W line north to Worcester or to Palmer.</p>
USDOT-FAA_Angeles	Table 4-5 shows new stations at Danbury and Waterbury CT under Alternative 3.1 and 3.4. Two GA airports are located in Danbury and Waterbury. They could benefit from this new air-rail connectivity.	The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions. The Preferred Alternative is further described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.

Table JJ-4: Stakeholder Comments (Elected Officials, Tribes, Federal Agencies, State Agencies, Local Agencies): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
USDOT-FAA_Angelos	How will the Alternative 3 avoid impacts to PHL operations and the airport's Capacity Enhancement Program? Alternative 3 considers tunneling the route beneath significant portions of Philadelphia International Airport as well as a belowgrade station at the airport. This prospect would involve several engineering and construction challenges, including potential impacts to both airside and landside operations during construction, as well as potential physical conflicts with existing and planned airport facilities and infrastructure.	<p>As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, and will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure. Such decisions would be made as part of the Tier 2 project planning processes, which would include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate.</p> <p>The new Philadelphia airport station has been identified as part of the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative does not include the new segment routing option to the Market East Station. The FRA has been coordinating with the City of Philadelphia and SEPTA about the proposed Philadelphia Airport Station through the NEC FUTURE process.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.</p>
Waterford_Piersall	Alternative 1 would have a direct and significant impact on environmental and economic resources in Waterford. The proposed route crossing under I-395 and running north of I-95 fragments significant wildlife habitat and wetland resources as it passes through Waterford. The proposed route also bisects areas identified for industrial and commercial development as it approaches New London.	<p>The FRA identified and inventoried ecological resources, major river and watershed crossings. (See Volume 2, Appendix E.05 and E.06) In addition the FRA also studied potential economic impacts in Volume 2 Chapter 6. In defining the Preferred Alternative, the FRA reviewed specific local concerns and refined representative routes and construction types to balance those with broader regional travel needs. Specific local issues will be given due consideration in subsequent Tier 2 project studies. Consistent with the Tier 1 NEPA process, the FRA developed Representative Routes for the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative, which provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the effects of each Alternative. Representative Routes define an envelope within which improvements might occur and whose location and construction type could change during subsequent Tier 2 project studies.</p>
Waterford_Piersall	It is unclear whether a closer parallel to the I-95 corridor was considered. Maintaining a single transportation corridor for rail and highway services through Waterford would reduce habitat fragmentation and may have the added benefit of consolidating and improving wetland crossings to address improvements for multiple modes of transportation. One corridor would also be less disruptive to potentially developable commercial and industrial lands.	<p>The FRA's development of the NEC FUTURE investment program began in 2012 with nearly 100 initial alternatives for improving the NEC. These alternatives were consolidated to 15 Preliminary Alternatives that reflected a full spectrum of possibilities for the NEC. After extensive analysis and public dialogue on the Preliminary Alternatives, the FRA developed a No Action and three Action Alternatives for evaluation in the Tier 1 Draft EIS. See Volume 2, Chapter 4 and Appendix B for additional information on the Alternatives Development Process.</p> <p>Consistent with the Tier 1 NEPA process, the FRA developed Representative Routes for the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative, which provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the effects of each Alternative. Representative Routes define an envelope within which improvements might occur and whose location and construction type could change during subsequent Tier 2 project studies, which would include stakeholder and public involvement. Opportunities to coordinate new NEC segments with existing transportation plans and to keep within existing transportation corridors, including a closer parallel to I-95, would be explored in those subsequent Tier 2 project studies.</p>

Table JJ–4: Stakeholder Comments (Elected Officials, Tribes, Federal Agencies, State Agencies, Local Agencies): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
WILMAPCO_Zegeye	...we support the need to transform the NEC to accommodate faster train trips and ex panded service to new markets, as is detailed in Alternative 3.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The Preferred Alternative achieves many of the benefits of Alternative 3 with extensive the new segments, conflict free express tracks, and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost than a full second spine. Limited-stop Intercity-Express service envisioned for the Preferred Alternative would offer very competitive trip times at a substantially smaller investment than the capacity necessary to provide for non-stop high-speed rail service on a dedicated second spine. The Preferred Alternative has the potential to accommodate other service plans that feature super-express limited stop services that can offer market dominant travel times and offer potential for higher margin intercity rail products that might attract public-private partnerships.</p> <p>While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions.</p>

Source: NEC FUTURE team, 2016

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Adam-Kearns_Mi	I would like to express my support for "Alternatives 2&3" as they are proposed for connecting Hartford to Boston via both Providence and Worcester. It is wonderful to think that I could go to Willimantic and/or Storrs to get the train to Boston and of course, also be able to connect with the rest of the NEC system. It is my understanding that there is thought of having a direct link to the University of Connecticut. This would be a great boost to the area. The University is a great resource that serves thousands in a whole myriad of ways. I highly support this idea!	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative includes upgrading the existing NEC shoreline route and the addition of a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line into the NEC, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield. It does not include a line connecting Hartford and Providence. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.</p> <p>The FRA noted views expressed about connections to UCONN and Hartford. However, the Preferred Alternative does not include the route to UCONN as envisioned in Alternative 2 and 3. The rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative is provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative. The NEC FUTURE program is focused on corridor-wide solutions for passenger rail improvements, and the selection of the Preferred Alternative does not preclude future consideration of transit or fixed guideway improvements to meet other transportation needs across the Study Area.</p>
Adams_Ma	...I just wanted to go on record being in favor of whatever alternative, 1 or 2 or 3...	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers.
Adams_Ma	I personally would prefer the third alternative, the one with the most bells and whistles, the one -- the high-speed option.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The Preferred Alternative achieves many of the benefits of Alternative 3 with extensive the new segments, conflict free express tracks, and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost than a full second spine. Limited-stop Intercity-Express service envisioned for the Preferred Alternative would offer very competitive trip times at a substantially smaller investment than the capacity necessary to provide for non-stop high-speed rail service on a dedicated second spine. The Preferred Alternative has the potential to accommodate other service plans that feature super-express limited stop services that can offer market dominant travel times and offer potential for higher margin intercity rail products that might attract public-private partnerships. Economic effects of the Preferred Alternative are discussed in Volume 1, Chapter 6.</p> <p>While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions.</p>

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Addamo_Ni	Alternative 2 presents much potential and promise. Hartford and UConn are huge economic engines for Connecticut, and can provide many potential riders under NEC FUTURE with such an inland route.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative includes upgrading the existing NEC shoreline route and the addition of a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line into the NEC, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield. It does not include a line connecting Hartford and Providence. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.</p> <p>The FRA noted views expressed about connections to UCONN and Hartford. However, the Preferred Alternative does not include the route to UCONN as envisioned in Alternative 2 and 3. The rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative is provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative. The NEC FUTURE program is focused on corridor-wide solutions for passenger rail improvements, and the selection of the Preferred Alternative does not preclude future consideration of transit or fixed guideway improvements to meet other transportation needs across the Study Area.</p>
Alan_Da	Concerning the different alternatives, it seems to me that it does not make much sense to go as far east on Long Island as Ronkonkoma and build a tunnel under Long Island Sound when the powers that be today are having trouble building tunnels between New Jersey and Penn Station.	<p>The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative does not include new segments between NYC and Long Island and Long Island and Connecticut via the Long Island Sound or a new Segment via Central Connecticut, as proposed in Alternative 3.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.</p>
Aldieri_Ja	I am however in favor of High Speed Rail and all modes to improve congestion and dependency on single vehicles. Tier 3 seems to give us the best impact and ridership through major cities.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative to improve passenger rail service on the NEC in a manner that will enhance mobility options and expand passenger rail service in support of future population and employment growth in the Study Area. The Preferred Alternative, described in Volume 1, Chapter 4, improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail, improve reliability, and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects.</p>

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Allen_Mi	There os no real need for a new rail road to parallel the highway I95! The present Amtrak tracks from Old Saybrook CT has a great detail for more traffic.	<p>The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrading the existing NEC to accommodate projected growth in regional population and employment. With replacement of aging infrastructure, elimination of chokepoints, and addition of capacity, rail service can be significantly expanded and made more reliable. The Preferred Alternative does not alter the route of the existing NEC through Southeastern Connecticut, as it serves local stations and provides access for freight service to businesses along the line. However, it does include a new 50-mile segment between Old Saybrook CT and Kenyon RI that provides significant travel time benefits for trains using the new segment. It also bypasses the movable bridges and the 11 remaining at-grade crossings on the NEC Shoreline route. While the location for and design of the segment would be determined during subsequent Tier 2 project studies, the FRA proposes a commitment to avoid use of an aerial structure through the historic district of Old Lyme, CT.</p> <p>As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure or alignments. Such decisions are made as part of Tier 2 project studies, which will include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate. Consistent with this process, the FRA developed Representative Routes for the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative, which provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the effects of each Alternative. Representative Routes define an envelope within which improvements might occur and whose location and construction type could change during subsequent Tier 2 project analysis.</p> <p>The Tier 1 NEPA process analyzes the environmental effects, both adverse and beneficial, associated with the Action and the Preferred Alternatives, including land use, transportation, and environmental resources. (See Volumes 1 and 2, Chapters 5, 6 and 7).</p>
Allen_Th	Alternatives 2 and 3 should be rejected.	<p>The FRA considered both opposing and supporting views on the NEC FUTURE program in preparing the Tier 1 Final EIS and identifying a Preferred Alternative. Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative that improves the existing NEC to a state of good repair and includes new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.</p>

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Allyn_Ch	And also connecting with UConn that Mr. Warren mentioned, that is big...	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative includes upgrading the existing NEC shoreline route and the addition of a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line into the NEC, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield. It does not include a line connecting Hartford and Providence. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.</p> <p>The FRA noted views expressed about connections to UCONN and Hartford. However, the Preferred Alternative does not include the route to UCONN as envisioned in Alternative 2 and 3. The rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative is provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative. The NEC FUTURE program is focused on corridor-wide solutions for passenger rail improvements, and the selection of the Preferred Alternative does not preclude future consideration of transit or fixed guideway improvements to meet other transportation needs across the Study Area.</p>
Alvine_Ro	Other proposed alternatives make far more sense such as the one providing service along the I-91 corridor to Hartford, Providence and Boston which is a highly needed inland service.	<p>The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. The Preferred Alternative expands the level of service on the existing NEC between New Haven and Boston, resulting in increased intercity and regional service at the existing New London Union Station. In addition, a new supplemental segment will be added between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as considered under Alternative 1. Trains using the new segment would serve the New London/Mystic station. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line into the NEC, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield. It does not include a line connecting Hartford and Providence. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. NEC FUTURE is utilizing existing rail corridor as it did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions. The Preferred Alternative is further described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.</p>

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Amyot_Le	I support Alternatives 2 or 3, with improved access to Hartford, CT and UCONN.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative includes upgrading the existing NEC shoreline route and the addition of a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line into the NEC, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield. It does not include a line connecting Hartford and Providence. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.</p> <p>The FRA noted views expressed about connections to UCONN and Hartford. However, the Preferred Alternative does not include the route to UCONN as envisioned in Alternative 2 and 3. The rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative is provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative. The NEC FUTURE program is focused on corridor-wide solutions for passenger rail improvements, and the selection of the Preferred Alternative does not preclude future consideration of transit or fixed guideway improvements to meet other transportation needs across the Study Area.</p>
Anderson_De	Forget rebuilding Amtrak for passenger service. Traditional railroads were obsolete for carrying people nearly sixty years ago.	The FRA considered both opposing and supporting views on the NEC FUTURE program in preparing the Tier 1 Final EIS and identifying a Preferred Alternative. Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative that improves the existing NEC to a state of good repair and includes new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Anderson-Bays_Ja	Though I like the corridor to include connections along the new haven- new London shoreline	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative provides connections along the existing Northeast Corridor, along a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT and Kenyon, RI, and along the Hartford/Springfield Line.

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Arena_Ri	...when I look at the alternatives, definitely in favor of, at minimal, Alternative 2, although I think to get where we want to be to be cost and time effective, it has to be Alternative 3.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives, including Alternatives 2 and 3, to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS.</p> <p>While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.</p>
Arena_Ri	...who indicated the line from Hartford to Worcester, to Boston, let's not waste our time. And I will say that as a person who used to live in the Newton-Wellesly-Brookline area, all right, you will never see a train going higher than 79 miles an hour there. Never.	<p>The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions. The Preferred Alternative is further described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.</p>
Arena_Ri	With respect to the NEC Future scenarios in New England, I strongly support Alternative 3.1 which routes from Hartford to Providence to Boston. This will permit true high speed rail speeds not currently available on the coast route while including another New England capital. Additionally, this central ROW combined with ongoing rail work throughout New England will bring all major cities within two to three hours of Boston and New York City. This is a significant improvement in regional connectivity.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The cost of a full high-speed second spine along with existing NEC improvements, as proposed by Alternative 3, is very high relative to the projected ridership benefits. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. Limited-stop Intercity-Express service envisioned for the Preferred Alternative would offer very competitive trip times at a substantially smaller investment than the capacity necessary to provide for high-speed rail service on a dedicated second spine.</p> <p>While the Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS, it incorporates enhanced electrified service along the Hartford/Springfield Line in order to respond to comments received to strengthen service to Central New England and leverage existing investments and identified market opportunities. This strengthens the connection between New York City and markets along the Hartford/Springfield Line, including Hartford. The FRA noted views expressed about connections to UCONN and Hartford. However, the Preferred Alternative does not include the route to UCONN as envisioned in Alternative 2 and 3. The Preferred Alternative includes upgrading the existing NEC shoreline route and the addition of a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley.</p> <p>Also, while NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions.</p>

Table JJ-5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Arena_Ri	APT believes we need world-class rail in the United States, and strongly support NEC Alternates 3.1 & 3.4 as a first step toward achieving this. It is important to clarify, however, that even these Alternates are modest by world standards, that they bring us only to a position many of our competitors reached and surpassed decades ago, and that none of the proposed Alternates will provide transportation parity, let alone bring us a leadership position. We are concerned that characterizing the 3 Alternates as: "maintains", "grows" and "transforms" masks this unfortunate reality, and may tacitly steer many decision makers toward compromise solutions that will leave us falling ever farther behind. Alternate 2 represents "growth" only when compared to our decades of underinvestment. Compared to the global standard it represents continued backsliding. The 3 Alternates might therefore be more aptly described as "obsolete", "falling behind" and "making progress". The DEIR and future studies need to do a much better job of putting our system, challenges, and goals in a global context, not simply in the context of our past neglect. Additional text and graphics should be added comparing performance, travel time and investment levels among modern industrialized countries. There will be great opposition to the investments proposed in NEC Future, and we therefore need to make our case forcefully. Performance Goals Even the 100-minute service between Boston and New York, proposed under Alternate 3 (DEIR p. 4-42) falls short of the less than 90-minute service Texas High Speed rail will offer between Houston and Dallas/Ft. Worth & cities that are farther apart, and they plan to do it decades earlier. We are not going to accomplish our goals by offering too little, too late.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. The purpose and need of NEC FUTURE includes improving connectivity through expanded and improved accessibility both within the NEC rail network and between NEC and the multimodal transportation system. Volume 2, Chapter 3 provides the purpose and need for NEC FUTURE. The Preferred Alternative also incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line, providing one-seat ride service to and from the NEC to Springfield. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.</p> <p>While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.</p>
Arena_Ri	We trust that the proposed "5 hour 10 minute" travel time from Washington to Boston, cited under Alternate 3 on p.4-42 is a typo, since it reflects no improvement over Alternate 2, far exceeds the separate Boston-NY and NY-DC travel times, and would be totally uncompetitive.	The text referenced incorrectly shows travel times for Alternative 3 Intercity-Corridor service. The Tier 1 Final EIS was revised to correct the Alternative 3 Intercity-Express Travel Times between Washington, D.C. and Boston to be on average 4 hours. See Volume 2, Chapter 4.
Arikan_Ab	I think uconn is the best point for being a transport hub between new york and boston.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative includes upgrading the existing NEC shoreline route and the addition of a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line into the NEC, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield. It does not include a line connecting Hartford and Providence. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.</p> <p>The FRA noted views expressed about connections to UCONN and Hartford. However, the Preferred Alternative does not include the route to UCONN as envisioned in Alternative 2 and 3. The rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative is provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative. The NEC FUTURE program is focused on corridor-wide solutions for passenger rail improvements, and the selection of the Preferred Alternative does not preclude future consideration of transit or fixed guideway improvements to meet other transportation needs across the Study Area.</p>
Arneson_Er	Train service in the Northeast Corridor is incredibly important.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative to improve passenger rail service on the NEC in a manner that will enhance mobility options and expand passenger rail service in support of future population and employment growth in the Study Area. The Preferred Alternative is further described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Aronow_AI	Alternative #1 is a short sighted and costly non-solution to a serious long-term infrastructure issue. It doesn't really address the overall NE Corridor congestion problem through CT, is invasive, and destructive to historically significant areas in CT. One hopes that America ingenuity is still capable of developing sensible and scalable transportation options	The FRA noted public concerns about Action Alternatives. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to best meet the service needs of specific markets and avoid environmental constraints. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.
Ascarelli_Si	I commute to New York City from New Jersey, and I have experienced enough delays from signal problems, downed wires, disabled trains and more to know how important it is for the region's economy that we upgrade signals and wires, add two tunnels and deal with the portal bridge.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative to improve passenger rail service on the NEC in a manner that will enhance mobility options and expand passenger rail service in support of future population and employment growth in the Study Area. The Preferred Alternative does include improvements in New Jersey and Manhattan to support demand beyond 2040. The Preferred Alternative, described in Volume 1, Chapter 4, improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail, improve reliability, and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative includes new tracks added under the Hudson River to connect with Penn Station New York. The location and design of those new tracks would be examined as part of the Hudson Tunnel project, a project separate from NEC FUTURE and intended to preserve the current functionality of the NEC's Hudson River rail crossing between New Jersey and New York and strengthen the resilience of the NEC; FRA and NJ TRANSIT are currently leading the NEPA process for the Hudson Tunnel Project.</p>
Astuti_Mi	honestly, any rail improvement is a great improvement and I would like to see the rail lines moved a little further inland. We use the New London station when traveling and it is a pretty little station-I would hate to see it closed down, but making rail travel safer is important.	The Preferred Alternative includes a new 50-mile rail segment between Old Saybrook, CT and Kenyon, RI, generally following the I-95 corridor. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The precise location for and design of the rail segment would be determined in subsequent Tier 2 project studies.
Bailey_Valente	The Groton Business Association supports Alternative #1. We believe that at this time, when a great deal of the existing NEC infrastructure is in urgent need of various repairs, upgrades, maintenance and improvements, preservation of the current line is of utmost priority. ... In addition, Alternative #1 actually increases capacity, adds track, and relieves functional bottlenecks and preserves the Corridor itself, along with our region's workforce, tourism base and economic growth. Finally, Groton's desire to enhance commuter options for the large corporate employee base - primarily Electric Boat, Pfizer, Inc. and Submarine Base New London - will be well served by the infrastructure supports within Alternative #1 including the possibility of re-establishing a train station in the Town of Groton. It is our opinion that Alternative #1 offers the best option fiscally and by virtue of supporting and improving existing infrastructure to the benefit of all metropolitan communities along the NEe.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives, including Alternative 1, to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. Between New Haven and Providence, the existing NEC shoreline route will be upgraded with a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience. In addition, the Preferred Alternative includes electrification of the Hartford/Springfield Line between New Haven, Hartford and Springfield. This will facilitate direct service to Hartford and Springfield from the NEC without an engine change.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative brings the NEC to a state-of-good repair, but does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.</p>
Bair_Ad	I also believe the ambitious goals of alternative 3 are impressive but likely highly unfeasible, even with PPP funding.	The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Bair_Ad	Targeting the more palatable investment level with significant enhancements to service on the NEC (Via alternative 2) is the best choice.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives, including Alternative 2, to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers.
Banquer_Ky	I think that Alternative 3 is the best option because it fundamentally changes society for the better and saves the country money in the long run by means of moving the cost of transportation away from the individual and toward the state [In other words, I'd rather pay for a train ticket than pay for a car and automotive maintenance any day].	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. The Preferred Alternative achieves many of the benefits of Alternative 3 with extensive the new segments, conflict free express tracks, and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost than a full second spine. Limited-stop Intercity-Express service envisioned for the Preferred Alternative would offer very competitive trip times at a substantially smaller investment than the capacity necessary to provide for non-stop high-speed rail service on a dedicated second spine. The Preferred Alternative has the potential to accommodate other service plans that feature super-express limited stop services that can offer market dominant travel times and offer potential for higher margin intercity rail products that might attract public-private partnerships.</p> <p>While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions.</p>
Barone_Ri	Further study of the northern alignments is needed to understand the following: 1. The extent to which the right-of-way can be grade-separated, either above or below ground, to speed service, albeit at higher costs and the accompanying effects or benefits of this separation. 2. The extent to which the right-of-way can avoid existing development, particularly residential neighborhoods. 3. The extent to which development can be built to not interfere and even improve existing commuter regional services.	<p>As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure or alignments. Such decisions are made as part of subsequent planning processes, which would include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate. Consistent with this process, the FRA developed Representative Routes for the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative, which provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the effects of each Alternative. Representative Routes define an envelope within which improvements might occur and whose location and construction type could change during Tier 2 project analysis. These representative routes utilized existing transportation corridors to the maximum extent practicable. A Mapping Atlas with the Representative Routes has been included as Volume 1, Appendix AA and Volume 2, Appendix A.</p> <p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. The rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative is provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative. The NEC FUTURE program is focused on corridor-wide solutions for passenger rail improvements, and the selection of the Preferred Alternative does not preclude future consideration of transit or fixed guideway improvements to meet other transportation needs across the Study Area.</p>

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Barone_Ri	RPA strongly supports the investments proposed in Alternatives 1 and 2, which would bring the NEC to a state of good repair and address major bottlenecks. The first priority must be to create a solid foundation to build upon by restoring all part of the NEC to a state of good repair.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives, including Alternatives 1 and 2, to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. The Preferred Alternative also brings the NEC to a state-of-good repair. Volume 1, Chapter 10, identifies steps towards the Initial Phase of implementing the Preferred Alternative that would improve service and address critical infrastructure improvements.
Barone_Ri	To tap into the full market potential of the Northeast corridor, RPA recommends that the FRA pursue Alternative 3, with the following conditions: 1. The initial focus should be on high-speed rail (HSR) for the southern alignment, with two dedicated tracks (all or part of the distance) between New York City and Washington, D.C. 2. The two new dedicated HSR tracks between New York City and Boston for the northern alignments require further analysis before either should move forward. This analysis should also include the consideration of a third alignment - two new tracks along the existing New Haven Line - which might be superior to the Long Island or inland alignments. 3. A more thorough analysis of market demand in the corridor is needed, which should include an assessment of the potentially transformative impacts of higher- and high-speed rail services. ... 1. The FRA should pursue Alternative 3, with the following conditions: a. Initial focus should be on HSR for the southern alignment, two dedicated tracks (all or part of the distance) between New York City and Washington, D.C. b. Further investigation is required for northern portion between New York City and Boston. This analysis should include an assessment of the full costs and benefits of each alignment, as well as the consideration of a third alignment of two new tracks along the existing New Haven Line. c. Further investigation is required of potential demand for HSR in all markets.	The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative. Volume 1, Chapter 5 provides an explanation of the transportation analysis used to identify the Preferred Alternative.
Barone_Ri	With regard to the northern alignments, the findings of the NEC FUTURE DEIS don 't examine the alignment options in sufficient detail and with defensible assumptions to support or reject any northern alignments at this time. RPA questions many of the assumptions made in this analysis and its completeness, and doesn 't wish to foreclose the possibility of either of the two new dedicated HSR northern alignments and/or additional improvements to the New Haven Line to support HSR and the exploration of yet unidentified options. We respectfully request that the FRA further investigate the New York City-to-Boston alternatives to understand the benefits, costs and implications of three alignment alternatives, including the New Haven Line. Particular attention should be given to the potential market for high-speed service given current and potential development patterns and current and potential transit connection options along each of the three northern alignments.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative includes upgrading the existing NEC shoreline route and the addition of a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line into the NEC, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield. It does not include a line connecting Hartford and Providence. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Barone_Ri	RPA suggests the following principles to guide the FRA in evaluating the benefits of the high-speed rail action alternative (Alternative 3) and possible alignments. As articulated in the NEC FUTURE DEIS, the Northeast intercity rail system is in need of hundreds of millions of dollars of additional investments annually just to maintain current service levels and without addressing the state of good repair backlog. Any long-term investment plan for the NEC should begin with bringing the railroad up to a state of good repair. Additional investments to enhance the capacity for intercity service should favor those locations, typically metropolitan areas, with a robust transit ridership to complement and interact with intercity service. Near-term and mid-term investments for alignments and stations should support economic growth in existing large and medium-sized cities in the NEC. Longer-term investments should not only continue to support these locations but also should be used to transform areas that encourage and support compact urban development.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit. The Preferred Alternative brings the existing NEC to a state of good repair and maximizes its capacity through alleviation of chokepoints, addition of new tracks and segments at targeted locations, and implementation of service operational efficiencies. The Preferred Alternative also removes speed restrictions where practical and safe, reduces trip times, offers frequent Metropolitan and enhanced express Intercity services, and allows substantial growth for all Regional rail markets.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. Volume 1, Chapter 6, economic effects describes the representative economic effects that would occur with implementation of the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.</p>
Barreno_Na	I'm very gung ho for this. I find that when we have, you know, when we have to go to Connecticut, you have to go all the way out to the end of the Island, hop a ferry and the only other way is through -- all the way around, you know, but definitely when you do do these projects, like many people have said, we do need to be vigilant about how we go about doing these projects.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.
Barrett_Ka	Consideration must be to preserve our cities and towns and a balance must be made on cost vs. benefit. Alternative 1 does not appear to have taken into account these important aspects of the WDC to Boston rail improvement.	The FRA studied potential economic impacts as described in Volume 2, Chapter 6. In defining the Preferred Alternative, the FRA reviewed specific local concerns and refined representative routes and construction types to balance those with broader regional travel needs. Specific local issues will be given due consideration in subsequent Tier 2 project studies.
Bartosiewicz_Ju	I do not think it is a good idea to build a tunnel underneath Long Island sound to Milford.	The Preferred Alternative does not include the new segment routing option on Long Island, as proposed in Alternative 3. The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative.

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Baudouin_Da	Anything that can improve the service between Providence and Boston -- I know now you have to kind of pull over in a communter every now and then to let the high-speed Amtrak go through. If we can kind of straighten that out and increase the service between Providence and Boston as an incremental step, I think that would be a great positive sign.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative includes improvements to the existing NEC and a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. This new segment will improve performance (travel times, frequency of service, and mix of service types) between New York City and Boston. In the Preferred Alternative, travel times on the fastest trains (Intercity-Express) would be under 3 hours, a reduction of 45 minutes over the No Action Alternative. Between Providence and Boston, the Preferred Alternative includes chokepoint relief projects between Providence and Boston which would eliminate capacity constraints, provide for increased service frequency and improved trip times. See Volume 1, Chapter 4.</p>
Baudouin_Da	More frequent regional and Acela Amtrak service.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers.</p>
Baudouin_Da	New dedicated tracks for true high-speed rail along the corridor. The high speed rail should serve downtown Providence, one of the busiest stations in the Northeast Corridor, with the new high speed rail service between Boston and New York. Regardless of the selected alternative, Providence should be the major station that accommodates all high speed rail service between New York and Boston because of the high, growing demand in Providence.	<p>The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. The Preferred Alternative expands the level of service on the existing NEC between New Haven and Boston, resulting in increased intercity and regional service at the existing New London Union Station. In addition, a new supplemental segment will be added between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as considered under Alternative 1. Trains using the new segment would serve the New London/Mystic station. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line into the NEC, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield. It does not include a line connecting Hartford and Providence. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. NEC FUTURE is utilizing existing rail corridor as it did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions. The Preferred Alternative is further described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.</p>
Baudouin_Da	More reliable, frequent and faster commuter service between Providence and Boston. Short-term improvements to improve and enhance tracks and service between Providence and Boston should be a priority.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. The Preferred Alternative also removes speed restrictions where practical and safe, reduces trip times, offers frequent Metropolitan and enhanced express Intercity services, and allows substantial growth for all Regional rail markets.</p> <p>As described in Volume 1, Chapter 4, the Preferred Alternative adds capacity between Providence and Boston, by including two new tracks between Pawtucket, RI, and Sharon, MA. The Preferred Alternative also includes station improvements at Providence and Boston South Station, and a new station in Pawtucket.</p>

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Bauer_La	Clear explanations of where rail lines will run must be provided. The Tier 1 report is very vague on this point. Local government indicates that a portion of the newly proposed line will run right through the heart of my town, Garden City. If the intent of the new rail line is to prevent economic collapse or stagnation in the NEC, running a train line through a town 's commercial corridor and destroying the quality of life in that town is counterproductive.	<p>The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. The Preferred Alternative does not include the Long Island routing option considered in Alternative 3. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions. The Preferred Alternative is further described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.</p> <p>As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure or alignments. Such decisions would be made as part of the Tier 2 project planning processes, which would include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate.</p>
Beale_Zo	The fastest idea is best	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative to improve passenger rail service on the NEC in a manner that will enhance mobility options and expand passenger rail service in support of future population and employment growth in the Study Area. The Preferred Alternative has high-speed capacity and reduces trip time along the corridor. The Preferred Alternative is further described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Beale_Zo	On the whole we must develop high speed rail not only for the corridor but for small outlying towns and cities so that the car culture will devolve	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. Limited-stop Intercity-Express service envisioned for the Preferred Alternative would offer very competitive trip times at a substantially smaller investment than the capacity necessary to provide for high-speed rail service on a dedicated second spine.</p> <p>While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.</p>
Becker_Br	"Alternative 2" (also called "Grow") contains many items that may be very expensive with minimal benefit and contains many items that would grow the NEC with relatively small expense. We are not sure that an alternative referred to as "Grow", needs to contain an entirely new right-of-way from Hartford to Providence, which does not even have any rail on it today, and also contain a new route through Philadelphia to serve the Philadelphia airport.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. A new Philadelphia airport station has been identified as part of the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative adds new capacity across the NEC, including the portion of the NEC between New York and New Haven. The Preferred Alternative incorporates and electrified Hartford Line, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield to other markets on the NEC. The Preferred Alternative does not include the new segments between Hartford and Providence, as proposed in Alternative 2. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative.

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Becker_Br	The "No Action Alternatiye" should not be considered, as significant investment is vital, and critical to the current and Juture operation of the Northeast Corridor.	As described in Volume 1, Chapter 9, Evaluation of the Preferred Alternative, the No Action Alternative inadequate to meet the needs of the Northeast. The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrades to the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment. By replacing aging infrastructure and eliminating chokepoints, train service will be faster and far more reliable. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.
Becker_Br	"Alternative 1" (also called "Maintain") contains items that are critical now to the operation of the corridor and, in some cases, initial funding of some of the projects has been, at least partially, secured. Two additional tracks under the Hudson River and replacement of the Baltimore tunnels are absolutely critical. Adding tracks to relieve known congestion points is also required for a proper flow of rail projects.	The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrades to the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment. The Preferred Alternative includes two new tracks under both the Hudson and East Rivers and replacement of the Baltimore Tunnels to provide additional capacity. By replacing aging infrastructure and eliminating chokepoints, train service will be faster and far more reliable. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.
Becker_Br	Alternative 3" (also called "Transform") contains several ideas that are certainly thinking "outside-ofthe-box" and would certainly transform the Northeast Corridor. Perhaps this alternative should also be divided into sub alternatives. We agree that it would be transformational to build a route that serves the Philadelphia Airport and also to build a new route from Hartford to Providence.	<p>The Preferred Alternative combines key elements of all three Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate future growth in Northeast population and employment. The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. This includes a new station at Philadelphia International Airport, as well as new NEC service on an electrified Hartford Line. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.</p> <p>While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.</p>
Becker_Br	We would see an alternative of "Grow", to contain chokepoint improvements and perhas an alternative route around New London, and new through service from New York Boston via Hartford and Springfield. For Alternative 2 "Grow", we would prefer a package of projects that is more than "Maintain", but which does not make use of lengthy new rights-of-ways. One option would be to divide this alternative into 2 options; (a) Growth, one with an alternative route through Philadelphia and through Connecticut and (b) without these two new route segments.	The Preferred Alternative combines key elements of all three Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate future growth in Northeast population and employment. The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. The Preferred Alternative brings the existing NEC to a state of good repair and maximizes its capacity through alleviation of chokepoints, addition of new tracks and segments at targeted locations, and implementation of service operational efficiencies. The Preferred Alternative also removes speed restrictions where practical and safe, reduces trip times, offers frequent Metropolitan and enhanced express Intercity services, and allows substantial growth for all Regional rail markets. The Preferred Alternative also incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line as part of the NEC, providing one-seat ride service to and from the NEC and Springfield. See Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Becker_Iv	I think the tunnel is a bad idea.	The Preferred Alternative does not include the new segments on Long Island or a Long Island Sound crossing, as proposed in Alternative 3. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Becker_Iv	The trains are outdated, the railways are as well. Upgrade the existing and forget creating additional bridges and tunnels.	The purpose of NEC FUTURE is to upgrade aging infrastructure and to improve the reliability, capacity, connectivity, performance, and resiliency of future passenger rail service on the NEC for both Intercity and Regional trips, while promoting environmental sustainability and continued economic growth. The Preferred Alternative is consistent with this purpose and responsive to the overall NEC needs (Volume 1 and 2, Chapter 3). The Preferred Alternative, described in Volume 1, Chapter 4, improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects.

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Behringer_Fr	Please add my name to those strongly opposed to the NEC Future Alternative 1 plan.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers.
Behringer_Fr	...it appears the primary objective is to provide rapid rail service to the major population centers in the New England. It seems a rail line connecting New Haven, Hartford, Springfield and Worcester to New York and Boston would go a great way in meeting that objective. This is similar in many respects to Alternative 2.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives, including Alternative 2, to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. It does not include a second spine or connection to Worcester, as considered in Alternative 3. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.</p> <p>In Connecticut, the existing NEC shoreline route will be upgraded with a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative also incorporates enhanced electrified service along the Hartford/Springfield Line in order to strengthen service to Central New England and leverage existing investments and identified market opportunities.</p>
Belanger_De	RU nuts! No tunnel to Milford. Major impact on the environment and culture of the town	<p>The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative does not include new segments between NYC and Long Island and Long Island and Connecticut via the Long Island Sound or a new Segment via Central Connecticut, as proposed in Alternative 3.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.</p>
Benjamin_Au	#2 sounds good to me - it accomplishes much of what is needed to improve transportation with a minimum to disruption.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives, including Alternative 2, to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers.

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Berbari_Ji	please do not destroy the beautiful town of Garden City by placing a train line down the historic street of Stewart Avenue. Our community is one of the gems of Long Island... Please do not destroy our quiet close knit community by placing a high speed train down one of our main thoroughfares.	<p>The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative does not include new segments between NYC and Long Island and Long Island and Connecticut via the Long Island Sound or a new Segment via Central Connecticut, as proposed in Alternative 3.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.</p>
Berry_Sa	I love the idea of a rail line that connects Storrs, CT with the rest of New England. I lived in Boston and commuted to the University of Connecticut for years--this would have been so helpful to me and so many of my colleagues. And I know students at UConn would love this transportation option to Boston and NYC.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative includes upgrading the existing NEC shoreline route and the addition of a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line into the NEC, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield. It does not include a line connecting Hartford and Providence. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.</p> <p>The FRA noted views expressed about connections to UCONN and Hartford. However, the Preferred Alternative does not include the route to UCONN as envisioned in Alternative 2 and 3. The rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative is provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative. The NEC FUTURE program is focused on corridor-wide solutions for passenger rail improvements, and the selection of the Preferred Alternative does not preclude future consideration of transit or fixed guideway improvements to meet other transportation needs across the Study Area.</p>

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Biagioni_Wi	A tunnel under Milford harbor is a horrible idea, and will be met with tremendous opposition form the Milford community! Without more information, it just doesn't seem feasible without wrecking havoc on the harbor and the community, Also, the end of Milford harbor is a historical district, how could you possibly dig a tunnel there without destroying Milford s history, I am a sixty year resident and it is just wrong, Please, there has to be a better idea!	<p>The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative does not include new segments between NYC and Long Island and Long Island and Connecticut via the Long Island Sound or a new Segment via Central Connecticut, as proposed in Alternative 3.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.</p>
Black_Pe	The coast route is not suitable for high speed rail. Due to high land costs, the need for bridges, and environmental impact on marshes, I don't think it can be upgraded.	The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrading the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment. The Preferred Alternative adds a supplemental route between Old Saybrook CT and Kenyon RI to support an increase in rail service across the region, as well as to provide a more resilient route that bypasses the five movable bridges and 11 at-grade crossings in southeastern CT. However, the Preferred Alternative also maintains the current NEC alignment along the coast in southeastern Connecticut. This is necessary because the existing line serves local commuter and freight markets that would be eliminated in the event the coast route were closed. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.
Black_Pe	Best to move the Acela inland to Danbury/ Watbury/ Hartford/ Worchester, on purpose built rails.	The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The cost of a full high-speed second spine along with existing NEC improvements, as proposed by Alternative 3, is very high relative to the projected ridership benefits. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be a heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.
Black_Pe	I do not, however, understand the need for a cross Sound tunnel. There is little demand now for cross Sound travel. This seems absurdly expensive. If one must tunnel, better to make a more direct route out of NYC, eliminating the Queens detour	<p>The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative does not include new segments between NYC and Long Island and Long Island and Connecticut via the Long Island Sound or a new Segment via Central Connecticut, as proposed in Alternative 3.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.</p>

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Black_Pe	How about putting meaningful maps of where new rail would go on your website? New Rochelle to Westport is very expensive real estate. Where, exactly would rails be built? Just read you want to destroy Old Saybrook for new rails. Use inland route: NYC to Danbury to Hartford to Boston.	The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions. The Preferred Alternative is further described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Blume_Fr	I would like to see a change from the current line. Particularly in the New London area.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative provides connections along the existing Northeast Corridor, along a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT and Kenyon, RI, and along the Hartford/Springfield Line.
Bombassei_Su	It's horrible that you think you can come in and destroy everything with out a care to the environment. You should not be allowed to go on. Keep out...	The FRA considered both opposing and supporting views on the NEC FUTURE program in preparing the Tier 1 Final EIS and identifying a Preferred Alternative. Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative that improves the existing NEC to a state of good repair and includes new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Bonomo_Ni	I recommend that Alternative 1, with proper design, and combined with an emphasis on completing the New Haven to Springfield commuter line, be selected as the Preferred Alternative.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives, including Alternative 1, to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. Between New Haven and Providence, the existing NEC shoreline route will be upgraded with a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience. In addition, the Preferred Alternative includes electrification of the Hartford/Springfield Line between New Haven, Hartford and Springfield. This will facilitate direct service to Hartford and Springfield from the NEC without an engine change.
Book_Gr	The rail options that go through Hartford are ambitious but worth the investment.	<p>The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrading the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment. The Preferred Alternative incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line into the NEC, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield. It does not include a line connecting Hartford and Providence. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.</p> <p>The FRA noted views expressed about connections to UCONN and Hartford. However, the Preferred Alternative does not include the route to UCONN as envisioned in Alternative 2 and 3. The rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative is provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative.</p>

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Borton_Re	Expanding and improving the NEC rail corridor will be a boon for the region and the country and I am very supportive....This is a wonderful opportunity to improve the region for the connectivity of the cities, the ease of commuters, and the access to regional tourism sites.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative to improve passenger rail service on the NEC in a manner that will enhance mobility options and expand passenger rail service in support of future population and employment growth in the Study Area. The Preferred Alternative, described in Volume 1, Chapter 4, improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail, improve reliability, and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects.
Bottinelli-Gada_El	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.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The cost of a full high-speed second spine along with existing NEC improvements, as proposed by Alternative 3, is very high relative to the projected ridership benefits. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. Limited-stop Intercity-Express service envisioned for the Preferred Alternative would offer very competitive trip times at a substantially smaller investment than the capacity necessary to provide for high-speed rail service on a dedicated second spine.</p> <p>While the Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS, it incorporates enhanced electrified service along the Hartford/Springfield Line in order to respond to comments received to strengthen service to Central New England and leverage existing investments and identified market opportunities. This strengthens the connection between New York City and markets along the Hartford/Springfield Line, including Hartford. The FRA noted views expressed about connections to UCONN and Hartford. However, the Preferred Alternative does not include the route to UCONN as envisioned in Alternative 2 and 3. The Preferred Alternative includes upgrading the existing NEC shoreline route and the addition of a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley.</p> <p>Also, while NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions.</p>
Bourque_Da	If the commission is seeking improvement, make it a generational improvement in the rail system. Consider nothing less than the level of benefit that an Alternate 3 provides.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The Preferred Alternative achieves many of the benefits of Alternative 3 with extensive the new segments, conflict free express tracks, and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost than a full second spine. Limited-stop Intercity-Express service envisioned for the Preferred Alternative would offer very competitive trip times at a substantially smaller investment than the capacity necessary to provide for non-stop high-speed rail service on a dedicated second spine. The Preferred Alternative has the potential to accommodate other service plans that feature super-express limited stop services that can offer market dominant travel times and offer potential for higher margin intercity rail products that might attract public-private partnerships. Economic effects of the Preferred Alternative are discussed in Volume 1, Chapter 6.</p> <p>While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions.</p>

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Bousquet_Da	Having a line that goes through Storrs would be fantastic! Needing to drive to Hartford or New Haven to get to the train involves either getting a ride, finding a bus, or leaving your car behind. None of these options is ideal, and it has been one of the major barriers in getting people to sign up for conferences in this area as well as for me to travel to other conferences.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative includes upgrading the existing NEC shoreline route and the addition of a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line into the NEC, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield. It does not include a line connecting Hartford and Providence. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.</p> <p>The FRA noted views expressed about connections to UCONN and Hartford. However, the Preferred Alternative does not include the route to UCONN as envisioned in Alternative 2 and 3. The rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative is provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative. The NEC FUTURE program is focused on corridor-wide solutions for passenger rail improvements, and the selection of the Preferred Alternative does not preclude future consideration of transit or fixed guideway improvements to meet other transportation needs across the Study Area.</p>
Branchini_An	I prefer Option3 since it allows for wholesale expansion and increased opportunity across the state of CT.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The cost of a full high-speed second spine along with existing NEC improvements, as proposed by Alternative 3, is very high relative to the projected ridership benefits. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. Limited-stop Intercity-Express service envisioned for the Preferred Alternative would offer very competitive trip times at a substantially smaller investment than the capacity necessary to provide for high-speed rail service on a dedicated second spine.</p> <p>While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions.</p>
Brassard_Pe	A No-Action Alternative is not an acceptable option for the future of the NEC.	<p>As described in Volume 1, Chapter 9, Evaluation of the Preferred Alternative, the No Action Alternative inadequate to meet the needs of the Northeast. The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrades to the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment. By replacing aging infrastructure and eliminating chokepoints, train service will be faster and far more reliable. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.</p>

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Brassard_Pe	Alternative 3.2, the Long Island to New Haven to Hartford to Providence alignment should the top priority for a second HSR route between New York and Boston.	<p>The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative does not include new segments between NYC and Long Island and Long Island and Connecticut via the Long Island Sound or a new Segment via Central Connecticut, as proposed in Alternative 3.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.</p>
Brassard_Pe	Population and employment data (and resulting projections) cited in the Tier 1 Draft EIS (DEIS) Alternatives Report (October 2015) for the southern New England region is inaccurate and inconsistent with actual US Census and Bureau of Labor Statistics data. At an early NEC Future public meeting, it was mentioned by study staff people that Moody 's Analytics population and market data was being used instead of US government data. Moody 's assumptions and methodologies for determining population and metropolitan area designations in the DEIS are not clear. U.S. Government census and employment data should replace Moody 's data in the DEIS and final EIS.	<p>The FRA used Moody's as a commercial available forecast that was available corridor-wide, commensurate with the corridor-wide perspective of the NEC FUTURE analysis.</p> <p>The numbers in question are different due to the source quoted (Census data projections from 2014) and boundaries used to calculate the population and employment numbers. FRA's data (obtained on a county-level basis for the Study Area) is based on Moody's Analytics June 2013 "base" demographic forecasts. Moody's data uses actual Census data (not the same as census projections) to make projections. Moody's supplied three forecasts for the 2040 NEC population and employment projections based on this data: low, base (most likely), and high.</p> <p>For purposes of ridership forecasting, travel zones were established which are not the same as the Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) boundaries cited by the constituent. The boundaries in the Tier 1 Draft EIS were drawn based on markets served and do not match up specifically to the MSA boundaries.</p> <p>For a description of these boundaries, please refer to the ridership methodology in Volume 1, Appendix BB.</p>
Brassard_Pe	The greatest economic activity between New York and Boston occurs in the metro areas of Long Island, New Haven, Hartford, and Providence and these four regions are where HSR investment should be made. Due to limited economic impact and lower potential ridership, as a result of smaller populations, a second NEC HSR alignment through Danbury and/or Worcester should be deemphasized or not recommended in the final EIS.	<p>The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions. The Preferred Alternative is further described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.</p>

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Brassard_Pe	Providence metropolitan area is the second largest in southern New England. It has the 15th busiest Amtrak station and highest number of passengers of any MBTA station outside of Boston 's three main train stations and with both railroads over a 1,000,000 passengers a year use the station and usage continues to increase. Any second southern New England HSR alignment must go through Providence Station.	The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. The Preferred Alternative expands the level of service on the existing NEC between New Haven and Boston, resulting in increased intercity and regional service at the existing New London Union Station. In addition, a new supplemental segment will be added between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as considered under Alternative 1. Trains using the new segment would serve the New London/Mystic station. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line into the NEC, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield. It does not include a line connecting Hartford and Providence. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. NEC FUTURE is utilizing existing rail corridor as it did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions. The Preferred Alternative is further described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Brenda	I oppose Alternative 1 of the era's Northeast Corridor futures proposal	The FRA noted public concerns about Action Alternatives. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to best meet the service needs of specific markets and avoid environmental constraints. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.
Brengel_Da	Central CT needs better connections to New York and Boston. Alternative 2, connecting New Haven to Boston via Hartford and Providence seems to me to be a much better choice than the current path through New London. It would better serve the largest city in CT, bring service to the largest university in CT, and likely reduce travel times between NY and Boston.	<p>As a result of the Tier 1 Draft EIS and the public comment process, the FRA has identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1 Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative brings the NEC to a state-of-good repair, but does not include a separate second spine. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.</p> <p>In Connecticut, the existing NEC shoreline route will be upgraded with a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative also incorporates enhanced electrified service along the Hartford/Springfield Line in order to strengthen service to Central New England and leverage existing investments and identified market opportunities.</p>
Brennen_Ly	Alternative 3 would transform public thinking about rail transport from being an alternative to being the first and most sensible choice for transportation in the NEC.	The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Briggs_Th	I would like to see a railroad expansion that goes through UConn Storrs. It would really help international graduates students like me, and help make UConn more internationally competitive.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative includes upgrading the existing NEC shoreline route and the addition of a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line into the NEC, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield. It does not include a line connecting Hartford and Providence. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.</p> <p>The FRA noted views expressed about connections to UCONN and Hartford. However, the Preferred Alternative does not include the route to UCONN as envisioned in Alternative 2 and 3. The rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative is provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative. The NEC FUTURE program is focused on corridor-wide solutions for passenger rail improvements, and the selection of the Preferred Alternative does not preclude future consideration of transit or fixed guideway improvements to meet other transportation needs across the Study Area.</p>
Brown_Ri	I have read the report and it is obvious that Alternative 3 is the correct choice for the future of the Northeast economy and environment	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The Preferred Alternative achieves many of the benefits of Alternative 3 with extensive the new segments, conflict free express tracks, and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost than a full second spine. Limited-stop Intercity-Express service envisioned for the Preferred Alternative would offer very competitive trip times at a substantially smaller investment than the capacity necessary to provide for non-stop high-speed rail service on a dedicated second spine. The Preferred Alternative has the potential to accommodate other service plans that feature super-express limited stop services that can offer market dominant travel times and offer potential for higher margin intercity rail products that might attract public-private partnerships.</p> <p>While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions.</p>

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Bruhl_Ch	The NEC Tier 1 Environmental Impact Statement does not provide an adequate number of alternatives to improve service along the Northeast Corridor. ... Unfortunately the NEC Tier 1 report has not sufficiently examined alternatives to achieve improved service along the existing New Haven Line corridor.	<p>The FRA began development of the NEC FUTURE investment program in 2012 with nearly 100 initial alternatives for improving the NEC. These alternatives were consolidated to 15 Preliminary Alternatives that reflected a full spectrum of possibilities for the NEC. After extensive analysis and public dialogue on the Preliminary Alternatives, the FRA developed a No Action and three Action Alternatives for evaluation in the Tier 1 Draft EIS.</p> <p>The purpose of NEC FUTURE is to upgrade aging infrastructure and to improve the reliability, capacity, connectivity, performance, and resiliency of future passenger rail service on the NEC for both Intercity and Regional trips, while promoting environmental sustainability and continued economic growth. The range of Action Alternatives evaluated and the recommended Preferred Alternative are consistent with this purpose and responsive to the overall NEC needs (Volume 2, Chapter 3).</p> <p>The NEC spine and its connecting corridors (south of Washington, D.C., Keystone Corridor, Empire Corridor, and Hartford/Springfield Line) were considered in the Tier 1 Draft EIS analysis of Action Alternatives. The Preferred Alternative incorporates the Hartford/Springfield Line, a connecting corridor, in response to feedback received from stakeholders and the public to capitalize on existing rail investments and better serve Central New England. The Preferred Alternative includes an enhanced, electrified Hartford/Springfield Line, leveraging recent and future investments to create intermodal connections and strengthen existing urban centers. Services on other connecting corridors, including south of Washington, D.C., west to Harrisburg, north to Albany, and north/east of Springfield, are considered in the representative service plan for the Preferred Alternative. Connections north and east of Springfield would be possible. Further details are included in Volume 1, Chapter 4.</p>
Bruhl_Ch	How are alternatives that would improve capacity on the New Haven Line, but which were not considered in Tier 1 (e.g. tunneling to improve the S curve in Bridgeport, CT, or higher design speeds on the 100 year old moveable bridges scheduled for replacement, or restoring a full four track system), to be included in the Tier 1 EIS document process, thereby becoming potential alternatives for selection in Tier 2? It is our understanding that possible improvements to the existing NEC corridor in New York and Connecticut must be included in the Tier 1 document in order to be considered for analysis in Tier 2. If we are correct, how will those additional alternatives be considered in the Tiered EIS process? Who must initiate the request for a Tier 1 Supplemental EIS (SEIS)? If we misunderstand the options, can you explain to us the process by which alternatives not included at all in Tier 1 can be considered in Tier 2?	The Preferred Alternative does identify the overall performance requirements for the existing NEC, which would include number of tracks, chokepoint relief, and curve modifications. At the Tier 1 level of analysis, the FRA does not identify specific projects. The commenter referenced projects while not specifically identified in the Preferred Alternative could be considered in subsequent Tier 2 project studies if they address proposed performance requirements. The Preferred Alternative includes expansion of the NEC to a four-track railroad with the addition of a supplemental segment from Old Lyme, CT to Kenyon RI. Alternatives to achieve that throughput would be explored in subsequent Tier 2 project studies. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude other options not included in the Preferred Alternatives from being explored should future conditions dictate examination and implementation. However, for investments that would occur along the NEC and Hartford/Springfield Line, and use federal funding, consistency with NEC FUTURE will be encouraged by FRA and FTA. The FRA would determine the need to initiate a Supplemental EIS.
Bruhl_Ch	The No Build Alternative does not provide for any increase in capacity or level of service, effectively locking the state into current levels of performance until at least 2040, thus constraining rather than supporting population and economic growth.	As described in Volume 1, Chapter 9, Evaluation of the Preferred Alternative, the No Action Alternative is inadequate to meet the needs of the Northeast. The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrades to the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment. By replacing aging infrastructure and eliminating chokepoints, train service will be faster and far more reliable. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.
Brunau_Ch	According to the map I am seeing, this would be invading on beachfront areas, not to mention Charles Island and Silver Sands State Park, as well as Gulf Pond.	<p>The Preferred Alternative does not include the new segments on Long Island, as proposed in Alternative 3. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative</p> <p>As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure or alignments in the Tier 1 Record of Decision.</p>

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Bruno_Gw	If you can find a way to route this rail without compromising our built history or environment, go for it. But I vehemently oppose the plan as it stands. I am very active in historic preservation and my colleagues are getting the word out to as many other Historic Preservation groups and Connecticut residents as we can, to oppose the present plan. If you are unable to route this rail without damaging resources we can not reclaim, as indicated above, then I want to see this plan declined, cancelled...DERAILED!	The FRA supports the preservation of historic districts, cultural and historic resources. For NEC FUTURE, the FRA has and will continue to coordinate closely with the Advisory Council for Historic Preservation and each individual state and D.C. historic preservation office in compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. More information about cultural and historic resources evaluation is in Volume 1, Chapter 7.09.
Bullock_Ch	I encourage the development of an improved Northeast Corridor Rail program. I do feel to properly develop the potential for this corridor it is necessary to reroute intercity trains north and east of New York, NY on an alignment that is separate from the Metro North right of way between New York and New Haven, CT and probably off the current alignment east of New Haven which has too many curves and bridges to be an effective high speed corridor.	<p>The Preferred Alternative combines key elements of all three Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate future growth in Northeast population and employment. The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative provides connections along the existing Northeast Corridor, along a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT and Kenyon, RI, and along the Hartford/Springfield Line which strengthens service to Central New England and leverages existing investments and identified market opportunities. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions.</p>
Bullock_Ch	A reworking of the right of way in the Philadelphia area to eliminate several of the junctions there to improve speeds especially at the Zoo interlocking.	As a result of the Tier 1 Draft EIS and the public comment process, the FRA has identified a Preferred Alternative to improve passenger rail service on the NEC in a manner that will enhance mobility options and expand passenger rail service in support of future population and employment growth in the Study Area. The Preferred Alternative, described in Volume 1, Chapter 4, improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, and will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure. Such decisions would be made as part of the Tier 2 project studies, which would include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate.
Burke_He	Why in heck can't I find maps of the proposed routes?! Purposeful?	The maps of the Action Alternatives are provided in Volume 2, Appendix AA, Mapping Atlas.
Butler_Ka	Maybe have rail go from New Haven to Hartford then to RI, or right to casino. Get it off shoreline. Too congested. Don't ruin what's left of these beautiful historic towns.	The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. The Preferred Alternative expands the level of service on the existing NEC between New Haven and Boston, resulting in increased intercity and regional service at the existing New London Union Station. In addition, a new supplemental segment will be added between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as considered under Alternative 1. Trains using the new segment would serve the New London/Mystic station. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line into the NEC, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield. It does not include a line connecting Hartford and Providence. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. NEC FUTURE is utilizing existing rail corridor as it did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions. The Preferred Alternative is further described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Buttrick_Br	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.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative includes upgrading the existing NEC shoreline route and the addition of a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line into the NEC, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield. It does not include a line connecting Hartford and Providence. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.</p> <p>The FRA noted views expressed about connections to UCONN and Hartford. However, the Preferred Alternative does not include the route to UCONN as envisioned in Alternative 2 and 3. The rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative is provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative. The NEC FUTURE program is focused on corridor-wide solutions for passenger rail improvements, and the selection of the Preferred Alternative does not preclude future consideration of transit or fixed guideway improvements to meet other transportation needs across the Study Area.</p>
C_PA	I support the proposal 100%.... high speed rail and sound crossing makes so much sense. It will ease traffic congestion on Long Island and save time for all commuters to and from NYC other North.	<p>The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative does not include new segments between NYC and Long Island and Long Island and Connecticut via the Long Island Sound or a new Segment via Central Connecticut, as proposed in Alternative 3.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.</p>

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Campo_Ri	Suffolk county residents do not know about this proposal. It has not been publicized. This would be an excellent opportunity to bring Long Island into the future. Don't listen to the few loud naysayers. WE WANT THIS.	<p>The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative does not include new segments between NYC and Long Island and Long Island and Connecticut via the Long Island Sound or a new Segment via Central Connecticut, as proposed in Alternative 3.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.</p>
Caracciolo_Da	based on the proposals that I've read, there are three; correct? There are three proposals and two are kind of -- it seems like non-Long Island based; is that kind of right? I don't know. But it still impacts us, you know, it impacts us. But in the same breath, if we could draw people from other parts of the northeast to work here, I think that's very, very good and a strong benefit...	As described in Volume 2, Chapter 4, Alternatives Considered, the Draft Tier 1 EIS considered three Action Alternatives. Alternative 3 provided two route options between New York City and Harford, CT, and between Hartford and Boston. The FRA noted public concerns about the route from New York City to Hartford via Long Island as proposed in Alternative 3. In light of these and other considerations, the Preferred Alternative does not include this route. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.
Carbone_Vi	I think both Alternatives #2 & 3 are the best choices on the list for the improvement ideas.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives, including Alternatives 2 and 3, to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers.
Carbone_Vi	Going through central Connecticut is a great idea.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative provides connections along the existing Northeast Corridor, along a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT and Kenyon, RI, and along the Hartford/Springfield Line.
Carella_Ri	We think that it is in many ways visionary, some of the longer-term, transformative approaches that you're looking at, but at the same time, we think, scalable.	Because of the complexity and cost of the projects included in the Preferred Alternative, and the challenges associated with implementing work on an operational railroad on which millions of travelers depend, the Preferred Alternative must necessarily be implemented incrementally. The Tier 1 Final EIS includes a plan for incremental project phasing and implementation. The Initial Phase of project implementation focuses on the highest priority projects for which planning is already underway and required for addressing aging infrastructure and chokepoints along the NEC. The FRA established a Working Group to collaborate on the projects and sequencing for an Initial Phase. Completion of the Initial Phase will support an important increment increase in service for both Intercity and Regional services, thereby enhancing service for all operators and travelers using the NEC. It will also improve the way that rail serves are provided to the customer and provide opportunities to make rail operations more efficient. The Initial Phase and subsequent project phases will be further detailed in the Service Development Plan.

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Carella_Ri	We are leaning towards Alternative 1 at the moment, looking at the benefits of that, the more immediate impact. We think it's a better bang for your buck right out of the gate with that first alternative.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives, including Alternative 1, to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers.
Carella_Ri	Even at Alternative 1, we see an entirely revamped Connecticut rail system. It would be essentially, you know, a new system between the shoreline east, the chokepoint projects, development on the Metro North side and the New Haven-Hartford-Springfield line.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative provides connections along the existing Northeast Corridor, along a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT and Kenyon, RI, and along the Hartford/Springfield Line.
Carey_Dy	I urge the FRA to adopt Alternative 3, and give the Northeast Corridor the transformative rail service that would reflect the importance of the corridor in connecting the major population centers of the country. This corridor has a long and rich history of being on the cutting edge of rail innovation in the US, and the adoption of Alternative 3 poses the opportunity to continue that innovation.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The cost of a full high-speed second spine along with existing NEC improvements, as proposed by Alternative 3, is very high relative to the projected ridership benefits. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. Limited-stop Intercity-Express service envisioned for the Preferred Alternative would offer very competitive trip times at a substantially smaller investment than the capacity necessary to provide for high-speed rail service on a dedicated second spine.</p> <p>While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions.</p>
Carija_Su	I would like to express my support for alternative 3. Money will never be cheaper so the time to invest heavily is now. The need to expand mass transit is imperative when one considers the ramifications of an ever increasing population putting more cars on the road. Alternative 3 expands in areas that have less impact on the fragile shoreline and will encourage business and individuals to settle in these expanded areas... In conclusion I urge the panel to think broadly with an eye for the future.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The cost of a full high-speed second spine along with existing NEC improvements, as proposed by Alternative 3, is very high relative to the projected ridership benefits. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. Limited-stop Intercity-Express service envisioned for the Preferred Alternative would offer very competitive trip times at a substantially smaller investment than the capacity necessary to provide for high-speed rail service on a dedicated second spine.</p> <p>While the Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS, it incorporates enhanced electrified service along the Hartford/Springfield Line in order to respond to comments received to strengthen service to Central New England and leverage existing investments and identified market opportunities.</p> <p>Also, while NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions.</p>
Carija_Su	As well I want to express my opinion that alternative 1 is poor option. It encourages growth in areas that cannot sustain it environmentally and geographically. By its own admission the FRA limits this option's benefit to the short term.	The FRA noted public concerns about Action Alternatives. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to best meet the service needs of specific markets and avoid environmental constraints. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Carley_Ro	this entire process needs to be conducted with an eye to the art of the doable, because I think that most of the people here would say, Let's do Alternative 3. Let's build the whole thing out. Let's do it as soon as possible. Let's get it done tomorrow. And I certainly would put myself in that camp, but I'm a pragmatist and a realist about these things. I'm aware of the political environment, particularly at the federal level	The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrades to the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment. By replacing aging infrastructure and eliminating chokepoints, train service will be faster and far more reliable. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.
Carley_Ro	In Alternative 2, there is a proposal to create a new run from Providence essentially to Hartford... The only thing is, there is not really a whole lot there. I think it's admirable to want to connect UConn onto the spine. The thing is, from a selling perspective to people, it's very difficult to get people to go along with the construction of this for something that might happen; whereas, if you run the alternative through Worcester, the second largest city in New England, and then connect down to Hartford, you've already got established population centers for which you're building to accommodate now, not hoping for future economic development. Although I think it would be a great thing for northeast Connecticut, I just don't think it's as easy to sell this to people and to Senators and Representatives and to an increasingly skeptical public that doesn't want to spend anything on infrastructure.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative includes upgrading the existing NEC shoreline route and the addition of a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line into the NEC, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield. It does not include a line connecting Hartford and Providence. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.</p> <p>The FRA noted views expressed about connections to UCONN and Hartford. However, the Preferred Alternative does not include the route to UCONN as envisioned in Alternative 2 and 3. The rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative is provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative. The NEC FUTURE program is focused on corridor-wide solutions for passenger rail improvements, and the selection of the Preferred Alternative does not preclude future consideration of transit or fixed guideway improvements to meet other transportation needs across the Study Area.</p>
Carreras_Ra	... I think by 2040, the investment that Alternative 3 would provide in terms of results will be the best way forward.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The Preferred Alternative achieves many of the benefits of Alternative 3 with extensive the new segments, conflict free express tracks, and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost than a full second spine. Limited-stop Intercity-Express service envisioned for the Preferred Alternative would offer very competitive trip times at a substantially smaller investment than the capacity necessary to provide for non-stop high-speed rail service on a dedicated second spine. The Preferred Alternative has the potential to accommodate other service plans that feature super-express limited stop services that can offer market dominant travel times and offer potential for higher margin intercity rail products that might attract public-private partnerships.</p> <p>While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions.</p>
Cassidy_Ja	Is this really a choice? It seems more like a guaranteed to lose option. It is the scariest, because while the initial cost is likely the lowest, the long term costs in terms of lost economic and employment opportunities may far exceed the eventual costs of the most expensive option.	As described in Volume 1, Chapter 9, Evaluation of the Preferred Alternative, the No Action Alternative inadequate to meet the needs of the Northeast. The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrades to the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment. By replacing aging infrastructure and eliminating chokepoints, train service will be faster and far more reliable. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Cassidy_Ja	Please provide one of the following for NEC description: total miles of right-of-way or total track miles, whichever will best fit the context of the explanation of benefits and better understanding of the scope of the improvements suggested at each alternative.	Volume 1, Chapter 8, Construction Effects, and Chapter 9, Evaluation of the Preferred Alternative, provide the route miles of improvements for the Preferred Alternative.
Cassidy_Ja	What portion (percentage or track miles) of the current corridor is currently served high speed service and what is the definition of that speed (79mph; 120mph)? What percentage/track miles will be served by 160mph?	The FRA has focused on improving performance and travel times throughout the NEC rather than on track design speeds themselves. Targeted trip time reductions between markets were balanced with cost and potential ridership increases. As described in Volume 1, Chapter 4, Alternatives Considered, as part of the analysis of Action Alternative 3, FRA evaluated service plans that supported speeds up to 220 mph between major NEC markets along a second spine between Washington, D.C., and Boston, MA. Based on the evaluation, the FRA selected a Preferred Alternative that includes, where practical, opportunities to operate at speeds up to 220 mph; and a design speed for the existing NEC of 160 mph where possible considering physical constraints. Performance criteria may be considered as part of the FRA's decision making for NEC FUTURE and site-specific design speeds would be further evaluated in Tier 2 project reviews.
Cassidy_Ja	What is the benchmark for calculating the reduction in travel time (35, 65, 175 minutes)? Where does Acela service fit in here?	The FRA estimated total trips for all modes based on forecast population and employment growth and the application of an interregional travel demand model. Details of the travel demand forecasting methodology are provided in Volume 2, Appendix B.8, Ridership and in Volume 1, Appendix BB.8, Ridership. Intercity-Express is included in all Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative.
Cassidy_Ja	Please provide more detailed information about the proposed route of the new segment. At the public hearing I attended, the municipal official from Old Lyme, CT seemed to possess more detailed knowledge for her town than seemed to be available to the rest of us.	<p>As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure or alignments. Such decisions are made as part of Tier 2 project analysis, which would include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate. Consistent with this process, the FRA developed Representative Routes for the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative, which provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the effects of each Alternative. Representative Routes define an envelope within which improvements might occur and whose location and construction type could change during Tier 2 project analysis. These representative routes utilized existing transportation corridors to the maximum extent practicable. Nevertheless, the Preferred Alternative includes the potential for acquisition or displacements within areas of existing transportation use. As part of the Tier 2 project analysis, socioeconomic effects and any necessary acquisitions, temporary easements, and displacements would be identified, and compliance with the Uniform Relocation Act will be required.</p> <p>In November 2015, the FRA notified state and local governments and regional agencies along each of the Action Alternatives' Representative Routes of the availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The FRA sent information on the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comment process, and public hearings to elected officials in each of the local jurisdictions and counties along these Representative Routes, including those in Connecticut, and made hard copies of the Tier 1 Draft EIS available for review at central libraries in each of these counties.</p>
Cassidy_Ja	Please explain new interconnectivity to Connecticut River Valley. Is this a result of the HFD-Storrs-Providence segment, or the new HFD-SPG high(er) speed, more frequent service?	The FRA noted concerns regarding the Representative Route through Central Connecticut as proposed in Alternatives 2 and 3. In light of these and other comments, the Preferred Alternative does not include this route. The Preferred Alternative includes electrification of the Hartford/Springfield Line. This will facilitate direct service to Hartford and Springfield from the NEC without an engine change, providing one-seat ride service to and from the NEC and Springfield.
Cassidy_Ja	Is the 5X increase in Intercity service based on what is provided in Alternative 1 or on some other metric?	The five-time increase for peak Intercity trains per hour was forecasted for Alternative 3 compared to the No Action Alternative. This represents the top of the scale and would vary by geographic segment along the NEC. An twofold increase was forecast for Alternative 1 compared to the No Action Alternative. The Preferred Alternative would provide up to five times as much service as provided today in some markets. See Volume 1, Chapters 4, 5 and 6.

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Cassidy_Ja	Please define majority of corridor for 160mph top speeds (percentage or track miles).	FRA has focused on improving performance and travel times throughout the NEC rather than on track design speeds themselves. Targeted trip time reductions between markets were balanced with cost and potential ridership increases. As described in Volume 1, Chapter 4, Alternatives Considered, as part of the analysis of Action Alternative 3, FRA evaluated service plans that supported speeds up to 220 mph between major NEC markets along a second spine between Washington, D.C., and Boston, MA. Based on the evaluation, the FRA selected a Preferred Alternative that includes, where practical, opportunities to operate at speeds up to 220 mph; and a design speed for the existing NEC of 160 mph where possible considering physical constraints. Performance criteria may be considered as part of the FRA's decision making for NEC FUTURE and site-specific design speeds would be further evaluated in Tier 2 project analysis.
Cassidy_Ja	Please provide a simple graphic comparing reductions in travel times for each alternative (with some reference to current travel times).	A discussion of the performance of the Action Alternatives compared to the No Action, with a table that displays average Intercity travel time by representative station-pair can be found in Volume 2, Chapter 5, Transportation Effects.
Cassidy_Ja	In the map legend, please designate the second spine as a separate entity with 2 sections (northern and southern). Since the second spine concept seems to be the best hope for the future, please provide enough detail and explanation to make it very clear. For instance, is the second spine totally within the NEC corridor right-of-way for the entire length, or is it composed of some shared r-o-w and some track distinctly parallel to the existing r-o-w?	The FRA defined and developed the Action Alternatives at a programmatic level, focusing on corridor-wide solutions within the context of the Tier 1 EIS process. Consistent with this process, the FRA developed Representative Routes, which provide a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the environmental effects of each Action Alternative. Representative Routes define an envelope within which improvements might occur and whose location and construction type could change during Tier 2 project analysis. For the purposes of this analysis, the width of the existing NEC was defined as 150 feet, conservatively accounting for a four-track right-of-way between Washington, D.C., and Boston. The 150-foot width is inclusive of tracks, ballast, signals, etc. Improvements for Alternative 1 would generally be within the existing NEC right-of-way; Alternatives 2 and 3 could require an envelope that extends beyond the existing NEC right-of-way. The FRA did not develop diagrams of representative construction types or structures for the Tier 1 level of analysis. The proposed width of the Representative Route for each segment within each Action Alternative is considered conceptual and could change during Tier 2 project analysis. It is premature to provide the specific detail requested at this point in the environmental review process. Refer to Volume 2, Chapter 4 for descriptions of Representative Routes.
Cassidy_Ja	It appears new track , shown in green, does not have a comparable entry on the map.	Volume 1, Appendix AA, Mapping Atlas, was reviewed and refined to provide a more accurate depiction of the construction types and route of the Representative Route.
Cassidy_Ja	my vote goes to the TRANSFORMATIVE ALTERNATIVE, fully mindful of the high cost and the many other pitfalls that await. I am not very hopeful of its adoption because I believe it will involve a major cultural change that I am not certain that the USA is ready to undergo.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The Preferred Alternative achieves many of the benefits of Alternative 3 with extensive the new segments, conflict free express tracks, and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost than a full second spine. Limited-stop Intercity-Express service envisioned for the Preferred Alternative would offer very competitive trip times at a substantially smaller investment than the capacity necessary to provide for non-stop high-speed rail service on a dedicated second spine. The Preferred Alternative has the potential to accommodate other service plans that feature super-express limited stop services that can offer market dominant travel times and offer potential for higher margin intercity rail products that might attract public-private partnerships. Economic effects of the Preferred Alternative are discussed in Volume 1, Chapter 6.</p> <p>While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions.</p>

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Castellan_Su	advocate Alternative 2...The added cost to go inland as in Alternative 2 in small when compared to other governmental expenses.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives, including Alternative 2, to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers.</p> <p>In Connecticut, the existing NEC shoreline route will be upgraded with a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative also incorporates enhanced electrified service along the Hartford/Springfield Line in order to strengthen service to Central New England and leverage existing investments and identified market opportunities.</p>
Castellano_Ei	I am firmly opposed to the plan to put a high speed rail system that will go through Garden City. It would devastate our community	<p>The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative does not include new segments between NYC and Long Island and Long Island and Connecticut via the Long Island Sound or a new Segment via Central Connecticut, as proposed in Alternative 3.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.</p>
Cerrone_Br	I am opposed to this project first as a Garden City resident, secondly as a Long Island resident and thirdly as a U.S. Tax payer	<p>The FRA considered both opposing and supporting views on the NEC FUTURE program in preparing the Tier 1 Final EIS and identifying a Preferred Alternative. Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative that improves the existing NEC to a state of good repair and includes new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.</p>
Cerrone_Ma	I am opposed to Alternative 3 in Long Island.	<p>The Preferred Alternative does not include the new segment routing option on Long Island, as proposed in Alternative 3. The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative.</p>
Champagne_Ma	I am against a tunnel coming into Milford Harbor!!!!	<p>The Preferred Alternative does not include the new segment routing option on Long Island, as proposed in Alternative 3. The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative.</p>

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Chan_Fr	alternative 2 makes the most sense for it reduces the travel time between Wash, DC and Boston by a significant amount of time with a cost in the middle of the 3 new alternatives. Alternative 2 also links the major cities in the northeast (Western CT, New Haven, Hartford, Storrs (yes, it is a major city when school is in session), and Providence.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives, including Alternative 2, to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. It does not include a routing option through Storrs, as considered in Alternative 2 and 3. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.</p> <p>In Connecticut, the existing NEC shoreline route will be upgraded with a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative also incorporates enhanced electrified service along the Hartford/Springfield Line in order to strengthen service to Central New England and leverage existing investments and identified market opportunities.</p>
Chan_Fr	Alternative 3 is ambiguous but cost is likely prohibitive.	The FRA focused on a corridor-wide investment program for NEC FUTURE and did not make decisions about project-specific funding or financing. Funding and financing the Tier 2 projects necessary to implement the Preferred Alternative will be an incremental process for the federal government, Amtrak, the NEC states and stakeholders, and the entire region. Opportunities exist for both the public and private sectors to participate in implementing the Preferred Alternative. The FRA and the NEC Commission will take a leading role in working with project sponsors to identify the federal financial assistance necessary to advance implementation, including existing and future grant and other financing programs and options. Funding and financing options will be further detailed in the Service Development Plan.
Chase_Da	In the report it talks about having two tracks -- I forget what the alternative was -- through Fairfield County along the existing four-track New Haven line. I'm not sure that's a very practical idea. We have 95. You have development backed up to the railroad. So they had it on one slide as far as what they're going to evaluate, they have constructability. That's a very, very important item, as you look at anything you're doing along the existing corridors.	The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit. The Preferred Alternative brings the existing NEC to a state of good repair and maximizes its capacity through alleviation of chokepoints, addition of new tracks and segments at targeted locations, and implementation of service operational efficiencies. The Representative Route for the Preferred Alternative through Fairfield County, CT includes the existing four-track railroad between Greens farms CT and Mill River CT. Two new tracks are added between Branford, CT and Guilford, CT adjacent to the existing NEC. Some segments of the NEC in southeastern Connecticut would remain two-tracks. As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure or alignments. Such decisions are made as part of Tier 2 project studies, which will include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Chase_Da	I think probably as far as a new alignment, it may be a good idea for high speed. I think it should be considered just as that, using a European model, and I think it's been studied before. You have a sealed corridor, you have two tracks, high-speed trains.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The Preferred Alternative achieves many of the benefits of Alternative 3 with extensive the new segments, conflict free express tracks, and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost than a full second spine. Limited-stop Intercity-Express service envisioned for the Preferred Alternative would offer very competitive trip times at a substantially smaller investment than the capacity necessary to provide for non-stop high-speed rail service on a dedicated second spine. The Preferred Alternative has the potential to accommodate other service plans that feature super-express limited stop services that can offer market dominant travel times and offer potential for higher margin intercity rail products that might attract public-private partnerships.
Chaucer_Ti	Any proposal to tunnel under Long Island Sound is absurd...Milford, Ct. and Old Lyme are historic areas and their character is what makes New England special. These towns and other coastal towns should not be subject to massive spending projects for minimal gain.	<p>The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative does not include new segments between NYC and Long Island and Long Island and Connecticut via the Long Island Sound or a new Segment via Central Connecticut, as proposed in Alternative 3.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.</p>
Chesmer_Ro	Every effort should be made to make improvements within the confines of the existing railroad infrastructure.	The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrades to the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment. By replacing aging infrastructure and eliminating chokepoints, train service will be faster and far more reliable. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.
Childs_Ha	I am absolutely, 150% against this proposed railroad...	The FRA considered both opposing and supporting views on the NEC FUTURE program in preparing the Tier 1 Final EIS and identifying a Preferred Alternative. Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative that improves the existing NEC to a state of good repair and includes new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Chinatti_Ma	Thompson is in the extreme northeast corner of Connecticut, and we have existing rail lines which freight service runs on it now. We had passenger rail up until the '70s. In my mind, it makes absolute sense for the Commission to consider a connector line from New London up through Norwich, up through Griswold, Plainfield, Killingly, Putnum, Thompson to Worcester. It's pretty much a straight shot. The rail is already there. It's an existing asset that seems to have been ignored. We in the northeast corner of the state seem to be ignored a lot when it comes to projects and things. We had an engineering firm do a passenger rail study in 2010, which it's an excellent document, it's extremely informative, and I will forward that along via email as well. But I would just ask that before you finalize anything you seriously, seriously consider a connector route from New London up through Thompson to Worcester.	<p>The FRA’s development of the NEC FUTURE investment program began in 2012 with nearly 100 initial alternatives for improving the NEC. These alternatives were consolidated to 15 Preliminary Alternatives that reflected a full spectrum of possibilities for the NEC. After extensive analysis and public dialogue on the Preliminary Alternatives, the FRA developed a No Action and three Action Alternatives for evaluation in the Tier 1 Draft EIS. See Volume 2, Appendix B for additional information on the Alternatives Development Process.</p> <p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. The Preferred Alternative does not include a second spine or segment that would connect to Thompson, CT. However, the FRA recognizes it is possible that in future decades there may be need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of expansion. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude options for new connecting service to and from the NEC, such as the suggestion to use the P&W line north to Worcester or to Palmer.</p>
Christiano_Ca	Other proposed alternatives make far more sense, such as the 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.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The cost of a full high-speed second spine along with existing NEC improvements, as proposed by Alternative 3, is very high relative to the projected ridership benefits. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. Limited-stop Intercity-Express service envisioned for the Preferred Alternative would offer very competitive trip times at a substantially smaller investment than the capacity necessary to provide for high-speed rail service on a dedicated second spine.</p> <p>While the Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS, it incorporates enhanced electrified service along the Hartford/Springfield Line in order to respond to comments received to strengthen service to Central New England and leverage existing investments and identified market opportunities. This strengthens the connection between New York City and markets along the Hartford/Springfield Line, including Hartford. The FRA noted views expressed about connections to UCONN and Hartford. However, the Preferred Alternative does not include the route to UCONN as envisioned in Alternative 2 and 3. The Preferred Alternative includes upgrading the existing NEC shoreline route and the addition of a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley.</p> <p>Also, while NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions.</p>

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Cirone_Ca	Alternative 2 seems like the best blend of realistic improvements with an exciting vision for the future. I particularly like how it will connect NE CT (including UCONN) to the rail lines, this will be a great service for the population. Investment in new rail lines in this region makes good sense.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative includes upgrading the existing NEC shoreline route and the addition of a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line into the NEC, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield. It does not include a line connecting Hartford and Providence. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.</p> <p>The FRA noted views expressed about connections to UCONN and Hartford. However, the Preferred Alternative does not include the route to UCONN as envisioned in Alternative 2 and 3. The rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative is provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative. The NEC FUTURE program is focused on corridor-wide solutions for passenger rail improvements, and the selection of the Preferred Alternative does not preclude future consideration of transit or fixed guideway improvements to meet other transportation needs across the Study Area.</p>
Cleary_Da	Alternatives 2 or 3 will be more useful for the greatest number of riders.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives, including Alternatives 2 and 3, to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.</p>
Colvin_Sh	I totally oppose this option	<p>The FRA considered both opposing and supporting views on the NEC FUTURE program in preparing the Tier 1 Final EIS and identifying a Preferred Alternative. Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative that improves the existing NEC to a state of good repair and includes new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.</p>

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Conklin_Ed	Alternative 2 picks up a major city and the UCONN campus which is isolated.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative includes upgrading the existing NEC shoreline route and the addition of a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line into the NEC, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield. It does not include a line connecting Hartford and Providence. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.</p> <p>The FRA noted views expressed about connections to UCONN and Hartford. However, the Preferred Alternative does not include the route to UCONN as envisioned in Alternative 2 and 3. The rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative is provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative. The NEC FUTURE program is focused on corridor-wide solutions for passenger rail improvements, and the selection of the Preferred Alternative does not preclude future consideration of transit or fixed guideway improvements to meet other transportation needs across the Study Area.</p>
Conlon_Ch	Maintain isn't enough. We are overdue and well behind the rest of the world. I vote for Transform.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The cost of a full high-speed second spine along with existing NEC improvements, as proposed by Alternative 3, is very high relative to the projected ridership benefits. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. Limited-stop Intercity-Express service envisioned for the Preferred Alternative would offer very competitive trip times at a substantially smaller investment than the capacity necessary to provide for high-speed rail service on a dedicated second spine.</p> <p>While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions.</p>

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Connolly_Ju	I reside approximately 30 miles from New York city within short walking distance of a LIRR station. My family and I would be grateful for any enhancements to our railroad infrastructure.	<p>The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative does not include new segments between NYC and Long Island and Long Island and Connecticut via the Long Island Sound or a new Segment via Central Connecticut, as proposed in Alternative 3.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.</p>
Cooley_Ben	Alternative 2 and 3 are far more impactful and worthwhile plans. ...Alternative 2 and 3 not only distribute train traffic with a more direct route to Boston it adds significant economic development opportunities to northern ct cities.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives, including Alternatives 2 and 3, to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.</p> <p>In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative provides connections along the existing Northeast Corridor, along a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT and Kenyon, RI, and along the Hartford/Springfield Line which strengthens service to Central New England and leverages existing investments and identified market opportunities.</p>
Cooley_Ben	Alternative 1 would not relieve track congestion due to Amtrak/metro north track sharing - there would be no change.	The FRA noted public concerns about Action Alternatives. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to best meet the service needs of specific markets and avoid environmental constraints. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.
Cornaglia_Fr	The Alt 1 segment on the NEC corridor would have a terrible impact on the historic towns on that route. Although I do not live in those towns they are important to me for the cultural and recreational opportunities they offer nd to the state for the tourist businesses. Please do not run the rails through our most precious heritage.	Cultural and historic resources, including historic districts, are one of many factors that the FRA considered in identifying a Preferred Alternative. The FRA has worked with State Historic Preservation Offices in the Study Area and the Advisory council on Historic Preservation to develop a Programmatic Agreement for NEC FUTURE to ensure that continued evaluation and consideration of cultural and historic resources is undertaken as the program advances into subsequent Tier 2 project studies.
Corrao_Ma	I strongly oppose this project!	The FRA considered both opposing and supporting views on the NEC FUTURE program in preparing the Tier 1 Final EIS and identifying a Preferred Alternative. Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative that improves the existing NEC to a state of good repair and includes new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Cosgrove_Ju	i would endorse alternative 2 which brings much needed improvement in rail service to Hartford, linking New York and Boston. In addition, this plan spares the character of shoreline communities for both residents and tourists.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives, including Alternative 2, to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. The Preferred Alternative also incorporates enhanced electrified service along the Hartford/Springfield Line in order to strengthen service to Central New England and leverage existing investments and identified market opportunities.
Court_Ta	Two new segments adjacent to the existing NEC in Fairfield County. The western segment is on aerial structure, adjacent to the existing NEC near Stamford Station. Question: Please clarify the alignment of the aerial structure. Is this structure within the existing rail ROW in Greenwich and Stamford? Please include a diagram of the representative aerial structure.	The FRA defined and developed the Action Alternatives at a programmatic level, focusing on corridor-wide solutions within the context of the Tier 1 EIS process. Consistent with this process, the FRA developed Representative Routes, which provide a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the environmental effects of each Action Alternative. Representative Routes define an envelope within which improvements might occur and whose location and construction type could change during Tier 2 project analysis. For the purposes of this analysis, the width of the existing NEC was defined as 150 feet, conservatively accounting for a four-track right-of-way between Washington, D.C., and Boston. The 150-foot width is inclusive of tracks, ballast, signals, etc. Improvements for Alternative 1 would generally be within the existing NEC right-of-way; Alternatives 2 and 3 could require an envelope that extends beyond the existing NEC right-of-way. The FRA did not develop diagrams of representative construction types or structures for the Tier 1 level of analysis. The proposed width of the Representative Route for each segment within each Action Alternative is considered conceptual and could change during Tier 2 project analysis. It is premature to provide the specific detail requested at this point in the environmental review process. Refer to Appendix A, Mapping Atlas, for locations and construction types of Representative Routes.
Court_Ta	The eastern segment is parallel to the existing NEC between Noroton Heights Station and near Green's Farms Station, near the Saugatuck River. Most of this segment is north of the existing NEC, parallel to I-95 and inland from the coast. Question: Please clarify the alignment. Are segments parallel to the existing NEC within the existing rail ROW?	The FRA defined and developed the Action Alternatives at a programmatic level, focusing on corridor-wide solutions within the context of the Tier 1 EIS process. Consistent with this process, the FRA developed Representative Routes, which provide a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the environmental effects of each Action Alternative. Representative Routes define an envelope within which improvements might occur and whose location and construction type could change during Tier 2 project analysis. For the purposes of this analysis, the width of the existing NEC was defined as 150 feet, conservatively accounting for a four-track right-of-way between Washington, D.C., and Boston. The 150-foot width is inclusive of tracks, ballast, signals, etc. Improvements for Alternative 1 would generally be within the existing NEC right-of-way; Alternatives 2 and 3 could require an envelope that extends beyond the existing NEC right-of-way. As described in Volume 1, Chapter 4, the Representative Route of the Preferred Alternative includes a new segment parallel to I-95 typically on embankment or aerial structure through Greenwich, Stamford, and Norwalk; terminating in Westport west of Greens Farms rail station. This new segment of the Preferred Alternative is within the I-95 right-of-way across the Saugatuck River; and within the ROW of the NEC east of the Saugatuck River.

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Court_Ta	The eastern segment is parallel to the existing NEC between Noroton Heights Station and near Green's Farms Station, near the Saugatuck River. Most of this segment is north of the existing NEC, parallel to I-95 and inland from the coast. Question: Are segments parallel to I-95 within the I-95 ROW? Is there an impact on any current or future plans to widen I-95?	<p>The FRA defined and developed the Action Alternatives at a programmatic level, focusing on corridor-wide solutions within the context of the Tier 1 EIS process. Consistent with this process, the FRA developed Representative Routes, which provide a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the environmental effects of each Action Alternative. Representative Routes define an envelope within which improvements might occur and whose location and construction type could change during Tier 2 project analysis. For the purposes of this analysis, the width of the existing NEC is defined as 150 feet, conservatively accounting for a four-track right-of-way between Washington, D.C., and Boston. The 150-foot width is inclusive of tracks, ballast, signals, etc. Improvements for Alternative 1 would generally be within the existing NEC right-of-way; Alternatives 2 and 3 could require an envelope that extends beyond the existing NEC right-of-way. NEC FUTURE is intended to define a future vision for passenger rail along the NEC and to identify the rail improvements required to implement that vision. NEC FUTURE is not meant to slow down work on the many existing transportation projects currently being implemented or planned in the Study Area. The FRA considered existing plans and local project sponsors will continue coordination with local agencies in subsequent Tier 2 studies.</p> <p>With the Preferred Alternative, the FRA focuses on the existing NEC ways to increase capacity, improve resiliency, and improve travel times. Expanding the Northeast corridor rail line and I-95 between New Haven and New York will be essential to accommodate growth in population and employment and to keep the regional economy vibrant and competitive. The FRA is and will continue to coordinate closely with Connecticut DOT as NEC FUTURE advances from this Tier 1 level review to subsequent Tier 2 project studies. Given the scarcity of available land for new infrastructure, planning should consider ways to co-locate new rail and highway infrastructure to the maximum extent possible as a means to reduce adverse environmental and land use impacts as well as capital costs. Connecticut DOT is currently using this same approach in Hartford to co-locate a new Hartford train station and additional rail infrastructure with the new I-84 highway.</p>
Court_Ta	"New, two-track segment beginning east of Old Saybrook Station, shifting north of the existing NEC, crossing the Connecticut River and continuing in a series of tunnels, trenches, and aerial structures parallel to I-95 through East Lyme. The new segment shifts northeast and continues a short distance parallel to I-395 in Waterford before crossing to the south of I-395 in tunnel and continuing east adjacent to I-95. The segment crosses the Thames River in New London, between the eastbound and westbound bridge spans of I-95 and continues on embankment or aerial structure parallel to I-95 through Groton and Stonington, crossing the Pawcatuck River north of the existing NEC into Westerly, Rhode Island (Figure 4-13)." Please clarify ROW impacts.	The new 52-mile-long Old Saybrook, CT, to Kenyon, RI, segment would provide the capacity to significantly increase Intercity train service between New Haven and Boston and to reduce travel time between New York City and Boston. As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure or alignments. Such decisions are made as part of Tier 2 project analysis, which would include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate. Consistent with this process, the FRA developed Representative Routes for the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative, which provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the effects of each Alternative. Representative Routes define an envelope within which improvements might occur and whose location and construction type could change during Tier 2 project analysis. These representative routes utilized existing transportation corridors to the maximum extent practicable. Nevertheless, the Preferred Alternative includes the potential for acquisition or displacements within areas of existing transportation use. As part of the Tier 2 project analysis, socioeconomic effects and any necessary acquisitions, temporary easements, and displacements would be identified, and compliance with the Uniform Relocation Act will be required.
Court_Ta	New, two-track infrastructure, continuing from Westchester County, NY, through coastal Fairfield County, parallel to I-95 typically on embankment or aerial structure through Greenwich, Stamford, and Norwalk; terminating in Westport west of Green's Farms Rail Station. Please clarify ROW impacts. Is the proposed structure within the I-95 ROW?	It is not the intent of this Tier 1 Draft EIS to select site-specific alignments for the Action Alternatives or the Preferred Alternative. Rather, the FRA developed Representative Routes, which provide a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the environmental effects of each Alternative. Representative Routes are used to capture the conceptual and representative nature of a proposed route, whose location could shift during Tier 2 project analysis. Representative Routes may overlap where new segments are proposed adjacent to the I-95 right-of-way; however, because the Representative Route represents the corridor or envelope within which improvements would occur, determination as to whether new segments would be located within the I-95 right-of-way cannot be made at this time. This determination would be made in Tier 2 analysis.

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Court_Ta	New, two-track infrastructure, continuing from Westchester County, NY, through coastal Fairfield County, parallel to I-95 typically on embankment or aerial structure through Greenwich, Stamford, and Norwalk; terminating in Westport west of Green's Farms Rail Station. What factors determine if project is on embankment or aerial structure?	The FRA defined construction types to highlight effects on resources based on Representative Route widths, as well as sensitivity to construction-specific methods. As noted in Volume 2, Chapter 4, Section 4.2.4, embankment construction places the tracks atop an earthen embankment or retaining wall of varying height that slopes down to meet the existing grade. Embankment construction would generally be applied to the Representative Route prior to and following an aerial structure. Aerial structure construction elevates the tracks on infrastructure above the ground. Aerial structure construction would generally be applied to the Representative Route in heavily urbanized areas where at-grade construction is not practical. Aerial structures would also be constructed at river crossings, wetland areas, valleys, or crossings over existing highways/roadways where vertical grade changes do not permit at-grade construction. Aerial structures consist of both bridges and viaducts, depending on topography, land use, and presence of environmental resources.
Court_Ta	Alternative 3 is organized into three segments with routing options in two of the three segments as described in Section 4.4.3, providing the FRA with the flexibility to analyze options that would serve various intermediate markets north of New York should the FRA select Alternative 3 as the Preferred Alternative. Section 4.7.2 describes improvements to the existing NEC under Alternative 3. Only the second spine separate from the existing NEC is described below. Section 4.7.1 describes the Representative Route for the existing NEC. Question: Please clarify the rationale for including Alternative 3 improvements to existing NEC in the Alternative 2 section.	As noted in Volume 2, Chapter 4, Section 4.4.3, Alternative 3 also includes service and infrastructure improvements on the existing NEC to increase capacity, eliminate chokepoints, and bring the existing NEC to a state of good repair. Section 4.7.2 describes locations where Alternative 1 differs or varies from the Representative Route of the No Action Alternative. With the exception of the Old Saybrook-Kenyon new segment, the Alternative 3 improvements to the existing NEC are identical to the Alternative 1 improvements to the existing NEC. Section 4.7.3 describes the locations where Alternative 2 differs or varies from the No Action Alternative. Section 4.7.4 describes the Representative Route of Alternative 3, highlighting the location of the second spine relative to the existing NEC, environmental features, metropolitan areas, and major passenger rail stations.
Court_Ta	Also, the proposal that bypassed Stamford and Norwalk -- that would be the northern route or the Long Island Sound route -- would seem to undermine some of the economic development efforts under way in those communities and not really conform to the state plan of conservation and development.	The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions. The Preferred Alternative is further described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Courtney_Ti	...I want to get out of my car, and I want to use a train or a bus, and I want to be more active. I don't need to go over the negative aspects, the stress, the health, financial, environmental of single occupancy commuting. So in that sense, I'm very much for the transform option. I would love to get a train to Boston. I would love to have passenger service to New York and to D.C.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The Preferred Alternative achieves many of the benefits of Alternative 3 with extensive the new segments, conflict free express tracks, and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost than a full second spine. Limited-stop Intercity-Express service envisioned for the Preferred Alternative would offer very competitive trip times at a substantially smaller investment than the capacity necessary to provide for non-stop high-speed rail service on a dedicated second spine. The Preferred Alternative has the potential to accommodate other service plans that feature super-express limited stop services that can offer market dominant travel times and offer potential for higher margin intercity rail products that might attract public-private partnerships. Economic effects of the Preferred Alternative are discussed in Volume 1, Chapter 6.</p> <p>While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions.</p>

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Coyle_Ma	I am strongly opposed to Alternative #3 for the high speed Amtrak rail line proposed extension. I am a resident of Garden City and firmly believe this would have a devastating effect on my town and my home.	The Preferred Alternative does not include the new segment routing option on Long Island, as proposed in Alternative 3. The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative.
Crafa_Lo	Alternative 3 would decimate my community. It would split our school district and community lines. My property values would plummet.	<p>The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative does not include new segments between NYC and Long Island and Long Island and Connecticut via the Long Island Sound or a new Segment via Central Connecticut, as proposed in Alternative 3.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.</p>
Crail_K	As a resident of Floral Park, a homeowner, business owner and member of the local Chamber of Commerce, I would like to vote No Action , on the proposed plans.	As described in Volume 1, Chapter 9, Evaluation of the Preferred Alternative, the No Action Alternative inadequate to meet the needs of the Northeast. The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrades to the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment. By replacing aging infrastructure and eliminating chokepoints, train service will be faster and far more reliable. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.
Cunningham_Mac	I support Amtraks / FRA future capital plans to improve the capacity and reliability of passenger train service in the NEC.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative to improve passenger rail service on the NEC in a manner that will enhance mobility options and expand passenger rail service in support of future population and employment growth in the Study Area. The Preferred Alternative, described in Volume 1, Chapter 4, improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects.
Cuthbert_Ma	Move it inland! It is stupid with global,warming to build along the shoreline	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers.</p> <p>In Connecticut, the existing NEC shoreline route will be upgraded with a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative also incorporates enhanced electrified service along the Hartford/Springfield Line which strengthens service to Central New England and leverages existing investments and identified market opportunities.</p>

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Dale_AI	I would like to voice, I think for a lot of us, support for the corridor and support for alternative 3 primarily as a visionary piece that if we look at the need for climate change mitigation, if we look at the need to redo how we travel and where we have access to, the only way to do a lot of intercity travel is -- if we can't do flying is to do a lot of rail. And alternative 3 seems to be the only one that really supports that. I don't know that I have particular -- I think it's very interesting to go out to Long Island. At the same time, I feel like Long Island can come into New York, and that people are connecting more of New England.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The Preferred Alternative achieves many of the benefits of Alternative 3 with extensive the new segments, conflict free express tracks, and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost than a full second spine. Limited-stop Intercity-Express service envisioned for the Preferred Alternative would offer very competitive trip times at a substantially smaller investment than the capacity necessary to provide for non-stop high-speed rail service on a dedicated second spine. The Preferred Alternative has the potential to accommodate other service plans that feature super-express limited stop services that can offer market dominant travel times and offer potential for higher margin intercity rail products that might attract public-private partnerships.</p> <p>While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions.</p> <p>The FRA considered climate change in the identification and evaluation of the Preferred Alternative. This topic is discussed in Chapter 7.15 of Volume 1.</p>
Daly_Lo	As a resident of Garden City, who lives in the Eastern Section on Washington Ave, I am opposed to the Alternative 3.	The Preferred Alternative does not include the new segment routing option on Long Island, as proposed in Alternative 3. The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative.
Davidson Cragoe_Ca	... then Option 3, linking Hartford, which is desperately in need of regeneration is a much better option.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.</p> <p>While the Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS, it incorporates enhanced electrified service along the Hartford/Springfield Line to strengthen service to Central New England and leverage existing investments and identified market opportunities. The incorporation of service along the Hartford/Springfield Line would promote economic development and growth, further discussed in Chapter 6 of Volume 1.</p>
Davies_Ju	Wouldn't it be easier to build it in the middle of I-95?	As a result of the Tier 1 Draft EIS and the public comment process, the FRA has identified a Preferred Alternative to improve passenger rail service on the NEC in a manner that will enhance mobility options and expand passenger rail service in support of future population and employment growth in the Study Area. The Preferred Alternative, described in Volume 1, Chapter 4, improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, and will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure. Such decisions would be made as part of the Tier 2 project studies, which would include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate.
Davis_St	While no action should be the preferred course	As described in Volume 1, Chapter 9, Evaluation of the Preferred Alternative, the No Action Alternative inadequate to meet the needs of the Northeast. The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrades to the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment. By replacing aging infrastructure and eliminating chokepoints, train service will be faster and far more reliable. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Davis_St	if we had to build a modernized rail system it should go through Hartford as the state is already committed to build that area out economically and this could actually help where as there would be 0 to negative impact of this train on the coast!!!	The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrading the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment. It also incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line to provide one-seat ride service to and from the NEC and Hartford and Springfield. More information on the Preferred Alternative can be found in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Dean_Fr	I strongly object to the plan to run a high speed railway through Garden City and several neighboring towns. This Alternative 3 plan would destroy Garden City economically, in terms of real estate values, and aesthetically.	The Preferred Alternative does not include the new segment routing option on Long Island, as proposed in Alternative 3. The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative.
Dean_Fr	This plan would destroy Garden City economically, in terms of property values, and aesthetically. I am strongly opposed to this plan.	<p>The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative does not include new segments between NYC and Long Island and Long Island and Connecticut via the Long Island Sound or a new Segment via Central Connecticut, as proposed in Alternative 3.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.</p>
DeBernardo_Pa	you needed to relocate your tracks and come up with a different plan, why ruin something that is a benefit to the community and evironment, look to what can be changed and hope it will be something all will benefit from and want to live with.	The FRA recognizes that there are sensitive resources such as those associated with local communities, wildlife refuges and habitat corridor wide. The FRA has identified a Preferred Alternative that minimizes impacts to wildlife refuge, wetlands, communities, water resources and ecological resources. Volume 1, Chapter 4 describes the Preferred Alternative.
DeGray_Ro	Alternative 3 please including provisions for travel to points north from Hatford, Springfield, Boston to Montreal!	The Preferred Alternative includes electrification of the Hartford/Springfield Line between New Haven, Hartford and Springfield. This will facilitate direct service to Hartford and Springfield from the NEC without an engine change. The Preferred Alternative supports as many as four NEC trains per hour on the Hartford/Springfield Line (see Volume 1, Chapter 4). While the Preferred Alternative does not include service to Montreal, it assumes continued operation of the service to Vermont. The FRA is working with Massachusetts and Vermont on the Northern New England Intercity Rail Initiative, which would enhance service between Boston, Springfield and Vermont, and eventually extend to Montreal.
DeLena_Ge	There needs to be the maximum commitment to rail in the NE corridor.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative to improve passenger rail service on the NEC in a manner that will enhance mobility options and expand passenger rail service in support of future population and employment growth in the Study Area. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
DeSimone_Bo	Go with alternative 3!	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The Preferred Alternative achieves many of the benefits of Alternative 3 with extensive the new segments, conflict free express tracks, and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost than a full second spine. Limited-stop Intercity-Express service envisioned for the Preferred Alternative would offer very competitive trip times at a substantially smaller investment than the capacity necessary to provide for non-stop high-speed rail service on a dedicated second spine. The Preferred Alternative has the potential to accommodate other service plans that feature super-express limited stop services that can offer market dominant travel times and offer potential for higher margin intercity rail products that might attract public-private partnerships.</p> <p>While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions.</p>
Dharia_An	I believe Alternative 2 is best compromise in terms of service expansion, reduction of travel times, and cost of construction. Alternative 2 also provides provision for future growth. It is not quite world class with 91 mph average speed from Boston to DC but still 50% better than current average speed of just 63 mph.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives, including Alternative 2, to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers.
Dharia_An	No action alternative and alternative 1 do not provide sufficient upgrades for existing infrastructure needs and for any future growth. No action and alternative 1 should be not considered as viable options.	The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit. The Preferred Alternative brings the existing NEC to a state of good repair and maximizes its capacity through alleviation of chokepoints, addition of new tracks and segments at targeted locations, and implementation of service operational efficiencies. The Preferred Alternative also removes speed restrictions where practical and safe, reduces trip times, offers frequent Metropolitan and enhanced express Intercity services, and allows substantial growth for all Regional rail markets. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.
Dharia_An	the study lists travel times from DC to Boston as 5 hours 10 minutes (same as alternative 2). The travel time should only 3 hours 20 minutes.	The text referenced incorrectly shows travel times for Alternative 3 Intercity-Corridor service. The Tier 1 Final EIS was revised to correct the Alternative 3 Intercity-Express Travel Times between Washington, D.C. and Boston to be on average 4 hours. See Volume 2, Chapter 4.
Dharia_An	I also believe Long Islanders will not allow the project to built in their towns.	The Preferred Alternative does not include the new segments between NYC and Long Island and Long Island and Connecticut via the Long Island Sound, as proposed in Alternative 3. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Dharia_An	I firmly believe Alternative 3 will make America competitive with the rest of the world.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The Preferred Alternative achieves many of the benefits of Alternative 3 with extensive the new segments, conflict free express tracks, and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost than a full second spine. Limited-stop Intercity-Express service envisioned for the Preferred Alternative would offer very competitive trip times at a substantially smaller investment than the capacity necessary to provide for non-stop high-speed rail service on a dedicated second spine. The Preferred Alternative has the potential to accommodate other service plans that feature super-express limited stop services that can offer market dominant travel times and offer potential for higher margin intercity rail products that might attract public-private partnerships.</p> <p>While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions.</p>
Di_Pa	I am voicing my STRONG OPPOSITION to Alternative 3 proposal. This incredibly expensive option would destroy thousands of property values, cause the displacement of dozens of families from their homes, and offer no clear value to the citizens of Long Island. I implore the FRA to strike Alternative 3 from its planning process and to focus its precious resources on more urgent NEC upgrades (such as tunnels in and out of Manhattan).	The Preferred Alternative does not include the new segment routing option on Long Island, as proposed in Alternative 3. The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative.
DiCristina_Fr	I believe Alternative 1 is the only viable one	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives, including Alternative 1, to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers.
Dimmling_Le	I write to express my opposition to a proposed high speed Amtrak rail line running through my town of Garden City, Long Island. I understand this is considered "option 3" of several considerations. Its hard to imagine who thinks it would be wise to run a high speed rail through one of the most densely- packed areas of Long Island. This is in terms of both population and car traffic. The immense physical danger posed to our residents by a high speed train, in addition to negative quality of life issues because of noise and increased traffic, makes it obvious this idea must be strongly rejected.	<p>The Preferred Alternative does not include the new segments on Long Island, as proposed in Alternative 3. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative</p> <p>As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure or alignments in the Tier 1 Record of Decision.</p>
Donelan_Br	We are very much opposed to the high-speed Amtrak train running through our quiet, little town. Please keep in mind allowing this high-speed train to go through Garden City has the potential to ruin our little town.	<p>The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative does not include new segments between NYC and Long Island and Long Island and Connecticut via the Long Island Sound or a new Segment via Central Connecticut, as proposed in Alternative 3.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.</p>

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Dougherty_Ke	I would like voice my support for improvements to rail lines that abut the coastline that will be made more vulnerable to storm surge from our rising seas.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. As described in Volume 1, Chapter 9, Evaluation of the Preferred Alternative, the Preferred Alternative affords an opportunity to upgrade existing infrastructure in vulnerable areas and design and build new infrastructure resistant to the effects of climate change, minimizing future flooding risks.
Dounis_Sp	I am strongly opposed to Alternative 3 Amtrak extension into Garden City. This would severely impair property values and create even more noise pollution beyond the 2 main train lines that already run through town.	The Preferred Alternative does not include the new segment routing option on Long Island, as proposed in Alternative 3. The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative.
Doyle_Ja	The concept of a connection between Long Island and Connecticut is not new. I found an old newspaper in my house with an article describing a series of bridges and tunnels connecting Eastern Connecticut and Eastern Long Island. I comes up now and then, and always gets shot down, because no one wants it to dump off in their town! Again, WHO, exactly, wants this?	<p>The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative does not include new segments between NYC and Long Island and Long Island and Connecticut via the Long Island Sound or a new Segment via Central Connecticut, as proposed in Alternative 3.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.</p>
Doyle_Pa	This report presents a false set of alternatives. True alternatives (invest in road, invest in rail, invest in air, invest in some combination, or invest in none and accept the regional gridlock) would allow the public to compare different modes and the amount of investment required to satisfy projected needs. This multimodal analysis would focus on the projected regional transportation problems and the ability of targeted investments to solve these problems. This mutlimodal analysis would enable the public to consider the broad impacts of an investment program as is required for a Tier 1 analysis. Instead, the NEC Future Draft EIS presents the same alternative with different levels of funding. The level of federal funding should not be considered as part of the environmental review process. This report sets a dangerous precedent of modal agencies tacitly lobbying the federal government for funding using the environmental review process. Although I appreciate the practical limitations of multimodal transportation assessments in the United States, the FRA has made no effort to collaborate with the FHWA or FAA to develop a multimodal investment alternatives for the Northeast Corridor. Without a multimodal approach to the analysis, the NEC Future Draft Tier 1 EIS does not present any alternatives (other than the three separate northern routes for the system in Alternative 3). The Draft EIS identifies a series of projects, which when combined into three investment levels (the faux 'Alternatives'), yield three levels of investment for a single alternative. When issuing its record of decision, the FRA should acknowledge that all three alternatives may be publicly-preferred depending on the other modal investments in the region. For example, if the regional highway system is not expanded, the rail system may be an effective investment in intercity capacity, and vice versa (even at the same level of funding).	<p>The purpose of NEC FUTURE is to upgrade aging infrastructure and to improve the reliability, capacity, connectivity, performance, and resiliency of future passenger rail service on the NEC for both Intercity and Regional trips, while promoting environmental sustainability and continued economic growth. The alternatives development process evaluated separate service, infrastructure, and route options that could be combined to meet the needs of various markets along the NEC. The FRA took a market-based approach that incorporated analysis of current travel demand, population growth projections, ridership projections, data from states and planning organizations, and public and agency comments. The Action Alternatives differ in the Representative Service plans and Representative Routes, while all Action Alternatives include improvements to the existing NEC.</p> <p>NEC FUTURE is a passenger rail study. The NEC FUTURE Tier 1 EIS analyzes the environmental impacts, both adverse and beneficial, of each of the Tier 1 DEIS Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative, identified and described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. As part of this analysis, the FRA evaluated the potential effects of the Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative on other modes, particularly if travelers are attracted to passenger rail from congested highways and airports, in Volume 1 and 2, Chapter 5, Transportation Effects, and Chapter 6, Economic Effects and Growth, and Indirect Effects. While focused on passenger rail, the FRA considered the overall effects on travel across the entire transportation system in evaluating the benefits and effects of each Action Alternative. Volume 1 and 2, Chapter 9, Evaluation of Alternatives, also presents these broader system-wide effects.</p> <p>As described in Volume 1 AND 2, Chapter 11, Agency and Public Involvement, the FRA coordinated with other federal agencies on several levels. First, periodic coordination meetings for NEC FUTURE occurred at the headquarters level with other U.S. DOT modal administrations, including the Federal Transit Administration, the Federal Highway Administration, the Federal Aviation Administration, and the Maritime Administration.</p>

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Doyle_Pa	Alternative 3 is a bad alternative. The third alternative costs roughly 150% more than the second alternative with only a modest increase in ridership and other benefits. This result is largely an artifact of NEC Future's demand assumptions. This poor benefit-cost ratio seems like an effort (accidental or intentional) to push the final record of decision toward Alternative 2 (the 'compromise' solution) when in fact additional alternatives between 2 and 3 would be more desirable for the public. In my opinion, NEC Future should reevaluate its assumptions for Alternative 3 and consider one or more alternatives in between Alternatives 2 and 3 which have a more reasonable benefit-cost ratio.	The FRA has considered both cost and environmental impacts in the identification of the Preferred Alternative. Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Action Alternatives, including Alternatives 2 and 3, and improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. Representative construction types for Alternatives 2 and 3 were identified based on existing environmental and geographic conditions in order to support grade and curvature assumptions, which were used to best understand environmental constraints and impacts. However, these were made without field observations and at a Tier 1 programmatic level as appropriate. During subsequent Tier 2 project studies, specific engineering solutions would be developed to best meet environmental, cost and construction needs. Additional Alternatives that were eliminated prior to the publication of the DEIS can be reviewed in Volume 2, Appendix B.
Duarte_Ph	I am in support of the secondary spine as well as bring the current NEC up to a good state of repair.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The Preferred Alternative achieves many of the benefits of Alternative 3 with extensive the new segments, conflict free express tracks, and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost than a full second spine. Limited-stop Intercity-Express service envisioned for the Preferred Alternative would offer very competitive trip times at a substantially smaller investment than the capacity necessary to provide for non-stop high-speed rail service on a dedicated second spine. The Preferred Alternative has the potential to accommodate other service plans that feature super-express limited stop services that can offer market dominant travel times and offer potential for higher margin intercity rail products that might attract public-private partnerships. Economic effects of the Preferred Alternative are discussed in Volume 1, Chapter 6.</p> <p>While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions.</p>

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Dugas_AI	It seems to me that Alternative 2 makes a lot more sense, adds service to additional areas (Hartford/UConn) and has to reduce cost and time to implement.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative includes upgrading the existing NEC shoreline route and the addition of a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line into the NEC, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield. It does not include a line connecting Hartford and Providence. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.</p> <p>The FRA noted views expressed about connections to UCONN and Hartford. However, the Preferred Alternative does not include the route to UCONN as envisioned in Alternative 2 and 3. The rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative is provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative. The NEC FUTURE program is focused on corridor-wide solutions for passenger rail improvements, and the selection of the Preferred Alternative does not preclude future consideration of transit or fixed guideway improvements to meet other transportation needs across the Study Area.</p>
Duncan_H	The high cost and environmental damage are not going to justify a somewhat faster way to get to Boston. Ruining historic cities in CT is irreparable damage to our state and should not be allowed to happen.	<p>The FRA recognizes that there are sensitive resources such as those associated with local communities, wildlife refuges and habitat corridor wide. The FRA has identified a Preferred Alternative that minimizes impacts to wildlife refuge, wetlands, communities, water resources and ecological resources. Volume 1, Chapter 4 describes the Preferred Alternative.</p>
DV_Er	The proposal for a line that runs through Storrs, CT is exactly what the state -and the Northeast- needs to expand not only the access to the flagship educational institution, but more importantly, a hub of knowledge production, research and innovayion that presents a host of economic opportunities for the region. Connecting Storrs to the rest of the Northeast corridor would complete the university belt that runs from DC through the likes of Princeton, Yale, Brown, Harvard and other top tier research institutions. The flow of innovation and ingenuity-literally and figuratively -would indeed bode well for us. Moreover, having mass transportation through Storrs would encourage residential and commercial development to the area, which could bring more jons and build more communities. As long as the environmental impacts are properly assessed, I fully support the plan.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative includes upgrading the existing NEC shoreline route and the addition of a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line into the NEC, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield. It does not include a line connecting Hartford and Providence. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.</p> <p>The FRA noted views expressed about connections to UCONN and Hartford. However, the Preferred Alternative does not include the route to UCONN as envisioned in Alternative 2 and 3. The rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative is provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative. The NEC FUTURE program is focused on corridor-wide solutions for passenger rail improvements, and the selection of the Preferred Alternative does not preclude future consideration of transit or fixed guideway improvements to meet other transportation needs across the Study Area.</p>

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Edwards_Cl	We are completely opposed to Alternative 1. It would do unimaginable damage to one of the most beautiful and historically important landscapes and villages in America.	The FRA noted public concerns about Action Alternatives. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to best meet the service needs of specific markets and avoid environmental constraints. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.
Edwards_Er	this idea would forever change (and I my opinion, negatively impact) the beautiful shoreline and its residents.	The Preferred Alternative does not alter the route of the existing NEC through Southeastern Connecticut, as it serves local stations and provides access for freight service to businesses along the line. However, the Preferred Alternative does include a new 50-mile segment between Old Saybrook CT and Kenyon RI that provides significant travel time benefits for trains using the new segment. It also bypasses the movable bridges and the 11 remaining at-grade crossings on the NEC. The location for and design of the new segment will be determined during subsequent Tier 2 project analysis, which will include consideration of impacts on natural resources, habitats and the built environment. The FRA proposes a commitment to avoid use of an aerial structure through the historic district of Old Lyme, CT.
ElliottLewis_Da	I really don't think there's any other option but the second spine... I feel like everything else is pretty much a Band-Aid.	<p>The Preferred Alternative is a combination of elements of the Action Alternative to best meet the service needs of specific markets and avoid environmental constraints. The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrades to the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment. By replacing aging infrastructure and eliminating chokepoints, train service will be faster and far more reliable. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.</p>
ElliottLewis_Da	So I understand that it becomes a huge investment cost up front, and I'm willing to pay that because I feel like the benefits go down to my children and generations that follow. So sign me up for the additional taxes, I think it's well worth it... I wish there was an opportunity for me to be more involved as an advocate	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
ElliottLewis_Da	So I'm fully in favor of the most expensive and the option that requires the greatest investment, because I think that the benefits are really -- you can't calculate the benefits to having that type of world-class system. And I'm very much in favor of the new route tying in new cities. So the idea of bringing high-speed rail to Hartford or to Worcester would open up other places for people to live, other places for people to commute from.	The FRA noted views expressed about connections to Hartford and Worcester. However, the Preferred Alternative does not include the route to Worcester as envisioned in Alternative 3. The Preferred Alternative includes electrification of the Hartford/Springfield Line. The rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative is provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative. The NEC FUTURE program is focused on corridor-wide solutions for passenger rail improvements, and the selection of the Preferred Alternative does not preclude future consideration of transit or fixed guideway improvements to meet other transportation needs across the Study Area.

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Ellis_Mi	I have recently been made aware of a proposal to have a high speed rail line run through most of Long Island, but my concern is relayed to Garden City in particular...I oppose this plan as it will have a negative impact on my community.	<p>The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative does not include new segments between NYC and Long Island and Long Island and Connecticut via the Long Island Sound or a new Segment via Central Connecticut, as proposed in Alternative 3.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.</p>
Ely_Dw	Current rail line is completely adequate and can be upgraded	The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrades to the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment. By replacing aging infrastructure and eliminating chokepoints, train service will be faster and far more reliable. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.
Ely_Jo	Good high speed rail transportation is essential moving forward. No one likes it going through their town but option #1 makes the most sense .	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives, including Alternative 1, to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers.
Ely_Pa	This waste of Federal Dollars is Un-necessary for CT residents. It will only benefit those who travel THROUGH CT. The Current rail line is completely adequate and can be upgraded without carving a NEW path of destruction through beautiful towns and neighborhoods.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative includes upgrading the existing NEC shoreline route. The Preferred Alternative retains service on the existing NEC in southeastern Connecticut and includes a new 50-mile segment between Old Saybrook CT and Kenyon RI that provides significant travel time benefits for trains using the new segment. It also bypasses the movable bridges and the 11 remaining at-grade crossings on the NEC. The location for and design of the new segment will be determined subsequent Tier 2 project analysis. The Preferred Alternative also incorporates an electrified Hartford Line into the NEC, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield. This could play a significant role in enhancing the competitiveness of the central Connecticut region as well as provide source for jobs and growth across the Northeast.

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Engelke_Je	Please find another way to accomplish the rail line. Run it next to the Interstate.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative to improve passenger rail service on the NEC in a manner that will enhance mobility options and expand passenger rail service in support of future population and employment growth in the Study Area. The Preferred Alternative, described in Volume 1, Chapter 4, improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, and will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure. Such decisions would be made as part of the Tier 2 project studies, which would include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate.
Ensinger_Bi	I would recommend careful analysis of satellite images of the existing route, and finding places where it could be straightened for faster service. They do exist, and the amount of eminent domain would be far less than building an entirely new route, which would also need new stations which just add to the cost. Straighter routes also means shorter distances to cover, which contributes to shorter travel times as well as less maintenance on the existing route. New routes just mean more route miles to maintain, more train sets needed, and either weaving into existing stations, or like I said, building new stations.	The FRA identified opportunities to improve travel times and relieve capacity constraints along the existing NEC with curve modifications, track improvements, as well a supplemental segments. These improvements were incorporated into each of the Action Alternatives described in the Tier 1 Draft EIS (Volume 2, Chapter 4) and are foundational improvements to achieve the travel times, frequencies and operating enhancements defined for the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative utilizes existing stations and stays within or adjacent to the existing NEC wherever possible; in some cases these existing stations require modifications. These stations and their improvements are described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The FRA focus for the Preferred Alternatives is on the existing NEC and improving its operation.
Eppenstein_Ma	RESOLVED, that the Report of the Committee recommending that the Village of Scarsdale should continue by all means possible to: (1) oppose strenuously both the construction of any future high speed rail line through Scarsdale, and Alternative 3 of the Northeast Corridor (NEC) Tier 1 Draft Environmental Impact Statement, and (2) advocate for removal of NEC Alternative 3 from further consideration ... The Committee unequivocally supports the objectives of the Public Comment filed by the Village in opposition to both the construction of any future high speed rail line through Scarsdale and NEC Alternative 3. The Committee further recommends that the other NEC options that do not include the proposed spine through Scarsdale are more appropriate, and should be considered instead of NEC Alternative 3 because they will eliminate unacceptably costly construction to the detriment of meeting existing needs, will avoid significant adverse impacts to Scarsdale and its residents, and will better serve to preserve and protect the Scarsdale community and its natural environment. The high speed rail segment proposed by NEC Alternative 3 would be completely incompatible with the character of our Village. It has the potential to transform Scarsdale into an urban transportation hub. Aside from the adverse, highly disruptive impacts of tunnel or aerial construction, once built a high speed segment could potentially overburden the Village with an even higher level of vehicular congestion that already plagues the local parkways, streets and arteries.	<p>The Preferred Alternative does not include the new segments on Long Island, as proposed in Alternative 3. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative</p> <p>As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure or alignments in the Tier 1 Record of Decision.</p>
Epstein_Al	Please invest in reducing the travel times between these two cities to under 3 hours, at least.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative to improve passenger rail service on the NEC in a manner that will enhance mobility options and expand passenger rail service in support of future population and employment growth in the Study Area. The Preferred Alternative has high-speed capacity and reduces trip time along the corridor. The fastest representative trips times between Boston and New York City are just under 3 hours, a savings of 45 minutes when compared to No Action Alternative or existing trip times. The Preferred Alternative is further described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Erat_Wi	Chosing Option 4 would provide the most forward-thinking and world class outcome. We need this investment in rail, especially in high speed rail. The Philly portion with two new stops is especially valuable for us who live there.	The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit. The Preferred Alternative brings the existing NEC to a state of good repair and maximizes its capacity through alleviation of chokepoints, addition of new tracks and segments at targeted locations, and implementation of service operational efficiencies. The Preferred Alternative includes new service and station to the Philadelphia Airport. The Preferred Alternative does not include a second spine. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.
Estepar-Garcia_Wi	I urge the committee to move forward with an option that connects Boston to Hartford through Storrs as an opportunity to continue building the future of the Northeast Corridor, supporting not only the citizens of CT, but also of nearby states that could also benefit from such an investment.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative includes upgrading the existing NEC shoreline route and the addition of a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line into the NEC, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield. It does not include a line connecting Hartford and Providence. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.</p> <p>The FRA noted views expressed about connections to UCONN and Hartford. However, the Preferred Alternative does not include the route to UCONN as envisioned in Alternative 2 and 3. The rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative is provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative. The NEC FUTURE program is focused on corridor-wide solutions for passenger rail improvements, and the selection of the Preferred Alternative does not preclude future consideration of transit or fixed guideway improvements to meet other transportation needs across the Study Area.</p>
Fahl_C	Action plan 3 is ridiculous, and the plan for Philadelphia there is particularly ill thought out and potentially disastrous with all the necessary construction	The Preferred Alternative does not include the new segment routing option to the Market East Station, as proposed in Alternative 3. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative.
Fairben_D	...you now want to put a high speed rail route through these communities.Environmental impact is just one concern. What about the destruction of homes and property that would be necessary to this project? I live a block from the LIRR in Floral Park, this affects me personally. And let's not forget AMTRACK's less than stellar track derailment scorecard. So, I guess the quality of life for those of us along the way is disregarded?	<p>The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative does not include new segments between NYC and Long Island and Long Island and Connecticut via the Long Island Sound or a new Segment via Central Connecticut, as proposed in Alternative 3.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.</p>

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Feakins_Ka	As I understand it, the current proposal of alternative 1 doesn't gain much for the user-in terms of time or cost. Why don't we fiix what we have?	The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative focuses improvements along the existing NEC with targeted new segments, replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Fernandez_We	I think it would be deceptive to portray high speed rail as being a community solution on Long Island. Long Island's approximately 225 miles from end to end. It seems to me the train ought to be able to do it in less than an hour if it were moving at speed. So accordingly, I don't think there's going to be a lot of room there for local stops. So once again, if we're portraying it as a local solution to our transportation issues here, is a bit disingenuous to the public.	<p>The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative does not include new segments between NYC and Long Island and Long Island and Connecticut via the Long Island Sound or a new Segment via Central Connecticut, as proposed in Alternative 3.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.</p>
Fields_He	I am glad to gear that your plans for the future are right on track!! As a summer resident on the Shoreline of Old Lyme , Connecticut, we have seen much devastation from two major storms.Putting the railroad more inland to insure its safety from the rising seas is a smart thing to do.	The FRA considered both opposing and supporting views on the NEC FUTURE program in preparing the Tier 1 Final EIS and identifying a Preferred Alternative. Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative that improves the existing NEC to a state of good repair and includes new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Fisk_Ri	Why don't you leave the process of education to itself and find another alternative. There are other ways you can go I'm sure it doesn't take a rocket scientist to figure it out. Call if you need some help. Please don't make it more complicated than it really is	The FRA considered both opposing and supporting views on the NEC FUTURE program in preparing the Tier 1 Final EIS and identifying a Preferred Alternative. Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative that improves the existing NEC to a state of good repair and includes new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Flannigan_Li	I disagree with the proposal through Milford, CT. Our city is over 350 years old and you will destroy much history.	<p>The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative does not include new segments between NYC and Long Island and Long Island and Connecticut via the Long Island Sound or a new Segment via Central Connecticut, as proposed in Alternative 3.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.</p>
Flay_Ni	I am opposed to alternative I.	The FRA noted public concerns about Action Alternatives. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to best meet the service needs of specific markets and avoid environmental constraints. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.
Floroff_Pa	Now I'm going to say that I do strongly support Alternative 3 for the simple fact that it would be a lot more convenient for me to go to and from anywhere in the country without having to go into New York City. My local Long Island Railroad branch sometimes on weekends can be as much an 130 minute interval between trains. And as a result, I usually get driven to one of the other surrounding stations. In this plan I notice that there's a potential first station in the Nassau Hub area. From my house to Nassau Hub takes about 20 minutes. To go from my house to New York to Penn Station, regardless of what station I use, takes over an hour.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The cost of a full high-speed second spine along with existing NEC improvements, as proposed by Alternative 3, is very high relative to the projected ridership benefits. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. Limited-stop Intercity-Express service envisioned for the Preferred Alternative would offer very competitive trip times at a substantially smaller investment than the capacity necessary to provide for high-speed rail service on a dedicated second spine. The FRA noted public concerns about the route from New York City to Hartford via Long Island as proposed in Alternative 3. In light of these and other considerations, the Preferred Alternative does not include this route.</p> <p>While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions.</p>
Flueckiger_Mo	Improved rail is necessary to maintain and grow the CT Shoreline economy. Doing little will drive the population of young folks out as there will continue to be poor economic opportunities in CT. If Shoreline communities are distracted by nostalgia and frightened by city folk the area will continue to decline.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers.</p> <p>In Connecticut, the existing NEC shoreline route will be upgraded with a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative also incorporates enhanced electrified service along the Hartford/Springfield Line which strengthens service to Central New England and leverages existing investments and identified market opportunities.</p>

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Fochesto_Ga	I am writing, as a resident of Garden City, NY, to express my opposition to your proposed high speed rail line through my community and through a beautiful county park (Eisenhower Park).	<p>The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative does not include new segments between NYC and Long Island and Long Island and Connecticut via the Long Island Sound or a new Segment via Central Connecticut, as proposed in Alternative 3.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.</p>
Foehr_Al	I oppose any improvements or additions to the NEC that would include a route through Nassau County, Long Island and the Long Island Sound	<p>The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative does not include new segments between NYC and Long Island and Long Island and Connecticut via the Long Island Sound or a new Segment via Central Connecticut, as proposed in Alternative 3.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.</p>
Foehr_Ma	A train already exists from New York to Hempstead. Less than 2 miles north is the main LIRR line through New Hyde Park + Mineola. This line has express trains The planned route through Garden City will not only impact Garden City residents property taxes and businesses negatively. This plan will also negatively impact the wells located along this route + playgrounds schools. The noise level will increase significantly.	<p>The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative does not include new segments between NYC and Long Island and Long Island and Connecticut via the Long Island Sound or a new Segment via Central Connecticut, as proposed in Alternative 3.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.</p>

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Foehr_Me	I am opposed to any improvements or additions to the NEC that would bring a route through Long Island, NY, especially the alternative that includes a route through Nassau County, NY and the Long Island Sound	<p>The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative does not include new segments between NYC and Long Island and Long Island and Connecticut via the Long Island Sound or a new Segment via Central Connecticut, as proposed in Alternative 3.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.</p>
Foehr_Me	I am opposed to an NEC Future expansion through Nassau + Suffolk County, N.Y. The proposed route through Long Island would be of no benefit to Nassau County...The proposed route would pass directly through the Village of Garden City and through this historical district. The Village receives it water from ten (10) underground artesian wells and has 104 miles of water pipes and 91 miles of sewer mains, all of which would be disrupted....Any route through the Village of Garden Siy would be disasterous to home values. In addition, Eisenhower Park in Nassau County contains the last 19 acres of the Hempstead Plains, the only true prairie east of the Appachians that used to be over 600,000 acres.	<p>The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative does not include new segments between NYC and Long Island and Long Island and Connecticut via the Long Island Sound or a new Segment via Central Connecticut, as proposed in Alternative 3.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.</p>
Forte_St	I am very much opposed to the proposed invasion of Amtrak into residential Long Island. I am particularly opposed to Alternative Number 3 contemplating railroad service through the heart of Garden City and other residential communities.	The Preferred Alternative does not include the new segment routing option on Long Island, as proposed in Alternative 3. The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative.

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Foster_Aa	Alternatives 2 and 3 and their connection to UConn is a great idea and would provide new routes and accessibility to the region. I highly urge the FRA to consider these alternatives as the recommended option.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative includes upgrading the existing NEC shoreline route and the addition of a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line into the NEC, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield. It does not include a line connecting Hartford and Providence. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.</p> <p>The FRA noted views expressed about connections to UCONN and Hartford. However, the Preferred Alternative does not include the route to UCONN as envisioned in Alternative 2 and 3. The rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative is provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative. The NEC FUTURE program is focused on corridor-wide solutions for passenger rail improvements, and the selection of the Preferred Alternative does not preclude future consideration of transit or fixed guideway improvements to meet other transportation needs across the Study Area.</p>
Frascogna_Ma	I am a resident of Garden City and am opposed to the Alternative 3 .	<p>The Preferred Alternative does not include the new segment routing option on Long Island, as proposed in Alternative 3. The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative.</p>
Freedman_Sa	And I am here to speak in favor of the transformative alternative to the Northeast corridor. As our population increases, as the earth's temperature increases, we need more reliable, low carbon energy, and that means electrified rail.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The cost of a full high-speed second spine along with existing NEC improvements, as proposed by Alternative 3, is very high relative to the projected ridership benefits. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. Limited-stop Intercity-Express service envisioned for the Preferred Alternative would offer very competitive trip times at a substantially smaller investment than the capacity necessary to provide for high-speed rail service on a dedicated second spine.</p> <p>While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions.</p> <p>The FRA considered environmental effects in the identification and evacuation of the Preferred Alternative. The environmental effects of the Preferred Alternative, including energy and climate change, are discussed in Chapter 7 of Volume 1.</p>

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Fuller_An	While I greatly appreciate the vision to transform rail travel, and I think we should maintain that goal and vision, I think it is unlikely that congress will be allocating the funds for that sort of vision (alternative 3) any time soon. I would like to see a focus on more practical issues (like alternatives 1 &2) instead of the risk of sticker shock from alternative 3 and getting the status quo when congress doesn't bite. Some elements of alternative 3 could certainly be incorporated in other plans, but the sheer amount of tunneling seems unrealistic for our current political dynamic.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Action Alternatives and improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and provides additional capacity to support a faster and far more reliable railroad. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3.
Galli_Vi	Of the alternatives presented, the Alternative #3 is the alternative that is most appropriate... While Alternative #3 is the best alternative presented, it is still far less robust than is ideal, considering that even Alternative 3 would leave the NEC decades behind the development and progress of other industrialized nations' rail systems... As a millennial, I feel strongly that my peers are deeply invested in a robust rail system and the vibrant cities fostered by robust rail systems.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The Preferred Alternative achieves many of the benefits of Alternative 3 with extensive the new segments, conflict free express tracks, and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost than a full second spine. Limited-stop Intercity-Express service envisioned for the Preferred Alternative would offer very competitive trip times at a substantially smaller investment than the capacity necessary to provide for non-stop high-speed rail service on a dedicated second spine. The Preferred Alternative has the potential to accommodate other service plans that feature super-express limited stop services that can offer market dominant travel times and offer potential for higher margin intercity rail products that might attract public-private partnerships. Economic effects of the Preferred Alternative are discussed in Volume 1, Chapter 6. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions.
Galli_Vi	I feel very strongly that it is unadulterated nonsense to use any option other than the third option, which obviously is the most robust alternative that has been presented. Even with the most robust alternative that's been presented, we are still going to be decades behind other peer train systems and other nations. People love to reference Japan. I don't know. But with that being said, I would like that to be captured very clearly that I feel very strongly about the third option.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The Preferred Alternative achieves many of the benefits of Alternative 3 with extensive the new segments, conflict free express tracks, and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost than a full second spine. Limited-stop Intercity-Express service envisioned for the Preferred Alternative would offer very competitive trip times at a substantially smaller investment than the capacity necessary to provide for non-stop high-speed rail service on a dedicated second spine. The Preferred Alternative has the potential to accommodate other service plans that feature super-express limited stop services that can offer market dominant travel times and offer potential for higher margin intercity rail products that might attract public-private partnerships. Economic effects of the Preferred Alternative are discussed in Volume 1, Chapter 6. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions.

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Gallucci_Th	I have looked over the several plans and after considering all of them along with the shifting economics of the state of Connecticut I have to say that I believe that the best plan for the segment that passes through Connecticut would be the plan that has the new rail passing through the state inland through Danbury, Waterbury, and Hartford. I believe this option will be best for Connecticut and the areas served by the rail line because the state currently has and maintains a rail line along the shoreline that is at capacity and would not be easily expanded. The inland portion of Connecticut has been in economic decline for several decades with the exit of manufacturing, the states business unfriendly environment dictates that if people in these areas do not have easy access to employment they will either move to the already overcrowded shore line, or out of state all together. An inland rail line will grant access for both New York and Boston to a huge labor and talent pool, while affording people that current live along the Connecticut shoreline the ability to move inland where their cost of living would be lower. I believe that this plan is not only what is best for Connecticut but the Northeast as a whole.	The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions. The Preferred Alternative is further described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Gara_El	COST concurs with the Lower Connecticut River Council of Governments which recommends investing in the existing rail lines in the Corridor rather than disrupting local economies and smaller communities by cutting through downtowns and established neighborhoods.	The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrades to the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment and replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative provides connections along the existing NEC, along a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT and Kenyon, RI, and along the Hartford/Springfield Line. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The location of and design for the new supplemental segment between Old Saybrook, CT and Kenyon, RI, will be determined in a subsequent Tier 2 planning process. The FRA proposes a commitment to avoid use of an aerial structure through the historic district of Old Lyme, CT.
Gasper_Jo	I am very much in favor of implementing rapid transit systems but understand some of the local concerns residents might have living in small towns on the planned route.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure or alignments. Such decisions are made as part of the subsequent planning processes, which would include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate. Consistent with this process, the FRA developed Representative Routes for the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative, which provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the effects of each alternative. Representative Routes define an envelope within which improvements might occur and whose location and construction type could change during subsequent Tier 2 project analysis.
Gates_Ch	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.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative to improve passenger rail service on the NEC in a manner that will enhance mobility options and expand passenger rail service in support of future population and employment growth in the Study Area. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative provides connections along the existing Northeast Corridor, along a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT and Kenyon, RI, and along the Hartford/Springfield Line.

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
GatewayCC_Halkyard	I do like that little spur that goes to UConn.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative includes upgrading the existing NEC shoreline route and the addition of a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line into the NEC, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield. It does not include a line connecting Hartford and Providence. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.</p> <p>The FRA noted views expressed about connections to UCONN and Hartford. However, the Preferred Alternative does not include the route to UCONN as envisioned in Alternative 2 and 3. The rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative is provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative. The NEC FUTURE program is focused on corridor-wide solutions for passenger rail improvements, and the selection of the Preferred Alternative does not preclude future consideration of transit or fixed guideway improvements to meet other transportation needs across the Study Area.</p>
GatewayCC_Halkyard	I support probably Alternative 2 the best.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives, including Alternative 2, to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers.</p>
Gaudio_Ra	Alternative 2 lies between Alternatives 1 and 3 in terms of environmental impacts. It is unclear, however, why a route that follows the I-84 corridor to Worcester, Massachusetts was not considered or proposed for Alternative 2. By doing this, the rail route would follow existing road infrastructure. This could limit further environmental harm in the area and prevent seemingly needless destruction of undeveloped areas along other proposed routes. For example, the space between Hartford and Providence is largely undeveloped and contains large areas of prime timberland and floodplains.	<p>The FRA’s development of the NEC FUTURE investment program began in 2012 with nearly 100 initial alternatives for improving the NEC. These alternatives were consolidated to 15 Preliminary Alternatives that reflected a full spectrum of possibilities for the NEC. After extensive analysis and public dialogue on the Preliminary Alternatives, the FRA developed a No Action and three Action Alternatives for evaluation in the Tier 1 Draft EIS. See Volume 2, Appendix B for additional information on the Alternatives Development Process.</p> <p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers.</p> <p>The FRA identified a Preferred Alternative that focuses on leveraging the investment in the existing NEC and Hartford/Springfield Lines over the proposed Hartford-Worcester routing. FRA considered travel time improvements, connectivity, environmental benefits and effects and overall mobility benefits when deciding on a Preferred Alternative. Improved service between Worcester and Boston are being evaluated as part of a separate study effort that was considered in the definition of the Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>Subsequent Tier 2 project studies will include stakeholder and public participation and focus in detail on specific service, routing, and infrastructure requirements.</p>

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Gaudio_Ra	CFE, or Connecticut Fund for the Environment, is particularly concerned about Alternative 3, especially with a potential tunnel being built under Long Island Sound. Long Island Sound is responsible for \$17 to \$36 billion of economic activity in the region and is a valuable resource. ...Generally, CFE is concerned with the environmental impacts and financial costs of Alternative 3.	The Preferred Alternative does not include the new segment routing option on Long Island, as proposed in Alternative 3. The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative.
Gaudio_Ra	Alternative 1 is most consistent with smart growth and existing investment in infrastructure, with the least amount of environmental impact.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives, including Alternative 1, to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers.</p> <p>The FRA considered environmental effects in the identification and evaluation of the Preferred Alternative, discussed in Chapter 7 of Volume 1.</p>
Gaudio_Ra	Alternative 2 is a balance between Alternatives 1 and 3 in terms of environmental impacts; however, the NEC should consider putting a line through Worcester. This route would go along the 84 interstate transit infrastructure that already exists, thus limiting environmental harm.	The Preferred Alternative does not include routing option to Worcester, as considered in Alternative 3. The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrades to the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment. By replacing aging infrastructure and eliminating chokepoints, train service will be faster and far more reliable. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.
Gaudio_Ra	...the Final EIS should balance environmental impacts against improvements and the money that you are both spending and receiving. The benefits, both financial and environmental, seem to favor Alternative 1.	The FRA considered environmental effects along with cost and performance in the identification and evaluation of the Preferred Alternative, discussed in Volume 1, Chapter 7. Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives, including Alternative 1, to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers.
Gaudio_Ra	Alternative 1 would result in the fewest environmental impacts, and is most consistent with smart growth and existing investment in infrastructure. This alternative would be synergistic with and build upon the gains in Governor Malloy 's "Let 's Go CT" Transportation Plan... Alternative 1 seems consistent with and builds upon these called-for improvements.	The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrades to the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment. By replacing aging infrastructure and eliminating chokepoints, train service will be faster and far more reliable. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.
Gaudio_Ra	We urge you to rule out blasting a tunnel under Long Island Sound, as proposed in Alternative 3.	<p>The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative does not include new segments between NYC and Long Island and Long Island and Connecticut via the Long Island Sound or a new Segment via Central Connecticut, as proposed in Alternative 3.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.</p>

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Gaynor_Ma	I would hope that alternative 2 can do less damage and have moreadvantage to all concerns without hurting the environment as much	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives, including Alternative 2, to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers.</p> <p>The environmental effects of the Preferred Alternative are discussed in Chapter 7 of Volume 1.</p>
Geer_Ge	Alternative 2 along I-91 to Hartford makes more sense because that line is already there. The line can then be built to Providence.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives, including Alternative 2, to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. It does not include a routing option through Storrs, as considered in Alternative 2 and 3. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.</p> <p>In Connecticut, the existing NEC shoreline route will be upgraded with a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative also incorporates enhanced electrified service along the Hartford/Springfield Line in order to strengthen service to Central New England and leverage existing investments and identified market opportunities.</p>
Gentry_Ad	I believe sending the train through, or in the general vicinity of Hartford, would be a superior choice, with less negative impact on environmental and cultural locations in Connecticut. A Hartford focused pathway would also create a much more direct line, adding to current efforts focused on developing Hartford as a destination for commerce and industry. Since Hartford is a very dense location, there would probably be merit in having the train stop there, creating more opportunities for commerce and tourism in an already developed area	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers.</p> <p>In Connecticut, the existing NEC shoreline route will be upgraded with a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative also incorporates enhanced electrified service along the Hartford/Springfield Line which strengthens service to Central New England and leverages existing investments and identified market opportunities.</p>
Geraghty_Ph	Rail travel is essential to growth within the Northeast and, the NEC represents the largest link in a chain that has potential to change the region from sprawling suburbs with massive traffic issues to a true economic hub with ties to all of the country. Rail can connect small cities such as my own (Burlington, VT) to New York and, Boston with relative ease with the right improvements. Currently it takes approx 9 hours from Essex Junct VT to Penn station by train and 5 by car. and 13 hours from Essex Junction VT to Boston by train and 3.5 by car. Invest in the NEC and drop those times!!!!	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative to improve passenger rail service on the NEC in a manner that will enhance mobility options and expand passenger rail service in support of future population and employment growth in the Study Area. The Preferred Alternative has high-speed capacity and reduces trip times along the corridor. The Preferred Alternative is further described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Ghirardi_La	If you must put one in, connect Hartford with Providence RI	The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. The Preferred Alternative expands the level of service on the existing NEC between New Haven and Boston, resulting in increased intercity and regional service at the existing New London Union Station. In addition, a new supplemental segment will be added between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as considered under Alternative 1. Trains using the new segment would serve the New London/Mystic station. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line into the NEC, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield. It does not include a line connecting Hartford and Providence. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. NEC FUTURE is utilizing existing rail corridor as it did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions. The Preferred Alternative is further described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Giarratana_Ge	I am concerned about proposed rail line that utilizes the Hempstead line of the LIRR,and if this goes through(implementation/construction) How does it impact my village(Floral Park). Much hysteria about this proposal from community and community leaders	<p>The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative does not include new segments between NYC and Long Island and Long Island and Connecticut via the Long Island Sound or a new Segment via Central Connecticut, as proposed in Alternative 3.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.</p>
Gillan_Ma	Please do not choose to run train tracks through the university campus	The FRA considered both opposing and supporting views on the NEC FUTURE program in preparing the Tier 1 Final EIS and identifying a Preferred Alternative. Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative that improves the existing NEC to a state of good repair and includes new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Gilmour_To	NEC needs transformative rail investment to bring the region up to a level of connectivity that European and Asian cities have benefitting from for decades.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative to improve passenger rail service on the NEC in a manner that will enhance mobility options and expand passenger rail service in support of future population and employment growth in the Study Area. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Giuffrida_Sh	I am absolutely against this idea. LI is one of the most expensive places in America to live, we don't need Amtrak barreling through our beautiful, peaceful, family oriented town.	<p>The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative does not include new segments between NYC and Long Island and Long Island and Connecticut via the Long Island Sound or a new Segment via Central Connecticut, as proposed in Alternative 3.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.</p>
Gniazdowski_St	I support the full expansion of the Northeast corridor to add new routes. We need this to reduce our reliance on air travel and car travel.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative is competitive with other modes and combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers.
Gold_To	...I would love to see Option 3, the high-speed alternative, if -- and this is a big if -- if it works okay on the ground.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The Preferred Alternative achieves many of the benefits of Alternative 3 with extensive the new segments, conflict free express tracks, and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost than a full second spine. Limited-stop Intercity-Express service envisioned for the Preferred Alternative would offer very competitive trip times at a substantially smaller investment than the capacity necessary to provide for non-stop high-speed rail service on a dedicated second spine. The Preferred Alternative has the potential to accommodate other service plans that feature super-express limited stop services that can offer market dominant travel times and offer potential for higher margin intercity rail products that might attract public-private partnerships. Economic effects of the Preferred Alternative are discussed in Volume 1, Chapter 6.</p> <p>While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions.</p>
Gold_To	...the right-of-way ought to be chosen with great care. For example, it should not go through any town centers that it doesn't stop at.	As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, and will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure. Such decisions would be made as part of the Tier 2 project planning processes, which would include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate.

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Gold_To	I would love to see it come to Hartford. I would love Hartford to benefit from being on the Northeast Corridor, but I wouldn't want it to split the city in half as the I-84 right-of-way did.	The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. The Preferred Alternative expands the level of service on the existing NEC between New Haven and Boston, resulting in increased intercity and regional service at the existing New London Union Station. In addition, a new supplemental segment will be added between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as considered under Alternative 1. Trains using the new segment would serve the New London/Mystic station. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line into the NEC, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield. It does not include a line connecting Hartford and Providence. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. NEC FUTURE is utilizing existing rail corridor as it did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions. The Preferred Alternative is further described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Gold_To	One thought is that a new Amtrak right-of-way might be put within the median of I-84. And I think this should be seriously considered. But my point overall is that if we're to get the benefits of high-speed rail, and particularly of better rail service of any kind, we have to be very careful about how it works on the ground and how it affects the communities. I would opt for few stops and very well-designed intermodal locations where it does stop.	As a result of the Tier 1 Draft EIS and the public comment process, the FRA has identified a Preferred Alternative to improve passenger rail service on the NEC in a manner that will enhance mobility options and expand passenger rail service in support of future population and employment growth in the Study Area. The Preferred Alternative, described in Volume 1, Chapter 4, improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. Limited-stop Intercity-Express service envisioned for the Preferred Alternative would offer very competitive trip times at a substantially smaller investment than the capacity necessary to provide for non-stop high-speed rail service on a dedicated second spine. The Preferred Alternative has the potential to accommodate other service plans that feature super-express limited stop services that can offer market dominant travel times and offer potential for higher margin intercity rail products that might attract public-private partnerships. As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, and will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure. Such decisions would be made as part of the Tier 2 project studies, which would include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate.
Gore_Me	I oppose!! (commentor located in Bethpage, Long Island)	The Preferred Alternative does not include the new segment routing option on Long Island, as proposed in Alternative 3. The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative.

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Gotowka_Ch	Plan two makes so much more sense. Connecting Storrs with Boston offers more gains for economic development and supporting all the thousands of \$\$\$ invested in the UConn campus.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative includes upgrading the existing NEC shoreline route and the addition of a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line into the NEC, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield. It does not include a line connecting Hartford and Providence. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.</p> <p>The FRA noted views expressed about connections to UCONN and Hartford. However, the Preferred Alternative does not include the route to UCONN as envisioned in Alternative 2 and 3. The rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative is provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative. The NEC FUTURE program is focused on corridor-wide solutions for passenger rail improvements, and the selection of the Preferred Alternative does not preclude future consideration of transit or fixed guideway improvements to meet other transportation needs across the Study Area.</p>
Gottesman_Je	I am writing to commend the Federal Railroad Administration and its consultants on the content of the NEC Future Tier 1 Environmental Impact Study, specifically the identification of Secaucus Junction, in all three Action Alternatives, as a hub station where future intercity rail services would stop. We fully agree with the DEIS finding that intercity rail service stops at Secaucus Junction would fill a major gap in the connectivity of the Northeast Corridor. With stops at Secaucus Junction, easy rail connections could then be made from populous, northern Hudson County (including Hoboken) and from all the numerous markets served by NJ TRANSIT 's Bergen County, Main and Pascack Valley lines as well as Metro-North 's Port Jervis Line. This intermodal connectivity would make Northeast Corridor intercity rail service more accessible for hundreds of thousands of people living in communities in northern Jersey and adjacent New York counties of the Hudson River looking for increased business and leisure mobility.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative includes service to Secaucus Station to provide more direct one-seat connections. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Grace_Pa	We need to bring Amtrak to Long Island and expand LIRR, especially electrification to revert the Long Island economy from imploding. We also need the car tunnels.	<p>The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative does not include new segments between NYC and Long Island and Long Island and Connecticut via the Long Island Sound or a new Segment via Central Connecticut, as proposed in Alternative 3.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.</p>

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Graham_Da	The general idea of a rail system connecting Storrs, Providence, etc. is a great idea for connecting Storrs to major cities in the region.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative includes upgrading the existing NEC shoreline route and the addition of a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line into the NEC, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield. It does not include a line connecting Hartford and Providence. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.</p> <p>The FRA noted views expressed about connections to UCONN and Hartford. However, the Preferred Alternative does not include the route to UCONN as envisioned in Alternative 2 and 3. The rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative is provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative. The NEC FUTURE program is focused on corridor-wide solutions for passenger rail improvements, and the selection of the Preferred Alternative does not preclude future consideration of transit or fixed guideway improvements to meet other transportation needs across the Study Area.</p>
Graham_Me	We are writing to express great disapproval of the FRA's proposal of a high speed train running through Garden City, NY, on Long Island. This would be devastating to a very historical, peaceful and productive community. The traffic, noise, danger to pedestrians, disruption of travel, and sheer presence of a train cutting through the heart of the town are all reasons to dismiss this proposal. Please note that we strongly oppose Alternative 3 to the Federal Railroad Association.	The Preferred Alternative does not include the new segment routing option on Long Island, as proposed in Alternative 3. The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative.
Graham_Ro	Please do what ever is needed to enhance the ride quality and efficiency of travel in the corridor. A dedicated track for trains to run express.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. The Preferred Alternative reduces trip time from Washington, D.C. to Boston. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.
Grande_Sh	fix what we have now	The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrades to the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment. By replacing aging infrastructure and eliminating chokepoints, train service will be faster and far more reliable. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.
Grant_Je	I believe the wisest choice is to focus on routes through CT away from the vulnerable shoreline and go through Hartford.	The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrading the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment. It also incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line to provide one-seat ride service to and from the NEC and Hartford and Springfield. More information on the Preferred Alternative can be found in Volume 1, Chapter 4.

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Griswold_Da	Alternative 2 would allow for more customers including the students at the University of Connecticut who would utilize that line far more than local towns.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative includes upgrading the existing NEC shoreline route and the addition of a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line into the NEC, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield. It does not include a line connecting Hartford and Providence. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.</p> <p>The FRA noted views expressed about connections to UCONN and Hartford. However, the Preferred Alternative does not include the route to UCONN as envisioned in Alternative 2 and 3. The rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative is provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative. The NEC FUTURE program is focused on corridor-wide solutions for passenger rail improvements, and the selection of the Preferred Alternative does not preclude future consideration of transit or fixed guideway improvements to meet other transportation needs across the Study Area.</p>
Griswold_Je	The Tier 1 Draft EIS raises many questions and provides little in the way of answers. A tunnel under Long Island Sound from LI to Milford? A very bad idea! Leave The Sound out of it, please! Billions of dollars to save a half hour in travel time? hmmm... More information, more transparency, less surreptitious handling of the information please.	<p>The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative does not include new segments between NYC and Long Island and Long Island and Connecticut via the Long Island Sound or a new Segment via Central Connecticut, as proposed in Alternative 3.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.</p>

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Groth_An	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.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative includes upgrading the existing NEC shoreline route and the addition of a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line into the NEC, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield. It does not include a line connecting Hartford and Providence. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.</p> <p>The FRA noted views expressed about connections to UCONN and Hartford. However, the Preferred Alternative does not include the route to UCONN as envisioned in Alternative 2 and 3. The rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative is provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative. The NEC FUTURE program is focused on corridor-wide solutions for passenger rail improvements, and the selection of the Preferred Alternative does not preclude future consideration of transit or fixed guideway improvements to meet other transportation needs across the Study Area.</p>
Groth_Ke	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.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative includes upgrading the existing NEC shoreline route and the addition of a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line into the NEC, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield. It does not include a line connecting Hartford and Providence. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.</p> <p>The FRA noted views expressed about connections to UCONN and Hartford. However, the Preferred Alternative does not include the route to UCONN as envisioned in Alternative 2 and 3. The rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative is provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative. The NEC FUTURE program is focused on corridor-wide solutions for passenger rail improvements, and the selection of the Preferred Alternative does not preclude future consideration of transit or fixed guideway improvements to meet other transportation needs across the Study Area.</p>

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Groth_Ma	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.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative includes upgrading the existing NEC shoreline route and the addition of a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line into the NEC, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield. It does not include a line connecting Hartford and Providence. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.</p> <p>The FRA noted views expressed about connections to UCONN and Hartford. However, the Preferred Alternative does not include the route to UCONN as envisioned in Alternative 2 and 3. The rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative is provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative. The NEC FUTURE program is focused on corridor-wide solutions for passenger rail improvements, and the selection of the Preferred Alternative does not preclude future consideration of transit or fixed guideway improvements to meet other transportation needs across the Study Area.</p>
Groth_Sy	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.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative includes upgrading the existing NEC shoreline route and the addition of a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line into the NEC, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield. It does not include a line connecting Hartford and Providence. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.</p> <p>The FRA noted views expressed about connections to UCONN and Hartford. However, the Preferred Alternative does not include the route to UCONN as envisioned in Alternative 2 and 3. The rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative is provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative. The NEC FUTURE program is focused on corridor-wide solutions for passenger rail improvements, and the selection of the Preferred Alternative does not preclude future consideration of transit or fixed guideway improvements to meet other transportation needs across the Study Area.</p>
Guizol_Ja	We need better connection by train. We do lot need to take historical (in center of town) or recreational space (close to water and beaches) to do so... Having the Shoreline connection to go to NY has been a +. So please keep improving without scarifying what is essential: our way of life	The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrading the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment. It also incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line to provide one-seat ride service to and from the NEC and Hartford and Springfield. More information on the Preferred Alternative can be found in Volume 1, Chapter 4.

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Hackett_Ei	This is a BAD idea. There are so few beautiful places left in Connecticut. Don't ruin another one	The FRA recognizes that there are sensitive resources such as those associated with local communities, wildlife refuges and habitat corridor wide. The FRA has identified a Preferred Alternative that minimizes impacts to wildlife refuge, wetlands, communities, water resources and ecological resources. Volume 1, Chapter 4 describes the Preferred Alternative.
Hadlock_Ke	I agree with inland alternatives that will provide much-needed rail service connections such as along the I-91 corridor to Hartford and then to points east.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives, including Alternatives 2 and 3, to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.</p> <p>In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative provides connections along the existing Northeast Corridor, along a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT and Kenyon, RI, and along the Hartford/Springfield Line which strengthens service to Central New England and leverages existing investments and identified market opportunities.</p>
Haigh_Va	I strongly oppose Alternative 1.	The FRA noted public concerns about Action Alternatives. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to best meet the service needs of specific markets and avoid environmental constraints. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.
Haikalis_Ge	Add selected high speed segments with maximum speed of 168 mph (270 km/h). If a long enough segment of new alignment can be secured in eastern Connecticut to bypass the sinuous coastal route then a higher top speed becomes feasible. consideration should be given to operating half of the NY-Boston trains by way of the more heavily populated Inland Route serving Hartford, Springfield and Worcester...	The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. A new supplemental segment will be added between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as considered under Alternative 1. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line into the NEC, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions. The Preferred Alternative is further described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Haines_Ba	As a former 20 year resident of Fairfield County and now a 10 year resident of Middlesex County in CT, I strongly support investment in the Northeast Rail Corridor. Alternative 2 has my vote for it's link to Central CT. This looks like it would improve public transport access to the Hartford area, Bradley Airport and UConn. This would be of great benefit to the state of CT.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative includes upgrading the existing NEC shoreline route and the addition of a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line into the NEC, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield. It does not include a line connecting Hartford and Providence. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.</p> <p>The FRA noted views expressed about connections to UCONN and Hartford. However, the Preferred Alternative does not include the route to UCONN as envisioned in Alternative 2 and 3. The rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative is provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative. The NEC FUTURE program is focused on corridor-wide solutions for passenger rail improvements, and the selection of the Preferred Alternative does not preclude future consideration of transit or fixed guideway improvements to meet other transportation needs across the Study Area.</p>
Hale_Ro	... the cost/benefit analysis stacks up strongly in favor of a bold action that involves in large part a bypass around the existing Northeast Corridor to take traffic off of our roads and out of our airports and reduce emissions that are significantly affecting quality of life in this area, as well as the environment in a negative way.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative to improve passenger rail service on the NEC in a manner that will enhance mobility options and expand passenger rail service in support of future population and employment growth in the Study Area. The Preferred Alternative, described in Volume 1, Chapter 4, improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects.</p> <p>While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.</p>

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Hale_Ro	...we are not going to get a WAS-BOS trip time reduction of 2h30 just with low-cost, low-impact tweaks to the Shoreline from New Rochelle to Rhode Island as contemplated in Alternative 1. Indeed, the bypass around New London would be the height of wastefulness, as it would traverse terrain that is just as difficult as that further inland while still locking all trains into using most of the Shore Line/ New Haven line between New York and Boston. Moreover, few to no new travel markets would be opened up.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit. It brings the existing NEC to a state of good repair and maximizes its capacity through alleviation of chokepoints, addition of new tracks and segments at targeted locations, and implementation of service operational efficiencies while minimizing impacts to local communities and resources corridor wide. The Preferred Alternative also removes speed restrictions where practical and safe, reduces trip times, offers frequent Metropolitan and enhanced express Intercity services, and allows substantial growth for all Regional rail markets. In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative includes upgrading the existing NEC shoreline route and the addition of a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line into the NEC, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield. It does not include a line connecting Hartford and Providence. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.
Hale_Ro	...the only alternative that allows the Northeast Corridor north of New York to reach its full potential is Alternative 3. It is the only alternative that brings end-to-end travel times in line with those achievable on other corridors of similar length elsewhere on the planet. When one looks at the \$300B price tag spread over at least 30 years and many entities, the yearly economic output of the Northeast as it stands dwarfs that number. Moreover, the economic output that additional travel opportunities presented by a real HSR spine can be expected to unlock are massive. Hours will be cut off the travel times from inland Connecticut to destinations elsewhere in the Northeast, and trips that are not practical by rail today will be opened up. ... As much as the financial, geographic, legal, etc. obstacles to Alternative 3 are great, many of our peers in the G-20 have successfully navigated the same obstacles. Advancing any alternative besides Alternative 3 would be the height of myopia and a disservice to the NEC Future process as well as an unacceptable missed opportunity for our environment.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The Preferred Alternative achieves many of the benefits of Alternative 3 with extensive the new segments, conflict free express tracks, and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost than a full second spine. Limited-stop Intercity-Express service envisioned for the Preferred Alternative would offer very competitive trip times at a substantially smaller investment than the capacity necessary to provide for non-stop high-speed rail service on a dedicated second spine. The Preferred Alternative has the potential to accommodate other service plans that feature super-express limited stop services that can offer market dominant travel times and offer potential for higher margin intercity rail products that might attract public-private partnerships.</p> <p>While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions.</p>

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Hannon_Lo	Bringing high speed rail to and through Long Island is good and necessary.	<p>The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative does not include new segments between NYC and Long Island and Long Island and Connecticut via the Long Island Sound or a new Segment via Central Connecticut, as proposed in Alternative 3.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.</p>
Harbour_Wi	Not only is it unacceptable to simply maintain existing infrastructure, but even a small build initiative does nothing but shackle perhaps the greatest economic region in the world. It is our civic duty to faciliate, in a responsible manner, the development of this region to keep America at the forefront of economic development, innovation and the seamless flow of ideas. Nothing will facilitate that more than world-class rail travel along the corridor. Anything short of a vote for the most progressive development of the NEC is a vote against the future of America. Whatever the cost of developing this corridor pales in comparison to the damage that will be done to our economic development if the project does not move forward quickly, effectively and correctly.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.
Harmon_Ma	We need a fast train from DC - NY - Boston, with no other stops.	As described in Volume 2, Chapter 3, Purpose and Need, the purpose of the NEC FUTURE rail investment program is to upgrade aging infrastructure and to improve the reliability, capacity, connectivity, performance, and resiliency of passenger rail service on the NEC. The FRA developed representative Service Plans which include service frequencies, stopping patterns, train routings, and rolling stock characteristics in order to assess their ability to achieve efficient use of proposed rail infrastructure capacity and to serve the NEC's rail travel markets. The Service Plans are representational only and consistent with a Tier 1 level of detail, required for analysis of capacity, performance, and costs, as well as assessment of the environmental impacts associated with planned improvements. Limited-stop Intercity-Express service envisioned for the Preferred Alternative would offer very competitive trip times at a substantially smaller investment than the capacity necessary to provide for non-stop high-speed rail service on a dedicated second spine. The Preferred Alternative has the potential to accommodate other service plans that feature super-express limited stop services that can offer market dominant travel times and offer potential for higher margin intercity rail products that might attract public-private partnerships. Additional information on the representative service plans are included in Volume 1, Appendix BB (Preferred Alternative) and Volume 2, Appendix B (Action Alternatives).

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Hart_Ro	I believe alternative 2 or alternative 3 (either central CT- providence or central CT Worcester) would be the best options	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. As described for Alternative 2, the Preferred Alternative includes additional track in Maryland as well as Rhode Island that would help to relieve conflicts between freight and passenger service where they both operate on the NEC. The Preferred Alternative does not include the new segments between Hartford and Providence, as proposed in Alternative 2. The Preferred Alternative assumes continued use of Penn Station as the primary terminus for New Jersey travelers and includes two additional tunnels under the Hudson River, as proposed in Alternative 2. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions</p> <p>In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative includes upgrading the existing NEC shoreline route and the addition of a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative also incorporates enhanced electrified service along the Hartford/Springfield Line which strengthens service to Central New England and leverages existing investments and identified market opportunities.</p>
Hart_Ro	I am more in favor of alternative 3. As a resident of the Hartford are I would LOVE LOVE LOVE better intercity connections and I know others would too	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.</p> <p>While the Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS, the Preferred Alternative provides connections along the existing Northeast Corridor, along a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT and Kenyon, RI, and incorporates enhanced electrified service along the Hartford/Springfield Line in order to respond to comments received to strengthen service to Central New England and leverage existing investments and identified market opportunities. The incorporation of service along the Hartford/Springfield Line would promote economic development and growth, further discussed in Chapter 6 of Volume 1.</p>
Hart_Ro	Also alternative one seems like putting a piece of tape over a cracked foundation and hoping it holds.	<p>The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit. It brings the existing NEC to a state of good repair and maximizes its capacity through alleviation of chokepoints, addition of new tracks and segments at targeted locations, and implementation of service operational efficiencies while minimizing impacts to local communities and resources corridor wide. The Preferred Alternative also removes speed restrictions where practical and safe, reduces trip times, offers frequent Metropolitan and enhanced express Intercity services, and allows substantial growth for all Regional rail markets. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.</p>

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Hartley_Pa	Please, consider including Western Massachusetts in future planning proposals, namely; Palmer, Amherst, Northampton and Springfield. This area is already laid out well to make realistic and sustainable improvements with worthwhile investment for upgrading. The citizens of these towns, in general, are already working toward moving in the direction of mass transit and consumer sustainability. UMass Amherst and the Five Colleges are leading the way in many areas of the type and excel in comparison to many others in the country with similar future goals. Commuter rail in the area could be the benchmark and supersede ridesharing if it is a proactive plan. The enthusiasm and realistic patronage for such a line is high.	The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrades to the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment. To better serve Central New England, the Preferred Alternative incorporates electrification on the Hartford/Springfield Line, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield on the NEC. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The FRA is coordinating with Massachusetts and Vermont on the Northern New England Intercity Rail Initiative, a separate study, to explore options for improved intercity rail service in New England.
Haven_Pa	An alternatives analysis for the NEC Future is only realistic if it is done in the context of the entire multimodal transportation network, not just the rail network. The analysis must consider what would happen in the rest of the transportation network under each of the NEC Future alternatives. As the region 's population grows, demand for transportation grows, and transportation network capacity will almost certainly increase. If rail capacity does not increase, then road and air capacity will increase - the alternative is economic decline. The question must be this - what is the most efficient way to meet increasing transportation demand of a growing population? Each alternative should bear the cost of the impact on other modes ' capacity. Alternative 1 should bear the cost of increasing roadway and airport capacity to meet increasing demand, since rail capacity increases will be insufficient to meet the demand. For example, how much would it cost to double-deck I-95 and the New Jersey Turnpike? How much would significantly expanding existing airports and building new airports cost? In addition to uncovering the real cost of the NEC Future alternatives, this approach leads to consideration of each alternative 's environmental impacts across all modes. Those impacts include not only direct use of the land needed for the transportation facilities, but also the land use impacts of expanding each particular mode. Expanding rail capacity moves more people from city center to city center, supporting efficient community development. Expanding highway capacity results in sprawl, and the inherent higher rate of spending for infrastructure that such development inevitably requires. Concurrently, rail and urbanization reduce emissions from the transportation sector, directly because modern passenger rail is powered by electricity, while ubiquitous electrification of auto and air transportation are still aspirations, decades behind rail.	The NEC FUTURE program is focused on improvements to passenger rail. While the condition of and planned improvements to other modes were important considerations to development of the Preferred Alternative, the analysis was not intended to provide a regional assessment of how to optimize improvements to all modes of transportation to meet regional transportation needs. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. Consideration of other modes in evaluation of the Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 5 and for the Action Alternatives in Volume 2, Chapter 5. Additionally the environmental impacts are described in Volumes 1 and 2, Chapter 7 for the Preferred and Action Alternatives respectively.
Hawkins Lecce_Je	I support Alternative 2 and Alternative 3. Not including Middletown, Meriden, Hartford in an expansion of service is unthinkable.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives, including Alternatives 2 and 3, to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions. In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative provides connections along the existing Northeast Corridor, along a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT and Kenyon, RI, and along the Hartford/Springfield Line which strengthens service to Central New England and leverages existing investments and identified market opportunities. Stations included in the Preferred Alternative, on the Hartford/Springfield Line, are listed in Chapter 4 of Volume 1.
Hefler_Pe	The NEC is a life line for travel from DC to Boston. It is time to really start to upgrade the NEC. I honestly think that it would be a bad move to create a new Corridor, cost would be unbelievable. If the current NEC could be upgraded to 2and a half hours from BOS to NYC and the same for NYC to DC we would have a corridor that would be close to approaching other rail systems. That should be the goal. Cost of a new corridor would be just too much.	The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrading the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment. It does not include a second spine. However, additional trackage and segments are included to add capacity, improve trip time, and eliminate chokepoints. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Hegarty_Da	The proposed cost of this crazy plan is astronomical and that would be so even without the usual cost over runs. You would in addition be laying waste to all the lovely communities in and adjacent to this corridor. HOW DISGUSTING !!!!! My entire family, my neighbors & I are adamantly opposed to this ludicrous, nightmare of a so called plan.	The FRA considered both opposing and supporting views on the NEC FUTURE program in preparing the Tier 1 Final EIA and identifying a Preferred Alternative. Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative that improves the existing NEC to a state of good repair and includes new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Hicks_Li	I oppose Alternative 1.	The FRA noted public concerns about Action Alternatives. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to best meet the service needs of specific markets and avoid environmental constraints. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.
Hess_Da	Alternative 3 would be an unsuitable choice for all Long Islanders, especially neighborhoods where a high speed train will be cutting through people's backyards. As a homeowner in Garden City I am vehemently opposed to the idea of this train running through our village and effecting residents personally, environmentally and economically.	The Preferred Alternative does not include the new segment routing option on Long Island, as proposed in Alternative 3. The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative.
Hill_Ra	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.	The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. The Preferred Alternative expands the level of service on the existing NEC between New Haven and Boston, resulting in increased intercity and regional service at the existing New London Union Station. In addition, a new supplemental segment will be added between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as considered under Alternative 1. Trains using the new segment would serve the New London/Mystic station. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line into the NEC, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield. It does not include a line connecting Hartford and Providence. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. NEC FUTURE is utilizing existing rail corridor as it did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions. The Preferred Alternative is further described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Hirsch_Mi	Any rerouting of a highway or railway is going to be met with protests from NIMBYs and existing route stakeholders. We cannot let what was (difficult to maintain, sustain, and upgrade to true high speed trackage) define what will be (an even more successful NEC). Connecticut is a crossroads of startups and residents working in NYC and Boston, doing multiple weekly commutes via Shore Line East and Amtrak. The punishingly slow rail speeds in Connecticut due to 150 year-old rail routes lead people to drive instead of ride. We need to respect small communities but recognize that the NEC needs a routing refresh.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative to improve passenger rail service on the NEC in a manner that will enhance mobility options and expand passenger rail service in support of future population and employment growth in the Study Area. The Preferred Alternative, described in Volume 1, Chapter 4, improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative provides connections along the existing Northeast Corridor, along a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT and Kenyon, RI, and along the Hartford/Springfield Line.

Table JJ-5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Hochman_Jo	In particular the Inland Route to Boston should be re-established to increase capacity and provide better service to Central Connecticut, Western Massachusetts and Boston's western suburbs.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. In Massachusetts, the Preferred Alternative provides connections along the existing Northeast Corridor and along the Hartford/Springfield Line.</p> <p>While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.</p>
Hood_Be	Palmer is a planned stop on the Inland Route from Boston to New Haven. Restoring local and regional passenger rail service to our part of Central/Western Massachusetts will extend the benefits of improved transportation from Worcester through Palmer to Springfield, a region that is home to the largest populations of residents and students west of Boston. The NNEIRI plan is ready to go; and we are waiting for it to be implemented to benefit those of us left behind by decades of economic decline and bureaucratic neglect. The East-West route through Palmer will also connect to the Knowledge Corridor line, providing a much-needed regional economic boost to the Pioneer Valley, of which we are part. There is no reason to delay on the NNEIRI plan, since the plan requires only upgrades to existing tracks from Worcester to Springfield. Please fast track passenger rail in an area where it will have a huge impact for a lot of people!	The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrades to the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment. To better serve Central New England, the Preferred Alternative incorporates electrification on the Hartford/Springfield Line, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield on the NEC. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The FRA is coordinating with Massachusetts and Vermont on the Northern New England Intercity Rail Initiative, a separate study, to explore options for improved intercity rail service in New England.
Hood_Ed	...MassConn favors Alternative 1 that mostly follows current railway lines, but makes many necessary improvements to increase passenger rail for the future.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives, including Alternative 1, to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers.
Horan-Silva_Ka	...the changes proposed by one or more of the options for high speed rail service have no respect or regard for the people and places where these rail lines will be built. Would you build a rail line that cut right through the south lawn of the White House? Of course not! Then you should have as much respect for the property that will be impacted by the current proposals. I, for one, am vehemently opposed to the plans as they are currently presented.	The FRA recognizes that there are sensitive resources such as those associated with local communities, wildlife refuges and habitat corridor wide. The FRA has identified a Preferred Alternative that minimizes impacts to wildlife refuge, wetlands, communities, water resources and ecological resources. Volume 1, Chapter 4 describes the Preferred Alternative.
Horn_Ja	I strongly oppose any expansion of Anrak through the Nassau County region	The Preferred Alternative does not include the new segment routing option on Long Island, as proposed in Alternative 3. The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative.

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Horowitz_Ma	I support alternative 3.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. The Preferred Alternative achieves many of the benefits of Alternative 3 with extensive the new segments, conflict free express tracks, and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost than a full second spine. Limited-stop Intercity-Express service envisioned for the Preferred Alternative would offer very competitive trip times at a substantially smaller investment than the capacity necessary to provide for non-stop high-speed rail service on a dedicated second spine. The Preferred Alternative has the potential to accommodate other service plans that feature super-express limited stop services that can offer market dominant travel times and offer potential for higher margin intercity rail products that might attract public-private partnerships.</p> <p>While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions.</p>
Horowitz_Ma	Added "inland" service will help reduce traffic and expand economic opportunities.	<p>The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.</p>
Horvath_Ma	I support the alternative plan. There should be no train going through the campus.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. The FRA noted the concerns expressed regarding the impact through central Connecticut as proposed in Alternative 3 between New York City and Hartford, CT. The Preferred Alternative does not include this route. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.</p>
Hosack_Su	Alternatives 2 or 3 are better choices for the future of train transportation in the Northeastern corridor	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives, including Alternatives 2 and 3, to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.</p>

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Howat_Ca	Run thr raikroad through Hartford to get to Boston. That way we preserve our coastline and it is a natural, normsl line between NY and Boston. CT is small and people who need to got to these two cities can pickup the train in central CT really easily. Keep the coast rail "scenic" only.I Ri is too tiny to worry about rail destination.	The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. The Preferred Alternative expands the level of service on the existing NEC between New Haven and Boston, resulting in increased intercity and regional service at the existing New London Union Station. In addition, a new supplemental segment will be added between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as considered under Alternative 1. Trains using the new segment would serve the New London/Mystic station. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line into the NEC, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield. It does not include a line connecting Hartford and Providence. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. NEC FUTURE is utilizing existing rail corridor as it did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions. The Preferred Alternative is further described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Hughes_Jo	My preference is for alternative 3 minus the connection from Suffolk County, NY to New Haven, CT.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. The cost of a full high-speed second spine along with existing NEC improvements, as proposed by Alternative 3, is very high relative to the projected ridership benefits. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. Limited-stop Intercity-Express service envisioned for the Preferred Alternative would offer very competitive trip times at a substantially smaller investment than the capacity necessary to provide for high-speed rail service on a dedicated second spine.</p> <p>While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions.</p>
Hughes_Jo	My second choice would be alternative 2.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives, including Alternative 2, to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers.

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Humphries_Jo	Recognizing concern for climate change, I tend toward the transformational. We are going to have to move in that direction and radically address and reduce the greenhouse gas emissions in transportation here in Connecticut. Transportation accounts for 40 percent of our greenhouse gas emissions.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. The cost of a full high-speed second spine along with existing NEC improvements, as proposed by Alternative 3, is very high relative to the projected ridership benefits. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. Limited-stop Intercity-Express service envisioned for the Preferred Alternative would offer very competitive trip times at a substantially smaller investment than the capacity necessary to provide for high-speed rail service on a dedicated second spine.</p> <p>The FRA considered environmental effects in the identification and evacuation of the Preferred Alternative. The environmental effects of the Preferred Alternative, in particular with regard to air quality and climate change, are discussed in Chapter 7 of Volume 1.</p>
Hutchinson_Na	Alternative 2 seems to be the one most worth striving for, if costs can be offset by adequate federal funds: it aligns with efforts to establish a rail system supporting central Connecticut; it provides an alternative rail route through southeastern Connecticut should rising oceans impact the rail route that runs along the coastline in southeastern Connecticut; it should be less costly (both in \$ and overall environmental impacts) than Alternative 3; and, importantly, it would not bisect the heart of the small, historic Town of Old Lyme as would Alternative 1.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives, including Alternative 2, to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers.</p> <p>In Connecticut, the existing NEC shoreline route will be upgraded with a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. While the location for and design of the segment would be determined during a subsequent Tier 2 project studies, the FRA proposes a commitment to avoid use of an aerial structure through the historic district of Old Lyme, CT.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative also incorporates enhanced electrified service along the Hartford/Springfield Line in order to strengthen service to Central New England and leverage existing investments and identified market opportunities.</p> <p>Funding and financing the Tier 2 projects necessary to implement the Preferred Alternative will be an incremental process for the federal government, Amtrak, the NEC states and stakeholders, and the entire region. This process will require the commitment of both the public and private sectors over a long period of time. The FRA and the NEC Commission will take a leading role in working with project sponsors to support the federal financial assistance to advance implementation, including existing and future grant and other financing programs and options. The FRA and other NEC stakeholders will also engage the private sector to explore options for commercial funding or financing to advance Tier 2 projects. Funding and financing options will be further detailed in the Service Development Plan.</p>
Ilardi_St	I am strongly opposed to the Alternative 3 version that would be an all-new high speed rail network that would stretch from Floral Park, cuts through the heart of Garden City in a parallel trench along Stewart Avenue, through Eisenhower Park straight into Levittown.	<p>The Preferred Alternative does not include the new segment routing option on Long Island, as proposed in Alternative 3. The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative.</p>

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Inglis_AI	Please route the new rail line through Hartford (with a spur to the airport) then East to Worcester and on to Boston. We don't need more Amtrak capacity through New London, Kingston, Providence, etc. Capacity is already perfect. By routing the trains North for the same or less distance and certainly far higher speeds, many passengers would be able to bypass the slower routes. You may even be able to reduce the shoreline Amtrak trains!	The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. The Preferred Alternative expands the level of service on the existing NEC between New Haven and Boston, resulting in increased intercity and regional service at the existing New London Union Station. In addition, a new supplemental segment will be added between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as considered under Alternative 1. Trains using the new segment would serve the New London/Mystic station. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line into the NEC, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield. It does not include a line connecting Hartford and Providence. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions. The Preferred Alternative is further described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Inglis_AI	It is clear to me that the best alternatives lie between alternative 2 and 3. Much of the traffic on the current lines does not have to be on the current lines. New York to Boston passengers don't care whether they go through New London or Hartford. They just want the best and reliable service. There is more than enough, possibly excessive, service at the current stations at Old Saybrook, New London, Westerly, Kingston, Providence, etc. If we moved some of the trains north between New York and Boston it would take the pressure off the shoreline tracks!	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives, including Alternatives 2 and 3, to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.</p> <p>In Connecticut, the existing NEC shoreline route will be upgraded with a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative also incorporates enhanced electrified service along the Hartford/Springfield Line which strengthens service to Central New England and leverages existing investments and identified market opportunities.</p>
Isaksen_Ma	Full support for complete implementation of Alternative 3	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. The Preferred Alternative achieves many of the benefits of Alternative 3 with extensive the new segments, conflict free express tracks, and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost than a full second spine. Limited-stop Intercity-Express service envisioned for the Preferred Alternative would offer very competitive trip times at a substantially smaller investment than the capacity necessary to provide for non-stop high-speed rail service on a dedicated second spine. The Preferred Alternative has the potential to accommodate other service plans that feature super-express limited stop services that can offer market dominant travel times and offer potential for higher margin intercity rail products that might attract public-private partnerships.</p> <p>While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions.</p>

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Ivanoff_AI	Of the four proposals (including disinvestment) Alternative 1 (with some changes) is the one I prefer to see. Cost wise and projected ridership growth have the best balance, with the other two proposals alternatives more expensive with little additional ridership growth.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives, including Alternative 1, to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative brings the NEC to a state-of-good repair, but does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.</p>
Ivanoff_AI	I have written off Alternative 3 as impractical for the time being. Saying that, Alternative 3 should not be entirely written off, as future growth might necessitate the usage of a dedicated high speed corridor. Also, if the political climate were to change in Washington and would be more friendly towards high speed rail, I would say Alternative 3 should be looked at and built out in phases. However, I see concerns from Alternative 3 being problematic from a land use standpoint, as portions of the right of way would be built through rural and suburban communities which would be highly opposed towards huge construction.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The Preferred Alternative achieves many of the benefits of Alternative 3 with extensive the new segments, conflict free express tracks, and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost than a full second spine. Limited-stop Intercity-Express service envisioned for the Preferred Alternative would offer very competitive trip times at a substantially smaller investment than the capacity necessary to provide for non-stop high-speed rail service on a dedicated second spine. The Preferred Alternative has the potential to accommodate other service plans that feature super-express limited stop services that can offer market dominant travel times and offer potential for higher margin intercity rail products that might attract public-private partnerships.</p> <p>While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions.</p>
Jackson_Ma	This proposal should consider open land, a historic area and should not be allowed. This is not the right answer. Please keep the RR where the tracks are already or build it above 1-95 or within the center islands. Destroy no more lands.	<p>As a result of the Tier 1 Draft EIS and the public comment process, the FRA has identified a Preferred Alternative to improve passenger rail service on the NEC in a manner that will enhance mobility options and expand passenger rail service in support of future population and employment growth in the Study Area. The Preferred Alternative, described in Volume 1, Chapter 4, improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, and will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure. Representative Routes define an envelope within which improvements might occur and whose location and construction type could change during Tier 2 project analysis. These representative routes utilized existing transportation corridors to the maximum extent practicable. Nevertheless, the Preferred Alternative includes the potential for acquisition or displacements within areas of existing transportation use. Such decisions would be made as part of the Tier 2 project studies, which would include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate.</p>
James-Hart_Di	Instead, repair/replace decaying infrastructure.	<p>The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrades to the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment. By replacing aging infrastructure and eliminating chokepoints, train service will be faster and far more reliable. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.</p>

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Jankowski_Bi	I love alternative 1 for southeastern CT.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives, including Alternative 1, to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. Between New Haven and Providence, the existing NEC shoreline route will be upgraded with a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience. In addition, the Preferred Alternative includes electrification of the Hartford/Springfield Line between New Haven, Hartford and Springfield. This will facilitate direct service to Hartford and Springfield from the NEC without an engine change.
Janzen_Ja	My public comment mostly is to be in support of the corridor. I'd like to see these things built and built sooner than later. I really support access to city centers and a transportation alternative that can be competitive with other modes.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative that supports access to urban centers and that is competitive with other modes. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. Phasing and implementation of the Preferred Alternative is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 10.
Jasper_Ro	The projected marginal increase of regional rail ridership of 30 percent by 2040, if Alternative 3 is realized, would be a major impetus for both transit-oriented development and regional rail commuting in NoMa.	Volume 2, Chapter 6, examines the economic development potential for the region and the metropolitan areas that would have been served by the No Action and Action Alternatives. Volume 1, Chapter 6, updates this information for the Preferred Alternative. Subsequent Tier 2 analysis by the lead agency will examine economic effects at the local level.
Jibilian_An	Alternative 3 is the best because: -We are investing in our future -Our roads are too congested -Our rail is outdated compared to other industrialized nations -Our lack of transportation is deterring businesses from coming to this area -Congestion means we can not enjoy all our seashore has to offer -Transportation from boston ny philly DC has become very unreliable -We are a nation of drivers and it's time to reorient to rail bc of population growth. This will take education and offering perks to the consumer -be sure to treat the rider as a respected customer not a user.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The cost of a full high-speed second spine along with existing NEC improvements, as proposed by Alternative 3, is very high relative to the projected ridership benefits. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. Limited-stop Intercity-Express service envisioned for the Preferred Alternative would offer very competitive trip times at a substantially smaller investment than the capacity necessary to provide for high-speed rail service on a dedicated second spine.</p> <p>While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions.</p>
Joelson_Ch	I am against the construction of a high speed rail to go throughout Long Island as part of the NEC expansion. This would destroy the long-standing, high-value communities in its path.	<p>The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative does not include new segments between NYC and Long Island and Long Island and Connecticut via the Long Island Sound or a new Segment via Central Connecticut, as proposed in Alternative 3.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.</p>

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Johnson_Ba	Why not move the route a little further north to miss the main street.	As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, and will not make decisions about final alignments or locations of new or expanded infrastructure. Such decisions would be made as part of the Tier 2 project planning processes, which would include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate. Consistent with this process, the FRA developed Representative Routes for the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative, which provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the effects of each Alternative. Representative Routes define an envelope within which improvements might occur and whose location and construction type could change during subsequent Tier 2 project studies.
Jokl_To	I feel that Alternative 2 provides the only real benefit to the state and establishes a much needed inland rail service.	<p>As a result of the Tier 1 Draft EIS and the public comment process, the FRA has identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1 Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative brings the NEC to a state-of-good repair, but does not include a separate second spine. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.</p> <p>In Connecticut, the existing NEC shoreline route will be upgraded with a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative also incorporates enhanced electrified service along the Hartford/Springfield Line in order to respond to comments received to strengthen service to Central New England and leverage existing investments and identified market opportunities.</p>
Julius_Ad	I am fully in support of Alternative 3 to transform the Amtrak system in the northeastern corridor.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The Preferred Alternative achieves many of the benefits of Alternative 3 with extensive the new segments, conflict free express tracks, and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost than a full second spine. Limited-stop Intercity-Express service envisioned for the Preferred Alternative would offer very competitive trip times at a substantially smaller investment than the capacity necessary to provide for non-stop high-speed rail service on a dedicated second spine. The Preferred Alternative has the potential to accommodate other service plans that feature super-express limited stop services that can offer market dominant travel times and offer potential for higher margin intercity rail products that might attract public-private partnerships.</p> <p>While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions.</p>

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Julius_Ad	I support Alternative 3... We need higher speed rail and additional tracks and alleviation of system bottlenecks and modernization of equipment.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The Preferred Alternative achieves many of the benefits of Alternative 3 with extensive the new segments, conflict free express tracks, and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost than a full second spine. Limited-stop Intercity-Express service envisioned for the Preferred Alternative would offer very competitive trip times at a substantially smaller investment than the capacity necessary to provide for non-stop high-speed rail service on a dedicated second spine. The Preferred Alternative has the potential to accommodate other service plans that feature super-express limited stop services that can offer market dominant travel times and offer potential for higher margin intercity rail products that might attract public-private partnerships.</p> <p>While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions.</p>
Kalafarski_EJ	As an NEC commuter between New York and Washington, I enthusiastically support the transformative Alternative 3. We have the technology; it's time to make the investment in high-speed rail.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The cost of a full high-speed second spine along with existing NEC improvements, as proposed by Alternative 3, is very high relative to the projected ridership benefits. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. Limited-stop Intercity-Express service envisioned for the Preferred Alternative would offer very competitive trip times at a substantially smaller investment than the capacity necessary to provide for high-speed rail service on a dedicated second spine.</p> <p>While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions.</p>

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Kankanam Kapuge_Th	As a UCONN Student ,this seems to be a wonderful proposal.This will connect an isolated giant to outside world.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative includes upgrading the existing NEC shoreline route and the addition of a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line into the NEC, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield. It does not include a line connecting Hartford and Providence. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.</p> <p>The FRA noted views expressed about connections to UCONN and Hartford. However, the Preferred Alternative does not include the route to UCONN as envisioned in Alternative 2 and 3. The rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative is provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative. The NEC FUTURE program is focused on corridor-wide solutions for passenger rail improvements, and the selection of the Preferred Alternative does not preclude future consideration of transit or fixed guideway improvements to meet other transportation needs across the Study Area.</p>
Karpenski_Ma	It is a wonderful idea to have trains added for transportation in the North eastern part of Connecticut.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative to improve passenger rail service on the NEC in a manner that will enhance mobility options and expand passenger rail service in support of future population and employment growth in the Study Area. The Preferred Alternative, described in Volume 1, Chapter 4, improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine through northeastern Connecticut. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.</p>

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Kaufman_Da	Alternative 3 is the only option.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The Preferred Alternative achieves many of the benefits of Alternative 3 with extensive the new segments, conflict free express tracks, and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost than a full second spine. Limited-stop Intercity-Express service envisioned for the Preferred Alternative would offer very competitive trip times at a substantially smaller investment than the capacity necessary to provide for non-stop high-speed rail service on a dedicated second spine. The Preferred Alternative has the potential to accommodate other service plans that feature super-express limited stop services that can offer market dominant travel times and offer potential for higher margin intercity rail products that might attract public-private partnerships.</p> <p>While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions.</p>
Kehoe_Pa	This project will have a negative impact on the residential Milford shoreline and adversely impact the beautiful and historic Charles Island, intrude on beachfront, affect the fish and wildlife and cramp this already dense open public space. Why put it smack in the middle of private and public beach property.	<p>The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative does not include new segments between NYC and Long Island and Long Island and Connecticut via the Long Island Sound or a new Segment via Central Connecticut, as proposed in Alternative 3.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.</p>
Kelley_Jo	We would prefer Alternative 2 GROWS the role of rail with service to new markets and accommodates a greater portion of the population.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives, including Alternative 2, to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative also incorporates enhanced electrified service along the Hartford/Springfield Line in order to strengthen service to Central New England and leverage existing investments and identified market opportunities.</p>
Kelley_Mi	Alternative 2 would broaden access for consumers.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives, including Alternative 2, to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers.</p>

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Kelly_Ja	Considering that the plan to have a tunnel to Connecticut would have a terrible ecological and economical impact, and that this plan would have the system bypass the upmarket areas of Westchester and Fairfield counties, it would seem that this would be the least favorable of the options, especially to the people of the town that would have the terminus of the tunnel.	<p>The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative does not include new segments between NYC and Long Island and Long Island and Connecticut via the Long Island Sound or a new Segment via Central Connecticut, as proposed in Alternative 3.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.</p>
Kelly_Joh	I would rather see rail service extended along the I-91 corridor	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative incorporates enhanced electrified service along the Hartford/Springfield Line in order to respond to comments received to strengthen service to Central New England and leverage existing investments and identified market opportunities.</p>
Kelly_Pa	Please do not have any sort of tunnel come from Ling Island, NY to Milford, CT. It would destroy our city and its ecosystem. With so many nice beaches right on the sound, it would all be lost if a tunnel was put in there. Everything our is and stands for is against this plan. Please do not do this for our sake and the sake of our future	<p>The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative does not include new segments between NYC and Long Island and Long Island and Connecticut via the Long Island Sound or a new Segment via Central Connecticut, as proposed in Alternative 3.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.</p>
Kennard_EI	I am totally against any tunnel disrupting Long Island Sound environmentally.	<p>The Preferred Alternative does not include the new segment routing option on Long Island, as proposed in Alternative 3. The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative.</p>

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Kennedy_Je	We would like to take this opportunity to voice our objections specifically to Alternative 3 of the NEC Future Plan. Running a high speed 220MPH track down the middle of Long Island would be of little use to the local population and would destroy the communities in its proposed path. This plan would destroy the fabric of one of the most densely populated and beautiful areas of our country. Apparently, the intent is to provide a short cut to Boston from Washington D.C. by running a high speed 220MPH track through Garden City and straight down the Stewart Avenue Mall. Our Garden City Village is a wonderful example of a planned community and The Stewart Ave Mall is a major feature of the thoughtful planning and architecture present throughout our village. This NEC Future Plan is truly insensitive and not in any way beneficial to the local Garden City village and greater Long Island residents.	The Preferred Alternative does not include the new segment routing option on Long Island, as proposed in Alternative 3. The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative.
Kenny_Ja	We are vehemently opposed to the proposal for a high speed train, especially Alternative 3 , as presented. Amtrak now cannot run without subsidies & yet you want to spend billions of taxpayer's money on a continuously losing proposition that would irrevocably change Long Island & not for the better.	The Preferred Alternative does not include the new segment routing option on Long Island, as proposed in Alternative 3. The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative.
Kessler_Je	one of the concerns that I personally have is by having established the three potential alternatives that some of the things that may be deemed infeasible in the Transform Alternative, such as building a tunnel under South Philadelphia to the Market East Station in Center City, Philadelphia, will ultimately render the entire alternative being removed from consideration. Whereas, there are portions of the Transform Alternative that definitely should be considered and given additional weight beyond those already included in the Alternative 2 measure.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives, including Alternatives 2 and 3, to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit. The Preferred Alternative brings the existing NEC to a state of good repair and maximizes its capacity through alleviation of chokepoints, addition of new tracks and segments at targeted locations, and implementation of service operational efficiencies. The Preferred Alternative also removes speed restrictions where practical and safe, reduces trip times, offers frequent Metropolitan and enhanced express Intercity services, and allows substantial growth for all Regional rail markets. Additional information about the Preferred Alternative has been included in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Kirkendall-Rodriguez_Br	The NEC is already best situated for a dominant rail solution. If coupled with a green source of power this would also do a lot for our carbon footprint. Considering the NEC already makes a disproportionately greater contribution to U.S. employment and GDP, it would be fool-hardy to risk compromising this economic engine. I support alternative 3!	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The Preferred Alternative achieves many of the benefits of Alternative 3 with extensive the new segments, conflict free express tracks, and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost than a full second spine. Limited-stop Intercity-Express service envisioned for the Preferred Alternative would offer very competitive trip times at a substantially smaller investment than the capacity necessary to provide for non-stop high-speed rail service on a dedicated second spine. The Preferred Alternative has the potential to accommodate other service plans that feature super-express limited stop services that can offer market dominant travel times and offer potential for higher margin intercity rail products that might attract public-private partnerships. Economic effects of the Preferred Alternative are discussed in Volume 1, Chapter 6.</p> <p>While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions.</p>

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Knowlton_Dr	Alternative 1 is also the most limited in scope, and it would be shortsighted not to extend in new and potentially further directions.	The Preferred Alternative combines key elements of all three Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate future growth in Northeast population and employment to best meet the service needs of specific markets and avoid environmental constraints. Volume 1, Chapter 4 provides a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.
Koch_Er	... sincerely hope that FRA will consider Alt. #3 as a viable solution.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The cost of a full high-speed second spine along with existing NEC improvements, as proposed by Alternative 3, is very high relative to the projected ridership benefits. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. Limited-stop Intercity-Express service envisioned for the Preferred Alternative would offer very competitive trip times at a substantially smaller investment than the capacity necessary to provide for high-speed rail service on a dedicated second spine.</p> <p>While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions.</p>
Kolesinskas_Ki	It is not clear where the routes are proposing to use existing right-of-ways, which should always be considered.	As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure or alignments. Such decisions are made as part of subsequent planning processes, which would include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate. Consistent with this process, the FRA developed Representative Routes for the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative, which provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the effects of each Alternative. Representative Routes define an envelope within which improvements might occur and whose location and construction type could change during Tier 2 project analysis. These representative routes utilized existing transportation corridors to the maximum extent practicable. A Mapping Atlas with the Representative Routes has been included as Volume 1, Appendix AA and Volume 2, Appendix A.
Komara_Mi	You have received extensive comments from Audubon Connecticut and the Connecticut Ornithological Association recommending Alternative 1 as the most environmentally respectful option. I strongly second their well-informed voice and want to again express that if we keep nibbling at the edges of our environment, there will be nothing of worth left.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative brings the NEC to a state-of-good repair, but does not include a separate second spine.</p> <p>In Connecticut, the existing NEC shoreline route will be upgraded with a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience. The Preferred Alternative also incorporates enhanced electrified service along the Hartford/Springfield Line in order to respond to comments received to strengthen service to Central New England and leverage existing investments and identified market opportunities.</p>

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Koty_St	I favor 2 or 3 because it will afford rail service to more, new populations while also not further crowding the Ct and RI shorelines which are already too crowded with roads and rails.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers.</p> <p>In Connecticut and Rhode Island, the existing NEC shoreline route will be upgraded with a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative also incorporates enhanced electrified service along the Hartford/Springfield Line which strengthens service to Central New England and leverages existing investments and identified market opportunities.</p>
Kozlowski_Gi	... we currently support option 1, Alternate 1, that would go along the coastal area. Over the past three years, since we did our last update on our comprehensive economic development strategy, we've seen a significant increase in the shoreline east.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives, including Alternative 1, to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers.</p> <p>Between New Haven and Providence, in addition to improvements to the existing NEC shoreline route, the Preferred Alternative includes a new supplemental segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience. In addition, the Preferred Alternative includes electrification of the Hartford/Springfield Line between New Haven, Hartford and Springfield. This will facilitate direct service to Hartford and Springfield from the NEC without an engine change.</p>
Kozlowski_Gi	Future rail service must contribute to the nation's economic competitiveness and New Haven plays an important role in the nation's economic recovery... In no uncertain terms, intercity and commuter rail are essential to the economic development of our region... I urge you to work with the State of Connecticut and the Metropolitan Transportation Authority to upgrade the eXisting Northeast Corridor in Connecticut and introduce any and all new service on this shoreline route. In other words, do not analyze an inland route, which would bypass three of Connecticut's major economic centers - Stamford, Bridgeport and New Haven. Moving people in and out of New Haven on state-of-the-art rail systems is too important for us and for the many other businesses that are growing in this region. Instead, I urge you to invest the nation's infrastructure resources in a manner that supports the economic future of southern Connecticut.	<p>The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. The Preferred Alternative expands the level of service on the existing NEC between New Haven and Boston, resulting in increased intercity and regional service at the existing New London Union Station. In addition, a new supplemental segment will be added between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as considered under Alternative 1. Trains using the new segment would serve the New London/Mystic station. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line into the NEC, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield. It does not include a line connecting Hartford and Providence. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. NEC FUTURE is utilizing existing rail corridor as it did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions. The Preferred Alternative is further described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.</p>

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Kramer_Mi	Milford, dating back to 1639, is unique in that its harbor meets its colonial town - and two historic districts are within walking distance. Apart from the environmental nightmare, the harm done to our local historic districts would be catastrophic. It is bad enough that we have to fight local developers, but this is just absurd. As President of the Milford Preservation Trust I object to the very idea! No thank you!	<p>The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative does not include new segments between NYC and Long Island and Long Island and Connecticut via the Long Island Sound or a new Segment via Central Connecticut, as proposed in Alternative 3.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.</p>
Krauss_Mi	The plans to improve rail service are a total and complete disgrace. I am a proponent of rail service improvement where and when it's sensible and well considered. Is improvement needed? Perhaps. Is it imperative to disregard the care that we have for history, existing historic locations and the use of Long Island Sound been carefully and reasonably been researched by "experts" and environmentalists? I haven't heard that that has happened. Until complete information regarding ALL pros and cons, I cannot support this until ALL bases are researched and that research is made public.	<p>The Preferred Alternative does not include the new segments on Long Island, as proposed in Alternative 3. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative</p> <p>As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure or alignments in the Tier 1 Record of Decision.</p>
Kurimay_Pe	I am all for Alternative 3. The benefits will be enormous for Hartford and central Connecticut. Travel to both Boston and NYC would be greatly enhanced. Even if we can't get the LI Sound tunnel we should go ahead with the rest of this plan.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.</p> <p>While the Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS, the Preferred Alternative provides connections along the existing Northeast Corridor, along a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT and Kenyon, RI, and incorporates enhanced electrified service along the Hartford/Springfield Line in order to respond to comments received to strengthen service to Central New England and leverage existing investments and identified market opportunities. The incorporation of service along the Hartford/Springfield Line would promote economic development and growth, further discussed in Chapter 6 of Volume 1.</p>
Laadt_Jo	I would like to voice my support for the Alternative 3 plan for the Northeast Corridor.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. The Preferred Alternative achieves many of the benefits of Alternative 3 with extensive the new segments, conflict free express tracks, and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost than a full second spine. Limited-stop Intercity-Express service envisioned for the Preferred Alternative would offer very competitive trip times at a substantially smaller investment than the capacity necessary to provide for non-stop high-speed rail service on a dedicated second spine. The Preferred Alternative has the potential to accommodate other service plans that feature super-express limited stop services that can offer market dominant travel times and offer potential for higher margin intercity rail products that might attract public-private partnerships.</p> <p>While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions.</p>

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Lacy_Hu	I think overall perhaps the plans, you're thinking too small. I think that you're talking about increasing speeds, at least in parts of this, up to 160 miles an hour. As we've all probably read, the trains, the Japanese trains and the trains in Europe travel much faster. The way you're able to go faster is to keep your alignments pretty straight. And the way to do that in the urban areas is place your -- your tracks in tunnels and make them underground. It avoids a lot of interferences with service structures. And with the decreased cost of tunnels, the -- it's becoming more economical. It's not a cheap solution but I think if we're going to have the trains compete -- reduce the number of airplanes in the skies in these shorter haul distances between New York and Washington, D.C., I think it's essential that these trains be much faster, that we spend more money and do it right the first time.	The Preferred Alternative combines key elements of all three Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate future growth in Northeast population and employment. While it does not add a second spine, it replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints, and provides the capacity to more than triple intercity train service, enable regional rail service to keep pace with growth in demand for commuter and local service, and significantly improve travel time and performance. The Preferred Alternative also incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Lacy_Hu	I believe that the EIS planners are thinking too small with train speeds that are much lower than existing trains in Europe and Japan. If we are ever going to substantially reduce short haul plane traffic in the NEC. To accomplish this, the plans for Alt III should include at least 2 dedicated passenger tracks that are as straight as possible with large radius curves with few stops between Wash. DC and NYC and Boston. In order to accomplish this, the alignment should be underground in urban areas and in areas of uneven ground. This will be costly to construct but the benefits will be well worth it. The actual cost may not be much more when the cost of acquiring land, relocating utilities and constructing highway bridges and the cost of environmental impacts are fairly estimated. The decision to place the East Side Access at a deep level to avoid shallow impacts on NYC is similar to what I am proposing.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS.</p> <p>While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions.</p>
LaFarrara_Ca	The Alternative 3 for rail expansion makes the most sense from an environmental perspective ... I urge the FRA to invest in this corridor for a lasting impact, not a temporary fix.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The Preferred Alternative achieves many of the benefits of Alternative 3 with extensive the new segments, conflict free express tracks, and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost than a full second spine. Limited-stop Intercity-Express service envisioned for the Preferred Alternative would offer very competitive trip times at a substantially smaller investment than the capacity necessary to provide for non-stop high-speed rail service on a dedicated second spine. The Preferred Alternative has the potential to accommodate other service plans that feature super-express limited stop services that can offer market dominant travel times and offer potential for higher margin intercity rail products that might attract public-private partnerships.</p> <p>While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions.</p>

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Langlois_St	In my opinion, Option 3 makes more sense as it provides rail access to Hartford and inland populations centers.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The cost of a full high-speed second spine along with existing NEC improvements, as proposed by Alternative 3, is very high relative to the projected ridership benefits. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. Limited-stop Intercity-Express service envisioned for the Preferred Alternative would offer very competitive trip times at a substantially smaller investment than the capacity necessary to provide for high-speed rail service on a dedicated second spine.</p> <p>While the Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS, it incorporates enhanced electrified service along the Hartford/Springfield Line in order to respond to comments received to strengthen service to Central New England and leverage existing investments and identified market opportunities.</p> <p>Also, while NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions.</p>
Lansdale_Ca	I am not in favor of option three for the NEC. It would be a disaster for the small Village of Garden City, NY.	The Preferred Alternative does not include the new segment routing option on Long Island, as proposed in Alternative 3. The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative.
Leistman_Ma	I am totally against the High Speed Train Proposal Alternative 3 that would devastate the Garden City community. Putting high speed trains through the middle of residential communities is not acceptable.	The Preferred Alternative does not include the new segment routing option on Long Island, as proposed in Alternative 3. The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative.
Lenhart_To	At this time, while No. 3 is a nice feature, I think we need to focus more on Nos. 1 and 2 at this time.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Action Alternatives and improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and provides additional capacity to support a faster and far more reliable railroad. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3.

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Levitz_Da	Hoping for Alternative 3.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. The Preferred Alternative achieves many of the benefits of Alternative 3 with extensive the new segments, conflict free express tracks, and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost than a full second spine. Limited-stop Intercity-Express service envisioned for the Preferred Alternative would offer very competitive trip times at a substantially smaller investment than the capacity necessary to provide for non-stop high-speed rail service on a dedicated second spine. The Preferred Alternative has the potential to accommodate other service plans that feature super-express limited stop services that can offer market dominant travel times and offer potential for higher margin intercity rail products that might attract public-private partnerships.</p> <p>While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions.</p>
Levitz_Da	There seems to be confusion regarding alternative 3. Most in CT, including WNPR think it's all or nothing and not an amalgam or one of the sub categories within in Alt. 3 (3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4). Would it be possible to further define?	<p>Alternative 3, as described and evaluated in the Tier 1 Draft EIS and Volume 2, considered four routing options north of New York to Boston. The routing options provided the FRA flexibility to consider different intermediate markets. These routing options were not advanced as part of the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit. The Preferred Alternative brings the existing NEC to a state of good repair and maximizes its capacity through alleviation of chokepoints, addition of new tracks and segments at targeted locations, and implementation of service operational efficiencies. The Preferred Alternative includes an enhanced, electrified Hartford/Springfield Line. The Preferred Alternative also removes speed restrictions where practical and safe, reduces trip times, offers frequent Metropolitan and enhanced express Intercity services, and allows substantial growth for all Regional rail markets. For additional information on the Preferred Alternative, see Volume 1, Chapter 4.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative does not include a second spine. However, the FRA recognizes it is possible that in future decades there may be need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of expansion.</p>
Lewerk_Jo	To whom it may concern,In regard to your current study of the environmental impact of various options for passenger rail transportation in the northeast, please let me express my belief that it would be best to pursue alternative 3 that transforms the role of rail by becoming a dominant mode choice for travel in the Northeast. Given the population density of the region and the need to maintain if not improve its environmental quality this is the best way forward especially if it is coupled with transit oriented and in-fill development. Thank you for your consideration.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. The Preferred Alternative achieves many of the benefits of Alternative 3 with extensive the new segments, conflict free express tracks, and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost than a full second spine. Limited-stop Intercity-Express service envisioned for the Preferred Alternative would offer very competitive trip times at a substantially smaller investment than the capacity necessary to provide for non-stop high-speed rail service on a dedicated second spine. The Preferred Alternative has the potential to accommodate other service plans that feature super-express limited stop services that can offer market dominant travel times and offer potential for higher margin intercity rail products that might attract public-private partnerships.</p>

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Li_Ja	I support alternate plan number one and number two.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives, including Alternatives 1 and 2, to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers.
Li_Ja	The Long Island access is not a good idea because I live near -- I live in Kew Gardens, and I have people that live in Glendale and Richmond Hill, and they go to church there and they said like a lot of diesel trains are keeping them awake overnight.	<p>The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative does not include new segments between NYC and Long Island and Long Island and Connecticut via the Long Island Sound or a new Segment via Central Connecticut, as proposed in Alternative 3.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.</p>
Liberton_De	A strong investment to transform the NEC with alternative 3 is the best option. With increasing population growth and climate change, there is a need for more efficient rail options, especially as cities attempt to reduce car ownership. As a millennial, I already frequently travel throughout the NEC via Amtrak. Increasing the number of trains and decreasing the travel time, especially between DC/Boston, makes those trips much more feasible by rail than current options.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The cost of a full high-speed second spine along with existing NEC improvements, as proposed by Alternative 3, is very high relative to the projected ridership benefits. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. Limited-stop Intercity-Express service envisioned for the Preferred Alternative would offer very competitive trip times at a substantially smaller investment than the capacity necessary to provide for high-speed rail service on a dedicated second spine.</p> <p>While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions.</p> <p>The FRA considered climate change in the identification and evaluation of the Preferred Alternative. This topic is discussed in Volume 1, Chapter 7.15.</p>
Liberton_De	At minimum, we need growth as incidated in alternative 2.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives, including Alternative 2, to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers.
Lieberman_Al	Alternative 1 makes no sense whatsoever. ...All alternative 1 does is ruin a beautiful part of Connecticut.	The FRA noted public concerns about Action Alternatives. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to best meet the service needs of specific markets and avoid environmental constraints. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Lieberman_Al	Alternatives 2 and 3 have a much larger positive impact on a much larger group of people and have a much better economic development impact. ...Alternatives 2 and 3 include Hartford and inject much needed connectivity to central ct.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives, including Alternatives 2 and 3, to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.</p> <p>In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative provides connections along the existing Northeast Corridor, along a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT and Kenyon, RI, and along the Hartford/Springfield Line which strengthens service to Central New England and leverages existing investments and identified market opportunities.</p>
Linares_Ro	Do not do this!!	The FRA considered both opposing and supporting views on the NEC FUTURE program in preparing the Tier 1 Final EIS and identifying a Preferred Alternative. Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative that improves the existing NEC to a state of good repair and includes new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Lindblad_Ka	Full support for Alternative #2. Appears to be the best bang for the buck. Serious leap in service from Alt #1, with great benefits. Alt #3 over Alt # 2 is way too costly and does not get much better speed or throughput. Using Alt # 2 we get an improved system in today's technology plus a view to future innovations without overspending.	As a result of the Tier 1 Draft EIS and the public comment process, the FRA has identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1 Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives, including Alternative 2, to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. It replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers.
Linell_Th	The NEC should be expanded to include... a revival of Boston to Montreal passenger rail service, via Concord,N.H. and over the Northern Railroad to White River Junction Vermont . From W.R.J. the service would continue over existing Amtrak route.	The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrades to the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment. To better serve Central New England, the Preferred Alternative incorporates electrification on the Hartford/Springfield Line, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield on the NEC. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The FRA is coordinating with Massachusetts and Vermont on the Northern New England Intercity Rail Initiative, a separate study, to explore options for improved intercity rail service in New England.
Listokin_Ya	I strongly support Alternatives 1 or 2.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives, including Alternatives 1 and 2, to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers.
Listokin_Ya	I think Alternative 3 is a time wasting pipe dream.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Action Alternatives and improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and provides additional capacity to support a faster and far more reliable railroad. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3.

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Lopez_An	In principle, I am most interested in Alternative 3, because it concerns itself with transforming our transportation environment in the NEC, which, based on my ideas here, seems necessary.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The Preferred Alternative achieves many of the benefits of Alternative 3 with extensive the new segments, conflict free express tracks, and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost than a full second spine. Limited-stop Intercity-Express service envisioned for the Preferred Alternative would offer very competitive trip times at a substantially smaller investment than the capacity necessary to provide for non-stop high-speed rail service on a dedicated second spine. The Preferred Alternative has the potential to accommodate other service plans that feature super-express limited stop services that can offer market dominant travel times and offer potential for higher margin intercity rail products that might attract public-private partnerships.</p> <p>While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions.</p>
Lowe_Do	I don't believe the current route to Boston can be improved on enough to make it a true high speed railroad.	As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure or alignments in the Tier 1 Record of Decision. Such decisions are made as part of the Tier 2 project studies, which would include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate. Consistent with this process, the FRA developed Representative Routes for the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative, which provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the effects of each Alternative. Representative Routes define an envelope within which improvements might occur and whose location and construction type could change during subsequent Tier 2 project analysis.
Lowe_Do	The ONLY way would be the most direct and straightest line from N.Y. to Boston and would more than likely require the new rails to go inland, NOT follow the shoreline. I would suggest taking a map of the northeast and draw a straight line from N.Y. directly through Ct. & R.I. to Boston. Put down a whole new railroad that can sustain speeds of 200mph.	<p>Alternative 3, as described and evaluated in the Tier 1 Draft EIS and Volume 2, considered four routing options north of New York to Boston. The routing options provided the FRA flexibility to consider different intermediate markets. These routing options were not advanced as part of the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit. The Preferred Alternative brings the existing NEC to a state of good repair and maximizes its capacity through alleviation of chokepoints, addition of new tracks and segments at targeted locations, and implementation of service operational efficiencies. The Preferred Alternative includes an enhanced, electrified Hartford/Springfield Line. The Preferred Alternative also removes speed restrictions where practical and safe, reduces trip times, offers frequent Metropolitan and enhanced express Intercity services, and allows substantial growth for all Regional rail markets. For additional information on the Preferred Alternative, see Volume 1, Chapter 4.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative does not include a second spine. However, the FRA recognizes it is possible that in future decades there may be need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of expansion.</p>
Lucas_Da	I am opposed to any rail modernization plan that destroys historical landmarks, displaces people who do not want to be displaced, or alters the character of affected towns in the process. The decision of where new lines should go belongs to the people who live on those tracts of land, not to some bureaucrat a thousand miles away. If we are going to build new rail lines in the NEC, it needs to have the blessing of those who would be sacrificing their land and homes. If it doesn't, it should not happen.	The FRA considered both opposing and supporting views on the NEC FUTURE program in preparing the Tier 1 Final EIA and identifying a Preferred Alternative. Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative that improves the existing NEC to a state of good repair and includes new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Lucas_Ri	No other state (on a per capita basis) has shown its commitment to investment in rail greater than the State of Rhode Island and it would be a tremendous insult to this investment to chose a corridor that bypasses one of the busiest Amtrak stations in the system. Skipping Providence also eliminates a future meaningful airport connection at TF Green Airport as Boston Logan approaches capacity again. In addition, the existing Providence to Boston rail corridor is already one of the few high speed corridors that exists on the NEC today, carving (literally) a new approach to Boston would be an extreme waste of financial resources and political capital.	The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrading the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment. It also incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line to provide one-seat ride service to and from the NEC and Hartford and Springfield. More information on the Preferred Alternative can be found in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Lucas_Ri	I find it difficult to believe that there are not more opportunities in Southwest CT to achieve greater trip reduction times. Even more drastic measures such as buying right-of-way adjacent to the corridor, buying the center tracks from ConnDOT, constructing additional station sidings (to compensate for MNRR loss of the bypass/express tracks) are all still significantly cheaper than carving a new corridor through some of the most expensive real-estate in the country. A mere 30 MPH improvement across the entire state of CT would get the Providence to New York segment near or perhaps under 2 hours, with Boston at 2 hrs 30 minutes, a comparable downtown to downtown of flying with security.	The alternatives development process evaluated separate service, infrastructure, and route options that could be crafted into different alternatives that meet the needs of various markets along the NEC. The FRA took a market-based approach that incorporated analysis of current travel demand, population growth projections, ridership projections, data from states and planning organizations, and public and agency comments. Travel times for the Preferred Alternative and Action Alternatives are addressed in Volume 1 and Volume 2, Chapter 5 respectively. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.
Lucas_Ri	I understand the desire to include Hartford into the mix and believe an additional spine (perhaps using the current Acela equipment once replaced)can adequately serve this need. Existing Washington to New York only trains can be extended to Hartford and Springfield. If there is a desire to venture outside of Alternative 1, Alternative 2, could be a true test for the implementation of broader alternatives in Alternative 3.	The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrading the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment. It also incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line to provide one-seat ride service to and from the NEC and Hartford and Springfield. More information on the Preferred Alternative can be found in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Lucas_Ri	Let 's focus on getting Alternative 1, and/or perhaps Alternative 2 in the next 20 years, which is a tall order in and of itself. These investments are all consistent with those in Alterative 3, but represent longer term objectives outside of this plan. I would much rather see money spend to expand high speed rail, rather than re-align, so someone can save 30-60 minutes on their business trip.	The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit. The Preferred Alternative brings the existing NEC to a state of good repair and maximizes its capacity through alleviation of chokepoints, addition of new tracks and segments at targeted locations, and implementation of service operational efficiencies. The Preferred Alternative also removes speed restrictions where practical and safe, reduces trip times, offers frequent Metropolitan and enhanced express Intercity services, and allows substantial growth for all Regional rail markets. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.
Luciani_J	Alternative 1 does not seem like it will really help us move in the right direction. This almost appears throwaway, if we ever want to move towards Alternative 3. I oppose Alternative 1.	The FRA noted public concerns about Action Alternatives. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to best meet the service needs of specific markets and avoid environmental constraints. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.
M	... improve the rails we have	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative to improve passenger rail service on the NEC in a manner that will enhance mobility options and expand passenger rail service in support of future population and employment growth in the Study Area. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
MacDonald_Ri	I support Alternative 3. The NEC is well suited to an upgraded, rail dominant system like you might see in a small country like Belgium, Holland or Switzerland.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The cost of a full high-speed second spine along with existing NEC improvements, as proposed by Alternative 3, is very high relative to the projected ridership benefits. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. Limited-stop Intercity-Express service envisioned for the Preferred Alternative would offer very competitive trip times at a substantially smaller investment than the capacity necessary to provide for high-speed rail service on a dedicated second spine.</p> <p>While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions.</p>
Madsen_Er	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.	The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions. The Preferred Alternative is further described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Mager_Jo	I am vehemently opposed to this extraordinary expenditure of tax payer dollars that will destroy the character and economy of many New England towns with very little return. People who commut can put up with the current time it takes to travel from Boston to Washington. If they need to get there quicker (and very few people actually have to) there are planes to serve that need quite economically. Improve the existing tracks and rights of way. Abandon this costly folly.	The FRA considered both opposing and supporting views on the NEC FUTURE program in preparing the Tier 1 Final EIS and identifying a Preferred Alternative. Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative that improves the existing NEC to a state of good repair and includes new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Mahida_Vi	I support Alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridor Futures proposal because it will allow more passengers to travel major cities between Boston and Washinton DC. It will definitely help to reduce lots of traffic on I-95 and that needs to be done cause I-95 is being too much conjugated. Also it will help to prevent environmental pollution since more people will travel by Northeast Corridor. It will help university students commuting between main campus and the campus of Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts of the University of New Haven.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives, including Alternative 1, to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. Between New Haven and Providence, the existing NEC shoreline route will be upgraded with a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience. In addition, the Preferred Alternative includes electrification of the Hartford/Springfield Line between New Haven, Hartford and Springfield. This will facilitate direct service to Hartford and Springfield from the NEC without an engine change.</p> <p>The FRA considered environmental effects in the identification and evaluation of the Preferred Alternative. The environmental effects of the Preferred Alternative, in particular with regard to air quality, are discussed in Chapter 7 of Volume 1.</p>
Mahida-solanki_Bh	I support Alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridor Futures proposal because it will allow more passengers to travel major cities between Boston and Washinton DC. It will definitely help to reduce lots of traffic on I-95 and that needs to be done cause I-95 is being too much conjugated. Also it will help to prevent environmental pollution since more people will travel by Northeast Corridor. It will help university students commuting between main campus and the campus of Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts of the University of New Haven.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives, including Alternative 1, to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. Between New Haven and Providence, the existing NEC shoreline route will be upgraded with a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience. In addition, the Preferred Alternative includes electrification of the Hartford/Springfield Line between New Haven, Hartford and Springfield. This will facilitate direct service to Hartford and Springfield from the NEC without an engine change.</p> <p>The FRA considered environmental effects in the identification and evaluation of the Preferred Alternative. The environmental effects of the Preferred Alternative, in particular with regard to air quality, are discussed in Chapter 7 of Volume 1.</p>
Mahler_Ma	I strongly oppose any cross sound project, I feel the increased rail traffic will add to further urbanization of Long Island. The island and it's wetlands, pine Barrens and farm lands suffer enough, our water quality is poor and our bays are only now just beginning to heal. Cutting an hour or two off of some travelers time is not worth destroying the green spaces let in the shadow of NYC with urban sprawl that alway accompanies these projects,	<p>The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative does not include new segments between NYC and Long Island and Long Island and Connecticut via the Long Island Sound or a new Segment via Central Connecticut, as proposed in Alternative 3.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.</p>

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Maines_Ka	I am writing to support Alternative 3.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. The Preferred Alternative achieves many of the benefits of Alternative 3 with extensive the new segments, conflict free express tracks, and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost than a full second spine. Limited-stop Intercity-Express service envisioned for the Preferred Alternative would offer very competitive trip times at a substantially smaller investment than the capacity necessary to provide for non-stop high-speed rail service on a dedicated second spine. The Preferred Alternative has the potential to accommodate other service plans that feature super-express limited stop services that can offer market dominant travel times and offer potential for higher margin intercity rail products that might attract public-private partnerships.</p> <p>While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions.</p>
Maits_Sc	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.	<p>The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative does not include new segments between NYC and Long Island and Long Island and Connecticut via the Long Island Sound or a new Segment via Central Connecticut, as proposed in Alternative 3.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.</p>
Maits_Sc	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... And Ronkonkoma... 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.	<p>The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative does not include new segments between NYC and Long Island and Long Island and Connecticut via the Long Island Sound or a new Segment via Central Connecticut, as proposed in Alternative 3.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.</p>

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Maits_Sc	We have a 100-year old line... 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.	<p>The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative does not include new segments between NYC and Long Island and Long Island and Connecticut via the Long Island Sound or a new Segment via Central Connecticut, as proposed in Alternative 3.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.</p>
Maits_Sc	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.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The Preferred Alternative achieves many of the benefits of Alternative 3 with extensive the new segments, conflict free express tracks, and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost than a full second spine. Limited-stop Intercity-Express service envisioned for the Preferred Alternative would offer very competitive trip times at a substantially smaller investment than the capacity necessary to provide for non-stop high-speed rail service on a dedicated second spine. The Preferred Alternative has the potential to accommodate other service plans that feature super-express limited stop services that can offer market dominant travel times and offer potential for higher margin intercity rail products that might attract public-private partnerships.</p> <p>While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions.</p>
Maits_Sc	I love the Long Island going -- via that way. It hits the numbers.	<p>The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative does not include new segments between NYC and Long Island and Long Island and Connecticut via the Long Island Sound or a new Segment via Central Connecticut, as proposed in Alternative 3.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.</p>

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Maits_Sc	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.	The Preferred Alternative does utilize the existing Southwest corridor in Boston and does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions. The Preferred Alternative is further described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Maits_Sc	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... 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.	<p>The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative does not include new segments between NYC and Long Island and Long Island and Connecticut via the Long Island Sound or a new Segment via Central Connecticut, as proposed in Alternative 3.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.</p>
Maits_Sc	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.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Representative Routes of the Action Alternatives considered in the Tier 1 Draft EIS process and the Preferred Alternative utilized existing transportation corridors to the maximum extent practicable.
Maits_Sc	But we do need to build this line. It's absolutely economically a prerequisite to do things... So I'm advocating an alternative to combine with an alternative 3, the most transformative alternatives that you can come up with, and most affordable because we have to build the tunnels in Baltimore. We have to build them in New York. We're going to need small tunnels in other places, including in New Jersey.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The cost of a full high-speed second spine along with existing NEC improvements, as proposed by Alternative 3, is very high relative to the projected ridership benefits. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. Limited-stop Intercity-Express service envisioned for the Preferred Alternative would offer very competitive trip times at a substantially smaller investment than the capacity necessary to provide for high-speed rail service on a dedicated second spine.</p> <p>While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions.</p>

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Maits_Sc	I am concerned with the New London bypasses. That would be the biggest losing city if that low-hanging -- seemingly low-hanging fruit happened or was done to speed up the line to Boston. If we did go out Long Island and to New Haven from Ronkonkoma, that would allow a very fast service even on the slow section between New Haven and Kingston where it then speeds up to 150 miles an hour, even if the through-line went to Hartford and then to Providence that way. So I think that's acceptable. I just want to emphasize. I know I've said it again. Because it is such low-hanging fruit that it will be pushed for, and it is a feasibility issue.	The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative in fact expands the level of service on the existing NEC between New Haven and Boston, resulting in increased intercity and regional service at the existing New London Union Station. In addition, a new supplemental segment will be added between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as considered under Alternative 1. Trains using the new segment would serve the New London/Mystic station. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions. The Preferred Alternative is further described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Maits_Sc	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.	The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. The Preferred Alternative expands the level of service on the existing NEC between New Haven and Boston, resulting in increased intercity and regional service at the existing New London Union Station. In addition, a new supplemental segment will be added between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as considered under Alternative 1. Trains using the new segment would serve the New London/Mystic station. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line into the NEC, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield. It does not include a line connecting Hartford and Providence. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. NEC FUTURE is utilizing existing rail corridor as it did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions. The Preferred Alternative is further described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Maits_Sc	Any line going downstate in Delaware, Atlantic City, North coastline, Long Island -- the Northeast corridor, it goes to Long Island. -- should tap in to offshore power. Solar, title, offshore wind, whether it's in the mountains or down here provide the right-of-way for the -- for the power companies. In exchange, they electrify. That should be part of recommendations here.	As a result of the Tier 1 Draft EIS and the public comment process, the FRA has identified a Preferred Alternative to improve passenger rail service on the NEC in a manner that will enhance mobility options and expand passenger rail service in support of future population and employment growth in the Study Area. The Preferred Alternative, described in Volume 1, Chapter 4, improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, and will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure. The FRA developed a representative service plan for the purposes of analysis; that representative service plan identifies the opportunity to use dual-powered equipment to allow for operations both within the electrified NEC and to connecting corridors that may not be electrified. Specific decisions about equipment are the subject of subsequent Tier 2 project studies or other planning processes, which would include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate.
Maits_Sc	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.	The Preferred Alternative serves Philadelphia 30th Street as well as includes a new station at the Philadelphia International Airport. It does not include a second station in downtown Philadelphia. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Malaguti_Je	If there were a vote on it today, my vote would be no to a high speed train through CT.	The FRA considered both opposing and supporting views on the NEC FUTURE program in preparing the Tier 1 Final EIS and identifying a Preferred Alternative. Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative that improves the existing NEC to a state of good repair and includes new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Malicka_An	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.	The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. The Preferred Alternative expands the level of service on the existing NEC between New Haven and Boston, resulting in increased intercity and regional service at the existing New London Union Station. In addition, a new supplemental segment will be added between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as considered under Alternative 1. Trains using the new segment would serve the New London/Mystic station. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line into the NEC, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield. It does not include a line connecting Hartford and Providence. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. NEC FUTURE is utilizing existing rail corridor as it did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions. The Preferred Alternative is further described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Malmberg_Ba	I urge you to work with the State of Connecticut and the Metropolitan Transportation Authority to upgrade the existing Northeast Corridor in Connecticut and introduce any and all new service on this shoreline route. In other words, do not analyze an inland route, which would bypass three of Connecticut's major economic centers - Stamford, Bridgeport and New Haven. Moving people in and out of New Haven on state-of-the-art rail systems is too important for us and for the many other businesses that are growing in this region.	The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. The Preferred Alternative expands the level of service on the existing NEC between New Haven and Boston, resulting in increased intercity and regional service at the existing New London Union Station. In addition, a new supplemental segment will be added between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as considered under Alternative 1. Trains using the new segment would serve the New London/Mystic station. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line into the NEC, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield. It does not include a line connecting Hartford and Providence. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. NEC FUTURE is utilizing existing rail corridor as it did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions. The Preferred Alternative is further described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Mangal_Ma	I do not agree with high-speed trains passing through Garden City, NY	<p>The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative does not include new segments between NYC and Long Island and Long Island and Connecticut via the Long Island Sound or a new Segment via Central Connecticut, as proposed in Alternative 3.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.</p>
Maples_St	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.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. While the Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS, it would divert 42percent of trips from auto, air, and intercity bus. In addition, the cost of a full high-speed second spine along with existing NEC improvements, as proposed by Alternative 3, is very high relative to the projected ridership benefits. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost.</p> <p>The FRA considered environmental effects in the identification and evacuation of the Preferred Alternative. The environmental effects of the Preferred Alternative, including climate change and environmental justice, are discussed in Chapter 7 of Volume 1.</p>
Marcus_Su	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... 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... Please keep improving and expanding service. Don 't cut service from existing routes!	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives, including Alternative 1, to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. Between New Haven and Providence, the existing NEC shoreline route will be upgraded with a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience. In addition, the Preferred Alternative includes electrification of the Hartford/Springfield Line between New Haven, Hartford and Springfield. This will facilitate direct service to Hartford and Springfield from the NEC without an engine change.</p>

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Margaret_Se	...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	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative includes upgrading the existing NEC shoreline route and the addition of a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line into the NEC, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield. It does not include a line connecting Hartford and Providence. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.</p> <p>The FRA noted views expressed about connections to UCONN and Hartford. However, the Preferred Alternative does not include the route to UCONN as envisioned in Alternative 2 and 3. The rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative is provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative. The NEC FUTURE program is focused on corridor-wide solutions for passenger rail improvements, and the selection of the Preferred Alternative does not preclude future consideration of transit or fixed guideway improvements to meet other transportation needs across the Study Area.</p> <p>As stated in Volume 1, Chapter 4, T.F. Green Airport is currently served by Regional rail service only. The Preferred Alternative identifies T.F. Green Airport station as Hub stations to accommodate new service types and improve gaps in connectivity. Intercity service would be provided at least every 30 minutes at peak periods.</p>
Margaret_Se	...there are too many hurdles for Alt 3 to be a viable option in near future.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Action Alternatives and improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and provides additional capacity to support a faster and far more reliable railroad. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3.</p>
Marks_Ba	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.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives, including Alternatives 2 and 3, to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.</p>

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Marmon_St	I urge the FRA to favor the CT inland route, which will ensure the shortest runs and improve commuter traffic on the existing corridor.	The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. In Connecticut, the existing NEC shoreline route will be upgraded with a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative also incorporates enhanced electrified service along the Hartford/Springfield Line which strengthens service to Central New England and leverages existing investments and identified market opportunities. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions. The Preferred Alternative is further described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Marsh_Ed	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!	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades.</p> <p>In Connecticut, the existing NEC shoreline route will be upgraded with a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative also incorporates enhanced electrified service along the Hartford/Springfield Line which strengthens service to Central New England and leverages existing investments and identified market opportunities.</p>
Martinez_Pa	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.	<p>The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative does not include new segments between NYC and Long Island and Long Island and Connecticut via the Long Island Sound or a new Segment via Central Connecticut, as proposed in Alternative 3.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.</p>

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Massa_Ma	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.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative includes upgrading the existing NEC shoreline route and the addition of a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line into the NEC, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield. It does not include a line connecting Hartford and Providence. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.</p> <p>The FRA noted views expressed about connections to UCONN and Hartford. However, the Preferred Alternative does not include the route to UCONN as envisioned in Alternative 2 and 3. The rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative is provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative. The NEC FUTURE program is focused on corridor-wide solutions for passenger rail improvements, and the selection of the Preferred Alternative does not preclude future consideration of transit or fixed guideway improvements to meet other transportation needs across the Study Area.</p>
Massa_Mi	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.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative includes upgrading the existing NEC shoreline route and the addition of a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line into the NEC, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield. It does not include a line connecting Hartford and Providence. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.</p> <p>The FRA noted views expressed about connections to UCONN and Hartford. However, the Preferred Alternative does not include the route to UCONN as envisioned in Alternative 2 and 3. The rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative is provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative. The NEC FUTURE program is focused on corridor-wide solutions for passenger rail improvements, and the selection of the Preferred Alternative does not preclude future consideration of transit or fixed guideway improvements to meet other transportation needs across the Study Area.</p>

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Mastanduono_Th	This would not be good for Long Island.	The Preferred Alternative does not include the new segment routing on Long Island, as proposed in Alternative 3. Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative that improves the existing NEC to a state of good repair and includes new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Masucci_Jo	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.	The Preferred Alternative does not include the new segment routing option on Long Island, as proposed in Alternative 3. The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative.
Mazzalupo_Ma	My support is to explore Alternative 3 at this time.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The cost of a full high-speed second spine along with existing NEC improvements, as proposed by Alternative 3, is very high relative to the projected ridership benefits. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. Limited-stop Intercity-Express service envisioned for the Preferred Alternative would offer very competitive trip times at a substantially smaller investment than the capacity necessary to provide for high-speed rail service on a dedicated second spine.</p> <p>While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions.</p>
Mazzarella_Br	I like alternative 3. Please run the train through Waterbury CT and to Hartford CT.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. The Preferred Alternative achieves many of the benefits of Alternative 3 with extensive the new segments, conflict free express tracks, and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost than a full second spine. Limited-stop Intercity-Express service envisioned for the Preferred Alternative would offer very competitive trip times at a substantially smaller investment than the capacity necessary to provide for non-stop high-speed rail service on a dedicated second spine. The Preferred Alternative has the potential to accommodate other service plans that feature super-express limited stop services that can offer market dominant travel times and offer potential for higher margin intercity rail products that might attract public-private partnerships.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative includes electrification of the Hartford/ Springfield Line. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions.</p>

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
McArdle_Jo	I fully support the Tier 1 proposals is in order to improve rail travel in the future on the NE corridor.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative to improve passenger rail service on the NEC in a manner that will enhance mobility options and expand passenger rail service in support of future population and employment growth in the Study Area. The Preferred Alternative has high-speed capacity and reduces trip time along the corridor. The Preferred Alternative is further described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
McCann_An	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... Please note that I am not against building out the transportation network but would like to see less impact on quality of life.	The Preferred Alternative does not include the new segment routing option on Long Island, as proposed in Alternative 3. The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative.
McCarthy_Ke	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.	As described in Volume 1, Chapter 9, Evaluation of the Preferred Alternative, the No Action Alternative inadequate to meet the needs of the Northeast. The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrades to the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment. By replacing aging infrastructure and eliminating chokepoints, train service will be faster and far more reliable. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.
McDonald_Wi	Has building a rail route within the right of way of I 95 been thoroughly been investigated as an alternative to a new right of way through the Conn. Shoreline communities? The quality of lore considerations are obvious.	<p>The FRA’s development of the NEC FUTURE investment program began in 2012 with nearly 100 initial alternatives for improving the NEC. These alternatives were consolidated to 15 Preliminary Alternatives that reflected a full spectrum of possibilities for the NEC. After extensive analysis and public dialogue on the Preliminary Alternatives, the FRA developed a No Action and three Action Alternatives for evaluation in the Tier 1 Draft EIS. See Volume 2, Appendix B for additional information on the Alternatives Development Process.</p> <p>As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA focused on corridor-wide representative routes and will not make decisions about specific alignments. Subsequent Tier 2 project studies will include stakeholder and public participation and focus in detail on specific service, routing, and infrastructure requirements.</p>
McFadden_Da	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.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The Preferred Alternative achieves many of the benefits of Alternative 3 with extensive the new segments, conflict free express tracks, and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost than a full second spine. Limited-stop Intercity-Express service envisioned for the Preferred Alternative would offer very competitive trip times at a substantially smaller investment than the capacity necessary to provide for non-stop high-speed rail service on a dedicated second spine. The Preferred Alternative has the potential to accommodate other service plans that feature super-express limited stop services that can offer market dominant travel times and offer potential for higher margin intercity rail products that might attract public-private partnerships.</p> <p>While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions.</p>

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
McGee_Jo	The Business Council of Fairfield County supports vastly improved travel times and speeds on the New Haven Line.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative provides connections along the existing Northeast Corridor, along a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT and Kenyon, RI, and along the Hartford/Springfield Line.
McGuire_Br	I strongly recommend that the inland route, which would serve Danbury, Waterbury, and Hartford, be reconsidered instead.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The cost of a full high-speed second spine along with existing NEC improvements, as proposed by Alternative 3, is very high relative to the projected ridership benefits. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. Limited-stop Intercity-Express service envisioned for the Preferred Alternative would offer very competitive trip times at a substantially smaller investment than the capacity necessary to provide for high-speed rail service on a dedicated second spine.</p> <p>While the Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS, it incorporates enhanced electrified service along the Hartford/Springfield Line in order to respond to comments received to strengthen service to Central New England and leverage existing investments and identified market opportunities. This strengthens the connection between New York City and markets along the Hartford/Springfield Line, including Hartford. The FRA noted views expressed about connections to UCONN and Hartford. However, the Preferred Alternative does not include the route to UCONN as envisioned in Alternative 2 and 3. The Preferred Alternative includes upgrading the existing NEC shoreline route and the addition of a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley.</p> <p>Also, while NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions.</p>
McGuire_Ca	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.	The Preferred Alternative does not include the new segment routing option on Long Island, as proposed in Alternative 3. The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative.
McGurk_Bo	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.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. The FRA noted public concerns about Alternative 3. In light of these and other considerations, the Preferred Alternative is a combination of the elements of the Action Alternatives to best meet the service needs of specific markets and avoid environmental constraints. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
McGurk_Bo	Regarding the alternative 1 plans 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.	The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrades to the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment. By replacing aging infrastructure and eliminating chokepoints, train service will be faster and far more reliable. In the referenced area of Delaware, the Preferred Alternative includes a new segment to supplement the capacity of the Existing NEC. The Representative Service Plan for the Preferred Alternative also provides for 'windows' of daytime through freight operations for portions of the NEC between Baltimore, MD, and Wilmington, DE in addition to overnight freight operations. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative including freight rail considerations.
Mcknight_Cr	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.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative includes upgrading the existing NEC shoreline route and the addition of a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line into the NEC, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield. It does not include a line connecting Hartford and Providence. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.</p> <p>The FRA noted views expressed about connections to UCONN and Hartford. However, the Preferred Alternative does not include the route to UCONN as envisioned in Alternative 2 and 3. The rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative is provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative. The NEC FUTURE program is focused on corridor-wide solutions for passenger rail improvements, and the selection of the Preferred Alternative does not preclude future consideration of transit or fixed guideway improvements to meet other transportation needs across the Study Area.</p>
McLaughlin_Ma	I am looking into investing in some more property along the shoreline in southeastern CT... 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.	As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure. Such decisions are made as part of the Tier 2 project planning processes, which would include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate. Consistent with this process, the FRA developed Representative Routes for the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative, which provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the effects of each Alternative. Representative Routes define an envelope within which improvements might occur and whose location and construction type could change during subsequent Tier 2 project studies.

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
McNiff_Da	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.	<p>As a result of the Tier 1 Draft EIS and the public comment process, the FRA has identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1 Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative brings the NEC to a state-of-good repair, but does not include a separate second spine.</p> <p>In Connecticut, the existing NEC shoreline route will be upgraded with a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative also incorporates enhanced electrified service along the Hartford/Springfield Line in order to respond to comments received to strengthen service to Central New England and leverage existing investments and identified market opportunities.</p>
Merola_Ji	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.	The FRA considered both opposing and supporting views on the NEC FUTURE program in preparing the Tier 1 Final EIA and identifying a Preferred Alternative. Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative that improves the existing NEC to a state of good repair and includes new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Meyers_Da	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.	The Preferred Alternative does not include the new segment routing option on Long Island, as proposed in Alternative 3. The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative.
Michelle	I am opposed to the Alternative 3 ... 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.	The Preferred Alternative does not include the new segment routing option on Long Island, as proposed in Alternative 3. The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative.
Middleton_Ta	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.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative to improve passenger rail service on the NEC in a manner that will enhance mobility options and expand passenger rail service in support of future population and employment growth in the Study Area. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative provides connections along the existing Northeast Corridor, along a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT and Kenyon, RI, and along the Hartford/Springfield Line.
Miller_Li	I oppose the proposed route.	The FRA considered both opposing and supporting views on the NEC FUTURE program in preparing the Tier 1 Final EIS and identifying a Preferred Alternative. Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative that improves the existing NEC to a state of good repair and includes new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Miller-Aird_Cy	I commute into NY City out of Old Saybrook on a weekly basis and find the current transportation options more than adequate.	The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrades to the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment. By replacing aging infrastructure and eliminating chokepoints, train service will be faster and far more reliable. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Miragliuolo_Jo	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.	The FRA recognizes that there are sensitive resources such as those associated with local communities, wildlife refuges and habitat corridor wide. The FRA has identified a Preferred Alternative that minimizes impacts to wildlife refuge, wetlands, communities, water resources and ecological resources. Volume 1, Chapter 4 describes the Preferred Alternative.
Mitchell_AI	Please go back to the drawing board and put your glasses on. Thank you for listening.	The FRA noted public concerns about Action Alternatives. In light of these and other considerations, the Preferred Alternative is a re-packing of elements of the Action Alternative to best meet the service needs of specific markets and avoid environmental constraints. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.
Mittelman_Da	Please recommend alternative 2 or 3.	The Preferred Alternative is a combination of elements of the Action Alternatives to best meet the service needs of specific markets and avoid environmental constraints. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.
Mittelman_Da	Alternative 1's cost and disruption are not justified by the relatively minor reduction in travel time.	The FRA noted public concerns about Action Alternatives. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to best meet the service needs of specific markets and avoid environmental constraints. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.
Moll_An	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.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives, including Alternative 1, to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers.</p> <p>As described in Volume 1, Chapter 4, the Preferred Alternative includes a new, four-track infrastructure in tunnel, approaching Baltimore Penn Station from the west. The existing NEC, between Lafayette Avenue and North Avenue in Baltimore City would be retired from passenger rail service. The NEC FUTURE program will not interfere with the current and ongoing process led by the FRA, Maryland Department of Transportation, and Amtrak to examine improvements to the B&P Tunnel.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative includes new third and fourth Hudson River tunnels, beginning on embankment east of Secaucus Rail Station, terminating south of the existing NEC and Penn Station New York, under West 31st Street. Improvements will also be made in New Jersey to support demand beyond 2040.</p>
Moody_Jo	Besides I attended the meeting at the Nassau County Legislators Building. The information was lacking, where exactly will the tracks go, how will our communities be impacted. Ant questions that were asked, the people were told to meet the woman leading the discussion in the back of the room after the meeting. How is that transparent? The FRA has not giving any good reasons to do Alternative 3 . The cost is too much and the construction would devastate many Long Island Communities.	<p>The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative does not include new segments between NYC and Long Island and Long Island and Connecticut via the Long Island Sound or a new Segment via Central Connecticut, as proposed in Alternative 3.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.</p>

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Moore_Ma	I like alternative 2 or 3, because they broaden the option of rail transportation.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives, including Alternatives 2 and 3, to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.
Moore_Ma	why not include Bradley International in the play? Why just Providence?	The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. The Preferred Alternative incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line into the NEC, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield. In the Hartford area, the Preferred Alternative Representative Route via New Haven to Hartford and Springfield includes a station stop at Windsor Locks, which is only 2.5 miles from Bradley Airport and accessible with a quality transit or shuttle bus connection. The FRA will not decide specific details for this type of connecting service. However, those decisions would be the subject of subsequent Tier 2 project studies which would include public and stakeholder outreach, as appropriate. The Preferred Alternative does not include a line connecting Hartford and Providence. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions. The Preferred Alternative is further described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Morey_Ga	I want to see a robust NEC, and therefore support the 4th alternative. Although it costs the most, the increased service and competitiveness achieved by the 4th alternative is unbeatable. Currently, the NEC is a patchwork of 20th and 19th century infrastructure. Only a transformation will give us a 21st century rail network.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives, including Alternative 3, to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. Limited-stop Intercity-Express service envisioned for the Preferred Alternative would offer very competitive trip times at a substantially smaller investment than the capacity necessary to provide for high-speed rail service on a dedicated second spine. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.
Morgan_Ma	this project risks destroying not just a town, but a historical destination. Traffic on 95 is already treacherous, please do not add to the problem.	The FRA recognizes that there are sensitive resources such as those associated with local communities, wildlife refuges and habitat corridor wide. The FRA has identified a Preferred Alternative that minimizes impacts to wildlife refuge, wetlands, communities, water resources and ecological resources. Volume 1, Chapter 4 describes the Preferred Alternative.

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Mosier_Ra	I am against Alternative 1. Further destroying the shoreline and the coves is criminal. Too many inlets have already died due to lack of water flow when the existing line was built. Besides, any alternative that does not involve getting the rail closer to our biggest city - Hartford - and our biggest university - UCONN - is a waste of time and money.	<p>The FRA identified and inventoried ecological resources, major river and watershed crossings. (See Volume 2, Appendix E.05 and E.06) In defining the Preferred Alternative, the FRA reviewed specific local concerns and refined representative routes and construction types to balance those with broader regional travel needs. Specific local issues will be given due consideration in subsequent Tier 2 project studies.</p> <p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative includes upgrading the existing NEC shoreline route and the addition of a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line into the NEC, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.</p> <p>The FRA noted views expressed about connections to UCONN and Hartford. However, the Preferred Alternative does not include the route to UCONN as envisioned in Alternative 2 and 3. The rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative is provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative. The NEC FUTURE program is focused on corridor-wide solutions for passenger rail improvements, and the selection of the Preferred Alternative does not preclude future consideration of transit or fixed guideway improvements to meet other transportation needs across the Study Area.</p>
Mountanos_Tr	So I believe that we should push forward for Alternative 1, focusing on upgrading things like the Hudson Tubes that really do increase capacity and increase the speed and service of the Northeast Corridor.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives, including Alternative 1, to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. The Preferred Alternative includes new third and fourth Hudson River tunnels, beginning on embankment east of Secaucus Rail Station, terminating south of the existing NEC and Penn Station New York, under West 31st Street.
Mullaney_Ch	Alternative 3 of the FRA plan for the Amtrak NE corridor is outrageous and never should have been proposed. It would destroy Garden City and other communities to our west and east. To propose such a destructive plan demonstrates how out of touch the FRA is with residents of Long Island. Please drop alternative 3 immediately. We can assure you, if you proceed with such a reckless proposal, the demonstrations against it will be huge and widespread.	The Preferred Alternative does not include the new segment routing option on Long Island, as proposed in Alternative 3. The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative.

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Muntz_Ei	So I really don't see that this tunnel out to Connecticut will benefit most of the people on Long Island. It will be a degradation, I think, to the service. I can see more service into the City. I do see the viability of a third track going into the City where you can have higher speed service. And I think that would alleviate some of the pressure in the Island and some of the pressure on the expressway, the parkways. But the tunnel, the Amtrak going through the middle of Long Island, it's just really too small when you really look at it.	<p>The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative does not include new segments between NYC and Long Island and Long Island and Connecticut via the Long Island Sound or a new Segment via Central Connecticut, as proposed in Alternative 3.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.</p>
Murdocco_Ri	The NEC Future project is ambitious in its scope with impacts that would fundamentally resonate across countless communities on Long Island. As a region, Nassau and Suffolk Counties have more pressing transportation needs that affect residents and their livelihoods everyday. Examples include, construction of the third LIRR track between Floral Park and Hicksville, as well as the much-delayed Second Avenue Subway and East Side Access, all of which would open Long Island's access to the Northeast Corridor.	<p>The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative does not include new segments between NYC and Long Island and Long Island and Connecticut via the Long Island Sound or a new Segment via Central Connecticut, as proposed in Alternative 3.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.</p>
Murphy_Da	Alternative 3 would dissect and devastate Garden City, New York and other suburban communities on Long Island and is not an acceptable option.	The Preferred Alternative does not include the new segment routing option on Long Island, as proposed in Alternative 3. The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative.
Murphy_Kar	And then to undo decades of land trust preservation in one if our most beautiful and pristine areas in the state is unconscionable!!!! NO NO NO . Who comes up with this stuff?? We have a perfectly fine line to Boston now. If you want to get to Boston quicker MOVE CLOSER !!!!	The NEC FUTURE Tier 1 EIS analyzes the environmental impacts, both adverse and beneficial, of each Action Alternative and the Preferred Alternative, including impacts to land cover. The FRA has identified a Preferred Alternative that minimizes impacts to wildlife refuge, wetlands, communities, water resources and ecological resources. Volume 1, Chapter 4 describes the Preferred Alternative. Volume 1, Chapter 7 identifies additional project studies that will occur as part of Tier 2 Analysis.

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Murphy_Mari	I am adamantly opposed to the proposal that would put an Amtrack train track through Garden Citythis would have a negative impact on the quality of life in our village ... Other options should be considered!!!!!!!	<p>The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative does not include new segments between NYC and Long Island and Long Island and Connecticut via the Long Island Sound or a new Segment via Central Connecticut, as proposed in Alternative 3.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.</p>
Murphy_Mi	Please consider making alternative plans to install the railway.	<p>The FRA considered both opposing and supporting views on the NEC FUTURE program in preparing the Tier 1 Final EIS and identifying a Preferred Alternative. Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative that improves the existing NEC to a state of good repair and includes new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.</p>
Murphy_Wa	Alternate Plan 3 is the only one that makes sense. With growing population and diverse metropolitan centers the increase in track right of ways both in the south end but especially the North end of the NEC will make Rail travel easier and more accessible to the population of the areas served	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. The Preferred Alternative achieves many of the benefits of Alternative 3 with extensive the new segments, conflict free express tracks, and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost than a full second spine. Limited-stop Intercity-Express service envisioned for the Preferred Alternative would offer very competitive trip times at a substantially smaller investment than the capacity necessary to provide for non-stop high-speed rail service on a dedicated second spine. The Preferred Alternative has the potential to accommodate other service plans that feature super-express limited stop services that can offer market dominant travel times and offer potential for higher margin intercity rail products that might attract public-private partnerships.</p> <p>While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions.</p>
Muscato_Ni	vote for alternative 2	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives, including Alternative 2, to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers.</p>

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Muscato_Ni	(vote for alternative) 3	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The Preferred Alternative achieves many of the benefits of Alternative 3 with extensive the new segments, conflict free express tracks, and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost than a full second spine. Limited-stop Intercity-Express service envisioned for the Preferred Alternative would offer very competitive trip times at a substantially smaller investment than the capacity necessary to provide for non-stop high-speed rail service on a dedicated second spine. The Preferred Alternative has the potential to accommodate other service plans that feature super-express limited stop services that can offer market dominant travel times and offer potential for higher margin intercity rail products that might attract public-private partnerships.</p> <p>While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions.</p>
Napolitano_Ra	To build a RailRoad from Ronkonkoma to the L.I. Sound for a highspped train, seems to be an unrealistic and extremely costly undertaking.	<p>The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative does not include new segments between NYC and Long Island and Long Island and Connecticut via the Long Island Sound or a new Segment via Central Connecticut, as proposed in Alternative 3.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.</p>
Nauta_An	I am in favour of any improvement of service to and from Waterbury as it will be beneficial to this city. I note your proposal via Danbury on alternate 3, and consider it viable.	<p>The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions. The Preferred Alternative is further described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.</p>

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Nayowith_Ma	I'd love to see rail become a viable transportation alternative for the Northeast. I'd prefer to travel that way more often if it was faster, cleaner and safer. I'd go for Option 3 - let's start moving to where other countries are in terms of rail travel.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The Preferred Alternative achieves many of the benefits of Alternative 3 with extensive the new segments, conflict free express tracks, and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost than a full second spine. Limited-stop Intercity-Express service envisioned for the Preferred Alternative would offer very competitive trip times at a substantially smaller investment than the capacity necessary to provide for non-stop high-speed rail service on a dedicated second spine. The Preferred Alternative has the potential to accommodate other service plans that feature super-express limited stop services that can offer market dominant travel times and offer potential for higher margin intercity rail products that might attract public-private partnerships.</p> <p>While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions.</p>
Nazar_De	The only rail service that should be expanded is from New Haven to Hartford and stops between. Connecticut need rail service that entices manufacturing and corporations to locate here other than in Stamford and metro NYC. If new Haven and Bridgeport and Hartford are to grow and expand , Amtrak's plans do not help. You need local cT railway service like the Shoreline east to cross and go diagonal and vertical, not owned by Amtrak, MetroNorth, NYC Port Authority - strictly CT owned and operated rather than tolls on I95.	The Preferred Alternative includes chokepoint relief projects along the existing NEC (parallel to I-95) as well as extending service via the Hartford/Springfield Line between New Haven and Springfield. In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative includes upgrading the existing NEC shoreline route and the addition of a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. As such, the Preferred Alternative would significantly relieve capacity constraints along the NEC and accommodate increases in types and volumes of passenger rail service. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Neale_Bi	...dramatically improved commuter travel time to New York City together with improved travel time and more frequent service to Washington and Boston. In fact, some of the alternatives presented still present new alignments which bypass New Haven and/or the entire coastal corridor of Connecticut. These bypass routes do not support the knowledge-based and innovative economies of southern Connecticut, nor do they merit further consideration by the FRA based on the technical analysis presented in the DEIS.	The Preferred Alternative, described in Volume 1, Chapter 4, would significantly relieve capacity constraints along the NEC and accommodate increases in types and volumes of passenger rail service. In Connecticut, the existing NEC shoreline route will be upgraded with a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative also incorporates enhanced electrified service along the Hartford/Springfield Line which strengthens service to Central New England and leverages existing investments and identified market opportunities.
Neale_Bi	I call your attention to the significant environmental impacts associated with the Alternative 3 route through central Connecticut, which is anticipated to affect over 42,000 acres of developed land and another 30,000 acres of undeveloped land (Page 7.2-5). Such a pronounced change in development in largely rural portions of Connecticut is inconsistent with the State of Connecticut 's Conservation and Development Policies, which calls for the State to conserve and restore the natural environment, cultural and historical resources and traditional rural lands. Our State, furthermore, places a high emphasis on its existing urban centers, with focused reinvestment in center cities, inner ring suburbs and transit-rich environments.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Action Alternatives and improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine nor does not include the new segment routing option from New Haven to Hartford to Providence as considered under Alternatives 2 and 3. In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative includes electrification of the Hartford/Springfield Line, improvements to the existing NEC, and a new supplemental segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI.
Neale_Bi	I urge you to support Connecticut 's center cities by focusing your recommendations on the existing coastal corridor and the Hartford-Springfield line. New Haven, and the other cities on these existing routes, need higher-speed, higher-frequency service in order to support economic development efforts and access to jobs. Many of New Haven 's neighborhoods are economically distressed. From an environmental justice perspective, it is equally important to support these communities and not circumvent them through bypass alignments.	The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrading the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment. It also incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line to provide one-seat ride service to and from the NEC and Hartford and Springfield. More information on the Preferred Alternative can be found in Volume 1, Chapter 4.

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Neale_Bi	I encourage you to issue a final EIS that recommends (1) dramatically improved commuter travel time from New Haven to New York City on the coastal route; (2) improved travel time and more frequent service to and from Washington and Boston on the coastal route, Hartford-Springfield route and, if feasible, a Long Island tunnel; and (3) a final decision to not move forward with the Central Connecticut alignment.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. In New York, the aerial structure near Stamford Station is generally located between the existing NEC and I-95; may change construction type during subsequent Tier 2 project-level reviews. This is part of the New Rochelle to Greens Farms new segment. In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative includes upgrading the existing NEC shoreline route and the addition of a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line into the NEC, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine or service to Long Island, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.
Neckanoff_De	We in Westbury and Long Island will fight this [Eisenhower Park & Stewart ave proposed 'trench' rail system].	The Preferred Alternative does not include the new segment routing option on Long Island, as proposed in Alternative 3. The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative.
Neef_Na	I strongly support alternative 1 - Amtrak may not realize it, but significant numbers of people in the New London to Providence segment commute to Boston daily and this would shorten journey times and make the ride safer.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives, including Alternative 1, to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. Between New Haven and Providence, the existing NEC shoreline route will be upgraded with a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience. In addition, the Preferred Alternative includes electrification of the Hartford/Springfield Line between New Haven, Hartford and Springfield. This will facilitate direct service to Hartford and Springfield from the NEC without an engine change.
Nelson_Kat	What is the purpose of moving the service north when the majority of the population that uses the service lives along the coast. Service and speed does need to improve but I don't think the proposed move would be an improvement.	The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions. The Preferred Alternative is further described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Nesemeier_Gr	I strongly support the adoption of the proposed investment program. As far as which alternative to adopt, I would advocate adopting the largest scale alternative for which funding can be obtained. Therefore, it is reasonable to project that the next major infrastructure improvement to the NEC --at least the next truly transformative one -- will need to provide for a time frame close to the next 100 years as well. So, although each alternative is successively more expensive and has greater environmental impact associated with construction, it is an investment that can be anticipated to return commensurately greater benefits to the region for a greater period of time (and thus can be amortized over that greater period of time). Therefore, I consider Alternative 1 (Maintain) the minimum acceptable level of investment for this program. However, as previously stated, Alternatives 2 (Grow) and 3 (Transform) provide successively greater economic and environmental benefits to the region for longer periods of time, and would therefore be preferable options to the extent that funding can be obtained.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. Economic effects of the Preferred Alternative are described in Volume 1, Chapter 6.</p> <p>While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, as proposed by Alternative 3, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.</p>
Nesemeier_Gr	In considering which alternative to pursue, I would recommend that the following be considered as key factors in determining the most cost-effective alternative: capacity/frequency of service; operational reliability; travel time/speed; and environmental benefit (e.g. fuel savings compared to highway travel, reduced hydrocarbon emissions, etc.)	All of the factors identified were considerations in the deliberation of the Preferred Alternative. As a result of the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS and the public comment process, the FRA has identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Nesemeier_Gr	The No Action Alternative is not a viable option because, as the draft EIS states, it does not return the NEC to a state of good repair, and it provides insufficient capacity to meet future demand. Maintaining the status quo will result in reduced reliability, unanticipated repair costs to maintain service, significantly increased highway congestion, and associated environmental impact.	As described in Volume 1, Chapter 9, Evaluation of the Preferred Alternative, the No Action Alternative inadequate to meet the needs of the Northeast. The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrades to the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment. By replacing aging infrastructure and eliminating chokepoints, train service will be faster and far more reliable. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.
Nielsen_He	The residents of Garden City and many other towns on Long Island do not want this train running through our towns.	<p>The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative does not include new segments between NYC and Long Island and Long Island and Connecticut via the Long Island Sound or a new Segment via Central Connecticut, as proposed in Alternative 3.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.</p>
Northrop_Wi	If your going to improve service into the future, I would recommend number two.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives, including Alternative 2, to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers.

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Northrop_Wi	Number three looks like the best but the expense most likely would rule it out.	The FRA focused on a corridor-wide investment program for NEC FUTURE and did not make decisions about project-specific funding or financing. Funding and financing the Tier 2 projects necessary to implement the Preferred Alternative will be an incremental process for the federal government, Amtrak, the NEC states and stakeholders, and the entire region. Opportunities exist for both the public and private sectors to participate in implementing the Preferred Alternative. The FRA and the NEC Commission will take a leading role in working with project sponsors to identify the federal financial assistance necessary to advance implementation, including existing and future grant and other financing programs and options. Funding and financing options will be further detailed in the Service Development Plan.
Oberg_Ka	I fully support Alternative 3	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The Preferred Alternative achieves many of the benefits of Alternative 3 with extensive the new segments, conflict free express tracks, and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost than a full second spine. Limited-stop Intercity-Express service envisioned for the Preferred Alternative would offer very competitive trip times at a substantially smaller investment than the capacity necessary to provide for non-stop high-speed rail service on a dedicated second spine. The Preferred Alternative has the potential to accommodate other service plans that feature super-express limited stop services that can offer market dominant travel times and offer potential for higher margin intercity rail products that might attract public-private partnerships.</p> <p>While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions.</p>
O'Brien_An	I am opposed to Alternative 3 of the NEC Rail Investment Plan which would place a high speed rail through the densely populated communities of Long Island. The plan would pose a great environmental and safety hazard to our people. Add to that the prohibitive cost and the result becomes one in which the disadvantages far outweigh the advantages.	<p>The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative does not include new segments between NYC and Long Island and Long Island and Connecticut via the Long Island Sound or a new Segment via Central Connecticut, as proposed in Alternative 3.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.</p>
Odeh_Sa	opposition to alternate No.1	The FRA noted public concerns about Action Alternatives. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to best meet the service needs of specific markets and avoid environmental constraints. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Ogety_Bh	I support Alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridor Futures proposal because it will enhance the quality of life in the inland areas and better life leads to more growth in economy. Please dont let these money greedy institutions manipulate the laws to sacrifice the potential economical growth the inland can benefit with this rail road.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives, including Alternative 1, to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers.</p> <p>While the Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS, it incorporates enhanced electrified service along the Hartford/Springfield Line in order to respond to comments received to strengthen service to Central New England and leverage existing investments and identified market opportunities.</p>
Olanoff_St	Makes logical sense to me to go with Alternative 3.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. The Preferred Alternative achieves many of the benefits of Alternative 3 with extensive the new segments, conflict free express tracks, and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost than a full second spine. Limited-stop Intercity-Express service envisioned for the Preferred Alternative would offer very competitive trip times at a substantially smaller investment than the capacity necessary to provide for non-stop high-speed rail service on a dedicated second spine. The Preferred Alternative has the potential to accommodate other service plans that feature super-express limited stop services that can offer market dominant travel times and offer potential for higher margin intercity rail products that might attract public-private partnerships.</p> <p>While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions.</p>
Olanoff_St	where you actually make the choice between which alternative, because it said you would study this alternative and then announce it.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comment received on the Tier 1 Draft EIS, and FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. A full description of the Preferred Alternative and the FRA's process for identifying the Preferred Alternative was release with the issuance of this Tier 1 Final EIS.
Oleksy_Ed	I am against Tier 1 , other alternatives make more sense	The FRA noted public concerns about Action Alternatives. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to best meet the service needs of specific markets and avoid environmental constraints. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Oles_Ma	I appreciate that you are continuing to maintain and make incremental improvements to the NEC, specifically the Harrisburg line.	<p>Volume 1, Chapter 10 includes a plan for incremental project phasing and implementation for the Preferred Alternative. An Initial Phase for implementing the Preferred Alternative will be developed that includes priority projects for which planning is already underway and those required for addressing aging infrastructure and chokepoints along the NEC. Completion of the Initial Phase will support incremental improvement in service for both Intercity and Regional services, thereby enhancing service for all operators and travelers using the NEC. The Initial Phase will also improve the way that rail services are provided to the customer and will provide opportunities to make rail operations more efficient. The Initial Phase and subsequent project phases will be further developed in the Service Development Plan.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative allows for increased service between Philadelphia and Harrisburg, PA, on the existing Keystone Line. These service enhancements would further expand the integrated network of passenger rail in the Northeast. Possible service improvements could include introduction of Metropolitan service on the Keystone corridor at 30-minute headways in peak periods. Metropolitan service on the Keystone corridor would follow existing Keystone stopping patterns and serve as a direct replacement. Considering recent improvements to the Keystone Corridor, the enhanced service levels could be accommodated within existing capacity. These improvements are identified as either part of the No Action Alternative or as a Related Project as documented in the No Action Alternative Report (Volume 2, Appendix B). Further exploration of opportunities created by the Preferred Alternative for connecting corridors such as the Keystone corridor are not addressed as direct effects in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, but are qualitatively discussed as Indirect Effects (Volume 1 Chapter 6) and would be the subject of subsequent planning processes. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.</p>
O'Malley_Br	We view rail service connecting the major cities and other activity centers in the NEC as critical to a future that supports continued economic growth, meets rising demand, and supports environmental stewardship. For that reason we support Alternative 2, which "grows the role of rail" in the corridor or Alternative 3, which "transforms the role of rail" in the corridor.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative to improve passenger rail service on the NEC in a manner that will enhance mobility options and expand passenger rail service in support of future population and employment growth in the Study Area. The Preferred Alternative, described in Volume 1, Chapter 4, provides service to urban centers, improves the existing NEC, and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects.</p> <p>While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, as proposed by Alternative 3, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.</p>
OReilly_Ji	NO Sound tunnel, NO ONE in Connecticut wants to go to Long Island. It would overload our infrastructure and provide NO benefits to our state.	The Preferred Alternative does not include the new segment routing option on Long Island, as proposed in Alternative 3. The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative.

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Ortiz_Lu	I want to base my decision to support or comment that is the option three, a newer, better and more reliable system, that gives the North East the support to maintain and grow based on an organized and studied implementation of a better rail system	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The Preferred Alternative achieves many of the benefits of Alternative 3 with extensive the new segments, conflict free express tracks, and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost than a full second spine. Limited-stop Intercity-Express service envisioned for the Preferred Alternative would offer very competitive trip times at a substantially smaller investment than the capacity necessary to provide for non-stop high-speed rail service on a dedicated second spine. The Preferred Alternative has the potential to accommodate other service plans that feature super-express limited stop services that can offer market dominant travel times and offer potential for higher margin intercity rail products that might attract public-private partnerships.</p> <p>While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions.</p>
Ossmann_Fr	Alternative 3, although more costly has the vision to bring us into the next century with the foresight for future growth in the Northeast.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The Preferred Alternative achieves many of the benefits of Alternative 3 with extensive the new segments, conflict free express tracks, and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost than a full second spine. Limited-stop Intercity-Express service envisioned for the Preferred Alternative would offer very competitive trip times at a substantially smaller investment than the capacity necessary to provide for non-stop high-speed rail service on a dedicated second spine. The Preferred Alternative has the potential to accommodate other service plans that feature super-express limited stop services that can offer market dominant travel times and offer potential for higher margin intercity rail products that might attract public-private partnerships.</p> <p>While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions.</p>
Owens_El	I would like to express my strong opposition to the expansion of the Northeast Corridor Passenger Rail Line involving Alternative 3. To place a high speed railway through Garden City would be potentially devastating to its residents and community at large. I strongly urge the FRA to reconsider this proposal.	<p>The Preferred Alternative does not include the new segment routing option on Long Island, as proposed in Alternative 3. The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative.</p>

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Pacheco_Ad	Any track plan needs to include the CT inner corridor, providing service through New Haven or Bridgeport and Hartford. It would seem to make sense to also have a rail option from Hartford to Providence, RI.	The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. The Preferred Alternative expands the level of service on the existing NEC between New Haven and Boston, resulting in increased intercity and regional service at the existing New London Union Station. In addition, a new supplemental segment will be added between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as considered under Alternative 1. Trains using the new segment would serve the New London/Mystic station. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line into the NEC, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield. It does not include a line connecting Hartford and Providence. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. NEC FUTURE is utilizing existing rail corridor as it did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions. The Preferred Alternative is further described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Pacheco_Jos	I feel very strongly that the only sensible presented alternative for rail development is #3, since it is the option that requires the most investment. As a millennial professional living in New York, I am convinced that creating more seamless + affordable transportation options between major metro areas will DRASTICALLY increase the development and growth of the ENTIRE REGION, especially metro areas other than New York, like Philadelphia...	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. The cost of a full high-speed second spine along with existing NEC improvements, as proposed by Alternative 3, is very high relative to the projected ridership benefits. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. Limited-stop Intercity-Express service envisioned for the Preferred Alternative would offer very competitive trip times at a substantially smaller investment than the capacity necessary to provide for high-speed rail service on a dedicated second spine.</p> <p>The FRA considered economic effects and growth in the identification and evaluation of the Preferred Alternative. This topic is discussed in Volume 1,Chapter 6.</p>
Painter_Ro	I'm an advocate for Alternative 3, the transformational alternative.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The Preferred Alternative achieves many of the benefits of Alternative 3 with extensive the new segments, conflict free express tracks, and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost than a full second spine. Limited-stop Intercity-Express service envisioned for the Preferred Alternative would offer very competitive trip times at a substantially smaller investment than the capacity necessary to provide for non-stop high-speed rail service on a dedicated second spine. The Preferred Alternative has the potential to accommodate other service plans that feature super-express limited stop services that can offer market dominant travel times and offer potential for higher margin intercity rail products that might attract public-private partnerships.</p> <p>While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions.</p>

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Papp_AI	I do want to commend the NEC Future Study for including the famed fabled bypass around New London, Connecticut. This was a 50 mile bypass originally instituted by the Volpe National Transportation System Center in 1993 in their study to increase speeds between Boston and New York. This 50 mile bypass had five alternative alignments around New London. The bottom line of it all is it would have permitted on existing and new right-of-way a two and a half hour trip time between New York and Boston. So that key line, which again, was shown in one of the first slides we viewed this evening, it was a small line, but it's a very, very key link in incrementally upgrading the existing former New York New Haven and Hartford right-of-way.	The Preferred Alternative in fact expands the level of service on the existing NEC between New Haven and Boston, resulting in increased intercity and regional service at the existing New London Union Station. In addition, a new supplemental segment will be added between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as considered under Alternative 1. Trains using the new segment would serve the New London/Mystic station. The specific location of and design for the new station, including the number of parking spaces, would be determined in subsequent Tier 2 project studies. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Paradine_Br	...a rail line through Garden City, Eisenhower Park , Westbury and Levittown is unimaginable. It would tear the fabric of suburban L.I. life and change the way of life for not only those towns where a projected line might pass but the entire Island. Please take this option off the table.	<p>The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative does not include new segments between NYC and Long Island and Long Island and Connecticut via the Long Island Sound or a new Segment via Central Connecticut, as proposed in Alternative 3.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.</p>
Parrara_Ca	But what we're sort of in favor of -- of something similar to Alternative 3 but we want to make some better recommendations to improve upon it and to have less community opposition. There are other routes that could be taken to connect the communities to get them -- we're looking at it.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The Preferred Alternative achieves many of the benefits of Alternative 3 with extensive the new segments, conflict free express tracks, and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost than a full second spine. Limited-stop Intercity-Express service envisioned for the Preferred Alternative would offer very competitive trip times at a substantially smaller investment than the capacity necessary to provide for non-stop high-speed rail service on a dedicated second spine. The Preferred Alternative has the potential to accommodate other service plans that feature super-express limited stop services that can offer market dominant travel times and offer potential for higher margin intercity rail products that might attract public-private partnerships.</p> <p>While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions.</p>

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Pasquini_Ma	It's difficult to comment intelligently without a detail map and sufficient time to analyze the cost benefit of such a plan. As a resident of Milford with a sailboat docked in the harbor any change that would severely alter the Milford way of life of peace and quiet of a rural pastoral town and thereby lose the value in our homes is unacceptable	<p>The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative does not include new segments between NYC and Long Island and Long Island and Connecticut via the Long Island Sound or a new Segment via Central Connecticut, as proposed in Alternative 3.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.</p>
Patelunas_An	The railway from Hartford to Providence via Storrs, CT is essential to the growth of eastern CT. The University of Connecticut is a premiere public research institution with campuses in Storrs, Hartford, and Farmington. By providing easy public transportation between Providence and Hartford via Storrs, a stronger link can be made between major research centers which will drive innovation and business growth in eastern ct.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative includes upgrading the existing NEC shoreline route and the addition of a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line into the NEC, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield. It does not include a line connecting Hartford and Providence. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.</p> <p>The FRA noted views expressed about connections to UCONN and Hartford. However, the Preferred Alternative does not include the route to UCONN as envisioned in Alternative 2 and 3. The rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative is provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative. The NEC FUTURE program is focused on corridor-wide solutions for passenger rail improvements, and the selection of the Preferred Alternative does not preclude future consideration of transit or fixed guideway improvements to meet other transportation needs across the Study Area.</p>
Pazzano_Pr	I support funding all improvements to the NEC and am willing to have my tax dollars support these improvements.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative to improve passenger rail service on the NEC in a manner that will enhance mobility options and expand passenger rail service in support of future population and employment growth in the Study Area. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Pearce_Br	I would like to see a map of Old Lyme showing where the pusposed rail line ran through town.	<p>The FRA defined and developed the Action Alternatives at a programmatic level, focusing on corridor-wide solutions within the context of the Tier 1 EIS process. Consistent with this process, the FRA developed Representative Routes, which provide a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the environmental effects of each Action Alternative. Representative Routes define an envelope within which improvements might occur and whose location and construction type could change during Tier 2 project analysis. For the purposes of this analysis, the width of the existing NEC was defined as 150 feet, conservatively accounting for a four-track right-of-way between Washington, D.C., and Boston. The 150-foot width is inclusive of tracks, ballast, signals, etc. Improvements for Alternative 1 would generally be within the existing NEC right-of-way; Alternatives 2 and 3 could require an envelope that extends beyond the existing NEC right-of-way. The FRA did not develop diagrams of representative construction types or structures for the Tier 1 level of analysis. The proposed width of the Representative Route for each segment within each Action Alternative is considered conceptual and could change during Tier 2 project analysis. It is premature to provide the specific detail requested at this point in the environmental review process. Refer to Appendix A, Mapping Atlas, for locations and construction types of Representative Routes.</p>
Peitrowski_St	Our youth are leaving for jobs in other states where the cost of living is cheaper and where opportunities abound. We have to wake up and begin to respond to the needs of our community for expansion and modernization of our infrastructure. New High Speed rail as well as other opportunities for improvement in transportation are only the first step in attracting businesses who can provide employment which will keep Long Island vibrant and attractive to our young people.	<p>The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative does not include new segments between NYC and Long Island and Long Island and Connecticut via the Long Island Sound or a new Segment via Central Connecticut, as proposed in Alternative 3.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.</p>
Pelliccia_Jo	I would like to support alternative 3 for future rail travel.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. The Preferred Alternative achieves many of the benefits of Alternative 3 with extensive the new segments, conflict free express tracks, and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost than a full second spine. Limited-stop Intercity-Express service envisioned for the Preferred Alternative would offer very competitive trip times at a substantially smaller investment than the capacity necessary to provide for non-stop high-speed rail service on a dedicated second spine. The Preferred Alternative has the potential to accommodate other service plans that feature super-express limited stop services that can offer market dominant travel times and offer potential for higher margin intercity rail products that might attract public-private partnerships.</p> <p>While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions.</p>

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Penn Design_Taylor_Yaro	We strongly urge that the investments proposed under Alternatives 1 and 2 to bring the whole corridor to a state of good repair and eliminate bottlenecks should be recommended in the Final NEC Future Master document. In addition, we believe that the Alternative 3 investments in both the NY-DC and NY-Boston sections, which would create world-class HSR the length of the corridor, should be recommended in the Final Master Plan and Tier 1 EIS. This will provide the broadest Tier 1 "envelope" within which future planning and development can proceed for transformational investments in the entire NEC.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.
Penn Design_Taylor_Yaro	These concerns add to our belief that it would be far preferable for the NEC improvements to run from New Haven to Hartford and then on to Providence.	The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. The FRA noted views expressed about connections to UCONN and Hartford. However, the Preferred Alternative does not include the route to UCONN as envisioned in Alternative 2 and 3. The rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative is provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative. The NEC FUTURE program is focused on corridor-wide solutions for passenger rail improvements, and the selection of the Preferred Alternative does not preclude future consideration of transit or fixed guideway improvements to meet other transportation needs across the Study Area. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions. The Preferred Alternative is further described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Peresman_Cl	I would like to express my support for alternative 3. Money will never be cheaper so the time to invest heavily is now. The need to expand mass transit is imperative when one considers the ramifications of an ever increasing population putting more cars on the road. Alternative 3 expands in areas that have less impact on the fragile shoreline and will encourage business and individuals to settle in these expanded areas.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The Preferred Alternative achieves many of the benefits of Alternative 3 with extensive the new segments, conflict free express tracks, and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost than a full second spine. Limited-stop Intercity-Express service envisioned for the Preferred Alternative would offer very competitive trip times at a substantially smaller investment than the capacity necessary to provide for non-stop high-speed rail service on a dedicated second spine. The Preferred Alternative has the potential to accommodate other service plans that feature super-express limited stop services that can offer market dominant travel times and offer potential for higher margin intercity rail products that might attract public-private partnerships.</p> <p>While the Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS, it incorporates enhanced electrified service along the Hartford/Springfield Line to strengthen service to Central New England and leverage existing investments and identified market opportunities.</p> <p>Also, while NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions.</p>
Peresman_Cl	As well I want to express my opinion that alternative 1 is poor option. It encourages growth in areas that cannot sustain it environmentally and geographically. By its own admission the FRA limits this option's benefit to the short term.	The FRA noted public concerns about Action Alternatives. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to best meet the service needs of specific markets and avoid environmental constraints. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Perreault_Ma	I support Alternative 1 as providing significant additional capacity and service improvements in a realistic fashion.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives, including Alternative 1, to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers.
Perreault_Ma	Alternatives 2 and 3 would present significant environmental impact issues, especially in Quinebaug & Shetucket Rivers Valley National Heritage Corridor, as well as costs that Congress and the states are unlikely to fund.	The NEC FUTURE Tier 1 EIS analyzes the environmental impacts, both adverse and beneficial, of each Action Alternative and the Preferred Alternative. Privately held or non-profit recreational areas have been called out as a Tier 2 issue in Volume 1, Chapter 7.4. The FRA encourages groups such as Quinebaug & Shetucket Rivers Valley National Heritage Corridor, to stay involved with FRA as the NEC FUTURE Preferred Alternative is advanced during subsequent Tier 2 project studies. The FRA has identified a Preferred Alternative that minimizes impacts to wildlife refuge, wetlands, communities, water resources and ecological resources. Volume 1, Chapter 4 describes the Preferred Alternative. The FRA and the NEC Commission will take a leading role in working with project sponsors to support the federal financial assistance necessary to advance implementation, including existing and future grant and other financing programs and options.
Perry_Ra	I support Alternative #3 as the most sensible, logical and best-use plan for full utilization of Public Moneys, ability of the NEC to contribute to the Regional economy and overall positive future and quality-of-life issues.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The Preferred Alternative achieves many of the benefits of Alternative 3 with extensive the new segments, conflict free express tracks, and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost than a full second spine. Limited-stop Intercity-Express service envisioned for the Preferred Alternative would offer very competitive trip times at a substantially smaller investment than the capacity necessary to provide for non-stop high-speed rail service on a dedicated second spine. The Preferred Alternative has the potential to accommodate other service plans that feature super-express limited stop services that can offer market dominant travel times and offer potential for higher margin intercity rail products that might attract public-private partnerships.</p> <p>While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions.</p>
Persson_Jo	Alternative 3, IF it maintains both the new and CURRENT routes.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The Preferred Alternative achieves many of the benefits of Alternative 3 with extensive the new segments, conflict free express tracks, and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost than a full second spine. Limited-stop Intercity-Express service envisioned for the Preferred Alternative would offer very competitive trip times at a substantially smaller investment than the capacity necessary to provide for non-stop high-speed rail service on a dedicated second spine. The Preferred Alternative has the potential to accommodate other service plans that feature super-express limited stop services that can offer market dominant travel times and offer potential for higher margin intercity rail products that might attract public-private partnerships.</p> <p>While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions.</p>

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Petaja_Th	We are vehemently opposed to Alternative 3	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Action Alternatives and improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and provides additional capacity to support a faster and far more reliable railroad. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3.
Peter	I am very much concerned about Amtrak Alternative 3 through Long Island	The Preferred Alternative does not include the new segment routing option on Long Island, as proposed in Alternative 3. The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative.
Pevzner_Ni	I'm writing in support of Alternative 3, which represents the most holistic investment strategy in rail capacity along the NEC. It is the only alternative that overcomes the constraints of topography and geography at several key locations, and which will truly enable high-speed rail service between the metropolitan hubs along the NEC. The most densely populated, most economically productive and most vulnerable megaregion in the nation deserves a transportation infrastructure that will allow this region to continue to grow unimpeded.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The Preferred Alternative achieves many of the benefits of Alternative 3 with extensive the new segments, conflict free express tracks, and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost than a full second spine. Limited-stop Intercity-Express service envisioned for the Preferred Alternative would offer very competitive trip times at a substantially smaller investment than the capacity necessary to provide for non-stop high-speed rail service on a dedicated second spine. The Preferred Alternative has the potential to accommodate other service plans that feature super-express limited stop services that can offer market dominant travel times and offer potential for higher margin intercity rail products that might attract public-private partnerships.</p> <p>While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions.</p>
Pezzo_Ca	I strongly oppose this project. A ride to Boston shortened by only thirty minutes is not worth decimating numerous 200 year old homes.	As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure or alignments in the Tier 1 Record of Decision. Such decisions are made as part of the Tier 2 project studies, which would include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate. Consistent with this process, the FRA developed Representative Routes for the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative, which provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the effects of each Alternative. Representative Routes define an envelope within which improvements might occur and whose location and construction type could change during subsequent Tier 2 project analysis.
Phelps_Ha	Don't!! It looks easy and cheap but it will ruin a rare and biologically essential habitat in our state. It has been studied for years which provides an irreplaceable record of climate change that is of serious present concern. Building the line would show bad priority and I expect many others would agree that money isn't everything!	The FRA recognizes that there are sensitive resources such as those associated with local communities, wildlife refuges and habitat corridor wide. The FRA has identified a Preferred Alternative that minimizes impacts to wildlife refuge, wetlands, communities, water resources and ecological resources. Volume 1, Chapter 4 describes the Preferred Alternative.

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Phelps_La	I think drafts 1 and 2 are long overdue for Amtrak and our Country. We need a modern High Speed Rail in this country as soon as possible. Draft 3 is just never going to happen so stick with 1 or 2.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Action Alternatives, including Alternatives 1 and 2, and improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and provides additional capacity to support a faster and far more reliable railroad. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3.
Phillips_Da	Planning for expanded terminal capacity should focus on an underground link from south to north. It appears that providing adequate capacity at South Station will have very high cost and high operating cost compared to through routing to the north.	The Preferred Alternative focuses on improvements to the existing NEC to accommodate growth in population and employment. It does not extend north, but does not preclude future consideration of a North-South rail link in Boston for direct access to Portland, ME. Service south of Washington Union Station is accounted for in the Preferred Alternative representative service and infrastructure planning. Details are provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4 and Volume 2, Appendix B.
Pierson_Ro	Alternative 1 as sketched out appears likely to be highly disruptive to some very old, picturesque communities, such as those around the mouth of the Connecticut River. If that route is selected, this adverse impact should be addressed.	The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrading the existing NEC to accommodate projected growth in regional population and employment. With replacement of aging infrastructure, elimination of chokepoints, and addition of capacity, rail service can be significantly expanded and made more reliable. The Preferred Alternative does not alter the route of the existing NEC through Southeastern Connecticut, as it serves local stations and provides access for freight service to businesses along the line. However, it does include a new 50-mile segment between Old Saybrook CT and Kenyon RI that provides significant travel time benefits for trains using the new segment. It also bypasses the movable bridges and the 11 remaining at-grade crossings on the NEC. While the location for and design of the segment would be determined during subsequent Tier 2 project studies, the FRA proposes a commitment to avoid use of an aerial structure through the historic district of Old Lyme, CT. Potential impacts of the Preferred Alternative are addressed in Volume 1, Chapters 5, 6, and 7.
Plaughner_Da	In regards to the NEC Future Tier 1 Draft EIS, we support Alternative 3: Transform. Not only does this alternative move 141 million annual trips from other modes to passenger rail, but it brings the NEC to a state of good repair which is vital to the quality of service to and from Virginia. Further, it provides excess capacity at all locations along the corridor to accommodate additional off-corridor trips and future growth post-2040. We believe that Alternative 3 is the best opportunity for not only the currently planned expansion of service along the Washington-Richmond-Hampton Roads higher speed rail corridor, but it will allow for even further growth from Virginia and the Southeast.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The Preferred Alternative achieves many of the benefits of Alternative 3 with extensive the new segments, conflict free express tracks, and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost than a full second spine. Limited-stop Intercity-Express service envisioned for the Preferred Alternative would offer very competitive trip times at a substantially smaller investment than the capacity necessary to provide for non-stop high-speed rail service on a dedicated second spine. The Preferred Alternative has the potential to accommodate other service plans that feature super-express limited stop services that can offer market dominant travel times and offer potential for higher margin intercity rail products that might attract public-private partnerships.</p> <p>The capacity and travel time improvements proposed in the Preferred Alternative allow for increased through service from points south of Washington, D.C. The representative service plan for the Preferred Alternative includes up to two slots per hour in each direction for trains that operate directly to and from points south of Washington Union Station. Planned and on-going improvements to the Southeast High Speed Rail (SEHSR) network would further improve service frequency, travel times, and connectivity for Virginia and the Southeast. See Volume 1, Chapters 4, 5 and 6.</p>

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Pote_Ad	Please add UConn as one of the destination in this plan as many students would love to use the service	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative includes upgrading the existing NEC shoreline route and the addition of a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line into the NEC, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield. It does not include a line connecting Hartford and Providence. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.</p> <p>The FRA noted views expressed about connections to UCONN and Hartford. However, the Preferred Alternative does not include the route to UCONN as envisioned in Alternative 2 and 3. The rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative is provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative. The NEC FUTURE program is focused on corridor-wide solutions for passenger rail improvements, and the selection of the Preferred Alternative does not preclude future consideration of transit or fixed guideway improvements to meet other transportation needs across the Study Area.</p>
Pough_De	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.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. The Hartford to Providence Representative Route is not included in the Preferred Alternatives. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.</p> <p>In Connecticut, Rhode Island, and Massachusetts, the Preferred Alternative provides connections along the existing Northeast Corridor, along a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT and Kenyon, RI, and along the Hartford/Springfield Line which strengthens service to Central New England and leverages existing investments and identified market opportunities.</p>
Preston_Ev	So I would encourage -- and we're glad to see the review of the proposals -- an aggressive approach to shifting our priorities from the past to the 21st century transportation options.	<p>The FRA's focus for NEC FUTURE is to meet both current and future passenger rail transportation needs. The overall needs addressed include aging infrastructure, insufficient capacity, gaps in connectivity, compromised performance, and lack of resiliency. Bringing the NEC to a state of good repair and meeting current and forecast needs are fundamental requirements for the Preferred Alternative, as described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.</p>

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Prophet_Ga	As far as option 3, I really don't see too much funding for that so I think it was entertaining to look at some of the panels but I'm not sure that's really going anywhere in the future of the public with the cost estimates for that.	The FRA focused on a corridor-wide investment program for NEC FUTURE and did not make decisions about project-specific funding or financing. Funding and financing the Tier 2 projects necessary to implement the Preferred Alternative will be an incremental process for the federal government, Amtrak, the NEC states and stakeholders, and the entire region. Opportunities exist for both the public and private sectors to participate in implementing the Preferred Alternative. The FRA and the NEC Commission will take a leading role in working with project sponsors to identify the federal financial assistance necessary to advance implementation, including existing and future grant and other financing programs and options. Funding and financing options will be further detailed in the Service Development Plan.
Prophet_Ga	One thing I saw missing though was thru service from New Haven up to Hartford, Springfield and over to Boston. Right now that's a shuttle service. If some of you can remember back a number of years, that used to allow thru service from New Haven to Boston through Springfield and through the area that the Lakeshore Limited currently goes through. And that area is still -- still a main line of CSX. And there's no reason why Amtrak cannot use that as an alternative route for train -- for rail passenger service. Obviously, that route is not going to be 150 miles an hour but even at 90 or 100 miles an hour, that provides an alternative route for people and, also, provides thru service for people to get from New Haven and from Hartford up to Boston in a speedy way and really connects Hartford and Connecticut into the Northeast Corridor, even though it may not qualify as, you know, high speed for 150 miles an hour.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines key elements of all three Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate future growth in Northeast population and employment. The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. The FRA noted concerns about service on the Hartford/Springfield line. The FRA received many comments about including the Hartford/Springfield Line in the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative includes an enhanced, electrified Hartford/Springfield Line, leveraging recent and future investments to create intermodal connections and strengthen existing urban centers. While the Preferred Alternative does not extend the NEC east to Palmer, Worcester and Boston MA, it provides the opportunity for connections at Springfield to increased service north on the Vermonter corridor and east on the Inland Route. The FRA is coordinating with Massachusetts and Vermont on the Northern New England Intercity Rail Initiative, a separate study, to explore options for improved intercity rail service in New England. Further details are included in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Pucciano_Jo	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.	The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. The Preferred Alternative expands the level of service on the existing NEC between New Haven and Boston, resulting in increased intercity and regional service at the existing New London Union Station. In addition, a new supplemental segment will be added between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as considered under Alternative 1. Trains using the new segment would serve the New London/Mystic station. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line into the NEC, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield. It does not include a line connecting Hartford and Providence. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. NEC FUTURE is utilizing existing rail corridor as it did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions. The Preferred Alternative is further described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Quarto_Ja	I do not think that proposed rail service should impact any town or community in any way against the wishes of that community.	The FRA identified coordination with individuals and local communities as an important element of the NEC FUTURE Tier 1 EIS. The FRA provided numerous opportunities for the public to comment on NEC FUTURE starting with the announcement for the Tier Draft EIS and scoping in 2012. In November 2015, the FRA notified state agencies, regional and county governments, and local communities located along the routes of the proposed Action Alternatives, of the availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS, notice for the eleven public hearings, and the details of the public comment process. More information can be found at www.NECFUTURE.com . Future Tier 2 projects will address project level coordination issues such as impacts to local resources and communities. Future Tier 2 project coordination will be the responsibility of the local project sponsor. The Tier 2 project sponsors will coordinate with potentially impacted communities, counties, state resource and regulatory agencies and federal agencies, as appropriate.
Quigley_Sa	... we urgently advise the Administration to invest in Alternative #2	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives, including Alternative 2, to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers.
Quinn_Ke	I recently was informed of proposed plans to run a high speed train through Garden City, called Alternative 3. As a resident of that community, my first reaction is that such a plan would be devastating for our village.	The Preferred Alternative does not include the new segment routing option on Long Island, as proposed in Alternative 3. The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative.
Raible Birth_Su	Please consider another alternative like New London or even Waterford that thrives on Commercial Business.	The Preferred Alternative does not alter the route of the existing NEC through Southeastern Connecticut, as it serves local stations and provides access for freight service to businesses along the line. However, the Preferred Alternative does include a new 50-mile segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, that provides significant travel time benefits, improves resiliency, and improved reliability. This new segment also bypasses the movable bridges and the 11 remaining at-grade crossings on the NEC. In addition, the Preferred Alternative incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield to other markets on the NEC. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Ramsay_De	I vehemently oppose Alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridor Futures proposal	The FRA noted public concerns about Action Alternatives. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to best meet the service needs of specific markets and avoid environmental constraints. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.
Rechter_Ma	...connecting the three largest New England metro areas on the same high speed line would be advantageous to the whole region.	The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions. The Preferred Alternative is further described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Rechter_Ma	Proposed new high speed lines are suddenly being directed away from Providence. I think connecting the Hartford, Providence and Boston metro areas should be a prime directive for New England. Boston and Providence metro areas are all ready proven to be users of rail. Adding both Hartford, Storrs? and the Worcester areas is questionable as neither have supported rail service.	The Preferred Alternative reinforces the importance of improving connectivity between the urban centers along the NEC including Providence and Boston. The Preferred Alternative includes upgrade of the existing NEC shoreline route with a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1, and enhanced electrified service along the Hartford Line to Hartford, CT, and Springfield, MA, to strengthen service to Central New England.

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Redlich_Ka	I like Alternatives 2 and 3 much better because they actually increase the options that people will have to reach other areas of NY, CT and RI. Right now, if you aren't trying to travel from or to an area near the i-95 corridor, it is very hard to get anywhere in CT via public transportation.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives, including Alternatives 2 and 3, to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.</p> <p>In Connecticut and Rhode Island, the Preferred Alternative provides connections along the existing Northeast Corridor, along a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT and Kenyon, RI, and along the Hartford/Springfield Line which strengthens service to Central New England and leverages existing investments and identified market opportunities.</p>
Reed_Mar	I'm here in reference to the rail coming through my community in South Wilmington... Our community is not in favor of this, and you'll be hearing from us.	As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure or alignments in the Tier 1 Record of Decision. Such decisions are made as part of the Tier 2 project studies, which would include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate. Consistent with this process, the FRA developed Representative Routes for the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative, which provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the effects of each Alternative. Representative Routes define an envelope within which improvements might occur and whose location and construction type could change during subsequent Tier 2 project analysis.
Reeds_Ph	I am opposed to Alternative 1	The FRA noted public concerns about Action Alternatives. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to best meet the service needs of specific markets and avoid environmental constraints. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.
Reiss_Ba	Efficient high speed rail and expanded local servcie key to growth and the economy.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. Economic effects of the Preferred Alternative are described in Volume 1, Chapter 6.
Reiss_Br	Having a reliable, clean and fast transportation alternative to driving or flying, both of which use and inordinate amount of fossil fuel, would be fantastic. I support this initiative whole heartedly.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative that is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative is competitive with other modes and combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers.

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Renkavinsky_Ar	I think that a rail tunnel under Long Island Sound of sufficient depth and being constructed primarily from the shore to minimize or eliminate environmental impact on The Sound would be an excellent addition to our transportation system. Long Island is practically inaccessible to me currently. For example, I live just 60 miles from Patchogue but it would take at least 2.5 hours to get there, the fastest route being by car.	<p>The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative does not include new segments between NYC and Long Island and Long Island and Connecticut via the Long Island Sound or a new Segment via Central Connecticut, as proposed in Alternative 3.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.</p>
Rescigno_An	Today, much like our predecessors over 200 years ago, we join together to persuade the federal government to maintain and improve the vital Northeast Corridor rail infrastructure, which is crucial to economic vitality in our entire region, by supporting Alternatives 1 and/or 2 set forth in the DEIS. We view these two Alternatives as being the timeliest achieved, and most cost effective. Additionally, because these two Alternatives focus primarily on improvements to existing rail infrastructure, these two Alternatives present the least environmental impact to Connecticut 's rural areas.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives, including Alternatives 1 and 2, to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. The Preferred Alternative brings the NEC to a state-of-good repair, but does not include a separate second spine.</p> <p>In Connecticut, the existing NEC shoreline route will be upgraded with a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative also incorporates enhanced electrified service along the Hartford/Springfield Line in order to respond to comments received to strengthen service to Central New England and leverage existing investments and identified market opportunities.</p>
Rescigno_An	...some of the alternatives presented still present new alignments which bypass New Haven and/or the entire coastal corridor of Connecticut. These bypass routes would discard over 100 years of the historic economic development and infrastructure currently existing and centered on the rail corridor. Further, these bypass routes do not support the knowledge-based and innovative economies of southern Connecticut which have arisen as a result of the existing infrastructure. Finally these bypass routes do not merit further consideration by the FRA based on the technical analysis presented in the DEIS. ... I encourage you to issue a final EIS that recommends... to not move forward as outline in Alternative 3 with the Central Connecticut alignment.	The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions. The Preferred Alternative is further described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Reuter_Ro	Most of the work done seems to be very good. I think an accommodation of Tier 3 and Tier 4, or phase, however you want to call it, is really what needs to be done.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers.

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Rhum_Da	A high speed rail line between DC and Boston is a good idea. The new track through central Connecticut via Hartford is the way to go.	The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions. The Preferred Alternative is further described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Rice_Je	Increasing train ridership is key to the growth of the northeast and mid-Atlantic, not expanding and improving rail service is not a viable option. Expanding regional train service in heavily populated areas such as Long Island, Worcester and Hartford is needed and will be beneficial to growth. All investments into the rail need to anticipate future needs and key growth areas.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.</p> <p>In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative provides connections along the existing Northeast Corridor, along a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT and Kenyon, RI, and along the Hartford/Springfield Line which strengthens service to Central New England and leverages existing investments and identified market opportunities.</p>
Richards_Je	I oppose Alternative 1.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers.
Richards_Me	VRPI does not support the No Action Alternative as outlined in the NEC Future study. Obviously the current NEC desperately requires major infrastructure upgrades, but it is our view that NEC needs to GROW, at a minimum, and ideally be transformed into a higher capacity system. Otherwise, Virginia passenger rail will eventually wither as the NEC experiences more congestion, breakdowns in facilities, slower runtimes and service interruptions. These outcomes are simply unacceptable for the future of the NEC.	As described in Volume 1, Chapter 9, Evaluation of the Preferred Alternative, the No Action Alternative inadequate to meet the needs of the Northeast. The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrades to the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment. By replacing aging infrastructure and eliminating chokepoints, train service will be faster and far more reliable. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Richards_Me	The improvements outlined in Alternative 1 will add the needed capacity for the corridor to grow, and at the same time will remove the chokepoints that slow rail traffic, including the additional Hudson River tunnels and new bridges, improvements to the Baltimore & Potomac Tunnel in Baltimore, etc. Alternative 1 promises to add 75% more capacity to the corridor, with higher speeds on some parts, more frequent trains and unblocked chokepoints. We believe these improvements will be sufficient to accommodate the expected increases in the frequency of Virginia's regional trains and the higher speeds of Southeast High Speed Rail. Alternative 1 provides for the greatest increment in capacity at the least expense and will increase the reliability and performance of trains in connecting corridors such as Virginia - all at a cost that can realistically be expected to be funded through federal, state and private partnerships.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives, including Alternative 1, to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative brings the NEC to a state-of-good repair, but does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.</p> <p>As part of NEC FUTURE, the FRA considered connecting corridors (south of Washington, D.C., the Keystone Corridor, the Empire Corridor, and north of Springfield) in developing representative service plans and associated infrastructure. Depending on the characteristics of each connecting corridor, improvements proposed with the Preferred Alternative could be leveraged to expand connecting corridor services and expand the benefits of the Preferred Alternative to a larger integrated network. Connecting corridors are described in Volume 1, Chapter 4 and 5.</p>
Richards_Me	VRPI is concerned that the additional projects in Alternatives 2 and 3, besides their enormous costs, will stir local opposition from communities in the Northern parts of the corridor most affected by the environmental changes they entail. We note that even the relatively modest north bypass of the Connecticut shoreline (and its bridges and grade crossings) contained in Alternative 1 has already stirred up massive opposition from Connecticut communities.	The FRA recognizes that there are sensitive resources such as those associated with local communities, wildlife refuges and habitat corridor wide. The FRA has identified a Preferred Alternative that minimizes impacts to wildlife refuge, wetlands, communities, water resources and ecological resources. Volume 1, Chapter 4 describes the Preferred Alternative. Consistent with the Tier 1 NEPA process, the FRA developed Representative Routes for the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative, which provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the effects of each Alternative. Representative Routes define an envelope within which improvements might occur and whose location and construction type could change during subsequent Tier 2 project studies. As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA has been committed to open and transparent outreach process, consistent with NEPA and the FRA's Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts. The FRA's extensive agency consultation and involvement process is described in Volume 1 and 2, Chapter 11.
Richardson_Sa	My final comment is that if the transformative larger high speed rail plans are funded, those of us along the Shoreline must not be left high and dry. The route along the Connecticut shoreline through Providence to Boston is an economic lifeblood around here. I hope that regular and convenient service on these lines will remain a priority.	The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. The Preferred Alternative expands the level of service on the existing NEC between New Haven and Boston, resulting in increased intercity and regional service at the existing New London Union Station. In addition, a new supplemental segment will be added between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as considered under Alternative 1. Trains using the new segment would serve the New London/Mystic station. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line into the NEC, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield. It does not include a line connecting Hartford and Providence. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. NEC FUTURE is utilizing existing rail corridor as it did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions. The Preferred Alternative is further described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Richman_Wi	I am excited about alternative 3, transforming rail service, reliability, speed, and enhanced connections. I travel often between Baltimore and NYC, usually by bus.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The Preferred Alternative achieves many of the benefits of Alternative 3 with extensive the new segments, conflict free express tracks, and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost than a full second spine. Limited-stop Intercity-Express service envisioned for the Preferred Alternative would offer very competitive trip times at a substantially smaller investment than the capacity necessary to provide for non-stop high-speed rail service on a dedicated second spine. The Preferred Alternative has the potential to accommodate other service plans that feature super-express limited stop services that can offer market dominant travel times and offer potential for higher margin intercity rail products that might attract public-private partnerships. Economic effects of the Preferred Alternative are discussed in Volume 1, Chapter 6.</p> <p>While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions.</p>
Richman_Wi	Do you envision a bridge across the L I Sound from Ronkonkoma?	The Preferred Alternative does not include the new segments between NYC and Long Island and Long Island and Connecticut via the Long Island Sound, as proposed in Alternative 3. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.
Richmond_CI	I fully support improving and expanding the NEC regional system. All proposed route options between Boston and New York are acceptable	The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative includes upgrading the existing NEC shoreline route and the addition of a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line into the NEC, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield. It does not include a line connecting Hartford and Providence. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions. The Preferred Alternative is further described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Richmond_CI	Some not all routes have this final important benefit: 4) Better integration with existing intercity rail routes. Therefore I would argue for some form of Option 3 via Worcester and Hartford and New Haven.	The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. The Preferred Alternative also incorporates enhanced electrified service along the Hartford/Springfield Line which strengthens service to Central New England and leverages existing investments and identified market opportunities. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions. The Preferred Alternative is further described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Richmond_CI	UConn is a new destination and so is not currently part of any existing passenger rail network. I think that UConn, a state university, should be handled as a commuter/regional rail spur to its capital, Hartford. Connecting UConn to Providence is a desirable project, but should not be part of the proposed NEC Future mainline.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative includes upgrading the existing NEC shoreline route and the addition of a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line into the NEC, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield. It does not include a line connecting Hartford and Providence. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.</p> <p>The FRA noted views expressed about connections to UCONN and Hartford. However, the Preferred Alternative does not include the route to UCONN as envisioned in Alternative 2 and 3. The rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative is provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative. The NEC FUTURE program is focused on corridor-wide solutions for passenger rail improvements, and the selection of the Preferred Alternative does not preclude future consideration of transit or fixed guideway improvements to meet other transportation needs across the Study Area.</p>
Richmond_CI	Providence already has excellent service so equity also argues for a route via Worcester at least. Boston-Worcester is also an existing, publicly owned segment.	<p>The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions. The Preferred Alternative is further described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.</p>
Rickard_Ce	Rail tunnel into Milford is a very, very terrible idea. Milford residents and boaters in this area must have the opportunity to have input on any plan.	<p>The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative does not include new segments between NYC and Long Island and Long Island and Connecticut via the Long Island Sound or a new Segment via Central Connecticut, as proposed in Alternative 3.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.</p>

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Riley_Co	If there are alternatives that would save federally protected land, and any historical value, then it should be taken.	The Tier 1 Draft and Final EIS identify potential effects to sensitive environmental resources, including resources protected under Section 4(f) of the US DOT Act, and Section 6(f) of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act as well as historic properties. The FRA considered these effects in its selection of a Preferred Alternative, as well as identified possible avoidance or mitigation strategies to be employed as part of subsequent Tier 2 project studies. Information on the effects of the Preferred Alternative on environmental resources such as the ones mentioned can be found in Chapter 7 of Volume 1, and for effects of Action Alternatives, in Chapter 7 of Volume 2. More information on how FRA considered environmental effects in its selection of the Preferred Alternative is provided in Chapter 4 of Volume 1.
Riordan_De	As of now, Menunkatuck Audubon Society opposes the rail expansion.	The FRA recognizes that there are sensitive resources such as those associated with local communities, wildlife refuges and habitat corridor wide. The FRA has identified a Preferred Alternative that minimizes impacts to wildlife refuge, wetlands, communities, water resources and ecological resources. Volume 1, Chapter 4 describes the Preferred Alternative.
Robins_Ma	What I want to do is commend the study for two specific New Jersey decisions that were made in the study. One was to designate Secaucus Junction as a hub station. And the second one is to designate as a chokepoint relief measure the Hunter Flyover, which is the reconfiguration of the connection between the Raritan Valley rail line and the Northeast Corridor.	Thank you for your support. Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative includes service to Secaucus Station to provide more direct one-seat connections. The inclusion of the Hunter Flyover chokepoint relief project supports improved access to the NEC from the Raritan Valley Line and from Hoboken Terminal. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Robins_Ma	...which I think we all agree is exactly what we do not want to do is the no action alternative.	As described in Volume 1, Chapter 9, Evaluation of the Preferred Alternative, the No Action Alternative inadequate to meet the needs of the Northeast. The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrades to the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment. By replacing aging infrastructure and eliminating chokepoints, train service will be faster and far more reliable. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.
Robins_Ma	And the early victories would be really giving the Secaucus Junction a meaningful designation as a hub station and introducing Amtrak stops at that location. Edison Properties has made a large investment already in a park-ride at that facility, which has been extremely successful. And it's obvious that that investment could be expanded. And it would fit in beautifully with the expansion of service by Amtrak at Secaucus. The reason that it's such a good place is that it's not only that it's served by a parking lot, but it also served -- is connected to both Hoboken and the Bergen County line, the Pascack Valley Line and the Main Line. So you've got three major rail lines passing by there. And it would add, not insignificantly, to Amtrak ridership in the future.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative includes service to Secaucus Station to provide more direct one-seat connections. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Robinson_John	I strongly support updating and improving rail service anywhere in the USA, and especially in the northeast corridor. A modern high-speed rail network will help alleviate traffic problems and improve air quality.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative that is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative is competitive with other modes and combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers.

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Rooney_Ta	Long term opportunity lies in Alternatives 2 and 3.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives, including Alternatives 2 and 3, to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.
Rosenberg_Da	I believe rail travel along the Northeast Corridor is very important and should be made to be a shining example of high-speed rail travel not just for the US, but for the world. To that end, I believe Alternative 3 would do this, and I fully support the alternative. I live in the DC area, however, so more than anything, I support what is proposed in that plan for the DC to New York corridor. I especially like moving the Baltimore Station to a more central location, and the redesign of DC's Union Station.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative does not include a downtown Baltimore station or a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The Preferred Alternative achieves many of the benefits of Alternative 3 with extensive the new segments, conflict free express tracks, and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost than a full second spine. Limited-stop Intercity-Express service envisioned for the Preferred Alternative would offer very competitive trip times at a substantially smaller investment than the capacity necessary to provide for non-stop high-speed rail service on a dedicated second spine. The Preferred Alternative has the potential to accommodate other service plans that feature super-express limited stop services that can offer market dominant travel times and offer potential for higher margin intercity rail products that might attract public-private partnerships. The Preferred Alternative does not include the downtown station in Baltimore, which was considered in Alternative 3, as discussed in Volume 1, Chapter 4.</p> <p>While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions.</p>
Ross_Ca	Alternative 2 would be the best choice, because it would connect Hartford with Providence - more riders would be accessible to service. Yes for Alt 2.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives, including Alternative 2, to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers.</p> <p>In Connecticut, the existing NEC shoreline route will be upgraded with a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative also incorporates enhanced electrified service along the Hartford/Springfield Line in order to strengthen service to Central New England and leverage existing investments and identified market opportunities.</p>
Rossi_Mi	More significantly your EIS shows that this will have a negative impact on Long Island Sound's coast in this region.	The Preferred Alternative does not include the new segments between NYC and Long Island and Long Island and Connecticut via the Long Island Sound, as proposed in Alternative 3. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative.

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Ryan	In regards to Alternative 1, what would happen to the existing track between Old Saybrook, CT and Kenyon, RI? Would this track remain active? Or would the land be returned to each state?	Alternative 1 does not alter the route of the existing NEC through Southeastern Connecticut, as it serves local stations and provides access for freight services to business along the line. Alternative 1 also includes a new 50-mile segment between Old Saybrook CT and Kenyon RI that provides significant travel time benefits for trains using the new segment. It also bypasses the movable bridges and the 11 remaining at-grade crossings on the NEC. In Connecticut, the existing NEC shoreline route will be upgraded with a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative also incorporates enhanced electrified service along the Hartford/Springfield Line which strengthens service to Central New England and leverages existing investments and identified market opportunities.
Sabatini_Ke	I'm trying to understand why the government continues to invest in an antiquated rail line along the coastline which could be recuperated by selling off the land for billions of dollars and we allocate the center median of interstate 95 for an easy straight high-speed rail which would utilize existing infrastructure boost economy and restore the shoreline. Amtrak does not need a scenic route, Amtrak needs a fast efficient route.	The Preferred Alternative combines key elements of all three Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate future growth in Northeast population and employment. The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative provides connections along the existing Northeast Corridor, along a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT and Kenyon, RI, and along the Hartford/Springfield Line which strengthens service to Central New England and leverages existing investments and identified market opportunities. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Sam	Alternative 2 is the best for the state. Reinforcing rail travel through major economic hubs of our state, New Haven with Hartford and the University of Connecticut, is what best serves our state as a whole.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives, including Alternative 2, to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. It does not include a routing option through Storrs, as considered in Alternative 2 and 3. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.</p> <p>In Connecticut, the existing NEC shoreline route will be upgraded with a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative also incorporates enhanced electrified service along the Hartford/Springfield Line in order to strengthen service to Central New England and leverage existing investments and identified market opportunities.</p>

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Sandor_Ma	It's a shame that no better public transit exists from the Hartford area to Storrs, CT, especially because such a large proportion of students and faculty at the University of Connecticut commute from the Hartford area. The 2nd alternative proposed in the plan would create a non-automotive way for university students and employees to commute from Hartford to Storrs and back, solving this problem. The line east of Storrs would make Providence and Boston more accessible from the campus, creating the potential to draw more students from these areas.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative includes upgrading the existing NEC shoreline route and the addition of a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line into the NEC, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield. It does not include a line connecting Hartford and Providence. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions. The FRA noted views expressed about connections to UCONN and Hartford. However, the Preferred Alternative does not include the route to UCONN as envisioned in Alternative 2 and 3. The rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative is provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative. The NEC FUTURE program is focused on corridor-wide solutions for passenger rail improvements, and the selection of the Preferred Alternative does not preclude future consideration of transit or fixed guideway improvements to meet other transportation needs across the Study Area.
Santangelo_Ga	If the United States government can spend \$1.5 trillion on the F-35 joint strike fighter jet, then they can definitely spend a few billion dollars building a dedicated high speed rail line from Boston to Washington D.C. Let's just get this done already!	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Sarisley III_Ed	Opportunities for faster and more frequent service would strengthen the economy through the creation of construction and operational jobs, and promote business and trade amongst New England companies. Alternatives 2 and 3 that include UCONN, the #1 public university and top 20 in the country, will allow the nearly 30,000 students and hundreds of faculty improved transportation options for travel.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative includes upgrading the existing NEC shoreline route and the addition of a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line into the NEC, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield. It does not include a line connecting Hartford and Providence. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.</p> <p>The FRA noted views expressed about connections to UCONN and Hartford. However, the Preferred Alternative does not include the route to UCONN as envisioned in Alternative 2 and 3. The rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative is provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative. The NEC FUTURE program is focused on corridor-wide solutions for passenger rail improvements, and the selection of the Preferred Alternative does not preclude future consideration of transit or fixed guideway improvements to meet other transportation needs across the Study Area.</p>
Sarisley_Ed	I have reviewed this entire document and believe that the only way for our country, and particularly the aging infrastructure of the northeast, to not fall further behind other industrialized countries is to follow their lead and fully build out Alternative 2 then 3.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives, including Alternatives 2 and 3, to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.
Sarlin_Mi	Alternative 2 makes much more sense and the increased cost is really so small compared to the number of people affected and the eventual environmental impact.	As a result of the Tier 1 Draft EIS and the public comment process, the FRA has identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1 Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives, including Alternative 2, to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. It replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers.
Saunders_Da	Essential that NEC be upgraded to AlternativecTwo level. Both interstates and airways are overloaded and the solution to their problems is not immediately visible. Fixing the air and road problems with probably cost vastly more than fixing thevNEC.	As a result of the Tier 1 Draft EIS and the public comment process, the FRA has identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1 Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives, including Alternative 2, to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. It replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers.

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Sausville_Kr	Prefer Alternative 3, we need to expand rail and reduce travel times to encourage rail usage instead of driving!	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The cost of a full high-speed second spine along with existing NEC improvements, as proposed by Alternative 3, is very high relative to the projected ridership benefits. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. Limited-stop Intercity-Express service envisioned for the Preferred Alternative would offer very competitive trip times at a substantially smaller investment than the capacity necessary to provide for high-speed rail service on a dedicated second spine.</p> <p>While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions.</p>
Sausville_Kr	I would consider Alternative 2 to be the minimum.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives, including Alternatives 2 and 3, to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit. The Preferred Alternative brings the existing NEC to a state of good repair and maximizes its capacity through alleviation of chokepoints, addition of new tracks and segments at targeted locations, and implementation of service operational efficiencies. The Preferred Alternative also removes speed restrictions where practical and safe, reduces trip times, offers frequent Metropolitan and enhanced express Intercity services, and allows substantial growth for all Regional rail markets. Additional information about the Preferred Alternative has been included in Volume 1, Chapter 4.</p>
Sbeglia_Ca	I am very opposed to the Alternative 3 which has a plan of running a high speed train through Garden City, NY.	<p>The Preferred Alternative does not include the new segment routing option on Long Island, as proposed in Alternative 3. The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative.</p>
Schaefer_Di	I am against the proposal to build and run a high-speed train through our communities. This will lower our property values, disrupt lives, commerce and compromise our already compromised environment on Long Island.	<p>The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative does not include new segments between NYC and Long Island and Long Island and Connecticut via the Long Island Sound or a new Segment via Central Connecticut, as proposed in Alternative 3.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.</p>

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Schaefer_EI	I oppose to the proposal of the high-speed train running through our Long Island neighborhoods. Our taxes are high enough and we do not want to fund a project that we do not want or need. Our property values will diminish at the rate your trains will travel. Stop ruining the environment and our quality of life.	<p>The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative does not include new segments between NYC and Long Island and Long Island and Connecticut via the Long Island Sound or a new Segment via Central Connecticut, as proposed in Alternative 3.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.</p>
Schaffer_Mi	I do believe that, after examining all the plans, all the alternatives presented for the NEC, I believe a combination of alternative one and alternative two would be best. We can bypass curves, existing impediments to higher speed trains. We can also ease curves in areas. And in certain areas, such as between New Haven and Providence, we could bypass the line. Except in this scenario we would be extending the Kenyon to Old Saybrook bypass all the way to New Haven.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives, including Alternatives 1 and 2, to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative provides connections along the existing Northeast Corridor, along a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT and Kenyon, RI, and along the Hartford/Springfield Line.
Schellends_Ka	Please improve what we have. Do not spend money on new rail lines.	The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrades to the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment. By replacing aging infrastructure and eliminating chokepoints, train service will be faster and far more reliable. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.
Schiff_Ka	Alternative 2 (and possibly Alternative 3) would support a university instead of destroying one, by extending rail service to the University of Connecticut. I support these options!	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives, including Alternatives 2 and 3, to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. The Hartford to Providence Representative Route is not included in the Preferred Alternatives. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.</p> <p>In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative provides connections along the existing Northeast Corridor, along a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT and Kenyon, RI, and along the Hartford/Springfield Line which strengthens service to Central New England and leverages existing investments and identified market opportunities.</p>

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Schoen_Cl	Please don't destroy this beautiful town by constructing tracks through it.	The FRA considered both opposing and supporting views on the NEC FUTURE program in preparing the Tier 1 Final EIS and identifying a Preferred Alternative. Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative that improves the existing NEC to a state of good repair and includes new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Schoman_Je	there are vast advantages of combining Alternative 1, 2, & 3 and eliminating "No Action"- !. Amtrak needs to offer a transportation system that provides reliable, time efficient, and cost effective movement of passengers and goods... Less effect by storms... Less lift bridges which would be better for both trains & the boating community... And more higher speed trains would benefit this country	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.
Seaver_Ch	I think Alternative 3 is the right thing to do for the future. We also use I-95 and would always prefer to travel by train. It would be so exciting to see Rail travel chosen and infrastructure strengthened.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The cost of a full high-speed second spine along with existing NEC improvements, as proposed by Alternative 3, is very high relative to the projected ridership benefits. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. Limited-stop Intercity-Express service envisioned for the Preferred Alternative would offer very competitive trip times at a substantially smaller investment than the capacity necessary to provide for high-speed rail service on a dedicated second spine.</p> <p>While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions.</p>
Sedgwick_He	Plan 2 takes the new service appropriately through State capitols and less developed areas of CT and RI, aiding in their future development and avoiding the disruption of the historical and thickly settled coastal areas. This is a more forward looking plan which will serve the region as well as the major Northeastern cities.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative brings the NEC to a state-of-good repair, but does not include a separate second spine. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.</p> <p>In Connecticut, the existing NEC shoreline route will be upgraded with a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative also incorporates enhanced electrified service along the Hartford/Springfield Line in order to strengthen service to Central New England and leverage existing investments and identified market opportunities.</p>

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Seip_Po	Of course, I, among many are opposed to this current plan high speed rail route; chiefly because the route plan is quite idiotic. Please go back to the drawing board, put on those thinking caps of yours, and come up with a BETTER and SMARTER solution!!	The FRA considered both opposing and supporting views on the NEC FUTURE program in preparing the Tier 1 Final EIS and identifying a Preferred Alternative. Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative that improves the existing NEC to a state of good repair and includes new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Seligson_Ka	Alternative 2 makes the most sense to me, as long as environmental impact studies are conducted ethically and followed respectfully.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives, including Alternative 2, to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. It replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers.</p> <p>As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, and will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure, including construction types in the Tier 1 Record of Decision. Such decisions would be made as part of the Tier 2 project planning processes, which would include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate. Subsequent Tier 2 projects would incorporate environmental analyses in compliance with NEPA and other applicable regulations. Volume 1, Chapter 10 provides more information on Phasing and Implementation of the Preferred Alternatives including information on the transition from the Tier 1 decision to Tier 2 Studies.</p>
Semeraro_Mi	Section 4.7.3.4 I believe the text is referring to the wrong municipality. Kearney is east and north of the Passaic River, Newark is west of the Passaic River. Kearney is west of the Hackensack River.	The text has been updated in Volume 2, Chapter 4, Alternatives Considered.
Semeraro_Mi	Were additional projects considered for Alternate 2 which would raise ridership on Long Island? If LIRR was to improve service times into and out of Penn Station comparable to Intercity Regional speeds, would Long Island residents choose to catch service from NY Penn Stations to other NEC destinations at a rate which would be comparable to the ridership projected in Alternate 3?	<p>The FRA began development of the NEC FUTURE investment program in 2012 with nearly 100 initial alternatives for improving the NEC. These alternatives were consolidated to 15 Preliminary Alternatives that reflected a full spectrum of possibilities for the NEC. After extensive analysis and public dialogue on the Preliminary Alternatives, the FRA developed a No Action and three Action Alternatives for evaluation in the Tier 1 Draft EIS.</p> <p>The FRA identified a Preferred Alternative that focuses on leveraging the investment in the existing NEC and Hartford/Springfield Lines over the proposed Hartford-Worcester routing. FRA considered travel time improvements, connectivity, environmental benefits and effects and overall mobility benefits when deciding on a Preferred Alternative. Easy scheduled connections between different rail operators, such as LIRR, as well as the ability to operate through-service at Penn Station New York, are key elements of the network created by the Preferred Alternative. In addition, a common fare medium and coordinated scheduling between different operators would greatly improve service for the customer. The FRA will work with the NEC operators to develop scheduled transfers and through service options and to pursue other options for enhancing the customer experience.</p> <p>While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine service to Long Island, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.</p>

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Semeraro_Mi	Could the Representative Route Mapping Atlas be modified to improve the distinction between the Construction Types of the Alternative Alignments?Currently the sheets for Alternates 2 & 3 have the previous Construction Type alignments shown. Alternate 3 sheets show both Alternate 1 and Alternate 2 Construction Types. The inclusion of previous alternates makes the sheets difficult to follow.	Volume 2, Appendix A, separates the Action Alternatives on different sheets. The specific location for and design of improvements including construction types would be determined during subsequent Tier 2 planning analysis.
Semeraro_Mi	When estimating construction costs was any consideration given to existing known site conditions or restrictions aside from the representative ROW sections? A trench section which is constructed alongside of an existing operating railroad would have a different construction cost than a trench section built on brand new ROW due to restrictions in construction methods and times.	<p>The capital cost estimates for the Action and Preferred Alternatives are based on Representative Routes which are based on cross sections identifying construction type that are applied to topography or land use type. As a corridor-wide assessment, however, site-specific conditions were not evaluated.</p> <p>While the cost estimate does not reflect site-specific conditions, the cost estimate accounts for uncertainty through allocated contingencies or assumptions regarding various construction line items and components, including efficiencies of construction, types of contract execution, and the construction schedule. Subsequent tier 2 project analyses would identify site-specific conditions.</p> <p>Additional details about the capital cost estimates, Representative Routes and prototypical construction types are provided in Volumes 1 and 2, Chapters 4 and 8 and Appendices BB and B. As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, and will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure. Such decisions would be made as part of the Tier 2 project planning processes, which would include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate. During subsequent Tier 2 project studies, specific engineering solutions would be developed to best meet environmental, cost and construction needs.</p>
Shaw_La	After reviewing the alternatives it is clear to me that I fully and strongly support Alternative 3. My company's travel to NYC has become nearly 100% Amtrak and that will only be aided by Alt 3. However the reduction in pollution from air travel and the lessening of airport congestion and noise are significant benefits.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The Preferred Alternative achieves many of the benefits of Alternative 3 with extensive the new segments, conflict free express tracks, and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost than a full second spine. Limited-stop Intercity-Express service envisioned for the Preferred Alternative would offer very competitive trip times at a substantially smaller investment than the capacity necessary to provide for non-stop high-speed rail service on a dedicated second spine. The Preferred Alternative has the potential to accommodate other service plans that feature super-express limited stop services that can offer market dominant travel times and offer potential for higher margin intercity rail products that might attract public-private partnerships.</p> <p>While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions.</p> <p>The FRA considered environmental effects in the identification and evacuation of the Preferred Alternative. The environmental effects of the Preferred Alternative, including air quality and noise, are discussed in Volume 1, Chapter 7.</p>
Shepherd_Em	Please look again at this plan. There is already a high speed rail plan from Boston to Worcester. Extending this the 55 miles through Palmer to Springfield would not cost as much as the 3 mile extension of the green line of the MBTA in Boston (millions instead of billions). And there would be a huge number of potential riders in the area.	The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions. The Preferred Alternative is further described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Sherrick_Vi	I am against the proposal for the railway to go through Milford Harbor. The construction of a tunnel would be detrimental to the ecosystem of the sound as well as the protected lands on Charles Island and those in the Gulf Pond. I grew up in Milford and it has taken DECADES, literally, to finally see an impact on the improvement of the quality of the water and wildlife in that area. You would be going backwards are for a 1/2 hour of 'progress'. It's not worth it.	<p>The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative does not include new segments between NYC and Long Island and Long Island and Connecticut via the Long Island Sound or a new Segment via Central Connecticut, as proposed in Alternative 3.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.</p>
Shields_Er	And I want to focus on what you guys said about the three alternatives. I, personally, and as well as I've -- given all the ways I've traveled, transforming I feel would be a good way to start because things change. You know, sometimes what worked may still continue to work. But in some cases it may also -- it may also help to think of what else you can do. For example, I notice the transform option pointed out different areas that are actually already served by a number of commuter railroads. And I notice that when you put a railroad or any transportation option; bus, subway, whatever, into a certain neighborhood, the neighborhood, more than likely, tends to benefit from it. Because where there's transportation, there's foot traffic, and businesses like along Main Street, Broadway, or in Albany, whatever, tends to directly benefit from that. So I feel as though if, you know, if a transform idea is considered, not only would it look at new options, it would look at fortifying the existing options like the kinds that would be vulnerable to future storms like the one that caused so much damage for the subway system three years back.	The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit. The Preferred Alternative brings the existing NEC to a state of good repair and maximizes its capacity through alleviation of chokepoints, addition of new tracks and segments at targeted locations, and implementation of service operational efficiencies. The Preferred Alternative is further described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Shields_Er	I also look at the fact that when we build things over other things, it tends to disrupt. Somebody here mentioned the residential properties and commercial properties. Never should we build something at the expense of somebody else. Because you know, like it's kind of like, you know, shut the stairwells in Brooklyn. The population's growing. Not bad with bottleneck, one entrance, for example. That doesn't help. And the businesses that don't get that foot traffic, suffer. We shouldn't make progress at the expense of others. What I mean by transform is looking at options we already have. Clearly, it's not a bridge, it's not going to appear to connect Connecticut to Long Island. Other than the Port Jefferson Ferry, you know, why not build it off of what we already have.	The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. The Preferred Alternative does not include the new segments between NYC and Long Island and Long Island and Connecticut via the Long Island Sound, as proposed in Alternative 3. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Simon_El	We need Amtrak to bring high-speed rail to Long Island which why I support that alternative route.	<p>The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative does not include new segments between NYC and Long Island and Long Island and Connecticut via the Long Island Sound or a new Segment via Central Connecticut, as proposed in Alternative 3.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.</p>
Skeen_Do	Please continue to improve the North East Corridor with such things as fencing to keep people off the tracks, tunnel replacement, reducing dangerous speed restricted curves, track upgrades and a new designed passenger car.	The Preferred Alternative, described in Volume 1, Chapter 4, focuses on upgrading the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment. By replacing aging infrastructure, eliminating chokepoints, and adding capacity, the reliability of the system will be significantly enhanced. As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, and will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure. Such decisions would be made as part of the Tier 2 project studies, which would include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate.
Skomorucha_Ro	I write to express my support for Alternative 3. My reasons align with those offered by others in support of Alternative 3; in the interest of brevity I will not repeat them here. I do want America to become the best it can be and that includes tremendously improved infrastructure and certainly improved assets related to all aspects of inter- and intra-city passenger rail.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The cost of a full high-speed second spine along with existing NEC improvements, as proposed by Alternative 3, is very high relative to the projected ridership benefits. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. Limited-stop Intercity-Express service envisioned for the Preferred Alternative would offer very competitive trip times at a substantially smaller investment than the capacity necessary to provide for high-speed rail service on a dedicated second spine.</p> <p>While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions.</p>

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Slaney_He	Conversely, I would be in favor of rebuilding the lines between Danbury, Waterbury, Hartford, and Worcester with possible spur lines through Storrs and Providence. This is a heavily traveled corridor paralleling I-84 and would get a large amount of both commuter and freight traffic. There also are remnants of old rail and trolley lines that could be utilized without cutting out huge swaths of the cultural centers of our state. My vote is for Alternative Three, with the stipulation that you listen to all the stakeholders involved before putting down track.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The cost of a full high-speed second spine along with existing NEC improvements, as proposed by Alternative 3, is very high relative to the projected ridership benefits. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. Limited-stop Intercity-Express service envisioned for the Preferred Alternative would offer very competitive trip times at a substantially smaller investment than the capacity necessary to provide for high-speed rail service on a dedicated second spine.</p> <p>While the Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS, it incorporates enhanced electrified service along the Hartford/Springfield Line in order to respond to comments received to strengthen service to Central New England and leverage existing investments and identified market opportunities. This strengthens the connection between New York City and markets along the Hartford/Springfield Line, including Hartford. The FRA noted views expressed about connections to UCONN and Hartford. However, the Preferred Alternative does not include the route to UCONN as envisioned in Alternative 2 and 3. The Preferred Alternative includes upgrading the existing NEC shoreline route and the addition of a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley.</p> <p>Also, while NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions.</p>
Sloane_Da	This rail service needs to go up the I-91 corridor and across the state inland.	<p>The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. The Preferred Alternative expands the level of service on the existing NEC between New Haven and Boston, resulting in increased intercity and regional service at the existing New London Union Station. In addition, a new supplemental segment will be added between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as considered under Alternative 1. Trains using the new segment would serve the New London/Mystic station. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line into the NEC, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield. It does not include a line connecting Hartford and Providence. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. NEC FUTURE is utilizing existing rail corridor as it did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions. The Preferred Alternative is further described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.</p>
Smari_Pe	let the railway go it will most likely be the least cost.	<p>The FRA considered both opposing and supporting views on the NEC FUTURE program in preparing the Tier 1 Final EIS and identifying a Preferred Alternative. Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative that improves the existing NEC to a state of good repair and includes new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.</p>

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Smith_Ke	I believe wholeheartedly that the proposed high speed rail network through the heart of Long Island would have a devastating effect on communities. I am particularly opposed to Alternative 3 for the terrible changes in the quality of life it would create throughout Long Island.	The Preferred Alternative does not include the new segment routing option on Long Island, as proposed in Alternative 3. The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative.
Smith_Sh	This tunnel under Long Island Sound is preposterous, both in terms of its cost and its impact on communities on both sides of the Sound. Spend your time thinking up something more sensible.	<p>The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative does not include new segments between NYC and Long Island and Long Island and Connecticut via the Long Island Sound or a new Segment via Central Connecticut, as proposed in Alternative 3.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.</p>
Snitkin_Mi	I prefer #2 since it opens up train travel to UCONN...The investment in the second alternative is worth the additional price in providing expanded service, speed and safety through 2040 (and likely beyond).	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative includes upgrading the existing NEC shoreline route and the addition of a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line into the NEC, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield. It does not include a line connecting Hartford and Providence. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.</p> <p>The FRA noted views expressed about connections to UCONN and Hartford. However, the Preferred Alternative does not include the route to UCONN as envisioned in Alternative 2 and 3. The rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative is provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative. The NEC FUTURE program is focused on corridor-wide solutions for passenger rail improvements, and the selection of the Preferred Alternative does not preclude future consideration of transit or fixed guideway improvements to meet other transportation needs across the Study Area.</p>
Sola_Ma	"Maintain" should not be an option as it is shortsighted and a waste of money that could go towards the more sustainable options of "GROW" OR "TRANSFORM".	The FRA noted public concerns about Action Alternatives. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to best meet the service needs of specific markets and avoid environmental constraints. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Sola_Ma	While I love the idea of "Transform", I am opposed to any plan that calls for a bridge or tunnel affecting Long Island Sound.	<p>The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative does not include new segments between NYC and Long Island and Long Island and Connecticut via the Long Island Sound or a new Segment via Central Connecticut, as proposed in Alternative 3.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.</p>
Sola_Ma	If that were not part of the deal, I would vote for "transform" as all evidence is pointing to people wanting to get out of their cars.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The cost of a full high-speed second spine along with existing NEC improvements, as proposed by Alternative 3, is very high relative to the projected ridership benefits. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. Limited-stop Intercity-Express service envisioned for the Preferred Alternative would offer very competitive trip times at a substantially smaller investment than the capacity necessary to provide for high-speed rail service on a dedicated second spine.</p> <p>While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions.</p>
Solanki_Ma	I support Alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridor Futures proposal because it will allow more passengers to travel major cities between Boston and Washinton DC. It will definitely help to reduce lots of traffic on I-95 and that needs to be done cause I-95 is being too much conjugated. Also it will help to prevent environmental pollution since more people will travel by Northeast Corridor. It will help university students commuting between main campus and the campus of Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts of the University of New Haven.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives, including Alternative 1, to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers.</p> <p>The FRA considered environmental effects in the identification and evaluation of the Preferred Alternative. The environmental effects of the Preferred Alternative, in particular with regard to air quality, are discussed in Chapter 7 of Volume 1.</p>

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Sorenson_Pa	Stop at UConn all the way!	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative includes upgrading the existing NEC shoreline route and the addition of a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line into the NEC, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield. It does not include a line connecting Hartford and Providence. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.</p> <p>The FRA noted views expressed about connections to UCONN and Hartford. However, the Preferred Alternative does not include the route to UCONN as envisioned in Alternative 2 and 3. The rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative is provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative. The NEC FUTURE program is focused on corridor-wide solutions for passenger rail improvements, and the selection of the Preferred Alternative does not preclude future consideration of transit or fixed guideway improvements to meet other transportation needs across the Study Area.</p>
Speirs_Sa	With that, Alternative 1 is obviously the best course of action with the least amount of environmental impact. I do think that there could be more research done on just expanding the current rail way rather than installing a new one.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives, including Alternative 1, to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers.
Standart_Cl	I think that Alternative 2 ... (And Alternative 3) would be much better alternatives and hope that they will be faster.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives, including Alternatives 2 and 3, to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers.
Standart_Cl	I think that ... (Alternative 2) and Alternative 3 would be much better alternatives and hope that they will be faster.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives, including Alternatives 2 and 3, to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions.

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Stanton_Er	I support proceeding with either alternative 2 or 3, they provide significantly increased speed and service while the other alternatives do little to address the need for a more robust public transit network.	The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit. The Preferred Alternative brings the existing NEC to a state of good repair and maximizes its capacity through alleviation of chokepoints, addition of new tracks and segments at targeted locations, and implementation of service operational efficiencies. The Preferred Alternative also removes speed restrictions where practical and safe, reduces trip times, offers frequent Metropolitan and enhanced express Intercity services, and allows substantial growth for all Regional rail markets. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine nor does not include the new segment routing option from New Haven to Hartford to Providence as considered under Alternatives 2 and 3. In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative includes electrification of the Hartford/Springfield Line, improvements to the existing NEC, and a new supplemental segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI.
Stanzione_Ke	I am in complete agreement with alternative 3 of the NEC FUTURE plan. I would support capital improvements of the existing NEC as well as expansion of the current infrastructure. The economic impact would be offset by the improvement in transportation of goods and people. Ecologically, more rail passengers leads to less automobile use thus less pollution.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The Preferred Alternative achieves many of the benefits of Alternative 3 with extensive the new segments, conflict free express tracks, and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost than a full second spine. Limited-stop Intercity-Express service envisioned for the Preferred Alternative would offer very competitive trip times at a substantially smaller investment than the capacity necessary to provide for non-stop high-speed rail service on a dedicated second spine. The Preferred Alternative has the potential to accommodate other service plans that feature super-express limited stop services that can offer market dominant travel times and offer potential for higher margin intercity rail products that might attract public-private partnerships.</p> <p>The FRA considered the environment and economic benefits in the identification and evaluation of the Preferred Alternative. These topics are discussed in Chapters 6 and 7 of Volume 1.</p>

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Stanzione_Ra	As a supporter of infrastructure investment I must respectfully disagree however with the FRA's proposed rail bypass in Southeastern CT. Amtrak has already spent an enormous amount of taxpayer money upgrading the current corridor. To even consider the astronomical cost a new bypass would cost not to mention the unnecessary disruption to historic towns is not responsible guardianship of the people's money. I therefore request that you focus on updates to the existing corridor as a responsible upgrade to the infrastructure.	<p>The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrading the existing NEC to accommodate projected growth in regional population and employment. With replacement of aging infrastructure, elimination of chokepoints, and addition of capacity, rail service can be significantly expanded and made more reliable. The Preferred Alternative does not alter the route of the existing NEC through Southeastern Connecticut, as it serves local stations and provides access for freight service to businesses along the line. However, it does include a new 50-mile segment between Old Saybrook CT and Kenyon RI that provides significant travel time benefits for trains using the new segment. It also bypasses the movable bridges and the 11 remaining at-grade crossings on the NEC Shoreline route. While the location for and design of the segment would be determined during subsequent Tier 2 project studies, the FRA proposes a commitment to avoid use of an aerial structure through the historic district of Old Lyme, CT.</p> <p>As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure or alignments. Such decisions are made as part of Tier 2 project studies, which will include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate. Consistent with this process, the FRA developed Representative Routes for the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative, which provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the effects of each Alternative. Representative Routes define an envelope within which improvements might occur and whose location and construction type could change during subsequent Tier 2 project analysis.</p> <p>The Tier 1 NEPA process analyzes the environmental effects, both adverse and beneficial, associated with the Action and the Preferred Alternatives, including land use, transportation, and environmental resources. (See Volumes 1 and 2, Chapters 5, 6 and 7).</p>
Steadman_Be	In these economically stressful times, this project seems ill-advised, especially for Amtrak, which is , as I understand, not a profitable enterprise.	The FRA considered both opposing and supporting views on the NEC FUTURE program in preparing the Tier 1 Final EIS and identifying a Preferred Alternative. Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative that improves the existing NEC to a state of good repair and includes new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Steeves-Ta	This plan will commit irreparable harm to the natural resources of this State, through habitat loss, habitat fragmentation, and perpetual disturbance (train activity). All Options provided by the planning team damage important natural areas that have been set aside for conservation by State, Federal, and Non-Profit Conservation organizations. The people of CT value these natural resources about rail travel. This plan is masquerading as a green project to limit vehicle emissions; in reality this is a private for-profit development project that will damage the environment without providing affordable travel to the public. Current AmTrak and Shoreline East Prices are equal to or greater than car travel prices.	<p>The FRA recognizes that there are sensitive resources such as those associated with local communities, wildlife refuges and habitat corridor wide. The FRA has identified a Preferred Alternative that minimizes impacts to wildlife refuge, wetlands, communities, water resources and ecological resources.</p> <p>As part of the NEC FUTURE analyses, FRA considered fares from a corridor-wide perspective and did not evaluate pricing specific to individual station pairs. Furthermore, for this Tier 1 analysis, FRA was not prescriptive about pricing for Intercity services or more specifically for Amtrak. The FRA did evaluate the potential ridership gains with more service at lower, more competitive pricing.</p> <p>See Volume 1, Chapters 4, 5 and 6 for further details about the Preferred Alternative.</p>
Stephens_Br	Make it the same place as the railroad is already	The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrading the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Stevens_Se	... building an extensive new rail line that would bypass the coast and pass through Hartford and the University of Connecticut campus would be better option.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The cost of a full high-speed second spine along with existing NEC improvements, as proposed by Alternative 3, is very high relative to the projected ridership benefits. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. Limited-stop Intercity-Express service envisioned for the Preferred Alternative would offer very competitive trip times at a substantially smaller investment than the capacity necessary to provide for high-speed rail service on a dedicated second spine.</p> <p>While the Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS, it incorporates enhanced electrified service along the Hartford/Springfield Line in order to respond to comments received to strengthen service to Central New England and leverage existing investments and identified market opportunities. This strengthens the connection between New York City and markets along the Hartford/Springfield Line, including Hartford. The FRA noted views expressed about connections to UCONN and Hartford. However, the Preferred Alternative does not include the route to UCONN as envisioned in Alternative 2 and 3. The Preferred Alternative includes upgrading the existing NEC shoreline route and the addition of a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley.</p> <p>Also, while NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions.</p>
Stoddard_Cohen	For same reason the Ronkonkoma-New Haven-Meriden route (still Alternative -3) is an equally inappropriate solution to meet the FRA's stated objectives to serve the anticipated 7 million population increase by 2040. Also the potential for environmental disruption and the huge cost of constructing and maintaining a tunnel under Long Island Sound make the Ronkonkoma-New Haven-Meriden route as untenable as the White Palins-Danbury route.	<p>The Preferred Alternative does not include the new segments between NYC and Long Island and Long Island and Connecticut via the Long Island Sound, as proposed in Alternative 3. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>Consistent with the Tier 1 NEPA process, the FRA developed Representative Routes for the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative, which provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the effects of each Alternative. Representative Routes define an envelope within which improvements might occur and whose location and construction type could change during subsequent Tier 2 project studies. Maps of the Representative Routes are available in the Mapping Atlas, Volume 1, Appendix AA and Volume 2, Appendix A which can be downloaded from the Tier 1 EIS page of the website, www.necfuture.com.</p> <p>As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure or alignments.</p>
Stoddard_Cohen	There is an important typographical error that misstates the Alternative-3 fastest travel time from Washington, D.C., to Boston on page 4-42; Section 4.5.4. The Intercity-Express travel time from Washington, D.C. to Boston is incorrectly stated as 5 hours 10 minutes. Obviously if the average decrease from the No Action Alternative is 2 hours 55 minutes and the No Action Alternative travel time is 6 hours 15 minutes, then the correct Alternative-3 travel time is 3 hours 20 minutes.	The text referenced incorrectly shows travel times for Alternative 3 Intercity-Corridor service. The Tier 1 Final EIS was revised to correct the Alternative 3 Intercity-Express Travel Times between Washington, D.C. and Boston to be on average 4 hours. See Volume 2, Chapter 4.

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Stoddard_Cohen	Intercity routes that by-pass Stamford and Norwalk undermine economic developments underway in those cities, appear to be inconsistent with the State Plan of Conservation and Development and are contrary to the long-term investment priorities stated in the Regional Plan Association's (RPA) New Haven Line Plan (see Getting Back on Track, Unlocking the Full Potential of the New Haven Line, January 2014 at www.rpa.org)	<p>The Preferred Alternative retains service on the existing NEC in southeastern Connecticut and includes a new 50-mile segment between Old Saybrook CT and Kenyon RI that provides significant travel time benefits for trains using the new segment. It also bypasses the movable bridges and the 11 remaining at-grade crossings on the NEC. The location for and design of the new segment will be determined during subsequent Tier 2 project analysis. The Preferred Alternative also incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line into the NEC, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield.</p> <p>The consideration given to land use and regional and state plans is more clearly discussed in the Tier 1 Final EIS and the Land Cover methodology is included in Volume 2, Appendix E.02. It should also be noted that as part of Tier 2 project analysis, environmental effects of projects will be fully assessed.</p>
Stoddard_Cohen	The excess time necessary to construct over 55 miles of tunnels for the White Plains- Danbury route under Alternative 3 appear to make that route unrealistic. A likely material impediment to this route will be the time lost to eminent domain cases moving through the courts, postponing the taking of right-of-way (ROW) and ruinously delaying construction of that scope. The unrelenting 7-million increase in population through 2040 requires a more logical and defensible route.	The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.
Stoddard_Cohen	The New Rochelle-Stamford-New Haven route in Alternative 3 is the most realistic, achievable route and will certainly be the fastest way to implement an Inter-city speed train and regional rail services necessary to serve the NEC population anticipated to increase by 7 million people by 2040. This route also has access to the largest concentration of potential riders and, thus, the largest source of tickets purchase to best financially support both regional and Inter-city services along the entire NEC. Why? Because transfers are readily available from local commuter New Haven Line stations. Unlike the other Alternative-3 routes, the New Rochelle Stamford-New Haven Route is consistent with economic developments underway in Stamford and Norwalk and consistent with the RPA's well thought-out, specific proposals in its 2014 report Getting Back on Track.	The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.
Strauss_St	The Grow alternative would require a federal, state, local and passenger commitment of nearly \$5.5 billion per year for twenty-five years to bring the Corridor to a state of good repair, eliminate numerous bottlenecks that regularly disrupt service and cause passenger delays, modify alignments and add significant track capacity, establish significantly more rail service and reduce travel times between city pairs. The Grow alternative allows for intercity passenger rail speeds of up to 160 mph along most of the right of way and shifts 93 million annual trips from crowded roads and air corridors to trains. It expands the market for doing business along the Corridor and widens housing and employment opportunities for the millions of individuals who live within 25 miles of the NEC. With a renewed interest in working and living in America 's cities bringing more jobs, employees and residents to cities the Northeast needs the added opportunities and mobility that the Grow alternative provides; particularly the faster, more reliable and more frequent intercity rail service and the expanded network capacity to accommodate additional commuter rail service.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives, including Alternative 2, to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers.
Strauss_St	It is also important to note that the No Action alternative is not an acceptable outcome of this process. Current expenditures by the federal government, the states and Amtrak are insufficient to reduce the existing state of good repair backlog on the Corridor. The No Action alternative would not significantly change this situation and would result in the continued slow degradation of the reliability of both commuter rail and intercity passenger rail service.	As described in Volume 1, Chapter 9, Evaluation of the Preferred Alternative, the No Action Alternative inadequate to meet the needs of the Northeast. The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrades to the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment. By replacing aging infrastructure and eliminating chokepoints, train service will be faster and far more reliable. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Strauss_St	Should the FRA chose the more ambitious Transform alternative for the Corridor I would also like to voice my support for the proposed alignment through Long Island between New York City and New Haven. This alignment would be truly transformational by creating a way to exit the Island without having to travel through New York City. It would open the Corridor to a large rail market on Long Island and provide an extraordinary opportunity to reduce traffic and congestion in Nassau County, New York City, the northern suburbs of New York City and southwestern Connecticut.	<p>The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative does not include new segments between NYC and Long Island and Long Island and Connecticut via the Long Island Sound or a new Segment via Central Connecticut, as proposed in Alternative 3.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.</p>
Sulmasy_Lo	A new route through UConn Storrs and direct linkage from state capitals Hartford to Providence along with expanding coverage to White Plains, Danbury, Waterbury, and Worcester is critical to the vibrancy of the region's future with population expansion. I strongly support Alternative 3 as the way to truly transform our transportation capabilities for a viable future along the NEC	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative includes upgrading the existing NEC shoreline route and the addition of a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line into the NEC, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield. It does not include a line connecting Hartford and Providence. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.</p> <p>The FRA noted views expressed about connections to UCONN and Hartford. However, the Preferred Alternative does not include the route to UCONN as envisioned in Alternative 2 and 3. The rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative is provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative. The NEC FUTURE program is focused on corridor-wide solutions for passenger rail improvements, and the selection of the Preferred Alternative does not preclude future consideration of transit or fixed guideway improvements to meet other transportation needs across the Study Area.</p>
Sundack_Br	I believe the NEC has a pivotal role to play as the primary transportation provider for the region. Population is on the increase, air transportation is inconvenient for trips under 300 miles, and highway expansion is out of the question. Amtrak's plan for routing high speed service on improved rights of way is a good one	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative that is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative is competitive with other modes and combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers.
Sutherland_Ru	But to go beyond Birchwood Co-operative property, to run Amtrak through the main line of Long Island right through the middle of Long Island, would disrupt one of the densest residential suburban commercial properties in the country. I just can't conceive that aspect of the Alternative No. 3. Not to expect -- not to mention the expense of running a main line through the middle of the Long Island. It's just phenomenal. Also, the planned tunnel under Long Island Sound, the expense of that.	<p>The Preferred Alternative does not include the new segments on Long Island, as proposed in Alternative 3. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative</p> <p>As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure or alignments in the Tier 1 Record of Decision.</p>

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Swarts_Ma	I vote to improve the existing rails...not to add a new rail. We are already dealing with decreasing shoreline and development. Their is not enough land to add a new line.	The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrading the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Swarts_Ma	I vote to improve the existing rails...not to add a new rail. We are already dealing with decreasing shoreline and development. Their is not enough land to add a new line.	The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrading the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Sweeney_Ka	Proposal 3 for high speed train service through Floral Park Stewart Manor and Garden City over to Eisenhower Park does not make sense. The truest failure of train service on Long Island is that there are no north south arteries. We have plenty of service and plenty of different kinds of roads highway and local that go east and west but if you want to go from the South shore to the middle of the island or north shore there is no railroad link. Same especially out east you have to ferry across to shelter island to greenport. Linking a tunnel to New Haven is a good idea though.	The Preferred Alternative does not include the new segments between NYC and Long Island and Long Island and Connecticut via the Long Island Sound, as proposed in Alternative 3. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.
Sweenwy_Jo	alternative -- Choice No. 1 is a loser from the beginning. It's like, let it stay the way it is, let it rot away. We cannot possibly condone that.	The FRA noted public concerns about Action Alternatives. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to best meet the service needs of specific markets and avoid environmental constraints. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.
Sweenwy_Jo	I think each of the alternatives offers many pluses that are going to improve and upgrade the infrastructure. I think there's no doubt about the fact that there is a drastic need to upgrade the infrastructure, replace old bridges and other segments of the roadways that need to be improved.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers.
Tarr_Jo	I favor Alternative 3.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The cost of a full high-speed second spine along with existing NEC improvements, as proposed by Alternative 3, is very high relative to the projected ridership benefits. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. Limited-stop Intercity-Express service envisioned for the Preferred Alternative would offer very competitive trip times at a substantially smaller investment than the capacity necessary to provide for high-speed rail service on a dedicated second spine.</p> <p>While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions.</p>

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Terrana_RI	Not liking the plan to put Amtrak trains through Long Island. Terrible idea, bad plan, not needed.	<p>The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative does not include new segments between NYC and Long Island and Long Island and Connecticut via the Long Island Sound or a new Segment via Central Connecticut, as proposed in Alternative 3.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.</p>
Thomas_Jo	In the sense of planning for the future, Alternative 3 is the best plan. It will alleviate all of the present problems and extend service to new areas.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The Preferred Alternative achieves many of the benefits of Alternative 3 with extensive the new segments, conflict free express tracks, and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost than a full second spine. Limited-stop Intercity-Express service envisioned for the Preferred Alternative would offer very competitive trip times at a substantially smaller investment than the capacity necessary to provide for non-stop high-speed rail service on a dedicated second spine. The Preferred Alternative has the potential to accommodate other service plans that feature super-express limited stop services that can offer market dominant travel times and offer potential for higher margin intercity rail products that might attract public-private partnerships. Economic effects of the Preferred Alternative are discussed in Volume 1, Chapter 6.</p> <p>While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions.</p>
Todd_Ro	Please choose one of the less damaging Alternatives (1 or 2) outlined in the EIS."	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives, including Alternatives 1 and 2, to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers.</p>

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Tuchmann_Da	<p>I write on behalf of Akridge in strong support of Alternative 3 as defined by the NEC Future Tier 1 Draft EIS. After assessing the Draft EIS Alternatives, we believe that only Alternative 3 provides the level of rail service required to achieve the full economic potential of Union Station and its impact on the regional economy. While the Draft EIS identifies several regions north of Washington as having high potential for rail-investment based economic value capture, the introduction of premium, high-capacity rail service in Greater Washington would also have a transformational impact. Decreased travel times, more frequent service, and greater reliability for Amtrak, MARC and VRE are the key ingredients to catalyzing and leveraging substantial private sector investments (such as Burnham Place) in our region. Similar to Grand Central Terminal's position in New York City in previous decades, under Alternative 3, Union Station has the potential to serve as our region's transportation and economic crossroads. Frequent and fast rail service to New York City, Philadelphia and Baltimore will expand the perceived borders of our region making daily round trips to these destinations more commonplace. Increased regional rail service will make Union Station, and the areas accessible to it, a compelling place for businesses with a national presence to locate. Coupled with long-range, planned improvements to our region's subway system, Alternative 3 would promote enhanced, convenient access from Union Station to Reagan National, Baltimore Washington International, Dulles International and even Philadelphia International Airports. This access would allow downtown Washington to compete with any region in the world to attract and retain global corporations.</p>	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The cost of a full high-speed second spine along with existing NEC improvements, as proposed by Alternative 3, is very high relative to the projected ridership benefits. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. Limited-stop Intercity-Express service envisioned for the Preferred Alternative would offer very competitive trip times at a substantially smaller investment than the capacity necessary to provide for high-speed rail service on a dedicated second spine.</p> <p>While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions.</p> <p>The FRA considered economic effects and growth with regard to metropolitan areas in the identification and evaluation of the Preferred Alternative. Economic benefits and growth would occur all along the Preferred Alternative, including the Greater Washington Area, and are discussed in Volume 1, Chapter 6.</p>
Turner_Da	<p>I strongly oppose tunneling under the LI Sound through Milford Harbor.</p>	<p>The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative does not include new segments between NYC and Long Island and Long Island and Connecticut via the Long Island Sound or a new Segment via Central Connecticut, as proposed in Alternative 3.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.</p>

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Turner_Mo	For Connecticut, I am most interested in Alternative 2. Our highways are overburdened, we need the new inland rail lines, we and the connections with the Providence airport and with UConn (where I taught forseveral years, and am very conscious of how isolated it is for a major state university). As a frequent passengeron the entire corridor from Washington to Boston and all stops between, I would hope for the greatest investment in the entire rail system, including the developments in CT. But I think that those developments are the first priority, and I am uncertain about tunneling beneath Long Island Sound. So I would advocate for Alternative 2.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative includes upgrading the existing NEC shoreline route and the addition of a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line into the NEC, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield. It does not include a line connecting Hartford and Providence. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.</p> <p>The FRA noted views expressed about connections to UCONN and Hartford. However, the Preferred Alternative does not include the route to UCONN as envisioned in Alternative 2 and 3. The rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative is provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative. The NEC FUTURE program is focused on corridor-wide solutions for passenger rail improvements, and the selection of the Preferred Alternative does not preclude future consideration of transit or fixed guideway improvements to meet other transportation needs across the Study Area.</p>
Turon_Be	It 's for this reason that I will voice my support for Alt. 1. I think the \$65 billion cost is within the realm of what could win the necessary political support to be fully funded by a combination of federal, state, and private money. It also is the alternative which leads to the biggest jump in ridership, with annual intercity passenger increasing from today 's 11.7 million to 34 million. Commuter or "regional" ridership also sees a considerable bump. For the other two alternatives (Alt. 2 & Alt. 3) I think you see a case of diminishing returns on investment. For Alt. 1 if you divide the ridership by cost you get 523,000 passengers for each billion you spend, but in Alt. 2 only another additional 43,000 per each billion after doubling the cost to \$135 billion. Adding \$155 billion in Alt. 3 gets you only another 5 million passengers annually over Alt. 2, at over quadruple the cost of Alt. 1. True, you do see a big jump in regional ridership 72 million in Alt. 3 compared to Alt. 1; but perhaps this is another reason to "unbundle" projects so that they can be judge on their regional impacts. They could part of a la carte menu of options to increase regional commuter rail capacity beyond the projects included in Alt. 1. Once again I support Alt. 1 because at about \$143m per mile its costs are in line with the cost per mile of Britain 's HS-2 which is \$152m per mile adding up to a total project cost of \$50.1 billion.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives, including Alternative 1, to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. As described in Volume 2, Appendix B.9, Operations and Maintenance Costs, for all Action Alternatives, and Volume 1, Appendix BB for the Preferred Alternative, the total revenues exceed total costs, resulting in positive net contribution, for the proposed Intercity services (Intercity-Express, Metropolitan, and Intercity-Corridor services). For information on the ridership methodology, see Volume 1, Appendix BB and Volume 2, Appendix B.
Turon_Be	The \$290 billion cost of Alt. 3 in this DEIS is mind blowing even to a fierce HSR supporter such as myself. I think the general reaction among the public will be a rolling of the eyes and then a forgetting of the whole idea of significantly upgrading and expanding passenger rail service in the BosWash corridor.	The FRA focused on a corridor-wide investment program for NEC FUTURE and did not make decisions about project-specific funding or financing. Funding and financing the Tier 2 projects necessary to implement the Preferred Alternative will be an incremental process for the federal government, Amtrak, the NEC states and stakeholders, and the entire region. Opportunities exist for both the public and private sectors to participate in implementing the Preferred Alternative. The FRA and the NEC Commission will take a leading role in working with project sponsors to identify the federal financial assistance necessary to advance implementation, including existing and future grant and other financing programs and options. Funding and financing options will be further detailed in the Service Development Plan.

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Turon_Be	Amtrak 's New Haven-Springfield Line is currently being doubled-tracked; it should also I think be electrified as part of the final alternative, eliminating the need to change engines at New Haven. Building a new segment of high speed line between Hartford and Providence via the University of Connecticut in Storrs could provide an alternative path and perhaps replace the need for the 50-mile Old Saybrook-Kenyon ' new segment currently included in Alt. 1. Some of the additional Boston-NYC frequencies of Alt. 1 could then be routed via Hartford instead of the current coastal route.	The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. The Preferred Alternative expands the level of service on the existing NEC between New Haven and Boston, resulting in increased intercity and regional service at the existing New London Union Station. In addition, a new supplemental segment will be added between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as considered under Alternative 1. Trains using the new segment would serve the New London/Mystic station. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line into the NEC, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield. It does not include a line connecting Hartford and Providence. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. NEC FUTURE is utilizing existing rail corridor as it did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions. The Preferred Alternative is further described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Tzanavaris_Ch	Looking beyond 2016 and the next few decades, well into the future, it is clear that ambitious efforts to develop the most comprehensive and far-reaching (also the most costly, in the short-term) alternative plan is not really an alternative at all, but the only logical solution. I would argue that the current alternative don't go far enough.	The purpose of NEC FUTURE is to upgrade aging infrastructure and to improve the reliability, capacity, connectivity, performance, and resiliency of future passenger rail service on the NEC for both Intercity and Regional trips, while promoting environmental sustainability and continued economic growth. The Preferred Alternative is consistent with this purpose and responsive to the overall NEC needs (Volume 1 and 2, Chapter 3). The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. The Preferred Alternative brings the existing NEC to a state of good repair and maximizes its capacity through alleviation of chokepoints, addition of new tracks and segments at targeted locations, and implementation of service operational efficiencies. The Preferred Alternative also removes speed restrictions where practical and safe, reduces trip times, offers frequent Metropolitan and enhanced express Intercity services, and allows substantial growth for all Regional rail markets. See Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Tzanavaris_Ch	The FRA should push for the strongest possible development so that there is a place for rail in a technological future that could quickly render it obsolete, if it were not done properly,	The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. The Preferred Alternative brings the existing NEC to a state of good repair and maximizes its capacity through alleviation of chokepoints, addition of new tracks and segments at targeted locations, and implementation of service operational efficiencies. The Preferred Alternative also removes speed restrictions where practical and safe, reduces trip times, offers frequent Metropolitan and enhanced express Intercity services, and allows substantial growth for all Regional rail markets. See Volume 1, Chapter 4.

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Vachon_To	I'm writing in support of the expansion of rail service to alleviate delays as well as to expand access in the Northeast Corridor. As a frequent rail commuter to NYC and Washington, DC, and as Teacher and Researcher at the University of CT, I find alternatives 2 and 3 to be most desirable. These alternatives offer a connection to the UConn campus, which would be a tremendous opportunity to grow the knowledge economy in CT and create lots of good paying jobs as well as attract the brightest scholars from around the world to attend our flagship state university. The Northeast region and the state of CT in particular needs to be a leader by creating a 21st century infrastructure.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative includes upgrading the existing NEC shoreline route and the addition of a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line into the NEC, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield. It does not include a line connecting Hartford and Providence. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.</p> <p>The FRA noted views expressed about connections to UCONN and Hartford. However, the Preferred Alternative does not include the route to UCONN as envisioned in Alternative 2 and 3. The rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative is provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative. The NEC FUTURE program is focused on corridor-wide solutions for passenger rail improvements, and the selection of the Preferred Alternative does not preclude future consideration of transit or fixed guideway improvements to meet other transportation needs across the Study Area.</p>
Valudes_He	Our ability to connect knowledge-based individuals to points throughout the Northeast region, through a system that is convenient and reliable positions us for further economic growth. Our organizations jointly support an action alternative that goes beyond just maintaining the role of rail. Alternative 2 and Alternative 3 that look to grow the role of rail service and transform it into the dominant choice for travel better align with our vision.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives, including Alternatives 2 and 3, to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. The Preferred Alternative retains service on the existing NEC in southeastern Connecticut and includes a new 50-mile segment between Old Saybrook CT and Kenyon RI that provides significant travel time benefits for trains using the new segment. It also bypasses the movable bridges and the 11 remaining at-grade crossings on the NEC. The location for and design of the new segment will be determined during subsequent Tier 2 project analysis. The Preferred Alternative also incorporates an electrified Hartford Line into the NEC, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield. This could play a significant role in enhancing the competitiveness of the central Connecticut region as well as provide source for jobs and growth across the Northeast.</p>

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Varano_Sa	I vehemently oppose any Amtrack rail service suggestions that run through Garden City, NY. Such action would be the most destructive action to the entire communities of Garden City, Stewart manor, and Floral Park.	<p>The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative does not include new segments between NYC and Long Island and Long Island and Connecticut via the Long Island Sound or a new Segment via Central Connecticut, as proposed in Alternative 3.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.</p>
Varano_Yv	This proposal [of a new high speed line ... through Nassau County and Suffolk] is so preposterous I can believe it is even given a second thought. I can't imagine there is a single community along that route that would be supportive of this proposal.	<p>The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative does not include new segments between NYC and Long Island and Long Island and Connecticut via the Long Island Sound or a new Segment via Central Connecticut, as proposed in Alternative 3.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.</p>
Vasko_Jo	I read the information, and I believe Plan #2, is the best option.	As a result of the Tier 1 Draft EIS and the public comment process, the FRA has identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1 Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives, including Alternative 2, to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. It replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers.

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Vella_An	No - as a long island resident I do not want this to happen. We have too much congestion on tracks, I don't want anymore. Amtrack is constantly breaking down and doesn't maintain its tracks and tunnels. Stay off Long Island.	<p>The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative does not include new segments between NYC and Long Island and Long Island and Connecticut via the Long Island Sound or a new Segment via Central Connecticut, as proposed in Alternative 3.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.</p>
Vinci_Ke	Actions indicated by Alternative 3 are long overdue. I fully support such measures - the safety of riders and environment are essential - not to mention the economic benefits.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. The Preferred Alternative achieves many of the benefits of Alternative 3 with extensive the new segments, conflict free express tracks, and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost than a full second spine. Limited-stop Intercity-Express service envisioned for the Preferred Alternative would offer very competitive trip times at a substantially smaller investment than the capacity necessary to provide for non-stop high-speed rail service on a dedicated second spine. The Preferred Alternative has the potential to accommodate other service plans that feature super-express limited stop services that can offer market dominant travel times and offer potential for higher margin intercity rail products that might attract public-private partnerships.</p> <p>The FRA considered the environment, safety, and economic benefits in the identification and evaluation of the Preferred Alternative. These topics are discussed in Volume 1, Chapters 6 and 7.</p>
Vinci_Ke	Alt. #1 & Alt. #2 - any improvements is nice	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives, including Alternatives 1 and 2, to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers.</p>

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Vinci_Ke	My preference is Alternative 3. Fix it and do it right! People will complain about infrastructure into the future with #1, #2. Do it right spend the money now - Our current, Alt 1, alt 2 do not compare with China, Japan, & other nations.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. The Preferred Alternative achieves many of the benefits of Alternative 3 with extensive the new segments, conflict free express tracks, and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost than a full second spine. Limited-stop Intercity-Express service envisioned for the Preferred Alternative would offer very competitive trip times at a substantially smaller investment than the capacity necessary to provide for non-stop high-speed rail service on a dedicated second spine. The Preferred Alternative has the potential to accommodate other service plans that feature super-express limited stop services that can offer market dominant travel times and offer potential for higher margin intercity rail products that might attract public-private partnerships.</p> <p>While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions.</p>
Vinci_Ke	Alt. #1 & Alt. #2 - any improvements is nice	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives, including Alternatives 1 and 2, to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers.
Vitale_Ma	I was extremely disappointed to hear about the proposal for a high speed train through Garden City. I obviously don't want to see this happen for several reasons.	<p>The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative does not include new segments between NYC and Long Island and Long Island and Connecticut via the Long Island Sound or a new Segment via Central Connecticut, as proposed in Alternative 3.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.</p>
Vitale_Pa	Alt # 3 is absurd and the billions of dollars would be better spent improving existing infrastructure and rail management.	The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Vitale_Pa	Don't be ridiculous and move this [Alternative 3] plan forward.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The cost of a full high-speed second spine along with existing NEC improvements, as proposed by Alternative 3, is very high relative to the projected ridership benefits. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. Limited-stop Intercity-Express service envisioned for the Preferred Alternative would offer very competitive trip times at a substantially smaller investment than the capacity necessary to provide for high-speed rail service on a dedicated second spine.</p> <p>While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions.</p>
Vogel_Ke	But I know a good idea when I see one; And the program should be expanded	<p>As a result of the Tier 1 Draft EIS and the public comment process, the FRA has identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. Volume 1, Chapter 6 describes the economic effects that could occur as a result of the Preferred Alternative.</p>
Vogel_Ke	as soon as you cross with a local train you're not going to be high speed anymore. And that's one of the reasons why I find it very interesting that the line sort of goes not quite to the existing Northeast Corridor hubs because that's where the slow present day trains exist. So it kind of makes sense to think new like that.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. The Preferred Alternative reduces trip time along the corridor. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.</p>
Votto_Di	I am an Old Lyme property owner and would like to see alternative 3.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The Preferred Alternative achieves many of the benefits of Alternative 3 with extensive the new segments, conflict free express tracks, and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost than a full second spine. Limited-stop Intercity-Express service envisioned for the Preferred Alternative would offer very competitive trip times at a substantially smaller investment than the capacity necessary to provide for non-stop high-speed rail service on a dedicated second spine. The Preferred Alternative has the potential to accommodate other service plans that feature super-express limited stop services that can offer market dominant travel times and offer potential for higher margin intercity rail products that might attract public-private partnerships. The FRA proposes a commitment to avoid use of an aerial structure through the historic district of Old Lyme, CT.</p> <p>While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions.</p>
Walters_Sc	Only has the ability to move huge numbers of people into and out of dense urban centers. That projects built nearly 200 years ago, in some cases, are still in daily use demonstrates the profound value of rain infrastructure investments. Please make the necessary investments -- which have been long delayed -- to not only maintain but radically increase capacity and connectivity of rail transportation.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative to improve passenger rail service on the NEC in a manner that will enhance mobility options and expand passenger rail service in support of future population and employment growth in the Study Area. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.</p>

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Ward_Sp	I am much more in favor of connecting New Haven, Hartford, and Providence by rail, especially since that plan would link UConn to all three cities. This University is a huge asset to our state, and further linking it with the rest of New England will only serve to expand its influence, prestige, and profitability. I	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative includes upgrading the existing NEC shoreline route and the addition of a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line into the NEC, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield. It does not include a line connecting Hartford and Providence. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.</p> <p>The FRA noted views expressed about connections to UCONN and Hartford. However, the Preferred Alternative does not include the route to UCONN as envisioned in Alternative 2 and 3. The rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative is provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative. The NEC FUTURE program is focused on corridor-wide solutions for passenger rail improvements, and the selection of the Preferred Alternative does not preclude future consideration of transit or fixed guideway improvements to meet other transportation needs across the Study Area.</p>
Wardman_Sa	I am a resident of Milford, and I am especially concerned about the plan for a tunnel from Milford to Long Island. I would be against a tunnel without having further information on the plan and its effects on my community.	<p>The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative does not include new segments between NYC and Long Island and Long Island and Connecticut via the Long Island Sound or a new Segment via Central Connecticut, as proposed in Alternative 3.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.</p>

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Warren_Da	I want to speak strongly in favor for the connecting route between Hartford and Providence with a station at UConn, because in my area, property values are basically generated, increased and decreased, by people's ability to work in these two areas and some other areas, but mostly the significant job centers.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative includes upgrading the existing NEC shoreline route and the addition of a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line into the NEC, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield. It does not include a line connecting Hartford and Providence. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.</p> <p>The FRA noted views expressed about connections to UCONN and Hartford. However, the Preferred Alternative does not include the route to UCONN as envisioned in Alternative 2 and 3. The rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative is provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative. The NEC FUTURE program is focused on corridor-wide solutions for passenger rail improvements, and the selection of the Preferred Alternative does not preclude future consideration of transit or fixed guideway improvements to meet other transportation needs across the Study Area.</p>
Weimann_Pe	It is a wise idea to move the tracks away from the receding shoreline.	<p>The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrades to the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment and replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative provides connections along the existing Northeast Corridor, along a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT and Kenyon, RI, and along the Hartford/Springfield Line. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.</p>
Wenck_M	i believe that Alternative 3 will provide the most beneficial services to the most people and bring the RR to vitally important central areas.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The cost of a full high-speed second spine along with existing NEC improvements, as proposed by Alternative 3, is very high relative to the projected ridership benefits. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. Limited-stop Intercity-Express service envisioned for the Preferred Alternative would offer very competitive trip times at a substantially smaller investment than the capacity necessary to provide for high-speed rail service on a dedicated second spine.</p> <p>While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions.</p>

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Wenck_Wi	I prefer Alternative 3 with Benefits. This route should have been built 20 years ago. Let's do this right!	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The cost of a full high-speed second spine along with existing NEC improvements, as proposed by Alternative 3, is very high relative to the projected ridership benefits. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. Limited-stop Intercity-Express service envisioned for the Preferred Alternative would offer very competitive trip times at a substantially smaller investment than the capacity necessary to provide for high-speed rail service on a dedicated second spine.</p> <p>While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions.</p>
Wenzel_Ma	I don't support any of these proposed unnecessary plans but the Alt 3 option will ruin so many things for no justified reason & ruin Garden City.	The Preferred Alternative does not include the new segments between NYC and Long Island and Long Island and Connecticut via the Long Island Sound, as proposed in Alternative 3. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative.
Wenzel_Ma	Fix what is existing & can't be maintained before building extravagant projects that are objected by all directly impacted & supported by distant political influence.	As a result of the Tier 1 Draft EIS and the public comment process, the FRA has identified a Preferred Alternative to improve passenger rail service on the NEC in a manner that will enhance mobility options and expand passenger rail service in support of future population and employment growth in the Study Area. The Preferred Alternative, described in Volume 1, Chapter 4, improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. The Preferred Alternative does not include a second spine.
Wierzbicki_Sa	Please do not destroy our Sound or our towns with this nonsense . There are plenty of other modes of transportation- use Ferrys or build a subway under the current railroad tracks but do not destroy our lovely Sound!	The Preferred Alternative does not include the new segments on Long Island or a Long Island Sound crossing, as proposed in Alternative 3. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Wilkins_An	I would like to applaud the inclusion of Worcester, MA as a potential station for increased high-speed service and would strongly urge consideration of Alternatives 3.3 or 3.4.	The FRA identified a Preferred Alternative that focuses on leveraging the investment in the existing NEC and Hartford/Springfield Lines over the proposed Hartford-Worcester routing. FRA considered travel time improvements, connectivity, environmental benefits and effects and overall mobility benefits when deciding on a Preferred Alternative. In addition to the FRA decision to prioritize the NEC, the cost of a second spine was high relative to the travel-time savings and other benefits. The FRA found that much of the benefit of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. Improved service between Worcester and Boston are being evaluated as part of a separate study effort that was considered in the definition of the Preferred Alternative. The rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative is provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative.
Williams_Ja	Building a route through Annapolis and Delmarva would protect service in the event of a terrorist attack on the Havre de Grace bridge-which must be one of the most tempting targets in the US-as well as open up new commuting options in Baltimore and DC, and open a gateway to restoring seasonal passenger service to the Delaware shore, which would reduce traffic on congested 2-lane highways... I'd further note that the Delmarva option could utilize tracks over the Bay Bridge and would be much cheaper than building a tunnel beneath Long Island Sound.	Information about Preliminary Alternatives that were not evaluated as part of the EIS can be found in Volume 2, Appendix B in the Preliminary Alternatives Evaluation Report. The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrades to the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment. By replacing aging infrastructure and eliminating chokepoints, train service will be faster and far more reliable. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Williams_Mi	...after having gone over the Tier 1 Environmental Impact Statement, I believe that the NEC Future should choose Alternative 3.2, which is the Long Island to Providence routing, for the NEC Future.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The cost of a full high-speed second spine along with existing NEC improvements, as proposed by Alternative 3, is very high relative to the projected ridership benefits. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. Limited-stop Intercity-Express service envisioned for the Preferred Alternative would offer very competitive trip times at a substantially smaller investment than the capacity necessary to provide for high-speed rail service on a dedicated second spine.</p> <p>While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions.</p>
Williams_Mi	Understanding that sometimes budget constraints lower the aim of where, of what can be done, if Alternative 3.2 is not able funded or any of the other Alternative 3 routings, then I would put my support behind Alternative 2.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives, including Alternative 2 and 3, to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.</p>
Wilmerding_Ga	keep and repair the existing route and build new track from Providence to U Conn/Storrs to Hartford. Though initial cost may appear higher, protecting coastline and expanding service inland has many advantages. Instead of eminent domain litigation over well-loved locations and environmental mitigation, fund new access. A broader base increases ridership, hence efficiency, and minimizes local impacts. New, alternative service routes allow for existing track to remain the same scale, the same right-of-way. More rail decreases car and air traffic and lowers carbon emissions and pollution, while increasing quality of life and prosperity. An inland route offers systemic redundancy and resiliency in case of disruption from a storm or bridge failure, or catastrophe like a bomb train explosion along a single route such as 1-95... A web of smaller track across a region, rather than one large corridor on a stressed and crowded seacoast, gives greater flexibility, security, mobility and opportunity for operators and public, alike, over time.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative includes upgrading the existing NEC shoreline route and the addition of a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line into the NEC, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield. It does not include a line connecting Hartford and Providence. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.</p> <p>The FRA noted views expressed about connections to UCONN and Hartford. However, the Preferred Alternative does not include the route to UCONN as envisioned in Alternative 2 and 3. The rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative is provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative. The NEC FUTURE program is focused on corridor-wide solutions for passenger rail improvements, and the selection of the Preferred Alternative does not preclude future consideration of transit or fixed guideway improvements to meet other transportation needs across the Study Area.</p>

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Wilson_Me	Alternative 2 and 3 seem most viable	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives, including Alternatives 2 and 3, to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.
Wilson_Ro	I'll sum it up and say that probably the least expensive proposition out of the proposals is the most expensive alternative in terms of our economy, in terms of funding our country. If you're a believer in the military or a believer in public service, if our economic engine stalls, everything gets cut. This is to me a lifeline that's vital for the future, even beyond 2040.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative to improve passenger rail service on the NEC in a manner that will enhance mobility options and expand passenger rail service in support of future population and employment growth in the Study Area. The Preferred Alternative, described in Volume 1, Chapter 4, improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects.
Wilson_Ro	For this reason, the most expensive alternative of building a second NEC is actually the most economically efficient and effective to keep the USA strong.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative to improve passenger rail service on the NEC in a manner that will enhance mobility options and expand passenger rail service in support of future population and employment growth in the Study Area. The Preferred Alternative, described in Volume 1, Chapter 4, improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives, however, it does not include a second spine.</p> <p>While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.</p>
Wooley_Jo	Another thing is, in the chart on alternative one in chapter four of the report, the DEIS, it states, among the other stations in Rhode Island is T.F. Green Airport, and it states both Amtrak and -- I believe both Amtrak and regional rail and commuter rail listed as operating there. That doesn't happen today. I don't know why the hell it doesn't, I always think Amtrak should and they don't. But -- silly me -- but that's on there. The way I -- the way the report reads to me, it reads as though Amtrak currently operates there when in fact they don't. I just checked the schedule before I came over here. So it could be just I'm misreading the report when I scanned it or what. But that's something that I think -- I think should be done going forward but isn't being done right now.	As stated in Volume 1, Chapter 4, T.F. Green Airport is currently served by Regional rail service only. The Preferred Alternative identifies T.F. Green Airport station as Hub stations to accommodate new service types and improve gaps in connectivity. Intercity service would be provided at least every 30 minutes at peak periods.

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Wooley_Jo	Building in Philadelphia, the whole Washington -- the Washington Square West neighborhood, I can't think of a harder place to get past your historical -- to get historical approvals than Washington Square West. This -- that may be a choice -- is listed on alternative -- as one of the things in alternative three. That may be an area where you really want to keep to your alternative two. Like I said, I would like to see it go through that part of Center City. Just for permitting sake, run it through 30th Street, and then down to the Philadelphia International Airport that way. Not necessarily on the SEPTA train. You may have to branch off kind of north of Eastwick in order to serve the terminals that way or something. But just to avoid the permitting process in Center City in Washington Square West I think is going to be abysmal.	<p>The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions. A new Philadelphia airport station has been identified as part of the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative does not include the new segment routing option to the Market East Station. The FRA has been coordinating with the City of Philadelphia about the proposed Philadelphia Airport Station through the NEC FUTURE process. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>Consistent with the Tier 1 NEPA process, the FRA developed Representative Routes for the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative, which provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the effects of each Alternative. Representative Routes define an envelope within which improvements might occur and whose location and construction type could change during subsequent Tier 2 project studies.</p>
Wooley_Jo	And for the Long Island Railroad, the Long Island tunnel, it's -- the ridership -- I think the ridership is there. I think it would be a huge -- hugely popular alternative way of getting from Long Island to Boston if it were implemented. I'm not sure if it's -- and it would certainly live up to the original purpose of the Long Island Railroad in the first place.	<p>The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative does not include new segments between NYC and Long Island and Long Island and Connecticut via the Long Island Sound or a new Segment via Central Connecticut, as proposed in Alternative 3.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.</p>
Wooley_Jo	The only possible way I could see of getting from White Plains up to Danbury is go up 684, in the median of 648, then across on 84 to Hartford that way. How you're going to get around White Plains, unless you're planning to build an alternate station on 684, then branch it off at Rye or something like that and over to 287. I really don't see, there isn't a hell of a lot of capacity on the Metro-North tracks on the Harlem line, and tunneling under White Plains is going to be expensive as well. I think what you're going to be ending up with is a station, maybe a good idea for one up by Westchester County Airport, or maybe over on the eastern side of White Plains. But it's not -- I don't see how it's going to tie in with the Metro-North station at White Plains that currently exists.	<p>The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions. The Preferred Alternative is further described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.</p>

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Wyman_Do	Our family looks forward to being able to use high speed mass transit from Huntington NY north to Boston or south to Washington DC, bypassing NYC if possible. Long Island, larger than 38 other states, is under served by high speed rail transport	<p>The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative does not include new segments between NYC and Long Island and Long Island and Connecticut via the Long Island Sound or a new Segment via Central Connecticut, as proposed in Alternative 3.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.</p>
Yale_Jacob	In our view the draft EIS has not fully examined all of the options for improvements to achieve substantial improvements on the existing corridor. Neither the "No Build" option nor Alternative 1 include all of the proposals in Governor Malloy 's "Let 's Go CT!" 30-year plan, such as restoration of four tracks on the full length of the New Haven Line.	<p>The Preferred Alternative combines key elements of all three Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate future growth in Northeast population and employment. The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. The Preferred Alternative brings the existing NEC to a state of good repair and maximizes its capacity through alleviation of chokepoints, addition of new tracks and segments at targeted locations, and implementation of service operational efficiencies. In developing the Preferred Alternative, the FRA re-evaluated the feasibility of achieving 'grow' vision service levels along the existing NEC.</p> <p>As a result of this assessment, the FRA included the Alternative 1 proposed new segment between Old Saybrook, CT and Kenyon, RI and incorporated a two-track, electrified Hartford/Springfield Line. Between New Haven, CT, and New York, the Preferred Alternative includes capacity to support transit-style regional rail service, as advocated by Connecticut Governor Malloy, and additional trackage to support faster intercity travel time.</p> <p>With regard to Governor Malloy's Let's Go Connecticut plan, the Preferred Alternative does incorporate Connecticut's funded or programmed improvements as part of the No Action Alternative; those improvements that are not yet funded were also considered in defining the Action Alternatives and in the development of the Preferred Alternative. Specific details of how to achieve the proposed performance levels would be subject to subsequent Tier 2 project studies and would be coordinated with Connecticut DOT, stakeholders and the public.</p>

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Yale_Jacob	With respect to any potential future alignment of high-speed rail service that could be developed later in the century, we recommend against any alignment that does not include New Haven. The development of an interior route would have significant environmental impact on rural landscapes and would encourage sprawl instead of maximizing use of existing urban centers. In addition, the FRA should consider the longstanding commercial and cultural ties between New Haven, the residential communities along the shoreline, and the financial centers in Fairfield County as well as New York. The route alignment should reflect the fact that one-half of the population of Connecticut lives in New Haven and Fairfield counties. It should also anticipate and exploit the opportunities for the expanded four-track Hartford to Springfield line to support a knowledge corridor between New Haven, Jackson Labs, the University of Connecticut, and Boston. In our view any new alignment should reinforce, instead of compete with, the commercial and cultural ties that already exist in Connecticut.	<p>As described in Volume 1, Chapter 2, the factors identified by the commenter were considerations in the deliberation of the Preferred Alternative. As a result of the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS and the public comment process, the FRA has identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines key elements of all three Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate future growth in Northeast population and employment. The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. The Preferred Alternative brings the existing NEC to a state of good repair and maximizes its capacity through alleviation of chokepoints, addition of new tracks and segments at targeted locations, and implementation of service operational efficiencies. The Preferred Alternative also removes speed restrictions where practical and safe, reduces trip times, offers frequent Metropolitan and enhanced express Intercity services, and allows substantial growth for all Regional rail markets. The Preferred Alternative also incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line as part of the NEC, providing one-seat ride service to and from the NEC and Springfield. Between New Haven, CT, and New York, the Preferred Alternative includes capacity to support expanded regional service to and from New York and additional trackage to support faster intercity travel time.</p> <p>In Connecticut, the existing NEC shoreline route will be upgraded with a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative includes expanded service to New Haven, CT. The Preferred Alternative also incorporates enhanced electrified service along the Hartford/Springfield Line which strengthens service to Central New England and leverages existing investments and identified market opportunities. While the Preferred Alternative does not include a second spine that would connect Storrs, CT, the Preferred Alternative does not preclude future development of second spine, or additional segments.</p>
Yuste-Alonso_Ru	I am writing to support the initiative to expand the railroad that goes through UConn Storrs. It would extremely helpful for both domestic and particularly international graduate students like me, and help make UConn more internationally competitive and accessible.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative includes upgrading the existing NEC shoreline route and the addition of a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line into the NEC, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield. It does not include a line connecting Hartford and Providence. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.</p> <p>The FRA noted views expressed about connections to UCONN and Hartford. However, the Preferred Alternative does not include the route to UCONN as envisioned in Alternative 2 and 3. The rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative is provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative. The NEC FUTURE program is focused on corridor-wide solutions for passenger rail improvements, and the selection of the Preferred Alternative does not preclude future consideration of transit or fixed guideway improvements to meet other transportation needs across the Study Area.</p>

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Zajac_Ro	Therefore, while alternatives 2 and 3 include the development of more infrastructure they expand rail service significantly to areas that do not have it. Commuting down Interstate 91 between Hartford and New Haven, and frequently making trips into the Worcester area, I know the relief that rail service through these areas would provide. And while the cost for the answer structure is greater, the long-term benefits of increased ridership and indeed reduction in environmental impacts through the reduction in automobile usage, would in the long run provide much greater benefits to the environment and the social and economic well-being of the Northeast corridor.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. Economic effects of the Preferred Alternative are described in Volume 1, Chapter 6. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.</p> <p>In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative provides connections along the existing Northeast Corridor, along a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT and Kenyon, RI, and along the Hartford/Springfield Line which strengthens service to Central New England and leverages existing investments and identified market opportunities.</p>
Zatorski_Ra	I am fully in favor of the proposal 'Alternative 1' for the NEC. This will allow better rail travel in the busy Northeast corridor. As a frequent user of the rail system, I am familiar with the delays in the system, this proposal will help alleviate the current situation.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives, including Alternative 1, to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers.
Zeller_Ja	I support modernizing the NEC for generations to come. Alt. 2 seems to have the best benefit / cost ratio.	As a result of the Tier 1 Draft EIS and the public comment process, the FRA has identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1 Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives, including Alternative 2, to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. It replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers.

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Ziaks_Da	I recommend adoption of Alternative 2 because it will incorporate Hartford and UConn into the NEC. This would add all of central CT and southern MA to the ridership area.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative includes upgrading the existing NEC shoreline route and the addition of a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line into the NEC, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield. It does not include a line connecting Hartford and Providence. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.</p> <p>The FRA noted views expressed about connections to UCONN and Hartford. However, the Preferred Alternative does not include the route to UCONN as envisioned in Alternative 2 and 3. The rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative is provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative. The NEC FUTURE program is focused on corridor-wide solutions for passenger rail improvements, and the selection of the Preferred Alternative does not preclude future consideration of transit or fixed guideway improvements to meet other transportation needs across the Study Area.</p>
Zipprich_Be	We need to invest for the next 100 years: the Alternative 3 proposal -- rebuilding the corridor for high speed rail -- would be a game changer, tying the Boston-Washington corridor together in such a way to ensure that it becomes and remains an unified economic center unrivaled by anywhere else in the world, unlike today, where it operates like three separate cities... Imagine the entrepreneur who lives in Boston, but who can now hire talent from New York -- because suddenly the commute is less than the commute from Poughkeepsie to Manhattan on Metro North. Think about the human capital potential that unlocks , the economic growth it will unleash, the jobs created, and economic livelihoods enhanced. It would be great to see the transformative option actually move forward.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. The cost of a full high-speed second spine along with existing NEC improvements, as proposed by Alternative 3, is very high relative to the projected ridership benefits. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. Limited-stop Intercity-Express service envisioned for the Preferred Alternative would offer very competitive trip times at a substantially smaller investment than the capacity necessary to provide for high-speed rail service on a dedicated second spine.</p> <p>The FRA considered economic benefits, including labor market effects and agglomeration, in the identification and evaluation of the Preferred Alternative. This topic is discussed in Chapter 6 of Volume 1.</p>
Zito_Ch	...we should grow or transform the NEC as describe in Alternatives 2 and 3.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives, including Alternatives 2 and 3, to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.</p>
Zoghb_Ni	I oppose to Alternative 1 of the FRA 's Northeast Corridor Futures proposal.	<p>The FRA noted public concerns about Action Alternatives. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to best meet the service needs of specific markets and avoid environmental constraints. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.</p>

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Anonymous_003	Alternative 3! Rail is crucial to a sustainable future	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. The Preferred Alternative achieves many of the benefits of Alternative 3 with extensive the new segments, conflict free express tracks, and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost than a full second spine. Limited-stop Intercity-Express service envisioned for the Preferred Alternative would offer very competitive trip times at a substantially smaller investment than the capacity necessary to provide for non-stop high-speed rail service on a dedicated second spine. The Preferred Alternative has the potential to accommodate other service plans that feature super-express limited stop services that can offer market dominant travel times and offer potential for higher margin intercity rail products that might attract public-private partnerships.</p> <p>While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions.</p>
Anonymous_004	Page 4-42 of the report incorrectly states that the travel time from DC to Boston of Alternative 3 would be 5 hr 10 min rather than the correct value (I believe 3 hr 20 min).	The text referenced incorrectly shows travel times for Alternative 3 Intercity-Corridor service. The Tier 1 Final EIS was revised to correct the Alternative 3 Intercity-Express Travel Times between Washington, D.C. and Boston to be on average 4 hours. See Volume 2, Chapter 4.
Anonymous_005	Sustain is the only plan that has a real practical chance of being complete within its stated time frame and budget.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers.
Anonymous_012	The most ambitious plan Transform is needed to reduce car travel along 95.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.</p> <p>While the Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS, it divert 42 percent of trips from auto, air, and intercity bus. Appendix BB of Volume 1 provides more details regarding diversions.</p>
Anonymous_013	Supportive of the new airport alignment	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The FRA noted interest regarding service to the Philadelphia International Airport as proposed in Alternative 2, and the Preferred Alternative includes service to Philadelphia International Airport with a refinement to the route proposed in Alternative 2. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Anonymous_013	Not supportive of the new downtown Phila Station. Keep all services through 30th St Station to create the momentum for revitalization and organic enhancement of that area of the city.	The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrades to the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment, as described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. It does not include an additional downtown station in Philadelphia.
Anonymous_014	Map error Representative Route Alternative one - Sheet 2 Schuylkill River to Bucks count change red to blue and green	Volume 1, Appendix AA, Mapping Atlas, was reviewed and refined to provide a more accurate depiction of the construction types and route of the Representative Route.

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Anonymous_022	As a UConn grad student, a rail line would be a great and welcome development to connect the thousands of us on campus to major points of interest in the northeast. With a rail line to improve two-way access between Storrs and other communities, there is great potential to grow and enhance many university-community partnerships.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative includes upgrading the existing NEC shoreline route and the addition of a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line into the NEC, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield. It does not include a line connecting Hartford and Providence. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.</p> <p>The FRA noted views expressed about connections to UCONN and Hartford. However, the Preferred Alternative does not include the route to UCONN as envisioned in Alternative 2 and 3. The rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative is provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative. The NEC FUTURE program is focused on corridor-wide solutions for passenger rail improvements, and the selection of the Preferred Alternative does not preclude future consideration of transit or fixed guideway improvements to meet other transportation needs across the Study Area.</p>
Anonymous_024	A train connection in Storrs would be incredibly helpful for faculty and students to travel to and from the university for personal and professional events.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative includes upgrading the existing NEC shoreline route and the addition of a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line into the NEC, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield. It does not include a line connecting Hartford and Providence. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.</p> <p>The FRA noted views expressed about connections to UCONN and Hartford. However, the Preferred Alternative does not include the route to UCONN as envisioned in Alternative 2 and 3. The rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative is provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative. The NEC FUTURE program is focused on corridor-wide solutions for passenger rail improvements, and the selection of the Preferred Alternative does not preclude future consideration of transit or fixed guideway improvements to meet other transportation needs across the Study Area.</p>

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Anonymous_026	As one of, if not the, most densely populated region in the country, the Northeast Corridor deserves to receive massive investment in non-automobile infrastructure. People who live in such a dense region should not have to rely on a private automobile for intercity transit. Expanding rail infrastructure is a key part of making the area livable for people of all incomes and ensuring climate and environmental sustainability. Please adopt Alternative 3 and focus on expanding rail access to as many cities in the corridor as possible.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. The cost of a full high-speed second spine along with existing NEC improvements, as proposed by Alternative 3, is very high relative to the projected ridership benefits. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. Limited-stop Intercity-Express service envisioned for the Preferred Alternative would offer very competitive trip times at a substantially smaller investment than the capacity necessary to provide for high-speed rail service on a dedicated second spine.</p> <p>While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions.</p> <p>The FRA considered environmental effects in the identification and evacuation of the Preferred Alternative. The environmental effects of the Preferred Alternative, including climate change, are discussed in Volume 1, Chapter 7.</p>
Anonymous_030	Do not do this. Dont ruin our beautiful hometown.	The FRA considered both opposing and supporting views on the NEC FUTURE program in preparing the Tier 1 Final EIS and identifying a Preferred Alternative. Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative that improves the existing NEC to a state of good repair and includes new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Anonymous_032	the NO BUILD alternative is best.	As described in Volume 1, Chapter 9, Evaluation of the Preferred Alternative, the No Action Alternative inadequate to meet the needs of the Northeast. The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrades to the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment. By replacing aging infrastructure and eliminating chokepoints, train service will be faster and far more reliable. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.
Anonymous_032	At the very worst, Alternative 1.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives, including Alternative 1, to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers.

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Anonymous_035	As a graduate student at Uconn Storrs ho can not afford a car payment, being a part of the rail corridor would be wildly helpful to me. It would improve commerce in both Providence and Hartford as those are destinations enjoyed by many students who can not visit as often as they might like. I fully support the decision to include Storrs in the railway.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative includes upgrading the existing NEC shoreline route and the addition of a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line into the NEC, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield. It does not include a line connecting Hartford and Providence. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.</p> <p>The FRA noted views expressed about connections to UCONN and Hartford. However, the Preferred Alternative does not include the route to UCONN as envisioned in Alternative 2 and 3. The rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative is provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative. The NEC FUTURE program is focused on corridor-wide solutions for passenger rail improvements, and the selection of the Preferred Alternative does not preclude future consideration of transit or fixed guideway improvements to meet other transportation needs across the Study Area.</p>
Anonymous_040	I support alternative 3. The Northeast US contains a huge percentage of our nation's population, industry and commerce. Yet this region has the oldest infrastructure in the country, with little federal investment. If America wants to remain a world power it needs to act and move like a modern power does. Regional high speed rail is big part of that.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The cost of a full high-speed second spine along with existing NEC improvements, as proposed by Alternative 3, is very high relative to the projected ridership benefits. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. Limited-stop Intercity-Express service envisioned for the Preferred Alternative would offer very competitive trip times at a substantially smaller investment than the capacity necessary to provide for high-speed rail service on a dedicated second spine.</p> <p>While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions.</p>
Anonymous_041	I believe that creating a new rail segment, which will go through the towns of New London and Mystic, is ideal. The Interstate Highway 95 is heavily used and always congested. Constructing a rail segment would alleviate these conditions and provide another way for people living in Southeastern CT to travel and commute to New York Clty and Boston.	<p>The Preferred Alternative includes a new 50-mile rail segment between Old Saybrook, CT and Kenyon, RI, generally following the I-95 corridor. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The precise location for and design of the rail segment would be determined in subsequent Tier 2 project studies.</p>

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Anonymous_047	I feel that the transform option best suits our long term goals	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The Preferred Alternative achieves many of the benefits of Alternative 3 with extensive the new segments, conflict free express tracks, and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost than a full second spine. Limited-stop Intercity-Express service envisioned for the Preferred Alternative would offer very competitive trip times at a substantially smaller investment than the capacity necessary to provide for non-stop high-speed rail service on a dedicated second spine. The Preferred Alternative has the potential to accommodate other service plans that feature super-express limited stop services that can offer market dominant travel times and offer potential for higher margin intercity rail products that might attract public-private partnerships.</p> <p>While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions.</p>
Anonymous_048	strongly advocate using either tier2	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives, including Alternative 2, to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers.</p>
Anonymous_048	I strongly advocate using tier3.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The Preferred Alternative achieves many of the benefits of Alternative 3 with extensive the new segments, conflict free express tracks, and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost than a full second spine. Limited-stop Intercity-Express service envisioned for the Preferred Alternative would offer very competitive trip times at a substantially smaller investment than the capacity necessary to provide for non-stop high-speed rail service on a dedicated second spine. The Preferred Alternative has the potential to accommodate other service plans that feature super-express limited stop services that can offer market dominant travel times and offer potential for higher margin intercity rail products that might attract public-private partnerships.</p> <p>While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions.</p>

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Anonymous_049	Alternative 3, the transformation of the system gets my vote.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The cost of a full high-speed second spine along with existing NEC improvements, as proposed by Alternative 3, is very high relative to the projected ridership benefits. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. Limited-stop Intercity-Express service envisioned for the Preferred Alternative would offer very competitive trip times at a substantially smaller investment than the capacity necessary to provide for high-speed rail service on a dedicated second spine.</p> <p>While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions.</p>
Anonymous_058	no action alternative - way too expensive	<p>The cost of the No Action Alternative includes those projects that are funded or included within approved funding plans, those projects that are funded or unfunded mandates, and those projects that are unfunded but necessary to keep the railroad running. As described in Volume 1, Chapter 9, Evaluation of the Preferred Alternative, the No Action Alternative is inadequate to meet the needs of the Northeast.</p>
Anonymous_080	I oppose this plan. Your ideas suck and will rouine ct state forests and the natural peaceful environment we all enjoy in CT's quiet corner.	<p>The FRA recognizes that there are sensitive resources such as those associated with local communities, wildlife refuges and habitat corridor wide. The FRA has identified a Preferred Alternative that minimizes impacts to wildlife refuge, wetlands, communities, water resources and ecological resources. Volume 1, Chapter 4 describes the Preferred Alternative.</p>
Anonymous_103	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 two is clearly the better option.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative includes upgrading the existing NEC shoreline route and the addition of a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line into the NEC, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield. It does not include a line connecting Hartford and Providence. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.</p> <p>The FRA noted views expressed about connections to UCONN and Hartford. However, the Preferred Alternative does not include the route to UCONN as envisioned in Alternative 2 and 3. The rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative is provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative. The NEC FUTURE program is focused on corridor-wide solutions for passenger rail improvements, and the selection of the Preferred Alternative does not preclude future consideration of transit or fixed guideway improvements to meet other transportation needs across the Study Area.</p>

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Anonymous_128	... we urgently advise the Administration to invest in Alternative #2	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives, including Alternative 2, to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers.
Anonymous_130	Please do NOT tunnel under Long Island Sound for new rail tracks.	The Preferred Alternative does not include the new segment routing option on Long Island, as proposed in Alternative 3. The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative.
Anonymous_137	You guys are leaving nothing behind for your grandchildren nor mine. The railroad can be improved without tunnels in the Sound, and the train goes fast enough already.	The Preferred Alternative does not include the new segment routing option on Long Island, as proposed in Alternative 3. The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative.
Anonymous_143	As a Milford resident, I am 100% opposed to the rail plans as currently outlined. The concept of a tunnel under Long Island sound is ridiculous! The public has been kept in the dark regarding the proposed changes and the money is desperately needed in other areas, health and education to name two. If only today were April 1st, we could all enjoy a good laugh and move on. I hope this "plan" is truly the joke it appears to be.	<p>The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative does not include new segments between NYC and Long Island and Long Island and Connecticut via the Long Island Sound or a new Segment via Central Connecticut, as proposed in Alternative 3.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.</p>
Anonymous_149	NO high speed train tunnel into Milford Harbor, Connecticut from Long Island. Be very careful about proposing plans that show a lack of attention and respect for the charming beautiful towns dotting the shoreline in CT.	<p>The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative does not include new segments between NYC and Long Island and Long Island and Connecticut via the Long Island Sound or a new Segment via Central Connecticut, as proposed in Alternative 3.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative and a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.</p>

Table JJ–5: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Considered (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Anonymous_149	A better alternative may be to come directly into New Haven harbor which is already primarily commercial. You would also likely face much lesser public outcry.	<p>The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrades to the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment. By replacing aging infrastructure and eliminating chokepoints, train service will be faster and far more reliable. As such, the FRA did not evaluate a new location for a station stop in New Haven, but rather focused on improving service and connectivity to the existing New Haven Union Station. By incorporating the Hartford/Springfield Line into the Preferred Alternative, the FRA further emphasizes the importance of leveraging existing investment in transportation corridors.</p> <p>The FRA began development of the NEC FUTURE investment program in 2012 with nearly 100 initial alternatives for improving the NEC. These alternatives were consolidated to 15 Preliminary Alternatives that reflected a full spectrum of possibilities for the NEC. After extensive analysis and public dialogue on the Preliminary Alternatives, the FRA developed a No Action and three Action Alternatives for evaluation in the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The purpose of NEC FUTURE is to upgrade aging infrastructure and to improve the reliability, capacity, connectivity, performance, and resiliency of future passenger rail service on the NEC for both Intercity and Regional trips, while promoting environmental sustainability and continued economic growth. The range of Action Alternatives evaluated and the recommended Preferred Alternative are consistent with this purpose and responsive to the overall NEC needs (Volume 2, Chapter 3).</p>
Anonymous_149	The best plan may be to connect Hartford to NYC via 84 corridor with a very high speed rail with travel time of ONE HOUR or less. That will attract people to move up towards Hartford again (attract the population to move AWAY FROM THE CROWDED SHORELINE). This State is losing residents because of the exodus of corporations out of Hartford due to the high cost of doing business. But if folks can live near Hartford and commute to jobs in NYC you may have a renewed interest in the middleclass moving to more affordable and beautiful areas surrounding Hartford.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. With the Preferred Alternative, daily service frequency from Hartford to New York City would increase from 3 to 22 trains; and Intercity-Express travel times would be improved by 1 hr, 20 minutes.</p> <p>In Connecticut, the existing NEC shoreline route will be upgraded with a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative also incorporates enhanced electrified service along the Hartford/Springfield Line which strengthens service to Central New England and leverages existing investments and identified market opportunities.</p>
Anonymous_150	The second alternative plan of going through Hartford is far more obviously straight line and in more industrial, business area.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives, including Alternative 2, to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative incorporates enhanced electrified service along the Hartford/Springfield Line in order to respond to comments received to strengthen service to Central New England and leverage existing investments and identified market opportunities.</p>

Source: NEC FUTURE team, 2016

JJ.5.3 Alternatives Related

The category encompassed a wide range of concerns regarding the No Action Alternative and Action Alternatives considered in Volume 2, Chapter 4, Alternatives Considered. The comments expressed concern regarding the technology or service options considered for the Action Alternatives, specific locations that are in need of potential infrastructure improvements, request for new service outside of the NEC, or support for routing options or use of right-of-way not considered in the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The process that the FRA undertook to identify the Preferred Alternative, based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, stakeholder input, and the FRA's policy objectives, is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative. Evaluation of the Preferred Alternative is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 9, Evaluation of the Preferred Alternative.

Table JJ–6: Stakeholder Comments (Elected Officials, Tribes, Federal Agencies, State Agencies, Local Agencies): Alternatives Related

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Amtrak_Boardman	<p>- The comparison of costs and benefits in the NEC FUTURE analysis appears to understate the long-term value of the investments by artificially cutting off analysis at the 2040 time horizon. Assets, many with useful lives of over 100 years, and spanning the 2040 horizon, are simply not recognized for their enduring benefit beyond 2040. Further, the Action Alternatives analysis does not generally assign capital costs associated with each Alternative to Intercity and Regional services or discuss which set of service requirements are driving which set of investments. This obscures possible trade-off analysis between various investments.</p>	<p>The year 2040 was selected as a reasonable long-term horizon for ridership and costs. Data analysis extending beyond 25 years becomes increasingly unreliable. By using 2040 to compare all of the alternatives, NEC FUTURE was able to achieve a level playing field for evaluation of the alternatives. As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA focused on capacity of the NEC with the goal of allowing the marketplace to determine the appropriate mix of Intercity and Regional trains. Throughout the process, the FRA has committed to viewing the entire passenger rail network needs for both Intercity and Regional operators. At this point in the process, and given the programmatic level of detail, it is premature to attempt to allocate between the different service types; that distribution would be somewhat arbitrary and without benefit of input from various railroad operators. Those decisions will be made in subsequent phases as the FRA works with stakeholder states and railroads in defining an Initial Phase and project-specific actions. A Benefit Cost Allocation (BCA) will be developed for the Preferred Alternative and documented in the Service Development Plan. The BCA will determine the overall net benefits of the rail line without a detailed differentiation between Intercity and Regional.</p>
Amtrak_Boardman	<p>While Amtrak generally supports Alternative 3, Amtrak believes the NEC FUTURE analysis fails to capture the true benefits of this transformative option and has not optimized the Alternative to create a commercially viable system. We believe crucial assumptions built into the analysis substantively understate the relative benefits of higher levels of investment. In fact, several factors in the analysis lead to worsening outcomes despite successive increases in capital investment, most notably progressively declining commercial performance. We believe these findings are contrary to international experience and risk sending NEC FUTURE off course. It is Amtrak's strong recommendation that key assumptions are reconsidered before the FRA selects a Preferred Alternative... Prior to selecting its Preferred Alternative, Amtrak requests that the FRA evaluate Amtrak's concerns, particularly the ridership and revenue modeling assumptions underlying the NEC FUTURE analysis. We believe re-working of specifications and assumptions is required before conclusions can be accurately drawn. This need not -- and should not -- be a lengthy process, but should help clarify and better align the outcomes, documented to the high standards that the process has followed to date.</p>	<p>Based on comments received from Amtrak and other stakeholders regarding the interregional ridership forecasts, and in particular their reasonableness in forecasting ridership with 'transformational' change in passenger rail, the FRA conducted benchmarking of the NEC FUTURE interregional model compared to other intercity high-speed passenger rail forecasts within the U.S. and Europe. The findings of this benchmarking are summarized in Volume 1, Chapter 5 and detailed in Appendix BB.</p> <p>As a result of the FRA's model review, and in collaboration with key staff at Amtrak, adjustments were made to the interregional ridership model and updated forecasts for the action alternatives are presented in Volume 1, Appendix BB. The revised ridership estimates did not change the relative attractiveness of the Action Alternatives when compared to the No Action Alternative and did not change the FRA's evaluation of Action Alternatives and decision-making about a Preferred Alternative. In light of the concerns noted, service planning was reassessed. That reassessment confirmed the relative benefits of the Action Alternatives when compared to the No Action Alternative did not change the overall Tier 1 Draft EIS findings or the FRA's decision about a Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>For NEC FUTURE, the FRA focused on a corridor-wide assessment of traveler benefits based on representative service and infrastructure plans. The FRA did not attempt to optimize the service plan for commercial profit, although the analysis shows intercity services would be operationally profitable with various pricing strategies. There is potential within the Preferred Alternative to develop intercity services that take greater advantage of market opportunities for commercial performance. FRA will not make decisions about the optimal service or infrastructure investments; those decisions are made in subsequent planning processes.</p>

Table JJ-6: Stakeholder Comments (Elected Officials, Tribes, Federal Agencies, State Agencies, Local Agencies): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Amtrak_Boardman	<p>Alternative Service Specification: A critical service component that affects the evaluation of alternatives is presuming a new service type ("Metropolitan") in all three Action Alternatives. Metropolitan service operates at high maximum speeds (160 mph) with rapid acceleration and deceleration rates; high frequency levels (typically 4 trains/hour, on a standard interval pattern) and stops at all stations served by today's slower Amtrak Regional services and at selected stations served today only by commuter service providers. Whether or not this type of service innovation is appropriate cannot be properly evaluated since it is featured in every investment case. Expanded Metropolitan high frequency service, with fares set well below IC-E levels, diverts significant demand away from express high-speed rail service. Further, in our view the demand modeling does not account for passenger responses to different rail options and amenities that can be observed today, and it underestimates the likely appeal of express high-speed rail service to future travelers. The net effect is a decrease in the commercial performance of rail operations on the Corridor (Table 4-15). A scenario that encourages passengers to switch from higher-priced, premium service to a slower but significantly cheaper service, is likely detrimental to the financial feasibility of NEC investments. This scenario would, in Amtrak's estimation, introduce large public subsidy requirements to sustain the Metropolitan service and all-but-eliminate Amtrak's ability to finance the service on a sound commercial basis. The ridership and revenue modeling assumptions need to be re-assessed without Metropolitan Service to demonstrate a more balanced evaluation of intercity rail alternatives.</p>	<p>Based on the analysis presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, Metropolitan service was identified as a promising service type which could attract many new passengers to rail service for a broader range of trips. In identifying the Preferred Alternative, the U.S. DOT, the FRA and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) embrace the vision of advanced rail service that seamlessly integrates operations and services of Regional and Intercity operators and incorporates a new corridor-wide Metropolitan service to reach and connect local stations with hub and terminal stations. The Metropolitan service was evaluated in each Action Alternative as a subset of the broader Intercity-Corridor service, as a refinement to balance markets served and performance. The intent of the FRA's analysis was to maximize ridership rather than to optimize revenue. This approach was standardized across each of the Action Alternatives where a mix of services to stations by station type was identified to compare Action or the Preferred Alternatives to the No Action Alternative. A more refined analysis of the best mix of Intercity-Express and Intercity-Corridor service would be left to the commercial operators, although the FRA policy objectives would favor the representative service plan that results in more ridership and meets the breakeven threshold for costs-revenues. The objective of the NEC FUTURE intercity fare structure was for ticket revenues to cover operating and maintenance costs, while approximately sizing the rail network to accommodate potential growth. To represent a higher potential for ridership, for the Preferred Alternative the FRA used a reduced fare structure in both Intercity-Express and Intercity-Corridor fares by 30 percent, compared to today's fare structure. This fare policy is not intended as a fare-maximizing or ridership-maximizing analysis. See Volume 1, Chapter 5 and Volume 2, Appendix B for more discussion on the assumptions of fare pricing. Amtrak or other operators have flexibility to establish fare structures that yield higher revenues. FRA's analysis of the Metropolitan service concept shows that it would not require an operating subsidy.</p>
Amtrak_Boardman	<p>Service Frequencies and Load Factors: Substantial increases in service frequency are assumed for the Action Alternatives. For example, up to 151 trains per day between New York and Washington are assumed under Alternative 3 for the IC-E and TC-C services combined (Table 5-19), a frequency equivalent to one train every 7 minutes with seating capacity as high as 980 seats (Table 14 of Appendix A to Appendix B.5). However, the demand modeling analysis assumes there is little to no impact on ridership for frequency levels above 50 trains per day per service (Sections 3.2.4. 1 and 3.2.5. 1 of Appendix B.8). This means transformative increases in train frequency do not translate to substantial ridership changes between alternatives and therefore the proposed infrastructure is overbuilt relative to its use. This modeling approach assumes the average number of riders per train decreases significantly as additional trains are added. Average load factors reach very high and possibly unachievable levels in the No Action Alternative, while in Alternative 3, the load factor of the improved IC-E service drops to roughly a one-third of current Acela levels. With an annual ridership forecast of around 1.5 million one-way trips between New York and D.C. (Table 5-21), the implied number of passengers per train could be as low as 30 in Alternative 3 despite average fares remaining virtually unchanged and travel time and frequency vastly improved. The demand modeling assumptions should be re-examined to more closely align with observable consumer behavior.</p>	<p>For the Tier 1 Draft EIS, many formulations of the frequency variable were tested. The variable that limits the impact of frequency above approximately 50 trains per day, is the one that fits the survey data best, and has been used in several other intercity models to describe the limitation of frequency to influence Intercity ridership past the point of approximately 15-20 minute headways. This is not an arbitrary cut-off, but a formula that slowly reduces the impact of frequency as it approaches higher levels. Once the train runs that frequently, additional trains will not have the ability to sway large numbers of travelers to rail, but could still draw smaller numbers of riders. Based on feedback from Amtrak and other stakeholder comments, the FRA reviewed their model assumptions and conducted additional sensitivity tests to better understand the influence of variables on the predictive nature of the interregional model. These sensitivity tests did not indicate a change in relative performance of Action Alternatives with regard to the frequency formula. The results of these sensitivity tests were discussed with Amtrak staff on multiple occasions and are further described in Volume 1, Chapter 5 and Appendix BB. Regarding comments on specific load factors, the No Action Alternative results were constrained by capacity in the service plan. Also, reported trips between city-pairs do not include other intermediate city pair trips and should not be construed to represent total train occupancy.</p>
Amtrak_Boardman	<p>Further, we question whether there is sufficient infrastructure to support the service frequencies and travel times proposed in the Action Alternatives, given additional capacity needed for regular, ongoing maintenance. A conceptual basic maintenance plan, based on reasonable assumptions of required track outages, should be included in the analysis to demonstrate sustainable levels of service frequency and trip time improvements for each Alternative.</p>	<p>The FRA recognizes the existing constraints limiting track outages to make repairs or to implement projects without shutting down or severely limiting ongoing operations. With the NEC already at capacity in numerous key locations, implementing many of the major projects included in the Preferred Alternative without adversely affecting train operations is extremely challenging. The FRA also acknowledges the importance of scheduling construction work so it does not significantly impinge on annual maintenance activities, other state-of-good-repair work, or priority projects (such as those included in the No Action Alternative). A suggested maintenance plan is not included in the Tier 1 EIS, but is expected to be a critical activity in development of the Service Development Plan and, more specifically, the Initial Phase of the Preferred Alternative. The FRA established a Working Group to collaborate on the projects and sequencing for an Initial Phase; paramount in those discussions will be the requisite capacity to sustain desired service levels and allow for regular maintenance and major project construction. See Volume 1, Chapter 10, Phasing and Implementation for more details.</p>

Table JJ–6: Stakeholder Comments (Elected Officials, Tribes, Federal Agencies, State Agencies, Local Agencies): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Amtrak_Boardman	The levels of induced demand -- 0.6 percent for Alternative 1 and 1.1 percent for Alternatives 2 and Alternative 3 (Section 6.3 of Appendix 8.8) -- appear very low in comparison to international experience of between 6 percent and 27 percent on European high-speed rail systems such as LGV (Paris-Lyon), Eurostar (London-Paris), and Eurostar HS I (London-Paris speed improvement). These ranges are commonly accepted in international rail planning projects. For example, in the United Kingdom the demand model which supports the business case for HS2 (high-speed rail service between London and several other British cities) suggests induced trips will form 24 percent of additional high-speed rail ridership. ⁴ Closer to home, the induced demand for the proposed California High-Speed Rail system was predicted to be 2.1 percent to 2.2 percents While still low compared to high-speed rail studies elsewhere, these rates were nonetheless roughly double than those predicted by NEC FUTURE.	Induced demand is a product of both increased service and policy changes. In the Tier 1 Draft EIS, induced demand was recognized, but addressed primarily qualitatively. A sensitivity analysis will be conducted for the Preferred Alternative and reflected in the Service Development Plan, which will include extensive stakeholder coordination. Text has been added to Volume 1, Chapter 5, to reflect this ongoing analysis and how it will be used in future decision making.
Amtrak_Boardman	Travel Model Analysis: The underlying assumptions of intercity travel preferences within the NEC FUTURE study are contrary to what other studies have shown. For example, the travel model analysis shows rail to be the least preferred mode relative to auto, air and bus for both business and non-business travelers (Tables 14 and 16 of Appendix B.08) when observed service attributes like travel time, cost, and frequency are already accounted for. This finding is not consistent with other international and U.S. intercity passenger rail studies where, all things being equal, high-speed rail is always assumed to be more attractive than the air mode. ⁷ In addition, the FRA has opted to constrain distinctions between different types of passenger rail modes --that is, unobserved attributes (e.g., comfort, convenience, seat pitch, ability to work on board, etc.) that are not already accounted for in other travel components such as travel time, cost, and frequency, were made to be equal across all rail options (Table 14 of Appendix B.8). This is contrary to typical intercity modeling practice where express rail services are considered more attractive than regional rail services, all else being equal, ⁸ and is another factor contributing to undervaluing of IC-E services and the questionable modal shifts discussed earlier. A re-examination of travel preference assumptions needs to be incorporated in the FEIS.	<p>For the Tier 1 Draft EIS, the alternative specific constants (ASC) were developed from the new survey data, and reflect current attitudes in the corridor. The unobserved attributes were constrained to be equal across all rail options only for the business model, as that model had a much higher time sensitivity, which was able to account for the desirability of Intercity-Express service. The non-business and commute models did have different ASCs for the different rail types.</p> <p>For the Tier 1 Final EIS, the FRA examined the rail ASCs in a sensitivity analysis to determine impacts of changing attitudes towards rail as well as to incorporate some of these other unseen attributes that are not even necessarily in place today.</p>
Amtrak_Boardman	- The DEIS states that the opportunity for additional ridership as a result of improved connectivity between Regional and Intercity services may have been underestimated because ridership forecasts for these services were estimated separately (Section 9.4.1.2). Given the substantial frequency increases in the Action Alternatives, the connectivity benefits could be quite significant as intercity rail travel becomes much more convenient for suburban residents and businesses. - Disruptions to existing services during construction have not been considered adequately. International experience suggests extended service disruptions have considerable impact and ridership can take up to five years to respond fully to service improvements. Further, the impact will vary depending whether the work occurs on or off existing track.	Intercity and Regional rail connections are accounted for in some degree with the addition of Metropolitan service. Also, connections to local transit from Regional rail are accounted for in the major markets: Washington, D.C., Philadelphia, New York, and Boston. Because of the size of the Study Area, the interregional model is not able to account for all local transit connections; however, additional ridership analysis will be conducted at the Tier 2 level.
Anne Arundel County_Schuh	We support the extra rail line and new hubs in downtown Baltimore and Philadelphia as these areas should be the focus of improved high speed rail service.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4). The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints, and adds capacity to support more-frequent, faster, and more-reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. The Preferred Alternative does not include the downtown stations in Baltimore and Philadelphia, which were considered in Alternative 3 (as discussed in Volume 1, Chapter 4).
Anne Arundel County_Schuh	...the study shows the vast majority of trips will be taken on regional rail, we recommend increased funding for the regional rail services that will make the high speed corridor a success.	Funding has not been identified to implement the Preferred Alternative. However, with a long-term vision shared by the region’s railroads and states, a case can be made for substantial federal and state and local funding for incremental upgrades of the NEC consistent with NEC FUTURE. The federal government, through the FRA and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), has been a funding partner of the NEC states, railroads, and Amtrak. Potential future project sponsors are likely to include both public and private entities that plan, operate, and/or fund passenger rail service on the NEC, including Amtrak, the eight commuter railroads, state departments of transportation and private companies.

Table JJ–6: Stakeholder Comments (Elected Officials, Tribes, Federal Agencies, State Agencies, Local Agencies): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Anne Arundel County_Schuh	...it is not clear why Philadelphia International Airport is proposed to have a stop and not Baltimore-Washington International (BWI) Airport, when both the material in the report and the presentations identify BWI as a major transportation hub along the corridor identical to Philadelphia's airport. ...high speed rail service should be focused on the major urban downtowns and that stops between those areas should be limited, we recommend that the Philadelphia airport stop not be included.	The Preferred Alternative includes a new station serving Philadelphia International Airport that could be accessed by both intercity and regional trains. Rail service at the BWI airport train station also will be increased. Shuttle service is currently provided to BWI airport from the train station, which would continue under the Preferred Alternative, described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Cecil County_DiGiacomo	...with well-documented documented delays for regional commuters owing to issues with electrical lines, serious consideration should be given to converting from electrical to diesel power. Not only would that increase reliability while decreasing right-of-way maintenance costs, it would also reduce new segment and northern route implementation costs.	<p>As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions for passenger rail within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process. Incompatible infrastructure, such as different rail power delivery systems, creates inefficiencies for operations and passenger travel; however, NEC FUTURE is not prescriptive with respect to the use of particular equipment types. The Preferred Alternative is flexible with respect to the mix of equipment that could be operated. In light of the individual fleet standards and requirements for the Regional rail operators, rolling stock assumptions for the Preferred Alternative are not prescriptive for Regional rail. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. Consideration of the effects of converting from electric to diesel would be the subject of subsequent Tier 2 project level analyses.</p> <p>For the Preferred Alternative, the FRA has identified the performance requirement for electric operations on the NEC and further has allowed for the possible introduction of dual-mode technology to reduce delays and travel times associated with engine switches for long-distance trains operating under diesel power. As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA has identified overarching performance requirements, but will not make specific fleet decisions for either Intercity or Regional rail operations. Those decisions would be made in subsequent Tier 2 project studies.</p>
Cecil County_DiGiacomo	Alternative 3's technical, financial, and ridership projection details associated with the proposed rail crossing of Long Island Sound component need to be articulated - albeit at a macro level.	As a result of the Tier 1 Draft EIS and the public comment process, the FRA has identified a Preferred Alternative to improve passenger rail service on the NEC in a manner that will enhance mobility options and expand passenger rail service in support of future population and employment growth in the Study Area. The Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4) improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. The Long Island Sound crossing, considered as a routing option in Alternative 3 (described in Volume 2) is not included in the Preferred Alternative. As such, the FRA did not further evaluate ridership, technical or financial considerations. The evaluation to inform the FRA's decision-making about a Preferred Alternative was conducted at a corridor-wide scale, with emphasis on understanding the travel and ridership trends between markets and the general environmental effects of proposed infrastructure. The ridership and financial tools (capital and operating and maintenance costs) developed by the FRA for NEC FUTURE were designed to consider these factors at a corridor-wide scale based on a Representative Route and therefore did not provide insights for isolated segments, such as the Long Island crossing. That more project-specific analysis would be conducted in subsequent Tier 2 project analyses.
Cecil County_DiGiacomo	The methodology of future ridership calculations by alternative is curious. Alternatives 1 and 2 respectively shift 69 and 93 million annual trips from other modes to passenger rail, which are corroborated in the Evaluating the Alternatives section. However, Alternative 3 is touted to shift 141 million annual trips from other modes to passenger rail, while the figure in the Evaluating the Alternatives section says 146. Why the discrepancy?	Volume 2, Chapter 9, Table 9-8 and the supporting analysis provided in Appendix B, Table 6 is consistent. The number of annual trips diverted is 33.6 million, 37.1 million, and a range of 38.6 - 39.8 million for Alternative 1, 2 and 3 respectively.
Cecil County_DiGiacomo	Fiscally and operationally, how does the proposed, high-speed mag-lev service between Baltimore and Washington, D.C. fit into this plan?	In separate studies, the FRA continues to explore new technologies such as maglev and is currently sponsoring a study of maglev between Baltimore and Washington, D.C. Such a system would require separate stations, and would not support run-through trains from connecting corridors nor offer proven integration efficiencies with today's NEC infrastructure and operators. For these reasons, the FRA did not incorporate advanced guideway or similar new technologies in the NEC FUTURE Alternatives Development Process. The Preferred Alternative does not include maglev. However, it also does not preclude the option in the future of building new transportation corridors using other technologies, such as maglev.

Table JJ–6: Stakeholder Comments (Elected Officials, Tribes, Federal Agencies, State Agencies, Local Agencies): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Chester_Mayor Kirkland	The City of Chester requests that Federal Railroad Administration and Amtrak designate Chester, Pennsylvania as a Hub station providing inter-city service...[reasons to include Chester as a Hub Station]... Providing Amtrak service to Chester would be consistent with the DEIS goal to complement local efforts to promote transit-oriented development in Chester's central business district. Service to Chester is consistent with the Northeast Corridor Commission's goal to enhance the integration between trnnsportation investments and local development in communities throughout the corridor. Recent studies, including Econsult Solutions' The Chester Transportation Center & Economic Development-Action Plan and the Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission's Chester City Amtrak Se1vice, have been done to revitalize the Chester business district by utilizing the value of the Chester Transportation Center supplemented with Amtrak service.	<p>In the Preferred Alternative, Chester Station remains a Local Station, consistent with its status today and in the No Action Alternative. The station types assigned for NEC FUTURE and whether the station type should be modified for the Action Alternatives or Preferred Alternatives were based on a methodology that considered ridership, connectivity and other factors (see Volume 2, Appendix B.7). The FRA used representative service plans to evaluate station stopping patterns, improve connectivity, service frequency and types and other opportunities for better integrated passenger rail scheduling and user convenience. Specific station designations will be determined in subsequent planning studies.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative includes improved Regional service provided by SEPTA to Chester. Under the representative service plan, passengers could board regional trains at Chester at regular intervals and perform cross-platform transfers to northbound Intercity trains at a new Baldwin station or quick transfers to southbound Intercity trains at Wilmington.</p>
Congress MA_Moulton	I ask that you consider the NorthSouth Rail Link (NSRL) as part of your Alternatives Considered to unify the Northeast Conidor' s disconnected interstate rail system. Over the past decade, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, in partnership with the FRA and other federal stakeholders, have been pressing ahead with the short-term expansion of Boston' s North and South Stations without seriously considering the NSRL's through-service alternative. Already, there is overwhelming evidence that South Station expansion is currently facing rapidly rising costs and provides only temporary capacity relief. In contrast, the through-service provided by the North-South Rail Link presents long-term benefits of substantially faster commute times, higher revenues from more passengers, significantly greater operating efficiencies, reduced highway congestion, and the conversion of urban rail yards into more productive spaces by pushing switching and storage yards outside of Boston. In fact, the savings are substantial enough to bond a major portion of the project costs. Further, studies of comparable projects underway in dozens of cities across the globe today suggest that the NSRL could be completed for approximately the same cost as expanding both terminals. All this strongly suggests that the addition of more surface tracks at both stub-end terminals does little to address increased congestion and would be a poor investment.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. The Preferred Alternative does include an extension of service north of Boston. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The North South Rail Link was not included in the No Action Alternative Project List (see Volume 2, Appendix B, No Action Alternative Report) as is does not meet the criteria for consideration: Funded projects or projects with approved funding plans, funded or unfunded mandates, unfunded projects necessary to keep the railroad running. Likewise, North South Rail Link was not included as a Related Project in the Action Alternatives because it does not meet the criteria for consideration: fully or partially funded projects located in a connecting corridor and not on the NEC; unfunded projects along the NEC with ongoing or completed NEPA/PE; fully or partially funded transit (e.g., NJ TRANSIT, MTA-LIRR) or freight projects located off of but connecting to the NEC. A project to connect Boston's North and South stations, such as the North South Rail Link, could be studied separately, and is not precluded as future investment.
Congress MA_Moulton	It is deeply concerning that the DEIS for the Northeast Corridor Rail Investment Plan identifies South Station as a Major Hub, without fully addressing the ways in which NEC FUTURES plans to address the growing capacity issues and the costs associated with expanding this stub-end terminal. It is estimated that the South Station and North Station expansion projects would cost upwards of \$3 billion and only serve to exacerbate the efficiency and connectivity issues that have plagued the Commonwealth's transportation system and the Northeast Corridor for decades.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. The Preferred Alternative does include an extension of service north of Boston. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The North South Rail Link was not included in the No Action Alternative Project List (see Volume 2, Appendix B, No Action Alternative Report) as is does not meet the criteria for consideration: Funded projects or projects with approved funding plans, funded or unfunded mandates, unfunded projects necessary to keep the railroad running. Likewise, North South Rail Link was not included as a Related Project in the Action Alternatives because it does not meet the criteria for consideration: fully or partially funded projects located in a connecting corridor and not on the NEC; unfunded projects along the NEC with ongoing or completed NEPA/PE; fully or partially funded transit (e.g., NJ TRANSIT, MTA-LIRR) or freight projects located off of but connecting to the NEC. A project to connect Boston's North and South stations, such as the North South Rail Link, could be studied separately, and is not precluded as future investment.

Table JJ–6: Stakeholder Comments (Elected Officials, Tribes, Federal Agencies, State Agencies, Local Agencies): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
CRCOG_Wray	As previously stated in our other correspondence, a priority for CRCOG is connecting with Springfield. We are disappointed that the Tier 1 Draft EIS does not include the existing Inland Route alignment (Hartford / Springfield / Worcester / Boston). ...By omitting the existing inland route from consideration, the NEC FUTURE project fails to leverage this impressive improvement program in a way that would further enhance the regional rail system while offering system redundancy for users of the existing NEC mainline.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The FRA identified a Preferred Alternative that focuses on leveraging the investment in the existing NEC and Hartford/Springfield Lines. The Preferred Alternative brings the NEC to a state of good repair and maximizes its capacity through alleviation of chokepoints, addition of new tracks and segments at targeted locations, and implementation of operational efficiencies. The Preferred Alternative does not include a new second spine connecting Hartford and Boston via either Worcester or Providence, but does include the Hartford/Springfield Line and new segments on the NEC that together expand capacity to grow the role of rail consistent with the Alternative 2 service vision. FRA considered travel time improvements, connectivity, environmental benefits and effects and overall mobility benefits when deciding on a Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative achieves many of the benefits of Alternative 3 with extensive new segments, conflict-free express tracks, and terminal and chokepoint relief projects at a lower cost than a full second spine.</p> <p>The FRA received numerous comments from stakeholders and the public regarding the importance of connecting Hartford and Springfield to the NEC at New Haven as well as via Springfield to points east to Boston and north to central Massachusetts and Vermont. In light of these and other considerations, the FRA decided on a Preferred Alternative that includes an enhanced, electrified Hartford/Springfield Line, leveraging recent and future investments to create intermodal connections and strengthen existing urban centers. These improvements on the Hartford/Springfield Line fully incorporate service on that line into the NEC. In this way, NEC trains can move directly to and from the Hartford/Springfield line without the need to change engines at New Haven. Up to four intercity trains per hour would serve the line, providing one-seat ride service to and from the NEC. Services on connecting corridors to points east and north of Springfield are the subject of a separate NEPA study (Northern New England Intercity Rail Initiative (NNEIRI)). Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a description of the Preferred Alternative and improved connectivity for connecting corridors.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line into the NEC, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield. Incorporation of the Hartford/Springfield Line into the Preferred Alternative supports improved connectivity at Springfield Union Station for connecting services to points north via the Boston to Montreal Route and points east via the Inland Route. Service to these connecting corridors is further discussed in Volume 1, Chapter 4.</p> <p>While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.</p>
CRCOG_Wray	...a connection to Bradley International Airport (BDL, Gateway to New England) is critical. Service at the airport is expanding, as evidenced by new nonstop service to Ireland and Los Angeles being announced within the last six months. This airport also serves as an important relief airport for both the Boston and New York City areas.	<p>The Preferred Alternative focuses on improvements to the existing NEC to accommodate growth in population and employment. A key feature and benefit of the Preferred Alternative is freedom of mobility. The Preferred Alternative creates intermodal connections by concentrating improvements on urban hub stations well served by transit and by creating convenient airport services with frequent intercity and regional service. The improved connectivity increases the number of markets served by the combined air-to-rail mode, and results in a rail system that gains more riders going to an airport for longer-distance flights, and an air system that gets better-quality ground access for its air passengers. This includes a new station at Philadelphia International Airport, as well as better integration with the Hartford/Springfield Line, which includes a station at Windsor Locks, enabling better connections to Bradley International Airport. Under the Preferred Alternative, improved frequencies and services would be provided at BWI, Newark and TF Green airports. Rail-Air connections considered for the Preferred Alternative are discussed in Volume 1, Chapter 4 and 5.</p>

Table JJ–6: Stakeholder Comments (Elected Officials, Tribes, Federal Agencies, State Agencies, Local Agencies): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
CRCOG_Wray	Planning is underway for a once in a generation reconstruction of the Hartford Rail Viaduct. CRCOG continues to strongly encourage FRA to consider the positive impacts that the Hartford Rail Viaduct project could have on any future NEC alignment through Hartford.	The Preferred Alternative, described in Volume 1, Chapter 4, includes incorporation of an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line into the NEC. This will provide one seat ride service to and from the NEC to Hartford and Springfield. The FRA is a partner with Connecticut DOT in advancing the CTrail Hartford Line project and will continue to coordinate closely with Connecticut DOT on that project as well as the I-84 Viaduct project. The Representative Route for the Hartford/Springfield Line creates an envelope within which improvements would be made to create a two-track, electrified rail line between New Haven and Springfield. On-going coordination between the various projects in the area will be critical as designs are advanced. The FRA will not make decisions about location or site-specific designs in the Tier 1 EIS; those decisions will be made in subsequent Tier 2 project studies, which will include participation by Connecticut DOT, stakeholders and the interested public.
CRCOG_Wray	Service Redundancy and Resiliency: The existing rail infrastructure in the Northeast Corridor can very easily be interrupted due to weather events or other service disruptions. This demonstrates the need to emphasize a long-term strategy that not only allows for improved services but also focuses on network and service redundancy. An inland route from Hartford to Springfield would allow for alternative routing during catastrophic events or facilitate construction-related re-routing of trains when needed for coastal rail infrastructure projects.	The Preferred Alternative includes approximately 200 miles of new route segments which provide redundancy to the existing NEC and improve the overall resiliency of the NEC Rail Network. More specifically, the Preferred Alternative adds a supplemental segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI to support faster intercity service, bypass the region's five movable bridges and 11 at-grade crossings, and add resilience in the event of weather-related events on the NEC. In addition, the Preferred Alternative incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield to other markets on the NEC. This routing off of the coastline would not only add capacity and improve connectivity but would also add to the overall resiliency of the NEC Rail Network. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
DE SHPO_Lukezic	As presented, Alternative 1 maintains the role of rail as it is today, keeping pace with the level of rail service required to support growth in population. There are vague references to expanding capacity, adding tracks, and relieving key chokepoints in reference to the Newark Station. It is our understanding that planning for improvements at the Newark Station are currently underway, and should be stated as such in this document.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative expands service to the Newark, DE, train station, requiring additional infrastructure to accommodate the additional train service. The need for improvements in the infrastructure at Newark is included in the Tier 1 Final EIS. The specific design and scope of improvements would be determined during subsequent Tier 2 project studies.</p> <p>Assumed in all alternatives is completion of the Newark Delaware Regional Transportation Center, a multimodal train and transit center; this project is part of the No Action Alternative projects. The Federal Transit Administration, the Delaware Department of Transportation, and Amtrak are leading this project, separate from NEC FUTURE.</p>
DE SHPO_Lukezic	As presented, Alternative 1... Also, there is a reference to new stations to be constructed at Edgemoor and Newport. This option can impact historic properties, but additional details about the project area are needed to properly assess the potential for effects.	The Preferred Alternative includes new regional rail stations at Edgemoor and Newport, DE. As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, and will not make decisions about final locations or designs of new or expanded infrastructure. Such decisions about the new stations at Edgemoor and Newport would be made as part of the Tier 2 project planning processes, which includes a separate environmental compliance process during which effects to the built and natural environment, including historic properties, would be evaluated and local stakeholder and public involvement would be conducted as appropriate to the process.

Table JJ-6: Stakeholder Comments (Elected Officials, Tribes, Federal Agencies, State Agencies, Local Agencies): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
DEDNREC_Kennel	I'm going to invite you and the FRA to explore and study a new alignment from Churchman's Crossing through a new station underneath Rodney Square into the state line with Pennsylvania. Philadelphia has done this to connect Philadelphia Airport with Market East. I think it's a better option for Delaware. We have opportunities for economic growth into central downtown. With that, there are expected to be lower per capita ecological impacts and costs for services. State support for development in urban areas would relieve pressure on sensitive lands. It is reasonably expected that most urban areas will support the economic viability of rail, and rail would support the economic growth along a new alignment. ... Wilmington Rodney Square is a transit hub, and it has the state's most favorable area for expanding high-rise development as bedrock to support heavy structures is sizably stable; has an active water supply; is close to water, road, and air transportation; ample infrastructure to support additional population for comparatively small environmental costs. The present ridership through Wilmington has been profitable for over a decade. You can check my sources on that.	The FRA is focusing the Preferred Alternative on the existing NEC and strengthening connections to its urban centers. As such, a shifting of the station away from Wilmington was not evaluated for NEC FUTURE. The proposed supplemental segment from Newport to Edgemoor which bypasses Wilmington Station would be used as an express track for some Intercity-Express service. All other Intercity and Regional services would continue to use the Existing NEC routing via Wilmington Station. Regarding the future possibility of reviewing the proposed routing for the new segment, as part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, and will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure in the Tier 1 Record of Decision. Such decisions would be made as part of the Tier 2 project planning and NEPA processes, which would include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate.
Delaware County_Hill	The County requests that FRA and Amtrak designate Chester, Pennsylvania as a Hub station providing inter-city service. Chester is a city of 34,000 people with excellent highway access and regional rail and bus service. It has major institutions and businesses such as Widener University, Crozer Chester Medical Center, Harrah's Casino and Racetrack, the Wharf at Rivertown (Class A office space in a former power plant), Talen Energy Stadium (home of Major League Soccer's Union team), and Kimberly Clark paper mill. The City was served by Amtrak's Chesapeake train from 1978 to 1983 and has desired Amtrak service since then for Chester residents, institutions, and businesses.	The Preferred Alternative does not change the status of Chester Station within the Representative Route. However, the Preferred Alternative does not preclude consideration of expanded intercity service in the future if the state, city or operator wishes to explore that opportunity. Chester is a local station.
Delaware County_Hill	Delaware County supports the proposed direct service to Philadelphia International Airport from the south, especially if it allows regional rail service to use the new lines. SEPTA regional rail stations in Delaware County and Delaware State on the NEC do not have direct Airport service. Riders from the south must take trains on the Wilmington/Newark line to University City station in Philadelphia and transfer to an Airport train to come back out to the Airport.	The Preferred Alternative includes a new station serving Philadelphia International airport that could be accessed by both intercity and regional trains. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, and will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure. Such decisions would be made as part of the Tier 2 project planning processes, which would include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate.
EPA_Walsh	...the integration of sustainable design should be discussed in the Tier I FEIS. Discussion of key sustainability principles within the Tier 1 document will help communicate the importance of sustainable design and will also lay the foundation for future Tier 2 commitments to sustainably designed projects.	The FRA has not evaluated specific information on infrastructure design in the Tier 1 EIS process. The Preferred Alternative includes investments to support infrastructure and operational improvements for passenger rail services and at stations. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for a description of the Preferred Alternative. Specific design features, such as sustainability of various infrastructure, is not prescribed as part of the NEC FUTURE Tier 1 EIS process. However, it is assumed that elements of the Preferred Alternative would meet the design standards, including requirements for sustainability, which are current at the time of project implementation.
EPA_Walsh	While the specific equipment need not be identified at this point in the review process, the environmental impacts of the different options should be discussed in the Tier 1 FEIS.	As part of NEC FUTURE, the FRA focused on general equipment standards, e.g., class or 'tier' of equipment, top speed, etc., and in the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process will not make equipment-specific decisions. The environmental effects for the representative equipment were considered in the Tier 1 Draft EIS and were evaluated for the Preferred Alternative (See Volumes 1 and 2, Chapter 7, Energy, Air Quality and Noise/Vibration sections.)
EPA_Walsh	FRA to evaluate whether emerging rail technologies hold promise, particularly those with positive environmental impacts. Given the advances being made in rail transportation technology throughout the world, limiting the technology discussion to this single option narrows the range of reasonable alternatives considered. A broader look at other technologies, particular in light of the fact that the DEIS is based on a horizon year of 2040, would be appropriate. While this document provides a high level view of options, it would be improved by considering promising new technologies that are likely to become available within a reasonable timeframe. Consideration of this factor is essential in the early planning phases, as the technology chosen for the universal first phase should not preclude use of advanced rail technologies in following segments.	<p>The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrading the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment. Importantly, the Preferred Alternative does not preclude development or use of new technologies such as maglev or other fixed guideway technologies.</p> <p>As discussed in Chapter 4 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS, although Maglev technology could be used to develop a second spine or portions thereof, such a system would require separate stations, and would not support run-through trains from connecting corridors nor offer proven integration efficiencies with today's NEC infrastructure and operators. For these reasons, although the FRA acknowledges the future possibilities for passenger Maglev in the northeast, it was not incorporated into the Action Alternatives and is not identified for the Preferred Alternative. The FRA has left open the possibility to consider alternative technologies, such as Maglev, for a second spine at some future point in time based on separate planning processes.</p>

Table JJ–6: Stakeholder Comments (Elected Officials, Tribes, Federal Agencies, State Agencies, Local Agencies): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Governor RI_Raimondo	We believe strongly that the greatest positive regional impact would come from alignments that continue to serve Rhode Island and include Providence as a major hub. A frequent, fast rail connection from Boston to New York, through Providence and Hartford would build upon the region's existing strengths by serving the metropolitan areas where the densest concentrations of populations and jobs already exist and positioning these areas for further economic growth. As a result, Rhode Island would oppose any high speed alternative that does not include Providence.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. The Preferred Alternative provides Intercity-Express service to the Providence station. It also creates convenient airport services with frequent Intercity and Regional rail service to TF Green Airport. However, the Preferred Alternative does not include the Hartford to Providence route option considered in Alternative 3. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. Economic effects for the Preferred Alternative are considered in Volume 1, Chapter 6.</p> <p>While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify the construction of additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative is compatible with a later addition of such a new segment connecting in New Haven and with later addition of new segments connecting to Harford and Providence.</p>
Groton_Bronk	Also, for our needs within coastal Connecticut, particularly the southeastern corner, that particular option does offer the potential for another station, as was indicated. It's stated as New London/Mystic. Groton clearly is in between. Our perception of that was that you were providing somewhat of a range, and we actually have looked at some key locations that would marry with some redevelopment opportunities in Groton that could potentially offer some benefits as well. Groton offers a significant number of jobs, and we have a net influx of employees on a daily basis. According to our calculations, there have been some significant opportunities for people that are currently driving into Groton today that may be able to take the train if there was a stop in the Groton area, and that would be a close connection to many of our large employers.	<p>The Preferred Alternative expands the level of service on the existing NEC between New Haven and Boston, resulting in increased intercity and regional service at existing stations along the shoreline. In addition, a new supplemental segment will be added between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as considered under Alternative 1. A new station stop along this new segment is proposed in the area of New London/Mystic in Connecticut and is intended as a representational station location. As such, the specific location of such a station would be determined in subsequent Tier 2 studies, which would consider access to jobs and development opportunities in the general area Groton, New London and Mystic.</p> <p>As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure. Such decisions would be made as part of the Tier 2 project planning processes, which would include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate. Description of the Preferred Alternative is provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4.</p>
LCRVCOG_Gold	... I have a concern of whether, based on the previous track record of Amtrak over the last 45 years being able to maintain existing facilities it has, whether they would be able to maintain in the future a new spine and major new significant infrastructures. We currently -- my region is home to the Connecticut River Bridge, which need to be replaced but currently does not have the funding to fully do so. So that is a bridge that is well overdue for replacement, and we currently don't have enough funding to replace it. So my concern if a second spine is built: Would there be money to maintain this in a good state of repair when we can't maintain the current Northeast Corridor to the state of good repair that we would like it to be maintained to?	Although critical factors to decision-making about the specific implementation of the Preferred Alternative, The FRA did not specifically address funding and finance concerns in the Tier 1 EIS. In estimating the Operating and Maintenance costs for each Action Alternative and for the Preferred Alternative, the FRA did include an order-of-magnitude cost for ongoing maintenance of proposed improvements. As described in Volume 2, Appendix B.9, for all Action Alternatives, and Volume 1, Appendix BB, for the Preferred Alternative, the total revenues exceed total costs, resulting in positive net contribution, for the proposed Intercity services (Intercity-Express, Metropolitan, and Intercity-Corridor services).
Mansfield_Mayor Shapiro	Based on the maps of Alternatives 2 and 3 contained in Appendix A of the draft EIS, it appears that the route segment tunning through Mansfield is located in a rural area of town. This alignmnet not only will have significant impact on our neighborhoods, it will fail to provide rail service to key employment centers in the area, thereby diminishing its impact.	As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, and will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure. Such decisions would be made as part of the Tier 2 project planning processes, which would include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate. Consistent with this process, the FRA developed Representative Routes for the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative, which provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the effects of each Alternative. Representative Routes define an envelope within which improvements might occur and whose location and construction type could change during subsequent Tier 2 project studies.

Table JJ–6: Stakeholder Comments (Elected Officials, Tribes, Federal Agencies, State Agencies, Local Agencies): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Mansfield_Mayor Shapiro	The Town [of Mansfield] has been working with other communities and the New England Central Railroad for many years to encourage restoration of passenger rail service between New London and Vermont using the existing rail line in Mansfield. While the potential for this service is in the early stages of evaluation, we believe that it offers tremendous opportunity when paired with the Hartford to Providence connection envisioned in the EIS. We hope that you will consider this potential and work with state officials to explore that connection.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA has identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. The Preferred Alternative Service Plan includes Intercity passenger rail stations in Hartford and Windsor, CT. The route option between Hartford and Providence is not included in the Preferred Alternative. In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative provides connections along the existing Northeast Corridor, along a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT and Kenyon, RI, and along the Hartford/Springfield Line which strengthens service to Central New England and leverages existing investments and identified market opportunities.
MDOT_Smith	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 fund ing and move into the next phase of project development.	As noted, the FRA, MDDOT and Amtrak are currently working together to advance several major projects in Maryland include the B & P Tunnel, BWI Rail Station Improvements, 4th Track south of Baltimore, and the Susquehanna River Bridge. As lead federal agency, the FRA has and will continue to support and contribute to funding each of these efforts. Each of these projects were included in the NEC FUTURE No Action Alternative and the FRA is coordinating closely to ensure consistency between these concurrent projects and NEC FUTURE. As such, the Preferred Alternative incorporates the most up-to-date information on each of these critical projects. By way of example, the recommended new four-track replacement of the B & P Tunnel is incorporated into the Preferred Alternative, as are the funded elements of each of the other on-going efforts. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for a complete description of the Preferred Alternative and Volume 2, Appendix B for a complete description of the No Action Alternative.
Montgomery County_Holton	Keystone Service - One Seat Ride to NYC - AMTRAK 's Keystone Service between Harrisburg and New York City runs through Montgomery County and includes a stop within our borders at Ardmore. It is important that any changes to the Northeast Corridor preserve the one-seat ride to New York City on the Keystone Service, and keep convenient connections to other NEC services. Montgomery County desires that an increase in the frequency of Keystone service on the Northeast Corridor be planned for under any future potential scenario.	<p>The Preferred Alternative allows for increased service between Philadelphia and Harrisburg, PA, on the existing Keystone Line. These service enhancements would further expand the integrated network of passenger rail in the Northeast. Possible service improvements could include introduction of Metropolitan service on the Keystone corridor at 30-minute headways in peak periods. Metropolitan service on the Keystone corridor would follow existing Keystone stopping patterns and serve as a direct replacement. Considering recent improvements to the Keystone Corridor, the enhanced service levels could be accommodated within existing capacity. Further exploration of opportunities created by the Preferred Alternative would be the subject of subsequent planning processes.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative includes sufficient capacity for frequent service to and from the Keystone Corridor. The level of service is significantly higher than under the No Action Alternative (Volume 1, Chapters 4, 5 and 6).</p>
Montgomery County_Holton	30th Street Station as an Intercity Rail Station - Finally, Montgomery County understands that 30th Street Station will continue to remain a major hub under all three alternatives presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS. We support this approach and stress how important it is that 30th Street Station remain a significant intercity rail asset, not only for the Northeast Corridor, but for the potential future additional intercity service to western parts of Pennsylvania such as Pottstown, Bethlehem, and Quakertown.	The Preferred Alternative does not include a second station in Philadelphia. The Preferred Alternative, described in Volume 1, Chapter 4, focuses on the Philadelphia 30th Street Station to support the significant growth in both intercity and regional rail service envisioned by the Preferred Alternative in Philadelphia.
Montgomery County_Holton	Allow for a seamless connection to high-speed service from the Keystone - If the Preferred Alternative creates high-speed rail that is separate from 30th Street Station, both the Keystone and the high-speed rail services should stop at a station outside of Center City Philadelphia (such as Cornwell Heights with a park-n-ride) where passengers can make a seamless connection between the two, rather than having to take a separate trip from 30th Street Station to a new station in Center City.	The Preferred Alternative includes only one Philadelphia station at 30th Street. All NEC and Keystone Corridor trains will stop at this station. The Preferred Alternative includes sufficient capacity to support a highly integrated service at Philadelphia, enabling passengers to transfer easily between Intercity Express, Intercity Corridor and Keystone Corridor trains. See Volume 1, Chapter 4.

Table JJ–6: Stakeholder Comments (Elected Officials, Tribes, Federal Agencies, State Agencies, Local Agencies): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
New London_Mayor Passero	Additionally, the track location depicted in Alternative 1 appears to bypass the current Union Train Station in downtown New London. This train station stop is vital not only to our existing transportation needs, the needs of the region, and present and future Transit Oriented Development initiatives but is hugely important to the successful development and sustainability of the future \$100 million National Coast Guard Museum to be located directly adjacent to and connected to Union Station. Any significant reduction in the number of passengers and train stops at this station will assuredly impact the City's growth.	The Preferred Alternative in fact expands the level of service on the existing NEC between New Haven and Boston, resulting in increased intercity and regional service at the existing New London Union Station. In addition, a new supplemental segment will be added between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as considered under Alternative 1. Trains using the new segment would serve the New London/Mystic station. The specific location of and design for the new station, including the number of parking spaces, would be determined in subsequent Tier 2 project studies. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
New Rochelle_Arron	New Rochelle is building a future around multimodal transportation in Southern Westchester and the broader region, and bringing the North East Corridor existing infrastructure into good repair is the minimum that must be done to keep pace with growth and provide good service.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4). The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Action Alternatives and improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. The Preferred Alternative does not include a second spine.
NJ TRANSIT_Martin	There are also implied impacts on all the NEC stations, especially with Alternatives 2 and 3. Notably, NJ TRANSIT has over the last decade invested tens of millions of dollars to improve some of these stations, for example Trenton Station and Thus, any proposed changes to these stations must be carefully scrutinized and fully understood before feasibility is assumed. NJ TRANSIT must also have it understood and explicitly acknowledged that we will be able to continue to work to achieve and maintain a state of good repair on the 14 New Jersey NEC stations we own, as well as to continue to make necessary safety and ADA compliance improvements to these stations... NJ TRANSIT also believes that more analysis must be done concerning future station impacts, access, parking and train service stopping patterns before we can be comfortable with some of the implications found in this analysis. This particularly applies to Trenton, Metropark and Newark Penn Station. Changing where trains stop and how other NEC stations function might offset the suggested need to dramatically physically impact these facilities.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative brings the NEC to a state of good repair and replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. The Preferred Alternative recognizes the need to increase track and station capacity across the corridor, specifically in New Jersey. More specifically, the Preferred Alternative includes supplemental new segments of capacity between North Brunswick and Secaucus and Secaucus and PSNY.</p> <p>The FRA understands the importance of on-going improvements to the NEC and in particular the safety and compliance upgrades to NJ TRANSIT or other railroad owned stations. As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, and will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure. Such decisions would be made as part of the Tier 2 project planning processes, which would include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate.</p> <p>In order to ensure that the necessary improvements are made in a way that both conforms with Regional and Intercity railroad operations in the near-term and is consistent with and does not preclude improvements to achieve the Preferred Alternative vision, the FRA is committed to working closely with the railroads operating on the NEC. A first step in this collaboration will be for key NEC states and railroad stakeholders to define the Initial Phase and initiate steps required to advance implementation. In June 2016, the FRA established the NEC FUTURE SDP Working Group. Its members include the Northeast Corridor Infrastructure and Operations Advisory Commission (NEC Commission) and staff from the NEC states and railroads with experience in capital planning and project delivery. See Volume 1, Chapter 10.</p>
NJ TRANSIT_Martin	Meanwhile, the DEIS draft mentions the potential need for a new Amtrak rail yard in New Jersey, (see page 4-32, Table 4-7) but no potential location is indicated nor is there a broad description of the purpose and scope of such a new facility. Importantly, NJ TRANSIT will also require additional rail yard space to permit it to increase trans-Hudson rail services. We believe a new rail yard is a critical piece of infrastructure and it requires a large piece of well-located property. Defining the purpose and need for a new rail yard in New Jersey for Amtrak, along with NJ TRANSIT's own rail yard requirements, should be listed as needed analysis in any proposed next steps.	For NEC FUTURE, the FRA did not evaluate the physical footprint- or service-related effects associated with ancillary facilities and supporting structures for storage and maintenance facilities, including yards and storage requirements. The FRA did consider existing storage and maintenance facility locations where capacity could be added to accommodate the rolling stock requirements of the Preferred Alternative. Some potential sites are referenced in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The FRA did not identify Regional rail storage and maintenance facilities requirements as those would depend on the specific operating patterns identified by individual Regional rail operators, such as NJ TRANSIT, and how those services were integrated with each Regional rail operator's system, including branch line services not on the NEC. The FRA identifies in the Tier 1 Final EIS the need to consider the requirements for additional Regional and Intercity rail storage and maintenance facilities in subsequent project-level analyses (see Volume 1, Chapter 4).

Table JJ–6: Stakeholder Comments (Elected Officials, Tribes, Federal Agencies, State Agencies, Local Agencies): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Old Saybrook_Selectman Fortuna	However, in reviewing the options presented I fail to see the Old Saybrook Train Station listed on any of the Alternatives. I do note that not all stations are shown on your maps. Old Saybrook's absence may simply be due to space saving on the map.	All of the Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative continue service at Old Saybrook Station. The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environmental effects. Volume 1, Chapter 4, describes the Preferred Alternative. Both Intercity and Regional service would grow at Old Saybrook since the service levels supported by the Preferred Alternative would be achieved.
OysterBay_Alesia	The DEIS vaguely indicates that the potential new route on Long Island would be installed in a "trench" through the Town of Oyster Bay, between Garden City and the Main Line of the Long Island Rail Road in Farmingdale. The DEIS does not even include a generic discussion of how this physically would be accomplished in an area that is already essentially fully built-out; nor is there even the most basic description of methods that could be used to accomplish this type of construction, where it has been successfully implemented in a similar setting, or how potential impacts during construction and operation would be mitigated.	<p>The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. The Preferred Alternative does not include the Long Island routing option considered in Alternative 3. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions. The Preferred Alternative is further described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.</p> <p>As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure or alignments. Such decisions would be made as part of the Tier 2 project planning processes, which would include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate.</p>
PANYNJ_Amtrak_NJT	The proposed Hudson Tunnel Project scope includes two new tracks in new tubes under the river connected to the existing NEC tracks in New Jersey and the existing PSNY track and platform complex, with their completion allowing for the two existing rail tubes to be taken off-line in succession for repair. Until this multi-year effort can be completed, current levels of passenger rail service via the existing Hudson Tunnel will remain vulnerable to disruption from continued deterioration and future events such as severe weather (e.g. hurricanes, flooding). The NEC Future DEIS recognizes the Hudson Tunnel Project as a "Universal First Phase Project". The Hudson Tunnel Project is, in fact, currently the subject of a separate environmental process led by the Federal Railroad Administration which is urgently going forward in advance of the completion of the NEC Future work.	<p>As described in Volume 2, Chapter 4, Alternatives Considered, all Action Alternatives address critical capacity issues through New York City, including new tunnels under the Hudson River between New Jersey and New York. The Preferred Alternative, described in Volume 1, Chapter 4, includes new third and fourth Hudson River tunnels, beginning on embankment east of Secaucus Rail Station, terminating south of the existing NEC and Penn Station New York, under West 31st Street. In addition, the Preferred Alternative includes two tunnels under the Easter River. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers.</p> <p>The Gateway program is Amtrak's proposed set of strategic infrastructure improvements to improve service and address capacity constraints in the area of New York City in New York and New Jersey. Separate from the Gateway program, the Hudson Tunnel Project is intended to preserve the current functionality of the NEC's Hudson River rail crossing between New Jersey and New York and strengthen the resilience of the NEC; FRA and NJ TRANSIT are currently leading the NEPA process for the Hudson Tunnel Project. The Gateway Program and the Hudson Tunnel Project are separate from the NEC FUTURE program. NEC FUTURE does evaluate overall capacity needs and potential improvements for the entire NEC including the New York City area. The FRA coordinates closely with the project teams for the Gateway program and Hudson Tunnel Project in order that their scope do not preclude NEC FUTURE findings.</p>
PANYNJ_Amtrak_NJT	Another NEC Future Universal First Phase Project is the replacement of the Portal Bridge. Through a recently announced grant from USDOT, early action construction activities are planned to begin shortly.	Portal Bridge is identified as a Related Project in the Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4). Volume 1, Chapter 10, includes a plan for incremental project phasing and implementation. The Initial Phase for implementing the Preferred Alternative focuses on the highest priority projects already under planning and required for addressing aging infrastructure and chokepoints along the NEC. Completion of the Initial Phase will support an important increment in service for both Intercity and Regional services, thereby enhancing service for all operators and travelers using the NEC. The Initial Phase will also improve the way that rail services are provided to the customer and will provide opportunities to make rail operations more efficient. The Initial Phase and subsequent project phases will be further detailed in the Service Development Plan.

Table JJ–6: Stakeholder Comments (Elected Officials, Tribes, Federal Agencies, State Agencies, Local Agencies): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Pawtucket Central Falls_Mayors	Table 7 NEC Population Forecasts does not accurately reflect the Providence MSA catchment area, which has a population of 1,609,000 (2014 U.S. Census). Table 8 NEC Employment Forecasts does not square with the November 2015 Bureau of Labor Statistics for the Providence MSA, which has the Providence MSA at 649,000 jobs.	<p>The FRA used Moody's as a commercial available forecast that was available corridor-wide, commensurate with the corridor-wide perspective of the NEC FUTURE analysis.</p> <p>The numbers in question are different due to the source quoted (Census data projections from 2014) and boundaries used to calculate the population and employment numbers. FRA's data (obtained on a county-level basis for the Study Area) is based on Moody's Analytics June 2013 "base" demographic forecasts. Moody's data uses actual Census data (not the same as census projections) to make projections. Moody's supplied three forecasts for the 2040 NEC population and employment projections based on this data: low, base (most likely), and high.</p> <p>For purposes of ridership forecasting, travel zones were established which are not the same as the Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) boundaries cited by the constituent. The boundaries in the Tier 1 Draft EIS were drawn based on markets served and do not match up specifically to the MSA boundaries.</p> <p>For example, the numbers pretend in Volume 2, Appendix B.8 show Providence County numbers, rather than those for the entire MSA. For NEC FUTURE, the FRA relied on a corridor-wide data source; for future year forecasts, the U.S. Census data are not available at the detailed level required for this analysis.</p> <p>Details on the Preferred Alternative representative Service Plan are provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4 and Appendix BB.</p>
Philadelphia_Tolson_Padullon	We do strongly endorse the idea of improved rail service to our 'Metropolitan Center', including both Center City and University City, and to Philadelphia International Airport (PHL).	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA has identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative strengthens existing urban centers, such as Philadelphia, concentrating improvements on the existing NEC and Hartford/Springfield Line. A costly new route and station in downtown Philadelphia is not included, in favor of concentrating service at the existing stations in the City well served by transit. Enhancing convenient airport services with frequent Intercity and Regional rail service, the Preferred Alternative includes a new segment between Chester City and Philadelphia, providing direct intercity service to Philadelphia International Airport.
Providence_MayorElorza	I recommend a revision to Alternative 1 which, based on Table 7-1-10, does not appear to include Providence as a Major Hub, but rather lists it as a Local Hub. ... I look forward to remaining engaged in the NEC Future planning effort as the FRA proceeds to select a Preferred Alternative. It is critical that the City of Providence must be included as a Major Hub in the Preferred Alternative. More frequent service, faster travel times, and connections to new markets not currently served by passenger rail would create new opportunities for Providence and create positive environmental, economic, and transportation impacts extending beyond Rhode Island's capital city to benefit the entire region.	Providence Station is considered a Major Hub in the Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4). Intercity rail service will grow at Providence to up to 6 round-trip trains per hour and regional rail service will also expand under the Preferred Alternative. Providence (Station 129) is identified as a Major Hub station in Volume 2, Table 7-1-10 Chapter 7.1.
PVPC_Brennan	Moreover, we believe the lack of an Inland Route alternative or variant misses the opportunity to better assess the intermodal and access benefits for regional air traffic relief potential of a high capacity rail connection to western New England's largest airport, namely Bradley International Airport in Windsor Locks, Connecticut.	The Preferred Alternative focuses on improvements to the existing NEC to accommodate growth in population and employment. A key feature and benefit of the Preferred Alternative is freedom of mobility. The Preferred Alternative creates intermodal connections by concentrating improvements on urban hub stations well served by transit and by creating convenient airport services with frequent intercity and regional service. The improved connectivity increases the number of markets served by the combined air-to-rail mode, and results in a rail system that gains more riders going to an airport for longer-distance flights, and an air system that gets better-quality ground access for its air passengers. This includes a new station at Philadelphia International Airport, as well as better integration with the Hartford/Springfield Line, which includes a station at Windsor Locks, enabling better connections to Bradley International Airport. Under the Preferred Alternative, improved frequencies and services would be provided at BWI, Newark and TF Green airports. Rail-Air connections considered for the Preferred Alternative are discussed in Volume 1, Chapter 4 and 5.

Table JJ–6: Stakeholder Comments (Elected Officials, Tribes, Federal Agencies, State Agencies, Local Agencies): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
RiverCOG_Gold	The high-speed rail service envisioned in Alternative 1 would not stop in Middlesex County and service to New Haven and New London will probably be infrequent. Express trains may not stop in Connecticut at all. Old Saybrook and Old Lyme are being asked to bear significant environmental, cultural, and commercial impacts for a national high-speed rail infrastructure that will not benefit them.	<p>The new 52-mile-long Old Saybrook, CT, to Kenyon, RI, segment would provide the capacity to significantly increase Intercity train service between New Haven and Boston and to reduce travel time between New York City and Boston. As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure or alignments. Such decisions are made as part of Tier 2 project analysis, which would include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate. Consistent with this process, the FRA developed Representative Routes for the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative, which provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the effects of each Alternative.</p> <p>Representative Routes define an envelope within which improvements might occur and whose location and construction type could change during subsequent Tier 2 project studies.</p>
RiverCOG_Gold	The North East Corridor (NEC) is not in a state of good repair. Many of the most needed improvements are in Connecticut, where movable bridges such as the existing bridge over the Connecticut River has speed limits and operational difficulties that restrict NEC capacity and marine traffic. Investment in a parallel high-speed track, when funding for the maintenance of the existing NEC has not been adequate, could lead to continued under investment in the maintenance of the existing NEC and service to existing stations. A project to rebuild the Connecticut River Railroad Bridge is progressing. Could this project be re-scoped to include accommodations for future high-speed rail? This solution would lessen the impact of high speed rail in the towns that host line and significantly save construction costs over building a new bridge over the Connecticut River.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative, described in Volume 1, Chapter 4, focuses on upgrading the existing NEC to accommodate projected growth in regional population and employment. In the Preferred Alternative, the entire NEC would be brought to a state of good repair with replacement of aging infrastructure, elimination of chokepoints, and addition of capacity. The current movable bridge over the Connecticut River is two tracks to support the existing NEC along the Connecticut coast line. As noted by the commenter, it needs to be repaired or replaced to continue to support the existing NEC and is currently being advanced through the planning process by Amtrak in cooperation with the FRA. The replacement or rehabilitation of the existing Connecticut River bridge is included in the NEC FUTURE No Action Alternative and is being advanced concurrent with NEC FUTURE.</p> <p>To address much needed capacity, improve travel times and create network redundancy and resiliency, the Preferred Alternative includes a supplemental segment and additional Connecticut River crossing as part of a 50-mile new segment between Old Saybrook, CT and Kenyon, RI. This segment is in addition to the existing Connecticut River bridge crossing supporting the existing NEC. The current Connecticut River bridge opens frequently in summer months to allow boats to pass; the need to raise the bridge further limits capacity of the existing NEC and would not meet the forecast needs addressed with a supplemental segment. The FRA concluded that a separate crossing to support the high-speed new segment was preferable given timing and impacts from the new segment if it crossed at the same location as the current Amtrak Connecticut River bridge.</p> <p>While the location for and design of the segment would be determined during a subsequent Tier 2 project studies, the FRA proposes a commitment to avoiding use of an aerial structure through the historic district of Old Lyme, CT.</p>
SCRCOG_Amento	...we urge you to support Connecticut's center cities by focusing your recommendations on the existing coastal corridor and the Hartford-Springfield line. The South Central region, along with New Haven, and the other regions and cities on these existing routes, need higher-speed, higher-frequency service in order to support economic development efforts and access to jobs.	The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrades to the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment, as described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The FRA noted concerns about service on the New Haven-Hartford-Springfield line. In light of these and other considerations, the Preferred Alternative includes an enhanced, electrified Hartford/Springfield Line, leveraging recent and future investments to create intermodal connections and strengthen existing urban centers. While the Preferred Alternative does not extend from Springfield to Boston, it supports options for expanded service north of Springfield on the Vermonter Corridor and east of Springfield to Boston on the Inland Route.

Table JJ–6: Stakeholder Comments (Elected Officials, Tribes, Federal Agencies, State Agencies, Local Agencies): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
SEPTA_Knueppel	SEPTA acknowledges the efforts of the FRA to evaluate and present issues that impact both Regional Rail and Intercity Rail. However, it should be noted that alternatives with features that create more capacity on the corridor clearly benefit all users, but alternatives with features designed for higher speeds primarily benefit Intercity Rail service, as provided by Amtrak. This DEIS and the associated service development plan and record of decision which will result from it should recognize that Regional Rail agencies are not endorsing investments that primarily benefit intercity service.	<p>As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions to address both Intercity and Regional rail needs. The NEC FUTURE purpose clearly states the intent to address all types of passenger rail service; furthermore, the FRA approached the NEC FUTURE analysis by first considering market-driven needs, without regard to whether they were strictly interregional trips. In addition, the FRA intentionally approached the development and analysis alternatives with an operator-neutral perspective to fairly consider the range of possibilities without bias towards one operator or another and to consider the broadest possible range of options. Throughout this NEPA process, the FRA has coordinated closely with Regional railroads and states to ensure their perspectives, customer needs, and other concerns are reflected in the development and evaluation of alternatives. This close coordination will continue through the Record of Decision and the development of the Service Development Plan.</p> <p>At this point, specific responsibility for individual projects or packages of projects, how they will be implemented, funded or financed has yet to be determined. Given the corridor-wide perspective of NEC FUTURE, the FRA did not attempt to allocate capital costs by operator - the overall benefit to the region was the primary focus of this analysis. The capital costs developed for the Preferred Alternative are representative of a corridor-wide investment and are not scaled for individual elements. Project-specific cost estimates and cost sharing will be discussed as the NEC Commission, states, railroads, the FRA and FTA work together to develop an Initial Phase for the Service Development Plan. The Preferred Alternative does not commit any individual state or railroad to implementing specific projects.</p>
SEPTA_Knueppel	30th St. Station is an important intermodal hub for SEPTA service, where the Authority's regional rail lines operate in addition to the Market Frankford (heavy rail) line, five trolley routes and seven bus routes and a local circulator. In addition, there is the Keystone Corridor service as well as Amtrak intercity service at 30th Street Station. Any investment under Alternative 3 to improve intercity speed by introducing a new alignment with a station stop at Market East/Jefferson Station in Center City Philadelphia should not diminish the importance of service to 30th St. Station.	The Preferred Alternative does not include a second station in Philadelphia. The Preferred Alternative, described in Volume 1, Chapter 4, focuses on the Philadelphia 30th Street Station to support the significant growth in both intercity and regional rail service envisioned by the Preferred Alternative in Philadelphia.
Springfield_Mayor Sarno	Further the Draft EIS does not fully account for the leverage effects of substantial transportation investments by federal, state, and municipal agencies that are already occurring or anticipated, in Massachusetts and Connecticut. These include the Springfield Union Station, New Haven/Hartford/Springfield (NHHS) commuter rail, and the Northern New England Inland Rail Initiative (of which the Inland Route is a part). Further, these projects clearly take advantage of existing rail rights of way.	The Preferred Alternative combines key elements of all three Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate future growth in Northeast population and employment. The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. The FRA noted concerns about service on the New Haven-Hartford-Springfield line. In light of these and other considerations, the Preferred Alternative includes an enhanced, electrified Hartford/Springfield Line, leveraging recent and future investments to create intermodal connections and strengthen existing urban centers. The FRA is coordinating with Massachusetts and Vermont on the Northern New England Intercity Rail Initiative, a separate study, to explore options for improved intercity rail service in New England. Further details are included in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
USDOT-FAA_Angeles	Table 4-5 contemplates a new BWI Airport H.S.Station. The current BWI Airport Station is on airport property. Any development of a new High Speed Station servicing the airport, or any improvement to the infrastructure in and around the existing station, would require a revision to the BWI Airport Layout Plan (ALP). ALP revisions are reviewed and approved by FAA. Completed environmental documentation is a prerequisite to that approval. Also note that we are currently a Cooperating Agency to the FRA on an EA considering the addition of a fourth rail line servicing the BWI Airport Station.	As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, and will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure. Such decisions would be made as part of the Tier 2 project planning processes, which would include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate. Under the Preferred Alternative, improved frequencies and services would be provided at existing BWI, Newark and TF Green airports. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. In particular, the design and scope of a new BWI Airport station would be determined in subsequent Tier 2 project studies with the FAA, City of Baltimore and Maryland Aviation Authority coordination and involvement.

Table JJ–6: Stakeholder Comments (Elected Officials, Tribes, Federal Agencies, State Agencies, Local Agencies): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
USDOT-FAA_Angelos	Table 4-5 contemplates a new Philadelphia Airport Station. The airport is already serviced by a dedicated rail link to 30th Street Station. The FAA has been working closely with the City of Philadelphia on a major reconfiguration of both airside and landside facilities at the airport. Accordingly, it is crucial to understand any physical impacts that this proposed project might have on the airport's long-term plans. We strongly urge the project proponents communicate as soon as possible with the City of Philadelphia so that the City can consider the feasibility of protecting for this possibility.	As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, and will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure. Such decisions would be made as part of the Tier 2 project planning processes, which would include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate. A new Philadelphia airport station has been identified as part of the Preferred Alternative. Current rail provides only regional service directly to Philadelphia and does not serve stations in Wilmington and south. The FRA has been coordinating with the City of Philadelphia about the proposed Philadelphia Airport Station through the NEC FUTURE process. The design and scope of a new Philadelphia Airport station would be determined in subsequent Tier 2 project studies with the FAA and City of Philadelphia coordination and involvement.
USDOT-FAA_Angelos	Table 4-5 considers a new Jamaica H.S. Station which may affect the operation of the JFK AirTrain, a project that received substantial Airport Passenger Facility Charge investment.	The Preferred Alternative does not include a new Jamaica New York station. The referenced Jamaica High Speed Station was included in Alternative 3, with the Long Island routing via Ronkonkoma to New Haven, CT. The Preferred Alternative does not include a full high-speed second spine as proposed by Alternative 3. In addition to the FRA decision to prioritize the NEC, the cost of a second spine was high relative to the travel-time savings and other benefits. The FRA found that much of the benefit of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
USDOT-FAA_Angelos	Additionally, a new White Plains East and Suffolk Hub are presented under each alternative. Figures depicting the proposed station locations would be helpful to determine where these are located in regards to Westchester Airport and Long Island MacArthur Airport.	The FRA has identified a Preferred Alternative that improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environmental effects. Volume 1, Chapter 4, describes the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative does not include a second spine with a Long Island routing option considered under Alternative 3; therefore, there will be no impacts related to the Westchester Airport or Long Island MacArthur Airport in White Plains or Suffolk County, New York.
USDOT-FAA_Angelos	Additionally, Alternative 2 considers the removal of the Newark Airport (EWR) Station. The Port Authority of NY and NJ has an AirTrain servicing EWR that links to this station which is currently reaching the end of its useful life. The Port Authority has plans to consider replacing the AirTrain in kind; however, these plans would be heavily dependent upon the continued presence of this station.	The Preferred Alternative retains service at the Newark ,NJ, airport station. Extension of the Newark Airport's AirTrain (monorail) to Newark Penn Station or the proposed PATH extension to Newark Airport are both outside the scope of NEC FUTURE, which focuses on passenger rail service along the existing Northeast Corridor. The FRA forwarded these comments to the Port Authority of New York & New Jersey and NJ TRANSIT, which are separately advancing a study of the PATH extension to Newark Airport.
USDOT-FAA_Angelos	Intercity service is provided to T.F.Green under the build alternatives. This service is created by changing T.F.Green from Local Hub to Hub service (page 4-43). This increased service will take advantage of the Interlink intermodal facility, which was completed in 2010. The \$250m Interlink includes a 3,500 spaGe parking garage and 1,250-ft. skywalk connecting to the T.F.Green Airport terminal. When the Interlink was constructed, the track was not electrified and it serves only local traffic. The proposed change in service will be a considerable benefit to passengers utilizing T.F. Green Airport.	The Preferred Alternative includes expanded regional and new intercity rail service to the TF Green airport station. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
VRE_Gonzalez	We do have concerns with some of the longer-term (2045+) concepts discussed that extend beyond the established study limits of the NEC Future study to Alexandria, including electrification, a new Metropolitan service, and relocation of engine changes. Our initial review of the concepts suggest there may be conflict with operating and infrastructure plans currently being developed for the corridor jointly by CSX Transportation, VRE, and the Commonwealth of Virginia. It should be more clearly noted in the report that any discussion of the three service alternatives (Maintain, Grow, Transform) south of Washington Union Station are purely speculative and have not been fully scrutinized in this current study.	<p>As stated in Volume 1, Chapter 4, the representative service and infrastructure assumptions are not intended to be prescriptive. As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA focused on concepts for improving the frequency, travel time and connectivity of service, and will not make decisions about operator-specific service plans or schedules in the Tier 1 Record of Decision. Such decisions are made as part of Tier 2 project studies, which would include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate. Consistent with this process, the FRA developed representative service plans for the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative, which provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the effects of each Alternative.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative accommodates as many as two trains per hour to and from the connecting rail corridor to Richmond. However, it does not extend the NEC beyond Washington, D.C. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. Additional information on the representative service plan for the Preferred Alternative is in Volume 1, Appendix BB. Discussion of the concept to relieve congestion at Washington Union Station by extending some NEC intercity services to a new terminal in northern Virginia illustrates an option that would benefit the NEC and merits consideration in other studies.</p>

Table JJ–6: Stakeholder Comments (Elected Officials, Tribes, Federal Agencies, State Agencies, Local Agencies): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Waterford_Piersall	More information is desired about the potential impacts to the existing rail service along the shoreline should Alternatives 2 or 3 be advanced. Improving service along the existing route and addressing vulnerable coastal infrastructure is a critical aspect of encouraging transportation alternatives in Southeastern Connecticut. There is concern that selection of Alternatives 2 or 3 would lead to disinvestment in the existing corridor.	<p>As a result of the Tier 1 Draft EIS and the public comment process, the FRA has identified a Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4). The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives, including Alternatives 2 and 3, to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints, and adds capacity to support more-frequent, faster, and more-reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.</p> <p>In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative provides connections along the existing NEC, along a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, and along the Hartford/Springfield Line, which strengthens service to Central New England and leverages existing investments and identified market opportunities.</p>
WILMAPCO_Zegeye	The path of Alternative 2 [through the City of Wilmington that deviates from the NEC spine] appears to follow an existing freight rail right-of-way, and we anticipate that there will be negative impacts to the properties along this ROW. We suggest the consideration of an alternate path that would follow the existing 1-495 ROW and which would have a lesser impact on the surrounding residents.	<p>As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure. Such decisions are made as part of the Tier 2 project planning and NEPA processes, which would include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate. At this Tier 1 Level, the FRA developed Representative Routes for the Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative, which provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the effects of each Alternative. Representative Routes define an envelope within which improvements might occur and whose location and construction type could change during subsequent Tier 2 project studies.</p> <p>As discussed in Volume 1, Chapter 4, the Preferred Alternative includes a supplemental segment at Wilmington, DE, the location of which follows the Representative Route for Alternative 2. This segment would be implemented as service is added to address future capacity constraints; specifics about the timing and location of the new segment would include stakeholder and public involvement as part of a subsequent Tier 2 project study.</p>
WILMAPCO_Zegeye	Of an even larger concern for WILMAPCO and the State of Delaware is the lack of a connection to the Biden Amtrak Station for the proposed highest speed train service (220 mph) that would travel on the NEC as part of Alternative 3. The Biden Amtrak Station is currently a very strong market for the Acela service. ... In the future, with even shorter rail travel times to New York and Washington, the market for high-speed train service in Wilmington should grow even stronger as the trip time becomes more competitive with commercial air travel. This high-speed connection for Wilmington will allow the region to attract new residents who can take advantage of the efficient train service for commuting and will foster continued economic growth for Wilmington's business community due to the ease of business travel. The Biden Amtrak Station must continue to have connections the fastest train services that can be planned for the NEC as part of the proposed service expansion.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. The Preferred Alternative provides a significant increase in Intercity and Regional rail service to Wilmington, DE. The Preferred Alternative also includes a supplemental segment that does not serve the Biden Station. This is required to accommodate shorter trip times and growth in service that cannot be accommodated on the existing tracks through the Biden Station due to land use constraints. Travel time from Wilmington to Washington, D.C., would decrease once the Preferred Alternative is fully implemented. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information on the Preferred Alternative.</p>

Table JJ–6: Stakeholder Comments (Elected Officials, Tribes, Federal Agencies, State Agencies, Local Agencies): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
WILMAPCO_Zegeye	The potential ex tension of MARC commuter service north from Perryville, MD to Newark, DE will have an impact on train operations in a corridor that currently serves only Amtrak and NS freight trains. In Cecil County, MD, the NEC is constrained by a 6 mile segment that consists of two tracks, instead of three or four. WILMAPCO coordinated with MDOT, DeIDOT, NS and Amtrak to complete the Chesapeake Connector Freight and Rail Passenger Benefits Study, which examines the potential benefits of adding a third track to this segment. Th is section of track would appear to be a future chokepoint for passenger rail , but it is a current chokepoint for Norfolk Southern (NS) freight trains that are accessing the NEC between the NS Port Road in Perryville, MD and the NS Newark freight Yard in Newark, DE. WILMAPCO believes that the Chesapeake Connector should be addressed within the draft EIS and while sections 4.6.1.2, 4 .6.2.2 and 4.6 .3.2 note that additional track should be constructed between Bayview, MD and Newark, DE we would like to see a specific reference to this important project.	NEC FUTURE is focused on passenger rail improvements on the NEC. The Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4), includes a new segment between Baltimore, MD, and Wilmington, DE, to accommodate the significant increase in Intercity trains. This reduces the need to add tracks to the existing NEC between Baltimore and Wilmington. The location for and design of the new segment will be determined in a subsequent Tier 2 project study. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude addition of the Chesapeake connector and it could be evaluated under a separate study.
WILMAPCO_Zegeye	We are also very supportive of the proposed connection to the Philadelphia International Airport. Staff would like to request that riders must be able to connect directly to the airport from the Biden Amtrak Station, as we feel that this rail connection will be well utilized by Delaware residents who are looking for a better multi-modal connection for this trip. We hear frequent comments from residents of our region requesting a rail connection from Wilmington to the airport, but that trip currently requires a train ride into Philadelphia and a second train back to the airport, and we have not heard of any plans by SEPTA to change that situation. This is the type of change that encourages new rail users who are looking for ways to reduce their carbon footprint with more multi-modal transportation choices.	The Preferred Alternative includes a new station serving Philadelphia International Airport, as described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, and will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure. Such decisions would be made as part of the Tier 2 project planning processes, which would include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate. This could be accessed by both intercity and regional trains from the Wilmington DE train station without requiring Delaware travelers to transfer at 30th Street Station and backtrack to the airport.

Source: NEC FUTURE team, 2016

Table JJ–7: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Related

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Adam-Kearns_Mi	Another suggestion, would be to have a new station in Tolland, Ct. on the "via Worcester route". This is a rapidly growing community that needs to be served with effective and efficient mass transit.	The Preferred Alternative focuses on improvements to the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment. It does not include a new segment between Springfield, Worcester and Boston MA. However, it incorporates the Hartford/Springfield Line as part of the NEC, resulting in a significant increase in service to Springfield, where passengers can connect with trains north to Vermont and east to Boston. The FRA is coordinating with Massachusetts and Vermont on the Northern New England Intercity Rail Initiative, a separate study, to explore options for improved intercity rail service in New England.
Alan_Da	I am not endorsing every bit of Gateway. I am endorsing tunnels, because we need them, and they are cost effective. And we may need a new Portal Bridge too. But we look at a planning frontier for this process of 2040, and that's only six years behind the deadline for which Joe Gordman and Drew Galloway and other people at Amtrak say that the existing tunnels need to be taken out of service. And the same people say that with Gateway as it is, the soonest we could have new tunnels is 2030. I don't trust a four year window like that. Things take too long.	<p>As described in Volume 2, Chapter 4, Alternatives Considered, all Action Alternatives address critical capacity issues through New York City, including new tunnels under the Hudson River between New Jersey and New York. The Preferred Alternative, described in Volume 1, Chapter 4, includes new third and fourth Hudson River tunnels, beginning on embankment east of Secaucus Rail Station, terminating south of the existing NEC and Penn Station New York, under West 31st Street.</p> <p>The Gateway program is Amtrak's proposed set of strategic infrastructure improvements to improve service and address capacity constraints in the area of New York City in New York and New Jersey. Separate from the Gateway program, the Hudson Tunnel Project is intended to preserve the current functionality of the NEC's Hudson River rail crossing between New Jersey and New York and strengthen the resilience of the NEC; FRA and NJ TRANSIT are currently leading the NEPA process for the Hudson Tunnel Project. The Gateway Program and the Hudson Tunnel Project are separate from the NEC FUTURE program. NEC FUTURE does evaluate overall capacity needs and potential improvements for the entire NEC including the New York City area. The FRA coordinates closely with Amtrak about the Gateway program.</p>
Alan_Da	And I think we have to look first at getting the NEC into a state of good repair. The part of the NEC in New Jersey that's called the Raceway, between New Brunswick and Trenton, is not up to par. And the Amtrak inspector general in a report last June 17th, expressed doubt that this project would be completed on schedule, which could risk a major grant. So before we start talking about expanding the NEC and building other alternatives, I think we have to get the entire house in order.	In all Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative, the existing NEC would be brought to a state of good repair by replacing or renewing aging infrastructure on the existing NEC and eliminating the backlog of infrastructure requiring replacement. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The referenced Raceway project is included in the Preferred Alternative as an ongoing No Action Alternative project. The FRA is working closely with Amtrak and NJ TRANSIT to advance the Raceway project. Concerns with regard to how the Raceway project is being implemented and its timeline for delivery are noted.
Alan_Da	And that map I refer to was the general public timetable for the New York New Haven and Hartford Railroad from the early 1950s. There were places people could go, both on the existing shoreline and connected to it, that we cannot go now. The Springfield line, the air line through Hartford and Willimantic, no longer exists. But many of these can and should be brought back.	While the Preferred Alternative would not bring service back to many of the lines that once operated across the Northeast, it includes electrification of the Hartford/Springfield Line, providing one-seat service to and from Hartford and Springfield. In addition, there would be many more options for connecting to other trains at Springfield to Vermont (and eventually Montreal) and to Boston via the Inland Route. Volume 1, Chapter 4 describes the Preferred Alternative.
Allen_Th	New rail cars with less weight and which can be used throughout the NEC should be invested into.	The Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative assume the use of high-performance trainsets, which is consistent with the projected pace of rolling stock technology development. High-performance trainsets use rail infrastructure more efficiently by minimizing the variations in train performance (e.g., top speed, acceleration and braking rates). The FRA is developing Tier III passenger equipment safety standards. These Tier III standards would represent a relatively new national standard for high-speed rail operations and equipment and are assumed for future NEC operations in the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. Service planning assumptions are provided in Volume 2, Appendix B.5.
Allen_Th	Tunnels should be avoided whenever possible.	Consistent with the Tier 1 NEPA process, the FRA developed Representative Routes for the Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative, which provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the effects of each Alternative. Representative Routes define an envelope within which improvements might occur and whose location and construction type could change during subsequent Tier 2 project studies. The FRA incorporated the construction of tunnels into each of the Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative (described in Volumes 2 and 1, Chapter 4, respectively) to provide for operational efficiencies, to overcome topographic challenges, or to minimize impacts to the natural and built environments.

Table JJ–7: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Allen_Th	Significant bonuses should be included for underbudget and on time performance.	The NEC FUTURE program follows a "tiered" approach to environmental review. Tier 1 focuses on broad programs and initial analysis. Tier 2 focuses on site-specific, project-level proposals and impacts. For the Tier 1 EIS process, the FRA did not address project delivery as part of NEC FUTURE, appropriate with a Tier 1 level of detail. Cost control practices would be addressed during the development of as part of the Tier 2 project planning process.
Anderson_De	Instead, build a modern monorail system. Run it right, smack down the middle of I-95. Use our shopping malls for monorail stations. Instead of running down in an ugly gully (which most of the existing rail line is) it'd be up overhead. The monorail cars will be swift, clean, and quiet. I rode on one at the New York World's Fair nearly fifty years ago. Yet the government keeps dumping endless dollars into patching up an obsolete choo-choo system The existing track could be used to move freight and freight only. It's good for carrying heavy weight which passenger trains are not. Think about it. It's time for a 21st Century solution to our transportation problems.	In separate studies, the FRA continues to explore new technologies such as maglev and is currently sponsoring a study of maglev between Baltimore and Washington, D.C. Such a system would require separate stations, and would not support run-through trains from connecting corridors nor offer proven integration efficiencies with today's NEC infrastructure and operators. For these reasons, the FRA did not incorporate advanced guideway or similar new technologies in the NEC FUTURE Alternatives Development Process. The Preferred Alternative does not include maglev. However, it also does not preclude the option in the future of building new transportation corridors supporting other technologies, such as maglev. The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrading the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment (as described in Volume 1, Chapter 4).
Anderson_Ge	Adding options for a suburban station with parking (like Metropark station in NJ) would also greatly increase usage.	As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, and will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure. Such decisions would be made as part of the Tier 2 project planning processes, which would include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate.
Andres_Ge	Riding north on amtrak after the Baltimore stop looks like a war zone. Both sides north & south. All passengers on the train are outraged. Baltimore should demolish the whole area before building a new station.	The scope of NEC FUTURE does not address improving the visual experience or the visual appearance of properties adjacent to the existing NEC. NEC FUTURE is a high-level planning study that will define a long-term vision for the NEC and a phased investment program to increase mobility and help maintain the economic vitality of the Northeast region by improving passenger rail. Addressing specific locations of visual blight along the corridor, such as referenced in the comment, are more appropriately addressed by the localities.
Angus_No	It would be better to move the line to cross the Connecticut Rive over the bridge at Middletown.	The Preferred Alternative retains service to Boston via the existing NEC shoreline route, which crosses the Connecticut River at Old Saybrook, CT. The routing option between Hartford and Providence was not advanced as part of the Preferred Alternative, described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line as part of the NEC, which includes repairs to the Connecticut River bridge at Windsor Locks, CT to support two-track operations. As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, and will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure in the Tier 1 Record of Decision. Such decisions would be made as part of the Tier 2 project planning and NEPA processes, which would include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate.
Arena_Ri	The other issue I'd like to bring up is I think the numbers in Boston are being short changed. When I look at the -- at the chart, it shows like there's a -- there's a route for the airport to Providence. There's capability from the airport in Philly. In Boston, there's a direct connection to the rail from South Station via the silver line. So there should be more there.	For NEC FUTURE, the FRA focused on passenger rail travel between places, but did not explicitly forecast change in air travel and use of passenger rail to access airports. The ridership forecast should be viewed at the overall metropolitan level of detail, given the representative nature of both the service plans and routing. Based on comments received during the Tier 1 Draft EIS comment period, the FRA adjusted some of the underlying model inputs, including a correction to the overall air travel data sets. Updated results of improvements to the model better depict the overall shift in travel mode from air to passenger rail with proposed frequency, travel time, and connectivity improvements proposed in the Preferred Alternative (see Volume 1, Chapter 5).

Table JJ–7: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Arena_Ri	I think that the NEC Future process has made a major mistake not including north-south rail link as one of the alternatives that should be there.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4). The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints, and adds capacity to support more-frequent, faster, and more-reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. The Preferred Alternative does include an extension of service north of Boston. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The North South Rail Link was not included in the No Action Alternative Project List (see Volume 2, Appendix B.1) since it does not meet the criteria for consideration: Funded projects or projects with approved funding plans, funded or unfunded mandates, unfunded projects necessary to keep the railroad running. Likewise, North South Rail Link was not included as a Related Project in the Action Alternatives because it does not meet the criteria for consideration: fully or partially funded projects located in a connecting corridor and not on the NEC; unfunded projects along the NEC with ongoing or completed NEPA/PE; fully or partially funded transit (e.g., NJ TRANSIT, MTA-LIRR) or freight projects located off of but connecting to the NEC. A project to connect Boston's North and South stations, such as the North South Rail Link, could be studied separately, and is not precluded as future investment.
Arena_Ri	...the numbers in Boston literally explode because there's a whole user base up there which cannot use -- cannot use it because it's inconvenient to get to the train.	The physical limits considered for NEC FUTURE are from Washington Union Station to Boston South Station. Future connections north of South Station are beyond the scope of NEC FUTURE. A North-South Rail Link that would allow for through Intercity service beyond South Station to points north in New England are the subject of separate planning processes. For NEC FUTURE, the FRA did consider the market potential within the Boston metropolitan area which includes portions of New Hampshire and in that regard captures the market potential north of Boston.
Arena_Ri	Furthermore, the EIS should be scoped to evaluate the improvements (including passenger rail stations in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts) that would be needed in connection with the extension of a high speed rail corridor from New York City to Boston with provisions for expansion of high speed rail to northern New England. Many of the Commonwealth 's facilities need improvements to be able to provide true high speed rail service in that segment of the Northeast Corridor, while also providing for commuter rail and freight expansion with efficiency of operation in its shared corridors.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4). The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints, and adds capacity to support more-frequent, faster, and more-reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers.</p> <p>In Connecticut, the existing NEC shoreline route will be upgraded with a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. This new segment would improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative also incorporates enhanced electrified service along the Hartford/Springfield Line, which strengthens service to Central New England and leverages existing investments and identified market opportunities.</p>

Table JJ–7: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Arena_Ri	Massachusetts, New England, as well as the entire NEC would likewise benefit by extending the NEC northward from Boston. The population density north of Boston to northeastern Massachusetts and Portland, Maine and Manchester, New Hampshire, and eventually Montreal, Canada would be well served by access to the high speed NEC. But South Station is actually a surface terminal, constrained on the east by Boston Harbor, on the north by the Charles River, and on the surface by extensive real estate development. What Boston urgently needs is an underground station at South Station and tunnels northward under the Charles River to reach key population and business centers north. This necessitates a project similar to the proposed North/South Rail Link (NSRL). The NSRL would create a new underground station adjacent to South Station with four to six underground tracks and easy access to the increased numbers of trains and passengers. Building the NSRL would alleviate track capacity and train storage issues in Boston. It will also provide through-running service between the separated north Amtrak and MBTA (Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority) services which terminate at North Station, as well as the south and west Amtrak and MBTA services which terminate at South Station. Providing through-service will reduce congestion on both regional highways and airports, and divert passengers and commuters to an environmentally superior and efficient mode. The cost for this project would be in the vicinity of \$4 billion. Considering that both North and South Stations are capacity constrained at this time, the NSRL is a cost-effective solution to the congestion as well as great opportunity to maximize transit oriented development in Boston 's Seaport and Financial District areas. Additionally, Transferrable Development Rights (TDR 's) for the construction above the now underground stations will provide an infusion of cash to jumpstart construction.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4). The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints, and adds capacity to support more-frequent, faster, and more-reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. The Preferred Alternative does include an extension of service north of Boston. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The North South Rail Link was not included in the No Action Alternative Project List (see Volume 2, Appendix B.1) since it does not meet the criteria for consideration: Funded projects or projects with approved funding plans, funded or unfunded mandates, unfunded projects necessary to keep the railroad running. Likewise, North South Rail Link was not included as a Related Project in the Action Alternatives because it does not meet the criteria for consideration: fully or partially funded projects located in a connecting corridor and not on the NEC; unfunded projects along the NEC with ongoing or completed NEPA/PE; fully or partially funded transit (e.g., NJ TRANSIT, MTA-LIRR) or freight projects located off of but connecting to the NEC. A project to connect Boston's North and South stations, such as the North South Rail Link, could be studied separately, and is not precluded as future investment.
Arena_Ri	The ROW between Boston and Providence is also capacity constrained. While some segments have three tracks, there are long distances of the ROW where there are only two tracks. The result is that high speed Amtrak Acela express train set are blocked by slower, local MBTA commuter trains. Even today, there is a need for a three track ROW. The EIS should investigate increasing the Providence - Boston ROW to as many as four tracks.	The Preferred Alternative includes both new track and new segment between Providence and Boston to increase capacity. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for discussion on the Preferred Alternative.
Arena_Ri	The DEIR refers to South Station in Boston as a Major Hub, accessible by transit, commuter rail, bus and other modes, but it neglects key factors that undermine its capacity to function effectively in this role, and overstates its capacity to support a revitalized NEC. Most critically, it ignores the fact that significant parts of Boston's transit and regional rail systems have no direct access to South Station... The DEIR 's near silence regarding South Station in Boston is puzzling. The discussion of Major Stations on page 10-15 reviews the preparatory work planned at Washington Union Station and Penn Station and its role in supporting NEC planning, with no mention of South Station in Boston, arguably one of the project 's major destinations and hubs. Given the scale of the investments that will be needed to modernize the NEC, haphazard integration of intercity rail, regional rail and transit, and lack of analysis of the improvements needed to achieve it, is simply unacceptable and fiscally unsound... The DEIR makes reference to "South Station Expansion", but it is important to recognize that MassDOT's current plans to add 7 extra surface tracks will not correct this critical defect, nor provide adequate long-term capacity and operating efficiency. What is urgently needed is a direct north-south rail link (NSRL) that will allow regional and intercity rail services to run below the city and connect with all 5 transit lines. Integrating the lines in this way will connect 57 additional northside commuter rail stations directly to the NEC and extend the NEC itself north to Maine and eventually Montreal. Current efforts to extend rail service from Manchester and Concord NH to North Station (Capitol Corridors Project) would be far more valuable if they connected directly with the NEC in this way... A Working Group led by two former Massachusetts governors, legislative leaders and other key stakeholders is pressing to move this needed project forward, and its necessity for the NEC Future should not be ignored. For more information, see: http://www.northsouthraillink.org . APT is concerned that despite extensive prior comment by our organization and other stakeholders, there is no reference to the North South Rail Link or Massachusetts regional rail integration in the DEIR.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4). The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints, and adds capacity to support more-frequent, faster, and more-reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. The Preferred Alternative does include an extension of service north of Boston. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The North South Rail Link was not included in the No Action Alternative Project List (see Volume 2, Appendix B.1) since it does not meet the criteria for consideration: Funded projects or projects with approved funding plans, funded or unfunded mandates, unfunded projects necessary to keep the railroad running. Likewise, North South Rail Link was not included as a Related Project in the Action Alternatives because it does not meet the criteria for consideration: fully or partially funded projects located in a connecting corridor and not on the NEC; unfunded projects along the NEC with ongoing or completed NEPA/PE; fully or partially funded transit (e.g., NJ TRANSIT, MTA-LIRR) or freight projects located off of but connecting to the NEC. A project to connect Boston's North and South stations, such as the North South Rail Link, could be studied separately, and is not precluded as future investment.

Table JJ–7: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Arneson_Er	Please do whatever possible to expand and improve service (including more high-speed service) in the NEC, including across Pennsylvania to Harrisburg and Pittsburgh.	The Preferred Alternative significantly expands Intercity Express service on the NEC from today's one trip per hour to four trips per hour. Travel time would also be significantly reduced. In addition, service would grow to and from the Keystone Corridor to Harrisburg and Pittsburgh. There would be sufficient capacity for up to two Keystone trains per hour providing one-seat rides onto the NEC, as well as additional Keystone trains providing connections to the NEC at Philadelphia 30th Street Station (see Volume 1, Chapters 4, 5, and 6).
Atkinson_Ch	we need rail service. more frequent and high speed.	The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and also incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. For additional details on the Preferred Alternative, see Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Austin_Jo	The existing MNR line has reached parking capacity saturation which rules out significant expansion, since the towns surrounding the MNR stations are built right up to the stations and their parking lots. Providing more parking for them (a la South Norwalk, etc.) would be very expensive and cause downtown congestion.	The Preferred Alternative focuses on improvements to the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment. The Preferred Alternative, described in Volume 1, Chapter 4, does not add a second spine but adds a number of new segments to increase capacity and reliability. Many stations along the NEC, including regional rail stations in Connecticut, will require additional capacity to accommodate future growth in service envisioned by the Preferred Alternative. As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, and will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure. Such decisions would be made as part of the Tier 2 project planning processes, which would include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate.
Austin_Jo	There is also the problem of replacing the five aged moveable bridges along this route, (ca. 1890), which will make trip times even slower as temporary bridges are constructed and put in use. This shoreline route also suffers from some tracks built on unstable ground, which need constant maintenance.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4). The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives, including Alternatives 2 and 3, to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints, and adds capacity to support more-frequent, faster, and more-reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers.</p> <p>In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative provides connections along the existing NEC, along a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, and along the Hartford/Springfield Line, which would strengthen service to Central New England and leverage existing investments and identified market opportunities. This new segment would improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley.</p>
Austin_Jo	To address these problems, we need the new HS rail tracks to be designed for DUAL USE, and placed in high traffic routes where they will be an additional resource to deliver passengers to NYC, White Plains and two nearby airports. This route will handle HS trains running at full speed, interlaced with new faster commuter trains travelling along the same route. Advanced signaling techniques will be used to interleave these trains running on this line. Only a few stations will be allowed along this new line, and they will each have passing sidings so the faster commuter trains can wait on a siding for the HS rail trains to pass. The new DUAL USE line is needed to serve existing coastal towns, which have been built up along the MNR line. This line will also provide additional parking for commuters and regional travelers. This badly needed parking can be built in the undeveloped land along the new DUAL USE route, which should be located mostly in the unused land corridor on the southern edge of the Merritt Parkway. It would make sense to route the DUAL USE line north from New Haven to Hartford/Springfield where it would continue on to Boston.	<p>The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative does not include new segments between NYC and Long Island and Long Island and Connecticut via the Long Island Sound or a new Segment via Central Connecticut, as proposed in Alternative 3. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. Many of the benefits of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the new segments and terminal and chokepoint relief projects incorporated into the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost.</p> <p>In Metro-North owned territory of the NEC, the Preferred Alternative includes a new segment between New Rochelle, NY and Greens Farms, CT which creates two additional tracks thereby facilitating the operating of express and local stop services. The Preferred Alternative also includes track and infrastructure improvements throughout New York and Connecticut. For NEC FUTURE, the FRA considered Intercity and Regional services, recognizing the importance of each to regional mobility.</p> <p>In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative provides connections along the existing Northeast Corridor, along a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT and Kenyon, RI, and along the Hartford/Springfield Line which strengthens service to Central New England and leverages existing investments and identified market opportunities. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley.</p>

Table JJ–7: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Austin_Jo	Existing MNR tracks from Greenwich to New Haven are saturated with traffic! They suffer overcrowding (no seats available), and irritating commuters with ever slower trip times to Grand Central Terminal. Even if additional M-8 cars are delivered, the existing tracks are heavily used and may be saturated when trains using these additional M-8 cars are put in service.	The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit. The Preferred Alternative provides capacity for growth beyond 2040, which is particularly important in the highly congested New Jersey/New York/Connecticut markets. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more discussion on the Preferred Alternative.
Austin_Jo	This upgrade could potentially serve Bradley Field via a new terminal in or next to the air terminal.	The Preferred Alternative incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line into the NEC, providing one-seat ride service from the NEC to Hartford and Springfield. This includes increased service to Windsor Locks, just five miles from Bradley International Airport. Local shuttle service to and from the airport is planned in conjunction with the CTrail improvements anticipated in 2018. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more details.
Bailey_Do	I want to know when you are going to make more trains available daily to Canada (or even Plattsburg) One Train daily is not enough and the 8 hr layover at Penn Station is crazy.	NEC FUTURE is a comprehensive planning effort to define, evaluate, and prioritize future investments in the Northeast Corridor (NEC), from Washington, D.C., to Boston. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. While the Preferred Alternative does not include service to Montreal, it assumes continued operation of the service to Vermont. The FRA is working with Massachusetts and Vermont on the Northern New England Intercity Rail Initiative, which would enhance service between Boston and Springfield, MA, and Vermont, and eventually extend to Montreal.
Bair_Ad	I believe a direct "pass through" connection to Philadelphia Int airport is critical as an enhancement to the NEC. This would enable travelers originating from points south of the airport to avoid bypassing PHL, travelling on to 30th street station, switching trains, and riding to PHL on the current SEPTA airport line. Taking a train is highly preferable to dealing with driving, parking, and shuttles to and from the terminal.	A key feature and benefit of the Preferred Alternative is freedom of mobility. The Preferred Alternative creates intermodal connections by concentrating improvements on urban hub stations well served by transit and by creating convenient airport services with frequent Intercity and Regional service. Specifically, the Preferred Alternative includes a new segment to connect to Philadelphia Airport. For additional details on the Preferred Alternative, see Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Baker_Ma	I urge a massive increasing in funding for rail transportation projects, epically regarding the Portal Bridge and Hudson River Tunnels along the Northeast Corridor. The NEC is the backbone of American Rail and of the American Economy. Please work to support massive renovations and upgrades that are extremely needed from Boston to Washington.	As described in Volume 2, Chapter 4, Alternatives Considered, all Action Alternatives address critical capacity issues through New York City, including new tunnels under the Hudson River between New Jersey and New York. The Preferred Alternative, described in Volume 1, Chapter 4, includes new third and fourth Hudson River tunnels, beginning on embankment east of Secaucus Rail Station, terminating south of the existing NEC and Penn Station New York, under West 31st Street. Portal Bridge is identified as a Related Project in the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. After the completion of the NEPA process, FRA will develop a Service Development Plan that will describe the projects to be prioritized for implementation as part of the first phase. Funding and financing the projects necessary to implement the Preferred Alternative will be an incremental process for the federal government, Amtrak, the NEC states and stakeholders, and the entire region. This process will require the commitment of both the public and private sectors over a long period of time. The FRA and the NEC Commission will take a leading role in working with Congress to support the funding necessary to advance implementation, utilizing existing and future funding and financing programs and options. Funding and financing options will be further detailed in the Service Development Plan. For general information about phasing and implementation of the Preferred Alternative, please refer to Volume 1, Chapter 10.
Bannoura_Mi	Amtrak between Albany NY & NYC has been the best thing I have discovered since moving to Albany in 1997. It makes my business and leisure trips so much easier. No worries about traffic or parking in NYC. The trains are always full which suggests that I am not alone in benefiting from the service. I know I would make far fewer trips to NYC if I had to drive.	The Preferred Alternative includes capacity to support a significant increase in service to and from connecting corridors to the South to Richmond, West to Harrisburg/Pittsburgh and north to Albany/Rochester. The Preferred Alternative includes increased capacity at Penn Station New York to support expanded service on the NEC, as well as additional trains to and from the Empire Corridor to Albany and Rochester. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.

Table JJ–7: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Barone_Ri	The current analysis doesn 't account for a host of ridership opportunities that could be created with high-speed intercity connections with local transit systems, airport /rail connections, and travel generated by greater economic activity in detail for each northern alignment.	As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA focused on opportunities for improved connections at airports, larger and intermediate urban centers, and the importance of good local transit connections at those stations. These connections are described in Volumes 1 and 2, Chapter 5. Additionally, the broad implications of more connections are discussed with regard to influences on economic activity in Volumes 1 and 2, Chapter 6. The NEC FUTURE program is focused on the passenger rail system improvements. The FRA has worked closely throughout this process with the Federal Transit Administration (FTA). Both agencies understand the importance of and support multimodal connectivity with passenger rail, including connections to transit. The specifics for transit connections with the NEC are the subject of subsequent Tier 2 project studies and other planning processes.
Barone_Ri	Intercity rail improvements must accommodate the operational and market needs of commuter services. While intercity rail services are important, helping to decongest interstate highways and airports, the volume of travel within urban areas far exceeds that of all intercity travel. Amtrak today carries 11.6 million people per year between Boston and Washington, the full length of the NEC.1 By comparison, NJ Transit - one of three railroads in the New York metropolitan area - alone carries an estimated 85.6 million riders annually.2 Seven other transit operators also use the NEC to provide commuter rail services between Washington and Boston. Acknowledging the demand on commuter rail services and accommodating these operators is necessary for an accurate modeling of the capacity and determination of investments needed for seamless mixed operation of intercity and regional services.	The focus of NEC FUTURE is to improve passenger rail service throughout the Study Area. The FRA's analysis confirms the commenters remarks that the eight Regional (commuter) railroads operate the overwhelming majority of service on the NEC and carry significantly more daily and annual customers. The focus of NEC FUTURE is to consider the overall market needs of the Study Area without regard to specific operator. A key emphasis for the Preferred Alternative is to create operating efficiencies - to better serve both Regional and Intercity customers and to leverage the extensive investment in infrastructure - and to offer all customers a mix of services to address mobility within and between metropolitan areas. The Preferred Alternative creates opportunities for efficiencies and generates customer and operator benefits from operating the NEC as an integrated network. Volume 1, Chapter 4 provides more discussion on the Preferred Alternative.
Barone_Ri	Higher- and high-speed rail services should be designed to capitalize on proximity of the NEC to adjacent airports to establish multi-modal connectivity. Currently, this is possible in Baltimore, Philadelphia, Newark and Providence, but not for other major airports in the region, most notably John F. Kennedy Airport. But even with new air-rail connections, our analysis indicates that high- and higher-speed rail wouldn 't have a significant effect on airport congestion overall. It is only in the Boston-New York/LaGuardia market where those connections could have a substantial impact, and that air market represents a small share of airport congestion in New York and in the Northeast.3	The Preferred Alternative focuses on improvements to the existing NEC to accommodate growth in population and employment. A key feature and benefit of the Preferred Alternative is freedom of mobility. The Preferred Alternative creates intermodal connections by concentrating improvements on urban hub stations well served by transit and by creating convenient airport services with frequent intercity and regional service. The improved connectivity increases the number of markets served by the combined air-to-rail mode, and results in a rail system that gains more riders going to an airport for longer-distance flights, and an air system that gets better-quality ground access for its air passengers. This includes a new station at Philadelphia International Airport, as well as better integration with the Hartford/Springfield Line, which includes a station at Windsor Locks, enabling better connections to Bradley International Airport. Under the Preferred Alternative, improved frequencies and services would be provided at BWI, Newark and TF Green airports. Rail-Air connections considered for the Preferred Alternative are discussed in Volume 1, Chapter 4 and 5.
Barone_Ri	Project costs must be controlled, and the NEC FUTURE DEIS doesn 't explore potential cost-saving measures by minimizing phasing or through the use of various financing and project delivery alternatives. Additionally, by being operator neutral, the NEC FUTURE DEIS is limited in a detailed assessment of operation costs. RPA recommends the NEC FUTURE DEIS more fully assess capital and operation cost reductions measures, expanding the scope of the DEIS to explore innovative financing and procurement strategies.	<p>The NEC FUTURE program is focused on corridor-wide vision for the future of passenger rail in the Northeast region. The Tier 1 EIS portion of the NEC FUTURE program is focused on assessing potential environmental impacts of the No Action and Action Alternatives, including the Preferred Alternative, and identifying a Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>Neither NEPA nor the FRA's Procedures for considering environmental impacts require detailed capital or operational cost analysis in an EIS. The capital costs estimate of the Preferred Alternative provides a conceptual estimate commensurate with the level of detail appropriate for a Tier 1 process to provide an accurate, documented, validated, and defensible cost estimate. Additional information on the capital cost methodology is provided in Volume 1, Appendix BB and Volume 2, Appendix B.</p> <p>As part of the Service Development Plan, the FRA will engage with stakeholders in more detailed conversations about potential funding and financing, project delivery, and related options for the Preferred Alternative. More information about the FRA's approach to the Service Development Plan is provided in Chapter 10, Volume 1 of the Final EIS.</p>

Table JJ–7: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Baudouin_Da	The covering of the tracks from the existing station to Smith Street should be evaluated and incorporated. The covering of these tracks are part of the long standing Capital Center District Plan for which the train station is a part.	As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, and will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure in the Tier 1 Record of Decision. Such decisions would be made as part of the Tier 2 project planning and NEPA processes, which would include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate.
Baudouin_Da	The expansion or possibly the construction of a new train station in downtown Providence to accommodate the expected significant increase in ridership in the next several decades. The new and expanded station should be an intermodal transportation center served by local buses, and interstate buses, and trolleys and bicycles.	The Preferred Alternatives uses the existing train station in Providence to accommodate future growth in service. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, and will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure. Such decisions would be made as part of the Tier 2 project planning processes, which would include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate.
Beale_Zo	the tunnel areas should be reconsidered according to predicted sea level rise, already the tunnels to and from NYC should maybe be nixed and instead do bridges. the whole flooding thing really is an issue and failure here would be a colosal waste of time and money and set the United States up for an infrasrtucture failure. perhaps both tunnels and alternate bridges could be built, or over land around the major metros withhigh speed rail connectors?	<p>As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, and will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure in the Tier 1 Record of Decision. Such decisions would be made as part of the Tier 2 project planning and NEPA processes, which would include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate.</p> <p>As discussed in Volume 2, Chapter 7.15, areas that are currently at risk from the effects of climate change, including sea level rise and increased storm severity, are predicted to experience worsening conditions. Each Action Alternative considered adaptation measures that could be undertaken to make the existing NEC more resilient.</p> <p>The FRA recognizes the potential impacts caused by climate change (including sea level rise) on the coastline and rail infrastructure; therefore, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative route that improves resiliency on the NEC and provides for redundant infrastructure in areas most vulnerable to the effects of climate change.</p>
Becker_Br	These 'relatively easy' projects may need to be delineated from the extremely expensive and perhaps impossible to accomplish projects such as the construction of a new corridor north of New York City; the construction of a tunnel under Long Island Sound and the installation of multiple new tunnels under the East River and Hudson River.	As described in Volume 2, Chapter 4, Alternatives Considered, all Action Alternatives address critical capacity issues through New York City, including new tunnels under the Hudson River between New Jersey and New York. The Preferred Alternative, described in Volume 1, Chapter 4, includes new third and fourth Hudson River tunnels, beginning on embankment east of Secaucus Rail Station, terminating south of the existing NEC and Penn Station New York, under West 31st Street. In addition, the Preferred Alternative includes two tunnels under the Easter River. Portal Bridge is identified as a Related Project in the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. The Preferred Alternative does not include a new second spine corridor north of New York, Tunnel under the Long Island Sound or multiple tunnels under the East River. Volume 1, Chapter 10, includes a plan for incremental project phasing and implementation. The Initial Phase for implementing the Preferred Alternative focuses on the highest priority projects already under planning and required for addressing aging infrastructure and chokepoints along the NEC. Completion of the Initial Phase will support an important increment in service for both Intercity and Regional services, thereby enhancing service for all operators and travelers using the NEC. The Initial Phase will also improve the way that rail services are provided to the customer and will provide opportunities to make rail operations more efficient. The Initial Phase and subsequent project phases will be further detailed in the Service Development Plan.

Table JJ–7: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Becker_Br	One proposed aspect of the alternative, an alternate route around New London, should be viewed as a separate item, and not necessarily be part of Alternative 1. While this project has many advantages, it also has some disadvantages particularly to existing passengers in Connecticut, and this item should not delay all of the other items contained Alternative 1, which we view as required items for the NEe.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4). The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives, including Alternatives 2 and 3, to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints, and adds capacity to support more-frequent, faster, and more-reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. The FRA developed the alternatives with the intent that they could be implemented in phases. Prioritization will be accomplished through phasing plans that define the necessary infrastructure and operational enhancements required to support various increments of new corridor-wide service. Volume 1, Chapter 10, describes specific priorities for advancing projects.</p> <p>In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative provides connections along the existing NEC, along a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, and along the Hartford/Springfield Line, which strengthens service to Central New England and leverages existing investments and identified market opportunities.</p>
Becker_Br	Regardless of the infrastructure improvements which may occur in the future, it is vitally important that the operators of the various levels of service to be provided on the NEC be funded so that adequate equipment is available to meet the new passenger demand. Limiting train consists to accommodate only 300-400 passengers would be short sighted. Future trains should have the capacity to carry at least 1,000 passengers each. The stated policy goal for any improvements should be the movement of large numbers of people, with attractive trip times and affordable fares. Such an increase in passenger traffic could be accomplished today, with minimal infrastructure improvement, if only more equipment were available.	The FRA considered ways to gain operating efficiencies, such as longer trains or increased seating capacity, in the definition of the Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative. Examples of these types of enhancements are noted in Volume 1, Chapters 4 and 5. As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA will not make decisions about specific train consists or their configuration. Specific details about train equipment will be considered in more detail in subsequent Tier 2 project studies or other planning processes.
Becker_Br	We strongly encourage near-term improvements be evaluated to allow for additional use of the 'Inland' route between New Haven and Boston via Springfield, which would open up numerous new city pairs to direct service and which would allow for additional trains to operate between New York and Boston within the next ten years.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrades to the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment. The FRA received many comments about including the Hartford/Springfield Line in the Preferred Alternative. Based on feedback from stakeholders and the public the FRA investigated the feasibility of incorporating service via the Hartford/Springfield Line into the Preferred Alternative; serving underserved markets between New Haven, CT and Springfield, MA, and leveraging ongoing improvements associated with the Connecticut DOT's on-going CTrail Hartford Line. The FRA determined that there were benefits to incorporating the Hartford/Springfield Line into the Preferred Alternative. As a result, the Preferred Alternative includes an enhanced, electrified Hartford/Springfield Line, leveraging recent and future investments to create intermodal connections and strengthen existing urban centers. While the Preferred Alternative does not extend from Springfield to Boston, it supports options for expanded service north and east of Springfield.

Table JJ–7: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Becker_Br	We also strongly encourage the addition of a direct rail link between Boston's South and North Stations in either Alternative 2 or 3.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4). The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints, and adds capacity to support more-frequent, faster, and more-reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. The Preferred Alternative does include an extension of service north of Boston. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The North South Rail Link was not included in the No Action Alternative Project List (see Volume 2, Appendix B.1) since it does not meet the criteria for consideration: Funded projects or projects with approved funding plans, funded or unfunded mandates, unfunded projects necessary to keep the railroad running. Likewise, North South Rail Link was not included as a Related Project in the Action Alternatives because it does not meet the criteria for consideration: fully or partially funded projects located in a connecting corridor and not on the NEC; unfunded projects along the NEC with ongoing or completed NEPA/PE; fully or partially funded transit (e.g., NJ TRANSIT, MTA-LIRR) or freight projects located off of but connecting to the NEC. A project to connect Boston's North and South stations, such as the North South Rail Link, could be studied separately, and is not precluded as future investment.
Becker_Iv	I'd prefer to see a more advanced rail system - using trains seen in other countries, such as Japan - where the trains are wrapped around the tracks and are far faster than those we have in CT.	In separate studies, the FRA continues to explore new technologies such as maglev and is currently sponsoring a study of maglev between Baltimore and Washington, D.C. Such a system would require separate stations, and would not support run-through trains from connecting corridors nor offer proven integration efficiencies with today's NEC infrastructure and operators. For these reasons, the FRA did not incorporate advanced guideway or similar new technologies in the NEC FUTURE Alternatives Development Process. The Preferred Alternative does not include maglev. However, it also does not preclude the option in the future of building new transportation corridors supporting other technologies, such as maglev. The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrading the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment (as described in Volume 1, Chapter 4).
Becker_Iv	Try putting a train line right down the center of major highways - there's always room there.	The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrades to the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment. It does not include a second spine. Where possible, improvements are kept within or just adjacent to the existing NEC. In some cases, new segments would be outside the existing NEC, particularly where topography or other natural or built conditions make it infeasible to achieve the desired capacity and travel times. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Bell_We	Whatever level of improvements are decided for the Northeast Corridor itself, please consider simultaneous improvements in the Connecting Corridors. Some changes can be small and not costly (for example a train will not have to stop at a station if no passengers need to get off or on). Even small, inexpensive improvements may help trains run efficiently and more quickly. Thousands of current and potential travelers can have faster, shorter trips within Connecting Corridors. They will thus be more likely to use and be satisfied with the Northeast Corridor services.	The Preferred Alternative includes capacity to support a significant increase in service to and from connecting corridors to the South to Richmond, West to Harrisburg/Pittsburgh and north to Albany/Rochester. The Preferred Alternative incorporates the Hartford/Springfield Line, with service to Hartford, CT, and Springfield, MA. The Preferred Alternative does not include improvements to the connecting corridors, each of which are currently undergoing upgrades under separate programs. Use of dual power locomotives would reduce travel times for services to and from Richmond by eliminating the current need to change locomotives in Washington, D.C. Connecting corridors are described in Volume 1, Chapter 4 and 5.

Table JJ–7: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Bellows_Br	...unification of the commuter rail system in Boston is relevant for the Northeast Corridor. The first reason is that it much more convincingly and in a long-term way provides the capacity and the operating efficiency that's needed at South Station. Adding stub-end tracks to a dysfunctional stub-end terminal buys you maybe a few years of extra capacity, but, in addition to being an incredible waste of money, it doesn't give you the scalability that is essential for an investment of the magnitude that you're talking about with the more ambitious high-speed rail plans, which we certainly all support and want to encourage.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. The Preferred Alternative does include an extension of service north of Boston. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The North South Rail Link was not included in the No Action Alternative Project List (see Volume 2, Appendix B, No Action Alternative Report) as it does not meet the criteria for consideration: Funded projects or projects with approved funding plans, funded or unfunded mandates, unfunded projects necessary to keep the railroad running. Likewise, North South Rail Link was not included as a Related Project in the Action Alternatives because it does not meet the criteria for consideration: fully or partially funded projects located in a connecting corridor and not on the NEC; unfunded projects along the NEC with ongoing or completed NEPA/PE; fully or partially funded transit (e.g., NJ TRANSIT, MTA-LIRR) or freight projects located off of but connecting to the NEC. A project to connect Boston's North and South stations, such as the North South Rail Link, could be studied separately, and is not precluded as future investment.
Bellows_Br	...the Northeast Corridor, by stopping at Boston, leaves everyone north of Boston essentially disconnected and at a great economic disadvantage. I think it behooves us to continue the work of previous generations and extend this engine of prosperity to the entire East Coast. There are some significant growth centers north of Boston that could benefit greatly from that, and the project would also benefit from their support.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4). The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints, and adds capacity to support more-frequent, faster, and more-reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. The Preferred Alternative does include an extension of service north of Boston. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The North South Rail Link was not included in the No Action Alternative Project List (see Volume 2, Appendix B.1) since it does not meet the criteria for consideration: Funded projects or projects with approved funding plans, funded or unfunded mandates, unfunded projects necessary to keep the railroad running. Likewise, North South Rail Link was not included as a Related Project in the Action Alternatives because it does not meet the criteria for consideration: fully or partially funded projects located in a connecting corridor and not on the NEC; unfunded projects along the NEC with ongoing or completed NEPA/PE; fully or partially funded transit (e.g., NJ TRANSIT, MTA-LIRR) or freight projects located off of but connecting to the NEC. A project to connect Boston's North and South stations, such as the North South Rail Link, could be studied separately, and is not precluded as future investment.
Bellows_Br	... if we're going to spend billions of dollars building this incredible and very necessary and long overdue world class transportation infrastructure, it's essential that every single stop along the way has to do everything in its power to maximize the delivery of passengers to that system. Because it's not just trains running on your tracks; it's the whole system as an integrated whole that counts, and we have to get people to it. We have to get rid of the impedances that keep them in their cars and making other choices. And that's how we really tap the benefit and improve the cost/benefit of a project like this. So for Massachusetts to have hundreds of miles of commuter rail track that operate as two totally separate systems means that everything on the north side can't even get to the Northeast Corridor service that you're running. Even if we assume it never extends through Boston, we still need to deliver passengers to it, and it would be incredibly irresponsible for this state to just say, Well, gee, bring us your great system, and we're not going to lift a finger to help people use it.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4). The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints, and adds capacity to support more-frequent, faster, and more-reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. The Preferred Alternative does include an extension of service north of Boston. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The North South Rail Link was not included in the No Action Alternative Project List (see Volume 2, Appendix B, No Action Alternative Report) as it does not meet the criteria for consideration: Funded projects or projects with approved funding plans, funded or unfunded mandates, unfunded projects necessary to keep the railroad running. Likewise, North South Rail Link was not included as a Related Project in the Action Alternatives because it does not meet the criteria for consideration: fully or partially funded projects located in a connecting corridor and not on the NEC; unfunded projects along the NEC with ongoing or completed NEPA/PE; fully or partially funded transit (e.g., NJ TRANSIT, MTA-LIRR) or freight projects located off of but connecting to the NEC. A project to connect Boston's North and South stations, such as the North South Rail Link, could be studied separately, and is not precluded as future investment.

Table JJ–7: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Bennett_He	Less that 15 years ago millions of dollars were spent to put up poles and electricity so that the Acela could run through this area of the Northeast corridor. It seems totally irresponsible and wasteful to declare this expense and improvement out of date.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative brings the NEC to a state of good repair and replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. The FRA focused the Preferred Alternative on the existing NEC, in combination with the Hartford/Springfield Line. As noted by the commenter, recent upgrades to the NEC would be leveraged to bring the entire NEC+Hartford/Springfield Line to a state of good repair and to provide the required capacity and performance enhancements those areas of the NEC already in a state of good repair. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for further details on how and what is proposed for upgrade.
Bension_Ro	Can the FRA conduct a study of ?DORADO? service ? Drive On, Ride And Drive Off?	The FRA defined and developed the Preferred Alternative at a programmatic level, focusing on corridor-wide solutions within a Tier 1 EIS. Service and infrastructure assumptions made at the Tier 1 level are representative and illustrative to support analysis in both the alternatives development process and the Tier 1 EIS. These assumptions are not intended to be specific or prescriptive. Future services and operating plans will evolve as they are developed by NEC railroads. Subsequent Tier 2 analysis for projects in the NEC will provide greater detail on site-specific service and infrastructure requirements. A multimodal service concept, such as DORADO could be studied separately.
Bension_Ro	DORADO service would, of course, have to be an Alternative 3 component.	The FRA defined and developed the Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative at a programmatic level, focusing on corridor-wide solutions within a Tier 1 EIS. Service and infrastructure assumptions made at the Tier 1 level are representative and illustrative to support analysis in both the alternatives development process and the Tier 1 EIS. These assumptions are not intended to be specific or prescriptive. Future services and operating plans will evolve as they are developed by NEC railroads. Subsequent Tier 2 project studies in the NEC will provide greater detail on site-specific service and infrastructure requirements. A multimodal service concept, such as DORADO could be studied separately. .
Bension_Ro	If this [DORADO] cannot be accommodated within the NEC Futures program, could you issue a separate BAA or can you recommend another opportunity (a Transit IDEA application for example)?	The NEC FUTURE Tier 1 Draft EIS follows a “tiered” approach to environmental review. Tier 1 focuses on broad programs and initial analysis. Tier 2 focuses on site-specific, project-level proposals and impacts. The FRA defined and developed the Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative at a programmatic level, focusing on corridor-wide solutions within a Tier 1 EIS. Future services and operating plans will evolve as they are developed by NEC railroads. Subsequent Tier 2 project analysis would provide greater detail on site-specific service and infrastructure requirements. A multimodal service concept, such as DORADO, like Amtrak’s Autotrain service, could be studied separately, and is not precluded by the Preferred Alternative.
Bension_Ro	Why can’t that integration be extended to ?DORADO?? The Chunnel Train (Britain ? France) is a good precedent, albeit a much simpler one.	Within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and will not make decisions’ regarding the configuration of passenger trains to accommodate automobiles and bicycles or other similar amenities. Such decisions are made as part of Tier 2 project studies, which would include local stakeholder and public involvement. Looking to the future, 2040 and beyond, the FRA’s Preferred Alternative considers flexibility to consider emerging or newly available technologies in subsequent Tier 2 project studies.
Bergfels_Do	we so desperately need better and More rail transportation. not just in the city areas but also in local services in upper eastern NY.	The focus of NEC FUTURE is improving both Intercity and Regional rail service. The Preferred Alternative brings the existing NEC to a state of good repair and maximizes its capacity through alleviation of chokepoints, addition of new tracks and segments at targeted locations, and implementation of service operational efficiencies. The Preferred Alternative also removes speed restrictions where practical and safe and allows substantial growth for all Regional rail markets. See Volume 1, Chapter 4, for more discussion on the Preferred Alternative.

Table JJ–7: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Bessette_St	I realize that the moving of the rail line will cause the loss of the Downtown Mystic Train Station and the station in Westerly RI. However there is a location in the northern section of both towns that could accommodate new stations and the potential development that may follow.	The Preferred Alternative expands the level of service on the existing NEC between New Haven and Boston, resulting in increased intercity and regional service at existing stations along the shoreline. Service to the existing station would continue. In addition, a new supplemental segment will be added between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as considered under Alternative 1. Trains using the new segment would serve the New London/Mystic station. The specific location of and design for the new station, including the number of parking spaces, would be determined in subsequent Tier 2 project studies. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Bourget_Am	We really need a stop in western ma. with the casino coming in, having a stop in Palmer would be amazing! It would also make it so much easier for people from here to get to Boston for day trips and for people from Boston to come explore western ma!	<p>The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrades to the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment. To better serve Central New England, the Preferred Alternative incorporates electrification on the Hartford/Springfield Line, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield on the NEC. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The FRA is coordinating with Massachusetts and Vermont on the Northern New England Intercity Rail Initiative, a separate study, to explore options for improved intercity rail service in New England.</p> <p>While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify the construction of additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network.</p>
Bowers_Da	Has any thought been given to a route via the Air Line that ran Northeast from New Haven, CT, through Middletown and on to Boston? This was a fairly straight route in it's day.	<p>The former Air Line route between New Haven, CT, and Boston, MA, was initially considered during alternatives development as a possible route for a second spine; however, it was not advanced for further consideration because it includes many curves, which prevented trip-time improvements and did not directly serve either the Hartford, CT, or Providence, RI, markets. Although not tied to any one route, the FRA did look to stay within existing transportation corridors to the extent practical. The Air Line route was not only not well-suited to the overall needs defined for NEC FUTURE, but is also designated a Connecticut State Park Trail (Air Line Route State Park Trail). For these reasons it was eliminated from consideration as an Initial Alternative.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative does not include a routing connecting Hartford, CT, and Providence, RI, as shown in Alternatives 2 and 3. The Preferred Alternative combines key elements of all three Action Alternatives to accommodate future growth in Northeast population and employment. The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.</p>
Brassard_Pe	The absolute minimum two projects that should advocated for in the final EIS and built are two additional Trans-Hudson tunnels between New Jersey and Penn Station New York, along with an additional or a replacement Portal Bridge in Kearny, New Jersey. Without two new tunnels, if there were an infrastructure failure between New Jersey and New York, the Northeast rail corridor would cease to exist.	As described in Volume 2, Chapter 4, Alternatives Considered, all Action Alternatives address critical capacity issues through New York City, including new tunnels under the Hudson River between New Jersey and New York. The Preferred Alternative, described in Volume 1, Chapter 4, includes new third and fourth Hudson River tunnels, beginning on embankment east of Secaucus Rail Station, terminating south of the existing NEC and Penn Station New York, under West 31st Street. Portal Bridge is identified as a Related Project in the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. Funding and financing the projects necessary to implement the Preferred Alternative will be an incremental process for the federal government, Amtrak, the NEC states and stakeholders, and the entire region. This process will require the commitment of both the public and private sectors over a long period of time. The FRA and the NEC Commission will take a leading role in working with Congress to support the funding necessary to advance implementation, utilizing existing and future funding and financing programs and options. Funding and financing options will be further detailed in the Service Development Plan.

Table JJ-7: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Brassard_Pe	The New Bedford region of the Providence area, as well as the Massachusetts cities and towns that border Rhode Island, and some of Rhode Island 's population was left out of the Providence metropolitan area population count. Springfield, which is 30 miles from Hartford, is its own separate metropolitan region (a CSA) was added to the Hartford CSA in the DEIS, where as New Bedford, also 30 miles away but from Providence, which is generally included in the Providence MSA calculation, was left out. All missing communities of the Providence MSA should be added and reflected throughout the DEIS and final EIS.	The FRA drew boundaries based on markets served; those travel zone boundaries do not specifically align with MSA boundaries. For a description of these boundaries, please refer to the ridership methodology in Volume 2, Appendix B.8, and the Technical Analysis in Volume 1, Appendix BB.
Brassard_Pe	The following incorrect data is shown in the DEIS - Alternatives Report (October 2015): Table 7: Population Forecasts (page 37) Providence - 970,000 Hartford -1,800,000 (includes the Springfield CSA) Table 8: NEC Employment Forecast (page 38) Providence - 426,000 Hartford - 873,000 !! The actual data from US Census (2014) for Population and Bureau of Labor Statistics (November 2015) for Employment Statistics shows: Population Providence MSA -1,609,000 Hartford CSA -1,214,000 Worcester MSA - 931,000 Springfield CSA - 629,000! Employment Providence-Warwick RI-MA - 649,000 Hartford CT - 590,400 Springfield MA - 395,000 Worcester MA - 329,000 New Bedford MA - 78,000 The Providence metropolitan area is slightly larger than the Hartford area. The Springfield and Worcester metropolitan areas are considerably smaller than both Providence and Hartford. The set of population numbers in the DEIS Alternatives Report incorrectly implies that Providence is equivalent to Worcester instead of Hartford.	<p>The FRA used Moody's as a commercial available forecast that was available corridor-wide, commensurate with the corridor-wide perspective of the NEC FUTURE analysis.</p> <p>The numbers in question are different due to the source quoted (Census data projections from 2014) and boundaries used to calculate the population and employment numbers. FRA's data (obtained on a county-level basis for the Study Area) is based on Moody's Analytics June 2013 "base" demographic forecasts. Moody's data uses actual Census data (not the same as census projections) to make projections. Moody's supplied three forecasts for the 2040 NEC population and employment projections based on this data: low, base (most likely), and high.</p> <p>For purposes of ridership forecasting, travel zones were established which are not the same as the Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) boundaries cited by the constituent. The boundaries in the Tier 1 Draft EIS were drawn based on markets served and do not match up specifically to the MSA boundaries.</p> <p>For example, the numbers pretend in Volume 2, Appendix B.8 show Providence County numbers, rather than those for the entire MSA. For NEC FUTURE, the FRA relied on a corridor-wide data source; for future year forecasts, the U.S. Census data are not available at the detailed level required for this analysis.</p> <p>Details on the Preferred Alternative representative Service Plan are provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4 and Appendix BB.</p>
Brassard_Pe	If a Hartford to Worcester HSR alignment were created, the coastal NEC would effectively become secondary local tracks. It may be a coincidence, but series of diagrams on page 212 and 213 of the Alternatives Report illustrates NEC coastal route in southern New England labeled not as even intermediate tracks, but as "local tracks."	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives, including Alternative 1, to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. In Connecticut, the existing NEC shoreline route will be upgraded with a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. This new segment in addition to the existing tracks will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The precise location for and design of the rail segment would be determined in a subsequent Tier 2 project study. The Preferred Alternative also incorporates enhanced electrified service along the Hartford/Springfield Line which strengthens service to Central New England and leverages existing investments and identified market opportunities. Demand for both Shoreline East regional rail service and intercity trains across the Northeast is project to grow significantly as population and employment expand in the coming decades.</p> <p>The FRA identified a Preferred Alternative that focuses on leveraging the investment in the existing NEC and Hartford/Springfield Lines over the proposed Hartford-Worcester routing. FRA considered travel time improvements, connectivity, environmental benefits and effects and overall mobility benefits when deciding on a Preferred Alternative. Improved service between Worcester and Boston are being evaluated as part of a separate study effort that was considered in the definition of the Preferred Alternative. Volume 1, Chapter 4 describes the Preferred Alternative.</p>

Table JJ–7: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Brassard_Pe	If large sums of money are spent on a new HSR Hartford-Worcester alignment, no matter what the EIS might outline, it's highly unlikely that much will be done to improve the NEC coastal route or to upgrade it to a proposed 160mph HSR service. There 's a huge difference in the quality of service that an inland 220mph route would provide compared to a 160mph coastal route (even with assuming that upgrades are possible). A 220mph inland route that went through Providence would have similar advantages as a 220mph inland route through Worcester for speed train service between Boston and New York.	<p>The Hartford to Worcester routing option considered in Alternative 3 is not included in the Preferred Alternative, described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. However, between New Haven and Boston, the Preferred Alternative includes upgrade of the existing NEC shoreline route with a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1, and enhanced electrified service along the Hartford/Springfield Line which strengthens service to Central New England and leverages existing investments and identified market opportunities.</p> <p>While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify the construction of additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative is compatible with a later addition of such a new segment connecting in New Haven and with later addition of new segments connecting to Harford and Providence.</p>
Brassard_Pe	An additional pair of local or express tracks should be built between Providence to just south of Boston. If Alternative 2 or 3 are not selected, the proposed bypass from Old Saybrook to Kingston should be constructed, as well as, additional tracks south of Providence, in Westchester and Fairfield counties, and north-central New Jersey.	The FRA has incorporated several of these ideas into the Preferred Alternative. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for a complete description of the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative includes upgrading the existing NEC shoreline route with a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative also incorporates enhanced electrified service along the Hartford/Springfield Line.
Brassard_Pe	Even if rail infrastructure north of South Station Boston is technically beyond the scope of the NEC Future study and EIS, an exception for connecting South and North Stations should be considered and incorporated into the final EIS.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4). The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints, and adds capacity to support more-frequent, faster, and more-reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. The Preferred Alternative does include an extension of service north of Boston. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The North South Rail Link was not included in the No Action Alternative Project List (see Volume 2, Appendix B.1) since it does not meet the criteria for consideration: Funded projects or projects with approved funding plans, funded or unfunded mandates, unfunded projects necessary to keep the railroad running. Likewise, North South Rail Link was not included as a Related Project in the Action Alternatives because it does not meet the criteria for consideration: fully or partially funded projects located in a connecting corridor and not on the NEC; unfunded projects along the NEC with ongoing or completed NEPA/PE; fully or partially funded transit (e.g., NJ TRANSIT, MTA-LIRR) or freight projects located off of but connecting to the NEC. A project to connect Boston's North and South stations, such as the North South Rail Link, could be studied separately, and is not precluded as future investment.
Brassard_Pe	There is no additional capacity at South Station Boston to accommodate both expanded intercity and commuter rail service. If through routing, particularly for commuter rail trains, is made possible by connecting the two stations, future intercity and commuter rail capacity could be accommodated. An alternate that would not connect the two stations would be to demolish the US Postal Service building adjacent to existing South Station terminal tracks to use that area for added tracks to increase capacity.	The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative includes projects to replace aging infrastructure, eliminate chokepoints and add capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. At South Station, the FRA and the Massachusetts Department of Transportation are advancing improvements to expand station capacity under a separate project. Representative service levels included in the Preferred Alternative could be accommodated at the expanded South Station.

Table JJ–7: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Brassard_Pe	Whatever is established in this EIS, even if it's a mistake or wrong, will inform future studies, projects, and funding priorities for the NEC. U.S government population, employment and economic data should substitute for Moody 's Analytic 's current population and economic data in the DEIS. Assumptions regarding location of a potential second HSR alignment must reflect actual or existing transportation, population and economic conditions and potential.	<p>The FRA used Moody's as a commercial available forecast that was available corridor-wide, commensurate with the corridor-wide perspective of the NEC FUTURE analysis.</p> <p>The numbers in question are different due to the source quoted (Census data projections from 2014) and boundaries used to calculate the population and employment numbers. FRA's data (obtained on a county-level basis for the Study Area) is based on Moody's Analytics June 2013 "base" demographic forecasts. Moody's data uses actual Census data (not the same as census projections) to make projections. Moody's supplied three forecasts for the 2040 NEC population and employment projections based on this data: low, base (most likely), and high.</p>
Brassard_Pe	New Trans-Hudson tunnels should directly terminate at exiting Penn Station tracks and platforms levels, rather than constructing a separate new deep-cavern station, as was proposed with the ARC plan.	<p>The Preferred Alternative, described in Volume 1, Chapter 4, includes new third and fourth Hudson River tunnels, beginning on embankment east of Secaucus Rail Station, terminating south of the existing NEC and Penn Station New York, under West 31st Street.</p> <p>The Hudson Tunnel Project is intended to preserve the current functionality of the NEC's Hudson River rail crossing between New Jersey and New York and strengthen the resilience of the NEC; FRA and NJ TRANSIT are currently leading the NEPA process for the Hudson Tunnel Project. The Hudson Tunnel Project is separate from the NEC FUTURE program. NEC FUTURE does evaluate overall capacity needs and potential improvements for the entire NEC including the New York City area. The FRA coordinates closely with the project team for the Hudson Tunnel Project in order that its scope does not preclude NEC FUTURE findings.</p>
Brassard_Pe	Commuter trains from New Jersey and Long Island that use Penn Station should incorporate a through routing strategy to allow for better utilization and effectively increase capacity at Penn Station for intercity regional or high speed rail (HSR) service and better local commuter operations.	The Preferred Alternative supports sufficient capacity and reliability improvements to significantly enhance the customer experience while riding on the NEC. Scheduled connections between different rail operators, as well as the ability to operate through-service at Washington Union Station and Penn Station New York, are key network opportunities created by the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Brenner_Er	With Amtrak looking to increase high-speed rail in the NEC, at the same time as you are increasing your position as an important part of the multi-modal solutions needed in this high-population area, I hope you would consider adding a bike/pedestrian bridge addition to the Susquehanna River bridge crossing platform that needs to be build in the next decade. The Susquehanna River crossing is a critical barrier to increasing the economic impact of both the September 11 National Memorial Trail and the East Coast Greenway. Given Amtrak's recent expansion of roll-on/roll-off bike service in baggage cars (reducing the needs to box bikes), this seems like the next step to further solidify the bicycling community as an even stronger supporter of Amtrak's core mission.	<p>The NEC FUTURE program is focused on corridor-wide improvements and solutions to advance passenger rail. The NEC FUTURE Tier 1 EIS analyzes the environmental impacts, both adverse and beneficial, of each of the Tier 1 DEIS Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative including impacts on all transportation modes as discussed in Volume 1 and 2, Chapter 5. Subsequent planning for Tier 2 projects would further examine intermodal connectivity. Volume 1, Chapter 5, notes that Tier 2 projects may consider impacts to bicycle routes if appropriate to the project.</p> <p>The NEC FUTURE program will not interfere with the current and ongoing process led by FRA, Maryland Department of Transportation, the Maryland Transit Administration and Amtrak to study various alternatives to improve the Susquehanna River rail crossing.</p>
Brown_Ju	From this area [Hampton Roads], we can ride seamlessly (in a single seat) all the way to Boston, so the Richmond -Newport News-Norfolk corridor should probably be considered a Connecting Rail Corridor.	The Southeast High Speed Rail Corridor is a considered a connecting corridor serving Richmond and Hampton Roads, VA, Raleigh and Charlotte, NC, and Atlanta, GA. Opportunities created for service continuing south of Washington Union Station are described in Volume 1, Chapter 4 and 5.
Brown_Ro	I would like to see real high speed rail access to serve the Northeast Corridor from Boston to Washington D.C. with speeds up to 150 MPH with updated technology along with infrastructure.	The FRA has focused on high-performance and improving travel times throughout the NEC rather than on track design speeds themselves. Where practical, the FRA has provided for design speeds up to 220 mph in the Preferred Alternative. Design speeds of up to 160 mph are suggested where grade, curvature, or other physical constraints limit speeds. Specific design speeds could be further evaluated in subsequent Tier 2 project studies.

Table JJ–7: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Brown_Ro	Any future plans of using hi-speed trains at greater speeds for the NEC?	As a result of the Tier 1 Draft EIS and the public comment process, the FRA has identified a Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4). The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints, and adds capacity to support more-frequent, faster, and more-reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, as proposed by Alternative 3, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.
Bruhl_Ch	The primary focus should be on achieving the economic and environmental benefits of vastly improved travel times on the New Haven Line, specifically the linking of Hartford to New Haven to Stamford to New York City in 30 minute travel time increments, as well as the integration of Shore Line East service into the network with 30 minute travel time from New London to New Haven. This higher speed system will be the backbone of Connecticut 's 21st century economy and we believe that this alternative should proceed into the Tier 2 process.	The Preferred Alternative adds new capacity across the NEC, including the portion of the NEC between New York and New Haven. This will support additional regional rail service on the New haven Line to and from Penn Station New York and Grand Central Terminal, as well as faster intercity rail service. The Preferred Alternative also incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield to other markets on the NEC. The representative service plan for the Preferred Alternative, including travel times and service frequencies, are provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Bruno_Gw	Why not consider (with no negative impact to the environment or historic districts) routing the rail to TweedNew Haven Airport so riders can hope a plane?	<p>The FRA’s development of the NEC FUTURE investment program began in 2012 with nearly 100 initial alternatives for improving the NEC. These alternatives were consolidated to 15 Preliminary Alternatives that reflected a full spectrum of possibilities for the NEC. After extensive analysis and public dialogue on the Preliminary Alternatives, the FRA developed a No Action and three Action Alternatives for evaluation in the Tier 1 Draft EIS. See Volume 2, Appendix B for additional information on the Alternatives Development Process.</p> <p>As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA focused on corridor-wide representative routes and will not make decisions about specific alignments. Subsequent Tier 2 project studies will include stakeholder and public participation and focus in detail on specific service, routing, and infrastructure requirements.</p>
Bukowski_Pa	Please consider routing train traffic through western Mass, with a new stop at the former Palmer railroad station. I think it would be so helpful for economic recovery in Palmer and its surrounding towns. It would also allow us to travel to Boston without dealing with or adding to the car traffic.	<p>The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrades to the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment. To better serve Central New England, the Preferred Alternative incorporates electrification on the Hartford/Springfield Line, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield on the NEC. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The FRA is coordinating with Massachusetts and Vermont on the Northern New England Intercity Rail Initiative, a separate study, to explore options for improved intercity rail service in New England.</p> <p>While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify the construction of additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network.</p>
Bullock_Ch	South and West of New York there needs to be a new tunnel with at least two additional tracks from New York Penn Station to Newark.	As described in Volume 2, Chapter 4, Alternatives Considered, all Action Alternatives address critical capacity issues through New York City, including new tunnels under the Hudson River between New Jersey and New York. The Preferred Alternative, described in Volume 1, Chapter 4, includes new third and fourth Hudson River tunnels, beginning on embankment east of Secaucus Rail Station, terminating south of the existing NEC and Penn Station New York, under West 31st Street. In addition, the Preferred Alternative includes two tunnels under the Easter River. Portal Bridge is identified as a Related Project in the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers.
Bullock_Ch	There needs to be either a new alignment through/around Baltimore or a complete renovation of the tunnels including the building of two new tracks.	As described in Volume 1, Chapter 4, the Preferred Alternative includes a new, four-track infrastructure in tunnel, approaching Baltimore Penn Station from the west. The existing NEC, between Lafayette Avenue and North Avenue in Baltimore City, would be retired from passenger rail service.

Table JJ–7: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Bullock_Ch	There should be at least four tracks for the entire length of the corridor.	The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrading the existing NEC to accommodate projected growth in regional population and employment. With replacement of aging infrastructure, elimination of chokepoints, and addition of capacity, rail service can be significantly expanded and made more reliable. It includes a minimum of four tracks across much of the NEC, including its most congested areas, as described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Burns_Ma	Palmer needs rail service	<p>The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrades to the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment. To better serve Central New England, the Preferred Alternative incorporates electrification on the Hartford/Springfield Line, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield on the NEC. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The FRA is coordinating with Massachusetts and Vermont on the Northern New England Intercity Rail Initiative, a separate study, to explore options for improved intercity rail service in New England.</p> <p>While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify the construction of additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network.</p>
Businger_Jo	... if we do all this work but still dead end at South Station, the route does not work very well. It doesn't serve potential high-speed rail, because it dead ends. It doesn't serve the commuter rail system in Massachusetts to get from places like Brockton to Lynn or from Providence to Portland. So it serves neither the Northeast Corridor of Amtrak, and it does not serve the MBTA commuter rail lines. And that's a very important thing to take into account.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4). The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints, and adds capacity to support more-frequent, faster, and more-reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. The Preferred Alternative does include an extension of service north of Boston. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The North South Rail Link was not included in the No Action Alternative Project List (see Volume 2, Appendix B.1) since it does not meet the criteria for consideration: Funded projects or projects with approved funding plans, funded or unfunded mandates, unfunded projects necessary to keep the railroad running. Likewise, North South Rail Link was not included as a Related Project in the Action Alternatives because it does not meet the criteria for consideration: fully or partially funded projects located in a connecting corridor and not on the NEC; unfunded projects along the NEC with ongoing or completed NEPA/PE; fully or partially funded transit (e.g., NJ TRANSIT, MTA-LIRR) or freight projects located off of but connecting to the NEC. A project to connect Boston's North and South stations, such as the North South Rail Link, could be studied separately, and is not precluded as future investment.
Businger_Jo	With through service [at the North-South Rail Link], you can run trains out that could get the excess on one side in terms of numbers and run them out the other side. It's a tremendous development opportunity...	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4). The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints, and adds capacity to support more-frequent, faster, and more-reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. The Preferred Alternative does include an extension of service north of Boston. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The North South Rail Link was not included in the No Action Alternative Project List (see Volume 2, Appendix B.1) since it does not meet the criteria for consideration: Funded projects or projects with approved funding plans, funded or unfunded mandates, unfunded projects necessary to keep the railroad running. Likewise, North South Rail Link was not included as a Related Project in the Action Alternatives because it does not meet the criteria for consideration: fully or partially funded projects located in a connecting corridor and not on the NEC; unfunded projects along the NEC with ongoing or completed NEPA/PE; fully or partially funded transit (e.g., NJ TRANSIT, MTA-LIRR) or freight projects located off of but connecting to the NEC. A project to connect Boston's North and South stations, such as the North South Rail Link, could be studied separately, and is not precluded as future investment.

Table JJ–7: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Butler_Ra	Northeast Corridor trains extend beyond Washington DC on to Norfolk Virginia. There are Boston trains which originate in Virginia and Virginia trains which originate Boston. Northeast Corridor stretches beyond Washington DC.	The Preferred Alternative includes capacity to support a significant increase in service to and from connecting corridors to the South to Richmond, West to Harrisburg/Pittsburgh and north to Albany/Rochester. The Preferred Alternative incorporates the Hartford/Springfield Line, with service to Hartford, CT, and Springfield, MA. The Preferred Alternative does not include improvements to the connecting corridors, each of which are currently undergoing upgrades under separate programs. Connecting corridors are described in Volume 1, Chapter 4 and 5.
Byrne_Je	Please improve reliability of the Sunday trains that run between Trenton and Alexandria, VA. They are almost always late!	As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA focused on concepts for improving the frequency, travel time and connectivity of service, and within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, the FRA will not make decisions about operator-specific service plans or schedules. Such decisions are made as part of Tier 2 project studies, which will include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate. Consistent with this process, the FRA developed representative service plans for the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative, which provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the effects of each Alternative. Representative service plans define a range of benefits that might occur and whose details could change during subsequent Tier 2 project analysis.
Byrne_Je	Also, please shorten the layover time at Union Station.	The Preferred Alternative includes up to two trains per hours to and from markets south of Washington, D.C. While the rail corridor south of Washington, D.C., is not electrified, use of dual power locomotives or future electrification would end the current need to change locomotives at Washington Union Station. This would significantly shorten the current delay in Washington, D.C. For additional information on the Preferred Alternative, see Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Cable_Pe	...the movable bridge scheduling could be renegotiated to allow more trains as needed, and resiliency of the existing line and bridges can be greatly improved by solid engineering and vigorous infrastructure improvement.	The Preferred Alternative adds a new, supplemental segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI. This supports faster service for trains using the supplemental track, as well as a route that bypasses the five movable bridges and 11 at-grade crossings on the existing NEC in that region. In this way, trains can continue to use the existing route along the coast for local service and freight without interfering with local marine traffic. In addition, because the new supplemental segment is located inland from the existing NEC, it enhances the resilience of the railroad by providing an alternative route in the event of weather-related problems on the existing route. Improvements proposed would incorporate best practices to address areas of vulnerability along the existing NEC as those segments would be upgraded or otherwise improved. Identifying opportunities to harden or otherwise mitigate effects of seal-level rise or other weather-related events would be incorporated by design into future projects. This approach to addressing vulnerability of the existing NEC is further described in Volume 1, Chapter 7.15. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Camean_Ho	...perhaps instead of trying to create new rail, you should improve on the safety and conditions of your current rails. I frequently run down Buttonball Road, where the trespasser was struck, and any one - adult, teenager, child, has access to those tracks easily. Especially being close to the shoreline beach area- that area is open and available to any one who can walk ably. While we grieve for the victim and the engineer at the head of the train, I must point out that the rails you already have can and should be improved upon before the thought of new rails even enter one's mind.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4). The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrading the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment. Critical to achieving this goal is bringing the NEC to a state of good repair and improving the reliability and safety of rail operations. The Preferred Alternative considers safety of railroad operations in Volume 1, Chapter 7.18.
Cantner_Sh	Revamp the current train bridge and keep the tracks where they are.	As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure or alignments. Such decisions are made as part of Tier 2 project studies, which would include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate. Consistent with this process, the FRA developed Representative Routes for the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative, which provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the effects of each Alternative. Representative Routes define an envelope within which improvements might occur and whose location and construction type could change during subsequent Tier 2 project analysis.

Table JJ–7: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Caracciolo_Da	is there any clarity on if existing structures are being used? If there's structures being built, is anyone conversating with the governor based on his recent, let's call grandiose plans for downstate New York, especially with the third rail going backwards from Floral Park to Hicksville.	<p>The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. The Preferred Alternative does not include the Long Island routing option considered in Alternative 3. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions. The Preferred Alternative is further described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.</p> <p>As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure or alignments. Such decisions would be made as part of the Tier 2 project planning processes, which would include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate.</p>
Carbone_Vi	Southington would be a the most perfect place to have a railway station. Southington has had no railway station for as long as I can remember. The railroad line that went through my hometown known as the Farmington Canal Line is now a rail trail that cuts through town on the railroad's old right-of-way. I think Southington should have more transportation; Southington hasn't had a station in over 66 years now. And it would be great to revive rail transport in Southington, Bristol, and in nearby New Britain.	<p>The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrades to the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment, as described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers.</p> <p>In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative provides connections along the existing Northeast Corridor, along a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT and Kenyon, RI, and along the Hartford/Springfield Line which strengthens service to Central New England and leverages existing investments and identified market opportunities. No new station is included for Southington. However, the town would have access to significant NEC service at stations along the Hartford/Springfield Line.</p>
Carella_Ri	One of the things I would ask you to focus on is the current development of the New Haven-Hartford-Springfield passenger line that is ongoing. It is mentioned a number of times in your Tier 1 assessment, but only tangentially. I think it really needs to be a real focus...	The Preferred Alternative includes electrification of the Hartford/Springfield Line between New Haven, Hartford and Springfield. This will facilitate direct service to Hartford and Springfield from the NEC without an engine change. The Preferred Alternative supports as many as four NEC trains per hour on the Hartford/Springfield Line, in addition to regional service provided by CTDOT (Volume 1, Chapters 4 and 5).
Carey_Dy	I also urge the FRA to look into any options to save money in operations, including potentially replacing the current ticketing system with one similar to that found in Europe or off-board fare payment used on Bus Rapid Transit systems, reducing personnel costs by cutting the necessary number of conductors and replacing them with periodic ticket inspectors.	The Preferred Alternative improves passenger experience by integrating passenger ticketing, operations and services, as well as incorporating a new corridor-wide Metropolitan service to connect local stations with hub and terminal stations; regular clock face headways and simplified operations; and enhanced flexibility, freedom, and travel choices for everyday travelers. For additional details on the Preferred Alternative, see Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Carey_Dy	Also, more local trains should be run in the Northeast to a greater variety of destinations, however, that seems beyond the scope of this DEIS.	The focus of NEC FUTURE is improving both Intercity and Regional rail service. The Preferred Alternative brings the existing NEC to a state of good repair and maximizes its capacity through alleviation of chokepoints, addition of new tracks and segments at targeted locations, and implementation of service operational efficiencies. The Preferred Alternative also removes speed restrictions where practical and safe and allows substantial growth for all Regional rail markets. See Volume 1, Chapter 4, for more discussion on the Preferred Alternative.
CarignanSr_Bo	It would be tragic for tourism in Southeastern Connecticut should you shift the rail line away from the coast and away from Mystic, Ct. which is a major New England tourist venue. It also facilitates our doing our business in New York and Boston.	The FRA has identified a Preferred Alternative that focuses improvements along the existing NEC with targeted new segments to alleviate chokepoints and increase capacity. Between New Haven and Boston, the Preferred Alternative includes upgrade of the existing NEC shoreline route, a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1, and enhanced electrified service along the Hartford/Springfield Line, which strengthens service to Central New England and leverages existing investments and identified market opportunities. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.

Table JJ–7: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Carley_Ro	this is overdue by a very long time. It's very congested up here. We are the engine of the U.S. economy. We deserve to have world-class infrastructure up here. We pay a lot of money into the federal government. We deserve to have the best train infrastructure that we can up here. There's no... proof-of-concept needed here. We know people in the Northeast are going to take trains if they're available.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4).
Carley_Ro	I would love to have a tunnel underneath Long Island Sound... Just, this is one of those things that I think, when people look at it, they say, The cost is just going to be far, far too high. We can't even talk about this thing.	The FRA noted concerns about the expense of constructing a tunnel under the Long Island Sound. The FRA has identified a Preferred Alternative that focuses improvements along the existing NEC with targeted new segments to alleviate chokepoints and increase capacity. The Preferred Alternative does not include a tunnel under the Long Island Sound. Volume 1, Chapter 4 provides a description of the Preferred Alternative.
Carolyn	I think the train would better serve ct if it went up rt 9.. across river where pratt & whitney exit 10, then over toward the casino it will open up the underdeveloped eastern area of CT. Then branches leading to the airport. Also get the Casinos, Pratt, Airport, involved.. it doesnt have to be high speed either more for a commuter, resident who lives in the state, NOT A PASS THROUGH CT to Mass & NY, DC, also must Employ Over 50% Qualified CT residents workers	As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA focused on corridor-wide representative routes and will not make decisions about specific alignments. Subsequent Tier 2 project studies will include stakeholder and public participation and focus in detail on specific service, routing, and infrastructure requirements. As a result of the Tier 1 Draft EIS and the public comment process, the FRA has identified a Preferred Alternative to improve passenger rail service on the NEC in a manner that will enhance mobility options and expand passenger rail service in support of future population and employment growth in the Study Area. The Preferred Alternative, described in Volume 1, Chapter 4, improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail, improve reliability, and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects.
Caruso_Ni	The proposed New London / Mystic station will likely become the only stop between Old Saybrook and Westerly, in turn destroying the urban hub and rail-ferry link dynamics in New London.	The Preferred Alternative expands the level of service on the existing NEC between New Haven and Boston, resulting in increased intercity and regional service at existing stations along the shoreline. In addition, a new supplemental segment will be added between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as considered under Alternative 1. Trains using the new segment would serve the New London/Mystic station. The specific location of and design for the new station, including the number of parking spaces, would be determined in subsequent Tier 2 project studies. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Caruso_Ni	By chance, has the team considered an even smaller segment?...one that starts at the existing New London station, rises and spans over the Thames without a movable bridge, and then continues along the same proposed I-95 path to Westerly? Has the team considered making the Mystic Aquarium node along I-95 the new Mystic NER station?...seeing as the existing stop will likely cease to exist? Attached is a quick corridor map highlighting some of the conditions.	As part of the NEC FUTURE process, FRA is focused on corridor-wide improvements that are representative, and as such did not identify specific alignment details. Subsequent Tier 2 project studies will include stakeholder and public participation and focus in detail on specific service, routing, and infrastructure requirements associated with the Selected Alternative. The length and location of the supplemental new segment in the Preferred Alternative from Old Saybrook, CT, to Kenyon, RI, is representative. The location of this representative route is based on three objectives: (1) it must be of sufficient length to provide the time for faster trains using the supplemental track to pass slower trains using the existing NEC; (2) it should bypass the five movable bridges between Old Saybrook and Mystic; and (3) it should bypass the eleven remaining at-grade crossings between Waterford and Stonington.
Carver_Ga	I would much rather see an elevated line running along the I-95 corridor or along existing rail corridors.	The FRA has identified a Preferred Alternative that focuses improvements along the existing NEC with targeted new segments to alleviate chokepoints and increase capacity. It also includes an enhanced, electrified Hartford/Springfield Line. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Cassidy_Ja	Define the term intercity service . Is this a new level of service between major cities (NYC, New Haven, Hartford, Boston) leaving out interim stops normally associated with those routes? Will this be achieve primarily with new equipment/new staff?	The term “Intercity” is defined as passenger rail service between metropolitan areas. It does include service to interim stops normally associated with the NEC. For NEC FUTURE, the FRA included service to all of the stations currently service by Amtrak, the Intercity railroad operator, as well as some new stations. The complete list of stations service is included in Chapter 4 and service types by station are also described in Chapter 5. For NEC FUTURE, the FRA looked at performance standards for operations on the NEC, but did not specifically identify equipment types. The Preferred Alternative does assume a consistent performance standard for equipment operating on the NEC (see Chapter 4 for more details). Similarly, the FRA made broad assumptions regarding staffing or crew requirements to evaluate representational service plans; specific decisions about equipment and staff will be made in subsequent planning study

Table JJ–7: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Cassidy_Ja	Please explain the concept of level-of-service .	Level-of-service is a qualitative measure describing operational road (traffic) conditions and the perception of motorists of the existing conditions. Six levels-of-service are defined for each type of facility, ranging from A to F, with LOS A representing the best operating conditions and LOS F the worst. Volumes 1 and 2, Chapter 13, contain a Glossary of terms.
Cassidy_Ja	Hudson River chokepoint: why is 6K passengers/hour in 2040 capacity excess a critical benchmark? What happens at 3K/hour excess by 2020? Will this result in an irreversible decline in rail traffic in favor of something more reliable?	The forecast year for NEC FUTURE is 2040; however, the FRA recognizes that the NEC is already at peak capacity at many locations along the corridor, particularly the Hudson River. A key feature and benefit of the Preferred Alternative is constructability and phasing. The Preferred Alternative makes it possible to repair the existing NEC in phases. Near-term benefits can be achieved while flexibility is maintained by allowing incremental improvements to adapt to market responses in the future. For more information on phasing, please refer to Volume 1, Chapter 10.
Cassidy_Ja	How does increased capacity for through trips get computed? Compared to what?	Increased capacity for through trips is computed by the availability of seats.
Cassidy_Ja	Manage expectations as to costs. Once a cost is stated, no matter how many weasel words are included, we public will remember those numbers and use them to judge the eventual plausibility of the final alternative.	<p>The capital cost estimate of the Preferred Alternative follows a consistent methodology and approach to provide a conceptual estimate appropriate to the level of detail required for a Tier 1 environmental process. The intent of the cost estimate is to provide a coherent, documented, and validated cost estimate at a corridor-wide level. The FRA has emphasized that the cost estimate for the Preferred Alternative represents an order-of-magnitude cost estimate for the likely scale of investment required to implement the Preferred Alternative, but still includes significant elements of uncertainty at the Tier 1 level.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative would be implemented in an incremental, phased approach. Future planning, engineering, and analysis would be necessary to develop more detailed and site-specific cost estimates these phases and for smaller-scale projects that are considered as part of the Preferred Alternative (e.g., bridge replacements, tunnel construction projects, or station projects). Detailed, project-specific cost estimates will be included as part of the Tier 2 project processes, which will include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate.</p>
Castiglioni_St	Retain and improve the route through PROVIDENCE. As New England's second largest city, second largest metro, and second largest port, it is critical that Providence be one of the major Acela and freight destinations of the NE corridor. As the commercial, business, industrial, educational, and cultural center of southeastern New England, Providence must be a key destination of any plan.	The FRA has identified a Preferred Alternative that focuses improvements along the existing NEC with targeted new segments to alleviate chokepoints and increase capacity. A key feature and benefit of the Preferred Alternative is freedom of mobility. The Preferred Alternative provides more-reliable and more-frequent train travel with easy connections to more places and shorter travel times, including high-frequency Intercity service to TF Green Airport in Providence, RI. Providence Station is considered a Major Hub in the Preferred Alternative. Intercity rail service will grow at Providence to up to 6 round-trip trains per hour and Regional rail service will also expand under the Preferred Alternative. For more details on the Preferred Alternative, see Volume 1, Chapter 4.

Table JJ–7: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Castonguay_Pa	I support Alternative 3 with the possibility of new parallel line being Maglev.	<p>The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The cost of a full high-speed second spine along with existing NEC improvements, as proposed by Alternative 3, is very high relative to the projected ridership benefits. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions.</p> <p>As noted in Volume 2, Chapter 4, an advanced guideway system, such as magnetic levitation technology, could be used to develop a second spine or portions thereof. This system would require separate stations, and would not support run-through trains from connecting corridors nor offer proven integration efficiencies with today's NEC infrastructure and operators. Furthermore, these technologies remain under development, with few systems in operation internationally. For these reasons, the FRA did not incorporate advanced guideway or similar new technologies in the Alternatives Development Process. However, such technologies could be studied separately, and are not precluded as a future transformative investment in the regional transportation system. Furthermore, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network or supporting the NEC passenger rail network by connecting off-corridor markets to the NEC, using advanced guideway or similar new technologies.</p>
Caulfield_Ch	NEC must find an alternative solution, which might just be elevating the current route along the shoreline.	The Preferred Alternative does not alter the route of the existing NEC through Southeastern Connecticut, as it serves local stations and provides access for freight service to businesses along the line. However, the Preferred Alternative does include a new 50-mile segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, that provides significant travel time benefits, improves resiliency, and improved reliability. This new segment also bypasses the movable bridges and the 11 remaining at-grade crossings on the NEC. In addition, the Preferred Alternative incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield to other markets on the NEC. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Chapman_Ra	extending the Line into Richmond VA would bring more between VA to the Washington Community.	The Preferred Alternative includes operation of two additional trains per hour south of Washington, D.C as per Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative does not extend the NEC beyond Washington, D.C. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The FRA and the state of Virginia are separately advancing improvements to the Southeast Corridor as part of the Southeast High-Speed Rail corridor program.
Chase_Da	It maybe makes no stops between New York and Boston. It may make one stop. You start stopping that train, you're going to lose all your time savings. So I think that needs to be probably realistically looked at. If you're going to have that high-speed service, you're not going to make local regional stops. So I think that needs to be really better defined, thought about, and let that stand on its own. If you do need to stop every 25 miles to get enough ridership, you don't have the high-speed service anymore, and the people that are going to Boston to New York aren't going to get on board. I think that's very important to look at, and I think they are.	The purpose of NEC FUTURE is to upgrade aging infrastructure and to improve the reliability, capacity, connectivity, performance, and resiliency of future passenger rail service on the NEC for both Intercity and Regional rail. The Preferred Alternative includes frequent limited-stop express service that will achieve trip time objectives to meet demand for most time-sensitive business trips; opportunities to offer express services that make limited intermediate stops; and metropolitan service that offers frequent lower cost service to many intermediate destinations. For additional details on the Preferred Alternative, see Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Chonka_Me	Please add an additional high speed rail in Western MA, Palmer, MA has a station that could be revitalized. There are many people in the western part of the state that would benefit from this, please don't neglect us.	<p>The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrades to the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment. To better serve Central New England, the Preferred Alternative incorporates electrification on the Hartford/Springfield Line, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield on the NEC. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The FRA is coordinating with Massachusetts and Vermont on the Northern New England Intercity Rail Initiative, a separate study, to explore options for improved intercity rail service in New England.</p> <p>While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify the construction of additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network.</p>

Table JJ–7: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Clark_Li	If we really want high speed trains, the line needs to be moved significantly inland, with few curves, and only select major stops. And the likelihood of that is ... ?	As a result of the Tier 1 Draft EIS and the public comment process, the FRA has identified a Preferred Alternative to improve passenger rail service on the NEC in a manner that will enhance mobility options and expand passenger rail service in support of future population and employment growth in the Study Area. The Preferred Alternative has high-speed capacity and reduces trip time along the corridor. The Preferred Alternative is further described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Clarke_Je	I would support a structural upgrade of the rail system using the existing route.	The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrading the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment. By replacing aging infrastructure, eliminating chokepoints, and adding capacity, performance and reliability will be significantly improved for both intercity and regional rail service. Further details are provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Clift_Jo	Inclusion of a NY Penn Station (NYP) - Grand Central Terminal (GCT) 2-track connection- This is THE CRITICAL KEY MISSING ELEMENT OF NEC FUTURE BUILD ALTERNATIVES! This connection must be added to Alternative 1, as well as the resulting base case for Alternatives 2 & 3. Completely missing from current alternatives, despite being vetted as constructible in the 2003 Access to the Region 's Core Major Investment Study, which showed far greater induced rail ridership and reduced auto travel than all other alternatives examined, due to the addition of a second Manhattan station on the NEC, this one within an improved GCT in the middle of East Midtown, where twice as much office space is within a 10-minute walk, compared with NYP. The NYP-GCT connection has the secondary benefit of avoiding the necessity of acquiring 1-1/2 blocks of Midtown Manhattan real estate and avoiding the necessity of constructing a station annex on the south side of NYP. Costs saved are in the billions of dollars, time saved is huge and political battles avoided are just as immense. Over 40% of NEC Manhattan riders are delivered to and from East Midtown without the need for a subway trip from and to NYP 's overcrowded subway stations. Clear language should be added throughout Alternatives descriptions to include the NYP-GCT connection as an alternative to an Expanded Penn Station New York, and a full analysis must be performed and included in the report. Two examples of added language [in brackets]: -4.6.1.3 New Segment (Alternative 1)- Hudson River third and fourth tunnels and expanded Penn Station New York [or a 2-track connection between Penn Station and Grand Central Terminal, with passenger handling improvements at both stations]. -4.7.2.3 New York (Alternative 1)- Two new tracks in one for two tunnels continue from new Jersey at [under] the Hudson River and terminate under 31st Street, south of Penn Station New York [or tie into the existing lower tracks of an improved Penn Station via the existing throat under 32nd Street and continue from the lower tracks out of the east end of Penn Station via the 1910-designed track ladder under 31st Street, then north under Park Avenue into the lower level of an improved Grand Central Terminal via the 1913-designed track ladder].	The FRA has incorporated several of these ideas into the Preferred Alternative. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for a complete description of the Preferred Alternative. The connection between NY Penn Station and Grand Central Terminal is not part of the Preferred Alternative. The NEC FUTURE program is focused on corridor-wide solutions for passenger rail improvements, and the selection of the Preferred Alternative does not preclude future consideration of transit or fixed guideway improvements to meet other transportation needs across the Study Area.
Cole_St	My reaction to all these alternatives right now is they're extraordinarily expensive, and a lot of it seems like a dream, considering what money has been appropriated since the 1990s, over the past near 20 years now. It's been paltry to just maintain the system.	<p>Funding has not been identified for the Preferred Alternative. Funding and financing the projects necessary to implement the Preferred Alternative will be an incremental process for the federal government, Amtrak, the NEC states and stakeholders, and the entire region (as described in Volume 1, Chapter 10).</p> <p>The No Action Alternative requires a level of investment higher than what has historically been available. The federal government, through the FRA and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), has been a funding partner of the NEC states, railroads, and Amtrak. Since 1978, the FRA has provided more than \$10 billion in funding for NEC improvements. The FTA grant programs have also provided operating and capital assistance to all of the NEC commuter railroad authorities. By developing a long-term vision shared by the region's railroads and states, a case can be made for substantial federal funding for incremental upgrades of the NEC consistent with NEC FUTURE.</p>

Table JJ–7: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Cole_St	... a lot of the alternatives that you show going inland in Connecticut, it's really building a different railroad that would serve a different population. I'm not sure if that accomplishes much when you look at the growth in ridership that has happened in eastern Connecticut and Rhode Island, western Rhode Island, Kingston, University of Rhode Island. These are all very important markets that have long been served by the railroad and should continue to be served by them.	<p>As described in Volume 2, Chapter 4, Alternatives Considered, the alternatives development process evaluated separate service, infrastructure, and route options that could be crafted into different alternatives that meet the needs of various markets along the NEC. The FRA took a market-based approach that incorporated analysis of current travel demand, population growth projections, ridership projections, data from states and planning organizations, and public and agency comments. All Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative, included bringing the existing NEC to a state of good repair and maintained existing markets served by the NEC today.</p> <p>In addition, the Preferred Alternative includes upgrade of the existing NEC shoreline route with a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1, and enhanced electrified service along the Hartford Line to Hartford, CT and Springfield, MA to strengthen service to Central New England. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.</p>
Cole_St	... efforts to expand capacity through New York City are most important, obviously. The cessation of the tunnel that was to be built can be argued, from New Jersey, but obviously you need more capacity in that area.	<p>As described in Volume 2, Chapter 4, Alternatives Considered, all Action Alternatives address critical capacity issues through New York City, including new tunnels under the Hudson River between New Jersey and New York. Alternative 1 includes Hudson River third and fourth tunnels. Alternative 2 includes Hudson River third and fourth tunnels, and two new tunnels under the East River. Alternative 3 includes a new route through New York City, resulting in six tracks in tunnels beneath the Hudson and East River. The Preferred Alternative, described in Volume 1, Chapter 4, includes new third and fourth Hudson River tunnels, beginning on embankment east of Secaucus Rail Station, terminating south of the existing NEC and Penn Station New York, under West 31st Street.</p>
Cole_St	What's lacking that I see is -- the obvious lacking of the railroad through New York City is no station that serves Brooklyn or Queens. Every other major city on the East Coast has suburban stations. New York City is unique in that it has one central station, Pennsylvania Station -- well, it has another one, Grand Central -- but they're both basically downtown. This means that anybody in Brooklyn or Queens doesn't use Amtrak, because no one wants to go into mid-town Manhattan to get on a train. It seems obvious that the obvious place would be on the existing line, whether it's in Queens or Brooklyn, wherever that line goes before it goes up over Randall's Island or wherever it is, to have a station there.	<p>The FRA has identified a Preferred Alternative that improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environmental effects. Volume 1, Chapter 4, describes the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternatives does not include a new station in Brooklyn or Queens, NY. The Preferred Alternative does not include direct service to Brooklyn, Queens, and Long Island associated with Alternative 3. However, improved service to/from Penn Station New York, reduced travel times and increased service frequencies would benefit residents of Brooklyn and Queens via available transit connections. With a more than doubling of frequency of service and the introduction of Metropolitan service, providing more connections to intermediate as well as major markets along the NEC, access for the New York metropolitan area would be improved with the Preferred Alternative. Opportunities to further improve the connectivity to the existing transit network would be an important consideration in the subsequent Tier 2 project analysis for station specific improvements (see Volume 1, Chapters 4, 5, and 6).</p> <p>It is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.</p>
Cole_St	Second, the original high-speed electrification included a high-speed flyover at New Rochelle to alleviate congestion where Metro North, the Harlem Line, meets Amtrak. That was never built, for whatever reason. It's different ones I've heard. It seems elemental that that would be something that would be needed and should be built to alleviate congestion there.	<p>As shown in Volume 2, Chapter 4, Alternatives Considered, all Action Alternatives include the New Rochelle (Shell Junction) grade separation (NY), to provide smoother train flows between the Hell Gate Line and New Haven Line as a chokepoint relief project.</p>
Cole_St	... the alternative route from Old Saybrook to Rhode Island looks incredibly expensive, knowing the topography as I do in eastern Connecticut. ... And you're basically traversing ridges that run north-south in Connecticut, anywhere from zero at sea level to 150 feet above sea level. So the infrastructure and earth moving would be just immense to effect a route that would then somehow connect into western Rhode Island.	<p>The FRA has noted concerns about the expense and difficulty of constructing the 50-mile two-track new segment along the shore beginning east of Old Saybrook Station and connecting back to the NEC in Rhode Island. The Preferred Alternative includes this new segment to expand capacity, add redundancy and resilience, and to avoid increases in higher-speed service over five movable bridges and 11 at-grade crossings. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.</p>

Table JJ–7: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Cole_St	... the route -- the one section which is a real slow place in eastern Connecticut and has two bridges, swing bridges, that have cost a mint to maintain is the route from Niantic to New London. And it seems to me, if you look at the map, you could straight line the line from Niantic, thereby giving Niantic back its waterfront, which it hasn't had for 150 years now, because the tracks basically run along the beach and cut the town off from its water. So if the tracks ran northeast before they got to Niantic, and took across Niantic Bay and into New London, that route, thereby coming into the bridge over the Thames River at grade, then moving the New London station slightly to the north, you would then eliminate two swing bridges, one at Shaw's Cove and one at the Niantic River. Whether they would be needed for freight operations, I don't know. But it seems like a simple solution to effect a section of track where literally the trains crawl up the Thames River to the New London station...	The Preferred Alternative does not alter the route of the existing NEC through Southeastern Connecticut, as it serves local stations and provides access for freight service to businesses along the line. However, the Preferred Alternative does include a new 50-mile segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, that provides significant travel time benefits, improves resiliency, and improved reliability. This new segment also bypasses the movable bridges and the 11 remaining at-grade crossings on the NEC. In addition, the Preferred Alternative incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield to other markets on the NEC. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Collins_Jo	Critical to do new tubes to Penn Station. Need station to Post Office move. Baltimore tunnels a must. Money spent on infrastructure is an investment, not an expense	The Preferred Alternative, described in Volume 1, Chapter 4, includes a new, four-track infrastructure in tunnel, approaching Baltimore Penn Station from the west. The existing NEC, between Lafayette Avenue and North Avenue in Baltimore City would be retired from passenger rail service. The Preferred Alternative includes new third and fourth Hudson River tunnels, beginning on embankment east of Secaucus Rail Station, terminating south of the existing NEC and Penn Station New York, under West 31st Street.
Comins_Pa	Can people have detailed shapefiles of the routes and which areas are tunnel and which are surface so that we can better evaluate the impacts to critical resources?	The electronic shapefiles containing the Representative Routes of the existing NEC and Action Alternatives are not publicly available. However, the FRA has made the data available to relevant federal and state agencies for their use in reviewing the document. As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure in the Tier 1 Record of Decision. Such decisions will be made as part of the Tier 2 project planning and NEPA processes, which will include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate. Consistent with this process, the FRA developed Representative Routes for the Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative, which provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the effects of each Alternative. Representative Routes define an envelope within which improvements might occur and whose location and construction type could change during subsequent Tier 2 project studies.
Corbett_Jen	What an incredible opportunity it would be for the town of Palmer and it's surrounding towns to have the rail service. I and many people hope it becomes a reality.	The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrades to the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment. To better serve Central New England, the Preferred Alternative incorporates electrification on the Hartford/Springfield Line, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield on the NEC. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The FRA is coordinating with Massachusetts and Vermont on the Northern New England Intercity Rail Initiative, a separate study, to explore options for improved intercity rail service in New England.
Corbitt_Br	As someone that travels to Europe it is sad the state of our rail system. The tracks should be upgraded to handle high speed trains	The FRA has focused on high-performance and improving travel times throughout the NEC rather than on track design speeds themselves. Where practical, the FRA has provided for design speeds up to 220 mph in the Preferred Alternative. Design speeds of up to 160 mph are suggested where grade, curvature, or other physical constraints limit speeds. The FRA further considered areas where 220 mph speeds could be incorporated in development of the Preferred Alternative. Specific design speeds could be further evaluated in subsequent Tier 2 project studies. Additional service planning assumptions are provided in Volume 1, Appendix BB, and Volume 2, Appendix B.5.
Coudert_Ho	There is demand for an affordable train to/from Mystic. When possible, we and our family members and houseguests currently take the Shore Line East to/from New London or Old Saybrook and so would certainly take a Shore Line train to Mystic if it were available, especially on Fridays and Sundays. (Amtrak has very limited service, is often late, and is too expensive to use regularly.) We know a number of retirees to Stonington who would certainly take an affordable train from Mystic to events and cultural attractions in New York, rather than fight traffic on 95. When weekend trains were added from Old Saybrook (it used to be just weekdays), the Sunday afternoon train I took was full the first day it ran! The demand is already there.	The Preferred Alternative includes upgrade of the existing NEC shoreline route with a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. In addition, the Preferred Alternative adds service to a new station in the areas of Mystic and New London, Connecticut. For additional details on the Preferred Alternative, see Volume 1, Chapter 4.

Table JJ–7: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Court_Ta	We are supportive of improved rail travel, and we're going to continue to review the document.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative to improve passenger rail service on the NEC in a manner that will enhance mobility options and expand passenger rail service in support of future population and employment growth in the Study Area. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Cupper_Da	Any report on the environmental impact of the Northeast Corridor should also include Amtrak's 103-mile Philadelphia-Harrisburg line, which is -- like the NEC -- electrified and so already contributes to a cleaner environment.	The Preferred Alternative allows for increased service between Philadelphia and Harrisburg, PA, on the existing Keystone Line. These service enhancements would further expand the integrated network of passenger rail in the Northeast. Possible service improvements could include introduction of Metropolitan service on the Keystone corridor at 30-minute headways in peak periods. Metropolitan service on the Keystone corridor would follow existing Keystone stopping patterns and serve as a direct replacement. Considering recent improvements to the Keystone Corridor, the enhanced service levels could be accommodated within existing capacity. These improvements are identified as either part of the No Action Alternative or as a Related Project as documented in the No Action Alternative Report (Volume 2, Appendix B). Further exploration of opportunities created by the Preferred Alternative for connecting corridors such as the Keystone corridor are not addressed as direct effects in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, but are qualitatively discussed as Indirect Effects (Volume 1 Chapter 6) and would be the subject of subsequent planning processes.
Curtiss_AI	I am aware that the railroad bridge across the Ct. river is very old and in need of repair/replacement.	All of the Action Alternatives evaluated in the Tier 1 Draft EIS included bringing the existing NEC to a state of good repair. The same is true for the Preferred Alternative identified by the FRA. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. Amtrak is concurrently advancing a project to replace the two-track Connecticut River Bridge. The Preferred Alternative includes bringing the Connecticut River Bridge to a state of good repair but does not include replacement. Additional track capacity over the Connecticut River would be provided with a new supplemental segment between Old Saybrook, CT and Kenyon, RI. The Preferred Alternative includes a representative tunnel construction type for this new Connecticut River crossing; specifics will be defined in a subsequent Tier 2 project study.
Dale_AI	I would also like to have questioned the very high cost relative to maybe a comparable length of system in other parts of the world that we want to hear, like what changes might be necessary in alignment with this project to bring some of those cost tools down. If we, as the public, are going to be asked to support this, I'm happy to vote for lots of funding for rail, but I would like to make sure that that funding is well spent.	<p>The capital cost estimate of the Preferred Alternative follows a consistent methodology and approach to provide a conceptual estimate appropriate to the level of detail required for a Tier 1 environmental process. The goal of the cost estimate is to provide a coherent, documented, and validated cost estimate at a corridor-wide level. The FRA has emphasized that the cost estimate for the Preferred Alternative represents an order-of-magnitude cost estimate for the likely scale of investment required to implement the Preferred Alternative, but still includes significant elements of uncertainty at the Tier 1 level.</p> <p>Detailed, project-specific cost estimates, including any cost impacts that result from specific alignment or routing option decisions, will be included as part of a subsequent Tier 2 project process, which will include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate.</p> <p>As described in Volume 2, Appendix B.6, the FRA collected data from other U.S. and international high-speed rail and passenger rail corridor investments as a means of benchmarking input into the NEC FUTURE capital cost model. This included the California High-Speed Rail Program and international high-speed rail projects in England and Spain, including the High Speed 2 (HS2) railway project in the United Kingdom.</p>

Table JJ–7: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Davis_Ha	Use the existing track path from Old Saybrook to Four Mile River and then split the path with two tracks going to the north along the Four Mile River and west of Rocky Neck State Park in East Lyme CT. Continue north over Route 156 west of the interstate 95 exit 72 connector, continue over interstate 95 and connect to the original path in Tier 1 and head to the east. The other split path will continue on the existing two rail tracks. Expand the tracks from Old Saybrook to Four Mile River from two to four tracks. Replace the bridges over the Connecticut and Lieutenant Rivers and others as needed and install four tracks. One bridge over the Connecticut River can be raised to minimize the number of openings to accommodate the projected increased volume of train usage. When you replace the Connecticut River and Lieutenant River bridges it opens a great opportunity to elevate the eastern and western approaches to the Connecticut River to provide the needed slope to significantly increase the Connecticut River Bridge clearance. If the bridge clearance is increased more boats can pass under. While it may not be able to be raised to a point that all boats can pass under, every little bit will help. The more boats that pass under without opening will decrease the times need to open the bridge and thus allow more trains to pass. It will also relieve some of the boat congestion waiting for the bridge to open and the mad dash to pass under before it closes.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative includes a new supplemental segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI and improvements to the existing NEC. As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, and will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure in the Tier 1 Record of Decision. Such decisions, including bridge improvements or replacements, would be made as part of the Tier 2 project planning and NEPA processes, which would include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate.
Davis_Sa	I do not believe in tunneling under the entire city of Philadelphia for a high-speed line using a separate station. It needs to run through 30th Street.	The Preferred Alternative does not include a second station in Philadelphia. The Preferred Alternative, described in Volume 1, Chapter 4, focuses on the Philadelphia 30th Street Station to support the significant growth in both intercity and regional rail service envisioned by the Preferred Alternative in Philadelphia.
Davis_Sa	The FRA or somebody, should be coordinating travel between Amtrak and commuter rail service. There should be through-service and through-ticketing available instead of no information and no coordination. That should increase intercity travel. Many people don't even know how much closer to their destination they could get. There is no nationwide information source on commuter rail that I can find, and it keeps growing.	The Preferred Alternative supports sufficient capacity and reliability improvements to significantly enhance the customer experience while riding on the NEC. Scheduled connections between different rail operators, as well as the ability to operate through-service at Washington Union Station and Penn Station New York, are key elements of the network created by the Preferred Alternative. These not only enhance the customer experience, but can generate both capital and operating efficiencies. In addition, a common fare medium and single system-wide schedule for all NEC operations would greatly improve service for the customer and is included in the Preferred Alternative. The FRA will work with the NEC operators to continue to pursue options for enhancing the customer experience.
Degray_Ro	Please help to restore the Montrealer between Washington, D.C. and Montreal via New Haven, Hartford, Springfield and points north.	The Preferred Alternative includes electrification of the Hartford/Springfield Line between New Haven, Hartford and Springfield. This will facilitate direct service to Hartford and Springfield from the NEC without an engine change. The Preferred Alternative supports as many as four NEC trains per hour on the Hartford/Springfield Line (see Volume 1, Chapter 4). While the Preferred Alternative does not include service to Montreal, it assumes continued operation of the service to Vermont. The FRA is working with Massachusetts and Vermont on the Northern New England Intercity Rail Initiative, which would enhance service between Boston, Springfield and Vermont, and eventually extend to Montreal.

Table JJ–7: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
DeMasi_Fr	There's also a move now to improve North and South Stations, but as dead-end terminals. So we would love to see the FRA and proponents for NEC take a positive position on using those funds to, rather than improve just as a band-aid some of the congestion issues at those two terminals, actually make the link between them, which would reduce the environmental impacts in the land use for rail uses and open up development.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4). The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints, and adds capacity to support more-frequent, faster, and more-reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. The Preferred Alternative does include an extension of service north of Boston. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The North South Rail Link was not included in the No Action Alternative Project List (see Volume 2, Appendix B.1) since it does not meet the criteria for consideration: Funded projects or projects with approved funding plans, funded or unfunded mandates, unfunded projects necessary to keep the railroad running. Likewise, North South Rail Link was not included as a Related Project in the Action Alternatives because it does not meet the criteria for consideration: fully or partially funded projects located in a connecting corridor and not on the NEC; unfunded projects along the NEC with ongoing or completed NEPA/PE; fully or partially funded transit (e.g., NJ TRANSIT, MTA-LIRR) or freight projects located off of but connecting to the NEC. A project to connect Boston's North and South stations, such as the North South Rail Link, could be studied separately, and is not precluded as future investment.
DeRoche_St	In New York, for example, we can't connect to another country from another country. I would like it to make a provision to go all the way to Montreal. And then from -- from Virginia all the way south. You know, I think United States is developing very, very fast, and we need to cover at least the East Coast.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative expands service across the NEC and electrifies the Hartford/Springfield Line. The Preferred Alternative focuses on improving passenger rail service on the Study Area within Washington, D.C., Maryland, Delaware, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, New York, Connecticut, Rhode Island and Massachusetts. The Preferred Alternative would allow for easier connections to markets served by connecting corridors, such as the Vermonter (which could be extended to Montreal) and by long distance trains to the Southeast and Florida. The FRA is working with Massachusetts and Vermont on the Northern New England Intercity Rail Initiative, which would enhance service between Boston, Springfield and Vermont, and eventually extend to Montreal. It is beyond the scope of NEC FUTURE to directly support service to Montreal or to markets south of Washington, D.C.
DeRoche_St	We talk so much about High Speed Rail but we forget about comprehensive Regional Light Railway System that costs much less, in which we need to construct five strategic goals and objectives:... The above five focal points are achievable through Electro-Light, an advanced regional light railway system powered by renewables and green grid.	In separate studies, the FRA continues to explore new technologies. Such systems would require separate stations, and would not support run-through trains from connecting corridors nor offer proven integration efficiencies with today's NEC infrastructure and operators. For these reasons, the FRA did not incorporate advanced guideway or similar new technologies in the NEC FUTURE Alternatives Development Process. However, it also does not preclude the option in the future of building new transportation corridors supporting other technologies. The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrading the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment (as described in Volume 1, Chapter 4).
DeSantis_To	You need two stations - west and east side in Manhattan.	The Preferred Alternative does not include additional stations in Manhattan. The Preferred Alternative, described in Volume 1, Chapter 4, requires expansion of Penn Station New York to accommodate additional tracks both to the east and the west. In addition, the Moynihan Project will include station functions associated with intercity rail moving to a new location. The specific location for and design of improvements at Penn Station New York to accommodate the additional tracks and growth in demand will be determined through subsequent Tier 2 project studies. This will include enhancements to the customer experience at the station, as well as improvements in the efficiency of operations.
DeSantis_To	What is the impact of a La Guardia Airport entrance on the NEC.	The Preferred Alternative does not include the addition of a new La Guardia Airport station stop. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.

Table JJ–7: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
DesJardins_Za	Third, operating profit is important because Amtrak, the owner of most of the Northeast Corridor, has stated that those profits will be the key funding source for infrastructure upgrades. In fact, Congress agreed when it wrote in the FAST Act that Amtrak should break out its operating profits for the Northeast Corridor to do exactly that. By comparing profits to infrastructure costs, it will take about 20 years for operating profits to pay off capital costs for doing nothing, 62 years for Alternative 1, 172 years for Alternative 2 and 438 years for Alternative 3. Those years exclude the cost of interest and used the lowest capital cost estimates so those years are lower than expected.	The FRA has noted concerns about funding to implement the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative will be implemented incrementally both to meet realistic funding constraints and to minimize impacts of construction of passenger and freight operators using the NEC. Funding and financing the projects necessary to implement the Preferred Alternative will be an incremental process for the federal government, Amtrak, the NEC states and stakeholders, and the entire region, as described in Volume 1, Chapter 10.
DesJardins_Za	Fourth, this study has numerous unnecessary costs. One example in Alternative 2 calls for realigning track between Perryville, MD and Newark, DE. The rationale for straightening track is to increase speed and reduce travel time. In Alternative 2, trains will travel a maximum of 160 mph. However in 2012, Amtrak has tested its Acela train at 165 mph on this exact track and the only barrier to traveling at 160 mph today are the old overhead wires (catenary). Replacing those wires on this track would cost about \$400-500 million. Even though trains have been tested at 160 mph on this track, Alternative 2 would spend billions to achieve a result we could get for millions.	<p>The FRA defined and developed the Action Alternatives at a programmatic level, focusing on corridor-wide solutions within the context of the Tier 1 EIS process. Consistent with this process, the FRA developed Representative Routes, which provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the environmental effects of each Action Alternative. Representative Routes define an “envelope” within which improvements might occur and whose location and construction type could change during subsequent Tier 2 project studies.</p> <p>Although critical factors to decisions about the specific implementation of the Preferred Alternative, funding and finance concerns were not specifically addressed in the Tier 1 EIS. In estimating the operations and maintenance costs for each Action Alternative and for the Preferred Alternative, the FRA did include an order-of-magnitude cost for ongoing maintenance of proposed improvements. As described in Volume 2, Appendix B.9, for all Action Alternatives, and Volume 1, Appendix BB, for the Preferred Alternative, the total revenues exceed total costs, resulting in positive net contribution, for the proposed Intercity services (Intercity-Express, Metropolitan, and Intercity-Corridor services).</p>
DesJardins_Za	Other unnecessary costs include a downtown Baltimore station and tunnel which Amtrak has expressly rejected, a tunnel under the Long Island Sound, a tunnel paralleling an existing, underused tunnel in downtown Philadelphia, a route through rural inland Connecticut to connect cities which have little travel demand between them, a tunnel under New York City 's Upper East Side which home to two of the most expansive tunnels ever built, a new station at Philadelphia Airport which already has an airport rail station, and many of the new routes skip some of the fastest existing track in Rhode Island and Massachusetts.	As a result of the Tier 1 Draft EIS and the public comment process, the FRA has identified a Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrades to the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment, as described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints, and adds capacity to support more-frequent, faster, and more-reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. Consistent with the Tier 1 NEPA process, the FRA developed Representative Routes for the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative, which provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the effects of each Alternative. Representative Routes define an envelope within which improvements might occur and whose location and construction type could change during subsequent Tier 2 project studies.
DesJardins_Za	Fifth, billions more in infrastructure costs generates comparatively little additional ridership. For \$19.9 billion to do nothing, intercity ridership increases by one third. For \$52-54 billion under Alterative 1, intercity ridership increases by about half compared to doing nothing and the number of commuters increases by about 12%. For \$116-121 billion under Alternative 2, intercity ridership rises 9% more than Alternative and commuters rise by 3%. For \$252-293 billion, intercity passengers rise a mere 5% compared to Alternative 2 and commuters rise by 9%.	For the Tier 1 EIS level of analysis, the FRA considered several factors in evaluating the costs and benefits of each Action Alternative and the Preferred Alternative. These factors included environmental effects, ridership, trips diverged from other travel modes such as air and auto, travel time savings and improvements in traveler convenience, improved connectivity, and economic benefits. The FRA considered these factors together when evaluating how well alternatives addressed the NEC FUTURE Purpose and Need. For additional information, see Volume 1, Chapter 9. For information on the ridership methodology, see Volume 1, Appendix BB, and Volume 2, Appendix B.

Table JJ–7: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
DesJardins_Za	First, Amtrak will achieve some of the results of Alternative 1 and 2 with its new Acela II high speed trainsets. The Amtrak request for proposal states that these trains will travel between New York and Washington in 2 hours, 21 minutes. For \$116-121 billion, Alternative 2 will achieve 2 hours, 26 minutes or five minutes SLOWER than what Amtrak already plans to do for \$2.7 billion.	<p>The purpose of NEC FUTURE is to address not only compromised performance on the Northeast Corridor (NEC) but also overall travel needs in the Study Area, including aging infrastructure, insufficient capacity, gaps in connectivity, and lack of resiliency. Consistent with NEC FUTURE goals, each Action Alternative also included necessary improvements to the existing NEC, which is and will continue to be an important transportation link for several major metropolitan areas, including those along the shoreline. The Preferred Alternative reflects the importance of improving the existing NEC while also improving performance.</p> <p>The FRA has focused on improving performance and travel times throughout the NEC rather than on track design speeds themselves. Targeted trip-time reductions between markets were balanced with cost and potential ridership increases. As described in Chapter 4, Alternatives Considered, as part of the analysis of Alternative 3, the FRA evaluated service plans that supported speeds up to 220 mph between major NEC markets along a second spine between Washington, D.C., and Boston, MA. Based on the evaluation, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative that includes, where practical, opportunities to operate at speeds up to 220 mph; and a design speed for the existing NEC of 160 mph where possible, considering physical constraints. Performance criteria may be considered as part of the FRA’s decision making for NEC FUTURE and site-specific design speeds will be further evaluated in Tier 2 project reviews.</p>
Destantis_To	We need to have a two-tiered section. We need to have commuter rail going from Washington to New York through New Haven just as we need high-speed rail as well, because I really think that we need some cheap trains throughout the corridor.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative to improve passenger rail service on the NEC in a manner that will enhance mobility options and expand passenger rail service in support of future population and employment growth in the Study Area. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Dharia_An	The costs [of Alternative 3] are significantly higher but it seems the revenues will not be much higher than Alternative 2... The cost difference between Alt 2 and Alt 3 warrants the FRA to consider another alternative. May be an alternative without the second spine but with separated HSR tracks.	As a result of the Tier 1 Draft EIS and the public comment process, the FRA has identified a Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4). The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints, and adds capacity to support more-frequent, faster, and more-reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers.
DiCristina_Fr	2 &3 cost too much for the incremental gains in ridership.	As discussed in Volume 1, Chapter 10, the Preferred Alternative will be implemented incrementally both to meet realistic funding constraints and to minimize impacts of construction of passenger and freight operators using the NEC. The capital cost of the Preferred Alternative includes improvements that provide excess capacity to accommodate additional off-corridor trips and future growth post 2040.
Diggs_Je	There is no valid financial basis for this expansion. Passenger transportation via train has never and will never work in this country.	The purpose for NEC FUTURE is stated in Volumes 1 and 2, Chapters 1 and 3. The purpose of NEC FUTURE is to upgrade aging infrastructure and to improve the reliability, capacity, connectivity, performance, and resiliency of future passenger rail service on the NEC for both Intercity and Regional trips, while promoting environmental sustainability and economic growth.
Diggs_Je	A better choice for mass transportation would be to erect a monorail system on the medium strips between the N and S bound lanes on I-95 and on any Interstate roads	In separate studies, the FRA continues to explore new technologies such as maglev and is currently sponsoring a study of maglev between Baltimore and Washington, D.C. Such a system would require separate stations, and would not support run-through trains from connecting corridors nor offer proven integration efficiencies with today’s NEC infrastructure and operators. For these reasons, the FRA did not incorporate advanced guideway or similar new technologies in the NEC FUTURE Alternatives Development Process. The Preferred Alternative does not include maglev. However, it also does not preclude the option in the future of building new transportation corridors supporting other technologies, such as maglev. The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrading the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment (as described in Volume 1, Chapter 4).

Table JJ–7: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
DiLullo_Ka	It remains too expensive to use for trips to Boston.	The Preferred Alternative will significantly boost the frequency of both intercity and regional train service on the NEC. The Preferred Alternative creates a high performance NEC with faster and more frequent coordinated services to more places. This includes the introduction of Metropolitan service, a frequent lower cost service to many intermediate destinations. For more details on fare assumptions, see Volume 1, Appendix BB. Specific details on fares will be determined by railroad operators, during subsequent Tier 2 project studies.
Distler_Ga	I included this antidote to demonstrate why New York 's east side needs Amtrak access as well and how if done right can takes trains off the crowded North East Corridor, a long needed and often forgotten rail connection between Boston and Hartford. I would like to suggest running some Boston-New York Trains to Grand Central Terminal via Worchester, Harford, the Beacon Branch and Metro North 's Harlem Line. From my understating this would need significant improvements to the Beacon branch as well as the construction of rail between Harford and Danbury, this is not easy but the befit is more frequent rail service with out adding to the north east corridors grid lock and while provided better Amtrak access to the East Side, and will provide a rail connection between Harford and Boston. If using the Beacon Branch is not possible then trains should run between Boston and New York (and point south) via the inland route. This would provide needed Boston to Hartford and Springfield service as provided service to New York from Worcester and Boston 's metro west suburbs. Framingham West of Boston can host a suburban station similar to Route 128 station in Westwood south of Boston. Framingham already service Commuter Rail and Lake Shore Limited trains. Since Grand Central is a terminal station, trains these trains would not be able to travel south of New York. That said most people traveling on Amtrak do not travel south of New York and a few trains a day only travel the north half of the northeast corridor. Thought most Amtrak trains should use Penn Station so they can continue south, and if speed of trains increases more Bostonians will want to take the train to place like Philadelphia and Washington, for the trains that do terminate in New York Grad Central should be used to provide east side access and prevent overcrowding at Penn Station. Ideally we would have more frequent service between Boston and New York with two thirds to three quarters of the trains using Penn Station and the reminder stopping in Grand Central.	The Preferred Alternative combines key elements of all three Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate future growth in Northeast population and employment. While it does not add a second spine, it replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints, and provides the capacity to more than triple intercity train service, enable regional rail service to keep pace with growth in demand for commuter and local service, and significantly improve travel time and performance. The Preferred Alternative also incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure in the Tier 1 Record of Decision. Such decisions are made as part of the Tier 2 project planning and NEPA processes, which would include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate.
Distler_Ga	Along with the need for more frequent trains, the Northeast corridor needs faster trains. In the long term it would be great to have trains that can run between Boston and New York in 90 minutes. In the short term it would be great to have trains that can travel from Boson to New York in between two and half and three hours.	The FRA considered higher-speed service between Boston and New York in the development of the Action Alternatives and the recommendation of a Preferred Alternative. The FRA research and technical analysis supports a decision to improve travel times between these key markets while also improving the reliability, frequency, connectivity and affordability of passenger rail service on the NEC. The specific characteristics of the Preferred Alternative are described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Distler_Ga	Running super-express trains should also be considered. Thought most trains would serve mid size cities like Providence and New Haven as well, a few can run during rush hour only serving the largest cities, Boston, New York, Philadelphia, and Washington, thus reducing travel time even further. This said more local trains can and should run the length of the corridor, thus allowing people who live in smaller communities access to rail transportation. Like rail service in Europe the Northeast corridor would benefit from the installation of high quality overnight service. A travel should be able to get on a train in Boston late at night and wake up in Washing refreshed the next day. One can ride in a sleeper car and instead of having to choose between the cost of a night in a hotel or an early morning flight, ride between cities in a moving hotel.	The purpose of NEC FUTURE is to upgrade aging infrastructure and to improve the reliability, capacity, connectivity, performance, and resiliency of future passenger rail service on the NEC for both Intercity and Regional rail. The Preferred Alternative includes frequent limited-stop express service that will achieve trip time objectives to meet demand for most time-sensitive business trips; opportunities to offer express services that make limited intermediate stops; and Metropolitan service that offers frequent lower cost service to many intermediate destinations. For additional details on the Preferred Alternative, see Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Dixon_Ry	Local public bus service in the Wilmington metropolitan region, as in most other metropolitan regions in the United States, does not adequately meet the needs of local residents. The SWPN recommends transit investment first support better local bus services before investing in high-speed rail service. From a broad social justice perspective, high speed rail only directly benefits those with high incomes while local bus service improvements benefit a much broader spectrum of our society--especially those in need.	NEC FUTURE is focused on improvements to passenger rail (see Volume 1 and 2, Chapter 3). In preparing the Tier 1 EIS, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions to improve the NEC to accommodate projected growth in population and employment. While the condition of and planned improvements to other modes were important considerations to development of the Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative, the analysis was not intended to provide a regional assessment of how to optimize improvements to all modes of transportation to meet regional transportation needs. Implementation of the Preferred Alternative would not be in lieu of other very critical improvements to other modes, including bus service in the Wilmington area.

Table JJ–7: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Dixon_Ry	We propose using the existing NEC rail corridor for high-speed service and adding a stop at the Wilmington station for some trips. Additionally, we propose an alternative bypass route through South Wilmington which closely follows the I-495 Expressway right-of-way. This alternative route would work to maximize speeds and minimize community impacts, including not disrupting plans for the much-needed restoration of a wetland to help control local flooding.	The Preferred Alternative, described in Volume 1, Chapter 4, expands service at the existing Wilmington, DE, station and adds a supplemental segment at Wilmington, DE, which follows the representative routing for Alternative 2 in the Tier 1 Draft EIS. Environmental effects are considered for the Preferred Alternative in Volume 1, Chapter 7. As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, and will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure. Such decisions would be made as part of the Tier 2 project studies, which would include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate.
Donaghue_Jo	I am in favor of an updated train tracking system	Decisions about equipment and specific features, such as train tracking, are not part of the Tier 1 EIS decision. Decisions on equipment and features will be made in subsequent phases of project development. As part of NEC FUTURE, the FRA focused on general equipment standards (e.g., class or "tier" of equipment, top speed, etc.) and in the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process will not make equipment-specific decisions. The environmental effects for the representative equipment were considered in the Tier 1 Draft EIS and are evaluated for the Preferred Alternative (see Volumes 1 and 2, Chapters 7.12, 7.13, 7.14).
Donovan_Ja	It would seem to me that the best approach in developing a NORTHEAST corridor would be the buying and owning the right-of ways in this area. This would help move any leasing issues and free up any improvement of equipment or fast tracking future development. While I understand the cost, wouldn't be best for the public to have a dedicated system for all American to use.	The NEC is owned by public entities -- Amtrak, New York MTA, Connecticut and Massachusetts. The Preferred Alternative would create a regional rail network with frequent, fast and reliable trains on the NEC and connecting to other rail corridors to the south, west and north. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Dosh_St	...although NYC needs new tunnels .	As described in Volume 2, Chapter 4, Alternatives Considered, all Action Alternatives address critical capacity issues through New York City, including new tunnels under the Hudson River between New Jersey and New York. The Preferred Alternative, described in Volume 1, Chapter 4, includes new third and fourth Hudson River tunnels, beginning on embankment east of Secaucus Rail Station, terminating south of the existing NEC and Penn Station New York, under West 31st Street. In addition, the Preferred Alternative includes two tunnels under the Easter River. Portal Bridge is identified as a Related Project in the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers.
Duarte_Ph	I feel the inland second spine makes sense for redundancy and for growing other markets and not just those that are already on the NEC.	As a result of the Tier 1 Draft EIS and the public comment process, the FRA has identified a Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4). The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives, including Alternatives 2 and 3, to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints, and adds capacity to support more-frequent, faster, and more-reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions. In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative provides connections along the existing NEC, along a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, and along the Hartford/Springfield Line, which strengthens service to Central New England and leverages existing investments and identified market opportunities.
Duncan_H	It seems like the money would be better spent on maintaining the existing tracks and bridges since there is already a train running through the area.	The FRA has identified a Preferred Alternative that focuses improvements along the existing NEC with targeted new segments to alleviate chokepoints and increase capacity. It also includes an enhanced, electrified Hartford/Springfield Line. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.

Table JJ–7: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Dunham_St	I welcome the idea of Metropolitan service. I travel on the Northeast Corridor a few times per year, always on personal trips. The Amtrak intercity fares are expensive, apparently geared to business travelers. I am always traveling on a budget. Furthermore, I often transfer to the North Jersey Coast line at Rahway, after transferring to NJ Transit. Maybe Rahway, being an important junction, would be served by Metropolitan trains. I would like that.	The Preferred Alternative improves passenger experience by integrating Regional and Intercity ticketing, operations and services, as well as incorporating a new corridor-wide Metropolitan service to connect local stations with hub and terminal stations. For additional details on the Preferred Alternative, see Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Dunham_St	I don't think it's necessary to relocate the main Philadelphia and Baltimore stations. I have used both stations many times, and I think they are close enough to the centers of the cities that it is not worth the expense of moving them a mile. In Philadelphia, particularly, development has been expanding west from Center City, with one or more skyscrapers popping up near 30th Street Station, so the city's center of gravity is shifting.	The Preferred Alternative does not include new downtown stations in either Baltimore or Philadelphia. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Edwards_Cl	Please consider population density along the shoreline connecting the biggest cities in Connecticut when planning future routes. Not only would hugging the shoreline along Connecticut be the more economical approach, it would serve a far greater number of cities and passengers.	The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrades to the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment and replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative provides connections along the existing Northeast Corridor, along a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT and Kenyon, RI, and along the Hartford/Springfield Line. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Elahi_Ma	I guess the option sticking to the current footprint is the best of all options.	As a result of the Tier 1 Draft EIS and the public comment process, the FRA has identified a Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4). The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more-frequent, faster, and more-reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers.
ElliottLewis_Da	There was a comment that was made, and I'd like to echo that, regarding using this as an opportunity to also add a connection between North Station and South Station and Boston that will allow people like myself to board a commuter train in the southwest and take them all the way through the city and then north of the city.	As a result of the Tier 1 Draft EIS and the public comment process, the FRA has identified a Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4). The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints, and adds capacity to support more-frequent, faster, and more-reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. The Preferred Alternative does not extend the NEC beyond the limits of Boston South Station. A project to connect Boston's North and South stations, such as the North South Rail Link, could be studied separately, and is not precluded as future investment.
Epstein_Al	And even more urgently, please revamp the entire Penn Station experience. Whereas South Station in Boston and Union Station in DC provide relatively civilized boarding experiences, New York's Penn Station feels like a cattle call when boarding Amtrak. There's only one cramped, chaotic , depressing boarding area and no crowd control when platforms are announced. Particularly with small children and luggage, this free for all is a daunting experience. Of all the traveler issues on the Northeast Corridor, providing expanded, more comfortable and orderly boarding facilities at Penn Station tops my list.	The Preferred Alternative does not include additional stations in Manhattan. The Preferred Alternative, described in Volume 1, Chapter 4, requires expansion of Penn Station New York to accommodate additional tracks both to the east and the west. In addition, the Moynihan Project will include station functions associated with intercity rail moving to a new location. The specific location for and design of improvements at Penn Station New York to accommodate the additional tracks and growth in demand will be determined through subsequent Tier 2 project studies. This will include enhancements to the customer experience at the station, as well as improvements in the efficiency of operations.
Esther_Lu	We also question the project for having a downtown Chinatown station, and we don't think that that community deserves to be upended.	The Preferred Alternative does not include new downtown stations in either Baltimore or Philadelphia. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.

Table JJ–7: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Fernandez_We	So I agree with many of the speakers here that perhaps one of the most highly populated areas the tunnel is the most likely solution	As described in Volume 2, Chapter 4, Alternatives Considered, all Action Alternatives address critical capacity issues through New York City, including new tunnels under the Hudson River between New Jersey and New York. The Preferred Alternative, described in Volume 1, Chapter 4, includes new third and fourth Hudson River tunnels, beginning on embankment east of Secaucus Rail Station, terminating south of the existing NEC and Penn Station New York, under West 31st Street. In addition, the Preferred Alternative includes two tunnels under the Easter River. Portal Bridge is identified as a Related Project in the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers.
Finnegan_Ro	Please consider having more evening north/east bound Acela trains from DC stop in Trenton.	The FRA defined and developed the Preferred Alternative at a programmatic level, focusing on corridor-wide solutions within a Tier 1 EIS. Service and infrastructure assumptions made at the Tier 1 level are representative and illustrative to support analysis in both the alternatives development process and the Tier 1 EIS. These assumptions are not intended to be specific or prescriptive. Future services and operating plans will evolve as they are developed by NEC railroads. Subsequent Tier 2 analysis for projects in the NEC will provide greater detail on site-specific service and infrastructure requirements.
Finnegan_Ro	Also, the passenger cars on regional trains seriously need to be updated, refurbished, or replaced.	As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA considered a range of rolling stock types and broad fleet requirements for proposed Intercity service; however, Regional rail rolling stock decisions are part of individual Regional rail operators total system fleet plans. Specific rolling stock decisions will be made during subsequent Tier 2 project studies or other planning processes. General fleet requirements for the Preferred Alternative are discussed in Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative and were also discussed in the Tier 1 Draft EIS (Volume 2, Appendix B). Specific rolling stock options would be considered in subsequent planning processes. Planned fleet replacement programs for individual railroad are identified in the No Action Alternative (volume 2, Appendix B).
Flaherty_Jo	Our primary concern is the risk that Rhode Island could be supplanted by Worcester or Hartford in a potential new alignment of the NEC (Alternatives 3.3 and 3.4) based on what we consider to be questionable population and workforce forecast estimates. We believe that all estimates should be based on U.S. Census Bureau statistics and forecasts. Our understanding is that FRA is basing its analysis on forecasts provided by Moody's Analytics, not the U.S. Census. We believe there are serious discrepancies between official U.S. Census data and Moody's, both in terms of population base numbers and the boundaries that each use to measure the metropolitan area. We believe that Moody's data incorrectly po1irays the Providence Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) to be significantly smaller than it is according to U.S. Census data. We respectfully request that population and workforce estimates be re-drafted using consistent U.S. Census data.	<p>The FRA used Moody's as a commercial available forecast that was available corridor-wide, commensurate with the corridor-wide perspective of the NEC FUTURE analysis.</p> <p>The numbers in question are different due to the source quoted (Census data projections from 2014) and boundaries used to calculate the population and employment numbers. FRA's data (obtained on a county-level basis for the Study Area) is based on Moody's Analytics June 2013 "base" demographic forecasts. Moody's data uses actual Census data (not the same as census projections) to make projections. Moody's supplied three forecasts for the 2040 NEC population and employment projections based on this data: low, base (most likely), and high.</p> <p>For purposes of ridership forecasting, travel zones were established which are not the same as the Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) boundaries cited by the constituent. The boundaries in the Tier 1 Draft EIS were drawn based on markets served and do not match up specifically to the MSA boundaries.</p> <p>For example, the numbers pretend in Volume 2, Appendix B.8 show Providence County numbers, rather than those for the entire MSA. For NEC FUTURE, the FRA relied on a corridor-wide data source; for future year forecasts, the U.S. Census data are not available at the detailed level required for this analysis.</p>

Table JJ-7: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Fletcher_An	[I am in support of the] Replacement of the Connecticut River Bridge-This bridge currently faces speed restrictions of 45 MPH. Improvement of this key bridge awaits FRA approval and funding.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives, including Alternatives 2 and 3, to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative provides connections along the existing Northeast Corridor, along a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT and Kenyon, RI including replacement of the Connecticut River Bridge, and along the Hartford/Springfield Line which strengthens service to Central New England and leverages existing investments and identified market opportunities.
Fletcher_An	30th Street Station Improvement- 30th Street Station is truly a beautiful and historic station and I am in full support of Amtrak making this historic structure more marketable and more accessible.	Philadelphia's 30th Street Station would continue to be served by both Intercity and Regional Rail services in the Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4). The total number of trains using the upper and lower levels of the station would increase from roughly 850 trains per day under the No Action Alternative to, over 1,300 trains per day in the Preferred Alternative.
Fletcher_An	Boston South Station Expansion- Boston South Station is, as well, a beautiful and historic structure. I am in full support of the FRA grant to study the need for more track capacity at the station. I applaud Amtrak and MassDOT working together for the needs of increased passenger service at South station.	The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC. The Preferred Alternative includes projects to replace aging infrastructure, eliminate chokepoints and add capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers, as described in Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative. At South Station, the FRA and the Massachusetts Department of Transportation are advancing improvements to expand station capacity. Representative service levels included in the Preferred Alternative could be accommodated at the expanded South Station.
Fletcher_An	[I am in support of the] Hudson Tunnel Project.-Although the construction will reduce rail capacity in the present, this project is vital to both maintain physical plant and increase traffic flow on a vital artery of rail infrastructure on the Northeast Corridor.	The Preferred Alternative, described in Volume 1, Chapter 4, includes new third and fourth Hudson River tunnels, beginning on embankment east of Secaucus Rail Station, terminating south of the existing NEC and Penn Station New York, under West 31st Street. The Gateway program is Amtrak 's proposed set of strategic infrastructure improvements to improve service and address capacity constraints in the area of New York City in New York and New Jersey. Separate from the Gateway program, the Hudson Tunnel Project is intended to preserve the current functionality of the NEC's Hudson River rail crossing between New Jersey and New York and strengthen the resilience of the NEC; FRA and NJ TRANSIT are currently leading the NEPA process for the Hudson Tunnel Project. The Gateway Program and the Hudson Tunnel Project are separate from the NEC FUTURE program. NEC FUTURE does evaluate overall capacity needs and potential improvements for the entire NEC including the New York City area. The FRA coordinates closely with the project teams for the Gateway program and Hudson Tunnel Project in order that their scope do not preclude NEC FUTURE findings.
Fletcher_An	New Trains to Increase Capacity- Ridership is up on the Northeast Corridor, and new trains that are faster than the current Acela and have greater capacity will keep the trend of ridership growing.	The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and also incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit. For additional details on the Preferred Alternative, see Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Follo_Mi	P 4-46/47/48/49/52/54. It mentions about direct NJ Transit rail service to and from NY Penn Station on the Main, Bergen County, Pascack Valley and Port Jervis Lines using the Bergen Loop on Alternatives 2 and 3 and how many trains an hour would operate to and from NY Penn Station on these lines but doesn't mention how many trains an hour would operate to and from NY Penn Station if NJ Transit restores the West Shore Rail Line and the New York Susquehanna Rail Line in Northwestern, NJ via the Bergen Loop and from the MOM (Monmouth/Ocean/Middlesex) Rail Line, the Lackawanna Cutoff, the West Trenton and extension of service west of High Bridge on the Raritan Valley Line. How many trains an hour would operate to and from NY Penn Station if NJ Transit restores these lines.	The FRA defined and developed the Preferred Alternative at a programmatic level, focusing on corridor-wide solutions within a Tier 1 EIS. Service and infrastructure assumptions made at the Tier 1 level are representative and illustrative to support analysis in both the alternatives development process and the Tier 1 EIS. These assumptions are not intended to be specific or prescriptive. Future services and operating plans will evolve as they are developed by NEC railroads. Subsequent Tier 2 analysis for projects in the NEC will provide greater detail on site-specific service and infrastructure requirements.

Table JJ–7: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Follo_Mi	Finally 4-5, it mentions new stations for Amtrak, another suggestion is to add a new Sunnyside Station in the vicinity of Queens Plaza in Long Island City Queens, the DEIS also doesn't mention that the LIRR is looking at building a new Sunnyside Station as part of it's East Side Access in the future. By having this new Sunnyside Station, this would give Amtrak riders access to bus routes that serve the Queens Plaza/Queensboro Plaza including NYC Transit subway lines that stop there including the E,M,N,Q R and #7 trains.	The FRA investigated opportunities for new stations, to fill gaps along both the existing NEC and the Representative Route for each Action Alternative. The stations identified along the Representative Route are representative of expected future conditions. See Volume 2, Appendix B.7, Stations Location and Access Analysis Technical Memorandum, for more details regarding the analysis of stations. The FRA has coordinated with LIRR on the East Side Access Project.
Forbes_Ch	A new bridge over the Susquehanna River must be part of the improvements made in the NEC corridor. Since there is no pedestrian or bicycle crossing of the river in Maryland, no new bridge should be built without providing a bicycle and pedestrian crossing.	<p>The NEC FUTURE program is focused on corridor-wide improvements and solutions to advance passenger rail. The NEC FUTURE Tier 1 EIS analyzes the environmental impacts, both adverse and beneficial, of each of the Tier 1 DEIS Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative including impacts on all transportation modes as discussed in Volume 1 and 2, Chapter 5. Subsequent planning for Tier 2 projects would further examine intermodal connectivity. Volume 1, Chapter 5, notes that Tier 2 projects may consider impacts to bicycle routes if appropriate to the project.</p> <p>The NEC FUTURE program will not interfere with the current and ongoing process led by FRA, Maryland Department of Transportation, the Maryland Transit Administration and Amtrak to study various alternatives to improve the Susquehanna River rail crossing.</p>
Frazier_Ri	Technological leaps that cannot even be imagined today will render any newly designed system completely obsolete and terribly inefficient by comparison. Focusing on investments that improve existing tracks and increase frequency of service would be a more prudent course that will minimize switching costs when a technological leap occurs.	In separate studies, the FRA continues to explore new technologies. Other technologies would require separate stations, and would not support run-through trains from connecting corridors nor offer proven integration efficiencies with today's NEC infrastructure and operators. For these reasons, the FRA did not incorporate advanced guideway or similar new technologies in the NEC FUTURE Alternatives Development Process. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude the option in the future of building new transportation corridors supporting other technologies. The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrading the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment (as described in Volume 1, Chapter 4).
Frix_Do	We once were the best in railroads and now we are like a fourth World Country. France has an efficient and fast rail system all over their country moving people and freight. We have gas guzzling trucks. If France can have a TGV why cant we?	<p>The Preferred Alternative brings the existing NEC to a state of good repair and maximizes its capacity through alleviation of chokepoints, addition of new tracks and segments at targeted locations, and implementation of service operational efficiencies. The Preferred Alternative includes an enhanced, electrified Hartford/Springfield Line. The Preferred Alternative also removes speed restrictions where practical and safe, reduces trip times, offers frequent Metropolitan and enhanced express Intercity services, and allows substantial growth for all Regional rail markets. For additional information on the Preferred Alternative, see Volume 1, Chapter 4.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative does not include a second spine. However, the FRA recognizes it is possible that in future decades there may be need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of expansion.</p>
Fry_Do	GBC maintains that the B&P Tunnel is an infrastructure item along the NEC that needs immediate attention for the present safety and security of the traveling public. The \$4 billion plan to install a network of four single-track tunnels arcing north around the current B&P path is a critically urgent need. We are encouraged that a separate EIS process is underway for the B&P replacement although construction will be needed after the tunnel planning process is completed in 2017.	As described in Volume 1, Chapter 4, the Preferred Alternative includes a new, four-track infrastructure in tunnel, approaching Baltimore Penn Station from the west. The existing NEC between Lafayette Avenue and North Avenue in Baltimore City would be retired from passenger rail service. The NEC FUTURE program will not interfere with the current and ongoing process led by the FRA, Maryland Department of Transportation, and Amtrak to examine improvements to the B&P Tunnel.

Table JJ-7: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Fry_Do	We also urge FRA to consider maglev technology fully in its NEC EIS. Having seen study results for maglev technology, we know that maglev has lower annual operating costs primarily because the technology uses less energy; creates much less wear and tear on the system's infrastructure since the vehicle levitates above the guideway; and is capable of higher speeds with faster acceleration and deceleration. This also enhances the prospect for attracting private investment. But for the private sector to invest there must be a fair return on that investment. The maglev technology, which costs less to operate and maintain year after year, is the one most likely to induce investors to participate. That is why the Greater Baltimore Committee believes that a very accurate assessment of the true lifecycle costs and benefits of maglev versus conventional rail is a critical issue that must be addressed in the EIS in order to attract private investment. Access to private capital could also make the schedule for completion of the corridor more timely. ... GBC further suggests that private sector involvement such as in the application of maglev technology on the NEC, be thoughtfully considered.	In separate studies, the FRA continues to explore new technologies such as maglev and is currently sponsoring a study of maglev between Baltimore and Washington, D.C. Such a system would require separate stations, and would not support run-through trains from connecting corridors nor offer proven integration efficiencies with today's NEC infrastructure and operators. For these reasons, the FRA did not incorporate advanced guideway or similar new technologies in the NEC FUTURE Alternatives Development Process. The Preferred Alternative does not include maglev. However, it also does not preclude the option in the future of building new transportation corridors supporting other technologies, such as maglev. The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrading the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment (as described in Volume 1, Chapter 4).
Fuller_An	Specific to Philadelphia - I believe it would not be a responsible move to locate a downtown Philadelphia Amtrak station. (Also, you may wish to utilize the term Center City - so it appears you are familiar with our city.) Please consider this planning in context with other planning efforts in Philadelphia (30th Street Station District Plan, Innovation Neighborhood - Drexel University, Children's Hospital of Philadelphia expansion, University of Pennsylvania expansion, Comcast Innovation and Technology Center, among several other developments in University City and Center City West). By 2040, 30th Street station will find itself in a much more central location to the business, research, education, and medical hubs than Market East. Additionally, the benefits of keeping one central Amtrak hub for inter-city travel, rather than two, should not be ignored.	The Preferred Alternative does not include a second station in Philadelphia. The Preferred Alternative, described in Volume 1, Chapter 4, focuses on the Philadelphia 30th Street Station to support the significant growth in both intercity and regional rail service envisioned by the Preferred Alternative in Philadelphia.
Fuller_An	If tunneling under Philadelphia is needed to achieve the highest speed rail or a second spine, tunnel under 30th Street, or within a distance to co-locate these stations.	The Preferred Alternative does not include a new segment below and adjacent to Philadelphia 30th Street Station. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Fuller_An	Philadelphia enjoys having one Amtrak station for the core of the city. SETPA (regional rail, buses, trolley, and MFL) offers adequate and speedy connections to Center City from 30th Street Station. This tunnel to Market East would be a waste of money for a station that would add unneeded complexity to inter-city travel and land the new station far from the areas of Philadelphia that are currently booming and projected to be growth points in the future.	The Preferred Alternative does not include a second station in Philadelphia. The Preferred Alternative, described in Volume 1, Chapter 4, focuses on the Philadelphia 30th Street Station to support the significant growth in both intercity and regional rail service envisioned by the Preferred Alternative in Philadelphia.
Gasper_Jo	Maybe the best solution would be to elevate the rail system wherever it will radically impact historical and nicely developed residential areas or pose safety related issues. Elevating the rail system will have minimal impact on land useage within these areas and eliminates rail crossing safety issues.	As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, and will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure in the Tier 1 Record of Decision. Such decisions would be made as part of the Tier 2 project planning and NEPA processes, which would include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate.
GatewayCC_Halkyard	...really hope that some day there will be that line to Hartford.	The Preferred Alternative includes improvements to the NEC between New York and Boston to reduce Intercity Express travel time to approximately 2 hours 45 minutes. The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrades to the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment and replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative provides connections along the existing Northeast Corridor, along a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT and Kenyon, RI, and along the Hartford/Springfield Line which strengthens service to Central New England and leverages existing investments and identified market opportunities. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
GatewayCC_Halkyard	It would be a shame to see some of these stations in Philadelphia and Baltimore be replaced. What they really need is some investment of fixing up. They've been let go and are in a state of disrepair.	The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrades to the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment. It does not include additional downtown stations in either Baltimore or Philadelphia. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.

Table JJ–7: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Gaudio_Ra	CFE is also concerned about the environmental impacts and financial costs of Alternative 3.	The FRA has noted concerns about the environmental impacts and expense of Alternate 3. The FRA has identified a Preferred Alternative that focuses improvements along the existing NEC with targeted new segments to alleviate chokepoints and increase capacity. The Preferred Alternative combines key elements of all three Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate future growth in Northeast population and employment. Volume 1, Chapter 4 provides a description of the Preferred Alternative.
Gaudio_Ra	In the FEIS, CFE believes there should be more of an emphasis on the resiliency of the rail system. By following existing rail and transportation structures, we can use the money and resources invested to make transportation corridors which will remain where they are more useful and more resilient. If we ignore and under-fund our existing corridors in favor of creating new ones, we may create new problems without addressing existing ones... Finally, we urge you to proceed with an alternative that follows and builds upon existing transportation corridors and leverages existing investments Connecticut is making to build faster and more resilient transportation lines while reducing greenhouse gases.	The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrading the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment. It does not include a second spine. By eliminating chokepoints, replacing aging infrastructure, and adding new capacity, the Preferred Alternative provides 3-4 times as much service as today, significantly reduces trip time for intercity service, and supports a much more reliable operation. In addition, several new segments are added that would provide redundancy and make the railroad more resilient to weather-related events along the coast line. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4; Resiliency is addressed in Volume 1 Chapter 4 and Chapter 7.15.
Gilliland_Ri	I would hope consideration would be given towards a combine RR track system within the expansion of I95 (2 to 3 lanes) where such a RR track system could be centered between the northbound and southbound lanes of I95 from Ild Saybrook, CT to New London CT. transportation systems such as this have been built in Queens, NY (Van Wyck Expressway).	The Preferred Alternative includes a new supplemental segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The representative route for the supplemental segment assumes it would follow the existing I-95 corridor wherever possible. As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure in the Tier 1 Record of Decision. Such decisions would be made as part of the Tier 2 project planning and NEPA processes, which would include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate. The FRA proposes a commitment to avoiding use of an aerial structure through the historic district of Old Lyme, CT.
Gottesman_Je	The Gateway project is the keystone to increasing significant rail capacity on the Northeast Corridor in the vicinity of the system 's major chokepoint, the Hudson River tunnels. This is the keystone project for the DEIS ' Alternative One 's implementation. As your study has drawn to a close, I am sure it is as sobering to you, as it is to me, to think implementation of an obvious Northeast Corridor connectivity improvement must wait 15 years -- the current Gateway projection for introduction of new NEC capacity.	<p>The Preferred Alternative, described in Volume 1, Chapter 4, includes new third and fourth Hudson River tunnels, beginning on embankment east of Secaucus Rail Station, terminating south of the existing NEC and Penn Station New York, under West 31st Street.</p> <p>The Gateway program is Amtrak's proposed set of strategic infrastructure improvements to improve service and address capacity constraints in the area of New York City in New York and New Jersey. Separate from the Gateway program, the Hudson Tunnel Project is intended to preserve the current functionality of the NEC's Hudson River rail crossing between New Jersey and New York and strengthen the resilience of the NEC; FRA and NJ TRANSIT are currently leading the NEPA process for the Hudson Tunnel Project. The Gateway Program and the Hudson Tunnel Project are separate from the NEC FUTURE program. NEC FUTURE does evaluate overall capacity needs and potential improvements for the entire NEC including the New York City area. The FRA coordinates closely with the project teams for the Gateway program and Hudson Tunnel Project in order that their scope do not preclude NEC FUTURE findings.</p>
Griffin_Pe	The scope of the Northeast Corridor should be extended beyond Boston through New Hampshire and Vermont to Montreal. There has already a phase one study that has been completed.	The Preferred Alternative includes electrification of the Hartford/Springfield Line between New Haven, Hartford and Springfield. This will facilitate direct service to Hartford and Springfield from the NEC without an engine change. The Preferred Alternative supports as many as four NEC trains per hour on the Hartford/Springfield Line (see Volume 1, Chapter 4). While the Preferred Alternative does not include service to Montreal, it assumes continued operation of the service to Vermont. The FRA is working with Massachusetts and Vermont on the Northern New England Intercity Rail Initiative, which would enhance service between Boston, Springfield and Vermont, and eventually extend to Montreal.

Table JJ–7: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Haddad_Na	We do agree with your assessment as stated in your report that Maglev levitation technology could be used to develop a second spine in the Northeast Corridor and could result in providing future transformative investment in the regional transportation system. However, we disagree with the statement made that advanced guideway systems, such as magnetic levitation technologies remain under development . The SCMAGLEV system has been fully developed and the Government of Japan has approved the technology for revenue service operation. In December 2011, the Japanese Ministry of Land Infrastructure Transport and Tourism enacted technological standards for the operation of the SCMAGLEV system and construction is currently underway on the extended revenue service line between Tokyo and Nagoya. A 42Km segment has already been built and the system has operated over 900,000 miles and has carried over 180,000 revenue passengers. While, as you note, the SCMAGLEV would require a new guideway, it would however, provide integration efficiencies with existing transportation options. It is correctly stated that it is currently being studied separately as it would not be inter-operable on the existing NEC lines.	In separate studies, the FRA continues to explore new technologies such as maglev and is currently sponsoring a study of maglev between Baltimore and Washington, D.C. Such a system would require separate stations, and would not support run-through trains from connecting corridors nor offer proven integration efficiencies with today’s NEC infrastructure and operators. For these reasons, the FRA did not incorporate advanced guideway or similar new technologies in the NEC FUTURE Alternatives Development Process. The Preferred Alternative does not include maglev. However, it also does not preclude the option in the future of building new transportation corridors supporting other technologies, such as maglev.
Haikalis_Ge	Include double track connection -- Penn Station-Amtrak West Side Line. Eliminating this single-track tunnel bottleneck permits more Hudson Line trains to shift to Penn Station.	The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. Important elements of the Preferred Alternative include addition of two additional tracks under both the Hudson and East Rivers, as well as expansion of Penn Station New York to support demand beyond 2040. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Haikalis_Ge	Explore the Hoboken Alternative as a way to reduce cost and negative environmental impacts. ...the new Hudson River tunnels by way of the Hoboken/Jersey waterfront businesses ...would be an important gain for this business center... would allow the NY-NJ-CT metropolitan area to better compete with its global financial rivals which are building cross-city rail lines.	The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. Important elements of the Preferred Alternative include addition of two additional tracks under both the Hudson and East Rivers, as well as expansion of Penn Station New York to support demand beyond 2040. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Haikalis_Ge	Remake commuter rail into Regional Rail - with frequent service, integrated fares, and through-running.	The purpose of NEC FUTURE is to upgrade aging infrastructure and to improve the reliability, capacity, connectivity, performance, and resiliency of future passenger rail service on the NEC for both Intercity and Regional rail. The Preferred Alternative improves passenger experience by integrating passenger ticketing, operations and services, as well as incorporating a new corridor-wide Metropolitan service to connect local stations with hub and terminal stations; these including: integrated ticketing and coordinated schedules; regular clock face headways and simplified operations; and enhanced flexibility, freedom, and travel choices for everyday travelers. For additional details on the Preferred Alternative, see Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Hale_Ro	A second spine north of New York will absolutely be necessary to segregate intercity traffic from slower commuter trains on the New Haven line and bypass the curves and drawbridges. Things get by on the New Haven Line right now precisely because all trains run at around the same speed.	The NEC FUTURE analysis of travel demand and cost does not support a completely separate second spine from Washington, D.C., to New York City and/or Boston, including new routes through major cities. Alternative 3 explored the potential for an optimized second spine that is integrated into the existing rail network to take greatest advantage of the new capacity, but even this did not demonstrate benefits that sufficiently outweigh the costs of a fully separate line. However, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The proposed Preferred Alternative is compatible with a later addition of such a new segment.

Table JJ–7: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Hale_Ro	The NEC south of New York can support more intercity trains before it gets to the point of demanding a second spine because of relatively wide stop spacing and lighter traffic.	The NEC FUTURE analysis of travel demand and cost does not support a completely separate second spine from Washington, D.C., to New York City and/or Boston, including new routes through major cities. Alternative 3 explored the potential for an optimized second spine that is integrated into the existing rail network to take greatest advantage of the new capacity, but even this did not demonstrate benefits that sufficiently outweigh the costs of a fully separate line. However, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network.
Hale_Ro	I wonder if the second spine can use the Bronx River Parkway right-of-way to bridge between the Harlem Line and the Hell Gate Line as part of a NYP-White Plains-Danbury-Waterbury-Hartford new line. The highway would need to be reconstructed, but that should be seen as an opportunity; the Bronx River Parkway cannot currently accommodate trucks (a relic of the Robert Moses era), forcing trucks to use local streets. A reconstruction of the corridor to be multimodal could bring truck traffic off of Bronx local streets and link the Harlem Line to Penn Station for both commuter and intercity services.	<p>As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure or alignments. Such decisions are made as part of Tier 2 project studies, which would include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate. Consistent with this process, the FRA developed Representative Routes for the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative, which provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the effects of each Alternative. Representative Routes define an envelope within which improvements might occur and whose location and construction type could change during subsequent Tier 2 project analysis.</p> <p>For the Preferred Alternative, the FRA's includes leveraging the existing investment in the NEC and the Hartford/Springfield Line. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions.</p>
Hamilton_An	I'm here to suggest the concept of complete corridors. Complete corridors, similar to the complete streets processes and evolutions that have been going on. The U.S. DOT and the different state DOTs have been very engaged with this, at least at different levels, but they are focused on this, especially with the now NACTO standards being accepted by the U.S. DOT, and working -- you're working in concert with the U.S. DOT. I think that that ought to be part of the processes moving forward.	As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure or alignments. Such decisions are made as part of Tier 2 project studies, which would include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate. Consistent with this process, the FRA developed Representative Routes for the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative, which provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the effects of each Alternative. Representative Routes define an envelope within which improvements might occur and whose location and construction type could change during subsequent Tier 2 project analysis.
Hamilton_An	There's no safe way to cross the Susquehanna River in the state of Maryland, and -- for a non-motorized user. I apologize. And you're building a bridge very soon down there, and we'd like to be a part of that.	<p>The NEC FUTURE program is focused on corridor-wide improvements and solutions to advance passenger rail. The NEC FUTURE Tier 1 EIS analyzes the environmental impacts, both adverse and beneficial, of each of the Tier 1 DEIS Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative including impacts on all transportation modes as discussed in Volume 1 and 2, Chapter 5. Subsequent planning for Tier 2 projects would further examine intermodal connectivity. Volume 1, Chapter 5, notes that Tier 2 projects may consider impacts to bicycle routes if appropriate to the project.</p> <p>The NEC FUTURE program will not interfere with the current and ongoing process led by FRA, Maryland Department of Transportation, the Maryland Transit Administration and Amtrak to study various alternatives to improve the Susquehanna River rail crossing.</p>

Table JJ–7: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Hargraves_Jo	Surely there is a way to secure the railbed witout removing it so far inland.	As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure in the Tier 1 Record of Decision. Such decisions are made as part of the Tier 2 project planning and NEPA processes, which would include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate. Consistent with this process, the FRA developed Representative Routes for the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative, which provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the effects of each Alternative. Representative Routes define an envelope within which improvements might occur and whose location and construction type could change during subsequent Tier 2 project studies.
Harris_Je	The communities in our region could greatly benefit from a rail stop in Palmer! Therefore, we wholeheartedly support it for the town of Palmer. The Amherst colleges are close by as well as Worcester and Hartford. This would be a great asset for New England as a whole! Please bring back the commuter train!	<p>The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrades to the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment. To better serve Central New England, the Preferred Alternative incorporates electrification on the Hartford/Springfield Line, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield on the NEC. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The FRA is coordinating with Massachusetts and Vermont on the Northern New England Intercity Rail Initiative, a separate study, to explore options for improved intercity rail service in New England.</p> <p>While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify the construction of additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network.</p>
Harvey_Ke	I think NEC (Amtrak) need to invest in adding those 4 station in the Bronx,and one on 125st in Harlem.Up grade your tracks in those area	The Preferred Alternative includes the four new regional rail stations on the Hellgate Line of the NEC, as proposed in the Metro North Railroad Penn Station Access Project. The specific location and design of the stations will be determined in project studies.
Heather	I would love to see passenger rail service come through Western Mass... specifically Palmer.	The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrades to the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment. To better serve Central New England, the Preferred Alternative incorporates electrification on the Hartford/Springfield Line, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield on the NEC. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The FRA is coordinating with Massachusetts and Vermont on the Northern New England Intercity Rail Initiative, a separate study, to explore options for improved intercity rail service in New England.
Hochman_Jo	Please focus on reliability and frequency of service. It will be better to fix existing rail lines, bridges and tunnels, eliminate bottlenecks, and add track where needed along existing routes.	The FRA has identified a Preferred Alternative that focuses improvements along the existing NEC with targeted new segments to alleviate chokepoints and increase capacity. The Preferred Alternative brings the existing NEC to a state of good repair and supports more-frequent, faster, and more-reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. It also includes an enhanced, electrified Hartford/Springfield Line. Volume 1, Chapter 4, provides a description of the Preferred Alternative.
Hochman_Jo	I do not like the extremely expensive options.	The FRA noted concerns about the expense of the Alternative 3 Route Options. The FRA has identified a Preferred Alternative that focuses improvements along the existing NEC with targeted new segments to alleviate chokepoints and increase capacity. The Preferred Alternative does not include the Alternative 3 Route Options. Volume 1, Chapter 4 provides a description of the Preferred Alternative.
Holmes_Ca	The NEC should be able to handl traffic on an Olymipic level. With that statement I mean, that if the Olympics were to arrive in Boston, New York City, Washington DC or Philadelphia, the future of the NEC should be able to accomodate this traffic. Once again this would suppliment the support of the local transit systems and benefit the area as a whole.	The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and also incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. For additional details on the Preferred Alternative, see Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Honer_Ja	I want a rail line to connect Hartford to old saybrook.	The Preferred Alternative does not provide a direct connection between Hartford and Old Saybrook, but with electrification of the Hartford/Springfield Line and incorporation of that line into the Preferred Alternative representative service plan, travelers between Old Saybrook and Hartford would have significantly improved train frequencies, faster and more frequent service (Volume 1, Chapters 4 and 5).

Table JJ–7: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Honer_Ja	It would also link new haven to Hartford thru the shoreline rail.	The Preferred Alternative includes electrification of the Hartford/Springfield Line between New Haven, Hartford and Springfield. This will facilitate direct service to Hartford and Springfield from the NEC without an engine change.
Hyde_Dw	Is there any talk of an 'overhead' rail system. With 'overhead' you will not have need for 'rail crossing' equipment. Car and truck traffic will not be stopping for 'passing through' trains. And a properly designed 'overhead' rail will eliminate track derailment.	Consistent with the NEC FUTURE Purpose and Need, the FRA focused on leveraging the investment in the existing NEC and, equally important, improving connectivity between the urban centers along the NEC. As such, the proposed Preferred Alternative included upgrading and enhancing the existing NEC rather than constructing an entirely new system. There are very few at-grade rail-highway crossings on the existing NEC; the elimination of remaining at-grade crossings will be considered in subsequent Tier 2 project studies.
Hyers_Ka	It is my opinion that creating a hub at Market East would only enhance the mobility of commuters, allowing more accessibility to NYC, Washington DC, etc. I believe that more area residents would consider commuting on a regular basis for work and leisure if there were more traveling locations available in center city where a large majority of businesses are located.	The Preferred Alternative does not include a second station in Philadelphia. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative includes the Philadelphia 30th Street Station to support the significant growth in both intercity and regional rail service envisioned by the Preferred Alternative in Philadelphia.
Ivanoff_AI	One thing I might add: a low-cost service on the corridor (no-frills) should be considered. While slower and less comfortable, the fares and unreserved nature would prove popular. For instance, NJ Transit and SEPTA's all local service between Philadelphia and New York is slow, but at less than \$30, it beats the Amtrak walk-up fare, which can be as high as over \$100. Both existing services prove to be lackluster: pay a little and have a slow trip or pay a lot and have a very quick one. New service options is a must, including select service from Grand Central Terminal to Boston, mirroring the existing Metro-North service and based on legacy New Haven Railroad services. That option would prove beneficial to riders coming from	The Preferred Alternative creates a high performance NEC with faster and more frequent coordinated services to more places. This includes the introduction of Metropolitan service, a frequent lower cost service to many intermediate destinations. For more details on fare assumptions, see Volume 1, Appendix BB. Specific details on fares will be determined by railroad operators, during subsequent Tier 2 project studies.
Jankowski_Bi	Please speed up the train by moving it to straighter tracks inland.	The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrading the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment. It does not include a second spine. However, additional trackage and segments are included to add capacity, improve trip time, and eliminate chokepoints. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Johnson_GI	...but yes, there needs to be expansion in certain areas. There needs to be improvements to the infrastructure. Not just the train sets alone, but the catenary, the right-of-way where you need certain switches that you can -- you can run over 80 miles an hour between two parallel tracks. Those sorts of things need to be done at strategic locations, yes.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative brings the NEC to a state of good repair and replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. The Preferred Alternative brings the entire NEC, including the Hartford/Springfield Line and new segments to a modern catenary system, capable of supporting speeds greater than 150 mph. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for a complete description of the Preferred Alternative.

Table JJ–7: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Johnson_GI	And one part you mentioned, the use of certain train sets. Since this is the concept that we are now going to is the use of a dedicated train set of a certain length. The best options that I saw in there was, yes, having push/pull trains with locomotives on either end, a set number of cars, say, seven to eight, but capable of running off corridor like New Jersey transit currently has where they run a catenary and switch over to diesel. Amtrak has similar locomotives, which run a third rail and switch over to diesel.	As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA focused on representative equipment types and, with the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, and will not make decisions about specific equipment configurations. The FRA developed a representative service plan for the purposes of analysis; that representative service plan identifies the opportunity to use dual-powered equipment to allow for operations both within the electrified NEC and to connecting corridors that may not be electrified. Specific decisions about equipment are the subject of subsequent Tier 2 project studies or other planning processes.
Johnson_GI	Now with Amtrak itself expanding, especially in Upstate New York where they're now leasing the line that's close to Albany, one of my suggestions would be, you know, in cooperation with Metro North and the state of New York, extend the third rail from where it currently ends in Croton-Harmon up to Rensselaer. That alone will be a cost savings as far as fuelwise. Yes, fuel is very low right now, but it could also reverse. And as anyone knows, fuel tanks on locomotives are a heck of a lot bigger than what they are in your car or truck.	The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrades to the existing NEC to accommodate future growth and employment across the Northeast. The Preferred Alternative does not include improvements to the Empire corridor between New York, Albany and Rochester. However, improved service with the connecting corridors was considered as part of NEC FUTURE and the development of the Preferred Alternative, as described in Volume 1, Chapter 4 and 5.
Johnson_GI	At one time, the Pennsylvania Railroad was looking to extend the catenary beyond Harrisburg. Now, we're losing a lot of business because we're not service -- we're not serving those communities like Pittsburgh. And there's still enough right-of-way to talk to -- you know, Norfolk Southern to say, look, you can have two tracks for free and give us two tracks for passenger. And have the same concept where locomotive -- if you don't extend the catenary out to Pittsburgh, at least have a locomotive that you can run on the catenary, switch over to diesel and continue on to Pittsburgh. And I have family in Virginia. The same thing. The down time between changing engines will be dramatically reduced if all you have to do is just switch over from one mode to another. And, also -- and I'm sure technology now in the modern railway age, you can have a locomotive that can run on third rail catenary and diesel. The savings would be dramatic. You know, as far as like I said, down time between running where there's electrified territory and where there's not.	<p>The Preferred Alternative allows for increased service between Philadelphia and Harrisburg, PA, on the existing Keystone Corridor. These service enhancements would further expand the integrated network of passenger rail in the Northeast. Possible service improvements could include introduction of Metropolitan service at 30-minute headways in peak periods. Considering recent improvements to the Keystone Line, the enhanced service levels could be accommodated within existing capacity. Further exploration of opportunities created by the Preferred Alternative would be the subject of subsequent planning processes.</p> <p>The FRA has identified a Preferred Alternative that focuses improvements along the existing NEC with targeted new segments to alleviate chokepoints and increase capacity. The Preferred Alternative does not include electrification of the Keystone Corridor beyond its current limits in Harrisburg, PA. The Preferred Alternative, described in Volume 1, Chapter 4, also does not extend south of Washington, D.C., but includes capacity to support a significant increase in service to and from the connecting corridor to the South to Richmond, VA.</p>
Johnston_GI	First off, before we can transform, we need to maintain what we have. Currently, our Catenary system is antiquated, very antiquated, unlike Europe, where they have constant tension system, even for trolley systems, they use a constant tension system Catenary System. We need to implement that here in order to achieve the higher speeds that we are discussing.	The FRA's focus for NEC FUTURE is to meet both current and future passenger rail transportation needs. The overall needs addressed include aging infrastructure, insufficient capacity, gaps in connectivity, compromised performance, and lack of resiliency. Bringing the NEC to a state of good repair and meeting current and forecast needs are fundamental requirements for the Preferred Alternative.
Johnston_GI	I agree there needs to be expansion, not just within the Northeast Corridor itself, where we are under wire, but also outside of the Northeast. More so in areas where there is market growth. Such as Virginia, Upstate New York, New England and even try to get some of the market in the State of Pennsylvania.	The Preferred Alternative expands service not only on the NEC, but includes service to and from connecting corridors to Richmond in the south, Harrisburg/Pittsburgh in the West, and Albany/Rochester to the north. It also fully incorporates the Hartford/Springfield Line, with electrified service. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. Connecting Corridors are described in Volume 1, Chapter 4 and 5, and Appendix BB.
Johnston_GI	right now we can start with, other than maintaining our track and Catenary infrastructure, we can invest in new trains currently. That would be one of the easier ways of improving service in the Northeast Corridor. In the public statement I made, I suggested that we can have train sets with locomotives on both ends operating in push/pull mode like the current Acela does. Having at least seven to eight cars in between, but where the locomotives can run outside of electrified territory, not just Catenary, but also third rail. Currently, New Jersey Transit has dual mode type equipment; dual mode locomotives that run off of Catenary and switch over to diesel.	The FRA considered a range of potential rolling stock types for passenger rail service on the NEC. As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA will establish a long-term vision and investment plan for the NEC, but will not make decisions about fleet composition and equipment design or procurement for NEC rail operators. Specific requirements for rolling stock and other equipment will be considered in subsequent Tier 2 project studies.
Johnston_GI	Me being a resident of Delaware, working in Wilmington, having a realignment that takes the main line further south out of the city, makes no sense. Also for the fact that you are running through what becomes now a flood prone area.	The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrades to the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment. The Preferred Alternative, described in Volume 1, Chapter 4, includes a supplemental track to the east of the existing Wilmington station to provide a faster route for some Intercity Express trains. However, both intercity and regional rail Service to Wilmington will be expanded.

Table JJ–7: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Joncus_St	The existing rail line over the Connecticut River from Old Saybrook is fairly high above the sound and stays pretty high through to New London. In addition we have a brand new bridge in Niantic. Replace the 100 year old bridge over the Connecticut River and think about alternate routes east of New London.	The Preferred Alternative does not alter the route of the existing NEC through Southeastern Connecticut, as it serves local stations and provides access for freight service to businesses along the line. However, the Preferred Alternative does include a new 50-mile segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, that provides significant travel time benefits, improves resiliency, and improved reliability. This new segment also bypasses the movable bridges and the 11 remaining at-grade crossings on the NEC. In addition, the Preferred Alternative incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield to other markets on the NEC. The Preferred Alternative includes projects to replace aging infrastructure, eliminate chokepoints and add capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Jonson_Mi	I would start between Manhatten and Newark with that old bridge as soon as you can.	Portal Bridge is identified as a Related Project in the Preferred Alternative. Related Projects are described in Volume 1, Chapter 4, and Volume 2, Appendix B.1. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints, and adds capacity to support more-frequent, faster, and more-reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. See Volume 1, Chapter 4, for more information on the Preferred Alternative.
Karpenski_Ma	If only Putnam could have train service from Boston to Worcester added to the plans as well. Putnam needs Train service.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA has identified a Preferred Alternative to improve passenger rail service on the NEC in a manner that will enhance mobility options and expand passenger rail service in support of future population and employment growth in the Study Area. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative provides connections along the existing Northeast Corridor, along a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT and Kenyon, RI, and along the Hartford/Springfield Line. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, as proposed by Alternative 3, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.
Keene_Jo	One critical constraint of the current alternatives study are the study boundaries. Current transportation challenges require that the southern boundary of the study area should extend at least as far south as Richmond, VA and a North Station/South Station link in Boston would allow expansion north into New Hampshire and southern Maine as well.	<p>The Preferred Alternative focuses on improving passenger rail service on the Study Area within Washington, D.C., Maryland, Delaware, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, New York, Connecticut, Rhode Island and Massachusetts. The Preferred Alternative would allow for easier connections to markets served by connecting corridors, such as the Vermonter (which could be extended to Montreal) and by long distance trains to the Southeast and Florida. It is beyond the scope of NEC FUTURE to directly support service to Montreal or to markets south of Washington, D.C.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative includes frequent connections to and from markets south of Washington, D.C., with capacity to support as many as two trains per hour in each direction. The Preferred Alternative does include an extension of service south of Washington, D.C to Virginia. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative is focused on improvements to the existing NEC and on enhancing connections to other rail corridors, such as to Richmond in the south, Harrisburg to the west and Albany/Rochester to the north. The result will be an expanded and far more integrated network of trains service the entire Northeast region from the mid-Atlantic to northern New England.</p>

Table JJ–7: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Keene_Jo	New stations should be located where reasonably direct access to regional roadways, transit routes, multi-use trails and sidewalks is possible. Where such amenities are not currently found, sufficient right of way along station access routes should be provided to allow for the future addition of other modes of access.	The NEC FUTURE program follows a "tiered" approach to environmental review. Tier 1 focuses on broad programs and initial analysis. Tier 2 focuses on site-specific, project-level proposals and impacts. Consistent with the Tier 1 NEPA process, the FRA developed Representative Routes for the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative, which provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the effects of each Alternative. Representative Routes define an envelope within which improvements might occur and whose location and construction type could change during subsequent Tier 2 project studies. Station locations identified for the Action Alternatives and Preferred Alternative were representative of markets to be served. Final station locations will be determined as part of subsequent Tier 2 planning processes. During Tier 2 project studies, factors such as roadway access and environmental features would be considered in determining station siting.
Kehoe_Pa	Why not move to New Haven shoreline where commercial space is available along with a link to the New Haven station and AMTRACK - which Milford does not offer. Or why not move South to Westport or Norwalk. The Milford infrastructure is not ready for this.	The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, and will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure in the Tier 1 Record of Decision. Such decisions would be made as part of the Tier 2 project planning and NEPA processes, which would include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate.
Kelley_Sh	4 - we need to work towards green energy instead of ruining wild areas & putting more pollution maches (trains) out there. put money towards green buses instead & there will be enough transportation for everyone. there is no need specific to trains that can't be met by buses.	<p>For NEC FUTURE, the FRA focuses specifically on the need for improving passenger rail and determining the best role that passenger rail should play, in the context of the overall transportation system, to serve the needs of the travelers within the Study Area. Thus the FRA does consider the appropriate role for rail via the development and analysis of the Action Alternatives. While the condition of and planned improvements to other modes were important considerations to development of the Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative, the analysis was not intended to provide a regional assessment of how to optimize improvements to all modes of transportation to meet regional transportation needs. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. Consideration of other modes in evaluation of the Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 5.</p> <p>The FRA is supportive of green energy and encourages implementation of technology to reduce emissions and promote cleaner air. Rail represents a mode choice that has lower greenhouse gas and pollutant emissions when compared to auto or air. Under the Preferred Alternative, there would be a net total decrease in greenhouse gas and most pollutant emissions in the year 2040. This decrease is due to predicted shifts in mode choice from bus and aircraft to passenger rail. Mode shift is a result of improved services provided by the Preferred Alternative. To further review the air quality and climate change benefits of the Preferred Alternative, see Volume 1, Chapters 7.13 and 7.15, respectively.</p>
Kirkos_Ja	We also want to emphasize the importance ofthe 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 ofNew Jersey commuters.	The Bergen Loop was included in the Preferred Alternative. Volume 1, Chapter 4, provides additional information on the Preferred Alternative. As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure. Such decisions will be made as part of the Tier 2 project studies, which will include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate.

Table JJ–7: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Kirkos_Ja	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. 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.	The Preferred Alternative includes the Bergen Loop, which would provide direct access to Penn Station New York from branch lines at Secaucus NJ. The Preferred Alternative does not add an intercity stop at Secaucus, however it does not preclude a station if the operators agree to do so in the future. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Kirkos_Ja	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.	<p>The Preferred Alternative, described in Volume 1, Chapter 4, includes new third and fourth Hudson River tunnels, beginning on embankment east of Secaucus Rail Station, terminating south of the existing NEC and Penn Station New York, under West 31st Street. The Preferred Alternative, described in Volume 1, Chapter 4, includes new third and fourth Hudson River tunnels, beginning on embankment east of Secaucus Rail Station, terminating south of the existing NEC and Penn Station New York, under West 31st Street.</p> <p>The Gateway program is Amtrak's proposed set of strategic infrastructure improvements to improve service and address capacity constraints in the area of New York City in New York and New Jersey. Separate from the Gateway program, the Hudson Tunnel Project is intended to preserve the current functionality of the NEC's Hudson River rail crossing between New Jersey and New York and strengthen the resilience of the NEC; FRA and NJ TRANSIT are currently leading the NEPA process for the Hudson Tunnel Project. The Gateway Program and the Hudson Tunnel Project are separate from the NEC FUTURE program. NEC FUTURE does evaluate overall capacity needs and potential improvements for the entire NEC including the New York City area. The FRA coordinates closely with the project teams for the Gateway program and Hudson Tunnel Project in order that their scope do not preclude NEC FUTURE findings.</p>
Kolber_St	Given that the movable railroad bridges in Connecticut west of Old Saybrook will remain (improved, repaired or not), that the times of the opening of those bridges, as well as the Connecticut River Railroad Bridge (known to sailors as the Old Lyme Draw) ...there is no reason why the goals in improved railroad traffic of Alternative 1 sought in Connecticut could not be achieved by CFR Rule Making (plainly within DOT control) to adjust the seasonal times, advance notice and hours of bridge openings for the boat traffic on the Connecticut River. That approach could be only modestly, if at all, less advantageous for improved railroad traffic	Demand for both Shoreline East regional rail service and intercity trains across the Northeast is projected to grow significantly as population and employment expand in the coming decades. Rail service is near or at capacity through Southeastern Connecticut due to the limited number of tracks (just two) and the need to open the five movable bridges to marine traffic. To support the demand for additional service, a new rail segment must be built. The Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4) includes a new 50-mile rail segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI. The precise location for and design of the rail segment will be determined in a subsequent Tier 2 project study.
Krueger_Ch	In order to increase train speeds on the NEC north of 30th St Station toward Trenton through a bypass of the tight curve at Frankford, Philadelphia, it will be necessary to tunnel beneath Erie and Torresdale Avenues in Philadelphia. The Amtrak mainline tracks west of Frankford will thence be tracks # 3 and 4. (Currently, they tracks #2 and 3, i.e., the middle two tracks of 4.) In order to increase through capacity in this area, it would be useful to reduce SEPTA Regional Rail trains on these lines and avoid the northeast approach to 30th St Station via Zoo Interlocking. This can be done through several projects that increase the value of the Frankford tunnel/bypass: 1. The SEPTA Chestnut Hill West line can be moved onto the SEPTA Main Line via a newly-constructed crossover at Swampoodle, Philadelphia. (See: http://philadelphia2050.blogspot.com/2012/05/swampoodle-connection.html?m=1) 2. The SEPTA Trenton local trains can also be transferred to the SEPTA mainline via a new tunnel from Amtrak tracks #1 and 2 east of the Frankford bypass junction in North Philadelphia to North Broad Street station. 3. The latter could share a tunnel with a new spur of the SEPTA Broad Street Line (subway) to Northeast Philadelphia, an area of the city underserved by public transport. (See: https://www.google.com/maps/d/edit?hl=en&authuser=0&mid=z3RZWQp5rDk0.knOL50ICya5U)	As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, and will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure in the Tier 1 Record of Decision. Such decisions would be made as part of the Tier 2 project planning and NEPA processes, which would include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate. This would apply to improvements considered under the Preferred Alternative in the Philadelphia area aimed at reducing travel time, increasing capacity and integrating intercity and regional service, as described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.

Table JJ–7: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Lamothe_BI	Palmer Union Station is a natural asset to the community itself and for patrons to potentially arrive and depart as an operating passenger rail station. There are other locations mentioned further in other cities, however, neither of these sites have any connection to the central corridor line. Palmer Union Station was and can be the central 'hubspot' again with connections to New London and Montreal via Springfield and Boston. In the long-term, having the connection at Palmer Union Station is the most logical location because it can provide connections to numerous other locations across New England.	<p>The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrades to the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment. To better serve Central New England, the Preferred Alternative incorporates electrification on the Hartford/Springfield Line, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield on the NEC. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The FRA is coordinating with Massachusetts and Vermont on the Northern New England Intercity Rail Initiative, a separate study, to explore options for improved intercity rail service in New England.</p> <p>While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify the construction of additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network.</p>
Lander_Ma	In a related vein, I have a copy of a proposal sent out less than two years ago by AMTRAK concerning the replacement of the existing 1917 rail bridge across the river. It appears that the bridge is structurally safe but mechanically cantankerous and not suitable for high-speed rail. As the existing Shoreline route would be retained, it seems that something would need to be done about this bridge even if high-speed rail were removed.	Portal Bridge is identified as a Related Project in the Preferred Alternative. Related Projects are described in Volume 1, Chapter 4, and Volume 2, Appendix B.1. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints, and adds capacity to support more-frequent, faster, and more-reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. See Volume 1, Chapter 4, for more information on the Preferred Alternative.
LeBlond_Te	More and faster Acela service please!	As described in Volume 2, Chapter 3, the purpose of the NEC FUTURE rail investment program is to upgrade aging infrastructure and to improve the reliability, capacity, connectivity, performance, and resiliency of passenger rail service on the NEC. The FRA considered improved connectivity and improved travel time in developing the Preferred Alternative. See Volume 1, Chapter 4, for discussion on the Preferred Alternative.
Lenhart_To	... get rid of the chokepoints that we currently do have. On that map, there were three chokepoints in this one section alone, indicating that there are serious problems here [from New York to New Haven] for on-time performance and overall speed and reliability.	The proposed Preferred Alternative brings the existing NEC to a state of good repair and maximizes its capacity through alleviation of chokepoints, addition of new tracks and segments at targeted locations, and implementation of service operational efficiencies. Specifically, between New York and New Haven, the Preferred Alternative includes two chokepoint relief projects, as well as improvements within (new track) and outside (new segment) of the NEC right of way. For additional details on the Preferred Alternative, see Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Levin_Ri	In option three all the new tunnels to Manhattan should not go to Penn Station. Most of the traffic from NJ is commuters and they are destined for the office district further north. Thus if that major amount of construction is to be done a new station in the 50s would make much more sense. Penn Station is already crowded and even the Farley plan won't do that much to improve things. Plus this creates more redundancy if something should happen.	The Preferred Alternative assumes continued use of Penn Station New York as the as the Major Hub station in Manhattan for both Intercity and Regional service. The Preferred Alternative includes two additional tracks in tunnels under the Hudson River, as proposed in Alternative 2. It does not include plans for a new station located north of Penn Station or direct connections to Grand Central Terminal. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Levitz_Da	Would it be possible to supply a map depicting where the 1,500 ft long, 900 ft wide Station would be? I understand it would be sub-terrian below the proposed Hartford Annex Station but if the FRA/NEC could further detail the positioning, that would help us immensely.	Station area siting, typology designation, and analysis outlined in the Tier 1 Draft EIS are representative of future station locations and conditions. used to evaluate the Tier 1 EIS Alternatives in a level of detail consistent with a Tier 1 Draft EIS. The Hartford Station Area Box is not intended to be used to specify a new station site or prescribe the extent of specific capital improvements at this location. Refer to Volume 2, Appendix B.7 - Stations Locations and Access Analysis Tech Memo - which describes the process for identifying the stations served by the Action Alternatives

Table JJ–7: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Levitz_Da	I would ask that your presentation include how NEC/FRA could accommodate non stop trains from Boston to NYC. I'm sure NEC/FRA has the answer to scheduling and performance. But I would be interesting in knowing if this is a reasonable scheduling solution.	The FRA developed representative Service Plans, which include service frequencies, stopping patterns (including limited stop service for express intercity trains.), train routings, and rolling stock characteristics in order to assess their ability to achieve efficient use of proposed rail infrastructure capacity and to serve the NEC's rail travel markets. By way of example, the representative Service Plans include Intercity-Express service between Boston and New York City with travel times of 2 hours 45 minutes—a savings of 45 minutes over today's express times. The Service Plans are representational only and consistent with a Tier 1 level of detail, required for analysis of capacity, performance, and costs, as well as assessment of the environmental impacts associated with planned improvements. The Service Plans are not intended in any way to be prescriptive regarding how service should be operated in the future. In addition, the Service Plans are not intended to predict future operating patterns of the NEC operators. Additional information on the representative service plans and express stopping patterns are included in Volume 1, Appendix BB, and Volume 2, Appendix B.5.
Levitz_Da	Or having a rail switch at station allowing for loading and unloading. Are one or both of these methods being considered and if not, what is?	The FRA developed Service Plans to describe the types and levels of passenger train service operating on the NEC in 2040. These Service Plans are a representative train schedule for a typical future weekday, and include the train stops by station for both peak and nonpeak periods. They do not include yarding and crewing assumptions, or specific track assignments at major stations and terminals. The Service Plans are not intended in any way to be prescriptive regarding how service should be operated in the future. In addition, the Service Plans are not intended to predict future operating patterns of the NEC operators. Additional information on the representative service plans are included in Volume 1, Appendix BB, and Volume 2, Appendix B.5.
Li_Ja	So what I support is like two tunnels under the Hudson river and the additional of three to four -- track three and track four along the corridor between Boston and Washington, just increase service.	The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. Important elements of the Preferred Alternative include addition of two additional tracks under both the Hudson and East Rivers, as well as expansion of Penn Station New York to support demand beyond 2040. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Linell_Th	The NEC should be expanded to include a Boston South Station-North Station rail link	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. The Preferred Alternative does include an extension of service north of Boston. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The North South Rail Link was not included in the No Action Alternative Project List (see Volume 2, Appendix B, No Action Alternative Report) as it does not meet the criteria for consideration: Funded projects or projects with approved funding plans, funded or unfunded mandates, unfunded projects necessary to keep the railroad running. Likewise, North South Rail Link was not included as a Related Project in the Action Alternatives because it does not meet the criteria for consideration: fully or partially funded projects located in a connecting corridor and not on the NEC; unfunded projects along the NEC with ongoing or completed NEPA/PE; fully or partially funded transit (e.g., NJ TRANSIT, MTA-LIRR) or freight projects located off of but connecting to the NEC. A project to connect Boston's North and South stations, such as the North South Rail Link, could be studied separately, and is not precluded as future investment.

Table JJ–7: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Lowe_Do	...use maglev. Technology & train engineers & dispatchers to operate these trains at max. authorized speeds	In separate studies, the FRA continues to explore new technologies such as maglev and is currently sponsoring a study of maglev between Baltimore and Washington, D.C. Such a system would require separate stations, and would not support run-through trains from connecting corridors nor offer proven integration efficiencies with today’s NEC infrastructure and operators. For these reasons, the FRA did not incorporate advanced guideway or similar new technologies in the NEC FUTURE Alternatives Development Process. The Preferred Alternative does not include maglev. However, it also does not preclude the option in the future of building new transportation corridors supporting other technologies, such as maglev. The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrading the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment (as described in Volume 1, Chapter 4).
Lower_Wi	In particular, our company intends major redevelopment activity in the Town of Newport, Delaware, and the future Newport Passenger Rail Station project identified in the EIS will be critical to those redevelopment efforts to effect smart growth, environmental sustainability, and passenger rail access to both Wilmington and Philadelphia.	The Preferred Alternative includes a proposed regional rail station in Edgemoor and Newport, DE. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Lucas_Ri	The report accurately identifies Long Island as having untapped potential for intercity service, which I agree. However, there are more effective ways to achieve this than spending \$100 Billion for a tunnel, so a Boston business traveler can save 60 minutes. Far greater demand for Long Island travel exists from Upstate NY and the service plan and NEC should consider a cross spine from Albany to Islip (this does not require a change of direction and could theoretically be done today). This service could be an expanded Empire Service offering same train service from Buffalo to Islip. Additional direct trains for Islip to Washington DC could also be considered in the service plan, perhaps even a few Islip to Harrisburg trains as well.	The Preferred Alternative does not change current connections between the Empire corridor and Long Island. While it does not include direct service from upstate New York to Long Island, the Preferred Alternative includes expanded capacity at Penn Station New York and additional tracks across the East River, which could support future Intercity or Regional service between those markets. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4, and the Connecting Corridor, such as Empire Corridor, are discussed in Volume 1, Chapter 4 and 5. The Preferred Alternative allows for increased Intercity travel for selected stations on the Keystone Corridor, the Empire Corridor to Albany, NY, service south of Washington, D.C., to Richmond, VA, and connecting services north and east of Springfield Union Station. The Preferred Alternative would create additional mobility choices for travelers in markets where non-automobile travel is possible but inconvenient.
Lucashu_Jo	How about using the existing interstate highways, with elevated tracks along the mediums? Also, to go to Boston, more trains can go up the Hudson and then cross over from Albany. That route already exists (at least it did years ago as the Boston & Albany, part of NYC system)	The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, and will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure in the Tier 1 Record of Decision. Such decisions would be made as part of the Tier 2 project planning and NEPA processes, which would include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate.
Lyons_Jo	While the Penn Station and the rest of NEC stations are being built, I want to know when the new South Station (SS) will be constructed? Why this project SS is taking so long? it is 21 century and this station needs to be rebuilt badly.	The Preferred Alternative includes projects to replace aging infrastructure, eliminate chokepoints, and add capacity to support more-frequent, faster, and more-reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. At South Station, the FRA and the Massachusetts Department of Transportation are advancing improvements to expand station capacity under a separate project. Representative service levels included in the Preferred Alternative could be accommodated at the expanded South Station.
Lyons_Jo	Also, why the train is taking over 4 hours to NYC from Boston. This should be less than 3 hours! I can drive faster than that.	The Preferred Alternative includes improvements to the NEC between New York and Boston to reduce Intercity Express travel time to approximately 2 hours 45 minutes. The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrades to the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment and replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative provides connections along the existing Northeast Corridor, along a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT and Kenyon, RI, and along the Hartford/Springfield Line which strengthens service to Central New England and leverages existing investments and identified market opportunities. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.

Table JJ–7: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Lyons_Jo	I wish that Amtrak installs the over head electric wires from Washington DC to Richmond VA! It is wasting the time to switch the electric train to the diesel train in DC bound to VA, just same way New Haven to Boston in past! Also, the train is running too slow from DC to VA even though it is 21st century!	The Preferred Alternative includes up to two trains per hours to and from markets south of Washington, D.C. While the rail corridor south of Washington, D.C., is not electrified, use of dual power locomotives or future electrification would end the current need to change locomotives at Washington Union Station. This would significantly shorten the current delay in Washington, D.C. For additional information on the Preferred Alternative, see Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Madsen_Er	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.	As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure in the Tier 1 Record of Decision. Such decisions are made as part of the Tier 2 project planning and NEPA processes, which would include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate. Consistent with this process, the FRA developed Representative Routes for the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative, which provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the effects of each Alternative. Representative Routes define an envelope within which improvements might occur and whose location and construction type could change during subsequent Tier 2 project studies. The Preferred Alternative, described in Volume 1, Chapter 4, includes incorporation of an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line into the NEC. The work will include reconstruction or replacement of the Hartford Viaduct. Connecticut Department of Transportation is leading a current effort to incorporate planning for work to rebuild or replace the Hartford Viaduct with planning for I-84. FRA is a cooperating agency on the Hartford Viaduct Project and, as such, is coordinating with ConnDOT.
Maher_St	As a resident of Palmer for over twenty years, I am hoping that this plan goes through and there is a rail stop in the town of Palmer. Some mill towns have bounced back, but many have not and Palmer is struggling and slowly dying. Young people are leaving and not coming back because there are no opportunities to keep them here. Our access to the Mass Pike, our location between Worcester & Springfield, out downtown area that is begging for a revitalization are reasons why a rail stop would change the lives of our residents, and bring hope for the future of our town.	<p>The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrades to the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment. To better serve Central New England, the Preferred Alternative incorporates electrification on the Hartford/Springfield Line, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield on the NEC. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The FRA is coordinating with Massachusetts and Vermont on the Northern New England Intercity Rail Initiative, a separate study, to explore options for improved intercity rail service in New England.</p> <p>While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify the construction of additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network.</p>
Maits_Sc	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... 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... And so making sure that that is taken care of and is impacted as minimally as possible is absolutely one of my goals.	The FRA has incorporated several of these ideas into the Preferred Alternative. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for a complete description of the Preferred Alternative. Consistent with the Tier 1 NEPA process, the FRA developed Representative Routes for the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative, which provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the effects of each Alternative. Representative Routes define an envelope within which improvements might occur and whose location and construction type could change during subsequent Tier 2 project studies. FRA evaluated effects on National Wildlife Refuges and took this into consideration when identifying a Preferred Alternative. The FRA has developed the Represenative Routefor the Preferred Alternative such that it generally avoids or minimized impacts on National Wildlife Refuges.
Maits_Sc	What I object to in the documents is the other Market East Station being called downtown. 30th Street is downtown... 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... 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.	The Preferred Alternative does not include a second station in Philadelphia. The Preferred Alternative, described in Volume 1, Chapter 4, focuses on the Philadelphia 30th Street Station to support the significant growth in both intercity and regional rail service envisioned by the Preferred Alternative in Philadelphia.
Maits_Sc	There are places where we have to invest - Baltimore, New York, obviously, but not in Philadelphia.	After deliberating the comments received and the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative that improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.

Table JJ–7: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Maits_Sc	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 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.	<p>The FRA has incorporated several of these ideas into the Preferred Alternative. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for a complete description of the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers.</p> <p>Consistent with the Tier 1 NEPA process, the FRA developed Representative Routes for the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative, which provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the effects of each Alternative. Representative Routes define an envelope within which improvements might occur and whose location and construction type could change during subsequent Tier 2 project studies.</p>
Maits_Sc	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.	As a result of the Tier 1 Draft EIS and the public comment process, the FRA has identified a Preferred Alternative to improve passenger rail service on the NEC in a manner that will enhance mobility options and expand passenger rail service in support of future population and employment growth in the Study Area. The Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4) improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. The Long Island Sound crossing, considered as a routing option in Alternative 3, is not included in the Preferred Alternative.
Maits_Sc	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.	The FRA has incorporated several of these ideas into the Preferred Alternative. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for a complete description of the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative includes a new, four-track infrastructure in tunnel, approaching Baltimore Penn Station from the west. The existing NEC, between Lafayette Avenue and North Avenue in Baltimore City would be retired from passenger rail service. The Preferred Alternative includes new third and fourth Hudson River tunnels, beginning on embankment east of Secaucus Rail Station, terminating south of the existing NEC and Penn Station New York, under West 31st Street.
Maits_Sc	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.	<p>The FRA has incorporated several of these ideas into the Preferred Alternative. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for a complete description of the Preferred Alternative. For the purposes of this analysis, the width of the existing NEC is defined as 150 feet, conservatively accounting for a four-track right-of-way between Washington, D.C., and Boston. The 150-foot width is inclusive of tracks, ballast, signals, etc. The Preferred Alternative could require an envelope that extends beyond the existing NEC right-of-way.</p> <p>Consistent with the Tier 1 NEPA process, the FRA developed Representative Routes for the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative, which provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the effects of each Alternative. Representative Routes define an envelope within which improvements might occur and whose location and construction type could change during subsequent Tier 2 project studies.</p>
Maits_Sc	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.	<p>The FRA has incorporated several of these ideas into the Preferred Alternative. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for a complete description of the Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>Consistent with the Tier 1 NEPA process, the FRA developed Representative Routes for the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative, which provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the effects of each Alternative. Representative Routes define an envelope within which improvements might occur and whose location and construction type could change during subsequent Tier 2 project studies.</p>

Table JJ–7: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Maits_Sc	So one of the things I didn't also get into was tunnel drives, the length of the Philadelphia tunnel... 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... 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... The Schuylkill River caught fire during World War I. So you have all this stuff in there in the worst kind of soil conditions.. But, anyway, the distance of the drives... has been partially confirmed in your own documents and all... 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 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... 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.	The FRA has noted concerns about the expense and difficulty of constructing the new segment connecting Philadelphia Airport to Philadelphia Market East. The Preferred Alternative does not include this new segment. The FRA has identified a Preferred Alternative that focuses improvements along the existing NEC with targeted new segments to alleviate chokepoints and increase capacity. Volume 1, Chapter 4 provides a description of the Preferred Alternative.
Maits_Sc	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... 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.	The FRA has noted concerns about the environmental impacts and expense of the Alternate 3 Route Option through Long Island. The FRA has identified a Preferred Alternative that focuses improvements along the existing NEC with targeted new segments to alleviate chokepoints and increase capacity. The Preferred Alternative does not include a tunnel under the Long Island Sound. Volume 1, Chapter 4 provides a description of the Preferred Alternative.
Maits_Sc	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 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... it would be a tremendous development opportunity for Chester... 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.	The Preferred Alternative does not change the status of Chester Station within the Representative Route. However, the Preferred Alternative does not preclude consideration of expanded intercity service in the future if the state, city or operator wishes to explore that opportunity. Chester is a local station.
Maits_Sc	We do need tunnels in New York. We do 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... 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	The FRA has incorporated several of these ideas into the Preferred Alternative. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for a complete description of the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative includes a new, four-track infrastructure in tunnel, approaching Baltimore Penn Station from the west. The existing NEC, between Lafayette Avenue and North Avenue in Baltimore City would be retired from passenger rail service. The Preferred Alternative includes new third and fourth Hudson River tunnels, beginning on embankment east of Secaucus Rail Station, terminating south of the existing NEC and Penn Station New York, under West 31st Street.

Table JJ–7: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Maits_Sc	<p>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... What you need to do... 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...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 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...The problem with the Howard Street tunnel at Penn Station is it's a very tight, very tight, area....To -- to direct the 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... The old Baltimore station would become the commuter station. It would thrive.</p>	<p>As described in Volume 1, Chapter 4, the Preferred Alternative includes a new, four-track infrastructure in tunnel, approaching Baltimore Penn Station from the west. The existing NEC between Lafayette Avenue and North Avenue in Baltimore City would be retired from passenger rail service. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints, and adds capacity to support more-frequent, faster, and more-reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. Freight operations are described in Volume 1, Chapter 4; freight consideration with the Preferred Alternative is considered in Volume 1, Chapter 5; and the role of freight in the study area is described in Volume 1, Chapter 6. Site-specific or location-specific decisions of design configurations will be the subject of subsequent Tier 2 project studies.</p>
Maits_Sc	<p>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.</p>	<p>Although the FRA has not included specifics on train and station maintenance and amenities in the Tier 1 EIS process, the Preferred Alternative includes investments to support infrastructure and operational improvements for passenger rail services and at stations. Volume 1, Chapter 4, provides representative operational improvements. Specific amenities and operational improvements will be addressed during subsequent Tier 2 project studies.</p>
Maits_Sc	<p>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... 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.</p>	<p>The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions. The Preferred Alternative is further described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.</p>

Table JJ–7: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Maits_Sc	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.	The FRA has incorporated several of these ideas into the Preferred Alternative. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for a complete description of the Preferred Alternative. Consistent with the Tier 1 NEPA process, the FRA developed Representative Routes for the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative, which provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the effects of each Alternative. Representative Routes define an envelope within which improvements might occur and whose location and construction type could change during subsequent Tier 2 project studies.
Maits_Sc	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.	As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure in the Tier 1 Record of Decision. The FRA developed Representative Routes for the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative, which provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the effects of each Alternative. Representative Routes define an envelope within which improvements might occur and whose location and construction type could change during subsequent Tier 2 project studies, which would include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate.
Maits_Sc	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.	<p>The FRA has incorporated several of these ideas into the Preferred Alternative. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for a complete description of the Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative does not include the route From New Haven to Hartford as envisioned in Alternative 2 and 3. The NEC FUTURE program is focused on corridor-wide solutions for passenger rail improvements, and the selection of the Preferred Alternative does not preclude future consideration of transit or fixed guideway improvements to meet other transportation needs across the Study Area.</p> <p>Consistent with the Tier 1 NEPA process, the FRA developed Representative Routes for the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative, which provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the effects of each Alternative. Representative Routes define an envelope within which improvements might occur and whose location and construction type could change during subsequent Tier 2 project studies.</p>
Maits_Sc	Another ten-mile tunnel to get to Rodney Square is not what the Northeast corridor can afford. As you know, I'm against the Philadelphia tunnel. It's 32 miles of single track to make the original ten-mile estimate. It's more than ten miles long, but you need multiple tracks at different places, of course. It's also an environmental justice issue. If we go from 30th Street -- only if we go from 30th Street to the airport can Chester, Marcus -- Highland Avenue, Marcus Hook, Claymont have direct service to Philadelphia Airport, which would be a tremendous opportunity, economic opportunity, for them to do that. That might be -- so that would likely be separate service, but only can it go if this line is built this way would that be able to happen. We'd save 40 to 80 billion dollars on the Philadelphia line estimate by mine being the low and some other people going up to 80 with that.	As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, and will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure. Such decisions would be made as part of the Tier 2 project planning processes, which would include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate. The Preferred Alternative creates intermodal connections by concentrating improvements on urban hub stations well served by transit and by creating convenient airport services with frequent intercity and regional service. Specifically, the Preferred Alternative includes a new segment to connect to Philadelphia Airport. For additional details on the Preferred Alternative, see Volume 1, Chapter 4. As described in Volume 1, Chapter 7.11, environmental justice communities can benefit from the improved transportation network as outlined in the Preferred Alternative. These benefits provided in the Preferred Alternative include increased travel choices, accessibility to jobs, and a range of pricing options for travelers. Such decisions and additional analysis would be made as part of the Tier 2 project planning processes, which would include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate.

Table JJ–7: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Maits_Sc	There was some talk in New Jersey about another right-of-way. New Jersey Turnpike and the old trolley line that used to go between Newark and Trenton. And, unfortunately, they are no -- I looked at them last night, and it was very clear. There was a hundred crossings on the trolley line. The turnpike would skip Philadelphia basically. I couldn't figure out how to get back over to Philly. It would require more bridges and all. Other than that, the work of a lot of the activists up there are excellent. I see no reason the Northeast corridor can't go through New Jersey and basically where it's being aligned in most places with the exception of Philadelphia for that other tunnel and all... One last thing about the New Jersey trolley thing, which is not really in consideration, but it actually goes in city streets and makes all sorts of different turns.	Consistent with the Tier 1 NEPA process, the FRA developed Representative Routes for the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative, which provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the effects of each Alternative. Representative Routes define an envelope within which improvements might occur and whose location and construction type could change during subsequent Tier 2 project studies. The FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, and will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure. Such decisions would be made as part of the Tier 2 project planning processes, which would include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate.
Maits_Sc	the FRA is -- has the power to regulate speed of trains and other different things. Obviously, speed is very important to get people out of their cars. It must go faster than the cars. And, of course, we have existing lines that we're trying to do that on. The TALGO, which was first built here in Wilmington, Delaware... They could be a huge help in Pennsylvania with the right regulations, the right safety... 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.	As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA considered overall performance requirements, but will not make decisions about specific train equipment. Those decisions will be made as part of subsequent Tier 2 project studies or other planning processes.
Maits_Sc	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.	The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine routing via Long Island, as proposed in Alternative 3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The cost of a full high-speed second spine along with existing NEC improvements, as proposed by Alternative 3, is very high relative to the projected ridership benefits. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be a heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.
Maits_Sc	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.	<p>The Preferred Alternative does not include the Long Island routing option considered in Alternative 3. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions. The Preferred Alternative is further described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.</p> <p>Consistent with the Tier 1 NEPA process, the FRA developed Representative Routes for the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative, which provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the effects of each Alternative. Representative Routes define an envelope within which improvements might occur and whose location and construction type could change during subsequent Tier 2 project studies.</p> <p>As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure or alignments. Such decisions would be made as part of the Tier 2 project planning processes, which would include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate.</p>

Table JJ–7: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Maits_Sc	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.	The FRA based the representative Service Plans on the use of high-performance equipment that is consistent with the projected pace of rolling stock technology development and which utilizes rail infrastructure most efficiently by minimizing the variations in train performance (such as top speed and acceleration and braking rates) among the types of trains using the network. However, NEC FUTURE is not prescriptive with respect to the use of particular equipment types, and the Preferred Alternative is flexible with respect to the mix of equipment that could be operated, although there are consequences associated with decisions to utilize equipment with more widely varying performance characteristics. The FRA focused on representative service plans and overall performance requirements for equipment in the context of the Tier 1 NEPA analysis. Decisions about specific equipment configurations will be the subject of subsequent Tier 1 project studies or other planning processes.
Maits_Sc	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.	<p>The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. The Preferred Alternative does not include the Long Island routing option considered in Alternative 3. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions. The Preferred Alternative is further described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.</p> <p>As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure or alignments. Such decisions would be made as part of the Tier 2 project planning processes, which would include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate.</p>
Maits_Sc	My original plan to go through the area before... 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.	<p>The Preferred Alternative does not include the Long Island routing option considered in Alternative 3. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions. The Preferred Alternative is further described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.</p> <p>Consistent with the Tier 1 NEPA process, the FRA developed Representative Routes for the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative, which provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the effects of each Alternative. Representative Routes define an envelope within which improvements might occur and whose location and construction type could change during subsequent Tier 2 project studies.</p> <p>As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure or alignments. Such decisions would be made as part of the Tier 2 project planning processes, which would include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate.</p>

Table JJ–7: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Maits_Sc	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.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4). The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints, and adds capacity to support more-frequent, faster, and more-reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. The Preferred Alternative does include an extension of service north of Boston. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The North South Rail Link was not included in the No Action Alternative Project List (see Volume 2, Appendix B.1) since it does not meet the criteria for consideration: Funded projects or projects with approved funding plans, funded or unfunded mandates, unfunded projects necessary to keep the railroad running. Likewise, North South Rail Link was not included as a Related Project in the Action Alternatives because it does not meet the criteria for consideration: fully or partially funded projects located in a connecting corridor and not on the NEC; unfunded projects along the NEC with ongoing or completed NEPA/PE; fully or partially funded transit (e.g., NJ TRANSIT, MTA-LIRR) or freight projects located off of but connecting to the NEC. A project to connect Boston's North and South stations, such as the North South Rail Link, could be studied separately, and is not precluded as future investment.
Maits_Sc	I do believe it should be extended as far as Richmond and, perhaps, to north of it too.	The Preferred Alternative includes frequent connections to and from markets south of Washington, D.C., with capacity to support as many as two trains per hour in each direction. It also includes extension of service to Hartford and Springfield with upgrades and electrification of the Hartford/Springfield Line and creates opportunities for increased services to the Keystone Corridor via Philadelphia. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Maits_Sc	But this Philadelphia tunnel is something we don't need... 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.	The Preferred Alternatives focuses on upgrades to the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment. It will continue to serve Philadelphia 30th Street Station as well as include a new station at Philadelphia International Airport. It does not include a second downtown station in Philadelphia. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Maits_Sc	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.... 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.	The Preferred Alternatives focuses on upgrades to the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment. It will continue to serve Philadelphia 30th Street Station as well as a new station at Philadelphia International airport. It does not include a second downtown station in Philadelphia. As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, and will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure. The specific location for and design of improvements in the Philadelphia area will be determined during subsequent Tier 2 project studies. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Maits_Sc	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 Preferred Alternatives focuses on upgrades to the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment. It will continue to serve Philadelphia 30th Street Station as well as a new station at Philadelphia International airport. It does not include a second downtown station in Philadelphia. As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, and will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure. The specific location for and design of improvements in the Philadelphia area will be determined during subsequent Tier 2 project studies. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.

Table JJ–7: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Maits_Sc	At Frankford Junction, that's the other problem here. These are all inner city issues... That tunnel would not fix the Frankford junction accident site... 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 would be four tracks, and I would prefer it actually to be an EI 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.	The Preferred Alternatives focuses on upgrades to the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment. It will continue to serve Philadelphia 30th Street Station as well as a new station at Philadelphia International airport. It does not include a second downtown station in Philadelphia. As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, and will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure. The specific location for and design of improvements in the Philadelphia area will be determined during subsequent Tier 2 project studies. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Maits_Sc	This is incredibly important for Wilmington, Delaware as it does not have an airport to have a high-speed line, even if not all the trains stop here, as could be the case. You would have more trains than you have today. They are downtown currently in the current station. It's a gorgeous station. It can be expanded. And if there's some not stopping, they wouldn't need to go through that way.	The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrades to the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment. The Preferred Alternative, described in Volume 1, Chapter 4, includes a supplemental track to the east of the existing Wilmington station to provide a faster route for some Intercity Express trains. However, both intercity and regional rail Service to Wilmington will be expanded.
Maits_Sc	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.	The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrades to the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment. Economic development will be spurred with the Preferred Alternative as it offers more frequent convenient connections to more places that will be used by more travelers. The existing network is strengthened because populations in the urban cores will have better access to jobs and destinations throughout the northeast region. Volume 1, Chapter 6 provides discussion on the economic effects of the Preferred Alternative.
Malmberg_Ba	I am writing on behalf of Visit New Haven concerning the NEC Future Tier 1 Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Northeast Corridor. As a tourism marketer for Greater New Haven, I am expressing deep concern about FAA's intent to analyze future route alignments which bypass Union Station in New Haven.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA has identified a Preferred Alternative to improve passenger rail service on the NEC in a manner that will enhance mobility options and expand passenger rail service in support of future population and employment growth in the Study Area. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative provides connections along the existing Northeast Corridor, along a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT and Kenyon, RI, and along the Hartford/Springfield Line. Improved service with increased frequencies of both intercity and Regional rail at New Haven is included in the Preferred Alternative.
Marcus_Su	The updating of tracks and tunnels around NYC should be the highest priority or the whole system may fail.	As described in Volume 2, Chapter 4, Alternatives Considered, all Action Alternatives address critical capacity issues through New York City, including new tunnels under the Hudson River between New Jersey and New York. The Preferred Alternative, described in Volume 1, Chapter 4, includes new third and fourth Hudson River tunnels, beginning on embankment east of Secaucus Rail Station, terminating south of the existing NEC and Penn Station New York, under West 31st Street. In addition, the Preferred Alternative includes two tunnels under the Easter River. Portal Bridge is identified as a Related Project in the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. Funding and financing the projects necessary to implement the Preferred Alternative will be an incremental process for the federal government, Amtrak, the NEC states and stakeholders, and the entire region. This process will require the commitment of both the public and private sectors over a long period of time. The FRA and the NEC Commission will take a leading role in working with Congress to support the funding necessary to advance implementation, utilizing existing and future funding and financing programs and options. Funding and financing options will be further detailed in the Service Development Plan. After the completion of the NEPA process, FRA will develop a Service Development Plan that will describe the projects to be prioritized for implementation as part of the first phase. For general information about phasing and implementation of the Preferred Alternative, please refer to Volume 1, Chapter 10.

Table JJ–7: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Marden_Ku	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.	As a result of the Tier 1 Draft EIS and the public comment process, the FRA has identified a Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4). The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints, and adds capacity to support more-frequent, faster, and more-reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. The Preferred Alternative does not extend the NEC beyond the limits of Boston South Station. A project to connect Boston's North and South stations, such as the North South Rail Link, could be studied separately, and is not precluded as future investment.
Marden_Ku	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.	Although the FRA has not included specifics on train and station maintenance and amenities in the Tier 1 EIS process, the Preferred Alternative includes investments to support infrastructure and operational improvements for passenger rail services and at stations. Volume 1, Chapter 4, provides representative operational improvements. The FRA considered existing storage and maintenance facility locations where capacity could be added to accommodate the rolling stock requirements of the Preferred Alternative. As identified in Volume 1, Chapter 4, Boston's Southampton Street Yard would be targeted for expansion to accommodate longer high-performance trainsets; and a new site would be required to accommodate full growth. Specific locations for storage and maintenance facilities will be addressed during subsequent Tier 2 project studies.
Marks_Ho	Raise the tunnels so double-decker passengers changes with dense seating can service the corridor.	As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, will not make decisions about equipment specifications or infrastructure-specific designs. Such decisions are made as part of Tier 2 project studies, which would include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate.
Maze_Wa	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	The FRA defined and developed the Preferred Alternative at a programmatic level, focusing on corridor-wide solutions within a Tier 1 EIS. Service and infrastructure assumptions made at the Tier 1 level are representative and illustrative to support analysis in both the alternatives development process and the Tier 1 EIS. These assumptions are not intended to be specific or prescriptive. Future services and operating plans will evolve as they are developed by NEC railroads. Subsequent Tier 2 analysis for projects in the NEC will provide greater detail on site-specific service and infrastructure requirements.
McDonald_Ne	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.	The Preferred Alternative includes frequent connections to and from markets south of Washington, D.C., with capacity to support as many as two trains per hour in each direction. The Preferred Alternative does include an extension of service south of Washington, D.C to Virginia. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.

Table JJ–7: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
McGee_Jo	What is the specific alignment of the proposals? Will acquisition of right of way be required? Are the improvements within the existing rail right of way? Or are the improvements within the 1-95 right of way? If the improvements are within the 1-95 right of way, what impact will that have regarding state plans to widen sections of I-95?	<p>As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure in the Tier 1 Record of Decision. Such decisions are made as part of the Tier 2 project planning and NEPA processes, which would include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate. Consistent with this process, the FRA developed Representative Routes for the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative, which provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the effects of each Alternative. Representative Routes define an envelope within which improvements might occur and whose location and construction type could change during subsequent Tier 2 project studies. The Preferred Alternative utilizes, to the extent practical, existing rights-of-way (adjacent to I-95, existing rail corridors, etc.) to minimize acquisition requirements and cost. The Preferred Alternative minimizes to the greatest extent possible, the use of greenfield corridors.</p> <p>NEC FUTURE is not meant to slow down work on the many existing transportation projects currently being implemented or planned in the Study Area. NEC FUTURE does evaluate overall capacity needs and potential improvements for the entire NEC. The FRA coordinates closely with the project teams on various projects to ensure that proposed NEC FUTURE investments are not precluded by project work.</p> <p>The FRA identified that the NEC FUTURE program and the Preferred Alternative are compatible with some but not all of the goals and objectives of the various state and regional plans based on the methodology described in Volume 2, Appendix E.02.</p>
McGee_Jo	What is specifically meant by an aerial structure, embankment, trenches or tunnels? Several different types of structures are proposed in Connecticut. For example, where would an aerial structure be located near the Stamford Station?	<p>Construction types are defined in Volumes 1 and 2, Chapter 4, and Volumes 1 and 2, Chapter 8. Generally aerial structures and embankments would be constructed above ground, and trenches and tunnels would be constructed below ground.</p> <p>The FRA defined and developed the Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative at a programmatic level, focusing on corridor-wide solutions within the context of the Tier 1 EIS process. Consistent with this process, the FRA developed Representative Routes, which provide a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the environmental effects of each alternative. Representative Routes define an “envelope” within which improvements might occur and whose location and construction type could change during subsequent Tier 2 project-level reviews. To this extent, the aerial structure near Stamford Station is generally located between the existing NEC and I-95; however, its location and construction type may change during subsequent Tier 2 project-level reviews. This is part of the New Rochelle to Greens Farms new segment, which is part of the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.</p>
McGill_Pa	I request you to use alternatives, such as running the train line along/beside the existing track.	<p>The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrades to the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment. It does not include a second spine. Where possible, improvements are kept within or just adjacent to the existing NEC. In some cases, new segments would be outside the existing NEC, particularly where topography or other natural or built conditions make it infeasible to achieve the desired capacity and travel times. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.</p>
McKeown_Eu	The new tunnel under the Hudson is needed - URGENTLY.	<p>The Preferred Alternative, described in Volume 1, Chapter 4, includes new third and fourth Hudson River tunnels, beginning on embankment east of Secaucus Rail Station, terminating south of the existing NEC and Penn Station New York, under West 31st Street. After the completion of the NEPA process, FRA will develop a Service Development Plan that will describe the projects to be prioritized for implementation as part of the first phase. For general information about phasing and implementation of the Preferred Alternative, please refer to Volume 1, Chapter 10.</p>

Table JJ–7: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Mehrotra_Ne	I like the fact that we are trying to get high-speed rail here, but the costs in this plan are frankly outrageous... 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.	As discussed in Volume 1, Chapter 10, the Preferred Alternative would be implemented incrementally both to meet realistic funding constraints and to minimize impacts of construction of passenger and freight operators using the NEC. The Preferred Alternative (and all Action Alternatives) include a first phase that consists of: major projects to replace aging infrastructure and to address major chokepoints; projects necessary to minimize adverse impacts on passengers and rail operations during construction; operational, efficiency, and appropriate organizational changes required to maximize the benefit and cost-effectiveness of investment in the NEC and provide for an enhanced passenger experience; passenger equipment with consistent performance standards across the NEC as described in Chapter 10, Phasing and Implementation. The capital costs estimate of the Preferred Alternative provides a conceptual estimate commensurate with the level of detail appropriate for a Tier 1 process to provide an accurate, documented, validated, and defensible cost estimate. Additional information on the capital cost methodology is provided in Volume 1, Appendix BB and Volume 2, Appendix B.
Metzger_Jo	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.	As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA considered representative routings, service plans and infrastructure improvements, but will not decide on specific technology or tools for implementation. Those decisions would be part of subsequent Tier 2 project studies or other planning processes. The FRA does have an on-going role in research and development of the new rail technology and as such would encourage that technological solutions or options be considered as appropriate.
Miller_An	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.	The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrades to the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment, as described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The FRA noted concerns about service on the New Haven-Hartford-Springfield line. In light of these and other considerations, the Preferred Alternative includes an enhanced, electrified Hartford/Springfield Line, leveraging recent and future investments to create intermodal connections and strengthen existing urban centers. While the Preferred Alternative does not extend the NEC east to Palmer, Worcester and Boston MA, it provides the opportunity for connections at Springfield to increased service north on the Vermonter corridor and east on the Inland Route. The FRA is coordinating with Massachusetts and Vermont on the Northern New England Intercity Rail Initiative, a separate study, to explore options for improved intercity rail service in New England.
Mogollon_Ma	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.	The purpose and need of NEC FUTURE includes improving connectivity through expanded and improved accessibility both within the NEC rail network and between NEC and the multimodal transportation system. Volume 2, Chapter 3 provides the purpose and need for NEC FUTURE. The Preferred Alternative combines key elements of all three Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate future growth in Northeast population and employment. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Monteiro_St	Attached is a document created by KSK Architects Planners Historians, Inc., one of the contractors supporting thhe development process of our 2025 Neighborhood Plan. As Laura states below, the document shows "how the Conrail line interacts with vacancy, retail corridors, key development sites, and missing connections, as well as showing best practices options for how to buffer the rail line from the neighborhood."... If you require additional information regarding this area, please let me know.	Thank you for the Information. The FRA reviewed it as part of the identification of the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Morris_Ro	Fix the chokepoints, and make the infrastructure more reliable. Fancier fixes are interesting, but not realizable.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4). The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative brings the NEC to a state of good repair and replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints, and adds capacity to support more-frequent, faster, and more-reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers.

Table JJ–7: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Mountanos_Tr	I'm mostly in favor of Alternative 1, especially since it -- one of the things you address is the Hudson Tubes.	The Preferred Alternative, described in Volume 1, Chapter 4, includes new third and fourth Hudson River tunnels, beginning on embankment east of Secaucus Rail Station, terminating south of the existing NEC and Penn Station New York, under West 31st Street.
Murdocco_Ri	As a region, Nassau and Suffolk Counties have more pressing transportation needs that affect residents and their livelihoods every day. Examples include construction of a third LIRR track between Floral Park and Hicksville, as well as the much-delayed Second Avenue Subway and East Side Access, all of which would open Long Island 's access to the Northeast Corridor.	This Tier 1 EIS allows for the advancement of No Action Alternative projects or Related Projects (as defined in the No Action Alternative Report, see Volume 2, Appendix B) in separate but concurrent NEPA processes. The LIRR Expansion project (third track between Floral Park and Hicksville as well as both Second Avenue Subway and East Side Access are projects in various stages of development by MTA and would continue to advance independent of NEC FUTURE. Anticipated service levels with the opening of MTA/LIRR East Side Access project and the proposed MTA/MNR Penn Station Access project are accounted for in the representative service plans for the Preferred Alternative. The FRA will continue to coordinate the technical analyses to ensure consistency with the Preferred Alternative.
Murphy_Kar	We do not need another Capitol expense the State of Connecticut is hundreds of millions of dollars in the red .	The FRA has noted concerns about funding to implement the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative will be implemented incrementally both to meet realistic funding constraints and to minimize impacts of construction of passenger and freight operators using the NEC. Funding and financing the projects necessary to implement the Preferred Alternative will be an incremental process for the federal government, Amtrak, the NEC states and stakeholders, and the entire region, as described in Volume 1, Chapter 10.
Napolitano_Ra	Before undertaking such a FUTUREISTIC PROJECT , why not consider eliminating the grade crossings on the MainLine, between Queens and Divide. No doubt this will improve the OTP and enhance the safety of vehicular traffic, that traverse over the crossings on a daily basis.	In all Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative, the existing NEC would be brought to a state of good repair by replacing or renewing aging infrastructure on the existing NEC and eliminating the backlog of infrastructure requiring replacement. Improvements to at-grade rail-highway crossings would be improved as appropriate, although grade-crossing elimination would be a consideration, the specific treatment would be decided in subsequent Tier 2 project studies. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The area between Queens and Divide Interlocking is on the Long Island Rail Road's (LIRR) Main Line in Nassau County, NY. The Preferred Alternative does not include service or improvements on the LIRR, which operates in Nassau and Suffolk Counties, NY. Enhanced LIRR service into Penn Station New York is accounted for in the Preferred Alternative; however, the specifics of LIRR service and improvements off of the NEC are outside the scope of NEC FUTURE.
Nauta_An	I propose an express train be utilized between Waterbury, Bridgeport, and New York City with bus service for points between Waterbury and Bridgeport, with the latter in both directions. Presently it requires a patron 2.5 hours to and from Waterbury and Grand Central during peak hours, and running express would cut that to under two hours, in my opinion.	The Alternative 3 routing options considered in the Tier 1 Draft EIS were not advanced as part of the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit. The Preferred Alternative brings the existing NEC to a state of good repair and maximizes its capacity through alleviation of chokepoints, addition of new tracks and segments at targeted locations, and implementation of service operational efficiencies. The Preferred Alternative includes an enhanced, electrified Hartford/Springfield Line. The Preferred Alternative also removes speed restrictions where practical and safe, reduces trip times, offers frequent Metropolitan and enhanced express Intercity services, and allows substantial growth for all Regional rail markets. For additional information on the Preferred Alternative, see Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Nealy_Hu	As preparation to dovetailing an improved NEC into the SEHSR corridor, what considerations have been made on dual-mode electric/diesel locomotives that can run the entire NPN-BOS trip without the need for a locomotive change? The locomotive change at WAS is usually :30 to :35+, and I think more consideration needs to be given to rolling stock	For the Preferred Alternative, the FRA has identified the performance requirement for electric operations on the NEC and further has allowed for the possible introduction of dual-mode technology to reduce delays and travel times associated with engine switches for long-distance trains operating under diesel power. As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA has identified overarching performance requirements, but will not make specific fleet decisions for either Intercity or Regional rail operations. Those decisions will be made in subsequent Tier 2 project studies.

Table JJ–7: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Nealy_Hu	Also, replacement of the Baltimore and Potomac tunnels, as well as adding additional track in to and out of NYP should be a priority.	As described in Volume 1, Chapter 4, the Preferred Alternative includes new, four-track infrastructure in tunnel, approaching Baltimore Penn Station from the west. The existing NEC between Lafayette Avenue and North Avenue in Baltimore City would be retired from passenger rail service. The Preferred Alternative includes new third and fourth Hudson River tunnels, beginning on embankment east of Secaucus Rail Station, terminating south of the existing NEC and Penn Station New York, under West 31st Street. After the conclusion of the NEPA process, the FRA will be developing a Service Development Plan in which it will identify projects that should be prioritized for implementation as part of a first phase; general information about phasing and implementation of the Preferred Alternative can be found in Volume 1, Chapter 10.
Nealy_Hu	Please, do not forget the Virginia connection to the NEC feeding from NPN, LYH, and RVR.	The Preferred Alternative includes up to two trains per hours to and from markets south of Washington, D.C. While the rail corridor south of Washington, D.C., is not electrified, use of dual power locomotives or future electrification would end the current need to change locomotives at Washington Union Station. This would significantly shorten the current delay in Washington, D.C. For additional information on the Preferred Alternative, see Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Nelson_Da	By the time this extremely expensive construction is done, trains on steel rails will be old technology. Decades from now it could be magnetic levitation or vacuum tubes. This low friction technology is likely to be faster than today's jet airplane travel. Vacuum tube trains may have the least impact to areas that it is traveling through. Quiet, narrow and can be hidden or covered in sensitive areas. Who knows in some segments it could be supersonic or hyper-sonic, but no one will hear it. NYC to Boston in a matter of minutes.	In separate studies, the FRA continues to explore new technologies such as maglev and is currently sponsoring a study of maglev between Baltimore and Washington, D.C. Such a system would require separate stations, and would not support run-through trains from connecting corridors nor offer proven integration efficiencies with today's NEC infrastructure and operators. For these reasons, the FRA did not incorporate advanced guideway or similar new technologies in the NEC FUTURE Alternatives Development Process. The Preferred Alternative does not include maglev. However, it also does not preclude the option in the future of building new transportation corridors supporting other technologies, such as maglev.
Nelson_Da	By the time this is built, trains on steel tracks may be an antiquated old technology. Two future possibilities are magnetic levitation and compression/vacuum tube trains. A magnetic levitation train car floats using an electromagnetic field and is nearly frictionless. Only air resistance. The one I know of that is in operation in China. Center of Beijing to the air port 19 miles away in 9 minutes, station to station at speeds of up to 300 mph. This on a straight more direct inland route from NYC to Boston should be considered. Faster yet, is vacuum tube technology moving capsule cars with air compression in the back and vacuum in the front. These whisking by in sound insulated tubes may not be noticed by those outside the tube. Siting through sensitive areas will be easier. Unfortunately for the airlines, future train travel will cut into their business. Check these two technologies out on You Tube.	In separate studies, the FRA continues to explore new technologies such as maglev and is currently sponsoring a study of maglev between Baltimore and Washington, D.C. Such a system would require separate stations, and would not support run-through trains from connecting corridors nor offer proven integration efficiencies with today's NEC infrastructure and operators. For these reasons, the FRA did not incorporate advanced guideway or similar new technologies in the NEC FUTURE Alternatives Development Process. The Preferred Alternative does not include maglev. However, it also does not preclude the option in the future of building new transportation corridors supporting other technologies, such as maglev.
Nelson_Kat	Can't the current route be upgraded to support faster service?	The existing NEC does not accommodate future growth in population and employment. By replacing aging infrastructure, eliminating chokepoints, and adding capacity, performance and reliability will be significantly improved for both Intercity and Regional rail service. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Noda_Mi	But, you know, the fact that the cost estimates are so inflated and the scope of each of these is, you know, inflated for, you know, for reasons that are -- you know, sort of, you know, defy understanding, it sort of, you know, discredits what should be a bit -- what should be, you know, a, you know, positive transformative process for all of us.	The capital costs estimate of the Preferred Alternative provides a conceptual estimate commensurate with the level of detail appropriate for a Tier 1 process to provide an accurate, documented, validated, and defensible cost estimate. Additional information on the capital cost methodology is provided in Volume 1, Appendix BB, and Volume 2, Appendix B.6.
Noda_Mi	You know, the detours for Philadelphia International Airport is great if you can get American Airlines to pay for it, because they're the only ones who will ever benefit from it. It's not a local transportation issue that, you know or that, you know, interests anybody outside of them, as far as I can tell. Because there, you know, there just aren't that many people who are taking Amtrak to catch a flight out of Philadelphia.	A key feature and benefit of the Preferred Alternative is freedom of mobility. The Preferred Alternative creates intermodal connections by concentrating improvements on urban hub stations well served by transit and by creating convenient airport services with frequent Intercity and Regional service. Specifically, the Preferred Alternative includes a new segment to connect to Philadelphia Airport. For additional details on the Preferred Alternative, see Volume 1, Chapter 4.

Table JJ–7: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Noda_Mi	there are critical things that could be done to, you know, vastly improve service on the Northeast Corridor through this region. Most of that is incredibly unsexy, but, you know, relatively cheap things that can be done to, you know, speed up and improve service through interlocking such as PHIL, which is where the Airport Line currently branches off; Zoo, which is the giant tangle north of 30th Street Station; you know, Shore, which is up in Kensington where the Amtrak 188 derailment took place, which is also where the New Jersey Transit Atlantic City Line branches off. And, you know, just, you know, each of those is, you know, a set -- is an interlocking set that slows down traffic on its own because, you know, the switches are old or at least of old design and are not capable of handling high-speed traffic... there are sharp curves at each one of those. Plus the PHIL, definitely the Zoo and the Shore, that could -- you know, that are, you know, just slow things down immensely... the only solution that has been, you know, brought for each of these problem sets is to bypass them widely by many, many miles.	<p>The FRA has incorporated several of these ideas into the Preferred Alternative. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for a complete description of the Preferred Alternative. As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure in the Tier 1 Record of Decision. Such decisions are made as part of the Tier 2 project planning and NEPA processes, which would include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative brings the NEC to a state of good repair and replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative includes new two-track segment north of 30th Street Station and continuing to the east of the Schuylkill River. The infrastructure follows I-76 on the east side before traversing the Schuylkill River on an aerial structure. Note the FRA recognizes the potential effects of this construction type and expects to evaluate alternative construction types to avoid potential effects on parklands and other environmental features in subsequent Tier 2 project studies.</p>
Nowak_JR	like the connection IF it stopped in any towns like East Lyme, Waterford AND it connected to the MBTA Boston-PVD-GREEN AIRPORT and any connecting local priced southwest terminus.	<p>The Preferred Alternative expands the level of service on the existing NEC between New Haven and Boston, resulting in increased Intercity and Regional service at existing stations along the shoreline. It adds both Intercity and Regional rail service to the T. F. Green airport station. In addition, a new supplemental segment will be added between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as considered under Alternative 1. A new station stop along this new segment is proposed in the area of New London/Mystic in Connecticut and is intended as a representational station location. As such, the specific location of such a station would be determined in subsequent Tier 2 studies, which would consider access to jobs and development opportunities in the general area of Groton, New London and Mystic.</p> <p>As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, and will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure. Such decisions would be made as part of the Tier 2 project planning processes, which would include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate. Description of the Preferred Alternative is provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4.</p>
Nucifora_Sa	You are planning the wrong path entirely. CONNECT THE AIRPORTS. Connect JFK, Laguardia, and Bradley via 300 mph high speed rail. The train should travel along 684 and 84 bringing Danbury and Waterbury within an hour of NYC. It would also put Bradley as an alternate airport in bad weather to NYC. Increasing the use of Bradley and enhance the economy of Danbury and Waterbury.	<p>The Preferred Alternative focuses on improvements to the existing NEC to accommodate growth in population and employment. A key feature and benefit of the Preferred Alternative is freedom of mobility. The Preferred Alternative creates intermodal connections by concentrating improvements on urban hub stations well served by transit and by creating convenient airport services with frequent intercity and regional service. The improved connectivity increases the number of markets served by the combined air-to-rail mode, and results in a rail system that gains more riders going to an airport for longer-distance flights, and an air system that gets better-quality ground access for its air passengers. This includes a new station at Philadelphia International Airport, as well as better integration with the Hartford/Springfield Line, which includes a station at Windsor Locks, enabling better connections to Bradley International Airport. Under the Preferred Alternative, improved frequencies and services would be provided at BWI, Newark and TF Green airports. Rail-Air connections considered for the Preferred Alternative are discussed in Volume 1, Chapter 4 and 5.</p>

Table JJ–7: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
O'Connor_He	Please prioritize the Inland Route via Palmer. The communities surrounding Springfield and Palmer will benefit from this high speed rail.	<p>The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrades to the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment. To better serve Central New England, the Preferred Alternative incorporates electrification on the Hartford/Springfield Line, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield on the NEC. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The FRA is coordinating with Massachusetts and Vermont on the Northern New England Intercity Rail Initiative, a separate study, to explore options for improved intercity rail service in New England.</p> <p>While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify the construction of additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network.</p>
Oles_Ma	I travel frequently, and would like to see service routes expanded, including reopening the Port Road from Harrisburg to Harve de Grace, so we could have direct access to BWI airport and the rail station there.	The FRA considered a wide-range of possible rail lines and routes during the initial development of alternatives. These possible rail lines, such as the Port Road Branch, were initially considered as the FRA identified a set of Preliminary Alternatives that would meet the Purpose and Need identified for NEC FUTURE. In selecting routes for further consideration, the FRA focused on those that served existing or underserved markets; smaller markets such as those served by the Port Branch were not advanced into the Preliminary Alternatives. A complete description of the Initial Alternatives and screening process is provided in Volume 2, Appendix B.2.
Oles_Ma	I would also like to see through sleeper service brought back to the Pittsburgh train.	A number of Intercity trains connect the NEC with long-distance markets in Vermont, Pittsburgh and the Midwest, and Florida and South. These trains are operated today by Amtrak and can include sleeper and dining car services. The Preferred Alternative assumes continued operation of these trains with operating characteristics similar to those of today.
O'Malley_Br	We raise the question why we are studying MagLev with \$28M in federal dollars separately from the NEC Futures effort. It seems to make more sense to consider MagLev among the alternatives for the NEC and evaluate all of them.	In separate studies, the FRA continues to explore new technologies such as maglev and is currently sponsoring a study of maglev between Baltimore and Washington, D.C. Such a system would require separate stations, and would not support run-through trains from connecting corridors nor offer proven integration efficiencies with today’s NEC infrastructure and operators. For these reasons, the FRA did not incorporate advanced guideway or similar new technologies in the NEC FUTURE Alternatives Development Process. The Preferred Alternative does not include maglev. However, it also does not preclude the option in the future of building new transportation corridors supporting other technologies, such as maglev. The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrading the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment (as described in Volume 1, Chapter 4).
O'Malley_Br	We urge you to consider Baltimore and BWI Airport as locations critical to the economic growth and movement of goods and people along the NEC.	The Preferred Alternative includes significant increases in service for both the BWI and Baltimore train stations, as both are critical to the future success of the NEC. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Orleans_Bi	I would vote for alternative 3, but I would prefer to have an alternative 4 to really transform the Northeast corridor. And I would add an S to that making it plural corridors with suggestions that there would be connectivity further north than what's presented in alternative 3, and suggestions as to how connections west from the Northeast corridors would be implemented as well.	The Preferred Alternative does not include a second spine as proposed in the Tier 1 Draft EIS Alternative 3. However, it greatly enhances connectivity between trains operating on the NEC and to corridors connecting with the NEC, such as the Southeast High Speed Rail Corridor to Richmond, the Keystone Corridor to Harrisburg, and the Empire Corridor to Albany/Rochester. The Preferred Alternative also incorporates the Hartford/Springfield Line, providing one-seat service to Hartford and Springfield. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4, and Connecting Corridors are described in Volume 1, Chapter 4 and 5. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions.

Table JJ–7: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Palmer_Pe	As part of all three proposed action alternatives the Raritan Valley Rail Coalition is fully supportive of constructing the Hunter Flyover to relieve a chokepoint which will allow Amtrak's and NJ Transit's Raritan Valley service to operate more efficiently into and out of Newark Penn Station. The Hunter Connection Flyover is a critical connection that will allow Amtrak trains to operate with fewer interruptions to Amtrak service on the Northeast Corridor. The Hunter Flyover will allow Raritan Valley line trains to operate by bypassing all but one of the NEC tracks allowing the Raritan Valley line trains to connect to the eastern most NEC track into and out of Newark Penn Station.	<p>As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure in the Tier 1 Record of Decision. Such decisions are made as part of the Tier 2 project planning and NEPA processes, which would include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate. Consistent with this process, the FRA developed Representative Routes for the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative, which provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the effects of each Alternative. Representative Routes define an envelope within which improvements might occur and whose location and construction type could change during subsequent Tier 2 project studies.</p> <p>The Hunter Flyover is identified as a Related Project and was considered in the overall envelope created for the Representative Route for Action Alternatives, and the Preferred Alternative. The benefits of the project are included as part of the analysis of project impacts of the three Action Alternatives described in the Tier I Draft EIS document as well as included in the analysis for the Preferred Alternative presented in the Tier 1 Final EIS Volume 1.</p>
Papp_AI	And one thing that did strike me that was not being considered is the use of joint utility rate-of-way. ...Today it is used by public service enterprise high tension wires. That is a straight line basically between Newark and Trenton. It could be used for high speed rail, rather than trying to disrupt communities with placing existing tracks along the existing NEC right-of-way. ... I would strongly urge that the NEC future consultants take a look at what alternative electric utility and/or road rights-of-way, interstate rights-of-way, turnpike rights-of-way could be used, rather than trying to Siamese a high speed line in with an already existing one.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional train travelers.</p> <p>Consistent with the Tier 1 NEPA process, the FRA developed Representative Routes for the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative, which provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the effects of each Alternative. Representative Routes define an envelope within which improvements might occur and whose location and construction type could change during subsequent Tier 2 project studies.</p>
Patelunas_An	And we should also consider, when purchasing trains, that they should have high reliability, high initial acceleration, high power to weight ratio, and ensure that they could tilt. That -- if -- that way we will be able to save money without spending two billion dollars on concrete.	The FRA considered a range of potential rolling stock types for passenger rail service on the NEC. As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA will establish a long-term vision and investment plan for the NEC, but will not make decisions about fleet composition and equipment design or procurement for NEC rail operators. Specific requirements for rolling stock and other equipment will be considered in subsequent Tier 2 project studies.
Pazzano_Pr	I travel from BWI to NYP frequently and am fairly satisfied with the service. However, the trains are often late. There also has to be a better way of boarding trains at NYP other than the mad rush. This is stressful and shouldn't be necessary.	The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrading the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment. By replacing aging infrastructure, eliminating chokepoints, and adding capacity, the reliability of the system will be significantly enhanced. The Preferred Alternative also includes improvements that would enhance and speed up boarding at major terminals. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Penn Design_Taylor_Yaro	One of the faulty assumptions in the ridership model was the forecasts ' attempts to remain "conservative," which has enormous impacts on these forecasts: The authors should consider potential boosts in ridership as a result of improved connectivity between Regional and Intercity services The authors should consider interrelatedness between the rail improvements, changes in travel patterns, and economic development. Induced demand. Other HSR and high-speed commuter services have experienced dramatic increases in induced demand, often way above ridership forecasts prepared before these services were introduced. We believe that there would be similar significant increases in demand for improved NEC services if they were created here. These should be incorporated into ridership forecasts for Alternative 3 services. These are crucial points, especially for Alternative 3, which maximizes these conditions and therefore, ridership.	<p>For NEC FUTURE, the FRA focused on corridor-wide ridership potential based on representative service plans. Specific effects of improved transit connections or the opportunities to better integrate Regional and Intercity services would be further analyzed in subsequent planning processes. Intercity and Regional rail connections are accounted for in some degree with the addition of Metropolitan service.</p> <p>The NEC FUTURE Interregional model accounts for some corridor-wide induced demand. As noted in Volume 1, Chapter 6, the FRA did not model local alternative economic growth or development scenarios, but did rely on insights from discussions with experts to understand the potential for economic growth with passenger rail improvements proposed in the Preferred Alternative. Given the scale and level of detail at which alternatives were evaluated for NEC FUTURE, this qualitative assessment is appropriate. The local nature of decisions influencing future development and economic growth will be assessed in subsequent Tier 1 project studies, including participation of local stakeholders and the public. Subsequent planning processes will provide further insights into the range of possible economic development benefits and potential for induced demand.</p>

Table JJ–7: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Penn Design_Taylor_Yaro	The ridership model utilized a survey to gauge users' responses to the action alternatives. However, several proxies were misleading, and therefore question, if not nullify, their results: Defining high-speed rail: participants were told that the high-speed rail proposed in Alternative 3 is comparable to the existing Acela line. This is problematic because the Acela train operates at speeds much lower than that of the high-speed service proposed in Alternative 3. The difference is one of seventy miles per hour in maximum speed. This makes it less likely for participants to say that they would switch to Alternative 3, therefore underestimating the line's potential ridership base. Survey design: the authors note that the stated preference portion of the survey may not cover a wide enough range of service characteristics in the questionnaire to induce mode-switching. According to traditional utility models, Alternative 3's high-speed rail proposal provides the greatest utility compared to other alternatives, again underestimating the benefits of Alternative 3.	The Stated Preference (SP) survey provided example travel times, frequency, and cost for all competing modes. The travel times and frequency provided for the high-speed alternative in the SP exercises were consistent with service plans for Alternative 3 which reflect very high speeds and frequency in the corridor. The comparison to the current Acela service plan was made to give the respondent a reference point for service features other than those explicitly detailed (such as leg room, work space, etc.) and to communicate the premium nature of the service. However, one finding of the analysis is that market specific factors other than travel time/frequency/cost have a great deal of impact on ridership. Volume 1, Appendix B and Volume 2, Appendix BB provide the ridership methodology and application results.
Penn Design_Taylor_Yaro	In the mode choice section of the ridership model, the authors define a saturation point - referred to as "Dampened Function of Frequency" - of fifty trains a day, stating that frequencies greater than that decrease in importance in determining mode choice. The rationale that the authors provide is that this transformation in the model induces the best model fit with existing and past information. Again, this provision disproportionately impacts Alternative 3, as it proposes the highest number of trains per day. Unlike the two previous flaws in the ridership model, the reliance on the saturation point may be justified (as per logit models and other mode choice models) that yield marginal benefits with increases as you approach infinity. That said, it is the reliance upon past or existing information as a means to fit the model that is faulty: the types of service and improvements in Alternative 3 would introduce a level of service new to the megaregion. This means that fitting the saturation point to an incongruous past does not adequately reflect a reality where Alternative 3 exists.	The use of dampened function of frequency is standard practice in interregional modeling, and is a response that is not expected to change in the future, even with higher levels of service. Based on comments received, the FRA did re-assess the appropriateness and effects of this utility and confirmed it would not result in measurable change in the relative performance of Action Alternatives compared to the No Action Alternative. The results of this reassessment are summarized in Volume 1, Appendix BB.
Perreault_Ma	The money that it would take for Alternatives 2 and 3 is better spent on improvements to connecting lines in Virginia to Richmond and Norfolk, to the Empire Corridor, an extended Keystone Corridor west to Pittsburgh, new service to Lehigh Valley, PA and a North-South rail link in Boston.	The Preferred Alternative includes frequent connections to and from markets south of Washington, D.C., with capacity to support as many as two trains per hour in each direction. It also includes extension of service to Hartford and Springfield with upgrades and electrification of the Hartford/Springfield Line and creates opportunities for increased services to the Keystone Corridor via Philadelphia. The Preferred Alternative does include an extension of service north of Boston. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. Connecting corridors are addressed in Volume 1, Chapters 4 and 5.
Persson_Jo	There was once a direct rail line between Boston and New York that went through Portland Ct called the Airline that may also be considered. If elevated this could be a truly high speed rail route. Conversely building an elevated route that rides above I95 traffic is viable and has no impact on surrounding towns. Pre-fab construction is indicated.	<p>The former Air Line route between New Haven, CT, and Boston, MA, was initially considered during alternatives development as a possible route for a second spine; however, it was not advanced for further consideration because it includes many curves, which prevented trip-time improvements and did not directly serve either the Hartford, CT, or Providence, RI, markets. Although not tied to any one route, the FRA did look to stay within existing transportation corridors to the extent practical. The Air Line route was not only not well-suited to the overall needs defined for NEC FUTURE, but is also designated a Connecticut State Park Trail (Air Line Route State Park Trail). For these reasons it was eliminated from consideration as an Initial Alternative.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative does not include a routing connecting Hartford, CT, and Providence, RI, as shown in Alternatives 2 and 3. The Preferred Alternative combines key elements of all three Action Alternatives to accommodate future growth in Northeast population and employment. The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.</p>

Table JJ–7: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Petrides_Pe	Secondly, how will the train station access be integrated into the local areas/community? I've lived in Mainz Germany, for over three years, and they had a pretty good system that was well integrated for all modes of transportation. (pedestrian, bicycle, trolley, bus)	Connectivity to local transit at NEC stations is critical to achieving the full potential of public transportation along the NEC. The NEC FUTURE program follows a "tiered" approach to environmental review. Tier 1 focuses on broad programs and initial analysis. Tier 2 focuses on site-specific, project-level proposals and impacts. Consistent with the Tier 1 NEPA process, the Preferred Alternative does not include specific improvements at stations to enhance connectivity with local transit or car sharing, but accommodating these and other future modes would be important elements of future upgrades and improvements at those stations required to accommodate growth and would be considered at subsequent Tier 2 project processes. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. Connectivity is discussed in Volume 1, Chapter 5.
Plaughter_Da	In our previous letter to the NEC Future project team dated April 17, 2013 we stated: it is imperative that as the NEC Future vision plan is advanced to its Tier 1 completion that it continues to take into account the envisioned service levels included in connected intercity and high speed rail corridors such as the Southeast High Speed Rail Corridor segments extending from Washington to Richmond and Hampton Roads. The Tier 1 E.I.S. for the Richmond to Hampton Roads High Speed Rail Corridor envisions 15 passenger trains initiating and terminating from Newport News and Norfolk connecting Richmond, Washington, New York, and potentially Boston. For the Northeast to get the full benefits of its connectivity to Virginia, any future corridor alignment or enhancements chosen should take into account service levels anticipated by the corridor plans for Washington to Richmond, Richmond to Hampton Roads, and future increases of Regional service to Lynchburg and Roanoke, as well as Raleigh, NC. This continues to be our primary focus in submitting comments regarding the draft report.	<p>The Preferred Alternative includes frequent connections to and from markets south of Washington, D.C., with capacity to support as many as two trains per hour in each direction. The Preferred Alternative does include an extension of service south of Washington, D.C to Virginia. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.</p> <p>Service beyond the study area, including Richmond-Hampton Roads, was considered in the alternatives development process. The FRA and the state of Virginia are separately advancing improvements to the Southeast Corridor as part of the Southeast High-Speed Rail corridor program.</p>
Ploof_Ch	Please strongly consider a rail stop on Palmer, MA. The pros heavily outweigh the cons and western Massachusetts needs the connection desperately. Both the Montrealer, and then the Vermonter, came up the route from New London, through Monson, then stopped in Palmer but didn't take on passengers. This is such a shame, and Palmers central raillocation makes it the perfect spot.	<p>The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrades to the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment. To better serve Central New England, the Preferred Alternative incorporates electrification on the Hartford/Springfield Line, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield on the NEC. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The FRA is coordinating with Massachusetts and Vermont on the Northern New England Intercity Rail Initiative, a separate study, to explore options for improved intercity rail service in New England.</p> <p>While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify the construction of additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network.</p>
Plouffe_Do	There needs to be a stop in western ma and the Palmer station would be ideal. We have available parking that would accommodate many vehicles. Please consider amending this	<p>The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrades to the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment. To better serve Central New England, the Preferred Alternative incorporates electrification on the Hartford/Springfield Line, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield on the NEC. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The FRA is coordinating with Massachusetts and Vermont on the Northern New England Intercity Rail Initiative, a separate study, to explore options for improved intercity rail service in New England.</p> <p>While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify the construction of additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network.</p>
Prael_Jo	Track work is needed badly on the NYC- Boston route to allow the train to operate at maximum speeds. New tunnels are needed entering NY Penn Station from New Jersey.	The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative, described in Volume 1, Chapter 4, includes projects to replace aging infrastructure, eliminate chokepoints and add capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers.

Table JJ–7: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Prophet_Ga	...we obviously need more equipment. For those of you who frequently ride the service, the antiquated equipment was mostly built along 30 -- 30 years ago. And for those of us traveling around holidays, it was disappointing to see that a lot of the trains were operating with only six, seven, eight cars. There's no reason why during the holidays every single train is not 10, 11 cars and that's true on the Northeast Corridor, and it was also true on the Empire Corridor where some trains just operated with just six cars, were sold out six weeks in advance but Amtrak just doesn't have the equipment to do it. So I think as part of any type of rebuilding, you need to immediately to look at getting new equipment and new single level coaches for passengers to ride because there isn't even enough to meet the demand of today.	As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA considered a range of rolling stock types and broad fleet requirements for proposed Intercity service, but will not decide on specific rolling stock specifications. Performance standards for rolling stock operating on the NEC in the Preferred Alternative are discussed in Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative and in Volume 1, Appendix BB. Specific rolling stock options would be considered in subsequent planning processes.
Prophet_Ga	...common ticketing is certainly a requirement. I grew up in Buffalo where EZ Pass was first tested. That was tested for several years before it went anywhere else. So I know it's a long process, an involved process, longer than maybe most of the public might think as far as getting -- as getting EZ Pass done but, certainly, through ticketing with Amtrak and the Corridor, would certainly help out.	As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA focused on corridor-wide benefits and impacts with regard to opportunities for creating efficiencies with common or integrated fare medium. The FRA will not make decisions about specific technologies or operator-specific applications as part of NEC FUTURE. Those decisions are made in subsequent Tier 2 project studies and would include stakeholder ad public involvement. The Preferred Alternative assumes development and use of a common fare medium across the NEC for service on any of the NEC passenger rail systems. In addition, the FRA intends to work with the railroads to provide scheduled connections between different regional trains and between trains operating to and from connecting corridors. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Prophet_Ga	...the Northeast Corridor is electrified but south of Washington and also north of New Haven to Hartford, currently isn't. There's is some type of dual locomotive that could actually operate from Richmond up to the Northeast Corridor up to Hartford, and over to Boston without having to change the locomotive anywhere. Obviously, we wouldn't need a lot of them but just a few of them would provide a lot of that additional flexibility and connect a lot of people in the Northeast Corridor much better.	The Preferred Alternative incorporates the Hartford/Springfield Line as part of the NEC, facilitating one-seat service from Hartford and Springfield onto the NEC. The Hartford/Springfield Line would be electrified to support faster and more convenient service. Use of dual power locomotives could also reduce delays caused by the need to change locomotives for trains entering the NEC from south of Washington, D.C. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Randall_Ro	I think they should also add trains going north/south throughout Long Island along the 110 corridor along William Floyd to the beaches on north and south shores	As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA did not evaluate connections to the existing LIRR or north-south connections along the Route 110 corridor. The FRA focused on the existing NEC and connecting corridors. For NEC FUTURE, the FRA focused on connections between urban centers at a broad scale, looking at metropolitan areas along the existing NEC and ways to improve or expand service to those markets. The opportunities for connections to the NEC and stations served by the NEC were important considerations in the FRA's analysis of service improvements. The FRA did not expand its analysis beyond the NEC which is shared by both Intercity and Regional railroads. Further, the scope of NEC FUTURE did not include location-specific transit solutions such as the referenced Route 110 corridor which is the subject of an on-going study. Connecting services to be provided by transit agencies such as the LIRR or local transit providers, such as Nassau or Suffolk counties on Long Island would complement the broader, corridor-wide perspective of NEC FUTURE. In this regard, the FRA coordinates closely with the Regional railroads within the Study Area with regard to their long-term planning processes.
Ranelli_J	...better the time, energy and considerable resources be put into simply upgrading the present amtrak right of way and track (really fixing it for safe, high- speed travel) and, AND, maybe less simply, putting light rail back in play, from border to border, in the medians of our highways... heavy lifting to be sure, but it will create a dedicated facility that can be up graded as technology moves us along, say, from electricity to compressed air to magnetic force, whatever...how about a test stretch, on 395, say from new london to the casinos, (fixing the i-95 death trap in east lyme along the way), then, once it's right, up the rest of 395 and full-stream onto 95 beginning with fairfield county? ...then 84, 9/91	The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. The Preferred Alternative brings the existing NEC to a state of good repair and maximizes its capacity through alleviation of chokepoints, addition of new tracks and segments at targeted locations, and implementation of service operational efficiencies. The Preferred Alternative also removes speed restrictions where practical and safe, reduces trip times, offers frequent Metropolitan and enhanced express Intercity services, and allows substantial growth for all Regional rail markets. The Preferred Alternative also incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line as part of the NEC, providing one-seat ride service to and from the NEC and Springfield. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.

Table JJ–7: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Rescigno_An	The primary concern and objective of our member businesses, their employees, and their customers, is the need for dramatically improved commuter travel time to New York City together with improved travel time and more frequent service to Washington and Boston. ... I encourage you to issue a final EIS that recommends (1) dramatically improved commuter travel time from New Haven to New York City on the coastal route; (2) improved travel time and more frequent service to and from Washington and Boston on the coastal route, Hartford-Springfield route and, if feasible, a Long Island tunnel;	<p>The Preferred Alternative would improve travel times from New Haven to New York City on the NEC by as much as 25 minutes for the Intercity-Express service, resulting in a trip time from New Haven to New York City of about 1 hour. The Preferred Alternative includes upgrade of the existing NEC shoreline route with a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1, and enhanced electrified service along the Hartford/Springfield Line to Hartford, CT and Springfield, MA to strengthen service to Central New England.</p> <p>In the Preferred Alternative, from Washington, D.C., to New Haven, there would be 10 trains per hour in the peak hour, or five times as many Intercity trains. From New Haven to Boston, there would be 6 trains per hour in the peak hour. From New Haven to Springfield, there would be 4 trains per hour in the peak hour, or three times as many Intercity trains than in the No Action Alternative. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.</p>
Reuter_Ro	Philadelphia and the crazy interlocking system there at Zoo tower and processing the northern part of Philadelphia, it originally went straight through, and they changed it back in the '30s when they put all the electric in. So going back to the way it was before.	As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, and will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure in the Tier 1 Record of Decision. Such decisions would be made as part of the Tier 2 project planning and NEPA processes, which would include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate. This would apply to improvements considered under the Preferred Alternative in the Philadelphia area aimed at reducing travel time, increasing capacity and integrating intercity and regional service, as described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Reuter_Ro	Susquehanna River Bridge needs to be changed. I mean, that -- that thing is ready to fall down. The -- there are several other places where wider tracks -- certainly everybody knows that there needs to be more tunnels under the Hudson River.	<p>As a result of the Tier 1 Draft EIS and the public comment process, the FRA has identified a Preferred Alternative to improve passenger rail service on the NEC in a manner that will enhance mobility options and expand passenger rail service in support of future population and employment growth in the Study Area. The Preferred Alternative brings the existing NEC to a state of good repair by replacing or renewing aging infrastructure and eliminating the backlog of infrastructure requiring replacement.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative does include a four-track Susquehanna River Bridge. The specific design and configuration for the Susquehanna River Bridge are under consideration as part of the Susquehanna River Bridge Replacement Project. As the lead agency for the Susquehanna River Bridge replacement project, the FRA will ensure coordination between that effort and NEC FUTURE.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4) includes new third and fourth Hudson River tunnels, beginning on embankment east of Secaucus Rail Station, terminating south of the existing NEC and Penn Station New York, under West 31st Street.</p>
Reuter_Ro	And the -- north of New York City, there really needs to be a new right-of-way between the Hell Gate Bridge and New Haven. Metro North is not a very friendly -- excuse me. It's not a very friendly location, and they are slowing you guys down something terrible. Unless you can work something out with Metro North, I think you're going to have to get off their right-of-way.	The Preferred Alternative adds new capacity across the NEC, including the portion of the NEC between New York and New Haven. This will support additional regional rail service to Penn Station New York and faster intercity rail service. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.

Table JJ–7: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Reuter_Ro	North of New Haven, the movable bridges are the biggest problem. They are restricting the number of trains that can be operated. Also, the great crossing into Connecticut, they need to be eliminated. These are all relatively minor things, but not cheap.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4). The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives, including Alternatives 2 and 3, to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints, and adds capacity to support more-frequent, faster, and more-reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers.</p> <p>In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative provides connections along the existing NEC along a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, and along the Hartford/Springfield Line, which strengthens service to Central New England and leverages existing investments and identified market opportunities. The length and location of the supplemental new segment in the Preferred Alternative from Old Saybrook, CT, to Kenyon, RI, is representative. The location of this representative route is based on three objectives: (1) it must be of sufficient length to provide the time for faster trains using the supplemental track to pass slower trains using the existing NEC; (2) it should bypass the five movable bridges between Old Saybrook and Mystic, CT; and (3) it should bypass the e11 remaining at-grade crossings between Waterford and Stonington, CT.</p>
Reuter_Ro	Obviously, there needs to be a connection between North and South station so the trains can run straight through from Portland to Richmond and extend to the Northeast corridor to cover the entire Northeast.	<p>The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The North South Rail Link was not included in the No Action Alternative Project List (see Volume 2, Appendix B.1) since it does not meet the criteria for consideration: Funded projects or projects with approved funding plans, funded or unfunded mandates, unfunded projects necessary to keep the railroad running. Likewise, North South Rail Link was not included as a Related Project in the Action Alternatives because it does not meet the criteria for consideration: fully or partially funded projects located in a connecting corridor and not on the NEC; unfunded projects along the NEC with ongoing or completed NEPA/PE; fully or partially funded transit (e.g., NJ TRANSIT, MTA-LIRR) or freight projects located off of but connecting to the NEC. A project to connect Boston's North and South stations, such as the North South Rail Link, could be studied separately, and is not precluded as future investment.</p>
Reuter_Ro	Number one, fix the MPV tunnel, get away from it, give it to the MARC railroad. Fix the Susquehanna River Bridge. Fix the rest of your movable bridges. A new entrance into New York and a nice secondary level.	<p>The FRA has incorporated several of these ideas into the Preferred Alternative. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for a complete description of the Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative includes a new, four-track infrastructure in tunnel, approaching Baltimore Penn Station from the west. The existing NEC, between Lafayette Avenue and North Avenue in Baltimore City would be retired from passenger rail service.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative does include a four-track Susquehanna River Bridge. The specific design and configuration for the Susquehanna River Bridge are under consideration as part of the Susquehanna River Bridge Replacement Project. As the lead agency for the Susquehanna River Bridge replacement project, the FRA will ensure coordination between that effort and NEC FUTURE.</p> <p>In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative includes upgrading the existing NEC shoreline route and the addition of a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. It also bypasses the movable bridges and the 11 remaining at-grade crossings on the NEC.</p>

Table JJ–7: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Rhum_Da	Do you have construction time and cost estimates on line now?	<p>The capital costs estimate of the Preferred Alternative provides a conceptual estimate commensurate with the level of detail appropriate for a Tier 1 process to provide an accurate, documented, validated, and defensible cost estimate. Additional information on the capital cost methodology is provided in Volume 1, Appendix BB, and Volume 2, Appendix B.6.</p> <p>Actual costs could meaningfully differ after more-refined engineering and design work is completed, value engineering occurs, selections of construction and staging methodologies are made, or price inflation/deflation occurs. The capital costs do not represent or include any specific implementation timelines, project delivery methods, funding sources, penalties or fees associated with construction impacts to existing operations, railroad force account construction costs that exceed direct labor required for the work, or temporary construction access agreements with the operating railroads.</p>
Richards_Me	Some solutions to the NEC Future are uniquely available in the South End of the corridor. The CSX Long Bridge across the Potomac dates to 1904 (with parts of the structure even older). It suffers from neglect and is a chokepoint for current rail traffic entering the NEC from the south. It is perhaps the greatest limiting factor to the further expansion of passenger rail from Virginia and the south, as all Amtrak long-distance, Virginia NER and VRE commuter trains must schedule bridge crossings at times available to CSX. The greatest relief on the South End of the NEC would be to route some CSX freight around DC by constructing an additional Potomac River rail crossing downstream in the vicinity of the Route 301 bridge.	NEC FUTURE is a comprehensive planning effort to define, evaluate, and prioritize future investments in the Northeast Corridor (NEC), from Washington, D.C. to Boston. The Preferred Alternative includes up to two trains per hours to and from markets south of Washington, D.C. With implementation of the Preferred Alternative, service on the NEC would become significantly more reliable with replacement of aging infrastructure and elimination of delay-causing chokepoints. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. South of Washington, D.C, the FRA is coordinating with the State of Virginia and the District of Columbia to advance improvements between Richmond, VA, and Washington, D.C., including the Long Bridge Corridor over the Potomac River, to support increased and more-reliable service.
Richards_Me	VRPI urges the FRA to implement the Gateway Project with all deliberate speed. Virginia and all the constituents of the NEC have too much at stake to allow these tunnels to close. Following the construction of a second Hudson Tunnel and needed repairs to the old tunnel, the additional tracks from the project will double the capacity of the NEC and open slots for more frequent and reliable Amtrak service. We are encouraged by recent agreements to move forward with the project. Anything else risks the catastrophic failure of the NEC and with it, the loss of years of progress in state-supported intercity rail for Virginia.	<p>The Preferred Alternative, described in Volume 1, Chapter 4, includes new third and fourth Hudson River tunnels, beginning on embankment east of Secaucus Rail Station, terminating south of the existing NEC and Penn Station New York, under West 31st Street. The Preferred Alternative, described in Volume 1, Chapter 4, includes new third and fourth Hudson River tunnels, beginning on embankment east of Secaucus Rail Station, terminating south of the existing NEC and Penn Station New York, under West 31st Street.</p> <p>The Gateway program is Amtrak's proposed set of strategic infrastructure improvements to improve service and address capacity constraints in the area of New York City in New York and New Jersey. Separate from the Gateway program, the Hudson Tunnel Project is intended to preserve the current functionality of the NEC's Hudson River rail crossing between New Jersey and New York and strengthen the resilience of the NEC; FRA and NJ TRANSIT are currently leading the NEPA process for the Hudson Tunnel Project. The Gateway Program and the Hudson Tunnel Project are separate from the NEC FUTURE program. NEC FUTURE does evaluate overall capacity needs and potential improvements for the entire NEC including the New York City area. The FRA coordinates closely with the project teams for the Gateway program and Hudson Tunnel Project in order that their scope do not preclude NEC FUTURE findings.</p>
Richards_Me	Another Virginia solution comes from the fact that, for every Amtrak NEC train that is extended south into Virginia's state-supported network, the state assumes the responsibility for turning and servicing that train. By increasing Virginia's network of NER trains, the state is assuming an ever-larger share of the South End NEC turning and servicing requirements at facilities in Northern Virginia, Richmond, Lynchburg, and elsewhere.	<p>The southern endpoint of the NEC infrastructure, as designated by Congress, is Washington, D.C. However, the FRA took a market-based approach in the NEC FUTURE process; and therefore, includes the market or population and activity centers for a broader metropolitan area. Current and future travel south of Washington, D.C., remains an important input to the NEC FUTURE overall study process. The FRA will continue to coordinate closely with other on-going efforts in Northern Virginia.</p> <p>Specific details about who owns, operates, or maintains both the new infrastructure and proposed passenger rail service have yet to be determined. As such, it is premature to assign either benefits or costs to a specific state or jurisdiction based on the geographic location of a proposed improvement.</p>

Table JJ–7: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Richmond_Cl	I would still prefer that Option 3 include Springfield since it connects with the Vermonter and would allow reasonable travel northward from Boston to Vermont (Vermont service). Springfield may be a slightly longer route to NYC, but if the trains are faster than present it should not make an appreciable difference in travel time. This route leverages the investment in New Haven Springfield Line, which is already owned by Amtrak. Furthermore, there is basically no service today between Worcester and Springfield. Worcester (and Springfield) connect with NY's Empire (and Ethan Allen) service and continue west with the Lake Shore Limited and Maple Leaf. With NY's investment in Empire service this route seems highly complementary.	The Preferred Alternative combines key elements of all three Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate future growth in Northeast population and employment. The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. The FRA noted concerns about service on the New Haven-Hartford-Springfield line. In light of these and other considerations, the Preferred Alternative includes an enhanced, electrified Hartford/Springfield Line, leveraging recent and future investments to create intermodal connections and strengthen existing urban centers. Connections north and east of Springfield would be possible. The FRA is coordinating with Massachusetts and Vermont on the Northern New England Intercity Rail Initiative, a separate study, to explore options for improved intercity rail service in New England. Further details are included in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Richmond_Cl	a new [between Boston and New York] route has so many benefits that make it an inevitable choice. These benefits include: 1) Allowing construction without affecting existing service.	The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrades to the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment. The Preferred Alternative does not include the construction of a second spine; however, additional tracks and segments are added to the NEC to support increased frequency of trains, reduced travel time and improved reliability. The location for and design of projects included in the Preferred Alternative will be determined during subsequent Tier 2 project studies. Volume 1, Chapter 10, includes a plan for incremental project phasing and implementation for the Preferred Alternative.
Ridgway_Wi	A better route is shown below. It avoids heavily built up areas, has minimal curvature, and crosses the river paralleling the existing bridge. [It is interesting to note that the present bridge appears to have piers that supported a 4 track mainline in the past and with some creative engineering might be reutilized.] Also, this route can probably be engineered with easier grades and less cut & fill.	As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure or alignments. Such decisions are made as part of Tier 2 project studies, which would include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate. Consistent with this process, the FRA developed Representative Routes for the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative, which provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the effects of each Alternative. Representative Routes define an envelope within which improvements might occur and whose location and construction type could change during subsequent Tier 2 project analysis.
Rivers_Pa	That train ride along the shore to Boston is an opportunity to view our beautiful coast,like the Connecticut River, one of the last great places . Add a dome car, and make it a tourist attraction.	The Preferred Alternative retains service to Boston via the existing NEC shoreline route, described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Roberts_Ca	However, the existing infrastructure should be upgraded where needed to keep it safe and reliable. The new Niantic bridge is an example	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4). The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives, including Alternatives 2 and 3, to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints, and adds capacity to support more-frequent, faster, and more-reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative provides connections along the existing NEC, along a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, and along the Hartford/Springfield Line, which strengthens service to Central New England and leverages existing investments and identified market opportunities.
Rose_Ch	I live on Flanders Road. Where would the station go?? If it is across from the 500 section of the road? I don't want a train station on my road. We have enough traffic with the normal people.	The NEC FUTURE program follows a "tiered" approach to environmental review. Tier 1 focuses on broad programs and initial analysis. Tier 2 focuses on site-specific, project-level proposals and impacts. Station locations identified for the Action Alternatives were representative of markets to be served. Final station locations will be determined as part of subsequent Tier 2 planning processes. During Tier 2 project studies, factors such as roadway access and environmental features would be considered in determining station siting.

Table JJ–7: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Roy_Na	As a Palmer, Ma. resident I strongly urge your consideration of high speed rail service via Palmer and Springfield in future rail plans. Thank you for your consideration.	<p>The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrades to the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment. To better serve Central New England, the Preferred Alternative incorporates electrification on the Hartford/Springfield Line, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield on the NEC. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The FRA is coordinating with Massachusetts and Vermont on the Northern New England Intercity Rail Initiative, a separate study, to explore options for improved intercity rail service in New England.</p> <p>While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify the construction of additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network.</p>
Ruane_Ke	Don't worry so much about Connecticut but the south end of NEC is slowest with 50 mph curves in Philadelphia and 30 mph tunnels in Baltimore. Make a list of every slow area and straighten the slow curves. Just that will save 1 hour +.!	The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrading the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment. It does not include a second spine. However, additional trackage and segments are included to add capacity, improve trip time, and eliminate chokepoints. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Rudnick_Za	I think the first thing is to increase and electrify all Northeast Corridor routes. By that I mean Amtrak regional services to Virginia and the Inland Route between New Haven, Springfield, and Boston.	The Preferred Alternative includes electrification of the New Haven-Hartford-Springfield corridor (Hartford/Springfield Line) as a means of fully incorporating service on that line into the NEC. In this way, NEC trains can move directly to and from the Hartford/Springfield line without the need to change engines at New Haven. Service on the Keystone Corridor also is electrified. The Preferred Alternative includes operation of trains to and from Richmond on the Southeast HSR Corridor. However, it does not include electrification of that corridor, as it falls outside the NEC and is owned and operated by a private freight rail company. The FRA and state of Virginia are separately advancing improvements to the Southeast Corridor as part of the Southeast High-Speed Rail corridor program (Volume 1, Chapter 4).
Rudnick_Za	I think the first thing to do is increase services and electrify all Northeast Corridor routes. By that I mean Amtrak regional services to Virginia and the Inland Route between New Haven, Springfield, and Boston.	The Preferred Alternative includes electrification of the New Haven-Hartford-Springfield corridor (Hartford/Springfield Line) as a means of fully incorporating service on that line into the NEC. In this way, NEC trains can move directly to and from the Hartford/Springfield line without the need to change engines at New Haven. Service on the Keystone line also is electrified. The Preferred Alternative includes operation of trains to and from Richmond on the Southeast HSR Corridor. However, it does not include electrification of that corridor, as it falls outside the NEC and is owned and operated by a private freight rail company. The FRA and state of Virginia are separately advancing improvements to the Southeast Corridor as part of the Southeast High-Speed Rail corridor program (Volume 1, Chapter 4).

Table JJ–7: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Rudolph_Ri	According to Amtrak, the existing North River Tunnels must be taken out of service for repairs no later than 2034. The Gateway project calls for new tunnels, with no promise earlier than 2030. This is an unreasonable risk to the mobility of the region.	<p>As described in Volume 2, Chapter 4, Alternatives Considered, all Action Alternatives address critical capacity issues through New York City, including new tunnels under the Hudson River between New Jersey and New York. The Preferred Alternative, described in Volume 1, Chapter 4, includes new third and fourth Hudson River tunnels, beginning on embankment east of Secaucus Rail Station, terminating south of the existing NEC and Penn Station New York, under West 31st Street. In addition, the Preferred Alternative includes two tunnels under the Easter River. Portal Bridge is identified as a Related Project in the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers.</p> <p>The Gateway program is Amtrak's proposed set of strategic infrastructure improvements to improve service and address capacity constraints in the area of New York City in New York and New Jersey. Separate from the Gateway program, the Hudson Tunnel Project is intended to preserve the current functionality of the NEC's Hudson River rail crossing between New Jersey and New York and strengthen the resilience of the NEC; FRA and NJ TRANSIT are currently leading the NEPA process for the Hudson Tunnel Project. The Gateway Program and the Hudson Tunnel Project are separate from the NEC FUTURE program. NEC FUTURE does evaluate overall capacity needs and potential improvements for the entire NEC including the New York City area. The FRA coordinates closely with the project teams for the Gateway program and Hudson Tunnel Project in order that their scope do not preclude NEC FUTURE findings.</p>
Ryan_Ja	... I think if they could increase the speed along the current route [in Connecticut] for the current stations -- I mean, I'm guessing it's around 70 or 75 miles per hour right now -- but if they could increase it to 80 or 90 perhaps just on the current infrastructure and right-of-way, they would also shorten travel times on the current routes. I think a lot of people would benefit from that, and it's a much more realistic option than some of the other proposed alternatives for the future.	The FRA has focused on high-performance and improving travel times throughout the NEC rather than on track design speeds themselves. Where practical, the FRA has provided for design speeds up to 220 mph in the Preferred Alternative. Design speeds of up to 160 mph are suggested where grade, curvature, or other physical constraints limit speeds. The FRA further considered areas where 220 mph speeds could be incorporated in development of the Preferred Alternative. Specific design speeds could be further evaluated in subsequent Tier 2 project studies. Additional service planning assumptions are provided in Volume 1, Appendix BB, and Volume 2, Appendix B.5.
Ryan_Ja	... the schedules need to be looked at, because every train from Fairfield to New Haven is always a local. It stops at every station along the way. And although it's convenient to people in other towns, it increases the trip dramatically, because sometimes station stops are longer than others, and driving would be much faster at that point. Although it's convenient to get to downtown, I think if they were able to have more express trains along the line, you could stop at fewer stations. The ridership would support it, I believe. Trains are crowded enough as they are. I think there is a great deal of possibility they should add that in the future.	The Preferred Alternative supports an integrated rail network that allows for operational efficiencies. It provides increased track capacity along the existing NEC, which allows for more efficient operation of regional, intercity, local, and express type services. This would result in faster travel times and improved performance. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Sanders_Wi	I like what VA is doing to help rail in VA that can help connection to the NEC better.	The Preferred Alternative includes up to two trains per hours to and from markets south of Washington, D.C. While the rail corridor south of Washington, D.C., is not electrified, use of dual power locomotives or future electrification would end the current need to change locomotives at Washington Union Station. This would significantly shorten the current delay in Washington, D.C. For additional information on the Preferred Alternative, see Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Saunders_Di	The FRA standards for rail car construction can be best characterized as overkill. It is not necessary or desirable to construction cars out of stainless steel. It make s the train so heavy they do not have the slightest chance of reaching 200 mph.	As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA considered a range of potential rolling stock types for passenger rail service on the NEC, including higher-performance Tier III equipment. Separate from NEC FUTURE, the FRA is responsible for setting equipment and other safety-related standards. As noted in Volume 2, Chapter 4 and Volume 1, Chapter 4, it is reasonable to expect that these standards may be modified over time. Tier 2 project studies would then reflect new standards and technological innovations in deciding specific equipment and infrastructure design.

Table JJ–7: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Schaffer_Mi	These principles are as follows, it should be considered: Rolling stock is cheaper than infrastructure; Speed up commuter trains instead of bypassing them. FRA regulations should be based on service needs. On un-bypassed shares -- shared segments, infrastructure should be built there to allow higher speeds for both existing commuter trains and for high speed inner city trains.	Implementation of the Preferred Alternative would result in a significant reduction in intercity travel time, as well as the ability to reduce travel time for regional rail service through reduced schedule pad that comes with improved reliability and elimination of chokepoints. Standardized high-performance equipment for all NEC operations also could enhance performance, reduce travel time, and generate cost efficiencies. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Schaffer_Mi	Make sure that the station throats allow full speed, which will allow trains to leave the platform and get up to speed faster instead of navigating through complex inter-lockings.	As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, and will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure. Such decisions would be made as part of the Tier 2 project planning processes, which would include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate.
Schaffer_Mi	Fixed curves and higher speed zones. Now, an example of that in New Jersey, we could eliminate the curve at Elizabeth, but that -- and that would require taking some property, including some newly built property, but it would save time. And we could also fix the curves at Metuchen as well bypassing them or also -- either in the tunnel or by just taking some property.	The FRA has incorporated several of these ideas into the Preferred Alternative. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for a complete description of the Preferred Alternative. Consistent with the Tier 1 NEPA process, the FRA developed Representative Routes for the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative, which provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the effects of each Alternative. Representative Routes define an envelope within which improvements might occur and whose location and construction type could change during subsequent Tier 2 project studies.
Schaffer_Mi	And lastly and most importantly, we should worry about track capacity when other track capacity factors have been optimized.	The Preferred Alternative adds sufficient capacity to the NEC to support up to five times as much intercity service as today and to expand regional rail service to meet projected growth. It also includes implementation of operational efficiencies, such as reduced dwell time and scheduled slot-based operations, to maximize the benefit from the new capacity. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Schaffer_Mi	In developed countries, the model for building for rail lines is organization before electronics, before concrete. For example, we could, like, ensure extra capacity on New York commuter rail by through-running trains, and also by adopting modern signaling systems, such as ETCS. When we are -- we need to ensure that when constructing the new segments of infrastructure for the NEC, that integration and electronics should be done before any concrete should be poured. That way we can be sure to save money and we can ensure that funds are allocated to ensure high speed trains and not waste it when other methods can be used.	The Preferred Alternative includes steps to improve the efficiency of operations as a means of reducing capital and operating costs, and enhancing the customer experience. The Preferred Alternative, described in Volume 1, Chapter 4, includes reduced dwell times at major stations, through-service at major stations, regularized slot-based schedules, and future acquisition of standardized equipment to reduce acquisition and maintenance costs. Future signal technology also could enhance capacity and travel time.
Schiller_Ba	...any improvements that you make should be compatible with a bus hub at Providence Station.	Connectivity to local transit at NEC stations is critical to achieving the full potential of public transportation along the NEC. The Preferred Alternative does not include specific improvements at Providence to enhance rail-bus connectivity, but the significant increase in rail service envisioned by the Preferred Alternative will create a strong market for expanding bus service at the station to local activity centers and other regional markets. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. Connectivity is discussed in Volume 1, Chapter 5.
Schiller_Ba	...there's no real coordination between bus and train schedules. Anything you could do, not just the fares, but to encourage coordination as part of the operating plan, that would be helpful.	The NEC FUTURE program follows a "tiered" approach to environmental review. Tier 1 focuses on broad programs and initial analysis. Tier 2 focuses on site-specific, project-level proposals and impacts. As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, and will not make decisions about final operations planning plans and coordinated schedules. Such decisions would be made as part of the Tier 2 project studies, which would include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate. The Service Plans developed for NEC FUTURE are representative only. While NEC FUTURE service plans are representative only, they have been developed around the concept of regular, repeating service intervals. Such a timetable concept would allow for convenient scheduling of local transit services to meet arriving and departing trains.

Table JJ–7: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Schoenfeld_Ro	The first thing to talk about with the B&P tunnels, they are also used for freight and make sure that the new tunnels are accessible for freight operation. That's very important, particularly for the Northeast Corridor when there's too much of a dependence upon trucks rather than railroads.	As described in Volume 1, Chapter 4, the Preferred Alternative includes a new, four-track infrastructure in tunnel, approaching Baltimore Penn Station from the west. The existing NEC between Lafayette Avenue and North Avenue in Baltimore City would be retired from passenger rail service. NEC FUTURE is a program that is focused on passenger rail operations rather than freight rail operations; however, considering the critical use of the NEC by freight railroads, the FRA was sure to consider the use of the NEC for freight operations as part of NEC FUTURE, and ensure that the Preferred Alternative did not preclude current freight operations or preclude future growth in freight operations. Freight operations on the NEC are described in Volume 1, Chapter 4; impacts of the Preferred Alternative to freight operations is described in Volume 1, Chapter 5; and the role of freight in the study area is described in Volume 1, Chapter 6.
Schoenfeld_Ro	...an improvement has to be made to the entire electric system across the corridor. Right now, I believe, the system is 12, 12.5 Kilovolts and 25 Hertz. This is very difficult because we -- there has to be converters to convert that from the 60 Hertz than to normal power is. When they did -- when they redid -- when they electrified the northern portion of the corridor from New Haven to Boston, they did it at 25 Kilohertz and 60 -- 25 kilovolts, excuse me and 60 Hertz. And I think that one of the things that -- one of the first things that should be done and put in the first Tier 1 proposal, is making the entire corridor from Washington Union Terminal up to Boston South Station, 25 Kilohertz -- 25 -- sorry, 25 Kilovolts, 60 hertz. And I should know that I'm an electrical	As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions for passenger rail within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process. Incompatible infrastructure, such as different rail power delivery systems, creates inefficiencies for operations and passenger travel; however, NEC FUTURE is not prescriptive with respect to the use of particular equipment types. The Preferred Alternative is flexible with respect to the mix of equipment that could be operated. In light of the individual fleet standards and requirements for the Regional rail operators, rolling stock assumptions for the Preferred Alternative are not prescriptive for Regional rail. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Schoenfeld_Ro	Obviously, replacing of the B&P tunnels is most important. They are really a chokehold at the southern end of the corridor. The next most important thing, which should have been taken care of but was vetoed by a particular governor who I shall not name, were the access to the -- Access to the Region Core Tunnels, which would -- going across the Hudson to a new Penn Station. Obviously, this has to -- these tunnels are necessary because the old tunnels have to be taken out of service and repaired. Also, the East River Tunnels are in similar condition.	As described in Volume 1, Chapter 4, the Preferred Alternative includes a new, four-track infrastructure in tunnel, approaching Baltimore Penn Station from the west. The existing NEC between Lafayette Avenue and North Avenue in Baltimore City would be retired from passenger rail service. The Hudson Tunnel Project is an example of a critical project that will advance concurrently with NEC FUTURE. Ongoing coordination will ensure consistency as both efforts proceed. As described in Volume 2, Chapter 4, all Action Alternatives address critical capacity issues through New York City, including new tunnels under the Hudson River between New Jersey and New York. The Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4), includes new third and fourth Hudson River tunnels, beginning on embankment east of Secaucus Rail Station, terminating south of the existing NEC and Penn Station New York, under West 31st Street.
Schoenfeld_Ro	...a complete rehabilitation of the old F interlocking and Harris (phonetic) interlocking, which the entrance and exit from Sunnyside Yard.	The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. The Preferred Alternative does not include the Long Island routing option considered in Alternative 3. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions. The Preferred Alternative is further described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure or alignments. Such decisions would be made as part of the Tier 2 project planning processes, which would include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate.

Table JJ–7: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Schoenfeld_Ro	...the Long Island Railroad right-of-way mainline, the Long Island Railroad Port Washington mainline, and the - - and the -- I'm not sure what they call it now, it used to be called the New York Connecting Railroad River Line, the old New Haven Line, going up to New Rochelle. This particular line is really good because it can be made four tracks very easily, even over the Hell Gate Bridge there is provision to do it, for an additional track and it could be shared with the freight service with no problem.	<p>The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. The Preferred Alternative does not include the Long Island routing option considered in Alternative 3. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions. The Preferred Alternative is further described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.</p> <p>As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure or alignments. Such decisions would be made as part of the Tier 2 project planning processes, which would include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate.</p>
Schoenfeld_Ro	The problem is Metro North and some of the bridges there. I know there was one bridge, which was built in the 1890s and keeps getting stuck. And this is a separate thing because Amtrak runs on this right-of-way rather than Amtrak owning the right-of-way, as it does in the rest of the -- most of the rest of the corridor while having control of the maintenance as it does over just about all of the rest of the corridor. So this is another chokepoint. One of the ideas that I would have taken off, which is not in any of the Tier 1 proposals, is using the Danbury and Housatonic Railroad. The Housatonic Railroad is proposing service to New York City at some point, via the Housatonic and Danbury branch. And this line could be made two double track and brought up to speed all the way into Massachusetts. Since Massachusetts now owns the old Boston and Albany Line in Massachusetts all the way into Holden, Massachusetts. This could be coordinated with the State of Massachusetts, including trains from Springfield also.	<p>The Preferred Alternative combines key elements of all three Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate future growth in Northeast population and employment. The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. In all Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative, the existing NEC would be brought to a state of good repair by replacing or renewing aging infrastructure on the existing NEC and eliminating the backlog of infrastructure requiring replacement. The Preferred Alternative includes an enhanced, electrified Hartford/Springfield Line, leveraging recent and future investments to create intermodal connections and strengthen existing urban centers. Connections north and east of Springfield would be possible. The FRA is coordinating with Massachusetts and Vermont on the Northern New England Intercity Rail Initiative (NNEIRI), a separate study, to explore options for improved intercity rail service in New England.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative does not include expanded Danbury branch or new service on the Housatonic The focus for NEC FUTURE was on the NEC, improving its capacity and performance and serving new markets. These lines can contribute to the overall passenger rail network, but did not address the identified needs for NEC FUTURE. The representative service plans creates opportunities for increased usage of the existing NEC and Hartford/Springfield Lines. For the Action and Preferred Alternatives the FRA focused on serving existing markets and leveraging the existing NEC; the Preferred Alternative does not, however, preclude states or Regional railroads from advancing separate but related projects to improve overall rail network connectivity. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.</p>
Schwarzwalder_Ja	I suggest that in the Tier 2 EIS there is a thorough examination of present dwell times with present Amtrak equipment at all NEC stations. In particular the number and location of doors per coach and width of doors per coach impacts boarding and alighting times.	As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, and will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure. Such decisions would be made as part of the Tier 2 project planning processes, which would include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate. Specific details about train equipment have not been evaluated as part of the Tier 1 EIS process. The number and location of doors per coach and width of doors per coach will be evaluated as part of the Tier 2 project analyses.
Schwarzwalder_Ja	Secondly, consideration should be given to using a coach along the lines of the multilevel coach used by NJ TRANSIT. Seating capacity with two levels is much greater than a single level coach and the ends of each multilevel coach for Amtrak NEC service could be devoted to just boarding and alighting purposes, that is, no seating.	As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA considered a range of rolling stock types and broad fleet requirements for proposed Intercity service, but will not decide on specific rolling stock specifications. Performance standards for rolling stock operating on the NEC in the Preferred Alternative are discussed in Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative and in Volume 1, Appendix BB. Specific rolling stock options would be considered in subsequent planning processes.

Table JJ–7: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Schwarzwalder_Ja	Seats on both upper and lower levels could be assigned by destination like most airlines and Amtrak long distance trains do. Then persons that are getting on or off at intermediate stations could be assigned to the lower level to speed boarding alighting, with persons destined for the terminal stations assigned to the upper level.	As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, and will not make decisions about passenger amenities, rolling stock, and operations planning. Such decisions would be made as part of the Tier 2 project planning processes, which would include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate
Schwarzwalder_Ja	A thorough study of access and egress modes for projected NEC travelers is highly desirable. With Uber, Lyft and others getting into the car or ride sharing or taxi business, those who access or egress NEC stations in the future may do so in different proportions than today.	Connectivity to local transit at NEC stations is critical to achieving the full potential of public transportation along the NEC. The NEC FUTURE program follows a "tiered" approach to environmental review. Tier 2 focuses on site-specific, project-level proposals and impacts. Consistent with the Tier 1 NEPA process, the Preferred Alternative does not include specific improvements at stations to enhance connectivity with local transit or car sharing, but accommodating these and other future modes would be important elements of future upgrades and improvements at those stations required to accommodate growth and would be considered at subsequent Tier 2 project processes.
Scrivens_Ot	Any plan for expanded or future rail improvements must include Core cities like Wilmington Delaware. Keeping our urban centers connected will ensure the prosperity of Amtrak n the North East. Keeping Wilmington connected recognizes its past and future role as one of your busiest stations. Here is a little more on Wilmington's possible future (see attached): The Riverfront Location: The expansion of the newly refurbished Amtrak station to allow for a variety of transportation options will create Delaware 's new Intermodal Transit Center as follows: Intermodal Transit Options (Wilmington Phase I) * Hub for Local DART Bus Services * Hub for National Bus Services * Onsite Philadelphia Airport Airline Ticket Booths (with luggage check-in) * Express Rail Access To Philadelphia International Airport * Hub for Airport Shuttle Services (Philadelphia & New Castle County) * Hub for Car Rental Services * Taxi Service Parking Area * Consider Future Ferry Services * Consider Future Expanded State & Regional Rail Services	The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrades to the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment. The Preferred Alternative, described in Volume 1, Chapter 4, includes a supplemental track to the east of the existing Wilmington station to provide a faster route for some Intercity Express trains. However, both intercity and regional rail Service to Wilmington will be expanded. The Preferred Alternative expands both intercity and regional rail service to Wilmington Station. Intercity service at Wilmington Station would increase from a total of 38 Intercity trains a day in the No Action Alternative to a total of 89 Intercity trains a day in the Preferred Alternative. (See Volume 1, Chapter 5). Additionally, a supplemental track to the east of the existing Wilmington station would provide a faster route for some intercity express trains and relieve capacity issues without modifying the historic Wilmington station.
Semeraro_Mi	Pg. 4-15 Please clarify the need for temporal separation where high-speed tracks and existing tracks are parallel. Is the temporal separation required for all alternatives including if a second spine was built?	The potential need for temporal separation is associated with freight service. New tracks generally will be built with sufficient separation from parallel tracks used by freight trains to permit simultaneous operation of freight and passenger traffic; however, temporal separation of freight traffic may be required for some portions of the NEC where existing express tracks are used by high-speed trainsets and are closely parallel to the existing local tracks, such as in Pennsylvania, New Jersey and Massachusetts. Freight operations are described in Volume 1, Chapter 4; freight consideration with the Preferred Alternative in Volume 1, Chapter 5; and the role of freight in the study area is described in Volume 1, Chapter 6.
Semeraro_Mi	Table 4-4 Why were Bi-level intercity-Express High Performance Trainsets like the TGV Duplex not considered?	The FRA based the representative Service Plans on the use of high-performance equipment that is consistent with the projected pace of rolling stock technology development and which utilizes rail infrastructure most efficiently by minimizing the variations in train performance (such as top speed and acceleration and braking rates) among the types of trains using the network. However, NEC FUTURE is not prescriptive with respect to the use of particular equipment types, and the Preferred Alternative is flexible with respect to the mix of equipment that could be operated, although there are consequences associated with decisions to utilize equipment with more widely varying performance characteristics. The FRA focused on representative service plans and overall performance requirements for equipment in the context of the Tier 1 NEPA analysis. Decisions about specific equipment configurations will be the subject of subsequent Tier 1 project studies or other planning processes.
Semeraro_Mi	Table 4-14 What priorities (environmental, cost, route geometry, physical restrictions etc.) drove the Central Connecticut Route? Could the costs of the route be reduced by utilizing means of construction which are less costly than the tunnels proposed?	The FRA has identified a Preferred Alternative that focuses improvements along the existing NEC with targeted new segments to alleviate chokepoints and increase capacity. It also includes an enhanced, electrified Hartford/Springfield Line. The Preferred Alternative does not include a second spine through Central Connecticut. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.

Table JJ–7: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Semeraro_Mi	Table 5-22 Why is there a decrease in Alt 2 for Regional Rail Trips through the Greater Providence area?	The Boston and Providence station-level ridership numbers were aggregated to the following four markets: Boston to Boston; Boston to Providence; Providence to Boston; and Providence to Providence. For each of the first three markets, Alternative 2 has more trips than Alternative 1. This is due to the additional Metropolitan service in Alternative 2, which facilitates travel between the Providence and Boston areas. For the “Providence to Providence” market, the reduction in trips from Alternative 1 to Alternative 2 is primarily due to a reduction in the number of trips made between Providence Station and a future Pawtucket Station, which would be located approximately 3.5 miles northeast of Providence Station.
She_Be	These are comments regarding the planned improvements to Philadelphia 30th St Station, with respect to: Appendix B.07, Stations Location and Access Analysis Technical Memorandum and B.05, Service Plans and Train Equipment Options Technical Memorandum (section 4.6.2)... --The reverse move required for Keystone Service trains originating from or continuing to New York was mentioned but not seen as a crucial issue to be addressed in the alternatives, but today this is a major source of needlessly lengthened trip times, and strategies to mitigate it, such as quickening the reverse maneuver, or creating a turnback loop as was originally considered by the Pennsylvania Railroad.	In the Action and Preferred Alternatives, Philadelphia's 30th Street Station would operate as a pulse hub for Intercity service as described in the representative service plan. The referenced services are for peak travel periods when there would be 4 Intercity-Express trains per hour and 2 Keystone trains per hour. Service frequencies would be less during off-peak periods. With pulse hub operations, layover times for Keystone trains would be coordinated with the timing of the pulses, with the eastbound Keystone trains needing to arrive at the platform prior to the arrival of the Intercity-Corridor (Metropolitan) and Intercity-Express trains, and, conversely, with westbound Keystone trains needing to wait for Intercity-Express and Intercity-Corridor (Metropolitan) trains to clear the station prior to departing. The representative service plan for the Preferred Alternative does not include a timetable for the connecting Keystone Corridor. Detailed service planning will take place as part of subsequent planning studies. (See Volume 1, Chapters 4 and 5 and Appendix BB).
She_Be	These are comments regarding the planned improvements to Philadelphia 30th St Station, with respect to: Appendix B.07, Stations Location and Access Analysis Technical Memorandum and B.05, Service Plans and Train Equipment Options Technical Memorandum (section 4.6.2) It is not immediately clear what exactly is proposed with the 30th St facility and track/approach improvements in 4.6.2, and what, if any, improvements are included in Alternative 1 as opposed to 2. There is a particular concern whether this Tier 1 EIS coordinates at all with the plethora of station improvements suggested in chapter 5.0 of the 30th St Station District Plan, Draft Physical Framework Report published by SOM in association with Amtrak, PennDOT, SEPTA, Drexel, etc. Most notably, the expanded northern concourse and direct platform connections, as well as the planned bus terminal should be considered in context.	The NEC FUTURE program follows a "tiered" approach to environmental review. Tier 1 focuses on broad programs and initial analysis. Tier 2 focuses on site-specific, project-level proposals and impacts. Many stations along the NEC will require additional capacity to accommodate future growth in service envisioned by the Preferred Alternative. This includes Philadelphia 30th Street Station, which will experience a significant growth in train and passenger volumes. The Preferred Alternative identifies a number of infrastructure projects at that station, but does not prescribe how these are to be implemented. The design and scope of improvements would be determined in subsequent Tier 2 project studies. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
She_Be	These are comments regarding the planned improvements to Philadelphia 30th St Station, with respect to: Appendix B.07, Stations Location and Access Analysis Technical Memorandum and B.05, Service Plans and Train Equipment Options Technical Memorandum (section 4.6.2).. --Not enough detail was given how the Penn Coach Yards might need to be expanded or modified to accommodate additional origin-destination trips with increased service, and how that might potentially affect the plans to cap the train yards for future development.	As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure in the Tier 1 Record of Decision. Such decisions are made as part of the Tier 2 project planning and NEPA processes, which would include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate. Consistent with this process, the FRA developed Representative Routes for the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative, which provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the effects of each Alternative. Representative Routes define an envelope within which improvements might occur and whose location and construction type could change during subsequent Tier 2 project studies.
She_Be	These are comments regarding the planned improvements to Philadelphia 30th St Station, with respect to: Appendix B.07, Stations Location and Access Analysis Technical Memorandum and B.05, Service Plans and Train Equipment Options Technical Memorandum (section 4.6.2)... It is rather unfortunate that the capital costs required for station-specific improvements could not be directly tied with capital-cost estimates for NEC FUTURE. For Philadelphia, these improvements are perhaps more important and immediately solvable than mitigating ZOO Interlocking or building a highly costly Market East tunnel.	The capital costs estimate of the Preferred Alternative provides a conceptual estimate commensurate with the level of detail appropriate for a Tier 1 process to provide an accurate, documented, validated, and defensible cost estimate. The cost model is not intended to estimate the costs of specific smaller-scale projects separately (e.g., individual bridge replacements, tunnel construction projects, or station projects). Detailed, project-specific cost estimates will be included as part of the Tier 2 project processes, which will include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate.
Sheldon_Ga	Would like to see those of us living up and down the I-395 corridor having and or reaping the benefit of traveling by rail . The tracks are here and there are over 45 sidings and or interlockings between new London and Worcester , no need for two tack system . Some of us are traveling 45 mins to get to a train station. Train stations are still in existence in most towns on this corridor let's get it together for eastern CT.	The Preferred Alternative retains service on the existing NEC in southeastern Connecticut, and adds a 50-mile supplemental segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI. The Preferred Alternative also incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line, providing one-seat ride service to and from the NEC and Hartford and Springfield. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.

Table JJ–7: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Shields_Er	...look at the tram in Roosevelt Island ... given that hurricane sea decline latitude gets higher and higher every year, I don't think we should even be investing in underground routes. Long Island, especially Islip, seems to be buried by every rainstorm, snowstorm, tropical storm. You know, what I meant by looking at infrastructure and what we're using to make materials, how are we're putting it in place is also important. You can't repeat the same mistakes because it's only going to get worse after that. So instead of like building bridges out of materials that are not, you know, building them out of materials that are native to the landscape, using masonry, terra-forming certain sections of the Sound, that way materials that are used there will cooperate with existing graphite. You don't put a metal out there. Maybe big stones that were with that -- with that water because I realized something happened there a few years ago, or maybe recently, that's already been threatened, the environmental sustainability of the Long Island Sound.	As part of the NEC FUTURE process program, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure, alignments, or construction materials. Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. The Long Island routing option considered in Alternative 3 was not advanced as part of the Preferred Alternative. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions. Such decisions are made as part of the Tier 2 project studies planning processes, which would include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate.
Shields_Er	make the parts interchangeable. If you're going to buy things or put investments in things, make sure that everybody's making the same thing for the same part. Like a bunch of giant Legos, make sure that everything fits and can be swapped if it breaks so that we don't have to buy something completely new to fix what we could have done with interlocking parts. You know, being resourceful.	As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA has emphasized the importance of considering innovative practices and new technology to improve the overall cost-effectiveness, quality and quantity of service provided on the NEC. For the Tier 1 evaluation, the FRA will not make decisions about specific technologies or designs, those decisions will be part of subsequent Tier 2 project studies or subsequent planning processes.
Shields_Er	I'm no big fan of increasing speed right away but rather what stations are stopped at. For example, in the morning you'll have an E train that goes directly -- that hops at multiple stations to get to areas that would have a lot of ridership. In a similar concept, instead of immediately thinking about a third or fourth rail, putting some of those trains on a different priority. You know, we have three Metro North lines east of the Hudson, not all of them made local stops. Some of them jump and then they make local stops or the other way around.	As described in Volume 2, Chapter 3, the purpose of the NEC FUTURE rail investment program is to upgrade aging infrastructure and to improve the reliability, capacity, connectivity, performance, and resiliency of passenger rail service on the NEC. The FRA considered improved connectivity and improved travel time in developing the Preferred Alternative. See Volume 1, Chapter 4, for discussion on the Preferred Alternative.
Shorette_Re	We need rail service in Springfield and Palmer Massachusetts too. Western MA suffers from a very poor economy. Bringing daily rail service here would benefit not only Western MA but the entire state. The only train that comes through here now is the Lake Shore Limited and only once a day East and West. Please don't let this important opportunity to improve the state's economy pass us by. We need Rail Service in Springfield and Palmer MA.	<p>The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrades to the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment. To better serve Central New England, the Preferred Alternative incorporates electrification on the Hartford/Springfield Line, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield on the NEC. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The FRA is coordinating with Massachusetts and Vermont on the Northern New England Intercity Rail Initiative, a separate study, to explore options for improved intercity rail service in New England.</p> <p>While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify the construction of additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network.</p>
Simon_El	However, instead of crossing Long Island Sound near Port Jefferson and New Haven, cross from Greenport to East Guilford. The tunneling would be shorter and less expensive and you will be able to serve all of Long Island.	The Preferred Alternative does not include the Long Island sound crossing, as considered in Alternative 3. The Preferred Alternative, described in Volume 1, Chapter 4, replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.

Table JJ–7: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Simpson_Do	I believe New London should continue as a stop(the colleges, Coast Guard museum, ferry port and casinos). Groton is a great add that would eliminate the need for the Mystic stop while serving more people conveniently. Adequate parking at or very close to stations is imperative.	The Preferred Alternative expands the level of service on the existing NEC between New Haven and Boston, resulting in increased intercity and regional service at existing stations along the shoreline. In addition, a new supplemental segment will be added between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as considered under Alternative 1. Trains using the new segment would serve the New London/Mystic station. The specific location of and design for the new station, including the number of parking spaces, would be determined in subsequent Tier 2 project studies. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Slattery_Fr	We need to build an Elevated Mag Lev Train from Boston to Washington, possibly to Richmond, Va.	In separate studies, the FRA continues to explore new technologies such as maglev and is currently sponsoring a study of maglev between Baltimore and Washington, D.C. Such a system would require separate stations, and would not support run-through trains from connecting corridors nor offer proven integration efficiencies with today’s NEC infrastructure and operators. For these reasons, the FRA did not incorporate advanced guideway or similar new technologies in the NEC FUTURE Alternatives Development Process. The Preferred Alternative does not include maglev. However, it also does not preclude the option in the future of building new transportation corridors supporting other technologies, such as maglev.
Smith_La	...the most pressing rail transport problem is the circa 1907 tunnel system under the Hudson.	As described in Volume 2, Chapter 4, Alternatives Considered, all Action Alternatives address critical capacity issues through New York City, including new tunnels under the Hudson River between New Jersey and New York. Alternative 1 includes Hudson River third and fourth tunnels. Alternative 2 includes Hudson River third and fourth tunnels, and two new tunnels under the East River. Alternative 3 includes a new route through New York City, resulting in six tracks in tunnels beneath the Hudson and East River. The Preferred Alternative, described in Volume 1, Chapter 4, includes new third and fourth Hudson River tunnels, beginning on embankment east of Secaucus Rail Station, terminating south of the existing NEC and Penn Station New York, under West 31st Street.
Smith_La	Or, expand the number of Amtrak stops in New Rochelle -- albeit only a small step toward lower fares from North to South.	The FRA defined and developed the Preferred Alternative at a programmatic level, focusing on corridor-wide solutions within a Tier 1 EIS. Service and infrastructure assumptions made at the Tier 1 level are representative and illustrative to support analysis in both the alternatives development process and the Tier 1 EIS. These assumptions are not intended to be specific or prescriptive. Future services and operating plans will evolve as they are developed by NEC railroads. Subsequent Tier 2 analysis for projects in the NEC will provide greater detail on site-specific service and infrastructure requirements.
Smith_Ph	Beware of building surface level tracks that destroy existing property and buildings, as these features are emotional triggers for dissent. Elevated lines work well and are only built once, are easier to maintain (less wear and tear from traffic), and provide an element of safety not present with the current lines.	As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, and will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure in the Tier 1 Record of Decision. Such decisions would be made as part of the Tier 2 project planning and NEPA processes, which would include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate.
Spencer_Sc	The distinction between Intercity - Express and Intercity - Corridor should be defined to be trains operated with the same standardized fleet offering a triple class of accommodations of coach, business and first class on every train. This would double the service offerings for all passengers while operating the same train-miles in the capacity constrained Northeast Corridor. In addition to speeds and stopping patterns, the EIS makes the distinction between Intercity - Express and Intercity - Corridor as offering services at premium prices and serving price sensitive passengers respectively. Unfortunately, the price sensitive passengers will also be paying the taxes that will be utilized to finance the infrastructure improvements necessary to operate Intercity - Express trains at top speeds between 160 MPH and 220 MPH and yet will not be able to afford the premium price tickets to ride at the top speeds made possible by their tax dollars. To improve the service accessibility for all income levels of passengers including senior citizens, students and families, the NEC Future should call for a standardized fleet offering triple class service of coach, business and first class on every train.	For NEC FUTURE, the FRA defined Intercity-Express and Intercity-Corridor service types to evaluate the market response to faster, premium-priced services as well as more affordable service, which also offers improved travel times, connectivity, and frequency. The FRA assumed a standard performance for both Intercity-Express and Intercity-Corridor services but did not define nor specific ways in which trains sets might be configured with regard to amenities, service classes on each trains (business, first, etc.). Those specifics will be defined in subsequent planning processes and should include consideration of a range of amenities, fare policies, and pricing. The FRA has emphasized throughout the NEC FUTURE process the importance of providing more, higher-quality, better connected services for all travelers. In fact, the Metropolitan service, which would offer frequent, higher-speed service to more markets along the NEC, was demonstrated to reach a broader market, including seniors, students, families, at travel times competitive with the higher-speed Intercity-Express service. The attractiveness of the Metropolitan service demonstrates the need for higher-quality service at affordable prices, as noted by the commenter. The fares tested are representative only, for the purposes of forecasting future ridership, and not intended to prescribe what future fare may be. For more information on fare pricing, see Volume 1, Chapter 5 and Volume 2, Appendix B.

Table JJ–7: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Spencer_Sc	A North South Rail Link Tunnel in Boston should be evaluated for the NEC Future. This tunnel has been long planned and a right of way was preserved during the construction of the Central Artery highway tunnel in Boston. The North South Rail Link would connect North and South Stations in Boston and provide significant benefits for regional rail services as well as extending direct Northeast Corridor services to New Hampshire and Maine. This would be as successful as the extension of direct Northeast Corridor services have been to Richmond, Harrisburg and Springfield.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4). The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints, and adds capacity to support more-frequent, faster, and more-reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. The Preferred Alternative does include an extension of service north of Boston. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The North South Rail Link was not included in the No Action Alternative Project List (see Volume 2, Appendix B.1) since it does not meet the criteria for consideration: Funded projects or projects with approved funding plans, funded or unfunded mandates, unfunded projects necessary to keep the railroad running. Likewise, North South Rail Link was not included as a Related Project in the Action Alternatives because it does not meet the criteria for consideration: fully or partially funded projects located in a connecting corridor and not on the NEC; unfunded projects along the NEC with ongoing or completed NEPA/PE; fully or partially funded transit (e.g., NJ TRANSIT, MTA-LIRR) or freight projects located off of but connecting to the NEC. A project to connect Boston's North and South stations, such as the North South Rail Link, could be studied separately, and is not precluded as future investment.
Spencer_Sc	The East River tunnels are just as old as the Hudson River tunnels and have themselves also in deteriorating condition. And so I have not heard of how they're going to address it. They propose these new Hudson River tunnels. That investment in that capacity is going to be at risk to the reliability of the East River tunnels and, really, the functionality of the entire Northeast corridor, whichever alternative you put up unless you use the bypass through Long Island that you're proposing. But I'm just curious how closely that the decisions that are underway now to the Gateway Tunnel are being coordinated with this so they don't preclude the investments that happen here.	<p>As described in Volume 2, Chapter 4, Alternatives Considered, all Action Alternatives address critical capacity issues through New York City, including new tunnels under the Hudson River between New Jersey and New York. The Preferred Alternative, described in Volume 1, Chapter 4, includes new third and fourth Hudson River tunnels, beginning on embankment east of Secaucus Rail Station, terminating south of the existing NEC and Penn Station New York, under West 31st Street. In addition, the Preferred Alternative includes two tunnels under the Easter River. Portal Bridge is identified as a Related Project in the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers.</p> <p>The Gateway program is Amtrak's proposed set of strategic infrastructure improvements to improve service and address capacity constraints in the area of New York City in New York and New Jersey. Separate from the Gateway program, the Hudson Tunnel Project is intended to preserve the current functionality of the NEC's Hudson River rail crossing between New Jersey and New York and strengthen the resilience of the NEC; FRA and NJ TRANSIT are currently leading the NEPA process for the Hudson Tunnel Project. The Gateway Program and the Hudson Tunnel Project are separate from the NEC FUTURE program. NEC FUTURE does evaluate overall capacity needs and potential improvements for the entire NEC including the New York City area. The FRA coordinates closely with the project teams of both the Gateway Program and Hudson Tunnel Project to ensure that proposed NEC FUTURE investments are not precluded by project work.</p>
Spencer_Sc	...perhaps going forward that this NEC FUTURE project can look closely on how they're coordinating these alternatives with some key decisions that are underway right now. For instance, you mentioned about the various alternatives that would include the improvements of the Hudson River tunnels. But I would encourage that as that planning of that tunnel go forward that it includes the capacities that are going to be necessary to sustain the improvements that are proposed in these alternatives. And I'll give one specific example. As I understand the Gateway Tunnel project now, they're proposing two new tunnels, which is great, but they go into the existing Penn Station, which has a track network that was laid out over a hundred years ago, which means none of the trains can move through that station faster than restricted speed, well under 20 miles an hour averaging ten or 15 miles an hour. So the bottom line is, even though the new tunnel would have as many as 20 slots per hour into Penn Station New York, there's very limited capacity to get that many extra trains per hour through Penn Station New York...	<p>The Preferred Alternative, described in Volume 1, Chapter 4, includes several improvements that increase capacity through Penn Station New York, including: the Bergen Loop, which would provide direct access to Penn Station New York from branch lines at Secaucus NJ; third and fourth Hudson River tunnels; two new tracks in tunnels Penn Station New York continuing east under the East River; and Station and terminal expansion at Penn Station New York.</p> <p>The Gateway program is Amtrak's proposed set of strategic infrastructure improvements to improve service and address capacity constraints in the area of New York City in New York and New Jersey. Separate from the Gateway program, the Hudson Tunnel Project is intended to preserve the current functionality of the NEC's Hudson River rail crossing between New Jersey and New York and strengthen the resilience of the NEC; FRA and NJ TRANSIT are currently leading the NEPA process for the Hudson Tunnel Project. The Gateway Program and the Hudson Tunnel Project are separate from the NEC FUTURE program. NEC FUTURE does evaluate overall capacity needs and potential improvements for the entire NEC including the New York City area. The FRA coordinates closely with the project teams for the Gateway program and Hudson Tunnel Project in order that their scope do not preclude NEC FUTURE findings.</p>

Table JJ-7: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Stanton_Da	I endorse rail in Connecticut. please extend the danbury line to the Berkshires(Massachusetts). this will enhance recreation and the economy in from Danbury north.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of such expansions.
Stillwaggon_Ja	No good reason to redirect the line. Do not threaten people in those towns or destroy their homes. Why continue with 19th century technology when you should be investing in electromagnetic train travel?	In separate studies, the FRA continues to explore new technologies such as maglev and is currently sponsoring a study of maglev between Baltimore and Washington, D.C. Such a system would require separate stations, and would not support run-through trains from connecting corridors nor offer proven integration efficiencies with today's NEC infrastructure and operators. For these reasons, the FRA did not incorporate advanced guideway or similar new technologies in the NEC FUTURE Alternatives Development Process. The Preferred Alternative does not include maglev. However, it also does not preclude the option in the future of building new transportation corridors supporting other technologies, such as maglev. The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrading the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment (as described in Volume 1, Chapter 4).
Stolle_Fr	We cannot build a hi-speed train from Portland Maine to Charlotte North Carolina fast enough. We need to emulate Japan's Shinkusan.	NEC FUTURE is a comprehensive planning effort to define, evaluate, and prioritize future investments in the Northeast Corridor (NEC), from Washington, D.C., to Boston. The Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4), replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more-frequent, faster, and more-reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. The Preferred Alternative reduces trip time from Washington, D.C. to Boston. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.
Strano_Ri	I think that instead of building new trackage you should revitalize and update the highland division of the old New Haven. This route is straighter but a little more hilly. the rout once(and probably still does) have direct rail access into Boston and would save millions of dollars in new trackage construction. the old NEC would still be used for local trains but high-speed trains would go north to Hartford via New Haven then east along the old Airline route and join up with Boston area Mass Rapid Transit trackage near Norwood-Walpole looking at an old New Haven RR map) then gain access to Boston via Back Bay.	<p>The former Air Line route between New Haven, CT, and Boston, MA, was initially considered during alternatives development as a possible route for a second spine; however, it was not advanced for further consideration because it includes many curves, which prevented trip-time improvements and did not directly serve either the Hartford, CT, or Providence, RI, markets. Although not tied to any one route, the FRA did look to stay within existing transportation corridors to the extent practical. The Air Line route was not only not well-suited to the overall needs defined for NEC FUTURE, but is also designated a Connecticut State Park Trail (Air Line Route State Park Trail). For these reasons it was eliminated from consideration as an Initial Alternative.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative does not include a routing connecting Hartford, CT, and Providence, RI, as shown in Alternatives 2 and 3. The Preferred Alternative combines key elements of all three Action Alternatives to accommodate future growth in Northeast population and employment. The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.</p>

Table JJ–7: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Sundack_Br	By linking North Station with South station, the added convenience for travel south of Boston will be enhanced. This will also give Boston a more flexible commuter rail system, by linking it's two separate operations.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4). The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints, and adds capacity to support more-frequent, faster, and more-reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. The Preferred Alternative does include an extension of service north of Boston. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The North South Rail Link was not included in the No Action Alternative Project List (see Volume 2, Appendix B.1) since it does not meet the criteria for consideration: Funded projects or projects with approved funding plans, funded or unfunded mandates, unfunded projects necessary to keep the railroad running. Likewise, North South Rail Link was not included as a Related Project in the Action Alternatives because it does not meet the criteria for consideration: fully or partially funded projects located in a connecting corridor and not on the NEC; unfunded projects along the NEC with ongoing or completed NEPA/PE; fully or partially funded transit (e.g., NJ TRANSIT, MTA-LIRR) or freight projects located off of but connecting to the NEC. A project to connect Boston's North and South stations, such as the North South Rail Link, could be studied separately, and is not precluded as future investment.
Sundack_Br	Double track, electrify, and rebuild Acela equipment for the service, and have a running time of approximately one hour, forty five minutes, Portland/Auburn to Boston.	NEC FUTURE is a comprehensive planning effort to define, evaluate, and prioritize future investments in the Northeast Corridor (NEC), from Washington, D.C. to Boston. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Sundack_Br	Extending corridor service to the proposed Boston-Portland/Auburn high speed corridor would allow the northeast to provide access to more affordable living while stimulating rational transportation based development.	The Preferred Alternative would significantly increase service between New York and Boston, and along the Hartford/Springfield Line to Hartford and Springfield. The Preferred Alternative does not include improvements north of Boston, so it does not include extension to Portland, ME. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Sutton_Ro	I do think that it's a good idea to have a vision that provides for a parallel rail system, not only for the enhancement of speed and to provide more efficient, straighter lines through the high-population areas, but also as an alternative in case there are infrastructure disruptions, which will inevitably happen.	The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrading the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment. It does not include a second spine. However, additional trackage and segments are included to add capacity, improve trip time, and eliminate chokepoints. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Sweenwy_Jo	...three ferry terminals connect New London with Block Island, Rhode Island, Fishers Island, New York, and Orient Point, Long Island. They were different places, but in this move Governor Rowland put through, those three ferry terminals are now located in the same complex with the Amtrak railroad station in New London, so you can get off the train and get into any one of those ferries quite easily. So the New London station is a major connecting point for three separate offshore island ferries, and I think that's got to be considered before eliminating New London.	The Preferred Alternative in fact expands the level of service on the existing NEC between New Haven and Boston, resulting in increased intercity and regional service at the existing New London Union Station. In addition, a new supplemental segment will be added between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as considered under Alternative 1. Trains using the new segment would serve the New London/Mystic station. The specific location of and design for the new station, including the number of parking spaces, would be determined in subsequent Tier 2 project studies. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Sweryda_Be	Why are you bypassing Palmer , MA or western Mass completely? We count! It would be very beneficial to have a stop over at the Palmer Ma station. Thank you for your consideration. Please again don't leave Western MA out off the loop.	<p>The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrades to the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment. To better serve Central New England, the Preferred Alternative incorporates electrification on the Hartford/Springfield Line, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield on the NEC. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The FRA is coordinating with Massachusetts and Vermont on the Northern New England Intercity Rail Initiative, a separate study, to explore options for improved intercity rail service in New England.</p> <p>While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify the construction of additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network.</p>

Table JJ–7: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Taggart_Ja	Two new North River tunnels are essential to the vitality of the NEC, and thus the Greater New York Region. This, supplemented by a new span over the Hackensack River, with a four track corridor to Newark will speed travel time, ease congestion, facilitate maintenance and raise the bar to 21st Century standards.	As described in Volume 2, Chapter 4, Alternatives Considered, all Action Alternatives address critical capacity issues through New York City, including new tunnels under the Hudson River between New Jersey and New York. The Preferred Alternative, described in Volume 1, Chapter 4, includes new third and fourth Hudson River tunnels, beginning on embankment east of Secaucus Rail Station, terminating south of the existing NEC and Penn Station New York, under West 31st Street. In addition, the Preferred Alternative includes two tunnels under the Easter River. Portal Bridge is identified as a Related Project in the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers.
Terwilliger_Ma	The NEC Future Tier 1 Draft EIS claims a gain of 30 minutes (sometimes 40 minutes) in the transit time between New York and Boston with Alternative #1. A closer look casts serious doubt on such claims. Truly significant and reliable improvements in service between Boston and New York can only be had by choosing Alternative #2 or (far better) Alternative #3. Alternative #1 claims an improvement of 30 minutes, but in fact the continued conflicts between the various owners and lessors of the rail lines in question will mean that such improvements are dependent on Acela (or any other high speed train sharing tracks with other services) keeping a perfect schedule. If the Acela should have fallen behind when it reaches any station on this stretch of track (a thing largely dependent on conditions further south, for north-bound trains), the local trains will have the right of way; and the Acela must then wait as long as it takes for the local to pass by -- and to go far enough ahead of the Acela to make sure the local is in no danger of being overtaken by it. Based on historical performance, the alleged 30 minutes' gain will be reduced to something more like 10 minutes on average. Ten minutes. A pitiful gain for some \$45 billion dollars over and above the cost of a fully-funded "No Action" alternative.	The Preferred Alternative brings the existing NEC to a state of good repair and maximizes its capacity through alleviation of chokepoints, addition of new tracks and segments at targeted locations, and implementation of service operational efficiencies. The Preferred Alternative also removes speed restrictions where practical and safe and reduces trip times. For specific details on travel time improvements, see the Volume 1, Chapters 5 and 9.
Thereault_Ed	Doesn't the Acela train line already suffer from the congestion of our coastal towns? Why build a train that needs a safe, open space to travel at high rates of speed through these very busy towns on the coast?	<p>As a result of the Tier 1 Draft EIS and the public comment process, the FRA has identified a Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4). The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints, and adds capacity to support more-frequent, faster, and more-reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers.</p> <p>In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative provides connections along the existing NEC, along a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, and along the Hartford/Springfield Line, which strengthens service to Central New England and leverages existing investments and identified market opportunities.</p>
Troy_Ro	Faster equipment needs to be purchased, and slow points badly need to be eliminated. We probably don't need such things as maglev - at least not yet, but we could greatly gain by having our form of bullet trains that exceed 200 MPH, rather than maybe doing 75, if that much.	The FRA considered alternatives with speeds in excess of 200 mph for new segments proposed for Alternatives 1 and 2, as well as for the second spine Representative Route for Alternative 3. Results from the FRA studies and feedback from stakeholder and public comments lead the FRA to conclude that a reliable, frequency network of services, providing better connections and mobility for more people was a priority for NEC FUTURE rather than being focused on only achieving a speed threshold. As such, the Preferred Alternative includes several new segments designed to 220 mph, but the Preferred Alternative focuses on the benefits derived from improved connections and travel times between city-pairs, in addition to travel time improvements resulting from higher speeds. The service enhancements proposed for the Preferred Alternative are described in Volume 1, Chapters 4 and 5.

Table JJ–7: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Truax_An	Alternative 2, the Providence-Hartford-New Haven route:... What, exactly, is the reason why the towns in this corridor cannot have public transportation REESTABLISHED as it was previously? Please add some local train stations and bus stops in between Providence and UConn.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative includes upgrading the existing NEC shoreline route and the addition of a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line into the NEC, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield. It does not include a line connecting Hartford and Providence. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.</p> <p>The FRA noted views expressed about connections to UCONN and Hartford. However, the Preferred Alternative does not include the route to UCONN as envisioned in Alternative 2 and 3. The rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative is provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative. The NEC FUTURE program is focused on corridor-wide solutions for passenger rail improvements, and the selection of the Preferred Alternative does not preclude future consideration of transit or fixed guideway improvements to meet other transportation needs across the Study Area.</p>
Turner_Je	Please bring rail to western Massachusetts.	<p>The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrades to the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment. To better serve Central New England, the Preferred Alternative incorporates electrification on the Hartford/Springfield Line, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield on the NEC. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The FRA is coordinating with Massachusetts and Vermont on the Northern New England Intercity Rail Initiative, a separate study, to explore options for improved intercity rail service in New England.</p> <p>While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify the construction of additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network.</p>
Turon_Be	To reduce costs but increase capacity I think the study should consider ideas like utilizing multi-level trains and alternative terminal stations for intercity service. In Japan and France growing demand lead to the introduction of double-decker high speed trains like the TGV Duplex which has a 45% greater capacity then single-level TGVs. It 's cheaper to run trains carrying more passengers then add new track to add more trains. Train length should also be increase to the maximum allowable by platform lengths. In Britain the Pendelinos of Virgin Trains on the West Coast Mainline are 11-cars long. On the Tokaido Shinkansen the bullet trains are 16-cars long. We must not repeat the mistake of the Acela, which has constrained capacity and stunted ridership and revenue due to its seven car length.	<p>The FRA considered ways to gain operating efficiencies, such as longer trains or increased seating capacity, in the definition of the Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative. Examples of these types of enhancements are noted in Volume 1, Chapters 4 and 5. As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA will not make decisions about specific train consists or their configuration. Specific details about train equipment will be considered in more detail in subsequent Tier 2 project studies or other planning processes.</p>

Table JJ–7: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Turon_Be	I think to avoid congestion at Penn Station that alternative New York City station sites for Amtrak service should be explored that would supplement but not supplant Penn Station. The SNCF's low-cost TGV service 'Ouigo' uses Marne-la-Vallee (Disneyland Paris) as its Paris terminus; the Réseau Express Régional (RER) rapid rail transit system connects to the rest of the metropolitan region including the central city. My question is do all intercity trains on the NEC need to terminate or transit thru Penn Station? With future increases in capacity south and north of New York City could perhaps additional NEC or Empire Service frequencies terminate at Grand Central Terminal or Hoboken Terminal instead of Penn Station? Both stations have excellent rapid transit connections. At Hoboken the PATH system connects to both Midtown and Downtown Manhattan. It has the Hudson ferries and NJT connections to northern New Jersey. And perhaps one distant day the number 7 Subway will reach Hoboken.	The Preferred Alternative assumes that all trains will operate through and serve Penn Station New York. The Preferred Alternative, described in Volume 1, Chapter 4, requires expansion of the station to accommodate additional tracks both to the east and the west of New York. In addition, the Moynihan Project will include station functions associated with intercity rail moving to a new location. The specific location for and design of improvements at Penn Station new York to accommodate the additional tracks and growth in demand will be determined through subsequent Tier 2 project studies. This will include enhancements to the customer experience at the station, as well as improvements that will improve the efficiency of operations.
Turon_Be	Given that it will take well over a decade to build two new tunnels into Penn Station and then rebuild (taking out of service) the two existing tubes; I could imagine Amtrak competing head one with budget coach services like MegaBus by operating high capacity multi-level trains out of Hoboken to Washington, or Penn Station to Albany-Rensselaer. Packing more passengers into the train thru use of multi-level coaches should allow a lowering of ticket prices that would stimulate ridership while not lowering overall train revenues.	Adding capacity on the NEC, along with replacement of aging infrastructure and elimination of chokepoints, will be essential to accommodate future growth in demand for passenger rail. However, making the best use of existing capacity will also play an important role in addressing near-term capacity needs and ensuring that benefits from investments are maximized. This includes maximizing the capacity of existing equipment and services, reducing dwell time at major terminals, using slot-based scheduling, and better coordinating transfers between rail services. The FRA is working with the NEC rail operators to implement these and other opportunities to reduce both capital and operating costs in developing the Initial Phase of the Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 10).
Turon_Be	Moving on I feel more should be done to improve the intermodal connection between intercity rail and air travel. We can see from Europe the benefits of including intercity stations in major airports for example at Frankfurt Airport in Germany and Charles de Gaulle Airport in France where direct connections can be made between airlines and ICE/TGV services thanks to codeshare agreements. Could perhaps NEC intercity services be extended to JFK utilizing the right-of-way of the long "out-of-service" LIRR Rockaway Beach Branch Line? At the very least the existing air-rail connections at Newark Liberty and BWI should be further improved and promoted.	The Preferred Alternative creates intermodal connections by concentrating improvements on urban hub stations well served by transit and by creating convenient airport services with frequent intercity and regional service. In addition to BWI and Newark airports, new segment provide service to Philadelphia International Airport, TF Green Airport in Providence, and Bradley International Airport. For additional details on the Preferred Alternative, see Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Turon_Be	To that I would propose that given Alt. 3 essentially proposes building an entirely new double-track high speed railway parallel to the existing corridor, then why not spin it off entirely as a completely separate high speed ground transportation link along the lines of the Shinkansen? Such new transport line could be conventional steel-wheel on steel-rail high speed rail technology or perhaps a new technology like the Japanese Linear Maglev or even Elon Musk 's Hyperloop. And it could be a project led by the private sector with perhaps some public financial assistance and right-of-way Currently there is an ongoing DEIS of a proposed maglev line connecting Washington DC, BWI Airport, and Baltimore. The plans of the private company Northeast Maglev to eventually extend this "demonstration line" northward to New York City. Could the NEC Future EIS be completed in such a way that would show a path forward for either conventional very high speed rail service or the SCMAGLEV NYC-DC proposal? The "new segment" right-of-way laid out in Alt. 3 including the new downtown routings and city center stations could still if included in the final EIS, configured for use by a future Shinkansen or maglev system even if Alt. 1 is selected as the primary alternative.	In separate studies, the FRA continues to explore new technologies such as maglev and is currently sponsoring a study of maglev between Baltimore and Washington, D.C. Such a system would require separate stations, and would not support run-through trains from connecting corridors nor offer proven integration efficiencies with today's NEC infrastructure and operators. For these reasons, the FRA did not incorporate advanced guideway or similar new technologies in the NEC FUTURE Alternatives Development Process. The Preferred Alternative does not include maglev. However, it also does not preclude the option in the future of building new transportation corridors supporting other technologies, such as maglev. The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrading the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment (as described in Volume 1, Chapter 4).
Untermeyer_Ad	As you craft your plans, I urge you to build railroad cooperation into any blueprint for the NEC's future... Running commuter trains between Long Island and New Jersey & rather than terminating them at Penn & could double capacity while opening up jobs to those on both sides of Manhattan. Coordinated communications and ticketing could ease crowding and nerves. And other options, such as sharing services, would slow the rate of fare increases for riders of all stripes.	The Preferred Alternative improves passenger experience by integrating passenger ticketing, operations and services, as well as incorporating a new corridor-wide Metropolitan service to connect local stations with hub and terminal stations; regular clock face headways and simplified operations; and enhanced flexibility, freedom, and travel choices for everyday travelers. For additional details on the Preferred Alternative, see Volume 1, Chapter 4. The FRA will continue to work with the NEC operators through service options for enhancing the customer experience in implementing the Preferred Alternative.

Table JJ–7: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Valudes_He	The Keystone Corridor, and Lancaster County, will be much better served by a network that is optimally effective and efficient. Investments that would better connect our more than 500,000 residents to major metropolitan regions in the northeast from Washington, DC to Boston, and inclusive of a connection to Philadelphia International Airport are critical for providing high-quality service to smaller markets.	The Preferred Alternative creates a regional network of trains on the NEC providing frequent and convenient connections to other rail corridors and transportation systems. Keystone trains will be scheduled to operate directly onto the NEC as well as connect at Philadelphia 30th Street Station with Intercity Corridor and Express trains and local regional trains. In addition, a new station would be built serving Philadelphia International Airport. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Valudes_He	We are particularly interested in alternatives 2 and 3 inclusion of pulse-hub operations that would better connect the Philadelphia 30th Street Station with Intercity-Express, Metropolitan, Keystone Corridor and Atlantic City trains and provide transfer opportunities every 30 minutes during the peak period.	A key feature and benefit of the Preferred Alternative is freedom of mobility. The Preferred Alternative improves passenger experience by integrating passenger ticketing, operations and services, as well as incorporating a new corridor-wide Metropolitan service to connect local stations with hub and terminal stations with these including integrated ticketing and coordinated schedules; regular clock face headways and simplified operations; and enhanced flexibility, freedom, and travel choices for everyday travelers. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The pulse-hub operations considered in Alternative 2 are included in the Preferred Alternative. See Volume 1, Chapter 4, for more information on the Preferred Alternative.
Van Ness_Ad	use I-95 as the path, is the only option we will support.	As part of the NEC FUTURE process, FRA is focused on corridor-wide improvements that are representative, and as such did not identify specific alignment details. Consistent with this process, the FRA developed Representative Routes for the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative, which provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the effects of each Alternative. Representative Routes define an envelope within which improvements might occur and whose location and construction type could change during subsequent Tier 2 project analysis. The Preferred Alternative includes a new supplemental segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon RI, generally following the I-95 corridor. Subsequent Tier 2 project studies will include stakeholder and public participation and focus in detail on specific service, routing, and infrastructure requirements. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Vitale_Pa	so does not reference NYS plans to expand the LIRR on Long Island as recently proposed by Gov. Cuomo (and opposed by many).	The NEC FUTURE Tier 1 EIS allows for the advancement of No Action Alternative projects or Related Projects (as defined in the No Action Alternative Report, see Volume 2, Appendix B) in separate but concurrent NEPA processes (e.g., B&P Tunnel Project). The LIRR Expansion Project has independent utility and is being advanced separate from NEC FUTURE and the Preferred Alternative. The FRA will continue to coordinate the technical analyses to ensure consistency with the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative, described in Volume 1, Chapter 4, is considered in the context of the multi-modal transportation system, including local regional rail and transit projects.
Voboril_Wi	I hope you consider vehicle plus other public transportation service movements/parking at the rail stops.	As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, and will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure. Such decisions would be made as part of the Tier 2 project planning processes, which would include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate.
Vogel_Ke	If you know how congested the New York City area is whether it be existing houses, buildings, roadways, or train tracks, not to mention terrain and then look at the alternative routes proposed (Drawn like Tron's Light Cycles) the idea seems to be avoiding these areas for speed, and let the local transportation system (Or something like yours) access to the existing city centers	After deliberating the comments received and the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative that improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.

Table JJ–7: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Vogel_Ke	It also seems that it is moving the line to the areas with the high incomes	As a result of the Tier 1 Draft EIS and the public comment process, the FRA has identified a Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4). The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. As discussed throughout the Tier 1 EIS process, the FRA anticipated combining elements of each of the Action Alternatives in assembling the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative would achieve the service objectives identified with the "grow" vision (Alternative 2), but focuses on the existing NEC and includes the Hartford/Springfield Line. The Preferred Alternative brings the existing NEC and Hartford/Springfield Lines to a state of good repair, replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints, and adds capacity to support more-frequent, faster, and more-reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. New segments are added where needed to relieve capacity constraints or improve trip times. The location for such segments off but adjacent to the existing NEC are representational; specific details of their design and location will be determined in subsequent Tier 2 project studies. The potential for land use conversion or effects on Environmental Justice communities was a factor in evaluating the Action Alternatives and defining and evaluating the Preferred Alternative. Segment locations were determined by railroad operating constraints or access to new or underserved markets.
Vogel_Ke	if you're going to draw a big line going across the Long Island Sound and, you know, and the thought of hey, I-287 isn't a completed loop around New York City, but every other city in the entire country has a completed loop interstate, something to think about that maybe you can merge with. Or if you want to cross at the Tappan Zee and then not have to pay for a tunnel through Brooklyn, because the train tracks are going to go to White Plains because your little blue line goes to White Plains, it makes sense to kind of merge these lines together because it really is a big investment.	As a result of the Tier 1 Draft EIS and the public comment process, the FRA has identified a Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4). The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints, and adds capacity to support more-frequent, faster, and more-reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.
Vogel_Ke	it's nice that the little lines drawn on the maps are using, for example, the Reading Railroad right-of-way rather than the Pennsylvania Railroad right-of-way, because it's now not competitive anymore, it's now one big system that has to be organized together...	As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure in the Tier 1 Record of Decision. Such decisions are made as part of the Tier 2 project planning and NEPA processes, which would include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate. Consistent with this process, the FRA developed Representative Routes for the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative, which provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the effects of each Alternative. Representative Routes define an envelope within which improvements might occur and whose location and construction type could change during subsequent Tier 2 project studies.
Wagner_Ma	Please put your resources into improving rail transportation elsewhere, particularly south of DC. With frequent delays and cancellations it is impossible to rely on rail services there.	The Preferred Alternative includes up to 11 Intercity trains daily between Washington, D.C and Richmond Staples Mill Road Station in Virginia. With implementation of the Preferred Alternative, service on the NEC would become significantly more reliable with replacement of aging infrastructure and elimination of delay-causing chokepoints. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. South of Washington, D.C, the FRA is coordinating with the state of Virginia and the District of Columbia to advance improvements between Richmond and Washington, D.C., including the Long Bridge Corridor over the Potomac River, to support increased and more reliable service.

Table JJ–7: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Wagner_To	The public interest of the United States would be better served if the FRA would include in its long-term vision and investment program for the NEC (North East Corridor), a plan to evolve the national transportation system to include the new 2nd generation superconducting Magnetic Levitation (Maglev) transport technology invented by Drs. James Powell and Gordon Danby and developed by Maglev 2000, Inc. The unique capabilities and versatility of the Maglev 2000 transport system better meets the energy efficiency, sustainable energy, and economic requirements for a 21st Century national high-speed transport network. Its low-cost guideway construction, operating and maintenance can reduce congestion, health harming and greenhouse gas emissions on US highways by offering passenger fares and freight shipping costs cheaper than highway driving and trucking and would persuade drivers to leave their cars and trucking companies to ship goods on the 300 mph service.	As discussed in Chapter 4 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS, although Maglev technology could be used to develop a second spine or portions thereof, such a system would require separate stations, and would not support run-through trains from connecting corridors nor offer proven integration efficiencies with today’s NEC infrastructure and operators. For these reasons, although the FRA acknowledges the future possibilities for passenger Maglev in the northeast, it was not incorporated into the Action Alternatives and is not identified for the Preferred Alternative. The FRA has left open the possibility to consider alternative technologies, such as Maglev, for a second spine at some future point in time based on separate planning processes.
Wagner_To	Another factor for planning should be to increase safety, speed and operability on existing or modified train tracks. A next generation train system that could leverage the rights-of-way of existing track, sharing the bed with traditional trains would maximize the economic return to existing infrastructure while providing for speedier and safer passenger service. 300 MPH trains on segments of existing train beds as well as rights-of-ways of national highways are possible but only if the FRA points to speed and capability to use existing rights-of-way as an important factor and final cost recovery potential in bid evaluation.	The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrading and expanding the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment, as described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. Improvements will be made to the existing right-of-way to replace aging infrastructure, eliminate chokepoints and add capacity to support high-speed Intercity Express trains , other intercity rail service and regional rail. Future opportunities may develop to use new technologies for even faster service and these are not precluded by the Preferred Alternative. However, the existing rail and highway rights-of-way, which includes many curves and is physically constrained at numerous locations, may not be appropriate for trains operating at 300 mph or faster speeds.
Waldron_Li	If the new rail line was run alongside 95, improvements could be made to both. 95 is in desperate need of widening in Ct. and the infrastructural work required for the railway could coincide with the work needed to make 95 wider.	As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure in the Tier 1 Record of Decision. Such decisions are made as part of the Tier 2 project planning and NEPA processes, which would include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate. Consistent with this process, the FRA developed Representative Routes for the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative, which provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the effects of each Alternative. Representative Routes define an envelope within which improvements might occur and whose location and construction type could change during subsequent Tier 2 project studies.
Watson_Su	Scrap this plan. Leave the shoreline intact.	The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrading the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Watson_Su	If you want to spend some money, reinstate Gov. Ella Grasso's plan (she had the engineering done 30 years back), and create the rail trail from the CT shoreline up to Middletown!	<p>The year 2040 was selected as a reasonable long-term horizon for ridership and costs. Data analysis extending beyond 25 years become increasingly unreliable. By using 2040 to compare all of the alternatives, NEC FUTURE was able to achieve a level playing field for evaluation of the alternatives. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. Rail Trails are beyond the scope of NEC FUTURE.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative retains service on the existing NEC in southeastern Connecticut, and adds a 50-mile supplemental segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI. The Preferred Alternative also incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line, providing one-seat ride service to and from the NEC and Hartford and Springfield. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.</p>
Webster_St	Skipping Providence, one of the largest commuter stops between NY and Boston, is horribly short sighted and will affect hundreds of people me being one of them. There are very few commuter trains that go to providence from Boston at an average time of 1 hour and 45 minutes one way.	The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrades to the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment. Both intercity and regional rail service to Providence, RI, will increase substantially as the Preferred Alternative, described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.

Table JJ–7: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Weimann_Pe	A New London/Mystic station is also a good idea and needs to be kept outside the city and have ample parking!	The Preferred Alternative expands the level of service on the existing NEC between New Haven and Boston, resulting in increased intercity and regional service at existing stations along the shoreline. In addition, a new supplemental segment will be added between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as considered under Alternative 1. Trains using the new segment would serve the New London/Mystic station. The specific location of and design for the new station, including the number of parking spaces, would be determined in subsequent Tier 2 project studies. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Weinstein_Da	the commuter rail services such as SEPTA, which I'll talk about in a moment, are unable to fill the gaps which Amtrak is supposed to provide. People taking SEPTA -- SEPTA runs on the same train lines as Amtrak and is routinely delayed due to problems on Amtrak... There's a single train in the mornings from Philadelphia to Wilmington over pretty much the entire three-hour period of rush hour. There's a train that leaves Philadelphia at 7:45. And if you're not on that train, the next train from Philadelphia to Wilmington is not till, I believe, 9:36. During the daytime, trains from Wilmington back to Philadelphia only run every two hours. For people such as myself, who commute from Philadelphia to Wilmington and back, this is just -- it's insufficient service. It discourages economic growth. It discourages people in Wilmington taking jobs in Philadelphia. It discourages people in Philadelphia taking jobs in Wilmington. I believe that there are tremendous economic benefits that could be achieved by expanding access from Philadelphia to Wilmington and vice versa... SEPTA service is -- there are frequent delays, frequent interruptions, aging infrastructure, and it's not enough service in general. I think all of that should be addressed... I'm here to urge you not to leave out Philadelphia and Wilmington. To take Philadelphia and Wilmington into account, and whatever alternative you're doing, not to leave out SEPTA, to increase SEPTA service going from Wilmington because I believe that that could benefit tremendously.	The Preferred Alternative allows substantial growth for all Regional rail markets, as described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. Economic development will be spurred with the Preferred Alternative as it offers more frequent convenient connections to more places that will be used by more travelers. The existing network is strengthened because populations in the urban cores will have better access to jobs and destinations throughout the northeast region. Economic effects of the Preferred Alternative are discussed in Volume 1, Chapter 6.
Weiss_Bo	don't overlook bus travel when you're considering rail alternatives.	The NEC FUTURE program is focused on improvements to passenger rail. While the condition of and planned improvements to other modes were important considerations to development of the Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative, the analysis was not intended to provide a regional assessment of how to optimize improvements to all modes of transportation to meet regional transportation needs. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. Consideration of other modes in evaluation of the Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 5.

Table JJ–7: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Wells_Ma	If the train service is going to be expanded on the Northeast Corridor, construction projects and infrastructure projects must be done. The replacement of bridge -- moveable bridges in Connecticut and the Portal Bridge in New Jersey, and the rehabilitation of major stations, like Boston, South Station, and New York Penn Station, and 30th Street Station in Philadelphia. And, also, the Baltimore Tunnel must be rehabilitated so to increase train speed service and increase so more trains will be able to run through it.	<p>The FRA has incorporated several of these ideas into the Preferred Alternative. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for a complete description of the Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative includes a new, four-track infrastructure in tunnel, approaching Baltimore Penn Station from the west. The existing NEC, between Lafayette Avenue and North Avenue in Baltimore City would be retired from passenger rail service.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative includes new third and fourth Hudson River tunnels, beginning on embankment east of Secaucus Rail Station, terminating south of the existing NEC and Penn Station New York, under West 31st Street. Portal Bridge is identified as a Related Project in the Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative includes upgrading the existing NEC shoreline route and the addition of a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. It also bypasses the movable bridges and the 11 remaining at-grade crossings on the NEC.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line into the NEC, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield. The NEC FUTURE program is focused on corridor-wide solutions for passenger rail improvements, and the selection of the Preferred Alternative does not preclude future consideration of transit or fixed guideway improvements to meet other transportation needs across the Study Area.</p> <p>The North South Rail Link was not included in the No Action Alternative Project List (see Volume 2, Appendix B, No Action Alternative Report) as it does not meet the criteria for consideration: Funded projects or projects with approved funding plans, funded or unfunded mandates, unfunded projects necessary to keep the railroad running. Likewise, North South Rail Link was not included as a Related Project in the Action Alternatives because it does not meet the criteria for consideration: fully or partially funded projects located in a connecting corridor and not on the NEC; unfunded projects along the NEC with ongoing or completed NEPA/PE; fully or partially funded transit (e.g., NJ TRANSIT, MTA-LIRR) or freight projects located off of but connecting to the NEC. A project to connect Boston's North and South stations, such as the North South Rail Link, could be studied separately, and is not precluded as future investment.</p>
Wells_Ma	I would love to see high speed rail more high speed rail train service or more Acela trains. This country needs more high speed train service. We are so far behind Europe, Japan and China.	The FRA has focused on high-performance and improving travel times throughout the NEC rather than on track design speeds themselves. Where practical, the FRA has provided for design speeds up to 220 mph in the Preferred Alternative. Design speeds of up to 160 mph are suggested where grade, curvature, or other physical constraints limit speeds. The FRA further considered areas where 220 mph speeds could be incorporated in development of the Preferred Alternative. Specific design speeds could be further evaluated in subsequent Tier 2 project studies. Additional service planning assumptions are provided in Volume 1, Appendix BB, and Volume 2, Appendix B.5.
Wells_Pr	I would prefer the building of a mono-rail over I-95 that already exists.	In separate studies, the FRA continues to explore new technologies. Such systems would require separate stations, and would not support run-through trains from connecting corridors nor offer proven integration efficiencies with today's NEC infrastructure and operators. For these reasons, the FRA did not incorporate advanced guideway or similar new technologies in the NEC FUTURE Alternatives Development Process. However, the Preferred Alternative does not preclude the option in the future of building new transportation corridors supporting other technologies.
Werner_St	However,the biggest barrier to freight movement in the NEC is the disconnect in NY Harbor. The idea of a cross harbor rail freight tunnel was first proposed in 1921. It was one of the reasons for the creation of the Port Authority in 1921. However, nothing has been accomplished beyond periodic feasibility studies. ... I think that you should make mention of the Cross Harbor Rail Freight Tunnel as part of your proposals.	The NEC FUTURE NEPA process allows for the advancement of No Action Alternative projects or Related Projects (as defined in the No Action Alternative Report, see Volume 2, Appendix B) in separate but concurrent NEPA processes. The Cross Harbor Freight Movement Program is included in the No Action Alternative The FRA will continue to coordinate the technical analyses to ensure consistency with the Preferred Alternative.

Table JJ–7: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Weymouth_Ch	Common sense dictates drastically increased, high speed, efficient passenger rail service... A prerequisite solution must be found to expeditiously access current/proposed stations.	As a result of the Tier 1 Draft EIS and the public comment process, the FRA has identified a Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4). The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more-frequent, faster, and more-reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers.
Weymouth_Ch	Discovered at that time was an under utilized rail access from the intended site [the Claymont, Citi-Steel site] to within eight blocks of the Phila. International Airport.	the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure or alignments. Such decisions are made as part of the Tier 2 project studies planning processes, which would include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate. Consistent with this a Tier 1 NEPA process, the FRA developed Representative Routes for the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative, which provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the effects of each Alternative. Representative Routes define an envelope within which improvements might occur and whose location and construction type could change during subsequent Tier 2 project studies. Additional details of the Preferred Alternative have been identified in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Weymouth_Ch	By way of background, our firm produced, as an integral part of the Wilmington Master Plan-1996, a new commuter station, using existing multi tracks at the present AMTRAK service/marshalling yards (commuters bypassing constricted access to the present Wilmington Station), and, concurrently, during that period of time, proposing a Regional Inter modal Transportation Center at the North Claymont 420 acre Citi-Steel site, [such concept informally reviewed with favor by an on site Dept. of Transportation team],... For Citi-Steel, we further, in the overall Master Plan for the 420 acre entirety, divided those elements North of the current Rt. 13 Industrial Highway into a Corporate/Headquarters commons, and expanded retail. Retained was the entirety of property designated for the Regional Inter modal Transportation Center and with enhanced, adjacent heavy tonnage cruise and cargo Port facilities. This all to say the following, and with Urgency: Please immediately review, and as a priority, the preferred previous steel manufactory site to be the preferred and implemental Regional Inter modal Transportation Center Site. Currently, from the multi-fold of reviewing agencies, those oft within, not of the same conclusion in regard to site location, an overall authoritative body must intercede.	The Preferred Alternative serves Wilmington DE at the existing downtown station. It also includes a representative new Regional station at Edgemoor which would provide additional commuter travel options and station area parking. The service gap addressed with the addition of an Edgemoor Regional is consistent with the commenters point; while for NEC FUTURE the FRA will not identify a specific location, the Regional rail station in Edgemoor is representative of the area needs for improved Regional service. Subsequent Tier 2 project studies would include stakeholder and public involvement in determining the most effective location and would likely include consideration of development opportunities, compatibility with regional and local land use plans, and state and regional long-term plans. The Wilmington Master Plan will be an important consideration when site-specific decision are made.
Weymouth_Ch	An earlier, City of Wilmington Master Plan, authored by our firm designated an East Wilmington by pass over an existent rail right of way and with a relocated, new commuter station located at the present N. Wilmington marshalling/servicing AMTRAK yards. We, (under sub contract to Railroad Management Assoc's- 1996), in a study to determine the best location for a Claymont commuter station, performed a detailed demographic/user intensity analysis, proving a preponderence of passenger user from N. Brandywine Hundred/also Chester County, Pa., designed to schematic perspective, a pedestrian overpass/new commuter station, and, (due to ease of access) at that optimum location-- the Claymont, Citi-Steel (420 acres) site. Recognizing the strategic advantage of immediate adjacency to rail, water, multi interstate vehicular traffic routes, for the then current land owners, Citi-Steel (1996-2001) proposed along the AMTRAK alignment a multi purpose, Regional, Inter modal, Transportation Center, to include a combined commuter station w/ the North East corridor traffic, commercial retail, and adjacent, limited draft/expanded harbor... NOTING THIS FIRM'S EARLIER STUDIED SITES, ADDITIONALLY, AND WITH ITS POSSIBILITY OF INTERMODAL PASSENGER TRAFFIC , AT THE LESSOR OF INFRA STRUCTURE COST, A REGIONAL INTERMODAL CENTER MUST BE CONSIDERED.	The Preferred Alternative serves Wilmington DE at the existing downtown station. It also includes a representative new Regional station at Edgemoor which would provide additional commuter travel options and station area parking. The service gap addressed with the addition of an Edgemoor Regional is consistent with the commenters point; while for NEC FUTURE the FRA will not identify a specific location, the Regional rail station in Edgemoor is representative of the area needs for improved Regional service. Subsequent Tier 2 project studies would include stakeholder and public involvement in determining the most effective location and would likely include consideration of development opportunities, compatibility with regional and local land use plans, and state and regional long-term plans. The Wilmington Master Plan will be an important consideration when site-specific decisions are made.

Table JJ–7: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Weymouth_Ch	A Regional Inter Modal Transportation Center provides that justification. With the Federal Railroad Administration now considering high speed rail, to include an East bi pass of the Wilmington Station, (the State embarrassed at two major, multi million dollar, renovations/additions to that Station, while continued inadequate vehicular access from 1-95), what could be more logical than a major and new station complex at the N. Claymont site?	The Preferred Alternative serves Wilmington DE at the existing downtown station. It also includes a representative new Regional station at Edgemoor which would provide additional commuter travel options and station area parking. The service gap addressed with the addition of an Edgemoor Regional is consistent with the commenters point; while for NEC FUTURE the FRA will not identify a specific location, the Regional rail station in Edgemoor is representative of the area needs for improved Regional service. Subsequent Tier 2 project studies would include stakeholder and public involvement in determining the most effective location and would likely include consideration of development opportunities, compatibility with regional and local land use plans, and state and regional long-term plans. The Wilmington Master Plan will be an important consideration when site-specific decisions are made. The FRA will continue to work with project sponsors to ensure that subsequent Tier 2 project studies to advance the Preferred Alternative reflect on-going initiatives such as the Newark and Claymont Regional Transportation Centers.
Whisker_Pa	Do not run rails through historic districts, museums or established town centers. Find alternate routes -- try heading north east from Clinton and save the shore towns.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative includes a new supplemental segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI and improvements to the existing NEC. As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, and will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure. Such decisions would be made as part of the Tier 2 project planning and NEPA processes, which would include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate. The FRA proposes a commitment to avoiding use of an aerial structure through the historic district of Old Lyme, CT. Consistent with the Tier 1 NEPA process, the FRA developed Representative Routes for the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative, which provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the effects of each Alternative. Representative Routes define an envelope within which improvements might occur and whose location and construction type could change during subsequent Tier 2 project studies.
Wilcox_Ad	I do not support High Speed rail. After skimming some of the documentation, I have no other objections to NEC FUTURE plans.	After deliberating the comments received and the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative that improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Wilkins_An	Including Worcester in the future plan for the Northeast Corridor will provide synergy with other regional rail plans, such as the Northern New England Rail Initiative.	The FRA identified a Preferred Alternative that focuses on leveraging the investment in the existing NEC and Hartford/Springfield Lines over the proposed Hartford-Worcester routing. FRA considered travel time improvements, connectivity, environmental benefits and effects and overall mobility benefits when deciding on a Preferred Alternative. In addition to the FRA decision to prioritize the NEC, the cost of a second spine was high relative to the travel-time savings and other benefits. The FRA found that much of the benefit of Alternative 3 can be achieved with the Preferred Alternative at a lower cost. The rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative is provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative. The inclusion of the Hartford/Springfield Line in the Preferred Alternative provides improved service frequency and travel times via Springfield for origins and destinations east to Worcester and Boston. Future improvements between Springfield and Boston, as proposed in the Northern New England Intercity Rail Initiative (NNEIRI) complement the improved Intercity and Regional rail connections offered at Springfield Union Station with the Preferred Alternative.

Table JJ–7: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Wooley_Jo	Hubs work -- hubs work well when they're done right. When they're not done right, they become kind of -- well, they're better than nothing, but they kind of let the public down. And that's true for passenger rail, it's true for freight rail, it's true for aircraft as well. Which is why the airlines tend to have the planes come in and make as quick a transfer time as possible between the incoming plane and the outgoing plane. And for the New York City subway, it works the same way. A transfer between a local platform -- you have a cross platform transfer between a local train and an express train. It works great when they come in relatively close together and then you can make it. When you have a long wait, you've kind of wasted some time. A lot of time in some cases. And the first thing I would say is, with the hub concept, and I think it's a great one, for gosh sake, you have to design it in such a way that it will work well. You have to have the easy transfer between what Mr. Alan talked about between the local and the express trains. Because if you don't, people are going to spend too much time waiting on platforms to negate any -- any time savings that may have gone, and in the end they'll end up just deciding to go on another mode of transport.	The Preferred Alternative adds sufficient capacity to support hub-type operations at both Philadelphia 30th Street Station and New Haven, CT. At both stations, passengers will be able to connect to different types of intercity trains -- e.g., from an Intercity Corridor train to an Intercity Express train -- or to a regional train (e.g., to a local train at New Haven serving Westport or Clinton, CT). As noted, hubs require easy transfers between trains and a very high degree of service reliability, which are elements of the Preferred Alternative. The FRA will work with the NEC rail operators to advance hub operations as the Preferred Alternative is implemented. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Yale_Jacob	We're also very pleased to see, in this version of the EIS plan, that we've moved to having very concrete and specific targets for travel between certain points. And certainly we were very pleased to see that we're getting to the range of talking about one hour between New York and New Haven, for example.	As described in Volume 2, Chapter 3, the purpose of the NEC FUTURE rail investment program is to upgrade aging infrastructure and to improve the reliability, capacity, connectivity, performance, and resiliency of passenger rail service on the NEC. The FRA considered improved connectivity and travel times in developing the Preferred Alternative (as described in Volume 1, Chapter 4).
Yale_Jacob	We're also very pleased to see significant discussion in the plan about connection among different rail lines and envisioning ways, for example, with appropriate scheduling, to move something closer to one-seat rides, even if we don't have actual one-seat rides, facilitating the connections. I'm very pleased to see that.	As described in Volume 2, Chapter 3, the purpose of the NEC FUTURE rail investment program is to upgrade aging infrastructure and to improve the reliability, capacity, connectivity, performance, and resiliency of passenger rail service on the NEC. The FRA considered improved connectivity and travel times in developing the Preferred Alternative (as described in Volume 1, Chapter 4).
Yale_Jacob	...while it is prudent to plan for development of high-speed trains travelling faster than 200 mph, those plans will not be realized for decades and the existing corridor will be the only alignment for the foreseeable future. It is therefore imperative that the FRA use the EIS process to enable investments that will achieve substantial improvements on the New Haven Line and take advantage of current upgrades to the New Haven-Hartford-Springfield Line.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative brings the NEC to a state of good repair and replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers.</p> <p>The FRA noted concerns about service on the New Haven-Hartford-Springfield line. In light of these and other considerations, the Preferred Alternative includes an enhanced, electrified Hartford/Springfield Line, leveraging recent and future investments to create intermodal connections and strengthen existing urban centers. Connections north and east of Springfield would be possible. Further details are included in Volume 1, Chapter 4.</p>
Young_Ha	Improving Penn Station and building the new tunnels under the Hudson are the two most important immediate goals.	The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. Important elements of the Preferred Alternative include addition of two additional tracks under both the Hudson and East Rivers, as well as expansion of Penn Station New York to support demand beyond 2040. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Young_Ha	Long term, rebuilding the NEC to true high speed rail is a must.	As described in Volume 2, Chapter 3, the purpose of the NEC FUTURE rail investment program is to upgrade aging infrastructure and to improve the reliability, capacity, connectivity, performance, and resiliency of passenger rail service on the NEC. The FRA considered improved connectivity and improved travel time in developing the Preferred Alternative. See Volume 1, Chapter 4, for discussion on the Preferred Alternative.

Table JJ–7: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Anonymous_001	Another major concern is that this draft does not include any plans to connect South Station in Boston to the North Station.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. The Preferred Alternative does include an extension of service north of Boston. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The North South Rail Link was not included in the No Action Alternative Project List (see Volume 2, Appendix B, No Action Alternative Report) as it does not meet the criteria for consideration: Funded projects or projects with approved funding plans, funded or unfunded mandates, unfunded projects necessary to keep the railroad running. Likewise, North South Rail Link was not included as a Related Project in the Action Alternatives because it does not meet the criteria for consideration: fully or partially funded projects located in a connecting corridor and not on the NEC; unfunded projects along the NEC with ongoing or completed NEPA/PE; fully or partially funded transit (e.g., NJ TRANSIT, MTA-LIRR) or freight projects located off of but connecting to the NEC. A project to connect Boston's North and South stations, such as the North South Rail Link, could be studied separately, and is not precluded as future investment.
Anonymous_008	Establish multi use passes or touches for traveling between CT and NJ.	The FRA supports development of a single fare medium for use across the NEC to access all rail operators, which is included in the Preferred Alternative to enhance the customer experience. Fare policies, such as multi-use fares, are determined by individual operators. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Anonymous_012	A train that stops at Philadelphia airport, Newark and BWI would be a boon to travelers.	The Preferred Alternative creates intermodal connections by concentrating improvements on urban hub stations well served by transit and by creating convenient airport services with frequent intercity and regional service. In addition to BWI and Newark airports, new segment provide service to Philadelphia International Airport, TF Green Airport in Providence, and Bradley International Airport. For additional details on the Preferred Alternative, see Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Anonymous_012	Trains need to be cheaper and faster and reliable.	The Preferred Alternatives focuses on upgrades to the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment. By replacing aging infrastructure, eliminating chokepoints, and adding new segment, the Preferred Alternative, described in Volume 1, Chapter 4, provides 3-4 times as much service as today, faster speeds and a significant increase in reliability. The Preferred Alternative includes the introduction of Metropolitan service, a frequent lower cost service to many intermediate destinations. For more details on fare assumptions, see Volume 1, Appendix BB. Specific details on fares will be determined by railroad operators, during subsequent Tier 2 project studies.
Anonymous_027	Need a true express line. DC Philly NYC Boston	As described in Volume 2, Chapter 3, the purpose of the NEC FUTURE rail investment program is to upgrade aging infrastructure and to improve the reliability, capacity, connectivity, performance, and resiliency of passenger rail service on the NEC. The FRA developed representative Service Plans that include service frequencies, stopping patterns, train routings, and rolling stock characteristics in order to assess their ability to achieve efficient use of proposed rail infrastructure capacity and to serve the NEC's rail travel markets. The Service Plans are representational only and consistent with a Tier 1 level of detail, required for analysis of capacity, performance, and costs, as well as assessment of the environmental impacts associated with planned improvements. Limited-stop Intercity-Express service envisioned for the Preferred Alternative would offer very competitive trip times at a substantially smaller investment than the capacity necessary to provide for non-stop high-speed rail service on a dedicated second spine. The Preferred Alternative has the potential to accommodate other service plans that feature super-express limited stop services that can offer market dominant travel times and offer potential for higher margin intercity rail products that might attract public-private partnerships. Additional information on the representative service plans are included in Volume 1, Appendix BB, and Volume 2, Appendix B.

Table JJ–7: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Alternatives Related (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Anonymous_028	We once were the best in railroads and now we are like a fourth World Country. France has an efficient and fast rail system all over their country moving people and freight. We have gas guzzling trucks. I France can have a TGV why cant we?	<p>The Preferred Alternative brings the existing NEC to a state of good repair and maximizes its capacity through alleviation of chokepoints, addition of new tracks and segments at targeted locations, and implementation of service operational efficiencies. The Preferred Alternative includes an enhanced, electrified Hartford/Springfield Line. The Preferred Alternative also removes speed restrictions where practical and safe, reduces trip times, offers frequent Metropolitan and enhanced express Intercity services, and allows substantial growth for all Regional rail markets. For additional information on the Preferred Alternative, see Volume 1, Chapter 4.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative does not include a second spine. However, the FRA recognizes it is possible that in future decades there may be need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of expansion.</p>
Anonymous_029	How about a truly fast /express train between NYC and Boston /DC?	As described in Volume 2, Chapter 3, the purpose of the NEC FUTURE rail investment program is to upgrade aging infrastructure and to improve the reliability, capacity, connectivity, performance, and resiliency of passenger rail service on the NEC. The FRA developed representative Service Plans that include service frequencies, stopping patterns, train routings, and rolling stock characteristics in order to assess their ability to achieve efficient use of proposed rail infrastructure capacity and to serve the NEC's rail travel markets. The Service Plans are representational only and consistent with a Tier 1 level of detail, required for analysis of capacity, performance, and costs, as well as assessment of the environmental impacts associated with planned improvements. Limited-stop Intercity-Express service envisioned for the Preferred Alternative would offer very competitive trip times at a substantially smaller investment than the capacity necessary to provide for non-stop high-speed rail service on a dedicated second spine. The Preferred Alternative has the potential to accommodate other service plans that feature super-express limited stop services that can offer market dominant travel times and offer potential for higher margin intercity rail products that might attract public-private partnerships. Additional information on the representative service plans are included in Volume 1, Appendix BB, and Volume 2, Appendix B.
Anonymous_032	It's completely criminal the fact that Amtrak even thinks it has the right to build tracks in downtown Philadelphia and to the Airport, bypassing the SEPTA system.	The Preferred Alternative does not include a second station in Philadelphia. The Preferred Alternative, described in Volume 1, Chapter 4, focuses on the Philadelphia 30th Street Station to support the significant growth in both intercity and regional rail service envisioned by the Preferred Alternative in Philadelphia.
Anonymous_055	Technological leaps that cannot even be imagined today will render any newly designed system completely obsolete and grossly inefficient. Focusing on investments in existing track capacity and increasing frequency of service would be a more prudent course that will minimize switching costs when a technological leap occurs.	The Preferred Alternative does not preclude the option of building new transportation corridors supporting other technologies. The Preferred Alternative focuses on upgrading the existing NEC to accommodate future growth in population and employment, as described in Volume 1, Chapter 4, and it replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers.

Source: NEC FUTURE team, 2016

JJ.5.4 Transportation

The following spreadsheets contain comments on the Transportation Effects Assessment of the No Action Alternative and Action Alternatives described in Volume 2, Chapter 5, Transportation Effects. The comments focused on the current and future utilization of the NEC by freight operators, operation of the commuter rail service within the Study Area, expressed support for improved train connections to airports, and the importance of through-running and improved connecting services. While the FRA followed the same methodology for the Transportation Effects Assessment of the Preferred Alternative, three adjustments to the analysis were made in response to comments received. A description of these adjustments, as well as the Transportation Effects Assessment of the No Action Alternative and Preferred Alternative can be found in Volume 1, Chapter 5, Transportation Effects.

Table JJ–8: Stakeholder Comments (Elected Officials, Tribes, Federal Agencies, State Agencies, Local Agencies): Transportation

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Amtrak_Boardman	Consideration of freight development and its impact on alternative infrastructure options is limited. Beyond recognizing capacity and reliability constraints inherent to shared-use infrastructure (pages 3-8 and 3-13), there is no real comparative analysis of how the different alternatives impact freight traffic.	<p>For the Preferred Alternative, the FRA provides an expanded discussion of the interface between freight operations and the proposed passenger service and associated infrastructure improvements. This expanded discussion highlights the existing freight access to the NEC, locations along the NEC where conflicts or constraints could effect freight traffic, potential effects on freight traffic growth opportunities, and the economic effects and benefits of freight (Volume 1, Chapters 4, 5, and 6).</p> <p>The NEC FUTURE planning process provides representative routes and service plans; as such, the FRA includes only general statements regarding the interaction between passenger rail and freight rail. Specific or more-detailed discussions of impacts to freight traffic will be discussed and resolved during subsequent Tier 2 project studies, including public and stakeholder participation as appropriate.</p>
Amtrak_Boardman	The opportunities to create wider transportation hubs (including transit, pedestrian, bicycle, bus) were given limited consideration in the station development discussion (Section 6.3.5.1).	<p>The Preferred Alternative focuses on improved connections between passenger rail services and access to the multimodal transportation system. Opportunities for bicycle access to trains and passenger stations are generally described at this Tier 1 level of analysis in Volume 1, Chapter 5. Site-specific or location-specific decisions or equipment design configuration will be the subject of subsequent Tier 2 project studies.</p> <p>An expanded discussion of the importance of and opportunities for multimodal access to passenger rail stations, particularly at Major Hubs and Hubs, is included in Volume 1, Chapters 5 and 6.</p>
Cecil County_DiGiacomo	Freight movement needs to be emphasized more. First, the specific freight railroad stakeholders need to be identified. Second, the fact that more rail ridership frees up highway capacity, enhancing mobility for truck freight movement (so important along the NE Corridor) needs to be articulated.	Additional information on the role of freight rail in the region, and the type of commodities moved, was added to Volume 1, Chapter 6. Freight railroad stakeholders involved with the FRA throughout the NEC FUTURE program are identified in Volume 2, Chapters 3 and 11, and Volume 1, Chapters 4, 5, and 6, along with additional ownership information. The FRA focused NEC FUTURE on passenger rail improvements and as such did not include forecasting shifts in freight movement from highway to rail.
Cecil County_DiGiacomo	Considering [the fact that more rail ridership frees up highway capacity], the lane-miles of highways that would not have to be built as a result of each ofthe enumerated alternatives needs to be quantified (under the Sustainability section).	Given the broad scale of NEC FUTURE and the focus on passenger rail, the FRA did not attempt to evaluate modal alternatives to passenger rail. Therefore, the cost-effectiveness of passenger rail relative to air or highway improvements was not part of the overall study effort. For NEC FUTURE, the FRA considered the complementarity of air, rail, and highway transportation modes as a system necessary to meet overall future travel needs. In this regard, the FRA evaluated the role of passenger rail as a component of the overall regional transportation system. This approach is described in Volume 2, Chapters 1 and 3, and Volume 1, Chapters 3, 4, and 5.
Central Falls_Friedrichs	Service is proposed to a Pawtucket train station in Tiers 2 and 3 of the Northeast Corridor Environmental Impact Statement. The new station would provide access to the Northeast Corridor from northern Rhode Island and southeast Massachusetts without dealing with the congestion of Downtown Providence.	For NEC FUTURE, the FRA developed representative service plans and Representative Routes to evaluate the Action Alternatives. Pawtucket is a Regional rail station served by MBTA today and is included as a Regional rail station for service proposed for the Preferred Alternative, as it was in Alternatives 2 and 3. With the Preferred Alternative, Regional rail service to Pawtucket could see significant increases, depending on travel demand, over today's levels. Specific stations and stopping patterns are not decided for the Preferred Alternative, but would be decided in subsequent Tier 2 project studies.

Table JJ–8: Stakeholder Comments (Elected Officials, Tribes, Federal Agencies, State Agencies, Local Agencies): Transportation (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
CONRAIL_Broder	What we believe is most important, however, is for FRA to recognize in the Final EIS that the future of the NEC is as critical for freight rail as it is for passenger service. Accordingly, Conrail believes it is critical for FRA to adopt the following guiding principles in its evaluation of the Draft EIS proposed alternatives: Any Preferred Alternative must have the ability to preserve current freight service levels and access to freight rail customers throughout the entire existing or proposed NEC Any Preferred Alternative must provide sufficient capacity that does not preclude future expansion of freight service in the current or proposed NEC Any Preferred Alternative should provide opportunities for synergies in rail infrastructure investments that would benefit both passenger and freight rail service.	<p>NEC FUTURE considers opportunities where additional infrastructure would expand the efficiency and use of passenger rail services along the NEC. The Tier I EIS assumes that additional infrastructure would support complementary investments in the regional freight network and enable additional carrying capacity of those systems.</p> <p>NEC FUTURE is a passenger rail program and as such identifies improvements necessary to operate to desired passenger service levels while maintaining access to freight traffic already operating along the NEC. As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA takes a corridor-wide perspective and will not make decisions about specific alignments of infrastructure improvements; those would be made in subsequent Tier 2 project studies which would include stakeholder and public participation as appropriate.</p> <p>It is the aim of NEC FUTURE to not preclude investment under consideration throughout the freight rail network. Some opportunities to create greater efficiencies in both passenger and freight service, where those objectives are aligned, have also been identified. The FRA included representatives of the stakeholder freight railroads as part of overall coordination with the Northeast Corridor Commission and is committed to continuing this collaboration moving forward.</p> <p>Specific requirements regarding freight rail are highlighted in Volume 1 and will be further identified, as relevant, in the Record of Decision.</p>
CONRAIL_Broder	The Draft EIS asserts on page S-3 that "the investment program will be defined in a way that preserves current and planned service levels for freight railroad operations." While Conrail welcomes that assurance, at this time, Conrail concludes there is insufficient information in the Draft EIS to make any determination on what the real impacts on freight will be from any of the alternatives considered or whether current and planned service levels for freight railroad operations will in fact be preserved. We reiterate our concerns about any potential for limitations on current and future freight capacity in terms of volumes, weight or height restrictions or windows of service. The Draft EIS also states on page S-3 that "[o]pportunities are also being considered to accommodate improvement of freight rail service within the NEC FUTURE Study Area." Again, Conrail appreciates that representation, but we similarly conclude there is insufficient information to evaluate purported "opportunities under consideration for the improvement of freight rail service" in the Study Area. - We recommend that FRA revise the text in the final EIS to include a statement that the Commission will work closely with Conrail and the other freight railroads in the Study Area to protect current and future expansion of freight service levels.	The FRA will continue to coordinate with freight railroads operating on railroad rights-of-way connecting to the NEC; this coordination will be facilitated by the Northeast Corridor Commission and directed by the FRA as appropriate. Information about freight rail ownership and the types and volumes of commodities has been added to Volume 1, Chapters 4, 5, and 6, to better describe what is known about existing and future freight rail needs in the Study Area.

Table JJ–8: Stakeholder Comments (Elected Officials, Tribes, Federal Agencies, State Agencies, Local Agencies): Transportation (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
CONRAIL_Broder	<p>We have serious concerns about any Action Alternative that could compromise the freight capacity in the key freight nodes in south Philadelphia and the Chester area. Economic growth in this region, particularly in the energy, petrochemical and manufacturing sectors, has led to an increase in rail traffic. Indeed, this region is experiencing greater volumes of rail traffic than it has seen in many years. Conrail is working with stakeholders to improve our freight network to accommodate curient and anticipated growth, particularly along the Chester Industrial Track. We have serious concerns about any Action Alternative that could compromise the freight capacity in the key freight nodes in south Philadelphia and the Chester area. Economic growth in this region, particularly in the energy, petrochemical and manufacturing sectors, has led to an increase in rail traffic. Indeed, this region is experiencing greater volumes of rail traffic than it has seen in many years. Conrail is working with stakeholders to improve our freight network to accommodate curient and anticipated growth, particularly along the Chester Industrial Track... Conrail owns the Chester Industrial Track from its terminus in Claymont Delaware, north to where this line meets the SEPTA Airport Track. The City of Philadelphia owns the portion of the Chester Industrial Track known as the SEPTA Airport Line. Conrail has operating rights over the SEPTA Airport Line. Conrail also owns the section of the Chester Industrial Track north of the SEPTA Airport Line. The extent of the proposed interference with Conrail's Chestei Industrial Track is unclear, however, even a scenario involving curfews or specific travel windows would be unacceptable to Conrail. Freight railroads need to have the ability to operate during daytime hours to meet the growing service needs of freight shippers and customers. Conrail does not support any proposed Action Alternative that involves the use of Conrail's existing freight rail infrastructure.</p>	<p>As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure or alignments. Such decisions are made as part of Tier 2 project studies, which will include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate. Consistent with this process, the FRA developed Representative Routes for the Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative, which provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the effects of each Alternative. Representative Routes define an envelope within which improvements might occur and whose location and construction type could change during subsequent Tier 2 project analysis.</p> <p>The Representative Route for the Preferred Alternative near the Philadelphia Airport is representative of a path that would roughly parallel the existing SEPTA Airport Line; any decisions about use of privately owned rail rights-of-way, by Conrail or others, or changes in existing access agreements will be made in subsequent Tier 2 project studies. The FRA is committed to ongoing coordination with each of the NEC railroads.</p>
CONRAIL_Broder	<p>Another critical economic development location for freight rail is Raritan Center in New Jersey. Freight volumes have grown rapidly in this area and we anticipate further growth. Conrail has to operate over the NEC to service customers in this area. The area around exit 10 of the New Jersey Turn pike is one oft he few areas that has enough available land to support significant economic growth in the New York Metropolitan Area -- and freight rail access is a very important factor in that growth. It is critical to recognize that the NEC may be the only freight rail access to some ofthese locations. - We recommend that the FRA include in the Final EIS an express recognition that continued economic growth in the corridor is dependent, at least in part, upon allowing for existing and future growth in freight rail service on the NEC.</p>	<p>NEC FUTURE does not preclude investment under consideration throughout the freight rail network. Some opportunities to create greater efficiencies in both passenger and freight service, where those objectives are aligned, have also been identified in Volume 1, Chapter 5. The FRA participated in discussions with the stakeholder freight railroads as part of the overall coordination to understand the needs of the freight rail industry as they relate to the NEC. The FRA is committed to continuing this collaboration moving forward.</p> <p>Specific reference to the importance of freight rail to the economic growth of the Study Area, as well as a discussion of the economics of freight rail, is included in Volume 1, Chapter 6.</p>
CONRAIL_Broder	<p>With the development of the Port systems in the Delaware Valley region, including the Port of Paulsboro, double-stack clearance is becoming increasing critical to economic development. Many consumer goods arrive via intermodal service, which is most efficient when containers can be double stacked on rail cars, helping ensure that there is sufficient traffic density and efficiencies to allow rail intermodal options to be cost competitive with all-truck movements. The nation's leading container ports depend on double-stack rail. It is critical that the NEC incorporates higher vertical standards to allow the continued delivery of freight to customers and the surrounding communities. Currently, sections of NEC are limited to single stack rail service. Providing double-stack access for ports and major domestic load centers will be crucial to expanding freight rail's share of the intermodal market. We recommend that the FRA include specific reference to those critical infrastructure improvements along the NEC that will facilitate the operation of double-stack intermodal freight rail operations.</p>	<p>As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and will not make decisions about final alignments, infrastructure, or vertical and horizontal clearances. Such decisions are made as part of the Tier 2 project studies, which would include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate. Consistent with this process, the FRA developed Representative Routes for the Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative, which provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the effects of each Alternative. Representative Routes define an envelope within which improvements might occur and whose location and construction type could change during subsequent Tier 2 project analysis.</p> <p>Providing for the efficient and effective movement of freight rail is important to the FRA and stakeholders along the NEC. Consideration of freight rail requirements in Tier 2 project studies, where NEC is shared or could be shared, are discussed in Volume 1, Chapters 4 and 5. At this level of analysis, although the FRA did not identify specific infrastructure improvements to facilitate double-stack intermodal freight rail operations, in light of the critical role that freight rail plays, the FRA added language in Volume 1, Chapters 4 and 5, to better describe the existing constraints faced by freight railroads operating on the existing NEC and opportunities or effects of the Preferred Alternative.</p>

Table JJ–8: Stakeholder Comments (Elected Officials, Tribes, Federal Agencies, State Agencies, Local Agencies): Transportation (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
CONRAIL_Broder	Similarly, Conrail believes the viability and success of future freight rail service on the NEC will hinge on the capability of the corridor infrastructure to support the use of cars with 286,000 lb. gross vehicle weight. The use of 286k GVW allows more freight to be moved in each car, thereby reducing carloads and car-miles needed to move a given amount of freight. Currently, most of the NEC are not cleared for 286k GVW This weight limitation standard is outdated and plans to increase the weight limits on the NEC should be explored. We recommend that the FRA include in the Final EIS a discussion of how a modernization of freight car weight limits could result in important efficiencies in the use of the NEC.	<p>The FRA will not make specific decisions about weight requirements or other design criteria as part of the NEC FUTURE process. These decisions will be made in subsequent Tier 2 project studies, involving various stakeholders as well as the public.</p> <p>Freight and passenger access to the NEC remain an important consideration and as such should be reflected in future designs. Modernization of freight car weight limits is a much larger policy issue beyond the scope of NEC FUTURE.</p>
CONRAIL_Broder	Finally, Conrail believes that coordination between Amtrak, FRA and the freight railroads on the design and installation of new NEC station high level platforms is imperative to ensure that the high level platforms do not restrict clearances for freight operation and line capacity. If this issue is not resolved and new stations are constructed without the freight railroads' input, these new high level platforms will permanently restrict freight capacity on the NEC.	Recognizing the operating challenges shared rail corridors can represent to both passenger and freight, it is the aim of NEC FUTURE to not preclude investment under consideration throughout the freight rail network, or to degrade the viability of the rail system for freight operations in the future. The FRA participated in discussions with the stakeholder freight railroads as part of the overall coordination to understand the needs of the freight rail industry as they relate to the NEC. The FRA is committed to continuing this collaboration moving forward.
CRCOG_Wray	Need to Coordinate Rail with Other Modes and Leverage On-Going Planning Efforts: The Tier 1 Draft EIS identifies the importance of rail interfacing and connecting with other modes of travel. The state of Connecticut and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) have invested significant funding into CTfastrak, the state's first bust rapid transit (BRT) system. The Connecticut Department of Transportation (CTDOT) is in the process of extending CTfastrak east of the Connecticut River, connecting to important markets including the University of Connecticut. The Tier 1 Draft EIS does not acknowledge this critical investment in our transit system and does not support rail interfacing with existing modes of transportation.	The Preferred Alternative includes enhanced Intercity and Regional service, with direct connections to the NEC, from New Haven to Hartford, CT, and to Springfield, MA. This service, and the importance of connections to CTfastrak are described in Volume 1, Chapter 5.
CRCOG_Wray	Consideration for Freight Service: CRCOG encourages FRA to consider freight rail movement of goods through the NEC. It will be critical to understand the potential impacts to the freight network and focus on the need to strengthen Connecticut' s rail freight network.	<p>Current and future utilization of the NEC by each of the rail operators, both passenger and freight, are important considerations in long-term planning. However, NEC FUTURE is a passenger rail program and as such identifies improvements necessary to operate to desired passenger service levels while maintaining access to freight traffic already operating along the NEC. Some opportunities to create greater efficiencies in both passenger and freight service, where those objectives are aligned, have also been identified in Volume 1, Chapter 5. It is the aim of NEC FUTURE to not preclude investment under consideration throughout the freight rail network. The FRA participated in discussions with the stakeholder freight railroads as part of the overall coordination to understand the needs of the freight rail industry as they relate to the NEC.</p> <p>Additional information on the role of freight rail in the region, and the type of commodities moved, was added to Volume 1, Chapter 6.</p>

Table JJ-8: Stakeholder Comments (Elected Officials, Tribes, Federal Agencies, State Agencies, Local Agencies): Transportation (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
CSX_Turra	<p>* Any Preferred Alternative must have the ability to preserve current freight service levels and access to freight rail customers throughout the entire existing or proposed NEC</p> <p>* Any Preferred Alternative must provide sufficient capacity to not preclude future expansion of freight service in the current or proposed NEC</p> <p>* Any Preferred Alternative should provide opportunities for synergy in rail infrastructure investments that would benefit both passenger and freight rail service.</p> <p>* Any Preferred Alternative should not contemplate the use of any of CSXT's property.</p>	<p>The FRA heard from several states and stakeholders about the importance of freight-access to the NEC. Although the focus of NEC FUTURE is passenger rail, the definition of Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative incorporated existing and available information on forecast freight rail movements in service and infrastructure planning.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative preserves freight access to and from the existing NEC and Hartford/Springfield Line to seaports, inland ports, and dedicated freight corridors within the Study Area. Future freight expansion opportunities including a dedicated north-south high-clearance, high-density freight line would not be precluded in the Preferred Alternative. Specific decisions about multimodal facilities or other freight-specific infrastructure investments would be the subject of other studies (Volume 1, Chapter 5).</p> <p>Within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide passenger rail solutions and will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure or alignments. Such decisions are made as part of Tier 2 project studies, which would include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate. Consistent with this process, the FRA developed Representative Routes for the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative, which provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the effects of each Alternative. Representative Routes define an envelope within which improvements might occur and whose location and construction type could change during subsequent Tier 2 project analysis.</p>
CSX_Turra	<p>We recommend that FRA revise the text in the Final EIS to demonstrate that any Action Alternative selected to ease select chokepoints also would demonstrably offer benefits to freight rail, and that selection of any Preferred Alternative would not diminish freight-related outcomes relative to an alternative not selected.</p>	<p>The Preferred Alternative preserves freight access to and from the existing NEC and Hartford/Springfield Line to seaports, inland ports, and dedicated freight corridors within the Study Area. The FRA also considered opportunities to accommodate future growth and improvement of freight rail service within the Study Area. Future freight expansion opportunities including a dedicated north-south high-clearance high-density freight line would not be precluded in the Preferred Alternative (Volume 1, Chapter 5).</p> <p>Within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure or alignments. Such decisions will be made as part of Tier 2 project studies, which will include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate. Consistent with this process, the FRA developed Representative Routes for the Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative, which provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the effects of each Alternative. Representative Routes define an envelope within which improvements might occur and whose location and construction type could change during subsequent Tier 2 project studies.</p>
CSX_Turra	<p>We recommend that the FRA include specific reference to those critical infrastructure improvements along the NEC that will facilitate freight rail operations.</p>	<p>As appropriate, the description of the Preferred Alternative in the Tier 1 Final EIS Volume 1, Chapter 4, describes where representative infrastructure improvements could result in shared benefits to both passenger and freight rail services.</p> <p>Within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, the FRA focused on corridor-wide solutions and did not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure or alignments. Such decisions will be made as part of Tier 2 project studies, which will include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate. Consistent with this process, the FRA developed Representative Routes for the Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative, which provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the effects of each Alternative. Representative Routes define an envelope within which improvements might occur and whose location and construction type could change during subsequent Tier 2 project analysis.</p>

Table JJ–8: Stakeholder Comments (Elected Officials, Tribes, Federal Agencies, State Agencies, Local Agencies): Transportation (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
CSX_Turra	We recommend that FRA include in the Final EIS a discussion of how a modernization of freight car weight limits could produce important efficiencies in use of the NEC.	The focus of NEC FUTURE is passenger rail, the definition of Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative incorporated existing and available information on forecast freight rail movements in service and infrastructure planning. Specific decisions about freight-specific infrastructure investments operating changes could be considered in other studies. Within the context of this Tier 1 NEPA process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide passenger rail solutions and will not make decisions about freight operating conditions including car weight limits.
CSX_Turra	We recommend that FRA provide greater detail in the Final EIS as to how, with continued urban growth and limited highway capacity to transport freight, the NEC can provide critical access for goods and services to reach the largest cities in the Northeast.	As part of NEC FUTURE, the FRA focused on passenger rail within the context of the overall multimodal transportation system. Further evaluation of the constraints or limitations of the highway network, are beyond the scope of NEC FUTURE. The FRA did consider current and future utilization of the NEC for the movement of freight. However, NEC FUTURE is a passenger rail program and as such identifies improvements necessary to operate to desired passenger service levels while maintaining access to freight traffic already operating along the NEC. Some opportunities to create greater efficiencies in both passenger and freight service, where those objectives are aligned, have also been identified in Volume 1, Chapter 5. It is the aim of NEC FUTURE to not preclude investment under consideration throughout the freight rail network. The FRA participated in discussions with the stakeholder freight railroads as part of the overall coordination to understand the needs of the freight rail industry as they relate to the NEC.
CSX_Turra	We recommend that FRA take steps to insure that its actions regarding Tier III operations do not compromise its commitment that the NEC will continue to be available for freight service.	Current and future utilization of the NEC by both passenger and freight rail operators are important considerations in long-term planning. While NEC FUTURE is a passenger rail program and as such identifies improvements necessary to operate desired passenger service levels, maintaining access to freight traffic already operating along the NEC has been a general service planning objective. Some opportunities to create greater efficiencies in both passenger and freight service, where those objectives are aligned, have also been identified in Volume 1, Chapter 5. It is the aim of NEC FUTURE to not preclude investment under consideration throughout the freight rail network. FRA, in collaboration with the Northeast Corridor Commission, coordinated with representatives of stakeholder freight railroads to understand the needs of the freight rail industry as they relate to the NEC. Service planning assumptions for NEC FUTURE include Tier III train operations on the existing NEC at up to 160 mph which is similar to current Amtrak proposals. FRA assumes that NEC FUTURE would create conditions that would enable implementation of this operating assumption and would maintain the availability of the NEC for freight service similar to today.
CT DECD_Chandy	The Tier 1 DEIS does not currently contemplate a rail connection to Bradley International Airport. This omission is a significant concern for DECD. The Amtrak connection to BWI Airport, for example, has provided a major boost for the Maryland/Baltimore/Washington corridor. Service at Bradley is expanding and there needs to be coordination with the existing and proposed rail infrastructure.	In the Hartford, CT, area, the Preferred Alternative Representative Route via New Haven to Hartford, CT, and Springfield, MA, includes a station stop at Windsor Locks, CT, which is only 2.5 miles from Bradley Airport and accessible with a quality transit or shuttle bus connection. The Preferred Alternative leverages the ongoing investment by the State of Connecticut and the FRA in the Hartford/Springfield Line and as such the Representative Route does not deviate from that routing to provide a direct rail connection to Bradley International Airport. The FRA will not decide specific details for this type of connecting service as part of NEC FUTURE. Those decisions will be the subject of subsequent Tier 2 project studies that will include public and stakeholder outreach. The timing and focus of subsequent Tier 2 project studies will be determined by the State of Connecticut.

Table JJ–8: Stakeholder Comments (Elected Officials, Tribes, Federal Agencies, State Agencies, Local Agencies): Transportation (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
CT DECD_Chandy	Freight-rail network needs to be a component in the NEC Future planning. Freight-rail can relieve congestion on the highway systems and can have an impact on economic development. Freight connections to our airport systems can make us more competitive in the International markets.	Current and future utilization of the NEC by each of the rail operators, both passenger and freight, are important considerations in long-term planning. Similarly, freight rail is important to the regional economy. However, NEC FUTURE is a passenger rail program and as such identifies improvements necessary to operate to desired passenger service levels while maintaining access to freight traffic already operating along the NEC. It is the aim of NEC FUTURE to not preclude investment under consideration throughout the freight rail network. Some opportunities to create greater efficiencies in both passenger and freight service, where those objectives are aligned, have also been identified in Volume 1, Chapter 5. The FRA participated in discussions with the stakeholder freight railroads as part of the overall coordination to understand the needs of the freight rail industry as they relate to the NEC.
DTC_Loyola	The draft EIS mentions the DelDOT contracted SEPTA service in Chapter 5, but fails to list the service in Table 5-10, Annual Passenger by Regional Rail Service Provider (2006 and 2012) . Delaware's ridership is reported as part of SEPTA's data. Although the draft EIS reflects considerable research and analysis, the success of Delaware's service may have been overlooked. It is important to note that while SEPTA will continue to be Delaware's provider for regional rail, other providers may assume responsibilities at some point in the future.	Language has been added to the Tier 1 Final EIS (Volume 2, Chapter 5), to note that commuter rail ridership in Delaware is tracked and attributed to SEPTA. It is acknowledged that while SEPTA currently operates service in Delaware by agreement with DelDOT, the operator of future services is undetermined. For NEC FUTURE, the FRA identified future improvements to both Intercity and Regional service but did not determine the operator of those services. In this regard, the Preferred Alternative is operator neutral with regard to who would provide the Intercity or Regional services in the future. This point is emphasized in Volume 1, Chapter 5.
EPA_Walsh	The NEC Future process requires continued attention to freight rail issues as the project advances through the balance of Tier 1 and into the Tier 2 process. In particular we suggest that the FRA expand the discussion of infrastructure and operational planning, and the emissions and noise calculations that derive from them, for whichever NEC Alternative is selected as the Preferred Alternative. Specifically, we encourage an expanded discussion on the practice of letting freight locomotive engines run while trains sit idle on tracks (idling) yielding priority to passenger trains on the NEC. Suggestions of how the project can be designed to minimize impacts from idling is provided in the attachment to this letter, including a suggestion that the NEC Commission execute binding agreements with railroads and system operators to reduce idling, establish engine shutdown policies, and designate waiting locations for idling trains. Any successful NEC Future vision will require close ongoing coordination with passenger and freight rail interests. We recommend that the analysis fully encompass the impacts of the operational practices of each to both human health and the environment. ... we recommend that the Tier 1 FEIS explain how and where NEC improvements will change the quantity or nature of goods movement ... Delays at switches and waiting for access to shared track often have extensive ripple effects ... EPA recommends that the FRA consider the following during infrastructure and operational planning, and the emissions and noise calculations that derive from them, for whichever NEC Alternative is selected: Freight trains yielding priority to passenger trains on the NEC will idle. FRA should ask the freight railroads where, and for how long, they will idle, under all scenarios that can be envisioned (e .g., season, time of day, equipment, shift).	<p>As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA focused on concepts for improving the frequency, travel time, and connectivity of service. Within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, the FRA did not make decisions about operator-specific service plans or schedules. Such decisions will be made as part of Tier 2 project studies, which will include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate. Consistent with this process, the FRA developed representative service plans for the Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative, which provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the effects of each Alternative. Representative service plans define a range of benefits which might occur and whose details could change during subsequent Tier 2 project analysis.</p> <p>Given the representative nature of the service and infrastructure plans for NEC FUTURE, freight operating practices and how freight and passenger services would coordinate are beyond the scope of the Preferred Alternative. A discussion was added in Volume 1, Chapter 5, to describe how freight and passenger operating practices might result in delays and related environmental effects and the importance of considering these in subsequent Tier 2 project studies.</p>
Groton_Bronk	Additionally, it appears that if a new segment is constructed in the Groton area, the existing line would remain. We have plans and desires to expand local commuter service for our commuters who mostly work at Electric Boat, Pfizer, and the U.S. Navy Submarine Base. We are hopeful that the new NEC rail segment might offer more flexibility to use the existing line for other rail service.	The Preferred Alternative includes improvements to the existing NEC and would accommodate additional Intercity and Regional rail service for communities and stations along the NEC. Additionally, a supplemental segment expands the capacity to operate Intercity-Express service to both New London and Mystic, CT. Specific Regional and Intercity rail stopping patterns will be developed in subsequent Tier 2 project studies. Specific decisions about how or who will deliver Regional services will be the responsibility of the individual commuter railroads.

Table JJ–8: Stakeholder Comments (Elected Officials, Tribes, Federal Agencies, State Agencies, Local Agencies): Transportation (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Mansfield_Mayor Shapiro	The expansion of rail service contemplated in the Draft EIS would provide additional options for our residents, improving access to nearby metropolitan areas such as Hartford, Providence, Boston and New York. Additionally, as home to the main campus of the university of Connecticut (UConn), and particularly as UConn continues to grow its student population and expand its campus, there is continual pressure on our rural roads from vehicular traffic associated with this campus growth. The expansion of Northeast Corridor rail service to Mansfield would likely help to mitigate traffic impacts associated with UConn.	The Preferred Alternative achieves a 'grow' service vision with improvements to the existing NEC and expanded service from New Haven to Hartford and Springfield on the Hartford/Springfield Line. The FRA recognizes the importance of strengthening markets in Connecticut, and as those markets mature with the improved service from the Preferred Alternative, revisiting the opportunity to connect markets is possible in the future. As proposed in the Preferred Alternative, the extension of the NEC to Hartford and Springfield via the Hartford Line would improve Intercity rail connections to central Connecticut. The proposed representative routing and service, including connections, are described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
MassDOT_Pollack	It is difficult to understand the overarching logic that produced the distribution of service in Figure 5-6. 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 growth choices. Both can be important factors and we would like to understand their interplay.	<p>Decisions about operator-specific service plans or schedules are not part of the NEC Future Tier 1 process. Such decisions would be made as part of Tier 2 project studies, which would include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate. Consistent with this process, the FRA developed representative service plans for the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative, which provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the effects of each Alternative. Representative service plans define a range of benefits which might occur and whose details could change during subsequent Tier 2 project analysis.</p> <p>The FRA collaborated with states and railroads along the NEC to identify areas of concern with regard to station access, development limitations, or operating constraints. However, given the scale of NEC FUTURE, specific sites were not evaluated in detail. Areas of concern are noted throughout the Tier 1 Draft and Final EIS as appropriate. Existing railroad constraints were reflected in the representative service plans and associated infrastructure improvements. The FRA relied on commercially available growth forecasts, and considered these forecasts in light of available regional growth forecasts as developed by the several Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) in the Study Area. Details on how the FRA developed representative service plans, station stopping patterns, and evaluated growth potential are provided in Volume 2, Appendix B. More detailed considerations of site-specific constraints - with regard to station access, opportunities for development or operating constraints will be considered in subsequent Tier 2 project studies.</p>
MassDOT_Pollack	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.	<p>Current and future utilization of the NEC by each of the rail operators, both passenger and freight, are important considerations in long-term planning. Similarly, freight rail is important to the regional economy. However, NEC FUTURE is a passenger rail program and as such identifies improvements necessary to operate to desired passenger service levels while maintaining access to freight traffic already operating along the NEC. Some opportunities to create greater efficiencies in both passenger and freight service, where those objectives are aligned, have also been identified. It is the aim of NEC FUTURE to not preclude investment under consideration throughout the freight rail network. FRA included representatives of the stakeholder freight railroads as part of overall coordination with the Northeast Corridor Commission to understand the needs of the freight rail industry as they relate to the NEC.</p> <p>Additional information on the role of freight rail in the region, and the type of commodities moved, was added to Volume 1, Chapter 6, Economic Effects and Growth, Indirect Effects. Freight railroad stakeholders involved with FRA throughout the NEC FUTURE program are identified in Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative. Additional ownership information has also been incorporated.</p>

Table JJ–8: Stakeholder Comments (Elected Officials, Tribes, Federal Agencies, State Agencies, Local Agencies): Transportation (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
MDOT_Smith	MDOT requests that FRA also consider the needs of freight railroads as it identifies 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.	<p>Additional information on the role of freight rail in the region, and the type of commodities moved, was added to the Tier 1 Final EIS Volume 1, Chapter 6.</p> <p>For the Preferred Alternative, the FRA provides an expanded discussion of the interface between freight operations and the proposed passenger service and associated infrastructure improvements. This expanded discussion highlights the existing freight access to the NEC, locations along the NEC where conflicts or constraints could affect freight traffic, potential effects on freight traffic growth opportunities, and the economic effects and benefits of freight (Volume 1, Chapters 4, 5, and 6).</p> <p>The FRA heard from several states and stakeholders about the importance of freight-access to the NEC and the role of freight rail to the overall economy. Although the focus of NEC FUTURE is passenger rail, the definitions of the Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative incorporated existing and available information on forecast freight rail movements in service and infrastructure planning. Specific decisions about multimodal facilities or other freight-specific infrastructure investments will be the subject of subsequent Tier 2 project studies.</p>
NEC Commission_Padgette	The Commission notes that while the analytical work informing the Draft EIS is sound, certain technical constraints pose challenges to evaluating the proposed alternatives. For example, many assumptions used rely on analysis of past trends which do not capture the potential game- changing impacts of transformational investments.	Within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and did not model local economic growth or development scenarios. However, the FRA did rely on insights from discussions with experts to understand the potential for economic growth with passenger rail improvements proposed in the Action Alternatives. This qualitative discussion is expanded in Volume 1, Chapter 6.
New Haven_Mayor Harp	...one-hour service to and from New Haven and New York should be our goal and should be advanced to the Tier 2 level.	<p>As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA focused on concepts for improving the frequency, travel time and connectivity of service. Within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, the FRA did not make decisions about operator-specific service plans or schedules. Such decisions will be made as part of Tier 2 project studies, which will include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate. Consistent with this process, the FRA developed representative service plans for the Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative, which provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the effects of each Alternative. Representative service plans define a range of benefits which might occur and whose details could change during subsequent Tier 2 project analysis.</p> <p>Representative service in the Preferred Alternative suggests Intercity-Express travel times between New York and New Haven would be approximately one hour.</p>
New Haven_Mayor Harp	The City likewise supports efforts to further extend this line to Boston through Springfield. This historic inland alignment is a more appropriate alternative than the new Central Connecticut route, which has far more significant environmental impacts in our state.	The Preferred Alternative integrates service via New Haven to Hartford, CT, and Springfield, MA, with up to 4 trains/hour during the peak hours. This significant improvement in service to Springfield would also create opportunities for better connections north and east of Springfield. The FRA is participating with Massachusetts, Connecticut, and Vermont in ongoing studies of future improvements to these connecting services.

Table JJ–8: Stakeholder Comments (Elected Officials, Tribes, Federal Agencies, State Agencies, Local Agencies): Transportation (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
NJ TRANSIT_Martin	NJ TRANSIT considers the most critical finding among the alternatives examined to be the need for added trans-Hudson rail capacity into Midtown Manhattan. The analysis makes clear that to achieve a future capacity of 42 trains per hour; any proposed new Midtown Station facilities must accommodate a run-through set of tracks that extend across Manhattan and connect with the rest of the rail system in Queens, either with the Long Island Rail Road or the Hellgate Line into the Bronx, or both. From the analysis completed to date by NJ TRANSIT, it appears 42 trains per hour is a valid target to meet NJ TRANSIT's customer demand in 2040, based on our current rail system. However, there would not be room for additional rail service further into the future. Decisions on achieving the capacity to handle projected rail ridership must be considered in coordination with an examination of total trans-Hudson transit capacity, using an analytic approach which is sensitive to future customers' needs.	<p>As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure or alignments. Such decisions are made as part of the Tier 2 project studies, which would include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate. Consistent with this process, the FRA developed Representative Routes for the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative, which provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the effects of each Alternative. Representative Routes define an envelope within which improvements might occur and whose location and construction type could change during subsequent Tier 2 project analysis.</p> <p>The FRA understands the importance of thoughtful and comprehensive analysis to support decision-making, particularly with regard to the future needs of a complex region. Moving forward beyond the Tier 1 EIS, the FRA is committed to working with the stakeholders to ensure that future customer needs are at the forefront of subsequent Tier 2 project studies.</p>
NorfolkSouthern_Edwards	But it is always important to keep as a core principle - and ensure that those who in the future work with the Tier 1 Environmental Impact Statement (Tier 1 EIS) understand - that the NEC serves as a vital and core freight route to the Northeast United States that cannot be compromised. The Tier 1 EIS, when it is issued, needs to make that point simply and unambiguously, and not have it lost by having a few minor mentions among the hundreds of its pages. There is no discussion of ensuring access (including not only access to its current customers, but to new freight rail customers who would bring added employment and economic vitality to the Northeast) and capacity (paying attention to weight restrictions and the fluid movement, not only of extra - dimensional wide and high loads, but also normal freight, through passenger stations). Even in Chapter 3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS, which addresses Purpose and Need, there is as much or more discussion about how freight on the NEC causes interference with passenger operations as there is discussion of the need to protect freight access.	<p>Current and future utilization of the NEC by each of the rail operators, both passenger and freight, are important considerations in long-term planning. Similarly, freight rail is important to the regional economy. However, NEC FUTURE is a passenger rail program and as such identifies improvements necessary to operate to desired passenger service levels while maintaining access to freight traffic already operating along the NEC. Some opportunities to create greater efficiencies in both passenger and freight service, where those objectives are aligned, have also been identified in Volume 1, Chapter 5. The FRA participated in discussions with the stakeholder freight railroads as part of the overall coordination to understand the needs of the freight rail industry as they relate to the NEC. It is the aim of NEC FUTURE to not preclude investment under consideration throughout the freight rail network.</p> <p>Additional information on the role of freight rail in the region, and the type of commodities moved, was added to Volume 1, Chapter 6. Freight railroad stakeholders involved with FRA throughout the NEC FUTURE program are identified in Volume 1, Chapter 4. Additional ownership and existing freight access information has also been incorporated (Volume 1, Chapter 4).</p>
NorfolkSouthern_Edwards	NS strongly suggests that the Tier 1 EIS, when issued, contains a basic direction to those who use it in the future, that the NEC is as much vital economic, strategic, and environmentally important access route for freight rail service to and from the Northeast United States, and that any future development of the NEC must preserve and enhance that access, both in volume and capacity as discussed above. It should specifically mention the need to preserve side and overhead clearance routes that may be different for freight than for passenger, including for the double stack intermodal trains that are able to take so many trucks off of the highways throughout the rest of the United States. This admonition should be specific, and found in the Tier 1 EIS abstract, the purpose and need, and the summary.	<p>As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA focused on corridor-wide solutions and did not make decisions about design details such as side or overhead clearance. Such decisions will be made as part of Tier 2 project studies, which will include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate. Consistent with this process, the FRA developed Representative Routes for the Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative, which provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the effects of each Alternative. Representative Routes define an envelope within which improvements might occur and whose location and construction type could change during subsequent Tier 2 project analysis.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative does not preclude a dedicated north-south high-clearance, high-density freight line. Additional information on shared passenger-freight access and consideration of freight requirements is provided in Volume 1, Chapters 4 and 5; additional information about the role of freight rail in the region and the type of commodities moved is also provided in Volume 1, Chapter 6. Freight railroad stakeholders involved with the FRA throughout the NEC FUTURE program are identified in Volume 1, Chapter 4, along with additional ownership information.</p>

Table JJ–8: Stakeholder Comments (Elected Officials, Tribes, Federal Agencies, State Agencies, Local Agencies): Transportation (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
PVPC_Brennan	The explanation of how positive impacts to, and resulting from, NEC's direct and indirect links to regional rail, local transit services, and other modes, should be improved. Because Massachusetts and Connecticut are the states where Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 vary the most in terms of geography, population, and businesses and employment centers served, it is important that state and regional level evaluations be included.	As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, will not make decisions about how direct and indirect links to regional rail, local transit services or other modes should be improved. Such decisions are made as part of Tier 2 project studies, which will include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate. Consistent with this process, the FRA generally described the positive and negative effects on local infrastructure and services. Further information about these general effects are included in Volume 1, Chapters 5 and 6. The FRA's deliberative process incorporated feedback received from the comments on the Tier 1 Draft EIS and is described in Volume 1, Chapters 4 and 11. Extensive and continuous coordination and outreach with resource and regulatory agencies, state and regional agencies (including metropolitan planning organizations) was instrumental to the overall planning process and critical to the FRA's deliberations and recommendation of a Preferred Alternative.
SCCOG_Galbraith	Table 5.17 of the Draft EIS indicates that both Intercity and Regional rail service will expand in New London under all of the Action Alternatives when compared to the No Action Alternative, but this is counter-intuitive in a time of diminishing financial resources available for rail service and is contradictory to the finding on page 4-49 of the EIS, which in reference to the new segment from New Haven to Hartford to Providence in Alternative 2, states that this new route would remove train traffic from 120 miles of the Shore Line route that has capacity-limited, movable bridges and over which Providence and Worcester, MA freight trains operate in addition to Shore Line East and MBTA regional rail services. We would hope that no matter what Alternative is selected as an outcome of this EIS process, that further study be conducted to quantify the impact that new segments will have on existing rail service and funding.	<p>For the Action Alternatives, the representative service plans developed by the FRA would all provide increased service on the existing NEC. The commenter correctly points out an error on Page 4-49 in reference to the "removal of traffic from 120 miles of the Shore Line route". As defined, Alternative 2 would supplement the proposed service levels along the existing Shore Line route with additional capacity, improved travel times, and service to new markets with the creation of an additional routing to Boston via New Haven and Hartford, CT, and Providence, RI. The depiction of increased service levels in New London, CT, for the Action Alternatives is correct. The language referenced in the Tier 1 Draft EIS has been revised to better represent how the additional off-corridor route and capacity would supplement the existing NEC route along the shore line (Volume 2, Chapter 4).</p> <p>As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure or alignments. Such decisions are made as part of Tier 2 project studies, which will include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate. Consistent with this process, the FRA developed Representative Routes for the Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative, which provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the effects of each Alternative. Representative Routes define an envelope within which improvements might occur and whose location and construction type could change during subsequent Tier 2 project analysis.</p>
USDOT-FAA_Angelos	Section 5.2.4. Air only discusses commercial service airports. While this is understandable considering the geographic Scope of the NEC Future DEIS, recommend considering the potential benefits to larger General Aviation (GA) airports and the people they serve. Teterboro should be removed from the list of commercial service facilities on Page 5-12 or identified in a separate list if GA facilities are more specifically covered.	Consistent with a Tier 1 level of detail, the FRA analyzed commercial service airports and did not include general aviation airports. As such, Volume 1, Chapter 5, does not include Teterboro Airport in New Jersey.

Source: NEC FUTURE team, 2016

Table JJ–9: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Transportation

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Anderson_Ge	Without increasing the amount of airport capacity available, flight ticket prices will greatly increase, possibly past what the average middle class family can afford. Without a mass transit alternative, families or business travelers will be forced to drive, which is still quite expensive and time consuming, or choose not to travel. But, there is a way to increase capacity at airports. Through investment in high speed rail, specifically along the NEC, many more travelers can choose to take rail to their destination instead of planes. Further build out of the nation’s high speed rail network would provide even greater competition to airports, thus keeping capacity and prices in check... Faster service, more service and more reliability would greatly increase the amount of people who utilize rail as a travel option.	Rail travel competitiveness with air travel is a function of time, cost, schedule and accessibility. Alternatives 2 and 3 as well as the Preferred Alternative create new opportunities for improved access to airports, notably in Philadelphia and in the greater Hartford area. The Preferred Alternative also includes substantial increases in service frequency, improvements in travel times, and proposes new lower-priced fare options for Intercity service.
Arena_Ri	APT supports the FRA's stated goal of removing conflicts between Freight and Passenger Rail, while improving capacity for both. We also commend the FRA for its stated interest in identifying mutually beneficial opportunities. Given the likely very high cost of acquiring and developing the new alignments identified in Alternate 3, we wonder whether joint development of parallel but separate Freight and Passenger lines along these alignments might defray some of the cost of the Passenger share, while streamlining freight operations between the hubs. This should be evaluated.	Current and future utilization of the NEC by both passenger and freight rail operators are important considerations in long-term planning. Similarly, freight rail is important to the regional economy. However, NEC FUTURE is a passenger rail program and as such identifies improvements necessary to operate to desired passenger service levels while maintaining access to freight traffic already operating along the NEC. It is the aim of NEC FUTURE to not preclude investment under consideration throughout the freight rail network. Some opportunities to create greater efficiencies in both passenger and freight service, where those objectives are aligned, have also been identified. The FRA participated in discussions with the stakeholder freight railroads as part of the overall coordination to understand the needs of the freight rail industry as they relate to the NEC. Further consideration of shared access, passenger-freight interactions and opportunities for cost-sharing would occur in subsequent planning processes.
Ascarelli_Si	I'd love to see faster trains that can better compete with planes and cars, just like Eurostar and Thalys, among others. But given the hassles of airplane travel, do you need to be a lot faster, or is price a better point of competition?	Rail travel competitiveness with air travel is a function of time, cost, schedule and accessibility. Alternatives 2 and 3 as well as the Preferred Alternative create new opportunities for improved access to airports, notably in Philadelphia and in the greater Hartford area. The Preferred Alternative also includes substantial increases in service frequency, improvements in travel times, and proposes new lower-priced fare options for Intercity service.
Berka_Ge	The first one is to consider establishing electric freight trains along with passenger freight. I think you have a golden opportunity here to reduce carbon emissions, to get a significant amount of trucks off the road, and to shift the fuel source for our transportation from fossil fuels to electric power. If we do that, I think this can really go a long way to help with climate change and global warming and to reduce carbon emissions. And along with that, I would recommend having an electric truck train, so to speak, that will allow tractor trailers to be put directly on the railcars and transported from Boston all the way to Washington, D.C., with the truckers, and they can get off at different stops as they need to. And this, the benefit of this will be obviously to free up highway congestion and to, again, allow the trucks to be moved electrically instead of via fossil fuels. Here's something I prepared for you. More information can be had online at insideevs.com. It's there's an article I wrote about electric freight trains and the benefits. I wrote it about two years ago, actually, but it's very relevant to today's topic.	Specific details about train equipment have not been evaluated as part of the Tier 1 EIS process. Looking to the future, 2040 and beyond, the FRA's Preferred Alternative is flexible in considering emerging or newly available technologies in subsequent Tier 2 project studies.
Berka_Ge	seriously consider having all the electricity for the trains come from nuclear power. And the reason I say that is going forward, I think we need to get away from fossil fuels, and nuclear power is realistically the only option to deliver the quantity of electricity that we need with essentially no carbon emissions. And before I wrap up, along with that, I would suggest actually donating money to some of the power plants in need that are in danger of closing so they can be around tomorrow when we need them. And if you were to do this, it would ensure that these plants remain open until market conditions improve for them and until we are able to the new trains are able to utilize some of their power. And this would be the perfect marriage of low a low carbon form of transportation and a low carbon form of electricity generation. If we were to combine the two together, it would be the ultimate low carbon transportation system.	<p>The Preferred Alternative would result in both air quality improvements and energy savings as described in the Volume 1, Chapters 7.13 and 7.14.</p> <p>Emerging and new technologies may be applicable to rail service on the NEC and other transportation needs across the Study Area. The FRA plays an important role in researching and evaluating these emerging technologies. Innovations or emerging propulsion technologies could be explored separate from this Tier 1 EIS; those findings should be considered in subsequent Tier 2 project analyses.</p>

Table JJ–9: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Transportation (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Briggs_Th	Also, I would like to see the development of local rail services in the area, such as possibly expanding the trainline that runs through Willimantic so that it offers a local line to Storrs.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4). The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more-frequent, faster, and more-reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative includes upgrading the existing NEC shoreline route and adding a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. This new segment would improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line into the NEC, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield. It does not include a line connecting Hartford and Providence. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.</p> <p>The FRA noted views expressed about connections to UCONN and Hartford. However, the Preferred Alternative does not include the route to UCONN as envisioned in Alternatives 2 and 3. The rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative is provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The NEC FUTURE program is focused on corridor-wide solutions for passenger rail improvements, and the selection of the Preferred Alternative does not preclude future consideration of transit or fixed-guideway improvements to meet other transportation needs across the Study Area.</p>
Burgess_Br	Has the NEC (or much more importantly, The US Dept of Transportation, considered the number of individuals, plus commercial vehicles that travel thru Old Lyme every year on Interstate 95? A comparison of the number of individuals traveling by rail versus those by all vehicles (plus commodities) thru Old Lyme would more than suggest that the Federal Government should be putting funds into upgrading Interstate 95 versus Alternat1. Any projection of future passenger rail that would drastically alleviate the deaths on Interstate 95 is absurd. I for one enjoy traveling the Acela and Eurorail and realize rail travel can be and should be greatly improved, but not at the cost of NOT minimizing the carnage that continues on Interstate 95 thru Old Lyme. How many lives are lost currently traveling thru Old Lyme by rail, how many additionally are predicted to be saved versus improving Interstate 95?	NEC FUTURE is a passenger rail program and did not evaluate potential improvements to I-95 through southeastern Connecticut or specifically Old Lyme. The FRA did evaluate the ways in which improved passenger rail services could contribute to overall traveler safety in the Study Area, particularly based on diversions of trips from highway to rail and improvements in railroad operations and infrastructure. Modal safety is addressed in Volumes 1 and 2, Chapter 7.18. Volume 1, Chapter 5, discusses trip making by mode.
Campanelli_Le	Replacing hodge-podge mass transit to NYC airports with NEC/MTA dedicated efficient seamless lines/stops.	The Preferred Alternative identifies representative opportunities for improved transit connections at passenger stations, but the specifics of those improvements will be decided in subsequent Tier 2 project studies. Local plans for transit improvements, many of which would benefit from the improved Intercity and Regional connectivity proposed in the Preferred Alternative, are important future considerations for each of the metropolitan areas and transit operations throughout the Study Area.
arley_Ro	The Massachusetts Turnpike is just overwhelmed by traffic. It's insane that we just do not have any viable intercity rail to anywhere other than along the existing spine.	A focus of the FRA in the identification of the Action Alternatives and Preferred Alternative was to leverage the existing NEC spine as a focal point for creating an integrated network of passenger rail services; in this way, expanding the reach of the NEC and creating better connections for more passengers to more places. This service philosophy is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Carlson_AI	Consider re-routing thge Septa Chestnut Hill West line onto the former Reading line into Center City. A track connection just before CHW enters the NEC as North Philadelphia Station would remove these trains from the NEC and appears to be a simple fix.	SEPTA plans for commuter rail improvements in the Philadelphia metro area are independent of NEC FUTURE, but would require ongoing coordination in the future. The FRA understands that portions of the Reading Viaduct are under final design to create a lineal vertical park and as such that right-of-way was not considered for passenger rail services.

Table JJ–9: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Transportation (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Cassidy_Ja	Please provide some context for the 69M annual trips shifted from other modes to passenger rail.	The FRA estimated total trips for all modes based on forecast population and employment growth and application of an interregional travel demand model. Details of the travel demand forecasting methodology are provided in Volumes 1 and 2, Appendix B.8. The forecast mode represents individuals forecast to travel via air, highway or bus would shift to rail for each of the Action Alternatives, based on improved travel times, lower fares, or better connections.
Cerrone_Br	Before building a new train we should invest in and address the problems with the Long Island railroad.	NEC FUTURE is not prescriptive with regard to specific improvements to connecting commuter rail systems. Future plans for improvements, which should be consistent with NEC FUTURE, remain the responsibility of the individual states and/or commuter railroads. Commuter rail improvements in the NYC metro area require consideration by the Metropolitan Transportation Authority.
Cole_St	The New Haven Line, New Haven to New Rochelle, is problematic because it's very congested, and it's curvy. So anything that can help there is good. I think a lot of the problem there is simple traffic, when you combine Metro North and Amtrak trains.	The Preferred Alternative includes improvements to the existing NEC between New Haven and New York City and proposes additional capacity to relieve congestion and conflicting train moves near New Rochelle, NY, and Stamford, CT. The representative improvements are described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Connolly_Ju	i have a LIRR train station a short walk from my house a diesel branch-I would like to see enhancements to the entire system so that I could use it	NEC FUTURE addresses existing and future passenger rail service along the NEC. Existing operations of the Long Island Rail Road (LIRR) are beyond the scope of this Tier 1 EIS; the FRA coordinated closely with the MTA/LIRR to identify opportunities through NEC FUTURE to alleviate known chokepoints along the NEC, including the East River Tunnels. NEC FUTURE, however, is not prescriptive with regard to specific improvements to connecting commuter rail systems. Future plans for improvement, while coordinated through the NEC FUTURE process, remain the responsibility of the individual states and/or commuter railroads.
Crail_K	Newark airport could be served by a high speed rail.	The Newark Liberty Airport station on the NEC is proposed as a stop for Intercity-Express and Intercity-Corridor service for the Preferred Alternative. Air-rail connectivity is further discussed in Volume 1, Chapters 5, 6, and 9.
Davis_Sa	I believe freight and passenger rail must have separate trackage virtually everywhere... Freight trains MUST give way to passenger trains always! However, separate tracking would make it unnecessary... I want freight rail to be fast and efficient, able to transport food, to provide superior service to trucks. Too many freight lines have been abandoned, I suspect.	Current and future utilization of the NEC by each of the rail operators, both passenger and freight, are important considerations in long-term planning. Similarly, freight rail is important to the regional economy. However, NEC FUTURE is a passenger rail program and as such identifies improvements necessary to operate to desired passenger service levels while maintaining access to freight traffic already operating along the NEC. It is the aim of NEC FUTURE to not preclude investment under consideration throughout the freight rail network. Some opportunities to create greater efficiencies in both passenger and freight service, where those objectives are aligned, have also been identified in Volume 1, Chapter 5. The FRA participated in discussions with the stakeholder freight railroads as part of the overall coordination to understand the needs of the freight rail industry as they relate to the NEC. The freight rail roads have access rights to some portions of the NEC, as described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. Since the freight railroads are private companies, it would be their decision to pursue the construction of a dedicated freight track. The FRA, states and District of Columbia would be involved in any such decisions. These discussions are beyond the scope of the NEC FUTURE Tier 1 EIS.
Davis_Sa	We must have regional passenger service, but it will not work if it is too infrequent or inconvenient. Amtrak is currently running intercity service that is equivalent to local service in the 1940s. The 20th Century Limited had no stops except to change engines in Buffalo, and as a result was much faster. The frequent stops slow the trains down too much. There should be a daily local and express train on each route... Regional routes may need something more like two-car self-propelled trains for smaller ridership and efficiency. No one should be more than 75 miles from a train in the eastern states.	The FRA analyses conducted for NEC FUTURE similarly indicated the value of good connections, frequent, reliable and affordable service to the next generation of travelers. The Preferred Alternative, with a focus on connecting existing urban centers with well-integrated, frequent, fast, and reliable service, responds to this trend. For NEC FUTURE, the FRA evaluated representative service plans; specific details will be identified in subsequent Tier 2 project studies, with public and stakeholder input as appropriate.

Table JJ–9: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Transportation (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
DeRoche_St	I am in favor of a complete modernization of the system and leaving Amtrak the way they are and the freight as they are. We should not even pass near them. We should be far away from them as much as possible, and that's my approach.	NEC FUTURE is a passenger rail program and as such identifies improvements necessary to operate to desired passenger service levels while maintaining access to freight traffic already operating along the NEC. As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure or alignments. Such decisions will be made as part of Tier 2 project studies, which will include local stakeholder and public involvement. Consistent with this process, the FRA developed Representative Routes for the Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative, which provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the effects of each Alternative. Representative Routes define an envelope within which improvements might occur and whose location and construction type could change during subsequent Tier 2 project analysis.
Destantis_To	One of the things that I would like to see happen is the connection between MARC and SEPTA through the -- this is why we need -- this is why we need a four-track crossing over the Susquehanna River.	The Preferred Alternative does include a four-track Susquehanna River Bridge. The specific design and configuration for the Susquehanna River Bridge are under consideration as part of the Susquehanna River Bridge Replacement project. As the lead agency for the Susquehanna River Bridge Replacement project, the FRA will ensure coordination between that effort and NEC FUTURE.
DiCristina_Fr	Freight service is critical to my company and we are already seeing significant impacts to service reliability due to the high speed rail project. ...Freight service needs to be improved as much as passenger!	Current and future utilization of the NEC by both passenger and freight rail operators are important considerations in long-term planning. However, NEC FUTURE is a passenger rail program and as such identifies improvements necessary to operate to desired passenger service levels while maintaining access to freight traffic already operating along the NEC. Some opportunities to create greater efficiencies in both passenger and freight service, where those objectives are aligned, have also been identified in Volume 1, Chapter 5. It is the aim of NEC FUTURE to not preclude investment under consideration throughout the freight rail network. The FRA participated in discussions with the stakeholder freight railroads as part of the overall coordination to understand the needs of the freight rail industry as they relate to the NEC.
Distler_Ga	As important as building a Northeast corridor with faster and more frequent service, it is also important that rail service up and down the corridor has affordable options for travels. Today often an Amtrak ticket between New York and Boston can cost at least \$50, and can cost much more then this. When travels can chose between paying \$50 and taking a \$15 bus many chose to travel by bus. Our rail network should try to grow its passenger base but offering more adorable ticket pricing. When planning and improving the Northeast corridor it is important to build a rail network that is affordable which in turn will bring more people off the roads and buses and onto the rails, thus in the long term making the investment in a better north east corridor most worth while.	As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA tested a range of pricing options to understand market sensitivity to fares. The analysis and survey data supported the concept of a lower-fare, frequent, fast Intercity rail service type - referred to as Metropolitan. The concepts tested helped to establish the range of possible pricing options; however, the FRA will not make decisions on a specific fare structure in the Tier 1 NEPA context. Any such decisions will be made in subsequent Tier 2 project studies.
Edwards_Cl	Running the line north through Hartford ... would not solve the huge amount of congestion along the I-95 corridor.	The Preferred Alternative includes chokepoint relief projects along the existing NEC (parallel to I-95) and extends service via the Hartford/Springfield Line between New Haven, CT, and Springfield, MA. As such, the Preferred Alternative would significantly relieve capacity constraints along the NEC and accommodate increases in types and volumes of passenger rail service. While NEC FUTURE accounted for other modes within the transportation network, the Preferred Alternative is focused on rail improvements. The benefits of the Preferred Alternative are further described in Volume 1, Chapters 4 and 5.
Essue_He	the different coordinated transportation, but I heard nothing about -- there's an airport [in Hartford] in this state [Connecticut], I heard nothing about connectivity with the airport, which I think would be a great benefit to the region also.	In the Hartford, CT, area, the Preferred Alternative Representative Route via New Haven to Hartford, CT, and Springfield, MA, includes a station stop at Windsor Locks, CT, which is only 2.5 miles from Bradley Airport and accessible with a quality transit or shuttle bus connection. The FRA will not decide specific details for this type of connecting service. However, those decisions will be the subject of subsequent Tier 2 project studies, which will include public and stakeholder outreach, as appropriate.

Table JJ–9: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Transportation (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Etter_EI	Our area (Old Lyme Essex, Westbrook, Old Saybrook, etc) could really use more complete rail service, including airport rail service to Providence and Hartford. Does any alternative offer this?	<p>In the Hartford, CT, area, the Preferred Alternative Representative Route via New Haven to Hartford, CT, and Springfield, MA, includes a station stop at Windsor Locks, CT, which is only 2.5 miles from Bradley Airport and accessible with a quality transit or shuttle bus connection. The FRA will not decide specific details for this type of connecting service. However, those decisions will be the subject of subsequent Tier 2 project studies, which will include public and stakeholder outreach, as appropriate.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative also includes expanded service to TF Green Airport, with expanded Intercity and Regional service. The proposed airport connectivity for the Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapters 4 and 5.</p>
Follo_Mi	Also, this report doesn't mention anything about Metro North bringing some Hudson Line trains to and from NY Penn Station in the foreseeable future, how would the Hudson Line fit into this plan for NY Penn Station.	Metro-North service to Penn Station New York (PSNY) is included in each of the Action Alternative service plans based on the Metropolitan Transportation Authority's Metro-North Penn Station Access project. The Penn Station Access project, as currently proposed, provides access to Penn Station for Metro-North New Haven Line trains operating on the existing Hell Gate line. The Action Alternatives, and the Preferred Alternative, include Metro-North service to PSNY via the New Haven Line. Options for Metro-North to operate via the New Haven Line, Hudson Line, or both, are beyond the scope of the NEC Future Tier 1 EIS and would be considered by the individual operators in subsequent studies.
Follo_Mi	Page 4-49 New Segment and P.4-68 New Jersey. North Brunswick NJ to Colonia, NJ (16-miles) Alternatives 2 and Alternative 3 south of North Brunswick, NJ, what if NJ Transit studies the MOM Rail Study (Monmouth/Ocean/Middlesex) and if the Monmouth Junction route was selected as the Locally Preferred Alternative, how would this effect the MOM trains at Monmouth Junction, would a new tunnel or flyover have to be built at this location and how would the MOM trains effect the proposed Mid Line Loop and new North Brunswick stop for NJ Transit since a new segment would begin in North Brunswick. If the Monmouth Junction route isn't selected or if the MOM Rail isn't going to be studies, then how would this effect the proposed Mid Line Loop and the North Brunswick stop since a new segment would begin in North Brunswick.	The No Action Alternatives and Action Alternatives, including the Preferred Alternative, incorporate NJ TRANSIT projects that are planned or programmed, including projects such as the Mid Line Loop and a potential North Brunswick station. The Preferred Alternative is not prescriptive as to NJ TRANSIT's operations of its system, and as such is not specific about what service would be offered on the various branch lines, including NJCL or M & E, connecting to the NEC. Specific improvements necessary to accommodate the MOM Rail project or other NJ TRANSIT new initiatives will be addressed as the designs and specific locations for improvements are developed in subsequent Tier 2 project studies. The Preferred Alternative does accommodate growth in service on the branch lines and is generally consistent with NJ TRANSIT longer-term goals.
Follo_Mi	Checkpoints Relief Projects for Alternatives 2 and 3, it mentions that the Trenton Station and Yard access (NJ), to facilitate rail local train movements, my suggestion is to built a new flyover north of the Trenton Station for SEPTA Trenton Regional Rail Line, the Draft EIS never mentions about northbound SEPTA Trenton trains south of the Trenton Station and sometimes north of the Trenton station has to cross over three tracks to the southbound tracks for access to the Trenton Station, this causes both Amtrak and NJ Transit trains to stop near to where the SEPTA Trenton trains have to cross over three tracks, by having this new flyover north of the Trenton station, this would allow SEPTA Trenton Line to discharge passengers on the northbound platform at Trenton Station, then proceed and cross over this new flyover north of the Trenton Station and return southbound and pickup passengers on the southbound platform and eliminate delays for both Amtrak and NJ Transit trains, in addition, how would this tie in with the proposed Barracks Yard that SEPTA is considering for it's Trenton Regional Rail Line trains to store it's trains.	<p>Station-specific improvements to address existing interactions between SEPTA and NJ TRANSIT trains at Trenton Station were not evaluated in the Tier 1 Draft EIS. Planned and programmed improvements at or near Trenton Station on behalf of Amtrak, NJ TRANSIT and SEPTA were broadly accounted for in the representative footprint of Alternatives 2 and 3. Similarly, these planned improvements are broadly incorporated into the Preferred Alternative. Specific solutions suggested as well as other solutions could be explored in subsequent Tier 2 project studies.</p> <p>The opportunities to create more seamless connections for both railroad operators and the traveling public are important to the overall effectiveness of the Preferred Alternative.</p>
Follo_Mi	If SEPTA studies the Cross County Metro between Trenton and Thorndale, how would this effect the Cross County Metro south of the Trenton Station.	The No Action Alternative and Action Alternatives, including the Preferred Alternative, would not preclude SEPTA from exploring a Cross County Metro connection south of Trenton Station. The FRA included funded or committed projects for SEPTA in the No Action Alternative and Action Alternatives. The FRA does not prescribe how Regional railroads might expand or improve their individual rail systems that connect to but do not operate solely on the NEC. While subsequent planning efforts are expected to be consistent with NEC FUTURE, individual railroad operators will make decisions for their individual system requirements.

Table JJ–9: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Transportation (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Freedman_Sa	I'd also like to say that there needs to be a closure of the gap in commuter rail service between the Maryland area and the Philadelphia area. Amtrak should not be the only alternative to move north. You have a consistent, continuous commuter rail system from Newark, Delaware all the way up to New London, Connecticut, but there's a gap between New London and Providence.	The Purpose and Need for NEC FUTURE (Volume 2, Chapter 3) identifies the importance of addressing the existing "gaps" in connectivity and creating better-connected and more-convenient passenger rail (either Intercity or Regional) service along the NEC. As such, the Action Alternatives and Preferred Alternative propose Intercity service increases connecting intermediate stops along the NEC to address this and similar service "gaps." The Preferred Alternative would also create opportunities for SEPTA and MARC and CTDOT and Mass DOT to work together on improving connections. Specific decisions about how or who would deliver these Regional services will be the responsibility of the individual commuter railroads and will be made during subsequent Tier 2 project studies.
Galvin_Cl	How about trying to figure out how to fix the LIRR before we start this project!!	NEC FUTURE addresses existing and future passenger rail service along the NEC. Existing operations of the LIRR are beyond the scope of this Tier 1 EIS; the FRA coordinated closely with the MTA/LIRR to identify opportunities through NEC FUTURE to alleviate known chokepoints along the NEC, including the East River Tunnels. NEC FUTURE, however, is not prescriptive with regard to specific improvements to connecting commuter rail systems. Future plans for improvement, while consistent with NEC FUTURE, remain the responsibility of the individual states and/or commuter railroads.
Gingrave_Do	Please fund and improve! ... Everything should be done to connect airports, universities and population centers to help elevate congestion on the highway infrastructure which is currently maxed in this area of the country.	As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA focused on opportunities for improved connections at airports, larger and intermediate urban centers, and the importance of good local transit connections at those stations. These connections are described in Volumes 1 and 2, Chapter 5. Additionally, the broad implications of more connections are discussed with regard to influences on economic activity in Volumes 1 and 2, Chapter 6. The NEC FUTURE program is focused on the passenger rail system improvements. The FRA has worked closely throughout this process with the Federal Transit Administration (FTA). Both agencies understand the importance of and support multimodal connectivity with passenger rail, including connections to transit. The specifics for transit connections with the NEC are the subject of subsequent Tier 2 project studies and other planning processes.
Hale_Ro	Trip times--especially those for end-to-end journeys currently dominated by the airlines--are not going to be competitive with those achievable in other travel markets if trains average 60-70 mi/hr through all of Connecticut. That time and other suppressed economic potential has an opportunity cost that accumulates quickly.	Rail travel competitiveness with air travel is a function of time, cost, schedule and accessibility. The Preferred Alternative creates new opportunities for improved access to airports, notably in Philadelphia and in the greater Hartford area. The Preferred Alternative would improve overall transportation network connectivity and result in net benefits to travelers either via air, rail or highway modes.
Hinchliffe_Gr	Rail with Trail should be installed along the right-of-way to the maximum extent possible. Piggy-backing bicycle/pedestrian accommodation on any new bridges should be the default option.	As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure or alignments. Such decisions are made as part of Tier 2 project studies, which will include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate. Consistent with this process, the FRA developed Representative Routes for the Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative, which provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the effects of each Alternative. Representative Routes define an envelope within which improvements might occur and whose location and construction type could change during subsequent Tier 2 project analysis.
Holmes_Ca	The NEC should be able easily contribute to the success of the local public transit systems it intersects. This will further the use of the NEC and continue to expand the ecoomny along the NEC.	<p>As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, will not make decisions about specific transit services or systems. Such decisions are made as part of Tier 2 project studies, which will include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate.</p> <p>The FRA generally considered the effects of existing and proposed transit connections at NEC passenger stations in the evaluation of the Action Alternatives (Volume 2, Chapter 5). Connectivity to public transit systems at passenger rail stations contributes greatly to the overall effectiveness of the Preferred Alternative and the multimodal transportation system (Volume 1, Chapter 5). Specific ways public transit would be affected or benefit from the Preferred Alternative will be evaluated in Tier 2 project studies.</p>

Table JJ–9: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Transportation (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Janzen_Ja	It seems like there is an emphasis in the latest round of proposals, on including access to the Philadelphia and Rhode Island airports. I think that passenger rail is capable of competing with air traffic for certain markets, particularly city center to city center. Airport accessibility is a regional issue, and should not be included in a federal passenger rail program.	As described in Volume 1, Chapter 3, one of the needs the FRA addresses is gaps in connectivity to support environmental policies and practices and promote continued economic growth. In markets that exhibit high-quality connectivity between rail service and airports, rail service complements air travel. The improved connectivity increases the number of markets served by the combined air-to-rail mode, and results in a rail system that gains more riders going to an airport for longer-distance flights, and an air system that gets better-quality ground access for its air passengers. Rail-air connections considered for the Preferred Alternative are discussed in Volume 1, Chapters 4 and 5.
Janzen_Ja	Also, there was a point made about freight rail access. I think this is also a case of missed priority. The focus for Federal funds should not be on helping privately owned freight rail companies. To whatever extent rail improvements do help the freight companies, I think a deal should be struck with the freight companies so that passenger accessibility is rewarded in exchange for the taxpayer dollars.	Current and future utilization of the NEC by both passenger and freight rail operators are important considerations in long-term planning. However, NEC FUTURE is a passenger rail program and as such identifies improvements necessary to operate to desired passenger service levels while maintaining access to freight traffic already operating along the NEC. Some opportunities to create greater efficiencies in both passenger and freight service, where those objectives are aligned, have also been identified in Volume 1, Chapter 5. It is the aim of NEC FUTURE to not preclude investment under consideration throughout the freight rail network. Finance and funding and responsibility for various improvements will be determined in subsequent Tier 2 project studies.
Janzen_Ja	It seems like there is an emphasis in the alternative study for accessibility to airports. And I would like to see a transportation mode that's competitive with air travel. I don't know why you would ever fly from Dulles to Newark.	The FRA evaluated the air-rail connection both with regard to improved rail access to airports and with improved competitiveness of rail travel times. Improved access is measured by the increased frequency and travel times between key city-pairs and airports; improved competitiveness of travel times is measured by the numbers of air trips that would be diverted to Intercity rail in the Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative. Further details are provided in Volume 1, Chapter 5 and Volume 2, Appendix B.8.
Janzen_Ja	And then, also, I'm a little bit confused by the point that was made about ensuring freight rail access. I feel like a lot of the public investment in passenger rail ends up getting sidetracked into freight rail investments anyways... So, I mean, it's not like people are traveling to port facilities or anything.	Current and future utilization of the NEC by each of the rail operators, both passenger and freight, are important considerations in long-term planning. Similarly, freight rail is important to the regional economy. However, NEC FUTURE is a passenger rail program and as such identifies improvements necessary to operate to desired passenger service levels while maintaining access to freight traffic already operating along the NEC. Some opportunities to create greater efficiencies in both passenger and freight service, where those objectives are aligned, have also been identified in Volume 1, Chapters 4 and 5. It is the aim of NEC FUTURE to not preclude investment under consideration throughout the freight rail network. The FRA participated in discussions with the stakeholder freight railroads as part of the overall coordination to understand the needs of the freight rail industry as they relate to the NEC.
Jungkeit_Ra	I can already catch trains up and down the Northeast corridor. And the reason I personally don't do it more often is not because of a slow or inefficient train system. It is because the cost is ridiculously high, and it ends up more cost efficient for me to take my car.	As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA tested a range of pricing options to understand market sensitivity to fares. The analysis and survey data supported the concept of a lower-fare, frequent, fast Intercity rail service type - referred to as Metropolitan. The concepts tested helped to establish the range of possible pricing options; however, the FRA will not make decisions on a specific fare structure in the Tier 1 NEPA context. Any such decisions will be made in subsequent Tier 2 project studies.
Keene_Jo	...all planning for current repairs and expansion scenarios encompass multimodal access to the fullest extent possible. Pedestrians and bicyclists, as well as bus, light rail and heavy rail transit users and private automobiles, should all have easy access to and required support facilities for Corridor rail services. The Corridor study should adopt a policy similar to Complete Street guidelines which outline the multiple ways all user groups can be accommodated on public streets in an equitable manner.	<p>As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure or alignments. Such decisions are made as part of Tier 2 project studies, which would include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate. Consistent with this process, the FRA developed Representative Routes for the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative, which provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the effects of each Alternative. Representative Routes define an envelope within which improvements might occur and whose location and construction type could change during subsequent Tier 2 project analysis.</p> <p>Together with the FTA, the FRA encourages the consideration of accessibility at all facilities, particularly at passenger rail stations, for travelers arriving by auto, bus, public transit, bicycle or as a pedestrian.</p>

Table JJ–9: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Transportation (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Keene_Jo	...the Corridor study should embrace opportunities to co-locate bicycle trails within the Corridor's right of way, which has been successfully accomplished in Newark, DE and elsewhere. This is especially important at certain bridge locations, such as the Susquehanna River at Havre de Grace/Perryville, MD where the Maine-to-Florida East Coast Greenway has no available structure to cross this water barrier. By increasing accessibility, future Corridor improvements will lead to an increasing traffic base, enhanced revenues and most importantly improved utility for the citizens of the Northeast region which it is designed to serve.	<p>As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure or alignments. Such decisions are made as part of Tier 2 project studies, which would include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate. Consistent with this process, the FRA developed Representative Routes for the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative, which provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the effects of each Alternative. Representative Routes define an envelope within which improvements might occur and whose location and construction type could change during subsequent Tier 2 project analysis.</p> <p>Better connections between passenger rail services and improved access to those services to the multimodal transportation system were considered in the development of the Action and Preferred Alternatives. Opportunities for bicycle access to trains and passenger stations are generally described at this Tier 1 level of analysis in Volume 1, Chapter 5. Site-specific or location-specific decisions or equipment design configuration will be the subject of subsequent Tier 2 project studies.</p>
Kei_Ja	Whatever alternative/no action taken, the buildout should consider passenger comfort and intermodal options especially in regions of the NEC where passengers are incapable of transitioning to better job access and require the capacity to gain better job outlets.	Passenger convenience, better connections, and improved access to the multimodal transportation system, are included in the Action and Preferred Alternatives, as described in Volumes 1 and 2, Chapter 5. Potential economic benefits, including access to jobs, for the Preferred Alternative are described in Volume 1, Chapter 6.
Kessler_Je	One of the other concerns that I wanted to bring up is should there be parallel corridors? The consideration needs to be given for bridging the gap, if you will, between parallel stations and making sure the connectivity between two stations within a locality, so be it even the two Philadelphia stations or two commuter stations in Maryland, for example, making sure that access between the two stations is enhanced via either ideally with walkable access, bike lanes, but even, if need be, if the distance is great enough, bus and shuttle service, making sure that the access between the two stations is there.	<p>The Preferred Alternative focuses on services to existing stations and urban centers along the NEC. For the Action Alternatives and Preferred Alternative, the FRA considered the importance of multimodal connectivity between transit modes as well as access and connectivity to stations (Volume 1, Chapters 5 and 6). Specific connections within a metropolitan area will be considered in subsequent Tier 2 project studies.</p> <p>As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure or alignments. Such decisions will be made as part of Tier 2 project studies, which will include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate. Consistent with this process, the FRA developed Representative Routes for the Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative, which provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the effects of each Alternative. The Representative Routes define an envelope within which improvements might occur and whose location and construction type could change during subsequent Tier 2 project analysis.</p>
Laadt_Jo	...the need for increased connectivity couldn't be greater. Currently the only way to connect to New England and points north without travelling through New York City is to travel via the two ferry options located on the North Shore. ...The vision for the Northeast Corridor calling for a train tunnel/bridge could prove to be a more compelling alternative and would help reduce the reliance on the automobile for most of Long Island.	Based on the evaluation of the Action Alternatives presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public and stakeholder comments, and the FRA policy objectives, an end-to-end second spine and Alternative 3 off-corridor routing options were not carried forward in the Preferred Alternative. The FRA's deliberative process is further described in the Volume 1, Chapter 4. Improved travel times and service frequencies proposed in the Preferred Alternative would improve connections for travelers between New York City and points north.
Lewandowski_An	Would love to see a transit line opened from Middletown, Delaware to Newark, Dover, and Wilmington.	In the Tier 1 Draft EIS, the FRA identified opportunities for improved transit connections at passenger stations for the Action Alternatives, but the specifics of those improvements are beyond the scope of NEC FUTURE. Delaware plans for transit improvements would be important future considerations for each of the metropolitan areas and transit operations throughout the Study Area.
Lopez_An	Bicycles and biking should be factored into the heart of any NEC FUTURE plan, including guaranteeing that bicycles are welcome on all trains, long term weather-proof bicycle parking is offered at all train stations, and bicycle lanes and routes are part of the design of any new work not just on train lines, but on roads and routes connecting or leading to train stations or other forms of public transit.	The Action Alternatives and Preferred Alternative focus on improved connections between passenger rail services and access to the multimodal transportation system. Opportunities for bicycle access to trains and passenger stations are generally described at this Tier 1 level of analysis in Volume 1, Chapters 4 and 5. Site-specific or location-specific decisions or equipment design configuration will be the subject of subsequent Tier 2 project studies.

Table JJ–9: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Transportation (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Lopez_An	...options for alternative modes of transportation will become increasingly important. In order for our communities to find a way forward, regional rail together with regional bicycle routes could make Connecticut an attractive place to live and work. We should lead by example and show the nation what a transformed regional transportation system can do to revitalize communities in the age of a changing climate.	The FRA placed emphasis on improving passenger convenience and connectivity in defining the Action Alternatives and Preferred Alternative (see Volumes 1 and 2, Chapters 4, 5, and 6, respectively). The FRA did not specify ways to improve transit, auto, bus, bicycle and pedestrian access to stations. Those location-specific details will be determined in subsequent Tier 2 project studies.
Lukasik_Ta	You know, there have been some language and terminology about freight but being real and honest about what this means. You know, the boroughs are gentrifying. The City is the economic driver. Nassau County is in financial dire straits. There's a lot of freight-based planning that's already going on right now. There's discussion of internodal facilities. How is this going to tack onto what is already going on right here?	Current and future utilization of the NEC by each of the rail operators, both passenger and freight, are important considerations in long-term planning. Similarly, freight rail is important to the regional economy. However, NEC FUTURE is a passenger rail program and as such identifies improvements necessary to operate to desired passenger service levels while maintaining access to freight traffic already operating along the NEC. It is the aim of NEC FUTURE to not preclude investment under consideration throughout the freight rail network. Some opportunities to create greater efficiencies in both passenger and freight service, where those objectives are aligned, have also been identified in Volume 1, Chapter 5. The FRA participated in discussions with the stakeholder freight railroads as part of the overall coordination to understand the needs of the freight rail industry as they relate to the NEC. Further information about the freight rail industry, including ownership of rail lines, commodities carried is included in Volume 1, Chapters 4, 5, and 6.
MacDonald_Ri	Air travel is an increasing pain, and of no advantage in time savings. GO RAIL!!!	Support for improved passenger rail that is increasingly competitive with other transportation modes is reflected in the range of Action Alternatives evaluated in the Tier 1 Draft EIS and in the definition of the Preferred Alternative.
Mahler_Ma	nevermind that the lirr already has enough difficulty maintaining the current levels of traffic.	NEC FUTURE addresses existing and future passenger rail service along the NEC. Existing operations of the Long Island Rail Road (LIRR) are beyond the scope of this Tier 1 EIS; the FRA coordinated closely with the MTA/LIRR to identify opportunities through NEC FUTURE to alleviate known chokepoints along the NEC, including the East River Tunnels. NEC FUTURE, however, is not prescriptive with regard to specific improvements to connecting commuter rail systems. Future plans for improvement, while coordinated through the NEC FUTURE process, remain the responsibility of the individual states and/or commuter railroads.
Maits_Sc	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.	The Preferred Alternative does not include the new segments between NYC and Long Island and Long Island and Connecticut via the Long Island Sound, as proposed in Alternative 3. The FRA's deliberative process for deciding the Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure or alignments.
Maits_Sc	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 Secaucus 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	As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure or alignments. Such decisions are made as part of Tier 2 project studies, which will include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate. Consistent with this process, the FRA developed Representative Routes for the Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative, which provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the effects of each Alternative. Representative Routes define an envelope within which improvements might occur and whose location and construction type could change during subsequent Tier 2 project analysis.
Maits_Sc	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.	The Preferred Alternative proposes a Representative Route via a new 4-track tunnel(s) through Baltimore separate from the existing B&P tunnels. The Preferred Alternative would not use the existing B&P tunnels. The FRA is lead federal agency for the related B&P Tunnel project; details about the proposed new B&P tunnels and the disposition of the existing B&P tunnel are available at the B&P Tunnel project website - www.bptunnel.com .

Table JJ–9: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Transportation (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Maits_Sc	<p>In New York, the Fifth and/or Sixth, depending on if they can be in one tunnel or two 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, 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 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. 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.</p>	<p>As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure or alignments. Such decisions are made as part of Tier 2 project studies, which will include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate. Consistent with this process, the FRA developed Representative Routes for the Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative, which provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the effects of each Alternative. Representative Routes define an envelope within which improvements might occur and whose location and construction type could change during subsequent Tier 2 project analysis.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative does not include a Representative Route via Long Island. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.</p>
Maits_Sc	<p>The gentleman who was talking about freight -- I have not talked about it very much... They need new tunnels in Baltimore. I believe there's a cheaper way to do it not combined in Baltimore, but swapping tunnels and having one rebuilt before the other -- before it opens if you build a high-speed passenger tunnel... 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... 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 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.</p>	<p>Consistent with the recommendations of the related B & P Tunnel Project sponsored by Maryland DOT, Amtrak and FRA, the Preferred Alternative includes four-tracks in tunnel(s) replacing the existing two-track B & P tunnel. The disposition of the existing tunnel is the subject of that separate but related effort. Improvements to the Susquehanna River Bridge are also incorporated into the Representative Route of the Preferred Alternative.</p>
Maits_Sc	<p>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.</p>	<p>Current and future utilization of the NEC by each of the rail operators, both passenger and freight, are important considerations in long-term planning. Similarly, freight rail is important to the regional economy. However, NEC FUTURE is a passenger rail program and as such identifies improvements necessary to operate to desired passenger service levels while maintaining access to freight traffic already operating along the NEC. It is the aim of NEC FUTURE to not preclude investment under consideration throughout the freight rail network. Some opportunities to create greater efficiencies in both passenger and freight service, where those objectives are aligned, have also been identified in Volume 1, Chapter 5. The FRA participated in discussions with the stakeholder freight railroads as part of the overall coordination to understand the needs of the freight rail industry as they relate to the NEC.</p>
Maits_Sc	<p>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 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 don't think you can afford all of them either anyway.</p>	<p>The representative service plan for the Preferred Alternative includes opportunities for improved through-running and connecting services from the Keystone Corridor and the NEC to points east and west. Improved connections throughout the passenger rail network are emphasized in the Preferred Alternative, with a focus on creating an integrated network of passenger rail services. Additional details about the representative service plans are provide in Volume 1, Chapter 4. At the Tier 1 level of analysis the FRA will not make specific decisions about service plans or schedules; those would be the subject of subsequent Tier 2 project studies, which would include stakeholder and public participation as appropriate.</p>

Table JJ-9: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Transportation (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Maits_Sc	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.	Current and future utilization of the NEC by each of the rail operators, both passenger and freight, are important considerations in long-term planning. Similarly, freight rail is important to the regional economy. However, NEC FUTURE is a passenger rail program and as such identifies improvements necessary to operate to desired passenger service levels while maintaining access to freight traffic already operating along the NEC. It is the aim of NEC FUTURE to not preclude investment under consideration throughout the freight rail network. Some opportunities to create greater efficiencies in both passenger and freight service, where those objectives are aligned, have also been identified in Volume 1, Chapter 5. The FRA participated in discussions with the stakeholder freight railroads as part of the overall coordination to understand the needs of the freight rail industry as they relate to the NEC.
Manicastri_St	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.	The Preferred Alternative achieves a "grow" service vision with improvements to the existing NEC and expanded service from New Haven to Hartford, CT, and Springfield, MA, on the Hartford/Springfield Line. The existing NEC was chosen due to costs and impacts associated with a Hartford-Providence routing. The FRA recognizes the importance of strengthening markets in Connecticut, and as those markets mature with the improved service from the Preferred Alternative, revisiting the opportunity to connect markets is possible in the future. As proposed in the Preferred Alternative, the extension of the NEC to Hartford and Springfield via the Hartford/Springfield Line would improve Intercity rail connections to central Connecticut. The proposed representative routing and service, including connections, are described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Marden_Ku	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... 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.	Metropolitan planning organizations (MPO) throughout the Study Area participated and continue to participate in NEC FUTURE through the FRA's extensive agency coordination. At the Tier 1 level of analysis, insufficient information is known as to specific right-of-way requirements. Opportunities to protect and preserve rights-of-way could be explored by individual states, MPOs, and local jurisdictions as projects consistent with NEC FUTURE are advanced during subsequent Tier 2 project analysis.
Marden_Ku	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... which will bring more people to the corridor without the associated traffic	As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure or alignments. Such decisions are made as part of Tier 2 project studies, which will include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate. Consistent with this process, the FRA developed Representative Routes for the Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative, which provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the effects of each Alternative. Representative Routes define an envelope within which improvements might occur and whose location and construction type could change during subsequent Tier 2 project analysis.
Markatos-Soriano_De	...we ask that the FRA require Amtrak to: Adopt an equivalent of complete streets , which we call complete corridors . Specically, we believe that Amtrak should always give thorough consideration to sharing their corridors with bike/walk trails, especially when building new river bridges. Rails-with-trails are of growing importance in the U.S., enhancing pedestrian safety in the vicinity of railroads.	As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure or alignments. Such decisions are made as part of Tier 2 project studies, which will include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate. The FRA has identified the importance of connectivity and safety in defining the Preferred Alternative, as described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Markatos-Soriano_De	Transportation opportunities in the 21st century need to be multi-modal, to keep our country economically competitive and environmentally sustainable; inter-city rail service, walking, and bicycling must be key elements.	NEC FUTURE represents a vision of a more coordinated, efficient, sustainable transportation network that supports economic growth and expanded mobility.
Martin_Ja	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.	The Preferred Alternative does not include the new segments between NYC and Long Island and Long Island and Connecticut via the Long Island Sound, as proposed in Alternative 3.

Table JJ–9: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Transportation (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
McGurk_Bo	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 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... 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.	<p>The NEC FUTURE project considers opportunities where additional infrastructure would expand the efficiency and use of passenger rail services along the NEC. It is the aim of NEC FUTURE to not preclude investment under consideration throughout the freight rail network.</p> <p>As described for Alternative 2, the Preferred Alternative includes additional track in Maryland as well as Rhode Island that would help to relieve conflicts between freight and passenger service where they both operate on the NEC. Additional details about these proposed improvements are provided in Volume 1, Chapters 4 and 5.</p> <p>As part of the NEC FUTURE Tier 1 process, the FRA is evaluating Representative Routes which establish the overall envelope within which improvements might be made and will not make alignment-specific decisions. As such, specific ways in which the existing and new segments would be shared between passenger and freight rail was not evaluated by the FRA for the Tier 1 Draft EIS. Those decisions would be the subject of subsequent Tier 2 project studies.</p>
McGurk_Bo	We'd also like to see further consideration of connectors across the Northeast corridor. Freight users in Delaware and 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.	<p>The NEC FUTURE does not preclude investment under consideration throughout the freight rail network.</p> <p>Existing and proposed future utilization of the NEC, both by passenger and freight rail, are important considerations in long-term planning. Similarly, freight rail is important to the regional economy. However, NEC FUTURE is a passenger rail program and as such identifies improvements necessary to operate to desired passenger service levels while maintaining access to freight traffic already operating along the NEC. Some opportunities to create greater efficiencies in both passenger and freight service, where those objectives are aligned, have also been identified in Volume 1, Chapter 5. The FRA participated in discussions with the stakeholder freight railroads as part of the overall coordination to understand the needs of the freight rail industry as they relate to the NEC.</p>
Napolitano_Ra	Furthermore \$\$\$\$s should be allocated to the LIRR to build two fly- over tracks in Jamaica, which will improve the commute time, to Brooklyn, LIC, and Manhattan bound trains. In addition tracks along the MainLine in the Westbury Area at Nassau IV Interlocking should be extended over the Meadowbrook Parkway, and connected to existing tracks near Quinten and Roosevelt street, which would provide LIRR access to a hub where the Nassau Coliseum is located. COMMUTERS would have the capacity to travel on the Port Jefferson or MainLine branches to the planned Nassau Hub. This project would not require the MTA to take over any private property, as the ROW currently exist,but has been long abandoned.	Improvements mentioned are specific to the Long Island Rail Road (LIRR) and Long Island, which are beyond the scope of the NEC FUTURE program. Some of the referenced projects or plans are being advanced by local agencies or the LIRR and are reflected in the NEC FUTURE No Action Alternative as described in Volume 2, Chapter 4, and Volume 2, Appendix B.1.
Neef_Na	I notice in the NEC documents that a commute seems to be assumed to be 30 minutes or less - in reality, it is often much longer.	Volume 2, Chapter 6, uses a representative journey-to-work time of 30 minutes to evaluate the change in jobs accessible with improvements in service offered by each of the Action Alternatives. The use of 30 minutes is only by way of example and is not intended to suggest that the average commute is 30 minutes.
Osborne_Be	My comment is that we should do whatever it takes--tax businesses, raise tolls, reinstitute a gas tax in NJ, whatever--to get more train tracks, more trains, and better service between NJ and NY	The Action and Preferred Alternatives provide for increased capacity, improved train frequencies and reliability and replacement of the outdated, aging tunnels under the Hudson River between New Jersey and New York City to meet current and future demand. Specific funding for these investments is yet to be determined, but funding and finance strategies will be further explored by the FRA in the Service Development Plan process in conjunction with the NEC stakeholders and the Northeast Corridor Commission.

Table JJ–9: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Transportation (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Penn Design_Taylor_Yaro	However, before selecting a preferred alignment for the NY-Boston section of the NEC further analysis of the alternative alignments should be conducted to determine: a) what the impacts of placing two dedicated HSR tracks would be on commuter rail service in the New Haven Line section of the corridor;	The Preferred Alternative includes two additional tracks along the New Haven Line, which would be integral to both Intercity and Regional service for the purposes of adding express-style service in that heavily congested portion of the NEC. As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure or alignments. Such decisions will be made as part of the Tier 2 project studies, which will include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate. Consistent with this process, the FRA developed Representative Routes for the Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative, which provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the effects of each Alternative. Representative Routes define an envelope within which improvements might occur and whose location and construction type could change during subsequent Tier 2 project analysis.
Plaughner_Da	Virginians are increasingly left with few options to travel to the Northeast. Our citizens must choose between congested roads, packed flights, and too few trains. With the unlikelihood of major roadway expansions or dramatic increases in the number of airlines and flights serving our airports, high speed passenger rail connecting Virginia to destinations along the Northeast offers our citizens the best opportunity for major improvements.	The Action and Preferred Alternatives provide for improved travel times and increased frequency of service from points in Virginia in conjunction with ongoing Related Projects to improve rail service to Richmond and beyond. The Preferred Alternative includes capacity to accommodate increased through service via Washington Union Station to levels proposed in the DC2RVA or SEHSR programs.
Preston_Ev	...recognize the fact that America's transportation demands have changed, changed quite dramatically in the past generation. So people from my generation, Millennials, are increasing seeking transportation options. You've heard from several of those folks earlier tonight, but this is a nationwide trend, that areas which have the ability to access the kind of connections and multimodal opportunities that Connecticut does and that the Northeast Corridor does should be taking advantage of those opportunities, as they're some of the best ways to target public investment and shifting our priorities toward things that will allow us to solve the transportation problems, keep people in the state, and have a more viable opportunity for people in the 21st century.	The FRA analysis conducted for NEC FUTURE similarly indicated the value of good connections, frequent, reliable and affordable service to travelers. The Preferred Alternative is focused on connecting existing urban centers with well-integrated, frequent, fast, and reliable service, as described in the Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Action Alternatives also focused on connecting existing urban centers with well-integrated, frequent, fast, and reliable service, as described in the Volume 2, Chapter 4.
Previdi_Bo	...a discussion of better connections to the stations themselves. You might, for an example, just look at what they've been doing, a fabulous job at 30th Street, Amtrak's been doing this for 30th Street in their plans for 30th Street Station. A lot of discussion about how to make those connections with the existing infrastructure, Market Frankford Line as well as the bike lanes, you know, connecting the station itself to the Corridor and more discussion like that. And then just overall being more nimble with the right of way discussions, you know, rails to trails and that kind of thing.	The FRA identified the importance of connecting and strengthening urban centers and leveraging the extensive investments already made in infrastructure as a key policy objective for the Preferred Alternative. Additional discussion regarding how improved Intercity and Regional rail access can contribute to the viability of existing urban centers, such as Philadelphia, is provided in Volume 1, Chapter 6. Additional discussion about pedestrian, bicycle, and transit access to stations is provided in Volume 1, Chapter 5.
Rhodes_Ja	This railway will ruin a town that can and has been giving so much more to people than just quicker transportation	As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure or alignments. Such decisions are made as part of Tier 2 project studies, which will include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate. Consistent with this process, the FRA developed Representative Routes for the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative, which provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the effects of each Alternative. Representative Routes define an envelope within which improvements might occur and whose location and construction type could change during subsequent Tier 2 project analysis.
Richman_Wi	Train prices need to be more in line with the bus rather than the plane. In bad weather the highways are clear while the train is still delayed.	As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA tested a range of pricing options to understand market sensitivity to fares. The analysis and survey data supported the concept of a lower-fare, frequent, fast Intercity rail service type - referred to as Metropolitan. The concepts tested helped to establish the range of possible pricing options; however, the FRA will not make decisions on a specific fare structure in the Tier 1 NEPA context. Any such decisions will be made in subsequent Tier 2 project studies.

Table JJ–9: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Transportation (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Robins_Ma	The other choke -- the other thing I'd like to see as an early victory is the implementation of the Hunter Flyover. I understand that Amtrak and New Jersey Transit have completed their engineering on that project, they're agreed upon a concept. And it would be -- it would make a remarkable difference to both Amtrak and New Jersey Transit if in fact a flyover were created there instead of an at-grade tortuous crossing of many -- at many different interlockings between the point where the Raritan Valley intersects the Northeast Corridor to where it actually enters into Newark Penn Station. A flyover would greatly speed that process and reduce the interferences with Amtrak and other services.	<p>As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure or alignments. Such decisions are made as part of the Tier 2 project studies, which will include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate. Consistent with this process, the FRA developed Representative Routes for the Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative, which provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the effects of each Alternative. Representative Routes define an envelope within which improvements might occur and whose location and construction type could change during subsequent Tier 2 project analysis.</p> <p>The Hunter Flyover is identified as a Related Project and was considered in the overall envelope created for the Representative Route for the Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative. The benefits of the project are included as part of the analysis of project impacts of the three Action Alternatives described in the Tier 1 Draft EIS presented in Volume 2 as well as included in the analysis for the Preferred Alternative presented in Volume 1 of the Tier 1 Final EIS Volume 1.</p>
Schwarzwalder_Ja	Many commuter rail services operate in the off peak or base on hourly headways. If the commuter rail services operated on say 30 minute headways in the base period, then all things being equal, an NEC passenger beginning or ending their trip on commuter rail or using commuter rail for a leg of a through, multimodal trip could save on the average 15 minutes in travel time if the commuter train operated every 30 minutes versus every 60 minutes.	The Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative incorporate opportunities for efficiencies for both Intercity and Regional operations with enhancements that include increased frequencies and regular headways. Benefits could include more-frequent commuter rail service that would expand connectivity and increase the use of commuter rail as a mode.
Schwarzwalder_Ja	I suggest consideration be given to combining SEPTA and MARC service into a jointly operated low fare through service making local stops between Trenton and Washington D.C. This would fill a gap on the corridor between Newark Delaware and Aberdeen Maryland.	The Purpose and Need for NEC FUTURE (Volume 2, Chapter 3) identifies the importance of addressing the existing gaps' in connectivity and creating better connected and more convenient passenger rail (either Intercity or Regional) service along the NEC. As such, the Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternatives propose Intercity service increases connecting intermediate stops along the NEC to address this and similar service 'gaps' and would also create opportunities for SEPTA and MARC to work together on improving connections. Specific decisions about how or who would deliver these Regional services would be the responsibility of the individual commuter railroads and would be made during subsequent Tier 2 project studies.
Smith_La	...could a little re-ggiring of the NYC subway tunnels allow a few Metronorth trains access to NY Penn Sta.?	The FRA does not prescribe how Regional railroads might expand or improve their individual rail systems that connect to but do not operate solely on the NEC. Commuter rail improvements in the NYC metro area require consideration by the Metropolitan Transportation Authority.
Smith_La	Or have metronorth shuttles from New Rochelle to NYP.	The FRA does not prescribe how Regional railroads might expand or improve their individual rail systems that connect to but do not operate solely on the NEC. While subsequent planning efforts are expected to be consistent with NEC FUTURE, individual railroad operators will make decisions for their individual system requirements. Commuter rail improvements in the NYC metro area require consideration by the Metropolitan Transportation Authority.
Sullivan_Vi	Accommodation at stations will not be sufficient if there is poor access for bicycles. Bike paths, bike lanes, or other facilities are needed to insure that cyclists can reach stations for last mile and first mile use... Bridges are often barriers to full development of bicycle route networks when the bridges don't accommodate bicycles. When rail bridges in the NEC require replacement or refurbishment they should accommodate bicycle and pedestrian access... Rail with trail development makes optimum use of right-of-way within the NEC and will greatly contribute to improved bicycle route networks.	The Action Alternatives and Preferred Alternative focus on improved connections between passenger rail services and access to the multimodal transportation system. Opportunities for bicycle access to trains and passenger stations are generally described at this Tier 1 level of analysis in Volume 1, Chapters 4 and 5. Site-specific or location-specific decisions or equipment design configuration will be the subject of subsequent Tier 2 project studies.

Table JJ–9: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Transportation (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Tzanavaris_Ch	With the advent of self-driving vehicles and, by extension, the expectation that these networked vehicles will virtually eliminate all automobile traffic currently plaguing our roads (the main reason I use LIRR to commute to Manhattan), the American public will need a reason to choose rail over car. The only two compelling reasons will be (1) speed and (2) cost. On the former (speed) rail could have a clear advantage - but only if high-speed rail is ubiquitous and convenient. A 20% decrease in travel time to your destination simply will not cut it. Speeds must vastly exceed not only current average rail velocities, but must also compensate for the disadvantages inherent in rail travel to a fixed point that may not be as conveniently located to your final destination. The second reason, cost, is not as clear an advantage for rail, in status quo. Only by applying economies of scale can rail capture a market share sufficiently large to allow cost-per-mile to be truly competitive with automobiles that will be increasingly electric, automated, and efficient. We all know that rail is much more efficient than car, on an energy-per-mile basis, but this fact must translate to dollars-per-mile for it to be persuasive enough for a consumer to purchase a ticket to Boston instead of hopping in his automated Google car and simply saying, Boston, please.	The FRA considered several factors, including travel time and cost, in defining the Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative. The findings of this effort are presented for the Action and Preferred Alternatives in Volumes 1 and 2, Chapters 4, 5, 6, and 9, respectively. As noted by the commenter, the FRA's analysis shows the importance of not only speed, but improved frequency, reliability and connectivity of services.
Varano_Yv	The Long Island RR does an excellent job of transporting people from Floral Park to Ronkonkoma. There is absolutely no benefit to a second train line transporting passengers along the exact same route.	Within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and will not make decisions about specific locations or alignments. Those decisions would be the subject of Tier 2 project studies, which will include participation of stakeholders and the public as appropriate. As discussed in Volume 1, Chapter 4, the Preferred Alternative does not include Representative Routes or new segments between New York City and Connecticut via Long Island and the Long Island Sound, as proposed for Alternative 3.

Table JJ–9: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Transportation (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Weinstein_Da	<p>Insufficient Service Between Philadelphia and Wilmington Too few trains run between Philadelphia and Wilmington. My experience as a regular commuter on the Wilmington/Newark line leads me to believe that over 90 percent of riders on this line use it to travel from Philadelphia to Wilmington or vice-versa. However, on a typical weekday, only four trains run from University City (the last Center City Philadelphia station) to Wilmington during the eight and a half hour period between 6:45 am and 3:15 pm, and only five trains run from Wilmington to University City during the eight and a half hour period between 8:00 am and 4:30 pm. These "gap periods" span much of the morning rush hour for commuters in both directions. The dearth of routes between Philadelphia and Wilmington-on average, there is less than one per hour-creates difficulties for commuters, and is insufficient to encourage travelers between the two cities to choose SEPTA Regional Rail over other options. The situation is far worse on weekends: even fewer trains run between the two cities on Saturday and Sunday. Many trains originate or terminate at Marcus Hook: as others have noted, a partial solution would be to extend all such trains to Wilmington. ... Delays Due to Infrastructure Breakdowns Infrastructure on the Wilmington/Newark Line and other SEPTA Regional Rail routes appears to be falling apart. Trains are frequently delayed due to "signal problems" and other equipment failures of this nature (including severe issues such as train breakdowns en route). Sometimes, these delays are quite lengthy (i.e. one hour or more). The fact that infrastructure-related delays occur as frequently as they currently do significantly compounds the inconvenience to commuters caused by existing inadequate SEPTA Regional Rail service between Philadelphia and Wilmington. SEPTA Regional Rail infrastructure must be upgraded in order to resolve this problem. Inconvenient Service Due to Poor Schedule Planning During the evening rush hour-one of the few periods in which trains run between Philadelphia and Wilmington more than once every two hours-poor schedule planning makes the commute difficult for passengers traveling from Wilmington to Philadelphia. Rather than being spaced out evenly (e.g. once every half-hour), trains run from Wilmington to Philadelphia at oddly-timed intervals. Two trains leave Wilmington at 4:44 pm and 5:06 pm (too early for many rush hour commuters), respectively, but then no trains leave Wilmington until 5:50 pm and 6:02 pm. Those unable to make the 6:02 pm train are forced to wait until 7:06 pm or 7:29 pm, the departure times for the next two trains to leave Wilmington. Schedules which take a range of typical workplace departure times into account would encourage more commuters to view SEPTA Regional Rail as a viable option. Inefficient Service Due to Lack of Express Routes In contrast to other commuter rail services such as NJ Transit, SEPTA runs only a small number of express routes on its Northeast Corridor lines. Moreover, the existing express routes are inefficient. On a typical weekday, only four express routes run from Philadelphia to Wilmington, and only three express routes run from Wilmington to Philadelphia. There is only one express train from Philadelphia to Wilmington during the morning rush hour, and there is only one express train from Wilmington to Philadelphia during the evening rush hour. ... Adding more express trains would save time and encourage commuters with a greater variety of work schedules to choose Regional Rail over other travel options. Moreover, as noted previously, my experience suggests that most commuters who take the Wilmington/Newark Line use it to travel from Philadelphia to Wilmington or vice-versa: few people get on or off the train at intermediate stations. SEPTA should emulate NJ Transit in operating "super express" routes which run directly from Center City Philadelphia stations to Wilmington (without stopping at Chester, Marcus Hook, and Claymont in between). Delays Due to Track Sharing and Train Traffic SEPTA Regional Rail trains are frequently compelled to wait in order for Amtrak trains to pass them by. The addition of new track to areas which experience congestion regularly would help alleviate this problem. Inability to Maintain Consistent Schedules Beyond delays caused by infrastructure breakdowns, SEPTA Regional Rail trains on the Wilmington/Newark line simply run late far too often. (In my experience, this problem is particularly acute with respect to evening trains which originate in Newark.) If increased train ridership is a goal, this must change. Need for More Stations in Wilmington Given the size of the city, it would seem appropriate for there to be more than one train station in Wilmington. Ease of access to train arrival and departure points would make the benefits of SEPTA Regional Rail more apparent to commuters.</p>	<p>The Purpose and Need for NEC FUTURE (Volume 2, Chapter 3) identifies the importance of addressing the existing "gaps" in connectivity and creating better-connected and more-convenient passenger rail (either Intercity or Regional) service along the NEC. As such, the Action Alternatives and Preferred Alternative propose Intercity service increases connecting intermediate stops along the NEC to address this and similar service "gaps."</p> <p>As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on concepts for improving the frequency, travel time and connectivity of service and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, will not make decisions about operator-specific service plans or schedules. Such decisions will be made as part of Tier 2 project studies, which will include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate. Consistent with this process, the FRA developed representative service plans for the Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative, which provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the effects of each Alternative. Representative service plans define a range of benefits that might occur and whose details could change during subsequent Tier 2 project analysis.</p>

Table JJ–9: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Transportation (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Weissman_Ne	Transportation systems form an integrated network in which each element influences the other elements and the performance and environmental impact of the entire system. Passenger rail service interacts with other transportation modes so the environmental impact of the NEC has to consider how it influences those modes.	The Action Alternatives and Preferred Alternative focus on improved connections between passenger rail services and access to the multimodal transportation system. NEC FUTURE is a passenger rail study, but considers passenger rail in the context of the multimodal transportation system. Implications to the entire system, and how passenger rail contributes to regional mobility are discussed in Volume 1, Chapters 5 and 6, for the Preferred Alternative, and Volume 2, Chapters 5 and 6, for the Action Alternatives.
Weissman_Ne	Rail with trail development makes optimum use of right-of-way within the NEG and will greatly contribute to improved bicycle route networks.	As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure or alignments. Such decisions are made as part of Tier 2 project studies, which will include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate. Consistent with this process, the FRA developed Representative Routes for the Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative, which provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the effects of each Alternative. Representative Routes define an envelope within which improvements might occur and whose location and construction type could change during subsequent Tier 2 project analysis.
Werner_St	Unfortunately, your proposals do not address freight movement in the truck-dominated Northeast Corridor. The Northeast Corridor's potential for rail freight movement is underexploited. According to your report rail only accounts for 5.2% of freight movement in the NEe. In the New York CSA it is even lower at 2.3%. Nationally rail movement accounts for about 40% of freight movement. Clearly there is potential for improvement in the NEC.	Current and future utilization of the NEC by each of the rail operators, both passenger and freight, are important considerations in long-term planning. Similarly, freight rail is important to the regional economy. However, NEC FUTURE is a passenger rail program and as such identifies improvements necessary to operate to desired passenger service levels while maintaining access to freight traffic already operating along the NEC. Some opportunities to create greater efficiencies in both passenger and freight service, where those objectives are aligned, have also been identified in Volume 1, Chapters 4 and 5. It is the aim of NEC FUTURE to not preclude investment under consideration throughout the freight rail network. The FRA participated in discussions with the stakeholder freight railroads as part of the overall coordination to understand the needs of the freight rail industry as they relate to the NEC.
Whellan_Mi	...if you can look into through-running, whether that's, you know, in the D.C. area with VRE and MARC. It would be great if you could take a MARC train from here in Baltimore all the way down to, you know, VRE service territory in -- in Virginia, but the place where I think this is especially important and is probably also the most difficult would be New York, which is the metropolitan area that I come from. It would be fantastic if I could get on a train in my hometown of Fairfield, Connecticut and go through to, you know, the Northeast corridor in New Jersey.	The FRA considered opportunities for through running and incorporated these concepts into the representative service plans evaluated for the Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative. Through-running, integrated schedules, timed-transfers and other operating enhancements are cornerstones of the vision for improved NEC service. NEC FUTURE, however, is not prescriptive with regard to specific improvements to connecting commuter rail systems. Decisions about how or if through-running service would be implemented will be the subject of subsequent planning processes and remain the responsibility of the individual states and/or commuter railroads.

Table JJ–9: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Transportation (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Wieting_Sc	...as a resident that lives on a rail trail, I did not get a chance to study the maps, but the new rail between Hartford and UConn looks like it will go through my backyard. So if that's ever redeveloped, please keep in mind the Rails-With-Trails plan in as many locations as possible in the state.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4). The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more-frequent, faster, and more-reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative includes upgrading the existing NEC shoreline route and adding a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. This new segment would improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line into the NEC, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield. It does not include a line connecting Hartford and Providence. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.</p> <p>The FRA noted views expressed about connections to UCONN and Hartford. However, the Preferred Alternative does not include the route to UCONN as envisioned in Alternatives 2 and 3. The rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative is provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The NEC FUTURE program is focused on corridor-wide solutions for passenger rail improvements, and the selection of the Preferred Alternative does not preclude future consideration of transit or fixed-guideway improvements to meet other transportation needs across the Study Area.</p>
Wilkins_An	Improved rail service, combined with improvements to the local transit network such as bus rapid transit (BRT) or a fixed guideway rapid transit network, will help to ensure Worcester's continued success and prosperity as a city and increase its desirability as a place to live.	<p>The FRA noted views expressed about connections to Worcester. Improved connections to Worcester are included in Alternative 3. However, the Preferred Alternative does not include the route to Worcester as envisioned in Alternative 3. The deliberative process for the selection of the Preferred Alternative is provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The NEC FUTURE program is focused on corridor-wide solutions for passenger rail improvements, and the selection of the Preferred Alternative would not preclude future consideration of transit or fixed guideway improvements to meet other transportation needs across the Study Area.</p>
Williams_Mi	...it's very important to connect airports beyond just Newark International and Baltimore/Washington International Airports, the Alternative 3.2 would include the Philadelphia International Airport, John F. Kennedy Airport, McArther-Islip Airport, as well as the T. F. Green Airport as part of the reach of the Northeast Corridor.	<p>The Preferred Alternative includes the noted airport connections at Baltimore/Washington International Airport, Philadelphia International Airport, Newark Liberty International Airport, Bradley International Airport, and TF Green Airport. John F. Kennedy Airport is also connected via the LIRR and AirTrain service (connecting at Penn Station for service to Jamaica). These airport connections are further described in Volume 1, Chapters 4, 5, and 6.</p>
Wilmerding_Ga	Unrestricted freight service along the corridor. In Rhode Island, there are 43 customers employing 5,700 people that use rail for freight services.	<p>Current and future utilization of the NEC by each of the rail operators, both passenger and freight, are important considerations in long-term planning. Similarly, freight rail is important to the regional economy. However, NEC FUTURE is a passenger rail program and as such identifies improvements necessary to operate to desired passenger service levels while maintaining access to freight traffic already operating along the NEC. Some opportunities to create greater efficiencies in both passenger and freight service, where those objectives are aligned, have also been identified in Volume 1, Chapters 4 and 5. It is the aim of NEC FUTURE to not preclude investment under consideration throughout the freight rail network. The FRA participated in discussions with the stakeholder freight railroads as part of the overall coordination to understand the needs of the freight rail industry as they relate to the NEC.</p> <p>In Rhode Island, additional track capacity is proposed in the Preferred Alternative in part to eliminate existing conflicts between freight and passenger service. Details about design and location of these improvements would be addressed in subsequent Tier 2 project studies.</p>

Table JJ–9: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Transportation (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Wilmerding_Ga	Rethink Alternative One, particularly if commercial haulage shares track with passengers. Prioritizing one over the other in a single corridor results in delay, decreasing usage.	Current and future utilization of the NEC by each of the rail operators, both passenger and freight, are important considerations in long-term planning. However, NEC FUTURE is a passenger rail program and as such identifies improvements necessary to operate to desired passenger service levels while maintaining access to freight traffic already operating along the NEC. Some opportunities to create greater efficiencies in both passenger and freight service, where those objectives are aligned, have also been identified in Volume 1, Chapter 5. It is the aim of NEC FUTURE to not preclude investment under consideration throughout the freight rail network. The FRA participated in discussions with the stakeholder freight railroads as part of the overall coordination to understand the needs of the freight rail industry as they relate to the NEC.
Wilson_Tr	Will there be an integration of multimodal transportation?	The Preferred Alternative focuses on improved connections between passenger rail services and access to the multimodal transportation system as discussed in Volume 1, Chapters 5 and 6.
Yale_Jacob	First is that rail transportation is very important to New Haven and Yale. I think Mike Piscitelli referred to this. Certainly we are in a region that does not have a very functional airport, and I-95 is not a very functional route. We see rail as being very important to the movement of students and faculty in and out of campus and see it as a very significant part of the long-term transportation solution for the state.	NEC FUTURE represents a vision of a more coordinated, efficient, sustainable transportation network that supports economic growth and expanded mobility. The FRA considered comments received when deliberating on the Preferred Alternative, which defines a "grow" vision for the role of rail, further described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Yuste-Alonso_Ru	I would like to see the development of the local rail services in the area to improve its transportation infrastructure. In particular, it would be beneficial expanding the trainline that runs through Willimantic in order to offer a local line to Storrs.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4). The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more-frequent, faster, and more-reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative includes upgrading the existing NEC shoreline route and adding a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. This new segment would improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line into the NEC, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield. It does not include a line connecting Hartford and Providence. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.</p> <p>The FRA noted views expressed about connections to UCONN and Hartford. However, the Preferred Alternative does not include the route to UCONN as envisioned in Alternatives 2 and 3. The rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative is provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The NEC FUTURE program is focused on corridor-wide solutions for passenger rail improvements, and the selection of the Preferred Alternative does not preclude future consideration of transit or fixed-guideway improvements to meet other transportation needs across the Study Area.</p>
Anonymous_020	I would love for the Maryland train to be continued up into Delaware.	The Purpose and Need for NEC FUTURE (Volume 2, Chapter 3) identifies the importance of addressing the existing "gaps" in connectivity and creating better-connected and more-convenient passenger rail (either Intercity or Regional) service along the NEC. As such, the Action Alternatives and Preferred Alternative propose Intercity service increases connecting intermediate stops along the NEC to address this and similar service "gaps." The Preferred Alternative would create opportunities for Maryland and Delaware to work together on improving connections. Specific decisions about how or who would deliver these Regional services will be the responsibility of the individual commuter railroads and will be made during subsequent Tier 2 project studies.

Source: NEC FUTURE team, 2016

JJ.5.5 Economics and Growth

The following tables contain comments on the economic effects of the No Action Alternative and Action Alternatives described in Volume 2, Chapter 6, Economic Effects and Growth, and Indirect Effects. The comments focused primarily on the economic benefits or impacts from improved service, indirect effects on local communities such as those caused by induced growth, support for unified fare system, future fare policy, and the accuracy of the population forecasts. Based on these comments, the FRA adjusted the NEC FUTURE Interregional Model, a ridership forecasting tool use for service planning. For a description of these adjustments, please see Appendix BB, Technical Analysis of the Preferred Alternative. Volume 1, Chapter 6, presents the Economics Effects Assessment for the No Action Alternative and Preferred Alternative.

Table JJ-10: Stakeholder Comments (Elected Officials, Tribes, Federal Agencies, State Agencies, Local Agencies): Economics and Growth

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Amtrak_Boardman	Fare Assumptions: Overall, the fare policy assumptions contribute to a number of counter-intuitive ridership outcomes, which materially affect the assessment of alternatives. Non-express fares are reduced by 30% relative to existing Amtrak fares in the Action Alternatives, whereas fares are not adjusted at all in the No Action Alternative (Section 4.2.2.2; Section 9.4.1.3). Amtrak believes this assumption creates a distortion when comparing the Action Alternatives with the No Action Alternative, dilutes the proposed Intercity-Express ("IC-E") market product (whose rider profile typically involves air travel, the most environmentally harmful mode), and leads to a lower level of mode shift (Table 4-15). As evidence, the daily frequency between Boston and New York is presented increasing from 10 to 72 on the IC-E service and 9 to 72 on Intercity-Corridor ("IC-C") service between the No Action Alternative and Alternative 3 (Table 28 of Appendix B.08). However, the ridership increase between Boston and New York is vastly different among the two service types: [C-E ridership is forecasted to increase by 33 percent, whereas IC-C ridership shows a 356 percent increase. While there are substantial travel time improvements in both product lines, this suggests a significant underestimate of high-speed infrastructure and service utility. The fare strategy within the Action Alternatives is not intended for a fare-maximizing or ridership-maximizing analysis (page 4-15). We are concerned this approach damages the case for selecting an action alternative and has overlooked an opportunity to review existing fare structures across all service types. It would seem reasonable, for example, to attach a fare premium to transformative services resulting from major investment. In addition, under current law ³ , Amtrak is required to maximize revenues in order to minimize government subsidies, which is clearly at odds with NEC FUTURE's approach to fare policy. In short, the DEIS lets a seemingly arbitrary determination of potential fares drive the entire analysis. More prudent fare assumptions that comply with federal law and that reflect Amtrak and commuter rail policies should be incorporated into the analysis for the Final EIS (FEIS).	For this corridor-wide, representative level of analysis, a criteria used in determining the appropriateness of a fare structure is whether or not the service covers the estimated operating and maintenance costs, as well as a desire to allow for greater potential ridership. This approach led to the 30% decrease in the Intercity-Corridor fare in the Tier 1 Draft EIS. In response to concerns regarding fare assumptions and how they were incorporated into the evaluation of Action Alternatives, the FRA tested different fare policies for both Intercity-Express and Intercity-Corridor in the development of the Preferred Alternative. The FRA did not evaluate additional fare scenarios for the Action Alternatives. For NEC FUTURE, the FRA did not evaluate legal implications or commercial performance, but rather used the analysis as representative. The fares tested are only potential options of possible ridership and revenue and are not intended to prescribe of what future fares might be.
Amtrak_Boardman	The DEIS makes no distinction between levels of increased service reliability under the Action Alternatives. Despite the FRA's recognition that the increase in reliability is an important benefit to users and operators (Section 6.3.4.3), the choice not to differentiate these impacts between the alternatives, nor to undertake some kind of estimation, understates potential ridership growth and leaves the reader with only a partial view of what transformative rail infrastructure investments can provide. - The economic development impacts within the Action Alternatives could be much greater than the DEIS suggests. Experience from overseas suggests that the combination of labor market effects (i.e., better matching workers' skills to jobs) and agglomeration effects (i.e., economic efficiencies among close urban markets) are typically in the order of 10 percent-30 percent of travel market effects. ⁹ Given the characteristics of the Northeast-- its population density and clustering of major markets -- there are good reasons to believe that the impacts on the NEC could be towards the upper end of this range. However, the DEIS does not include these components in its quantitative evaluation of travel market effects (Section 6.3.4).	The Preferred Alternative and Action Alternatives were designed to provide reliable performance. Since the metric is difficult to calculate with the level of available information at this stage of the planning process, the FRA did not undertake further estimation of this outcome as part of the economic effects analysis. Volume 1, Chapter 6, includes quantitative metrics to estimate effects on the labor market and agglomeration. The economic development workshops also lay the groundwork for making the case that the Action Alternatives result in much greater economic development impacts when compared to the No Action Alternative. Agglomeration impacts will be further investigated as part of the benefit-cost analysis conducted for the Service Development Plan.
Brookhaven_Supervisor Romaine	Constructing addition north/south tracks through a densely developed populated portion of Brookhaven Town will have long-term detrimental effects on the community with minimal direct benefits as the traffic passing along these tracks will be transient and not contribute to the local economy or tax base as no stops are proposed.	The FRA noted the views expressed about the impact of Alternative 3 through Long Island. The Preferred Alternative does not include this route.
Cecil County_DiGiacomo	The language in the introduction needs to focus less on the region's economy and more on the region's importance to the whole nation's economy. All spending bills come out of the House, and the states proposed to be affected are represented therein as follows: CT 5 Seats; DE 1 Seat; MA 14 Seats; MD 8 Seats; NJ 12 Seats; NY 27 Seats; PA 18 Seats; RI 2 Seats; VA 11 Seats. Total: 98 Seats out of 435 (and in the Senate, only 18 out of 100). That's only 22.5% and 18%, respectively.	Volume 1, Chapter 6, discusses the Northeast regional economy in the context of the national economy.

Table JJ–10: Stakeholder Comments (Elected Officials, Tribes, Federal Agencies, State Agencies, Local Agencies): Economics and Growth (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Central Falls_Friedrichs	...[Pawtucket train station] also provides an economic development opportunity to one of the poorest areas in the region with millions of square feet of vacant and under-utilized former manufacturing space, as well as zoning regulations that permit millions more.	The Action Alternatives (evaluated in Volume 2) and the Preferred Alternative (evaluated in Volume 1) include a new Local station at Pawtucket, which is consistent with the additional service to accommodate the unique visions of each Action Alternative. As described in Volume 1, Chapter 6, the potential for induced growth is greater in areas that have the potential for station area development (such as from a new station), are forecast to see high population and employment growth, contain few environmental resources that could constrain development, or contain few development limitations. Subsequent Tier 2 analysis by other project sponsors will include more-specific analysis of effects associated with induced growth around new station areas.
CSX_Turra	We further recommend that Chapter 6 of the Final EIS, addressing economic matters, include a discussion of how continued freight service on the NEC is essential to the region's economic well being.	Volume 2, Chapter 6, discusses freight impacts on the corridor. It notes that the Action Alternatives would work to accommodate future growth and improvement of freight rail service in the Affected Environment. Volume 1, Chapters 5 and 6, include an expanded discussion regarding the importance of freight rail and freight activity in the Study Area.
EPA_Walsh	We believe that the analysis of the potential for induced growth in the DEIS (Section 6.3.6) is sufficient to identify the types of changes likely to be associated with the alternatives. ... we recommend that the list of potential mitigation strategies (Section 6.3.6.3) not be restricted to actions that could be implemented at the local level, but instead be expanded to add strategies that could be supported by regional, state, or federal governments, including those that might be funded by FRA to address the impacts of induced growth. ... We note that we found some of the tables in the section on Travel Market Effects (6.3.4)confusing, and recommend adding text in the FEIS to improve clarity.	The indirect effects discussion of potential mitigation strategies in Volume 1 has been expanded to include strategies that could be supported by regional, state, or federal governments. Additional text is provided in Volume 1 to clarify the Travel Market Effects tables.
Kearny_Mayor Santos	There's also properties along right near the Hackensack River, right near the bridge that traverses Route 7, which is a state highway, which are in the redevelopment area. So if the segment expands towards that direction, it may also impact properties that the town of Kearny is looking to redevelop in the Meadowlands district. I will note that these redevelopment efforts are significant in the town of Kearny.	As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA focused on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure or alignments. Such decisions will be made as part of Tier 2 project studies, which will include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate. Consistent with this process, the FRA developed Representative Routes for the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives and the Tier 1 Final EIS Preferred Alternative, which provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the effects of each Alternative. Representative Routes define an envelope within which improvements might occur and whose location and construction type could change during subsequent Tier 2 project analysis.
LCRVCOG_Gold	Furthermore, I would like to echo concerns voiced by previous speakers about a further inland route generating sprawl along that corridor.	As described in Volume 2, Chapter 6, for Alternatives 2 and 3, which include a new inland corridor in Connecticut, the potential for induced growth spurred by improvements in rail capacity and accessibility was greatest in Hartford, CT. Development in the Greater Hartford area could occur in the immediate station area and in locations within reasonable commute times to the station. Growth in urban infill locations could either encourage positive investment in or strain resources within the built and human environment. Growth on undeveloped land could result in effects on the natural environment. The Preferred Alternative stays within the existing NEC routing and adds service to Hartford and Springfield via the Hartford/Springfield Line. The economic development effects are discussed in Volume 1, Chapter 6.
Montgomery County_Holton	Consider ticket affordability We support increased frequency and capacity along the Northeast Corridor to allow more people to use the corridor instead of driving. While affordability of the service did not appear to be addressed directly in the purpose and need statement of the Tier 1 analysis, NEC FUTURE should consider ways to maintain and expand the most affordable service while maximizing the capacity of the corridor, such as double decker vehicles. Providing affordable transportation options could help provide access to jobs for diverse income levels and populations along the corridor.	A key objective in developing the Preferred Alternative has been to provide passengers with a broader mix of train types, services, and fares.

Table JJ–10: Stakeholder Comments (Elected Officials, Tribes, Federal Agencies, State Agencies, Local Agencies): Economics and Growth (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
NCPC_Kempf	To help ensure that the project is as compatible as possible with local, State, and federal plans within the Region, the Tier II EIS should evaluate potential impacts from the project to local/regional plans and economic conditions, both during and after construction. ... Any impacts to Union Station should be analyzed with a relatively high level of detail as the NEPA process continues. The Tier II EIS should also evaluate potential impacts to local, regional, and Interstate transportation systems, including inter-related changes in freight movement by trucking and rail, both during and after construction. For a list of NCPC transportation studies/initiatives that may be appropriate for coordination with the NEC study, please consult the NCPC website at: www.ncpc.gov . Also, please be aware of these on-going federal, District, and Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA) studies: Union Station Expansion Project; Long Bridge Study; DC to Richmond Southeast High Speed Rail; Union Station to Georgetown Transportation Improvements Environmental Assessment; and Momentum.	Throughout the Tier 1 process, the FRA has worked with local and state planners and transit operators throughout the study area to ensure that the Preferred Alternative considers existing and future plans to the greatest extent possible. Within the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focused on corridor-wide, representative service levels and improvements and will not make specific decisions about alignment or facility improvements. Those decisions will be made during subsequent or coordinated planning processes. As such, the FRA has coordinated closely with the referenced major projects, including Washington Union Station Expansion and DC to Richmond Southeast High Speed Rail to be consistent with their overall planning parameters. In addition, Volume 2, Chapter 6.3.5.1, describes Station Area Planning and how well the metropolitan areas are prepared for transit-oriented development. Subsequent Tier 2 project analysis by lead agencies will examine economic effects at the local level.
New Haven_Piscitelli	There's been a very significant, important relationship between the Northeast Corridor and New Haven's economic growth in recent years. ... And you'll see similar stories in the mid-size cities along the Northeast Corridor. Some of that was reported out in the NEC Commission report as well. We think that's important in part because of the relationship to rail.	The Preferred Alternative includes service to both Hartford and New Haven, CT. See Volume 1, Chapter 4, for more information.
SCRCOG_Amento	Obviously the importance to the economic development of not only the region but the country is at stake, and particularly in that corridor between New York and New Haven.	Volume 2, Chapter 6, examines the economic development potential for the region and the metropolitan areas that would have been served by the No Action and Action Alternatives. Volume 1, Chapter 6, updates this information for the Preferred Alternative. Subsequent Tier 2 analysis by other project sponsors will examine economic effects at the local level (e.g., at locations between New York City and New Haven, CT).

Source: NEC FUTURE team, 2016

Table JJ–11: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Economics and Growth

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Arena_Ri	For the Worcester options, more information is needed about regional economic effects, grade separations in the congested Worcester to Boston corridor, and other details to resolve this question. It is our position however that a very high value should be placed on achieving the shortest possible travel time between major hubs.	The FRA identified a Preferred Alternative that focuses on leveraging the investment in the existing NEC and Hartford/Springfield Line over the proposed Hartford-Worcester routing. The FRA considered travel-time improvements, connectivity, environmental benefits and effects and overall mobility benefits when deciding on a Preferred Alternative. Improved service between Worcester and Boston are being evaluated as part of a separate study effort that was considered in the definition of the Preferred Alternative. Additional details are provided in Volume 1, Chapters 4 and 5.
Bailey_Valente	Historically, the NEC has been a driver of coastal economic development all along its line, yet investment has been deficient, which has had a negative impact. This heavily traveled northeast megalopolis connector is worthy of the capital and operational investments needed to keep it vital. Not to do so would have a devastating impact on the many shoreline towns along the existing tracks.	The FRA agrees with the importance of strengthening the communities along the existing NEC with investment to bring the NEC to a state of good repair and increased and improved service. The Preferred Alternative emphasizes the importance of these urban areas. Additional details are provided in Volume 1, Chapters 4, 5, and 6.
Barone_Ri	The economic benefits of intercity service are assessed for each northern alignment in the DEIS , but construction/O&M job growth, travel time benefit for regional services, greater connectivity to air-to-rail, and general increases in economic activity aren 't explored in detail. We strongly recommended pursuing a detailed analysis of these costs and benefits for each of the northern alignments.	Due to data limitations, the benefits of Regional service were not able to be quantified in the same manner as the other service types. Chapter 6, Volume 1 describes that subsequent Tier 2 analyses may allow for a more geographically focused and detailed analysis with regard to regional service. Air-rail connections and potential for agglomeration are described in Volume 2, Section 6.3.5.1. This information is updated for the Preferred Alternative in Volume 1, Chapter 6.
Barone_Ri	The transformative economic benefits of faster rail travel are understated in the Tier 1 DEIS. RPA recommends the FRA more closely investigate the travel time savings and cost savings resulting for the regional commuter services that share the corridor with Amtrak rather than the simplified User Benefit metric. ... Additionally, as shown under Economic Growth in Chapter 3 each major market has its own associated economic costs and benefits, applying a single (and low) metric for travel time savings per hour of \$13.20, for all geographies, is potentially understating the benefits of each alternative. Assessing the travel time savings resulting from improvements to NEC that create greater reliability of regional services in detail for each alternative will help to better distinguish the alternatives in the final cost benefit analysis. Furthermore, separating the benefits of each northern alignment for Alternative 3, as was done for the intercity analysis, should be done for regional rail. ... There should be a detailed investigation of the travel time savings and cost savings resulting for the regional commuter services that share the corridor with Amtrak rather than the simplified User Benefit metric.	<p>At part of the NEC FUTURE analysis, FRA focused on corridor-wide travel time and cost savings and did not estimate operator-specific benefits. That analysis is appropriate in subsequent Tier 2 project or other planning studies and would include participation of the relevant railroads, stakeholders, and the public. Volume 1, Chapter 6 describes that subsequent Tier 2 analyses may allow for a more geographically focused and detailed analysis with regard to regional service.</p> <p>With regard to reliability, the Preferred Alternative and all Action Alternatives were designed to provide reliable performance. Since the metric is difficult to calculate with the level of available information at this stage of the planning process, the FRA did not undertake further estimation of this outcome as part of the economic effects analysis.</p>
Barone_Ri	the NEC FUTURE DEIS is limited in assessing the future population and job access to the major employment markets of each alternative. The assessment of population and employment growth described the Potential Indirect Effects in the Three Metropolitan Areas and Representative Station Areas in Chapter 6 is very cursory for each alternative, and especially Alternative 3, as it doesn 't include any detailed assessment of the northern alignment alternatives. Additionally, the analysis lacks detail for future job and resident access to key markets served along the corridor, especially the central business districts of Boston, New York, Newark, Philadelphia, and Washington, D.C., since representative station areas only include Baltimore, Hartford and Ronkonkoma. Reporting future resident and job access by station should be done using the base projections reported in Chapter 6. Incorporating future population and employment growth into ridership estimates will improve the assessment of alternatives for the final cost-per-rider comparison.	<p>Labor Market Effects are described for each Action Alternative, including the Alternative 3 route options, in Section 6.3.5.2 of Volume 2. This section describes the jobs accessible within a 30-minute train travel time from key Hub stations along the Action Alternatives. This information is updated for the Preferred Alternative in Volume 1, Chapter 6.</p> <p>The NEC FUTURE travel demand model and ridership estimates considered population and employment growth. Refer to Volume 2, Appendix B.8.</p>

Table JJ–11: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Economics and Growth (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Barone_Ri	Lastly, there is some mixing of timelines for the economic benefits and project costs. Construction and O&M jobs benefits are calculated for a 20-year construction period, while capital construction costs have been estimated for a 25-year timeframe. Additionally, the monetized value for travel time savings are annualized but not cumulative in a similar timeframe as the construction timeline, yet presumably the lifespan of the time savings benefits would extend far beyond 2040. Additionally, these travel time savings are calculated for ridership estimates that don 't incorporate future population and job growth along the corridor. RPA recommends that the monetized benefits of job growth and travel time savings are assessed alongside project costs for a consistent timeframe for all alternatives and alternative alignments. ... Monetized benefits of job growth and travel time savings should be assessed alongside project costs for a consistent timeframe for all alternatives and alternative alignments.	The capital costs do not represent or include any specific implementation timelines. At this stage of analysis, it is not known how long the construction period would take. Benefits would accrue for a number of years once service commences, but again, because that timeframe is unknown, the benefits for a single year (2040) were used as an example for benefits once full build-out is achieved. A more refined construction and benefits period will be developed as part of the benefit cost analysis.
Baudouin_Da	Table 7, NEC Population Forecasts and Table 8, NEC employment forecasts seriously underestimate population and jobs for the Providence area. The 2014 Census states that the Providence MSA has a population of 1,300,000. If we were to include New Bedford area, the population is about 1,600,000. Combining Providence MSA and New Bedford follows the same principle as combining Hartford with Springfield on the tables; both cities are about 30 miles apart. Similarly, the jobs figure on Table 8 should be about 649,000 including New Bedford.	The FRA drew boundaries based on markets served; those travel zone boundaries did not specifically align with MSA boundaries. For a description of these boundaries, please refer to the ridership methodology in Volume 2, Appendix B, and the Technical Analysis in Volume 1, Appendix BB.
Botzman_Ha	Since the Northeast Corridor Draft Tier 1 Environmental Impact Statement is concerned with the future of rail passenger trains and travelers it is surprising that this Draft does not include any mention of the demographic change of in cities along the Corridor.	Volumes 1 and 2, Chapter 6, examines the economic development potential within large metropolitan areas that would be served by the Preferred Alternative, No Action Alternative, and Action Alternatives. Demographic changes along the NEC are documented in Volume 1, Appendix EE, and Volume 2, Appendix E.
Brassard_Pe	Why are Moody's numbers "future," if the FRA and NEC FUTURE are using Moody's current numbers as the basis for determining future projections? Why are Moody's figures more "accurate" than the U.S. government's? If true, leaving it up to Moody's to include what they wanted for each metro area, without input from the FRA or NEC FUTURE is at a minimum sloppy direction. If I had used 2010 census data instead of 2014 census projections, would the FRA representative who wrote to Mr. Brennan have said that 2010 census data was too old? If the FRA's data is "obtained on a county-level basis for the Study Area" and the claim that Moody's is using "all of Rhode Island" five counties to determine the Providence area population, where did the figure of 970,000 in the Alternatives Report come from, that misses 80,000 from Rhode Island's population? Was Newport County or somewhere else left out of Moody's calculation for Rhode Island? Why is it that "[t]he boundaries in the Tier 1 Draft EIS were drawn based on markets served and do not match up specifically to the MSA boundaries" and "New Bedford (Bristol County, MA) is included in the Boston metro area?" What are the assumptions and methodology that Moody's uses to define a "market served" and how do they determine what a metropolitan area is? Does Moody's usually define "market's served" the same in other studies, as it has for the NEC FUTURE study? Does the population figures that Moody's provided to the FRA, for the other metropolitan areas along the NEC between Washington DC and Boston match US Government population data for MSA or CSA regions? How is it possible for the FRA to make an "objective" choice in selecting a "Preferred Alternative" if the data that's the basis of the study uses questionable population numbers that doesn't correlate with either established government or private sector definitions of metropolitan areas and how population is counted? If Moody's numbers stand uncorrected in the Tier 1 Draft EIS and the final EIS, this study and process will not be credible, because it will be based on inaccurate and untrue data. Any mistakes or wrong assumptions in data provided to the FRA and NEC FUTURE made by Moody's Analytics must either be corrected or replaced by U.S. government population and employment data. If not, this study and resulting EIS will be skewed and at best questionable.	<p>Moody's numbers are referred to as "future" because they are for the year 2040. The FRA used Moody's data because U.S. Census Bureau forecast data was not available at the county-level required for the NEC FUTURE interregional model.</p> <p>The population and employment numbers in Table 7 and Table 8 are presented for representative comparison only. The data used for the ridership analysis are at a finer geographic level. Moreover, the FRA considered all markets along the Study Area when identifying the Preferred Alternative. The variance in geographic boundaries, as noted in the comment, did not influence this decision.</p> <p>Moody's data were not used to define the NEC FUTURE markets. The markets served by the Action Alternatives were identified by the FRA during the alternative development process. For more details on this process, please refer to Volume 2, Appendix B. Moody's data were then aggregated to fit the market selected.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative does provide increased service to the Providence, RI, area. For more details on these service improvements, refer to Volume 1, Chapter 4.</p>

Table JJ–11: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Economics and Growth (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Bugge_St	I live in DC and commute up to NY (Long Island) to visit my parents and family very often. I do not own a car, and have two budget friendly options; 1) Rail or 2) Commuter bus. I almost always choose the bus because it is always far cheaper (20-30 dollars) then the cheapest ticket Ive ever seen for Amtrak (50 dollars minimim) and gets me to NYC in just about the same amount of time (4 hours or so vs. 3.5 on Amtrak). The time savings is not worth the cost. I would LOVE to take the train and be PROUD to take the train. I would love to get there in half the time. But cost is a issue. The time frame is an isse. The over all luster is an issue.	The Preferred Alternative creates the capacity and infrastructure upgrades to support a broader range of Intercity passenger rail options, including lower-priced, more-frequent, and more-reliable service. Volume 1, Chapter 6, presents the trade-off that some users make for travel costs and time.
Burke_He	How much will it cost to ride a high speed train? I always ride Metronorth instead of Amtrack, and I could afford Amtrack. The time difference isn't worth the expense.	For NEC FUTURE, the FRA considered a generalized fare policy for purposes of analysis and will not make decisions about ticket prices. Those decisions will be the subject of subsequent planning processes. The Preferred Alternative provides a variety of service types and price points to accommodate different transportation market needs and provides a range of choices. A key objective in developing the Preferred Alternative was to provide passengers with a broader mix of train types, services, and fares.
Carella_Ri	...perhaps the Alternative 1 or Alternative 2, are something that might be -- something that is actually doable in the near future, which would provide an enormous economic impact, not only to New Haven where we are today, but to the whole south central region that we serve.	As a result of the Tier 1 Draft EIS and the public comment process, the FRA has identified a Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4). The Preferred Alternative includes expanded service to New Haven, CT.
Carey_Dy	...as France did when they created the TGV system, measures must be taken to ensure that fares remain affordable for all, and that rail transportation can serve as a great equalizer.	The Preferred Alternative and Action Alternatives provide a variety of service types and price points, aiming to accommodate different transportation market needs. Volume 2, Chapter 6, presents the trade-off that some users make for travel costs and time for each of the Action Alternatives. This information is updated for the Preferred Alternative in Volume 1, Chapter 6.
Chiaraluce_Mi	I feel that Shoreline East should be extended to Mystic. It will encourage business in an area that has been hard hit economically and is slow to recover	The FRA did not consider extending or adding unplanned new stations for commuter rail services such as the Shoreline East. However, NEC FUTURE does not preclude opportunities to extend or add new stations to Shoreline East services. The Preferred Alternative (and the Action Alternatives) consider an overall increase and improvement in passenger rail services—Intercity and Regional—which would provide economic benefits to cities and towns along the NEC.
Childs_Ha	...this new high speed train would simply run through our state, offering NO benefit to the state of Connecticut, is disgusting.	The Preferred Alternative would provide travel-time savings, travel-cost savings, safety benefits, emissions savings, and net revenue increases. A portion of the benefits can be expected to be realized by localities along the route. The service plan of the Preferred Alternative includes numerous station stops in Connecticut communities. Volume 1, Chapter 6, discusses these effects for the Preferred Alternative. Volume 1 Chapter 4, contains information about all of the stations in Connecticut.
Coudert_Ho	(2) Businesses in Mystic and some in Stonington would benefit. ... Most New Yorkers and international tourists to New York do not have a car, and so a side trip to Mystic and Stonington only makes sense by train those are potential visitors who are not coming with their dollars	Volume 2, Chapter 6, examines the economic development potential within large metropolitan areas served by the No Action and Action Alternatives. Subsequent Tier 2 project analysis will examine economic effects at the local level.
Denorio_La	will this create new long term jobs in CT	As shown in Volume 1, Chapter 6, the construction of the Preferred Alternative would result in temporary jobs along the alignment, and the operation of the upgraded system would result in long-term jobs. In addition, many communities (including those in Connecticut) believed that improved rail investment would support job and productivity growth as described in Volume 2, Appendix D (Economic Development Workshop memorandum).
Dougherty_Ke	In future documents or follow-up research, I would like to see a projected market analysis for increased ridership that includes cost per ticket.	The FRA considered fares in the ridership analysis (see Volume 2, Appendix B). For NEC FUTURE, the FRA focused on a corridor-wide perspective and looked at ticket prices only with a representative fare structure and did not make decisions about the specific ticket prices. Those decisions will be made in subsequent planning processes.

Table JJ–11: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Economics and Growth (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Doyle_Ja	I know few people who travel this route regularly, for business purposes, mainly because of the cost. I remember living in New Haven, and paying \$8.10 for a round trip ticket to GCT. It stopped at nearly every station, and they ran nearly continuously. You knew that it would take two hours when you got on the train. Now, there are many fewer stops, and the cost is prohibitive. I can guess that the consumer cost will skyrocket after these "improvements".	The Preferred Alternative creates the capacity and infrastructure upgrades to support a broader range of Intercity passenger rail options, including lower-priced, more-frequent, and more-reliable service. Volume 1, Chapter 6, presents the trade-off that some users make for travel costs and time.
Edwards_CI	Running the line north through Hartford would not only promote sprawl in Connecticut...	As described in Volume 2, Chapter 6, for Alternatives 2 and 3, which include a new inland corridor in Connecticut, the potential for induced growth spurred by improvements in rail capacity and accessibility was greatest in Hartford, CT. Development in the Greater Hartford area could occur in the immediate station area and in locations within reasonable commute times to the station. Growth in urban infill locations could either encourage positive investment in or strain resources within the built and human environment. Growth on undeveloped land could result in effects on the natural environment. The Preferred Alternative provides service to Hartford and similar effects are discussed in Volume 1, Chapter 6.
ElliottLewis_Da	I see so many opportunities around a high-speed rail network. It becomes manufacturing in the United States. It becomes advanced technology, in terms of developing technology for safer or more efficient engines or electronic controls. It becomes more ways in which the United States can be more competitive globally.	As a result of the Tier 1 Draft EIS and the public comment process, the FRA has identified a Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4). Volume 1, Chapter 6, describes the economic effects and growth that could occur as a result of the Preferred Alternative.
ElliottLewis_Da	So I would hope with that level of investment, the billions of dollars it's going to cost to get that capability, that the cost of high-speed rail relative to air travel will come down to then drive people to use that as an alternative.	The Action Alternatives provided a variety of service types and price points. Volume 2, Chapter 6, documents the travel market effects of the Action Alternatives and includes impacts of rail diversions from both air and auto. Volume 1, Chapter 6, updates this information for the Preferred Alternative.
Estepar-Garcia_Wi	CT as a whole requires a major overall in terms of its rail transportation system, with primary consideration for the population who doesn't live near the shore. A rail system that effectively connects Boston to Hartford via Storrs will enable the state to thrive, both in terms of work opportunities to the middle and upper side of the state, while reducing our current dependency of cars. This is a paramount step to move forward as a competitive state that people also want to move to, and not one that people leave due to its limitation.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4). The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more-frequent, faster, and more-reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative includes upgrading the existing NEC shoreline route and adding a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. This new segment would improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line into the NEC, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford, CT, and Springfield, MA. It does not include a line connecting Hartford and Providence. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions. The FRA noted views expressed about connections to UCONN and Hartford. However, the Preferred Alternative does not include the route to UCONN as envisioned in Alternative 2 and 3. The rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative is provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The NEC FUTURE program is focused on corridor-wide solutions for passenger rail improvements, and the selection of the Preferred Alternative does not preclude future consideration of transit or fixed guideway improvements to meet other transportation needs across the Study Area.
Gauthier_Gr	You'll wipe out the business district in the Niantic area of East Lyme.	Specific alignments or requirements for property acquisition were not identified in the Tier 1 EIS evaluation, but will be defined further for consideration during subsequent Tier 2 project studies, which will include local stakeholder and public involvement.

Table JJ–11: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Economics and Growth (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Gentry_Ad	The existing train system can convey a person form DC to Boston in approximately 7 hours, I believe. How much time will really be saved by this revision? And, if someone truly needs to go from one to the other in a timely fashion, why not fly? A plane ticket would not cost substantially more, and would reduce the travel time to approximately 2 hrs. Reducing the travel time to less than a third by using a plane makes a lot more sense than spending such large amounts of money to provide yet another alternative, which still requires too much travel time for a round trip in a single day.	The Preferred Alternative and Action Alternatives provide a variety of service types and price points, aiming to accommodate different transportation market needs. Volume 2, Chapter 6, presents the trade-off that some users make for travel costs and time for each of the Action Alternatives. This information is updated for the Preferred Alternative in Volume 1, Chapter 6.
Gonzalez_Fr	I would use rail service more if it were more competitive in price vs. travel time between locations.	The Action Alternatives provided a variety of service types and price points that aimed to accommodate different transportation market needs. Volume 2, Chapter 6, presents the trade-off that some users make for travel costs and time with regard to the Action Alternatives. Volume 1, Chapter 6, updates this information for the Preferred Alternative.
Haikalis_Ge	Most successful high speed rail services abroad ...deploy longer trains with several classes of service... The USDOT should consider a similar plan, with high capacity high speed train sets providing frequent service while offering a variety of pricing options. ...it is important that high speed trains favor not only the NECs highest earners, leaving the less fortunate to rely on slower trains or overcrowded highways, but serve all passengers equitably.	A key objective in developing the Preferred Alternative has been to provide passengers with a broader mix of train types, services, and fares (Volume 1, Chapters 4 and 5).
Hamill_St	We desparately need hi-speed rail, as in France, in the NEC, offering thousands of new jobs as well.	As a result of the Tier 1 Draft EIS and the public comment process, the FRA has identified a Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4). Volume 1, Chapter 6, describes the economic effects, including employment effects that could occur as a result of the Preferred Alternative.
Holmes_Ca	The NEC is crucial to the economy of the NEC. It provides transportation for people and creates job opportunities for individuals in from Boston, MA to Richmond, VA.	As a result of the Tier 1 Draft EIS and the public comment process, the FRA has identified a Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4). Volume 1, Chapter 6, describes the economic effects, including employment and labor market effects that could occur as a result of the Preferred Alternative.
Hood_Ed	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.	As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA focused on a corridor-wide assessment based on Representative Routes and did not make decisions about specific alignments. Those decisions will be are made during subsequent Tier 2 project studies. The Representative Route for the Preferred Alternative roughly follows the route of the NEC and the Hartford/Springfield Line, both established transportation corridors. As described in Volume 2, Chapter 6, the potential for induced growth spurred by improvements in rail capacity and accessibility could occur in the immediate station area and in locations within reasonable commute times to the station. Growth in urban infill locations could encourage positive investment in or a strain on resources within the built and human environment and growth on undeveloped land could result in effects on the natural environment. Volume 1, Chapter 6, includes a similar discussion with regard to the Preferred Alternative.
Humphries_Jo	I also applaud that you've also lifted up in the visuals the job creation aspect, as well as the connectivity to jobs as support for transit- oriented development.	As a result of the Tier 1 Draft EIS and the public comment process, the FRA has identified a Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4). Volume 1, Chapter 6, describes the economic effects, including employment and labor market effects that could occur as a result of the Preferred Alternative.

Table JJ–11: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Economics and Growth (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Inglis_Ni	Your numbers are incorrect and you've made assumptions based on those numbers. Incorrect data from the DEIS Appendix - Alternatives Report (October 2015) Population: Providence 970,000 Hartford 1,800,000 (the separate CSA of Springfield is added to the Hartford count) Employment: Providence 426,000 Hartford 873,000 Actual U.S. Government data from Census Projections (2014) for Population and Bureau of Labor Statistics (November 2015) for Employment Statistics Population: Providence MSA 1,609,000 Hartford CSA 1,214,000 Worcester MSA 931,000 Springfield CSA 629,000 Employment: Providence 649,000 Hartford 590,400 Springfield 395,000 Worcester 329,000 New Bedford 78,000. The Northeast Corridor needs to continue serving the Providence Metro area, to bypass it would be a failure in federal planning.	<p>The FRA used Moody's as a commercially available forecast that was available corridor-wide, commensurate with the corridor-wide perspective of the NEC FUTURE analysis.</p> <p>The numbers in question are different due to the source quoted (U.S. Census Bureau data projections from 2014) and boundaries used to calculate the population and employment numbers. The FRA's data (obtained on a county-level basis for the Study Area) is based on Moody's Analytics June 2013 "base" demographic forecasts. Moody's data uses actual census data (not the same as census projections) to make projections. Moody's supplied three forecasts for the 2040 NEC population and employment projections based on this data: low, base (most likely), and high.</p> <p>For purposes of ridership forecasting, travel zones were established, which are not the same as the Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) boundaries cited by the constituent. The boundaries in the Tier 1 Draft EIS were drawn based on markets served and did not match up specifically to the MSA boundaries.</p> <p>For example, the numbers pretend in Volume 2, Appendix B.8, show Providence County numbers, rather than those for the entire MSA. For NEC FUTURE, the FRA relied on a corridor-wide data source; for future year forecasts, the census data were not available at the detailed level required for this analysis.</p> <p>Details on the Preferred Alternative representative Service Plan are provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4, and Appendix BB.</p>
Johnston_Gl	If people are looking toward economic recovery, such as putting people back to work, then whatever train sets are decided to be made, my suggestion would be make them hear. We have a defunct car plant, the old GM car plant that is still empty, is not being used for anything, and could be retrofitted to be used to build rail equipment. That alone to retrofit and re-purpose the property, should give you, say, a couple hundred jobs alone. And, also there are nearby steel mills that could make the steel needed, even possibly the stainless steel, there is also a defunct steel mill in Claymont, Delaware, where part of it is a fabrication shop, where part of these train sets could be fabricated and then assembled in the old GM plant. The reason why I bring this up, again, not only do I represent the people who I work with but also I feel that the State of Delaware and local areas such as Maryland and Pennsylvania can benefit from the job growth that can be created from these manufacturing jobs.	For this Tier 1 analysis, the FRA did not make decisions specific to fleet configurations, equipment standards, or procurement requirements. Those decisions will be made in subsequent planning processes or Tier 2 project studies. As such, the decision on where to manufacture equipment has not been made. For the purpose of this analysis, the FRA assumes that the rolling stock will be manufactured in the United States, consistent with Buy America requirements.
Kirmaier_Ra	The cost / benefit analysis on a plan like this is terribly skewed. The cost (in dollars and lost environment) exceeds any perceived benefits by many Orders of Magnitude.	The FRA considered both cost and environmental impacts in identifying the Preferred Alternative. A cost-benefit analysis for the Preferred Alternative will be conducted as part of the subsequent service development plan as required by FRA guidance.
Laadt_Jo	In Connecticut, there are a lot of communities that have fallen in prosperity which could be revived by a robust system like this.	Volume 2, Chapter 6, examines the economic development potential within large metropolitan areas that would be served by the No Action and Action Alternatives. Subsequent Tier 2 analysis by other project sponsors will examine economic effects at the local level.
Leach_Ge	Also, high speed rail line along the I-84 corridor in western Connecticut with stops in Danbury and Waterbury (Alternative 3) is likely to increase urban sprawl and development in Connecticut Northwest corner, part of the USDA Forest Service PA-NY-NJ-CT Highlands.	The FRA noted the views expressed about the impact of Alternative 3 through western Connecticut. The Preferred Alternative does not include this route.
Manicastri_St	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.	As a result of the Tier 1 Draft EIS and the public comment process, the FRA has identified a Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4). Volume 1, Chapter 6, describes the economic effects, including labor market effects that could occur as a result of the Preferred Alternative.
Marks_Ho	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.	The Preferred Alternative and Action Alternatives provide a variety of service types and price points, aiming to accommodate different transportation market needs. Volume 2, Chapter 6, presents the trade-off that some users make for travel costs and time for each of the Action Alternatives. This information is updated for the Preferred Alternative in Volume 1, Chapter 6.

Table JJ–11: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Economics and Growth (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
McLean_Ma	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??	The Preferred Alternative includes service to Hartford, which is projected to see an increase in population by 2040, as noted in Volume 2, Appendix E.11. The Preferred Alternative would strengthen existing urban centers, leveraging recent and future investments in the Hartford/Springfield line.
Oryani_Ka	Who is going to be the beneficiaries? And we know in say, the corridor from New York and say Washington, it is doing so well that it competes with airline. But whether the other areas or the other links which goes to the less wealthy areas, and those people who really need to have access to jobs and alternatives, whether that one has been taken into account for drawing of the alternatives.	The Preferred Alternative includes a variety of service types, fares, and service locations to respond to the market for travel throughout the NEC. The FRA conducted an extensive survey of residents across the corridor to determine the types of demand for travel from all demographic groups as part of its analysis. The service types and frequencies proposed in the Preferred Alternative are designed to provide useful services that will grow the role of rail in these markets for all potential users of the rail system.
Penn Design_Taylor_Yaro	We believe that the experience of the UK's HS2 high-speed rail line between London and Manchester is especially relevant to planning for the NEC. Both projects are approximately 475 miles in length and serve comparable populations and economies... The planning rationale for this project was based both on its direct transportation benefits and for its ability to transform the economy of the Midlands and North of England regions, by strengthening their economic links to London and the Southeast. We believe similar benefits would be experienced in the Northeast Megaregion, where HSR and improved inter-city and commuter rail services would create significant agglomeration effects, and integrate labor and housing markets across the Northeast. If this investment were made, weak market cities like Baltimore, New Haven and Providence would be brought into the economic orbit of strong market cities, including Boston, New York and DC, to the benefit of all. We understand that these benefits are not easily modeled, but nonetheless they should be estimated and incorporated into the NEC Future analysis and its assessment of benefit streams that would result from investments in the NEC. There are ways that the DEIS could integrate the economic development benefits into the range of alternatives as they move forward. In particular, there must be mention of the struggling small- to medium-sized markets that stand to gain the most from the from previously unprecedented connectivity and agglomeration economies that robust investments in the corridor would achieve. These benefit extend not only to underperforming cities on the corridor such as Baltimore, Bridgeport and New Haven, but within an hour's travel time of the project, such as Harrisburg. (And other struggling mid-sized cities and regions, such as Hartford and eastern Long Island, could be brought into the NEC corridor and its benefit streams if alignments were chosen that would serve these markets.) Regional equity is an important benefit of spreading infrastructure investment to slow growth or declining cities. In particular, Alternative 3 suffers the most from omitting economic development when so much could be gained, and has been gained in other high-speed rail projects across the world. We urge that you review the extensive international research documenting the benefits of HSR and higher speed commuter rail on similar places, including Sir Peter Hall's monographs on the benefits that higher-speed commuter service had for more than a score of second tier UK cities brought within an hour travel time of London.	<p>The FRA considered commenter views regarding the importance of improved connectivity for not only Major Hubs but also those small- and mid-size cities that would benefit from improved access to major markets, reduced travel times, and generally better and more-frequent connections. This theme is an important one and was considered in the FRA's deliberations on a Preferred Alternative. The importance of strengthening communities and mobility in choosing the Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.</p> <p>Additional discussion of mid-size markets is incorporated into the Tier 1 Final EIS. Case study examples are used to capture the type of agglomeration effects and economic development benefits that could be realized with the Preferred Alternative (see Volume 1, Chapter 6).</p>

Table JJ–11: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Economics and Growth (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Penn Design_Taylor_Yaro	For the Tier 1 DEIS, fares are used mostly as a placeholder since the level of analysis is zoomed out. However, some important decisions are made about fare calculation that affect the viability of the alternatives, and therefore the evaluation process. There are steps that the DEIS can take to tweak these assumptions into a more reasonable place. The Tier 1 DEIS assumes that fares for any rail system other than the No Build scenario will have fares that are 30% lower than current Amtrak fares (which they note are too high to be competitive). As it is understood that fares can play a decisive role in mode choice behavior for the average user, the results of this assumption play a serious role. Therefore, we make two recommendations for fares: first, to explicitly commit to a fare structure that would maximize ridership within each alternative... With regard to pricing, other international high-speed rail systems, such as the AVE line (high-speed rail) in Spain, provide a wide range of ticket and "class" options for their customers. Amongst the business class options, fares are less than \$50, making comfortable travel well within the means of many. Japan's Shinkansen HSR trains and other international HSR systems have three or more classes of service on every train, in much the same way that airlines price seats. While first and business class passengers pay more for additional services and amenities, most of the passengers on these services have coach seats providing minimal comfort but the same reliable service and reduced travel times. In addition, many of these users have daily weekly or monthly fare cards that allow for unreserved seating, increasing the convenience to frequent users of these systems. We believe that creating similar fare systems in the NEC, designed to maximize ridership, convenience and economic returns on the investment should be incorporated into the DEIS ridership forecasts.	At the Tier 1 level of detail considered for NEC FUTURE, the FRA considered a representative range of possible pricing options and how they would influence attractiveness of Intercity passenger rail. The FRA's analyses confirmed the importance of price and frequency to travelers along the NEC, and those insights influenced the definition of the Preferred Alternative. Specific decisions about fare policy or pricing options will be decided in subsequent planning processes involving stakeholder states, railroads, and, as appropriate, the public. More information about the representative range of services possible with the Preferred Alternative are presented in Volume 1, Chapters 4 and 5. Volume 2, Chapter 6, presents the trade-off that some users make for travel costs and time for each of the Action Alternatives. This information is updated for the Preferred Alternative in Volume 1, Chapter 6.
Penn Design_Taylor_Yaro	second, to assess the benefits that integrated fare media would create, in which inter-city, commuter rail and local transit fare media would be completely integrated across the Northeast, in much the same way that EZ-Pass has integrated toll collection from Maine to Maryland. Intuitive user systems, such as the Oyster Card in London or the Clipper Card in the San Francisco Bay area, integrate fares across different systems. Shared fare systems not only speak to user experience, but also the project 's larger goal of integration across the entire corridor.	The FRA identified the value of better-integrated fare mediums in their definition of operating efficiencies integral to each of the Action Alternatives and as a prominent element of the Preferred Alternative. Specific technologies and implementation strategies are encouraged for consideration in subsequent Tier 2 project studies or other planning processes, and the FRA expects to explore these topics further in the Service Development Plan of NEC FUTURE. Volume 1, Chapter 10, discusses the importance of integrated scheduling and fare mediums in defining an Initial Phase.
Rich_An	It would also mean a major loss of tourism dollars to the state. (Connecticut)	NEC FUTURE proposes improvements to passenger rail, including more frequency, reliable and better connected services, that would support both business and tourism related-travel needs.

Table JJ–11: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Economics and Growth (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Sam	believe me, a rail line connecting rural UConn to major cities in the Northeast Corridor would greatly benefit the University and State on economic levels for generations to come.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4). The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more-frequent, faster, and more-reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative includes upgrading the existing NEC shoreline route and adding a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. This new segment would improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line into the NEC, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford, CT, and Springfield, MA. It does not include a line connecting Hartford and Providence. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.</p> <p>The FRA noted views expressed about connections to UCONN and Hartford. However, the Preferred Alternative does not include the route to UCONN as envisioned in Alternative 2 and 3. The rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative is provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The NEC FUTURE program is focused on corridor-wide solutions for passenger rail improvements, and the selection of the Preferred Alternative does not preclude future consideration of transit or fixed guideway improvements to meet other transportation needs across the Study Area.</p>
Schiller_Ba	..frustration with the bureaucratic difficulty of having unified fares. RIPTA has a fare system. The MBTA, Amtrak, they all have separate fare systems. In the highway mode, we know there's a E-ZPasses that go across state boundaries. It shouldn't be insurmountable to help us rail passengers by having a more seamless system.	Volume 2, Chapter 10, discusses the Universal First Phase, which would include developing an integrated NEC trains schedule and trip-planning information and a common ticketing and fare collection system, which would simplify the travel experience for users of the NEC. The FRA expects to explore these topics further in the Service Development Plan of NEC FUTURE.
Schiller_Ba	...anything you could do to keep the fares down would be appreciated, especially on the Boston end of the Northeast Corridor rail market..	The Action Alternatives provided a variety of service types and price points that aimed to accommodate different transportation market needs. A key objective in developing the Preferred Alternative has been to provide passengers with a broader mix of train types, services, and fares.
Semeraro_Mi	Table 6-3 Were any cost savings due to increases in productivity, new maintenance technologies and new infrastructure taken into account?	Operational efficiencies were considered in service planning, which contribute to the Operating and Maintenance (O&M) cost model and potential cost savings. The FRA adjusted operating costs to capture some efficiencies associated with Intercity services (e.g., improvements in baggage handle), but given the representative nature of the service plans and high level of analysis, the FRA did not attempt to model savings associated with specific new technologies. Further information about the underlying assumptions incorporated into the O&M cost estimates are provided in Volume 2, Appendix B.
Semeraro_Mi	[Table 6-3] Why is there a significant increase in jobs needed to maintain a future corridor which is similar in size to today 's?	Table 6-3 in Volume 2 includes jobs for operations and maintenance of the Action Alternatives. More employees would be needed to operate and maintain the increasing frequency of services and infrastructure from Alternative 1 to 3. This information has been updated for the Preferred Alternative in Volume 1, Chapter 6.
Semeraro_Mi	Table 9-27 Is the 30 minute travel time via Intercity Express, Intercity Regional, or Regional Transit? Would pricing of the 30 minute service allow for an individual earning the median wage for the region to take the service to their job daily without requiring them to spend a disproportionate amount of their income on travel costs?	As part of the NEC FUTURE analysis, the FRA focused on corridor-wide travel time improvements and pricing and did not propose specific pricing for station-to-station trips. Those decisions will be made in subsequent planning studies. As representative of the mix of services available and the potential benefits to the labor force, the FRA evaluated all of the stations reachable within 30 minutes of a specified Hub station, via any of the service types without regard to pricing. This analysis, also provided for the Preferred Alternative in Volume 1, Chapter 6, provided a broad view of the improved access to employment opportunities.

Table JJ–11: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Economics and Growth (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Spencer_Sc	Amtrak currently operates its service in a way where the trains that reach the highest speeds made possible by those tax dollars, currently 150 miles an hour, are only accessible to passengers that can pay business class or first class fares on the Acela trains. Thereby, a large group of passengers such as families, senior citizens, and students can never afford to travel at those high speeds that their tax dollars pay for. ... consider a fleet decision that's inclusive for all classes of passengers, ... So that whatever speeds are the goals of NEC FUTURE, a standardized fleet should be accessible to all ticket classes so that all passengers can travel at those higher speeds. And then if those want to pay more for the amenities of business class or first class, they do so, but all the high-speed trains should have a coach class as well because those taxpayers are paying for it. ... And there should be a fleet decision by Amtrak even now to make it more accessible for all passengers with a standardized fleet with a coach, business, and first class.	A key objective in developing the Preferred Alternative has been to provide passengers with a broader mix of train types, services, and fares.
Taylor_Cr	The cost benefit analysis for a new rail system should be considered in conjunction with highway improvement through the same area. Transportation funding for this area of the state is limited and the order of magnitude cost for a slightly shorter rail trip does not sound like the best allocation of resources for the area residents.	For the Tier 1 analysis, the FRA focused on a range of corridor-wide benefits, including increased ridership, better access and connectivity, economic effects, as well as shorter travel times. A cost-benefit analysis for the Preferred Alternative will be conducted as part of the subsequent service development plan as required by FRA guidance.
Vitale_Pa	I also find some of your numbers in terms of population and ridership to be exceptionally difficult to believe.	The methodology for estimating interregional and regional ridership, as well as assumptions about population and employment forecasts are documented in Volume 2, Appendix B.8, and further updated in Volume 1, Appendix BB. The approach considers representative service plans for a corridor-wide analysis and captures some induced demand but primarily focuses on the organic growth in population and employment and how that would influence changes in travel, and, based on proposed passenger rail improvements, how that would further influence mode of travel decisions.
Vogel_Ke	They are just in the planning stages, but they agree that if this type of transportation does not exist in the future here And it exists in the other parts of the world, Our GDP will suffer	As a result of the Tier 1 Draft EIS and the public comment process, the FRA has identified a Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4). Volume 1, Chapter 6, describes the economic effects that could occur as a result of the Preferred Alternative.
Webster_St	To assume that there is more commuter traffic in Worcester, which has a higher frequency of commuter trains, based on inaccurate data is criminal. To assume Springfield as part of greater Worcester, 30 miles away, is a ridiculous skewing of data that is inaccurate at best.	The FRA identified a Preferred Alternative that focuses on leveraging the investment in the existing NEC and Hartford/Springfield Line over the proposed Hartford-Worcester routing. The FRA considered travel-time improvements, connectivity, environmental benefits and effects and overall mobility benefits when deciding on a Preferred Alternative. Improved service between Worcester and Boston are being evaluated as part of a separate study effort that was considered in the definition of the Preferred Alternative. Additional details are provided in Volume 1, Chapters 4 and 5.
Weinstein_Da	I think Amtrak is failing the American people. It's funded by -- partially out of government funds. I know the relationship between Amtrak and the government, federal government, is complicated, but it does receive taxpayer dollars, and yet it's reached the point where Amtrak fare is totally unaffordable for the middle class. It's unaffordable for people like myself who would be taking Amtrak if it were significantly cheaper, but instead, of course, take buses... Shouldn't Amtrak be serving the American people? Shouldn't it be looking to provide access to people to different communities?	For NEC FUTURE, the FRA considered a range of price and service types to test the market for more-affordable, frequent, and reliable Intercity rail. The FRA's analyses confirmed the importance of price and frequency to travelers along the NEC and those insights influenced the definition of the Preferred Alternative. More information about the representative range of services possible with the Preferred Alternative are presented in Volume 1, Chapters 4 and 5. Volume 2, Chapter 6, presents the trade-off that some users make for travel costs and time for each of the Action Alternatives. This information is updated for the Preferred Alternative in Volume 1, Chapter 6.
Weinstein_Da	Ideally, as part of this project, Amtrak service between Philadelphia and Wilmington-currently too expensive to serve as a viable option for most commuters looking to travel from one city to the other on a regular basis-would be made more affordable as well.	As part of the NEC FUTURE analyses, the FRA considered fares from a corridor-wide perspective and did not evaluate pricing specific to individual station-pairs. Furthermore, for this Tier 1 analysis, the FRA was not prescriptive about pricing for Intercity services or more specifically for Amtrak. The FRA evaluated the potential ridership gains with more service at lower, more-competitive pricing. See Volume 1, Chapters 4, 5, and 6 for further details about the Preferred Alternative.
Wilkins_An	Regional connectivity between the cities of New England by rail will serve to improve the economic vitality of not just Worcester, but of the region as a whole.	Volume 2, Chapter 6, examines the economic development potential within large metropolitan areas that would be served by the No Action and Action Alternatives. Subsequent Tier 2 project analysis will examine economic effects at the local level.

Table JJ–11: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Economics and Growth (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Yale_Jacob	we certainly do view New Haven as the hub. We view New Haven as the hub where -- if we look between New Haven and New York, we see commerce moving east out of New York as the cost of living rises there, and we certainly see further expansion, especially in the area of bioscience and the knowledge sector, moving west and east and north out of New Haven... We hope you will continue to think of New Haven as a significant hub within the network.	The Preferred Alternative includes expanded service to New Haven, CT.
Yale_Jacob	Yale is one of the world 's premier universities and accessibility by train has a direct impact on our ability to recruit faculty, employees, and students. The quality of train services can also impede the dissemination of knowledge to the broader public, as it influences whether scholars attend conferences at Yale, or whether members of the public visit Yale museums and enjoy the intellectual wealth of the University.	The importance of connecting existing urban areas and major employment centers such as New Haven and Yale University were primary factors in the FRA's decision to recommend a Preferred Alternative that commits to the existing NEC with improvements to reduce delay, improve reliability, add capacity for more and varied services, reduce travel times, and improve connectivity across the rail network.
Yale_Jacob	It is notoriously difficult to get to New Haven by train, plane, or automobile; the inconvenient access belies the City 's economic strength and potential. ... It is a thriving community that is in dire need of faster and more frequent train service. ... It is critically important that the approved EIS authorize the investments necessary to achieve not only a state of good repair but to enable 30-minute service between Hartford and New Haven and 60-minute service between New York and New Haven. An investment program that achieves those goals would stimulate job growth between New York and New Haven and it would help to reduce congestion and pollution from auto traffic along I-95.	The Preferred Alternative provides increased and improved service to New Haven and retains a focus on the existing NEC. Building from the service objectives of Alternative 2, but staying on the existing NEC and Hartford/Springfield Line, the representative service plan for the Preferred Alternative generally achieves the desired travel-time goals of approximately 30 minutes between Hartford and New Haven and approximately 60 minutes from New Haven to New York City. Specific timetables and travel times will be developed and refined in subsequent Tier 2 project studies.

Source: NEC FUTURE team, 2016

JJ.5.6 Environmental Resources

The category encompassed a wide range of concerns regarding the potential effects of the No Action Alternatives and Action Alternatives on environmental resources considered in Volume 2, Chapter 7, Affected Environment, Environmental Consequences, and Mitigation Strategies. The FRA used the same effects-assessment methodologies and data sources for the Tier 1 Final EIS as was used in the Tier 1 Draft EIS. However, input during the public comment period influenced minor changes to the presentation, review, or additional analysis of resources for this Tier 1 Final EIS. For example, the U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service division requested that analysis of historic and scenic trails be included in this Tier 1 Final EIS. The FRA complied and has included analysis of these trails in this Tier 1 Final EIS. Volume 1, Chapter 7, Affected Environment, Environmental Consequences, and Mitigation Strategies presents the potential effects of the Preferred Alternative on environmental resources. Wherever the analysis or data sources have changed since the Tier 1 Draft EIS, it has been noted in the appropriate sections of relevant chapters of this Tier 1 Final EIS.

Table JJ–12: Stakeholder Comments (Elected Officials, Tribes, Federal Agencies, State Agencies, Local Agencies): Environmental Resources

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Brookhaven_Supervisor Romaine	The LIRR main line serves as the border between the towns of Brookhaven and Islip in Ronkonkoma, with the Ronkonkoma train station sitting on the Brookhaven side of the line. Any shifting north near Long Island MacArthur Airport, crossing of the Long Island Expressway (1-495), continuing north to Stony Brook, or transition to trench and then into tunnel near Port Jefferson would have a clear and direct impact on the Town of Brookhaven, its nearly 500,000 residents, local businesses, schools, waterways, farmland, parkland, and open space.	The FRA noted the views expressed about the impact of Alternative 3 through Long Island. The Preferred Alternative does not include this route. For more details regarding the Preferred Alternative see Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Cecil County_DiGiacomo	Alternative 2 is shown with a New Segment through western New Castle County, Delaware and virtually the entirety of Cecil County, Maryland. The areas at which the New Segment would divert from the present NEC are culturally- and historically-significant, incorporated employment and population centers. ... A more careful consideration of Environmental Justice needs to take place (if not part of the NEPA process, then when?).	The Environmental Justice (EJ) effects that would occur under Alternative 2 are noted in the Volume 2, Chapter 7.11, Environmental Justice. A more detailed analysis of environmental impacts that have the potential to be borne by EJ populations will be conducted during Tier 2 project studies. As part of each Tier 2 study, the lead federal agency will ensure compliance with the EO 12898. Culturally and historically significant resources affected by Alternative 2 are noted in Volume 2, Chapter 7.9, Cultural Resources and Historic Properties. FRA has developed a Section 106 Programmatic Agreement to ensure that cultural and historic properties are fully evaluated during Tier 2 project studies.
Central Falls_Friedrichs	...[Pawtucket train] station will provide access to the newly created Blackstone National Park.	All Action Alternatives included a new local station at Pawtucket consistent with the additional service to accommodate the unique vision of each Action Alternative.
CRCOG_Wray	Lack of Consistency with Existing Regional Plans: CRCOG is proud of its on-going efforts to support meaningful, forward-thinking regional planning efforts. The Tier 1 Draft EIS does not acknowledge the Sustainable Knowledge Corridor or federally funded planning efforts such as One Region, One Future and Making It Happen - Opportunities and Strategies for Transit-Oriented Development in the Knowledge Corridor.	The FRA noted the concerns about these planning documents in Connecticut. The FRA reviewed these plans in preparing the Tier 1 Final EIS. See Volume 1, Appendix EE.07.02, for analysis of the NEC FUTURE program and the Preferred Alternative regarding consistency with regional planning documents.
CRCOG_Wray	Title VI and Environmental Justice Concerns: A HUD-funded 2013 Fair Housing and Equity Assessment found that the Hartford and Springfield regions are among the most racially and income segregated in the nation . Therefore, failure to include an alternative or variant that evaluates service improvements to these markets raises significant equity, environmental justice, and Title VI concerns.	FRA has identified a Preferred Alternative as presented in the Tier 1 Final EIS Volume 2, that incorporates the New Haven-Hartford-Springfield line. The Preferred Alternative may result in cleaner air and public health benefits, as well as transportation effects that would provide a benefit to environmental justice communities through increased travel choices, access to more reliable and frequent rail service, accessibility to jobs, and a range of pricing options for travelers. However, FRA did not do an analysis as part of the Tier 1 Final EIS to assess if EJ communities bear a disproportionate amount of the negative environmental resource effects that may occur as part of the implementation of the Preferred Alternative. See Volume 1, Chapter 7.11 for more information related to the Preferred Alternative and Environmental Justice issues.
CRCOG_Wray	CRCOG is concerned by the fact that Alternatives 2 and 3 would impact a significant number of Environmental Justice (EJ) populations within Hartford County, which comprises the majority of the Capitol Region. ... It appears, therefore, that these alternatives have the potential to disproportionately impact EJ and Title VI populations within the Capitol Region .	The environmental justice (EJ) methodology explains the screening-level analysis the FRA used to identify the location of EJ populations and related special resources. This analysis does not identify direct disproportional impacts on EJ populations; areas where EJ populations overlap with one or more potentially affected environmental resources are identified in order that they may be flagged as areas for detailed analysis in the future as part of subsequent Tier 2 project studies. At the Tier 1 EIS level of analysis, the FRA does not know how many of those locations would be affected or what the overall impact would be. Subsequent Tier 2 project analysis will provide site specific studies and identification of direct impacts within and to EJ populations.
CSX_Turra	We recommend that FRA include in its discussion of air quality a summary of the benefits provided by freight rail when intercity freight shifts from truck to rail within the NEC study area.	Changes in freight rail, and the resulting changes in criteria pollutants, greenhouse gas emissions, and energy usage are accounted for in the analysis. This analysis is based upon changes in rail miles, which is derived from changes in rail service between the Action Alternatives and the No Action scenario in Volume 2, Chapter 7.13 and the Preferred Alternative and no action scenario in Volume 1, Chapter 7.13, in each state. The effects-assessment methodology for Air Quality is provided in Volume 2, Appendix E.6 of the Tier 1 Final EIS. Subsequent Tier 2 level planning studies may evaluate the effects of mode shifts on air quality in greater detail.

Table JJ–12: Stakeholder Comments (Elected Officials, Tribes, Federal Agencies, State Agencies, Local Agencies): Environmental Resources (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
DE SHPO_Lukezic	In the submitted document, we find some confusion in comparing the information and chapters. Most of the text in the document states that the Affected Environment, a one mile wide swath, was the primary assessment corridor of the study. When it came to the actual collecting and analysis of data for cultural resources, FRA apparently dropped that unit as unworkable due to the large amounts of data. Instead, we are presented with a small undefined representative corridor. It is stated in section 9.2.1 in appendix E:... This undercuts any analytical comparison one may do with other environmental variables over space. Without adequate information, it is not clear if FRA can adequately assess indirect effects such as audio, visual or vibration, on historic properties. We need a realistic Area of Potential Effect presented, along with historic properties that are actually mapped in the graphics presented, and representative routes that are developed or defined. Until we have this information we cannot offer a meaningful comment regarding effects or to which alternative should be preferred.	The FRA undertook a phased approach to evaluate cultural resources and historic properties. The analysis for the Tier 1 EIS focuses on the identification of resources that are included on the National Register of Historic Resources and National Historic Landmarks within a preliminary area of potential effects (preliminary APE). In coordination with the involved State Historic Preservation Offices (SHPO), the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), the FRA defined the preliminary APE as a 1-mile swath. The 1-mile swath was used to identify existing conditions, encompass and account for the improvements associated with the Representative Route, and account for resources that may be sensitive to noise, vibration, or visual impacts. Indirect effects—such as visual, noise and vibration effects—are not quantitatively identified, but rather qualitatively discussed given the level of analysis conducted for the Tier 1 EIS. The Representative Route is a narrower swath, 150 feet in width, used to identify where direct impacts might occur. The FRA prepared a Programmatic Agreement (PA) in coordination with the involved SHPOs, ACHP and FTA as well as several tribal, national, state, and local consulting parties; the intent of the PA is to ensure, and to provide a framework for how, the Section 106 process is carried out fully in subsequent Tier 2 project studies.
DE SHPO_Lukezic	According to the data presented, there are no National Historic Landmarks present that will be impacted by Alternative 1 and 2. We disagree with this finding, as three National Landmarks, Holy Trinity Church (Old Swedes), Fort Christina and Howard High School, are close to the current corridor. It should also be noted that Holy Trinity Church and Fort Christina are now included in the First State National Historical Park.	The Tier 1 Draft EIS lists Holy Trinity Church and Fort Christina—both National Historic Landmarks (NHL)—as significant resources. Howard High School (also an NHL) has been added as noted in Volume 2, Appendix E.09 (Cultural Resources and Historic Properties Data). No Delaware NHLs lie in the more narrowly defined 150-foot-wide Representative Route. Volume 1, Chapter 7.9, notes the First State National Historical Park designation.
DE SHPO_Lukezic	As presented in the EIS, the Context Area is a 5 mile wide swath that surrounds the corridor. In section 7.9.5 of the document, the authors express a concern for Nation Historic Landmarks that are within the context area, and present lists of NHLs from various states. However, Delaware's NHLs are not included in the list. Within these parameters, Holy Trinity Church (Old Swedes), Fort Christina and Howard High School should be considered.	Volume 1, Chapter 7.9, provides examples of identified National Historic Landmarks within the Context Area and is not intended to be a comprehensive list. Volume 1, Appendix EE.09, lists Fort Christina, Holy Trinity Church, and the Eleutherian Mills in the Delaware Context Area. Howard High School has been added to both Volume 2, Appendix E.09, and Volume 1, Appendix EE.09 (Cultural Resources and Historic Properties Data).
DE SHPO_Lukezic	Overall, we understand that a Tier 1 EIS cannot provide the specific detail for many of the questions we are asking. We are aware that the upcoming Tier 2 study will include detailed studies and thus more specific information on currently unidentified historic properties. However, the authors' state in the abstract: The objective of this Tier 1 Draft EIS is to provide sufficient information for the public and agencies to comment on the alternatives and for the FRA to make an informed decision on identifying a Preferred Alternative for NEC FUTURE. At this point, we do not feel that the Draft EIS provides sufficient information to evaluate the alternatives' relative potential effects on historic properties. In order for the Final EIS to take historic properties into account in this decision process, and therefore meaningfully contribute to complying with Section 106 of the NHPA and NEPA, we recommend the document should include mapping of all the known historic properties within the Affected Environment Corridor... The National Historic Landmarks in all Affected Environment Corridors must be included.	Cultural resources is one of many factors that the FRA considered in identifying a Preferred Alternative. The FRA has coordinated with each State Historic Preservation Offices (SHPO), the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, the Federal Transit Administration, and federally recognized tribes having claims to lands or lands within the Study Area to identify cultural resources and historic properties of significance that were part of the analysis and the identification of a Preferred Alternative. Volume 2, Appendix AA, identifies clusters of National Register of Historic Places/National Historic Landmark sites as provided by the National Park Service (NPS). Mapping all known cultural resources and historic properties was not feasible for the Tier 1 EIS effort given the inconsistencies in data available from each SHPO and data provided by the NPS.
DEDNREC_Kennel	...this direction south of the [Wilmington] station where the alternatives 2 and 3 are proposed, we have a lot of wetlands areas, endangered species, hazardous waste sites, flood plains, and areas subject to sea level. It would not be suitable for additional development.	As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure or alignments. Such decisions are made as part of the Tier 2 project planning processes, which would include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate. Consistent with this process, the FRA developed Representative Routes for the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative, which provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the effects of each Alternative. Representative Routes define an envelope within which improvements might occur and whose location and construction type could change during subsequent Tier 2 project-level reviews. Subsequent Tier 2 project analysis by the lead agency will provide a deeper analysis of potential impacts. Direct impacts will be assessed at that time.

Table JJ–12: Stakeholder Comments (Elected Officials, Tribes, Federal Agencies, State Agencies, Local Agencies): Environmental Resources (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
DOI_Nelson	..the Washington-Rochambeau National Historic Trail due to the fact that it generally follows the NEC Future Corridor for its entire length, so it has potential for multiple impacts. An area that should have particular consideration is the point where the NEC crosses the Anacostia River and the Baltimore Washington Parkway. The NEC crosses three of these trails in that specific location. (See Image 2). The NPS requests that the FRA considers the extent to which the project will impact the experience of existing and planned segments of these trails, as well as the ways and extent to which: a) stations might serve as trailheads; and b) rail services might contribute to the increasing demand for outdoor recreation opportunities and to the promotion of heritage tourism. ... NPS CHBA requests that the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) consider the potential impacts from operational changes of the proposed project to the resources of the Captain John Smith Chesapeake National Historic Trail.	Volume 1, Chapter 7.4 considers impacts of the Preferred Alternative on the National Historic and Scenic Trails noted by the NPS, including ways in which stations along the Preferred Alternative could serve as trailheads and contribute to an increasing demand for outdoor recreation opportunities.
DOI_Nelson	NPS does not anticipate any potential visual impacts at this time to the White Clay Creek from the proposed Alternative 3 expansion of the existing railroad bridge.	Text in Volume 1, Chapter 7.4 reflects this finding in Tier 1 and that subsequent coordination in Tier 2 should be carried out when the exact nature of the proposed railroad crossing is known.
DOI_Nelson	NPS is, however, concerned about the impacts to the free flow of White Clay Creek from the expansion of the existing railroad bridge.	FRA recognizes the importance of preserving the free-flowing conditions of our nations Wild and Scenic Rivers. The subsequent Tier 2 project analysis will include a more detailed, site specific analysis and assessment of hydrologic resources and the potential effects of the Preferred Alternative on White Clay Creek and the surrounding areas.
DOI_Nelson	NPS also has concerns about the impacts to bald eagles. The area immediately downstream of the existing railroad crossing is Churchman's Marsh. The forest surrounding Churchman's Marsh has had documented eagle nesting sites. ... The Service is concerned that additional rail lines and stations associated with the NEC Future Plan project are likely to increase eagle mortality. The Service recommends that FRA identify all bald eagle nests, roost sites, breeding, migration (including golden eagles), and concentration areas within the project corridor and provide an Eagle Conservation Plan that includes plans to minimize impacts to eagles.	In accordance with the Ecological Resources methodology, Volume 2, Appendix E.06 , the FRA addressed potential effects of the Action Alternatives on ecological resources, including federally listed Threatened and Endangered Species. Subsequent Tier 2 project studies will include coordination with USFWS, field surveys, assessments, and screenings, as determined necessary, to ensure compliance with the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act and the Migratory Bird Act.
DOI_Nelson	Therefore, the Service respectfully requests that all units of the National Wildlife Refuge System be avoided in the NEC Future Plan for future rail investments.	FRA evaluated effects on National Wildlife Refuges and took this into consideration when identifying a Preferred Alternative. The FRA has developed the Representative Route for the Preferred Alternative such that it generally avoids or minimizes impacts on National Wildlife Refuges.
DOI_Nelson	The Service understands from the teleconference on January 7, 2016, that the FRA will be working with the Service on a programmatic consultation and will address potential impacts to listed species in the spring of 2016. When the Preferred Alternative is identified, the Service recommends that the FRA determine the project "action area" which is defined as all areas to be affected directly or indirectly by the Federal action and not merely the immediate area involved in the action (50 CFR 167;402.02). Pursuant to Section 7(c) of the ESA, the FRA should conduct a biological assessment for the purpose of identifying any endangered or threatened species which is likely to be affected by the proposed action. ... Until the proposed project is complete, the Service recommends that FRA check the Service's website2 every 90 days from the date of this letter to ensure that listed species presence/absence information for the proposed project is current. ... We recommend that FRA review the guidelines presented in EO 13186. If FRA has not already done so, the Service recommends that FRA work with the Service as part of the planning process to prepare a Memorandum of Agreement with the Service to implement those guidelines.	The FRA will continue to coordinate with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and take into consideration agency recommendations, including Tier 1 Draft EIS comments received, in the production of the Tier 1 Final EIS, the Record of Decision, and Tier 2 project studies. The FRA updated the species list for the Tier 1 Final EIS (Volume 1, Chapter 7.6). As planning for the program progresses, the lead federal agency will ensure that federal species lists are updated. Furthermore, for Tier 2 project studies, coordination with the USFWS will continue to determine the appropriate level of analysis needed to support and fulfill the requirements of Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act, including determination of the project "action area".

Table JJ–12: Stakeholder Comments (Elected Officials, Tribes, Federal Agencies, State Agencies, Local Agencies): Environmental Resources (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
DOI_Nelson	The Service is concerned that the NEC Future Plan project may result in adverse effects to fish and wildlife resources, including threatened and endangered species, (on and off refuges) as a result of construction and operation of the rail system. ... In addition, the Service is also concerned with the potential impacts of railroad tunnels, crossings (culverts, bridges), rock rip-rap along stream and riverbanks, pollutants, and surface runoff into waterways. ... The Service recommends that the FRA include in the Tier II EIS how it plans to address impacts to fish and wildlife. The Service also recommends that FRA design the NEC Future Plan project to avoid and minimize impacts during construction and operation and protect fish and wildlife resources by providing fish and wildlife passage, incorporating conservation measures, and mitigating for adverse impacts as appropriate.	The NEC FUTURE program follows a "tiered" approach to environmental review. Tier 1 focuses on broad programs and initial analysis. Tier 2 focuses on site-specific, project-level proposals and impacts. Within the context of the Tier 1 process, NEC FUTURE will not make a final decision regarding mitigation of impacts to ecological resources as a result of the construction and operation of the Preferred Alternative. Such decisions would be made as part of the Tier 2 project planning processes. The FRA evaluated the effects of implementing the Preferred Alternative on ecological resources, such as ecologically sensitive habitats, threatened and endangered species, and essential fish habitats in Volume 1, Chapter 7.6, Ecological Resources.
DOI_Nelson	In addition, the Susquehanna National Wildlife Refuge and Garrett Island occur near the NEC Future Plan corridor at the mouth of the Susquehanna River. Both are satellite refuges managed by the Chesapeake Marshlands National Wildlife Refuge Complex (Complex). If Susquehanna River rail-crossing locations or corridors change, FRA should coordinate with the Complex to ensure adverse effects to these refuges are avoided.	FRA recognizes the sensitivities associated with wildlife refuges and has identified a Preferred Alternative that minimizes effects on wildlife refuges. Volume 1, Chapter 4 of the Tier 1 Final EIS describes the Preferred Alternative, which does propose an additional crossing of the existing NEC over the Susquehanna River. The crossing would be immediately adjacent to the existing tracks; however, Tier 2 planning studies will determine the exact location and design of the crossing. As planning for this portion of the Preferred Alternative progresses, coordination with the Chesapeake Marshlands National Wildlife Refuge will continue.
DOI_Nelson	The John Heinz at Tinicum National Wildlife Refuge protects the largest remaining freshwater tidal marsh in Pennsylvania. ... Alternative 2, Figure 4-15 indicates the possibility for several impacts to the refuge. The rail segment appears to overlay portions of the refuge, which could negatively affect approximately 300 species of birds and other wildlife, and the Service 's ability to manage a 145 acre wetland.	FRA recognizes the sensitivities associated with wildlife refuges and identified a Preferred Alternative that minimizes effects on the John Heinz Wildlife Refuge. FRA recognizes that indirect effects to the refuge could occur with increased train speeds and frequencies through refuge. FRA has added discussion in the Tier 1 Final EIS Volume 1, Chapter 7.6 regarding the potential for indirect effects.
DOI_Nelson	The Salt Meadow unit of Stewart B. McKinney National Wildlife Refuge was Connecticut 's first national wildlife refuge when it was acquired by private donation in 1971 under authority of the Migratory Bird Conservation Act. The land was donated to protect the wetlands, perpetuate the property as a wildlife sanctuary, and provide opportunities for environmental awareness. The unit has since been designated as an Important Bird Area by the National Audubon Society. ... This salt marsh provides a nursery area for many fish species of the Long Island Sound as well as passage for migratory fish.	FRA recognizes the sensitivities associated with wildlife refuges and has identified a Preferred Alternative that does not impact the Stewart B. McKinney National Wildlife Refuge. Volume 1, Chapter 4 of the Tier 1 Final EIS describes the Preferred Alternative.
EPA_Walsh	Project success for this complex, long term project will require a firm commitment to avoid or reduce harmful environmental impacts and state whether all practicable means to avoid or minimize environmental harm from a selected alternative have been adopted, and, if not, why they were not. The Tier 1 DEIS does not contain sufficient detailed information for EPA to offer an opinion on either of these issues at this time. It is clear that construction and operation of any of the Action Alternatives could result in different direct, indirect and cumulative impacts to resources that are within EPA's areas of jurisdiction and expertise. The FEIS would benefit from an expansion of the discussion of types of project impacts (for all Action Alternatives). For example, the DEIS provides no discussion of potential impacts to drinking water resources (with the exception of Sole Source Aquifers) or mitigation measures that will be taken to address possible impacts. EPA is concerned with impacts to drinking water where the NEC Action Alternatives may cross through and potentially degrade surface and groundwater sources of drinking water. Specific suggestions as to how this issue and other potentially detrimental effects could be addressed in the balance of the Tier 1 process and in Tier 2 are included in the attachment to this letter. In addition, while the DEIS presents a broad look at the environmental impacts of various alternatives, the description of environmental consequences is often general, and expressed as acres of areas of environmental sensitivity. While this level of detail is useful for broad planning putposes, where permitting or other foreseeable hurdles will prohibit or delay construction of the project, they should be reflected in the Tier I FEIS.	The FRA prepared this Tier 1 Final EIS in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended (42 U.S.C. 4321–4327 and 40 C.F.R. Parts 1500–1508) (NEPA), and other applicable laws and regulations. This document is part of a “tiered” NEPA review as provided for in the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) NEPA implementing regulations. “Tiering” allows an agency, such as the FRA, to focus on the information available and issues relevant to the decision to be made at each level of environmental review. The environmental review for NEC FUTURE includes a Tier 1 (or programmatic) review that broadly assesses environmental impacts. Subsequent, more-detailed environmental reviews by the FRA and other federal agencies on specific project-level elements (Tier 2) will incorporate and reference the decisions and analyses conducted as part of this Tier 1 review. The FRA has considered the comments provided by EPA and has incorporated those into the discussion of the Tier 1 Final EIS where applicable. The FRA appreciates the coordination and assistance from EPA throughout the Tier 1 EIS process undertaken for NEC FUTURE.

Table JJ–12: Stakeholder Comments (Elected Officials, Tribes, Federal Agencies, State Agencies, Local Agencies): Environmental Resources (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
EPA_Walsh	<p>The positive greenhouse gas (GHG) implications and climate adaptation elements of the project are compelling and present an opportunity to make major strides in reducing the number of vehicles on the road. The DEIS presents a summary of changes in carbon dioxide equivalent (CO2e) emissions for roadways, and diesel and electric trains. Based on that analysis, net total GHGs decrease due to a reduction in vehicle miles traveled, with Alternative 1 reducing 274,650 tons of CO2c emissions and one Alternative 3 configuration reducing up to 581,525 tons of CO2e emissions per year. It remains clear that, in addition to the net benefits demonstrated in the DEIS, the NEC Future Action Alternatives have the potential to remedy some of the current vulnerabilities to sea level rise, storm surge and severe weather events. ... we recommend that the discussion and broad listing of relevant federal authorities and State laws addressing climate change be updated in the FEIS to reflect relevant EPA regulations, 2015 Executive Orders on flood risk and federal sustainability, and any recent revisions to State adaptation plans. Last, the discussion would benefit from two changes: first, focusing only on anthropogenic GHGs without discussing water vapor; and, second, consistently directing the measurement of GHG emissions in tons of CO2e per year without consideration of ambient GHG. ... We urge the FRA to require retrofit technology on older equipment to further reduce diesel emissions. ... We also encourage the FRA to require idle reduction technology on construction vehicles, and exhaust retrofit technology on older equipment, to further reduce diesel emissions. ... we recommend that the FEIS incorporate a rough approximation of likely emissions ascribable to all locations where equipment will lay over, since those emissions are as much a part of the overall project as are emissions from moving trains. ... As MOVES2014 is currently available, EPA recommends using MOVES2014 (or MOVES2014a) for any subsequent analysis regardless of whether it begins before or after October 7, 2016. ... we recommend that the Tier I FEIS incorporate a rough approximation of likely emissions attributable to all locations where equipment will lay over, since those emissions are as much a part of the overall project as are emissions from moving trains.</p>	<p>FRA has included a broad list of federal and state regulations addressing climate change in Volume 2, Chapters 7.5 Hydrologic Resources, 7.13 Air Quality, and 7.15 Climate Change.</p> <p>A note has been added to Volume 2 Chapter 7.13 errata sheet striking the discussion on water vapor; clarifying that Table 7.13-8 presents existing/ambient GHG emissions by state; and Table 7.13-9 and 7.13-10 only present those changes due to the Action Alternatives, and do not consider ambient GHG emissions.</p> <p>While the FRA recognizes that one of their roles included setting policy related to equipment and layovers, the purpose of this Tier 1 EIS is not to modify or amend policy. Rather it models existing and future conditions; potential future policy modifications are addressed within the mitigation and the subsequent Tier 2 level project analysis in Volume 1 and 2 , Chapter 7.13.</p> <p>The FRA used MOVES2010b to ensure consistent modeling between the work done on the Preferred Alternative in Volume 1 and the Action Alternatives in Volume 2 . MOVES2014, or the most current model, will be used for subsequent Tier 2 level project analyses. Furthermore, idle reduction and retrofit technology will be added to the list of construction mitigation measures.</p>
EPA_Walsh	<p>Need for summary of benefits and detriments. The DEIS highlights the tradeoffs between improving the transportation system and causing environmental harm. The addition of a chart that qualitatively summarizes the environmental benefits and detriments would provide the reader and decision-maker with a single, big picture accounting that would help in understanding tradeoffs. For purposes of measuring these impacts, it would be useful to provide metrics that are easily understood. For example, the reduction in GHGs presented as a reduction in tons of CO2 emitted on a project basis, might be expressed as its equivalent in the number of vehicles eliminated from roadways. ... The geographic boundaries for the cumulative impact analysis should be clearly identified. Geographic boundaries are typically shown on a map; and a historic (temporal) baseline is often set at a major event changing the local environment, possibly using the year a facility opened or when major upgrades occurred. Appropriate maps should be provided showing the geographic boundary in both Tier 1 and 2 documentation. ... This section may be more appropriately labeled "potential key resources and other considerations" to better incorporate items such as transportation. ... The cumulative impact analysis could be improved by including a more robust discussion of future trends and a more detailed analysis of specific resources.</p>	<p>The geographic extent of the cumulative effects analysis in the Tier 1 Final EIS includes the NEC FUTURE Study Area and the connecting corridors as shown in Volume 2, Summary (Figure S-1). As the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency notes, more-detailed mapping will be prepared during applicable Tier 2 project studies.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative as described in Volume 1, Chapter 4, provides additional discussion related to larger-scale trends that could contribute to cumulative effects on the potential key resources identified.</p>

Table JJ–12: Stakeholder Comments (Elected Officials, Tribes, Federal Agencies, State Agencies, Local Agencies): Environmental Resources (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
EPA_Walsh	<p>The FEIS, and ultimately the Tier 2 analyses would benefit from a more complete evaluation of environmental justice issues. The Tier 1 DEIS, by its general focus, limits insight into disproportionate impacts of the Action Alternatives on minority and low-income populations. This is understandable given the tiered nature of the environmental analysis and the lack of a Preferred Alternative at this early phase in the NEPA/planning process. The public may not be able to identify potential local impacts to their communities where alternatives are presented at a general level. We encourage the FRA to make best efforts to explain the potential impacts and mitigation being considered based on the general information at hand to the environmental justice communities at public hearings, in written documents, and in the Final EIS. We recommend the FRA include in the Final EIS how to include the environmental justice communities in mitigation measure discussions during the Tier 2 level NEPA reviews and analyses. Increasing levels of community coordination will be critical as project elements become more distinct during the Tier 2 analyses. EPA recommends that the FEIS more precisely identify minority and low income populations, expand its EJ outreach, provide a more complete discussion of the intra-city transit impacts of all facilities associated with the Action Alternatives, and begin a discussion of mitigation opportunities with affected environmental justice populations. ... EPA recommends that well before the beginning of scoping meetings for the Tier 2 EISs, FRA launch targeted outreach efforts as well as a neighborhood level analyses of impacts from construction and operation of the Preferred Alternative. During the Tier 2 analysis, the types of additional data collected at the neighborhood level should include, at a minimum, the density of minority and low income populations, existing and reasonably foreseeable localized pollution sources, unique geographical features that would amplify negative impacts, the proximity of the project to EJ populations, wind patterns, risks to pedestrians, and the like. ... we recommend the use of EPA's EJSCREEN as a resource to help identify minority and low income populations. ... should consider whether any of the Action Alternatives result in an increase in the cost of intra-city transportation or whether project funding at the state and local level has the potential to disproportionately burden EJ populations. ... discussion of freight transport by rail through EJ areas should be addressed.</p>	<p>More detailed analysis of EJ populations and the potential impacts and benefits to these populations will occur during subsequent Tier 2 studies. The FRA developed an effects-assessment methodology for evaluating Environmental Justice in the Tier 1 EIS (see Volume 2, Appendix E.11 of the Tier 1 Final EIS). The methodology explains the level of detail provided for the Tier 1 EIS, sources used and outcomes of the analysis.</p> <p>The FRA has identified a Preferred Alternative in consideration of identified EJ populations. FRA included additional analysis of the Preferred Alternative in the Tier 1 Final EIS (Volume 1, Chapter 7.11) that identifies concentrations of EJ populations along new segments that are included in the Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>As part of the Tier 1 EIS effort, FRA developed a public involvement plan that includes outreach to EJ organizations. The FRA understands that for subsequent phases of study, more targeted outreach to EJ organizations and specific communities is warranted. The FRA also recognizes the need for EJ communities to be involved in discussing mitigation options for effects within their communities, see Volume 1, Chapter 7.11.</p> <p>As part of the analysis conducted for the Tier 1 EIS, FRA developed a "dataviewer" that has been instrumental in evaluating effects on all resources, including EJ populations. The dataviewer is a mapping tool that was developed using readily available GIS data for all resources evaluated. The Affected Environment, Context Area and Representative Routes of each alternative were included as part of the dataviewer. This allowed analysts to identify intersections of multiple resources for each alternative. FRA reviewed EPA's EJSCREEN tool to ascertain if it provided additional information beyond what is available by the dataviewer created for NEC FUTURE. The two sources provide similar information and both require more in-depth analysis at a project level to verify information. As such, for purposes of the Tier 1 EIS, FRA has relied on the dataviewer. FRA has referenced use of the EJSCREEN tool for Tier 2 project-level analysis.</p> <p>NEC FUTURE focuses on passenger rail improvements. FRA has considered freight operations in the planning and development of the alternatives.</p>

Table JJ–12: Stakeholder Comments (Elected Officials, Tribes, Federal Agencies, State Agencies, Local Agencies): Environmental Resources (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
EPA_Walsh	<p>The DEIS' assessment of "environmental consequences does not adequately describe the extent and range of indirect impacts. Environmental consequences, under both the wetlands impact analysis and the ecological resources impact analysis, are estimated by tallying the acreage of wetlands or environmental resources present within the footprint of the representative route. This represents a distance of only a few hundred feet at most from the route centerline. This distance is not adequate to capture the range and extent of indirect impacts. Instead, we suggest a distance closer to the Ecological Resource Affected Environment boundary. A swath of fifteen hundred feet from the route centerline would better capture potential indirect impacts for a Tier 1 screening level analysis. For purposes of a Tier 1 assessment, we recommend that the FEIS provide a qualitative description of indirect impacts at the scale described above to capture the full extent of these impacts. We recommend clarifying whether all of the impacts considered (for example in Appendix E.05 and Appendix A.I) are permanent fills regulated by the Clean Water Act. It may be useful to clarify the nature of the aquatic impacts and categorize them as acres of wetland/water crossed by tunnel, aerial structure and at grade, as each of these have different impacts on aquatic resources. Qualitative information identifying wetlands of high value would enhance the analysis of wetland impacts. ... While NWI can be used to approximate the areal extent of wetland, it does not replace the need for detailed site investigations and for the in-field delineation of waters of the U.S., as defined by the Clean Water Act as the project moves beyond the Tier 1 planning level. It is imperative that actions to minimize or fully avoid environmental impacts, particularly to aquatic resources, be investigated and implemented using best available practices, such as longer bridges, advanced stormwater management methods, and reduced corridor widths in sensitive areas. Extra precautions to minimize or avoid impacts should be taken during construction in environmentally sensitive areas. EPA recommends that FRA commit in the Tier I FEIS to study alignment alternatives in the future that avoid valuable resources, incorporate best technologies for natural resource impact avoidance and minimization, and enhance overall resiliency of the NEC.</p>	<p>As part of the Tier 1 EIS, the FRA calculated the total number of acres of wetlands within the Affected Environment, defined as a 2,000 foot-wide swath centered on the Representative Route, for the Existing NEC and each of the Alternatives. The Effect-Assessment Methodology is described in Volume 2 Section 7.5.1 and total acreage of wetlands within the 2,000 foot wide swath, is provided in Volume 2 Section 7.5.3, Table 7.5-2. Volume 2, Appendix E.05, Freshwater Resources and Coastal Zones and Saltwater Wetlands of the Tier 1 Final EIS, also provide calculated acreage with the Affected Environment for each Alternative, by county and state. As part of the Tier 1 Final EIS, FRA has included a qualitative discussion of the extent of possible indirect effects and calculated acreage of wetlands within the Affected Environment, defined as a 2,000 foot-wide swath centered on the Representative Route, for the Preferred Alternative (see Volume 1, Chapter 7.5).</p> <p>Sections 7.5.4.4 through 7.5.4.7, Volume 2 of the Tier 1 Final EIS describe potential temporary and permanent impacts to wetlands and other hydrologic resources by construction type. A similar qualitative discussion regarding impacts and construction type has been provided in the Tier 1 Final EIS Volume 1, Chapter 7.5 for wetlands and other hydrologic resources.</p> <p>The FRA appreciates the comments and recommendations provided by EPA and recognizes the importance and need to further investigate and define impacts related to the Preferred Alternative. As recommended, the subsequent Tier 2 project analysis will include a more detailed, site specific analysis, including field delineations, and assessment of hydrologic resources and the potential effects of the Preferred Alternative performed by the lead agency.</p>
EPA_Walsh	<p>The reasoning behind the focus on ESH areas where ten percent or greater of the total area of ESH is potentially impacted should be re-examined. we suggest that the FRA refocus the Tier 1 assessment of indirect effects where ecological conditions warrant extension of the boundary of the Affected Environment. The section does not mention the Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA). We suggest that that the Tier 1 ROD include commitments regarding ecological resources be developed for Tier 2 including coordination with federal and state agencies and additional studies or surveys where appropriate.</p>	<p>The Tier 1 Final EIS Volume 2, Section 7.6.4 has provided additional text on the use and purpose of the ten percent or greater analysis. For consistency and comparison, this ten percent or greater analysis is also presented in the Tier 1 Final EIS Volume 1, Chapter 7.6.</p> <p>Volume 1, Chapter 7.6 also discusses the potential for indirect effects to go beyond the defined Affected Environment. Marine mammals identified as potentially affected by the Action Alternatives were included as part of the National Marine Fisheries service discussion (Tier 1 Final EIS Volume 2, Section 7.6.3.3). A reference to the Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA) has been added to the Tier 1 Final EIS Volume 2, Section 7.6.6.</p> <p>The FRA will include commitments in the Record of Decision regarding the need for continued coordination with regulatory agencies and more detailed analysis to determine site-specific effects to ecological resources.</p>
EPA_Walsh	<p>EPA recommends that the FRA explicitly include track elevation strategies in the FEIS as another way to reduce flooding risk. Also, in terms of available resources to guide more detailed Tier 2 risk analysis, we recommend the FEIS reference chapter 26 of the National Climate Assessment, Decision Support. ... We recommend that the FEIS also discuss at least briefly alternatives to reduce flood risks to the southern half of the NEC, including the potential for inland routes that may be feasible. ... We also recommend that the sources of comparative flood risk reduction among the alternatives be clarified. We recommend that the characterization of flood risks south of New York City, for example, be presented in the same fashion as for northern route options. ... FEIS display flood risks with increased granularity along the rail corridor to illustrate inundation risks in a given location.</p>	<p>The FRA included track elevation strategies to the list of possible adaptation/design features to be considered at future stages of program development and added a reference to Volume 1, Chapter 7.15, for the National Climate Assessment (Chapter 26: Decision Support). In addition in Volume 1, Chapter 7.15, the FRA has expanded the discussion on comparative flood risks south of New York City. During subsequent Tier 2 project studies, more-detailed analysis will be undertaken to understand project-specific flooding risks on rail infrastructure.</p>

Table JJ-12: Stakeholder Comments (Elected Officials, Tribes, Federal Agencies, State Agencies, Local Agencies): Environmental Resources (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
EPA_Walsh	EPA is concerned with impacts to drinking water where the NEC action alternatives may cross over and degrade surface water and groundwater sources of drinking water. ... In general we recommend that Chapter 7 include a discussion of the possible effects of the construction and operation of each alternative on public and private drinking water supplies. It should also indicate the number and location of surface and aquifer drinking water supply sources, and identify relevant local, state and federal protection zones and land use limitations. ... Sole source aquifers are of special significance, but all aquifers currently or potentially used for drinking water are of high value. We recommend that where the document identifies sole source aquifers, it explain its legal impact on alternatives. ... We recommend that the FEIS identify where the project will cross state-defined Source Water Protection Areas (for both surface water and groundwater). This includes all surface and ground water supplies used for public drinking water supplies within the existing NEC corridor and NEC alternatives being considered. ... the NEC alternatives must not pass through the state defined Sanitary Protective Areas for any public water supply in the project corridor. The EIS should also identify where the project will cross aquifers used for private drinking water supply. The FEIS should include an evaluation of potential impacts to all public drinking water supply protection areas or ground water protection areas (wellhead protection areas) particularly along the new segments which are being considered for Alternatives 2 and 3 within the Affected Environment. ... we recommend that the FRA contact all state agencies responsible for drinking water supply protection to include an evaluation of impacts to hydrologic/water resources. ... It also identifies a new station is to be constructed in Westerly, RI close to the Pawcatuck River. The Pawcatuck Basin Aquifer System is a 295-square mile watershed located primarily in southwestern Rhode Island and partially in southeastern Connecticut. The Pawcatuck Basin Aquifer was officially classified as a Sole Source Aquifer under the Safe Drinking Water Act on May 13, 1988. The FEIS should identify all potential construction impacts and the mitigation techniques used to reduce impacts to the Pawcatuck Basin Sole Source Aquifer (and other aquifers that may be impacted in the corridor), especially where construction is planned, on any state cleanup sites, Superfund sites or leaking underground storage tank sites within the Affected Environment (a 2,000 foot buffer along the rail corridor).	Analysis in the Tier 1 EIS is based on readily available information from federal and state agencies. The FRA reviewed available data on locations of drinking water sources and protection areas and found that data was not readily available for all states and localities within the Study Area. Therefore, specific locations of drinking water sources, with the exception of sole source aquifers, and designated local, state, and federal protection areas were not identified for the Tier 1 EIS. The FRA has included text in Volume 1, Chapter 7.7, regarding additional analysis that will occur during subsequent Tier 2 project studies. During Tier 2 project studies, specific construction effects and mitigation measures will be identified to avoid and minimize effects on drinking water sources and designated resource protection areas. Volume 1, Chapters 7.5 and 7.19 include additional discussion related to drinking water sources.
EPA_Walsh	FEIS identify all appropriate mitigation techniques proposed for freight transportation of hazardous materials along the NEC Futures corridor in the vicinity of Source Water Protection Areas and other watersheds contributing to drinking water supplies. A list of those sites that have been identified but that are not undergoing current remediation would be more accurate in determining the impacts those sites may have on the action alternatives. The FEIS should include specific references for the RCRA Corrective Action list and RCRA TSDF list.	The Tier 1 EIS is a planning document; therefore, the FRA did not specifically identify the remediation status of individual sites. Volume 2, Chapter 7.08, includes specific references for the RCRA Corrective Action list and RCRA TSDF list.
EPA_Walsh	The Tier 1 FEIS should examine the impact of the Action Alternatives on pedestrian safety issues as trains pass through highly urbanized areas, taking into account hot spots identified through accident data collected by FRA. The FEIS should also provide mitigation measures that can be identified at the Tier 1 phase, including safety measures that can reduce pedestrian accidents.	Safety issues are discussed for the Preferred Alternative in Volume 1, Chapter 7.18, and include additional potential mitigation strategies related to safety measures considered that reduce bicycle and pedestrian accidents. Specific details about pedestrian safety issues will be considered in more detail as part of subsequent Tier 2 project studies.
EPA_Walsh	The DEIS does not address potential noise impacts from idling locomotives.	The noise effects of stationary sources—such as maintenance facilities or other track locations where locomotives may be idling—are localized and based upon project-level design and engineering analysis, and these details are not available in this Tier 1 analysis. However, in Volume 1, Chapter 7.12, the FRA includes a qualitative discussion of potential noise impacts analysis from stationary sources that will be performed during applicable subsequent Tier 2 project studies. For example, where locomotives idle in areas such as rail yards and other locations, onboard or offboard idle-reduction technology will be considered as tools for reducing noise impacts.
EPA_Walsh	We recommend that the text accompanying Table 7.14.4 acknowledge that the analysis of energy use by alternative will be affected by a later decision as to the type of trainsets that will be used.	This statement will be included in the accompanying text in the Final Tier 1 EIS, Volume 2, Table 7.14.4, acknowledging that the analysis of energy use by alternative will be affected by a later decision as to the type of trainsets that will be used.

Table JJ–12: Stakeholder Comments (Elected Officials, Tribes, Federal Agencies, State Agencies, Local Agencies): Environmental Resources (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
EPA_Walsh	The FEIS should elaborate on the potential indirect affects, especially of Alternatives 2 and 3, for increased conversion of agricultural lands to other uses. ... New Jersey should be included as a state (indicated by a+ sign on the DEIS tables) that has set objectives and goals for farmland preservation; the state has a strong interest and program for farm preservation. Also, the section of Appendix E.03 does not contain the list of documents mentioned in Section 7.3.5.	The FRA considered the effects of land conversion on undeveloped agricultural land in the Tier 1 EIS. The Tier 1 Final EIS discusses indirect effects in Volume 1, Chapter 6. In evaluating all of the benefits and effects for each of the alternatives presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS (Volume 2, Chapters 4 and 9), the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative that minimizes off-corridor segments and focuses on existing rail lines. A list of the plans reviewed for goals and objectives for farmland preservation has been added to Volume 2, Appendix E.03. Additionally, a "+" sign has been added in Table 7.3-4 to denote New Jersey as a state that has set goals and objectives for farmland preservation.
Floral Park_Trustee Longobardi	In the absence of a formal detailed plan and based upon basic information provided in the Draft EIS, the land needed to erect structures to carry the rail system will require the loss of property within the Village [of Floral Park]. That property will be residential homes and commercial properties as available land to erect the system is non-existent. The loss of real property to residents and businesses could have a devastating effect on the future of the village, not only physically, but financially as well.	The FRA noted the views expressed about the impact of Alternative 3 through Long Island. The Preferred Alternative does not include this route; rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative is provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4. Nevertheless, the Preferred Alternative includes the potential for acquisition or displacements. As part of the Tier 2 project analyses, socioeconomic effects and any necessary acquisitions, temporary easements, and displacements will be identified, and compliance with the Uniform Relocation Act will be required
Floral Park_Trustee Longobardi	...the location of an aerial structure throughout the heart of the Village will provide for the elimination of properties, a major decrease in remaining property values, harm to local businesses, disruption to two (2) public grammar school operations, disruption of Village operations, traffic congestion throughout the Village and safety concerns for increased traffic and crime around the structure.	The FRA noted the views expressed about the impact of Alternative 3 through Long Island. The Preferred Alternative does not include this route. For more details regarding the Preferred Alternative see Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Kearny_Mayor Santos	...I'm assuming the new segment will follow closely the existing segment, although I'm not sure, I could not tell from existing maps on what was made publicly available. However, depending on whether there's additional tracks and what that new segment involves, there could be very substantial impacts in my community [town of Kearny]. The Northeast Corridor traverses two estuaries, the Hackensack River estuary and the Passaic River estuary. There are wetlands. There are marshes. There are migratory birds. There's all sorts of environmental issues, of which I'm sure you're aware of. And it really depends on whether the segment moves or if it's expanded.	Specific design features and engineering have not occurred for alternatives presented for evaluation in the NEC FUTURE Tier 1 EIS. Detailed design and engineering will occur during subsequent phases of the program for the Preferred Alternative. Tier 2 project analysis will incorporate more-detailed evaluations and assessment, particularly with regard to environmental sensitive areas such as wetlands, marshes, and ecologically sensitive habitat.
LCRVCOG_Gold	... the exclusion of Middlesex County in the list of counties that might be impacted by environmental and cultural impacts of the proposals, particularly for the closer-in inland bypass from Old Saybrook to Rhode Island. That would necessitate construction of a new bridge. The River Cog, as we call it, is the host to the Connecticut River Gateway Commission, which is a unique commission in the state of Connecticut that has authority over viewsheds and protecting the viewsheds from the Connecticut River. The Connecticut River has very important ecological and also cultural significance. The Florence Griswold Museum is nearly adjacent to where this new bridge could be located. That's the home of American Impressionism from the late 19th century and early 20th century. They came to Old Lime particularly because of the light and the scenery at the river. So that's something that we would be concerned about in the construction of a new bridge in that location.	Effects to visual resources in Middlesex County from the new bridge over the Connecticut River were identified for Alternative 1 (Volume 2, Chapter 7.10). Volume 2, Appendix E.09, Cultural Resources and Historic Properties Data identified effects to the Florence Griswold Museum in New London County as a National Historic Landmark from Alternative 1. Based on further conversations with representatives from Old Lyme and consideration of multiple comments received regarding the potential effects to the historic district, the construction type for the Old Saybrook to Kenyon segment associated with Alternative 1 was modified for the Preferred Alternative to reduce impacts. Effects of the Preferred Alternative on historic and visual resources in Middlesex and New London Counties are identified in Volume 1, Chapters 7.9 and Chapter 7.10. Resources identified, such as the Florence Griswold Museum, will be considered during subsequent Tier 2 project studies, where the lead agency will be responsible for Section 106 compliance which will include defining a project-specific area of potential effects.

Table JJ–12: Stakeholder Comments (Elected Officials, Tribes, Federal Agencies, State Agencies, Local Agencies): Environmental Resources (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Mansfield_Mayor Shapiro	As the proposal contemplates a new hub station in Mansfield, we would prefer that the alignment be shifted to coincide with one of the Smart Growth Development areas identified in our Plan of Conservation and Development. One of the primary goals of our future land use plan is to direct new growth and development to these Smart Growth Development areas to protect the rural character of the rest of the community. These areas have been designated for more intense growth based on the availability of public infrastructure (water and sewer service) that can support higher densities needed for transit-oriented development. For example, a more northerly alignment through the Storrs area, being careful to avoid direct impacts to agricultural lands, would provide direct access to the main campus of the University of Connecticut, a new technology park planned at the University, and our new downtown. A more southerly alignment in the vicinity of Route 6 would provide access to the town's other major commercial area at the intersection of Routes 6 and 195 as well as access to Willimantic, a historic downtown located in the Town of Windham to our south.	<p>The routing option between Hartford and Providence was not advanced as part of the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit. The Preferred Alternative brings the existing NEC to a state of good repair and maximizes its capacity through alleviation of chokepoints, addition of new tracks and segments at targeted locations, and implementation of service operational efficiencies. The Preferred Alternative includes an enhanced, electrified Hartford/Springfield Line. For additional information on the Preferred Alternative, see Volume 1, Chapter 4.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative does not include a second spine. However, the FRA recognizes it is possible that in future decades there may be need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of expansion.</p>
Mansfield_Mayor Shapiro	The protection and conservation of our natural resources and rural character is of paramount importance to our residents. Due to the high-level nature of the analysis conducted as part of the Tier 1 EIS we are unable to determine the actual impact on our community [Mansfield] at this time. We strongly encourage you to select an alignment and station location that minimizes impacts to our agricultural lands, working farms, natural resources and rural character. We will provide additional comments on impacts and mitigation measures as part of the Tier 2 EIS review process.	The FRA prepared this Tier 1 Final EIS in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended (42 U.S.C. 4321–4327 and 40 C.F.R. Parts 1500–1508) (NEPA), and other applicable laws and regulations. This document is part of a “tiered” NEPA review as provided for in the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) NEPA implementing regulations. “Tiering” allows an agency, such as the FRA, to focus on the information available and issues relevant to the decision to be made at each level of environmental review. The environmental review for NEC FUTURE includes a Tier 1 (or programmatic) review that broadly assesses environmental impacts. Subsequent, more-detailed environmental reviews by the FRA and other federal agencies on specific project-level elements (Tier 2) will incorporate and reference the decisions and analyses conducted as part of this Tier 1 review.
MassDOT_Pollack	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.	The FRA based the environmental evaluations for the Tier 1 Draft EIS on Representative Routes and representative service data, using readily available resource information from federal and state agencies. Only data available at the same level of detail for all the jurisdictions in the multi-state study area were used to conduct analyses. In accordance with the Parklands and Wild and Scenic Rivers methodology (Volume 2, Appendix E.04), the FRA identifies the data sources used for the analysis and additional tables that identify the parks in Table 7.4-6. Volume 2, Table 7.5-7 has been updated in the Tier 1 Final EIS to correctly identify Boston Harbor.
MDDNR_Golden	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 ... 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. ...We will be prepared to assist with such review assessments for this project.	The FRA appreciates the coordination and assistance from Maryland Department of Natural Resources (DNR) during the development of the Tier 1 EIS for NEC FUTURE. Tier 2 project studies occurring in Maryland will continue coordination DNR to assess the effects of subsequent project-level studies on the state resources.
MDDNR_Golden	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.	During Tier 2 project analysis, the project sponsor will coordinate with all agencies with jurisdiction over parklands, wild and scenic rivers, and wildlife refuges.

Table JJ–12: Stakeholder Comments (Elected Officials, Tribes, Federal Agencies, State Agencies, Local Agencies): Environmental Resources (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Mineola_Trentacos	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... 2. NEC Future must consider all potential property acquisitions needed... economic effects upon local communities, especially with regard to loss of real estate assessed valuation...potential temporary takings for construction period purposes. 3. NEC Future must consider all neighborhood and community disruption... 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... 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 FRA noted the views expressed about the impact of Alternative 3 through Long Island. The Preferred Alternative does not include this route. For more details regarding the Preferred Alternative see Volume 1, Chapter 4.
NCPC_Kempf	As a seat of the federal government, the National Capital Region has many nationally-significant features, views, and landmarks, including Union Station, where the NEC terminates. The physical layout of the city of Washington is historic, and Union Station holds a prominent position in the city plan. Designed by Daniel Burnham, Union Station was placed on the National Register of Historic Places in 1969, and is the central hub for rail transportation in Washington DC. Union Station is described in the McMillan Plan as the grand gateway to the capital. Recognizing that the proposed project has the potential to affect historic properties and the character of this area, the following historic views and properties should be analyzed in the Tier II EIS: Impacts to contributing view sheds, such as Louisiana, Delaware, and Florida A venues. Impacts to surrounding historic properties, including but not limited to, the US Capitol and Capitol Grounds, Union Station, the Russell Senate Office Building, and Federal Home Loan Bank Board Building.	Volume 2, Appendix E.09 (Cultural Resources and Historic Properties Data), notes significant resources sited as per the McMillan Plan, as well as additional significant cultural resources in the Affected Environment. Union Station is identified as a National Register of Historic Places-listed site in Volume 2, Appendix E.09. While outside the scope of the NEC FUTURE, the Section 106 process is ongoing for the Union Station Expansion project, taking viewsheds into consideration. Further Tier 2 project analysis will focus on local issues, including potential visual and contextual impacts to historic and cultural resources. In addition, applicable lead agencies will coordinate with the National Capitol Planning Commission.
NCPC_Kempf	The NEC currently bisects several large parks and open spaces, including the US Department of Agriculture's National Arboretum, US Fish and Wildlife Service's Patuxent Wildlife Refuge and the National Park Service's Kenilworth Aquatic Gardens, Brentwood Maintenance Facility, Anacostia Park, and Fort Lincoln. The Tier II EIS should evaluate potential impacts from station and infrastructure design on both the historic, natural and cultural resources, and visitor experience.	The FRA recognizes the concerns regarding the ecologically sensitive areas along the corridor, including the US Department of Agriculture's National Arboretum, US Fish and Wildlife Service's Patuxent Wildlife Refuge and the National Park Service's Kenilworth Aquatic Gardens, Brentwood Maintenance Facility, Anacostia Park, and Fort Lincoln. The FRA has identified a Preferred Alternative that follows the existing NEC in these crossing locations. Subsequent Tier 2 project studies will define the alignment and construction details as part of the planning, engineering, and design processes and evaluate potential impacts.
NCPC_Kempf	The NEC crosses several major watersheds including the Anacostia River, Patuxent River, and Western Branch. The Comprehensive Plan's Environmental Element provides policies related to water quality, tree replacement, and wildlife preservation that should be used to guide the project's future planning and design. Every effort should be made to avoid construction within the floodplain (100 and 500-year); to remove trees in excess of the number of new trees planted as mitigation; and to avoid sensitive ecological and wildlife areas along the corridor. Specifically, the following topic areas should be analyzed in the Tier II EIS in enough detail to enable NCPC to assess potential future impacts to federal property within the National Capital Region: Changes in vegetation and tree canopy Stormwater runoff and management, including both federal and local requirements Impervious surfaces Energy use Impacts from construction, including noise and air quality	The FRA identified and inventoried major river and watershed crossings. (See Volume 2, Appendix E.05, Waterbody Analysis of the Tier 1 Final EIS.) The FRA recognizes that numerous federal, state, and local laws, regulations, and Executive Orders, cover hydrologic resources. Subsequent Tier 2 project analysis will incorporate more-detailed analysis and assessment with regard to hydrologic resources (including floodplains and stormwater); ecological resources; noise and vibration; and air quality. Reference to these requirements will be highlighted in the Tier 1 Final EIS Chapter 7.

Table JJ-12: Stakeholder Comments (Elected Officials, Tribes, Federal Agencies, State Agencies, Local Agencies): Environmental Resources (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
NCPC_Kempf	...as the project is developed further through the Tier II process... The NEC FUTURE study should document impacts to several important federal properties that are located near the railway corridor, including the: Thurgood Marshall Federal Judiciary Building, U.S. Government Publishing Office headquarters, and the U.S. Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms & Explosives headquarters.	As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure or alignments. Such decisions are made as part of the Tier 2 project studies, which will include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate. Consistent with this process, the FRA developed Representative Routes for the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative, which provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the effects of each Alternative. Representative Routes define an envelope within which improvements might occur and whose location and construction type could change during subsequent Tier 2 project studies. Effects on specific properties were not considered for the NEC FUTURE Tier 1 EIS assessment given the scale and scope of that environmental review. However, property-specific effects will be an important consideration during subsequent Tier 2 project studies.
NE CT COG_Filchak	The NECCOG region is a rural region (by Connecticut standards)... characterized by rolling hills, forests and farms... According to 2010 data from the University of Connecticut, Center for Land Use Education and Research, northeastern Connecticut's land cover consisted of nearly 10% "Agricultural Field", Over 71% forested land, and just 9.3% "Developed" land cover. Our unique circumstances of being a largely undeveloped rural region led Congress to establish the Quinebaug and Shetucket National Rivers Heritage Corridor - now known as the Last Green Valley. We are also home to the Route 169 National Scenic Byway (which would be traversed by Alternative 2 and Alternative 3). We ask that NEC FUTURE strongly consider the impacts on our region before selecting an alternative to pursue.	The FRA recognizes the concerns regarding the ecologically sensitive, forested, and agricultural areas along the corridor. After evaluating the results of the Tier 1 Draft EIS and public comment, FRA has identified a Preferred Alternative that does not include routing options between Hartford, CT and Providence, RI. Volume 1, Chapter 4 provides details regarding the Preferred Alternative.
New Haven_Mayor Harp	The City requests that both Downtown Crossing and the Hill to Downtown Plan are added to Table 7.20-5 of the DEIS and are fully-considered in the context of the City's recommendations.	The FRA reviewed and incorporated the Downtown Crossing and the Hill to Downtown Plans into the Tier 1 Final EIS. See Volume 1, Appendix EE.19, for a complete list of plans considered in the cumulative effects analysis.
New Haven_Mayor Harp	We call your attention to the significant environmental impacts associated with the Alternative 3 route through Central Connecticut, which is anticipated to affect over 42,000 acres of developed land and another 30,000 acres of undeveloped land. Such a pronounced change in development in largely rural portions of Connecticut is inconsistent with the State of Connecticut's Conservation and Development Policies, which calls for the State to conserve and restore the natural environment, cultural and historical resources and traditional rural lands.	The FRA incorporated concerns regarding the loss of open space into their decision-making process. In light of these and other considerations, the recommended Preferred Alternative does not include the referenced routing through Central Connecticut as proposed in Alternatives 2 and 3. Rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative is provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The consideration of individual state land use plans is more clearly discussed in the Tier 1 Final EIS. It should also be noted that as part of Tier 2 project analysis, environmental effects of projects will be fully assessed.
New Hyde Park_Trentacos	2. NEC Future must consider all potential property acquisitions needed. 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. New Hyde Park is fortunate to have several parks within the Village. NEC Future must carefully study the impacts (both temporary and permanent) upon these parks. 8. NEC Future must consider if advancement will result in any loss of assessed valuation by the Village, a method to compensate New Hyde Park on a permanent basis for such loss must be devised. 9. NEC Future must conduct a careful analysis of impacts upon businesses. 10. NEC Future must consider the impact on public safety and security and conduct an appropriate analysis and study... The residents of New Hyde Park 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 New Hyde Park must also protect and promote that quality of life. New Hyde Park is also special as a business community.	The FRA noted the views expressed about the impact of Alternative 3 through Long Island. The Preferred Alternative does not include this route. For more details regarding the Preferred Alternative see Volume 1, Chapter 4.

Table JJ–12: Stakeholder Comments (Elected Officials, Tribes, Federal Agencies, State Agencies, Local Agencies): Environmental Resources (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
New London_Mayor Passero	In Alternative 1, a new segment would be constructed through our region (Old Saybrook, CT to Kenyon, RI) and we are concerned about how this new segment would relate to and disrupt existing land uses in this corridor; its impacts on environmental resources; and the potential for fewer intercity and regional trains having stops in New London and along the existing shoreline route. The City of New London is approximately 5.67 square miles in land area and of this over 50% of the land area is non-taxable. New London's commercially developed land area comprises 270 acres (7.3%). The City is one of the most densely populated cities in the State of Connecticut and provides all the municipal services of much larger cities. As such, the City struggles to maintain a good level of municipal services while keeping the tax burden to its property owners from being corrosively high. Alternative 1 appears to create a new track ROW through the municipality that will likely impact significant tax generating property. New London simply cannot afford to lose any more taxable land without maximum annual compensation in lieu of taxes.	As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure or alignments. Such decisions are made as part of the Tier 2 project planning processes, which would include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate. Consistent with this process, the FRA developed Representative Routes for the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative, which provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the effects of each Alternative. Representative Routes define an envelope within which improvements might occur and whose location and construction type could change during subsequent Tier 2 project-level reviews. The proposed construction type of the Representative Route through New London is consisted mainly of tunnel which mitigates the potential effects. Specific land use changes would be more fully explored during subsequent Tier 2 project reviews.
NJ TRANSIT_Martin	NJ TRANSIT is greatly concerned about many of the proposed improvements on the Northeast Corridor within New Jersey because they necessarily would involve both huge expense and serious impact on many built-up portions of New Jersey along the Corridor. For instance, some of the statements in the DEIS point toward widening the Northeast Corridor or creating extensive tunneling in areas that would require removing existing dense development. This raises important questions of community impact and environmental justice... The scoping letter that NJ TRANSIT sent as this effort was being initiated also indicated that we were very concerned even then about potential impacts on the existing physical surroundings along the NEC and various limitations that might be created, such as upon station access and parking, among other local impacts. We suggested then and we continued to suggest as work on the DEIS was progressing that it was crucial to think more carefully about how many and which trains stopped in particular locations, as well about the ramifications of seeking much higher train speeds.	As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure or alignments. Such decisions are made as part of the Tier 2 project studies, which would include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate. Consistent with this process, the FRA developed Representative Routes for the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative, which provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the effects of each Alternative. Representative Routes define an envelope within which improvements might occur and whose location and construction type could change during subsequent Tier 2 project studies. Subsequent Tier 2 project analysis will provide a deeper analysis of potential localized impacts including Environmental Justice project analysis. Direct impacts and appropriate mitigation strategies will be assessed at that time.
NJDEP_Fo	Natural Resources - In order for the NJ Division of Fish & Wildlife (DFW) to fully assess any potential impacts to plants, fish, and wildlife, please forward the GIS shape files for the any potential impact areas in New Jersey. The Department is concerned that any Green Acres encumbered land may not be fully represented in the Draft EIS and that some State owned lands may be impacted. A pre-application meeting at the NJDEP to discuss these issues would be helpful in resolving these questions.	As requested, the FRA provided the GIS shapefiles to NJ Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) for their use in reviewing potential impact areas. FRA has made GIS shapefiles of the alternatives available to state and federal agencies upon their request. The New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection's Green Acres Program stipulates that all lands held for conservation and/or recreation purposes at the time the local unit last received funding from Green Acres should be listed on the unit's Recreation and Open Space Inventory. Subsequent Tier 2 project reviews will consult the Recreation and Open Space Inventory (ROSI) database to determine whether the land is under the jurisdiction of the Green Acres Program and whether the property is encumbered by Green Acres funding. A pre-application meeting is more appropriate during subsequent Tier 2 project reviews when more detailed information is available regarding the Preferred Alternative.
NJDEP_Fo	Historic and Cultural Resources: NJ HPO's cultural resources GIS data is available via NJ Geoweb or direct download at NJ DEP's Statewide Digital Data Downloads. Please also provide GIS shape files to Patty Chrisman (609-984-0850), NJ Transit Historic Preservation Specialist, Historic Preservation Office at the NJ Department of Environmental Protection, Mail Code 501-048, P.O. Box 420, Trenton, NJ 08625-0420 or via email at Patty.Chrisman@dep.nj.gov.	Consistent with FRA's practice of providing such files to requesting agencies, the FRA made the GIS data available to NJ SHPO. NEC FUTURE is meant to be a high-level planning document that will assist the FRA in identifying a corridor-wide vision for improving passenger rail on the NEC. As such, the Tier 1 Draft EIS represents a high-level "desktop" analysis based on readily available information, representative service assumptions, and representative routes. No field work was conducted, and no permits are being requested or acquired as part of the NEC FUTURE process. In implementing the Preferred Alternative, project-level assessments with more-detailed analysis will be prepared for each Tier 2 project, and project sponsors will initiate appropriate pre-application meetings as recommended in your response. The FRA is continuing its coordination with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service on ecologically sensitive habitats and federally protected species. The focus of the Tier 1 EIS process has been on federally listed threatened and endangered species and the appropriate level of Section 7 compliance.

Table JJ–12: Stakeholder Comments (Elected Officials, Tribes, Federal Agencies, State Agencies, Local Agencies): Environmental Resources (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
NJDEP_Fo	Land Use: It is reasonable to expect that in NJ, the project will require an Individual Freshwater Wetlands Permit (N.J.S.A. 13:98), a Flood Hazard Area Permit (N.J.S.A. 58:16A) and a Waterfront Development Permit (N.J.S.A. 12:5-3). Three alternative alignments were considered for the overall project. The EIS did not discuss the alternative alignments in NJ in the regulatory context of avoiding wetland or State open water impacts. The regulatory standard for Freshwater Wetland Individual Permits requires a rebuttal of the presumption that an activity has an alternative that does not involve disturbances to freshwater wetlands or State open waters. Any discharge of fill material into more than 5 acres of wetlands would be considered a major discharge, which is an activity that the Department must transmit to the USEP A for review in accordance with the Department's 1993 MOA with the USEP A regarding assumption of the Federal 404 program. Mitigation is required pursuant to N.J.A.C. 7:7A-15 in order to compensate for disturbances to wetlands or State open waters authorized by an Individual Freshwater Wetlands Permit. The project will be required to demonstrate compliance with the regulatory standards for a Flood Hazard Area Permit (N.J.A.C. 7:13) and a Waterfront Development Permit (N.J.A.C. 7:7). Riparian zone mitigation may be required pursuant to N.J.A.C. 7: 13 for riparian zone impacts.	The FRA utilized federal datasets—including U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service National Wetlands Inventory—to perform a comparable multi-state analysis. As described in Volume 2, Chapter 7.5 (Section 7.5.7.2) of the Tier 1 Final EIS, the FRA recognizes that the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection has assumed the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' responsibility for administering Section 404 permitting. The designated Lead Agency will investigate and incorporate federal, state and local regulations and requirements related to wetlands, flood hazards, and fill into the Tier 2 project analysis. Reference to these requirements will be included in the Tier 1 Final EIS Volume 1, Chapter 7.05.
NJDEP_Fo	Site Remediation The NEPA Tier I Draft EIS for the proposed Federal Railroad Administration's (FRA) Northeast Corridor (NEC) is broad and programmatic in nature, the information required by decision-makers includes big picture constraints and opportunities. The Site Remediation Program does not have any specific comments on this draft Document at this time. For future assessments, the FRA should be aware of New Jersey's LSRP program http://www.nj.gov/dep/srp/ and specifically the Site Remediation Program Guidance for Linear Construction Projects http://www.nj.gov/dep/srp/guidance/srra/lcguidance.pdf .	Volume 1, Chapter 7.08, includes New Jersey's Licensed Site Remediation Professional program and the Site Remediation Program Guidance for Linear Construction Projects as resources for subsequent Tier 2 project studies.
NJDEP_Fo	Stormwater Management ...Based on the information provided the only permits that would be required for this project would be for construction related dewater and I have attached a guidance document detailing information on the types of permits issued by the Bureau. Based on the length of the proposed project and the fact that it will cross various counties and municipalities the applicant would be required to submit an application of some sort for each municipality unless group of municipalities if the dewatering will occur within an area up to three miles on a side.	The FRA received the guidance documentation submitted by the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection. The designated Lead Agency will incorporate the required federal, state, and local stormwater requirements (including applicable permits) into the Tier 2 project analysis. Reference to these requirements will be highlighted in the Tier 1 Final EIS, Chapter 7.05.
NYCLPC_Santucci	The project methodology for historic and cultural resources is acceptable.	Thank you for your review and concurrence.

Table JJ–12: Stakeholder Comments (Elected Officials, Tribes, Federal Agencies, State Agencies, Local Agencies): Environmental Resources (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Old Lyme_First Selectwoman Reemsnyder	The member land trusts of the LTE have charged themselves with protecting the natural assets of the RiverCOG Region, an invaluable environmental and recreational area of global significance that surrounds the lower 36 miles of the Connecticut River from the river 's mouth at Long Island Sound to the northern borders of the municipalities of Cromwell and Portland and over 20 miles of Long Island Sound coast line from the western border of the town of Clinton, to the eastern border of the town of Old Lyme. It is home to many of the State 's parks and forests and portions of two Refuges, the Menunketesuck/Duck Island complex and the Salt Meadow Unit of the Stewart B. McKinney National Wildlife Refuge and the southernmost 354 sq. miles of the Connecticut River watershed based Silvio O. Conte National Fish and Wildlife Refuge. This area of the Conte Refuge is now home to the Roger Tory Peterson Division, the Salmon River Division, and the Whalebone Cove Division; the Wild and Scenic Eightmile River; five Connecticut State designated greenways ; the Menunketesuck ; Cockaponset Regional Greenway, the Connecticut River Gateway Zone Greenway, the Eight Mile River Greenway, the Old Lyme Greenway, and parts of the Blue Blazed Trail System Greenway. The estuary of the lower river was designated as a Ramsar Estuary of Global Importance (1994), has been proclaimed by The Nature Conservancy to be one of the World 's Last Great Places, and is listed as a Long Island Sound Stewardship Site (2005) by the Long Island Sound Stewardship Initiative. In 1998 the Connecticut was designated as an American Heritage River, one of 14 in the country. Running through the Region is part of the Metacomet, Monadnock, Mattabesett Trail System designated in 2009 as the New England National Scenic Trail that strives to extend over 200 miles from Massachusetts to Long Island Sound; the Region also surrounds the Connecticut River Gateway Conservation Zone, a 30,000 acre area surrounding the lower 30 miles of the Connecticut River, from the nearest ridge top to nearest ridge top across the length of the lower river. Since 1974, the Connecticut River Gateway Commission has been charged with protecting the scenic and ecological properties of this unique landscape. Most recently the lower Connecticut River region was identified by The Nature Conservancy as a focal area in their report entitled Resilient Sites for Terrestrial Conservation in the Northeast and Mid-Atlantic Region and the Connecticut River watershed was named the Nation 's first National Blueway as part of the Dept. of the Interior 's Americas Great Outdoors Initiative.	The FRA recognizes the concerns raised by communities regarding various wildlife refuges, protected species, and other ecologically sensitive areas in proximity to the existing NEC and Action Alternatives. The FRA has considered input such as this in identifying a Preferred Alternative. The Tier 1 Final EIS Volume 1, Chapter 4 describes the Preferred Alternative.
OysterBay_Alesia	The DEIS vaguely indicates that the potential new route on Long Island... Although the DEIS prominently highlights the expected socio-economic benefits of the proposed action, information regarding anticipated adverse effects is almost completely omitted, making it problematic to arrive at fully informed and properly balanced findings.	The FRA noted the views expressed about the impact of Alternative 3 through Long Island. The Preferred Alternative does not include this route. For more details regarding the Preferred Alternative see Volume 1, Chapter 4.
PVPC_Brennan	Together, PVPC and CRCOG successfully completed a \$4.2 million planning program grant in 2013 funded by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development's Sustainable Communities Initiative. Two leading priorities of the action plan for this project, One Region, One Future, are the enhancement of passenger rail connections with the New York City and Boston markets, and stepping up strategies to accelerate transit-oriented development at passenger rail stations. Also as part of this program, CRCOG and PVPC produced a TOD market analysis, Making It Happen, which strongly recommends directing government development resources to existing passenger rail station areas and focusing on infill development in the Knowledge Corridor region. We urge the NEC Future team to review these two federally funded plans so that their relevant recommendations may be better incorporated in the NEC Future program.	The FRA reviewed Making It Happen: Opportunities and Strategies for Transit-Oriented Development in the Knowledge Corridor and One Region, One Future: An Action Agenda for a Connected, Competitive, Vibrant, Green Knowledge Corridor in preparing the Tier 1 Final EIS and found the NEC FUTURE program is compatible with One Region, One Future and partially compatible with Making It Happen. The FRA assessed the Preferred Alternative for consistency with these and other plans and found the NEC FUTURE program is compatible with One Region, One Future and partially compatible with Making It Happen. For each state and MPO planning document, the FRA determined if the Preferred Alternative supports the stated goals and objectives related to improved passenger rail transportation, transit-oriented development, and preservation of the built and natural environment by qualitatively considering the potential for conversion and acquisition of land cover by the Preferred Alternative as described in Volume 1, Chapter 7.2.

Table JJ-12: Stakeholder Comments (Elected Officials, Tribes, Federal Agencies, State Agencies, Local Agencies): Environmental Resources (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
PVPC_Brennan	Also, the lack of an alternative or variant to evaluate high capacity rail service via Springfield poses equity concerns. According to U.S. Census data, in 2014 Springfield's poverty rate exceeded 29% and there were more than 49% residents of color. Further, the city is the center of the U.S.'s third most segregated metro area by race, according to a 2013 Fair Housing and Equity Assessment for the region. Therefore, the lack of evaluation of high quality rail service to Springfield that is comparable to the other new segments that are contemplated in New England does not appear to be fully consistent with federal regulations and policies for equity and environmental justice, including Title VI of the Civil Rights Act.	FRA has identified a Preferred Alternative as presented in the Tier 1 Final EIS Volume 2, that incorporates the New Haven-Hartford-Springfield line. The Preferred Alternative may result in cleaner air and public health benefits, as well as transportation effects that would provide a benefit to environmental justice communities through increased travel choices, access to more reliable and frequent rail service, accessibility to jobs, and a range of pricing options for travelers. However, FRA did not do an analysis as part of the Tier 1 Final EIS to assess if EJ communities bear a disproportionate amount of the negative environmental resource effects that may occur as part of the implementation of the Preferred Alternative. See Volume 1, Chapter 7.11 for more information related to the Preferred Alternative and Environmental Justice issues.
PVPC_Brennan	...the lack of an alternative or variant with direct high capacity service to Springfield raises equity concerns. In 2014, Springfield's poverty rate exceeded 29% (compared to 11.6% statewide) and there were more than 49% residents of color (compared to 20.0% statewide). The city is the center of the U.S.'s third most segregated metro area by race, according to a 2013 Fair Housing and Equity Assessment for the region. Therefore, the S/DEIS ideally should present and evaluate an alternative or variant for direct high quality rail service to Springfield that is comparable to the current Alternative 2.	FRA has identified a Preferred Alternative as presented in the Tier 1 Final EIS Volume 2, that incorporates the New Haven-Hartford-Springfield line. The Preferred Alternative may result in cleaner air and public health benefits, as well as transportation effects that would provide a benefit to environmental justice communities through increased travel choices, access to more reliable and frequent rail service, accessibility to jobs, and a range of pricing options for travelers. However, FRA did not do an analysis as part of the Tier 1 Final EIS to assess if EJ communities bear a disproportionate amount of the negative environmental resource effects that may occur as part of the implementation of the Preferred Alternative. See Volume 1, Chapter 7.11 for more information related to the Preferred Alternative and Environmental Justice issues.
PVPC_Brennan	Improve equity and environmental justice criteria and considerations. We suggest that equity and environmental justice issues be considered in census tracts that are within a 1-mile buffer of all the preliminary alternatives considered. rather than just within 1-mile buffer from the alignments of the three proposed alternatives. Correspondingly, it is important to include an equity and EJ analysis as part of the baseline conditions. The DEIS does not appear to do so, as it states on page 7.11-9: The FRA did not quantify the effects of the No Action Alternative ... with respect to the resources considered for environmental justice listed in that section in the existing NEC spine corridor or the broader study area. Yet the No Action Alternative includes projects, such as the NHHS commuter rail and Springfield Union Station, that are likely to have impacts on environmental justice populations. Criteria for evaluating demographic information related to equity from the study area can be improved. For example, the evaluation criteria for (Table 4-3) do not explicitly include environmental justice, equity or sustainability factors. Section 7.11 does not list criteria and associated measures for social equity and environmental justice that have been identified by federal, state and regional agencies.	<p>Prior to the development of the Tier 1 Draft EIS, FRA undertook an extensive alternatives planning effort to identify alternatives. The fifteen Preliminary Alternatives cited went through a series of screenings to identify elements of each of those alternatives that performed the best to be carried forward for analysis in the Tier 1 Draft EIS. Volume 2, Chapter 4 and Appendix B, documents the screening process. The EJ methodology in the Tier 1 Final EIS Volume 2, Appendix E.11, explains the screening-level analysis the FRA used to identify the location of EJ populations and to assess potential effects on those populations for the alternatives carried forward for evaluation in the Tier 1 Draft EIS.</p> <p>As the commenter notes, FRA did consider the No Action Alternative but did not quantify the effects of the No Action. FRA was unable to quantify effects of the No Action because the physical limits of projects considered in the No Action are unknown; therefore quantitative analysis is not presented. However, FRA did quantify effects for the existing NEC and used that as a point of reference for the No Action (see explanation in the Tier 1 Final EIS Volume 2, Chapter 7.0). FRA has considered the general types of effects that may occur under the No Action in the cumulative effects analysis (see the Tier 1 Final EIS Volume 2, Chapter 7.20).</p> <p>While EJ was not specifically mentioned in the criteria in Table 4-3, it was considered as part of the Environmental Consequences criterion for evaluating the Preliminary Alternatives. Volume 2, Appendix B.4, shows areas of environmental sensitivity used in the evaluation of Preliminary Alternatives.</p>
PVPC_Brennan	The findings and recommendations of Massachusetts State Rail Plan 2010 should be addressed. We do not find documentation that the DEIS incorporates the Massachusetts Rail Plan 2010, which contains relevant information about passenger and freight rail service existing conditions and priorities for future rail growth in Massachusetts.	The FRA reviewed the Massachusetts State Rail Plan 2010, among other transportation planning documents, in the development of the Action Alternatives for the Tier 1 Draft EIS, and in the selection of the Preferred Alternative for the Tier 1 Final EIS.

Table JJ–12: Stakeholder Comments (Elected Officials, Tribes, Federal Agencies, State Agencies, Local Agencies): Environmental Resources (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
SCRCOG_Amento	We call your attention to the significant environmental impacts associated with the Alternative 3 route through central Connecticut, which is anticipated to affect over 42,000 acres of developed land and another 30,000 acres of undeveloped land (Page 7.2-5). Such a pronounced change in development in largely rural portions of Connecticut is inconsistent with the State of Connecticut's Conservation and Development Policies, which calls for the State to "conserve and restore the natural environment, cultural and historical resources and traditional rural lands." Our State, furthermore, places a high emphasis on its existing urban centers, with focused reinvestment in center cities, inner ring suburbs and transit-rich environments.	The FRA noted the concerns expressed regarding the impact through central Connecticut as proposed in Alternatives 2 and 3. The Preferred Alternative does not include this route. The rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative is provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4. Consistency with individual state land use plans is more clearly discussed in Volume 1, Chapter 7.2, Land Cover. It should also be noted that as part of Tier 2 project analysis, environmental effects will be fully assessed.
SCRCOG_Amento	Many of New Haven's neighborhoods are economically distressed. From an environmental justice perspective, it is equally important to support these communities and not circumvent them through bypass alignments.	As described in the Tier 1 Final EIS Volume 1, Chapter 4, the Preferred Alternative includes improved intercity and regional service on the New Haven-Hartford-Springfield (NHHS) line. Volume 2, Chapter 6, Economic Effects and Growth and Indirect Effects, discusses how transportation investments, such as NEC FUTURE, influences economic outcomes.
Springfield_Mayor Sarno	The lack of an inland route alternative also fails to recognize the unique needs of a City with a poverty rate of close to 30 percent and the importance that rail and transit service can play in connecting residents to employment and daily services.	FRA has identified a Preferred Alternative as presented in the Tier 1 Final EIS Volume 2, that incorporates the New Haven-Hartford-Springfield line. The Preferred Alternative may result in cleaner air and public health benefits, as well as transportation effects that would provide a benefit to environmental justice communities through increased travel choices, access to more reliable and frequent rail service, accessibility to jobs, and a range of pricing options for travelers. However, FRA did not do an analysis as part of the Tier 1 Final EIS to assess if EJ communities bear a disproportionate amount of the negative environmental resource effects that may occur as part of the implementation of the Preferred Alternative. See Volume 1, Chapter 7.11 for more information related to the Preferred Alternative and Environmental Justice issues.
USCG_Dunn	The USCG is a cooperating agency in the NEC FUTURE NEPA process and understands that this Tier 1 DEIS uses representative routes and does not recommend a Preferred Alternative. Prior to the development of the Tier 2 document, it is recommended that NEC contact the Coast Guard to discuss navigation for each bridge proposal. The NEC might be required to prepare and submit navigation impact reports at the beginning of the permit process to provide the most accurate picture of current and prospective navigation on each waterway. If any of the proposed bridges have the potential to impact any identified waterway users, the Coast Guard will evaluate the potential impacts to determine whether the proposed bridges meet the reasonable needs of navigation. The Coast Guard will then provide a preliminary determination, including the minimum navigational clearances, which will be required for each bridge proposed. The navigational clearances should be reflected in the project alternatives that are evaluated in the Tier 2 or subsequent NEC environmental documents. For the Tier 2 or subsequent NEPA document for any of the proposed bridges (new or replacement), please ensure the document addresses the USCG's environmental requirements as described in the Bridge Permit Application Guide (BPAG), found at http://www.uscg.mil/hg/cg5/cg551/default.asp . Navigation documentation and other bridge permit application requirements can also be found in this Guide.	The FRA recognizes concerns regarding the crossing of navigable waterways. Coordination with the U.S. Coast Guard will be initiated in the early stages of the Tier 2 project studies and continue throughout the development of the project.
WILMAPCO_Zegeye	...we have major concerns with the paths of Alternatives 2 and 3 through the City of Wilmington, DE. We understand that these alternatives are still in a draft form, but there is concern that the paths of Alternatives 2 and 3 would travel directly through an existing concentration of low income and minority residents in the Southbridge community. There will be a devastating impact on the revitalization efforts of this community if an elevated track structure were to be constructed through its core, as well as the negative effect on the proposed South Wilmington Wetland Park, which is currently being designed and falls under the proposed rail line.	The EJ methodology explains the screening-level analysis the FRA used to identify the location of EJ populations and special resources EJ areas. These correlations do not represent direct impacts on EJ populations; the correlations flag areas for detailed analysis in the future. The Southbridge community was identified as an EJ area. At the Tier 1 level of analysis, the FRA does not know where specific impacts might occur or degree of impact within that community. Subsequent Tier 2 project analysis will provide a complete analysis of potential impacts and identify appropriate mitigation, in coordination with the community.

Source: NEC FUTURE team, 2016

Table JJ–13: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Environmental Resources

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Allen_Th	As little acquisition of property should be performed.	As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure or alignments. Such decisions are made as part of the Tier 2 project studies, which would include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate. Consistent with this process, the FRA developed Representative Routes for the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative, which provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the effects of each Alternative. Representative Routes define an envelope within which improvements might occur and whose location and construction type could change during subsequent Tier 2 project studies. These representative routes utilized existing transportation corridors to the maximum extent practicable. Nevertheless, the Preferred Alternative includes the potential for acquisition or displacements within areas of developed and undeveloped land. As part of the Tier 2 project studies, socioeconomic effects and any necessary acquisitions, temporary easements, and displacements would be identified, and compliance with the Uniform Relocation Act will be required
Baehr_Th	4. Alternative 1 is the more susceptible to natural disasters such as hurricanes and rising sea levels because of it's proximity to the LI Sound shoreline	<p>Alternative 1 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS focused on the existing NEC—much of which closely follows the Atlantic coastline north of New York—and therefore is susceptible to natural disasters that could affect service. As discussed in Volume 2, Chapter 7.15, areas that are currently at risk from the effects of climate change, including sea level rise and increased storm severity, are predicted to experience worsening conditions. Each Action Alternative considered adaptation measures that could be undertaken to make the existing NEC more resilient.</p> <p>The FRA recognizes the potential impacts caused by climate change (including sea level rise) on the coastline and rail infrastructure; therefore, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative route that improves resiliency on the NEC and provides for redundant infrastructure in areas most vulnerable to the effects of climate change.</p>
Bailey_Valente	As a coastal community, we are quite aware of concerns related to rising water levels and flooding. However, we feel strongly that even improvements needed to respond to these will prove to be far more economical to implement than acquiring property and then constructing new rail lines.	The FRA recognizes the potential impacts caused by climate change (including sea level rise) on the coastline and rail infrastructure; therefore, each Action Alternative considered adaptation measures that could be undertaken to make the existing NEC more resilient. Any new infrastructure built within areas at risk from flooding would be designed to meet designated standards and criteria for infrastructure within flooding-relate risk areas.
Beale_Zo	Phill needs a buffer zone as it is a port city and security is an issue as well as derailments.	Safe operation of passenger and freight rail systems is a critical element of the FRA’s mission and is an important consideration in the planning and development of rail corridors. Volume 2, Chapter 7.18, describes that Tier 2 project studies will include necessary analysis and meet all compliance with existing and proposed safety standards and regulations as they relate to passenger rail.
Biggart_Jo	As usual, the details are missing in the brochure. How many communities, homes, businesses and schools will be destroyed and devalued in each of the three options? How can you expect ANYONE living in the NEC to support this without that information! The economic viability of the region is only as good as the communities which support it.	The FRA considered effects on the built and natural environment in identifying the Preferred Alternative. Volume 1, Chapter 7 identifies the potential impacts on the built and natural environment within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process. The Tier 1 Final EIS does not identify specific property acquisitions, effects on property values, or effects on community facilities. Subsequent Tier 2 project analysis will provide a complete analysis of potential impacts and identify appropriate mitigation, in coordination with the communities and regulating agencies.
Biggart_Jo	As usual, the details are missing in the brochure. How many communities, homes, businesses and schools will be destroyed and devalued in each of the three options? How can you expect ANYONE living in the NEC to support this without that information! The economic viability of the region is only as good as the communities which support it.	The FRA considered effects on the built and natural environment in identifying the Preferred Alternative. Volume 1, Chapter 7 identifies the potential impacts on the built and natural environment within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process. The Tier 1 Final EIS does not identify specific property acquisitions, effects on property values, or effects on community facilities. Subsequent Tier 2 project analysis will provide a complete analysis of potential impacts and identify appropriate mitigation, in coordination with the communities and regulating agencies.

Table JJ–13: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Environmental Resources (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Birdsey_Da	I oppose this plan. The natural diversity review is incomplete. Without a complete review the options cannot be considered.	The FRA developed an effects-assessment methodology for sensitive ecological resources identified as Ecologically Sensitive Habitats, federally listed Threatened and Endangered species, Essential Fish Habitats, and Federally Managed Fish Species (Tier 1 Final EIS Volume 2, Appendix E.06). The Tier 1 follows a "tiered" approach to environmental review under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). As such, for the Tier 1 NEPA review, the FRA analyzed ecological resources based on Representative Routes and service plans. Tier 2 project analysis will focus on site-specific areas to undertake more in-depth analysis of the resources affected.
Blakeney_Lo	I am concerned about the effect a new rail line will have on our parks, wildlife, natural vegetation, and current unfettered enjoyable use by the public.	The FRA identified a Preferred Alternative based on a representative route. Site-specific alignment and service requirements as well as coordination and consultation with local agencies and organizations will occur as part of the Tier 2 analysis. Tier 2 analysis will also include the development of mitigation measures and designs that avoid, minimize, or mitigate effects on natural resources, including parklands. The analysis will be conducted in accordance with applicable law. (See Volume 2, Appendix E and Appendix H.)
Bonomo_Ni	Despite the potential reduction in carbon emissions, the uncertainties associated with Action Alternatives 2 and 3 present some significant negative impacts on wildlife, important habitats such as Important Bird Areas, wetlands, grasslands, and forest interior habitats...The negative impacts on important habitats for birds and other wildlife presented by Alternatives 2 and 3 are just too high of a price to pay for an as of yet undefined transportation dividend.	The FRA considered the effects of the Action Alternatives on ecological resources, including ecologically sensitive habitats. A high level assessment of effects on these resources is included in the Tier 1 assessment. Site-specific effects will be evaluated as part of the Tier 2 project studies. The FRA has identified a Preferred Alternative that focuses improvements along the existing NEC with targeted new segments to alleviate chokepoints and increase capacity. The Preferred Alternative does not include the Alternative 3 route options north of New York.
Brash_AI	In sum, we strongly suggest that the NEC Future must seriously review and refine its environmental impact process, for the current fails to truly analyze the real ecological and historical impacts of each alternative.	<p>The FRA considered the potential for habitat fragmentation in the analysis presented in the Tier 1 Final EIS Volume 2, Chapters 7.1-7.4 and 7.6. The Tier 1 EIS acknowledges that one of the greatest environmental effects is the potential for land conversions of undeveloped land to developed land, which could result in the "loss or fragmentation of ecological resources." Undeveloped land captures a variety of undeveloped land cover categories, including forested lands. The FRA did not make any conclusions regarding the extent of fragmentation that would occur as a result of implementation of any of the Action Alternatives since the environmental effects analysis was based on Representative Routes and service plans.</p> <p>The FRA supports the preservation of cultural and historic resources, including historic districts. Cultural resources and historic properties, including historic districts, are some of the many factors that the FRA considered in identifying a Preferred Alternative. The FRA has worked with State Historic Preservation Offices in the Study Area and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation to develop a Programmatic Agreement (PA) for NEC FUTURE. This PA ensures that continued evaluation and consideration of cultural and historic resources is undertaken as the program advances into subsequent Tier 2 project studies.</p> <p>The Tier 1 Final EIS follows a "tiered" approach to environmental review under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). A Tier 1 NEPA review focuses on broad programmatic analysis. Subsequent Tier 2 NEPA review by other project sponsors will focus on site-specific project proposals and their impacts; impacts and their avoidance or mitigation will occur as part of Tier 2 analysis. The Tier 1 Final EIS Volume 1, Chapter 1, contains more information on the tiered NEPA process.</p>

Table JJ–13: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Environmental Resources (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Brash_AI	Third, while noting direct impacts on our own sites and sanctuaries, we believe there should be a greater effort made to project possible routes onto maps depicting all undeveloped and open spaces so that a real assessment can be made of the fragmentation NEC might bring.	The FRA based the environmental evaluations for the Tier 1 Draft EIS on Representative Routes and representative service data, using readily available resource information from federal and state agencies. Only data available at the same level of detail for all the jurisdictions in the multi-state study area were used to conduct analyses. All environmental analyses were completed using GIS tools; no field studies were conducted. The FRA considers this broad level of detail appropriate for the NEC FUTURE Tier 1 EIS given the large multi-state study area, the programmatic nature of the assessment, and the decisions being made. The lines depicting the Action Alternatives and Preferred Alternative in the Mapping Atlases for Volumes 1 and 2 along with the scale chosen, are representative—intended to highlight environmental resources relative to the Representative Route of a particular alternative that is consistent with the level of detail found in the Tier 1 EIS. The FRA will not decide specific routing or service options through NEC FUTURE. Site-specific alignment and service requirements, as well as coordination and consultation with local agencies and organizations will occur as part of the Tier 2 project-level planning processes. Additionally, proposed construction types will be reviewed during Tier 2 project studies and modified to avoid or minimize effects where feasible. The Tier 1 Draft EIS specifically states that during subsequent Tier 2 analysis, further investigations of municipal and local parks will be required. Data collection and effects on non-profit or privately-owned protected open space and conservation lands will occur during Tier 2 project analyses. The FRA coordinated with the National Park Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service throughout the development of the methodological approach for evaluating effects on parklands. (See Volume 2, Appendix E.09, Environmental Resource Documentation)
Briscoe_Ch	Routing further inland would provide a better alternate as it would reduce number of tidal waterway crossings. The predicted (and generally accepted by most scientists and citizens) rise of sea level is only going to make shoreline rail service more expensive to maintain in the future. Already NYC has changed its building codes to anticipate this impact in the future. If NEC is looking to the future then movement away from the coast would be the best long term plan.	The FRA recognizes the potential impacts caused by climate change (including sea level rise) to rail infrastructure along the coastline. As noted, inland routes provide redundancy to the existing rail network and provide resiliency by moving out of and away from coastal flood hazards. However, inland routes are still subject to riverine flooding that may result from severe storm events. As discussed in Volume 2, Chapter 7.15, each of the Action Alternatives considered adaptation measures that could be undertaken to make the existing NEC and any new segments more resilient to the effects related to climate change. The FRA identified a Preferred Alternative route that improves resiliency on the NEC and provides for redundant infrastructure in areas most vulnerable to the effects of climate change.
Bruinooge_Lo	The Last Green Valley, Inc. is the management entity for The Last Green Valley National Heritage Corridor in eastern CT and south central MA. Both Alternatives 2 and 3 would directly affect the Corridor yet we just found out about this project and the Draft EIS last week. We will likely be submitting more detailed comments but wanted to let you know that Section 107 of our enabling legislation, Public Law 103-449 as amended, requires Any federal entity conducting or supporting activities directly affecting the Corridor shall consult with the Secretary [of the Interior] and the management entity with respect to such activities to minimize any adverse effect on the Corridor. Please contact me to discuss. Thank you.	As described in Volume 2, Chapter 7.4, the FRA used data from the National Park Service, including locations of National Heritage Areas, to establish the existing conditions for parklands and wild and scenic rivers. The Preferred Alternative does not cross the Last Green Valley National Heritage Corridor. Natural Heritage Areas will be considered in Tier 2 project studies. Tier 2 project analysis will include the development of mitigation measures and designs that avoid, minimize effects on parklands. The analysis will be conducted in accordance with federal regulations as part of the Section 4(f) and Section 6(f) evaluations and state regulations.
Bruinooge_Lo	The Last Green Valley is 77% forest and farm land, a unique and rare landscape in the coastal sprawl between Boston and Washington. ... The Last Green Valley 's forests are part of the Southern New England Heritage Forest, ... The Last Green Valley is also home to a National Scenic Byway (Route 169), and 60 miles of National Recreation Water Trail (the Willimantic and Quinebaug Rivers). Alternatives 2 and 3 would cross these resources, and would impact many more state and locally significant trails and public lands. The federal government has already invested more than \$11 million in promoting and protecting The Last Green Valley 's unique resources, leveraging more than \$253 million in state, local, and private dollars dedicated to the same. While there are certainly benefits to expanding high speed rail service through the region, there are also tremendous costs. We simply wish all of those costs to be recognized and become part of the decision-making equation. ... The Last Green Valley National Heritage Corridor 's resources be recognized and accounted for in the decision-making process.	The FRA recognizes the concerns regarding the ecologically sensitive, forested, and agricultural areas along the corridor. After evaluating the results of the Tier 1 Draft EIS and public comment, FRA has identified a Preferred Alternative that does not include routing options between Hartford, CT and Providence, RI. Volume 1, Chapter 4 provides details regarding the Preferred Alternative.

Table JJ–13: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Environmental Resources (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Bruinooge_Lo	We would also note that there are 49 National Heritage Areas in the country, and this project directly impacts at least one more, the Blackstone Rivers Valley National Heritage Corridor to our east, and likely crosses through other NHAs to our south.	The 2010 National Park Service database that the FRA used in the analysis of the Tier 1 Draft EIS, did not include the multiple National Heritage Areas that exist in the Study Area. As described in Volume 1, Chapter 7.9, subsequent Tier 2 project analysis will focus on project-specific issues, including National Heritage Areas.
Businger_Jo	With through service [at the North-South Rail Link] it's the only way to meet the clean air objectives that were really enunciated in the Clean Air amendments, I believe, of 1990, and then the ISTE of 1991.	The North South Rail Link was not included in the No Action Alternative Project List (see Volume 2, Appendix B, No Action Alternative Report in the Tier 1 Final EIS) because it does not meet the criteria for consideration: Funded projects or projects with approved funding plans, funded or unfunded mandates, unfunded projects necessary to keep the railroad running. Likewise, North South Rail Link was not included in the Alternatives because it does not meet the criteria for consideration which are: fully or partially funded projects located in a connecting corridor and not on the NEC; unfunded projects along the NEC with ongoing or completed NEPA/PE; fully or partially funded transit (e.g., NJ TRANSIT, MTA-LIRR) or freight projects located off of but connecting to the NEC. A new project, such as North South Rail Link, could be studied separately, and is not precluded as future investment. As described in the Tier 1 Final EIS, the Preferred Alternative would have a beneficial effect on air quality, with a net decrease in emissions of criteria pollutants and greenhouse gases.
Buttrick_Br	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.	The FRA addressed potential effects of the alternatives on ecological resources, including ecologically sensitive habitats, essential fish habitat and federally listed Threatened and Endangered Species (Tier 1 Final EIS Volume 2, Chapter 7.6). The effects-assessment methodology describing how ecological resources were evaluated for the Tier 1 EIS is provided in (Tier 1 Final EIS Volume 2, Appendix E.06). Site-specific effects on ecological resources will be evaluated during Tier 2 project analysis.
Cahouet_Ka	This proposal would have a devastatingly negative effect on the wildlife and history of the connecticut river and it's surrounding towns.	The FRA recognizes the concerns raised by communities regarding various wildlife refuges, protected species, and other ecologically sensitive areas in proximity to the existing NEC and Action Alternatives. The FRA has considered input such as this in identifying a Preferred Alternative. The Tier 1 Final EIS Volume 1, Chapter 4 describes the Preferred Alternative.
Callan_Ly	It seems ill advised to have high speed rail lines going through Historic Districts. Historic Districts have a slower pace, and it is incongruous placement.	Cultural resources and historic properties, including historic districts, are some of the many factors that the FRA considered in identifying a Preferred Alternative. The FRA has worked with State Historic Preservation Offices in the Study Area and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation to develop a Programmatic Agreement (PA) for NEC FUTURE. This PA will ensure that continued evaluation and consideration of cultural resources and historic properties resources is undertaken as the program advances into subsequent Tier 2 project studies.
Campos_Ga	This proposed rail through marshes in low coastal areas is shortsighted at best! The projections on sea -level rising have been proven...the positioning would make veey difficult for long term use...Furthermore the marshes help protect surrounding communities from more flooding and erosion...Not to mention the ecological impact on burds of prey that are protectwd and nest along that area. In my estimation this is very bad long term planning.	The FRA considered the potential for effects to floodplains, coastal zones, saltwater wetlands, and ecologically sensitive habitats, and the effects of sea level rise for current and future years in identifying a Preferred Alternative. Volume 1, Chapter 7 describes the effects of the Preferred Alternative on these resources and identifies areas of the Preferred Alternative vulnerable to sea level rise.
Carlson_Iz	This threatens Connecticut wildlife	The FRA recognizes the concerns raised by communities regarding various wildlife refuges, protected species, and other ecologically sensitive areas in proximity to the existing NEC and Action Alternatives. The FRA has considered input such as this in identifying a Preferred Alternative. The Tier 1 Final EIS Volume 1, Chapter 4 describes the Preferred Alternative.

Table JJ–13: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Environmental Resources (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Caruso_Ni	Any new segment in Connecticut will likely lead to the older redundant segment being converted into a greenway. The towns and state gov have a low level of tolerance when it comes to funding, maintaining, and working around rail lines.	The Preferred Alternative does not abandon the existing NEC right-of-way, which will continue to serve passenger and/or freight rail. Moreover, the Preferred Alternative provides physical improvements and upgrades along the existing NEC right-of-way.
Carver_Ga	The corridor goes through too many wildlife refuges and other natural and environmentally sensitive areas. The environmental impact statement does not adequately reflect the negative impact.	The existing NEC traverses multiple National Wildlife Refuges. FRA considered possible additional effects on National Wildlife Refuges resulting from the Action Alternatives and has identified a Preferred Alternative that minimizes direct impacts to National Wildlife Refuges. See Volume 1, Chapter 7.4 for more discussion on effects to these resources.
Cassidy_Ja	Please provide a clear, concise explanation of current difficulties with providing resilience along the coastal route that necessitates the new segment.	<p>The FRA recognizes the potential impacts caused by climate change (including sea level rise) on the coastline and rail infrastructure; therefore, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative route that improves resiliency on the NEC and provides for redundant infrastructure in areas most vulnerable to the effects of climate change. Volume 1, Chapter 7.15, provides additional information on climate change considerations of the Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>Existing coastal segments of the NEC may not have been designed to withstand projected future conditions—given climate change and sea level rise—which would reduce resilience along some stretches of coastal segments. Volume 2, Table 7.15-5, lists the risks each asset class faces from climate change impacts and potential adaptation actions relevant to each asset class that could be considered to improve resiliency along the existing coastal segments. In some areas, upgrading the coastal route to be more resilient may not be sufficient to support functional rail service, especially in areas prone to increased inundation by seawater or riverine flooding. Providing redundant track outside of the high risk areas supplies alternative routing in the event that coastal segments are closed due to flooding. This redundancy allows some level-of-service to be maintained.</p>
Castellan_Su	global warming will have strong future impact on coastwise infrastructure.	<p>As discussed in Volume 2, Chapter 7.15, areas that are currently at risk from the effects of climate change, including sea level rise and increased storm severity, are predicted to experience worsening conditions. Each Action Alternative considered adaptation measures that could be undertaken to make the existing NEC more resilient.</p> <p>The FRA recognizes the potential impacts caused by climate change (including sea level rise) on the coastline and rail infrastructure; therefore, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative route that improves resiliency on the NEC and provides for redundant infrastructure in areas most vulnerable to the effects of climate change.</p>
Caulfield_Sh	The charm and history of these towns will be Forever lost.as well as the economic.In particula Real estate and tourists.It would be devastating.to This region	The FRA considered effects on the built and natural environment in identifying the Preferred Alternative. Volume 1, Chapter 7 identifies the potential impacts on the built and natural environment within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process. Subsequent Tier 2 project studies will provide analysis of potential impacts and identify appropriate mitigation, in coordination with the communities and regulating agencies.
Chaucer_Ti	Common sense dictates that this would be a massive waste of taxpayer money and have a huge and detrimental effect on this L.I.Sound estuary. Milford Harbor is one of the few harbors without a RR bridge at the entrance making it a special harbor for sailing vessels. It is also a State designated Wildlife Refuge since 1931. See Milford Refuge Act. Long Island Sound should not be traversed by tunnels or bridges. It is a rich estuary filled with wildlife including marine mammals, avian life, and invertebrate life. We must not worry about speeding up. As humans, we must slow down and enjoy the wild places we are blessed to have in Connecticut.	The Preferred Alternative avoids any crossing impacts to the Long Island Sound. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative. Tier 2 analysis will further evaluate the potential effects of the Preferred Alternative on ecological resources.

Table JJ–13: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Environmental Resources (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Childs_Ha	Is the FRA prepared to buy my house, in addition to all other homes this railroad would impact?	As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure or alignments. Such decisions are made as part of the Tier 2 project studies, which will include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate. Consistent with this process, the FRA developed Representative Routes for the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative, which provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the effects of each Alternative. Representative Routes define an envelope within which improvements might occur and whose location and construction type could change during subsequent Tier 2 project studies. Implementation of the Preferred Alternative includes the potential for acquisition or displacements. Tier 2 project analysis will identify any necessary acquisitions, temporary easements, and displacements, and would require compliance with the Uniform Relocation Act.
Comins_Pa	This is a massive undertaking, and while we can appreciate the potential reduction in carbon emissions by promoting mass transit, at the same time, the scope of these infrastructure proposals and the uncertainties associated with the planning present some significant potential concerns about negative impacts to wildlife and habitat, such as Audubon's important bird areas, wetlands, grasslands, forest interior habitats and other key habitats.	The FRA considered effects on the built and natural environment in identifying the Preferred Alternative. Volume 1, Chapter 7 identifies the potential impacts on the built and natural environment within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process. Subsequent Tier 2 project studies will provide analysis of potential impacts and identify appropriate mitigation, in coordination with the communities and regulating agencies.
Comins_Pa	At what grade would the tracks be going through the Bent of the River area in Southbury?... I notice that the Audubon Center at Bent of the River seems to be right in the middle of the route. That's an important bird area and really an amazing place in Connecticut.	The Tier 1 Final EIS Volume 2, Appendix A (Part 2) maps identify Alternative 3 as operating primarily in a tunnel within this area of Connecticut; however, the Preferred Alternative identified by FRA does not cross this portion of Connecticut.
Comins_Pa	And can the surface portion which is proposed through Paugussett State Forest, Lake Lillinonah and George Waldo State Park be avoided by continuing that as a tunnel?	The Preferred Alternative avoids any impacts to Paugussett State Forest, Lake Lillinonah and George Waldo State Park. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative.
Comins_Pa	What would the impacts to the acreage of forest interior habitat be, which is likely to be far larger than the actual footprint acreage of forest habitat?	The FRA considered the potential for forest habitat fragmentation in the analysis presented in Volume 2, Chapters 7.1-7.4 and 7.6. The Tier 1 EIS acknowledges that one of the greatest environmental effects is the potential for land conversions of undeveloped land to developed land, which could result in the "loss or fragmentation of ecological resources." Undeveloped land captures a variety of undeveloped land cover categories, including forested lands. The FRA did not make any conclusions regarding the extent of fragmentation that would occur as a result of implementation of any of the Action Alternatives since the environmental effects analysis was based on Representative Routes and service plans. Tier 2 project analysis will further evaluate the potential effects of the Preferred Alternative on ecological habitats and potential fragmentation of habitats.
Comins_Pa	Can the fragmentation of Natchaug State Forest, which is a very important habitat for cerulean warblers, a globally vulnerable species, can that be avoided?	FRA identified a Preferred Alternative that does not include the Representative Route between Hartford, CT and Providence, RI and therefore does not fragment Natchuag State Forest. The Ecological Resources methodology (Volume 2, Appendix E.06, Tier 1 Final EIS), explains that the FRA addresses potential effects of the alternatives on ecological resources, including federally listed Threatened and Endangered Species. The Cerulean Warbler is not a federally listed Threatened and Endangered Species.
Comins_Pa	Have you taken into account the impacts to private, NGO and municipal open space, or only state parklands and other state lands as well, like state forests and wildlife management areas?	In keeping with the Tier 1 level of assessment, the FRA identified only federal, state, and county parklands. The FRA states in Volume 2, Chapter 7.4, that information regarding municipal and local parklands and recreational facilities will be collected during subsequent Tier 2 project analysis. This text also clarifies that subsequent Tier 2 project analysis will evaluate privately held recreational or preservation lands.

Table JJ–13: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Environmental Resources (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Comins_Pa	What would be the impacts to state-listed species from this plan in Connecticut?	Based on federal regulations and consistent with a Tier 1 level of assessment, the FRA assessed effects on Federally-listed Threatened and Endangered Species within the Ecological Resources effects assessment (see Volume 1, Chapter 7.6, Ecological Resources). The assessment identifies species listed by the USFWS for counties that are crossed by the Preferred Alternative, and the assessment does determine effects on those species. Subsequent Tier 2 project studies will evaluate the effects of Federally-listed species, and as appropriate consider the effects on to state-listed species. Coordination with federal and state agencies with jurisdiction over protected species will continue for each Tier 2 project study.
Comins_Pa	Would this proposed route be going at the surface through the Connecticut Audubon Society's Bafflin Sanctuary in Pomfret? It appears to from the maps. That is one of 27 recognized important bird areas in the state.	The Connecticut Audubon Society's Bafflin Sanctuary in Pomfret is within the 3,000-foot-wide Affected Environment of Alternative 2, but is not within the Representative Route of Alternative 2. Bafflin Sanctuary is not within the Affected Environment of the Preferred Alternative.
Court-Ta	...need for more detail on the specific proposals. For example, along the existing right-of-way, are you going outside the right-of-way, or how much right-of-way is being acquired? Those are the things that we just are unable to determine from the document.	As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure or alignments. Such decisions are made as part of the Tier 2 project studies, which will include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate. Consistent with this process, the FRA developed Representative Routes for the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative, which provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the effects of each Alternative. Representative Routes define an envelope within which improvements might occur and whose location and construction type could change during subsequent Tier 2 project studies. See Volume 1, Chapter 4, for the description of the Preferred Alternative.
Curson_Da	The 2,000-ft-wide affected rail corridor in Alternative 3 does not adequately take into account indirect effects to habitat quality and function including habitat fragmentation and isolation, loss of forest interior, and degradation through increased noise and vibration. Increased rail traffic and speeds will also increase wildlife strikes and mortality. All of these factors play heavily into the quality of bird habitat and the viability of bird populations.	The Affected Environment for ecological resources is 3,000 feet wide, with 1,500 feet spanning either side of the center line of the train tracks. The FRA considered the potential for habitat fragmentation and the effects of noise and vibration on species/habitats (Tier 1 Final EIS Volume 2, Chapters 7.1 through 7.4 and 7.6). The potential for wildlife strikes and mortality related to increased rail traffic and speeds would be more appropriate analyzed during subsequent Tier 2 project analysis for site specific locations.
Davis_Ha	The addition of a new bridge will block views along the Connecticut River View Corridor. Since the span will rise 71 feet, it will tower over the treetops and thus views will be blocked for adjacent property owners and those with sight lines of the treetops surrounding the bridge. This is also true for me with the old bridge.	Specific design features and engineering were not completed for the Action Alternatives or the Preferred Alternative in the Tier 1 EIS. Further evaluation of visual and aesthetic elements, along with detailed design and engineering will be considered during subsequent Tier 2 project studies in order to minimize impacts on these resources.
Davis_Ha	Fixed railway operations have the potential to produce high vibration and noise levels. Expanding the track area to virgin ground, will expand the volume of noise levels and exposed high vibration to residents. This is an environmental injustice since they have not been exposed at these elevated levels in the past. Since most of this virgin rail will travel adjacent to less expensive property along interstate 95, environmental justice areas will result in a disproportionately high and adverse effects on low-income populations of people exposed to high vibration and noise levels. Thus not achieving the Goal 3 to minimize permanent and temporary impacts to the surrounding environment.	Fixed guideway railway operations do have the potential to produce noise and vibration effects. The Tier 1 Final EIS Volume 2, Chapter 7.12 describes the noise and vibration analysis performed for the Action Alternatives. The Environmental Justice (EJ) discussion presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS does not include an assessment of disproportionate and adverse effects on EJ populations. Subsequent Tier 2 project analysis will assess site specific effects to determine whether or not disproportionate or adverse effects would occur to EJ populations.
Davis_Ha	Virgin land area will be exposed to higher levels of pollutants. The new tracks will be placed on land that has not before seen railroad tracks. The construction and future maintenance of the track will cause the land to become polluted. Trains using the tracks will deposit pollutants such as oils, grease and debris onto the tracks. Chemicals will be used to control vegetation on the tracks. Consolidating the tracks could consolidate the pollution and minimize the usage of chemicals. Thus not achieving the Goal 3 to minimize permanent and temporary impacts to the surrounding environment.	The FRA recognizes concerns about the conversion of undeveloped land to rail use and the potential for related pollution. During subsequent Tier 2 project studies, additional analysis will be undertaken to more thoroughly identify risks for contamination in areas where land conversions may occur. Site-specific mitigation and best management practices will be identified during future stages of project development to minimize pollution risks during construction and operation.

Table JJ–13: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Environmental Resources (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Davis_Ha	Virgin land area will be exposed to additional pollutants and those pollutants could pollute drinking water. Since many home in Old Lyme use private well and community well for fresh drinking water, any pollutants entering the water supply could put our drinking water supply in jeopardy. Thus not achieving the Goal 3 to minimize permanent and temporary impacts to the surrounding environment.	The FRA recognizes concerns about the conversion of undeveloped land to rail use and the potential for related pollution. During subsequent Tier 2 project studies, additional analysis will be undertaken to more thoroughly identify potential contamination risks where drinking water supplies exist. Site-specific mitigation and best management practices will be identified during future stages of project development to minimize pollution risks to drinking water supplies during construction and operation.
Davis_Sa	The two-story trains are hazardous, not a good idea. Single-level like the LakeShore Limited is far better.	Specific details about train equipment have not been evaluated as part of the Tier 1 EIS process. Train equipment will be considered in more detail as part of subsequent Tier 2 project studies.
DeMent-Ta	An aspect of the NEC that is often overlooked is the condition of the landscape surrounding a rail corridor, especially as it enters major cities through old manufacturing corridors. Historically manufacturers, warehouses, transfer companies, etc. built facilities next to rail corridors. With the decline of these industries in cities these properties have been abandoned or at best have fallen into disrepair. This creates a modern day visual experience of blight that does not represent all of the great things happening in cities that are going through transformations. A prime example of this is Philadelphia... Visually the NEC through Philadelphia might dissuade investors... Is there an opportunity within the NEC Future's scope to address visual blight and work in partnership to improve and invest in the visual experience of commuters, tourists, business people, etc. ?	NEC FUTURE is a high-level planning study that will define a long-term vision for the NEC and develop a phased investment program to increase mobility and help maintain the economic vitality of the Northeast region. Addressing specific locations of visual blight along the corridor, are more appropriately addressed by the localities as part of local design and review processes.
Denorio_La	how will these towns be affected, please be specific	The Tier 1 Final EIS follows a "tiered" approach to environmental review under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). A Tier 1 NEPA review focuses on broad programmatic analysis. However, the FRA included discussion in the Tier 1 Final EIS on the potential effects of growth, indirect effects, and cumulative effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 6 and Chapter 7.20 for a discussion of these effects for the Preferred Alternative. Subsequent Tier 2 project studies will focus on site-specific analysis; specific effects on communities will occur as part of Tier 2 analysis.
DiCamillo_Jo	I recognize that with the upgrades in the transportation system, travel time will be reduced between the cities of New York and Boston, making travel easier and faster for future commuters. But have you really considered the future of the small communities that lie between them? The savings in time will come at a tremendous cost to our villages, neighborhoods and natural resources.	The FRA evaluated travel time savings in identifying a Preferred Alternative (Volume 2, Chapter 5, Transportation Effects and Chapter 6, Economic Effects and Growth and Indirect Effects) and effects on the built and natural environment (Volume 2, Chapter 7, Environmental Consequences) in identifying a Preferred Alternative.
Dimmling_Le	As a resident of Garden City I am very deeply disturbed by the proposal to send a third rail line through my community. Garden City sits in the midst one of the most heavily trafficked areas of all of Long Island. The last thing that is needed here is to play havoc with car traffic and pedestrian safety with yet more rail crossings. In addition, having another rail line and it's attendant noise so close to populated residential property raises the very real dangers presented by possible rail accidents and noise pollution to the local population.	The FRA noted the concerns expressed about the impact of Alternative 3 through Long Island. The Preferred Alternative does not include this route. The FRA considered the potential for effects related to noise and vibration (Volume 2, Chapter 7.12), safety (Volume 2, Chapter 7.18) and public health (Volume 2, Chapter 7.19).
Dixon_Ry	The SWPN group would like to express concern with the two proposed alternative rail alignments through Wilmington, Delaware between the Christina River crossings. We feel both proposed alignments would create an unfair burden on Southbridge by detracting from the social, health, economic, and environmental well-being of the community.	As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure or alignments. Such decisions are made as part of the Tier 2 project planning processes, which would include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate. Consistent with this process, the FRA developed Representative Routes for the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative, which provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the effects of each Alternative. Representative Routes define an envelope within which improvements might occur and whose location and construction type could change during subsequent Tier 2 project-level reviews.
Dixon_Ry	This burden would be more acutely felt given that residents of this environmental justice community (along with many residents of Delaware, generally) would not directly benefit from the high-speed rail right-of-way given the likely high costs of using the service, and because no stop is planned in Delaware.	The representative service plan for the Preferred Alternative includes improved Intercity-Express, Intercity-Corridor, and Regional rail services to Wilmington, DE. This range of services will be offered with a range of pricing. Volume 2, Chapter 6 of the Tier 1 Final EIS discusses the range of pricing.

Table JJ–13: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Environmental Resources (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Eagan_Ow	I feel that the plan should be adjusted to mitigate the negative environmental impacts to the ecosystems of New England,especially within the area of New London County. As the NEC FUTURE 's Tier 1 Draft Environmental Impact Statement notes the construction as it is currently proposed would result in [m]ore than 250 acres of floodplain impacts and more than 60 acres of saltwater wetland impacts in New London County. As these wetland and floodplain areas are important habitats for numerous species, including the threatened Snowy Egret and Great Egret, which I have often seen in the area, I feel that the Alternative 1 plan must be adjusted to preserve these environments. Moreover, the Alternative 1 plan possibly violates the Coastal Zone Management Act, and by that mark, it may be invalid in its current form.	The FRA will adhere to all federal and state regulations and requirements defined by the Coastal Zone Management Act as well as the Endangered Species Act. As planning for the program progresses, Tier 2 project studies will focus in on site-specific design, effects, permitting, and mitigation.
Ellis_Mi	I believe this would be a safety issue, and would only add to an area that is already congested with traffic.	As described in Volume 2, Chapter 7.18, Safety, subsequent Tier 2 project studies would include all necessary analysis and coordination with the FRA to ensure that any improvements associated with the Preferred Alternative would be consistent with existing and proposed safety standards and regulations.
Eppenstein_Ma	Oddly enough, with all its hype about the virtues of high speed rail, the NEC Future, Tier 1 Draft EIS promotional material fails to identify fully, much less assess the significant environmental, human and other "impacts" that are the likely consequences of imposing NEC Alternative 3 on Scarsdale. The potential harms include, but are not limited to, adverse effects involving noise, vibration, pollutants, damage to sensitive environmental wetland and watershed areas, prope1iy values, vehicular traffic, parking, existing rail infrastructure and other harmful disruptions to nearby residential and commercial properties. The NEC Future promotional material is also silent about what and whether specific mitigation procedures would be available or even possible to implement in order to avoid or reduce these potentially hazardous and/or disruptive impacts of a high speed rail line through Scarsdale.	<p>The FRA considered effects on the built and natural environment in identifying the Preferred Alternative. Volume 1, Chapter 7 identifies the potential impacts on the built and natural environment within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process. Subsequent Tier 2 project studies will provide a complete analysis of potential impacts and identify appropriate mitigation, in coordination with the communities and regulating agencies.</p> <p>Impacts on specific communities were not necessarily identified in the Tier 1 EIS. Given the size and scope of the Tier 1 EIS, FRA summarized data in the main body of the document and provided greater detail in the supporting appendix material for each topic area. In some instances, communities were called out as an example of where certain effects may occur or to note a particularly sensitive feature.</p>
Farwell_An	And I would just like to follow up on Mike Piscitelli's statement about the importance of investing in cities... Another aspect of that that could be related to the part of your report on historic resources, there isn't something specific, where you outline historic resources being impacted, but you could say that if you bypassed or did not continue to upgrade service to the state's historic cities, they continue to fall apart. New Haven, I think, has 13 national registered districts; it's almost the whole city. So not bringing good service -- we were built by the railroad and by the port, and what has destroyed our city and we're trying to undo is basically the highways. So one of the best ways of maintaining these historic resources was the scale built by the railroad.	The FRA recognizes the importance of maintaining urban centers and smaller cities. In light of this and other comments, the FRA considered the influence of railroads and the benefits of improved rail service to historic urban centers in Volume 1, Chapter 7.9. As described in Volume 1, Chapter 4, the Preferred Alternative provides improved passenger rail service to those historic cities located along the existing NEC.
Fernandez_We	Regarding Action Alternative 3 - NY/LI route It appears that acquisitions of land would stretch for a 1/2 mile wide swath centered on the right of way that ... parallel as the MTA/LIRR right of way to the south via the Hempstead branch. What is to be done through the very densely pouplated areas of Western Nassau County and Queens? I live in the village of Floral Park. It is approximately 1/4 mile square and the proposed route runs through the center of my town -- or former town because by the time the MTA/LIRR does the expansion on the main line to the north, our village will effectively be eliminated to become a rail hub. Relocation in this area will be nearly impossible.	The FRA noted the views expressed about the impact of Alternative 3 through Long Island. The Preferred Alternative does not include this route; rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative is provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4. It should also be noted that as part of Tier 2 project analysis any required property acquisition will be identified, and all such actions will comply with the Uniform Relocation Act.
Fernandez_We	And it's unfortunate there aren't more details about the land acquisition because and once again, as a resident of Floral Park, on your map, unfortunately your red line runs right over my house. And that would be a concern because in discussing relocations, once again, in a highly, very densely populated area, where are people to go? I	The FRA noted the views expressed about the impact of Alternative 3 through Long Island. The Preferred Alternative does not include this route; rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative is provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4. However, the Preferred Alternative includes the potential for acquisitions or displacements at other locations. As part of the Tier 2 project analysis, socioeconomic effects and any necessary acquisitions, temporary easements, and displacements would be identified, and compliance with the Uniform Relocation Act will be required.

Table JJ–13: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Environmental Resources (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Forte_St	1. Safety. Running such trains through the heart of heavily populated villages along a good part of Long Island creates strong possibilities for major accidents and loss of life at all crossings. The proposed rail would run in the close proximity of Grade and other Schools. How many children would have to lose their lives to understand this project is faulted? 2. It may be speculative but most probably true that there will be freight traffic as well. Some of the freight will without doubt contain HazMats and it would be criminal to run such materials through heavily populated area. The idea of accidents occurring due to either mechanical malfunctions or human errors is not IF but WHEN . It is inevitable.	Safe operation of passenger and freight rail systems is a critical element of the FRA’s mission and is an important consideration in the planning and development of rail corridors. In light of these and other considerations, the Preferred Alternative does not include the Long Island routing as proposed in Alternative 3. Rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative is provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Gail	We must never destroy prime farm land ;as if we have not done a vast destruction to our food supply already. Please use forest, swamps, an cities before farmland. Thank you, Gail.	The FRA minimized impacts to prime farmland to the maximum extent possible through the alternatives planning process. Subsequent Tier 2 project analysis by other project sponsors will further define the effects to prime farmland and timberland.
Gaudio_Ra	CFE is especially concerned about the lack of definite information concerning specific environmental costs. Sweeping and vague characterizations of environmental impacts are not acceptable for a project that has the potential to destroy various ecosystems along almost 500 miles of the eastern seaboard. The most affected areas on the entire route lie in Connecticut and Rhode Island. These two states could have thousands of acres of undeveloped land, water, and mineral resources put in danger, as well as hundreds of terrestrial and aquatic species many of which are threatened or endangered.1 Furthermore, the DEIS doesn 't address where a Connecticut River crossing for the rail would go in any of the Alternatives. The building of a bridge will substantially effect the surrounding environment and the area downstream. Such a gaping hole in the DEIS is not acceptable.	The FRA prepared this Tier 1 Final EIS in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended (42 U.S.C. 4321–4327 and 40 C.F.R. Parts 1500–1508) (NEPA), and other applicable laws and regulations. This document is part of a “tiered” NEPA review as provided for in the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) NEPA implementing regulations. “Tiering” allows an agency, such as the FRA, to focus on the information available and issues relevant to the decision to be made at each level of environmental review. The environmental review for NEC FUTURE includes a Tier 1 (or programmatic) review that broadly assesses environmental impacts. Subsequent, more-detailed environmental reviews by the FRA and other federal agencies on specific project-level elements (Tier 2) will incorporate and reference the decisions and analyses conducted as part of this Tier 1 review.
Gaudio_Ra	The Long Island Sound crossing in Alternative 3, and the lack of any meaningful environmental analysis of the impacts, is particularly alarming. Long Island Sound is an irreplaceable resource and is responsible for an estimated \$17-36 billion of economic activity in the region annually.2 The proposed tunnel in Alternative 3 can potentially cause substantial disruption to natural resources, including water, land, wetlands, and wildlife... Additionally, the Sound contains 1,200 invertebrate species, 170 fish species, and dozens of migratory bird species.4	The FRA prepared this Tier 1 Final EIS in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended (42 U.S.C. 4321–4327 and 40 C.F.R. Parts 1500–1508) (NEPA), and other applicable laws and regulations. This document is part of a “tiered” NEPA review as provided for in the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) NEPA implementing regulations. “Tiering” allows an agency, such as the FRA, to focus on the information available and issues relevant to the decision to be made at each level of environmental review. The environmental review for NEC FUTURE includes a Tier 1 (or programmatic) review that broadly assesses environmental impacts. Subsequent, more-detailed environmental reviews by the FRA and other federal agencies on specific project-level elements (Tier 2) will incorporate and reference the decisions and analyses conducted as part of this Tier 1 review. Using the analysis presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS and public feedback, FRA has not included the crossing of the Long Island Sound associated with Alternative 3 as part of the Preferred Alternative. For more detail on the Preferred Alternative, see Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Gaudio_Ra	While the climate and ridership benefits of Alternative 3 could be significant, the costs-both environmental and economic-are enormous and of a different magnitude. Overall, this alternative has the greatest impact on Ecologically Sensitive Habitat (ESH) and will affect prime timberlands, floodplains, prime farmland, coastal zones, and wetlands. The route would also pass through areas with high concentrations of hazardous waste and contaminated material sites.	The FRA considered effects on the built and natural environment in identifying the Preferred Alternative. Volume 1, Chapter 7 identifies the potential impacts on the built and natural environment within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process. Subsequent Tier 2 project studies will provide analysis of potential impacts and identify appropriate mitigation, in coordination with the communities and regulating agencies.
Gaudio_Ra	Another area requiring additional assessment is the possibility of utilizing green infrastructure along the rail corridor. Green infrastructure offers pollution mitigation, flood control, and resiliency opportunities along the rail line. Surprisingly, the DEIS does not evaluate such best management practices. We request that these opportunities be fully explored in the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS).	As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure or alignments, construction methods or materials, or mitigation. Numerous best management practices such as green infrastructure are addressed in Volume 1, Chapter 7 as part of the mitigation measures and subsequent Tier 2 analysis. Such decisions will be made as part of Tier 2 project studies.
Gauthier_Gr	Finally you're putting the New London/Mystic station on the Groton land fill which is on a cow-path sized road that does not have highway access!	Station locations identified for the Action Alternatives are intended to be representative of markets to be served. Final station locations will be determined as part of the Tier 2 project studies. During the Tier 2 project analysis, factors such as roadway access and environmental features will be considered in determining station siting.

Table JJ–13: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Environmental Resources (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Glennon_Ta	I am concerned about the shoreline impact of the LI tunnel ending in Milford. This is already a vulnerable area (see Superstorm Sandy data).	The Preferred Alternative does not include a tunnel across the Long Island Sound which reduces potential impacts to hydrologic resources in the Long Island Sound. See the Tier 1 Final EIS Volume 1 Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative. Subsequent Tier 2 project analysis will include a more detailed, site specific analysis and assessment of hydrologic resources and the potential effects of the Preferred Alternative.
Goetsch_Be	I oppose any cross sound tunnel or bridge construction that would negatively impact the shellfish resource of Long Island Sound, including any public or private shellfish grounds off the Connecticut coast. For instance, the state of Connecticut leases many thousands of acres of shellfish grounds to the aquaculture industry for the cultivation and rearing of shellfish such as clams and oysters. The shellfish resource held on these leases is the private property of the lessee and any impact on the shellfish resource, either directly or indirectly, from tunnel or bridge construction would most likely lead to legal action from the aquaculture industry. Likewise, damage to the public shellfish resource would deprive Connecticut residents from the ecosystem benefits these animals provide and the enjoyment received from the recreational harvesting of the resource in approved areas.	The FRA recognizes the concerns raised by communities regarding various wildlife refuges, protected species, and other ecologically sensitive areas, such as shellfish grounds, in proximity to the existing NEC and Action Alternatives. The FRA has considered input such as this in identifying a Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative does not include the segment of Alternative 3 that would have crossed the Long Island Sound via tunnel. The Tier 1 Final EIS Volume 1, Chapter 4 describes the Preferred Alternative.
Goldsmith_Ke	One major deficiencies is the failure of the EIS to assess the potential impacts of the alternatives on protected open space and conservation lands held by local governments and by non-profit organizations such as land trusts. A substantial percentage of the environmentally important lands in the study area are owned or managed by these entities in fee simple or as conservation easements. The EIS ... completely ignores the equally important areas owned by local governments and nonprofit organizations. No analysis of environmental impacts can be adequate without this information, even at the Tier 1 level.	The FRA based the environmental evaluations for the Tier 1 Draft EIS on Representative Routes and representative service data, using readily available resource information from federal and state agencies. Only data available at the same level of detail for all the jurisdictions in the multi-state study area were used to conduct analyses. All environmental analyses were completed using GIS tools; no field studies were conducted. The FRA considers this broad level of detail appropriate for the NEC FUTURE Tier 1 EIS given the large multi-state study area, the programmatic nature of the assessment, and the decisions being made. The FRA will not decide specific routing or service options through NEC FUTURE. Site-specific alignment and service requirements, as well as coordination and consultation with local agencies and organizations will occur as part of the Tier 2 project-level planning processes. Additionally, proposed construction types will be reviewed during Tier 2 project studies and modified to avoid or minimize effects where feasible. The Tier 1 Draft EIS specifically states that during subsequent Tier 2 analysis, further investigations of municipal and local parks will be required. Data collection and effects on non-profit or privately-owned protected open space and conservation lands will occur during Tier 2 project analyses. The FRA coordinated with the National Park Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service throughout the development of the methodological approach for evaluating effects on parklands. (See Volume 2, Appendix E.09, Environmental Resource Documentation)
Goldsmith_Ke	The second major deficiency is the lack of adequate analysis of the impact of the alternatives on unfragmented forest areas throughout the study area. Increasing forest fragmentation is generally agreed to be the most important negative environmental trend at the landscape level in the Northeast. ...The only reference to this critical subject is a brief mention in Chapter 7.6.3 that Connecticut is one of the geographically larger states with substantial tracts of contiguous forested and undeveloped land and therefore tends to have the most ecologically sensitive resources. There is no information given to determine the extent of fragmentation caused by each alternative or the consequence of such action at the landscape scale, in Connecticut or elsewhere. This is simply unacceptable.	The FRA considered the potential for forest habitat fragmentation in the analysis presented in the Tier 1 Final EIS Volume 2, Chapters 7.1-7.4 and 7.6. The Tier 1 EIS acknowledges that one of the greatest environmental effects is the potential for land conversions of undeveloped land to developed land, which could result in the "loss or fragmentation of ecological resources." Undeveloped land captures a variety of undeveloped land cover categories, including forested lands. The FRA did not make any conclusions regarding the extent of fragmentation that would occur as a result of implementation of any of the Action Alternatives since the environmental effects analysis was based on Representative Routes and service plans. The Tier 1 Final EIS follows a "tiered" approach to environmental review under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). A Tier 1 NEPA review focuses on broad programmatic analysis. Subsequent Tier 2 NEPA review by other project sponsors will focus on site-specific project proposals and their impacts; impacts and their avoidance or mitigation will occur as part of Tier 2 analysis. The Tier 1 Final EIS Volume 1, Chapter 1, contains more information on the tiered NEPA process.

Table JJ–13: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Environmental Resources (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Hale_Ro	I would imagine that utilizing an existing transportation right-of-way would minimize litigation risk.	As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure or alignments. Such decisions are made as part of the Tier 2 project studies, which will include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate. Consistent with this process, the FRA developed Representative Routes for the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative, which provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the effects of each Alternative. Representative Routes define an envelope within which improvements might occur and whose location and construction type could change during subsequent Tier 2 project studies. These representative routes utilized existing transportation corridors to the maximum extent practicable. Nevertheless, the Preferred Alternative includes the potential for acquisition or displacements within areas of existing transportation use. As part of the Tier 2 project analyses, socioeconomic effects and any necessary acquisitions, temporary easements, and displacements will be identified, and compliance with the Uniform Relocation Act will be required.
Hale_Ro	On the point of maximizing cost effectiveness, I would ask the decision makers to evaluate the possibility of using existing right-of-way where possible -- such as between Providence and Boston -- where the line that currently exists is electrified and supports, on much of the route, speeds of over 100 miles an hour and has room for expansion on both sides.	As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure or alignments. Such decisions are made as part of the Tier 2 project studies, which will include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate. Consistent with this process, the FRA developed Representative Routes for the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative, which provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the effects of each Alternative. Representative Routes define an envelope within which improvements might occur and whose location and construction type could change during subsequent Tier 2 project studies. These representative routes utilized existing transportation corridors to the maximum extent practicable. Between Providence and Boston, the Preferred Alternative includes new, two-track infrastructure within the existing NEC right-of-way as described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Hamer_Br	I have people, I mean, they're speeding right along that I travel with maybe four or five times on the train a day, just New Jersey Transit alone, all over the Tri-State area. I mean, so they get done with travel and they're saying I don't feel comfortable boarding the trains and they're saying oh, they're rattling and whatever and things of that nature. I'm saying if it's a comfortable ride, something that's going to be benefit for all, that we feel comfortable. This is the guarantee that's in that that we need to take into consideration and look forward to, you know, take into future consideration, future benefit on all our behalfs (sic). Not just talking about it but being about it, where we're safe and we feel comfortable. Sometimes things sound good, but they're not good until they're actually in effect.	Specific details about train equipment that address issues such as rider amenities have not been evaluated as part of the Tier 1 EIS process. Train equipment will be considered in more detail as part of subsequent Tier 2 project studies.
Hammerling_Er	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 sit 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. Additionally, just from the general locations of the new rail lines, we can tell that some alternatives will cross sections of our Blue-Blazed Hiking Trails, but without more detailed maps, we cannot tell what the impacts will be. These trails are considered Connecticut	The FRA developed the Action Alternatives and defined the Preferred Alternative at a programmatic level, focusing on corridor-wide solutions within the context of the Tier 1 EIS process. Consistent with this process, the FRA developed Representative Routes, which provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the environmental effects for each Action Alternative. Representative Routes define an envelope within which improvements might occur and whose location and construction type could change during subsequent Tier 2 analysis. The lines depicting the Action Alternatives and Preferred Alternative in the Mapping Atlases for Volumes 1 and 2 along with the scale chosen, are representative—intended to highlight environmental resources relative to the Representative Route of a particular alternative that is consistent with the level of detail found in the Tier 1 EIS. The Blue Blazed Hiking Trails are located in the vicinity of the Preferred Alternative. FRA states in Volume 1, Chapter 7.4, that subsequent Tier 2 project analysis will evaluate privately held recreational or preservation lands, and includes the Blue Blazed Hiking Trails an example of a resource that would be evaluated at that time. Other areas noted in the letter submitted for formal comment are located in Northeast Connecticut, which is not crossed by the Preferred Alternative.

Table JJ–13: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Environmental Resources (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Hammerling_Er	In 1997, the Connecticut general assembly set a goal of preserving 21% of the land area of Connecticut for open space. Alternatives 2 and 3, with their vast acreages for conversion, will likely result in a setback to this land conservation goal. These conservation resources increase the quality of life in the state and contribute over 1 billion dollars and 9,000 jobs a year. Putting a new railway right through the middle of these valuable public places will completely change them from quiet places of escape and solitude.	The FRA incorporated concerns regarding the loss of open space into their decision-making process. In light of these and other considerations, the Preferred Alternative does not include the referenced routing through Central Connecticut as proposed in Alternatives 2 and 3. Rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative is provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Hammerling_Er	One particular area that is of great concern is Northeast Connecticut, which is proposed to be traversed by Alternatives 2 & 3. This area 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 area was designated as part of the Last Green Valley National Heritage Corridor by Congress in 1994. ... 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 rates 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.	The FRA recognizes the concerns regarding the ecologically sensitive, forested, and agricultural areas along the corridor. After evaluating the results of the Tier 1 Draft EIS and public comment, FRA has identified a Preferred Alternative that does not include routing options between Hartford, CT and Providence, RI. Volume 1, Chapter 4 provides details regarding the Preferred Alternative.
Hammerling_Er	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.	The Tier 1 Final EIS follows a "tiered" approach to environmental review under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). A Tier 1 NEPA review focuses on broad programmatic analysis. Subsequent Tier 2 project studies will focus on site-specific analysis; field investigations will occur as part of Tier 2 analysis.
Hammerling_Er	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. When doing landowner outreach along our trails system, we often interact with over 20 landowners in less than one mile. 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.	As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure or alignments. Such decisions are made as part of the Tier 2 project studies, which will include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate. Consistent with this process, the FRA developed Representative Routes for the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative, which provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the effects of each Alternative. Representative Routes define an envelope within which improvements might occur and whose location and construction type could change during subsequent Tier 2 project studies. Implementation of the Preferred Alternative includes the potential for acquisition or displacements. Tier 2 project analysis will identify any necessary acquisitions, temporary easements, and displacements, and will require compliance with the Uniform Relocation Act. The cost and other effects of property acquisition were generally considered on a corridor-wide basis. The FRA considered such effects in its development of the Preferred Alternative.
Haven_Pa	I think it's critical that we look at -- when the evaluating the options that we look at the impacts on all of the modes of transportation in the corridor. So if we end up with, you know, a low-end alternative, if you will, that doesn't carry as much as capacity, it doesn't go as fast, will we need to build more roads? And what would be the environmental impact of that? Will we need to build airports or more runways, and what will be the impact of that? We need to look at all of the modes instead of just looking at it as a single mode in looking at the whole corridor. And I think that's critical.	NEC FUTURE is a passenger rail study. It considers how investment in passenger rail influences mode share. FRA did not conduct analysis to compare what other transportation investments would be needed in the absence of NEC FUTURE nor the environmental effects associated with other transportation investments.
Hinckley_Ch	Furthermore, this area is exceeding sensitive regarding T & D species.	In the Tier 1 Final EIS Volume 2, Chapter 7.6, the FRA considered effects on threatened and endangered species in identifying the Preferred Alternative. Subsequent Tier 2 project studies will conduct analysis and necessarily field investigations to confirm the absence or presence of protected species and their habitats.

Table JJ–13: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Environmental Resources (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Hishmeh_Li	Do not endanger the refuge by running a rail line through it. I support the Audubon position on this issue.	The FRA developed the Action Alternatives and defined the Preferred Alternative at a programmatic level, focusing on corridor-wide solutions within the context of the Tier 1 EIS process. Consistent with this process, the FRA developed Representative Routes, which provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the environmental effects for each Action Alternative. Representative Routes define an envelope within which improvements might occur and whose location and construction type could change during subsequent Tier 2 analysis. The lines depicting the Action Alternatives and Preferred Alternative in the Mapping Atlases for Volumes 1 and 2 along with the scale chosen, are representative—intended to highlight environmental resources relative to the Representative Route of a particular alternative that is consistent with the level of detail found in the Tier 1 EIS.
Holszanska_Ma	This option would destroy...the delicate biodiversity of CT River, and it's marshes.	The FRA recognizes the concerns raised by communities regarding various wildlife refuges, protected species, and other ecologically sensitive areas in proximity to the existing NEC and Action Alternatives. The FRA has considered input such as this in identifying a Preferred Alternative. The Tier 1 Final EIS Volume 1, Chapter 4 describes the Preferred Alternative.
Holt_Pa	The report acknowledges that the Old Lyme Historic District is included in the National Register of Historic Places, but it overlooks the fact that the Florence Griswold Museum , which is within 200 yards of the proposed re-routing, is a National historic Landmark that would be irreparably harmed by such a development.	Volume 2, Appendix E.09 (Cultural Resources and Historic Properties), identified effects to the Florence Griswold Museum in New London County as a National Historic Landmark from Alternative 1. Based on further conversations with representatives from Old Lyme and consideration of multiple comments received regarding the potential effects to the historic district, the construction type for the Old Saybrook to Kenyon segment associated with Alternative 1 was modified for the Preferred Alternative to reduce impacts. Effects of the Preferred Alternative on historic and visual resources in Middlesex and New London Counties are identified in Volume 1, Chapters 7.9 and 7.10. Resources identified, such as the Florence Griswold Museum, will be considered during subsequent Tier 2 project studies, where the lead agency will be responsible for Section 106 compliance, which will include defining a project-specific area of potential effects.
Hood_Ed	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.	The FRA recognizes the concerns regarding the ecologically sensitive, forested, and agricultural areas along the corridor. After evaluating the results of the Tier 1 Draft EIS and public comment, FRA has identified a Preferred Alternative that does not include routing options between Hartford, CT and Providence, RI. Volume 1, Chapter 4 provides details regarding the Preferred Alternative.
Hood_Ed	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.	The FRA considered the potential for forest habitat fragmentation in the analysis presented in Volume 2, Chapters 7.1-7.4 and 7.6. The Tier 1 EIS acknowledges that one of the greatest environmental effects is the potential for land conversions of undeveloped land to developed land, which could result in the "loss or fragmentation of ecological resources." Undeveloped land captures a variety of undeveloped land cover categories, including forested lands. The FRA did not make any conclusions regarding the extent of fragmentation that would occur as a result of implementation of any of the Action Alternatives since the environmental effects analysis was based on Representative Routes and service plans. Tier 2 project analysis will further evaluate the potential effects of the Preferred Alternative on ecological habitats and potential fragmentation of habitats.
Hood_Ed	...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.	The Tier 1 Final EIS follows a "tiered" approach to environmental review under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). A Tier 1 NEPA review focuses on broad programmatic analysis. Subsequent Tier 2 project studies will focus on site-specific analysis; field investigations will occur as part of Tier 2 analysis.

Table JJ–13: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Environmental Resources (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Humphries_Jo	I haven't had a chance to study the EIS. I hope that within the Environmental Impact Statement there is an estimation of the reduction in greenhouse gases from the different alternatives.	Changes in greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions were estimated for each of the Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative relative to the No Action Alternative. GHGs are predicted to decrease under all Action Alternatives, as well as the Preferred Alternative, in the year 2040 due to predicted shifts in mode choice as a result of implementing any of the Alternatives and predicted changes in renewable energy usage. The Tier 1 Final EIS, Volume 2, Chapter 7. 13 provides the analysis of the Action Alternatives; the Tier 1 Final EIS, Volume 1, Chapter 7.13 provides the analysis of the Preferred Alternative. See the Tier 1 Final EIS, Volume 1, Chapter 7.6 for the evaluation of ecological resources of the Preferred Alternative.
Hurley_Pa	impact on the environment	The FRA considered effects on the built and natural environment in identifying the Preferred Alternative. Volume 1, Chapter 7 identifies the potential impacts on the built and natural environment within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process. Subsequent Tier 2 project studies will provide analysis of potential impacts and identify appropriate mitigation, in coordination with the communities and regulating agencies.
Hutchinson_Na	in the Tier 1 EIS Appendix E.09 Cultural Resources and Historic Properties, the Table on Cultural Resources Data (page 7) INCORRECTLY states that the Environmental Consequences on Old Lyme Historic District are the same as existing NEC . This is not true: the new rail route as proposed in Alternative 1 would run through the heart of the Old Lyme Historic District and the town center, having significant adverse impacts on historic structures and the character of the town. In contrast, the existing northeast corridor (NEC) has a more southerly route through the Town of Old Lyme and does NOT run through the town center, nor does the existing NEC impact the Old Lyme Historic District.	The FRA revised the description of the Alternative 1 environmental consequences in Volume 2, Appendix E.09 (Cultural Resources and Historic Properties Data) to identify the effect of the Old Saybrook to Kenyon segment associated with Alternative 1 as an aerial structure in a new right-of-way. Based on further conversations with representatives from Old Lyme and consideration of multiple comments received regarding the potential effects to the historic district, the construction type for the Old Saybrook to Kenyon segment associated with Alternative 1 was modified for the Preferred Alternative to reduce impacts.
Johnson_Gl	And some of the information that I read, certain things I cannot agree with. Namely somebody pointed out the fact that to take the line from where it currently runs through Wilmington and then send it to where the freight line runs, it's kind of like counterproductive, because I know -- I work out at the shop, and when a huge storms come up the coast, it floods out.	As discussed in Volume 2, Chapter 7.15, each of the Action Alternatives considered adaptation measures that could be undertaken to make the existing NEC and any new segments more resilient to the effects related to climate change. During subsequent Tier 2 project studies, more-detailed analysis will be undertaken to understand project-specific flooding risks on rail infrastructure.
Kankanam Kapuge_Th	However, the scenic beauty of this tiny community should not be destroyed.UCONN is a one pack community with huge values in it.So the opening of this community to outside world should be done very carefully for the sake of students protection.	The FRA considered effects on the built and natural environment, including visual and aesthetic resources in identifying the Preferred Alternative. After evaluating the environmental impacts and costs, the FRA did not include the routing option between Hartford, CT and Providence, RI in the Preferred Alternative. However, the FRA recognizes the importance of strengthening markets in Connecticut, and as those markets mature with the improved service from the Preferred Alternative, revisiting the opportunity to connect markets is possible in the future.
Katherine	...more thought and time should be a requirement, especially when it impacts a historic community to such an extent.	Cultural resources and historic properties, including historic districts, are some of the many factors that the FRA considered in identifying a Preferred Alternative. The FRA has worked with State Historic Preservation Offices in the Study Area and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation to develop a Programmatic Agreement (PA) for NEC FUTURE. This PA will ensure that continued evaluation and consideration of cultural resources and historic properties resources is undertaken as the program advances into subsequent Tier 2 project studies.
Kelley_Sh	3 - the last remaining little bits of true wilderness left in the state are right along the proposed route and need to be left completely untouched.	The Tier 1 EIS acknowledges that one of the greatest environmental effects is the potential for land conversions of undeveloped land to developed land, which could result in the "loss or fragmentation of ecological resources." Undeveloped land captures a variety of undeveloped land cover categories, including forested lands. The FRA did not make any conclusions regarding the extent of fragmentation that would occur as a result of implementation of any of the Action Alternatives since the environmental effects analysis was based on Representative Routes and service plans. The FRA considered the potential for forest habitat fragmentation in the analysis presented in Volume 2, Chapters 7.1-7.4 and 7.6. Subsequent Tier 2 NEPA review by lead agencies will focus on site-specific project proposals and their impacts; impacts and their avoidance or mitigation will occur as part of Tier 2 analysis.

Table JJ–13: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Environmental Resources (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Kelly_Ja	Further, any plan that would basically decimate the historical or economic sections of any town should be immediately dropped as this would destroy much needed areas that can never be replaced.	The FRA considered effects on the built and natural environment in identifying the Preferred Alternative. Volume 1, Chapter 7 identifies the potential impacts on the built and natural environment within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process. Subsequent Tier 2 project studies will provide analysis of potential impacts and identify appropriate mitigation, in coordination with the communities and regulating agencies.
Koestner_Da	If you build on precious natural resources you should replant the forests you take down AND build wildlife bridges for their travel	Specific mitigation strategies, such as replanting, wetland mitigation, habitat enhancements, and wildlife crossings will be considered in Tier 2 project studies for the Preferred Alternative.
Kolesinskas_Ki	It is not clear if only Prime Farmland soils currently in agricultural use were considered in the analysis or the larger subset of soils that includes Prime, Statewide Important, and Locally Important soils in land uses that include all other non developed lands. A more complete analysis and compliance with FPPA requires these other categories be considered, not just Prime Farmland soils.	The FRA considered potential impacts to farmlands in the analysis presented in Volume 2, Chapter 7.3, by identifying soils qualifying as prime farmland (as defined by the U.S. Department of Agriculture). Applicable Tier 2 level project studies will further evaluate and identify active farms or areas designated as such; identify and consider state and locally important soils; and ensure that any effects identified will be undertaken in compliance with the Farmland Protection Policy Act.
Kolesinskas_Ki	The impacts on farm units (a farm is not just an agricultural field) and agricultural communities needs to be reviewed. Fragmentation by the rail of both individual farms and groups of farms can lead to difficulties in field operations, loss of agritourism potential, and disrupt the ingress and egress of products resulting in difficulties that then result in sale of the farms to non-farm uses.	The FRA has not identified specific farm units or potential fragmentation as part of the Tier 1 EIS. The FRA understands the potential adverse effects fragmentation can have on farmland and farm units. As such, the FRA has added text in Volume 1, Chapter 7.3, noting that evaluation and consideration of farmland fragmentation should be evaluated during subsequent Tier 2 project studies.
Kolesinskas_Ki	The impacts on farmland already protected by the State, municipalities and land trusts needs to be evaluated. These lands are critical to the agricultural land base.	As part of the Tier 1 EIS, the FRA identified areas where soils have been designated as prime or unique farmland within the Study Area and reviewed state and regional planning documents that identify agricultural areas. Consistent with a Tier 1 level of detail, the FRA analyzed readily available secondary source data in 2012 for the latest year in which a complete year of data was available, depending on the resource and availability of data, and did not conduct fieldwork. As such, the FRA did not specifically evaluate effects to local resources such as agricultural lands held in public or private land trust. Subsequent Tier 2 project analysis will evaluate specific effects on these lands, including potential conversion of farmland protected by public and private entities.
Kolesinskas_Ki	Alternatives 2&3 have the potential to not only directly fragment and convert Prime, Statewide, and Locally Important soils, but may indirectly result in farmland loss from sprawl development patterns accelerated by the Station locations and improvements. There is a high potential for this to happen with the stops in Danbury, Waterbury, and Storrs. There are not currently the planning tools in place to ensure that there is appropriate transit oriented development near these stations instead of creating sprawl development in outlying towns. Many of the towns within 1/2 hr drive of these stations have significant agriculture that would receive additional development pressure, and subsequent loss of farmland soils.	The FRA considered the effects of land conversion on undeveloped agricultural land in the Tier 1 EIS. The FRA understands that the effects of fragmentation and sprawl can result in adverse effects to farmland. In evaluating all of the benefits and effects for each of the Action Alternatives presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS (Volume 2, Chapters 4 and 9), the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative that does not pass through the communities of Danbury, Waterbury, or Storrs, CT. Volume 1, Chapter 4, provides additional information about the Preferred Alternative.
Lamperti_De	I have frequented this locations many times for Bird watching. Putting the NEC through is refuge would do irreparable harm to this wonderful refuge. Please consider another location.	The FRA recognizes the concerns raised by communities regarding various wildlife refuges and other ecologically sensitive areas in proximity to the existing NEC and Action Alternatives. The FRA has considered input such as this in identifying a Preferred Alternative. The Tier 1 Final EIS Volume 1, Chapter 4 describes the Preferred Alternative.
Lander_An	It is difficult to see exactly where the line is going(unless I go to the New London Library). I understand from the website that there are different plans and I amcompletely puzzled in studying them as they each have a lot of variations. Thefocus seems on the ecology and environment and the report itself says thatthere would be a definite negative impact on the local environment. Yet it is Alternate A???	As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure or alignments. Such decisions are made as part of the Tier 2 project planning processes, which would include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate. Consistent with this process, the FRA developed Representative Routes for the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative, which provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the effects of each Alternative. Representative Routes define an envelope within which improvements might occur and whose location and construction type could change during subsequent Tier 2 project-level reviews.

Table JJ–13: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Environmental Resources (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Leach_Ge	All of the Alternatives present negative impacts on important habitats for birds and wildlife. We hope action is taken to require a careful environmental review to avoid any environmental damage.	In accordance with the Ecological Resources methodology (Volume 2, Appendix E.06), the FRA addressed potential effects of the Action Alternatives on ecological resources, including federally listed Threatened and Endangered Species and critical habitats. Tier 2 analysis will further evaluate the potential effects of the Preferred Alternative on ecological resources.
Leach_Ge	Major impacts to several Important Bird Areas including the Connecticut Audubon Society's Bafflin Sanctuary in Pomfret, the Audubon Center at Bent of the River in Southbury, the Quinnipiac River Tidal Marsh in New Haven, and Mansfield Hollow State Park in Mansfield. Even if some of these areas are proposed to be tunnels there will likely be significant disruption of surface habitats and public access during construction and operational phases of the project.	The FRA based the environmental evaluations for the Tier 1 Draft EIS on Representative Routes and representative service data, using readily available resource information from federal and state agencies. Only data available at the same level of detail for all the jurisdictions in the multi-state study area were used to conduct analyses. All environmental analyses were completed using GIS tools; no field studies were conducted. The FRA considers this broad level of detail appropriate for the NEC FUTURE Tier 1 EIS given the large multi-state study area, the programmatic nature of the assessment, and the decisions being made. The FRA will not decide specific routing or service options through NEC FUTURE. Site-specific alignment and service requirements, as well as coordination and consultation with local agencies and organizations will occur as part of the Tier 2 project-level planning processes. Additionally, proposed construction types will be reviewed during Tier 2 project studies and modified to avoid or minimize effects where feasible. The Tier 1 Draft EIS specifically states that during subsequent Tier 2 analysis, further investigations of municipal and local parks will be required. Data collection and effects on non-profit or privately-owned protected open space and conservation lands will occur during Tier 2 project analyses. The FRA coordinated with the National Park Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service throughout the development of the methodological approach for evaluating effects on parklands. (See Volume 2, Appendix E.09, Environmental Resource Documentation)
Leach_Ge	There are questions as to what grade would the tracks be going through the Bent of the River Audubon Center in Southbury, CT. The topography is such that while the intent is to have this be underground it may have to come to the surface through the Pomperaug Valley. This would be unacceptable and violate deed restrictions related to the donation of the Audubon Center at Bent of the River to Audubon.	The Preferred Alternative does not include the north end routing option between New York and Hartford via Central Connecticut. Therefore, the Preferred Alternative does not impact the Audubon Center at Bent of the River Property.
Leach_Ge	Alternative 1 would have significant impacts on the tidal marshes of the lower Connecticut River, including a significant migratory roost for Tree Swallows that supports a high percentage of the eastern North American population of Tree Swallows in fall migration and includes some of the most important nesting habitat in the world for Saltmarsh Sparrows, a species of global conservation concern.	In accordance with the Ecological Resources methodology (Volume 2, Appendix E.06), the FRA addressed potential effects of the Action Alternatives on ecological resources, including federally listed Threatened and Endangered Species and critical habitats. Tier 2 analysis will further evaluate the potential effects of the Preferred Alternative on ecological resources.
Leach_Ge	The impacts to acreage of forest interior habitat that would be converted to edge, transitional or other non-interior classes is likely to be much larger than the footprint acreage directly affected. This impact is undefined in the draft EIS.	The FRA considered the potential for forest habitat fragmentation in the analysis presented in Volume 2, Chapters 7.1-7.4 and 7.6. The Tier 1 EIS acknowledges that one of the greatest environmental effects is the potential for land conversions of undeveloped land to developed land, which could result in the "loss or fragmentation of ecological resources." Undeveloped land captures a variety of undeveloped land cover categories, including forested lands. The FRA did not make any conclusions regarding the extent of fragmentation that would occur as a result of implementation of any of the Action Alternatives since the environmental effects analysis was based on Representative Routes and service plans. Tier 2 project analysis will further evaluate the potential effects of the Preferred Alternative on ecological habitats and potential fragmentation of habitats.
Leach_Ge	Alternatives 2 and 3 present an unacceptable fragmentation impact on important habitat for Cerulean Warblers at Natchaug State Forest.	FRA identified a Preferred Alternative that does not include the Representative Route between Hartford, CT and Providence, RI and therefore does not fragment Natchuag State Forest. The Ecological Resources methodology (Volume 2, Appendix E.06, Tier 1 Final EIS), explains that the FRA addresses potential effects of the alternatives on ecological resources, including federally listed Threatened and Endangered Species. The Cerulean Warbler is not a federally listed Threatened and Endangered Species.

Table JJ–13: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Environmental Resources (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Leach_Ge	Impacts to private, NGO and municipal open space, as well as impacts to state forests and wildlife management areas were not taken into account in the draft EIS.	For purposes of the Tier 1 EIS, FRA focused on obtaining readily available, second source data from Federal and state agencies to conduct the analysis for NEC FUTURE. This was done to provide consistency from state to state and across resources in developing the data sets and mapping. Private, NGO and municipal mapping will be reviewed and incorporated as appropriate during subsequent Tier 2 project studies.
Leach_Ge	Impacts to state-listed species and globally endangered, vulnerable, and near threatened species on the IUCN list were not taken into account in the draft EIS. This is particularly important for any potential negative impacts to Saltmarsh Sparrow, a species for which the Northeastern U.S. is a disproportionately important nesting area and a species that is already at high risk of extinction.	In accordance with the Ecological Resources methodology, Volume 2, Appendix E.06, the FRA addressed potential effects of the Action Alternatives on ecological resources, including federally listed Threatened and Endangered Species. The Saltmarsh Sparrow is not a federally listed Threatened and Endangered Species, but as a U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service "Bird of Conservation Concern," it will be considered with other sensitive species during subsequent Tier 2 project-level reviews.
Leach_Ge	We also strongly suggest that consideration be given to reducing existing tidal restrictions created by the existing rail lines as coastal routes are upgraded.	The FRA evaluated the effects of the Preferred Alternative on coastal zones and saltwater wetlands as part of its analysis on coastal resources (Volume 1, Chapter 7.5, Hydrologic/Water Resources). The FRA will adhere to all federal and state regulations and requirements defined by the Coastal Zone Management Act. The designated Lead Agency will incorporate detailed analyses and assessments as part of Tier 2 project analysis. The FRA evaluated existing conditions for the Northeast Corridor; however, site-specific routing or alignment will occur during Tier 2 project analysis.
Leach_Ge	... the details on specific impacts to habitats of importance to birds and other wildlife and on open space other than state or federal lands are very difficult to assess from the maps and text that are provided. This is a huge plan with major implications for Connecticut's habitats, open space, development patterns and our transportation network in the state. This project will impact tens of thousands of acres of habitat in Connecticut, in many cases converting critical and pristine habitat into rail infrastructure, with additional major fragmentation efforts on habitat in the state. The DEIS needs to do a better job of outlining resources such as NGO and municipal open space, open space owned by land trusts and other non-governmental organizations and private lands that may be protected under easement.	<p>The FRA considered the potential for forest habitat fragmentation in the analysis presented in Volume 2, Chapters 7.1-7.4 and 7.6. The Tier 1 EIS acknowledges that one of the greatest environmental effects is the potential for land conversions of undeveloped land to developed land, which could result in the "loss or fragmentation of ecological resources." Undeveloped land captures a variety of undeveloped land cover categories, including forested lands. The FRA did not make any conclusions regarding the extent of fragmentation that would occur as a result of implementation of any of the Action Alternatives since the environmental effects analysis was based on Representative Routes and service plans.</p> <p>In keeping with the Tier 1 level of assessment, the FRA identified only federal, state, and county parklands. The FRA states in Volume 2, Chapter 7.4, that information regarding municipal and local parklands and recreational facilities will be collected during subsequent Tier 2 project-level environmental assessments. Text in Volume 1 clarifies that Tier 2 analysis will evaluate privately held recreational or preservation lands.</p>
Leach_Ge	In 1997, the Connecticut General Assembly set a goal of preserving 21% of the land area (673,210 acres) of Connecticut for open space for public recreation and natural resource conservation and preservation. As of September 2014, the State, working with land trusts and other partners, has protected a total of 496,191 acres, or close to 15% of Connecticut's land area (The Connecticut Comprehensive Open Space Plan, The Green Plan , 2014-2019). Connecticut is 73% of the way toward achieving this open space preservation goal. ... for a list of open space lands that will be impacted by proposed routes. Both Alternatives 2 and 3, will likely result in a setback to Connecticut's land conservation goal as previously protected open space is converted and adjacent areas disrupted.	The FRA incorporated concerns regarding the loss of open space into their decision-making process. In light of these and other considerations, the recommended Preferred Alternative does not include the referenced routing through Central Connecticut as proposed in Alternatives 2 and 3. Rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative is provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The consideration of individual state land use plans is more clearly discussed in the Tier 1 Final EIS. It should also be noted that as part of Tier 2 project analysis, environmental effects of projects will be fully assessed.
Leach_Ge	While the DEIS does take into account the impacts of proposed rails on federal, state, and county parks and forests, it does not consider the 239,791 acres of protected municipal, not for profit, and water company lands in CT. See the chart at the end of this document for a list of open space lands that will be impacted by proposed routes.	Consistent with a Tier 1 level of detail, the FRA analyzed readily available secondary source data in 2012 for the latest year in which a complete year of data was available, depending on the resource and availability of data, and did not conduct fieldwork. As such, the FRA did not specifically evaluate effects to local protected municipal, not for profit, and water company lands. However, undeveloped land cover is considered in the National Land Cover Database developed by the Multi-Resolution Land Characteristics Consortium within the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Subsequent analysis conducted during the planning process for Tier 2 project studies will further define the effects to parklands and wild and scenic rivers, including municipal and local parks.

Table JJ–13: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Environmental Resources (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Leach_Ge	It is disturbing and unfortunate that the DEIS does not take into account state listed species or make use of the State's Natural Diversity Database. Nor does the plan consider the potential impacts on species identified as globally at risk by the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN). For example, expanses of woodlands in the Northeast corner of Connecticut, an area known to be important to Cerulean Warbler (a Species of Special Concern in Connecticut and identified as globally vulnerable by the IUCN) would be impacted by the constructions of a rail line from Hartford to Storrs to Providence.	In accordance with the Ecological Resources methodology, Volume 2, Appendix E.06, the FRA addressed potential effects of the Action Alternatives on ecological resources, including federally listed Threatened and Endangered Species. The cerulean warbler is not a federally listed Threatened and Endangered Species. Tier 2 project reviews will further evaluate the Preferred Alternative.
Leach_Ge	...beyond the number of acres that will be converted in Connecticut in Alternatives 1-3, the impact on adjacent forested lands may be underestimated. There are large areas of interior forest, identified by the Center for Land Use Education and Research at UCONN, around Natchaug State Forest and Nathan Hale State Park. The proposed rail line from Hartford to Storrs to Providence in Alternatives 2 and 3 would cut through some of these areas. Not only would sections of the forest be lost, but the adjacent woodlands would be more susceptible to edge effects, such as increased predation and cowbird parasitism.	<p>The FRA did consider land cover based on the National Land Cover Database developed by the Multi-Resolution Land Characteristics Consortium within the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. As described in Volume 2, Chapter 7.6, the FRA quantitatively and qualitatively assessed environmental consequences for Ecologically Sensitive Habitat (ESH) by type and acreage of impact within the Representative Route. The assessment included identification and discussion of impacts (including habitat fragmentation impacts) on those ESH areas where 10 percent or greater of the total area of the ESH would be potentially affected.</p> <p>The FRA incorporated concerns regarding representative environmental effects into their decision-making process. In light of these and other considerations, the Preferred Alternative does not include the referenced routing through Central Connecticut as proposed in Alternatives 2 and 3. Rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative is provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4. It should also be noted that as part of Tier 2 project analysis, environmental effects of projects will be fully assessed.</p>
Leach_Ge	Audubon Connecticut strongly opposes transit of the proposed rail corridor through the Audubon Center at Bent of the River Property. Construction effects, possible ventilation infrastructure, security provisions and unforeseen impacts from construction and observation would potentially have serious negative impacts to the habitat, aesthetics and public access to this Audubon Center, which is a recognized Important Bird Area and one of the most popular destinations for birding and nature observation in the state. The Bent of the River was bequeathed to Audubon in 1993 by the estate of Althea Ward Clark and has strict conservation easements on the property. Any disturbance to the habitats of the Bent of the River from the proposed rail corridor would be in violation of those easement restrictions.	The Preferred Alternative does not include the north end routing option between New York and Hartford via Central Connecticut. Therefore, the Preferred Alternative does not impact the Audubon Center at Bent of the River Property.
Leach_Ge	While the impacts of Alternative 1 on the state 's bird populations are limited, we do want to bring to your attention the presence of a significant Tree Swallow roost on the Lower Connecticut River... Additionally, the tidal wetlands of the lower Connecticut River have been identified as Wetlands of International Significance under the RAMSAR Convention and provide critical and irreplaceable nesting habitat for Saltmarsh Sparrows, a species classified as globally Vulnerable to extinction on the IUCN Red List.	The FRA addressed potential effects of the Action Alternatives on ecological resources, including federally listed Threatened and Endangered Species. The Saltmarsh Sparrow is not a federally listed Threatened and Endangered Species, but as a U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service "Bird of Conservation Concern." As appropriate, Tier 2 project studies will consider other protected species and their habitats.
Maits_Sc	The other place I wanted to talk about was Chester. Surprisingly, looking through the documents, I did not see any economic justice areas.	The FRA identified EJ areas at the census tract level and reported them at the state and county levels. The City of Chester, located in Delaware County, PA, contains several Environmental Justice (EJ) areas within the Affected Environment. The Tier 1 Draft EIS calls out areas with the greatest number of EJ areas. Volume 2, Appendix E.11 of the Tier 1 Final EIS, lists all EJ data by county for the Preferred Alternative
Maits_Sc	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 Tier 1 EIS process does not include specific construction or mitigation plans. Specific alignment decisions, design, construction types and methods, and appropriate mitigation will be further evaluated during subsequent Tier 2 project studies.
Maits_Sc	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... that needs to be looked at with hydrologics -- hydraulic studies that you guys are doing in more detail.	The FRA obtained data from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, appropriate state resource agencies, and the U.S. Geological Survey to identify specific geologic resources within the Study Area. The FRA has also coordinated with federal and state agencies on resources identified and potential effects. Further evaluation during Tier 2 project studies will determine if specific hydrogeological studies are necessary. See Volume 1, Chapter 7.7, for more information.

Table JJ–13: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Environmental Resources (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Martin_Ja	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.	The FRA noted the views expressed about the impact of Alternative 3 through Long Island. The Preferred Alternative does not include this route. For more details regarding the Preferred Alternative see Volume 1, Chapter 4.
McCann_Su	I just want to make sure that the plans are considering all impacts to our historic and environmental preservation for generations to come.	The FRA considered effects on the built and natural environment in identifying the Preferred Alternative. Volume 1, Chapter 7 identifies the potential impacts on the built and natural environment within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process. Subsequent Tier 2 project studies will provide analysis of potential impacts and identify appropriate mitigation, in coordination with the communities and regulating agencies.
McGee_Jo	Proposals that by-pass Stamford and Norwalk (e.g. the northern route or tunnel under the Long Island Sound) undermine economic developments underway in those communities and do not appear to be consistent with the State Plan of Conservation and Development.	The FRA identified that the NEC FUTURE program and the Preferred Alternative are compatible with some but not all of the goals and objectives of the Connecticut State Plan of Conservation and Development based on the methodology described in Volume 2, Appendix E.02. As described in Volume 1, Chapter 4, the Preferred Alternative maintains and improves service on the existing NEC in southwestern Connecticut and therefore supports economic developments underway in these communities. Representative service plans all include increased service levels for both Stamford and Norwalk, CT, but would be subject to further analysis and refinement in subsequent Tier 2 project analyses.
McGill_Pa	Impacts include potential for destruction of homes, businesses, schools, etc in the Historical District, including removal of wetlands, open space and natural resources.	The FRA considered effects on the built and natural environment in identifying the Preferred Alternative. Chapter 7 in Volume 1 of the Final EIS identifies the potential impacts on the built and natural environment within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process. The Tier 1 Final EIS does not identify specific property acquisitions, effects on property values, or effects on community facilities. Subsequent Tier 2 project analysis will provide a complete analysis of potential impacts and identify appropriate mitigation, in coordination with the communities and regulating agencies.
McKnight_Su	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.	The FRA addressed potential effects of the alternatives on ecological resources, including ecologically sensitive habitats, essential fish habitat and federally listed Threatened and Endangered Species (Tier 1 Final EIS Volume 2, Chapter 7.6). The effects-assessment methodology describing how ecological resources were evaluated for the Tier 1 EIS is provided in (Tier 1 Final EIS Volume 2, Appendix E.06). Site-specific effects on ecological resources will be evaluated during Tier 2 project analysis.
McQuade_Su	It [the entire town] 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!	The FRA considered effects on the built and natural environment in identifying the Preferred Alternative. Volume 1, Chapter 7 identifies the potential impacts on the built and natural environment within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process. Subsequent Tier 2 project studies will provide analysis of potential impacts and identify appropriate mitigation, in coordination with the communities and regulating agencies.
Michelson_Je	We should do our best to preserve historical districts	The FRA supports the preservation of cultural and historic resources, including historic districts. Cultural resources and historic properties, including historic districts, are some of the many factors that the FRA considered in identifying a Preferred Alternative. The FRA has worked with State Historic Preservation Offices in the Study Area and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation to develop a Programmatic Agreement (PA) for NEC FUTURE. This PA ensures that continued evaluation and consideration of cultural and historic resources is undertaken as the program advances into subsequent Tier 2 project studies.

Table JJ–13: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Environmental Resources (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Moeller_Be	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.	The FRA considered the effects of the Action Alternatives on ecological and coastal resources, including essential fish habitat. A high level assessment of effects on these resources is included in the Tier 1 assessment. Site-specific effects will be evaluated as part of the Tier 2 project studies. The FRA has identified a Preferred Alternative that focuses improvements along the existing NEC with targeted new segments to alleviate chokepoints and increase capacity. The Preferred Alternative does include the Long Island Sound crossing associated with Alternative 3.
Mora_Su	Total disregard for environmental impact on long island sound just to save a little travel time	The Preferred Alternative does not include a tunnel across the Long Island Sound which reduces potential impacts to hydrologic resources in the Long Island Sound. See the Tier 1 Final EIS Volume 1 Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative. Subsequent Tier 2 project analysis will include a more detailed, site specific analysis and assessment of hydrologic resources and the potential effects of the Preferred Alternative.
Muntz_Ei	And the idea of digging tunnels under parts of the Island that -- Long Island is very dependent on its aquifer. That aquifer is the only place that we get our drinking water from. It's under a lot of pressure. There are plumes of pollution that they monitor that move towards the aquifers.	The FRA did not analyze site-specific impacts on each individual aquifer. The FRA obtained data from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, appropriate state resource agencies, and the U.S. Geological Survey to identify specific geologic resources within the Study Area. The FRA has also coordinated with federal and state agencies on resources identified and potential effects. Further evaluation during Tier 2 project studies will determine if specific hydrogeological studies are necessary. See Volume 1, Chapter 7.7, for more information.
Neckanoff_De	[Seizing] 40 acres of our beautiful Eisenhower park & destroying the peace & quiet of the surrounding neighborhoods, filling it with noise pollution & vibrations & who knows what else. . You want a high speed rail, put it underground. Tunnel under the LIE expressway, or other parkways and then have it surface at the stations.	The FRA noted the views expressed about the impact of Alternative 3 through Long Island. The Preferred Alternative does not include this route. For more details regarding the Preferred Alternative see Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Nunn_Ry	I'm 22 years old and don't want to have to deal with people ruining one of the most beautiful ecosystems and estuaries in Connecticut. Thousands and thousands of animal species will be effected by this	The FRA addressed potential effects of the alternatives on ecological resources, including ecologically sensitive habitats, essential fish habitat and federally listed Threatened and Endangered Species (Tier 1 Final EIS Volume 2, Chapter 7.6). The effects-assessment methodology describing how ecological resources were evaluated for the Tier 1 EIS is provided in (Tier 1 Final EIS Volume 2, Appendix E.06). Site-specific effects on ecological resources will be evaluated during Tier 2 project analysis.
Oryani_Ka	...did you consider use of a land use model to see the effect of these alternatives? How land use changes around new corridors would happen?	The FRA qualitatively considered the opportunity for land use changes associated with the proposed Action Alternatives. Specific land use changes will be more fully explored during subsequent Tier 2 project analysis in light of the local nature of land use decisions. Volume 1, Chapter 6, provides some insights into the potential development effects associated with improved passenger rail service and in particular service to new markets.
Ossmann_Er	If the current rail system is such a threat to the existing environment, how exactly does breaking more ground on the CT River as it feeds to LI Sound not produce more greenhouse gases through equipment as well as heavy metals into the watershed?	As described in Volume 2, Chapter 7.13, the FRA did not conduct a quantitative analysis of construction impacts to air quality. It is assumed that construction of the Action Alternatives would result in temporary CO2e emissions. However, the net total GHGs would decrease under all the Action Alternatives. Subsequent Tier 2 project analysis by lead agencies will provide a deeper analysis of potential impacts of construction impacts. The impacts and their avoidance or mitigation will occur as part of Tier 2 analysis.
Paterson_Am	CLCC is concerned about the potential adverse impacts on Connecticut 's current and potential inventory of lands preserved for open space conservation, agriculture and recreation. These general concerns are further exacerbated by the DEIS 's overall lack of details, making it extremely difficult to assess, from the maps and analysis provided, which lands will be impacted and the extent of those impacts.	As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure or alignments. Such decisions are made as part of the Tier 2 project studies, which would include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate. Consistent with this process, the FRA developed Representative Routes for the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative, which provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the effects of each Alternative. Representative Routes define an envelope within which improvements might occur and whose location and construction type could change during subsequent Tier 2 project studies. Specific land use changes would be more fully explored during subsequent Tier 2 project analysis, in light of the local nature of land use decisions.

Table JJ–13: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Environmental Resources (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Paterson_Am	Each of the proposals, particularly options two and three, has the potential to significantly impact land protected for habitat and other conservation purposes. ... Permitting any of these options to move forward will serve to undercut the protections on these lands currently accorded under these laws, posing a risk of adverse impacts to highly valuable landwater, agricultural and recreational resources. Violation of Charitable Trusts and Conservation Restrictions The massive development activities associated with each of the proposals, particularly options two and three, will result in a conversion of land protected for conservation to railroad infrastructure purposes. Many of the impacted parcels were conveyed to land trusts, other conservation NGOs, towns or the state with the intent, often memorialized by conservation restrictions, that they be permanently preserved and held in public trust for conservation purposes. Permitting the construction associated with the Plan would, at a minimum, undermine the charitable intent and the associated public purpose and trust in permanently protecting the land that was established when the land was conveyed to the land trust.	The FRA based the environmental evaluations for the Tier 1 Draft EIS on Representative Routes and representative service data, using readily available resource information from federal and state agencies. Only data available at the same level of detail for all the jurisdictions in the multi-state study area were used to conduct analyses. All environmental analyses were completed using GIS tools; no field studies were conducted. The FRA considers this broad level of detail appropriate for the NEC FUTURE Tier 1 EIS given the large multi-state study area, the programmatic nature of the assessment, and the decisions being made. The FRA will not decide specific routing or service options through NEC FUTURE. Site-specific alignment and service requirements, as well as coordination and consultation with local agencies and organizations will occur as part of the Tier 2 project-level planning processes. Additionally, proposed construction types will be reviewed during Tier 2 project studies and modified to avoid or minimize effects where feasible. The Tier 1 Draft EIS specifically states that during subsequent Tier 2 analysis, further investigations of municipal and local parks will be required. Data collection and effects on non-profit or privately-owned protected open space and conservation lands will occur during Tier 2 project analyses. The FRA coordinated with the National Park Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service throughout the development of the methodological approach for evaluating effects on parklands. (See Volume 2, Appendix E.09, Environmental Resource Documentation)
Paterson_Am	...the state and its municipalities are required to adopt plans of conservation and development (POCD). Regional planning organizations and councils of governments also adopt POCDs . Generally speaking, the POCD goals, policies and recommendations are intended to: reflect the desire of the residents; provide a framework for coordinating state, regional and local conservation and development activities; guide land use decisions and regulations; and provide programs for implementation in order to achieve the POCD goals. Assessment of the plans potential impacts on the quality of life and health of local economies should be evaluated in the context of the POCDs not only of the state and affected region, but also of each of the towns impacted by the project.	Concerns expressed about the consideration of plans of conservation and development at the state, region, and town level are noted. The FRA considered existing statewide land-use-related planning documents and regional planning documents developed by federally mandated metropolitan planning organizations as described in Volume 1, Chapter 7.2. As part of subsequent Tier 2 project analysis, the actual acreage of land cover that would be affected will be calculated and specific effects to properties, zoning regulations, and development will be evaluated. The Tier 2 project analysis will further identify and evaluate compatibility with state, regional, MPO, and local plans.
Paterson_Am	Connecticut state law sets a goal of conserving 21 percent (673,210 acres) of Connecticuts land area. The Green Plan, Connecticuts official land conservation plan, establishes 2023 as the target date. That goal includes conservation land owned by municipalities, land trusts and other nonprofit organizations, water utilities and the state. Already struggling to meet this statutory goal, a project of this magnitude -- with alternatives two and three in particular likely converting tens of thousands of acres of habitat, recreation and agricultural lands to development for the rail infrastructure -- will set the states land conservation efforts back even further.	The FRA incorporated concerns regarding the loss of open space into their decision-making process. In light of these and other considerations, the recommended Preferred Alternative does not include the referenced routing through Central Connecticut as proposed in Alternatives 2 and 3. Rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative is provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The consideration of individual state land use plans is more clearly discussed in the Tier 1 Final EIS. It should also be noted that as part of Tier 2 project analysis, environmental effects of projects will be fully assessed.
Penn Design_Taylor_Yaro	We also share the concerns being expressed by Connecticut Shoreline East communities about the severe adverse impact that adding tracks and service would have on the important historic and environmental resources found in the coastal corridor between New Haven and Stonington. This section of the NEC (as well as the proposed inland alternative corridor proposed for this area in the Draft NEC Future document) includes several National Register districts, National and State Wildlife Refuges, dozens of state and local conservation areas and thousands of acres of inland and coastal wetlands and wildfowl habitat that would be adversely affected by the addition of new tracks and other measures in this corridor. We are also concerned that this route will be susceptible to more frequent flooding and erosion as sea levels rise and other effects of climate change increase.	As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure or alignments. Such decisions are made as part of the Tier 2 project planning processes, which would include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate. Consistent with this process, the FRA developed Representative Routes for the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative, which provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the effects of each Alternative. Representative Routes define an envelope within which improvements might occur and whose location and construction type could change during subsequent Tier 2 project-level reviews. Chapter 7 in Volume 1 of the Final EIS identifies the potential impacts on the environment within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, including cultural resources and historical properties, ecological resources, hydrological/water resources, and climate change and adaptation. Subsequent Tier 2 project analysis by the lead agency will provide a deeper analysis of potential impacts. Direct impacts will be assessed at that time.

Table JJ–13: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Environmental Resources (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Peruzzotti_Ca	...and destroy even more of our our precious natural resources -- estuaries and wetlands --	The FRA considered effects on the built and natural environment in identifying the Preferred Alternative. Volume 1, Chapter 7 identifies the potential impacts on the built and natural environment within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process. Subsequent Tier 2 project studies will provide analysis of potential impacts and identify appropriate mitigation, in coordination with the communities and regulating agencies.
Petrides_Pe	First the impact of the planned upgrades to the local environment and farms. (We have limited viable farmland hat we don't want to lose.)	The FRA considered potential impacts to farmlands in the analysis presented in Volume 2, Chapter 7.3, by identifying soils qualifying as prime farmland (as defined by the U.S. Department of Agriculture). No detailed analysis of the types of crops or whether the areas identified are actively farmed or designated locally for the preservation of farmland was completed as part of the Tier 1 EIS. Subsequent Tier 2 project studies will identify specific farmlands and effects. These studies will include coordination with applicable local, state, and federal agencies.
Przyborski_Kr	Furthermore, we will see significant sea level rise in the coming decades. Building a rail system so close to the shore makes absolutely no fiscal sense. We do not yet know the extent of the sea level rise that we will experience here, but most scientists are predicting that the east coast of the US is likely to be affected even more so than other areas of the US.	The FRA recognizes the potential impacts caused by climate change (including sea level rise) to rail infrastructure along the coastline. As noted, inland routes provide redundancy to the existing rail network and provide resiliency by moving out of and away from coastal flood hazards. However, inland routes are still subject to riverine flooding that may result from severe storm events. As discussed in Volume 2, Chapter 7.15, each of the Action Alternatives considered adaptation measures that could be undertaken to make the existing NEC and any new segments more resilient to the effects related to climate change.
Raday_Da	Although this project is a huge expansion project in the sense that it will potentially degrade the land in a way that will impact the surrounding ecosystem. It seems that it will improve the atmospheric pollutants already being produced.	Changes in greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions were estimated for each of the Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative relative to the No Action Alternative. GHGs are predicted to decrease under all Action Alternatives, as well as the Preferred Alternative, in the year 2040 due to predicted shifts in mode choice as a result of implementing any of the Alternatives and predicted changes in renewable energy usage. The Tier 1 Final EIS, Volume 2, Chapter 7. 13 provides the analysis of the Action Alternatives; the Tier 1 Final EIS, Volume 1, Chapter 7.13 provides the analysis of the Preferred Alternative. See the Tier 1 Final EIS, Volume 1, Chapter 7.6 for the evaluation of ecological resources of the Preferred Alternative.
Raday_Da	The biggest problem with the project is the loss of aesthetic and natural landscape. We want to be able to maintain the natural appearance of the land the railroad is cutting through.	The Tier 1 EIS assesses visual impacts associated with the No Action Alternative, the Action Alternatives (Volume 2, Chapter 7.10), and the Preferred Alternative (Volume 1, Chapter 7.10). Both chapters compare the visual impacts associated with each alternative with the No Action Alternative. Further evaluation of visual and aesthetic elements, along with detailed design and engineering will be considered during subsequent Tier 2 project studies in order to minimize impacts on these resources.
Raday_Da	There has to be awareness when there are potentially 24 endangered species. I understand that there will always be species threatened by either construction, population, exc., however I feel like the positives outweigh the negatives.	In the Tier 1 Final EIS Volume 2, Chapter 7.6, the FRA considered effects on threatened and endangered species in identifying the Preferred Alternative. The Tier 1 EIS did not undertake any field investigation to confirm the presence of habitat or species. Subsequent Tier 2 project studies will further evaluate protected species and their habitats to determine effects.
Reed_Mat	Upgrade existing corridor or build new within current established rights of way so there is no infringement on property owners who should not face eminent domain issues. Not to mention the I-95 corridor disaster you will cause!!!!	As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure or alignments. Such decisions are made as part of the Tier 2 project planning processes, which would include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate. Consistent with this process, the FRA developed Representative Routes for the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative. The Representative Route provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the effects, and defined an envelope within which improvements might occur and whose location and construction type could change during subsequent Tier 2 project analysis. These representative routes utilized existing transportation corridors to the maximum extent practicable. Nevertheless, the Preferred Alternative includes the potential for acquisition or displacements within areas of existing transportation use. As part of the Tier 2 project analysis, socioeconomic effects and any necessary acquisitions, temporary easements, and displacements would be identified, and compliance with the Uniform Relocation Act will be required

Table JJ–13: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Environmental Resources (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Reed_Mar	South Wilmington is an African-American historic community, and we are in the process of revitalization. Hopefully when you consider coming through our community, would you consider the residents? We are in the process of having a wetland project, a multilane wetland project, this rail line will affect, and it's close to residents' homes. We are in a flood plain, a historical flood plain, and that wetland project is going to take care of our flooding. Where the train's going to be coming through, that's on the Harriet Tubman Byway, and that's part of our storm preservation.	For the Tier 1 EIS, the FRA developed an effects-assessment methodology for identifying Environmental Justice (EJ) communities and evaluating potential effects on EJ populations. The Tier 1 Final EIS Volume 2, Appendix E.11) explains the screening-level analysis the FRA used to identify the location of EJ populations and special resources within EJ areas. These correlations do not represent direct impacts on EJ populations; the correlations flag areas for detailed analysis in the future as part of subsequent Tier 2 project-level analysis. Subsequent Tier 2 project-level analysis will be site specific and will identify direct and indirect impacts within and to EJ populations and resources within those communities.
Renn_Da	I am writing to express concern regarding the environmental and social impacts that would be a potential outcome of the Alternative 2 & 3 plans. The relocation of track through sensitive salt water marsh areas is my primary concern.	The FRA recognizes that numerous federal, state, and local laws, regulations, and Executive Orders, cover hydrologic resources. Tier 2 project analysis will incorporate more-detailed analysis and assessment, particularly with regard to environmentally sensitive areas such as salt water marshes, which will comply with applicable federal, state, and local laws, regulations, and executive orders.
Rescigno_An	New Haven, and the other cities on these existing routes, need higher-speed, higher-frequency service in order to support economic development efforts and access to jobs. Many of New Havens neighborhoods are economically distressed. From an environmental justice perspective, it is equally important to support these communities and not circumvent them through bypass alignments.	FRA has identified a Preferred Alternative as presented in the Tier 1 Final EIS Volume 2, that incorporates the New Haven-Hartford-Springfield line. The Preferred Alternative may result in cleaner air and public health benefits, as well as transportation effects that would provide a benefit to environmental justice communities through increased travel choices, access to more reliable and frequent rail service, accessibility to jobs, and a range of pricing options for travelers. However, FRA did not do an analysis as part of the Tier 1 Final EIS to assess if EJ communities bear a disproportionate amount of the negative environmental resource effects that may occur as part of the implementation of the Preferred Alternative. See Volume 1, Chapter 7.11 for more information related to the Preferred Alternative and Environmental Justice issues.
Richman_Wi	When taking a train to Boston I was enchanted to find us running along the beach at one point, but rising sea levels are an issue there and also coming across the Meadowlands into NYC.	The FRA recognizes the potential impacts caused by climate change (including sea level rise) on the coastline and rail infrastructure; therefore, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative route that improves resiliency on the NEC and provides for redundant infrastructure in areas most vulnerable to the effects of climate change. Volume 1, Chapter 7.15, provides additional information on climate change considerations of the Preferred Alternative.
Richmond_Cl	[benefits of a new route between Boston and New York include:] 2) Redundancy and resiliency from storms or other disasters that might affect the coastal Shore Line route. There are some environmental reasons to avoid the coast as well such as disruption of wetlands.	The FRA recognizes the potential impacts caused by climate change (including sea level rise) on the coastline and rail infrastructure; therefore, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative route that seeks ways to improve resiliency on the NEC. Volume 1, Chapter 7.15, provides additional information on climate change considerations of the Preferred Alternative.
Richmond_Cl	[benefits of a new route between Boston and New York include:] 3) A new route will create new destination pairs. This is especially important for the economic development of older mid-sized cities that have limited transportation options and in some case are economic justice communities. Even without population growth, we have a growing elderly population that will need more train access and service.	Volume 2, Chapter 6, examines the economic development potential within large metropolitan areas that would be served by the No Action and Action Alternatives. Subsequent Tier 2 project studies will examine economic effects at the local level.
Riordan_De	The proposed routes through Connecticut for the proposed NEC rail system would do much harm to sensitive areas of great environmental significance. In fact, the routes appear to have been designed with NO thought as to their impact on their surroundings. There must be a more rigorous survey of the environmental impacts of the routes proposed for Connecticut's portion of the NEC upgrades.	The FRA recognizes the concerns regarding the ecologically sensitive, forested, and agricultural areas along the corridor. After evaluating the results of the Tier 1 Draft EIS and public comment, FRA has identified a Preferred Alternative that generally focuses on existing rail corridors and incorporates new segments to minimize chokepoints and provide capacity. The Preferred Alternative does not include the off-corridor routing options between Hartford, CT and Providence, RI or Hartford, CT and Worcester, MA. Volume 1, Chapter 4 provides details regarding the Preferred Alternative.
Roche_Je	This would disrupt the ecology of 2 rivers and a lot of protective wetlands.	Numerous waterbodies and wetlands are located within the Study Area for NEC FUTURE that are subject to federal, state, and local laws, regulations, and Executive Orders. During Tier 2 project studies, additional analysis will be undertaken to determine specific impacts to each hydrologic resource and to identify required permits and mitigation.

Table JJ–13: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Environmental Resources (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Rueb_Sa	Appendix E.09: Cultural Resources and Historic Properties, Table 1, incorrectly lists the impacts to Cultural and Historical properties in New London County by the Alternative routes being evaluated... For example, in the section of Table 1 listing Environmental Consequences on CT - New London County (page 7) it states that the impact of Alternative 1 to the Old Lyme Historic District is the same as existing NEC , which is clearly incorrect. As you know, the existing section of the NEC rail has a more southerly route through Old Lyme and does not pass through the town center or the Old Lyme Historic District - whereas the Alternative 1 proposal goes through the town center and bisects the Historic District!..There are other errors in the Table as well...I am also attaching GIS maps comparing the different rail routes through Old Lyme of the Alternative 1 proposal versus the existing NEC rail - with and without the area of the Old Lyme Historic District highlighted as well. It may be helpful to attach these or similar maps to comments submitted...Please note highlighted data errors with respect to Appendix E.09: Cultural Resources and Historic Properties, Table 1, since they can most authoritatively represent the Old Lyme Historic District.	<p>The FRA revised the description of the Alternative 1 environmental consequences in Volume 2, Appendix E.09, Cultural Resources and Historic Properties Data to identify the effect of the Old Saybrook to Kenyon segment associated with Alternative 1 as an aerial structure in a new right-of-way.</p> <p>Based on further conversations with representatives from Old Lyme and consideration of multiple comments received regarding the potential effects to the historic district, the FRA proposes a commitment to avoiding use of a aerial structure through the historic district in Old Lyme, CT.</p>
Rueb_Sa	There will be ecological damage to the environment both wild life and plants as well as a drastic change to our beautiful community. We live next to the Lieutenant River which will be totally destroyed by both the noise and construction. Naturally, this will de- value our properties and destroy our town center.	The FRA recognized the concerns raised by the community of Old Lyme. In response, the FRA met with community stakeholders and local officials. As a result, the FRA proposed to modify the construction type of the Representative Route through Old Lyme from aerial structure to tunnel. This revision mitigates the potential effects on cultural, ecological, visual, and other local resources. Construction details related to the tunnel will be defined as part of the planning, engineering, and design process during subsequent Tier 2 analysis.
Russin_Al	DO NOT BUILD ON TOP OF VITAL BRUSH AND FOREST. Build on top of abandoned train work or roads.	As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure or alignments. Such decisions are made as part of the Tier 2 project studies, which will include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate. The FRA evaluated the effects of implementing the Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative on land cover, which included vital brush and forest as part of its analysis of effects on land cover (see Volume 1, Chapter 7.2, regarding Forest/Shrub and Grassland/Cultivated), agricultural lands (Volume 1, Chapter 7.3), and ecological resources (Volume 1, Chapter 7.6). While potential impacts have been identified, specific project impacts will be more fully evaluated and potential impacts will be addressed during subsequent Tier 2 project analysis.
Sackville_Do	We have spent years trying to clean up Long Island Sound. I can't believe that putting a tunnel under the Sound to Milford Harbor is a solution that you believe is the best decision! What about the impacts?	The Preferred Alternative does not include a tunnel across the Long Island Sound which reduces potential impacts to hydrologic resources in the Long Island Sound. See the Tier 1 Final EIS Volume 1 Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative. Subsequent Tier 2 project analysis will include a more detailed, site specific analysis and assessment of hydrologic resources and the potential effects of the Preferred Alternative.
Sam	If this much money is being spent, NEC Future should provide the most net benefit to those residents affected. Alternative 2 helps the most people and does the least harm to the environment.	The FRA considered effects on the built and natural environment in identifying the Preferred Alternative. Volume 1, Chapter 7 identifies the potential impacts on the built and natural environment within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process. Subsequent Tier 2 project studies will provide analysis of potential impacts and identify appropriate mitigation, in coordination with the communities and regulating agencies.
Sarlin_Mi	[Alt 1] It also fails to include the coming danger of service disruptions from the effects of global warming. Rising sea level and increased severity of storms are a significant risk in low-lying shoreline areas.	<p>Alternative 1 focused on the existing NEC—much of which closely follows the Atlantic coastline north of New York—and therefore is susceptible to natural disasters that could affect service. As discussed in Volume 2, Chapter 7.15, areas that are currently at risk from the effects of climate change, including sea level rise and increased storm severity, are predicted to experience worsening conditions. Each Action Alternative considered adaptation measures that could be undertaken to make the existing NEC more resilient.</p> <p>The FRA recognizes the potential impacts caused by climate change (including sea level rise) on the coastline and rail infrastructure; therefore, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative route that improves resiliency on the NEC and provides for redundant infrastructure in areas most vulnerable to the effects of climate change.</p>

Table JJ–13: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Environmental Resources (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Saunders_Di	Further, we must insist that truly high speed intercity passenger rail lines be constructed on paired, grade-separated, dedicated electrified track with no at-grade crossings. Doing so results in a level of safety much higher than requiring cars to made of steel. Furthermore, signaling systems currently in use and proposed in the US are far inferior to the European standard, the European Rail Traffic Management System, otherwise known as ERTMS/GSM-R. Positive Train Control is not the answer.	<p>Under the Preferred Alternative, there would be numerous equipment and infrastructure upgrades that would likely reduce the number of accidents associated with equipment failures or infrastructure deficiencies.</p> <p>There are portions of the Preferred Alternative that include at-grade crossings, which are discussed in Volume 1, Chapter 7.18. Additional discussions of at-grade crossings are included in Volume 1, Chapters 4, 5, 6, and 7.11.</p> <p>As described in Volume 2, Chapter 7.18, the FRA is currently developing new Tier III passenger-equipment safety standards. These Tier III standards will establish the crashworthiness standards for equipment that can operate on shared tracks or on separate tracks within a shared right-of-way and the infrastructure and systems required for safe operations. These standards (in addition to Positive Train Control) will also be required for future operation of the Preferred Alternative.</p>
Schmeelk_El	Though we need fast trains they should not go through historic towns & water's.	The FRA considered effects on the built and natural environment in identifying the Preferred Alternative. Volume 1, Chapter 7 identifies the potential impacts on the built and natural environment within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process. Subsequent Tier 2 project studies will provide analysis of potential impacts and identify appropriate mitigation, in coordination with the communities and regulating agencies.
Shields_Er	Another thing, materials I feel is also important. A lot of this is aging infrastructure uses metalloids and other materials that are not only prone to corrosion but, also, have a negative impact on the environment. So maybe investing in a different kind of material that is not only more resilient but also stronger and more aesthetically pleasing so as not to disrupt national landmarks. Because, you know, sometimes there's structures that take your eye off of something, you know, you want to be able to appreciate what a city or a town has to offer without what's supposed to help you also getting in the way.	FRA has not determined site-specific construction materials as part of the Tier 1 EIS process. Construction materials and context sensitive design will be considered at future stages of project development by the Tier 2 project study sponsor.
Shields_Er	You know, as much as you'd like to have rails, sometimes it's not easy to just throw the track down. You know, you have to consider who you're going to -- who you're going to displace and what else is going to happen.	As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure or alignments. Such decisions are made as part of the Tier 2 project planning processes, which would include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate. Consistent with this process, the FRA developed Representative Routes for the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative. The Representative Route provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the effects, and defined an envelope within which improvements might occur and whose location and construction type could change during subsequent Tier 2 project analysis. See Volume 1, Chapter 4 for the description of the Preferred Alternative.
Shivers_Th	If the tier1 draft is to cut through communities and have a negative impact on historic places I would suggest an alternative plan that does not do this and causes as little of an envirnomentaI do believe that the rail lines need to be updated so as to take as many trucks off the highways as possible.	Cultural resources and historic properties, including historic districts, are some of the many factors that the FRA considered in identifying a Preferred Alternative. The FRA has worked with State Historic Preservation Offices in the Study Area and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation to develop a Programmatic Agreement (PA) for NEC FUTURE. This PA will ensure that continued evaluation and consideration of cultural resources and historic properties resources is undertaken as the program advances into subsequent Tier 2 project studies.
Sloat_Ca	I would like to point out that the route between UConn (Storrs, CT) and Providence has already been the subject of scrutiny and rejected for an Interstate Highway. Routing through the protected wetlands area on the CT-RI border requires more careful study, and the result will quite likely be the same--that at the end of the day, it is not feasible.	The FRA recognizes the concerns regarding the ecologically sensitive, forested, and agricultural areas along the corridor. After evaluating the results of the Tier 1 Draft EIS and public comment, FRA has identified a Preferred Alternative that does not include routing options between Hartford, CT and Providence, RI. Volume 1, Chapter 4 provides details regarding the Preferred Alternative.

Table JJ–13: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Environmental Resources (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Speirs_Sa	The marshes of CT are rapidly diminishing and to build yet another human structure on them would have disastrous effects on the marsh, and Long Island Sound. Most of the local fish supply is supported by them breeding within the marsh. As climate change is causing sea level rise, by 1/2 -1 every year or two, marshes only grow at a rate of 1 per 100 years. Building more on the marsh will severely impact the Long Island sound. I know many of these EIS reports are done by people who have studied freshwater and inland habitats. You must get a Marine Biologist/Coastal Ecologist to assist in producing the EIS, because it is lacking information for the public and for you to decide whether it is viable to build.	The Tier 1 Draft EIS analysis considered hydrologic resources, including areas designated as wetlands/marshlands and waterbodies, such as the Long Island Sound (Tier 1 Final EIS Volume 2, Chapter 7.5). As part of the analysis completed for Tier 1 Draft EIS, FRA also considered Essential Fish Habitat (Tier 1 Final EIS Volume 2, Chapter 7.6). Essential Fish Habitat considers areas designated for fish breeding. Resource specialists, as needed, would be engaged for subsequent Tier 2 project reviews.
Stamm_Li	I am vehemently opposed to a third rail system going through Garden City. This is a sleepy/quiet village that thrives on many wonderful qualities including a bucolic residential feel. We have many lovely small-town businesses and families that have invested wisely to be part of that dynamic. A third rail would be such an all encompassing project and a devastation to our beautiful area.	The FRA noted the concerns expressed about the impact of Alternative 3 through Long Island. The Preferred Alternative does not include this route. Effects on specific properties were not considered for the Tier 1 EIS assessment given the scale and scope of that environmental review. Property-specific effects would however be an important consideration during subsequent Tier 2 project studies. The FRA considered regional needs as well as locally identified concerns in their Preferred Alternative.
Steeves-Ta	Additionally, this plan does not address impacts to the Federally threatened Northern Long-eared bat.	The FRA included the federally threatened and endangered (T&E) Northern Long-eared Bat in its analysis of effects on threatened and endangered species (Tier 1 Final EIS Volume 2, Chapter 7.6). The Tier 1 Final EIS provides updated information on T&E species listed since the publication of the Tier 1 Draft EIS, including the Northern Long-eared Bat, and includes any other newly listed species.
Sullivan_Ma	Much more detail about the impact on marine life, beaches, and fishing on Long Island Sound is required for this report to qualify as information useful for public consumption and analysis.	The Preferred Alternative does not include a tunnel across the Long Island Sound which reduces potential impacts to hydrologic resources in the Long Island Sound. See the Tier 1 Final EIS Volume 1 Chapter 4 for more information about the Preferred Alternative. Subsequent Tier 2 project analysis will include a more detailed, site specific analysis and assessment of hydrologic resources and the potential effects of the Preferred Alternative.
Sullivan_Sa	Any infringement impacting historical or environmental issues should be thoroughly examined.	The FRA considered effects on the built and natural environment in identifying the Preferred Alternative. Volume 1, Chapter 7 identifies the potential impacts on the built and natural environment within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process. Subsequent Tier 2 project studies will provide analysis of potential impacts and identify appropriate mitigation, in coordination with the communities and regulating agencies.
Sullivan_Vi	Based on national accident and injury statistics there is a need to improve grade crossing safety and accommodation for bicycles and pedestrians.	The Preferred Alternative includes numerous equipment and infrastructure upgrades that would likely reduce the number of accidents associated with equipment failures or infrastructure deficiencies. Furthermore, the Preferred Alternative proposes a fully grade-separated NEC for the new segments in portions of the corridor, which would reduce the frequency of conflicts and potential accidents that would occur at highway-rail at-grade crossings. However, there are portions of the Preferred Alternative that include at-grade crossings, which are discussed in Volume 1, Chapter 7.18. Additional discussions of at-grade crossings are included in Volume 1, Chapters 4, 5, 6, and 7.11. Specific details about accommodating bicycles and pedestrian access was not evaluated as part of the Tier 1 EIS process. Site-specific consideration of bicycle and pedestrian accommodations will be considered in more detail as part of subsequent Tier 2 project studies.
Sweenwy_Jo	Rhode Island is the tiniest state in the country. It's only one-third the size of Connecticut. And they have, as I understand it, most of their water reservoirs in this area of Scituate, Rhode Island, and thereabouts. And I understand that because of their massive commitment to water reservoirs in that area, Rhode Island authorities vigorously opposed the extension of Route 384 from Hartford to Providence, and it's a dead-end, a dead-end in Bolton. So before anything is done further on Alternative No. 2, which would create a new rail system from Hartford through Storrs to Providence, it's best that we reexamine that issue and determine we're not going to run into the same roadblock that Route 384 received from the authorities in Rhode Island.	The FRA recognizes the concerns regarding the ecologically sensitive, forested, and agricultural areas along the corridor. After evaluating the results of the Tier 1 Draft EIS and public comment, FRA has identified a Preferred Alternative that does not include routing options between Hartford, CT and Providence, RI. Volume 1, Chapter 4 provides details regarding the Preferred Alternative.

Table JJ–13: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Environmental Resources (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Van Der Aue_Ka	There is no indication of any but State and Federal lands that will be impacted by this project. It is impossible to address this issue unless the maps delineate other threatened lands such as those owned by NGOs like the numerous Audubon Societies and the Nature Conservancy; plus there is no mention of Municipal lands, lands under easement, land trusts or private holdings.	The FRA based the environmental evaluations for the Tier 1 Draft EIS on Representative Routes and representative service data, using readily available resource information from federal and state agencies. Only data available at the same level of detail for all the jurisdictions in the multi-state study area were used to conduct analyses. All environmental analyses were completed using GIS tools; no field studies were conducted. The FRA considers this broad level of detail appropriate for the NEC FUTURE Tier 1 EIS given the large multi-state study area, the programmatic nature of the assessment, and the decisions being made. The FRA will not decide specific routing or service options through NEC FUTURE. Site-specific alignment and service requirements, as well as coordination and consultation with local agencies and organizations will occur as part of the Tier 2 project-level planning processes. Additionally, proposed construction types will be reviewed during Tier 2 project studies and modified to avoid or minimize effects where feasible. The Tier 1 Draft EIS specifically states that during subsequent Tier 2 analysis, further investigations of municipal and local parks will be required. Data collection and effects on non-profit or privately-owned protected open space and conservation lands will occur during Tier 2 project analyses. The FRA coordinated with the National Park Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service throughout the development of the methodological approach for evaluating effects on parklands. (See Volume 2, Appendix E.09, Environmental Resource Documentation) Two of the resources noted in the letter submitted for formal comment are crossed by the Preferred Alternative: Quinnipiac River Marsh Wildlife Area and Ragged Rock Creek Marsh. Any effects on these parklands are reflected in Volume 1, Chapter 7.4 and Appendix E.04, and subsequent Tier 2 project studies would further evaluate effects on these resources.
Van Der Aue_Ka	There is no information on mitigation actions proposed to alleviate all the environmental damage that would be caused by this project. Many of the lands affected are home to endangered and threatened birds including the Black Rail and Saltmarsh Sparrow. We hope that such mitigation efforts will become an integral part of this proposal.	The FRA developed an effects-assessment methodology for sensitive ecological resources identified as Ecologically Sensitive Habitats, federally listed Threatened and Endangered species, Essential Fish Habitats, and Federally Managed Fish Species. The Tier 1 Final EIS follows a "tiered" approach to environmental review under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). As such, for the Tier 1 NEPA review, the FRA analyzed ecological resources based on Representative Routes and service plans. Subsequent Tier 2 project analysis will focus on site-specific project proposals and their impacts, and will determine avoidance or mitigation strategies.
Van Der Aue_Ka	...we can state that we object to any further fragmentation of the few remaining large unbroken areas of forest which are so necessary for wildlife.	During subsequent Tier 2 analysis, when a project is more clearly defined, if there a use of a 4(f) resource the project sponsor will evaluate all prudent and feasible alternatives to avoid impacts to publicly owned resources. The Tier 2 analysis will also develop mitigation measures and designs that avoid or minimize effects on parklands.
Varano_Yv	The proposal of a new high speed line that would originate in Floral Park and go straight down Stewart Avenue through Nassau County and Suffolk is completely absurd. It would absolutely destroy every community along the way.	The FRA noted the views expressed about the impact of Alternative 3 through Long Island. The Preferred Alternative does not include this route. For more details regarding the Preferred Alternative see Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Vavasour_Ro	I cannot make out any details of the proposed route along Long Island Sound, which passes directly behind our National Register-listed historic home in Guilford, CT, from the map provided, to determine what specific impacts upgrades would pose.	The FRA developed the Action Alternatives and defined the Preferred Alternative at a programmatic level, focusing on corridor-wide solutions within the context of the Tier 1 EIS process. Consistent with this process, the FRA developed Representative Routes, which provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the environmental effects for each Action Alternative. Representative Routes define an envelope within which improvements might occur and whose location and construction type could change during subsequent Tier 2 project studies. The lines depicting the Action Alternatives and Preferred Alternative in the Mapping Atlases for Volumes 1 and 2, along with the scale chosen, are representative—intended to highlight environmental resources relative to the Representative Route of a particular alternative that is consistent with the level of detail found in the Tier 1 EIS.
Vitale_Pa	Your assessments say nothing about the impact on local traffic, home values, etc. which Alt # 3 will absolutely have a negative impact on.	Effects on specific properties were not considered for the Tier 1 EIS assessment given the scale and scope of that environmental review. Property-specific effects and effects on local traffic would however be an important consideration during subsequent Tier 2 project studies.

Table JJ–13: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Environmental Resources (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Warren_Da	The only other thing I want to comment on is the valuation of cultural and ecological resources. I think they should be very carefully put into perspective. In that state taking for the highway in the '80s, one of the reasons the highway was never built -- which, incidentally, I was opposed to as a child -- was because of its impact on contiguous forest land. And that contiguous forest land, after the demise of the highway, was subsequently developed by a private landholder.	NEPA requires federal agencies to integrate environmental values into their decision-making processes by considering the environmental impacts of their proposed actions and reasonable alternatives to those actions. As such, the Tier 1 EIS does examine effects on cultural and ecological resources, though it does not offer a valuation of those resources. The Preferred Alternative includes the potential for land cover conversion to a transportation-related land use. Potential changes to existing land cover could result in loss or fragmentation of ecological resources and convert prime farmlands or timberlands. However, the effects on these resources will be further evaluated, and opportunities to avoid or mitigate will be more fully considered during subsequent Tier 2 project studies.
Warren_Da	Regarding cultural resources, the northeastern part of the state, the eastern part of the state, has a lot of cultural resources, but they are decrepit and neglected due to the financial constraints that our communities face that are solely based on failure for us to maintain strong urban and smaller cities.	The FRA recognizes the importance of maintaining urban centers and smaller cities. In light of this and other comments, the FRA considered the influence of railroads and the benefits of improved rail service to historic urban centers in Volume 1, Chapter 7.9. As described in Volume 1, Chapter 4, the Preferred Alternative provides improved passenger rail service to those historic cities located along the existing NEC.
Wieting_Sc	Please preserve landmarks and heritage features when planning your rail beds.	Cultural resources and historic properties, including historic districts, are some of the many factors that the FRA considered in identifying a Preferred Alternative. The FRA has worked with State Historic Preservation Offices in the Study Area and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation to develop a Programmatic Agreement (PA) for NEC FUTURE. This PA will ensure that continued evaluation and consideration of cultural resources and historic properties resources is undertaken as the program advances into subsequent Tier 2 project studies.
Williams_Ma	The Tier 1 DEIS is, if anything, excessively stringent. It fails to sufficiently take into account the substantial benefits to the human environment that derive from improved rail access (and the resulting decrease in reliance on automotive and air traffic).	The FRA considered the "human" benefits in identifying the Preferred Alternative. Chapter 5, Transportation Effects, Chapter 6, Economic Effects and Growth and Indirect Effects, and Chapter 7, Affected Environment, Environmental Consequences, and Mitigation Strategies each assess the benefits and impacts to the human environment. Benefits provided include improved mobility, connectivity, and a range of pricing that allow travelers to have more choices. This flexibility provides opportunities to travelers for more choices enabling people to have a greater selection and availability of jobs and services.
Williams_Sh	There hasn't been enough studies done, as to what kind of an impact this will have on our marine life and Eco system.	The FRA prepared this Tier 1 Final EIS in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended (42 U.S.C. 4321–4327 and 40 C.F.R. Parts 1500–1508) (NEPA), and other applicable laws and regulations. This document is part of a “tiered” NEPA review as provided for in the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) NEPA implementing regulations. “Tiering” allows an agency, such as the FRA, to focus on the information available and issues relevant to the decision to be made at each level of environmental review. The environmental review for NEC FUTURE includes a Tier 1 (or programmatic) review that broadly assesses environmental impacts. Subsequent, more-detailed environmental reviews by the FRA and other federal agencies on specific project-level elements (Tier 2) will incorporate and reference the decisions and analyses conducted as part of this Tier 1 review.
Woolley_Da	The path includes a new bridge over the Connecticut River and would have a critically negative effect on the river 's estuary and tidal wetlands, which constitute an irreplaceable, productive ecosystem for migratory fish, birds and threatened species. The estuary is listed on The Nature Conservancy 's list of the Western Hemisphere 's 40 Last Great Places. Since the early 1970 's the State of Connecticut has utilized The Gateway Commission and strong local enforcement of zoning standards to protect this treasured habitat for future generations. Conservation efforts and partnerships include grants from the Connecticut Department of Energy and Environmental Protection, the federal Environmental Protection Agency, the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation, The Nature Conservancy, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and collaborative programs with the States of New York and Massachusetts.	In accordance with the Ecological Resources methodology (Volume 2, Appendix E.06), the FRA addressed potential effects of the Action Alternatives on ecological resources, including federally listed Threatened and Endangered Species. Potential effects to cultural resources were addressed as well (Volume 2, Appendix E.09). Tier 2 analysis will further evaluate the potential effects of the Preferred Alternative on ecological and other resources.

Table JJ–13: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Environmental Resources (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Anonymous_149	Whatever you do plan, please keep a HUGE focus on maintaining the BEAUTY of the neighborhoods you affect. The railway should be physically attractive as well as functional. After all, this is about reducing congestion (both of residential properties, people and automobiles from the shoreline 95 corridor) while improving the economics and quality of life for us all, correct? If the Northeast loses its beauty due to ugly development, there will be nothing really left to keep folks wanting to live here.	The Tier 1 EIS assesses visual impacts associated with the No Action Alternative, the Action Alternatives (Volume 2, Chapter 7.10), and the Preferred Alternative (Volume 1, Chapter 7.10). Both chapters compare the visual impacts associated with each alternative with the No Action Alternative. Further evaluation of visual and aesthetic elements, along with detailed design and engineering will be considered during subsequent Tier 2 project studies in order to minimize impacts on these resources. Development or redevelopment of properties adjacent to the NEC is the responsibility of the localities as part of the local design and review process.

Source: NEC FUTURE team, 2016

JJ.5.7 Construction

The following tables contain comments on the effects of construction of the Action Alternatives described in Volume 2, Chapter 8, Construction Effects. The majority of the comments assigned to the category inquired about the schedule of the construction, specific details on the representative construction types, and the percentage of route miles by construction type. Volume 1, Chapter 8, Construction Effects presents the effects of construction of the Preferred Alternative.

Table JJ–14: Stakeholder Comments (Elected Officials, Tribes, Federal Agencies, State Agencies, Local Agencies): Construction

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
DE SHPO_Lukezic	We need some more information of the representative corridors themselves. For example, will Alternative 3 be at grade or an elevated causeway?	The NEC FUTURE program follows a "tiered" approach to environmental review. Tier 1 focuses on broad programs and initial analysis. Tier 2 focuses on site-specific, project-level proposals and impacts. The FRA developed a mapping atlas to provide a high level representation of the location and construction type of the Preferred Alternative (see Volume 1, Appendix AA). Detailed mapping would occur in subsequent Tier 2 project analyses. The Programmatic Agreement, provided in Volume 1, Appendix GG provides information on continuing the Section 106 process during subsequent Tier 2 project studies where more detailed mapping and a definition of the Area of Potential Effect (APE) will be further defined in coordination with each SHPO.
EPA_Walsh	EPA recommends that alternatives to blasting be fully explored, and that blasting within close proximity to bedrock wells be avoided. The FEIS (and the Tier 2 process to follow) should identify specific areas where blasting may occur in association with project construction. ... Provisions for construction should include designating acceptable waiting locations, away from homes, schools, heavily-used parks, and waterways.	<p>Volume 1, Chapter 8, includes a discussion related to the analysis for engineering and geotechnical investigations as they relate to construction. The FRA developed Representative Routes for each Action Alternative and the Preferred Alternative, which provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the effects of each Alternative, and included potential construction types. The Tier 1 Final EIS does not specifically cover blasting.</p> <p>The Tier 1 Final EIS does not identify specific locations where specific land clearance methods, such as blasting, drilling, or cut-and-fill may occur. Subsequent Tier 2 project analysis by other project sponsors will complete more-detailed engineering and geotechnical testing to confirm construction types and define depths and methodologies for building tunnels or other proposed infrastructure.</p>
Floral Park_Trustee Longobardi	In the absence of detailed plans, construction operations near the Villages business district where Alternative 3 is contemplated will cause major issues resulting in limited access to our local businesses. At the very least traffic patterns can be disrupted and street access will be closed. This will have lasting affects on the businesses owners as well as the viability of the business district. If the aerial structure is to be located along the LIRR Hempstead Branch, it is doubtful our business district would survive an extended construction period that would have to accompany a project such as Alternative 3.	For purposes of the Tier 1 EIS, the FRA discussed construction effects at a very high level, noting potential temporary construction effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 8, for examples of these temporary effects. Site-specific construction effects and methods will be determined during subsequent Tier 2 project studies. The FRA has identified a Preferred Alternative that does not include the Alternative 3 route option through Long Island and across the Long Island Sound.
NJDEP_Fo	Air Mobile Sources The Bureau of Mobile Sources has reviewed this project and finds no long term diesel impacts due to the extensnsive if not exclusive use of electrified systems on the NEC within New Jersey. During the construction phase, however, there are likely to be short term diesel impacts due to the use of diesel powered equipment, especially if one of the more ambitions alternatives is chosen. While there is some mention of standard mitigation procedures during construction in the plan, please refer to the following recommendations: Diesel exhaust contributes the highest cancer risk of all air toxics in New Jersey and is a major source of NOx within the state. Therefore, NJ DEP recommends that construction projects involving non-road diesel construction equipment operating in a small geographic area over an extended period of time implement the following measures to minimize the impact of diesel exhaust: 1. All on-road vehicles and non-road construction equipment operating at, or visiting, the construction site shall comply with the three minute idling limit, pursuant to N.J.A.C. 7:27-14 and N.J.A.C. 7:27-15. Consider purchasing No Idling signs to post at the site to remind contractors to comply with the idling limits. Signs are available for purchase from the Bureau of Mobile Sources at 609/292-7953 or http://www.stopthesoot.org/sts-no-idle-sign.htm . 2. All non-road diesel construction equipment greater than 100 horsepower used on the project for more than ten days should have engines that meet the USEPA Tier 4 non-road emission standards, or the best available emission control technology that is technologically feasible for that application and is verified by the USEP A or the CARB as a diesel emission control strategy for reducing particulate matter and/or NOx emissions. 3. All on-road diesel vehicles used to haul materials or traveling to and from the construction site should use designated truck routes that are designed to minimize impacts on residential areas and sensitive receptors such as hospitals, schools, daycare facilities, senior citizen housing, and convalescent facilities	Mitigation measures related to diesel emissions will be subject to applicable federal, state, and local regulations. The Tier 1 EIS process does not include specific mitigation measures for construction impacts. Subsequent Tier 2 project analysis will require the lead agency to develop project-specific measures to reduce and/or mitigate construction impacts.

Source: NEC FUTURE team, 2016

Table JJ–15: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Construction

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Allen_Th	Construction should be minimized to the greatest extent possible. This does not mean not restoring the right of way to a state of good repair.	The FRA has taken commenter views into consideration in making a decision regarding identification of the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative achieves a state of good repair for the Northeast Corridor; in order to achieve the "Grow" vision of the Preferred Alternative, the FRA has proposed new construction projects for the Preferred Alternative that include chokepoint relief, new track, and new segment projects, as described in Volume 2, Chapter 4. In addition, construction would take place within the existing right-of-way, to the greatest extent possible.
Carbone_Vi	When will construction begin?	The Tier 1 EIS process does not include specific construction timing or sequencing. However, the FRA developed Representative Routes for each Action Alternative and the Preferred Alternative that include potential construction types and typical sequencing of construction activities (Volumes 1 and 2, Chapter 8). Subsequent Tier 2 project analysis will identify specific construction scheduling and sequencing carried out in phases over several years.
Comins_Pa	since there is a mix of at-grade and tunnel proposals included in these options, it would be good to have more details on things like the depth and methodology for drilling to better assess the impacts to sensitive surface resources.	The FRA developed Representative Routes for each Action Alternative and the Preferred Alternative, which provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the effects of each Alternative, and included potential construction types. Volume 1, Chapter 8, presents a qualitative review of construction methods that the FRA considered for the NEC FUTURE Tier 1 Final EIS analysis. Subsequent Tier 2 project analysis will include detailed engineering and geotechnical testing to confirm construction types and to further define depths and methodologies for tunnel or other proposed infrastructure construction methods.
Comins_Pa	I also want to know what is going to be done with the materials that are from all of these drilling and tunnel routes.	The Tier 1 EIS process does not include specific construction designs or material removal or disposal plans. Subsequent Tier 2 project analysis will require the responsible implementing agency or entity to adhere to applicable federal, state, and local regulations when removing materials during construction.
Floroff_Pa	And I'd like to make a few comments about some of the ideas of the tunnel. ... Now I worked as a civil engineer. On Long Island you'll notice the electrical is above ground. But underground you still have sewer, water and mostly telecom. Now one idea you could do is, you could go under all these utilities but you still have and will probably have to do cut and cover at the stations. ... if you do build a tunnel and you do build the stations and you build, basically, a station at a time, because when you use the tunnel boring machines, there's very little surface disruption. ... But an elevated line, it's a lot more in your face. Now should we build a tunnel? Should we build an elevated? It -- it all -- it all depends. Building an elevated line through the middle of Floral Park is not going to cut the mustard. Building a tunnel in a less developed area of the northeast might just be overkill. It kind of has to be a balance. You put the tunnel where it's going to be -- make everyone's lives easier. You put elevated where it's going to make life -- and you might even consider ground level right-of-way to make it even cheaper.	The NEC FUTURE Tier 1 EIS follows a "tiered" approach to environmental review under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). A Tier 1 NEPA review focuses on broad programmatic analysis. A Tier 2 NEPA review focuses on site-specific, project-level proposals and impacts. Volume 1, Section 1.3, contains more information on the tiered NEPA process. For purposes of the Tier 1 EIS, the FRA discussed construction effects at a very high level, noting potential temporary construction effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 8, Construction Effects, for examples of these temporary effects. Site-specific construction effects and methods will be determined during Tier 2 project studies. For purposes of analysis, the FRA developed Representative Routes for the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative, which provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the effects of each Alternative. Representative Routes define an envelope within which improvements might occur and whose location and construction type could change during subsequent Tier 2 project analysis.
Gaudio_Ra	We are equally concerned that the DEIS does not include potential environmental consequences resulting from the construction of such a tunnel. Four million people call the Long Island Sound coastline home, and 9 million live within its watershed. ³	The NEC FUTURE Tier 1 EIS follows a "tiered" approach to environmental review under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). A Tier 1 NEPA review focuses on broad programmatic analysis. A Tier 2 NEPA review focuses on site-specific, project-level proposals and impacts. Volume 1, Section 1.3, contains more information on the tiered NEPA process. For purposes of the Tier 1 EIS, the FRA discussed construction effects at a very high level, noting potential temporary construction effects. See Volume 1, Chapter 8, Construction Effects, for examples of these temporary effects. Site-specific construction effects and methods will be determined during subsequent Tier 2 project studies. The FRA identified a Preferred Alternative that does not include the Alternative 3 route option through Long Island and across the Long Island Sound.

Table JJ–15: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Construction (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Hale_Ro	Although constructing an inland Connecticut bypass of the Shore Line would be difficult, global experience shows that it is feasible. For example, much of the mileage on the Naples-Milan high-speed rail spine in Italy cuts through quite rugged terrain.	The construction types defined for the new track construction of the Action Alternatives included methods that are capable of laying track in a variety of conditions, including where right-of-way topography is submerged, where the topography is too steep for tracks designed for speeds of 160 to 220 mph to accomplish the grades for climbing or braking, and where vertical grade changes do not permit at-grade construction. As described in the Volume 2, Appendix B.6, the development and application of the construction types considered the construction of national and international high-speed rail projects.
Leach_Ge	Additionally, since there is a mix of at-grade and tunnel proposals included in the options, it would be good to have more details on things like the depth and methodology for drilling and the size and frequency of tunnel ventilation shafts to better assess impacts to sensitive surface resources.	The Tier 1 EIS process does not include the depth and specific methodology for drilling tunnels. The FRA developed Representative Routes for each Action Alternative and the Preferred Alternative, which provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the effects of each Alternative, and included potential construction types. Subsequent Tier 2 project analysis by project sponsors will complete more-detailed service development planning, including detailed engineering and geotechnical testing to confirm construction types and to further define depths and methodologies for building tunnels or other proposed infrastructure. Volume 1, Chapter 8, presents a qualitative review of construction methods that were used for the NEC FUTURE Tier 1 Final EIS analysis.
Leach_Ge	The possible tunnel under Long Island Sound has its own issues, depending on tunnel construction methodology and much more detail must be provided to assess these impacts, particularly as the route appears to cross some unique and very important and productive hard substrate bottomlands of the Sound.	The Tier 1 EIS process does not include the depth and specific methodology for drilling tunnels. The FRA developed Representative Routes for each Action Alternative and the Preferred Alternative, which provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the effects of each Alternative, and included potential construction types. Subsequent Tier 2 project analysis by project sponsors will complete more-detailed service development planning, including detailed engineering and geotechnical testing to confirm construction types and to further define depths and methodologies for building tunnels or other proposed infrastructure. Volume 1, Chapter 8, presents a qualitative review of construction methods that were used for the Tier 1 Final EIS analysis. The Preferred Alternative does not include the route option through Long Island and across the Long Island Sound associated with Alternative 3.
Osler_Ja	Use other countries technology to build tunnels quickly thats how other Countries have build some great high speed rail recently. I would see the Danbury - Waterbury - Hartford - Worchester - Boston via I-84 and building tunnels in many areas.	<p>The NEC FUTURE Tier 1 EIS follows a "tiered" approach to environmental review under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). A Tier 1 NEPA review focuses on broad programmatic analysis. A Tier 2 NEPA review focuses on site-specific, project-level proposals and impacts. Volume 2, Section 1.3, contains more information on the tiered NEPA process.</p> <p>Volume 1, Chapter 8, presents a qualitative review of construction methods that were considered for the NEC FUTURE Tier 1 Final EIS analysis. The Tier 1 Final EIS process does not include specific construction methods for tunneling. Subsequent Tier 2 project studies will provide more detailed analysis, engineering, and identification of site-specific construction methods. Once specific alignments have been identified and appropriate testing to determine soil suitability and geotechnical investigations occur, appropriate construction methods will be determined.</p>
Semeraro_Mi	Table 9-36 How many miles of new construction by type per alternative? Are the percentages shown for the route overall or the new construction required for the alternative? The text is ambiguous on if the construction type is new or existing track.	<p>Volume 1, Chapter 8, presents the percentage of route miles by construction type for both new track and existing track for the Preferred Alternative. Volume 2, Chapter 8, likewise presents the percentage of route miles by construction type for the Action Alternatives. The FRA developed Representative Routes for each Action Alternative and the Preferred Alternative, which provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the effects of each Alternative, and included potential construction types.</p> <p>The Tier 1 Final EIS does not identify specific locations where specific land clearance methods, such as blasting, drilling, or cut-and-fill may occur. Subsequent Tier 2 project analysis by other project sponsors will complete more-detailed engineering and geotechnical testing to confirm construction types and define depths and methodologies for building tunnels or other proposed infrastructure.</p>

Table JJ–15: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Construction (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Shields_Er	We should stop digging after a certain point because there's going to be points where the weather is going to worsen and sea levels maybe could rise in the future.	<p>The FRA noted the concern regarding constructing tracks in a tunnel or trench that could be vulnerable to sea level rise. The FRA developed Representative Routes for each Action Alternative and the Preferred Alternative, which provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the effects of each Alternative, and included potential construction types.</p> <p>Subsequent Tier 2 project analysis will include detailed service development planning, and detailed engineering and geotechnical testing in order to confirm specific construction types and to further define necessary depths and methodologies for constructing tunnels or other proposed infrastructure. As described in Volume 2, Chapter 7.15 the lead agency will use multiple approaches to adapt rail service and infrastructure to mitigate impacts from future climate change. These mitigation measures would include designing assets that consider the identified risks associated with location and elevation.</p>
Van Der Aue_Ka	Some of this is tunnel, some is elevated and some at ground level. The tunneling is extraordinarily lengthy in some areas. Because the details of this proposal are not evident on the map detail (such as it is) it is difficult to determine :which portions would potentially disrupt areas set aside for wildlife, safe drinking water, recreational areas and scenic vistas. The plans also lack detail on the mechanisms that might be employed to deal with the tremendous amount of debris that would be generated by all that tunneling. There is no information regarding filling of wetlands or dredging.	<p>The NEC FUTURE Tier 1 EIS follows a "tiered" approach to environmental review under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). A Tier 1 NEPA review focuses on broad programmatic analysis. A Tier 2 NEPA review focuses on site-specific, project-level proposals and impacts. Volume 1, Section 1.3, contains more information on the tiered NEPA process.</p> <p>Volume 2, Chapter 8, presents a qualitative review of construction methods that were considered for the NEC FUTURE Tier 1 EIS analysis. It does not include specific construction methods for tunneling or removal and placement of soil and debris resulting from construction. Subsequent Tier 2 project studies will provide more detailed analysis, engineering, and identification of site-specific construction methods. Furthermore, Subsequent Tier 2 project studies will provide construction documents and required permitting prior to construction.</p>

Source: NEC FUTURE team, 2016

JJ.5.8 Evaluation of Alternatives

The following tables contain comments on the evaluation of the No Action Alternative and Action Alternatives described in Volume 2, Chapter 9, Evaluation of Alternatives. The comments expressed concern regarding the metrics used in the evaluation of the Action Alternatives and the evaluation of the costs and benefits of each Action Alternative. Chapter 9, Evaluation of the Preferred Alternative, presents the evaluation of the Preferred Alternative. The assessment of the Preferred Alternative is consistent with the evaluation of the Action Alternatives presented in Volume 2, Chapter 9.

Table JJ–16: Stakeholder Comments (Elected Officials, Tribes, Federal Agencies, State Agencies, Local Agencies): Evaluation of Alternatives

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Cecil County_DiGiacomo	Alternative 2 is touted as providing five times as much intercity service and more than doubles peak-hour Regional rail service. Yet, the Evaluating the Alternatives section reveals that those respective 400% and 100% service increases yield only 21.18% increase in aggregate rail ridership. In turn, that 21.18% ridership increase comes at the cost of an extra \$115 billion (a 475% increase).	<p>The FRA did not complete a detailed cost benefit analysis for the Action Alternatives in the Tier 1 Draft EIS. A detailed cost benefit analysis will be completed for the Preferred Alternative and presented in the FRA's Service Development Plan to be published subsequent to the Record of Decision. For the Tier 1 Draft EIS, the FRA considered several factors in evaluating the costs and benefits of each Action Alternative. These factors included environmental effects, ridership, trips diverged from other travel modes such as air and auto, travel time savings and improvements in traveler convenience, improved connectivity, and economic benefits. The FRA considered all of these factors when evaluating how well the Action Alternatives addressed the NEC FUTURE Purpose and Need.</p> <p>Service levels proposed for Alternative 2, and the other Action Alternatives, represented service capacity to meet travel demand to 2040 and beyond. Research and survey data developed for Intercity and Regional rail travel, supported the importance of service frequency in attracting travelers from other modes, particularly auto, where travel requires no pre-determined schedule. Beyond the importance of a robust service to attract new riders, service levels in the most heavily traveled segments of the NEC, such as the New York City metropolitan area, are driven by peak-period demands. The FRA considered attractiveness of proposed services, peak requirements, and future demand when developing representative service plans. It is also important to note that while service plans focused on the peak periods, ridership numbers reflected daily or annual totals. In evaluating the costs and benefits of proposed services, the FRA considered several other benefits and costs, including travel time savings, economic effects such as the creation of jobs, or improved access to employment opportunities.</p>
Cecil County_DiGiacomo	Alternative 3 is touted as providing six times as much intercity service and up to three times the amount of peak-hour Regional rail service. Yet, the Evaluating the Alternatives section reveals that those respective 500% and up to 200% service increases yield only 33.26% increase in aggregate rail ridership. In turn, that 33.26% ridership increase comes at the cost of an extra \$270 billion (a 1450% increase).	<p>The FRA did not complete a detailed cost benefit analysis for the Action Alternatives in the Tier 1 Draft EIS. A detailed cost benefit analysis will be completed for the Preferred Alternative and presented in the FRA's Service Development Plan to be published subsequent to the Record of Decision. For the Tier 1 Draft EIS, the FRA considered several factors in evaluating the costs and benefits of each Action Alternative. These factors included environmental effects, ridership, trips diverged from other travel modes such as air and auto, travel time savings and improvements in traveler convenience, improved connectivity, and economic benefits. The FRA considered all of these factors when evaluating how well the Action Alternatives addressed the NEC FUTURE Purpose and Need.</p> <p>Alternative 3 provided service capacity at all locations along the corridor to accommodate additional off-corridor trips and future growth post 2040. Economic development opportunities may extend beyond the NEC corridor to markets that gain new or expanded connecting service. The additional capacity could also accommodate growth from the Southeast High Speed Rail Corridor currently being developed to the south of the NEC, connecting in Washington, D.C. The Preferred Alternative would provide service capacity to accommodate additional off-corridor trips and future growth post 2040 and provides economic development opportunities to new markets throughout the Study Area.</p>
Cecil County_DiGiacomo	Alternative 1 nets 69 million more annual trips at an addition cost of \$45 billion, or \$652.17 per trip. Alternative 2 nets 93 million more annual trips at an addition cost of \$115 billion, or \$1,236.56 per trip. Alternative 3 nets 141 (or is it 146?) million more annual trips at an addition cost of \$270 billion, or \$1,914.89 per trip. Interesting!	The FRA did not complete a detailed cost benefit analysis for the Action Alternatives in the Tier 1 Draft EIS. A detailed cost benefit analysis will be completed for the Preferred Alternative and presented in the FRA's Service Development Plan to be published subsequent to the Record of Decision. For the Tier 1 Draft EIS, the FRA considered several factors in evaluating the costs and benefits of each Action Alternative. These factors included environmental effects, ridership, trips diverged from other travel modes such as air and auto, travel time savings and improvements in traveler convenience, improved connectivity, and economic benefits. The FRA considered all of these factors when evaluating how well the Action Alternatives addressed the NEC FUTURE Purpose and Need.

Table JJ–16: Stakeholder Comments (Elected Officials, Tribes, Federal Agencies, State Agencies, Local Agencies): Evaluation of Alternatives (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
EPA_Walsh	The table should clarify whether the values provided include property acquisition costs for the right of way. The FEIS should also clarify if the costs include mitigation, which as noted in the DEIS, can be difficult and expensive to implement.	Infrastructure capital costs identified in Table 9-32 and 9-33 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS are inclusive of right-of-way acquisition and environmental mitigation costs, but exclude property acquisition costs for yards or stations. Environmental mitigation costs were estimated as a percentage of the total infrastructure cost as specifics are unknown at this level of analysis. More-refined costs estimates would be prepared for subsequent Tier 1 project studies. Further details about the capital cost methodology are provided in Volume 2, Appendix B.6. FRA estimated capital costs for the Preferred Alternative following the same methodology applied for the No Action and Action Alternatives as described in Volume 1, Appendix BB.
PVPC_Brennan	We believe the S/DEIS should include more context-sensitive factors for both travel and economic development to improve the sensitivity of the alternatives evaluation for: 1) markets that currently have high speed rail service; 2) markets that currently have regional rail service; and 3) markets that currently have little or no rail service of any type. This market differentiation is especially important in the North region of the study area (MA, CT and RI), where Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 offer a wider range of options to serve existing and new markets...	Volume 1, Chapters 5 and 6, include expanded discussions of how various types of markets are affected with the Preferred Alternative. This discussion includes markets with high-performance rail service; markets with limited Intercity service, but with regional services; or those with limited passenger rail service. Additional details regarding the FRA's approach to travel demand forecasting with regard to market differentiation are explained in Volume 2, Appendix B.8.

Source: NEC FUTURE team, 2016

Table JJ–17: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Evaluation of Alternatives

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Arena_Ri	As noted previously, APT strongly supports Alternate 3. Regarding subalternates 3.1 through 3.4, we believe the priority should be reducing travel time between major hubs. It appears Table 9-17 (Avg. Station to Station Travel Times Savings") may in fact show travel times, not time savings, because the supposed "savings" match the average travel times cited in the preceding table. We would be grateful if you could clarify this. It appears that the travel times for the Alternate 3 Express options vary by only 10 minutes, which may not be determinative.	Table 9-17 in the Tier 1 Draft EIS was incorrectly labeled. The correct title should be "Average Station-to-Station Travel Times at Selected Stations – Alternative 3 Route Options (in hours and minutes)". Table 9-17 has been updated in Volume 2, Chapter 9. Additional information related to travel times, and inferred travel time savings, between the No Action and Action Alternatives is found in Volume 2, Chapter 9. Travel time savings associated with the Preferred Alternative when compared to the No Action Alternative are presented in Volume 1, Chapters 5, 6, and 9.
Collins_Ja	...in a country with competing societal needs, there is no wisdom in investing \$65 Billion tax-payer dollars to save 30 minutes for a limited number of individuals.	While travel time savings were part of the Tier 1 EIS analysis for the Action Alternatives, the investments considered would also include upgrades to address aging infrastructure and improve reliability, frequency, and connectivity, which would contribute to the overall benefits of the proposed program. Volume 1, Chapter 9, provides the rationale and justification of the Preferred Alternative.
DesJardins_Za	Second, I wanted to highlight that the operating profit for the no build option or doing nothing is higher than all of the alternatives and double the most expensive alternative. In your study, doing nothing will yield the greatest return on investment. Doing nothing actually doubles Amtrak 's 2014 profit on the Northeast Corridor to \$975 million while the most expensive alternative- \$252-293 billion-generates a profit only 16% more than Amtrak earns today. In addition, the average profit per passenger goes down despite more riders. Again, despite investing \$252-293 billion for Alternative 3, the average profit per passenger drops by 283% compared to 2014 and even more compared to doing nothing.	The No Action Alternative, as noted on Table 9-34 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS (Volume 2, Chapter 9), may also incur additional operating costs due to the higher risk of unplanned service disruptions. The No Action Alternative failed to meet the NEC FUTURE Purpose and Need in that it does not achieve a state of good repair, increase capacity to meet current and future demand, improve reliability, address connectivity gaps, or expand service to new markets. The potential net contribution from Intercity rail is only one of the metrics the FRA used to evaluate the Action Alternatives. Other evaluation criteria used to evaluate the Action Alternatives include the assessment of effects on the natural and built environment (environmental impacts), ridership and revenue projections, and the ability to meet economic development.
DesJardins_Za	Finally, below is a chart which manages to combine what the report does not, lay out profits, infrastructure cost and ridership to help the layman easily compare benefits to costs. While faster trains, increased capacity and additional infrastructure are vital for the Northeast Corridor, poorly done studies such as these undermine the case for those dearly needed improvements.	Detailed cost benefit analysis were not completed for the Action Alternatives in the Tier 1 Draft EIS. A detailed cost benefit analysis will be completed for the Preferred Alternative and presented in the FRA's Service Development Plan to be published subsequent to the Record of Decision. For the Tier 1 Draft EIS, the FRA considered several factors in evaluating the costs and benefits of each Action Alternative. These factors included environmental effects, ridership, trips diverged from other travel modes such as air and auto, travel time savings and improvements in traveler convenience, improved connectivity, and economic benefits. The FRA considered all of these factors when evaluating how well Action Alternatives address the NEC FUTURE Purpose and Need.
Hood_Ed	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.	The FRA identified estimated right-of-way acquisition costs for those locations where the Representative Route and station areas were not located within the existing NEC right-of-way. Site-specific property acquisitions were not identified as part of the Tier 1 EIS. The Preferred Alternative utilizes, to the extent practical, existing rights-of-way (adjacent to I-95, existing rail corridors, etc.) to minimize acquisition requirements and cost. The Preferred Alternative minimizes to the greatest extent possible, the use of greenfield corridors.
Humphries_Jo	I think that it's useful to compare investment in rail service as we look at the price tags with the amount that we're investing in our highway system...	As part of the Tier 1 Draft EIS, the FRA considered several factors when evaluating the costs and benefits of each Action Alternative. These factors included environmental effects, ridership, trips diverged from other travel modes such as air and auto, travel time savings and improvements in traveler convenience, improved connectivity, and economic benefits. The FRA considered all of these factors when evaluating how well the Action Alternatives addressed the NEC FUTURE Purpose and Need.
Igelbrink_Ca	...an expenditure of \$60 billion for a 30 minute improvement in service is a gross misuse of taxpayer money	While travel time savings were part of the analysis for the Action Alternatives, the investments considered would also include upgrades to address aging infrastructure and improve reliability, frequency, and connectivity, which would contribute to the overall benefits of the proposed program. Volume 1, Chapter 9, provides the rationale and justification of the Preferred Alternative.

Table JJ–17: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Evaluation of Alternatives (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Lenhart_To	How can we create tunnels on Long Island Sound or through up-state Connecticut when we have bridges that are easily 110 years old and tunnels under New York City and through it that now have been damaged by Sandy but before that were built during the World War periods?	The Preferred Alternative includes improvements to aging infrastructure on the NEC—including the trans-Hudson tunnels and Connecticut bridges—as necessary to bring the NEC to a state of good repair. Beyond the state-of-good-repair investment, however, equally important are critical investments necessary to relieve chokepoints, improve travel times, and achieve operating efficiencies. The Preferred Alternative focuses improvements on the existing NEC with select areas of new track, as described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative is likely to be implemented over several decades, so prioritizing the most immediate state-of-good-repair needs will be paramount in the development of an Initial Phase of work, as described in Volume 1, Chapter 10. The FRA anticipates working closely with the stakeholders and railroads to identify and agree upon priority improvements subsequent to the completion of the Tier 1 EIS during development of the Service Development Plan (further described in Volume 1, Chapters 1 and 10).
Penn Design_Taylor_Yaro	However, before selecting a preferred alignment for the NY-Boston section of the NEC further analysis of the alternative alignments should be conducted to determine:... b) what the benefits, costs and environmental and community impacts of the alternative alignments between New York and New Haven, and New Haven and Boston would be; and c) which of the three alternative alignments between New York City and New Haven (the existing New Haven Line, the proposed Long Island / Long Island Sound Tunnel corridor, and the Danbury / Waterbury corridor, would provide the greatest transportation and economic development benefits, and have the least impact on the environment, communities and existing rail services. We believe that this more detailed analysis will confirm the merits of the Long Island / Long Island Sound Tunnel alternative (which was originally proposed by PennDesign in 2010) over the others, but await further analysis of its costs and benefits to confirm this belief. This investment should be accompanied by strategic investments in the Hell Gate to New Haven corridor to add capacity, reliability and reduced travel time in this section of the NEC. We also believe that the proposed inland route from New Haven to Hartford and then to Providence would be preferable to the coastal route, because of the benefits it will provide to greater Hartford and because of the serious resilience and other concerns associated with the coastal route.	The FRA did not complete a detailed cost benefit analysis for the Action Alternatives in the Tier 1 Draft EIS. A detailed cost benefit analysis will be completed for the Preferred Alternative and presented in the FRA's Service Development Plan to be published subsequent to the Record of Decision. For the Tier 1 Draft EIS, the FRA considered the benefits and costs associated with improving passenger rail service between New York City and Boston via the existing NEC or a new route via Long Island or Central Connecticut. Volume 2, Chapter 9, summarized the findings of this analysis. Volume 1, Chapter 9, presents the analysis on the Preferred Alternative compared to the No Action Alternative. The FRA considered the benefits, costs, and environmental and community effects of each of the Action Alternatives in the deliberative process to recommend a Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative supports improvements along the existing NEC and includes service on the Hartford/Springfield Line. While focusing on the existing NEC, the FRA acknowledges future opportunities for off-corridor routes, but understands those improvements will require additional local decision-making. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude future opportunities to expand the corridor. The FRA's deliberative process and Preferred Alternative are described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.

Source: NEC FUTURE team, 2016

JJ.5.9 Phasing and Implementation

The following tables contain comments on the evaluation of the No Action Alternative and Action Alternatives described in Volume 2, Chapter 10, Phasing and Implementation. The comments focused primarily on coordination of future construction activity with current or planned infrastructure projects, concern about how the Tier 2 projects would be funded, concern regarding the projects included in an Initial Phase, and concern regarding the use of eminent domain to acquire land for construction. Volume 1, Chapter 10, Phasing and Implementation, presents information on phasing and implementation of the alternative selected in the Record of Decision.

Table JJ–18: Stakeholder Comments (Elected Officials, Tribes, Federal Agencies, State Agencies, Local Agencies): Phasing and Implementation

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
CT DECD_Chandy	As outlined in Governor Malloy's letter, DECD would encourage FRA to have a phased approach to the Tier 2 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) program. In the first phase, we would encourage FRA to focus on the study and implementation of the No Build option that includes funded and unfunded (but planned) initiatives. Our current rail infrastructure that includes Metro North commuter rail sections from New York to New Haven and Shore Line East is plagued by capacity and reliability issues. We need an urgent solution to these issues before it affects the established economic markets. We specifically request FRA to include the proposed Hartford Line, which connects New Haven, Hartford and Springfield in the first phase of the Tier 2 EIS Program. The Hartford line runs across the Knowledge Corridor, which is the 20th largest metro region in the country... Multi-modal connections within this region, including rail connections, are very important for the vitality of this growing economic giant... The State recommends that all other alternatives and alignments beyond the No Build Alternative be studied under future phases of the Tier 2 EIS Program. All potential rail connections should be included in the overall planning and vision. If high-speed rail is not the solution for a particular alignment, the Tier 2 EIS will open up other feasible options that the State can consider for these routes. A robust rail network at all levels, connecting major and medium economic centers, will catapult Connecticut to being a key player in the region.	<p>Volume 1, Chapter 10 includes a plan for incremental project phasing and implementation for the Preferred Alternative. The Initial Phase of project implementation focuses on the highest priority projects and those required for addressing aging infrastructure and chokepoints along the NEC. The FRA established a Working Group to collaborate on the projects and sequencing for an Initial Phase. Completion of the Initial Phase will support an important increment increase in service for both Intercity and Regional services, thereby enhancing service for all operators and travelers using the NEC. The Initial Phase will also improve the way that rail services are provided to the customer and provide opportunities to make rail operations more efficient. The Initial Phase and subsequent project phases will be further detailed in the Service Development Plan.</p> <p>Volume 1, Chapter 1 identifies methods in which the FRA will coordinate with stakeholders to transition from this Tier 1 process to subsequent planning processes.</p> <p>In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative includes improvements to the NEC in Connecticut and to the Hartford/Springfield Line. For additional information on the Preferred Alternative improvements to the Hartford/Springfield Line, see Volume 1, Chapter 4.</p>
DTC_Loyola	While OTC does not have specific views of No Action Alternatives and Options 1-3 presented in the EIS, it will be important for subsequent EIS investigations and in the Service Development Plan, to develop a collaborative financial plan. Delaware, like most NEC states, does not have long-range funding available to participate in construction of large system projects. The NEC will require substantive federal participation, as well as new sources of revenue, to support the options presented in the EIS. As the EIS notes, no development plans can begin to be implemented until the State of Good Repair is accomplished. Further deferring of critical infrastructure renewal threatens to curtail present levels of service, and such an outcome is unacceptable.	Funding and financing the Tier 2 projects necessary to implement the Preferred Alternative will be an incremental process for the federal government, Amtrak, the NEC states and stakeholders, and the entire region. This process will require the commitment of both the public and private sectors over a long period of time. The FRA and the NEC Commission will take a leading role in working with project sponsors to support the federal financial assistance to advance implementation, including existing and future grant and other financing programs and options. The FRA and other NEC stakeholders will also engage the private sector to explore options for commercial funding or financing to advance Tier 2 projects. Funding and financing options will be further detailed in the Service Development Plan.
EPA_Walsh	We recommend that the FEIS contain a specific summary/breakdown of the impacts and schedule associated with the implementation of the Universal First Phase. The addition of this specific discussion would add clarity and would take advantage of the Tier 1 process to advance the environmental impacts dialogue on anticipated first elements of the NEC Future project.	As a result of feedback from stakeholders, states and railroad operators during the review of the Tier 1 Draft EIS, the FRA initiated an NEC FUTURE Service Development Plan (SDP) Working Group (Working Group) to define an Initial Phase. This Working Group is led by the FRA and is responsible for identify service objectives, service benefits, project delivery, and a prioritized set of projects for an Initial Phase. The Initial Phase will focus on the highest priority projects for which planning is already underway and those required for addressing aging infrastructure and chokepoints along the NEC. Specific effects associated with the Initial Phase would be determined in subsequent Tier 2 project studies. A description of the overall approach to an Initial Phase, principles for the collaboration amongst the stakeholders, roles and responsibilities, and next steps are provided in Volume 1, Chapter 10.

Table JJ–18: Stakeholder Comments (Elected Officials, Tribes, Federal Agencies, State Agencies, Local Agencies): Phasing and Implementation (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Florio_Ja	I see that financing is not part of your mandate, but you might want to consider a supplemental report, putting on the table at least some of the financing options that are available. One of the options that I would suggest that's available is the public-private partnerships. Distinguished from privatization. All through the '80s in the Reagan administration I fought against privatization because they were going to off load everything to a private company, and there would be no opportunities for control over the public sector. There are proposals out there now, public-private partnerships. There are a number, and I'll leave with you some, if you don't mind, some articles that I'd like to place in the record. Some proposals that talk about spinning stock off of Amtrak into a separate trust that would still be government owned, the facilities would be government owned so you're not losing control. But what you would have is a trust that would raise money through a very intricate procedure but a very verifiable, verifiable procedure to ensure private control stays there. And this system would provide for the opportunity to be able to use the alternatives that you talked about, the alternatives under Tier I. All of those things could be done by a private sector infrastructure manager. It would be done probably much more efficiently by the private sector, much more rapidly by the private sector. And that's how they would make their money. The investment vehicle would be this trust fund. It would be authorized from what they call an infrastructure management organization. It would manage the infrastructure, that's still owned by the federal government, but they would have the versatility to be able to generate profits for themselves, as well as increase the improvement, the extent of the scope of the improvements called for in the three alternatives... private-public partnerships are really a wave of the future, and I think this is an ideal opportunity to move in that direction.	Funding and financing the Tier 2 projects necessary to implement the Preferred Alternative will be an incremental process for the federal government, Amtrak, the NEC states and stakeholders, and the entire region. This process will require the commitment of both the public and private sectors over a long period of time. The FRA and the NEC Commission will take a leading role in working with project sponsors to support the federal financial assistance to advance implementation, including existing and future grant and other financing programs and options. The FRA and other NEC stakeholders will also engage the private sector to explore options for commercial funding or financing to advance Tier 2 projects. As suggested, public-private partnerships could provide important financing and operations expertise. Funding and financing options will be further detailed in the Service Development Plan.
Governor CT_Malloy	Connecticut does not endorse any particular Action Alternative at this time. Rather, Connecticut 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 all projects identified in the No-Action Alternative (funded or unfunded) on the existing New Haven Line, Shore Line East and include similar work for the New Haven-Hartford-Springfield Corridor, including addressing connections to Bradley International Airport. Additionally, this program should acknowledge and advance the federally-funded "Knowledge Corridor" initiative. Only after this is completed should major new capacity be evaluated. These bolder and more costly initiatives deserve much more rigorous and comprehensive evaluation before FRA can recommend investments of this magnitude.	The Tier 1 Final EIS includes a plan for incremental project phasing and implementation. The Initial Phase of project implementation focuses on the highest priority projects for which planning is already underway and required for addressing aging infrastructure and chokepoints along the NEC. This includes improvements to the NEC in Connecticut and to the Hartford Line. Completion of the Initial Phase will support an important increment increase in service for both Intercity and Regional services, thereby enhancing service for all operators and travelers using the NEC. The Initial Phase will also improve the way that rail services are provided to the customer and provide opportunities to make rail operations more efficient. The Initial Phase and subsequent project phases will be further detailed in the Service Development Plan. The Tier 1 Final EIS also spells out the ways in which the FRA will coordinate with stakeholders to transition from this Tier 1 process to subsequent planning processes. Details of this overall planning approach are provided in Volume 1 Chapters 1 and 10.
Groton_Bronk	Groton is deeply concerned about the lack of resources historically allocated to the NEC for both capital and operational improvements and the resulting impacts to the system. Additionally, we know how much the NEC has historically benefitted our coastal region. We desire to support the ongoing improvement effort for the existing system. Funding at all national levels has been impacted and there is reason to believe that funding will continue to be a limiting factor into the future for projects such as the NEC.	The Preferred Alternative focuses on improving the existing NEC, augments in some locations to support additional capacity for expanding service, and provides important resilience and redundancy benefits. Funding and financing Tier 2 projects will be an incremental process for the federal government, Amtrak, the NEC states and stakeholders, and the entire region. This process will require the commitment of both the public and private sectors over a long period of time. The FRA and the NEC Commission will take a leading role in working with project sponsors to support the federal financial assistance necessary to advance implementation, including existing and future grant and other financing programs and options. The FRA and other NEC stakeholders will also engage the private sector to explore options for commercial funding or financing to advance Tier 2 projects. Funding and financing options will be further detailed in the Service Development Plan.

Table JJ–18: Stakeholder Comments (Elected Officials, Tribes, Federal Agencies, State Agencies, Local Agencies): Phasing and Implementation (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
MassDOT_Pollack	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?	The FRA collaborated with states and railroads along the NEC to identify areas of concern with regard to station access, development limitations, or operating constraints. However, given the scale of NEC FUTURE, specific sites were not evaluated in detail. Areas of concern are noted throughout the Tier 1 Draft and Final EIS as appropriate. Existing railroad constraints were reflected in the representative service plans and associated infrastructure improvements. The FRA relied on commercially available growth forecasts, and considered these forecasts in light of available regional growth forecasts as developed by the several Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) in the Study Area. Details on how the FRA developed representative service plans, station stopping patterns, and evaluated growth potential are provided in Volume 2, Appendix B.. More detailed considerations of site-specific constraints - with regard to station access, opportunities for development or operating constraints will be considered in subsequent Tier 2 project studies.
MDOT_Smith	As the FRA moves towards identifying the preferred build alternative and completes the NEC FUTURE service development plan (SDP), MOOT request s 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.	The Preferred Alternative will be implemented incrementally both to meet realistic funding constraints and to minimize impacts of construction of passenger and freight operators using the NEC. The Preferred Alternative includes the addition of a new rail segment between Baltimore, MD, and Wilmington, DE. Construction of that new segment prior to implementing other upgrades to the NEC (such as replacement of the Bush River or Gunpowder River bridges in Maryland) could help to minimize adverse impacts to ongoing train service. Construction staging and implementation are key elements of the Tier 2 project analyses (see Volume 1, Chapter 10). The Tier 1 Final EIS includes a plan for incremental project phasing and implementation. The FRA established a Working Group to collaborate on the projects and sequencing for an Initial Phase, as described in Volume 1, Chapter 10.
MetroCOG_Bidolli	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 agencys opinion that improvements to existing infrastructure be prioritized ahead of the more costly, longer term implementation of new rail infrastructure throughout the NEC.	The Preferred Alternative focuses on improvements to the existing NEC that address aging infrastructure, relieving chokepoints, and adding the capacity necessary to accommodate future demand for both Intercity and Regional rail demand. While a second spine is not included, some additional segments off the NEC are added to expand capacity and provide resilience and redundancy benefits. The Tier 1 Final EIS includes a plan for incremental project phasing and implementation, see Volume 1, Chapter 10.
MTA_Wheeler	We request FRA continue to clarify the relationship of the DEIS, the future Preferred Alternative, and Service Development plan, with more explanation about the steps that would prioritize these NEC projects and programs for federal funding- support and streamlined FTA, FRA and other federal NEPA and permitting reviews. Likewise, we would appreciate FRA clarifying how Tier 2 NEPA analysis might occur when a state or local sponsor decides to pursue a project that might be an element of the Universal First Phase or other Proposed Alternative, particularly if the project is pursued with another USDOT lead agency such as FTA.	<p>NEC FUTURE is a comprehensive planning effort to define, evaluate and prioritize future investments in the NEC. NEC FUTURE will result in a passenger rail corridor investment plan for the NEC, comprised of a Tier 1 EIS and a Service Development Plan.</p> <p>The FRA used the Tier 1 EIS to identify the preferred investment program for the NEC Preferred Alternative and presented and evaluated the Preferred Alternative in the Tier 1 Final EIS. Volume 1, Chapter 10 discussed how future projects would tier off from the Tier 1 Final EIS, including projects under FRA and FTA jurisdiction. The FRA will develop a Service Development Plan based on the Selected Alternative in the Record of Decision.</p> <p>The Record of Decision and Service Development Plan will detail next steps in prioritizing and implementing projects within the Selected Alternative. The FRA will work closely with the NEC Commission and other NEC stakeholders in developing the approach to implementation.</p> <p>Language clarifying the decisions memorialized in the Tier 1 Final EIS and Record of Decision as well as the next steps once a ROD is adopted are described in Volume 1 Chapters 1 and 10.</p>

Table JJ–18: Stakeholder Comments (Elected Officials, Tribes, Federal Agencies, State Agencies, Local Agencies): Phasing and Implementation (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
MTA_Wheeler	<p>Lastly, we request FRA clarify the statement on page 10-12 regarding coordination among NEC stakeholders, As noted, the FRA considers these issues of great importance and would consider conditioning future federal funding on the commitment to achieving necessary governance and institutional changes upon completion of projects. Please clarify what governance and institutional changes FRA seeks to bring about, or how funds will be withheld by USDOT until such changes are made.</p>	<p>As discussed in Volume 1, Chapter 10, the NEC network envisioned in the Preferred Alternative is an integrated network of local and intercity services that provide passengers more convenient, faster, and seamless traveling experience to more destinations than they can reach today. Part of advancing this network approach vision for the region will involve extensive discussion and coordination between the NEC stakeholders. Numerous legal, governance, and organizational issues may present particular challenges that require discussion, planning, and negotiation between railroad operators and states; some may require legislative and statutory changes at federal and state levels.</p> <p>Examples include improvements—such as additional stairways and wider platforms—to reduce the dwell time for trains at major stations such as Penn Station New York; through-service at New York City and Washington, D.C.; to reduce the number of train movements and platforms, use of longer and larger capacity trains. Resolving these issues is beyond the scope of the Tier 1 process. The FRA will work with the NEC Commission and the NEC stakeholder states and railroads to identify ways to expedite implementation of these types of operational improvements.</p> <p>Further clarification of how the FRA intends to ensure consistency with the Preferred Alternative as specific projects or groups of projects advance through subsequent planning processes is provided in Volume 1, Chapters 1 and 10.</p>
NEC Commission_Padgette	<p>While NEC FUTURE is a critical planning process that will establish a framework for future investments, it does not commit the region to specific projects and service plans, nor does it represent a funding commitment by the regions stakeholders. In recent years, the states in the NEC Region and Amtrak, in partnership with USDOT, have committed significant resources to improving the NEC. Across the region, planning and construction are underway on critical projects that will advance state-of-good-repair and improved performance efforts and support continued economic growth. Recognizing these recent investments, the states and Amtrak look forward to participating in future discussions on the funding partnerships that will be required to deliver new projects.</p>	<p>Funding and financing the Tier 2 projects necessary to implement the Preferred Alternative will be an incremental process for the federal government, Amtrak, the NEC states and stakeholders, and the entire region. This process will require the commitment of both the public and private sectors over a long period of time. The FRA and the NEC Commission will take a leading role in working with project sponsors to support the federal financial assistance to advance implementation, including existing and future grant and other financing programs and options. The FRA and other NEC stakeholders will also engage the private sector to explore options for commercial funding or financing to advance Tier 2 projects. Funding and financing options will be further detailed in the Service Development Plan.</p>
PennDOT_Fauver	<p>The most important project need identified brings the NEC in to a state of good repair. Before extensive efforts (time and money) are expended to grow and transform the system beyond the base line, state of good repair projects should take priority.</p>	<p>The Tier 1 Final EIS includes a plan for incremental project phasing and implementation. The Initial Phase of project implementation focuses on the highest priority projects for which planning is already underway and required for addressing aging infrastructure and chokepoints along the NEC. This Initial Phase includes many state-of-good-repair projects. The FRA established a Working Group to collaborate on the projects and sequencing for an Initial Phase. Completion of the Initial Phase will support an important increment increase in service for both Intercity and Regional services, thereby enhancing service for all operators and travelers using the NEC. It will also improve the way that rail services are provided to the customer and will provide opportunities to make rail operations more efficient. The Initial Phase and subsequent project phases will be further detailed in the Service Development Plan.</p>
SEPTA_Knueppel	<p>Federal funding is necessary to make the implementation of any of the Action Alternatives successful. The sustainability and resiliency of the infrastructure on the Northeast Corridor has to be a priority. Therefore any path forward for the future of the NEC must include a significant federal role in dealing with such backlog and improvements while recognizing that the stakeholders in the corridor are handling their normalized replacement obligations.</p>	<p>Funding and financing the Tier 2 projects necessary to implement the Preferred Alternative will be an incremental process for the federal government, Amtrak, the NEC states and stakeholders, and the entire region. This process will require the commitment of both the public and private sectors over a long period of time. The FRA and the NEC Commission will take a leading role in working with project sponsors to support the federal financial assistance to advance implementation, including existing and future grant and other financing programs and options. The FRA and other NEC stakeholders will also engage the private sector to explore options for commercial funding or financing to advance Tier 2 projects. Funding and financing options will be further detailed in the Service Development Plan.</p>

Source: NEC FUTURE team, 2016

Table JJ–19: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Phasing and Implementation

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Arena_Ri	I have serious reservations about the time frame for 220 mph service to Boston. At this time, such service to Boston is planned to be in operation by 2040. The New York to Washington segment will receive such service ten years earlier by 2030. It would be far preferable that development and construction of both the southern segment (NYC to DC) and the northern segment (NYC to BOS) of the high speed rail corridor be done simultaneously.	<p>The Preferred Alternative does not include a second spine, but does include new segments designed for speeds up to 220 mph. Travel time between markets on the NEC will see significant improvement. The Preferred Alternative does include new segments between Baltimore, MD, and Wilmington, DE, and in Southeastern Connecticut that will support high-speed operations.</p> <p>The purpose of NEC FUTURE is to address not only compromised performance on the NEC, but also overall travel needs in the Study Area, including aging infrastructure, insufficient capacity, gaps in connectivity, and lack of resiliency. Consistent with NEC FUTURE goals, the Preferred Alternative includes necessary improvements to the existing NEC, which is and will continue to be an important transportation link for several major metropolitan areas, including those along the shoreline. The Preferred Alternative reflects the importance of improving the existing NEC while also improving performance. Given the costs involved to implement the Preferred Alternative, and the potential disruption to ongoing rail operations that can result from construction of improvements, the FRA anticipates that the Preferred Alternative will be implemented incrementally in several phases. The Tier 1 Final EIS includes a plan for incremental project phasing and implementation (see Volume 1, Chapter 10).</p>
Arena_Ri	We do not find in the DEIR sufficient discussion of the potential timeframe for the proposed Build Alternates. There is urgency to this project. If we wait 25 more years to do the work, it will be obsolete when it's finished. We believe an aggressive timeframe will spur interest in the project as surely as a dilatory approach will depress it. Just as the DEIR has defined 3 potential scopes of work, it should also define schedule options, ranging from aggressive to more conservative, and identifying all key action items needed to accelerate the work and the economic benefits of doing so. As noted above, this analysis should be put in a global context, comparing our progress to that of our competitors. Readers should be told how quickly Alternate 3 could be built if it receives full and prompt support at all necessary levels, and how long it could drag on if this is not forthcoming. The cost of delay should be clearly articulated.	Because of the complexity and cost of the projects included in the Preferred Alternative, and the challenges associated with implementing work on an operational railroad on which millions of travelers depend, the Preferred Alternative must necessarily be implemented incrementally. The Tier 1 Final EIS includes a plan for incremental project phasing and implementation. The Initial Phase of project implementation focuses on the highest priority projects for which planning is already underway and required for addressing aging infrastructure and chokepoints along the NEC. Completion of the Initial Phase will support an important increment increase in service for both Intercity and Regional services, thereby enhancing service for all operators and travelers using the NEC. The Initial Phase will also improve the way that rail services are provided to the customer and will provide opportunities to make rail operations more efficient. The FRA is working with the NEC Commission and its members to coordinate phasing of the Preferred Alternative with capital planning activities underway by the NEC Commission. The Initial Phase and subsequent project phases will be further detailed in the Service Development Plan.
Bailey_Valente	However, we are concerned that funding limitations will significantly impact the sustainability of the Corridor. Each of the three proposed NEC FUTURE options entails an enormous commitment of funds and even the 'No Action Alternative' comes with a base price of \$9B, an amount that will surely increase substantially by implementation - at least partially due to cited and unavoidable 'unknown factors'	Funding and financing the Tier 2 projects necessary to implement the Preferred Alternative will be an incremental process for the federal government, Amtrak, the NEC states and stakeholders, and the entire region. This process will require the commitment of both the public and private sectors over a long period of time. The FRA and the NEC Commission will take a leading role in working with project sponsors to support the federal financial assistance to advance implementation, including existing and future grant and other financing programs and options. The FRA and other NEC stakeholders will also engage the private sector to explore options for commercial funding or financing to advance Tier 2 projects. Funding and financing options will be further detailed in the Service Development Plan.

Table JJ–19: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Phasing and Implementation (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Barone_Ri	The NEC FUTURE DEIS doesn't provide a set phase or implementation timeline for improvements, stating they will be explored in the final environmental impact statement. Given the additional costs associated with extending timelines for major capital construction, RPA recommends that the implementation timeline should not be drawn out and that the number of phases should be limited. ... In the FEIS, the implementation timeline shouldn't be drawn out, and the number of phases should be limited. The FEIS should assess capital and operation cost reductions measures, expanding the scope of the DEIS to explore innovative financing and procurement strategies.	The Tier 1 Final EIS includes a plan for incremental project phasing and implementation. The Initial Phase of project implementation focuses on the highest priority projects for which planning is already underway and required for addressing aging infrastructure and chokepoints along the NEC. Completion of the Initial Phase will support an important increment increase in service for both Intercity and Regional services, thereby enhancing service for all operators and travelers using the NEC. Subsequent phases would follow. Funding and financing the Tier 2 projects necessary to implement the Preferred Alternative will be an incremental process for the federal government, Amtrak, the NEC states and stakeholders, and the entire region. This process will require the commitment of both the public and private sectors over a long period of time. The FRA and the NEC Commission will take a leading role in working with project sponsors to support the federal financial assistance to advance implementation, including existing and future grant and other financing programs and options. The FRA and other NEC stakeholders will also engage the private sector to explore options for commercial funding or financing to advance Tier 2 projects. Phasing and funding/financing options will be further detailed in the Service Development Plan.
Becker_Br	We see two distinct time windows; one over the next ten years which would see most of Alternative 1 projects completed and those projects which are both cost effective and feasible from Alternative 2. In the longer term, additional transformational projects should be considered as new passenger demand grows. We however caution that such large projects must be carefully presented to the public, as the enormous costs and impacts involved may not be readily accepted and such negative public reaction could slow of the accomplishment of the vital near-term improvements necessary.	The Tier 1 Final EIS includes a plan for incremental project phasing and implementation. The Initial Phase of project implementation focuses on the highest priority projects for which planning is already underway and required for addressing aging infrastructure and chokepoints along the NEC. Completion of the Initial Phase, which will take at least 10 years, will support an important increment in service for both Intercity and Regional services, thereby enhancing service for all operators and travelers using the NEC. The Initial Phase will also improve the way that rail services are provided to the customer and will provide opportunities to make rail operations more efficient. How and when additional phases and major projects are presented to the public (and the benefits they generate) will be important in securing continued support for implementation of the full Preferred Alternative. The Initial Phase and subsequent project phases will be further detailed in the Service Development Plan. Decisions about project-specific implementation or phasing are the subject of subsequent Tier 2 project studies or other planning process, which would include appropriate stakeholder and public engagement.
Bessette_St	One of the options is under consideration follows Interstate I-95 and run approximately 30-40 miles in somewhat of a straight line. If this path is adopted, it should be done in concert with the expansion of I-95 as well as they would both be impacted and improved.	As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA focused on corridor-wide improvements based on a representative routing and service plans and, with the NEC FUTURE Tier 1 NEPA process, will not make decisions about specific alignments. Subsequent Tier 2 project analysis will be required to plan and construct the supplemental track between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI. The ability to coordinate construction of that segment with repairs to I-95 would be considered at that time.
Brassard_Pe	It's reasonable to suggest that "any Alternative 3 route option the infrastructure and service on the existing NEC would be improved," but if the federal government spends billions to construct a new second NEC route, there is no guarantee that Congress will approve funds to upgrade the existing NEC coastal route.	The Preferred Alternative focuses on improvements to the existing NEC that are essential to address aging infrastructure, relieve chokepoints, and add the capacity necessary to accommodate future demand for both Intercity and Regional rail demand. By remaining on the existing NEC—augmented where necessary to provide resiliency and redundancy benefits—the federal government and the NEC states and railroads can better ensure that needed improvements to the existing NEC are made. Funding and financing the Tier 2 projects necessary to implement the Preferred Alternative will be an incremental process for the federal government, Amtrak, the NEC states and stakeholders, and the entire region. This process will require the commitment of both the public and private sectors over a long period of time. The FRA and the NEC Commission will take a leading role in working with project sponsors to support the federal financial assistance to advance implementation, including existing and future grant and other financing programs and options. The FRA and other NEC stakeholders will also engage the private sector to explore options for commercial funding or financing to advance Tier 2 projects. Funding and financing options will be further detailed in the Service Development Plan.

Table JJ–19: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Phasing and Implementation (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Chase_Da	A lot of this is improvements that are necessary or for state of good repair for the commuter service. In the reports it doesn't talk about: Is it FRA money? Is it Amtrak money? Is it city money? Is it state money? And I think probably you need to start presenting that. How much of this, say, the three alternatives -- I think it was 280 billion? 290 billion? A big number. So how much of that do they think will come from the state, the commuter agencies, now called Regional Rail?	The FRA focused on a corridor-wide investment program for NEC FUTURE and did not make decisions about project-specific funding or financing. Funding and financing the Tier 2 projects necessary to implement the Preferred Alternative will be an incremental process for the federal government, Amtrak, the NEC states and stakeholders, and the entire region. This process will require the commitment of both the public and private sectors over a long period of time. The FRA and the NEC Commission will take a leading role in working with project sponsors to support the federal financial assistance to advance implementation, including existing and future grant and other financing programs and options. The FRA and other NEC stakeholders will also engage the private sector to explore options for commercial funding or financing to advance Tier 2 projects. Funding and financing options will be further detailed in the Service Development Plan.
Cheshire_Ev	In my opinion our existing roads and bridges should be repaired/replaced first.	The FRA is not recommending implementation of the Preferred Alternative in lieu of or to the exclusion of maintenance and upgrade of roads, highways, airports or other critical transportation infrastructure. If the region is to remain competitive, it must maintain its transportation system to support access to jobs and regional commerce. This also includes the NEC and other regional passenger and freight rail line, relied upon by millions of daily commuters and travelers and thousands of businesses each day.
Cuddeback_Ke	The segments that seem to make the most sense are New Downtown Baltimore , New Philadelphia Stations and Hartford- I-684 -Providence. I'd see Hartford-Providence as being a good route to pay for by co-building with a 4-lane toll road, and leave for some future generation plans to cross Hartford-Danbury or New Haven - Long Island.	The Preferred Alternative does not include construction of a second spine, new downtown stations in Baltimore, MD, and Philadelphia, PA, or a new rail segment connecting Hartford, CT, and Providence, RI. Volume 1, Chapter 4, provides a detailed description of the Preferred Alternative. Funding and financing the Tier 2 projects necessary to implement the Preferred Alternative will be an incremental process for the federal government, Amtrak, the NEC states, and stakeholders, and the entire region. This process will require the commitment of both the public and private sectors over a long period of time. The FRA and the NEC Commission will take a leading role in working with project sponsors to support the federal financial assistance to advance implementation, including existing and future grant and other financing programs and options. The FRA and other NEC stakeholders will also engage the private sector to explore options for commercial funding or financing to advance Tier 2 projects. Funding and financing options will be further detailed in the Service Development Plan.
Dixon_Jo	The new rail tunnels in Baltimore should be the highest priority infrastructure improvement on the NEC in Maryland. A close second on the infrastructure improvements in Maryland are the replacements of the Gunpowder River bridge, the Bush River bridge and the Susquehanna River bridge. All three bridges should be constructed with at least three tracks with four tracks the ideal. The third priority for the NEC in Maryland should be the implementation of a minimum of three tracks throughout the state; get rid of the two track bottlenecks.	The Preferred Alternative includes replacing the B & P tunnel and the bridges over the Gunpowder, Bush, and Susquehanna Rivers; expansion of the right-of-way in Maryland is also included. The Preferred Alternative includes a new rail segment between Baltimore, MD, and Wilmington, DE, which adds new capacity, provides trip time benefits, adds resiliency and redundancy benefits, and could help to reduce construction impacts to existing operations on the NEC. The Tier 1 Final EIS Volume 1, Chapter 10 includes a plan for incremental project phasing and implementation.
Ensinger_Bi	I would start with the slowest sections of the route, New Haven-NYC,which would provide the most benefit by providing the greatest increase in speed. Moreover, improving the existing route not only benefits the fastest trains, but ALL other trains as well, right down to the commuter locals. Once this is done and being used to its maximum capacity, increase fares and find other ways to raise revenue in order to finance other improvements.	Volume 1, Chapter 10 of the Tier 1 Final EIS includes a plan for incremental project phasing and implementation. The Initial Phase for implementing the Preferred Alternative focuses on the highest priority projects for which planning is already underway and required for addressing aging infrastructure and chokepoints, including the most congested areas of the NEC such as between New Haven, CT, and New York City. Completion of the Initial Phase will support an important increment increase in service for both intercity and regional services, thereby enhancing service for all operators and travelers using the NEC. The Initial Phase will also improve the way that rail services are provided to the customer and will provide opportunities to make rail operations more efficient. The Initial Phase and subsequent project phases will be further detailed in the Service Development Plan.

Table JJ–19: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Phasing and Implementation (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Essue_He	The last thing I want to mention was we're now planning to rebuild I-84 in Hartford, I guess within the next 10 years or so from what I know, and are we now going to build this new stretch of highway and then 15, 20 years later rip it apart again to put rail in or this new system? So I just want to talk about how much. And this might impact not just Hartford but in other areas that we're not doing things twice.	The Preferred Alternative will serve Hartford, CT, either at the existing Hartford Union Station or at a new station built to service Intercity and Regional rail in Hartford as part of the I-84 relocation program. A separate planning and environmental impact analysis is being prepared for the I-84 program by the Connecticut Department of Transportation (ConnDOT). The FRA has coordinated with ConnDOT to minimize the impacts to rail service and to incorporate a new station as part of the highway relocation as important elements of that work.
Floroff_Pa	Now some people might say, well, we can't afford this Alternative 3. The United States spends over half-a-trillion dollars on defense. I think we can take a little off the top.	Although the FRA did not select Alternative 3 as the Preferred Alternative, funding and financing the Tier 2 projects necessary to implement the Preferred Alternative will remain an incremental process for the federal government, Amtrak, the NEC states and stakeholders, and the entire region. This process will require the commitment of both the public and private sectors over a long period of time. The FRA and the NEC Commission will take a leading role in working with project sponsors to support the federal financial assistance to advance implementation, including existing and future grant and other financing programs and options. The FRA and other NEC stakeholders will also engage the private sector to explore options for commercial funding or financing to advance Tier 2 projects. Funding and financing options will be further detailed in the Service Development Plan.
Frazier_Ri	The cost estimates for anything more dramatic than improving existing tracks and increasing frequency of service will be grossly unrealistic. Rail project overruns average 45%. Such cost overruns have become practically unavoidable as overly optimistic budgets are initially submitted to increase the odds of approval. (See: Megaprojects and Risk by Bent Flyvbjerg)	The Preferred Alternative includes elements of all three Action Alternatives described in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, with the goal of balancing growth in rail service with the impacts—environmental and cost—of expanding the regional rail network. Costs are included for the Preferred Alternative in Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative.
Fry_Do	Yet, the projected levels of investment of the three alternatives are staggering ... These required levels of investment suggest the need for an alternative means of financing, such as some form of a public private partnership for there is no way the federal government would absorb these costs, even over a 40 year time frame. Additionally, access to private capital would make the schedule for completion of the corridor more timely irrespective of the Preferred Alternative. For many years, there has been a push to increase public private partnerships in transportation. The Northeast Corridor, with the density of population producing so much of the GDP for the entire country, is the textbook example of a location for such a partnership. ... funding will be a decisive element in the process, and therefore encourage that serious thought be given to a public private partnership endeavor.	Funding and financing the Tier 2 projects necessary to implement the Preferred Alternative will be an incremental process for the federal government, Amtrak, the NEC states and stakeholders, and the entire region. This process will require the commitment of both the public and private sectors over a long period of time. The FRA and the NEC Commission will take a leading role in working with project sponsors to support the federal financial assistance to advance implementation, including existing and future grant and other financing programs and options. The FRA and other NEC stakeholders will also engage the private sector to explore options for commercial funding or financing to advance Tier 2 projects. Funding and financing options will be further detailed in the Service Development Plan.
Gottesman_Je	Therefore, my firm urges NEC Future to examine, in conjunction with Amtrak, within the Final Environmental Impact Study and NECs subsequent Service Development Plan, the near-term feasibility of introducing intercity rail service stops at Secaucus Junction.	The Preferred Alternative includes construction of the "Bergen Loop" at Secaucus, NJ, which will support one-seat ride service from several New Jersey branch lines to and from Manhattan. The FRA developed a representative service plan for the Preferred Alternative and will not make specific decisions about service plans or schedules. That representative plan includes new Intercity service at Secaucus station; however, details of service stopping patterns for both Intercity and Regional service are the subject of subsequent planning processes.
Groff_Do	...the execution, as I understand it and correct me if I'm wrong, will depend on appropriations by our elected leaders in Washington. So I would expect that maybe continuing on, this is not going to be a one- or two-year project, you know, and I've been in contact with our elected leaders to encourage them to act.	Funding and financing the Tier 2 projects necessary to implement the Preferred Alternative requires commitments from the federal government, Amtrak, the NEC states and stakeholders, and the entire region. Opportunities exist for both the public and private sectors to participate in implementing the Preferred Alternative. The FRA and the NEC Commission will take a leading role in working with project sponsors to identify the federal financial assistance necessary to advance implementation, including existing and future grant and other financing programs and options. The FRA and other NEC stakeholders will also engage the private sector to explore opportunities for commercial funding or financing to advance Tier 2 projects. Funding and financing options will be further detailed in the Service Development Plan.

Table JJ–19: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Phasing and Implementation (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Groff_Do	But maybe the overall riding concern that we have to do is addressed by Governor Florio; funding, funding, funding. These are wonderful plans, wonderful alternatives, wonderful options, wonderful statistics. But if they can't be funded, either with the private or the public sector or the two probably working together, why, they're just going to be gathering dust on shelves or in data bases someplace out in the future.	Funding and financing the Tier 2 projects necessary to implement the Preferred Alternative will be an incremental process for the federal government, Amtrak, the NEC states and stakeholders, and the entire region. This process will require the commitment of both the public and private sectors over a long period of time. The FRA and the NEC Commission will take a leading role in working with project sponsors to support the federal financial assistance to advance implementation, including existing and future grant and other financing programs and options. The FRA and other NEC stakeholders will also engage the private sector to explore options for commercial funding or financing to advance Tier 2 projects. Funding and financing options will be further detailed in the Service Development Plan.
Haikalis_Ge	Package transit incentives with road user pricing disincentives	As the FRA, Congress, and the NEC stakeholders consider ways in which to fund and finance implementation of the Preferred Alternative, engagement of the private sector will be important and could net important financial and service benefits. Funding and financing options will be further detailed in the Service Development Plan.
Johnston_Gl	I don't know where the funding is going to come from. WE really need to start changing the minds of our elected officials, not just on the federal level but on the state and local level as well.	Funding and financing the Tier 2 projects necessary to implement the Preferred Alternative will be an incremental process for the federal government, Amtrak, the NEC states, and stakeholders, and the entire region. This process will require the commitment of both the public and private sectors over a long period of time. The FRA and the NEC Commission will take a leading role in working with project sponsors to support the federal financial assistance to advance implementation, including existing and future grant and other financing programs and options. The FRA and other NEC stakeholders will also engage the private sector to explore options for commercial funding or financing to advance Tier 2 projects. Funding and financing options will be further detailed in the Service Development Plan.
Jonson_Mi	My general comment is to make improvements whenever funding becomes available	Funding and financing the Tier 2 projects necessary to implement the Preferred Alternative will be a incremental process for the Federal government, Amtrak, the NEC states and stakeholders, and the entire region. This process will require the commitment of both the public and private sectors over a long period of time. FRA and the NEC Commission will take a leading role in working with project sponsors to support the federal financial assistance to advance implementation, including existing and future grant and other financing programs and options. FRA and other NEC stakeholders will also engage the private sector to explore options for commercial funding or financing to advance elements of the Preferred Alternative. Funding and financing options will be further detailed in the Service Development Plan.
Julius_Ad	The problem I have is the cost of the project. I do not want higher taxes to subsidize rail service and the service must be made to generate additional revenue for Amtrak or perhaps a private/public partnership or private rail lines in addition to Amtrak to fund such projects. One must realize there are multiple alternatives to rail and rail tends to work better for shorter haul high speed intracity routes or slower commuter rail where it can compete and alliviate vehicular traffic.	Funding and financing the Tier 2 projects necessary to implement the Preferred Alternative will be an incremental process for the federal government, Amtrak, the NEC states and stakeholders, and the entire region. This process will require the commitment of both the public and private sectors over a long period of time. The FRA and the NEC Commission will take a leading role in working with project sponsors to support the federal financial assistance to advance implementation, including existing and future grant and other financing programs and options. The FRA and other NEC stakeholders will also engage the private sector to explore options for commercial funding or financing to advance Tier 2 projects. Funding and financing options will be further detailed in the Service Development Plan.

Table JJ–19: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Phasing and Implementation (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Julius_Ad	...as long as profitability can be realized and Amtrak considers private or private/public alternatives and there are no additional taxes or wasteful government spending on such projects.	The FRA developed a representative service plan for the Preferred Alternative, which demonstrates that revenues from Intercity operations would exceed the cost to operate and maintain Intercity service. However, revenues from operations would remain insufficient to cover the capital cost of implementing the Preferred Alternative. Funding and financing Tier 2 projects will be an incremental process for the federal government, Amtrak, the NEC states and stakeholders, and the entire region. This process will require the commitment of both the public and private sectors over a long period of time. The FRA and the NEC Commission will take a leading role in working with project sponsors to support the federal financial assistance necessary to advance implementation, including existing and future grant and other financing programs and options. The FRA and other NEC stakeholders will also engage the private sector to explore options for commercial funding or financing to advance Tier 2 projects. Funding and financing options will be further detailed in the Service Development Plan.
Lucas_Ri	The proposed relocated stop for New London and Mystic represents a huge private investment opportunity in co-locating a stop between Foxwoods and Mohegan Sun casinos. Having a direct train ride of less than 2 hours to New York City would be a great benefit to these casinos and the private investment opportunities should be explored.	Funding and financing the Tier 2 projects will be an incremental process for the Federal government, Amtrak, the NEC states and stakeholders, and the entire region. This process will require the commitment of both the public and private sectors over a long period of time. The FRA and the NEC Commission will take a leading role in working with project sponsors to support the federal financial assistance necessary to advance implementation, including existing and future grant and other financing programs and options. The FRA and other NEC stakeholders will also engage the private sector to explore options for commercial funding or financing to advance Tier 2 projects. Funding and financing options will be further detailed in the Service Development Plan.
Maits_Sc	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	Funding and financing the Tier 2 projects necessary to implement the Preferred Alternative will be an incremental process for the federal government, Amtrak, the NEC states and stakeholders, and the entire region. This process will require the commitment of both the public and private sectors over a long period of time. The FRA and the NEC Commission will take a leading role in working with project sponsors to support the federal financial assistance to advance implementation, including existing and future grant and other financing programs and options. The FRA and other NEC stakeholders will also engage the private sector to explore options for commercial funding or financing to advance Tier 2 projects.
Maits_Sc	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... 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 themselves (sic) back in roughly ten years... 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... 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.	The Preferred Alternative focuses on improvements to the existing NEC that are essential to address aging infrastructure, relieve chokepoints, and add the capacity necessary to accommodate future demand for both Intercity and Regional rail demand. The high capital cost and environmental impacts of building new segments off the existing NEC were considered in identifying the Preferred Alternative. Funding and financing the Tier 2 projects necessary to implement the Preferred Alternative will be a incremental process for the federal government, Amtrak, the NEC states and stakeholders, and the entire region. This process will require the commitment of both the public and private sectors over a long period of time. The FRA and the NEC Commission will take a leading role in working with project sponsors to support the federal financial assistance to advance implementation, including existing and future grant and other financing programs and options. The FRA and other NEC stakeholders will also engage the private sector to explore options for commercial funding or financing to advance Tier 2 projects. Funding and financing options will be further detailed in the Service Development Plan.

Table JJ–19: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Phasing and Implementation (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Maits_Sc	One other thing about that line is the freight. You want to pay for these tunnels. Baltimore, New York City, Long Island. These things can -- freight can help pay for the tunnels. Auto trains for the people that will continue to drive can help pay for this. I know I've mentioned this before, but it's absolutely critical. People are scratching their heads. Where is the money going to come from? It's got to come from all sources, including sharing tunnels, but reducing where they're needed.	Funding and financing the Tier 2 projects necessary to implement the Preferred Alternative will be an incremental process for the federal government, Amtrak, the NEC states and stakeholders, and the entire region. This process will require the commitment of both the public and private sectors over a long period of time. The FRA and the NEC Commission will take a leading role in working with project sponsors to support the federal financial assistance to advance implementation, including existing and future grant and other financing programs and options, and ensuring that all users of the NEC—including freight railroads—share appropriate costs for building, operating, and maintaining the NEC. The FRA and other NEC stakeholders will also engage the private sector to explore options for commercial funding or financing to advance Tier 2 projects. Funding and financing options will be further detailed in the Service Development Plan.
Maits_Sc	The tunnel can also be helped paid for by freight and by automobiles... 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.	Operation of auto-train service north of Virginia has been studied, but it has been rejected because of vertical-height clearance limitations imposed by the electric catenary system. As noted, Funding and financing the Tier 2 projects necessary to implement the Preferred Alternative will be an incremental process for the federal government, Amtrak, the NEC states and stakeholders, and the entire region. This process will require the commitment of both the public and private sectors over a long period of time. The FRA and the NEC Commission will take a leading role in working with project sponsors to support the federal financial assistance to advance implementation, including existing and future grant and other financing programs and options. The FRA and other NEC stakeholders will also engage the private sector to explore options for commercial funding or financing to advance Tier 2 projects. Funding and financing options will be further detailed in the Service Development Plan.
Mastroly_Fr	As for priorities I feel the Hudson Tunnel must come first.	The Tier 1 Final EIS Volume 1, Chapter 10 includes a plan for incremental project phasing and implementation. The Initial Phase of project implementation focuses on the highest priority projects for which planning is already underway and required for addressing aging infrastructure and chokepoints along the NEC. Construction of two additional tracks under the Hudson River is one of the most critical projects currently under planning. The FRA established a Working Group to collaborate on the projects and sequencing for the Initial Phase, which will be included in the Service Development Plan.
Nes_Fr	The concept of incremental improvements appears to be the way to complete this project. However that increment must first meet the state of good repair of the present NEC. If there is a major failure of the North river bores, Portal draw bridge, B & P tunnel, or any of the Maryland or other draw bridges many persons will be unable to meet their job needs. In my opinion incremental work needs to be directed to the projects that will provide the most passenger minutes saved per dollar spent. The more passenger minutes saved per dollar the higher priority a project should be scored. Total number of revenue passenger miles increase needs careful analysis. Of course a factor needs to be given to what additional passengers any increment will add not only to that segment but also total thru traffic. An example would be if \$100M spent either PHL - Wilmington or PHL - New York Penn and the Wilmington would add 500 passengers a day NYP - WASH and the PHL - NYP section would only add 500 a day NYP - PHL then the PHL - WIL should be scored higher. especially if more beyond passengers board trains.	Volume 1, Chapter 10 includes a plan for incremental project phasing and implementation for the Preferred Alternative. An Initial Phase for implementing the Selected Alternative will be developed that includes priority projects for which planning is already underway and those required for addressing aging infrastructure and chokepoints along the NEC. Completion of the Initial Phase will support incremental improvement in service for both Intercity and Regional services, thereby enhancing service for all operators and travelers using the NEC. The Initial Phase will also improve the way that rail services are provided to the customer and will provide opportunities to make rail operations more efficient. The Initial Phase and subsequent project phases will be further developed in the Service Development Plan.

Table JJ–19: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Phasing and Implementation (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Nicosia-Rusin_Ra	This effort therefore should be married with a comprehensive corridor land use plan. There should be redevelopment districts planned around each station with eminent domain for shared public ownership of land around each station and improvements to corridors used to access these stations. The capital for acquisition could be financed by lease payments for current uses. The capital for high speed rail will be financed by future land leases for higher intensity development around each station and incremental value taxation on a widerdesignated district surrounding the station core district. This designated district reflects property that has strong benefits from the high speed rail services due to easy ground access service to a high speed rail station. There then needs to be a broad scale legislative commitment to this vision by creating the authorities and intergovernmental agreements necessary for modernizing the Northeast Corridor. This EIS may not be able to directly address this broader scope, but NEC FUTURE can use the EIS to advocate for the requirement for a more comprehensive implementation program for accomplishing the purpose and need of this study.	Funding and financing the Tier 2 projects necessary to implement the Preferred Alternative will be an incremental process for the federal government, Amtrak, the NEC states and stakeholders, and the entire region. This process will require the commitment of both the public and private sectors over a long period of time. The FRA and the NEC Commission will take a leading role in working with project sponsors to support the federal financial assistance to advance implementation, including existing and future grant and other financing programs and options. The FRA and other NEC stakeholders will also engage the private sector to explore options for commercial funding or financing to advance Tier 2 projects. As suggested, changes in land use planning and regulations around stations can be used to capture the value that improved rail service brings to communities, providing a source of revenue to spur development and investment in and around stations. The FRA reviewed state and regional plans as part of the Tier 1 EIS, as discussed in Volume 1, Chapter 7. Redevelopment around station areas and transit-oriented development (TOD) planning processes are handled at the local level and as such will be part of the future Tier 2 project analysis. Funding and financing options will be further detailed in the Service Development Plan.
Painter_Ro	Does the Alternative 3, because it's clearly more expensive, a more expensive alternative, does that weigh against it as a possibility? In other words, if we decide to do Alternative 3, will your organization say, Oh, dear. Well, that's way too much, we can't do it, so the whole project is off the table ?	The Preferred Alternative includes some elements of Alternative 3, but does not include construction of a second spine. The cost of implementing Alternative 3 was just one of many factors influencing the development and selection of the Preferred Alternative. The factors considered in the FRA's deliberative process are described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Palmer_Pe	The Raritan Valley Rail Coalition requests expedited construction of the Hunter Flyover as included in the study's final Environmental Impact Statement and Service Development Plan.	The Tier 1 Final EIS, Volume 1, Chapter 10, includes a plan for incremental project phasing and implementation. The FRA established a Working Group to collaborate on the projects and sequencing for an Initial Phase. The Initial Phase for implementing the Preferred Alternative focuses on the highest priority projects for which planning is already underway and required for addressing aging infrastructure and chokepoints along the NEC. Completion of the Initial Phase will support an important increment increase in service for both Intercity and Regional services, thereby enhancing service for all operators and travelers using the NEC. The Initial Phase will also improve the way that rail services are provided to the customer and will provide opportunities to make rail operations more efficient. The Initial Phase and subsequent project phases will be further detailed in the Service Development Plan.
Papp_AI	But the key to this all is it wouldn't be done with Amtrak money. It would be a public-private partnership where the state wouldn't have to put very much up. The only public moneys, government moneys that was mentioned was a \$325 million contribution from Washington. But they feel that this could be paid for by commercial enterprises within a rebuilt existing Penn Station, as well as the Moynihan Station. It's a three phase project, Moynihan, existing Penn, and the third would be a connection between the two stations under Eighth Avenue. And along that corridor would be placed many commercial type businesses, and that they would supply enough money to make this happen.	<p>Funding and financing the Tier 2 projects necessary to implement the Preferred Alternative will be an incremental process for the federal government, Amtrak, the NEC states and stakeholders, and the entire region. This process will require the commitment of both the public and private sectors over a long period of time. The FRA and the NEC Commission will take a leading role in working with project sponsors to support the federal financial assistance to advance implementation, including existing and future grant and other financing programs and options. The FRA and other NEC stakeholders will also engage the private sector to explore options for commercial funding or financing to advance Tier 2 projects. Funding and financing options will be further detailed in the Service Development Plan.</p> <p>The Moynihan Station project is being advanced separate from NEC FUTURE, although the FRA is providing funding for and lead federal agency for the overall program. The status of Moynihan Station funding is beyond the scope of NEC FUTURE, but the advancement of the project will be closely coordinated through the FRA. The Preferred Alternative assumes that all trains will operate through and serve Penn Station New York. The Preferred Alternative, described in Volume 1, Chapter 4, requires expansion of the station to accommodate additional tracks both to the east and the west of New York. The specific location for and design of improvements at Penn Station New York to accommodate the additional tracks and growth in demand will be determined through subsequent Tier 2 project studies. This will include enhancements to the customer experience at the station, as well as improvements that will improve the efficiency of operations.</p>

Table JJ–19: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Phasing and Implementation (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Pelliccia_Jo	Funding this (by an increased gas tax)	The FRA focused on a corridor-wide investment program for NEC FUTURE and did not make decisions about project-specific funding or financing. Funding and financing the Tier 2 projects necessary to implement the Preferred Alternative will be a incremental process for the federal government, Amtrak, the NEC states and stakeholders, and the entire region. This process will require the commitment of both the public and private sectors over a long period of time. Funding and financing options will be further detailed in the Service Development Plan.
Penn Design_Taylor_Yaro	The cost estimates for this project and its three action alternatives are understandably high, but we find that the estimates skyrocket past what costs in similar projects have incurred in other countries, or even for comparable projects in the US, such as the California HSR project. Part of this comes from the phasing plan, which plans implementation over twenty or more years. Phasing the project this way balloons to the cost estimates by losing efficiency of scale in construction, significantly increasing the contingency costs, and adding to the risk of the project. Additionally, the benefits which will make this project many times worth the costs are highly discounted when pushed back twenty or more years. Costs are essential to understanding and evaluating alternatives, and getting these lower and more accurate to the benefits that each scenario produces can be done with a less drawn-out phasing plan... The Tier 2 EIS and investments in the NY-DC section can proceed more rapidly simply because there is broad agreement on what the alignment should be --since it is largely in the existing right-of-way. But a more detailed investigation of preferred alignments for the NY-Boston segment should also be conducted by FRA following a ROD on the NEC Future Tier 1 Master Plan and EIS... We are also aware that it has been suggested that advancing HSR and other improvements in the NY-DC portion of the NEC should be a higher priority because of the existing strong rail market in this end of the corridor. We disagree, and instead we strongly believe that investing in, and advancing HSR service in the NY - Boston section of the corridor will be equally important since it would have the potential to transform the economies of the New England states, and several economically distressed second-tier cities, including Bridgeport, New Haven, Hartford and Providence. HSR and improved inter-city and commuter rail service in the corridor and branch lines (including Connecticut's branch lines serving Danbury and Waterbury, and other branch lines linking Springfield, Brattleboro, Worcester and Portland into the NEC) would pull these places into the metropolitan labor and housing markets of both NY and Boston, and also promote synergies between the economies of these smaller cities. For this reason be believe that a more detailed assessment of the alternative alignments in the NY- Boston section of the NEC should become a high priority for FRA once a Record of Decision has been achieved for the Tier 1 process. And then improvements in the NY - Boston section of the corridor should be initiated simultaneously with investments in the NY - Washington section of the corridor. This will also help shorten construction periods for the whole project, which will also help reduce the project's overall cost.	Because of the complexity and cost of the projects included in the Preferred Alternative, and the challenges associated with implementing work on an operational railroad on which millions of travelers depend, the Preferred Alternative must necessarily be implemented incrementally. The Tier 1 Final EIS includes a plan for incremental project phasing and implementation. The Initial Phase of project implementation focuses on the highest priority projects for which planning is already underway and required for addressing aging infrastructure and chokepoints along the NEC. The FRA established a Working Group to collaborate on the projects and sequencing for an Initial Phase. Completion of the Initial Phase will support an important increment increase in service for both Intercity and Regional services, thereby enhancing service for all operators and travelers using the NEC. It will also improve the way that rail serves are provided to the customer and provide opportunities to make rail operations more efficient. The Initial Phase and subsequent project phases will be further detailed in the Service Development Plan.
Richmond_Cl	Continuing south from Hartford, a LI route does not leverage the existing Amtrak network. White Plains is not part of the network either. So perhaps it would be less expensive and easier to connect initially to New Haven and devote more funds to other parts of the NEC.	The Preferred Alternative does not include a second spine, but remains generally on the existing NEC. At New Haven, CT, trains will either go to Boston via the NEC or use the Hartford line to access Hartford, CT, and Springfield, MA.

Table JJ–19: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Phasing and Implementation (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Rudolph_Ri	We are deeply concerned about the current state of repair of the entire NEC. While we understand the future capacity needs of the NEC, we also understand that it is not only used for Amtrak trains that stay within its boundaries, but also for trains that travel as far as Chicago, Miami and New Orleans. We also understand that it is used by hundreds of thousands of daily commuters on New Jersey Transit, SEPTA, MARC, Metro North and other systems. The number of riders on these systems greatly exceeds the number of Amtrak riders in the NEC, and it is vital to all riders that the NEC and connecting lines be brought to a state of good repair before grandiose projects are built. Today 's NEC is plagued by a number of difficulties that are approaching, or have reached, crisis level. New York 's Penn Station and the trains that go there from New Jersey are constantly beset by power outages, congestion, and inefficient operation. The existing North River Tunnels were damaged by Hurricane Sandy, with no plan to build additional tunnel capacity except Gateway. At least one more tunnel, if not two, must be built as soon as possible. The antiquated and non-standard power and signal systems in use there have no place on a modern railroad. Portal Bridge in nearby New Jersey is an unreliable chokepoint, but Gateway pushes for two new spans, when one will be sufficient. Further south, the 1873-vintage Baltimore Tunnel is a chokepoint and a security hazard. Further north, Metro-North track in Connecticut is not up to the appropriate standard for track on such a heavily-used line as the NEC. In Massachusetts, the MBTA has filed an action to have the PRIIA declared illegal. Before any grand plan is implemented, it is necessary to fix the existing problems on the NEC: tunnels to New York Penn Station, Portal Bridge, the Baltimore Tunnel, track improvements on the Metro-North-owned portion of the line, and equitable financial arrangements for "commuter" railroads which operate on the NEC. We call for the entire NEC to be upgraded to a state of good repair that is appropriate for a modern passenger railroad, before any further plans are made.	The Tier 1 Final EIS includes a plan for incremental project phasing and implementation. The Initial Phase of project implementation focuses on the highest priority projects for which planning is already underway and required for addressing aging infrastructure and chokepoints along the NEC. This includes many state-of-good-repair projects. The FRA established a Working Group to collaborate on the projects and sequencing for an Initial Phase. Completion of the Initial Phase will support an important increment increase in service for both Intercity and Regional services, thereby enhancing service for all operators and travelers using the NEC. The Initial Phase will also improve the way that rail services are provided to the customer and provide opportunities to make rail operations more efficient. The Initial Phase and subsequent project phases will be further detailed in the Service Development Plan.
Saunders_Di	After having read the Summary of the Tier 1 EIS, I just want to say if the FRA or Congress approach the future of the Northeast Corridor in a one to three decades-long piecemeal approach to solving the myriad of issues presented by the current condition of the corridor, the current and projected traffic in the corridor, and all the other factors discussed in the Summary, by the time you have approved the final plan for all the updates, the population, traffic, and other factors you are considering will have far surpassed projections, making what you plan now obsolete when it is actually time to implement said plans... The only way to approach the NEC is to fund it for a 10- to 15 year push in all aspects from environmental studies to completion of construction and the beginning of revenue operations.	Given the costs involved to implement the Preferred Alternative, and the potential disruption to ongoing rail operations that can result from construction of improvements, the FRA anticipates that the Preferred Alternative will be implemented incrementally in several phases. The Tier 1 Final EIS Volume 1, Chapter 10 provides a discussion of phasing. More details will be provided in the Service Development Plan. Funding and financing the Tier 2 projects necessary to timely implement the Preferred Alternative will be an incremental process for the federal government, Amtrak, the NEC states and stakeholders, and the entire region. This process will require the commitment of both the public and private sectors over a long period of time. The FRA and the NEC Commission will take a leading role in working with project sponsors to support the federal financial assistance to advance implementation, including existing and future grant and other financing programs and options. The FRA and other NEC stakeholders will also engage the private sector to explore options for commercial funding or financing to advance Tier 2 projects. Funding and financing options will be further detailed in the Service Development Plan.
Saunders_Di	if the FRA and Congress are to successfully address the issues presented by NEC Future there will be a level of commitment and political willingness to go all in on funding. The initial cost will be high; there is no getting around it. But over the life of the Corridor, it will mean the difference between a highly successful outcome and one which turns out to have been a waste of taxpayer dollars.	Funding and financing the Tier 2 projects necessary to implement the Preferred Alternative will be an incremental process for the federal government, Amtrak, the NEC states and stakeholders, and the entire region. This process will require the commitment of both the public and private sectors over a long period of time. The FRA and the NEC Commission will take a leading role in working with project sponsors to support the federal financial assistance to advance implementation, including existing and future grant and other financing programs and options. The FRA and other NEC stakeholders will also engage the private sector to explore options for commercial funding or financing to advance Tier 2 projects. Funding and financing options will be further detailed in the Service Development Plan.

Table JJ–19: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Phasing and Implementation (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Schaffer_Mi	We also need to avoid blown out construction costs. I do believe that currently Gateway Park Project as is costs too much, Penn South is unnecessary, ...We can -- it would be a lot easier to just through run to Grand Central Terminal and fight the turf battles. We all need to work together on this, we can't exactly be digging each other's own fortifications.	The FRA focused on a corridor-wide investment program for NEC FUTURE and did not make decisions about project-specific funding or financing. Funding and financing the projects necessary to implement the Preferred Alternative will be an incremental process for the federal government, Amtrak, the NEC states and stakeholders, and the entire region. This process will require the commitment of both the public and private sectors over a long period of time. The FRA and the NEC Commission will take a leading role in working with Congress to support the funding necessary to advance implementation, utilizing existing and future funding and financing programs and options. The FRA and other NEC stakeholders will also engage the private sector to explore options for commercial funding or financing to advance elements of the Preferred Alternative. Funding and financing options will be further detailed in the Service Development Plan.
Schaffer_Mi	I do believe Governor Florio's proposal for a public-private partnership with high speed rail is an interesting idea. In fact, Penn School of Design, in their programs on high speed rail they have advocated for such partnership for the NEC. I think -- I don't think we should like be having any ideology or ingrained practices from preventing us from pursuing any options such as that.	Funding and financing the Tier 2 projects necessary to implement the Preferred Alternative will be an incremental process for the federal government, Amtrak, the NEC states and stakeholders, and the entire region. This process will require the commitment of both the public and private sectors over a long period of time. The FRA and the NEC Commission will take a leading role in working with project sponsors to support the federal financial assistance to advance implementation, including existing and future grant and other financing programs and options. The FRA and other NEC stakeholders will also engage the private sector to explore options for commercial funding or financing to advance Tier 2 projects. Funding and financing options will be further detailed in the Service Development Plan.
Schoenfeld_Ro	Where we can get the money is another problem with the current Congress.	Funding and financing the Tier 2 projects necessary to implement the Preferred Alternative will be an incremental process for the federal government, Amtrak, the NEC states and stakeholders, and the entire region. This process will require the commitment of both the public and private sectors over a long period of time. The FRA and the NEC Commission will take a leading role in working with project sponsors to support the federal financial assistance to advance implementation, including existing and future grant and other financing programs and options. The FRA and other NEC stakeholders will also engage the private sector to explore options for commercial funding or financing to advance Tier 2 projects. Funding and financing options will be further detailed in the Service Development Plan.
Shields_Er	And I will let you know that the projects that we're proposing, I also think we should fix what we have first.	The Tier 1 Final EIS includes a plan for incremental project phasing and implementation. The Initial Phase of project implementation focuses on the highest priority projects for which planning is already underway and required for addressing aging infrastructure and chokepoints along the NEC. Completion of the Initial Phase will support an important increment increase in service for both Intercity and Regional services, thereby enhancing service for all operators and travelers using the NEC. It will also improve the way that rail services are provided to the customer and provide opportunities to make rail operations more efficient. The Initial Phase and subsequent project phases will be further detailed in the Service Development Plan. Bringing the existing NEC to a state of good repair is a high priority for the Preferred Alternative. Prioritizing the mix of improvements identified for an Initial Phase will require the on-going partnership between the FRA, FTA, NEC Commission and the stakeholder states and the District of Columbia. The FRA established a Working Group to collaborate on the projects and sequencing for an Initial Phase. More information about this process is provided in Volume 1, Chapters 1 and 10.
Spencer_Sc	...the key question no matter what alternative you propose here is going to be, okay, what's the price tag? How are we going to pay for it? We know tax payers are going to be involved in that.	Funding and financing the Tier 2 projects necessary to implement the Preferred Alternative will be an incremental process for the federal government, Amtrak, the NEC states and stakeholders, and the entire region. This process will require the commitment of both the public and private sectors over a long period of time. The FRA and the NEC Commission will take a leading role in working with project sponsors to support the federal financial assistance to advance implementation, including existing and future grant and other financing programs and options. The FRA and other NEC stakeholders will also engage the private sector to explore options for commercial funding or financing to advance Tier 2 projects. Funding and financing options will be further detailed in the Service Development Plan.

Table JJ–19: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Phasing and Implementation (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Stoddard_Cohen	To what extent are non-FRA design\construction plans and budgets prepared that can be incorporated in the Preferred Alternative and, the next step, the Service Development Plan?	The Preferred Alternative includes some projects that are already in development by stakeholder states and may or may not be receiving federal transportation funds from either the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) or FRA. Examples of this type of project are the Norwalk movable bridge in Connecticut. The Preferred Alternative sets the long-term vision for the corridor. Projects undertaken by the states with federal funding or other actions that require completion of a Tier 2 project analysis must be consistent with the long-term vision.
Stoddard_Cohen	In January 2014 the RPA released a New Haven Line Plan, including an Emergency Action Plan citing seven recommended investments estimated to cost \$3.6 Billion in addition to budgeted funding through 2020. Should such plans for segments along the NEC be adopted and referenced to further document terms like Universal First Phase and State of Good Repair?	The FRA identified a set of improvements to build the capacity necessary to implement the service levels of the Preferred Alternative independent from the Regional Plan Association's 2014 New Haven Line Plan. While there is considerable overlap with the projects listed in the RPA's New Haven Line Plan and the Preferred Alternative, the projects detailed in the New Haven Line Plan were developed using different assumptions to meet different objectives and are not reconciled with the Preferred Alternative. Volume 1, Chapter 10 describes the phasing and implementation of the Preferred Alternative. The FRA established a Working Group to collaborate on the projects and sequencing for an Initial Phase. The Initial Phase and subsequent project phases will be further detailed in the Service Development Plan.
Stoddard_Cohen	According to the RPA, the Hell Gate bridge and access to Penn Station should be used to add capacity (more trains) to service NHL commuters. Using longer trains into Grand Central Station will not meet ridership demands. Is use of Penn Station to add capacity to the NHL included in the Universal First Phase?	The Tier 1 Final EIS includes a plan for incremental project phasing and implementation. The Initial Phase of project implementation focuses on the highest priority projects for which planning is already underway and required for addressing aging infrastructure and chokepoints along the NEC. The FRA established a Working Group to collaborate on the projects and sequencing for an Initial Phase, including consideration of improvements to the NEC between New Haven, CT, and Penn Station New York. Completion of the Initial Phase will support an important increment increase in service for both Intercity and Regional services, thereby enhancing service for all operators and travelers using the NEC. The Initial Phase will also improve the way that rail services are provided to the customer and provide opportunities to make rail operations more efficient. The Initial Phase and subsequent project phases will be further detailed in the Service Development Plan.
Stoddard_Cohen	How much additional ROW will be necessary along the New Haven Line? How does the number and complexity of taking of ROW along the ROW compare to taking of ROW on proposed routes through Danbury (55-mile tunnel) and Ronkonkoma (tunnel under Long Island Sound)? Ruinous litigation is a high risk to project success.	Additional property along portions of the NEC will be required to fully implement the Preferred Alternative. The FRA developed a Representative Route for the Preferred Alternative that provides sufficient detail for a Tier 1 level environmental analysis, but does not dictate the specific track alignment required to add or shift tracks on the NEC. Subsequent Tier 2 project analysis by other project sponsors will identify acquisitions, temporary easements, and displacements, and will require compliance with the Uniform Relocation Act.
Stoddard_Cohen	How legitimate will eminent domain cases (acquisitions) be in the courts? ROW expansions will likely have a better chance of success than taking copious amounts of new ROW on entirely new routes. Where ROW expansion is necessary, takings along the New Rochelle-Stamford-New Haven route in Alternative-3 have the most promising chance of timely success. Taking for new ROW tied to an improbable 55-mile tunnel construction (Alternate-3, White Plains-Danbury Route) will like1y have a low chance of success in the courts. Assuming the New Rochelle- Stamford-New Haven route is the in Preferred Alternative, what improvements are within, and which are outside of, existing rail and 1-95 ROW? o What impact will such rail use of highway ROW have on proposed improvements to 1-95?	The Preferred Alternative includes improvements to the existing NEC between New Haven and New York and proposes additional capacity to relieve congestion and conflicting train moves near New Rochelle, NY and Stamford, CT, as described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The FRA developed a Representative Route for the Preferred Alternative that provides sufficient detail for a Tier 1 level environmental analysis, but does not dictate the specific track alignment required to add or shift tracks on the NEC. However, to fully implement the Preferred Alternative, additional property in a new right-of-way would be required between New Rochelle, NY, and Greens Farms, CT. Subsequent Tier 2 project analysis will identify acquisitions, temporary easements, displacements, and will require compliance with the Uniform Relocation Act.

Table JJ–19: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Phasing and Implementation (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Stoddard_Cohen	Can you describe the terms aerial structure, embankment, trench and tunnel as proposed on the NHL in locations shown on maps in Appendix A, Mapping Atlas. Many are proposed on the NHL. o Please provide examples of such structures, where they are currently being used and what firms designed and built them. o How would aerial structures impact underlying stations and highways?	The Tier 1 project analysis does not seek to define engineering solutions for added capacity and relief of chokepoints included in the Preferred Alternative. Subsequent Tier 2 project analysis by other project sponsors will analyze engineering solutions, and their impacts. Volume 2, Chapter 4, describes the different construction types. Consistent with the Tier 1 NEPA process, the FRA developed Representative Routes for the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative, which provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the effects of each Alternative. Representative Routes define an envelope within which improvements might occur and whose location and construction type could change during subsequent Tier 2 project studies.
Stoddard_Cohen	Hence it is crucial to accelerate the work to bring the New Haven Line to a State of Good Repair as soon as possible. Declining ridership and longer ride times threaten every office and apartment building along the New Haven Line with declining occupancy and slowly declining property value. Towns and cities suffer reduced ability to attract jobs. These conditions behoove the FRA to quickly identify the Preferred Alternative and move the next step, Service Develop Plan,toward implementing the Universal First Step and bringing the New Haven Line to a state-of good-repair.	The FRA is aware of the criticality of fast implementation of the Preferred Alternative. The FRA will work closely with the NEC states and railroads to develop and seek funding for implementation of the Preferred Alternative. The Tier 1 Final EIS includes a plan for incremental project phasing and implementation (see Volume 1, Chapter 10). The Initial Phase of project implementation focuses on the highest priority projects for which planning is already underway and required for addressing aging infrastructure and chokepoints along the NEC. The Initial Phase and subsequent project phases will be further detailed in the Service Development Plan.
Sutton_Ro	However, we also need to see that there is the recognition of the interim steps that can be done practically in the intervening periods of time because we need improvements not in 15 years or 25 years or 30 years, but we need improvements now. And I think that I'd like to also underline some of the statements that have been made earlier that we should take a look at the chokepoints and see what can be done at possibly lower cost to improve services and increase speeds at places where there are significant problems and try to take advantage of the practical opportunities to make improvements in the short run, as well as promoting the long term vision.	The Tier 1 Final EIS, Volume 1, Chapter 10, includes a plan for incremental project phasing and implementation. The Initial Phase for implementing the Preferred Alternative focuses on the highest priority projects for which planning is already underway and required for addressing aging infrastructure and chokepoints along the NEC. Completion of the Initial Phase will support an important increment increase in service for both Intercity and Regional services, thereby enhancing service for all operators and travelers using the NEC. The Initial Phase will also improve the way that rail services are provided to the customer and will provide opportunities to make rail operations more efficient. The Initial Phase and subsequent project phases will be further detailed in the Service Development Plan.
Sweenwy_Jo	...the Northeast Corridor is by far the most active and financially productive section of Amtrak. One thing that Congress just did recently, which I think is good news to us in the Northeast, is in the federal budget that was adopted these past few months, Congress has for the first time broken up the budget of Amtrak so that they have a separate budget dealing with the Northeast Corridor. As you know, it's eight states plus Washington, D.C. that are in the Northeast Corridor. This has been what I understand to be the most income-productive section of Amtrak, far and away above the others, and hopefully this new budget arrangement will allow some of the income produced by Amtrak in the Northeast Corridor, which I understand is the busiest part of the National Rail System, to be used to improve the Northeast Corridor. So, in essence, I think by getting a separate budget arrangement within Amtrak for the Northeast Corridor we may be better off than we have been until now. So that is a positive note.	Funding and financing the Tier 2 projects necessary to implement the Preferred Alternative will be an incremental process for the federal government, Amtrak, the NEC states and stakeholders, and the entire region. This process will require the commitment of both the public and private sectors over a long period of time. The FRA and the NEC Commission will take a leading role in working with project sponsors to support the federal financial assistance to advance implementation, including existing and future grant and other financing programs and options. Reinvestment of net revenues from Amtrak's NEC operations may be one important source for reinvestment into the NEC. The FRA and other NEC stakeholders will also engage the private sector to explore options for commercial funding or financing to advance Tier 2 projects. Funding and financing options will be further detailed in the Service Development Plan.
Terhune_An	All the plans look wonderful, but no mention of money. Better to focus on what can realistically be accomplished than pie-in-the-sky schemes. There is virtually no chance of getting funding for 220 MPH trains.	The Preferred Alternative includes some elements of Alternative 3, but does not include construction of a second spine. The cost of implementing Alternative 3 was just one of many factors influencing the development and selection of the Preferred Alternative. Funding and financing the Tier 2 projects necessary to implement the Preferred Alternative will be an incremental process for the federal government, Amtrak, the NEC states and stakeholders, and the entire region. This process will require the commitment of both the public and private sectors over a long period of time. The FRA and the NEC Commission will take a leading role in working with project sponsors to support the federal financial assistance to advance implementation, including existing and future grant and other financing programs and options. The FRA and other NEC stakeholders will also engage the private sector to explore options for commercial funding or financing to advance Tier 2 projects. Funding and financing options will be further detailed in the Service Development Plan.

Table JJ–19: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Phasing and Implementation (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Vogel_Ke	passenger service is now at the highest ridership of its history, but it's not privatized. But if you build all this, maybe it can be.	As the FRA, project sponsors, and the NEC stakeholders consider ways in which to fund and finance implementation of the Preferred Alternative, engaging the private sector will be important and could net important financial and service benefits. Funding and financing options will be further detailed in the Service Development Plan.
Anonymous_055	The cost estimates for the more dramatic alternatives will be enormously unrealistic. Rail project overruns average 45%. Such cost overruns have become unavoidable as overly optimistic budgets are submitted to increase the odds of approval. (See: Megaprojects and Risk by Bent Flyvbjerg)	The Preferred Alternative includes elements of all three Action Alternatives described in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, with the goal of balancing growth in rail service with the impacts—environmental and cost—of expanding the regional rail network. Costs are included for the Preferred Alternative in Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative.

Source: NEC FUTURE team, 2016

JJ.5.10 Public and Agency Outreach

The comments collected during the public outreach expressed concern about the length of the public comment period, with several comments requesting an extension to submit comments. Several of the comments expressed concern on the adequacy of the public outreach process and requested additional public meetings. In response to these comments, the FRA extended the Tier 1 Draft EIS public comment period. Volume 1, Chapter 11, presents a summary of the agency and public involvement process for the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comment period, and public hearings, as well as outreach activities following the Tier 1 Draft EIS comment period up to the release of this Tier 1 Final EIS.

Table JJ–20: Stakeholder Comments (Elected Officials, Tribes, Federal Agencies, State Agencies, Local Agencies): Public and Agency Outreach

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
CONEG_Stubbs	On behalf of our seven agencies, we respectfully request a 60-day extension for submitting comments to the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) on the NEC FUTURE Tier 1 Draft Environmental Impact Statement (Draft EIS). The additional time is needed so that states with a major stake in the future of the Northeast Corridor can complete a careful review of the extensive document and their consultation with key stakeholders. Specifically, this request for an extension of time for our states and state agencies to comment on the subject document need not affect the schedule for public comment or the Record of Decision. It is necessary because of the extraordinary volume and complexity of the technical material to be read, understood, researched, and commented upon. Some of the proposed projects included within the alternatives have implications and consequences that require more time for us to fully assess, particularly their impact and compatibility with local needs and concerns.	Due to public requests, the FRA extended the close of the public comment period to February 16, 2016, resulting in a 95-day comment period. The FRA appreciates the involvement and support of the state agencies and is committed to working closely with the states to address the concerns reflected in their comments, as well as concerns and questions that may arise following the close of the comment period, to the extent practical.
CONEG_Stubbs	...our states need time to engage our own key stakeholders in thoughtful discussions of the Draft EIS after the FRA has conducted its public hearings on the document. The FRA public hearings began on December 9, 2015 and continued through January 20, 2016. The public comment period ends on January 30, 2016, making it virtually impossible for our states and agencies to engage effectively within each state and among one another before responding to the FRA with meaningful comments to the Draft EIS by the deadline.	Due to public requests, the FRA extended the close of the public comment period to February 16, 2016, resulting in a 95-day comment period. The FRA appreciates the involvement and support of the state agencies and is committed to working closely with the states to address the concerns reflected in their comments, as well as concerns and questions that may arise following the close of the comment period, to the extent practical.
CT_Congress_Senate	We also urge you to be responsive to the many communities affected by this proposal and ensure all our constituents' concerns are thoroughly considered and addressed before you adopt any proposal... - Ensure you have conducted thorough outreach to all communities and stakeholders affected, including ensuring anyone who should be afforded an opportunity to comment has been provided ample, sufficient, timely notice of this undertaking. - Ensure everyone has been able to assess the costs of the proposals with enough specificity to provide constructive feedback.	The FRA is committed to an open public participation process. In November 2015, the FRA notified state, regional, and local governments along each of the Action Alternatives' Representative Routes of the availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The FRA sent information on the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comment process, and public hearings to elected officials in each of the 216 local jurisdictions and 42 counties along these Representative Routes, and made hard copies of the Tier 1 Draft EIS available for review at central libraries in each of these counties. The FRA also placed legal notice and advertisements in major regional newspapers and distributed media advisories to media outlets throughout the region to publicize availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public hearings, and the comment period. The outreach effort to local communities complied with the FRA's Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts and was appropriate with respect to the level of detail available in this Tier 1 environmental review. The FRA received and reviewed over 3,200 submissions on the Tier 1 Draft EIS, which were again instrumental to the FRA in identifying the Preferred Alternative presented in this Tier 1 Final EIS. Going forward, future Tier 2 projects will address project level coordination issues, such as impacts to local resources and communities. Future Tier 2 project coordination will be the responsibility of the local project sponsor, who will identify coordination with potentially impacted communities, counties, state resource and regulatory agencies and federal agencies.
CT_Congress_Senate2	As the Federal Railroad Administration continues the NEC FUTURE planning process, we write to underscore the importance of creating and maintaining a sense of open communication with communities who may be affected by new track segments constructed under the proposed Action Alternatives. Furthermore, we believe that it would be prudent for the FRA to consider hosting additional meetings and listening sessions in southeastern Connecticut. As representatives for the southeastern shore of Connecticut, we have seen firsthand the major need for improvement along the rail line. In fact, the vast majority of our constituents support upgrading our rail infrastructure to benefit our local economy and boost tourism. Unfortunately, these same constituents believe that the FRA has not done its due diligence in providing proper community outreach in towns that will be the most impacted by new track construction.	Coordination with affected local communities will be an important part of future Tier 2 projects consistent with this Tier 1 EIS, and this could include additional meetings and listening sessions in southeastern Connecticut. The outreach effort to local communities complied with the FRA's Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts and was appropriate with respect to the level of detail available in this Tier 1 environmental review. Going forward, future Tier 2 projects will address project level coordination issues, such as impacts to local resources and communities. Future Tier 2 project coordination will be the responsibility of the local project sponsor, who will identify coordination with potentially impacted communities, counties, state resource and regulatory agencies and federal agencies.

Table JJ–20: Stakeholder Comments (Elected Officials, Tribes, Federal Agencies, State Agencies, Local Agencies): Public and Agency Outreach (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
CT_Congress_Senate2	While we understand that the FRA is still in the project planning stages of NEC FUTURE and many more steps remain ahead in this process, we believe consistent community involvement will serve as the most important tool for finding agreeable alternatives, increasing local buy-in, and instilling a sense of trust among affected residents. As the planning process moves forward, we request that the FRA host listening sessions along the Connecticut shoreline where the proposed Alternative 1 new track segment will be constructed in order to hear the views and concerns of the communities in this area.	Future projects that require compliance with NEPA (i.e., Tier 2 projects that involve federal financial assistance or require a federal permit/clearance) must include coordination with the public. Coordination with affected local communities to find workable solutions and avoid negative impacts will be an important part of future Tier 2 projects consistent with this Tier 1 EIS. Going forward, future Tier 2 projects will address project-level coordination issues, including the appropriate level of public involvement consistent with the Council on Environmental Quality's NEPA regulations and the lead Federal agency's specific NEPA procedures. Appropriate public involvement at the Tier 2 project-level may include additional meetings and listening sessions in southeastern Connecticut. For this Tier 1 Draft EIS, The outreach effort to local communities complied with the FRA's Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts and was appropriate with respect to the level of detail available in this Tier 1 environmental review. Future Tier 2 project coordination will be developed and implemented by the local project sponsor in compliance with the lead Federal agency's NEPA procedures, in conjunction with the lead Federal agency.
EPA_Walsh	If the Preferred Alternative is a hybrid, or includes previously unidentified elements that have not evaluated in the past, the FRA should consider additional opportunity for public comment.	As discussed throughout the Tier 1 EIS process, the FRA anticipated combining elements of each of the Action Alternatives in assembling the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative would achieve the service objectives identified with the 'grow' vision (Alternative 2), but focuses on the existing NEC and includes the Hartford/Springfield Line. The Hartford/Springfield Line was considered only up to Hartford in conjunction with Alternatives 2 and 3; however, the Hartford/Springfield Line was the subject of a separate environmental review which was previously disclosed to the public. The Preferred Alternative does not include the off-corridor routing from Boston via Hartford and Providence. This variation from the Action Alternatives, as noted by USEPA, warrants the additional opportunity for public review. The FRA separately reached out to local, regional and state agency representatives in Hartford and Springfield to review the possibility of including Hartford/Springfield in the Preferred Alternative. In addition, the NEPA-required 30-day review period before issuing a ROD is another opportunity for the public to review the Preferred Alternative.

Table JJ–20: Stakeholder Comments (Elected Officials, Tribes, Federal Agencies, State Agencies, Local Agencies): Public and Agency Outreach (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Floral Park_Trustee Longobardi	The two January 12th public hearings in Mineola, NY were not well-publicized or well-attended in spite of the significant regional concerns regarding this project. It is important to note that 2.8 million people reside in Nassau/Suffolk Counties on Long Island, yet only two public hearings were held in central Nassau County on the same night. This would have forced most Suffolk County residents to travel twenty to ninety miles to attend the closest hearing. Attendees at the Mineola hearings were angered upon learning that the FRA representatives, while cordial and respectful, would not respond to questions from the audience.	As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA has been committed to open and transparent outreach process, consistent with NEPA and the FRA's Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts. The FRA's extensive agency consultation and involvement process is described in Volume 1 and 2, Chapter 11. In November 2015, the FRA notified state and local governments and regional agencies along each of the Action Alternatives' Representative Routes of the availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The FRA sent information on the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comment process, and public hearings to elected officials in each of the 216 local jurisdictions and 42 counties along these Representative Routes, including potentially affected municipalities on Long Island. The FRA also placed legal notice and advertisements in major regional newspapers, including in Newsday on November 13, 2015, and again on January 5, 2016, to publicize the availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS and the Mineola public hearing, and distributed media advisories to media outlets throughout the region to publicize availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public hearings, and the comment period. The original comment period was set for 78 days, ending January 30, 2016. Due to public requests, the public comment period was extended TO 95 DAYS, ending February 16, 2016. The outreach effort to local communities complied with the FRA's Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts and was appropriate with respect to the level of detail available in this Tier 1 environmental review. Under NEPA, public hearings are a formal method of public participation, with speakers' comments recorded by a stenographer. During the formal submission of comments, responses to questions or comments are not provided, and are instead addressed in written responses provided in the Tier 1 Final EIS (Appendix JJ). Informal comments and questions were addressed by the FRA and NEC FUTURE team members before and after the formal submission of comments. This procedure to handle questions was consistent corridor wide. Going forward, future Tier 2 projects will address project level coordination issues, such as impacts to local resources and communities. Future Tier 2 project coordination will be developed and implemented by the local project sponsor.
Groton_Bronk	Our hope would be that if Alternative #1 is selected as the preferred option, impacted communities such as Groton would have the opportunity to share local plans and knowledge prior to the development of more detailed plans.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives, including Alternative 1, to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. It replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. The NEC FUTURE program follows a "tiered" approach to environmental review. Tier 1 focuses on broad programs and initial analysis. Tier 2 focuses on site-specific, project-level proposals and impacts. As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, and will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure. Such decisions would be made as part of the Tier 2 project studies, which would include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate.
Kearny_Mayor Santos	Depending on which of these alternatives is selected, I notice there is a new segment that traverses that region. And I'm hoping that as this progress there will be coordination with the local communities that are affected by the new segment...	Coordination with affected local communities will be an important part of future Tier 2 projects consistent with this Tier 1 EIS. The outreach effort to local communities complied with the FRA's Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts and was appropriate with respect to the level of detail available in this Tier 1 environmental review. Going forward, future Tier 2 projects will address project level coordination issues, such as impacts to local resources and communities. Future Tier 2 project coordination will be the responsibility of the local project sponsor, who will identify coordination with potentially impacted communities, counties, state resource and regulatory agencies and federal agencies.

Table JJ–20: Stakeholder Comments (Elected Officials, Tribes, Federal Agencies, State Agencies, Local Agencies): Public and Agency Outreach (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Kearny_Mayor Santos	...if there are impacts on a community, on properties which could be ratables are taken, and if there are impacts in the community ... whether it's properties that are affected, whether it's roadways that are affected, that I'm hoping that you will work closely with the local communities, you will understand who your local communities are, and you will also hopefully understand how some of these local communities have not benefited from the Midtown Direct Line, for example, that New Jersey Transit did. Have not benefited from Secaucus Transfer. And my community is one of those. So I'm hoping you're sensitive to that as this progresses.	Coordination with affected local communities will be an important part of future Tier 2 projects consistent with this Tier 1 EIS. The outreach effort to local communities complied with the FRA's Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts and was appropriate with respect to the level of detail available in this Tier 1 environmental review. Going forward, future Tier 2 projects will address project level coordination issues, such as impacts to local resources and communities. Future Tier 2 project coordination will be the responsibility of the local project sponsor, who will identify coordination with potentially impacted communities, counties, state resource and regulatory agencies and federal agencies.
MDP_Sirota	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.	The FRA also looks forward to continued coordination with MDP.
Nassau County_Legislator Schaefer	Nassau County Legislator Laura Schaefer would like to request a meeting with representatives of the U.S. DOT Federal Railroad Administration with regards to the Alternative 3 proposal for a high speed rail line through Nassau County! Please let this office know of a date and time for representatives to meet with members and staff of the Nassau County Legislature on this very important matter!	The FRA has contacted Nassau County to discuss this issue.
NCPC_Kempf	...as the project is developed further through the Tier II process... To ensure a full and proper analysis of the proposed project, NCPC staff requests that FRA coordinate the preparation of the EIS with the following agencies and organizations : National Park Service (NPS), General Services Administration (GSA), Commission of Fine Arts (CF A), US Courts, District of Columbia Office of Planning (DCOP), District Department of Transportation (DDOT), DC State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), and the Architect of the Capitol (AOC). Furthermore, NCPC staff also recommends FRA coordinate the project with other relevant projects and planning studies, including those for Burnham Place and the Union Station Expansion Project.	Thank you for your suggestions about the Washington, D.C., area agencies that should be involved in the Tier 2 process. The FRA has coordinated with a variety of agencies in this region including NPS, DDOT, and SHPO. The agency coordination process for NEC FUTURE is detailed in Volume 1 and 2, Chapter 11. Future Tier 2 projects will address project level coordination issues such as impacts to local resources and communities. Tier 2 will also include coordination with the additional agencies once specific alignment and engineering details have been determined. The FRA is coordinating with the Union Station Expansion Project.
New York City_Shorris	To the extent that any selected alternative calls for new rail alignments in New York City, we look forward to a comprehensive analysis and stakeholder engagement process, beginning with direct outreach to New York City so we better understand the potential route and its impacts. We understand that any such action would also be subject to a full project-level Tier II EIS.	The FRA welcomes the opportunity to meet with New York City officials to discuss these issues. Responsibility for a comprehensive analysis and stakeholder engagement process will rest with future Tier 2 project sponsors.
Philadelphia_Tolson_Padullon	We nonetheless deem it prudent share these questions to inform USDOT/FRA deliberations as well as to obtain timely clarifications from the FRA to aid ongoing policy and planning coordination by the City and its partners... We look forward to further dialog this spring with the NEC FUTURE team on the selection of a Preferred Alternative . Please forward responses to the listed questions to the undersigned, and kindly contact Denise Goren at 215-686-2142 to set up additional discussion as appropriate.	The FRA met with City officials on June 10, 2016 to discuss these questions and provide clarification on these matters.
RiverCOG_Downes	It is the request of the Connecticut River Gateway Commission that any efforts to construct a new railroad bridge and its approaches between Old Saybrook and Old Lyme as summarized in Option 1 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS be carried out in a manner consistent with the Gateway mission of protection and involve said Commission early enough in any design process in order to seek advice on the best way to minimize any adverse visual or ecological impacts that may be caused by the construction of such infrastructure within the Gateway area of jurisdiction, the Gateway Conservation Zone as identified in Section 25-102c CGS.	In response to community concerns, the FRA proposes a commitment to avoiding use of an an aerial structure through the historic district in Old Lyme, CT. The design process for infrastructure in this area, as in any part of the corridor, will take place when a subsequent Tier 2 project is initiated. At that time, the Tier 2 project sponsor will conduct a community outreach process. The FRA encourages the involvement of the Connecticut River Gateway Commission in that process.

Table JJ–20: Stakeholder Comments (Elected Officials, Tribes, Federal Agencies, State Agencies, Local Agencies): Public and Agency Outreach (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
RiverCOG_Gold	River COG only became aware of the proposal upon the release of the draft EIS late last year. River COG is disappointed that the Federal Railroad Administration did not directly contact affected municipalities in Connecticut or conduct a public hearing within closer vicinity of the proposed new bypass track, such as in New London.	The FRA directly contacted each of the potentially affected municipalities at the release of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. An information packet was sent to the chief elected official of each community located along the proposed Action Alternatives' Representative Routes on November 13, 2015, providing information on the availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comment period, and public hearings; this mailing included Mayor Daryl Finizio of New London. The Connecticut public hearings took place in New Haven on December 14, 2016, and in Hartford on January 13, 2016. The outreach effort to local communities complied with the FRA's Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts and was appropriate with respect to the level of detail available in this Tier 1 environmental review. Additional coordination and public involvement would take place as part of Tier 2 project reviews, and would be the responsibility of the project sponsor.
Thompson_Chinatti	...the fact that the Plan was created with what seems like little, or no, input from many municipalities that may be affected - either positively or negatively - makes one question how informed that Plan actually is. It appears, in discussions I've had with other municipal officials, many municipalities only found out about the proposal at the 11th hour, and through the grapevine, which is unfair to those municipalities. It is extremely difficult to provide informed and thorough comments with so little time to review the very large document, and it would have been appreciated if we were made aware of this study/Plan at its outset, and had been included in discussions. Northeastern Connecticut is oftentimes ignored when proposals/projects/plans are brought forward regarding transportation, and it is unfair to those municipalities not to be considered merely because the area is predominantly rural. Thompson is central to all points in the Northeast, as you can see by the attached maps, and it is respectfully requested that the Town be included as an active participant in the NEC FUTURES Plan.	The FRA is committed to an open public participation process, and welcomes the involvement of the Town of Thompson, CT. In November 2015, the FRA notified state and local governments and regional agencies along each of the Action Alternatives' Representative Routes of the availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The FRA sent information on the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comment process, and public hearings to elected officials in each of the local jurisdictions and counties along these Representative Routes, including those in Connecticut, and made hard copies of the Tier 1 Draft EIS available for review at central libraries in each of these counties. The FRA also placed legal notice and advertisements in major regional newspapers including the Day, the Hour, the New Haven Register, Hartford Courant, and Connecticut Post, and distributed media advisories to media outlets throughout the region to publicize availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public hearings, and the comment period. For the Tier 1 Draft EIS, the FRA held public hearings in each of the states along the NEC, including two public hearings in Connecticut. The outreach effort to local communities complied with the FRA's Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts and was appropriate with respect to the level of detail available in this Tier 1 environmental review. Going forward, future Tier 2 projects will address project level coordination issues, such as impacts to local resources and communities. Future Tier 2 project coordination will be the responsibility of the local project sponsor, who will identify coordination with potentially impacted communities, counties, state resource and regulatory agencies and federal agencies.
Thompson_Chinatti	It is also formally requested that the public comment period for the Plan be kept open, with more public informational meetings/hearings held in the less populated areas of the region it would potentially impact, and that those meetings/hearings be better publicized, so the Commission may obtain comments from all municipalities/areas affected by, or omitted from, the proposed Plan.	Due to public requests, the FRA extended the close of the public comment period to February 16, 2016, resulting in a 95-day comment period. Eleven public hearings were held corridor wide providing individuals from a variety of locations the opportunity to comment on the Tier 1 Draft EIS. More information about the comment period and public hearings is provided in Volume 1, Chapter 11.

Table JJ–20: Stakeholder Comments (Elected Officials, Tribes, Federal Agencies, State Agencies, Local Agencies): Public and Agency Outreach (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Waterford_Piersall	The limited comment period for the Tier 1 Draft EIS that coincided with the holiday season, coupled with the lack of outreach to affected communities left little opportunity for meaningful discussion of the Alternatives. Given the significant potential impact of the proposed Alternatives, more discussion is needed in Southeastern Connecticut.	The FRA is committed to an open public participation process. In November 2015, the FRA notified state and local governments and regional agencies along each of the Action Alternatives’ Representative Routes of the availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The FRA sent information on the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comment process, and public hearings to elected officials in each of the local jurisdictions and counties along these Representative Routes, including those in Southeastern Connecticut, and made hard copies of the Tier 1 Draft EIS available for review at central libraries in each of these counties. The FRA also placed legal notice and advertisements in major regional newspapers including the Day, the Hour, the New Haven Register, Hartford Courant, and Connecticut Post, and distributed media advisories to media outlets throughout the region to publicize availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public hearings, and the comment period. The outreach effort to local communities complied with the FRA's Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts and was appropriate with respect to the level of detail available in this Tier 1 environmental review. Going forward, future Tier 2 projects will address project level coordination issues, such as impacts to local resources and communities. Future Tier 2 project coordination will be the responsibility of the local project sponsor, who will identify coordination with potentially impacted communities, counties, state resource and regulatory agencies and federal agencies.

Source: NEC FUTURE team, 2016

Table JJ–21: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Public and Agency Outreach

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Alan_Da	I must express my deep disappointment that there is one feature of the original ARC and Portal Bridge processes from the 1990s that we do not have now, and that was a Regional Citizens Liaison Committee. I was on the original RCLC. In those days, and it's showed that the riders, who, after all, will be paying for this system and using it, were considered special stakeholders. Today we are not. We are merely members of the general public.	The FRA is very interested in the views of rail riders and rider advocacy organizations, and has met with rider organizations throughout the region to discuss NEC FUTURE, as described in Volume 2, Chapter 11. The FRA also conducted direct outreach to passengers at 18 different stations, meeting with over 12,000 riders to alert them to the NEC FUTURE program and encourage them to become involved.
Alexander_Er	So there was a public hearing for this plan on Long Island that involved literally no one from Long Island. So a simple question who did you reach out to on Long Island? Who is advising your team on this project? Do you feel the public input you received is sufficient to get feedback from the 3 million people and over 100 municipalities in this region?	The FRA is committed to an open public participation process. In November 2015, the FRA notified state and local governments and regional agencies along each of the Action Alternatives' Representative Routes of the availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The FRA sent information on the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comment process, and public hearings to elected officials in each of the 216 local jurisdictions and 42 counties along these Representative Routes, including potentially affected municipalities on Long Island. The FRA also placed legal notice and advertisements in major regional newspapers, including Newsday, and distributed media advisories to media outlets throughout the region to publicize availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public hearings, and the comment period. The outreach effort to local communities complied with the FRA's Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts and was appropriate with respect to the level of detail available in this Tier 1 environmental review. Going forward, future Tier 2 projects will address project level coordination issues, such as impacts to local resources and communities. Future Tier 2 project coordination will be the responsibility of the local project sponsor, who will identify coordination with potentially impacted communities, counties, state resource and regulatory agencies and federal agencies.
Amarato_Ed	I only found out about this last week. ... [The town of Hicksville] is divided up into three legislators... Not one of them is here. I get political mailings all the time from them. I never got any sort of mailing to let me know about this meeting, ... but this is so big, so huge. This is going to impact so much of our lives. ... This can't happen without more people knowing about it. I'm sorry, but the whole County needs to know about this. If they can afford political mailers and then to say that -- that our comments have to be in by January 30th when most of us are only finding out about it this now, that's not right. And 7:30 in the evening, they're having a public hearing, that's not right. There's no rush. We waited this long, we can wait a little bit longer so that everybody knows what's going on.	The FRA is committed to an open public participation process. In November 2015, the FRA notified state and local governments and regional agencies along each of the Action Alternatives' Representative Routes of the availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The FRA sent information on the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comment process, and public hearings to elected officials in each of the 216 local jurisdictions and 42 counties along these Representative Routes, including potentially affected municipalities on Long Island. The FRA also placed legal notice and advertisements in major regional newspapers, including Newsday, and distributed media advisories to media outlets throughout the region to publicize availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public hearings, and the comment period. Due to public requests, the FRA extended the close of the public comment period to February 16, 2016, resulting in a 95-day comment period. The outreach effort to local communities complied with the FRA's Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts and was appropriate with respect to the level of detail available in this Tier 1 environmental review. Going forward, future Tier 2 projects will address project level coordination issues, such as impacts to local resources and communities. Future Tier 2 project coordination will be the responsibility of the local project sponsor, who will identify coordination with potentially impacted communities, counties, state resource and regulatory agencies and federal agencies.

Table JJ–21: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Public and Agency Outreach (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Aronow_AI	One hopes that America ingenuity is still capable of developing sensible and scalable transportation options and that the FRA provides the public appropriate time to review and comment these options.	The FRA is committed to an open public participation process that includes a dialogue on sensible and scalable transportation options for the NEC. In November 2015, the FRA notified state and local governments and regional agencies along each of the Action Alternatives’ Representative Routes of the availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The FRA sent information on the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comment process, and public hearings to elected officials in each of the 216 local jurisdictions and 42 counties along these Representative Routes, and made hard copies of the Tier 1 Draft EIS available for review at central libraries in each of these counties. The FRA also placed legal notice and advertisements in major regional newspapers and distributed media advisories to media outlets throughout the region to publicize availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public hearings, and the comment period. For the Tier 1 Draft EIS, the FRA held public hearings in each of the states along the NEC and provided opportunities for public comment online, by email and by mail. The outreach effort to local communities complied with the FRA’s Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts and was appropriate with respect to the level of detail available in this Tier 1 environmental review. Going forward, future Tier 2 projects will address project level coordination issues, such as impacts to local resources and communities. Future Tier 2 project coordination will be the responsibility of the local project sponsor, who will identify coordination with potentially impacted communities, counties, state resource and regulatory agencies and federal agencies.
Astuti_Mi	You didn't say where it would be going or where there might be a new station added. All of the towns here are hundreds of years old. I don't think that makes a difference in where the rail lines should go. It is a bit of a snub that the Feds did not ask for input... I cannot say that I oppose the proposal because you haven't offered me any specifics to what I should be opposing.	The Tier 1 EIS identifies routes and construction types that are representative or conceptual in nature. They identify the physical footprint to assess potential environmental consequences to compare to the No Action Alternative. The detailed project level information that you are seeking will be developed and available for review as part of subsequent Tier 2 project studies.
Bauer_La	Additional and well publicized hearings are required before the FRA takes any action.	The Preferred Alternative does not include a Long Island routing, so no further hearings are planned on Long Island.
Brash_AI	Second, we would note that for a project with such a proposed impact, there has been insufficient engagement within each of the communities that will so profoundly be effected.	The FRA is committed to an open public participation process. In November 2015, the FRA notified state, regional, and local governments along each of the Action Alternatives’ Representative Routes of the availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The FRA sent information on the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comment process, and public hearings to elected officials in each of the 216 local jurisdictions and 42 counties along these Representative Routes, and made hard copies of the Tier 1 Draft EIS available for review at central libraries in each of these counties. The FRA also placed legal notice and advertisements in major regional newspapers and distributed media advisories to media outlets throughout the region to publicize availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public hearings, and the comment period. The outreach effort to local communities complied with the FRA’s Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts and was appropriate with respect to the level of detail available in this Tier 1 environmental review. The FRA received and reviewed over 3,200 submissions on the Tier 1 Draft EIS, which were again instrumental to the FRA in identifying the Preferred Alternative presented in this Tier 1 Final EIS. Going forward, future Tier 2 projects will address project level coordination issues, such as impacts to local resources and communities. Future Tier 2 project coordination will be the responsibility of the local project sponsor, who will identify coordination with potentially impacted communities, counties, state resource and regulatory agencies and federal agencies.
Bruhl_Ch	The phased EIS process is very difficult to understand, especially for members of the public. Going forward, the phased process needs to be further explained to all stakeholders.	The FRA has made an effort to explain the phased EIS process in the Tier 1 Draft EIS document, in presentation materials, and in the Frequently Asked Questions section of the website. Materials have been refined throughout the EIS process in attempt to better explain the Tiering process and how it applies to NEC FUTURE. Additional information on the Tier 1 process is provided in Volume 1, Chapter 1.

Table JJ–21: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Public and Agency Outreach (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Bruinooge_Lo	Green Valley 's existence. The purpose of this testimony is to briefly describe The Last Green Valley 's resources, and to let you know that Section 107 of our enabling legislation, Public Law 103-449 as amended, requires that: Any federal entity conducting or supporting activities directly affecting the Corridor shall consult with the Secretary [of the Interior] and the management entity with respect to such activities to minimize any adverse effect on the Corridor. The Last Green Valley, Inc. (TLGV) is the nonprofit organization designated as the management entity for the Corridor. Our work is governed by our Vision 2020 Management Plan, available on our website, www.thelastgreenvalley.org . As the management entity, TLGV respectfully requests consultation with FRA prior to any decisions being made about Preferred Alternatives. ... The public comment period be extended and more informational meetings and/or public hearings be held outside of the major metropolitan areas;	<p>The FRA identified The Last Green Valley (TLGV) was part of the Alternatives 2 and 3 and has addressed this in Volume 2, Chapter 7.4. However, the FRA's Preferred Alternative, described in Volume 1, Chapter 4, does not intersect with TLGV area of responsibility. Therefore, FRA did not consult with TLGV prior to announcing the Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>In November 2015, the FRA notified state and local governments and regional agencies along each of the Action Alternatives' Representative Routes of the availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The FRA sent information on the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comment process, and public hearings to elected officials in each of the 216 local jurisdictions and 42 counties along these Representative Routes, including potentially affected municipalities on Long Island. The FRA also placed legal notice and advertisements in major regional newspapers to publicize the availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS and public hearings, and distributed media advisories to media outlets throughout the region to publicize availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public hearings, and the comment period. The original comment period was set for 78 days, ending January 30, 2016. Due to public requests, the public comment period was extended to 95 DAYS, ending February 16, 2016. The outreach effort to local communities complied with the FRA's Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts and was appropriate with respect to the level of detail available in this Tier 1 environmental review.</p> <p>The FRA encourages TLGV, Inc. to stay involved with FRA as the NEC FUTURE Preferred Alternative is advanced during subsequent Tier 2 project studies.</p>
Bruinooge_Lo	Alternatives 2 and 3 in the Tier I Draft EIS will directly affect and will substantially impact The Last Green Valley, yet there is no mention in thousands of pages of documents of The Last Green Valleys existence. ... Both Alternatives 2 and 3 have the potential to significantly impact Last Green Valley communities, yet there seems to be very little awareness about this project in our cities and towns. The Tier I Draft EIS came as quite a surprise, and with public hearings and a public comment period spanning the holidays, the timing could not be worse for real public participation. Our second request to FRA is that the public comment period be extended and that more informational meetings and/or public hearings be held outside of the major metropolitan areas. ... FRA begin the consultation process with us prior to making any decisions about Preferred Alternatives;	<p>The FRA addressed national heritage corridors and areas generally in Volume 1, Chapter 7.04 of the Tier 1 Final EIS. The FRA addressed The Last Green Valley in Volume 2, Chapter 7.04 of the Tier 1 Final EIS. The Preferred Alternative minimizes potential impacts to this region. Coordination with local plans such as those for national heritage areas is most appropriately addressed as part of Tier 2 projects.</p> <p>As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA has been committed to open and transparent outreach process, consistent with NEPA and the FRA's Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts. The FRA's extensive agency consultation and involvement process is described in Volume 1 and 2, Chapter 11.</p> <p>In November 2015, the FRA notified state, regional, and local governments along each of the Action Alternatives' Representative Routes of the availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The FRA sent information on the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comment process, and public hearings to elected officials in each of the 216 local jurisdictions and 42 counties along these Representative Routes, including those in Connecticut and Massachusetts, and made hard copies of the Tier 1 Draft EIS available for review at central libraries in each of these counties. The FRA also placed legal notice and advertisements in major regional newspapers and distributed media advisories to media outlets throughout the region to publicize availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public hearings, and the comment period. The original comment period was set for 78 days, ending January 30, 2016. Due to public requests, the FRA extended the close of the public comment period to February 16, 2016, resulting in a 95-day comment period. The outreach effort to local communities complied with the FRA's Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts and was appropriate with respect to the level of detail available in this Tier 1 environmental review.</p> <p>Going forward, future Tier 2 projects will address project level coordination issues, such as impacts to local resources and communities. Future Tier 2 project coordination will be developed and implemented by the local project sponsor.</p>

Table JJ–21: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Public and Agency Outreach (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Burns_Do	It is distressing that this project has been 3 years in the making and the public is just now learning of it. ... A local public hearing is needed before the public comment period ends on 2/15/16.	The FRA is committed to an open public participation process that has included 35 public meetings throughout the region since 2012, as well as numerous informal meetings with interested organizations upon request. In November 2015, the FRA notified state and local governments and regional agencies along each of the Action Alternatives’ Representative Routes of the availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The FRA sent information on the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comment process, and public hearings to elected officials in each of the 216 local jurisdictions and 42 counties along these Representative Routes, including potentially affected municipalities on Long Island. The FRA also placed legal notice and advertisements in major regional newspapers, including Newsday, and distributed media advisories to media outlets throughout the region to publicize availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public hearings, and the comment period. The outreach effort to local communities complied with the FRA's Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts and was appropriate with respect to the level of detail available in this Tier 1 environmental review. Going forward, future Tier 2 projects will address project level coordination issues, such as impacts to local resources and communities. Future Tier 2 project coordination will be the responsibility of the local project sponsor, who will identify coordination with potentially impacted communities, counties, state resource and regulatory agencies and federal agencies.
Caracciolo_Da	I'm just interested in this proposal for a couple of reasons. One being the significant impact and the lack of marketing that's taken place, I feel, in this particular public session... I felt like the marketing, in particular, surrounding this particular event, especially with the municipalities involved, mobile, here we're very fragmented and how can I put this, granular municipal structure here on Long Island where we have a lot of towns and a lot of villages, the counties. And I'm curious to know if there's any additional public comment sessions, particularly for our friends in Suffolk County who have been -- who have expressed interest but live all the way out in Ronkonkoma and couldn't make it tonight.	The FRA is committed to an open public participation process. In November 2015, the FRA notified state and local governments and regional agencies along each of the Action Alternatives’ Representative Routes of the availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The FRA sent information on the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comment process, and public hearings to elected officials in each of the 216 local jurisdictions and 42 counties along these Representative Routes, including potentially affected municipalities on Long Island. The FRA also placed legal notice and advertisements in major regional newspapers, including Newsday, and distributed media advisories to media outlets throughout the region to publicize availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public hearings, and the comment period. The outreach effort to local communities complied with the FRA's Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts and was appropriate with respect to the level of detail available in this Tier 1 environmental review. Going forward, future Tier 2 projects will address project level coordination issues, such as impacts to local resources and communities. Future Tier 2 project coordination will be the responsibility of the local project sponsor, who will identify coordination with potentially impacted communities, counties, state resource and regulatory agencies and federal agencies.
Carley_Ro	I commend the FRA and all of the consultants that are on board with this project and helping this. I think this has been a very, very well-run process, a very well-publicized process, an open process. I'm a little disappointed that we don't have more people here tonight, but I have been to several of these before, and I think the awareness is increasing of this.	FRA is committed to an open and transparent public involvement process. Thank you for your support.
Cassidy_Ja	Get a new logo! This is a big deal and the current logo screams small; uncreative .	Thank you for your input.
Cassidy_Ja	Use far fewer words in displays accompanying public presentations. I realize the project is large and complicated, but that is all the more reason to work hard at achieving brevity without sacrificing clarity.	Thank you for your input.
Cassidy_Ja	First and foremost: try to find a way to present the project background and options in a film or video with an absolute minimum of spoken words, remembering that many in the audience will not use English as a first language. The support of these folks will eventually be key to successful conclusion to this study and to its implementation.	The FRA has used videos, animations and graphics to present project information and agrees that these are valuable for communicating with a wide range of audiences, including those for whom English is not a first language. Program materials, including an introductory video, were also translated into Spanish, the primary language spoken by those residents along the NEC who have limited English proficiency. See Volume 2, Chapter 11 for additional information.
Cassidy_Ja	Maintain and improve - define these words and explain whether maintain speaks to physical or operational elements or both. Innovative approaches - provide end-to-end out-of-the-box thinking about all elements of various options. State of good repair - this must be the absolute minimum of any and all options. Protect freight rail access - get real creative here! Freight at night or on weekends along daily commuter lines?	All Action Alternatives considered in the Tier 1 Draft EIS include bringing the existing NEC to a state of good repair. Each Action Alternative considered the relationship between freight and passenger rail. The Tier 1 Draft EIS referenced "maintain and improve" in regards to Alternative 1 - Maintain. "Maintain" refers to maintaining 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.

Table JJ–21: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Public and Agency Outreach (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Cerrone_Ma	Please note I am also disturbed by the lack of notice our community HS had in regards to these proposals.	The FRA is committed to an open public participation process. In November 2015, the FRA notified state and local governments and regional agencies along each of the Action Alternatives’ Representative Routes of the availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The FRA sent information on the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comment process, and public hearings to elected officials in each of the 216 local jurisdictions and 42 counties along these Representative Routes, including potentially affected municipalities on Long Island. The FRA also placed legal notice and advertisements in major regional newspapers, including Newsday, and distributed media advisories to media outlets throughout the region to publicize availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public hearings, and the comment period. The outreach effort to local communities complied with the FRA's Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts and was appropriate with respect to the level of detail available in this Tier 1 environmental review. Going forward, future Tier 2 projects will address project level coordination issues, such as impacts to local resources and communities. Future Tier 2 project coordination will be the responsibility of the local project sponsor, who will identify coordination with potentially impacted communities, counties, state resource and regulatory agencies and federal agencies.
Chester_Sc	I believe that citizens whose property will be affected, should have a say in planning the project.	Coordination with affected local communities will be an important part of future Tier 2 projects consistent with this Tier 1 EIS. The outreach effort to local communities complied with the FRA's Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts and was appropriate with respect to the level of detail available in this Tier 1 environmental review. Going forward, future Tier 2 projects will address project level coordination issues, such as impacts to local resources and communities. Future Tier 2 project coordination will be the responsibility of the local project sponsor, who will identify coordination with potentially impacted communities, counties, state resource and regulatory agencies and federal agencies.
Clift_Jo	Need for organized ongoing two-way public input- TOTALLY MISSING FROM THE CURRENT PROCESS! A public participation program should be established immediately, based on the very successful Access to the Regions Core Regional Citizens Liaison Committee, where there are multiple meetings that allow for two-way dialogue and far greater public feedback. Current public outreach is one-way, limited in communication, and insufficient to gain true public input. If NEC FUTURE Team is serious about public input, this must change immediately. Otherwise, conclusion one reaches is that Team is, by design, avoiding public dialogue and input.	The FRA is committed to an open public participation process that has included 35 public meetings throughout the region since 2012, as well as numerous informal meetings with interested organizations upon request. This open process includes maintaining a comprehensive website that provides access to all of the technical reports generated during the program. The FRA has relied heavily on public dialogue in its decision-making for NEC FUTURE. Over 2,000 comments received during the scoping process in 2012 provided critical input in the development of the alternatives evaluated in the Tier 1 Draft EIS. For the Tier 1 Draft EIS, the FRA held public hearings in each of the states along the NEC and provided opportunities for public comment online, by email and by mail. The FRA received and reviewed over 3,200 submissions on the Tier 1 Draft EIS, which were again instrumental to the FRA in identifying the Preferred Alternative presented in this Tier 1 Final EIS.

Table JJ–21: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Public and Agency Outreach (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Collins_Ja	<p>...While such (Outreach) notifications are admirable and certainly meant to be extensive, the notification process falls short of legal and common sense requirements. ... Outreach to local jurisdictions may include meetings, videoconferences, informational mailings or e-mail communications. Individual meetings will be sought with mayoral and/or transportation staff for the NEC's largest cities". Emphasis added. NEC Futures Public Involvement Plan Appendix F, 4.15. No such communication with the affected local jurisdictions occurred. Had such notification occurred perhaps local jurisdictions and residents would have been notified of public hearings on November 10 and 12, 2014 in New Haven, CT and Providence, RI. Table 11-9. Clearly, such inadequate notice is not in keeping with the very essence of Section 101 of NEPA, and will subject the FRA to unnecessary future litigation associated with eminent domain issues.</p>	<p>As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA has been committed to open and transparent outreach process, consistent with NEPA and the FRA's Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts. The FRA's extensive agency consultation and involvement process is described in Volume 1 and 2, Chapter 11.</p> <p>In November 2015, the FRA notified state and local governments and regional agencies along each of the Action Alternatives' Representative Routes of the availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The FRA sent information on the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comment process, and public hearings to elected officials in each of the local jurisdictions and counties along these Representative Routes, including those in Connecticut and Rhode Island, and made hard copies of the Tier 1 Draft EIS available for review at central libraries in each of these counties. The FRA also placed legal notice and advertisements in major regional newspapers including the Day, the Hour, the New Haven Register, Hartford Courant, Connecticut Post, and Providence Journal, and distributed media advisories to media outlets throughout the region to publicize availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public hearings, and the comment period. The original comment period was set for 78 days, ending January 30, 2016. Due to public requests, the public comment period was extended to 95 days, ending February 16, 2016. The outreach effort to local communities complied with the FRA's Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts and was appropriate with respect to the level of detail available in this Tier 1 environmental review.</p> <p>Going forward, future Tier 2 projects will address project level coordination issues, such as impacts to local resources and communities. Future Tier 2 project coordination will be developed and implemented by the local project sponsor.</p>
Coyle_Ma	<p>I believe the notice for the [public] hearing was also deficient.</p>	<p>The FRA is committed to an open public participation process. In November 2015, the FRA notified state and local governments and regional agencies along each of the Action Alternatives' Representative Routes of the availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The FRA sent information on the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comment process, and public hearings to elected officials in each of the 216 local jurisdictions and 42 counties along these Representative Routes, including potentially affected municipalities on Long Island. The FRA also placed legal notice and advertisements in major regional newspapers, including Newsday, and distributed media advisories to media outlets throughout the region to publicize availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public hearings, and the comment period. The outreach effort to local communities complied with the FRA's Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts and was appropriate with respect to the level of detail available in this Tier 1 environmental review. Going forward, future Tier 2 projects will address project level coordination issues, such as impacts to local resources and communities. Future Tier 2 project coordination will be the responsibility of the local project sponsor, who will identify coordination with potentially impacted communities, counties, state resource and regulatory agencies and federal agencies.</p>
Crafa_Lo	<p>It is your obligation to properly inform us of how you intend to spend billions of tax dollars.</p>	<p>The FRA is committed to an open public participation process. In November 2015, the FRA notified state and local governments and regional agencies along each of the Action Alternatives' Representative Routes of the availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The FRA sent information on the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comment process, and public hearings to elected officials in each of the 216 local jurisdictions and 42 counties along these Representative Routes, including potentially affected municipalities on Long Island. The FRA also placed legal notice and advertisements in major regional newspapers, including Newsday, and distributed media advisories to media outlets throughout the region to publicize availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public hearings, and the comment period. The outreach effort to local communities complied with the FRA's Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts and was appropriate with respect to the level of detail available in this Tier 1 environmental review. Going forward, future Tier 2 projects will address project level coordination issues, such as impacts to local resources and communities. Future Tier 2 project coordination will be the responsibility of the local project sponsor, who will identify coordination with potentially impacted communities, counties, state resource and regulatory agencies and federal agencies.</p>

Table JJ–21: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Public and Agency Outreach (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Daly_Lo	Furthermore, It is your obligation to properly inform the public of how you intend to spend billions of tax dollars.	Funding and financing the Tier 2 projects necessary to implement the Preferred Alternative will be an incremental process for the federal government, Amtrak, the NEC states and stakeholders, and the entire region. This process will require the commitment of both the public and private sectors over a long period of time. The FRA and the NEC Commission will take a leading role in working with project sponsors to support the federal financial assistance to advance implementation, including existing and future grant and other financing programs and options. The FRA and other NEC stakeholders will also engage the private sector to explore options for commercial funding or financing to advance Tier 2 projects. Funding and financing options will be further detailed in the Service Development Plan.
Davis_Rob	The web site is loaded with detail and leagalize but it doesn't show the detail proposed routes [only a small map and cities] You need to show the detail so foks can see and comment - are you hiding something ?	More detailed maps are available in the Mapping Atlas, Appendix AA of Volume 2, which can be downloaded from the Tier 1 EIS page of the website. A hard copy of the Mapping Atlas was also provided at each public hearing, and during the public comment period, a hard copy of the Mapping Atlas was placed in a central library in each of the 42 counties along the Representative Routes of the Action Alternatives.
Delaney_Ma	This plan need more time for those communities that are impacted to have a voice. ...Please consider more public discussion in this!	The FRA is committed to an open public participation process. In November 2015, the FRA notified state, regional, and local governments along each of the Action Alternatives' Representative Routes of the availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The FRA sent information on the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comment process, and public hearings to elected officials in each of the local jurisdictions and counties along these Representative Routes, including those in Connecticut, and made hard copies of the Tier 1 Draft EIS available for review at central libraries in each of these counties. The FRA also placed legal notice and advertisements in major regional newspapers including the Day, the Hour, the New Haven Register, Hartford Courant, and Connecticut Post, and distributed media advisories to media outlets throughout the region to publicize availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public hearings, and the comment period. Due to public requests, the FRA extended the close of the public comment period to February 16, 2016, resulting in a 95-day comment period. The outreach effort to local communities complied with the FRA's Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts and was appropriate with respect to the level of detail available in this Tier 1 environmental review. Going forward, future Tier 2 projects will address project level coordination issues, such as impacts to local resources and communities. Future Tier 2 project coordination will be the responsibility of the local project sponsor, who will identify coordination with potentially impacted communities, counties, state resource and regulatory agencies and federal agencies.
DeRisio_Ma	Extend the comment period by at least 6 months	Due to public requests, the FRA extended the close of the public comment period to February 16, 2016, resulting in a 95-day comment period.
Dixon_Ri	Based on the limited information the FRA has provided during the process leading up to the current proposals and the lack of soliciting public input, it appears the FRA has not done an adequate job of balancing the need for better mass transportation with the needs of the local communities. ... I am particularly disturbed as I am a long time advocate of upgrading our passenger rail system. It has been difficult to get the needed political and public support for needed improvements. The way you have proceeded with the (avoiding local input) has unfortunately harmed the drive to get political and public support.	The FRA is committed to an open public participation process. In November 2015, the FRA notified state, regional, and local governments along each of the Action Alternatives' Representative Routes of the availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The FRA sent information on the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comment process, and public hearings to elected officials in each of the local jurisdictions and counties along these Representative Routes, including those in Connecticut, and made hard copies of the Tier 1 Draft EIS available for review at central libraries in each of these counties. The FRA also placed legal notice and advertisements in major regional newspapers including the Day, the Hour, the New Haven Register, Hartford Courant, and Connecticut Post, and distributed media advisories to media outlets throughout the region to publicize availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public hearings, and the comment period. The outreach effort to local communities complied with the FRA's Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts and was appropriate with respect to the level of detail available in this Tier 1 environmental review. Going forward, future Tier 2 projects will address project level coordination issues, such as impacts to local resources and communities. Future Tier 2 project coordination will be the responsibility of the local project sponsor, who will identify coordination with potentially impacted communities, counties, state resource and regulatory agencies and federal agencies.

Table JJ–21: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Public and Agency Outreach (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Dixon_Ry	Finally, the SWPN group encourages NEC Future planners to more meaningfully coordinate with local planners and communities in proposing routes both in Wilmington and elsewhere along the Northeast corridor.	Coordination with affected local communities will be an important part of future Tier 2 projects consistent with this Tier 1 EIS. The outreach effort to local communities complied with the FRA's Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts and was appropriate with respect to the level of detail available in this Tier 1 environmental review. Going forward, future Tier 2 projects will address project level coordination issues, such as impacts to local resources and communities. Future Tier 2 project coordination will be the responsibility of the local project sponsor, who will identify coordination with potentially impacted communities, counties, state resource and regulatory agencies and federal agencies.
Edwards_Br	I must thank Rich Murdocco for writing about this about two weeks ago - we were -- really no one would have known about this meeting. And I do think it's a problem that in a County of Nassau with three million residents and Suffolk with a million-and-a half residents that there's 50 people in the room to make a decision in such a short period of time... There are no coordination with local government and I think the FRA has made a serious error in that. After that article came out, I brought it to my local legislator and he had no clue that this was going on. And this is, Ronkonkoma is his district where the terminus before it heads north would be. I really feel that the extension of the comment period needs to be done. A Suffolk County meeting would be, I believe, wise to let more people understand what's going on. It's -- and let the people decide whether this project should go forward or not.	The FRA is committed to an open public participation process. In November 2015, the FRA notified state and local governments and regional agencies along each of the Action Alternatives' Representative Routes of the availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The FRA sent information on the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comment process, and public hearings to elected officials in each of the 216 local jurisdictions and 42 counties along these Representative Routes, including potentially affected municipalities on Long Island. The FRA also placed legal notice and advertisements in major regional newspapers, including Newsday, and distributed media advisories to media outlets throughout the region to publicize availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public hearings, and the comment period. Due to public requests, the FRA extended the close of the public comment period to February 16, 2016, resulting in a 95-day comment period. The outreach effort to local communities complied with the FRA's Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts and was appropriate with respect to the level of detail available in this Tier 1 environmental review. Going forward, future Tier 2 projects will address project level coordination issues, such as impacts to local resources and communities. Future Tier 2 project coordination will be the responsibility of the local project sponsor, who will identify coordination with potentially impacted communities, counties, state resource and regulatory agencies and federal agencies.
Ellis_Mi	I also do not believe we have been provided sufficient information on this project as a whole.	The FRA is committed to an open public participation process. In November 2015, the FRA notified state, regional, and local governments along each of the Action Alternatives' Representative Routes of the availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The FRA sent information on the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comment process, and public hearings to elected officials in each of the 216 local jurisdictions and 42 counties along these Representative Routes, including potentially affected municipalities on Long Island. The FRA also placed legal notice and advertisements in major regional newspapers, including Newsday, and distributed media advisories to media outlets throughout the region to publicize availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public hearings, and the comment period. The outreach effort to local communities complied with the FRA's Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts and was appropriate with respect to the level of detail available in this Tier 1 environmental review. Going forward, future Tier 2 projects will address project level coordination issues, such as impacts to local resources and communities. Future Tier 2 project coordination will be the responsibility of the local project sponsor, who will identify coordination with potentially impacted communities, counties, state resource and regulatory agencies and federal agencies.
Esther_Lu	we're wondering if you are communicating with the City on what they're envisioning for the 30th Street project, and there needs to be, you know, some more coordination there.	The FRA has coordinated with the City of Philadelphia and the 30th Street project.

Table JJ–21: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Public and Agency Outreach (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Farman_Ne	...the lack of publicized public hearings and lack of transparency makes the entire process a miscarriage of democratic process thus far.	The FRA is committed to an open public participation process. In November 2015, the FRA notified state and local governments and regional agencies along each of the Action Alternatives' Representative Routes of the availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The FRA sent information on the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comment process, and public hearings to elected officials in each of the 216 local jurisdictions and 42 counties along these Representative Routes, including potentially affected municipalities on Long Island. The FRA also placed legal notice and advertisements in major regional newspapers, including Newsday, and distributed media advisories to media outlets throughout the region to publicize availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public hearings, and the comment period. The outreach effort to local communities complied with the FRA's Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts and was appropriate with respect to the level of detail available in this Tier 1 environmental review. Going forward, future Tier 2 projects will address project level coordination issues, such as impacts to local resources and communities. Future Tier 2 project coordination will be the responsibility of the local project sponsor, who will identify coordination with potentially impacted communities, counties, state resource and regulatory agencies and federal agencies.
Fochesto_Ga	The lack of input that the FRA has requested is also very disturbing. Projects like this involving billions of dollars of tax money should have much more transparency.	The FRA is committed to an open public participation process. In November 2015, the FRA notified state and local governments and regional agencies along each of the Action Alternatives' Representative Routes of the availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The FRA sent information on the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comment process, and public hearings to elected officials in each of the 216 local jurisdictions and 42 counties along these Representative Routes, including potentially affected municipalities on Long Island. The FRA also placed legal notice and advertisements in major regional newspapers, including Newsday, and distributed media advisories to media outlets throughout the region to publicize availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public hearings, and the comment period. The outreach effort to local communities complied with the FRA's Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts and was appropriate with respect to the level of detail available in this Tier 1 environmental review. Going forward, future Tier 2 projects will address project level coordination issues, such as impacts to local resources and communities. Future Tier 2 project coordination will be the responsibility of the local project sponsor, who will identify coordination with potentially impacted communities, counties, state resource and regulatory agencies and federal agencies.
Frascogna_Ma	Further more it is your obligation to properly inform the public of how they intend to spend billions of tax dollars through much more open and transparent ways.	The FRA is committed to an open public participation process. In November 2015, the FRA notified state and local governments and regional agencies along each of the Action Alternatives' Representative Routes of the availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The FRA sent information on the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comment process, and public hearings to elected officials in each of the 216 local jurisdictions and 42 counties along these Representative Routes, including potentially affected municipalities on Long Island. The FRA also placed legal notice and advertisements in major regional newspapers, including Newsday, and distributed media advisories to media outlets throughout the region to publicize availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public hearings, and the comment period. The outreach effort to local communities complied with the FRA's Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts and was appropriate with respect to the level of detail available in this Tier 1 environmental review. Going forward, future Tier 2 projects will address project level coordination issues, such as impacts to local resources and communities. Future Tier 2 project coordination will be the responsibility of the local project sponsor, who will identify coordination with potentially impacted communities, counties, state resource and regulatory agencies and federal agencies.

Table JJ–21: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Public and Agency Outreach (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Furgueson_Mi	Also, I have been unable to determine what requirements, if any, are imposed upon the FRA to publish a Public Notice, i.e. a Legal Notice, informing the public about such a forum, how many days in advance of the first public forum that a Legal Notice must be published and where such a notice must be published to ensure that the potentially affected town, city, county and/or state, along with the citizens residing in such entities, receive proper notification. Proper notification may have been done but I have been unable to find any evidence of such notification.	The Council on Environmental Quality’s NEPA regulations require Federal agencies to provide public notice of NEPA-related hearings, public meetings, and the availability of environmental documents so as to inform those persons and agencies who may be interested or affected. For actions with effects of local concern, the CEQ regulations list acceptable methods to provide such notice, including publication in local newspapers. (40 CFR 1506.6(b)). The FRA's Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts state that if a hearing is held on a draft EIS, the draft EIS should be made available at least 30 days prior to the hearing, and the availability of the draft EIS should be advertised by press release, by advertisement in a local newspaper of general circulation, or by other suitable means. In compliance with these requirements, the Tier 1 Draft EIS was made available to the public on November 10, 2015, and a legal notice on the availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS and public hearings was placed on the U.S. DOT's website on November 10, 2015 and in The Day on November 13, 2015, along with 20 other newspapers throughout the region. This notice provided the required availability and notice for the Connecticut hearings that took place in New Haven on December 14, 2016, and in Hartford on January 13, 2016.
Furgueson_Mi	My question is why and how did the NEC FUTURE PLAN, launch in 2012, stay 'well below the radar' of our public officials for approximately three (3) years before its 'draft' contents became, and rightly so, the subject of public concern? Was it the intent of the FRA to get this plan as far down the 'tracks' (pun intended!) with little or no notice by the public and the public officials of the potentially impacted regions of our state? Reference (i) quotes Connecticut's Transportation Commissioner, Mr. James Rederker: 'My gut instinct is that more time would be helpful,' said DOT Commissioner Rederker. But he said some of the motivation for the current compressed timetable is to get things approved before the end of the Obama administration.	The FRA is committed to an open public participation process that has included 35 public meetings throughout the Northeast since 2012, including 5 in Connecticut. The FRA has coordinated closely with state officials in each NEC state, including Connecticut, since the program’s outset, and has provided periodic updates to Connecticut’s metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs). In November 2015, the FRA notified the MPOs and local governments along each of the Action Alternatives’ Representative Routes of the availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The FRA sent information on the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comment process, and public hearings to elected officials in each of the local jurisdictions and counties along these Representative Routes, including those in Connecticut, and made hard copies of the Tier 1 Draft EIS available for review at central libraries in each of these counties. The FRA also placed legal notice and advertisements in major regional newspapers including the Day, the Hour, the New Haven Register, Hartford Courant, and Connecticut Post, and distributed media advisories to media outlets throughout the region to publicize availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public hearings, and the comment period. The FRA held public hearings in each of the states along the NEC and provided opportunities for public comment online, by email and by mail. The outreach effort to local communities complied with the FRA's Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts and was appropriate with respect to the level of detail available in this Tier 1 environmental review. Going forward, future Tier 2 projects will address project level coordination issues, such as impacts to local resources and communities. Future Tier 2 project coordination will be the responsibility of the local project sponsor, who will identify coordination with potentially impacted communities, counties, state resource and regulatory agencies and federal agencies.
Galli_Vi	I believe you should attempt to pursue creating opportunities for Amtrak riders and the general public to demonstrate how much they desire an increase in funding and investment in the NEC and in the national rail system more broadly.	The FRA is committed to an open public participation process and is very interested in the views of rail riders and the general public on the level of investment they would like to see in the NEC. In addition to holding 35 public meetings over the course of NEC FUTURE, the FRA has elicited input from riders by conducting direct outreach at 18 rail stations, and by posting information on the program in commuter newspapers (the Washington Post Express, and the Philadelphia, New York, and Boston editions of Metro).

Table JJ–21: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Public and Agency Outreach (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Gallicchio_Ju	Also I question why this seems to have been kept "under wraps" to locals who are only now hearing about this issue, months after the hearings have been scheduled.	The FRA is committed to an open public participation process. In November 2015, the FRA notified state, regional, and local governments along each of the Action Alternatives' Representative Routes of the availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The FRA sent information on the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comment process, and public hearings to elected officials in each of the local jurisdictions and counties along these Representative Routes, including the First Selectman of Old Saybrook, and made hard copies of the Tier 1 Draft EIS available for review at central libraries in each of these counties. The FRA also placed legal notice and advertisements in major regional newspapers including the Day, the Hour, the New Haven Register, Hartford Courant, and Connecticut Post, and distributed media advisories to media outlets throughout the region to publicize availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public hearings, and the comment period. The outreach effort to local communities complied with the FRA's Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts and was appropriate with respect to the level of detail available in this Tier 1 environmental review. Going forward, future Tier 2 projects will address project level coordination issues, such as impacts to local resources and communities. Future Tier 2 project coordination will be the responsibility of the local project sponsor, who will identify coordination with potentially impacted communities, counties, state resource and regulatory agencies and federal agencies.
Gaudio_Ra	First, CFE is disappointed that the public comment period was only extended for such a short period. 60 to 90 days would have been preferred given the vast materials contained in this DEIS. Rail expansion is an important issue that has the potential to affect millions of people and natural resources along almost 500 miles of the east coast. The documents associated with the DEIS are extensive, and many stakeholders would have appreciated more time to review and study the materials. Additionally, an extended comment period would give Connecticut citizens more time to compare the DEIS with Governor Malloy 's "Let 's Go CT" Transportation Plan.	Due to public requests, the FRA extended the close of the public comment period to February 16, 2016, resulting in a 95-day comment period.
Gingolaski_Ma	Why was this not announced before the last minute so people would really have a chance to voice their opinion?	The FRA is committed to an open public participation process. In November 2015, the FRA notified state and local governments and regional agencies along each of the Action Alternatives' Representative Routes of the availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The FRA sent information on the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comment process, and public hearings to elected officials in each of the local jurisdictions and counties along these Representative Routes, including those in Connecticut, and made hard copies of the Tier 1 Draft EIS available for review at central libraries in each of these counties. The FRA also placed legal notice and advertisements in major regional newspapers including the Day, the Hour, the New Haven Register, Hartford Courant, and Connecticut Post, and distributed media advisories to media outlets throughout the region to publicize availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public hearings, and the comment period. The outreach effort to local communities complied with the FRA's Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts and was appropriate with respect to the level of detail available in this Tier 1 environmental review. Going forward, future Tier 2 projects will address project level coordination issues, such as impacts to local resources and communities. Future Tier 2 project coordination will be the responsibility of the local project sponsor, who will identify coordination with potentially impacted communities, counties, state resource and regulatory agencies and federal agencies.

Table JJ–21: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Public and Agency Outreach (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Giuffrida_Sh	No surprise that no one on LI seems to be aware of this proposal...seems like the Fed Gov railways were keeping it quiet.	The FRA is committed to an open public participation process. In November 2015, the FRA notified state and local governments and regional agencies along each of the Action Alternatives’ Representative Routes of the availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The FRA sent information on the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comment process, and public hearings to elected officials in each of the 216 local jurisdictions and 42 counties along these Representative Routes, including potentially affected municipalities on Long Island. The FRA also placed legal notice and advertisements in major regional newspapers, including Newsday, and distributed media advisories to media outlets throughout the region to publicize availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public hearings, and the comment period. The outreach effort to local communities complied with the FRA's Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts and was appropriate with respect to the level of detail available in this Tier 1 environmental review. Going forward, future Tier 2 projects will address project level coordination issues, such as impacts to local resources and communities. Future Tier 2 project coordination will be the responsibility of the local project sponsor, who will identify coordination with potentially impacted communities, counties, state resource and regulatory agencies and federal agencies.
Greenberg_St	And public hearings in New York City would also be appreciated.	Thank you for your interest; a public hearing was held in New York City on December 15, 2015.
Griswold_Je	I find it very troubling that millions of tax payers dollars have been spent on the Tier 1 Draft EIS only to have it so conveniently kept out of the public arena. Even the town leaders are seemingly unaware. The FRA needs go a lot further in getting the information out to the public, and in allowing the citizens a chance to weigh in. I doubt anyone would argue the fact that the infrastructure is in need of improvements. But to what extent economically, environmentally, and to what real benefit are all questions that need much further discussion.	The FRA is committed to an open public participation process. In November 2015, the FRA notified state and local governments and regional agencies along each of the Action Alternatives’ Representative Routes of the availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The FRA sent information on the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comment process, and public hearings to elected officials in each of the local jurisdictions and counties along these Representative Routes, including those in Connecticut, and made hard copies of the Tier 1 Draft EIS available for review at central libraries in each of these counties. The FRA also placed legal notice and advertisements in major regional newspapers including the Day, the Hour, the New Haven Register, Hartford Courant, and Connecticut Post, and distributed media advisories to media outlets throughout the region to publicize availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public hearings, and the comment period. The outreach effort to local communities complied with the FRA's Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts and was appropriate with respect to the level of detail available in this Tier 1 environmental review. Going forward, future Tier 2 projects will address project level coordination issues, such as impacts to local resources and communities. Future Tier 2 project coordination will be the responsibility of the local project sponsor, who will identify coordination with potentially impacted communities, counties, state resource and regulatory agencies and federal agencies.
Hayward_Ma	Shame on you for keeping this plan under the radar until the 11th hour.	The FRA is committed to an open public participation process that has included 35 public meetings throughout the region since 2012, as well as numerous informal meetings with interested organizations upon request. In November 2015, the FRA notified state and local governments and regional agencies along each of the Action Alternatives’ Representative Routes of the availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The FRA sent information on the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comment process, and public hearings to elected officials in each of the 216 local jurisdictions and 42 counties along these Representative Routes, including potentially affected municipalities on Long Island. The FRA also placed legal notice and advertisements in major regional newspapers, including Newsday, and distributed media advisories to media outlets throughout the region to publicize availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public hearings, and the comment period. The outreach effort to local communities complied with the FRA's Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts and was appropriate with respect to the level of detail available in this Tier 1 environmental review. Going forward, future Tier 2 projects will address project level coordination issues, such as impacts to local resources and communities. Future Tier 2 project coordination will be the responsibility of the local project sponsor, who will identify coordination with potentially impacted communities, counties, state resource and regulatory agencies and federal agencies.

Table JJ–21: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Public and Agency Outreach (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Johnson_Ba	I do hope this time the NEC FUTURE planning process will hold many meetings in many LOCAL locations as possible & try to address the people's concerns	Coordination with affected local communities will be an important part of future Tier 2 projects consistent with this Tier 1 EIS. The outreach effort to local communities complied with the FRA's Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts and was appropriate with respect to the level of detail available in this Tier 1 environmental review. Going forward, future Tier 2 projects will address project level coordination issues, such as impacts to local resources and communities. Future Tier 2 project coordination will be the responsibility of the local project sponsor, who will identify coordination with potentially impacted communities, counties, state resource and regulatory agencies and federal agencies.
Jonson_Mi	Make sure that you advertise whatever improvement you make.	The FRA is committed to an open public participation process. In November 2015, the FRA notified state and local governments and regional agencies along each of the Action Alternatives’ Representative Routes of the availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The FRA sent information on the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comment process, and public hearings to elected officials in each of the local jurisdictions and counties along these Representative Routes, including those in Connecticut, and made hard copies of the Tier 1 Draft EIS available for review at central libraries in each of these counties. The FRA also placed legal notice and advertisements in major regional newspapers including the Day, the Hour, the New Haven Register, Hartford Courant, and Connecticut Post, and distributed media advisories to media outlets throughout the region to publicize availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public hearings, and the comment period. Notice of the Tier 1 Final EIS will be provided in the Federal Register, various Study Area newspapers, and posted on the NEC FUTURE website @ www.necfuture.com. The FRA will also notify stakeholders, agencies and members of the public who are included on the NEC FUTURE mailing list. The FRA maintains a master email and mailing list of individuals who have signed up for the NEC FUTURE mailing list, participated in meetings, submitted comments or requested information. The outreach effort to local communities complied with the FRA's Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts and was appropriate with respect to the level of detail available in this Tier 1 environmental review. Going forward, future Tier 2 projects will address project level coordination issues, such as impacts to local resources and communities. Future Tier 2 project coordination will be the responsibility of the local project sponsor, who will identify coordination with potentially impacted communities, counties, state resource and regulatory agencies and federal agencies.
Kavalgian_My	How come I am just hearing about this today(1/20/16) and the session in Hartford wasn't publicized so I missed the meeting. Will there be another one scheduled in Connecticut? I feel like you all are trying to put something over on us taxpayers?	The Hartford public hearing was publicized in the Hartford Courant on January 3, 2016, and the availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS was publicized in an earlier notice in the Hartford Courant on November 13, 2015. As indicated in these and other publicity materials and on the NEC FUTURE website, comments were also accepted online or by mail or email, providing an alternative for anyone unable to attend a public hearing. The FRA is committed to an open public participation process. In November 2015, the FRA notified state, regional, and local governments along each of the Action Alternatives’ Representative Routes of the availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The FRA sent information on the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comment process, and public hearings to elected officials in each of the local jurisdictions and counties along these Representative Routes, including those in Connecticut, and made hard copies of the Tier 1 Draft EIS available for review at central libraries in each of these counties. The FRA also placed legal notice and advertisements in major regional newspapers including the Day, the Hour, the New Haven Register, Hartford Courant, and Connecticut Post, and distributed media advisories to media outlets throughout the region to publicize availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public hearings, and the comment period. The outreach effort to local communities complied with the FRA's Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts and was appropriate with respect to the level of detail available in this Tier 1 environmental review. Going forward, future Tier 2 projects will address project level coordination issues, such as impacts to local resources and communities. Future Tier 2 project coordination will be the responsibility of the local project sponsor, who will identify coordination with potentially impacted communities, counties, state resource and regulatory agencies and federal agencies.

Table JJ–21: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Public and Agency Outreach (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Kehoe_Pa	Finally, why is this so secretive, why have the local Milford authorities not been alerted or included in this decision to date?	The FRA is committed to an open public participation process. In November 2015, the FRA notified state, regional, and local governments along each of the Action Alternatives’ Representative Routes of the availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The FRA sent information on the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comment process, and public hearings to elected officials in each of the local jurisdictions and counties along these Representative Routes, including to Mayor Benjamin Blake in Milford, and made hard copies of the Tier 1 Draft EIS available for review at central libraries in each of these counties. The FRA also placed legal notice and advertisements in major regional newspapers including the Day, the Hour, the New Haven Register, Hartford Courant, and Connecticut Post, and distributed media advisories to media outlets throughout the region to publicize availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public hearings, and the comment period.
Kennard_EI	The lack of openness regarding this project is APPALLING.	The FRA is committed to an open public participation process that has included 35 public meetings throughout the region since 2012, as well as numerous informal meetings with interested organizations upon request. In November 2015, the FRA notified state and local governments and regional agencies along each of the Action Alternatives’ Representative Routes of the availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The FRA sent information on the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comment process, and public hearings to elected officials in each of the local jurisdictions and counties along these Representative Routes, including those in Connecticut, and made hard copies of the Tier 1 Draft EIS available for review at central libraries in each of these counties. The FRA also placed legal notice and advertisements in major regional newspapers including the Day, the Hour, the New Haven Register, Hartford Courant, and Connecticut Post, and distributed media advisories to media outlets throughout the region to publicize availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public hearings, and the comment period. The outreach effort to local communities complied with the FRA's Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts and was appropriate with respect to the level of detail available in this Tier 1 environmental review. Going forward, future Tier 2 projects will address project level coordination issues, such as impacts to local resources and communities. Future Tier 2 project coordination will be the responsibility of the local project sponsor, who will identify coordination with potentially impacted communities, counties, state resource and regulatory agencies and federal agencies.
Kenny_Ja	Additionally we find the lack of multiple public hearings on this huge project objectionable.	The FRA is committed to an open public participation process. In November 2015, the FRA notified state and local governments and regional agencies along each of the Action Alternatives’ Representative Routes of the availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The FRA sent information on the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comment process, and public hearings to elected officials in each of the 216 local jurisdictions and 42 counties along these Representative Routes, including potentially affected municipalities on Long Island. The FRA also placed legal notice and advertisements in major regional newspapers, including Newsday, and distributed media advisories to media outlets throughout the region to publicize availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public hearings, and the comment period. For the Tier 1 Draft EIS, the FRA held public hearings in each of the states along the NEC and provided opportunities for public comment online, by email and by mail. The outreach effort to local communities complied with the FRA's Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts and was appropriate with respect to the level of detail available in this Tier 1 environmental review. Going forward, future Tier 2 projects will address project level coordination issues, such as impacts to local resources and communities. Future Tier 2 project coordination will be the responsibility of the local project sponsor, who will identify coordination with potentially impacted communities, counties, state resource and regulatory agencies and federal agencies.
Kessler_Je	And what I'd like to focus on today is the fact that the core demographic that will be ultimately using the Northeast Corridor when all of this comes to fruition is the youth community... And so one of the things that we'd like to focus on is making sure that the youth community of individuals under the age of 25, particularly those, even the teenagers, being are being brought in to discuss things because we can all agree on the need for improving capacity and service throughout the system... we're really looking to see the youth community much more involved in this planning process and having some sort of a stakeholder role, even be it a nonvoting membership commission, ideally.	The FRA welcomes the involvement of youth and teens in NEC FUTURE. Where possible and appropriate, the FRA has held public meetings on college campuses and included students in outreach efforts to encourage involvement by this important demographic. Such locations have included the University of Baltimore, Delaware Technical and Community College in Wilmington, DE, CUNY Graduate Center in New York City, and Gateway Community College in New Haven.

Table JJ–21: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Public and Agency Outreach (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Kirmaier_Ra	Please do not consider such a plan until public disclosure and vetting is transparently undertaken and completed.	The FRA is committed to an open public participation process. In November 2015, the FRA notified state, regional, and local governments along each of the Action Alternatives’ Representative Routes of the availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The FRA sent information on the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comment process, and public hearings to elected officials in each of the local jurisdictions and counties along these Representative Routes, including those in Connecticut, and made hard copies of the Tier 1 Draft EIS available for review at central libraries in each of these counties. The FRA also placed legal notice and advertisements in major regional newspapers including the Day, the Hour, the New Haven Register, Hartford Courant, and Connecticut Post, and distributed media advisories to media outlets throughout the region to publicize availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public hearings, and the comment period. The outreach effort to local communities complied with the FRA's Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts and was appropriate with respect to the level of detail available in this Tier 1 environmental review. Going forward, future Tier 2 projects will address project level coordination issues, such as impacts to local resources and communities. Future Tier 2 project coordination will be the responsibility of the local project sponsor, who will identify coordination with potentially impacted communities, counties, state resource and regulatory agencies and federal agencies.
Klarnet_Ka	I am appalled at the way the alternatives for changing the Northeast Corridor route through Connecticut were all but SECRETLY rushed through the public comment process. I follow local planning and development news carefully and I saw NOTHING about public hearings, which were for obvious reasons very sparsely attended.	The FRA is committed to an open public participation process. In November 2015, the FRA notified state and local governments and regional agencies along each of the Action Alternatives’ Representative Routes of the availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The FRA sent information on the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comment process, and public hearings to elected officials in each of the local jurisdictions and counties along these Representative Routes, including those in Connecticut, and made hard copies of the Tier 1 Draft EIS available for review at central libraries in each of these counties. The FRA also placed legal notice and advertisements in major regional newspapers including the Day, the Hour, the New Haven Register, Hartford Courant, and Connecticut Post, and distributed media advisories to media outlets throughout the region to publicize availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public hearings, and the comment period. The outreach effort to local communities complied with the FRA's Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts and was appropriate with respect to the level of detail available in this Tier 1 environmental review. Going forward, future Tier 2 projects will address project level coordination issues, such as impacts to local resources and communities. Future Tier 2 project coordination will be the responsibility of the local project sponsor, who will identify coordination with potentially impacted communities, counties, state resource and regulatory agencies and federal agencies.
Kovach_Da	As we are unaware of the specific environmental impacts of the proposed project and how the project may conflict with or impair the Commissions Comprehensive Plan, the Commission requests that a pre-application meeting be scheduled with the DRBC to discuss the proposed project in detail and any Commission reviewable aspects.	Thank you for your suggestion regarding a pre-application meeting with the Delaware River Basin Commission. The Tier 1 EIS identifies routes and construction types that are representative or conceptual in nature. The most appropriate time for this meeting would likely be during the Tier 2 project development process, when a specific alignment and engineering details have been determined.
Lacey_Wi	The citizens of the communities [this new rail system] falls in and around should be afforded opportunity for public hearings.	Coordination with affected local communities will be an important part of future Tier 2 projects consistent with this Tier 1 EIS. For the Tier 1 Draft EIS, the FRA held public hearings in each of the states along the NEC and provided opportunities for public comment online, by email and by mail. The outreach effort to local communities complied with the FRA's Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts and was appropriate with respect to the level of detail available in this Tier 1 environmental review. Going forward, future Tier 2 projects will address project level coordination issues, such as impacts to local resources and communities. Future Tier 2 project coordination will be the responsibility of the local project sponsor, who will identify coordination with potentially impacted communities, counties, state resource and regulatory agencies and federal agencies.

Table JJ–21: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Public and Agency Outreach (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Lawless_Cy	This is very secretive and will possible impact the citizens of Milford and Old Saybrook with out any prior notice or environmental studies. I am sure People would like the opportunity to have more information regarding these proposals, and also more time and notice to weigh in.	The FRA is committed to an open public participation process. In November 2015, the FRA notified state and local governments and regional agencies along each of the Action Alternatives’ Representative Routes of the availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The FRA sent information on the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comment process, and public hearings to elected officials in each of the 216 local jurisdictions and 42 counties along these Representative Routes, including to Mayor Benjamin Blake of Milford and First Selectman Carl P. Fortuna, Jr., of Old Saybrook. The FRA also made hard copies of the Tier 1 Draft EIS available for review at central libraries in each county, including Middlesex and New Haven Counties. The FRA also placed legal notice and advertisements in major regional newspapers, including the Day, the Hour, the New Haven Register, Hartford Courant, and Connecticut Post, and distributed media advisories to media outlets throughout the region to publicize availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public hearings, and the comment period. Due to public requests, the FRA extended the close of the public comment period to February 16, 2016, resulting in a 95-day comment period. The outreach effort to local communities complied with the FRA's Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts and was appropriate with respect to the level of detail available in this Tier 1 environmental review. Going forward, future Tier 2 projects will address project level coordination issues, such as impacts to local resources and communities. Future Tier 2 project coordination will be the responsibility of the local project sponsor, who will identify coordination with potentially impacted communities, counties, state resource and regulatory agencies and federal agencies.
Leach_Ge	No detailed shapefiles of the routes and what is tunnel were provided to the public. This would have allowed us to better assess the full scale of impacts to important habitat for birds and other wildlife.	The Tier 1 EIS identifies routes and construction types that are representative or conceptual in nature. They identify the physical footprint to assess potential environmental consequences to compare to the No Action Alternative. The detailed project level information that you are seeking will be developed and available for review as part of subsequent Tier 2 project studies.
Lukasik-Ta	It's troubling that I see that not one of my legislators are here, that the County Executive is not here. That nothing was ... posted in Newsday or any other kind of local media source. This is a huge project. It's unprecedented. ... clearly you have some residents here but ... Not enough legislators know about this. And not a lot of State officials know about this. ... there's a strict requirement, especially using federal money that you've got to contact the community and do outreach and have have documentation about that... extending this comment period from January 30th is imperative. I think having the meeting in Suffolk makes sense. I also think having another meeting in Nassau and making sure that, you know, all the legislators are here. ... we also have a lot of hamlets that don't have representation and those are the ones that are going to be impacted. You know, Hicksville, for one instance, it's a huge location that I think is not being informed and there's thousands of residents there....they should have the opportunity to kind of chime in.	<p>As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA has been committed to open and transparent outreach process, consistent with NEPA and the FRA's Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts. The FRA's extensive agency consultation and involvement process is described in Volume 1 and 2, Chapter 11.</p> <p>In November 2015, the FRA notified state and local governments and regional agencies along each of the Action Alternatives’ Representative Routes of the availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The FRA sent information on the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comment process, and public hearings to elected officials in each of the 216 local jurisdictions and 42 counties along these Representative Routes, including potentially affected municipalities on Long Island. The FRA also placed legal notice and advertisements in major regional newspapers, including in Newsday on November 13, 2015, and again on January 5, 2016, to publicize the availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS and the Mineola public hearing, and distributed media advisories to media outlets throughout the region to publicize availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public hearings, and the comment period. The original comment period was set for 78 days, ending January 30, 2016. Due to public requests, the public comment period was extended TO 95 DAYS, ending February 16, 2016. The outreach effort to local communities complied with the FRA's Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts and was appropriate with respect to the level of detail available in this Tier 1 environmental review.</p> <p>Going forward, future Tier 2 projects will address project level coordination issues, such as impacts to local resources and communities. Future Tier 2 project coordination will be developed and implemented by the local project sponsor.</p>

Table JJ–21: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Public and Agency Outreach (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Lukasik_Ta	You're also kind of putting this in the lens of five other projects that are ongoing. ... you've got GMA (phonetic) with the Port Authority. You have the Cross Harbor Freight Study with the Port Authority. You have the Regional Freight Plan with the New York Metropolitan Transit Council. You have this project, and you also have the Hudson Tunnel Gateway Project. So you've got a series of State and federal agencies ... some are working together, some things are competing, some things might be piggybacking. ... When you look at the agencies that are involved, the MTA, the Port Authority, the New York Metropolitan Transit Council, the DOT, now the FRA, you've got the EPA, the DEC, ... this should be something that we're talking about collectively altogether, not separately, not incrementally. ... are a lot of these structures going to be piggybacking? ... is it going to be five tracks... Is it going to be two? This is information that you have to keep organized and put into a summary forms that it's not a 1,000 page EIS that you have to read through.	The FRA has actively coordinated with each of these Related Projects. Volume 2, Chapter 4 addresses Related Projects.
Marshall_Ro	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.	The Tier 1 EIS identifies routes and construction types that are representative or conceptual in nature. They identify the physical footprint to assess potential environmental consequences to compare to the No Action Alternative. Maps are available in the Mapping Atlas, Appendix AA of Volume 1, which can be downloaded from the Tier 1 EIS page of the website. A hard copy of the Mapping Atlas was also provided at each public hearing, and during the public comment period, a hard copy of the Mapping Atlas was placed in a central library in each of the 42 counties along the Representative Routes of the Action Alternatives. The detailed project level information that you are seeking will be developed and available for review as part of subsequent Tier 2 project studies.
McLaughlin_Ma	I hope there will public meetings and discussions far in advance of any possible decisions.	Coordination with affected local communities will be an important part of future Tier 2 projects consistent with this Tier 1 EIS. For the Tier 1 Draft EIS, the FRA held public hearings in each of the states along the NEC and provided opportunities for public comment online, by email and by mail. The outreach effort to local communities complied with the FRA's Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts and was appropriate with respect to the level of detail available in this Tier 1 environmental review. Going forward, future Tier 2 projects will address project level coordination issues, such as impacts to local resources and communities. Future Tier 2 project coordination will be the responsibility of the local project sponsor, who will identify coordination with potentially impacted communities, counties, state resource and regulatory agencies and federal agencies.
Mereday_Me	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.	The FRA is conducting a tiered environmental review process for NEC FUTURE. The first phase is a Tier 1 Environmental Impact Statement, which will not result in construction or employment opportunities. Employment opportunities would not occur until later on, when Tier 2 projects are conducted by individual project sponsors. The FRA encourages project sponsors to include employment advocacy organizations, such as veteran businesses, in their outreach programs at that time.
Michelle	...further it is your obligation to properly inform the public of how you intend to spend billions of tax dollars.	The FRA is committed to an open public participation process. In November 2015, the FRA notified state and local governments and regional agencies along each of the Action Alternatives' Representative Routes of the availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The FRA sent information on the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comment process, and public hearings to elected officials in each of the 216 local jurisdictions and 42 counties along these Representative Routes, including potentially affected municipalities on Long Island. The FRA also placed legal notice and advertisements in major regional newspapers, including Newsday, and distributed media advisories to media outlets throughout the region to publicize availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public hearings, and the comment period. The outreach effort to local communities complied with the FRA's Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts and was appropriate with respect to the level of detail available in this Tier 1 environmental review. Going forward, future Tier 2 projects will address project level coordination issues, such as impacts to local resources and communities. Future Tier 2 project coordination will be the responsibility of the local project sponsor, who will identify coordination with potentially impacted communities, counties, state resource and regulatory agencies and federal agencies.

Table JJ–21: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Public and Agency Outreach (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Mletschnig_Pe	Please extend the public comment period for six months	Due to public requests, the FRA extended the close of the public comment period to February 16, 2016, resulting in a 95-day comment period.
Monteiro_St	I realize that your plans for the area are not yet solidified. It is very important to me that NEC Future make informed decisions regarding development of this area, and that there are additional opportunities for people in our area to hear and respond to your plans for development in this community. As we make plans to develop the corridor and detract people from engaging in dangerous and/or violent activities along the ConRail line, it is in our shared best interests to be in open communication with one another regarding our respective visions for the corridor. To begin the conversation, please feel free to reach out to me via email or phone: smonteiro@hacecdc.org or (215) 426-8025 x3011.	The FRA team followed up with the commenter to learn more about this concern and relayed the information obtained to the project team. Coordination with local initiatives of this type will be appropriately handled in Tier 2 projects.
Moody_Jo	What is very concerning is the lackluster public input solicitation that the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) has had with Long Islanders. To have only one poorly advertised public hearing in Nassau County, for all of Long Island, is disturbing.	The FRA is committed to an open public participation process. In November 2015, the FRA notified state and local governments and regional agencies along each of the Action Alternatives’ Representative Routes of the availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The FRA sent information on the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comment process, and public hearings to elected officials in each of the 216 local jurisdictions and 42 counties along these Representative Routes, including potentially affected municipalities on Long Island. The FRA also placed legal notice and advertisements in major regional newspapers, including Newsday, and distributed media advisories to media outlets throughout the region to publicize availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public hearings, and the comment period. The outreach effort to local communities complied with the FRA's Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts and was appropriate with respect to the level of detail available in this Tier 1 environmental review. Going forward, future Tier 2 projects will address project level coordination issues, such as impacts to local resources and communities. Future Tier 2 project coordination will be the responsibility of the local project sponsor, who will identify coordination with potentially impacted communities, counties, state resource and regulatory agencies and federal agencies.
Murdocco_Ri	What is particularly concerning is the lackluster public input solicitation that the FRA has had with Long Islanders. And it's disconcerting that the project has been shaped with stakeholders and policymakers since 2012 but only now in 2016 is the public being brought into the planning process. Further, to have one public hearing in Nassau County but not in Suffolk County, where a large majority of NEC Future work is proposed to take place, is troubling.	The FRA is committed to an open public participation process that has included 35 public meetings throughout the region since 2012, as well as numerous informal meetings with interested organizations upon request. In November 2015, the FRA notified state and local governments and regional agencies along each of the Action Alternatives’ Representative Routes of the availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The FRA sent information on the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comment process, and public hearings to elected officials in each of the 216 local jurisdictions and 42 counties along these Representative Routes, including potentially affected municipalities on Long Island. The FRA also placed legal notice and advertisements in major regional newspapers, including Newsday, and distributed media advisories to media outlets throughout the region to publicize availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public hearings, and the comment period. The outreach effort to local communities complied with the FRA's Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts and was appropriate with respect to the level of detail available in this Tier 1 environmental review. Going forward, future Tier 2 projects will address project level coordination issues, such as impacts to local resources and communities. Future Tier 2 project coordination will be the responsibility of the local project sponsor, who will identify coordination with potentially impacted communities, counties, state resource and regulatory agencies and federal agencies.

Table JJ–21: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Public and Agency Outreach (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Murdocco_Ri	I formally request that opportunity for the 1.5 million residents of Suffolk County to share their input on this project in a formal public forum with an extension of the public comment period being given as well. I am optimistic that local elected officials, stakeholders and the FRA will remedy this.	The FRA is committed to an open public participation process. In November 2015, the FRA notified state and local governments and regional agencies along each of the Action Alternatives’ Representative Routes of the availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The FRA sent information on the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comment process, and public hearings to elected officials in each of the 216 local jurisdictions and 42 counties along these Representative Routes, including potentially affected municipalities on Long Island. The FRA also placed legal notice and advertisements in major regional newspapers, including Newsday, and distributed media advisories to media outlets throughout the region to publicize availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public hearings, and the comment period. Due to public requests, the FRA extended the close of the public comment period to February 16, 2016, resulting in a 95-day comment period. The outreach effort to local communities complied with the FRA's Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts and was appropriate with respect to the level of detail available in this Tier 1 environmental review. Going forward, future Tier 2 projects will address project level coordination issues, such as impacts to local resources and communities. Future Tier 2 project coordination will be the responsibility of the local project sponsor, who will identify coordination with potentially impacted communities, counties, state resource and regulatory agencies and federal agencies.
Murdocco_Ri	I formally request the opportunity for the 1.5 million residents of Suffolk County to share their input on this project in a formal public forum, with an extension of the public comment period being given as well.	Opportunities were afforded the residents of Suffolk County, New York and all other counties in the NEC FUTURE Study Area to review project materials and express their opinions, preferences and/or concerns about each of the proposed NEC FUTURE Action Alternatives. Additional opportunities will also be provided during subsequent Tier 2 project analysis. The Preferred Alternative does not include improvements on Long Island or in Suffolk County and no additional formal public forums are scheduled for this Tier 1 review.
Murdocco_Ri	What is particularly concerning is the lackluster public input solicitation that the FRA has had with Long Islanders. It is disconcerting that the project has been shaped with stakeholders and policymakers since 2012, but only now, in 2016, is the public being brought into the planning process. Further, to have one public hearing in Nassau County, but not in Suffolk County, where a large majority of NEC Future work is proposed to take place, is troubling.	The FRA is committed to an open public participation process that has included 35 public meetings throughout the region since 2012, as well as numerous informal meetings with interested organizations upon request. In November 2015, the FRA notified state and local governments and regional agencies along each of the Action Alternatives’ Representative Routes of the availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The FRA sent information on the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comment process, and public hearings to elected officials in each of the 216 local jurisdictions and 42 counties along these Representative Routes, including potentially affected municipalities on Long Island. The FRA also placed legal notice and advertisements in major regional newspapers, including Newsday, and distributed media advisories to media outlets throughout the region to publicize availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public hearings, and the comment period. The outreach effort to local communities complied with the FRA's Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts and was appropriate with respect to the level of detail available in this Tier 1 environmental review. Going forward, future Tier 2 projects will address project level coordination issues, such as impacts to local resources and communities. Future Tier 2 project coordination will be the responsibility of the local project sponsor, who will identify coordination with potentially impacted communities, counties, state resource and regulatory agencies and federal agencies.

Table JJ–21: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Public and Agency Outreach (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Neckanoff_De	You cut off this 'public comment period' on Jan. 30th without ever informing the public of this and you schedule ONE PUBLIC MEETING/HEARING for both Nassau & Suffolk Counties on Jan. 12th. Shame on you.	Due to public requests, the FRA extended the close of the public comment period to February 16, 2016, resulting in a 95-day comment period. The FRA is committed to an open public participation process. In November 2015, the FRA notified state, regional, and local governments along each of the Action Alternatives' Representative Routes of the availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The FRA sent information on the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comment process, and public hearings to elected officials in each of the 216 local jurisdictions and 42 counties along these Representative Routes, including potentially affected municipalities on Long Island. The FRA also placed legal notice and advertisements in major regional newspapers, including Newsday, and distributed media advisories to media outlets throughout the region to publicize availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public hearings, and the comment period. For the Tier 1 Draft EIS, the FRA held public hearings in each of the states along the NEC and provided opportunities for public comment online, by email and by mail. Public hearings in New York were held in New York City on December 15, 2015, and in Mineola on January 12, 2016. The outreach effort to local communities complied with the FRA's Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts and was appropriate with respect to the level of detail available in this Tier 1 environmental review. Additional information on the public involvement process for NEC FUTURE is provided in Volume 1 and 2, Chapter 11.
Nielsen_He	Additionally, I am extremely frustrated by the lack of transparency that has been involved in this project and the lack of opportunities for the public to comment on the proposals.	The FRA is committed to an open public participation process. In November 2015, the FRA notified state and local governments and regional agencies along each of the Action Alternatives' Representative Routes of the availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The FRA sent information on the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comment process, and public hearings to elected officials in each of the 216 local jurisdictions and 42 counties along these Representative Routes, including potentially affected municipalities on Long Island. The FRA also placed legal notice and advertisements in major regional newspapers, including Newsday, and distributed media advisories to media outlets throughout the region to publicize availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public hearings, and the comment period. The outreach effort to local communities complied with the FRA's Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts and was appropriate with respect to the level of detail available in this Tier 1 environmental review. Going forward, future Tier 2 projects will address project level coordination issues, such as impacts to local resources and communities. Future Tier 2 project coordination will be the responsibility of the local project sponsor, who will identify coordination with potentially impacted communities, counties, state resource and regulatory agencies and federal agencies.
Perreten_Sa	Please extend the public comment period for six months	Due to public requests, the FRA extended the close of the public comment period to February 16, 2016, resulting in a 95-day comment period.
Petaja_Th	...demand that we the public taxpayers of Garden City be notified of all hearings and information available related to this proposed project	The FRA is committed to an open public participation process. In November 2015, the FRA notified state and local governments and regional agencies along each of the Action Alternatives' Representative Routes of the availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The FRA sent information on the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comment process, and public hearings to elected officials in each of the 216 local jurisdictions and 42 counties along these Representative Routes, including the Nassau County Executive and the Town of Hempstead Town Supervisor. The FRA also placed legal notice and advertisements in major regional newspapers, including Newsday, and distributed media advisories to media outlets throughout the region to publicize availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public hearings, and the comment period. The outreach effort to local communities complied with the FRA's Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts and was appropriate with respect to the level of detail available in this Tier 1 environmental review. Going forward, future Tier 2 projects will address project level coordination issues, such as impacts to local resources and communities. Future Tier 2 project coordination will be the responsibility of the local project sponsor, who will identify coordination with potentially impacted communities, counties, state resource and regulatory agencies and federal agencies.

Table JJ–21: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Public and Agency Outreach (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Peter	...further it is your obligation to properly inform the public of how you intend to spend such money.	The FRA is committed to an open public participation process. In November 2015, the FRA notified state, regional, and local governments along each of the Action Alternatives’ Representative Routes of the availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The FRA sent information on the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comment process, and public hearings to elected officials in each of the 216 local jurisdictions and 42 counties along these Representative Routes, and made hard copies of the Tier 1 Draft EIS available for review at central libraries in each of these counties. The FRA also placed legal notice and advertisements in major regional newspapers and distributed media advisories to media outlets throughout the region to publicize availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public hearings, and the comment period. The outreach effort to local communities complied with the FRA’s Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts and was appropriate with respect to the level of detail available in this Tier 1 environmental review. Going forward, future Tier 2 projects will address project level coordination issues, such as impacts to local resources and communities. Future Tier 2 project coordination will be the responsibility of the local project sponsor, who will identify coordination with potentially impacted communities, counties, state resource and regulatory agencies and federal agencies.
Platt_Ri	This is highly disturbing. A plan that affects all of us but with very little or no advance publicity. It is especially bothersome that historic districts, commercial centers, etc. are endangered.	The FRA considered both opposing and supporting views on the NEC FUTURE program in preparing the Tier 1 Final EIA and identifying a Preferred Alternative. Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative that improves the existing NEC to a state of good repair and includes new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Quinn_Ke	I had not heard of such a plan until this morning. Apparently the public notice and comment on this proposal has been limited.	The FRA is committed to an open public participation process. In November 2015, the FRA notified state and local governments and regional agencies along each of the Action Alternatives’ Representative Routes of the availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The FRA sent information on the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comment process, and public hearings to elected officials in each of the 216 local jurisdictions and 42 counties along these Representative Routes, including potentially affected municipalities on Long Island. The FRA also placed legal notice and advertisements in major regional newspapers, including Newsday, and distributed media advisories to media outlets throughout the region to publicize availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public hearings, and the comment period. The outreach effort to local communities complied with the FRA’s Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts and was appropriate with respect to the level of detail available in this Tier 1 environmental review. Going forward, future Tier 2 projects will address project level coordination issues, such as impacts to local resources and communities. Future Tier 2 project coordination will be the responsibility of the local project sponsor, who will identify coordination with potentially impacted communities, counties, state resource and regulatory agencies and federal agencies.
Reuter_Ro	One thing that would be nice is your -- if we could get your strip maps and -- actually, you have them out there on the table. They're nice, but try reading them on a computer screen. They're next to impossible. So that would be nice to have if we could get those in print. I understand all the documentation. We can read that on the computer screen, but reading maps is next to impossible on a computer screen.	More detailed maps are available in the Mapping Atlas, Appendix AA of Volume 2, which can be downloaded from the Tier 1 EIS page of the website. A hard copy of the Mapping Atlas was also provided at each public hearing, and during the public comment period, a hard copy of the Mapping Atlas was placed in a central library in each of the 42 counties along the Representative Routes of the Action Alternatives. In addition, print copies of the Mapping Atlas were provided on request to various members of the public.

Table JJ–21: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Public and Agency Outreach (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Robb_Er	And you should really include towns in the conversation if you think you have a good plan. This sneaking around pretty much says that you know it's a bad idea.	The FRA is committed to an open public participation process. In November 2015, the FRA notified state and local governments and regional agencies along each of the Action Alternatives’ Representative Routes of the availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The FRA sent information on the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comment process, and public hearings to elected officials in each of the 216 local jurisdictions and 42 counties along these Representative Routes, including potentially affected municipalities on Long Island. The FRA also placed legal notice and advertisements in major regional newspapers, including Newsday, and distributed media advisories to media outlets throughout the region to publicize availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public hearings, and the comment period. The outreach effort to local communities complied with the FRA's Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts and was appropriate with respect to the level of detail available in this Tier 1 environmental review. Going forward, future Tier 2 projects will address project level coordination issues, such as impacts to local resources and communities. Future Tier 2 project coordination will be the responsibility of the local project sponsor, who will identify coordination with potentially impacted communities, counties, state resource and regulatory agencies and federal agencies.
Ryan_Ei	Please work with our Representatives to find workable solutions without these negative impacts.	Coordination with affected local communities to find workable solutions and avoid negative impacts will be an important part of future Tier 2 projects consistent with this Tier 1 EIS. The outreach effort to local communities complied with the FRA's Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts and was appropriate with respect to the level of detail available in this Tier 1 environmental review. Going forward, future Tier 2 projects will address project level coordination issues, such as impacts to local resources and communities. Future Tier 2 project coordination will be the responsibility of the local project sponsor, who will identify coordination with potentially impacted communities, counties, state resource and regulatory agencies and federal agencies.
Sackville_Do	How come this has not been publicized and the citizens of Milford asked to comment?	The FRA is committed to an open public participation process, and welcomes involvement by the citizens of Milford. In November 2015, the FRA sent information on the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comment process, and public hearings to elected officials in each of the local jurisdictions and counties along the Representative Routes of the Action Alternatives, including to Mayor Benjamin Blake of Milford. The FRA also placed legal notice and advertisements in major regional newspapers including the Day, the Hour, the New Haven Register, Hartford Courant, and Connecticut Post, and distributed media advisories to media outlets throughout the region to publicize availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public hearings, and the comment period.
Santiago_Gi	The public needs more time to understand and give feed back...Sounds like this was keep quiet for a reason so the public can't speak up.	The FRA is committed to an open public participation process. In November 2015 the FRA notified state, regional, and local governments along each of the Action Alternatives’ Representative Routes of the availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The FRA sent information on the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comment process, and public hearings to elected officials in each of the local jurisdictions and counties along these Representative Routes, including those in Connecticut, and made hard copies of the Tier 1 Draft EIS available for review at central libraries in each of these counties. The FRA also placed legal notice and advertisements in major regional newspapers including the Day, the Hour, the New Haven Register, Hartford Courant, and Connecticut Post, and distributed media advisories to media outlets throughout the region to publicize availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public hearings, and the comment period. Due to public requests, the FRA extended the close of the public comment period to February 16, 2016, resulting in a 95-day comment period. The outreach effort to local communities complied with the FRA's Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts and was appropriate with respect to the level of detail available in this Tier 1 environmental review. Going forward, future Tier 2 projects will address project level coordination issues, such as impacts to local resources and communities. Future Tier 2 project coordination will be the responsibility of the local project sponsor, who will identify coordination with potentially impacted communities, counties, state resource and regulatory agencies and federal agencies.
Saunders_Di	What concerns me is are the stakeholders up to the task. My guess is we simply do have the level of commitment necessary to ever make it happen.	The decisions made in the NEC FUTURE Tier 1 EIS will provide the groundwork for phased implementation of improvements. The FRA is committed to continuing to work with stakeholders in subsequent Tier 2 project studies or other planning processes necessary to achieve the Preferred Alternative.

Table JJ–21: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Public and Agency Outreach (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Sbeglia_Ca	I have not seen anything about it in the newspaper, nor have I received any mailings about this. I believe it is your obligation to properly inform the public of how they intend to spend billions of tax dollars.	The FRA focused on a corridor-wide investment program for NEC FUTURE and did not make decisions about project-specific funding or financing. Funding and financing the Tier 2 projects necessary to implement the Preferred Alternative will be an incremental process for the federal government, Amtrak, the NEC states and stakeholders, and the entire region. This process will require the commitment of both the public and private sectors over a long period of time. The FRA and the NEC Commission will take a leading role in working with project sponsors to support the federal financial assistance to advance implementation, including existing and future grant and other financing programs and options. The FRA and other NEC stakeholders will also engage the private sector to explore options for commercial funding or financing to advance Tier 2 projects. Funding and financing options will be further detailed in the Service Development Plan.
Shields_Er	...somebody mentioned here about like people being in the know, you know, not being told about this in advance enough. Local cohesion, you know, you have cities, you have towns at the base of representative structure, you can't just throw something out there and just give somebody a little bit amount of time to see. I feel that cohesion could make projects happen faster. Because like there's several agencies I travel through between Dutchess County and here and if nobody's on the same page, nothing's going to get done as quickly because everybody has to like do something differently. ...one agency may put emphasis on buses more than trams or rails. And if we're trying to build a rail through, you have to look at what they've built and what they haven't. And if they haven't built it, that is going to cause disruptions for a neighborhood. That's going to make some noise. That's going to invite trouble.	The FRA is committed to an open public participation process. In November 2015, the FRA notified state, regional, and local governments along each of the Action Alternatives’ Representative Routes of the availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The FRA sent information on the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comment process, and public hearings to elected officials in each of the 216 local jurisdictions and 42 counties along these Representative Routes, and made hard copies of the Tier 1 Draft EIS available for review at central libraries in each of these counties. The FRA also placed legal notice and advertisements in major regional newspapers and distributed media advisories to media outlets throughout the region to publicize availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public hearings, and the comment period to publicize availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public hearings, and the comment period. The outreach effort to local communities complied with the FRA's Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts and was appropriate with respect to the level of detail available in this Tier 1 environmental review. Going forward, future Tier 2 projects will address project level coordination issues, such as impacts to local resources and communities. Future Tier 2 project coordination will be the responsibility of the local project sponsor, who will identify coordination with potentially impacted communities, counties, state resource and regulatory agencies and federal agencies.
Simler_Su	Why is there not a detailed map of this project on display at every town hall of impacted towns? Why have those maps not appeared in local newspapers?... The last info session in CT passed before any of this "leaked" to the public.	The FRA is committed to an open public participation process. In November 2015, the FRA notified state and local governments and regional agencies along each of the Action Alternatives’ Representative Routes of the availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The FRA sent information on the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comment process, and public hearings to elected officials in each of the 216 local jurisdictions and 42 counties along these Representative Routes, including those in Connecticut, and made hard copies of the Tier 1 Draft EIS available for review at central libraries in each of these counties. The FRA also placed legal notice and advertisements in major regional newspapers including the Day, the Hour, the New Haven Register, Hartford Courant, and Connecticut Post, and distributed media advisories to media outlets throughout the region to publicize availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public hearings, and the comment period. The outreach effort to local communities complied with the FRA's Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts and was appropriate with respect to the level of detail available in this Tier 1 environmental review, in which the routes and construction types identified are representative or conceptual in nature. Going forward, future Tier 2 projects will address project level coordination issues, such as impacts to local resources and communities. Future Tier 2 project coordination will be the responsibility of the local project sponsor, who will identify coordination with potentially impacted communities, counties, state resource and regulatory agencies and federal agencies.

Table JJ–21: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Public and Agency Outreach (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Smith_Ke	Furthermore, to date, this project has not included enough outreach to, or input from community members, who should certainly be consulted prior to spending billions of tax dollars.	The FRA is committed to an open public participation process. In November 2015, the FRA notified state and local governments and regional agencies along each of the Action Alternatives’ Representative Routes of the availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The FRA sent information on the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comment process, and public hearings to elected officials in each of the 216 local jurisdictions and 42 counties along these Representative Routes, including potentially affected municipalities on Long Island. The FRA also placed legal notice and advertisements in major regional newspapers, including Newsday, and distributed media advisories to media outlets throughout the region to publicize availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public hearings, and the comment period. The outreach effort to local communities complied with the FRA's Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts and was appropriate with respect to the level of detail available in this Tier 1 environmental review. Going forward, future Tier 2 projects will address project level coordination issues, such as impacts to local resources and communities. Future Tier 2 project coordination will be the responsibility of the local project sponsor, who will identify coordination with potentially impacted communities, counties, state resource and regulatory agencies and federal agencies.
Strauss_St	Finally, I would acknowledged that my preferred Grow alternative and other alternative investment recommendations in the DEIS include significant new alignment proposals that will require extensive additional discussions and analysis with state and local shareowners. Generous deference should be given to the states and local stakeholders as investment priorities and alignment decisions are established while also acknowledging the wider benefits that flow to the entire Boston to Washington network from these investment decisions.	Coordination with states, local stakeholders, and communities will be an important part of future Tier 2 projects consistent with this Tier 1 EIS. Future Tier 2 projects will address project level coordination issues, such as impacts to local resources and communities. Future Tier 2 project coordination will be the responsibility of the local project sponsor, who will identify coordination with potentially impacted communities, counties, state resource and regulatory agencies and federal agencies.
Sullivan_Ce	I trust that communications regarding further exploration of the proposals set forth in the NEC Future EIS report will be more open, more timely, and better communicated than has been the case to date, and that any future efforts to improve the Northeast Corridor will reflect the will and needs of the people who live along it.	The FRA is committed to an open public participation process. In November 2015, the FRA notified state and local governments and regional agencies along each of the Action Alternatives’ Representative Routes of the availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The FRA sent information on the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comment process, and public hearings to elected officials in each of the local jurisdictions and counties along these Representative Routes, including those in Connecticut, and made hard copies of the Tier 1 Draft EIS available for review at central libraries in each of these counties. The FRA also placed legal notice and advertisements in major regional newspapers including the Day, the Hour, the New Haven Register, Hartford Courant, and Connecticut Post, and distributed media advisories to media outlets throughout the region to publicize availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public hearings, and the comment period. Notice of the Tier 1 Final EIS will be provided in the Federal Register, various Study Area newspapers, and posted on the NEC FUTURE website @ www.necfuture.com. The FRA will also notify stakeholders, agencies and members of the public who are included on the NEC FUTURE mailing list. The FRA maintains a master email and mailing list of individuals who have signed up for the NEC FUTURE mailing list, participated in meetings, submitted comments or requested information. The outreach effort to local communities complied with the FRA's Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts and was appropriate with respect to the level of detail available in this Tier 1 environmental review. Going forward, future Tier 2 projects will address project level coordination issues, such as impacts to local resources and communities. Future Tier 2 project coordination will be the responsibility of the local project sponsor, who will identify coordination with potentially impacted communities, counties, state resource and regulatory agencies and federal agencies.
Tarr_Jo	However, should the construction of new trackage and stations be pursued, local residents must be engaged earlier and more fully into the planning process.	Coordination with affected local communities will be an important part of future Tier 2 projects consistent with this Tier 1 EIS. The outreach effort to local communities complied with the FRA's Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts and was appropriate with respect to the level of detail available in this Tier 1 environmental review. Going forward, future Tier 2 projects will address project level coordination issues, such as impacts to local resources and communities. Future Tier 2 project coordination will be the responsibility of the local project sponsor, who will identify coordination with potentially impacted communities, counties, state resource and regulatory agencies and federal agencies.

Table JJ–21: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Public and Agency Outreach (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Thorton_Be	The need for information is so important to the people that live in the state of Ct.This state is a pass way for all of New England.Yet no improvements have been made for the citizens who use the rails to and from New York.Come and explain to us all.	The Tier 1 EIS identifies routes that are representative or conceptual in nature, this includes routes through Connecticut. They identify the physical footprint to assess potential environmental consequences to compare to the No Action Alternative. The FRA has made an effort to explain the phased EIS process in the Tier 1 Draft EIS document, in presentation materials, and in the Frequently Asked Questions section of the website. Materials have been refined throughout the EIS process in attempt to better explain the Tiering process and how it applies to NEC FUTURE. For additional information on the Tier 1 process, see Volume 1, Chapter 1.
Wardman_Sa	This is the first I'm hearing of the plans for the railroad going through Connecticut. It seems this was done surreptitiously without adequate public notice.	The FRA is committed to an open public participation process that has included 35 public meetings throughout the region since 2012, as well as numerous informal meetings with interested organizations upon request. In November 2015, the FRA notified state and local governments and regional agencies along each of the Action Alternatives' Representative Routes of the availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The FRA sent information on the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comment process, and public hearings to elected officials in each of the local jurisdictions and counties along these Representative Routes, including those in Connecticut, and made hard copies of the Tier 1 Draft EIS available for review at central libraries in each of these counties. The FRA also placed legal notice and advertisements in major regional newspapers including the Day, the Hour, the New Haven Register, Hartford Courant, and Connecticut Post, and distributed media advisories to media outlets throughout the region to publicize availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public hearings, and the comment period. The outreach effort to local communities complied with the FRA's Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts and was appropriate with respect to the level of detail available in this Tier 1 environmental review. Going forward, future Tier 2 projects will address project level coordination issues, such as impacts to local resources and communities. Future Tier 2 project coordination will be the responsibility of the local project sponsor, who will identify coordination with potentially impacted communities, counties, state resource and regulatory agencies and federal agencies.
Wenzel_Ma	Just sent the email below. How are the comments closed already. This hasn't been publicized at all?? Disgraceful.	Due to public requests, the FRA extended the close of the public comment period to February 16, 2016, resulting in a 95-day comment period.
Wooley_Jo	And I also want to say kudos to the people who were publicly announcing these hearings for putting up the big sign at Penn Station in Manhattan, not the Newark Penn Station, because that was a very good piece of notification to the public that normally these kinds of projects never get. It's normally just kind of minor thingson a website, in a newspaper and putting it up like that. Penn Station was a very good -- very good way of letting the public know.	FRA is committed to an open and transparent public involvement process. Thank you for your support.
Yale_Jacob	I want to thank you for coming here again. I think it's been a very long process. You've been very helpful to us in engaging us in the discussion all along the way.	FRA is committed to an open and transparent public involvement process. Thank you for your support.

Table JJ–21: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Public and Agency Outreach (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Anonymous_009	-the area was not adequately informed notice to petition It is shady and immoral to try to pass something like this quietly. This needs to be proposed publicly. The New London area is very familiar with eminent domain after the US Supreme Court got involved.	The FRA is committed to an open public participation process. In November 2015, the FRA notified state and local governments and regional agencies along each of the Action Alternatives’ Representative Routes of the availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The FRA sent information on the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comment process, and public hearings to elected officials in each of the local jurisdictions and counties along these Representative Routes, including to Mayor Daryl Finizio of New London, and made hard copies of the Tier 1 Draft EIS available for review at central libraries in each of these counties. The FRA also placed legal notice and advertisements in major regional newspapers including the Day, the Hour, the New Haven Register, Hartford Courant, and Connecticut Post, and distributed media advisories to media outlets throughout the region to publicize availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public hearings, and the comment period. The outreach effort to local communities complied with the FRA's Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts and was appropriate with respect to the level of detail available in this Tier 1 environmental review. Going forward, future Tier 2 projects will address project level coordination issues, such as impacts to local resources and communities. Future Tier 2 project coordination will be the responsibility of the local project sponsor, who will identify coordination with potentially impacted communities, counties, state resource and regulatory agencies and federal agencies.

Source: NEC FUTURE team, 2016

JJ.5.11 Section 106/Draft Programmatic Agreement

The following tables contain comments on the Draft Programmatic Agreement presented in Volume 2, Appendix G. The Programmatic Agreement is intended to establish the process that will be followed to complete Section 106 consultation during the environmental review process for Tier 2 projects. State and local agencies suggested changes to the Draft Programmatic Agreement and the need for further coordination during Tier 2 projects. The FRA incorporated these comments, as appropriate, in the Final Programmatic Agreement presented in Volume 1, Appendix GG.

Table JJ–22: Stakeholder Comments (Elected Officials, Tribes, Federal Agencies, State Agencies, Local Agencies): Section 106/Draft Programmatic Agreement

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
CT SHPO_Labadia	This office requests that SHPO is included as a repository for collecting background resource information in the CT specific section of the agreement.	The FRA has revised Stipulation XI of Appendix F in the Programmatic Agreement by adding: “The CTSHPO shall be considered as a repository for artifacts collected in Connecticut.” See Volume 1, Appendix GG, for the Programmatic Agreement.
CT SHPO_Labadia	The procedures and stipulations outlined in the agreement are acceptable to this office.	The FRA appreciates the CT SHPOs contributions to the development of the Programmatic Agreement throughout the Section 106 process.
MAHistoricalCommission_Simon	The MHC looks forward to reviewing updated project mapping at a smaller scale and the FRA's determination of the project area(s) of potential effect for Massachusetts as project planning proceeds during Tier 2 projects. The MHC recommends that updated project mapping for the proposed project impact area base maps in Massachusetts utilize current MassGIS town boundaries and current aerial photographs to show existing conditions within the proposed railway corridor.	The NEC FUTURE program follows a "tiered" approach to environmental review. Tier 1 focuses on broad programs and initial analysis. Tier 2 focuses on site-specific, project-level proposals and impacts. The FRA developed a mapping atlas to provide a high-level representation of the location and construction type of the Preferred Alternative (see Volume 1, Appendix AA). Detailed mapping will occur in subsequent Tier 2 project analyses. The Programmatic Agreement, provided in Volume 1, Appendix GG, provides information on continuing the Section 106 process during subsequent Tier 2 project studies where more-detailed mapping and a definition of the Area of Potential Effect will be further defined in coordination with each State Historic Preservation Office.
MAHistoricalCommission_Simon	The preliminary area of potential effect mapping provided to the MHC in DEIS Appendix A and draft PA Appendix B for portions of the project corridors in Massachusetts continue to include insufficient information for the MHC to offer comments on the proposed preliminary project area of potential effect, or recommendations for other potential interested and consulting parties in Massachusetts.	The mapping atlas provided in the Tier 1 Draft EIS (see Volume 2, Appendix A) and the draft Programmatic Agreement (see Volume 2, Appendix G) are meant to provide general information to support the level of detail presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS. No permits or approvals are being requested as part of the Tier 1 EIS process. More-detailed mapping and an Area of Potential Effect will be prepared in coordination with each relevant State Historic Preservation Office, as described in the Programmatic Agreement (see Volume 1, Appendix GG).
MAHistoricalCommission_Simon	The MHC looks forward to reviewing the final PA that includes a revised Appendix I incorporating the following language to assist in future consultation with the MHC for conducting environmental review projects in Massachusetts: Please delete lind 81 through 86 of Section IV and replace with the following language: Archaeological investigations, ii;icluding archaeological reconnaissance surveys that may be required for portions of the project in Massachusetts shall be conducted under a State Archaeologist's permit (950 CMR 70). A State Archaeologist's permit application shall be submitted to the MHC by a qualified professional archaeologist with relevant previous experience in the region and glaciated Northeast retained by the project proponent. The State Archaeologist shall be consulted concerning an appropriate curatorial facility for all collections from field investigations conducted under permit.	The FRA has revised the Programmatic Agreement, Appendix I, as requested. See Volume 1, Appendix GG for the Programmatic Agreement.
MAHistoricalCommission_Simon	The MHC looks forward to reviewing the final PA that includes a revised Appendix I incorporating the following language to assist in future consultation with the MHC for conducting environmental review projects in Massachusetts: ... Please also add the following paragraph to Section IV: "Within Massachusetts portions of the project impact area on non-federal lands, identified human remains shall be protected and treated consistently with the Massachusetts Unmarked Burial Law (Massachusetts General Laws, Chapter 38, 6; Chapter 9, 26A and 27C; and, Chapter 7, 38A; all as amended). Any non-Native American human remains shall be treated in accordance with the Massachusetts Historical Commission "Policy and Guidelines for Non-Native Human Remains Which Are Over 100 Years Old or Older."	The FRA has revised the Programmatic Agreement, Appendix I, as requested. See Volume 1, Appendix GG, for the Programmatic Agreement.
MashpeeWampanoag_Weeden	The Mashpee Wampanoag Tribes 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.	The FRA has revised the Programmatic Agreement, Appendix N, to include the Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe's Historic Preservation Department to the list of tribes to be invited to participate in Section 106 consultation for Tier 2 projects. See Volume 1, Appendix GG, for the Programmatic Agreement.

Table JJ-22: Stakeholder Comments (Elected Officials, Tribes, Federal Agencies, State Agencies, Local Agencies): Section 106/Draft Programmatic Agreement (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
MDP_Hughes	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.	Regarding the request to change the term "commissions" to "organizations": The FRA has revised the Programmatic Agreement as requested. See Volume 1, Appendix GG for the Programmatic Agreement.
MDP_Hughes	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."	Regarding the request to modify Stipulation III.B: The FRA has revised the Programmatic Agreement as requested to include "any additional requirements specified in a State-specific appendix to this PA." See Volume 1, Appendix GG for the Programmatic Agreement.
MDP_Hughes	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.	Regarding the request to add names and title for various individuals who will be signing the Programmatic Agreement: The FRA has added names and titles for signatories. See Volume 1, Appendix GG for the Programmatic Agreement.
MDP_Hughes	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.	The FRA has added new text to Appendix C of the Programmatic Agreement in response to recommendation. See Volume 1, Appendix GG, for the Programmatic Agreement.
MDP_Hughes	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.	The FRA has revised the Programmatic Agreement, Appendix E, to note that the Maryland Historical Trust has accepted the invitation to be a Signatory to the Programmatic Agreement. See Volume 1, Appendix GG for the Programmatic Agreement.
MDP_Hughes	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.	The FRA has added names and titles for Signatories. See Volume 1, Appendix GG, for the Programmatic Agreement.
MDP_Hughes	Careful proofreading and editing of the final PA are needed to correct minor typos, punctuation and format errors.	The FRA proofread the Programmatic Agreement prior to circulation of the signature version. See Volume 1, Appendix GG, for the Programmatic Agreement.
NCPC_Kempf	The Commission approves site development and building plans on federal lands and transfers of jurisdiction in DC. (40 U.S.C. Section 8722(b)(1) and (d)). In addition, NCPC retains advisory review over federal projects within Prince George's County, Maryland. Given our potential approval role over particular elements (i.e. landscape improvements, new structures, etc.) of the project, NCPC requests Cooperating Agency status to help us satisfy any applicable environmental and historic review responsibilities under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and National Historic Preservation Act.	Regarding involvement under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, Appendix G of the Section 106 Programmatic Agreement for the NEC FUTURE Investment Program identifies the NCPC as a potential consulting party to participate in Section 106 consultation for all Tier 2 projects located in the District of Columbia. Given the broad, programmatic scale of the Tier 1 NEPA process, FRA limited the cooperating agencies to the FTA, specifically due to their integral role in funding the commuter rail agencies along the NEC. However, FRA does encourage and has solicited on-going involvement by the NCPC.
NJDEP_Fo	Historic and Cultural Resources: The State Historic Preservation Office (HPO) is required to review any project affects to historic and archaeological resources as this project is subject to a NEPA regulatory review which considers effects to cultural resources. The Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) shall continue its' consult with the Historic Preservation Office and any other consulting parties pursuant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, and it's implementing regulations, to identify if the proposed NEC Future project area contains any historic properties, and if so, provide an assessment of effects. The HPO looks forward to, additional consultation with the FRA pursuant to Section 106 to better understand the project, alternatives, and NEC Future location(s) to provide informed comment to both the FRA and the Department as well as to develop a Programmatic Agreement.	The FRA appreciates the NJ SHPOs contributions to the development of the Programmatic Agreement throughout the Section 106 process.

Table JJ–22: Stakeholder Comments (Elected Officials, Tribes, Federal Agencies, State Agencies, Local Agencies): Section 106/Draft Programmatic Agreement (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
NJDEP_Saunders	Line 119; please add Newark Landmarks & Historic Preservation Commission, and historic preservation commissions for New Brunswick, Princeton, Elizabeth (there may be more).	<p>The local historic commissions for Newark, New Brunswick, and Princeton, NJ, have been invited to be consulting parties, as the FRA has done for most local historic preservation commissions involved in the process. These agencies will have the opportunity to concur after execution of the Programmatic Agreement. One exception is the Elizabeth, NJ, local historic preservation commission. Follow-up with NJSHPO found that this particular local commission is not yet developed.</p> <p>These agencies have been added to Appendix E as well as the list of Consulting Parties for Tier 2 in the NJ state-specific appendix. See Volume 1, Appendix GG, for the Programmatic Agreement.</p>
NJDEP_Saunders	Lines 183, 189, 192 & 230; Inconsistent use of the term "other federal agency." Line 199; "this paragraph"; should this phrase be replaced with "IB.1, 2., and 3."? Line 210; "Federal" should be "federal" (or change throughout the rest of the PA for consistency)... Line 249; add ")" after "receipt."... Line 288; Definitions for PA are in Appendix A, not E... Line 448; "XIV" appears to be incorrectly cited, should be "XVI"; also mis-referenced in lines 567, 631 and 679... Line 43; add "the applicable" after "shall consult with."	<p>The FRA has revised the Programmatic Agreement as requested and has made global revisions where applicable. With regard to use of the term "other federal agency," the FRA removed the definition of "other federal agencies" to avoid confusion; its meaning will be clear in context (e.g., if it says "FRA or other federal agency" the Programmatic Agreement is referring to any federal agency other than the FRA. See Volume 1, Appendix GG for the Programmatic Agreement.</p>
NJDEP_Saunders	Line 215; "Responsible," would "lead" be a better word? Lines 217 - 219; do we need to address cooperating agencies?	<p>The FRA has revised this section of the Programmatic Agreement to use the word "lead."</p> <p>The FRA did not make a change to the Programmatic Agreement to address cooperating agencies. The intent of the referenced text is to address a situation where two or more federal agencies all serve in an approval role and therefore each has a duty to comply with Section 106, which they can satisfy by designating one agency to serve as lead agency for purposes of Section 106. See Volume 1, Appendix GG, for the Programmatic Agreement.</p>
NJDEP_Saunders	Lines 257-263; Add full title for qualifications standards. e.g., archaeologist for archaeological survey, architectural historian for historic architectural survey, etc.	<p>The FRA did not make this change to the Programmatic Agreement regarding the request to add the full title for qualification standards presented in Section III of the Programmatic Agreement. The stipulation remains as written: "...shall be carried out by or under the direct supervision of a person or persons who meet, at a minimum, the Secretary of the Interior's Historic Preservation Professional Qualification Standards ..." See Volume 1, Appendix GG for the Programmatic Agreement.</p>
NJDEP_Saunders	Line 341; Recommend using this area to lay out the survey methodology used by the federal agency to identify historic properties (phased archaeological survey, architectural survey, etc.) and reporting to inform Line 342... In addition, the PA shall make explicitly clear that phased identification and/or evaluation level surveys shall be conducted to identify and evaluate effects on all historic properties within the Tier 2 undertaking's area of potential effects.	<p>Regarding the request to lay out survey methodology used by the federal agency to identify historic properties: The FRA did not make a change to the Programmatic Agreement because the FRA has attempted to avoid being prescriptive in this Programmatic Agreement regarding issues such as survey methodologies; those issues will be determined on a case-by-case basis during Tier 2 Section 106 compliance processes in consultation with the State Historic Preservation Offices.</p> <p>However, the FRA revised the Programmatic Agreement to state that the federal agency "will complete determinations of eligibility for historic properties within the project-specific APE as part of the Section 106 process for each Tier 2 undertaking." Previously, it said "will make...." The intent of this change is to clarify that the phased identification and evaluation process will be completed in Tier 2. It is "phased" in the sense that it began in Tier 1 and is being finished in Tier 2. See Volume 1, Appendix GG for the Programmatic Agreement.</p>

Table JJ–22: Stakeholder Comments (Elected Officials, Tribes, Federal Agencies, State Agencies, Local Agencies): Section 106/Draft Programmatic Agreement (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
NJDEP_Saunders	Lines 342-346; spell out what constitutes an historic property (eligible and listed etc.). For consistency use 106 language throughout... Finally, the Historic Preservation Office recommends to FRA that the PA shall make clear that the Tier 2 definition of "historic property" is the same as 36 C.F.R. Part 800.16(1).	The FRA did not make this change. Appendix A to the Programmatic Agreement includes definitions. It states that "Terms defined in the Section 106 regulations (36 C.F.R. Part 800) shall have the meanings given in those regulations." The regulations themselves define "historic property", so that definition applies throughout this Programmatic Agreement. As defined in the regulations, "historic property" includes "any prehistoric or historic district, site, building, structure, or object included in, or eligible for inclusion in, the National Register of Historic Places maintained by the Secretary of the Interior." See Volume 1, Appendix GG for the Programmatic Agreement.
NJDEP_Saunders	Lines 586-589; while this paragraph mentions historic buildings, it is unclear if archaeological concerns are also addressed ("the term monitoring" in Line 588). If not, we recommend expanding the paragraph referencing Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Archaeology and Historic Preservation to address affects to archaeological resources.	The FRA revised the Programmatic Agreement by removing the phrase "where historic buildings are involved" so the requirement to consider the Secretary's standards would apply to all "historic properties" (which include archaeological resources). See Volume 1, Appendix GG, for the Programmatic Agreement.
NJDEP_Saunders	Line 87; There needs to be language on reporting the results of these surveys/actions to the signatories for comments, as well as, language that the federal agency shall prepare an archaeological data recovery plan and submit that plan to consulting parties for their review and comment prior to work.	The FRA revised this stipulation (Standard Treatment # 4) of Appendix C of the Programmatic Agreement, which involves data recovery for archaeological resources, to include additional requirements. See Volume 1, Appendix GG, for the Programmatic Agreement.
NJDEP_Saunders	For list of SHPOs, NJ should be listed as signatory to the PA.	The FRA has revised the Programmatic Agreement, Appendix E, to note that the NJ SHPO has accepted the invitation to be a Signatory to the Programmatic Agreement. See Volume 1, Appendix GG for the Programmatic Agreement.
NJDEP_Saunders	Line 10; delete repeated "by submitting." Add as data source, NJDEP's Geo Web public GIS viewer program containing all known above-ground historic properties (archaeological properties are restricted): http://www.nj.gov/dep/gis/geoweb splash.htm Line 22; after "Commissions" recommend adding "Historic Preservation Commissions, Certified Local Governments." Lines 40-68; add parties from New Brunswick, Princeton Historic Preservation Commission, South Brunswick Historic Preservation Commission, Newark Landmarks & Historic Preservation Commission, Pennsylvania Railroad Technical & Historical Society. Line 72; while New Jersey has no federally-recognized tribes in the State, there are federally recognized tribes with an interest in New Jersey. The NJHPO can provide you with a list... Line 107; NJSHPO also requires one (1) digital copy (PDF) of all submission as part of our review. Line 127; Curation: State Register/National Register eligible and listed collections will need to meet 36 C.F.R. Part 79.	The FRA has revised the Programmatic Agreement, Appendix K, as requested. See Volume 1, Appendix GG, for the Programmatic Agreement. The Newark, Princeton, and New Brunswick commissions have been invited to be Consulting Parties. These agencies have been added to Appendix E as well as the list of Consulting Parties for Tier 2 in Appendix K. Regarding curation, the FRA has added "including requirements in 36 C.F.R. Part 79" to Appendix K.
NJDEP_Saunders	Line 84; Section IV-it is unclear if phased archaeological survey and architectural survey is planned as part of the identification process. Please clarify.	Regarding whether phased archaeological survey and architectural survey is planned as part of the identification process: This issue is addressed in the main body of the Programmatic Agreement. See Volume 1, Appendix GG for the Programmatic Agreement.
NYCLPC_Santucci	The LPC would like to be consulted about any potential impacts to archaeological resources and to LPC eligible properties for Tier 1 and Tier 2 projects within New York City.	The FRA has consulted with the New York City Landmarks Preservation Commission (LPC) during the Tier 1 EIS and the LPC is a consulting party to the Programmatic Agreement. The Programmatic Agreement (Volume 1, Appendix GG) describes how the lead federal agency of a Tier 2 undertaking in the state of New York shall consult with the LPC for any projects that affect a New York City landmarked property or historic district.
RIHPHC_Sanderson	Our only comment on the main body of the revised draft programmatic agreement is that the WHEREAS clause on lines 77 to 84 states that FRA has taken steps during the Tier 1 process to... assess potential effects on historic properties. This appears to be an overstatement the only potential effects to historic properties that are mentioned in the DEIS are very general statements about potential effects to National Historic Landmarks. DEIS page 7.9-4 justifies the lack of assessment of effects as it states: The information available in this Tier 1 process allows for the identification of potential effects on known historic properties, but the assessment of effects at Tier 1 is constrained by (1) the limitations of existing records, which do not comprehensively identify all historic properties that may be eligible for listing in the NRHP; and (2) the level of detail known about the Action Alternatives, which are developed only at a conceptual level during Tier 1.	Potential effects were assessed during the Tier 1 EIS by identifying known historic properties within the footprint of the Representative Route for each of the Action Alternatives; the Tier 1 analysis included non-National Historic Landmarks. The text in the Programmatic Agreement has been revised to clarify that the Tier 1 process began the process of identifying historic properties and assessing effects and did not include a full assessment of effects. See Volume 1, Appendix GG, for the Programmatic Agreement.

Table JJ–22: Stakeholder Comments (Elected Officials, Tribes, Federal Agencies, State Agencies, Local Agencies): Section 106/Draft Programmatic Agreement (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
RIHPHC_Sanderson	In Appendix E: Tier I Consulting Parties List, the RIHPHC is listed as a consulting party. The RIHPHC agreed to be a signatory in a letter dated 8 January 2015 (copy attached).	The FRA has revised the Programmatic Agreement, Appendix E, to note that the RIHPHC has accepted the invitation to be a Signatory to the Programmatic Agreement. See Volume 1, Appendix GG, for the Programmatic Agreement.
RIHPHC_Sanderson	In Appendix N: Section 106 Consultation for Tier 2 Undertakings in Rhode Island, we have the following comments: -Line 6: State should be inserted between Island and Historic; -Line 36: delete Rhode Island Historical Preservation and Heritage Commission(RIHPHC), as this is the RISHPO referred to in line 32; and -Line 74: there are other tribes listed in the DEIS page 7.9-8 which should also appear in this list.	The FRA has revised the Programmatic Agreement, Appendix N, as requested. In addition, the FRA added two tribes to the list of tribes to be invited to participate in Section 106 consultation for Tier 2 projects: Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe and Wampanoag Tribe of Gay Head (Aquinnah) of Massachusetts. See Volume 1, Appendix GG, for the Programmatic Agreement.

Source: NEC FUTURE team, 2016

JJ.5.12 Other

The comments that were assigned to this category were general in nature and not specific to the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The majority of the comments assigned to the category express support or opposition to the NEC FUTURE program.

Table JJ–23: Stakeholder Comments (Elected Officials, Tribes, Federal Agencies, State Agencies, Local Agencies): Other

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Amtrak_Boardman	Amtrak concurs with the findings in the NEC FUTURE Purpose and Need Statement and supports the FRA's efforts.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative to improve passenger rail service on the NEC in a manner that will enhance mobility options and expand passenger rail service in support of future population and employment growth in the Study Area. The Preferred Alternative—described in Volume 1, Chapter 4—improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects.
Anne Arundel County_Schuh	Both the airports and other smaller urban areas should continue to be served by regional, non-high speed rail.	The FRA incorporated this perspective into the overall service planning for the Preferred Alternative.
CAA_Dillon	The NEC Future program is a vital project to the Connecticut Airport Authority (CAA) and Bradley International Airport. The prospect of a strong intermoda transportation system holds great promises for the state and region's commuters and travelers. The Northeast Corridor has been neglected for far too long, and the CAA applauds the FRA's efforts to examine modernization and improvement initiatives.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4). In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative provides connections along the existing NEC, along a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, and along the Hartford/Springfield Line. By including the Hartford/Springfield Line, the Preferred Alternative strengthens possible connections to Bradley International Airport.
CONEG_Stubbs	From the perspective of the signatories to this letter, a Preferred Alternative should be the mix of projects from among the alternatives presented that will create an immediate framework for investment while not limiting future options to the extent that is practical.	The Preferred Alternative includes elements of all three Action Alternatives, integrated to best meet the needs of the NEC and the Northeast in the coming decades. While focusing investment on the existing NEC, the Preferred Alternative adds some new segments to support additional capacity for expanding service and to provide important resilience and redundancy benefits. The Preferred Alternative also leaves open future options to add other segments and to apply new rail technologies. Volume 1, Chapter 4, provides a complete description of the Preferred Alternative.
CONEG_Stubbs	A Preferred Alternative in the Final EIS and ROD must accomplish several primary objectives. It must accommodate investment in the existing infrastructure, returning the entire Northeast Corridor to a complete, safe and secure state of good repair. This is a pragmatic step that recognizes that existing local and intercity markets must continue to be served while planning moves forward to add new routes and expand services. Next, the Preferred Alternative must acknowledge that states, public authorities, and operators retain their right to make independent decisions on funding and implementing projects within their jurisdictions. Whatever decision-making structure may be incorporated, states should be given the opportunity to be full partners with the ability to opt in or out and to negotiate for outcomes that merit local support. It should provide an envelope to allow for and accommodate projects planned for or already under way and align with the investment priorities of states, local transportation agencies, and Amtrak.	<p>The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. The Preferred Alternative brings the existing NEC to a state of good repair and maximizes its capacity through alleviation of chokepoints, addition of new tracks and segments at targeted locations, and implementation of service operational efficiencies. The Preferred Alternative also removes speed restrictions where practical and safe, reduces trip times, offers frequent Metropolitan and enhanced express Intercity services, and allows substantial growth for all Regional rail markets. See Volume 1, Chapter 4, for additional information on the Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure or alignments. Such decisions are made as part of the Tier 2 project planning processes, which would include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate. The NEC States and railroads are critical partners in the future of the NEC and ultimately will be responsible for advancing many of the individual projects necessary to achieve the objective of a reliable and safe NEC capable of accommodating future ridership demand. The FRA is committed to working with the NEC states and railroads throughout this process.</p>

Table JJ–23: Stakeholder Comments (Elected Officials, Tribes, Federal Agencies, State Agencies, Local Agencies): Other (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
CONEG_Stubbs	It should provide a reasonable funding and project execution path between the existing NEC Five Year Capital plan and a 2040 horizon, and be bounded by a reasonable assumption of resources that could be available, including Federal funds. It should also present a business plan by which the goal of a stronger NEC will be achieved. That business plan should address the issue of funding and outline the process by which projects will be evaluated and advanced. What it should not do is construct a scenario by which states and transit authorities that support intercity rail are required to financially support unaffordable corridor strategies and assume obligations that are properly Federal.	<p>The Northeast Corridor (NEC) Commission Five-Year Capital Investment Plan is a region-wide action and funding plan for infrastructure projects that are underway or planned on the NEC and connecting corridors to Harrisburg, PA, Albany, NY, and Springfield, MA. The NEC Commission Five-Year Capital Investment Plan results from collaboration between NEC Commission members and identifies both funded projects and unfunded projects that could be advanced within the next five years if additional funding were made available. The Five-Year Capital Investment Plan is updated and approved annually by the NEC Commission in the spring and then transmitted to Congress as a unified capital request for the NEC.</p> <p>The FRA has coordinated closely with the NEC Commission throughout the NEC FUTURE process. The NEC FUTURE Service Development Plan, expected to be completed in 2017, will help guide the investment strategy and project prioritization of future investment throughout the NEC. Accordingly, subsequent annual updates to the Five-Year Capital Investment Plan developed and adopted by the NEC Commission will reflect the investment strategy and framework provided by the NEC FUTURE planning process. See Volume 1, Chapter 10, for a discussion on phasing and implementation.</p>
CONEG_Stubbs	When considering capacity expansion for the NEC, a Preferred Alternative should complete state-of-good-repair projects which provide for replacement/rehabilitation of antiquated tunnels, bridges and other infrastructure, include capacity improvements needed to maintain economic growth, and plan for ridership increases resulting from population increases and changing demographics. In addition, the Preferred Alternative should acknowledge the need to improve the intercity passenger rail connecting routes which provide regional and national access to the NEC main stem and suggest a process by which that need will be met. While some of these routes will not be on the Passenger Rail Corridor Investment Plan for the NEC, they should be recognized as important components of the regional and national intercity rail network and sources of ridership and revenue for the future. Engaging the states and authorities developing their plans and services in the ongoing NEC process will provide important background for long-term growth in services and capital investment needs the NEC owners and operators will need to address.	The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. The Preferred Alternative brings the existing NEC to a state of good repair and maximizes its capacity through alleviation of chokepoints, addition of new tracks and segments at targeted locations, and implementation of service operational efficiencies. Improved service with the connecting corridors was considered as part of NEC FUTURE and the development of the Preferred Alternative, as described in Volume 1, Chapters 4 and 5. The Preferred Alternative incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line into the NEC, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford, CT, and Springfield, MA. The Preferred Alternative also removes speed restrictions where practical and safe, reduces trip times, offers frequent Metropolitan and enhanced express Intercity services, and allows substantial growth for all Regional rail markets. See Volume 1, Chapter 4, for additional information on the Preferred Alternative. As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure or alignments. Such decisions will be made as part of the Tier 2 project planning processes, which will include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate. The Tier 1 Final EIS also identifies methods in which the FRA will coordinate with stakeholders to transition from this Tier 1 process to subsequent planning processes. Details of this overall planning approach are provided in Volume 1, Chapters 1 and 10.
Connecticut_Redeker_Barnes	Given the above, we respectfully request an additional 60 days to complete our review and vetting of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The additional time will allow proper review of the extensive document and consideration of stakeholder feedback.	In November 2015, the FRA notified state and local governments and regional agencies along each of the Action Alternatives' Representative Routes of the availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The FRA sent information on the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comment process, and public hearings to elected officials in each of the local jurisdictions and counties along these Representative Routes, including those in Connecticut, and made hard copies of the Tier 1 Draft EIS available for review at central libraries in each of these counties. The FRA also placed legal notice and advertisements in major regional newspapers including the Day, the Hour, the New Haven Register, Hartford Courant, Connecticut Post, and Providence Journal, and distributed media advisories to media outlets throughout the region to publicize availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public hearings, and the comment period. The original comment period was set for 78 days, ending January 30, 2016. Due to public requests, the public comment period was extended to 95 days, ending February 16, 2016. The outreach effort to local communities complied with the FRA's Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts and was appropriate with respect to the level of detail available in this Tier 1 environmental review.

Table JJ–23: Stakeholder Comments (Elected Officials, Tribes, Federal Agencies, State Agencies, Local Agencies): Other (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
CONRAIL_Broder	Conrail supports the efforts of FRA and others to improve the NEC by upgrading aging infrastructure, and adding additional capacity.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative to improve passenger rail service on the NEC in a manner that will enhance mobility options and expand passenger rail service in support of future population and employment growth in the Study Area. The Preferred Alternative—described in Volume 1, Chapter 4—improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects.
CRCOG_Wray	Understanding that the Tier 1 Draft EIS does not address comments CRCOG repeatedly submitted, we strongly urge the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) to initiate a phased Tier 2 EIS process with the first phase focusing on enabling all projects identified in the No Action Alternative PLUS the existing inland route running between New Haven - Hartford - Springfield to Worcester and Boston (connecting corridor). Planning and investments in NEC FUTURE should be complementary to current efforts within our region, not competitive. Advancing a phased Tier 2 process that includes the Hartford Rail Line will ensure that the existing corridors have the capacity to serve projected growth in the short term and enable the development and potential ultimate construction of new capacity along new alignments in a longer term time frame. Initiating Phase 1 of a Tier 2 EIS would address state-of-good repair needs and provide input on the maximum capacity, speed, and frequency on the existing Hartford Rail Line, providing valuable 'value-engineering' input to all stakeholders as we consider and move into Phase 2 of the Tier 2 EIS.	<p>The NEC FUTURE program follows a "tiered" approach to environmental review. Tier 1 focuses on broad programs and initial analysis. Tier 2 focuses on site-specific, project-level proposals and impacts. As planning for the program progresses, Tier 2 project studies will be defined and initiated—each undergoing the appropriate environmental review and analysis.</p> <p>The FRA has identified a Preferred Alternative that focuses improvements along the existing NEC with targeted new segments to alleviate chokepoints and increase capacity. It also includes an enhanced, electrified Hartford/Springfield Line. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.</p> <p>Volume 1, Chapter 10, describes phasing and implementation of the Preferred Alternative.</p>
CRCOG_Wray	There are significant Transit-Oriented (TOD) planning efforts and investments ongoing along the Hartford Line rail corridor. Municipalities are interested in leveraging these efforts and NEC FUTURE offers that opportunity.	The FRA considered opportunities for leveraging station-area development with proposed improved passenger rail service in evaluating the benefits of the Preferred Alternative. Volume 1, Chapter 6, further describes these relationships.
CT_Congress_Senate	We are vigorous supporters of increased investments in our transportation system and the many jobs that these investments create, and we urge you to be forward-thinking in finalizing the NEC FUTURE framework to ensure it is a robust blueprint for enhancing economic prospects for our constituents.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative to improve passenger rail service on the NEC in a manner that will enhance mobility options and expand passenger rail service in support of future population and employment growth in the Study Area. The Preferred Alternative—described in Volume 1, Chapter 4—improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects.
CT_Congress_Senate	We urge you to be visionary in your proposal, bringing our rail network into the modern age and preparing for the economy of the twenty-first century. The Preferred Alternative should ease congestion, reduce greenhouse gas emissions, ensure the resiliency of our infrastructure in the face of climate change, improve freight rail options for commercial development and guarantee our constituents first-in-class rail service so they can better access jobs and economic oppmtunities. We are encouraged by ideas that would rebuild our infrastructure, create new lines and hundreds of new stations, eliminate chokepoints, and increase oppmtunities for residents throughout New England to access dependable, reliable high-speed rail. Our global competitors are embracing ambitious plans; we must do so as well.	The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while reducing environmental impacts. The Preferred Alternative brings the existing NEC to a state of good repair and maximizes its capacity through alleviation of chokepoints, addition of new tracks and segments at targeted locations, and implementation of service operational efficiencies. The Preferred Alternative also removes speed restrictions where practical and safe, reduces trip times, offers frequent Metropolitan and enhanced express Intercity services, and allows substantial growth for all Regional rail markets. Volume 1, Chapter 4, provides a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative.

Table JJ–23: Stakeholder Comments (Elected Officials, Tribes, Federal Agencies, State Agencies, Local Agencies): Other (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
CT_Congress_Senate	Generally, a Tier 1 EIS focuses on large, regional issues, not local adverse and positive impacts which would be assessed during a second review of specific projects. Nonetheless, the Tier 1 EIS is still an important document that could guide decisions in the Northeast for decades to come, serving as a starting point for many critical state and local planning efforts. So, we urge you to closely consider the impact of your preferred plan on all communities affected and specifically ask that you:... - Ensure you have considered all economic impacts... and ensure this plan increases economic opportunities rather than undermine them. - Ensure you have considered all environmental impacts, minimizing any harm... as well as community quality of life issues, like noise. - Ensure it enhances service for all who depend on our transportation network, from bus and transit users and short-distance commuters to long-distance passengers, drivers, aviation stakeholders, and freight operators and customers. - Ensure it protects the unique, historic charm of the countless communities in Connecticut that have structures dating hundreds of years and proud, important traditions of historic preservation. - Ensure it leverages current resources, infrastructure and local planning efforts, complementing local priorities and needs and does not undermine them.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4).</p> <p>The FRA evaluated the effects of implementing the Action Alternatives (see Volume 2) and the Preferred Alternative (see Volume 1) on the transportation network, economy, and the environment within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process.</p> <p>Consistent with the Purpose and Need, the FRA is working to improve the NEC while promoting environmental sustainability and promoting economic growth. Volume 1, Chapter 3, provides a summary of the Purpose and Need. The FRA evaluated the alternatives presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS to determine how well each met the Purpose and Need and established goals and objectives. The evaluation presented and feedback provided during the public comment period led the FRA to identify a Preferred Alternative. Details about specific environmental resources including the methodology to assess impacts can be found in Volume 1, Chapter 7, and Volume 2, Appendix E.</p>
EPA_Walsh	Development of the Action Alternatives will trigger a wide range of significant impacts that will require permitting and appropriate mitigation. In particular, all of the Action Alternatives have a great potential to impact wetlands, parklands, ecological functions and communities along the proposed work areas. It is also clear that solutions to these problems will cause other impacts and have costs. We encourage the FRA to avoid segmentation when considering future actions to assure there is a thorough analysis of all the impacts. as connected actions. It will then be critical for the Tier 2 analyses to fully consider designs that avoid and minimize impacts, particularly when the proposed projects will intersect complex or high value resources (described in part in the attachment to this letter). ... In addition, subsequent Tier 2 EISs should address in a more detailed fashion the impacts of these increases on host neighborhoods, in terms of foregoing potential alternative land uses, emissions and noise hotspots, and how those impacts could be mitigated. Additional frequencies for regional rail service at stations are not nearly as sizeable, but add to the cumulative burden. ... To address this potential limitation we recommend that regardless of level of NEPA documentation selected, resource agencies and other stakeholders be kept informed and provided an opportunity to offer comments. We recommend that commitments made for Tier 2 NEPA documents be highlighted in a standalone section of the document. These commitments are critical for the project moving forward, and may address comments made that are not able to be resolved during the Tier 1 process. Stakeholders would greatly benefit from a summary of commitments covering such areas as agency and public coordination, avoidance and minimization of impacts, mitigation and the level of detail that will be provided in subsequent Tier 2 documents. We further suggest that these commitments be included in the ROD.	<p>As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, and will not make decisions about the scope of Tier 2 projects or final locations of new or expanded infrastructure in the Tier 1 Record of Decision. Such decisions will be made as part of the Tier 2 project planning and NEPA processes, which will include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate.</p> <p>The FRA evaluated the broad effects of implementing the Action Alternatives (see Volume 2) and the Preferred Alternative (see Volume 1) on the transportation network, economy, and the environment within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process. Subsequent Tier 2 project studies will build upon the Tier 1 and provide a project-level evaluation of environmental impacts, focused on the project area. Tier 2 projects will coordinate with resource agencies and other stakeholders and provide opportunity to comment as appropriate.</p> <p>Volume 1, Chapter 10, provides a discussion of the transition between the Tier 1 analysis and the Tier 2 project-level analysis, including discussion of Tier 2 commitments that may be included in the Record of Decision.</p>
EPA_Walsh	The FRA's proposed plan to issue the Final EIS (FEIS) and Record of Decision (ROD)at the same time may hinder public engagement critical to a successful project. The DEIS notes that the FRA may conclude the Tier 1 process through the issuance of a joint Tier I FEIS and ROD. In this instance, we do not think that the use of a combined FEIS/ROD is appropriate. As all of the Action Alternatives have the potential to affect a wide variety of resources including wetlands, parks, and environmental justice communities, EPA recommends that the FRA stagger issuance of the FEIS and ROD documents to allow the public and other stakeholders an opportunity to review and comment on the Preferred Alternative and any new information/analysis contained in the FEIS. The need for an opportunity to comment on the FEIS is particularly acute for a Tier 1 EIS where a ROD may finalize a decision that reaches far into the future and that will influence selection of Tier 2 projects. These projects will have pronounced direct and indirect impacts as well as short-- and long--term impacts. Public and agency comment on the FEIS will help the FRA produce a more fully informed ROD and a better decision. We request the opportunity for additional agency coordination prior to the issuance of the ROD. ... The FRA should clarify how logical termini, break out projects, or scope for the implementation of the Action Alternatives, particularly for a hybrid alternative, will be determined.	<p>The FRA agrees with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) recommendation to provide an opportunity for stakeholder, agency, and public review of the Tier 1 Final EIS and the Preferred Alternative prior to issuing a Record of Decision (ROD). The FRA will issue a separate Tier 1 Final EIS and ROD. A 30-day waiting period will be observed between the issuance of the Tier 1 Final EIS and the ROD. The FRA will continue to coordinate with the EPA and other regulatory and resource agencies throughout the development and issuance of the Tier 1 Final EIS and in the development of the ROD.</p> <p>Volume 2, Chapter 10, describes the transition from the Tier 1 scope and scale to identifying specific projects, or bundles of projects, which have logical termini and generate measurable benefits and will be further detailed in both the ROD and the subsequent Service Development Plan.</p>

Table JJ–23: Stakeholder Comments (Elected Officials, Tribes, Federal Agencies, State Agencies, Local Agencies): Other (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Governor CT_Malloy	Furthermore, major new alignments that have been identified in Action Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 of the DEIS affect the entire New England region and in large measure are dependent on investments along the entire Northeast Corridor. Therefore, Connecticut strongly recommends that FRA conduct this new corridor evaluation-with a deliberate, multi-state, multi-agency and multi-operator methodology. We recommend that the additional information required to enable such critical corridor-wide decisions include at a minimum: service development plans; forecasts of future land use and development; detailed economic and cost/benefit analysis; specific right-of-way, environmental, energy and construction impacts to our communities as well as our other transportation modes; and a coherent and sustainable funding strategy. Of course, decisions on new alignments cannot be made without agreements among states and stakeholders. Connecticut is prepared to work with FRA, Amtrak, New York, Massachusetts and other regional partners to fully advance this strategy on the existing passenger rail corridors.	<p>The Preferred Alternative focuses on the existing NEC, bringing it to a state of good repair, replacing aging infrastructure, adding capacity and improving trip times. The Preferred Alternative supports a "grow" service vision, but does not include a new off-corridor route to New Haven-Hartford-Providence-Boston. The Preferred Alternative incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line, building off of ongoing investments by Connecticut in the CTrail Hartford Line. Ongoing coordination with Connecticut will be critical to the future success of NEC FUTURE.</p> <p>Throughout the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA has worked closely with resource and regulatory agencies, each of the states, Washington, D.C., the Northeast Corridor (NEC) Commission, Amtrak, commuter and freight railroad operators. The FRA is committed to continuing to work in this multi-state, multi-operator, multi-agency format as NEC FUTURE transitions from the federal environmental review process to the next phase. For the FRA, the next phase in corridor planning is to develop a Service Development Plan (SDP). Consistent with their ongoing commitment to engagement and collaboration with key stakeholders, the FRA initiated an NEC SDP Working Group (Working Group) to begin the process of defining an Initial Phase of the Preferred Alternative. This Initial Phase will be an integral part of the SDP. The SDP will address many of the information requirements noted, including a cost/benefit analysis. As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, and will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure in the Tier 1 Record of Decision. More-specific details will be developed for individual projects or packages of projects during subsequent Tier 2 project studies, which will include stakeholder and public participation. Those studies will focus on land use and growth assumptions for specific station areas, detailed economic and environmental effects, and ridership forecasts. The FRA had described how the FRA and stakeholders will continue to collaborate as NEC FUTURE transitions to this next stage in Volume 1, Chapter 10.</p>
Groton_Bronk	Overall, we find that the report and the process was very well done, and we thank you for that. We're still reviewing the overall report and will provide our comments by January 30th, but we're here to make sure that you understood that we are watching the overall process and that we're in support	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4).
Mansfield_Mayor Shapiro	As you move forward with a Tier 2 EIS, extensive community outreach will be needed in each of the affected communities to ensure that residents and other stakeholders have ample opportunity to understand and comment on the proposed action and mitigation measures. This is particularly critical in areas where new rail routes and stations are proposed, such as Mansfield.	As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure in the Tier 1 Record of Decision. Such decisions will be made as part of the Tier 2 project planning processes, which will include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate.
MDDNR_Golden	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 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.	Thank you for your participation and collaboration during the NEC FUTURE process. Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, the public comment process, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA has identified a Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4) at the same Tier 1 level of detail previously provided on the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives. Agency coordination and participation was meaningful in the FRA's alternatives development and Preferred Alternative deliberative process. The FRA remains committed to ongoing collaboration with stakeholders moving forward toward implementation of a Preferred Alternative and appreciates the involvement of the Maryland Department of Natural Resources throughout the process.

Table JJ–23: Stakeholder Comments (Elected Officials, Tribes, Federal Agencies, State Agencies, Local Agencies): Other (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
MetroCOG_Bidolli	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 all 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 enable potential future investments to deliver new, dedicated high-speed alignments along the entire Northeast Corridor, including services in and through Connecticut. ...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.	<p>The Preferred Alternative lays out a vision that would require separate, project-level studies to implement. Those project-level or Tier 2 projects are expected to be implemented in an incremental manner. The Preferred Alternative includes an initial phase to reflect the more immediate needs of the Northeast Corridor and the importance of incremental implementation of the Preferred Alternative. Volume 1, Chapter 10, Phasing and Implementation, further describes this.</p> <p>In Connecticut, the existing NEC shoreline route will be upgraded with a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. This new segment will improve performance between New York City and Boston, and enhance system resilience, while connecting to new markets in the Connecticut River Valley. The Preferred Alternative also incorporates enhanced electrified service along the Hartford/Springfield Line which strengthens service to Central New England and leverages existing investments and identified market opportunities.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.</p>
Mineola_Trentacos	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... 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... As a result, further comment will be made once a design shall have been proposed.	<p>FRA encourages reviewers of this Tier 1 documentation to remain engaged as subsequent project-level studies The level of analysis in the Tier 1 Draft EIS is consistent with the type of broad, programmatic analysis appropriate for a Tier 1 EIS. In the Tier 1 Draft EIS, each Action Alternative was evaluated at a consistent level of detail to inform a comparison of each to the No Action Alternative and to inform, along with other factors, the FRA's deliberative process on the identification of Preferred Alternative. In the Tier 1 Final EIS, the Preferred Alternative is compared to the No Action Alternative using the same methodology applied in the Tier 1 Draft EIS to compare the Action Alternatives to the No Action Alternative. Site-specific environmental review will occur at the Tier 2 project-level. For more information on the transition to the Tier 2 process, refer to Volume 1, Section 10.5.</p> <p>FRA encourages reviewers of this Tier 1 documentation to remain engaged as subsequent project-level studies are initiated and to provide the appropriate detailed comments on site- and location-specific benefits and effects at that time.</p>
NCPC_Kempf	In general, NCPC supports the study's intent to enhance inter-regional and multimodal transportation service, and to improve access to the Nation's Capital. The Comprehensive Plan for the National Capital, which outlines planning polices for the National Capital Region (NCR), clearly states the importance of developing and maintaining a multi-modal regional transportation network that meets the needs of residents, workers, and visitors.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4).
NE CT COG_Filchak	We concur that we must improve the reliability, capacity, connectivity, performance, and resiliency of future passenger rail service.... NECCOG is supportive of passenger rail improvements and would like linkages from our region to regional centers such as Worcester, Boston, New London and beyond.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4). In Connecticut, Rhode Island, and Massachusetts, the Preferred Alternative provides connections along the existing NEC, along a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, and along the Hartford/Springfield Line. Although the Preferred Alternative does not include a route through northeastern Connecticut, this does not preclude this option from being further evaluated by others in the future. The FRA remains committed to ongoing collaboration with stakeholders moving forward toward implementation of a Preferred Alternative and appreciate the involvement of the NECCOG throughout the process.

Table JJ–23: Stakeholder Comments (Elected Officials, Tribes, Federal Agencies, State Agencies, Local Agencies): Other (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
New Haven_Mayor Harp	The City strongly believes that the FRA and NEC Commission must provide national-level leadership and establish a collaborative problem-solving approach in order to achieve the desired outcomes, specifically the coordination of capital investments and service plans leading to 60+ minute service between New Haven and New York City, together with allocation of track for more frequent high speed intercity service to Boston and Washington.	The FRA agrees with the importance of continued FRA leadership in the planning and implementation of projects supporting the Preferred Alternative. Moving forward, the FRA—working with the states, the District of Columbia, and the Northeast Corridor Commission—intends to continue the collaborative process established for NEC FUTURE. Volume 1, Chapter 10, describes the ways in which this collaboration might be advanced and will be further expanded on in the Record of Decision and Service Development Plan.
New Haven_Piscitelli	Thank you for the opportunity to enter prepared testimony concerning the Tier 1 DEIS. The City truly appreciates your efforts on this important matter.	Thank you for your support. Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4).
New Hyde Park_Trentacos	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... 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... As a result, further comment will be made once a design shall have been proposed.	<p>The level of analysis in the Tier 1 Draft EIS is consistent with the type of broad, programmatic analysis appropriate for a Tier 1 EIS. In the Tier 1 Draft EIS, each Action Alternative was evaluated at a consistent level of detail to inform a comparison of each to the No Action Alternative and to inform, along with other factors, the FRA's deliberative process on the identification of Preferred Alternative. In the Tier 1 Final EIS, the Preferred Alternative is compared to the No Action Alternative using the same methodology applied in the Tier 1 Draft EIS to compare the Action Alternatives to the No Action Alternative. Site-specific environmental review will occur at the Tier 2 project-level. For more information on the transition to the Tier 2 process, refer to Volume 1, Section 10.5.</p> <p>FRA encourages reviewers of this Tier 1 documentation to remain engaged as subsequent project-level studies are initiated and to provide the appropriate detailed comments on site- and location-specific benefits and effects at that time.</p>
New London_Mayor Passero	The of New City of New London clearly understands and appreciates the purpose and need of the NEC FUTURE program and while the City fully supports improved rail service and performance throughout the Northeast Corridor and affirm that the Northeast Corridor is critical to the future economic growth of this part of the country we are concerned that the alternatives presented in the EIS may have greater adverse impacts upon the City of New London than the predicted economic growth impacts.	<p>The FRA evaluated general economic effects and growth for the Preferred Alternative in Volume 1, Chapter 6. More-detailed analysis of the economic effects compared to impacts on the City of New London may be undertaken during subsequent Tier 2 project studies.</p> <p>The Tier 1 NEC FUTURE EIS follows a "tiered" approach to environmental review under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). A Tier 1 NEPA review focuses on broad programmatic issues and initial analysis. The NEC FUTURE Tier 1 EIS makes no conclusive statements about environmental effects, but rather analyzes them such that representative environmental consequences of each alternative can be assessed and compared among alternatives. A Tier 2 NEPA review will focus on site-specific, project proposals and impacts. During a Tier 2 project planning and review process, the future federal lead agency will reach conclusions regarding impacts and mitigation. More information on the tiered NEPA process is available in Volume 2, Section 1.3. As part of NEC FUTURE, the FRA prepared an effects-assessment methodology (see Volume 2, Appendix E) for each resource presented in Chapter 7. Targeted agency coordination and resource-specific technical working groups, comprising technical experts within the industry, and federal and state resource agencies reviewed and commented on each methodology; the FRA addressed all such reviews in revising and finalizing the effects-assessment methodologies. Each effects-assessment methodology identifies the data sources and methodology used to assess effects, Tier 1 EIS outcomes, and the applicability of the analysis to subsequent Tier 2 projects. Similarly, Volume 1, Chapter 9, is based on the analysis and findings presented in the individual chapters of the document. The evaluations were reviewed by state departments of transportation, federal modal agencies, and commuter rail authorities. Volume 2, Appendices B, C, and D present methodologies related to alternatives development and evaluation, transportation, and economics, respectively.</p>

Table JJ–23: Stakeholder Comments (Elected Officials, Tribes, Federal Agencies, State Agencies, Local Agencies): Other (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
NJ TRANSIT_Martin	Additionally, NJ TRANSIT must continue to make other necessary specific improvements along the NEC in order to maintain our ability to meet our future rail operating and customer needs. NJ TRANSIT is now pursuing some of those improvements to make our rail operation more resilient following the effects of Superstorm Sandy. As a successor to prior passenger rail operators with the right to use the NEC, none of the proposals in this DEIS can be allowed to prevent us from doing what is necessary to best serve our customers. For example, NJ TRANSIT has demonstrated our willingness to work with Amtrak on mutually agreed to longer-term projects, such as the reconstruction of the Elizabeth Train Station and its platforms. NJ TRANSIT worked with Amtrak, and at our cost, offered to relocate the eastern platform of this station to meet Amtrak's request to allow a fifth track to be added in the area. NJ TRANSIT would not accept a situation in which follow-on actions to this DEIS inhibited our ability to provide the rail services required to meet future customer needs.	The NEC FUTURE provides a broad envelope within which service and infrastructure improvements would be made. Specific decisions about the nature, design, and timing for those improvements will be the responsibility of sponsoring agencies (such as NJ TRANSIT), local interests, and federal funding partners. The Preferred Alternative does not predetermine or commit local sponsoring agencies to a specific solution.
Old Lyme_First Selectwoman Reemsnyder	There was wholehearted support for upgrades to our nation's passenger rail infrastructure and unquestioning agreement on the need for continued major improvements to eastern Connecticut's existing rail corridor.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4). In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative provides connections along the existing NEC, along a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, and along the Hartford/Springfield Line.
Old Saybrook_Selectman Fortuna	Obviously, investing and upgrading the NEC passenger rail line is critical to regional mobility, as the FRA points out in the report.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative to improve passenger rail service on the NEC in a manner that will enhance mobility options and expand passenger rail service in support of future population and employment growth in the Study Area. The Preferred Alternative—described in Volume 1, Chapter 4—improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects.
OysterBay_Alesia	However, the information provided in the DEIS regarding Alternative 3 is so nebulous that it is difficult to see how it can provide a suitable basis for decision-making... We recognize that a "Tier 1" DEIS is intended to provide a broad basis for programmatic decisions. However, in the absence of meaningful impact assessment the subject DEIS does not seem to establish the necessary foundation for effective deliberations. Accordingly, we urge you to complete appropriate analyses of potential environmental impacts and present same for public review and comment before any decision is made to pursue Alternative 3. Although detailed, site-specific investigations may not be required or feasible at this time, technically valid, generic impact evaluations are practicable and should be completed to ensure that all relevant factors are taken into consideration in choosing the most appropriate course of action.	<p>The level of analysis in the Tier 1 Draft EIS is consistent with the type of broad, programmatic analysis appropriate for a Tier 1 EIS. In the Tier 1 Draft EIS, each Action Alternative was evaluated at a consistent level of detail to inform a comparison of each to the No Action Alternative and to inform, along with other factors, the FRA's deliberative process on the identification of Preferred Alternative. In the Tier 1 Final EIS, the Preferred Alternative is compared to the No Action Alternative using the same methodology applied in the Tier 1 Draft EIS to compare the Action Alternatives to the No Action Alternative. Site-specific environmental review will occur at the Tier 2 project-level. For more information on the transition to the Tier 2 process, refer to Volume 1, Section 10.5.</p> <p>FRA encourages reviewers of this Tier 1 documentation to remain engaged as subsequent project-level studies are initiated and to provide the appropriate detailed comments on site- and location-specific benefits and effects at that time.</p>
OysterBay_Alesia	The Oyster Bay Town Board supports the NEC Future's overall goal of improving rail connections and capacity to advance the regional economy.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative to improve passenger rail service on the NEC in a manner that will enhance mobility options and expand passenger rail service in support of future population and employment growth in the Study Area. The Preferred Alternative—described in Volume 1, Chapter 4—improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects.
PennDOT_Fauver	In addition, as a member of the NEC Commission, a five year plan was just recently released. While the DEIS is looking for a long term vision and plan, the Preferred Alternative will need to take in to consideration the projects already identified for advancement and funding by the Commission. Ultimately, the Selected Alternative issued in the Record of Decision will not advance unless funding has been identified which does not conflict with the priorities already established by the Commission.	The FRA reviewed the NEC Commission Five-Year Capital Plan in preparing the Tier 1 Final EIS. The FRA is coordinating closely with the NEC Commission and its stakeholders to ensure consistency between near-term and ongoing initiatives such as the NEC Commission Five-Year Capital Plan. Volume 1, Chapter 10, describes the proposed process to maintain this close coordination and provides steps toward a representative Initial Phase.

Table JJ–23: Stakeholder Comments (Elected Officials, Tribes, Federal Agencies, State Agencies, Local Agencies): Other (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
Philadelphia_Tolson_Padullon	we firmly support the underlying predicate that the economic competitiveness of the Northeast region, and the Philadelphia metropolitan region in particular, depends on rail transportation that dramatically improves travel times and connectivity. We believe that such improvements will induce rail travel demand, generate vitally needed economic growth, and positively impact congestion and the environment.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4).
PVPC_Brennan	...PVPC requests that FRA prepare a Tier 1 Supplemental DEIS (S/DEIS) that addresses deficiencies in the subject DEIS described below before a Preferred Alternative is selected and a Tier 1 Final Environmental Impact Statement is issued. ... A Tier 1 S/DEIS is needed because the subject DEIS does not include an Inland Route alternative or variant and therefore does not fully account for the leverage effects of substantial transportation investments by federal, state, and municipal agencies that are already occurring and are anticipated in this corridor in Massachusetts and Connecticut. These include the Springfield Union Station Regional Intermodal Center, New Haven/Hartford/ Springfield (The Hartford Line) commuter rail, the Northern New England Inland Rail Initiative (of which the Inland Route is a part), the replacement of the Route 1-91 viaduct in downtown Springfield, and a planned bus rapid transit system in Springfield.	<p>The Preferred Alternative, described in Volume 1, Chapter 4, includes a two-track, electrified Hartford/Springfield Line. Incorporating the Hartford/Springfield Line into the Preferred Alternative provides one seat ride service to and from the NEC to Hartford and Springfield and improves connectivity to Connecting Corridors and other modes, which include the corridor evaluated by the Northern New England Intercity Rail Initiative and on-going improvements in Springfield.</p> <p>Under CEQ's regulations, a supplemental draft or final environmental impact statement is required if: "[An] agency makes substantial changes in the proposed action [or alternative] that are relevant to environmental concerns." 40 C.F.R. § 1502.9(c). Courts have interpreted this regulation to require the production of a supplemental draft environmental impact statement when a change to an alternative previously evaluated in a draft environmental impact statement may result in seriously different environmental impacts not previously considered in the preceding environmental impact statement.</p> <p>The proposed incorporation and improvements to the Hartford/Springfield Line are broadly consistent with 1) on-going improvements to the line, advanced by the Connecticut DOT under the New Haven-Hartford-Springfield Program and approved by the FRA in compliance with NEPA; and 2) the types of improvements considered in the Tier 1 DEIS, including the additional passenger rail infrastructure improvements between New Haven and Hartford included in Alternatives 2 and 3, and integrated operation of the Hartford/Springfield Line as part of the NEC included in Alternatives 2 and 3. The FRA has determined that the proposed incorporation of and improvements to the Hartford/Springfield Line as described in the Preferred Alternative would not result in seriously different environmental impacts not previously considered in the Tier 1 DEIS. However, FRA will discuss the changes and associated impacts in the Tier 1 FEIS. For this reason, the FRA will not prepare a supplemental environmental impact statement.</p>

Table JJ–23: Stakeholder Comments (Elected Officials, Tribes, Federal Agencies, State Agencies, Local Agencies): Other (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
PVPC_Brennan	...we strongly urge FRA to initiate a phased Tier 2 EIS program for NEC Future, as recommended by the Connecticut Department of Transportation and the Capital Region Council of Governments, that focuses on enabling all projects that are now programmed and/or in the planning stages, as well as those necessary to maintain a state of good repair and deliver maximum safety, speed, and capacity on the New Haven-Hartford-Springfield corridor. We further concur with Conn DOT and CROG that the first phase of this Tier 2 EIS program must include evaluation and project support for the Hartford-Springfield region, including the Inland Route, enhanced connections to Bradley International Airport, and other elements of the federally funded Knowledge Corridor initiative. A second phase of a Tier 2 EIS program could then be devoted to the development and comprehensive evaluation of potential new alignments and the substantially greater investments that will be needed to construct and operate them.	<p>Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative brings the existing NEC and Hartford/Springfield Line to a state of good repair, replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more frequent, faster and more reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers.</p> <p>In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative includes upgrading the existing NEC shoreline route and the addition of a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. The Preferred Alternative incorporates an electrified Hartford/Springfield Line into the NEC, providing one-seat ride service to and from Hartford and Springfield. It does not include a line connecting Hartford and Providence. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.</p> <p>Additionally, FRA has identified an Initial Phase that addresses concerns with leadership and the transition steps leading from the Tier 1 Final EIS and Record of Decision to subsequent Tier 2 project studies. After the conclusion of the NEPA process, the FRA will be developing a Service Development Plan in which it will identify projects that should be prioritized for implementation as part of a first phase; general information about phasing and implementation of the Preferred Alternative can be found in Chapter 10 of Volume 1.</p>
RIHPHC_Sanderson	The RIHPHC has not identified any changes that need to be made to the main body of the DEIS.	<p>Volume 1, Chapter 7.9 provides the updated analysis focused on the Preferred Alternative as it pertains to cultural resources and historic properties.</p> <p>Any errata style comments or corrects that were received on the Tier 1 Draft EIS during the public comment period are reflected in Volume 2.</p>
RIPTA_DiToro	we remain strongly supportive of the NEC FUTURE project. Increased rail capacity within the Northeast Corridor is crucial to the future development of our state, our region and our nation.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative to improve passenger rail service on the NEC in a manner that will enhance mobility options and expand passenger rail service in support of future population and employment growth in the Study Area. The Preferred Alternative—described in Volume 1, Chapter 4—improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects.
SCCOG_Galbraith	...the SCCOG understands and appreciates the purpose and need of the project as stated in the EIS. The improvement of and extension of rail service to and from our region is consistent with our Long Range Regional Transportation Plan. We fully agree with the finding that the Northeast Corridor is critical to the future economic growth of this part of the country. We note that due to the general nature of a Tier 1 EIS, it is difficult to make specific comments about specific components of the project, and we do recognize that further analysis will be provided in the future pending the outcome of the alternative selected in the Record of Decision.	As a result of the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, the public comment process, and U.S. DOT policy objectives, the FRA has identified a Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4). Agency coordination and participation was meaningful in the FRA's alternatives development and Preferred Alternative deliberative process. The FRA remains committed to ongoing collaboration with stakeholders moving forward toward implementation of a Preferred Alternative and appreciates the involvement of the South Central Council of Governments throughout the process.
SCCOG_Galbraith	...we wish to express support for the position on this Tier 1 EIS taken by the State of Connecticut and the Connecticut Department of Transportation, specifically that the FRA initiate a phased Tier 2 EIS, with the first phase addressing projects critical to maintaining a state of good repair along the entire Northeast Corridor. This first phase of a Tier 2 EIS program would enable advancement of already planned and ongoing projects in Connecticut such as the historic inland route from New Haven-Hartford-Springfield-Boston. The Tier 2 EIS process must then ensure that federal funding sources will be available to advance new projects in the selected Alternative only after funding for ongoing projects is committed and appropriated.	The Preferred Alternative lays out a vision that would require separate, project-level studies to implement. Those project-level or Tier 2 projects are expected to be implemented in an incremental manner. The Preferred Alternative includes an initial phase to reflect the more immediate needs of the Northeast Corridor and the importance of incremental implementation of the Preferred Alternative. Volume 1, Chapter 10, Phasing and Implementation, further describes this.

Table JJ–23: Stakeholder Comments (Elected Officials, Tribes, Federal Agencies, State Agencies, Local Agencies): Other (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
SCCRWA_Norris	In closing, let me again express strong support for the DEIS process and future improvements to the Northeast Corridor.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative to improve passenger rail service on the NEC in a manner that will enhance mobility options and expand passenger rail service in support of future population and employment growth in the Study Area. The Preferred Alternative—described in Volume 1, Chapter 4—improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects.
SCRCOG_Amento	In closing, let us again express strong support for the DEIS process and future improvements to the Northeast Corridor. We encourage you to issue a final EIS that recommends (1) dramatically improved commuter travel time from New Haven to New York City on the coastal route, including the necessary infrastructure improvements; (2) improved travel time and more frequent service to and from Washington and Boston on the coastal route, Hartford-Springfield route; and (3) a final decision to not move forward with the Central Connecticut alignment.	<p>The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit. The Preferred Alternative brings the existing NEC to a state of good repair and maximizes its capacity through alleviation of chokepoints, addition of new tracks and segments at targeted locations, and implementation of service operational efficiencies. The Preferred Alternative includes an enhanced, electrified Hartford/Springfield Line. The Preferred Alternative also removes speed restrictions where practical and safe, reduces trip times, offers frequent Metropolitan and enhanced Intercity-Express services, and allows substantial growth for all Regional rail markets. For additional information on the Preferred Alternative, see Volume 1, Chapter 4.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative does not include the Hartford, CT, to Providence, RI, routing options. However, the FRA recognizes it is possible that in future decades there may be need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions include examination and implementation of expansion.</p>
SEPTA_Knueppel	SEPTA supports an alternative that can meet the future rail demand of the Northeast Region and Southeastern Pennsylvania in particular. Given the long time horizon and uncertainty about funding, no alternative should limit the ability for future investments to meet the changing conditions and need for rail service. With SEPTA's Regional Rail ridership having grown at an unprecedented rate over the last decade, it is important for infrastructure improvements to keep pace.	The NEC states and railroads are critical partners in the future of the NEC and ultimately will be responsible for advancing many of the individual projects necessary to achieve the objective of a reliable and safe NEC capable of accommodating future ridership demand. Volume 1, Chapter 4, describes the Preferred Alternative as well as the FRA's deliberative process, which included consideration of future flexibility to meet changing conditions and opportunities for technology and service delivery.
Springfield_Mayor Sarno	I implore you to require the FRA to review and address these deficiencies before an alternative is selected and the Final Environmental Impact Statement is prepared. Otherwise, we cannot and do not support the actions contained in this Draft EIS.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. In identifying the Preferred Alternative, the FRA noted interest in including service on Hartford/Springfield Line, and between Springfield-Worcester-Boston as part of the Preferred Alternative. As discussed in Volume 1, Chapter 4, the Preferred Alternative includes an enhanced, electrified Hartford/Springfield Line, leveraging recent and future investments to create intermodal connections and strengthen existing urban centers. The inclusion of the Hartford/Springfield Line into the Preferred Alternative creates the possibility for new opportunities and improved connections north and east of Springfield. Additional discussion of the improved services to Springfield and improved connectivity to the north and east are included in Volume 1, Chapters 4, 5 and 6. Additionally, the Environmental Justice effects assessment (Volume 1, Chapter 7.11) further describes the effects on Springfield.
USACE_Haggerty	The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Regulatory Program has lent robust support to this effort as it evolved over the past four years from its origin as one of five projects identified by the Council on Environmental Quality as part of a pilot program to identify and promote more efficient ways to perform effective environmental reviews. Originally referred to as the Northeast Corridor High-Speed Rail Pilot, the original objectives were to 1) expedite the environmental reviews for high-speed passenger rail service in the Northeast Corridor through an innovative and more efficient collaborative process; and 2) Identify lessons learned and establish best practices for large-scale and multi-state projects integrated and tiered decision-making, and similar infrastructure programs. We appreciate the efforts of your agency and consulting team in successfully leading a mu ti-faceted collaborative process that informed preparation of the Draft EIS which your agency released for public comment on November 10, 2015.	Thank you for your participation and collaboration during the NEC FUTURE process. Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, the public comment process, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA has identified a Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4). Agency coordination and participation was meaningful in the FRA's alternatives development and Preferred Alternative deliberative process. The FRA remains committed to ongoing collaboration with stakeholders moving forward toward implementation of a Preferred Alternative and appreciates the involvement of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers throughout the process.

Table JJ–23: Stakeholder Comments (Elected Officials, Tribes, Federal Agencies, State Agencies, Local Agencies): Other (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment	Response
USACE_Haggerty	We recognize that this is a Tier 1 corridor-level Draft EIS which in and of itself may not be intended to provide the necessary level of National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documentation to support issuance of Department of the Army permits authorizing work in jurisdictional waters of the United States which may be undertaken in conjunction with specific projects. However, I anticipate that the New England, New York, Philadelphia and Baltimore Districts of the Corps will appropriately utilize the findings in the upcoming Final EIS to inform, and/or augment, any project-specific NEPA analyses that are required as they review permit applications for projects along the Northeast Corridor that may be submitted by a number different applicants.	The NEC FUTURE program follows a "tiered" approach to environmental review. Tier 1 focuses on broad programs and initial analysis. Tier 2 focuses on site-specific, project-level proposals and impacts. Within the context of the Tier 1 process, NEC FUTURE will not seek the issuance of permits related to effects to hydrologic/water resources from the Preferred Alternative. Such decisions will be made as part of Tier 2 project studies, which will include field work to delineate jurisdictional waters of the United States, specific mitigation and permitting actions. The FRA evaluated the effects of implementing the Preferred Alternative on hydrologic and water resources in Volume 1, Chapter 7.5.
USCG_Knowles	The main USCG Bridge program concern is that proposed bridges don't become obstructions to navigation. In doing this the USCG approves the construction of bridges and specifically the navigable channel clearances beneath the proposed bridges, such as horizontal and vertical clearances at Mean High Water (MHW). The applicant must identify, early in the process, the numbers and types of navigation by Public Notice and Navigation Study for each proposed bridge. Many bridges will not require a Bridge Permit due to the lack of navigation. Approvals and Bridge Permits will always consider the reasonable needs of navigation. If the waterway is tidal but only has small boats and no commerce it can be an Advance Approval not requiring a Bridge Permit. Please address the proposed waterway crossings to include: Is it a new bridge; Use of existing bridge; Water depth; Vertical clearance at MHW; Horizontal clearance; Tidal or not; Waterway commerce; Number of vessels on waterway; Types and sizes of vessels; Is it just an up-graded rail; And potential impacts. You can use this Coast Guard website for the Bridge Permit Application Guide and Navigation Study guidelines. http://www.uscg.mil/hq/cg5/cg551/BPAG_Page.asp	<p>As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure in the Tier 1 Record of Decision. Such decisions will be made as part of the Tier 2 project planning processes, which will include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate.</p> <p>During subsequent Tier 2 project studies, bridge crossings will be evaluated further and identify the need for Navigation Studies, approvals, and bridge permits in coordination with U.S. Coast Guard.</p>

Source: NEC FUTURE team, 2016

Table JJ–24: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Other

Commenter ID	Comment Text	Response Text
Adam-Kearns_Mi	In looking at the Alternative 2&3 proposals it appears that the "Hop River" and "Airline" multi-purpose trails would be maintained parallel to the proposed rail corridor . It also appears, from the maps, that the multi purpose trail would be extended to Providence. This would be fantastic. A suggestion I have, is to pave these trails so the very active and large cycling community of the region could use these trails more effectively, especially for commuting and regional connectivity. It would be a dream come true for many of us, especially if it connected all the way to Hartford as a safe means of bicycle travel.	As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions for passenger rail within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process. NEC FUTURE does not propose any improvements to recreational resources, such as the trails mentioned. However, the FRA has considered the federal trails in evaluating the environmental consequences of the Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 7.4).
Adams_Gr	Wouldn't improved rail service, both freight and passenger be a good thing? Greyhound bus might resent competition, but other than that?	<p>By 2040, continued population and employment growth in the Study Area is expected to create increasing demand for travel options across the passenger transportation system—rail, air, auto, transit, and intercity bus. A well-defined and coordinated investment program to support both preservation and enhancement of the NEC is critical to connect passenger and freight markets with established and growing business centers in the Study Area.</p> <p>Volume 1, Chapter 3, provides a summary of the Purpose and Need. The FRA evaluated the alternatives presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS to determine how well each met the Purpose and Need and established goals and objectives. The evaluation presented and feedback provided during the public comment period led the FRA to identify a Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4).</p>
Allen_Th	A full time inspector on each project should be retained to control costs.	The NEC FUTURE program follows a "tiered" approach to environmental review. Tier 1 focuses on broad programs and initial analysis. Tier 2 focuses on site-specific, project-level proposals and impacts. For the Tier 1 EIS process, the FRA did not address project delivery as part of NEC FUTURE, appropriate with a Tier 1 level of detail. Cost control practices, including the use of inspectors, will be addressed during the development of as part of the Tier 2 project planning process.
Allen_Th	Organizational changes should be done before electronics and concrete	The NEC FUTURE program follows a "tiered" approach to environmental review. Tier 1 focuses on broad programs and initial analysis. Tier 2 focuses on site-specific, project-level proposals and impacts. Changes to operations, such as organizational practices of railroads operating on the NEC, will be addressed during subsequent Tier 2 project studies.
Allyn_Ch	I would like to echo a lot of what I heard today, particularly improving our rail network for people in rural communities like the one that I live in in far northwestern Connecticut.	The FRA undertook an extensive process to identify and evaluate a range of alternatives. Some alternatives focused on existing rail infrastructure while others proposed off-corridor routes to expand the geographic reach of passenger rail. The process and range of alternatives considered is documented in Volume 2, Chapter 4 and Appendix B. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Anderson_Ge	Fantastic investments have been made in airport and highway transportation. Its time that we make the same level of investments in our rail networks.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4).
Arena_Ri	The Association for Public Transportation, and its affiliate organization the Massachusetts Association of Railroad Passengers (APT) strongly supports the construction of high speed passenger rail service (220 mph) to more efficiently connect Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Washington and additional destinations beyond the existing corridor. We consider this a vital regional and national necessity, for a host of environmental and economic reasons. As you are aware, although the region served by the Northeast Corridor is one of the United States major economic engines, our transportation infrastructure lags far behind the global standard, undermining our long-term competitiveness. Poor transportation weighs particularly heavily on a region whose primary resource is our skilled workforce. This substantial disadvantage needs to be urgently and decisively corrected.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative to improve passenger rail service on the NEC in a manner that will enhance mobility options and expand passenger rail service in support of future population and employment growth in the Study Area. The Preferred Alternative—described in Volume 1, Chapter 4—improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. The improved mobility, frequency of service and range of pricing options provided by the Preferred Alternative results in an economic benefit to corridor. Volume 1, Chapter 6, discusses the economic effects of the Preferred Alternative.

Table JJ–24: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Other (continued)

Commenter ID	Comment Text	Response Text
Arena_Ri	While we commend the FRA for the leadership and expertise is has brought to advancing this necessary and challenging project, we are concerned that the current DEIR overlooks key elements critical to its successful implementation and the maximization its long-term value. We are also concerned that the DEIR does not establish any global context for the improvements it proposes, without which many decision makers may not fully appreciate the urgency and necessity of the required investments.	The NEC FUTURE program follows a "tiered" approach to environmental review. Tier 1 focuses on broad programs and initial analysis. Tier 2 focuses on site-specific, project-level proposals and impacts. As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure in the Tier 1 Record of Decision. Such decisions will be made as part of the Tier 2 project studies, which will include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate. Volume 1, Chapter 4, describes the Preferred Alternative and Volume 1, Chapter 10, discusses phasing and implementation of the Preferred Alternative.
Aronow_My	What an awful idea	The FRA considered both opposing and supporting views on the NEC FUTURE program in preparing the Tier 1 Final EIS and identifying a Preferred Alternative. Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative that improves the existing NEC to a state of good repair and includes new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Averill_An	Don't do it.	The FRA considered both opposing and supporting views on the NEC FUTURE program in preparing the Tier 1 Final EIS and identifying a Preferred Alternative. Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative that improves the existing NEC to a state of good repair and includes new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Azimi_Sa	I am here also just to voice my support for investment in Connecticut's transportation future. I have lived in Connecticut my whole life, I'm from Storrs actually, and in that area and everywhere around Connecticut it is very difficult to get around and not be car-dependent. This intersects with so many facets of life in Connecticut, like the urban dynamics that we have, and our environmental footprint and just connectivity, quality of life, access to jobs, economic growth.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4). In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative provides connections along the existing NEC, along a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, and along the Hartford/Springfield Line.
Baker_Na	I commuted on the train (New London-New Haven) for 15 months. It was frustrating.It seemed to me that our country should have better service and - most importantly - more reliable service. For example, the weather should not affect the trains as much as it does (too hot, trains delayed and same issue if it is too cold because the tracks are brittle).	The purpose of NEC FUTURE is to upgrade aging infrastructure and to improve the reliability, capacity, connectivity, performance, and resiliency of future passenger rail service on the NEC for both Intercity and Regional trips, while promoting environmental sustainability and continues economic growth. Volume 1, Chapter 7.15 Climate Change and Adaptation, discusses the effects of extreme temperatures on rail infrastructure.
Becker_Br	While many positive ideas were presented, the three alternatives presented were viewed by many as not necessarily the best way to assemble a multi-decade investment plan. Instead, various projects from each of the alternatives should be considered within a either short-term or long-term timespan, or in some cases not considered at all regardless of the time span. ... many very important and vital projects have been presented in the DEIS and we urge that a fresh look at how these projects are grouped is critical.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4). The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints and adds capacity to support more-frequent, faster, and more-reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. Volume 1, Chapter 10, discusses the phasing and implementation of the Preferred Alternative. Upon completion of the Tier 1 NEPA process, the Preferred Alternative will be carried forward into a Service Development Plan. The Service Development Plan will begin to lay out the sequencing and next steps for implementation. The FRA has established a Working Group with the NEC states and railroads that will plan the work necessary to define and advance an Initial Phase of the Preferred Alternative.

Table JJ–24: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Other (continued)

Commenter ID	Comment Text	Response Text
Becker_Iv	We need faster commutes to NYC from CT. A two hour train ride from Danbury the Grand Central is just unacceptable in this day and age.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4). The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints, and adds capacity to support more-frequent, faster, and more-reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers. Danbury is currently served and would continue to be served by Metro-North Railroad; improvements included with the Preferred Alternative between New Haven and New York City would result in improved travel times and frequency of service for Regional Rail service between Danbury, CT, and Grand Central Terminal (NYC); additionally, new opportunities to connect to express service at Stamford would be available (Volume 1, Chapter 4) further improving both frequency and travel times for travelers between Danbury and New York City.
Behringer_Fr	I suggest any proposals be more carefully considered before any further decisions are made for such a costly and consequential undertaking.	The FRA considered nearly 100 different ideas about improvements to the NEC and thoughtfully narrowed this list to the Action Alternatives evaluated in the Tier 1 Draft EIS. Decisions about routing, service, and infrastructure improvements incorporated into the Preferred Alternative reflect a thorough technical analysis and extensive public and stakeholder outreach. Project-level studies will provide an opportunity to further evaluate site-specific options or alternatives within the broad scope of the Preferred Alternative.
Bell_We	I feel that more trains should be added that one can upgrade from coach to either Business Class or add in a First Class, especially on the Regional Routes.	Although the FRA has not included specifics on train and station amenities in the Tier 1 EIS process, the Preferred Alternative includes investments to enhance the attractiveness and convenience of passenger rail services. Amenities would be addressed during subsequent Tier 2 project studies.
Berthet_Ch	Per Manhattan Community Board letter to Joseph H. Boardman, President Amtrak, dated May 15, 2015, We are disappointed that the EIS does not contemplate one option and does not include an impact study, both priorities for Manhattan CB4 and crucial for a strategic long-term regional transportation network Option - Direct Access to the East Side/East Side subway lines for West of the Hudson River commuters: Even with creative mitigations, the Penn Station accessed west side subway system (particularly the E train, which goes to the east side from Penn Station) will likely be saturated beyond existing subway lines with the projected Gateway Program growth. Enabling direct commuter lines from New Jersey to the east side will enable more options and thus easier rail commute and avoid oversaturating the subway system; Study -We encourage Amtrak to ensure the EIS for the future Gateway phases include the affects a 50% increase in commuters will have on the surrounding mass transit systems - both below (from Penn Station) and above ground subway platforms, entrances/exits, surrounding bus lines, 6th through 9th Avenue sidewalks and street usage and bicycle (include bicycle lanes), pedestrian and vehicular traffic will all be affected. This impact, particularly related to subways, will need to take in account the cumulative effects of plans to increase by 35% the capacity of the Port Authority Bus Terminal, which shares subway lines and 8th Avenue to disgorge its commuters and should include examining building new subway tunnels for projected substantial impacted lines such as the A, C and, as mentioned above, E trains. It should also examine the requirements for increased 8th Avenue sidewalk capacity and its effect on the number of traffic lanes.	The FRA is coordinating with Amtrak and has shared this letter with them.
Berthet_Ch	Per Manhattan Community Board letter to Joseph H. Boardman, President Amtrak, dated May 15, 2015, We are disappointed that the EIS does not contemplate one option and does not include an impact study, both priorities for Manhattan CB4 and crucial for a strategic long-term regional transportation network. ... We encourage Amtrak to ensure the EIS for the future Gateway phases include...	The Gateway Program is Amtrak 's proposed set of strategic infrastructure improvements to improve service and address capacity constraints in the area of New York City in New York and New Jersey. The Gateway Program is separate from the NEC FUTURE program. NEC FUTURE does evaluate overall capacity needs and potential improvements for the entire NEC including the New York City area. The FRA coordinates closely with Amtrak about the Gateway program.

Table JJ–24: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Other (continued)

Commenter ID	Comment Text	Response Text
Bick_Ta	really, we're once again going to eminent domain property for corporations for people who don't have 10-15 minutes in their life to relax and take in the sights? And who gets to absorb the costs in the end, certainly not Amtrak and we all know the prices will be outrageous and unridable for normal people, Once again being irresponsible and catering to corporate America	The FRA considered both opposing and supporting views on the NEC FUTURE program in preparing the Tier 1 Final EIS and identifying a Preferred Alternative. Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative that improves the existing NEC to a state of good repair and includes new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Bonomo_Ni	And identifying Alternative 1 as a preferred scenario does not exclude the need for careful environmental review and the inevitable need for planning and design work that would avoid any environmental damage that presents a significant threat either on a temporary or permanent basis.	As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure in the Tier 1 Record of Decision. Such decisions will be made as part of the Tier 2 project planning processes, which will include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate.
Brassell_Ro	It has been FAR TOO LONG for our nation 's Northeast Corridor (NEC) and its many accompanying transit stations, inclusive of Amtrak 's Pennsylvania Station complex, to be hopefully finally improved upon... it hopefully finally will be the actually-public-friendly-and-accommodating professional experience, care, accommodation and service all of us, inclusive of LL, ALL INCLUSIVE, visitors, customers, patrons, investors, tourists and admirers, ALL INCLUSIVE, have come to expect and want from Amtrak, its Northeast Corridor and its many accompanying transit stations	Although the FRA has not included specifics on station amenities in the Tier 1 EIS process, the Preferred Alternative includes investments to enhance the attractiveness and convenience of station services (as described in Volume 1, Chapter 4). The Preferred Alternative focuses on better connections between passenger rail services and improved access to those services to the multimodal transportation system. Site-specific or location-specific decisions of design configurations will be the subject of subsequent Tier 2 project studies.
Bremer_Ma	Glad to see a proposal to upgrade the rail line through CT. I understand the concerns of those property owners that may be affected along any proposed route, however there must be the will to proceed forward for the benefit of the greater public. The I-95 corridor is over traveled as it is....this country must invest in this type of infrastructure if we are to move forward.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4).
Brown_Ro	The railroad network in the United States especially in the NEC is outdated and it needs a 21st century feel and look we should take note from the Japanese and Europeans on high speed rail travel as insight.	Specific details about train equipment, and passenger and station amenities have not been evaluated as part of the Tier 1 EIS process. Amenities will be considered in future project development, such as part of Tier 2 project studies.
Bruhl_Ch	How are the needs of all stakeholders in the corridor considered? Have the New York Metropolitan Transportation Authority (MTA), Amtrak, ConnDOT and freight operators been convened to identify improvements that are needed to satisfy the current projected demand for rail travel in the region? Shouldn 't such a plan be developed? At what point in this process do impacts on other operators become known and resolved? Finally, how are differences in opinion between the FRA and other entities such as the State of Connecticut, local elected officials, or the MTA resolved?	The FRA is working in close collaboration with each of the mentioned agencies and in fact each of the states, the District of Columbia, freight and passenger railroads who operate or interface with the NEC. The Northeast Corridor Infrastructure and Operations Advisory Commission (NEC Commission) provides a forums for organizing this on-going coordination through regular meetings, working groups and ad-hoc as needed. To date differences have been addressed through this on-going collaborative process. The FRA intends to continue to utilize a similar forum for engaging each of the stakeholders in dialogue throughout the NEC FUTURE process. Details regarding this on-going working relationship are described in Volume 1, Chapter 10, Phasing and Implementation.
Bugge_St	I fully support a major investment into the rail system.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative to improve passenger rail service on the NEC in a manner that will enhance mobility options and expand passenger rail service in support of future population and employment growth in the Study Area. The Preferred Alternative—described in Volume 1, Chapter 4—improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects.
Burghardt_Ch	Don't destroy part of our culture	The FRA considered both opposing and supporting views on the NEC FUTURE program in preparing the Tier 1 Final EIA and identifying a Preferred Alternative. Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative that improves the existing NEC to a state of good repair and includes new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.

Table JJ–24: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Other (continued)

Commenter ID	Comment Text	Response Text
Carbone_Vi	If NEC Future unveils the improvement project plans when will they be unveiled?	This Tier 1 Final EIS identifies a Preferred Alternative vision. If the FRA selects the Preferred Alternative for implementation in its Record of Decision, this Tier 1 EIS identifies service and infrastructure elements of the Preferred Alternative that would need to be included in Tier 2 project studies. The FRA will not make decisions about specific alignments or infrastructure, facilities, or equipment or related design elements of the Preferred Alternative. Project sponsors will make those more-detailed, project-specific decisions in the subsequent Tier 2 project studies, or if outside the federal-funding process, in other planning processes or future studies.
Carver_Ga	I am firmly against this proposal.	The FRA considered both opposing and supporting views on the NEC FUTURE program in preparing the Tier 1 Final EIS and identifying a Preferred Alternative. Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative that improves the existing NEC to a state of good repair and includes new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Casey_Ca	While I understand the importance that high speed rail service holds for our economic development,	The FRA considered customer convenience and attractiveness of passenger rail service in developing the Preferred Alternative; travel times were emphasized over travel speed.
Cassidy_Ja	While the current effort is billed as a draft EIS , I, for one, have little confidence in the federal (or state and municipal) government adequately addressing critical environmental, cultural, or personal life issues that such a venture is certain to produce. As another participant in the Hartford hearing put it so well: there will be pain and suffering produced by such monsters as the use of eminent domain , but this must be explained and managed at every step of the process.	As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, and will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure in the Tier 1 Record of Decision. Such decisions will be made as part of the Tier 2 project planning processes, which will include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate. Consistent with this process, the FRA developed Representative Routes for the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative, which provided a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the effects of each Alternative. Representative Routes define an envelope within which improvements might occur and whose location and construction type could change during subsequent Tier 2 project studies. Implementation of the Preferred Alternative includes the potential for acquisition or displacements. Tier 2 project analysis will identify any necessary acquisitions, temporary easements, and displacements, and would will require compliance with the Uniform Relocation Act.
Cecil_Ch	A little less focus on the environment and a little more focus on the functionality of the rail system and fulfillment of the railroad's paramount objective (moving people and freight from place to place)	Regional transportation benefits and the role of the NEC are the primary focus of NEC FUTURE. The Purpose and Need (Volume 2, Chapter 3) for NEC FUTURE reflects that emphasis. The environmental effects assessment is a requirement of the federal project development and funding process and fulfills the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act and the FRA's Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts. Volume 1, Chapters 4 and 5, describe the specific aspects of railroad operations considered in the development of the Action Alternatives. Volume 2, Appendix B, provides additional analysis of railroad operations.
Cerrone_Br	As for Amtrack the government should invest that money in creating a real high speed cost effective super train from NY to Boston and other hubs on the East coast. Currently air travel is faster and cheaper	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative that supports access to urban centers and that is competitive with other modes. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Childs_Su	I have never heard of a worse idea. PERIOD.	The FRA considered both opposing and supporting views on the NEC FUTURE program in preparing the Tier 1 Final EIS and identifying a Preferred Alternative. Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative that improves the existing NEC to a state of good repair and includes new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.

Table JJ–24: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Other (continued)

Commenter ID	Comment Text	Response Text
Colbert_Ra	The network needs to go west from NYC to Pittsburgh and to Chicago. A maglev there would be a plus.	<p>The FRA has identified a Preferred Alternative that improves the existing NEC and includes new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environmental effects. Volume 1, Chapter 4, describes the Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>In separate studies, the FRA continues to explore new technologies such as maglev and is currently sponsoring a study of maglev between Baltimore and Washington, D.C. Such a system would require separate stations, and would not support run-through trains from connecting corridors nor offer proven integration efficiencies with today’s NEC infrastructure and operators. For these reasons, the FRA did not incorporate advanced guideway or similar new technologies in the Alternatives Development Process. The Preferred Alternative does not include maglev. However, it also does not preclude the option in the future of building new transportation corridors supporting other technologies such as maglev.</p>
Comins_Pa	the details are very difficult to assess from the maps that are provided. This is a huge plan, with major implications for Connecticut. The Environmental Impact Statement needs to do a better job of outlining resources, such as private easements, NGO and municipal open space, habitat for state-listed species and also for species of global concern, as noted by the IUCN Red List... and features such as interior forest habitat, as identified by the Center for Land Use Education and Research, a part of UConn.	The FRA considered effects on the built and natural environment, including visual and aesthetic resources in identifying the Preferred Alternative. After evaluating the environmental impacts and costs, the FRA did not include the routing option between Hartford, CT, and Providence, RI, in the Preferred Alternative. However, the FRA recognizes the importance of strengthening markets in Connecticut, and as those markets mature with the improved service, the Preferred Alternative does not preclude the opportunity to connect markets in the future. Volume 1, Chapter 4, provides more detail on the Preferred Alternative.
Comins_Pa	We strongly suggest that consideration be given to reducing the existing tidal restrictions created by the existing rail lines as coastal routes are upgraded. That's causing a major problem for tidal marshes up and down the East Coast, and I think this would be an opportunity to address some of that.	The NEC FUTURE program follows a "tiered" approach to environmental review. Tier 1 focuses on broad programs and initial analysis. Tier 2 focuses on site-specific, project-level proposals and impacts. Within the context of the Tier 1 process, NEC FUTURE will not make final decisions about mitigating existing tidal restrictions. Such decisions will be made as part of the Tier 2 project planning processes, which will include compliance with Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, state laws, and regulations to protect wetlands, and further define the effects on floodplains and determine the actual results of encroaching/filling identified floodplains at specific locations, as well as include the development of mitigation measures and designs that would avoid or minimize the effects on floodplains. The FRA evaluated the effects of the Preferred Alternative on coastal zones and saltwater wetlands as part of its analysis on coastal resources (Volume 1, Chapter 7.5).
Comins_Pa	Finally, the tunnel under Long Island Sound would likely have its own issues, depending on the tunnel construction methodology, and we would need a lot more detail to be able to properly assess that, especially since this route appears to cross some very unique, important and productive hard substrate bottomlands of Long Island Sound.	<p>The FRA has identified a Preferred Alternative that focuses improvements along the existing NEC with targeted new segments to alleviate chokepoints and increase capacity. The Preferred Alternative does not include the Long Island Sound crossing associated with Alternative 3. Volume 1, Chapter 4, provides a description of the Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.</p>
Corcoran_Ma	The fact that the original railway was laid in a most intrusive position through scenic wetlands with maximum disturbance doesn't mean the state should exacerbate the situation even further. Please reconsider this plan.	The FRA considered both opposing and supporting views on the NEC FUTURE program in preparing the Tier 1 Final EIS and identifying a Preferred Alternative. Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative that improves the existing NEC to a state of good repair and includes new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Coudert_Ho	In other words, our family and friends would use and support Shore Line East service to Mystic, and better train service would improve business and quality of life (less car traffic) in several ways	The Preferred Alternative includes upgrade of the existing NEC shoreline route with a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, as envisioned in Alternative 1. In addition, the Preferred Alternative adds service to a new station in the areas of Mystic and New London, CT. For additional details on the Preferred Alternative, see Volume 1, Chapter 4.

Table JJ–24: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Other (continued)

Commenter ID	Comment Text	Response Text
Cuthbert_Ma	I am not in favor of this NEC Future plan. I live too close to Amtrak already and never use the train as it is too expensive. It is in my backyard and I do not wish it in anybody' else's. It should never have followed the shoreline.....it has ruined the northeast corridor. Let it not ruin any other pristine land, shoreline or private property again.	The FRA considered both opposing and supporting views on the NEC FUTURE program in preparing the Tier 1 Final EIS and identifying a Preferred Alternative. Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative that improves the existing NEC to a state of good repair and includes new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Davis_Ca	Please do not do this! The best asset about this area is the natural bucolic setting. You will ruin it forever. Add a couple of non-stop trains if you must. The trains are fast enough. How many is it really serving? You will destroy natural habitats and residential neighborhoods.	The FRA considered both opposing and supporting views on the NEC FUTURE program in preparing the Tier 1 Final EIS and identifying a Preferred Alternative. Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative that improves the existing NEC to a state of good repair and includes new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Davis_Sa	I want more transparency on the 30th Street Station redevelopment project... 30th Street Station needs to be renamed to Franklin or Philadelphia Central or something more meaningful.... The new development proposals do not include amenities the city needs, like performing arts venues and a town hall... We need the Broadway Limited service restored, it should originate in Boston or New York, or even in DC. The current connection via Pittsburgh is useless for going to Chicago and beyond... As for the congestion in Chicago, there used to be alternate routes like through St. Louis and east from there or south of Chicago, what happened to them? It may require the government to operate another loop train to ease congestion... There must be a train from Chicago to Duluth via Eau Claire and St. Paul... Service from Denver to Salt Lake City to Seattle should also be restored. Many lines need restoration... What about a train from the US all the way to Mexico City and beyond?... I think there should be a northern route from St. Paul to Boston through Canada, and from St. Paul to Kansas City and Texas. It would also be good if cross-country trains just stopped in Chicago instead of having to change trains.	As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, will not make local decisions, such as local development or renaming existing stations. The NEC FUTURE Study Area is focused on the eight states and District of Columbia that include portions of the NEC.
Davis_Sa	Amtrak no longer has anti-macassars on your seats, but left the velcro in place to catch on and tear up clothing. Put back the anti-macassars. Have pillows and blankets for at least a small fee. Stop this crazy bs of allowing pets on board. They can only go in a baggage car, not coach. It's an outrage, an insult to other passengers. Horrendous decision. It violates the rights of other passengers to safe, hypo-allergenic, smell-free quiet rides. The bathrooms need to be less smelly. The flush water needs something better, and the room needs something to absorb smells... It used to be so reasonable to have a compartment, a roomette, just \$40 or 50 extra. The meals are high-priced for what you get, the menu incredibly limited. The cafe still has unbalanced offerings, particularly west of Chicago. There should be no third-party involved in food and beverages. It should be Amtrak staff only, and only one manager above the food attendant, not several. The stores of food and beverage should be refilled at every major city.	Although the FRA has not included specifics on train and station maintenance and amenities in the Tier 1 EIS process, the Preferred Alternative includes investments to support infrastructure and operational improvements for passenger rail services and at stations. Volume 1, Chapter 4, provides representative operational improvements. Specific amenities and operational improvements will be addressed during subsequent Tier 2 project studies.
Delaney_Ma	It is a short sighted, potentially devastating plan with few benefits.	The FRA considered both opposing and supporting views on the NEC FUTURE program in preparing the Tier 1 Final EIS and identifying a Preferred Alternative. Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative that improves the existing NEC to a state of good repair and includes new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Denya_Ro	Why is the government so anxious to spend money, ruin property values, destroy the environment, all in the name of speed? Oh wait, that's right, because it's all about them! Another example of not giving one hoot what the PEOPLE want. Or deserve.	The FRA considered both opposing and supporting views on the NEC FUTURE program in preparing the Tier 1 Final EIS and identifying a Preferred Alternative. Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative that improves the existing NEC to a state of good repair and includes new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.

Table JJ–24: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Other (continued)

Commenter ID	Comment Text	Response Text
Devins_Ma	There is not doubt that the US needs efficient, effective and affordable public transportation. AMTRAK is the major rail corridor on the east coast and sorely needs improvement.	The purpose of NEC FUTURE is to upgrade aging infrastructure and to improve the reliability, capacity, connectivity, performance, and resiliency of future passenger rail service on the NEC for both Intercity and Regional trips, while promoting environmental sustainability and continues economic growth. Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative to improve passenger rail service on the NEC in a manner that will enhance mobility options and expand passenger rail service in support of future population and employment growth in the Study Area. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Distler_Ga	It is important that Amtrak maintain and improver rail service on this important railway that links someone the Americans largest and most dankly populated etropolitan areas. With out reliable and frequent rail users people will have no alternative but to drive on the Northeast already crowded roads or take short flights. As more people flock to central cities the needed for world class rail travel will become more necessary as these house people less likely to own a car or have access to parking. For the northeast to remain an internationally economically competitive region it needs reliable, frequent and affordable rail travel connecting all its cities.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative that improves passenger rail service on the NEC in a manner that will enhance mobility options and expand passenger rail service in support of future population and employment growth in the Study Area, including major northeast cities. The Preferred Alternative—described in Volume 1, Chapter 4—improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects.
Dolce_Au	It seems that there is a connection between the northeast corner and other areas of Connecticut, even with jobs. People who may not be able to find a job in their community could then find one somewhere else and get to it. The commute would be shorter and financially that would be beneficial for them. So overall something like this really can be beneficial financially for individuals, for the environment, and it can keep people in Connecticut and even bring new people into Connecticut.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4). In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative provides connections along the existing NEC, along a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, and along the Hartford/Springfield Line.
Dosh_St	NEC future ? What ever . It i spretty built out already ...Do high speed rail out West somewhere it will make a positive difference , there is no real environment (desert) and AMTRAK will not be competing with http://www.megabus.com . us /s a guy in Hawai'i and his ohana	The FRA considered both opposing and supporting views on the NEC FUTURE program in preparing the Tier 1 Final EIA and identifying a Preferred Alternative. Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative that improves the existing NEC to a state of good repair and includes new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Edwards_Br	I also feel the project is tremendous in scope and very light on actual information. You talk about some sort of overhead equipment but nothing is really concrete as to where it's going.	As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, and will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure in the Tier 1 Record of Decision. Such decisions will be made as part of the Tier 2 project planning processes, which will include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate. Description of the Preferred Alternative is provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4. Volume 1, Chapter 7, Affected Environment, Environmental Consequences, and Mitigation Strategies, describes the environmental effects of the Preferred Alternative within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process.
Edwards_Er	I find it hard to believe that building an entirely new rail system is more efficient than updating the existing one.	The FRA's Preferred Alternative focuses on the existing NEC, with the addition of service via the existing New Haven-Hartford-Springfield Corridor. Possible off-corridor routings, while not specifically included in the Preferred Alternative, in some cases represent future opportunities that are not precluded based on the decisions of the Preferred Alternative.
Eklof_Es	a Connecticut treasure of art, growth, community between youth and experience. We need to preserve communities--build rather than cut out. Please investigate with depth that which "outsiders"consider be done with a healthy, community that is working to bring quality expertise to the youth.	The FRA considered both opposing and supporting views on the NEC FUTURE program in preparing the Tier 1 Final EIS and identifying a Preferred Alternative. Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative that improves the existing NEC to a state of good repair and includes new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.

Table JJ–24: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Other (continued)

Commenter ID	Comment Text	Response Text
ElliottLewis_Da	you should have that alternative option to take a train and do so comfortably and do so safely and quickly that we just don't have today.	The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit. The Preferred Alternative brings the existing NEC to a state of good repair and maximizes its capacity through alleviation of chokepoints, addition of new tracks and segments at targeted locations, and implementation of service operational efficiencies. The Preferred Alternative also removes speed restrictions where practical and safe, reduces trip times, offers frequent Metropolitan and enhanced express Intercity services, and allows substantial growth for all Regional rail markets. Volume 1, Chapter 4, describes the Preferred Alternative.
Ensinger_Bi	And while you're at it, extend the Newark airport Monorail to Newark Penn Station. I believe this is the best option for improving mobility to Newark Airport for a variety of reasons, primarily that making a hub at one location creates the greatest number of options for the greatest number of people to make connections all at one location, and FAR better than extending PATH to Newark Airport, which creates connections only for those using PATH.	Extension of the Newark Airport's AirTrain (monorail) to Newark Penn Station or the proposed PATH extension to Newark Airport are both outside the scope of NEC FUTURE, which focuses on passenger rail service along the existing Northeast Corridor. The FRA forwarded these comments to the Port Authority of New York & New Jersey and NJ TRANSIT, which are separately advancing a study of the PATH extension to Newark Airport.
Essue_He	where when someone has public transportation, probably like this, it's basically a pooled resource that's going to impact a lot of people. So therefore, this is one way the least privileged in our society can get the benefits of a pooled resource.	Public transportation can provide a benefit to many when it provides flexibility, good connections, and a range of pricing options. The FRA recognizes this and identified a Preferred Alternative that offers a range of service and pricing (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4).
Etter_El	I strongly support improved rail service for the Northeast Corridor.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative to improve passenger rail service on the NEC in a manner that will enhance mobility options and expand passenger rail service in support of future population and employment growth in the Study Area. The Preferred Alternative—described in Volume 1, Chapter 4—improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects.
Fanelli_St	stop wasting taxpayer dollars even considering absurd projects such as this	The FRA's identification of a Preferred Alternative considered a range of factors, including costs as well as traveler, economic development, and environmental benefits and impacts.
Farwell_An	I've read a great deal of your report, not all of it, but I also found it really helpful.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4).
Faryard_Do	Trying to reduce my global warming solution was very difficult for me to do without different rail options and alternative transportation. So the decision to want to be less dependent on my car is definitely not something that only I experienced but young people today are experiencing. More and more young people are deciding to live in communities with better alternative transportation options and deciding to not buy a car. So definitely the decision to have alternative transportation like rail will be a great step forward to making sure that young people are seeing the transportation future that they want to see but also will help in our decision to stay in places like the Northeast.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4).
Feliciano_Tr	This is a waste of taxpayer dollars and you are endangering without regard the environment and history of specific areas of CT. No thank you. Completely against it . CT is not your highway between NY and Boston for you to run through and poop on.	The FRA considered both opposing and supporting views on the NEC FUTURE program in preparing the Tier 1 Final EIS and identifying a Preferred Alternative. Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative that improves the existing NEC to a state of good repair and includes new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.

Table JJ–24: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Other (continued)

Commenter ID	Comment Text	Response Text
Fenyk_He	We are most specifically interested in Tier 1 Draft EIS Alternatives #2 and #3 which would involve expansions of the NEC outside of its current right-of-way in Central New Jersey, including the parts running through Edison and New Brunswick. ... which would have significant environmental impacts on the River and her habitat. We would trust that any further development of EIS or similar will involve a comprehensive habitat and environmental analysis, we trust that it will engage in participatory fashion the environmental and other stakeholders in the area, and we also expect that it will include an economic valuation of the River and River habitat and weigh this against economic benefits of the proposed rail infrastructure installation.	Subsequent Tier 2 project-level studies or actions will include more-detailed and comprehensive habitat and environmental analysis, and coordination and engagement with environmental resource agencies and area stakeholders.
Fenyk_He	The LRWP is supportive of planning for anticipated demographic shifts that will increase regional population and demand increased rail capacity. We are likewise supportive of expanding rail capacity in general to benefit the region's economy and to increase rail ridership as a means of reducing the environmental impacts of auto transit.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4).
Fenyk_He	We would trust that any further development of EIS or similar will involve a comprehensive habitat and environmental analysis, we trust that it will engage in participatory fashion the environmental and other stakeholders in the area, and we also expect that it will include an economic valuation of the River and River habitat and weigh this against economic benefits of the proposed rail infrastructure installation.	Subsequent Tier 2 project-level studies or actions will include more-detailed and comprehensive habitat and environmental analysis, and coordination and engagement with environmental resource agencies and area stakeholders.
Fernandez_We	on a personal level we understand the need for infrastructure improvements and broadbased improvements to -- across the Northeast Corridor.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative to improve passenger rail service on the NEC in a manner that will enhance mobility options and expand passenger rail service in support of future population and employment growth in the Study Area. The Preferred Alternative—described in Volume 1, Chapter 4—improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects.
Ferris_Pe	I am from the northeast (upstate NY) and am aware and comprehend what a value the NEC is.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4).
Firth_Ma	Do you anticipate giving suppliers the opportunity to present their product for potential inclusion in the NEC project? Depending on funding will there be an RFP for potential services/supplies?	The NEC FUTURE program follows a "tiered" approach to environmental review. Tier 1 focuses on broad programs and initial analysis. Tier 2 focuses on site-specific, project-level proposals and impacts. The NEC FUTURE program is focused on improvements to passenger rail. Within the context of the Tier 1 process, NEC FUTURE will not issue a request for proposals. The FRA will explore project implementation strategies in more detail, focusing specifically on the Selected Alternative in the phasing plan included in the Service Development Plan. The Northeast Corridor (NEC) Commission and the NEC railroads can build off the more detailed phasing plan to develop a long-term implementation plan that better reflects funding realities and project complexities.
Foehr_Ma	The plans to improve + update the existing system should be inspected closer.	The NEC FUTURE program follows a "tiered" approach to environmental review. Tier 1 focuses on broad programs and initial analysis. Tier 2 focuses on site-specific, project-level proposals and impacts. As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure in the Tier 1 Record of Decision. Such decisions will be made as part of the Tier 2 project studies, which will include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.

Table JJ–24: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Other (continued)

Commenter ID	Comment Text	Response Text
Follo_Mi	I'm interested into transportation and the future of Amtrak's Northeast Corridor Gateway Project and I am e-mailing you is when the new two track Hudson River rail tunnels are completed, will one or both of the existing Hudson River rail tunnels be shut down for repairs, if one tunnel is only shut down one at a time, will there be three tunnels available for both NJ Transit and Amtrak, will the two new Hudson River rail tunnels be completed at the same time as Penn Station South is completed, if not, with three of the four track being used, will there be additional capacity during rush hours to add more NJ Transit trains from the Northeast Corridor, North Jersey Coast, Morris & Essex, Montclair/Boonton Line and extending some Raritan Valley trains to and from NY Penn Station as well as adding more Amtrak trains as well since NY Penn Station would now have available capacity since some LIRR trains will be serving Grand Central Station.	<p>The Gateway Program is Amtrak 's proposed set of strategic infrastructure improvements to improve service and address capacity constraints in the area of New York City in New York and New Jersey. Separate from the Gateway Program, the Hudson Tunnel Project is intended to preserve the current functionality of the NEC's Hudson River rail crossing between New Jersey and New York and strengthen the resilience of the NEC; the FRA and NJ TRANSIT are currently leading the NEPA process for the Hudson Tunnel Project. The Gateway Program and the Hudson Tunnel Project are separate from the NEC FUTURE program. NEC FUTURE does evaluate overall capacity needs and potential improvements for the entire NEC including the New York City area. The FRA coordinates closely with Amtrak about the Gateway program.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative provides new two-track infrastructure under the Hudson River to accommodate significant growth in the New York area market. Volume 1, Chapter 4, provides a full description of the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative is consistent with the Hudson Tunnel Project proposed action.</p>
Forte_St	4. Whether the project is planned to be funded by the State of New York or the federal DOT, it is still funded by taxpayers money who would certainly like to see their money allocated to either a reduction in taxes or to much more sensible projects including, but not limited to, new buildings such as housing and office, new schools, refurbishment of older constructions, better public services to benefit local communities, better road maintenance, better Fire Fighting equipment, better Police technology, just to name a few.	The FRA anticipates working with the Northeast Corridor Commission, Amtrak, the NEC commuter authorities, and the eight states plus the District of Columbia to develop finance strategies and funding plans that reflect the corridor-wide value of proposed improvements. More information about this process is described in Volume 1, Chapter 10.
Friday_No	Please act as responsible agencies and follow a doctor's rule, First, Do NO Harm!!! We have a representative government that include little town and individual rights. Make sure they are not violated in the rush to modernity	The FRA considered both opposing and supporting views on the NEC FUTURE program in preparing the Tier 1 Final EIS and identifying a Preferred Alternative. Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative that improves the existing NEC to a state of good repair and includes new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Fry_Do	As we have from the outset of the NEC FUTURE process, the GBC applauds the Federal Railroad Administration for undertaking the EIS process for an improved Northeast Corridor since more efficient high speed ground transportation is critical to the economic advancement of businesses located along the Northeast Corridor.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4).
Galaty_Mi	Your planning team is so junior and out of touch that I assume you must be part of the Democratic White house administration. I hate chamber of commerce designers with no clue of the value of the historic or natural beauty of our world. The company which did this plan should be fired, the material passed to a more mature wise team before anyone even considers this. I'd even suggest revoking some of the payment provided. Save the beauty of our country.	The FRA considered both opposing and supporting views on the NEC FUTURE program in preparing the Tier 1 Final EIS and identifying a Preferred Alternative. Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative that improves the existing NEC to a state of good repair and includes new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Galli_Vi	I and kind of anyone else who's invested in Amtrak and kind of has seen the development of the agency over the years knows that the agency and kind of the Federal Railroad Administration, more broadly, are significantly underfunded, especially compared to other peers who have much more advanced train systems, both for commuter rail and for commercial rail.	The FRA anticipates working with the Northeast Corridor Commission, Amtrak, the NEC commuter authorities, and the eight states plus the District of Columbia to develop finance strategies and funding plans that reflect the corridor-wide value of proposed improvements. More information about this process is described in Volume 1, Chapter 10.
Galvin_Cl	Too aggressive a plan. This transportation will run through too many towns and harm the quality of life we now enjoy.	The FRA considered both opposing and supporting views on the NEC FUTURE program in preparing the Tier 1 Final EIA and identifying a Preferred Alternative. Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative that improves the existing NEC to a state of good repair and includes new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Gamboa_Ma	Please do the the NEC project ASAP !	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4). Volume 1, Chapter 10, identifies the steps toward an Initial Phase of the Preferred Alternative that would improve service and address critical infrastructure improvements.

Table JJ–24: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Other (continued)

Commenter ID	Comment Text	Response Text
GatewayCC_Halkyard	...new FAST legislation, as I read in there, it says that revenues produced in the Northeast Corridor will stay in the Northeast Corridor. I wonder, is that going to improve the railroad situation?	The FRA is working with Amtrak to implement new requirements under the FAST Act related to Amtrak's account structure. Specifically, the FAST Act requires Amtrak to define an account structure and accounting methodologies that "support, at a minimum, the northeast corridor and the national network." The purpose of this provision is to "promote the effective use and stewardship by Amtrak of Amtrak revenues, federal, state, and third party investments, appropriations, grants and other forms of financial assistance, and other sources of funds" and "enhance the transparency of the assignment of revenues and costs among Amtrak business lines while ensuring the health of the northeast corridor and national network." NEC FUTURE is a project to improve passenger rail service on the NEC and is not directly related to this provision of the FAST Act.
Gaudio_Ra	CFE believes the DEIS is facially inadequate. The materials do not give enough information to sufficiently support a particular alternative. More must be done to provide citizens with a better idea of the proposed rail line 's exact location, an evaluation of potential impacts in each municipality traversed, and, for Alternative 3, which route will ultimately be selected. Alternative 3 is an alternative containing alternatives, which is confusing to stakeholders. For more clarity, each of the alternatives within Alternative 3 should be considered separately... Connecticut Fund for the Environment requests the Federal Railroad Administration to provide more information about the specific impacts expected with each Alternative. Without this information, it is unfair to request comments on the "best" alternative.	<p>The level of analysis in the Tier 1 Draft EIS is consistent with the type of broad, programmatic analysis appropriate for a Tier 1 EIS. In the Tier 1 Draft EIS, each Action Alternative was evaluated at a consistent level of detail to inform a comparison of each to the No Action Alternative and to inform, along with other factors, the FRA's deliberative process on the identification of Preferred Alternative. In the Tier 1 Final EIS, the Preferred Alternative is compared to the No Action Alternative using the same methodology applied in the Tier 1 Draft EIS. Site-specific environmental review will occur at the Tier 2 level. For more information on the transition to the Tier 2 process, refer to Volume 1, Section 10.5.</p> <p>Alternative 3 does include four routing options. FRA did not include any of those routing options for the Preferred Alternative. The routing options were discussed in detail in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, Appendix B.5, Tier 1 EIS Alternatives Report.</p>
Gay_Da	I am truly glad to see that projects are in the works! Thank you for understanding the need to renovate and update our aging infrastructure. I look forward to enjoying an update riding experience in the near future.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative to improve passenger rail service on the NEC in a manner that will enhance mobility options and expand passenger rail service in support of future population and employment growth in the Study Area. The Preferred Alternative—described in Volume 1, Chapter 4—improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects.
Goddess_Li	I am thrilled to learn that the rail service between Delaware and Boston may be improved. With airline travel becoming increasingly uncomfortable and time consuming, I will be turning more and more to travelling by train and certainly look forward to any improvements and upgrades to the entire Nortrheast Corridor.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative to improve passenger rail service on the NEC in a manner that will enhance mobility options and expand passenger rail service in support of future population and employment growth in the Study Area. The Preferred Alternative—described in Volume 1, Chapter 4—improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects.

Table JJ–24: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Other (continued)

Commenter ID	Comment Text	Response Text
Goldsmith_Ke	The Tier 1 Draft EIS for the NEC FUTURE project has major deficiencies. In particular, the analysis of environmental impacts in the chapter on Affected Environment, Environmental Consequences, and Mitigation and the subsequent Evaluation of Alternatives is woefully inadequate and legally insufficient.	The Tier 1 NEC FUTURE DEIS follows a "tiered" approach to environmental review under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). A Tier 1 NEPA review focuses on broad programmatic issues and initial analysis. The NEC FUTURE Tier 1 EIS makes no conclusive statements about environmental effects, but rather analyzes them such that representative environmental consequences of each alternative can be assessed and compared among alternatives. A Tier 2 NEPA review would focus on site-specific, project proposals and impacts. During a Tier 2 project planning and review process, the future Federal lead agency would reach conclusions regarding impacts and mitigation. More information on the tiered NEPA process is available in Section 1.3 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. As part of NEC FUTURE, the FRA prepared an effects-assessment methodology for each resource presented in Chapter 7, Affected Environment, Environmental Consequences, and Mitigation, of the Tier 1 Draft EIS (see Appendix E of the Tier 1 Draft EIS). Targeted agency coordination and resource-specific technical working groups, comprising technical experts within the industry, and federal and state resource agencies reviewed and commented on each methodology; FRA addressed all such reviews in revising and finalizing the effects-assessment methodologies. Each effects-assessment methodology identifies the data sources and methodology used to assess effects, Tier 1 EIS outcomes, and the applicability of the analysis to subsequent Tier 2 projects. Similarly, Chapter 9, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Tier 1 Draft EIS is based on the analysis and findings presented in the individual chapters of the document. The evaluations were reviewed by state departments of transportation, federal modal agencies, and commuter rail authorities. Appendices B, C, and D of the Tier 1 Draft EIS present methodologies related to alternatives development and evaluation, transportation, and economics, respectively.
Gonzalez_Fr	Expanding rail service is needed.	The evaluation presented and feedback provided during the public comment period led the FRA to identify a Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4).
Gould_Ri	Doesn't anyone in Washington ever do their homework? It's bad enough we have to deal with super high taxes, crappy roads an idiot for a governor and now your ignorant agency. Have a nice day.	The FRA considered both opposing and supporting views on the NEC FUTURE program in preparing the Tier 1 Final EIS and identifying a Preferred Alternative. Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative that improves the existing NEC to a state of good repair and includes new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Graham_Ro	Overhaul the water faucets to stop water leakage. Add a dedicated Internet cafe car. This would allow passengers that just want to eat a place to sit.	Although the FRA has not included specifics on train and station maintenance and amenities in the Tier 1 EIS process, the Preferred Alternative includes investments to support infrastructure and operational improvements for passenger rail services and at stations. Volume 1, Chapter 4, provides representative operational improvements. Specific amenities and operational improvements will be addressed during subsequent Tier 2 project studies.
Haas_Bu	Rail must become the dominant transport mode in the Northeast.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4). The Preferred Alternative would result in diversions from other modes to rail, as discussed in Volume 1, Chapter 5.
Haikalis_Ge	Add rail freight service elements. ...the existing Amtrak route via Secaucus becomes available for off-peak and weekend operation of high performance low-profile container trains through Penn Station.	The FRA is coordinating with Amtrak and has shared this letter with them.
Haikalis_Ge	Provide one-seat ride service Manhattan - JFK Airport using LIRR Rockaway Beach Branch	The FRA has identified a Preferred Alternative that improves the existing NEC and includes new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environmental effects. Volume 1, Chapter 4, describes the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative does not include the Long Island routing option considered in Alternative 3. However, the FRA recognizes it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.

Table JJ–24: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Other (continued)

Commenter ID	Comment Text	Response Text
Haikalis_Ge	Connect Raritan Valley Line to NEC at Elizabeth, instead of at Hunter, just South of Newark	The FRA has identified a Preferred Alternative that improves the existing NEC and includes new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environmental effects. Volume 1, Chapter 4, describes the Preferred Alternative.
Hale_Ro	...it's important for members of the public as well as decision makers to understand that there will be no way to avoid all local impacts, and there will be no way to satisfy everybody. That's why this process is so important, because it assigns, to the best of our ability to do so, numbers for comparison.	The Commenter's point is supportive of the process that FRA is following with regard to considering effects and benefits to both the natural and built environment when assessing the No Action Alternative and Action Alternatives. For the Tier 1 level of assessment, broad effects and benefits are identified; more-detailed, site-specific local effects will be identified in subsequent project-level studies.
Hale_Ro	I would also ask that the impact of existing crashworthiness regulations on the ability to cost effectively procure equipment be evaluated. While it is favorable to have additional levels of protection in a crash in rolling stock, it is my understanding that the requirements imposed by the FRA have significantly increased the costs of procuring rail equipment, including that that operates the Acela service today. It reduces its ability to accelerate and also to brake in a fast manner. I would argue that the cumulative impacts of the increase in cost of procuring those train sets is passed on to consumers like us, pushing many to choose an automobile, a bus or a [plain plane] where they might otherwise choose a train, and especially in the case of buses or automobiles, making the overall transportation system less safe.	The NEC FUTURE program is focused on improvements to passenger rail. It has considered the effects of the Preferred Alternatives on railroad operational safety. As described in Volume 1, Chapter 7.18, the FRA's passenger-equipment safety standards currently govern the crashworthiness standards and emergency egress/rescue access systems of Tier I and Tier II passenger equipment. The FRA is currently developing Tier III passenger-equipment safety standards. NEC FUTURE does not propose any changes to the current safety standards.
Hale_Ro	While it is true that landowners can be expected to fight any new alignment in the Northeast, planners and leaders in Italy faced many of the same obstacles that we in the Northeast face today. Their success in delivering incremental improvements culminating in a full Naples-Milan high speed rail spine suggests that a similar effort in the Northeast is quite achievable.	The FRA is committed to an open and transparent involvement process with stakeholders, elected officials, and the public. An initial phase of improvements is integral to the Preferred Alternative and further described in Volume 1, Chapter 10. Benefits of the initial phase are likely to build support for subsequent implementation phases.
Hammerling_Er	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.	<p>The FRA defined and developed the Action Alternatives and Preferred Alternative at a programmatic level, focusing on corridor-wide solutions within the context of the Tier 1 EIS process. Consistent with this process, the FRA developed Representative Routes, which provide a basis for the programmatic evaluation of the environmental effects of each Action Alternative. Representative Routes define an envelope within which improvements might occur and whose location and construction type could change during Tier 2 project analysis. For the purposes of this analysis, the width of the existing NEC is defined as 150 feet, conservatively accounting for a four-track right-of-way between Washington, D.C., and Boston. The 150-foot width is inclusive of tracks, ballast, signals, etc.</p> <p>FRA made available to federal and state environmental resource and regulatory entities, at their request, the GIS data base used for the analysis of the Action Alternatives and Preferred Alternative's Representative Routes. Because the proposed routes are representative only, this GIS data is not indicative of actual route locations. The under laying data that was imported into database was provided by various agencies, several of which required confidentiality agreements in order to share that source data.</p> <p>The Tier 1 EIS provides information to the general public from the GIS data base in the data tables located throughout the document and the Mapping Atlas, Volume 1 Appendix AA and Volume 2 Appendix.</p>
Harvey_Ke	speed up the process so it won't seem like your wasting money	For projects such as NEC FUTURE, the FRA follows a process and timeline in compliance with federal laws and regulations, including the National Environmental Policy Act and its implementing regulations. The FRA is committed to finding opportunities to make efficient use of time and resources and to streamline the process where possible.
Heiss_To	We so enjoy the Amtrak passenger service that allows us to travel and see this beautiful country from the rail...the same rails that bring freight cars past our house, to and from Canada. It's very affordable on our retirement pay, and allows us to travel to Virginia twice a year to visit our grandchildren...so many railroad stories to share with them! Some day, we can also travel with them by rail! Thank you for funding this American adventure for all of us!	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4).

Table JJ–24: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Other (continued)

Commenter ID	Comment Text	Response Text
Herrick_Su	there needs to be more checked baggage possibilities for stations between BOS and NYP	Although the FRA has not included specifics on train and station maintenance and amenities in the Tier 1 EIS process, the Preferred Alternative includes investments to support infrastructure and operational improvements for passenger rail services and at stations. Volume 1, Chapter 4, provides representative operational improvements. Specific amenities and operational improvements will be addressed during subsequent Tier 2 project studies.
Holt_Li	I do use the train and recognize the need to upgrade the system.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4).
Hood_Ed	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 NEC FUTURE program follows a "tiered" approach to environmental review. Tier 1 focuses on broad programs and initial analysis. Tier 2 focuses on site-specific, project-level proposals and impacts. The FRA developed a mapping atlas to provide a high level representation of the location and construction type of the Preferred Alternative (see Volume 1, Appendix AA). Detailed mapping will occur in subsequent Tier 2 project analyses.
Hutchinson_Na	It is my understanding that once the potential environmental impacts are further understood, additional due diligence will be required before these alternatives (or modified versions thereof) will be adequately developed to support meaningful cost estimates and decision criteria to support the selection of any one plan moving forward.	The FRA recommends a Preferred Alternative that is described and evaluated in the Tier 1 Final EIS. Additional project-level or Tier 2 studies will be required prior to advancing the specific projects required to achieve the vision defined by the Preferred Alternative.
Jacobs_Ma	we suggest that the consecration and effort be on fixing the ROADS and bridges we have and use to the highest capacity before installing another line, that promises not to be used based on what facts that present a need for this type of rail travel. WE feel that the use of existing rail line are sufficient .	The FRA considered both opposing and supporting views on the NEC FUTURE program in preparing the Tier 1 Final EIS and identifying a Preferred Alternative. Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative that improves the existing NEC to a state of good repair and includes new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Janzen_Ja	And, also, I think at the local level, I'd like to see the silver line out here in D.C. Access to the airport sort of happens naturally on a local level, and I don't know if it's the best idea to have that as part of a federal intercity passenger plan.	The purpose and need of NEC FUTURE includes improving connectivity through expanded and improved accessibility both within the NEC rail network and between NEC and the multimodal transportation system. Volume 2, Chapter 3 provides the purpose and need for NEC FUTURE. NEC FUTURE does not propose any specific improvements to public transit operations, such as Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority, in the Tier 1 EIS process.
Jasper_Ro	The NoMa BID strongly supports the Federal Railroad Administration's NEC FUTURE... The ability for our tenants to take fast, reliable rail to New York City and other major employment centers along the Northeast Corridor is a crucial amenity in the neighborhood and the region... Due to both the increasing constraints of vehicular commuting in Washington and the demand for transit-oriented development, the rail capacity planned in the NEC FUTURE along the Northeast Corridor and Union Station is imperative for the future of the Washington region and NoMa.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative to improve passenger rail service on the NEC in a manner that will enhance mobility options and expand passenger rail service in support of future population and employment growth in the Study Area. The Preferred Alternative—described in Volume 1, Chapter 4—improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects.
Johnson_Ja	I feel a new idea would be updating the paint scheme on your Amfleet I Cars. A new vibrant scheme would be nice for the new Corridor	As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions for passenger rail within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process. Specific amenities and branding of services could be addressed during subsequent Tier 2 project studies or as equipment is replaced.
Johnson_Le	Too expensive for very little benefit.	The FRA considered both opposing and supporting views on the NEC FUTURE program in preparing the Tier 1 Final EIS and identifying a Preferred Alternative. Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative that improves the existing NEC to a state of good repair and includes new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.

Table JJ–24: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Other (continued)

Commenter ID	Comment Text	Response Text
Johnston_Gl	I am here tonight to show my support for the NEC future, some things I like about it, the preliminary Tier One Environmental Impact Study.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4).
Katherine	Upgrades to the system is a good idea.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4).
Kelley_Mi	The first step is to either eliminate or reformulate AMTRAK...The current organization is incompetent, uncooperative and obstructive. Cost of current AMTRAK use is prohibitive.	The FRA is coordinating with Amtrak and has shared this letter with them.
Kelly_Ja	Rail travel in the United States will never be as popular (or as necessary) as it is in Europe for numerous reasons, including the facts that auto insurance is less expensive here, gas is cheaper, and Americans cars and roads are more suitable for longer travel. Spending this money on a project that most likely won't save the rail travel industry seems ludicrous, when this money can obviously be used for more logical projects.	The FRA considered both opposing and supporting views on the NEC FUTURE program in preparing the Tier 1 Final EIS and identifying a Preferred Alternative. Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative that improves the existing NEC to a state of good repair and includes new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Kolesinskas_Ki	It is difficult to truly understand the impacts on farms without displaying the routes on current imagery or land cover maps.	The NEC FUTURE program follows a "tiered" approach to environmental review. Tier 1 focuses on broad programs and initial analysis. Tier 2 focuses on site-specific, project-level proposals and impacts. The FRA developed a mapping atlas to provide a high level representation of the location and construction type of the Preferred Alternative (see Volume 1, Appendix AA). Detailed mapping will occur in subsequent Tier 2 project analyses. The affects to agricultural resources, including prime farmland and prime timberland, are evaluated in the Tier 1 EIS (see Volume 1, Chapter 7.3).
Kovach_Da	The purpose of this letter is to inform you that because of the proposed location of the various Alternatives included in the Draft EIS in the States of Delaware and New Jersey and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania relative to a recreation area designated in the Commission 's Comprehensive Plan, and potential impacts to wetlands, a portion of the project may be reviewable under Section 3.8 of the Delaware River Basin Compact. Approximately 90 miles of the Northeast Corridor rail line from Washington D.C. to Boston, MA is located within the Delaware River Basin and under certain proposed Alternatives, may traverse the John Heinz National Wildlife Refuge in Philadelphia and Delaware County, Pennsylvania. The John Heinz National Wildlife Refuge was incorporated into the Commission 's Comprehensive Plan as a recreation area in July 2001.	The FRA noted concerns regarding impacts to the John Heinz National Wildlife Refuge. In light of these and other considerations, the Preferred Alternative does not include the route envisioned in Alternative 2. Rationale for the selection of the Preferred Alternative is provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The FRA evaluated the effects of implementing the Preferred Alternative on parklands resources as part of its analysis on parklands (Volume 1, Chapter 7.4). Specific decisions regarding mitigation of impacts and permitting will be made as part of the Tier 2 project planning process.
Kovach_Da	If the project is determined by the Commission to be a reviewable project, the project sponsor will be required to submit an application for review. Please be advised that the Commission meets four times per year and projects such as these can only be approved at one of these meetings after a public hearing. Additionally, you should file the application for the project a minimum of six to nine months prior to projected initiation of construction activity to allow adequate time for Commission review and processing. If the project is subject to Commission review, there shall be no substantial construction activity thereon, including preparation of land, unless and until the project has been approved by the Commission.	The NEC FUTURE program follows a "tiered" approach to environmental review. Tier 1 focuses on broad programs and initial analysis. Tier 2 focuses on site-specific, project-level proposals and impacts. Within the context of the Tier 1 process, NEC FUTURE will not seek permitting or approval of construction. Such decisions will be made as part of Tier 2 project studies, which will include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate.
Kulper_Ke	there is a very pressing need to move ahead with the upgrade of the NEC. Thanks for the thoughtful work you are doing on behalf of both residents, business people and tourists who will be active riders.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4).
Lacari_Ma	We must invest and expand the Northeast Corridor and bring it up to true, high speed rail.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative to improve passenger rail service on the NEC in a manner that will enhance mobility options and expand passenger rail service in support of future population and employment growth in the Study Area. The Preferred Alternative—described in Volume 1, Chapter 4—improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects.

Table JJ–24: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Other (continued)

Commenter ID	Comment Text	Response Text
Lacari_Ma	This nation used to be the world leader in its rail system and it's time to lead the world again in high speed rail. It's time to rebuild and reinvest in the Northeast Corridor.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative to improve passenger rail service on the NEC in a manner that will enhance mobility options and expand passenger rail service in support of future population and employment growth in the Study Area. The Preferred Alternative—described in Volume 1, Chapter 4—improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects.
Lacey_Wi	I am opposed to this New Rail System. Many of the towns that this new rail segment would cut through are hundreds of years old, and are home to numerous cultural landmarks and buildings on the National Register of Historic Places. CT is not in any financial situation to support said infrastructure.	The FRA considered both opposing and supporting views on the NEC FUTURE program in preparing the Tier 1 Final EIS and identifying a Preferred Alternative. Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative that improves the existing NEC to a state of good repair and includes new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4; cultural resources and historic properties are described in Volume 1, Chapter 7.9.
Lamothe_Sc	Implementing high-speed rail and rail service across the northeast is a huge step in expanding public transportation in the United States. In particular, having multiple stops along it's route; in Palmer Massachusetts. Increasing the number of available stops, increases the advantage for people to make use of public transportation, especially now that our world has become more environmentally conscious. I am a college student from Western New England University in Massachusetts, and I believe that expanding public transpiration, particularly rail, is an important factor for the United States to become a more eco-friendly environment that allows its citizens with a decent ease of travel.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative to improve passenger rail service on the NEC in a manner that will enhance mobility options and expand passenger rail service in support of future population and employment growth in the Study Area. The Preferred Alternative—described in Volume 1, Chapter 4—improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects.
Lawrence_Je	I feel that rail service is desperately needed to alleviate our over-crowded highways, and to reduce shipping by eighteen wheel trucks that help cause highway congestion..	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4). Analysis presented in Volume 1, Chapter 5, shows that the Preferred Alternative would result in diversions from other modes, including auto. NEC FUTURE is a passenger rail study; however, the FRA has considered freight use in the corridor and has identified a Preferred Alternative that is designed to preserve access to freight rail customers and to not preclude future expansion of freight rail service.
Leach_Ge	Despite the potential reduction in carbon emissions, the Action Alternatives 2 and 3 present some significant negative impacts on wildlife, important habitats such as Audubon Important Bird Areas, wetlands, grasslands, and forest interior habitats. Audubon Connecticut therefore strongly recommends that Alternatives 2 and 3 be eliminated, and that would allow us to focus on Alternative 1, which itself presents significant environmental and social impacts in communities across Connecticut that are of great concern to us.	The FRA assessed the impacts to ecological resources associated with each Action Alternative in Chapter 7 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4). The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Action Alternatives that best meet the service needs of specific markets while minimizing environmental impacts. Volume 1, Chapter 4, provides a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative and the FRA's basis for including these improvements in the Preferred Alternative. Volume 1, Chapter 7, provides the affected environment, environmental consequences, and mitigation strategies for the Preferred Alternative.
Lee_Ba	please complete this massive project as soon as possible.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4). Volume 1, Chapter 10 identifies the steps towards an Initial Phase of the Preferred Alternative that would improve service and address critical infrastructure improvements..
Lee_De	I am hugely in favor of expanding rail service in the New England/Northeast area, as distance driving is becoming more tedious and difficult as I age. The potential for easy access to rail service in and beyond New England is extremely appealing and is definitely a quality of life issue!	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4).

Table JJ–24: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Other (continued)

Commenter ID	Comment Text	Response Text
Lewis_Be	Don't do it.	The FRA considered both opposing and supporting views on the NEC FUTURE program in preparing the Tier 1 Final EIS and identifying a Preferred Alternative. Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative that improves the existing NEC to a state of good repair and includes new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Little_Ge	Can you please tell me the names of the "Consultants" who actually performed the Tier I Draft EIS?	A list of preparers from the FRA and the Parsons Brinkerhoff/AECOM Joint Venture can be found in Volume 2, Chapter 14, List of Preparers.
Loper_De	This will destroy what families have worked a lifetime to do for their loved ones.	The FRA considered both opposing and supporting views on the NEC FUTURE program in preparing the Tier 1 Final EIS and identifying a Preferred Alternative. Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative that improves the existing NEC to a state of good repair and includes new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Louis_Jo	You can enlarge South Station all you want, but it won't make any difference. We're very, very interested in having this north-south railway be the big thing that would work that would bring us into the 21st century.	The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC. The Preferred Alternative includes projects to replace aging infrastructure, eliminate chokepoints and add capacity to support more-frequent, faster and more-reliable service for both intercity and regional travelers (as described in Volume 1, Chapter 4). At South Station, the FRA and the Massachusetts Department of Transportation are advancing improvements to expand station capacity. Representative service levels included in the Preferred Alternative could be accommodated at the expanded South Station.
Lukasik-Ta	...I think just more process and procedures and just education about, you know, NEPA and SEQRA. I know about it but I know a lot of people don't. People don't understand what a Tier 1 is, how it differs between federal level and state level and environmental review.	The FRA is committed to finding meaningful ways to educate the public and stakeholders about the tiered National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process. Volume 1, Chapter 10, includes further explanation of how Tier 1 NEPA relates to project-specific environmental reviews.
Maits_Sc	I'm very happy; this needs to happen. Very happy this is happening.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4).
Maits_Sc	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.	The FRA has identified a Preferred Alternative that improves the existing NEC and includes new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environmental effects. Volume 1, Chapter 4, describes the Preferred Alternative.
Maits_Sc	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 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.	Although the FRA has not included specifics on train and station maintenance and amenities in the Tier 1 EIS process, the Preferred Alternative includes investments to support infrastructure and operational improvements for passenger rail services and at stations. Volume 1, Chapter 4, provides representative operational improvements. Specific amenities and operational improvements will be addressed during subsequent Tier 2 project studies.
Maits_Sc	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.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4).
Maits_Sc	And I hope we can all support no matter what comes out because we all know we need this.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4).

Table JJ–24: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Other (continued)

Commenter ID	Comment Text	Response Text
Maits_Sc	We have to keep this line alive, and the hope and the dream of doing it and doing it better and making sure it's sensitive to the communities, all the other things.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. Volume 1, Chapter 7 identifies the potential for environments effects associated with the Preferred Alternative as well as mitigation strategies and analysis that would occur in subsequent Tier 2 projects.
Maits_Sc	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	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative to improve passenger rail service on the NEC in a manner that will enhance mobility options and expand passenger rail service in support of future population and employment growth in the Study Area. The Preferred Alternative—described in Volume 1, Chapter 4—improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. The improved mobility, frequency of service and range of pricing options provided by the Preferred Alternative results in an economic benefit to corridor. Volume 1, Chapter 6, discusses the economic effects of the Preferred Alternative.
Marden_Ku	My comments are that the plans that were presented tonight look extremely promising; they have absolutely commendable goals.	Volume 1, Chapter 3 provides a summary of the Purpose and Need. The FRA evaluated the alternatives presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS to determine how well each met the Purpose and Need and established goals and objectives. The evaluation presented and feedback provided during the public comment period led FRA to identify a Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Martin_Fr	Progress in mass transit is important for the U.S. economy ...	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4).
Masucci_Jo	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. 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. 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.	The FRA identified in the NEC FUTURE Purpose and Need (Volume 2, Chapter 3) the importance of bringing the infrastructure of the NEC to a state of good repair and the importance of improving the quality and frequency of service to the population centers located along the NEC. Consideration of new or emerging technologies to gain efficiencies in operations and passenger services are similarly highlighted in the Purpose and Need and are reflected in the Preferred Alternative.
Mayer_Ph	Please do everything possible to improve rail service between Washington, DC and Boston.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative to improve passenger rail service on the NEC in a manner that will enhance mobility options and expand passenger rail service in support of future population and employment growth in the Study Area. The Preferred Alternative—described in Volume 1, Chapter 4—improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects.
McArdle_Jo	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.	The NEC FUTURE program is focused on improvements to passenger rail. The FRA considered the effects of the Preferred Alternatives on railroad operational safety for both passenger and freight operations. NEC FUTURE does not propose any changes to the current safety standards or monitoring rules. Where operation of freight trains on high-speed or express tracks (at Class 8 or below) would be unavoidable and could be accommodated—either for normal or contingency operations—restrictions may be placed on the type, weight, or maximum speed of freight trains operating on the high-speed tracks, with possible requirements for signaling, dragging equipment, overheated bearing, shifted load, and high-impact wheel detectors in place at entry points to such tracks. See Volume 1, Chapter 7.18.

Table JJ–24: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Other (continued)

Commenter ID	Comment Text	Response Text
McCullough_Fr	Improve what exists.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative to improve passenger rail service on the NEC in a manner that will enhance mobility options and expand passenger rail service in support of future population and employment growth in the Study Area. The Preferred Alternative—described in Volume 1, Chapter 4—improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects.
McCullough_Ka	The trains offer a viable alternative to the hassle of driving or flying.	As a result of the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, the public comment process, and USDOT policy objectives, the FRA has identified a Preferred Alternative to improve passenger rail service on the NEC in a manner that will enhance mobility options and expand passenger rail service in support of future population and employment growth in the Study Area. The Preferred Alternative (described in Chapter 4, Volume 1) improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environmental effects.
McEnery_De	The commentor (from the Floral Park Third Track Task Force) attached comments on the 3rd Track Draft Scoping document. The comments were specific to the scope for that project. The community was against the 3rd track and would likely oppose Alternative 3 if it went through Lond Island.	The FRA has identified a Preferred Alternative that focuses improvements along the existing NEC with targeted new segments to alleviate chokepoints and increase capacity. The Preferred Alternative does not include the Long Island Sound crossing associated with Alternative 3. Volume 1, Chapter 4, provides a description of the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.
McGrath_Su	Our family frequently uses Amtrak between Boston and DC and understands the importance of this service.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4).
Me_Me	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.	The NEC FUTURE program follows a "tiered" approach to environmental review. Tier 1 focuses on broad programs and initial analysis. Tier 2 focuses on site-specific, project-level proposals and impacts. As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, and will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure in the Tier 1 Record of Decision. Such decisions would be made as part of the Tier 2 project studies, which would include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate.
Melius_Na	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	Although the FRA has not included specifics on train and station maintenance and amenities in the Tier 1 EIS process, the Preferred Alternative includes investments to support infrastructure and operational improvements for passenger rail services and at stations. Volume 1, Chapter 4, provides representative operational improvements. Specific amenities and operational improvements will be addressed during subsequent Tier 2 project studies.
Melius_Na	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)	Although the FRA has not included specifics on train and station maintenance and amenities in the Tier 1 EIS process, the Preferred Alternative includes investments to support infrastructure and operational improvements for passenger rail services and at stations. Volume 1, Chapter 4, provides representative operational improvements. Specific amenities and operational improvements will be addressed during subsequent Tier 2 project studies.
Menges_Ri	I forgot to mention what an IMPRESSIVE amount of work you have done!!! thank you for your service.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4).

Table JJ–24: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Other (continued)

Commenter ID	Comment Text	Response Text
Menges_Ri	I forgot to mention what an IMPRESSIVE amount of work you have done!!! thank you for your service.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4).
Merante_An	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 hour across this country.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative to improve passenger rail service on the NEC in a manner that will enhance mobility options and expand passenger rail service in support of future population and employment growth in the Study Area. The Preferred Alternative—described in Volume 1, Chapter 4—improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects.
Mereday_Me	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.	FRA engaged legal counsel throughout the NEC FUTURE Tier 1 Draft EIS planning process and conscientiously complies with all applicable rules and regulations, particularly those relevant to the National Environmental Policy Act, and National Historic Preservation Act, and FRA Regulations and Procedures.
Moylan_Ma	Keep Amtrak! It is the best way to travel for the environment.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4).
Mullen_Pe	fix existing rail lines and upgrade before the world leaves us in the dust. yall been talking about this stuff forever	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative to improve passenger rail service on the NEC in a manner that will enhance mobility options and expand passenger rail service in support of future population and employment growth in the Study Area. The Preferred Alternative—described in Volume 1, Chapter 4—improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects.
Muntz_Ra	I just was curious how we find out more information about the line's that's going through Long Island because very little is shown. And I know there are maps that are showing stuff but I don't know the details, elevated, tunnel, whatever, high speed, low speed. How do we find that out?	<p>The FRA has identified a Preferred Alternative that focuses improvements along the existing NEC with targeted new segments to alleviate chokepoints and increase capacity. The Preferred Alternative does not include the Long Island Sound crossing associated with Alternative 3. Volume 1, Chapter 4, provides a description of the Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative does not include a separate second spine, as proposed in Alternative 3. While NEC FUTURE did not demonstrate the need for a second spine, it is possible that in future decades there may be heightened need for additional capacity and performance improvement that could justify adding additional segments of a second spine to the existing rail network. The Preferred Alternative does not preclude further expansion should future conditions dictate examination and implementation of such expansions.</p>
Muratore_An	Why don't you repair your existing problems before you create new ones	The FRA considered both opposing and supporting views on the NEC FUTURE program in preparing the Tier 1 Final EIS and identifying a Preferred Alternative. Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative that improves the existing NEC to a state of good repair and includes new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Murdocco_Ri	Good transportation policy is grounded in an assessment of current and future community needs, as well as open and plentiful public input. In this case, it seems that a large majority of Long Island 's residents, with the exception of a select few well-connected insiders, have been left out of the process. I am optimistic that local elected officials, stakeholders and the FRA will remedy this, and I look forward to constructively working with them on improving quality of service on the Northeast Corridor in the New York Metro Area.	The FRA engaged stakeholders, elected officials, and the public in an extensive outreach effort throughout the NEC FUTURE. That outreach included emails and mailings to each of the counties and towns along the NEC and proposed off-corridor routes. More-localized and targeted outreach to residents and businesses will be an important component of subsequent project-level studies.
Murphy_Wa	High Speed rail should be from Richmond, Va to Boston, Ma. and Albany. Further projects should make High Speed Rail from Florida to Maine a reality with connections to Canada.	The FRA has identified a Preferred Alternative that improves the existing NEC and includes new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environmental effects. Volume 1, Chapter 4, describes the Preferred Alternative. The FRA has considered the relationship of connecting corridors, such as the Southeast High speed Rail. See Volume 1, Chapter 5.

Table JJ–24: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Other (continued)

Commenter ID	Comment Text	Response Text
Nichols_Wi	As part of the plan all management along the east coast corridor needs to develop a comprehensive trash abatement plan! I ride from Baltimore to DC every weekday. The lines are trashed the entire trip. I see the same abandoned cars/boats/large debris every day for years. Both Amtrak and CSX need to send cleaning crews out on a regular basis to pick up trash and debris including 100s of tires. This waste contaminates streams and clogs drainage that can cause backups/flooding of tracks. This work cannot be done by volunteers since its too dangerous so that means YOU need to do more to keep the tracks cleaner and looking better. Its a sad way to travel when all you see is trash for miles on both sides of the tracks.	As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process. This comment has been shared with Amtrak and CSX and will be available for subsequent consideration at the time of a Tier 2 project-level analysis.
Nicosia-Rusin_Ra	The key decision is whether high speed rail is pursued with pragmatic or transformative vision. The pragmatic vision is seductive by the allure of achieving some improvement. But it begs off of the major capital and political costs that can potentially doom it to sub-par performance and low capacity. These in term prevent the economies of scale for long range success and fulfillment of public needs. For a transformative vision to become pragmatic it needs to communicate to a broad public - the scale of its vision, - the public interest benefits, - the unavoidable negative impacts, and - a commitment for + fair compensation and + transparency in imposition of governmental authority to achieve a public good..	The FRA noted concerns about the vision of the Action Alternatives. Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4. The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Action Alternatives that best meet the service needs of specific markets while minimizing environmental impacts. Volume 1, Chapter 4, provides a detailed description of the service and infrastructure improvements of the Preferred Alternative and the FRA's basis for including these improvements in the Preferred Alternative.
Nicosia-Rusin_Ra	High speed rail stations need to recognize their close relationship to airport terminals and provide the parking, shuttle vans, and moving walkways suitable for a high volume of passengers with luggage.	Although the FRA has not included specifics on train and station maintenance and amenities in the Tier 1 EIS process, the Preferred Alternative includes investments to support infrastructure and operational improvements for passenger rail services and at stations. Volume 1, Chapter 4, provides representative operational improvements. Specific amenities and operational improvements will be addressed during subsequent Tier 2 project studies.
Nielsen_He	As a resident of Garden City, NY, I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed high speed train project.	The FRA considered both opposing and supporting views on the NEC FUTURE program in preparing the Tier 1 Final EIS and identifying a Preferred Alternative. Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative that improves the existing NEC to a state of good repair and includes new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Norris_Jo	Great to see this key step re DEIS taking place on this hugely important project for all those who travel in the NE.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4).
Owens_Ki	Leave well enough alone!	The FRA considered both opposing and supporting views on the NEC FUTURE program in preparing the Tier 1 Final EIS and identifying a Preferred Alternative. Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative that improves the existing NEC to a state of good repair and includes new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Papp_Al	The Texas Central Railroad between -- proposed between Dallas and Houston is being looked at as a turnkey with the Central Railroad of Japan, the J & R Central, doing the complete design, engineering and build. It's a design-build system. It isn't being done by Texas, it's not being done by Washington. It's going to be a turnkey. And they too hope that revenues collected from this high speed train would be sufficient not only for operations -- pay for operations, but also make a giant if not a complete contribution to the physical infrastructure.	The FRA expects that a diverse set of public- and private-sector entities, including multiple NEC states, railroad owners and operators, and federal, and state, and local governments, may be involved in advancing elements of the Preferred Alternative. During the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA has sought to develop potential future service plans for Intercity service that generate sufficient ticket revenues to cover the service's ongoing operating and maintenance costs. Additional detail about how the Preferred Alternative satisfies this objective is discussed in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Passoni_Ro	NO, NO, NO, NOT WITHOUT APPROVAL OF THE RESIDENTS OF THE CITIES AND TOWNS AFFECTED BY THIS EXPENSIVE AND SENSELESS PLAN. A PLAN THAT WILL ONLY SHORTEN THE TRIP TIME FROM D.C. TO BOSTON BY 1/2 HOUR?? WHAT AN INCREDIBLE WASTE OF TAX PAYER \$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$.	The FRA considered both opposing and supporting views on the NEC FUTURE program in preparing the Tier 1 Final EIS and identifying a Preferred Alternative. Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative that improves the existing NEC to a state of good repair and includes new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.

Table JJ–24: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Other (continued)

Commenter ID	Comment Text	Response Text
Paterson_Am	we contend that a project of this magnitude, proposed multiple areas of the state rich with protected natural, scenic and recreational resources, should be subject to the highest and most comprehensive degree of scrutiny.	The Tier 1 level of analysis provides a consistent and comprehensive review of environmental resources, both built and natural, commensurate with the level of detail available. Subsequent Tier 2 project-level studies will provide additional, site-specific analysis to a greater level of detail.
Penn Design_Taylor_Yaro	We thank you again for this opportunity to provide comments on the Tier 1 DEIS and offer our sincerest support as plans for the Northeast Corridor progress.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4).
Pereira_Ma	I believe that the United States needs trains like France's TGV however great care should be taken to preserve the historic sites and the environment.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4). Volume 1, Chapter 7, identifies the potential for environments effects associated with the Preferred Alternative as well as mitigation strategies and analysis that will occur in subsequent Tier 2 projects.
Philapavage_De	We should have world leading high speed rail!!!	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative to improve passenger rail service on the NEC in a manner that will enhance mobility options and expand passenger rail service in support of future population and employment growth in the Study Area. The Preferred Alternative—described in Volume 1, Chapter 4—improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects.
Post_Ro	at this point without any additional information the Harbor Commission is totally opposed to this proposal.	The FRA considered both opposing and supporting views on the NEC FUTURE program in preparing the Tier 1 Final EIS and identifying a Preferred Alternative. Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative that improves the existing NEC to a state of good repair and includes new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Powell_Br	I oppose the project from the beginning, spending more time and taxpayers money, when we are in a deficit, losing jobs in CT, your own spending. What is important to the State is what Congressman Joe Courtney fights for.	The FRA considered both opposing and supporting views on the NEC FUTURE program in preparing the Tier 1 Final EIS and identifying a Preferred Alternative. Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative that improves the existing NEC to a state of good repair and includes new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Pulvirenti_Di	ANY kind of added extra train routes would be fabulous! ...You should add more routes and upgrades all the time. I usually get a sleepette or business class on every trip that I take no matter the traveling time because I simply like riding with Amtrak. Keep it up-you'll also get a higher income traveler as well.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4).
Raday_Da	...after reviewing your Environmental Impact Statement I am for this expansion.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4).
Ranelli_J	maps are way too large scale for close up critical viewing, any chance of something smaller so we can click smaller areas, say 1:100,000 ?	The NEC FUTURE program follows a "tiered" approach to environmental review. Tier 1 focuses on broad programs and initial analysis. Tier 2 focuses on site-specific, project-level proposals and impacts. The FRA developed a mapping atlas to provide a high level representation of the location and construction type of the Preferred Alternative (see Volume 1, Appendix AA). Detailed mapping will occur in subsequent Tier 2 project analyses.
Ravi_Ja	Not just students but also postdocs (postdoctoral researchers and related positions) in universities should be allowed to avail the student discount since the salary bracket is only marginally higher than that of a student.	Resolving issues such as student discounts is beyond the scope of the Tier 1 EIS and is a policy decision made by the rail service providers. As part of the Preferred Alternative, the FRA included the ability to provide passengers with a broader mix of services and fares (see Volume 1, Chapters 4 and 5).

Table JJ–24: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Other (continued)

Commenter ID	Comment Text	Response Text
Rescigno_An	The DEIS is a milestone achievement that will enable the future development of the Northeast Corridor in a manner that improves passenger experiences and supports economic development. Let me again express strong support for the DEIS process and future improvements to the Northeast Corridor.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative to improve passenger rail service on the NEC in a manner that will enhance mobility options and expand passenger rail service in support of future population and employment growth in the Study Area. The Preferred Alternative—described in Volume 1, Chapter 4—improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects.
Rescigno_An	The State of Connecticut places a high emphasis on its existing urban centers, with focused reinvestment in center cities, inner ring suburbs and transit-rich environments. I urge you to support Connecticut 's center cities by focusing your recommendations on the existing coastal corridor and the Hartford-Springfield line.	The FRA noted interest about enhancing existing urban centers, the existing shoreline routing, and including service on the Hartford/Springfield Line. In light of these and other considerations, the Preferred Alternative includes an enhanced, electrified Hartford/Springfield Line, leveraging recent and future investments to create intermodal connections and strengthen existing urban centers. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Rich_An	I understand the need to find ways to enhance the transportation options - Route 95 is a mess, in our area especially, and I'm all for lessening the number of cars on the road.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative to improve passenger rail service on the NEC in a manner that will enhance mobility options and expand passenger rail service in support of future population and employment growth in the Study Area. The Preferred Alternative—described in Volume 1, Chapter 4—improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects.
Riodriguez_Pa	I support the sustainable and much redevelopment of the railroad network.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4).
Riodriguez_Pa	I believe that we can find a way to balance al the demands of a new network whilst preserving our cherished history.	The Preferred Alternative strives to achieve balance between protection of environmental and cultural resources, and local interests, while addressing the growing travel needs of the Northeast.
Robbins_Jo	Updating the rails, stations, trains and track lands would be a wonderful natural necessary step reinvigorating the national rail system...	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative to improve passenger rail service on the NEC in a manner that will enhance mobility options and expand passenger rail service in support of future population and employment growth in the Study Area. The Preferred Alternative—described in Volume 1, Chapter 4—improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects.
Sanders_Wi	I am in support of improvements to the NEC. Need to get the rail in good repair and improve existing equipment.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative to improve passenger rail service on the NEC in a manner that will enhance mobility options and expand passenger rail service in support of future population and employment growth in the Study Area. The Preferred Alternative—described in Volume 1, Chapter 4—improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects.
Santiago_Gi	So far my opinion is NO, animals and water will get contaminated and affect the people that use the beaches or go fishing.	The FRA considered both opposing and supporting views on the NEC FUTURE program in preparing the Tier 1 Final EIS and identifying a Preferred Alternative. Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative that improves the existing NEC to a state of good repair and includes new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Schmeelk_El	We need fast trains in this country. We are so behind Europe Japan etc.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4).
Schoenfeld_Ro	...these proposals are very good and I hope they consider, not only what I'm saying, but all the rest of them that are in proposals right now.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4).

Table JJ–24: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Other (continued)

Commenter ID	Comment Text	Response Text
Shields_Er	And if anything, I also want -- not want, but would like to see cohesion. You know, as much as I took the pains of getting here, this card (indicating) is only accepted by three agencies in the whole -- in other areas. What I mean by cohesion is that everybody puts their differences aside and thinks about the reason why public transportation exists for the public, maybe. And in a sense, you know, like other agencies have slightly better technology than this but in a sense we should be sharing ideas, we should be making these fair for the end person to actually get around. That way we -- and somebody mentioned tickets should be modular. Like if you need to get on multiple methods of transportation, there should be a seamless ticket that you -- like a form, they will direct you to different areas of the form. So if you want to get, let's say, Pennsauken, which I believe if you were coming from Queens, you need to take seven different methods of transport, at a minimum five or four. You want to have a ticket that covers all four of them instead of having separate forms. I'm sure we've all had that moment where the ticket we need slips out of our pocket, gets banged up and you need to submit it anyway. It happens. So in a sense keeping it consolidated and even better, voucher. So if someone buys the ticket, they could send copy or proof to the -- something that it could print just in case it doesn't work.	Although the FRA has not included specifics on train and station maintenance and amenities in the Tier 1 EIS process, the Preferred Alternative includes investments to support infrastructure and operational improvements for passenger rail services and at stations. Volume 1, Chapter 4, provides representative operational improvements. Specific amenities and operational improvements will be addressed during subsequent Tier 2 project studies.
Slater_Wa	It is critically important that everything reasonable be done to support and expedite the NEC FUTURE planning process. The US has much catching up to do on the quality of passenger rail service in both NEC and the rest of the country.	The FRA is working closely with federal resource and regulatory agencies, stakeholders, and elected officials to advance NEC FUTURE in an efficient and expeditious manner. However, the decisions to be made require that sufficient time is provided for the dialogue among the stakeholders and public to ensure a shared understanding and support for the Preferred Alternative.
Slattery_Fr	We need to upgrade our national power grid. Can we do both by using the Elevated Mag Lev Train as a center for the power grid upgrades? The cost would be spread out among the power companies and government.	The NEC FUTURE program is focused on improvements to passenger rail. The FRA considered the effects of the Preferred Alternative on energy (see Volume 1, Chapter 7.14). Emerging and new technologies may be applicable to rail service on the NEC and other transportation needs across the Study Area, and the selection of the Preferred Alternative does not preclude future consideration of maglev or other new technologies in the Study Area (see Volume 1, Chapter 4). The NEC FUTURE does not propose any power grid upgrades.
St. Germain_Kr	Stop measuring loss by least impacted.	The FRA's identification of a Preferred Alternative considered a range of factors, including costs as well as traveler, economic development, and environmental benefits and impacts.
Standart_Cl	I agree that we absolutely need a high speed train from New York to Boston.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative to improve passenger rail service on the NEC in a manner that will enhance mobility options and expand passenger rail service in support of future population and employment growth in the Study Area. The Preferred Alternative—described in Volume 1, Chapter 4—improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects.
Stevens_Se	Doing nothing ... would be better option	The FRA considered both opposing and supporting views on the NEC FUTURE program in preparing the Tier 1 Final EIS and identifying a Preferred Alternative. Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative that improves the existing NEC to a state of good repair and includes new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Sutton_Ro	I think that it's important to both develop a lofty vision for the future. I think that this country badly needs to have significant visions for good high speed rail transportation.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative to improve passenger rail service on the NEC in a manner that will enhance mobility options and expand passenger rail service in support of future population and employment growth in the Study Area. The Preferred Alternative—described in Volume 1, Chapter 4—improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects.

Table JJ–24: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Other (continued)

Commenter ID	Comment Text	Response Text
Swangler_Jo	As long as Mr. Boardman is around NO	The FRA considered both opposing and supporting views on the NEC FUTURE program in preparing the Tier 1 Final EIS and identifying a Preferred Alternative. Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative that improves the existing NEC to a state of good repair and includes new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Turon_Be	To make costs more political palatable I think projects contained within the final recommended alternative should be "unbundled", so that each project can be judge individually on the merits of their costs/benefits. The very large estimates for the various alternatives total project program costs I feel run the risk of being very off putting to the general public. Likely the average man and woman on street is not predisposed to support or comprehend a single public works project costing not just many tens of billions, but hundreds of billions of dollars. The falling public support for California 's HSR project seems to be directly a result of its very high price of the final system, which has escalated much from its original estimates. Breaking down the final alternative into specific individual projects with individual cost and benefit estimates for each project should make the scheme for building HSR in the NEC much easier to understand for the average citizen, and hopefully lead to greater public support.	<p>The NEC FUTURE cost estimates are representative of levels of investment that could be required to fully build out the Preferred Alternative (see Volume 1, Appendix BB). Detailed costs for specific projects are not appropriate for a Tier 1 level of assessment.</p> <p>Volume 1, Chapter 10, discusses the phasing and implementation of the Preferred Alternative. Upon completion of the Tier 1 NEPA process, the Preferred Alternative will be carried forward into a Service Development Plan. The Service Development Plan will begin to lay out the sequencing and next steps for implementation. The FRA has established a Working Group with the NEC states and railroads that will plan the work necessary to define and advance an Initial Phase of the Preferred Alternative.</p>
Untermeyer_Ad	Thank you for your efforts to improve the NEC.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4).
Valudes_He	While Lancaster is only tangentially connected to the NEC, we strongly favor a plan that supports investment in railway infrastructure, enhances connectivity, accommodates for future capacity, improves travel time, reduces environmental impacts and supports continued economic growth in the Northeast region.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative that supports the stated principles. Agency coordination and participation was meaningful in the FRA's alternatives development and Preferred Alternative deliberative process. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Varley_Ri	Amtrak, PLEASE DO move forward on your good plans!	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4).
Vogel_Ke	One of the things I was thinking about was Newark Airport has E-ZPass parking, and why isn't that at train stations locally.	Although the FRA has not included specifics on train and station maintenance and amenities in the Tier 1 EIS process, the Preferred Alternative includes investments to support infrastructure and operational improvements for passenger rail services and at stations. Volume 1, Chapter 4, provides representative operational improvements. Specific amenities and operational improvements will be addressed during subsequent Tier 2 project studies.
Vogel_Ke	one of the things I want to think about is usage and who is using it...If you're going to build this sort of thing, you really need the educated masses...You've really got to know how to do it and know that when you want to do a radius curve and you need the land to make that hundred mile radius turn, that people are not going to say NIMBY, you can't do this. It's got to be all together.	The NEC FUTURE program follows a "tiered" approach to environmental review. Tier 1 focuses on broad programs and initial analysis. Tier 2 focuses on site-specific, project-level proposals and impacts. As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, will not make decisions about final locations of new or expanded infrastructure in the Tier 1 Record of Decision. Such decisions will be made as part of the Tier 2 project studies, which will include local stakeholder and public involvement as appropriate.
Wagner_Ma	I frequently use rail service in NY/CT but do not support the proposed expansion. Too much would be lost in terms of natural and historic resources for the sake of speed.	The FRA considered both opposing and supporting views on the NEC FUTURE program in preparing the Tier 1 Final EIS and identifying a Preferred Alternative. Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative that improves the existing NEC to a state of good repair and includes new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.

Table JJ–24: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Other (continued)

Commenter ID	Comment Text	Response Text
Wagner_To	However, full and fair competition can be undermined if FRA does not set requirements for procurement that are in the national interest. Full and open competition means that the FRA should not stack the deck against domestic providers competed against foreign government subsidized trains. Full and open competition is based on a level playing field that is not upset by foreign government destruction of domestic private sector suppliers based on foreign government subsidization of proffered trains. Private sector competition against foreign government subsidized goods is not fair trade. Rather it is government action that destroys a domestic private sector in favor of a foreign government takeover of that goods and services sector.	The FRA pursued development of a long-term vision for the role of rail on the NEC as a Tier 1 Draft EIS under the National Environmental Policy Act. The Tier 1 process seeks to address programmatic corridor-wide issues to assist long-term planning activities. It is not a procurement process, nor does it take any position with regard to procurement activities. Further, the FRA (as a federal agency) is committed to the principles and practices of Buy America, which would be incorporated into any future procurements involving federal funding.
Wagner_To	As important, the FRA should develop a package of bidding requirements based on a next generation train system that minimizes or eliminates the need for continuing public sector subsidy for operations once the new trains are in service. The FRA does not have to pre-judge this, but it should make this one criterion a very high rating factor in evaluation of bids for next gen trains. A self-sustaining combination passenger and freight system should be one of "the foremost goals of the next gen train system. This goal can be accomplished if the FRA will make it a requirement and high point for evaluation.	The Tier 1 process seeks to address programmatic corridor-wide issues to assist long-term planning activities. It is not a procurement process, nor does it include any consideration of bidding requirements or priorities. The FRA will continue to promote research into new and emerging technologies and how those might be incorporated into subsequent project-level actions.
Walker_Je	The millions spent on the last Amtrak upgrade did nothing because of the topography of Shoreline tracks. Another R.R. Travesty....It takes 2 hours to get to GC from New Haven,instead of 1.5 on Metro North.	The FRA is coordinating with Amtrak and has shared this letter with them.
Walton_Da	Please keep the trains running	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4).
Warner_Ti	Tear down Madison Square Garden and make it all part of the redo!	As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, will not make local decisions, such as tearing down Madison Square Garden.
Waters_Ri	The Rail Investment Plan currently proposed is a terrible idea, invasive to the the environment and to the people who may live on property that is in the way, Eminent domain for the supposed greater good for the greatest number has never prospered and always requires subsidies to keep it going speaks of unionism and stupidity, build the transportation system to include transfers, buses and connections. Never, never intrude on the environment to build something for a few . No !	The FRA considered both opposing and supporting views on the NEC FUTURE program in preparing the Tier 1 Final EIS and identifying a Preferred Alternative. Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative that improves the existing NEC to a state of good repair and includes new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Weeks_Sa	I fully support the proposed rail trail along the CT shore, including through Old Lyme. I understand that residents have concerns. In my experience with the Amherst - Northampton Rail Trail these apprehensions are common but ultimately the trail is a wonderful thing and a great asset to the residents.	The NEC FUTURE program is focused on improvements to passenger rail. The FRA has, however, considered the effects of the alternatives evaluated on designated federal and state owned trails (Volume 2, Chapter 7.4). NEC FUTURE does not propose any improvements to recreational resources, such as the trails mentioned.
Weinmann_Le	No railroad!	The FRA considered both opposing and supporting views on the NEC FUTURE program in preparing the Tier 1 Final EIS and identifying a Preferred Alternative. Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative that improves the existing NEC to a state of good repair and includes new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.

Table JJ–24: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Other (continued)

Commenter ID	Comment Text	Response Text
Weiss_Bo	South Station is already a rail and bus hub. Any testing that you would do, I would suggest, or ideas that are presented here, work there.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4). The Preferred Alternative combines elements of the Tier 1 Draft EIS Action Alternatives to accommodate population and employment growth on the NEC in the coming decades. The Preferred Alternative replaces aging infrastructure, eliminates chokepoints, and adds capacity to support more-frequent, faster, and more-reliable service for both Intercity and Regional rail travelers. The Preferred Alternative does include an extension of service north of Boston. The North South Rail Link was not included in the No Action Alternative Project List (see Volume 2, Appendix B.1) since it does not meet the criteria for consideration: Funded projects or projects with approved funding plans, funded or unfunded mandates, unfunded projects necessary to keep the railroad running. Likewise, North South Rail Link was not included as a Related Project in the Action Alternatives because it does not meet the criteria for consideration: fully or partially funded projects located in a connecting corridor and not on the NEC; unfunded projects along the NEC with ongoing or completed NEPA/PE; fully or partially funded transit (e.g., NJ TRANSIT, MTA-LIRR) or freight projects located off of but connecting to the NEC. A project to connect Boston's North and South stations, such as the North South Rail Link, could be studied separately, and is not precluded as future investment.
Weiss_Bo	The complaint I hear most about the Acela and Amtrak is poor Wi-Fi by business people. That should be looked at, because I think it would be a great source of business for you.	Although the FRA has not included specifics on train and station maintenance and amenities in the Tier 1 EIS process, the Preferred Alternative includes investments to support infrastructure and operational improvements for passenger rail services and at stations. Volume 1, Chapter 4, provides representative operational improvements. Specific amenities and operational improvements will be addressed during subsequent Tier 2 project studies.
Weissman_Ne	... comply with provisions of the FAST Act (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Fixing_America%E2%80%99s_Surface_Transportation_Act ;) that require Amtrak to report on implementing roll-on roll off bike service.	The commenter is referring to Section 11212 of the federal Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act of 2015, which requires Amtrak to submit a report to the U.S. Congress describing, among other things, options to strengthen multimodal connections at Amtrak stations and terminal, including roll-on and roll-off bicycles. Amtrak is required under the FAST Act to submit such a report no later than 12/4/2016, a year after the FAST Act was passed. The status of Amtrak's reporting to Congress is separate from the planning efforts being undertaken for NEC FUTURE. Although separate from the referenced mandate, the FRA considered the importance of multimodal connectivity, including bicycle and pedestrian access to stations and passenger rail service throughout the planning for NEC FUTURE. These features are further described in Volume 1, Chapters 4 and 5, for the Preferred Alternative.
Weissman_Ne	...comply with relevant provisions of the FAST Act.	FRA is working to comply with relevant provisions of the FAST Act as are other U.S. DOT agencies, including the FTA. However, certain provisions of the FAST Act are not applicable to the NEC FUTURE Tier 1 environmental review because FRA initiated the project prior to enactment of the FAST Act. For example, consistent with FAST Act section 11503 (49 U.S.C. 24201(e)), FRA will not apply the Section 139 environmental review process to any railroad project for which notice of intent to develop an environmental impact statement was published before December 4, 2015, or for which the Secretary approved the funding arrangement under title 49 of the United States Code before December 4, 2015.
Wilkins_An	Voice my support for the objectives laid out in the Northeast Corridor Future Tier 1 Draft Environmental Impact Statement	Volume 1, Chapter 3 provides a summary of the Purpose and Need. The FRA evaluated the alternatives presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS to determine how well each met the Purpose and Need and established goals and objectives. The evaluation presented and feedback provided during the public comment period led FRA to identify a Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Williams_Ma	The Administrator should favorably conclude the EIS process as rapidly as possible.	The FRA is working closely with federal resource and regulatory agencies, stakeholders, and elected officials to advance NEC FUTURE in an efficient and expeditious manner. However, the decisions to be made require that sufficient time is provided for the dialogue among the stakeholders and public to ensure a shared understanding and support for the Preferred Alternative.

Table JJ–24: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Other (continued)

Commenter ID	Comment Text	Response Text
Williams_Sh	I am against this.	The FRA considered both opposing and supporting views on the NEC FUTURE program in preparing the Tier 1 Final EIS and identifying a Preferred Alternative. Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative that improves the existing NEC to a state of good repair and includes new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Wilmerding_Ga	Regarding the Northeast Corridor (NEC) rail service upgrade, infrastructure improvements are desperately needed.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative to improve passenger rail service on the NEC in a manner that will enhance mobility options and expand passenger rail service in support of future population and employment growth in the Study Area. The Preferred Alternative—described in Volume 1, Chapter 4—improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects.
Wolde_Di	I'm very much concerned about every-day commuters. I feel that they're not protected, because the platform is so naked. Anybody behind them might be mentally sick; perhaps they might not take medicine. They can push you, and you're gone. That's a very tragedy, and I'm very much concerned on that. So I thought that this meeting is basically a kind of automatic fence rail that protects commuters...	Although the FRA has not included specifics on train and station maintenance and amenities in the Tier 1 EIS process, the Preferred Alternative includes investments to support infrastructure and operational improvements for passenger rail services and at stations. Volume 1, Chapter 4, provides representative operational improvements. Specific amenities and operational improvements will be addressed during subsequent Tier 2 project studies.
Wright_Ca	As a long time Old Saybrook CT resident I look forward to the progress in improving transportation options.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Yale_Jacob	My colleagues and I commend you for developing a vision for the future of the Northeast Corridor and, in the process, highlighting the need for significant infrastructure investment that will support economic growth and yield major environmental benefits by substituting rail for automobile and airline traffic.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4).
Zelson_St	The plans/plan summaries do not include any detailed maps of proposed routes or immediate environmental impacts near and/or connecting to existing tracks. This kind of information is essential for people to make an informed decision among the proposed alternatives. The lack of this critical information is surprising considering the length of time these plans have been under consideration.	The NEC FUTURE program follows a "tiered" approach to environmental review. Tier 1 focuses on broad programs and initial analysis. Tier 2 focuses on site-specific, project-level proposals and impacts. The FRA developed a mapping atlas to provide a high level representation of the location and construction type of the Preferred Alternative (see Volume 1, Appendix AA). Detailed mapping will occur in subsequent Tier 2 project analyses.
Zingre_Sh	North East Corridor certainly needs an upgrade to rail as well as trainset infrastructure. Current Northeast Regional trains are slow, aging, and uncomfortable. While the Acela trains are more comfortable, they are in high demand yet much more expensive compared to alternative modes of transport. The NEC is USA's busiest corridor and can use faster, more comfortable and more reliable service to reduce vehicle traffic and pollution.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative to improve passenger rail service on the NEC in a manner that will enhance mobility options and expand passenger rail service in support of future population and employment growth in the Study Area. The Preferred Alternative—described in Volume 1, Chapter 4—improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects.
Zipprich_Be	Amtrak should close unprofitable lines, and reinvest those dollars in high speed rail equal or better to anywhere else in the world. And political leaders should support this goal by working collaboratively to make it happen.	The FRA is coordinating with Amtrak and has shared this letter with them.
Zissimos_Br	We move a ton of people daily, it only makes sense to keep the Northeast corridor running at optimal speeds.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4).
Zumpano_He	I am against the Tier 1 Draft EIS	The FRA considered both opposing and supporting views on the NEC FUTURE program in preparing the Tier 1 Final EIS and identifying a Preferred Alternative. Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative that improves the existing NEC to a state of good repair and includes new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.

Table JJ–24: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Other (continued)

Commenter ID	Comment Text	Response Text
Anonymous_001	Preferred Alternative: Alternative 2 at least; Alternative 3 if possible	The Preferred Alternative improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. The Preferred Alternative brings the existing NEC to a state of good repair and maximizes its capacity through alleviation of chokepoints, addition of new tracks and segments at targeted locations, and implementation of service operational efficiencies. The Preferred Alternative also removes speed restrictions where practical and safe, reduces trip times, offers frequent Metropolitan and enhanced express Intercity services, and allows substantial growth for all Regional rail markets. See Volume 1, Chapter 4, for additional information on the Preferred Alternative.
Anonymous_001	The system falls behind many Asian and European countries in all other aspects as well: tidiness, cleanliness, ticketing and seat allotment.	Although the FRA has not included specifics on train and station maintenance and amenities in the Tier 1 EIS process, the Preferred Alternative includes investments to support infrastructure and operational improvements for passenger rail services and at stations. Volume 1, Chapter 4, provides representative operational improvements. Specific amenities and operational improvements will be addressed during subsequent Tier 2 project studies.
Anonymous_006	...that if you make this gateway tunnel for Amtrak, is there any room for New York City subway tracks under that tunnel?	<p>The Preferred Alternative provides new two-track infrastructure under the Hudson River to accommodate significant growth in intercity and regional rail operations in the New York area market. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Preferred Alternative, provides a full description of the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative is consistent with the proposed action for the Hudson Tunnel Project, a project separate from NEC FUTURE and intended to preserve the current functionality of the NEC's Hudson River rail crossing between New Jersey and New York and strengthen the resilience of the NEC; FRA and NJ TRANSIT are currently leading the NEPA process for the Hudson Tunnel Project.</p> <p>As part of the NEC FUTURE program, the new two-track tunnel will accommodate intercity and regional rail operations. No specific improvements to public transit operations, such as the New York City subway operated by Metropolitan Transportation Authority New York City Transit, are examined.</p>
Anonymous_011	Good idea.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4).
Anonymous_015	It seems like the NEC is getting slower and slower. With trains being the most affordable, convenient, and environmental friendly way to travel, investment in it is key.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative to improve passenger rail service on the NEC in a manner that will enhance mobility options and expand passenger rail service in support of future population and employment growth in the Study Area. The Preferred Alternative—described in Volume 1, Chapter 4—improves the existing NEC and incorporates new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects.
Anonymous_022	This is a vital and valuable extension of rail transit, one that would provide important commuter access to much of Connecticut and the Northeast. It would also help to eliminate traffic congestion and carbon emissions in the New England area.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4). In Connecticut, the Preferred Alternative provides connections along the existing NEC, along a supplemental new segment between Old Saybrook, CT, and Kenyon, RI, and along the Hartford/Springfield Line.
Anonymous_043	This is NOT what is best for our community. Please reconsider.	The FRA considered both opposing and supporting views on the NEC FUTURE program in preparing the Tier 1 Final EIS and identifying a Preferred Alternative. Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative that improves the existing NEC to a state of good repair and includes new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.

Table JJ–24: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Other (continued)

Commenter ID	Comment Text	Response Text
Anonymous_047	why are we hastening into this. I feel the Govt is being the usual underhanded and self serving monster it always is. I would like to see the ecological and community impact studies done by independent surveyors. I will probably move out of this area if the social and economic impact is to destructive. Also I would like to know that the work being done is not performed by heavy donors to politicians but actually helps the average worker and local job market. But having watched our government i.e. politicians be so self serving torso long I have lost all faith that this will be done for the puplic good!!!	The FRA considered both opposing and supporting views on the NEC FUTURE program in preparing the Tier 1 Final EIS and identifying a Preferred Alternative. Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative that improves the existing NEC to a state of good repair and includes new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.
Anonymous_056	I support this project. Stop holding up progress and let them get to work. We need the upgrades to the infrastructure system and this would create jobs.	Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative (described in Volume 1, Chapter 4). Volume 1, Chapter 10, identifies the steps toward an Initial Phase of the Preferred Alternative, which would improve service and address critical infrastructure improvements. The Preferred Alternative would create jobs related to construction and operations and maintenance of the project (described in Volume 1, Chapter 6).
Anonymous_134	Trying to push one bad plan through is criminal! The best plan would have the least impact on the people and environment and is not the proposed plan. You don't even know how this plan would make any difference to the use of the railway!	The FRA considered effects to the natural and built environment in evaluating each of the Action Alternatives. Additional feedback and comments from federal and state resource and regulatory agencies, the public, elected officials, and agencies helped to identify areas of sensitivity and opportunities to balance needed improvements with potential effects.
Anonymous_135	Slow down and take time to talk some.	The FRA is committed to an open public participation process that has included 35 public meetings throughout the region since 2012, as well as numerous informal meetings with interested organizations upon request. In November 2015, the FRA notified state and local governments and regional agencies along each of the Action Alternatives’ Representative Routes of the availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The FRA sent information on the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comment process, and public hearings to elected officials in each of the 216 local jurisdictions and 42 counties along these Representative Routes. The FRA also placed legal notice and advertisements in major regional newspapers, and distributed media advisories to media outlets throughout the region to publicize availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public hearings, and the comment period. The outreach effort to local communities complied with the FRA's Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts and was appropriate with respect to the level of detail available in this Tier 1 environmental review. Going forward, future Tier 2 projects will address project level coordination issues, such as impacts to local resources and communities. Future Tier 2 project coordination will be the responsibility of the local project sponsor, who will identify coordination with potentially impacted communities, counties, state resource and regulatory agencies and federal agencies.
Anonymous_136	I am not okay with my money, and other tax payers money being spent on a project that will demolish historic buildings and damage a beautiful, historic town to cut out a half hour of a commute. I'm sorry but the benefits do not out weigh the risks.	The FRA considered both opposing and supporting views on the NEC FUTURE program in preparing the Tier 1 Final EIA and identifying a Preferred Alternative. Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative that improves the existing NEC to a state of good repair and includes new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4; cultural resources are described in Volume 1, Chapter 7.09.
Anonymous_142	Bad idea for our community and the sound. Especially if it will only save a half hour travel time. Not worth all the trouble.	The FRA considered both opposing and supporting views on the NEC FUTURE program in preparing the Tier 1 Final EIS and identifying a Preferred Alternative. Based on the evaluation presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public comments received, and the FRA policy objectives, the FRA identified a Preferred Alternative that improves the existing NEC to a state of good repair and includes new segments that, together, expand capacity to grow the role of rail and have the greatest potential for operational benefit while minimizing environment effects. The Preferred Alternative is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4.

Source: NEC FUTURE team, 2016

JJ.5.13 Patuxent Research Refuge

The following response addresses all of the comments contained within the following table:

The goals and scope of the NEC FUTURE Tier 1 EIS address the large-scale regional transportation needs for proposed improvements to the NEC in the Study Area. The alternatives and their routes and service plans described in the Tier 1 EIS are representative of prospective markets served, routings, and possible construction types. In defining the Preferred Alternative, the FRA reviewed specific local concerns and subsequently refined representative routes and construction types to balance the concerns with broader regional travel needs, including for the Patuxent Research Refuge as described below. However, it is important to note that local issues will be given full consideration as part of Tier 2 project studies. Only after the completion of a Tier 2 project study for specific projects, including any located in the vicinity of Patuxent Research Refuge, will decisions be made about specific routes and construction types.

The FRA recognized the concerns raised by the numerous commenters about potential impacts to the Patuxent Research Refuge, as well as impacts to National Wildlife Refuges in general. Given the level of concern, the legislative mandates governing activity in such protected areas, and the existence of an alternate routing that does not significantly compromise travel times, the FRA has developed the Representative Route for the Preferred Alternative such that it generally avoids or minimizes impacts on National Wildlife Refuges. The Tier 1 Final EIS includes a proposed commitment to avoid substantial crossings of National Wildlife Refuges (such as the crossing shown in Alternative 3 in the area of Patuxent Research Refuge) and will seek to minimize impacts to National Wildlife Refuges.. Volume 1, Chapter 7.5, has more information about the Patuxent Research Refuge and how the FRA has generally addressed National Wildlife Refuges near the NEC.

During the subsequent Tier 2 project studies, the project sponsor will define the final alignment and construction details as part of the planning, engineering, and design processes. Going forward, the FRA encourages local participation during subsequent Tier 2 project analysis. During the Tier 2 project analysis, the project sponsor and/or lead agency, who may be FRA or another agency, will be responsible for the public participation process.

Additional details about the Tier 1 Draft EIS comment process, including the announcement for the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public hearings, and comment period can be found at Volume 1, Chapter 11 and Appendix FF as well as at www.NECFUTURE.com.

Table JJ–25: Stakeholder Comments (Elected Officials, Tribes, Federal Agencies, State Agencies, Local Agencies): Patuxent Wildlife Refuge

Stakeholder ID	Comment
Greenbelt_Robles	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...
MDDNR_Smith	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.

Source: NEC FUTURE team, 2016

Table JJ-26: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Patuxent Wildlife Refuge

Stakeholder ID	Comment
Agarwal_Ni	...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...
Ahearn_Do	...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...
Alderson_Ge	We heartily support the overall thrust of the NEC Future project, but we are absolutely opposed to taking any lands from Patuxent Research Refuge for railroad purposes, as contemplated in Alternative3.
Alderson_Ge	The Alternative 3 proposal would take away 60 acres of the refuge, destroying wildlife habitats that include wetlands, pristine streams, riparian and forested areas. The area has been identified as an Important Bird Area. It is also the largest remaining block of continuous forest in central Maryland. We question whether such refuge lands could be lawfully taken for non-refuge purposes under the laws governing the National Wildlife Refuge System. This legal question should be addressed in the EIS.
Allison_Ka	I would like nothing more than a better, safer, quicker rail system, but NOT AT THE EXPENSE OF LOSING THE PATUXENT WILDLIFE REFUGE!! Please do not destroy this national treasure!
Babiak_Ka	...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...
Baehr_Jo	...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...
Bagwill_Ap	...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...
Bailey_An	...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...
Balascio_La	...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...
Baummer_To	...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...
Beck_Ba	...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...
Bell_Ja	...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...
Bentley_Ka	...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...
Bentley_Ly	I am deeply concerned about the proposal rail line that would completely destroy a portion of the Patuxent Wildlife Refuge. The greater Washington, DC area is gradually losing much of what makes it so attractive: protected areas such as Patuxent Wildlife Refuge where local citizens can observe and learn about many species of birds, in particular those that are threatened. To destroy these pristine stream, wetland, riparian and forest habitats is unconscionable and unacceptable. It is imperative this draft plan be changed in order to maintain this National Wildlife Refuge as it exists today. According to the laws that established the National Wildlife Refuges, these lands are not to be used for purposes other than conservation. If this draft plan is finalized as proposed, it would be a horrid precedent for what is so vitally important to our environment.

Table JJ–26: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Patuxent Wildlife Refuge (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment
Benyus_Di	...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...
Bernadzikowski_Fr	...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...
Berry_BB	If Alternate 3 were chosen, it would destroy valuable, contiguous wildlife habitat in a region of Maryland where development has taken an immense toll on natural resources. Chopping off 60 acres of the Patuxent Wildlife Refuge would damage the ecological integrity of the largest remaining forest block in central Maryland. Critical habitat for several declining bird species, including the Eastern whip-poor-will and wood thrush, among others, would be destroyed if Alternate 3 were chosen negating the key purpose of the refuge. The Patuxent refuge was established as part of the Migratory Bird Conservation Act to more effectively meet U.S. treaty obligations for the perpetual preservation of birds.
Bjerke_Jo	I oppose the proposal to run a rail line through the Patuxent Refuge. The Refuge is a designated Important Bird Area and the site of much important wildlife research. The rail line would be detrimental to this research.
Bohlander_Ja	...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...
Bourdon_Ro	...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...
Boyle_Ro	I am horrified to learn that another wildlife area might be sacrificed for misplaced development. I speak of the NEC line proposal to grab lands from the Patuxent Wildlife Refuge. What a horror. This protected space now contains the largest mid-Maryland forest preserve which is a critical breeding habitat. Once destroyed, identical complex ecosystems cannot be recreated elsewhere with bulldozers and developers' dollars. The Patuxent Research Refuge is the only National Wildlife Refuge in the USA supporting wildlife research. Ongoing research should be honored and commitments to preserve wildlife habitat must be upheld.
Bradley_Ch	That a portion of the Patuxent NWR would be a corridor option for the proposed rail system is a travesty. Is this the best you can do?
Bravo_Cy	As a resident of Maryland (for over 50 years) and a lover of our state's wild places I am writing to oppose your rail plan running through Patuxent Wildlife Refuge.
Bromberger_Le	...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...
Brown_Li	A rail line here would cause an ecological disaster. You can create another route--you can't create another Patuxent Research Refuge or replace the wild like you will destroy.
Bucci_Mi	...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...
Bulmer_Bi	...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...
Byron_Da	...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...
Cadogdazed	...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...

Table JJ–26: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Patuxent Wildlife Refuge (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment
Callicrate_Ta	I am writing this letter in opposition to Alternate 3 in your rail plan... As time goes on and there are more people, it's tempting to think we can split chunks off of places like Patuxent or section it up and that we'll still get the benefit of a natural area, but doing something like that is a bad idea, and here's why. Many species have biological requirements for large forest patches in order to successfully breed. When a large area is broken up (and this proposal would remove 60 acres- a huge area!), the resulting smaller patches are no longer safe and usable for these birds, and we lose them. ... Short-term, a railroad line might seem like a nice idea, but what we lose in cutting up Patuxent will really hurt Marylanders in the long run... Please chose an alternate proposal to protect Patuxent for Marylanders.
Casey_Ca	...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...
Chasson_Ma	The Patuxent Wildlife Area is a unique sanctuary in our area. It is not a good place for a rail line .Alternative locations for the rail should be given more consideration - it is always easy to use undeveloped land, but when especially when such land is scarce. But that is all the more reason not to use it for rail purposes. We must preserve some places for birds and wildlife along this river.
Churchill_Jo	I read today that there is a plan being considered to put a rail line through the Patuxent National Wildlife Refuge. I think that would be a huge mistake. In an area that has been already over-developed, the refuge stands out as a pristine sanctuary for nature. I grew up nearby in Greenbelt and visited the refuge frequently as I was learning about birdwatching and nature in general. I can't begin to tell you how important that refuge is to the people that visit and to the wildlife in the area. A rail line would cause major harm on both of those fronts and I am opposed to that happening. Please consider nixing this option for the rail plan.
Colin	...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...
Conoscenti_Pa	...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...
Copp_Al	I oppose the portion of the Alternative 3 route which passes through the Patuxent Wildlife Refuge
Copp_Al	The refuge was established in 1973 to preserve wildlife and should not be diminished.
Coursey_Ca	...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...
Cowan_Ca	...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...
Crabb_An	...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...
Cunningham_De	I write you to oppose Alternate 3 in your railway plan. This option would destroy five dozen acres of the publicly-owned Patuxent Wildlife Refuge in central Maryland, less than an hour from your office... There are multiple practical, feasible, less destructive alternative routes. Please select a different option that does not devastate this publicly-owned, long-standing treasure.
Cunningham_De	The Patuxent Research Refuge... This biologically rich and diverse piece of land has been incredibly helpful in preserving at-risk species of migrating birds. The size of the Patuxent Research Refuge has made it far more priceless than several smaller parcels of land.
Curson_Da	The loss of natural habitat and its wildlife on the Refuge for the benefit of an unrelated use, transportation, is contrary to the purpose and mission of the Refuge, as described by the National Wildlife Refuge System Improvement Act of 1997. This Act describes the mission of the National Wildlife Refuge System as follows: "to administer a national network of lands and waters for the conservation, management, and where appropriate, restoration of the fish, wildlife and plant resources and their habitats within the United States for the benefit of present and future generations of Americans." The Refuge is a valuable and much-loved public asset, which provides an opportunity for people . to enjoy recreation in a natural setting in a densely developed region of the country where such opportunities are limited. It is a refuge for the American people as much as for wildlife.
Curson_Da	Alternative 3 would destroy valuable wildlife habitat and forest cover 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, which is recognized as an Important Bird Area of statewide significance. Audubon identified the Patuxent Research Refuge as an Important Bird Area in 2006, because of its importance to several declining bird species, including Eastern whip-poor-will, wood thrush, Kentucky warbler and prairie warbler. Scarlet tanagers and summer tanagers are also favorites for birdwatchers who frequent the refuge. Important Bird Areas (IBAs) are sites supporting significant populations of vulnerable bird species. The network of IBA sites is global, covering over 200 countries under the auspices of Birdlife International, a worldwide partnership of bird conservation organizations. In Maryland, 43 IBAs have been identified (see attachment).

Table JJ–26: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Patuxent Wildlife Refuge (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment
Curson_Da	Allowing the proposed "take" of a publicly-owned natural resource at the Refuge would set a dangerous precedent, which could allow similar developments over future decades to erode the Refuge to the point of its ultimate loss by attrition. Acquisition and/or conversion of refuge land for transportation use are currently prohibited by law and any attempt to convert it would set a disturbing precedent for the country's most beautiful and biologically diverse landscapes
Curson_Da	Audubon Maryland-DC is opposed to Alternative 3 and we ask that you reject it.
Curtis_Wi	...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...
Cwi_Jo	I strongly oppose Alternate 3 in your rail plan, the one that would slice off 60-acres of the Patuxent Research Refuge... Feasible and less destructive alternatives exist--please choose one that does not disturb this national treasure!
Cwi_Jo	Audubon has designated Patuxent as one of its Important Bird Areas (IBA). IBA's are sites that provide essential habitat for breeding, wintering, and/or migrating birds whose populations are vulnerable for a number of reasons. The ecological integrity of Patuxent is vital to many declining bird species such as Eastern whip-poor-will, wood thrush, Kentucky warbler and prairie warbler.
Davie_Mi	...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...
Davis_Ka	...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...
Davis_Ron	...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...
Dement_Do	...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...
Dittman_Da	...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...
Donaldson_Br	Saying no to the expansion through Maryland state parks. Patuxent research refuge's land transfer is very specific and this would break the agreement.
Druding_Je	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.
Druding_Je	The laws that established National Wildlife Refuges state that the land should not be used for purposes other than conservation. Any loss of Refuge land to a transportation corridor would set a disturbing precedent for our country's precious network of wildlife refuges. Patuxent Wildlife Refuge is the wrong place for the new rail line. 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. Again, I repeat Patuxent Wildlife Refuge is the wrong place for the new rail line.
Dungan_Am	I am writing to oppose Alternate 3 of the Northeast Corridor rail plan. ... Patuxent Wildlife Refuge encompasses pristine stream, wetland, riparian and forest habitats that are critical to a number of at-risk bird species. Alternate 3 would destroy this invaluable wildlife habitat in a region of Maryland where development has already taken an immense toll on natural resources. ... While I appreciate the need for the expansion of rail in the Northeast corridor, there are alternatives that would avoid this environmental destruction. Please do not make a decision that would destroy a national wildlife refuge which provides vital habitat birds and other creatures.
Dunlap_Ju	I am writing to express my strong opposition to Alternate 3 of the proposed rail plan in our area... While rail transportation is important to support for environmental and economic reasons, please identify and follow another route that does not imperil the wildlife and environmental science values of Patuxent Research Refuge. The damage caused by the rail construction would be permanent and far reaching
Dunlap_Ju	The proposal would seriously damage and degrade some of the precious few acres of wildlife habitat remaining in the eastern U.S. The fragile wetlands, stream, and forest are vital habitats to declining birds, reptiles, amphibians, and mammals, all at risk from many hazards including heavy development throughout our region. Patuxent is the last best place for them to survive, and we need to keep it for this high purpose, which no other land in the region can fulfill. It's especially important to recognize the dependence of many wildlife species on large, intact habitat areas. A few acres here and there are not sufficient, as proven repeatedly by research into the declining biodiversity of many parks around the world. Each diminution of acreage is another small cut that reduces an area's value to flora and fauna. Patuxent Wildlife Refuge remains large and needs to stay that way if it is to serve its function of protecting viable wildlife and plant populations... Patuxent has been the site of many pivotal environmental studies

Table JJ–26: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Patuxent Wildlife Refuge (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment
Durel_An	...I am writing to stress my deep concern about the proposal put forth in Alternate 3 of your rail plan. My understanding is that a draft proposal for a new rail line on the Northeast Corridor from Baltimore to Washington, DC, includes destruction of a priceless wildlife habitat. The Patuxent Wildlife Refuge remains the largest forest block in central Maryland - one that is a haven for wildlife and central to the environment health of our region. We cannot afford to jeopardize its pristine stream, wetland, riparian and forest habitat. We cannot afford to dismiss the fact that the Refuge is critical to a number of at-risk bird species. It's integrity must be protected. We have witnessed rampant development in this area already and seen countless green spaces swallowed up. If this action goes forward you would be responsible for slicing through 60 acres of the Patuxent Wildlife Refuge and destroying over 60 acres of irreplaceable wildlife habitat. . Not only would this action take an immense toll on natural resources but also it would damage the ecological integrity of the largest remaining forest block in central Maryland. Audubon Maryland-DC has recognized this area as an Important Bird Area (IBA) because it provides critical habitat for several declining bird species.
Dynes_El	...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...
Eastman_Aj	I am writing to strongly object to the plan to fragment the Patuxent Wildlife Refuge for a rail line slicing through this incredibly important, environmentally rich tract of land serving both protection for wildlife and a research area for the scientists at the Wildlife Refuge. Please find a corridor for the rail line that does not fragment rare open space land.
Elvander_Ro	...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...
Enak	...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...
Engelke_Je	...it cannot be at the expense of irreplaceable natural areas. Patuxent National Wildlife Refuge is more than an essential breeding ground for wildlife (birds, mammals, reptiles and amphibians), it provides critical areas of uninterrupted forest cover and (almost) pristine river source acreage for the benefit of both the Chesapeake Bay and the humanity surrounding it.
Fagan_Ke	...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...
Fahlman_Ch	...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...
Filigenzi_Ba	...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...
Fisher_El	I am writing to let you know that as a concerned Maryland citizen, I strongly urge any proposed rail line to circumvent the Park. The construction process would be disruptive to wildlife and plants, especially to several bird species that the Audubon Society has stated need protecting.
Fleming_An	...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...
Forester_Ge	...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...
Friedhoffer_Je	...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...
Genovese_Li	...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. ...

Table JJ–26: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Patuxent Wildlife Refuge (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment
Geran_Ti	...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...
Gibbs_De	This refuge is the wrong place for a new rail line. Do not disturb this unique and critical wildlife habitat. Too many rare species depend on it for survival.
Givan_Pe	...The proposal to take 60 acres from the Patuxent Wildlife Refuge is unacceptable. The refuge is home to some of the best stream and wetland areas in Maryland. In addition it contains some of the best forest habitats for resident and migratory wildlife. In past years, this area suffered immense degradation from exceptionally poor land use management. Since this area was designated as a wildlife refuge it has become an important birding area by providing habitat for many of our declining species of birds...
Glancy_Jo	...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...
Goldman_Ma	Do not run trains through nature preserve area.
Gonce_Sa	...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...
Grant_Yv	...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...
Gray_La	I'm for protecting the Wildlife at the Patuxent Wildlife Refuge! I do not want any transportation or destruction coming in contact with any wildlife refuge.
Greenawalt_An	...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...
Gunther_Ma	...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...
Hammond_Pa	...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...
Hanson_An	Please do not place a railroad through the Patuxent Wildlife Refuge.
Harmony_Lo	Make the transportation corridor go AROUND THE OUTSIDE OF THE Wildlife Refuge on private land - making sure to erect structures that will preserve bio-diversity within the refuge. There are few enough semi-wild places in the Baltimore- Washington area. We CERTAINLY do NOT NEED LESS semi-wild places. Species protection IS IMPORTANT. But it not just about bio-diversity. PEOPLE need wild places to get to = BEST if near large cities.
Hartman_Ke	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.
Hartman_Ro	...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...
Heckman_Ja	The Patuxent Wildlife Refuge is a rare extent of contiguous undeveloped land that is set aside for wildlife. Dividing the land, by a railroad line or any other development, disrupts the ecosystem and diminishes the value of the land for wildlife. Please protect the integrity of the preserved area and do not allow a rail line to be built inside or through the refuge.
Heinsman_Aa	..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...

Table JJ–26: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Patuxent Wildlife Refuge (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment
Hudgins_De	...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...
Irions_Am	I am a Maryland resident and I write to strongly oppose using any part of the Patuxent Wildlife Refuge for a rail line on the Northeast Corridor. I live near this beautiful wildlife refuge, so I see firsthand the diversity of flora and fauna on the land. And, more important, as the seasons change, I see the diversity of migrating species that rely on this land for food, shelter, and, most important, sanctuary. As I understand it, the purpose of a wildlife refuge is to conserve and manage land so that destructive human practices do not entirely spoil the environment for the other millions of species who live alongside us. Running a rail line through land specifically dedicated for conserving already at-risk species would set a dangerous precedent: If the Northeast Corridor is approved, no refuge can be reasonably considered a conservation sanctuary again.
Isaacs_Ka	...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. My husband and I are long-time birders who enjoy seeing wildlife of all kinds in our own backyard in Pasadena, MD, in refuges in Maryland, and in other states and countries. We appreciate the work our government has done to keep some places relatively wild and appropriate for the plants and animals that live there...
Johnson_Am	...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...
Johnson_Ba	...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...
Johnson-Ulrich_Li	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. Patuxent Wildlife Refuge is a publicly owned natural resource. The federal laws that established this national wildlife refuge state that this land should not be used for purposes other than conservation. From my point of view, this rail plan violates federal law and is putting the interests of corporations over that of the people. To me, this rail plan has parallels to the armed and illegal occupation of the wildlife refuge in Oregon. Public lands exist for the enjoyment of all US citizens and once established no one has the right to use that land for specific project interests. This rail plan sets a dangerous precedent against the preservation of precious network of wildlife refuges in the US.
Johnston_Ma	I am writing to oppose Alternate 3 or any proposal to place a rail line in or proximate to the Patuxent Wildlife Refuge.
Johnston_Ma	That the Office of Environmental Policy and Compliance and other planning bodies are even considering the destruction of a US wildlife refuge is beyond reasoning. Patuxent WR and all of our federal refuges are important to the preservation of habitat and species. Patuxent, in particular, offers critical acreage to preserve species and conserve resources in a highly developed region where habitat fragmentation is predominant. The proposed rail line would damage the ecological integrity of the largest remaining forest block in central Maryland-recognized by Audubon Maryland-DC (of which I am a proud member) as an Important Bird Area (IBA) in 2006 because it provides habitat for several declining bird species.
Juliana_Ca	Please don't put a rail line through the Patuxent Wildlife Refuge. We need to preserve the entire Refuge for the wildlife & for our children.
Just_Li	Please be aware that I am strongly opposed to Alternate 3 in your rail plan. This act would be detrimental to the valuable wildlife habitat, in a region where destructive development has already taken a toll on our natural resources. Please choose an alternate route that would not destroy this national treasure.
Just_Li	Destroying this habitat would go against the purpose for which the refuge was established! Furthermore, bulldozing through, even a section of the area, would disturb the contiguous habitat birds and wildlife need to survive. Allowing this irresponsible proposal to continue would be an assault to the natural habitat and would set a dangerous precedent.
Kantrowitz_Ra	...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...
Kassell_Su	The scheme 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) because it provides critical habitat for several declining bird species.
Kassell_Su	The laws that established National Wildlife Refuges state that the land should not be used for purposes other than conservation. Any loss of Refuge land to a transportation corridor would set a disturbing precedent for our country's precious network of wildlife refuges.
Katauskas_Pa	...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...

Table JJ–26: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Patuxent Wildlife Refuge (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment
Kennie	...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...
Kimbis_Ti	...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...
Klopp_Ed	...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...
Knodel_Ma	...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...
Koenig_Cl	I have been a life-long visitor of the Patuxent Wildlife Refuge... We have plenty of methods by which to traverse the Northeast corridor (i.e. cars, buses, trains, airplanes). It is illogical to create another means of getting from point A to point B where that method of travel destroys woodlands where wood thrushes sing their melodic songs at dusk. It is truly immoral to take what little undisturbed places are left to our wildlife just so we can get to places quicker.
Koenig_Ga	...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...
Koonce_Cl	I am voicing my opposition to the proposed rail plan that would carve out a portion of the Patuxent NWR and Research Center... Having visited and photographed the Patuxent area in particular several times and having appreciated the respite and calm which it offers, I would like to see it preserved intact with no intrusion by a railway or any other development. Please also consider that the refuge already deals with some impact from the nearby Tipton Airfield and the remnants of the artillery test range which occupied the area formerly.
Koonce_Cl	I have read over the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, and I see that other areas besides the Patuxent would be affected, both here in Maryland and elsewhere along the rail corridor. In addition to the wildlife areas, I see historic landmarks and similar sites on the list of places that would be affected adversely by the presence of a railway.
Krispin_No	The Patuxent Wildlife Refuge is a vital organ in the body of the natural world... You have an obligation to stop this destruction of an established Wildlife Habitat & learning center. As a member of the public who values our smallest creatures & also knows the importance of public transportation, I beg you to cancel this proposal & leave the open space & woodland alone... I am completely opposed to this project in the proposed location.
Larsen_Ell	...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...
Latham_Je	The Friends of Patuxent strongly oppose Alternate 3 in the proposal to expand and modify the Northeast Rail Corridor through this National Wildlife Refuge. ... The Friends of Patuxent do not oppose the improvement of the Northeast Rail Corridor, but we strongly oppose any alternative that would take any portion of the Research Refuge. Federal regulation requires that other alternatives be chosen in preference to the taking of national public lands of the significance of Patuxent Research Refuge. Patuxent Research Refuge, a national wildlife refuge of unparalleled value and importance, must not be compromised. The Friends of Patuxent strongly oppose selection of Alternative 3.
Latham_Je	National Wildlife Refuges such as Patuxent Research Refuge are afforded the maximum level of protection of any public lands in the United States. Any plan to take such lands for other public purposes requires the highest level of scrutiny and complete consideration of all alternatives. Alternate 3 of the Rail Investment Plan for the Northeast Corridor would eliminate 60 acres of the Patuxent Research Refuge (PRR) including pristine stream, wetland, riparian and forest habitats which are critical to a number of at-risk bird species as well as other important wildlife species. The refuge is a very valuable wildlife habitat in a heavily developed area. It contains the largest forest block remaining in central Maryland. As others have noted, including the Maryland Ornithological Society, the ecological integrity of this large mostly contiguous forest block is vital to many declining bird species such as Eastern whip-poor-will, wood thrush, Kentucky warbler and prairie warbler. It has also hosted Chuck-Wills- Widow, a very uncommon species in Maryland. Because it serves as a vital habitat for these species, PRR has been recognized in 2006 as an Important Bird Area (IBA).
Lavish_Ke	...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...

Table JJ–26: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Patuxent Wildlife Refuge (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment
Lewis_Or	...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...
Liversidge_He	I have just read about a proposal to build a rail line along the northeast corridor between Washington and Baltimore that would take 60 acres of streams, wetlands and forest from the Patuxent Wildlife Refuge. This would do irreparable damage to birds and other wildlife that are already struggling to survive in this heavily developed area....Please do not consider taking even one acre from this valuable refuge.
Lowe_Ed	...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...
Lutmerding_Jo	...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...
Luttrell_Sa	...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...
Mahlstedt_De	...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...
Maize_Ca	Please don't consider slicing through the Patuxent Wildlife Refuge with a new rail line. The construction would cause permanent damage.
McCoskey_Da	...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...
Minkler_Bo	...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....
Minkler_Pe	...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...
Moriarty_Ni	please do not put a rail through Patuxent wildlife refuge, we have too few conservation areas left in the northeast.
Morrison_Jo	...The 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...
Mullen_St	...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...
Myers_Li	...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...
Nerlinger_Su	...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...

[illegible]

Table JJ–26: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Patuxent Wildlife Refuge (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment
Rajbhandary_Ja	...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...
Rapp_Ji	...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...
Richardson_De	By way of this email I am expressing my opposition to any plan to develop national wildlife refuge land, as I understand is currently being considered in order to establish a new rail line that could impact Patuxent Research Refuge. Specifically, this is in regards to "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, Alternate 3". As a resident of neighboring Prince Georges county, and a regular visitor to the refuge, I place high value on these areas that were set aside by federal law for protecting the natural wild spaces of our country. I urge you to find an alternative to this particular transportation plan.
Robinson_Joyce	...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...
Romulo_Ch	I am writing you to express concern about a proposed railway line planned to go through Patuxent Research Refuge. The proposed disturbance would significantly reduce the ecosystem value this refuge provides to us and the wildlife the area sustains. Not only the construction, but the long-term noise and pollution impact will be unsustainable. I understand it's easier to plan to go through an area currently without human population, but just as we need sensible public transportation, we also need a healthy environment to survive, and exploring already-disturbed areas should be a priority for this project.
Rossen_Ka	...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...
Rubenstein_Al	...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...
Ruble_Ba	...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...
Schreter_Ca	...This proposal would slice off 60 acres of the Patuxent Research Refuge (PRR), including a pristine stream, wetland, riparian and forest habitat critical to a number of at- risk bird species. This would dissect the largest remaining forest block in central Maryland. The ecological integrity of this block is vital to many declining bird species such as Eastern whip-poor-will, wood thrush, Kentucky warbler and prairie warbler...
Schwartz_Do	Do not allow a rail line or any invasion of the preserve.
Schwarz_Ku	This proposal would eliminate 60 acres of the Patuxent Research Refuge (PRR) to include pristine stream, wetland, riparian and forest habitats, critical to a number of at- risk bird species. This area constitutes valuable wildlife habitat in a heavily developed area. It contains the largest forest block still in existence in central Maryland. The ecological integrity of the block is vital to many declining bird species such as Eastern Whip-poor-will, Wood Thrush, Kentucky Warbler and Prairie Warbler. It has also hosted Chuck-Will's-Widow, a very uncommon species in Maryland. Because it serves as a vital habitat for these species, PRR was recognized in 2006 as an Important Bird Area (IBA).
Schwenker_Da	We have very little woodlands left in the DC-Baltimore corridor why do we have to use acreage in a NWR for a rail line?? It does not make much sense!! We need to find a better alternative.
Siddique_Om	...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...
Siemon_De	...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...
Silber_Ir	I hike in the Patuxent Wildlife refuge. When we stop for lunch we look forward to watching the birds. We enter the refuge through Croon Rd and cross rail tracks there. That low habitation area, and reutilization of those tracks, seems a far better location for a new rail line than attacking a wildlife refuge.

Table JJ–26: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Patuxent Wildlife Refuge (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment
Simmons_Hu	...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...
Stanzione_Su	...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...
Starr_Le	Please do not construct anything within the boundaries of the Patuxent Research Refuge. This ecological gem should be protected, not exploited. Surely there are other routes which would have a less deleterious impact on our natural resources.
Stiteley_Su	...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 animal 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...
Stutzman_Ma	...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...
Thurber_Ch	...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...
Tisch_Ra	I am writing you to express concern about a proposed railway line planned to go through Patuxent Research Refuge. The Patuxent Research Refuge was established in 1973 specifically for the purpose of upholding and promulgating the Migratory Bird Conservation Act... The proposed disturbance would significantly reduce the ecosystem value this refuge provides to us and the wildlife the area sustains. Not only the construction, but the long-term noise and pollution impact will be unsustainable. I understand it's easier to plan to go through an area currently without human population, but just as we need sensible public transportation, we also need a healthy environment to survive, and exploring already-disturbed areas should be a priority for this project.
Todd_Ro	On behalf of the Howard County Bird Club, I wish to register our strong objection to Alternative 3 in the above-noted EIS. Alternative 3 would destroy 60 acres of beautiful, woodlands, stream and wetland habitat in the Patuxent Research Refuge (PRR). The PRR is the largest preserved area of wildlife habitat in the rapidly-developing Baltimore-Washington corridor.
Todd_Ro	Please choose one of the less damaging Alternatives (1 or 2) outlined in the EIS.
Todd_Ro	On behalf of the Howard County Bird Club, I wish to register our strong objection to Alternative 3 in the above-noted EIS." Alternative 3 would destroy 60 acres of beautiful, woodlands, stream and wetland habitat in the Patuxent Research Refuge (PRR). The PRR is the largest preserved area of wildlife habitat in the rapidly-developing Baltimore-Washington corridor."
Toler_Fra	...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...
Toscano_Ch	...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...
Traversa_Ma	Putting a rail line through the Refuge is illegal and not in the best interest of Marylanders.
Tucker_AI	...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...
Tucker_AI	...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...
Turner_Je	I completely oppose devastating the Patuxent Wildlife Refuge for rail use. Please use an option that does not impinge on critical wildlife habitat in high density human populations.

Table JJ–26: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Patuxent Wildlife Refuge (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment
Tyler_Ja	..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...
Valdata_Pa	I strongly oppose the proposal to run a new rail line for the Northeast Corridor through the Patuxent Wildlife Tract. This historic refuge, established in 1936 by executive order of President Franklin D. Roosevelt, is the nation's only national wildlife refuge established to support wildlife research. As such it is one of Maryland's most significant research facilities. In addition, the public areas of this woodland include stream, wetland, riparian and forest habitats that are critical to a number of at-risk bird species. The habitat in this preserve has been recognized by Audubon Maryland-DC as an Important Bird Area (IBA) because it provides critical habitat for several declining bird species. I have birded at Patuxent, which was one of the major stopovers a few winters ago for Red Crossbills and White-winged Crossbills, two birds that rarely come this far south... I urge you to choose an alternative route.
Van der Veer_Ly	...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...
Van Wagner_Tr	...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...
Vanden Heuvel_Li	There can be no justification for putting a rail line through the park. We have enough challenges to our natural world without deliberately adding more. Do not approve this idea! We need to keep all that we still have in the way of preserved land for wildlife. Far too much is already gone!
Varner_Ch	I am writing this letter as citizen of Maryland in opposition to Alternative Three in your rail plan. I feel it would be a terrible loss of wildlife, wetlands, and to the citizens of our State. Many folks in the local area enjoy the wooded trails and wildlife in the Patuxent Wildlife Center. Please try to find another way.
Varona_Jo	...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...
Verweij_Vi	I am writing you to express concern about a proposed railway line planned to go through Patuxent Research Refuge. The proposed disturbance would significantly reduce the ecosystem value this refuge provides to us and the wildlife the area sustains. Not only the construction, but the long-term noise and pollution impact will be unsustainable. This refuge was designated for wildlife research back in the early 1900s by President Roosevelt. To continue this research properly, the refuge must remain undisturbed. I understand it's easier to plan to go through an area currently without human population, but just as we need sensible public transportation, we also need a healthy environment to survive, and exploring already-disturbed areas should be a priority for this project.
Wagner_Fl	...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...
Waldman_Ro	I am writing in opposition to Alternate 3 in your rail plan... The current rail proposal seeks to undo this by destroying 60 acres of the Patuxent Wildlife Refuge. According to information just received from Audubon Maryland-DC these acres include a 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.
Wallman_Mi	...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...
Wayner_Cl	...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...
Weller_Ma	...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...

Table JJ–26: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Patuxent Wildlife Refuge (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment
Wells_La	I am writing you to express concern about a proposed railway line planned to go through Patuxent Research Refuge. The proposed disturbance would significantly reduce the ecosystem value this refuge provides to us and the wildlife the area sustains. Not only the construction, but the long-term noise and pollution impact will be unsustainable... just as we need sensible public transportation, we also need a healthy environment to survive, and exploring already-disturbed areas should be a priority for this project.
Wilkinson_Ji	...I wish to comment on the proposed Alternative 3 for the Northeast Corridor (NEC) that would remove 60 acres of wildlife habitat including stream valley and forests. National Wildlife Refuge land has been established by law to be used only for purposes of conservation. Removal of this acreage would set a bad precedent for other 'takings' in the future...
Wilson_Da	...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...
Woolridge_Gi	...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...
Worsham_Ri	...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...
Youngs_Ra	I believe that the consideration of expanding right of way into a wetland of such significant importance as the PRR is misguided. It is misguided for a number of reasons: 1. Loss of critical wildlife habitat. 2. Increase in impervious surface in a critical watershed. 3. The continuous disruption of wildlife in the remaining Refuge. 4. The interruption of ongoing and planned biologic research. 5. The denial of area access to citizens. 6. It distracts from and does not address the more critical issue of infrastructure restoration. 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 focus on restoring existing property resources and only consider alternatives that do not disturb national treasures.
Youngs_Su	...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...
Zamora_La	...As a resident of Bowie, MD, as a bird lover, and as parent trying to foster a love of our state's dwindling wild places in my children, I am writing this letter in opposition to Alternate 3 in your rail plan. I understand that this proposal would chop off 60 acres of the Patuxent Wildlife Refuge including pristine stream, wetland, riparian and forest habitats, which are 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. There are already so few natural places that I can take my kids in our area, and many other animals besides just birds rely on this area as well...

Source: NEC FUTURE team, 2016

JJ.5.14 Bicycle Access

The following response addresses all of the comments contained within the following table:

As part of the NEC FUTURE process, the FRA is focusing on corridor-wide solutions and, within the context of the Tier 1 NEPA process, did not evaluate the ability of train equipment or stations to accommodate bicycles. Such decisions will be made as part of the applicable Tier 2 project studies.

However, the FRA is aware of the desire for bicycle amenities such as roll-on/off access on trains, bike parking at stations and bridge crossings, and pedestrian/bike trails running parallel with the NEC. As part of the Tier 1 Final EIS, the FRA has catalogued and shared these comments with the various service providers in the corridor. In addition, Volume 1, Chapter 5, contains information addressing modal choice and connectivity as related to bicycles and notes the need to further consider interconnectivity among modes as part of subsequent Tier 2 project studies.

Table JJ–27: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Bicycle Access

Stakeholder ID	Comment
Aaron_Pe	I believe that the ability to easily and comfortably board a train with a bicycle is a vital part of any improvement plan for rail in the US. A multimodal transportation system that involves all methods of pedestrian and cyclist use of rail is vital to the continued and development of an all encompassing transportation system this country badly needs. This not only makes it possible for extended travel with bicycles but makes a healthy lifestyle possible which is discouraged by not allowing free access to the rail system
Adams_Ma	just increasing the amount of access and putting bicycles on Amtrak or any other service train -- it's gotten better in the last year, but it can still get so much better.
Aridas_Do	We hope that roll on bike service will soon be instituted on all of Amtrak routes.
Ascarelli_Si	What's needed is roll on, roll off service, as you have started with the train from Washington to Chicago. It should be so easy to do -- even if you limit it to selected trains.
Burnley_Ch	<p>Increase bike and pedestrian access to Amtrak stations. Make it safe and easy for passengers to use alternative transportation to and from Amtrak stations. Accessing trains by bike or walking reduces traffic congestion around the station and resulting in reduced CO2 emissions.</p> <p>Increase and prioritize secure bike parking at train stations- Many passengers would use their bikes for first and last mile connections if they knew their bikes would be secure and protected from weather. Secure bike parking reduces traffic congestion around the station. Bike parking reduces expensive car parking at stations. A single car parking space can accommodate 12 - 15 bicycles. Reducing car parking and decks reduces capitol outlay for Amtrak. Environmentally, reduced parking decreases the need for paved (normally impervious) surfaces. Less pavement reduces storm water runoff, including silt, car and surface related pollution that ends up in our streams, rivers and even the Chesapeake Bay</p> <p>Addition to and inclusion of roll-on bike services throughout the network - allowing passengers to take their bike on-board their train - preferably for free- allows passengers to use their bikes for last mile connections when they arrive at their destinations. This would also decrease demand for bike parking at the originating stations, reducing costs to Amtrak.</p> <p>Include rails-with-trails (RWTs) along the entire North East Corridor, within new and existing right of ways. These trail facilities could be used by cyclists and pedestrians to access local train stations as well as creating a non-motorized transportation spine in often built-up, urban centers. USDOT has documented the safety and efficacy of RWTs. These facilities remove cyclists and pedestrians from the busy streets that often surround train stations. RWTs reduce rail trespasser casualties by providing alternatives to walking along train tracks. As a secondary benefit, RWT corridors could be used by Amtrak for maintenance of their NEC tracks, providing emergency access to trains in the case of equipment stoppage or accidents and even facilitate emergency egress from trains. Trespasser casualties are the biggest safety issue facing railroading today. RWTs remove trespassers from tracks and would drastically reduce accidents and fatalities. For similar reasons, we would also strongly encourage inclusion of bike and ped facilities when Amtrak bridges are upgraded or refurbished.</p>
Camero_Da	Roll on access on all amtrak trains for bicycles is a critical step in increasing multi modal transportation in the region.
Caporale_Ly	I am eagerly awaiting the chance to roll my bicycle onto Amtrak trains preferably, eventually, starting at Penn Station.
Castonguay_Pa	I also support the addition of a parallel bike path wherever possible, especially on any new bridges.
Conroy_Ri	Please keep bicyclists and the growth of cycling in mind when you make your plans for the Northeast Corridor. The four major cities along the Northeast Corridor, Boston, New York, Philadelphia and Washington, D.C. have the lowest rates of adult automobile ownership in the United States. And those cities are attracting younger populations of people who are buying fewer cars, and leaving their cars for bicycles. So one thing, please be thinking about as you make your plans to take care of the Northeast Corridor, is work with local planning agencies and bike advocates to promote bike commuting to and from the railroad stations along the Northeast Corridor.
Conroy_Ri	So please, please, please think about expanding roll on, roll off service to include the Northeast Corridor. I know it's very challenging with such a heavily traveled line, with maybe shorter stations and aging baggage cars, but there has to be a way to figure this out.
Courtney_Ti	...[adopt] Complete Corridors policy for development to allow for bike facilities on the bridges as well; to allow for greater services for people to bring their bikes with them on the train, if they're commuting or if they're going and doing recreational activities; as well as building in some allowances for additional bike parking, lockers, facilities like that, at the Amtrak station. So I wanted to add to that the hope that you adopt policies that allow active users.
Dodd_St	If tracks are relocated north in SE Connecticut, the existing rail beds should be cleaned up, environmental concerns addressed, and then converted to a walking and biking trail system. This improves alternate transportation, economic vitality, health and quality of life.
Donald_Br	<p>The ability to bring a bike on a train and importantly to have bicycle racks and storage areas in train stations is crucial to building this multimodality. I urge you to create a policy that includes not just "consideration" but actual planning and design for these facilities in both reconstruction and new construction projects. This would hopefully include multi-use trails within such corridors as well, and what I mean by that, of course, is Rail-With-Trail.</p> <p>Connecticut is an interesting state, although we have exactly zero miles of Rail-With-Trail. It doesn't exist in this state. This would go a long way toward working on that. By creating an integrated network of rail, we will reduce road traffic congestion by improving mobility options and therefore improve the general quality of life for our communities.</p>
Dougherty_Ja	Continue expansion & enhancement of bicycle roll-on/roll-off service throughout the Northeast Corridor (especially between New York and Boston) and also in Hartford CT. (Amtrak announced a pilot program for the Vermonter line, which serves Hartford, but I haven't seen this implemented. See last few lines of https://www.adventurecycling.org/about-us/media/press-releases/amtrak-launches-new-roll-on-bicycle-service/).

Table JJ-27: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Bicycle Access (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment
Dougherty_Ja	Complete Corridors : Amtrak should always give proper consideration to sharing their corridors with bike/walk trails, especially when building new river bridges.
Dougherty_Ja	Improve bicycle parking at stations owned and/or managed by Amtrak, and for other stations, work with the pertinent parties to improve bicycle parking.
Feuer_Ej	Roll on access for bikes will increase ridership as well as bike tourism.
Friedman_Pa	I can guarantee that if you had walk on service for bicycles, I would certainly travel to new destinations for overnight or several night trips. I now use MTA (MetroNorth, LIRR) and NJ Transit for same day trips. Would love to have AmTrack on my list to!
Fries_Ri	The membership of the Massachusetts Bicycle Coalition (aka MassBike) is wholeheartedly in support of Amtrak initiating roll-on bicycle access throughout the entire national system, and particularly in the Northeast Corridor....If we are going to continue to see the Northeast Corridor flourish both culturally and economically, bicycles are going to be THE key complement to Amtrak's train service. And roll-on access is a simple means to provide that access.
Garrett_Pe	a bicycle-accessible bridge over the Susquehanna River is essential. Please include it in future plans. It could be attached to a rail bridge, as so many are in other parts of the country and world.
Gozdz_He	Please do all you can to improve bicyclists' access to the mass transit system.
Greenberg_St	Please allow roll-on bikes in NE corridor trains.
Greenwald_Ph	Intercity buses - some bus users, myself included, would use trains instead if Amtrak provided convenient options. The NYC area transit trains (LIRR, Metro North, and NJ Transit) bicycles on a roll-on, roll off basis, generally using wheelchair space when not needed by a disabled person.
Gross_M	Please plan for pedestrians and bicyclists to make our communities healthier. Include connecting paths and bridges. Amtrak continue improvements for its multi-modal transit users! Examples include more and better bike parking, convenient and expanded bicycle roll-on service, as well as shared-use bridges designed for safe bike and pedestrian river crossings.
Gross_Ml	Please plan for pedestrians and bicyclists to make our communities healthier. Include connecting paths and bridges. Amtrak continue improvements for its multi-modal transit users! Examples include more and better bike parking, convenient and expanded bicycle roll-on service, as well as shared-use bridges designed for safe bike and pedestrian river crossings.
Hallstein_Pa	Please provide better bike access - safe way to bring bikes on board and store them during trips. I and many friends frequently need to travel along the corridor with a bike and nearly always have to choose car or flight over rail because of this issue.
Hanna_Da	Please allow bicycle roll on access on the Northeast Corridor. This would allow me to use your service.
Hardwick_Br	I would love to be able to have a more European style train service available. I can't believe my family can't cycle from Dover, NH to Portland, ME and get back on the train with our bikes (something many cyclists would love to do)
Henry_Mo	...we are starting to call Complete Corridors, which Bruce mentioned. Specifically we would like for Amtrak to always give proper consideration to sharing their corridors with bike and walk trails, especially when building new bridges over rivers. And so Rails-With-Trails, as Bruce mentioned too, are growing in importance in the U.S. enhancing the development of railroads. No. 2 is that we would like for continued expansion and enhancement of bicycle roll-on and roll-off services throughout the Northeast Corridor, especially between New York and Boston. This will really allow for that first and last mile connectivity to and from train stations. Then, lastly, we'd like to see improved bicycle parking, both capacity and security, at the stations which are owned and/or managed by Amtrak and for other stations to work with pertinent parties to improve bicycle parking.
Hinchliffe_Gr	Bicycles should be accommodated on as many tarins as possible...
Hreha_AS	I use a bicycle as my primary form of transportation and strongly urge Amtrak to be more accommodating - the Metro North is a great working model
Keene_Jo	...include short distance ADA-accessible station entrances for pedestrians, cyclists and transit users, convenient parking designed to accommodate growth in demand, bike lockers, and appropriately-sized covered waiting areas. High level platforms should be provided to speed boarding and allow roll on/roll off availability for bicyclists.
Keene_Jo	Trains themselves need to be designed with in-car bicycle racks to allow cyclists to utilize all stations, not merely those that provide checked baggage service. This should also shorten stations stops by eliminating the need for passengers to make their way to the baggage car.
Macbride_Da	Please do as much as you can to support multi-use trails along the NEC

Table JJ–27: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Bicycle Access (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment
Meyer_Ma	We're speaking today simply toemphasize 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 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.
Mitchell_St	... multimodal is the way to go, it's the way of the future. ... 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.
Mullen_Pa	Please bring back bicycle roll on service to the northeast corridor.
Nichols_Em	I travel frequently from NYP to Massachusetts by rail and would love to have rollon bicycle service to Northampton, Greenfield, and Boston.
Offringa_Re	I'd love to be able to bring my bike on the train more casually. I sometimes have long bike trips, where I spend a weekend biking for a couple hundred miles, but I don't have the time/energy to bike back. It would be really awesome if I didn't have to disassemble my bike and put it into a bike box in order to get on an Amtrak. Why isn't there a bike car?
Popper_St	...to adopt an equivalent of Complete Streets, which we've started calling Complete Corridors. Specifically, Amtrak should always give proper consideration to sharing their corridors with bike/walk trails, especially when building new bridges
Popper_St	No. 2, continued expansion and enhancement of bicycle roll-on/roll-off service throughout the Northeast Corridor, especially between New York and Boston. No. 3, improved bicycle parking at stations owned and/or managed by Amtrak and for other stations working with pertinent parties to improve bicycle parking.
Salomone_Pe	It is important to allow cyclists to roll their bicycles on and off at all stations and to accommodate bicycles in passenger cars.
Snow_Cy	we encourage the roll-on service for bikes on Amtrak... The service MUST include recumbent bikes--at least those that are no bigger than regular bikes. Even better would be allowances for tandems, bike trailers and longer recumbents where baggage service is available.
Steiner_Cy	<p>When considering the environmental impact of future Northeast Corridor improvements, it is absolutely essential that bicycling and walking be included as a key component of any development plan. Unfortunately, such an approach is somewhat lacking from the initial plan that has been outlined. We urge the Federal Railroad Administration to consider the benefits of a bike-inclusive approach to NEC planning that would allow for both increased connectivity and higher use with lower demand for parking. Even within the framework of the “No Action” alternative, these should be considered necessary improvements that would allow the network to maintain its existing service levels.</p> <p>With those principles in mind we would like to request that both roll-on/roll-off bike access and secure bike parking at Amtrak stations be provided to NEC customers. In addition, the FRA should take advantage of opportunities for NEC expansion to provide a true multi-use corridor allowing for many modes of travel along the NEC right-of way.</p> <p>In particular, we ask that specific attention be given to the inclusion of multi-use trails on rail bridges. Bridges are often barriers to full development of bicycle route networks when the bridges do not accommodate bicycles. When rail bridges in the NEC require replacement or refurbishment they should accommodate bicycle and pedestrian access. In New Jersey, the soon- to-be-replaced Portal Bridge comes to mind as an excellent opportunity to provide access to bike riders and pedestrians on what would be the only available facility allowing for the crossing of the Hackensack River.</p> <p>to this potential plan. Southeastern CT small town character is constantly being eroded and degraded. Pushing through historic Old Lyme simply is unacceptable at any level.</p>
Syracuse_Mi	Roll on bicycle service should be provided on as many routes as possible. The current policy that requires bicycles to be boxed is not practical.
Thibodeau_De	I agree with the East Coast Greenway Alliance's recommendations for the NEC plan to include improved and expanded bicycle parking and roll-on service for multi-modal users, plus complete corridors ; shared-use trails along active rail lines, highways, utility corridors, or waterways including bridges designed for bicycle and pedestrian river crossings.
Varley_Ri	Enhancement of our public transportation system and easy use of bicycles is critically important for lowering our dependence on fossil fuels. I have a bike but it is too difficult to use it regularly to get places.
Waaser_Ca	I am writing in support of including roll-on service for bicycles and wheelchairs in the very near future of the North East Corridor. Roll-on service fits within the five broad goals developed during the EIS scoping process. 1. Meet growing demand. There is a current and growing demand for roll-on service in all markets... More and more people are using bicycles for commuting and/or have taken up recreational cycling, and they need access to farther-reaching train travel in both existing and new NEC markets. 2. Strengthen intermodal passenger connections. ...most of the other cities served in the NEC do not have bike share programs, meaning that anyone wishing to include bicycle transportation to or from one of those stations must be able to bring their bike onboard. Roll-on service would also open up new routes for recreational cyclists... 3. Investment plan addressing near- and long-term mobility solutions. All new rolling stock for Amtrak should include solutions for bicycle and wheelchair placement. Solutions should also be found for existing stock, even if initial solutions are temporary and not ideal... 4. Promote environmental sustainability. There is no more environmentally friendly means of transportation than bicycling... 5. Enhance the economic viability of the region. Roll-on service in existing and new markets would increase commuting options, particularly for workers living in suburban and exurban markets, thus opening up job opportunities for those workers and expanding the pool of qualified workers for businesses... cycle touring does bring economic benefits by opening up suburban and exurban areas to tourism...

Table JJ–27: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Bicycle Access (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment
Weissman_Ne	...expanding roll-on-roll-off access is fully consistent with the five goals developed during the EIS scoping process: - meet growing demand - strengthen intermodal passenger connections - address near and long-term mobility solutions - promote environmental sustainability - enhance the economic viability of the region
Weissman_Ne	...I ask that you include AASHTO-compliant bicycle-pedestrian facilities on any expansion or renovation. Particularly bridges, but also rights of way near active rail lines. For the daily enjoyment of area residents, to reduce the number of car trips and to enhance resilience, like the East River Bridges after of Superstorm Sandy.
Wieting_Sc	Please include rails with trails whenever feasible! Please include roll-on bike service everywhere.
Wilson_Tr	On these trains, I am considered about the accomodations for bikers. Will there be roll-on access, secure bike parking at stations
Woods_Ha	We need roll on bicycle rights!
Anonymous_010	I'm writing in support of roll-on / roll-off facilities for bicycles. This would make an enormous difference to those of us who would like to use bicycles as a means of transportation when we're away from home. Several cities on the NEC have well-developed bicycle infrastructure, and to be able to reach them by railroad would be a great benefit in reducing local and intercity car traffic.

Source: NEC FUTURE team, 2016

JJ.5.15 Old Lyme: Old Saybrook-Kenyon New Segment

The following response addresses all of the comments contained within the following table:

The goals and scope of the NEC FUTURE Tier 1 EIS address the large-scale regional transportation needs for proposed improvements to the NEC in the Study Area. The alternatives and their routes and service plans described in the Tier 1 EIS are representative of markets served, routings, and possible construction types. In defining the Preferred Alternative, the FRA reviewed specific local concerns and subsequently refined representative routes and construction types to balance the concerns with broader regional travel needs as described below. However, it is important to note that local issues will be given full consideration as part of Tier 2 project studies. Only after the completion of a Tier 2 project analysis for specific projects, including any located in Old Lyme, CT, will decisions be made about specific routes and construction types.

The FRA recognized the concerns raised by the community of Old Lyme, CT, following the publication of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. Accordingly, because of the extensive level of concern from the public, local institutions and organizations, as well as local and state elected officials in Old Lyme, the FRA met with community stakeholders and local officials. As a result, the FRA better understands the concerns raised by the commenters with the Tier 1 Draft EIS Alternative 1 (Alternative 1), which included a proposal to construct an aerial structure through the town of Old Lyme to serve as a supplemental segment to the existing NEC along the Connecticut coastline (referred to as the Old Saybrook-Kenyon new segment). Broadly, Alternative 1 involved adding rail services and making commensurate investment in the NEC to expand capacity, add tracks, and relieve key chokepoints. Alternative 1 included new segments parallel to and outside of the existing NEC right-of-way where the railroad is capacity-constrained, or where expanding capacity within the existing right-of-way is difficult or impractical. The Tier 1 EIS explored the supplemental routing from Old Saybrook, CT, to Kenyon, RI, as one potential new segment. The FRA proposed the new segment as an option to improve travel times between markets from New York City to Boston and to provide a redundant routing to the existing NEC along the Connecticut coastline, which is particularly vulnerable to the effects of climate change.

Because of its travel and resiliency benefits, the FRA included the new segment from Old Saybrook, CT, to Kenyon, RI, connecting to the existing NEC as part of the Preferred Alternative. However, as a result of the comments received, the FRA used tunnel as the representative construction type for the portion of this new segment in Old Lyme, CT. This revision avoids the potential effects on cultural, ecological, visual, and other local resources that an aerial structure might cause. In addition, the Tier 1 Final EIS includes a proposed commitment to avoid use of an aerial structure in the historic district of Old Lyme. Specific location and construction details related to the final chosen alignment will be determined as part of the planning, engineering, and design process during subsequent Tier 2 project studies.

Additionally, the FRA has made the following changes to the Tier 1 EIS: First, in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, the FRA identified the Connecticut River Estuary as a potentially affected resource and accounted for potential acreage affected within the county-by-county tabulations of acreages of effect. The FRA performed additional environmental review in response to various comments about the significance of the Connecticut River Estuary, a candidate for designation as a National Estuary Research Reserve. The Tier 1 Final EIS incorporates language clarifying the significance of the estuary. Second, the Tier 1 Final EIS acknowledges the historic features and significance of Old Lyme.

The FRA is committed to an open public participation process and notified state agencies, regional and county governments, as well as local communities located along the proposed Action Alternatives' Representative Routes of the availability of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The outreach effort to local communities was appropriate with respect to the level of detail available in this Tier 1 environmental review. Going forward, the FRA encourages local participation during subsequent Tier 2 project studies. During subsequent Tier 2 project studies, the project sponsor and/or lead agency, which may be the FRA or another agency, will be responsible for the public participation process. All future public outreach efforts will be documented on the NEC FUTURE website, www.NECFUTURE.com.

Additional details about the Tier 1 Draft EIS comment process, including the announcements for the Tier 1 Draft EIS, public hearings, comment period, the Preferred Alternative, and the Tier 1 Final EIS can be found at www.NECFUTURE.com.

Table JJ–28: Stakeholder Comments (Elected Officials, Tribes, Federal Agencies, State Agencies, Local Agencies): Old Lyme

Stakeholder ID	Comment
Clinton_Selectman Farmer	Please do NOT re-route AMTRAK through the middle of Old Lyme,Ct as it would DESTROY this historic town and it's historic and current ART college and museums which people travel to from all over the world. How can people who sit in their office destroy a town by designing a very bad plan without even researching the impact of what they are doing.
CRCOG_Wray	[To endorse a preferred alternative] we would need additional information regarding cost, economic impact analysis, construction feasibility, and potential impacts to historic resources, freight movements, land use, and other resources within our Region .
CT Representative_Carney	I strongly object to the proposal within Alternative 1 wherein Amtrak’s train tracks would be moved and would cut through the Town of Old Lyme. This proposal would have negative social and environmental impacts on the town, which I feel have not been properly taken into consideration.
CT Representative_Carney	There are worrisome eminent domain implications regarding this proposal that would destroy Old" Lyme’s infrastructure, community, and overall way of life. Alternative 1 would negatively affect homeowners, the Old Lyme Historic District (including many shops, historic art galleries, the Florence Griswold Museum, and the Lyme Academy of Fine Arts), businesses, and the character within this quiet, beautiful community. Not to mention, the environmental impacts would be severe including additional pollution, the demolition of wetlands and open space, and the destruction of our natural resources."
CT Representative_Carney	I ask, before this process moves any further, that this proposal be removed from any current and future studies.
CT Representative_Carney	I do not believe I or my constituents were given enough notice or time to digest this plan and the potentially drastic effects it could have on Old Lyme or the region. Therefore, I respectfully request, should this proposal not be removed, that there be a public hearing in Old Lyme, CT before the comment period ends on February 15".
CT Representative_Carney	Please see the attached petition against the NEC Future Tier 1 EIS 'Alternative I' proposal, specifically regarding its effect on the Town of Old Lyme and the region. As you can see, hundreds oftownspeople have signed it and are united in opposition to this plan that will negatively impact Old Lyme's character, history, and quality of life. In addition, there has been a lot of testimony submitted from local leaders and townspeople and I urge you to consider a different plan for the future ofthe Northeast Corridor.
CT Senator_Formica	I strongly object to the proposal within Alternative I wherein the tracks would be moved and would cut through the Town of Old Lyme. This proposal would have negative social and environmental impacts on the town, which I feel have not been properly taken into consideration.
CT Senator_Formica	There are severely woffisome 'eminent domain' implications regarding this proposal that would destroy Old Lyme's infrastructure, community, and overall way of life. Alternative 1 would negatively affect homeowners, the Old Lyme Historic District (including many shops, historic mt galleries, the Florence Griswold Museum, and the Lyme Academy of Fine Arts), businesses, and the character within this quiet, beautiful community. Not to mention, the environmental impacts including additional pollution and the demolition of wetlands, open space and our natural resources.
CT Senator_Formica	I ask, before this process moves any fmther, that this proposal be removed from any current and future studies.
CT Senator_Formica	I do not believe I, or my constituents, were given enough notice or time to digest this plan and the potentially drastic effects it could have on Old Lyme or the" region. Therefore, I respectfully request, should this proposal not be removed, that there be a public hearing in Old Lyme, CT before the comment period ends on February 15th."
CT Senator_Formica	This will greatly upset and disrupt the Town of Old Lyme and surrounding areas.
CT_Congress_Senate2	Specifically, we write to raise concerns we have heard from our constituents regarding the proposed new segment construction outlined in Alternative 1. As you know, the new segment in Alternative 1 will shift northward east ofthe Old Saybrook Station and run through several Connecticut and Rhode Island shoreline communities before reconnecting to the existing segment in Kenyon, RI. Connecticut's shoreline boasts a rich, vibrant history and is home to quiet villages and historic port cities. Importantly, according to the assessment of cultural resources and historic properties in the draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), Connecticut is home to the greatest amount of properties on the National Register of Historic Places that may be affected by new rail construction.
CT_Congress_Senate2	To that end, it is understandable that the NEC FUTURE Draft EIS has raised alarm among many Connecticut residents. Many in the region were surprised to learn about the potential placement of a new rail line in the towns. For example, as currently proposed Alternative 1 would run straight through the center of Old Lyme, impacting the cultural, historical and geographic integrity of the town - which is concerning to town leaders and community stakeholders. We recognize that FRA held listening sessions and public meetings in several Connecticut cities, and we understand that the proposals in the EIS are just the beginning of any analysis-a more thorough vetting with local stakeholders consistent with federal law would happen before any project moves forward. Still, it appears that little engagement was done in these communities to assess even the preliminary views and concerns of those potentially impacted by the proposed new segment in Alternative 1 prior to inclusion in the report.
Munster_Ed	With all due respect to the need to improve commuter rail service in the United States, this Alternative 1 would be a disaster.
New Rochelle_Strome	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.

Table JJ–28: Stakeholder Comments (Elected Officials, Tribes, Federal Agencies, State Agencies, Local Agencies): Old Lyme (continued)

Stakeholder ID			Comment
Old Lyme_First Reemsnyder	Selectwoman		I am here today to express my concern with and opposition to the Alternative 1 of the Draft EIS for the NEC plan to improve rail service. First and foremost, this plan would decimate the heart of our community. The path of the railroad would completely change, according to this plan, cutting through the heart of our community.
Old Lyme_First Reemsnyder	Selectwoman		I am equally concerned that the Federal Railroad Administration did not contact first the First Selectman's office personally to solicit feedback and comment. Hearing about plans that have major impact for our community through the grapevine is unacceptable.
Old Lyme_First Reemsnyder	Selectwoman		However, the Federal Railroad Administration's vision for high speed rail notes that this investment should "serve as a catalyst for growth in regional economic productivity and expansion by stimulating domestic manufacturing, promoting local tourism, and driving commercial and residential development," as well as "foster livable urban and rural communities." We concurred that the proposed routing of high speed rail through Old Lyme in Alternative 1 would destroy and detract far more than enhance and promote our historically and environmentally unique community.
Old Lyme_First Reemsnyder	Selectwoman		NEC Alternative 1 will threaten historic and environ mental resources that arc integral to our economic and social live lihood and quality of life. We also took note of the project's human cost. The Old Lyme community already absorbs the impact of Interstate 95's noise and vehicular emissions. It is worth noting that the National Register description for Old Lyme's National Historic District ends by noting the "major damage" already suffered from the "four-lane swath" of Interstate 95. Our emergency resources - a Volunteer Fire Department and Volunteer Ambulance Association - are first responders to I-95 incidents. Local commerce comes to a standstill when re-routed traffic from those incidents descend upon the only two major arteries in the town: Routes 1 and 156. A bridge and rail construction project of the magnitude proposed in Alternative 1 will multiply traffic problems as it inflicts dust, dirt, delays and noise over a period of many years.
Old Lyme_First Reemsnyder	Selectwoman		Old Lyme is a designated Preserve America community, earning this national recognition for efforts to protect our heritage and use our historic assets fo economic development and community revitalization... Preliminary plans show the proposed new rail corridor accessing the 1-95 right of way by cutting across the Old Lyme Historic District. This district is National Register listed and comprises the community's village center and only commercial area. Designated in 1971, the district acknowledges historic residential, commercial, ecclesiastical, municipal and institutional structures (including Lyme Academy of Fine Arts, the Florence Griswold Museum and the Lyme Art Association). The Florence Griswold House and Museum have National Historic Landmark status.
Old Lyme_First Reemsnyder	Selectwoman		The Connecticut River estuary was named a Wetland of International Importance under the RAMSAR Convention, was identified as one of the 40 "Last Great Places" by the Nature Conservancy, and has American Heritage River and National Blueway River designations granted by the Department of Interior. Under NEC Alternative 1, the proposed construction of a new rail bridge at the mouth of the Connecticut River for dedicated use by high speed trains would significantly compromise the environmental integrity of the estuary.
Old Lyme_First Reemsnyder	Selectwoman		We would expect the collective resources identified above to afford our community significant protections under the National Environmental Policy Act and the National Historic Preservation Act. Yet Alternative 1 makes it clear that these designations and laws are meaningless should the Federal Railroad Administration elect to proceed with Alternative 1.
Old Lyme_First Reemsnyder	Selectwoman		We oppose NEC Future Alternative 1... We request that NEC Future Alternative 1 be removed from further consideration.
Old Lyme_First Reemsnyder	Selectwoman		So severe is the impact on our town that the proposal amounts to a taking of the entire Town of Old Lyme.
Old Lyme_First Reemsnyder	Selectwoman		Middlesex County is omitted as a county "with highest potential ecological resource impact." The Connecticut River Estuary borders both New London and Middlesex counties, so this is factually incorrect... Clearly, the installation of a massive bridge structure with longer approaches than currently exist will seriously impact the biodiverse river estuary and ecological balance in the region on both sides of the River and Long Island Sound... Connecticut River Estuary is the longest and largest river system in New England. The Estuary consists of open water, fresh, salt and brackish tidal wetlands, floodplains, river islands, beaches, and dunes. It provides essential habitat for numerous species and forms a biological corridor linking marine and estuary waters of the Atlantic Ocean. Native birds include 18 species of waterfowl, the Osprey and American Bald Eagle. Scores of others, including migratory Tree Swallows, the Piping Plover, the Sharp-tailed sparrow and the Seaside sparrow, many elusive rail species, and wading and shore bird species nest or migrate here... Designated a Wetland of International Importance by the Ramsar Convention, the Connecticut River Estuary is one of only 34 U.S. sites among 2,000 so named. The Convention on Wetlands of International Importance is an intergovernmental treaty that provides the framework for national action and international cooperation for the conservation and wise use of wetlands and their resources... When the US Fish & Wildlife Service's National Blueways System was active, the Connecticut River was the first and only designated National Blueway River in the country. The Connecticut River was designated an American Heritage River under the American Heritage Rivers Protection Program authorized by President Clinton in 1997... Recognizing the unique ecological value...- the Town of Old Lyme and the Old Lyme Land Trust have been protecting open space and conservation land for 50 years... Together, the Town and Trust now own almost 2,000 precious acres... Given the small size of Old Lyme and the wide swath that the rail line would cut through it, much of that open acreage stands to be irreparably harmed by NEC Future Alternative 1... The State of Connecticut, The Nature Conservancy and, most recently U.S. Fish and Wildlife through its acquisition of the Roger Tory Peterson property as a gateway to the Silvio Conte Fish and Wildlife Refuge, all recognize the critical importance of the lower Connecticut River estuary and the uniqueness of its ecosystem... they, too, own in fee or protect by easement additional conservation lands that are endangered by the rail proposal... Two million people live in the river basin that supports active fisheries, tourist facilities and activities... Of all of the impacted communities, Old Lyme will be most impacted, with hundreds of feet of industrial steel dividing what is left of its north and south, and no means of crossing the tracks built for high speed rail. The Tier 1 Draft Environmental Impact Statement clearly identifies impact to ESH (ecologically sensitive habitat), T&E (federally listed threatened and endangered species), and EFH (essential fish habitat). All are part of the Connecticut River Estuary which will be impacted by NEC Future Alternative 1.

Table JJ–28: Stakeholder Comments (Elected Officials, Tribes, Federal Agencies, State Agencies, Local Agencies): Old Lyme (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment
Old Lyme_First Selectwoman Reemsnyder	Cultural/Historical Properties: it is unclear if the "143 NRHPs" (National Register of Historic Places) include the 50+ structures in Old Lyme's Historic District within the 1 mile impact zone that predate the year 1900. The Florence Griswold Museum has NHL (National Historic Landmark) status, is centrally located in the identified impact zone of Alternative 1, but is not listed... The proposed industrial corridor is incongruous with the unique historical and cultural value of the area. Old Lyme is home to prehistoric and historic resources of national significance. Engineering for the industrial corridor required by NEC Future Alternative 1 will be detrimental to archaeological sites of tremendous significance. Ranging in age from 3,000 to 5,000 years old, these sites have been nominated for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places. Old Lyme is a Preserve America community... Old Lyme's Historic District, central in the identified impact zone of NEC Future Alternative 1, has been listed on the National Register of Historic Places since 1971. The Florence Griswold Museum, also in the identified impact zone, has National Historic Landmark status. The Historic District is home to 80+ properties, including non-profit arts, cultural, youth services and social organizations, residences, regional public schools, Old Lyme Memorial Town Hall and the Old Lyme Phoebe Griffin Noyes Library, and Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts of the University of New Haven campus. Approximately 50 of the structures in the Historic District were either built in the late 19th century, or predate 1900, thus falling well within the State of Connecticut's definition of "historic." ... The John Sill House, 1817, located on the Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts property, and immediately in the path of the rail proposal, has been documented by both the Colonial Dames's book, "Old Houses of Connecticut," 1915, the WPA "census of old buildings in Connecticut," 1938 and again in 1985, the Historic American Buildings Survey by the National Park Service. This structure should be evaluated for National Historic Landmark status... At the turn of the last century, Old Lyme's natural beauty and historic character inspired leading artists from across the country to come to this village where they founded one of the largest and most significant art colonies in America... Works created by the Old Lyme artists can be seen in museums throughout the country and the world at large... Old Lyme's art colony eventually gave the town its identity as an arts community, one whose lineage flourishes today through the Florence Griswold Museum, housed in the original boardinghouse of the colony; the Lyme Art Association gallery, where artists have shown their work for over 100 years; and Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts, where the next generation of fine artists are being trained. NEC Future Alternative 1 will eliminate the entire campus of Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts... NEC Future Alternative 1 creates an irrevocable fissure which will destroy the legacy and integrity of how the town's natural beauty, cultural assets, and historic character all complement each other for the benefit of the region, and the nation as a whole.
Old Lyme_First Selectwoman Reemsnyder	NEC Future Alternative 1 will fail to support southeastern Connecticut economically in any way. Connecticut will continue to suffer from its reputation as a "drive- through" state and Old Lyme will change from a destination into a place to avoid... Based on a University of Connecticut economic impact study, the average out-of-state Florence Griswold Museum visitor spends an additional \$479 while in the area. Thus, those out-of-state museum visitors alone currently contribute \$8,622,000 annually to the local tourism-based economy. Under NEC Future Alternative 1, Old Lyme will no longer serve as a gateway, resulting in severe ramifications to tourism in the region and negative economic implications for the town, the region and the state. Old Lyme's small commercial district, its fine arts college, three buildings in its regional school system, its Town Hall, Public Library, youth services center, an Historic Landmark museum, nationally recognized art association, two historic inns, 50+ properties of a century-old or more, the Lieutenant River, and the Connecticut River all lie within the impact zone defined in the NEC Future Alternative 1, Tier 1 Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Old Lyme will lose its entire - its only- commercial district as well as its main jobs generator: employment in the arts and culture industry. The Town's only grocery store and single pharmacy, all of its banks and the majority of its medical, legal and real estate offices will be severely comprised under NEC Future Alternative 1. With the loss of the small businesses that serve the Old Lyme community's daily needs as well as its primary industry, tax revenue will decline and property values plummet.
Old Lyme_Selectman Sibley	I strongly object to the proposal as outlined in Alternative 1 , in which the current train tracks would be relocated through the center of Old Lyme... The rail path for Alternate option # 1 cuts through the heart of our historic district, potentially causing a devastating impact to residents, businesses, museums and schools. And I can 't imagine the damaging impact it would have on our environmentally sensitive areas.
Old Lyme_Selectman Sibley	Additionally I find it incredible that a \$30 million study using taxpayer dollars was already conducted producing a 1000 page report without any correspondence to the impacted towns. It was only a tip given by an outsider that Old Lyme even became aware of this initiative by the NEC corridor agency. I 'm glad that an extension was given for folks to post their comments... Before moving forward in your plan and spending more dollars, I strongly encourage that a public hearing be scheduled so that other concerned citizens could voice their opinions as well. Please keep me informed on my request.
Old Lyme_Selectwoman Nosal	...the proposed section of new track from Old Saybrook to East Lyme, CT will adversely affect our entire community, will cut-off the established tourism lifeline of our region and will not provide a meaningful improvement in efficient rail service. No data was provided in the EIE to demonstrate that our local commercial, residential and environmental concerns were considered. A new track through Old Lyme provides no local economic benefit or advantage to local commuters or residents, while the extreme destruction it will cause to an environmentally sensitive area is irreversible. As proposed, Alternative 1 will be strongly opposed by the community.
RiverCOG_Downes	This memorandum is submitted on behalf of the Connecticut River Gateway Commission and its member towns Old Saybrook and Old Lyme to express strenuous opposition to Alternative 1 which would establish the high speed rail corridor through the shoreline of Connecticut in the area of the lower Connecticut River. ... It is the opinion of the Connecticut River Gateway Commission that any efforts to construct a new railroad bridge and its approaches between Old Saybrook and Old Lyme and to develop a right-of-way as summarized in Alternative 1 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS should be discontinued with the other two alternatives being likely more feasible and explored more seriously as the NEC Future planning process moves forward.
RiverCOG_Downes	Alternative 1 will cause significant damage to historical resources dating back to the first English settlements in Connecticut and to the unique environmental resources of the lower Connecticut River. Those environmental resources have received international, national, state, regional and local accolades. To damage or impact those celebrated estuarine resources in any way is shortsighted and makes little sense.
RiverCOG_Gold	At its January 27, 2016 meeting the Lower Connecticut River Valley Council of Governments (River COG) and Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) voted unanimously to oppose Alternative 1, as proposed in the draft NEC Future Tier 1 Environmental Impact Statement. In particular, the chief elected officials of the River COG 's seventeen member municipalities, comprising all of Middlesex County and the towns of Lyme and Old Lyme in Connecticut, object to the proposed new rail bridge over the Connecticut River between Old Saybrook and Old Lyme and the new bypass rail line from Old Lyme to Kenyon, Rhode Island recommended in Alternative 1. ... Given the short notice and the seemingly inadequate review of the impacts that a new railroad bridge and line would have in Old Saybrook and Old Lyme, River COG respectfully requests that the FRA remove the new Connecticut River bridge and new rail think through Old Lyme from its NEC Future Tier 1 EIS Alternative 1, and pursue the other proposed recommendations separately.

Table JJ–28: Stakeholder Comments (Elected Officials, Tribes, Federal Agencies, State Agencies, Local Agencies): Old Lyme (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment
RiverCOG_Gold	The proposed new rail bridge and line from Old Saybrook, CT to Kenyon, RI would have significant impacts to the towns of Old Saybrook and Old Lyme, who are members of River COG. The new railroad corridor would decimate Old Lyme 's federally designated historic district, famous art academy, and only commercial area. Old Saybrook, which is in Middlesex County, would be seriously impacted by a new railroad bridge. The draft EIS does not list Middlesex County as being significantly impacted by the EIS alternatives.
RiverCOG_Gold	Depending on the type and height of the bridge constructed, the bridge could significantly impact all sorts of marine traffic originating or heading north of the proposed bridge location, in other parts of Middlesex, New London, and Hartford Counties. If a non-movable bridge is constructed, long elevated approaches will be necessary for a high-speed train to cross a bridge as tall as the existing Baldwin I-95 bridge. At a one percent grade, the approaches could be as long at 8,000 feet on either side. The elevated approaches will have significant impacts on both Old Saybrook and Old Lyme.
RiverCOG_Gold	The Connecticut River and its estuary is a place of unique environmental significance. The Connecticut River is the only major East coast river that does not have a city or majority industry at its mouth. This is due to the sandbars located there, impeding navigation of larger ships. Because of this, the Connecticut River Estuary, was left largely undeveloped. The significance of this place to birds migration, aquatic wildlife spawning, flood and storm surge mitigation cannot be overstated. The importance of this place has been recognized by a number of state, federal, and international designations: ... River COG questions the use of the numerous designations, intended to protect this special place, when they seem to have been overlooked in this environmental impact statement process? The same can be said for Old Lyme 's historic district.
Weicker_Lo	Old Lyme, tiny in area, is one of the oldest and most historic towns in our state. The proposed rail line would cut its historic district in half and destroy the historic integrity and beauty of the community.
Weicker_Lo	In addition, the impact on the Connecticut River, its estuary and the marshlands and habitats therein would likely be severe and affect not just the Old Lyme community but all others who share this estuary, including Old Saybrook and Essex. The habits within these waters have been either a home or a resting place to many varieties of species of birds and migratory species who breed in its waters.
Weicker_Lo	The construction of a new railroad bridge connecting Old Saybrook to Old Lyme would require a detailed environmental study of its impact on the Estuary and its habitats.

Source: NEC FUTURE team, 2016

Table JJ–29: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Old Lyme

Stakeholder ID	Comment
Abagnaro_Sa	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.
Aberbach_Su	I am strongly opposed to the plan to construct a rail line through the center of Old Lyme, Connecticut. ... The effect of a rail line bisecting Old Lyme would destroy the nature of the community-- both its historic identity and contemporary economic community. I am strongly opposed to this plan and the detrimental effect it would have on one of Connecticut's most irreplaceable and important institutions.
Abrahamsson_Ma	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 well as the beauty and historical essence of Lyme Street which is the heart of Old Lyme
Accettullo_Gi	"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."
Aceto_Sh	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.
Achorn_Ch	I am an alum from the Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts. Please let the tradition of fine arts so precious in the area remain intact and find somewhere else to disrupt.
Acosta_Mi	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.
Adams_Ca	Do not implement option 1 through old Lyme !!!!! Leave a piece of our artistic history in peace!
Adams_Da	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.
Adams_Da	Please do not destroy Old Lyme the viability of Old Lyme can not be hurt especially the Lyme Academy
Adinolfi_Su	"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."
Agenbroad_Mi	The proposed route would destroy not only historic areas of Old Lyme but also important wetland habitats. This would be a travesty.
Akin_Jo	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.
Al Arkoubi_Kh	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.
Aldieri_Ja	I am opposed to Alternative #1 based on its high financial cost and its destruction of a natural wonder. You don't get a second chance with repairing beauty lost. The Lieutenant River and Historic district of Old Lyme are treasures in the State of Connecticut, so unique and irreplaceable. Please do not destroy the beauty. We are the Stewards of this land and temporary inhabitants. Let's consider our children and their children being able to enjoy and learn from this beauty.
Alex	The plan to build a high-speed railway through historic Old Lyme and other towns should be turned down and never revisited. It is a foolish idea and it is unnecessary, and when it is at the cost of the Lyme Art Academy and other local homes and institutions, it is shameful. Put the money toward something we need, like helping the environment - shoreline east is plenty fine.
Alexander_Li	I am writing from the Old Lyme Phoebe Griffin Noyes in Old Lyme. There is considerable concern about the NEC Future project in our town and we would like a print copy of the Tier I Draft Environmental Impact Statement for our library. We realize that this document is available online however many of our patrons would prefer to use the print copy. Please respond to this request as soon as possible.
Alexander_Th	PLEASE do not move forward with Alternative 1!!!!!!
Alfano_Ra	"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."
Alharbi_Ab	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.
Alison	Alternative 1, the plan to update the rail system by essentially sacrificing an historic town, is beyond comprehension. Alternative 1 invades the rights of property owners and townspeople while simultaneously destroying a precious, and preserved, ecosystem. Not only will townspeople be displaced from their homes, but the damage to property values will be significant and the potential for destruction of the local economy is real.
Alison	In addition, the damage done to the local ecosystems and marshlands by the proposed Alternative 1 plan should immediately take the plan off the table. Old Lyme contains marshlands and land trusts that are preserved, untouchable, and full of natural wild life that absolutely must be protected. For example, living in this town has afforded me the chance to see bald eagles in the wild on multiple occasions, as there are a few nests throughout town that locals know about. To disrupt an environment where endangered animals live is beyond reproach, especially in today's era where environmental conservation is key.
Allen_Mi	The NEC Option 1 plan would destroy the center of our town.
Allen_Re	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.
Alsharif_Sa	"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, endanger the federally protected areas of the" "Connecticut River Estuary and ruin the aesthetic quality of Old Lyme's nationally recognized historic district."
Altamemi_Ab	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.

Table JJ–29: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Old Lyme (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment
Alvine_Ro	I strongly oppose Alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridor Futures proposal because it will destroy the campus of the Nationally known Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts and that of the University of New Haven.
Amacher_Ch	I oppose the construction of this rail line through the OLD LYME historic village.
Ames_St	Several years ago there was the Ocela Train which was supposed to be a high speed train. It failed miserably and now they want to destroy a beautiful colonial and historic town which will surely become another failure. Why not use the existing rail line and build a new bridge next to the existing one thereby not destroying a beautiful town?
Amico_Ni	"I strongly oppose Alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridor Futures proposal, as it will have a profound affect on The University of New Haven's (UNH) Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts."
Amyot_Le	I oppose Alternative 1 for the Northeast Corridor, which would result in the destruction of the many cultural and historic resources in Old Lyme, CT, environmental harms to the CT Shoreline east of Old Saybrook, CT and would leave the train infrastructure vulnerable to hurricane damage.
Anastos_Sa	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.
Andersen_Je	As Director of the Florence Griswold Museum in Old Lyme, Connecticut, I am gravely concerned about the cultural and historic damage to our town by Alternative 1 that runs right through our historic district and in close proximity to our National Historic Landmark Florence Griswold House and Museum. I strongly urge that you remove the new track route that goes through the center of the town as part of Alternative 1 and give priorities to other less damaging alternatives.
Anderson_St	I respectfully suggest that rather than the needless destruction of the heart of Old Lyme that the new by pass use the existing, recently upgraded, right of way from New Haven to Hartford and from there follow I-84 to Boston.
Anderson_St	The existing shoreline service could remain without the destruction proposed by Alternat 1
Anderson_Sy	NO!!!! I fully support UPGRADING EXISTING RAIL LINES, but NOT adding any new ones.
Anderson_Sy	The new lines would cut through some of our most historical and culturally rich towns, with their historic buildings and landmarks, devastating their way of life and negatively impacting real estate values. Improve the lines we already have!!!!
Andrade_Fl	I oppose to 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.
Angerame_Er	While I am very excited in the NEC rail plan, I wish that you could find a way to avoid destroying the Lyme School of Art.
Angus_No	The original layout of the Amtrak line should be replaced. However moving it North through the Town of Old Lyme will distroy the town.
Angus_No	Why has this been so hidden from the citizens involved. It is a travesty that we were no informed and a hearing was not planned out in the Community that would be most effected! Why were we not informed?
Annino_Ja	"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."
Anthony_Ti	"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."
Antonellis_Th	I am very much opposed to the construction of a railroad that goes through my undergrad's campus... It was bad enough when the University of New Haven bought the Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts, but don't drive the stake through by literally removing my college from its historic location
Archer_Ju	Needless to say this plan would have a huge impact of an historic N.E. village [Old Lyme]. This village prides itself on staying the same for centuries. Alot of hard working and dedicated people over the years have kept it that way. This Tier 1 plan would take all that away from it's residents. So please save our town and look at other plans.
Archer_Ju	There of course is the environmental impact as the trains would go through an estuary that has nesting sites of the Osprey [Old Lyme], once an endangered bird. What are you looking to improve??
Archer_Ju	We just cannot believe the idea of running a high speed rail line through our small and historic town of Old Lyme would even be considered at all..there are antique historic homes right in the path of this proposal. What are you thinking! We oppose this idea 100%.
Archer_Ju	I just absolutely cannot believe that this plan to run a high speed Amtrak line through the historic village of Old Lyme, Ct was ever considered. It's like running one through Williamsburg, Va or Concord, Ma. Historic sites of our nation's history. Old Lyme is a noted Art's Colony and this train track would eliminate an art college and remove and demolish nationally credited historic home. WHY? was this ever thought of???
Armstrong_Su	The plans will cut through many lovely Connecticut towns for the purpose of a few travelers to save a few minutes on their train ride. I object to these plans. The cost is so high and the tracks will cut through our mainstreet in Old Lyme.
Arnold_Am	"I oppose Alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridor Futures proposal because it will destroy the historic community and village of Old Lyme that I live in!
Arnold_Ch	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.
Ash_Sh	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 run through sensitive estuary areas.

Table JJ–29: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Old Lyme (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment
Ashley	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.
Astley_An	I have come here today to express my concern with and opposition to the Alternative 1 of the draft EIS for the NEC plan to improve rail service.First and foremost, this plan would destroy the heart of our community. This plan would impact our only commercial area, which houses our grocery store, pharmacy and many small businesses. Our village center, which is directly off of the commercial area, houses the Lyme Academy of Fine Arts, as well as the famous Florence Griswold Museum and the Lyme Art Association. All are sites of historic significance and the individual organizations have worked diligently to continue with their legacy and maintain the physical structures. It is beyond comprehension that these buildings would be considered of little importance as this project moves forward. But the plan also impacts many properties along the way, as it is an entirely new track, cutting through several neighborhoods, not to mention wetlands, open space and areas of archaeological significance. Our community maintains our character through strict zoning regulations, considerate planning, and support of our historic treasures, including the museums, colleges, library and various art organizations. I am utterly opposed to Alternative 1 of this plan and urge you to look at other, more reasonable solutions for reducing time travel between major cities.
Athanas_Da	We are strongly opposed to NEC Future Alternative number one as it would destroy one of the oldest and most beautiful towns on the shoreline. It would also have a very strong negative effect on all Old Lyme property values. There is already an existing railroad right of way and we see no reason why that can not be used and enlarged or refurbished as necessary.
Avitable_Ja	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.
Ayers_Di	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.
Babin_Pe	As a Property owner in the town of Old Lyme and an Alumni of the University of New Haven, I oppose Alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridor Futures proposal because it will not only destroy the campus of Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts of the University of New Haven but will also potentially cause environmental damage to many of the open space properties along the project areas.
Bachman_Ja	The proposed rail line through Old Lyme will completely destroy a historic and art centric town and vibrant community. We are completely opposed to this plan. Our home is located directly in the path of the rail line. This plan is a disaster for our town and will displace our community.
Baehr_Re	As a permanent resident of Old Lyme, CT, the current proposal of a new railway line is extremely distressing. ... I implore you, the FRA, to eliminate this proposal entirely, and instead craft a proposal that is far less disruptive to current communities and economies, and to do so with the input of all community members.
Baehr_Su	Alternative 1 with it's new segment of track is environmentally damaging to the shoreline's natural habitat. It also does not take into consideration the historic significance of the area and the huge negative impact on the town's economy. The town should have been contacted as part of the plan to provide input on historic sites and environmental priorities.
Baehr_Th	I object to the Alternative 1of the EIS plan because of four (4) fundamental flaws in the plan
Baehr_Th	1. Alternative 1 is highlighted in the EIS as having the greatest negative environmental impact to CT. New construction will destroy wetland both along the shoreline and inland. 2. Alternative 1 destroys the cultural and historic heritage of Old Lyme.
Baehr_Th	3. Alternative 1 adds little if any additional capacity to Northeast Corridor rail service and serves fewer people as compared to alternatives 2 and 3.
Baffaro_Jo	I am appalled at the plan to build a rail line that intersects the historic gown of OldLyme and especially disappointed that we who live here are just finding out about this plan, after the opportunity to voice opinions at a public meeting has passed. I can only think that this was done with the intention of stifling public opinion . Shame on NEC. We citizens of Old Lyme will not be denied our voice. No rail line must be allowed to disrupt our bucolic village.
Baffaro_Ti	What an awful way to ruin the beautiful Old Lyme, CT historic district with an ugly train track system through its middle. It would also completely wreck 2 of our precious resources; the Lyme Art College and the Florence Griswold Museum. There must be a better solution to this need. Please spare Old Lyme and find another way. Thank you.
Bair_Gl	I object to the current NEC proposal as it would impact buildings with historic significance in Old Lyme, CT.
Bair_Gl	Perhaps moving the rail to more closely align with the current rail route could be accomplished. I would rather see a proposal that supports a modified route passing through the current Old Lyme Country Club and the Black Hall Country Club. Expanding rail traffic through these privately-owned golf clubs with large acreage would impact fewer residents. Both of these (recreational) sites border the existing rail line, could more easily support rail line expansion and would the limit impacts of the rail expansion to fewer residents.
Baker_Da	"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."
Baker_Ja	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.
Baker_Je	As much as I agree that Connecticut will be best served by the development of light rail, I cannot agree with the current proposed plan that would literally destroy the historic and environmental character of Old Lyme. I encourage all parties to develop an alternative plan.
Baldo_Re	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.
Ballachino_Ma	I oppose Alternative 1. A rail line through Old Lyme would decimate the character of the town, including The Historic District, The Lyme Art Academy, Lyme Art Association and The Florence Griswold Museum!
Ballard_Ba	I am categorically opposed to the Alternative 1 proposal that would require laying new tracks through the middle of Old Lyme, CT.

Table JJ–29: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Old Lyme (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment
Ballard_Ba	The fact that there has been so little time to publicly discuss the plan is outrageous.
Balsamo_Di	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.
Banker_Sk	Historical Old Lyme is irreplaceable. This plan would do irreversible damage and should be stopped.
Barber_Br	I am troubled by the proposal to put rail tracks through the University of New Haven Lyme campus.
Barclay_Ni	Please STOP this proposed plan to destroy the campus of the Lyme Art Academy and SPLIT the town of Old Lyme in half.
Barker_Di	Please do not run the high-speed line through the center of Old Lyme. There must be another route, or else one parallel to the existing one instead.
Barlow_Ca	We are opposed to this proposal as it cuts through the historic district of Old Lyme and would destroy a relative's home.
Barri_An	I am vehemently opposed to the plan called "alternative 1" which calls for running new track through Old Lyme,Ct. Not only would this adversely impact several fine residential neighborhoods, but from what I've heard it would severely disrupt our business district. This would, no doubt, meet with uproarious disapproval by inhabitants of this town, if it threatened to become closer to reality.
Barsky_He	I believe the proposed track should be re routed from the proposed plan.
Bartlett_St	Terrible idea . Atrocious impact on Main Street ,historic district and marshes.
Bartolini_Th	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.
Bartolini_Th	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.
Barton_Sh	please do not destroy our beautiful community of Old Lyme. We pay a lot to live here for the privacy and peaceful environment we have.
Bartone_Ka	Stop the rail from going through the nature preserve, Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts and the Historic District of Old Lyme and Lyme. Find another solution for the rail.
Bartosiewicz_Ju	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.
Bauer_Jo	This proposal will create tremendous congestion and disruption, during the many years it will be under construction. It will not bring businesses to CT, but will drive even more out. For those of us who live in East Lyme and Old Lyme, in the vicinity of I 95, our home values will be lowered along with our quality of life.
Bauer_Ka	As a resident of Old Lyme CT, I'd like to point out that one of the charms of our small town is its historic section which your proposal seeks to demolish. Your construction plans will cut directly through the small area considered to be our town center...Please note that I am 100% against this new track line and hope that the rest of the town residents will be informed of these plans and given the opportunity to make sure this alternative does not come to fruition
Bauer_Ma	This cannot happen and is a terrible idea. This will devastate many historical sites and natural preserves in CT and other areas. Please do not pursue this any longer.
Bausback-Aballo_Sa	As a parent of a student attending the university of New haven, 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.
Beal_Ba	I would like to express my concern about the impact option 1 would cause for the town of Old Lyme.
Bearse_Sh	I am writing to express my concern and disagreement with the FRA's Alternative 1 Plan to run the high speed rail line through Old Lyme, CT. Old Lyme is a beautiful, historic and vibrant town. To run a high speed rail line through the center of town would destroy much of what makes Old Lyme a functioning community. Please do not implement the Alternative 1 Plan for the high speed rail line for the NEC.
Beaudoin_Ma	I strongly oppose Alternative 1 which will negatively impact Old Lyme and the historic character of this wonderful town.
Beaudoin_Su	I strongly oppose Alternative 1 which will negatively impact Old Lyme and the historic character of this wonderful town.
Becerra_Ke	I oppose alternative 1 as it will destroy the Lyme college of art of the university of new haven in old lyme. A history of education excellence in a pristine landscape will be lost as well as the jobs of the teachers and staff. Please do not do this!
Becerra_Ro	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.
Bechtel_Ja	I strongly object to the proposed plan that would redirect the rail line over the Lieutenant River and through the Old Lyme Historic District.
Becker_Ca	"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."
Bedard_Em	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.
Beers_Ju	Please revise the plan to have the railroad destroy the Old Lyme historic district! A rail line is already existing and please use it!

Table JJ–29: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Old Lyme (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment
Beglin_Cy	I am completely against expanding Metro North's tracks through the middle of Old Lyme. The historic village will be ruined forever if this were to happen. The town is a haven for artists and artlovers with several small but famous museums and galleries. There is no place as lovely and bucolic between New York and Boston, and many people - locals and weekenders alike are shocked to hear of the plans under consideration. We are also concerned by lack of advance warning about the plan. This will negatively impact the livelihoods of so many local residents who derive their incomes from tourism. (See the article in The New York Post last summer about the a CT River Valley being the next new Hamptons and listing all the area attractions - many of which are in Old Lyme.) Ruining OL will not only destroy a colonial gem, but it will destroy the local economy of the whole area. Please reconsider what you are proposing.
Behringer_Fr	...notice of these plans was not effectively publicized.
Belemlih_Ha	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.
Belemlih_Ha	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.
Belemlih_Ha	Although I am greatly in favor of expanding mass transit, I am opposed to destroying a college campus and a vital art community to do so. I oppose Alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridor Futures proposal because it will destroy the campus of Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts. I urge you to find alternative routes for this project.
Belini_Ky	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.
Belmer_Ch	There are apparantly other viable alternatives to running the proposed tracks through Old Lyme and through a school campus, virtually destroying the campus and potentially the school. In addition the tracks will be running through valuable estuary areas and disturbing them. Finally Old Lyme is a unique and beautiful town, there is no reason to infringe upon that.
Belmer_Me	I oppose alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridor Futures proposal because it will destroy the site of Lyme Academy College of fine arts as part of the university of New Haven. This is the most beautiful piece of historic property and is where many famous artists were educated. It is a peaceful beautiful place. Please don't destroy it.
Belton_No	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.
Benbow_Ju	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.
Bennett_He	This is an appalling plan to reroute the railroad tracks and bridge from Old Saybrook through the middle of the historic village and residential neighborhoods of Old Lyme, CT.
Bennett_Ri	The village of Old Lyme is a unique preservation of time that should be protected as such. Alternative A, that as I understand it, would run through such an American treasure, does not seem to take this aspect of our culture in consideration and, as such, should scream for alternative options.
Bento_De	My backyard backs up to the railroad. Trains go by at horrifying speeds as it is. I oppose this idea immensely. Please do not let this go through.
Berblum_Be	Alternative 1, calling for the construction of a new bridge over the Connecticut River in Old Lyme and new rail lines through the heart of this town, cannot pass this test.
Berblum_Be	This plan would: (1) have substantial negative impact on the Connecticut River Estuary and the various species of wildlife now living in (and in some cases returning to) this area, from bald eagles to salmon; (2) literally destroy the business, historic and cultural center of Old Lyme; and (3) have enormous, adverse consequences for the entire residential community.
Bergami_Sa	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.
Berglund_Da	Unbelievable, nobody rides the existing train so you decide to spend billions on new tracks through our historic residential town. NO WAY!
Bergmans_Rud	I oppose alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridor proposal. It will destroy the Lyme Art Academy, College of Fine Arts and have a major negative impact on the University of New Haven.
Bergmans_Ruu	would crush the already low real estate values and overall economic viability of the area (Old Lyme).
Bergmans_Ruu	The Tier 1 draft is unacceptable.
Bergquist_Sh	Our vote is no on option #1...Not only do we have trains already traveling through the edges of our community we, also, have the noise that these trains emit 24/7. Anyone who knows Old Lyme is aware of its historic contribution to the art world--home of the American Impressionist Movement, home of one of the only classic art colleges in the US, home of the Florence Griswold Museum and home of the oldest continuing art associations in the US. Old Lyme is one of the very few picture postcard towns left in CT with many early American homes and one of the best known churches in the state...It's inconceivable to imagine a decision to wipe out this wonderful town when the train could follow close to the current path or go north of Old Lyme.
Bergquist_Sh	The costs lost to our historic town in terms of housing values and tourism have to be added to the economic considerations being measured. Quality of life, once it's gone, can not be replicated or counted in dollars.
Bernstein_Ad	I do not live in Old Lyme, and while I think a fast track rail line is a great idea, it should not now, not ever, go through the middle of a school
Bernstein_Ad	in fact, the middle of a town which is so rich in Connecticut history. The planners need to go back to the drawing board and find a route that will not impact a school or a town or the people living there. You need to preserve Old Lyme.

Table JJ–29: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Old Lyme (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment
Berry_Je	I am begging, from the bottom of my heart, for you to reconsider running a high speed rail through my quiet little town. I understand the necessity but I do not understand the desire to go through our historic district and marsh lands. I'm not sure who will read this or how much of an impact it will have on the overall decision but all I ask is that you please do not disturb my quiet little town.
Berry_Ka	We can't imagine a more unwise decision! Who in his or her right mind would disrupt a healthy community at such a huge cost to gain a few minutes. Utter nonsense.
Berry_Lo	I totally appose the construction of the new rail line thru the Old Lyme Historical District.
Bertolini_Ma	violently against a new rail going through our small business center in Old Lyme CT.
Bertolini_Ma	Our little town of Old LYme could not possibly sustain the kinds of changes being talked about in this plan. I am totally agaist it.
Bessette_St	If money was free, I do feel that the elimination of the rail line from the Thames River to Kingston Rhode Island along the shore would have many positive impacts. The first would be the elimination of over 10 miles of rail lines that have been built that are causing serious environmental impacts due to the rail line structure. It is estimated that trains that travel from New London to Kingston Rhode Island make 3 complete circles if you added up the number of twists and turns between these points. I encourage you to explore looking at moving the rail line from the coast to a parallel path along I-95 between Groton CT and Kingston RI.
Betten_Fl	I cannot think of a worse way to try to improve the NEC than to build this flyway through bucolic Old Lyme. I am not a resident of this town but I am a user of the rail system. Nevertheless, I would strongly object to to this plan.
Bettley_De	"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."
Bevington_Ph	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.
Bevington_Ph	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.
Bianca	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.
Bielski_Di	Please consider how devastating the loss of historic buildings, our town center, and the cultural area that would be affected should you continue to proceed with the current mapping of the relocation of the rail line through Old Lyme. There must be another route you can use to improve the rail service along the coast. We are all in favor of progress but not at the cost of the environmental, historic and cultural impact this current proposed route would be.
Bielski_St	It would substantially alter the character of our historic community in a negative way. Not to mention an adverse environmental impact. Failure to inform our legislators or communities about the proposal is sufficient grounds to look at the entire process with a jaundiced eye.
Bienia_Da	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.
Bieniewicz_Pa	Alternative 1 of the three high-speed railtrack routes proposed by the Federal Railroad Authority (FRA) in their Northeast Corridor (NEC) Future plan is a horror, an ill conceived idea with no regard for the historical nature of a beautiful town, its waterways, wetlands, ponds and most of all its people. Government agencies come up with these plans, consulting no one , getting no local input and expect what result? Applause? What will be gained by such a venture? Total disruption, homes wiped out and a town drastically changed for what? Think again. Go back to your drawing boards and reassess this plan. Choose another alternative, please.
Bigelow_Cy	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.
Billiau_Ch	I am all for the new train bridge and nec plan in old Lyme Connecticut
Bilotto_Pa	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 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 plans make more sense
Bilumane_Pr	Please refrain from running train tracks or building train station in or around the Old Lyme college/university. It's important to preserve and conserve environment for our children and for future.
Bingham_Da	I applaud your efforts. Though a proponent of rail, "high speed " rail through southeastern CT is not an option because of the terrain and geology, with significant environmental and social impacts to gain only a small degree of increased velocity. This option should be a non-starter.
Bingham_Lu	This would eviscerate the heart of a flourishing and historically important art community (Old Lyme)
Bingham_Ru	Take Alternative 1 off the table. Save beautiful and historical Old Lyme.
Bingham_Ru	Please don't allow the proposed new railroad go through the heart of Old Lyme. It should not be a destructive process to such a historical community. There are plenty of open spaces nearby.
Bingham_Ru	The rail line should not go through the heart of town in Old Lyme, Ct. There's plenty of room elsewhere.
Birdsell_Re	This option to go through Old Lyme Historical District should not even be considered. Do not let this happen.

Table JJ–29: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Old Lyme (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment
Birdsell_Wi	I can not imagine you even remotely considering running a train line through the middle of an old, established New Engand town. Not the outskirts, but through the actual center of our town. Horrible !!! What about the towns inhabitants? Property values? Ruining a great old town !!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!! Go away. Besides, you've never even made a profit. Without subsidies you wouldn't even exist. GO AWAY
Birkic_Cr	Remove alternative one grimy he conversation!
Birkic_Cr	I am utterly opposed to this rerouting of the railroad. It will destroy the wonderful culture and lifestyle of Old Lyme,an historic American town.
Birkic_Da	This kind of project not only disrupts the public enjoyment of this city, but seriously devalue real estate in an area that is already struggling.
Birkic_Da	I also heard that the Old Lyme Selectman was not aware of this ridiculous proposal until late in its introduction.
Birkic_Da	Totally illogic, it will cost billions of dollars to reduce travel time by how much. 30 to 40 minutes.
Birkic_Da	I will continue to fight this proposal.
Birkic_Da	"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, several cherished art treasures and severally" "devalue real estate properties."
Bjorkman_Mi	This would be a terrible impact on the residence of Old Lyme
Bjorkman_Mi	Other options need to be presented! Maintaining and enhancing the existing rail system should be s viable option not disrupting the lives of Old Lyme residents!
Blader_De	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.
Blair_Ma	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.
Blake_Ch	I appreciate the interest in improving our railways but am concerned about the impact on the shoreline towns (specifically Old Lyme) with Alternative 1. The shoreline towns and natural landscapes are an important part of our states heritage and current tourism draw. I recognize the advantage of the rail system improving but not at all costs. We need to preserve our history, the natural environment and work better with the communities to resolve all the barriers of making these improvements. Personally, I am opposed to Alternative 1 due to the impact on my home and the limited benefit to the state.
Blaskovich_Je	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 the surrounding area of Old Lyme.
Block_Sh	The person who designed these options obviously has NO common sense. On examining them, and considering cost to usage ratios, they fall far short of the mark (that I expect they were aiming for.) The option that TOTALLY RUINS several shoreline towns in southeast Connecticut needs considerably more thought. Please reconsider these extremely flawed options.
Bloom_To	This Alternative 1" option to the Tier 1 Draft Environmental Impact Statement for "Nec Future"would be a disaster for the Town Of Old Lyme,Ct.In my mind it would have severe economic implications for the town and would drastically affect property values.The Town of Old Lyme is one of the most quaint and historic towns in the State of Connecticut-proactive zoning laws and common sense development over the years have led to a beautifully laid out grid and this Alternative 1 Option would make a mockery of all these activities over the years. ... This Option 1 Proposal should be removed from these studies and if that doesn't happen a public hearing should be held immediately! This Option 1 is totally unacceptable.
Bloustine_Ka	The entire idea of this high speech rail project is ludicrous. It would be a massive waste of money for a tiny improvement in the time required to get from Washington, D.C. to Boston. In addition Alternative 1 would destroy one of the areas jewels - the historic and arts district of Old Lyme. This area prides itself on preserving our history - why destroy a prime example of history that is being used today?
Boales_Ra	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.
Bocian_Da	I oppose to option 1. This option would destroy the heart of Old Lyme with virtually no up side
Bocian_Re	I am the third generation of my family to live in Old Lyme and a direct descendent of Thomas Hooker, the founder of Connecticut, and I can literally feel their outrage at the idiocy of this plan! The impact this would have on one of Connecticut's remaining positive Attributes, not to mention the environmental impact is astronomical! I am also a teacher in this town who has watched many a former child from my class be impacted positively by the unique environment of this community. Many attending the very college which this train would tear down, and others becoming marine biologists or going in to environmental studies due to the beauty of their surroundings! Please do not do this.
Bodor_Ch	As an alumni of the University of New Haven, 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.
Bond_Ch	PLEASE...re think the plan. Old Lyme is a nice quiet little town, a train thru the center of town, destroying homes and property is NOT the answer. look at what happened in New London with the Pfizer issue...oh it will be better they said, it will be beneficial they said, they took homes and property, destroying lives and memories...
Bondarenko_Do	As a long time summer resident of Old Lyme, I very disappointed and concerned about the prospects of Alternative 1 and ask that you weigh the limited benefit of the improvement with the importance of maintaining the character of the town.

Table JJ–29: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Old Lyme (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment
Bonfiglio_Th	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.
Bonomo_Fr	"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."
Borie Wood_Ma	Do not let this happen!
Boro_Gi	I'm somewhat concerned regarding the short response time allowed. Will there be another public hearing not in the dead of winter so people with mobility problems can attend?
Borton_Re	However, please be mindful and inclusive of the communities along the expanded rail lines. Many places along the lines are dependent on charm as their main economic driver. It is imperative that their planning and zoning decision makers are included in the process to make sure the location and style of the new railroad facilities are appropriate for the local communities character...The local communities are best positioned to make sure the places people love to visit and live are protected as well as shared.
Bosco_Ro	I want to add my support to those who have been actively opposing the proposal to reroute the rail line further inland through the town of Old Lyme (Alternative 1).
Bottinelli-Gada_El	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.
Bouchard_Jo	Whether or not to adopt the Alternative #1 should be a cooperative decision, reflecting the opinions of the local authorities and residents in the towns affected. and after gathering information about the impact the rail line would have on those communities. Thank you for taking my views on this subject into account in making your decision.
Bouchard-Ta	Don't destroy CT history for a train - the price is too high
Bourgoin_Lo	I oppose the proposal to run the rail through protected environmental areas of the CT River Estuary and through the historic district of Old Lyme. The ecological, cultural and educational value of this area should be preserved. Developments to our mass transit should take consideration of actual improvements to all including the established pass-through areas. The option to run through the rt 91 & 84 coordinator provides more value to improve mass transit! Preservation and Improvement Please! Do not destroy Old Lyme's historical legacy and protected environmental areas!
Bourgoin_Lo	I oppose the proposal to run the rail through protected environmental areas of the CT River Estuary and through the historic district of Old Lyme. The ecological, cultural and educational value of this area should be preserved. Developments to our mass transit should take consideration of actual improvements to all including the established pass-through areas. The option to run through the rt 91 & 84 coordinator provides more value to improve mass transit! Preservation and Improvement Please! Do not destroy Old Lyme's historical legacy and protected environmental areas!
Bourque_Ca	I strongly oppose the plan to expand railway tracks through the town of Old Lyme.
Bourque_Da	Alternate 1 provides for minimal overall improvement at the cost of several shoreline towns that already struggle with the congestion that I-95 creates. Old Lyme, CT suffers the worst under Alternate 1 and the cost to benefit for ridership is unjustified.
Boyle_Do	Although I am generally in support of this transformational transportation project, I am compelled today to say that I strongly object to the proposed plan to run the rail system through the heart of one of New England's loveliest and culturally and historically important towns: OLD LYME, CT...
Brainard_Ma	I am vehemently opposed to the Tier 1 Draft for the Northeast Corridor High Speed Rail for the following reasons: It will run through and destroy a very valuable Historic Artistic region in Connecticut, the area is already well served by rail and other public transportation and the high speed rail should route through Hartford which does not have direct service from NY, and finally, this route is a shorter distance to Boston than through the Shoreline.
Brainerd_We	To destroy an entire town [Old Lyme],(listed on the National Registry of Historic Places) it's residential and commercial areas is unconscionable.
Branchini_An	Option 1 unfairly affects towns like Old Lyme, with only minimal improvement in transportation. More lost than gained in that plan
Brash_AI	With respect to specifics; in Alternative 1, the “new segment” proposed from Old Saybrook, Ct., to Kenyon, RI. threatens to essentially destroy “main street” in Old Lyme, Ct., and substantively alter the character and aesthetics of the surrounding landscape. The proposed new segment would dissect the center of this town, and in addition negatively impact thousands of acres (directly impacting hundreds, and aesthetically impacting thousands) of woods and marshes that surround and characterize this beautiful pastoral community.
Breault_Ro	It is incredible that such a plan could be developed without prior input from the town of Old Lyme. Our First Selectwoman is now on record, January 13, expressing vehement opposition, and I join her.
Breeding_An	I am against the proposed NEC plan to put the high speed rail through the town of Old Lyme CT. Old Lyme is an almost perfectly preserved example of small town, coastal Connecticut life.
Breeding_An	At the center of its cultural life, The Old Lyme Art Academy, and the Florence Griswold Museum draw artists and visitors from all over the world; the Old Lyme Art Colony made its home there and the Florence Griswold Museum offers the visitor the chance to see the Connecticut Impressionists in a building and Main Street that offer a view of 19th century life unmatched by other larger coastal Connecticut towns. Old Lyme is also tied to the life of The Connecticut River, its tributaries and fragile estuaries, the intended plan will wreak destruction and devastation for the plants and wildlife that make the area home.
Breeding_Ro	Dear Sir or Madam, Your plan to build a new rail route across the Connecticut River and right through downtown Old Lyme, would destroy the scenic and environmentally sensitive marshes that were the subject of American Impressionism, it would physically destroy the current and important Old Lyme Art Academy which builds on that earlier movement, and which is the heart of new American realist painting, it would destroy the town of Old Lyme which maintains the historic legacy of this movement and remains an important tourist hub and gateway for New London County.

Table JJ–29: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Old Lyme (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment
Breeding_Ro	What sense is there in the current and successful work by the Nature Conservancy, and others, to protect the Connecticut River watershed, if the actual outlet, rich with wildlife, including eagles and osprey, is destroyed? The plan is not just destructive, it's insane.
Breen_Ro	As a lifelong seasonal resident of the Town of Old Lyme, Connecticut I am writing to express great concern regarding the potential impact of the North East Corridor Future Alternative 1 on the Town. It is apparent that routing new railroad tracks to the north of I-95 in Old Lyme would destroy unique and priceless institutions that are at the core of Old Lyme 's value as a community. These include the Florence Griswold Museum, The Lyme Academy of Fine Arts, as well as the Lyme Art Association. Maintaining and upgrading transportation infrastructure is clearly essential to economic growth, public safety, national defense and the greater public good. However, one would hope that such projects be undertaken with due consideration to the value of elements in the communities which they are intended to serve. I call upon those with decision making authority in the Federal Railroad Administration not to choose Alternative 1, and to leave the cultural assets of Old Lyme undisturbed.
Brekke_Ga	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.
Breunig_Ro	I hope that other options will be developed as going through the Old Lyme Historic District as well as other old time areas would be a shame. Lyme/Old Lyme dates back to be well before the train. I first came to old Lyme in 1946 and I would hate to see the charm impacted in such a negative way.
Breunig_Sa	I am surprised that there is even a thought of going through a historic district of town or the largest business section of a small town with the railroad. There must be a less invasive option. I am certainly opposed to the current plan.
Briggs_Na	Please do not consider ruining Old Lyme with your plan for Alternative 1 of the three high-speed railtrack routes proposed by the Federal Railroad Authority (FRA). Please don't destroy a town that means so much to so many people. Please forget it and come up with a different plan that doesn't damage Old Lyme or any town for that matter.
Brill_Li	"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."
Briscoe_Ch	In regard to your Alternate (1) for NEC to run from Old Saybrook, across the CT River, across a portion of the Old Lyme Historical District and meet up with and parallel Interstate 95 to New London - 1.) In Old Lyme it is called a Historical District for a reason and they aren't making them anymore. Its value to the citizens of Old Lyme and the people who visit will be severely impacted by this negative proposal and it should not even be considered.
Brock_Al	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.
Broderick_De	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.
Brown_Ch	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.
Brown_Je	"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
Brown_Ma	I strongly oppose Alternative 1 of the NEC futures proposal because it would destroy the campus of Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts.
Brown_Wi	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.
Brubaker_An	my opposition to the Connecticut portion of Alternative 1 which is proposed in the NEC Future draft plan.
Brubaker_An	The new high speed rail route proposed in Alternative 1 from Old Saybrook, CT to Kenyon, RI would destroy ... and commercial viability of Old Lyme. Businesses in Old Lyme depend not only on resident traffic and summer visitors but on year-round tourism generated by the Florence Griswold Museum, two historic inns and the general character of the town, particularly its historic main street.
Brubaker_An	this alternative plan would have a negative impact on the ecology and rural character of the Connecticut River estuary.
Brubaker_An	I am sure that more thorough research on the negative impact of this alternative will lead you to delete this alternative from your future plans.
Bruno_Gw	We have been hearing about the high-speed rail project but no tangible details until today?? And now you want to, pardon the pun, railroad this asinine idea through our state destroying historic area and natural habitat?? This is one unbelievably sleazy move on your part.
Bu Khamsin_Kh	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.
Buchberger_Ir	My husband and I lived in Old Lyme for a year, and we love this wonderful town with its historical heart. The pretty well maintended homes are treasure and fortune of this town.You can read about the Florence Griswold Museum in every tour-guide book. I want to let you know our disappointment, also people in Germany are concerned about this senseless plan. I guess it's made by people who never have been in the area.
Bucior_Mi	Please fire the person who thought it was a good idea to route this through Old Lyme center.
Buckingham_Du	This concerns SE Connecticut and Old Lyme in particular. It seems to me that generally using the right-of-way and path of I-95 would make good sense. HOWEVER, in the case of Old Lyme, it could not be done "next to" I-95 without literally destroying the town and its historical buildings. So I am wondering whether the new rail line could be elevated "above" I-95 for those sections which would otherwise be too disruptive to local communities. This has been a method which has been successfully implemented in Japan and other countries, and, while more expensive for short stretches, those costs would likely be more than offset by eliminating the costs for eminent domain and other right-of-way purchases. It might also eliminate the costs of protracted legal wrangling in the courts.

Table JJ–29: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Old Lyme (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment
Bucknall_Wi	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.
Budas_Or	" 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. "
Bugarchich_Ta	"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."
Buitron_Sh	I oppose Alternative 1 of the northeast Corridor future of fine arts of UNH.
Bundschuh_Ke	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.
Burdeshaw_Jo	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.
Burgess_To	I am completely against the new high speed rail plan put a new track section right through our beautiful, historic downtown of Old Lyme.
Burke_He	I heard one route smashes through Old Lyme, which is too horrible to contemplate.
Burke_Je	Please reconsider this proposal. This rail line would physically and psychologically destroy the heart of Old Lyme. In addition to damaging the historic beauty of the area, the rail line would also eliminate the only town center that we have. Without any real retail downtown area, the school campuses and art museums have become the place where people gather for town events. This proposal would devastate this community.
Burns_Do	The impact to the town of Old Lyme, CT, is mind-boggling.
Burramukku_Na	"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."
Burridge_Ke	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.
Burt_Ha	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.
Burtis_Ta	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.
Bush_Ba	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.
Bushley_Da	The proposed alternative 1 is an outrageous expenditure of money to gain little increase in speed and shorter travel time. In particular, the proposal to essentially eliminate the character and nationally recognized historic stature of Old Lyme Ct strongly counters our desire to embrace our culture, history and preserve our environmental heritage. And the statement about the favorable economic impact on the area shows a total disregard for the actual facts concerning the local economy and how this project would hurt, not help our area. I strongly oppose Alternative 1 as drafted and hope that the FRA can find a more economic way to improve service with minimal adverse impact to the affected communities.
Buteau_Ga	"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."
Buttrick_Br	1) The proposed new bridge and rail will bisect the charming and historic village of Old Lyme, ruining its unique character... 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.
Buttrick_Br	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:
C_Jo	"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."
Cable_Pe	The unique historical and artistic heritage of Old Lyme will be sacrificed if Alternative 1 of the NEC plan is adopted.
Cable_Pe	I know also that the cumulative annual intercity travel time savings estimated for construction of the new rail segment would be roughly comparable to the labor time lost through the implied closing of the Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts mentioned by Bonnie Reemsnyder. What benefit-cost calculus justifies adoption of such a plan?
Cable_Pe	This comment pertains to the proposed Alternative 1 new rail segment from Old Saybrook, CT, to Kenyon, RI, and in particular concerns that part of the new segment that cuts through Old Lyme. The Town of Old Lyme would not directly benefit from any increase in rail service, but it is surely a stakeholder in Alternative 1, though it was not consulted or even directly informed about the new segment bisecting the Town center. The Tier 1 EIS is at a high level and inadequate to judge the impact on Old Lyme of the new segment. ...Nothing suggests that the residents of Old Lyme oppose improvements to NEC service, but this new segment of Alternative 1 would irreparably damage the existing scenic, cultural-historic, environmental and commercial character of the Town and it is difficult to imagine what can mitigate that.
Cable_Pe	...a Tier 2 EIS, which might be sufficient to reveal the damage to Old Lyme of the new segment through town, comes too late and only mitigation procedures would apply not abandonment of the new segment.
Cabral_Mi	Completely opposed to the Old Lyme amtrak proposal-how can it be considered to destroy a beautiful town for the sake of saving a half hour train time
Caccavale_La	"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."

Table JJ–29: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Old Lyme (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment
Cady_Ja	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 Old Lyme in general. It's bad enough that I-95 cuts right through the area, and this would only further disrupt the placid, small-town ambiance that make Old Lyme so special...
Caffey_Wa	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.
Cahill_Na	Old Lyme is a special historical village of famed artistry in CT where the arts, aesthetic seascapes & natural wildlife are the most unusual along the CT shoreline. It was an artist colony from back in the 1800s known for the special lighting effects. If the infra structure is changed in any way the entire environment will negate everything this town means to the this unique artistic culture & society.
Cahill_Re	Absolutely not...no train through Old Lymes historic district and no Long Island Sound tunnel into Milford...are you people crazy????????
Cahouet Fulreader_Cy	Please DO NOT allow this train to dissect Old Lyme! Under any circumstances, NO!
Cairns_Ka	Please don't ruin Old Lyme with this rail plan.
Calabrese_Pa	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.
Calatayud_Sa	I'm a former resident of Old Lyme. Alternative 1 is just a horrible concept. The community of Old Lyme, and others in its vicinity would be severely and negatively impacted by rail activity as proposed in this scenario. Property values will be negatively impacted, and so much of the atmosphere that people love so much about Old Lyme will be destroyed. Please, please reconsider this plan.
Caldwell_La	I oppose the plan to put a transit line through Old Lyme, Connecticut.
Callahan_Ti	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.
Callahan_Ti	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.
Camean_Ho	I plead with you to consider a well thought alternative and listen to your riders, communities, elected officials and surely you can result in a plan considerate and effective of all parties involved.
Campbell_Ch	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.
Campbell_Jo	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.
Cann_Te	we in Old Lyme are strongly opposed to your plan of running parallel to I-95 just south of it.
Cann_Te	It will disrupt lives, people's homes and businesses here in our beautiful little historic town.
Cantner_Sh	This plan is detrimental to the center of Old Lyme CT. And at what gain? A few minutes of commuting time? Please consider other alternatives to this horrible plan
Cantrell_He	don't go through Old Lyme. Wouldn't it make more sense to send the route through an under-served area, with larger cities with riders--like Hartford and Springfield?
Caporale_Ma	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. Frankly, this would destroy an entire historic community around the campus as well.
Cappello_Be	This would be a devastating impact on the historic village area of Old Lyme. Really ?? Our historic district ??....My vote is a resounding no !!!!!
Cappello_Do	It's outrageous that you would even try to do this to a historic town. My vote is...NO!!
Cappello_Do	It's outrageous that you would even try to do this to a historic town. My vote is ... NO!!
Carey_Jo	please do not destroy this beautiful part of eastern Connecticut. Especially the area including the fine arts college and the University of New Haven. Alternate routes going North makes more sense. Train service to this part of the state would be a welcome addition to our transportation system
Carija_Ma	I oppose the tier 1 plan that would cut a path of destruction through historic coastal towns.
Carija_Vi	Leave things as they are!!!!
Carley_Wi	I oppose Alternative 1 or any plan that threatens the town of Old Lyme, CT. Our community has fought for years to maintain the integrity of the town itself and we wish to preserve that integrity by opposing any rail system development that changes the town. I suggest no change to the existing rail access and routing.
Carlile_Am	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. Additionally, as a Marine Scientist I am concerned about the environmental impact on coastal communities. At a time when spatial planners are starting to discuss strategies to retreat from the shoreline as sea levels rise, it does not seem prudent to plan a major development such as this.

Table JJ–29: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Old Lyme (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment
Carlson_Ca	The impact of the NEC FUTURE plans are devastating for Old Lyme. The footprint of rail service is already significant in Old Lyme. The proposal places a huge burden on an historic town and all the residents, institutions, and businesses that have already accommodated rail and highway development.
Carlson_Li	I agree that repair needs to be made to the current railroad infrastructure; however, to alter the way of life for those who live and work on our precious Conn shoreline deserves very,very close scrutiny..Every aspect of the project should enhance our way of life..we live in small communities here and value our lifestyles greatly.
Carlson_Zo	Lyme Academy
Carosella_Er	the plans to reroute the NE corridor segment from Old Saybrook CT to Rhode Island as they've been presented are ill advised and foolish. A good sized electrified right of way exists. Why not improve it? Who stands to gain from this project? Construction Companies? Trying to cut right through centers of towns like Old Lyme CT will only invite litigation and delays in the overall improvements needed... This seems to me like, "get out of the way, the railroads coming through, and we can go wherever we want!"
Carr_Je	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.
Cartland_Je	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.
Caruso_Jo	Please reconsider plans that will have such a negative impact on Lyme Academy College's future and the Old Lyme community in general
Casey_Ca	I am opposed to Option number 1.
Casinghino_Mi	If someone has forgotten, the job of the gov't. is to carry out the will of the people, NOT to tell the people what to do. The town of Old Lyme does not want their town destroyed by some high speed train cutting through the historic district.That is the will of the people. I live in Ct. and visit Old Lyme quite a bit, and I would just as soon keep it just the way it is, a beautiful, peaceful shoreline village.
Caspers_Ky	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
Cassella_Pa	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.
Castellan_Su	I oppose Alternative 1... I am concerned about the impact on Old Lyme and surrounding communities. These historic places are an irreplaceable part of our national heritage.
Castonguay_Ch	Alternative 1 as proposed in the Tier One Draft would adversely impact the town of Old Lyme, Connecticut in ways both measurable and immeasurable. Weighing this fact coupled with the negative impact a high speed rail would have running through the middle of the historical and school district of town as well as the negative impact on the environment and fragile eco systems that are so important to the community, this option is simply unacceptable.
Castonguay_Ja	I sincerely hope that Old Lyme forever remains as pristine and abundant with the marshland nature that we as a community have always known and loved, and I hope that this post and others like it will inspire you to abandon the disruptive current plans.
Castonguay_Ma	You CANNOT install this railway!! It will not only increase taxes for Old Lyme residents, but more importantly will destroy our fragile wetlands!! These wetlands are home to many endangered species, such as the osprey, and is extremely important for our local biodiversity! All residents of Old Lyme are against this. Although it may make travel a tiny bit easier, it will destroy the ecosystems of Old Lyme, which are much more valuable.
Castonguay_Ma	Additionally, these wetlands provide biological services to us each year, such as water filtration, and the monetary value of this process is greater than any economic gain you hope to incur from this railway. The preservation If nature is MUCH more important in the long run.
Caulfield_Ch	This plan would be incredibly disruptive and destructive to the environment, culture and historic nature of the town of Old Lyme, CT.
Caulfield_Sh	I protest in every way the railroad being rerouted Through Old Lyme and other Shoreline towns
Caulkins_AI	Our family's opposes the changes that are being proposed for the rail system cutting through Old Lyme as they would greatly impact the integrity of our wonderful and historic town.
Caulkins_AI	Our family's opposes the changes that are being proposed for the rail system cutiing through Old Lyme as they would greatly impact the integrity of our wonderful and historic town.
Cavanaugh_Ke	Why was the announcement muzzled.
Cavanaugh_Ke	Nobody in Old Lyme is in favor of putting a railroad through the heart of the Old Lyme Historical District.
Cdelbuono	I have just learned about the proposed track to run through Old Lyme and I cannot stress enough how this is a bad idea for our community.We have been trying so hard to turn this area around economically and environmentally that this would destroy everything! It is unacceptable! It will destroy our property value and quality of life here. The communities need to be heard and respected - we are NOT OK with this plan.
Celone_Ji	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.
Cephas_Re	I feel the public should be able to view a proposal of where the tracks are going to be placed. Communities should have a say in not only them being placed but where as well.

Table JJ–29: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Old Lyme (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment
Cerniglia_Ri	"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."
Ceruzzi_Fr	"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."
Cervero_Ma	"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."
Chakravaram_Vi	University of new haven is a very good school and has lot of historic importance. Students can get to learn in that peaceful environment. If the school is disturbed by rail track through it thousands of students will be troubled. Today's students are tomorrow's citizens.
Chambers_He	I object to the relocation of the rail track going north of the existing railroad bridge in Old Lyme
Chan_Fr	Alternative 1 makes the least sense, it does not reduce travel time significantly and it will disrupt the economy of eastern Connecticut with Old Lyme and East Lyme bearing the cost and little benefit.
Chandra_Ba	"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."
Chapman_Ha	Take Alternative 1 off the table
Chapman_Ju	I am sure you can come up with a plan that will not ruin Old Lyme. How can you disregard an historic street to try and gain a half hour in time?
Chapman_Ju	Totally opposed to your plan to parallel I-95 and go through the Academy's area.
Charney_Ro	No passage through old Lyme: do not pass plan1
Chartier_Wa	Nooooo
Chavent Morgan_Ge	"I oppose Alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridor Futures proposal because it will destroy the campus of Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts and other historical, tourist locations along the CT River that are so necessary to our economy in CT
Chavent Morgan_Ge	I live in New Haven County and we desperately need improved rail service along the I 91 corridor heading north. We drive to VT for weekend work every winter Friday and the traffic mess in Springfield, MASS adds at least 45 min. to our trip. Improving rail service in the center of our state is more critical and will not damage the bucolic nature of the CT River towns. Please reconsider this rail line.
Cherry_Ca	Old Lyme is a historic treasure, and should be treated as such. Any proposal that would destroy a mile-wide corridor of historic landmarks along the shoreline for little overall gain is a non-starter, and is in conflict with the state of Connecticut’s own goals around tourism and historic preservation.
Chesnutt_Ja	I strongly oppose the part of Alternative 1 that would reroute the tracks through the heart of Old Lyme and its historic district. OL is one of the state's and country's most significant small towns, with a rare combination of historic, artistic and environmental riches. This proposal would effectively destroy those treasures, along with a long-rooted community... I'm a huge proponent of rail and ride various combinations of Amtrak, Shoreline East and Metro-North at least once a week and would love to have better rail service. Surely you can figure out how to meet your objectives without destroying one of the nation's great small towns... I look forward to hearing about a revised proposal.
Chesnutt_Ja	Moreover, it's unclear why this specific section [the part of Alternative 1 that would reroute the tracks through... Old Lyme] needs rerouting given that many other track areas in the NEC run through marshes and along the water. And it's also unclear that there would be any benefit to citizens; our area would become simply a despoiled corridor through which trains would run.
Childs_El	Take Alternative 1 off the table! It would mean death to an historic town, it's environment, and its economy.
Childs_Ha	I am absolutely horrified at the prospect of this railroad proposal. Not only will this ruin historically significant landmarks, but it
Childs_Ha	I am horrified that the FRA tried to sneak this by us and am not alone.
Childs_Ja	This would be tragic for the historical town of Old Lyme.
Childs_Sa	As a resident of Old Lyme I strongly oppose the high speed rail line that would go through the center of the historic district.Please take Alternative 1 off the table.
Chin_De	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.
Chinatti_Ma	...we found out about this [NEC FUTURE Program] seemingly at the eleventh hour and, ... through the grapevine.
Chmiel_Ca	VERY BAD PLAN! ONE MORE EXAMPLE OF THE LACK OF LEADERSHIP IN THE STATE OF CONNECTICUT
Chowdhury_Ak	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.
Christiano_Ca	I oppose Alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridor Futures proposal because it would destroy the campus of Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts of the University of New Haven, endanger the federally protected areas of the Connecticut River Estuary and ruin the aesthetic quality of Old Lyme 's nationally recognized historic district.

Table JJ–29: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Old Lyme (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment
Christiano_Jo	This proposal includes creating a 150 ft. wide easement through sensitive marshland environment bordering the town, Connecticut River and a pathway right through the center of the Old Lyme community. This is a disruptive plan that will destroy the historic character of the community and disrupt the surrounding sensitive natural marshland.
Christiano_Jo	I urge you to take special care in your planning process to preserve the character of Old Lyme and the sensitive environmental surroundings. The current proposal shown in the figures above does not seriously consider the destructive impact this plan would have on our community or the environment.
Christie_Le	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.
Christison_Ro	I am adamantly opposed to this plan. As a long time resident of Lyme the Connecticut River is an important part of our town, the state and the entire east coast. It is unconscionable to consider building another bridge across the river. The impact on the community of Lyme and Old Lyme would be enormous and destroy the heart of our historic center.
Chukwu_On	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."
Ciaburri_Le	I'm opposed to Alternative 1 because it would destroy the campus of the Lyme Academy Art School.
Ciaglo_Ti	Alternative One is ridiculous! To ruin the beautiful community of Old Lyme is unspeakable! Repair the current train path if necessary, as it's existed for decades without any issues! Planners of this, would you want to have your town destroyed by your decisions, I think not!
Cianfaglione_Mi	I must offer my serious opposition to the current proposal for the NEC high speed rail. While improvement to our current rail system could greatly aid in supporting sustainable and eco-friendly growth, the current plan WILL have a devastating impact on the local area and will not help in achieving the goals of the project. I STRONGLY encourage the FRA to seek further input from the local community to develop an alternative with greater potential to accomplish its goals and starting by avoiding detrimental impacts to the communities it touches. It is easy for a great plan on paper to overlook it's potential negative impact, and now that the community is engaged, it would certainly be a benefit to all parties to re-address the issue further.
Cicccone_Ma	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
Cicccone_Th	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.
Cieplak_Jo	I am in strong opposition to 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. This is a beautiful campus in an historic area and should be nurtured, not destroyed. Additionally other alternatives are much better suited to expansion of rail opportunities.
Cirone_Ca	I don't like Alternative 1 - the new line proposed in Old Saybrook CT seems like too much investment for too little gain, and it would cut through historic small towns. What would be the purpose? The gain from investing in new lines as proposed in Alternate 2 would instead provide welcome connections to the northern CT/NY regions.
Citron_Cr	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.
Clark_An	Although I am greatly in favor of expanding mass transit, I am opposed to destroying a college campus and a vital art community to do so. Seriously, there has to be a better way to go about this. I oppose Alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridor Futures proposal because it will destroy the campus of Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts. I urge you to find alternative routes for this project. Thank you.
Clark_Da	The current Alternative 1 of the draft EIS for the NEC plan to improve the railways would destroy the heart of my town- Our town. The current pathway would decimate our already fragile wetlands (due to the 95 expansion), historic area, school area, community area and commerce area (which is minuscule to be begin with!). I am vehemently opposed to Alternative 1 of this plan.
Clark_De	" 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. "
Clark_Kr	I strongly oppose Alternative 1. As a resident of Old Lyme I am concerned of the impact it will have on our small town including our historic district.
Clark_Li	I cannot support the proposal to run the train line through the heart of Old Lyme, Ct. Such an action would devastate that small historic town. I am optimistic that the FRA can offer alternatives that will upgrade our rail system without degrading little communities like Old Lyme. ...So, don't destroy a little town for a very little return in the rail system.
Clarke_Je	The minimal benefit of the reroute to save commuters a few minutes of travel time will not justify the devastating impact on many homeowners and businesses. And the concept that this project will have a net positive effect on the ecology is laughable
Clarke_Ju	I am strongly opposed to the rail re-routing as a Old Lyme resident. Our historic town and our personal property would be greatly impacted. It would essentially destroy our town. I have every penny I have worked for invested into my home. If the rail is built through our town I will lose my home and the value received will not be market value. Not only would I lose my financial security but also my home and my town. I find it incomprehensible that the government would destroy such a lovely and historic residential area. The proposed benefit of sustainability is inaccurate. The destruction of the terrain, a beautiful shoreline and all it's wildlife, is not justified by the proposed long term environmental improvements the new route would offer.
Clarke_Ka	It would be a crime to move the RR so that it goes thru the middle of Old Lyme. It should stay near or where it is in location. Otherwise, it would disrupt a beautiful part of town with great legacy.
Clayton_Ch	Please reject Alternative 1, which cuts through the center of the Town of Old Lyme. We are a very small town with a disproportionately large historic and ecological significance.

Table JJ–29: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Old Lyme (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment
Clayton_Ch	FRA's 2014 Connecticut River Railroad Bridge Environmental Assessment (the Bridge EA), a study that took at least seven years to complete, catalogues in detail and with particularity the extraordinary natural, archeological, historic, cultural and visual resources of Old Lyme. The EA is effectively a Tier 2 analysis of what is at stake in the Old Saybrook to Kenyon bypass segment of Alternative 1. While the building of a new moveable bridge next to the existing one would have a relatively minor impact on most of these resources, the impact of Alternative 1's elevated bridge and bypass would be profound. Will you consider the content of the Bridge EA, your own excellent study, in your selection of a Preferred Alternative for NEC FUTURE? HOW COULD YOU POSSIBLY IGNORE IT? Indeed, how was the bypass segment added to the Alternative 1 proposal presented for Public Comment in light of what you learned from the Bridge EA?
Clayton_Ch	The Old Lyme Land Trust (OLLT) hereby submits testimony in opposition to the Tier 1 Draft EIS Alternative I.
Clayton_Ch	For its 50-year history, OLLT, a private, non-profit organization, has worked with town residents to preserve over 900 acres with varied terrain and ecological characteristics. Our concern is that the proposal, as we understand the location of the new track, would remove, alter and harm wetlands, conservation land and other natural resources that OLLT and other groups have fought hard to save. These resources are precious and unique. For example,as you know, our tidal marshes and rivers are part of the CT River estuarine system. Harm to them could result in harm to the region.
Cleary_Da	I certainly understand the need for rail service improvements but Alternative 1 affects Old Lyme, CT in a very negative way
Clement_Me	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 must preserve the learning grounds of our future leaders and scientists.
Clement_Pe	This is a nightmare scenario. Downtown Old Lyme is a national treasure, not unlike Williamsburg ... seriously. A train does not belong there.
Clinton_Br	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.
Coady_Ro	"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."
Cocks_An	No! This would be a travesty if allowed. Please do not destroy our community.
Cody_Ca	It breaks my heart to hear Alternative 1 would cut straight through the heart of my new town, Old Lyme, CT...I would hate to see this wonderful, quaint town be compromised by the addition of a new train route since there is already a route that follows I-95 for the majority of the Connecticut shoreline....Please do not choose Alternative 1 as it would not be much of a change for a considerably high amount of money.
Cody_Ca	I would have appreciated Alternative 2 much more than any other option. I feel Alternative 2 would significantly increase young students' abilities to commute to college each semester, including weekend trips to/from home. Alternative 2 makes the most sense as it also come straight up a major highway in CT and would not have to alter any historical district on the shoreline, specifically Old Lyme. ...Instead, consider Alternative 2 since it parallels a major highway and gives UConn a greater chance to be visited and frequented.
Cohen_Av	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.
Cohen_Av	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.
Cohen_Sh	"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.
Colangelo_Ch	I am writing to express my concern regarding the negative impact to the Old Lyme community if the proposed "Alternative 1" draft for the Northeast Corridor (NEC) is allowed to go forward... I am asking that you not pursue this plan and take action on our behalf to stop the potential destruction of our quiet community.
Colangelo_Ch	The current proposal goes directly through downtown Old Lyme, CT and would directly impact our community in numerous ways. 1. environmental impact due to increased pollution 2. demolition of wetlands adjacent to the proposed site. 3. The proposed path would place the train within a few hundred yards of the Old Lyme High School and Middle school 4. Loss of character for downtown business - businesses such as Old Lyme Inn, Bee and Thistle Inn would be directly affected by having a high-speed train 5. Demolition of historic sites
Colberg_Ja	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.
Colburn_Ro	As a 50+ year resident of Old Lyme Ct. I want to go on record as being completely opposed to rerouting the train lines from where they are now to going right through our historic district and historic town. Destroying a town to save a few minutes travel time is ridiculous.
Cole_Ab	Please do not ruin the beauty and history in our local shoreline communities with the addition of this rail line.
Cole_He	"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."
Collagan_Pa	Why, who, where & what..... Why did NO ONE know about this (thanks to Senator Blumenthal!!!) , who came up with this ridiculous idea so that people can save what , 15 mins????? Where is this railway REALLY going (seriously.... The historic part of our beautiful town that has been preserved for all these years, and now someone has a bright idea to run it through our beautiful, peaceful town!!!) . What is this going to accomplish & who is this going to benefit??? I seriously do not understand and cannot comprehend the idiocies Obviously this was kept a SECRET for a reason!!!! I moved to this wonderful quiet town for a reason!!!!!! I am outraged with our state & those who govern it!!!!
Colley_Ba	I am. NOT in favor of Alternative 1. It does not provide the greatest opportunity for growth, the time savings is only 35 minutes, and would impact the shoreline area, quite an important tourist attraction, TOO much. To think about impacting the and Lyme area is incomprehensible.

Table JJ–29: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Old Lyme (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment
Collins_Ja	I write in opposition to proposed NEC Future Tier 1 EIS Alternative 1.
Collins_Ja	...the proposal fails to address groundwater considerations attendant to such a proposal. A large underground watercourse travels from Rogers Lake in northern Old Lyme and essentially follows underneath Route 1, Lyme Street and thereafter to the beach communities and Long Island Sound. This watercourse is essential to the drinking water provided by well to thousands of local residents. A proposed tunnel will forever alter the course --- and drinking water supply ---of the many, many residents. Geological maps reflecting such water resources are readily available at Old Lyme Town Hall.
Collins_Je	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.
Collins_Li	Please do not run the new high-speed train tracks through downtown Old Lyme. I am definitely in favor of improved rail service, but there has to be a better way. I suggest you visit Old Lyme, particularly the Florence Griswold Museum on a nice day, to see how special it is. It is not only historic, it is beautiful. Alternative 1 would destroy this.
Collins_Su	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.
Colon_Jo	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.
Colten-Carey_Su	I believe this is the most asinine proposal I have ever seen. To cut a town in half, destroy historic areas and mess with the Ct River estuary destroys my entire faith in the railroad system.
Colwell_Mo	Please do not go with alternative 1, the negative impact on the town of Old Lyme would be devastating with no benefit.
Condon_Na	A plan to create a rail system though the small coastal towns of Old Saybrook, East Lyme and Old Lyme would have far reaching negative impact. In particular, it's path through Od Lyme would literally destroy the entire communities ability to survive. It would not only destroy the town's small center and it's local businesses, it would impact the environmentally fragile coastal lands and neighborhoods. Old Lyme represents a unique town in the state of Connecticut, because of it's historical and cultural interests, as well as it's ecologically important location adjacent to the Ct. River and Long Island Sound.
Condon_Na	Connecticut is already severely faltering with residents and business leaving the state. A move to decimate an entire, beautiful coastal town would surely be another nail in the coffin of our tiny state's future and economy. The towns of Old Saybrook, Old Lyme and East Lyme are such an asset to our state, as they attract tourists and businesses seeking a quiet, peaceful coastal lifestyle. A plan which would destroy large portions of these towns would change the very nature of these communities and diminish their value. Connecticut can't afford to destroy what little is left of the historic coastal communities.
Condron_De	do not use alternative one (commentor live in Lyme,CT)
Congdon_Ro	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 well as harm the character of the Old Lyme historic district and protected areas of the CT River estuary.
Conklin_Ed	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
Conklin_Ja	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.
Conlin_Ed	"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."
Cook_El	"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."
Cooley_Bet	The idea of destroying the bucolic beauty of a treasured historic village like Old Lyme in order to shave only minutes off travel time is appalling. Perfect places like the village of Old Lyme are too few. As the co-owner of an art gallery in a place where people have gathered to make art for over a century and appreciate the beauty of a small New England town we hear from nearly every out of town visitor how beautiful our town is and how lucky we are to live here. They often talk about plans for their next visit.
Cooper_Ro	I am firmly opposed to the proposal to run a new rail line through Old Lyme, Ct. I feel the destruction is totally unwarranted as the area will not benefit from any reconfiguration of Amtrac.
Copp_Eu	I am against the plan to bring train though our historic district of the beautiful town of old Lyme.
Copp_Eu	the NEC FUTURE proposal is a terrible plan, destructive of the town center and community buildings, schools.
Cordock_An	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, endanger the federally protected areas of the Connecticut River Estuary and ruin the aesthetic quality of Old Lyme 's nationally recognized historic district.
Cordsen_Ri	I vehemently oppose the NEC proposal to re-route the rail line through Old Lyme. This would be a tragic desecration of this historic community.
Cornell_Br	*PLEASE reconsider any actions outlined in *NEC FUTURE Tier 1 Draft EIS. (Old Lyme)
Cowan_Tr	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.

Table JJ–29: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Old Lyme (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment
Cowell_Ch	I am horrified and terrified that this could actually happen. If this proposed rail line rips through our charming, historically significant town, it will completely wreak havoc on the people that have worked so hard to preserve it's history and the businesses that thrive here. Not to mention the destruction and death it would cause to the fragile environment. PLEASE DO NOT MOVE FORWARD WITH THIS. PLEASE!!!!
Cowell_Ch	I hope our voices will be heard. You cannot change the railroad tracks to run through the center of our lovely town. You will destroy the most beautiful wetlands that are home to thousands of birds, fox, coyotes, and several other cherished animals. Your plan will completely wreak havoc on our small town charm and history. It's unfathomable to me that this plan is even being considered. Please please please reconsider this idea. If someone from your organization did a research study on how our town will be impacted, they would see very clearly that this SHOULD NOT EVEN BE CONSIDERED.
Cox_Al	I do not agree with the idea to destroy any college or historic building. There is no government matter important enough to take away such a wonderful place. Seizing homes or buildings that matter to citizens is a totalitarian action. It is ridiculous. This can not be justified. Do we really need to invade more forests, more towns to have a high-speed railway? The answer is no. Please do not go through with this course of action. I beg you to not interfere with LACFA, or the town around it. You will be stealing a beloved center for beauty and knowledge. It is the heart of the town.
Cox_Ma	I am opposed to the Tier 1 Draft EIS presented for the Northeast Corridor because of the potential for extensive negative effects on the historic Old Lyme neighborhoods, its institutions and its economy as a whole.
Coyne_Su	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. Please implement an alternative plan.
Cramond_Do	I oppose Alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridor Future Proposal because it will destroy the campus of Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts of University of New Haven.
Cremin_Le	Doesn't seem prudent to the past, present or future residents to put a railroad through the town's historic district.
Crisp_Sa	I strongly oppose Alternative 1 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. The proposal will mean that the tracks will cut straight through the middle of our small town. Whilst the number of people impacted may be less than for other alternatives, the actual impact on our town will be devastating. The proposed tracks will cut straight through the middle of the historic district an area of prime historic interest and the location of our children's schools.
Critchett_Do	Extremely deceptive methodology re: the Old Lyme, CT planning process. Is it surprising the working class no longer trusts the Federal Government? Destroy a beautiful and valuable cultural area and swap in an industrial corridor. Makes good sence.....
Critchett_Ja	Extremely deceptive methodology re: the Old Lyme, CT planning process. Is it surprising the working class no longer trusts the Federal Government? Destroy a beautiful and valuable cultural area and swap in an industrial corridor. Makes good sence.....
Critchett_Ja	Knowing the cultural and geographical heritage of Old Lyme to the State of CT we are appalled at this Proposal for a new Railroad route through this historical Area!... So very much would be lost to all of CT and surrounding States And Countries throughout the world as well.
Critchett_Ja	Especially perplexing is how none of this information Was made known beforehand to the major parties Concerned.
Crosnier_An	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.
Cruz_En	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.
Cruz_Kr	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.
CT Resident_Co	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.
Cummings_Ei	I am writing in opposition to the present plan to run Amtrak rails through the historic district of Old Lyme.
Cummiskey_Su	My family and I vehemently oppose the plan to reroute the Amtrak trains through the center of Old Lyme Ct. Not only will it destroy a beautiful and cherished historic district, it will irrevocably damage beyond repair one of the foremost and important estuaries on the east coast and in the country. It is abominable that the environmental impact has not be adequately studied or considered. This proposal should be removed from further discussion immediately.
Cunningham_Mar	Leave the communities along our beautiful and historic shoreline alone.
Cuozzo_Ka	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.
Curtiss_Al	I am aware that the railroad bridge across the Ct. river is very old and in need of repair/replacement.
Curtiss_Al	I am sure with more thought a better option can be found. Please do everything possible to eliminate this as an option.
Curtiss_Th	This plan will ruin the beautiful town of Old Lyme and all its historic sites. We also will not have any stores to shop like a super market!! No wonderful Museums and Art Associations. I am an elderly person that needs to shop locally and see beautiful things locally. THINK about this atrocious plan to ruin a majestic and lovely town for the sake of a faster train!! Make I95 wider and that can help with the congestions and traffic accidents on the roads!! We need our town left in its present bucolic state.
Czepiel_An	The idea of constructing a railway through this nationally recognized historic district is an atrocity. Surely there is another path for Amtrak that would not be so destructive.

Table JJ–29: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Old Lyme (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment
Dailey_Je	I am aghast at the Alternative 1 proposal which will decimate the historic town of Old Lyme by building a high speed railroad segment through the center of town. I fully support alternative mass transit but not at the expense of a vibrant community. This is both unnecessary and ludicrous.
Dailey_Je	Seems like the new line can be moved slight north through Lyme and avoid the historic middle of Old Lyme.
Daisey_Pa	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.
Dalton_Jo	It is time for us to rise-up and fight this attempt to railroad the coastline. This is a slap in the face to the huge tax payers and non-tax payers along coastal Connecticut. All Connecticut has to offer now is our beautiful coastal areas. This will destroy future tourism and the beauty of of shore areas.
Damato_Je	The Lieutenant River is beautiful and so is Old Lyme, the historical route is right across from their house. The Lyme Arts Academy is too. How can you say you are going to take all that out. Never mind the horribly ugly diagonal bridge you are looking to put over the CT River. Find a different route I urge you!!! Modify the existing route. Do not destroy peoples homes and Old Lyme for a train.
Damato_Sc	I think moving forward with relocating the tracks is a horrible idea. It will ruin the beautiful Connecticut river area, the old Lyme historical area, the Lyme Arts academy and all the history in old Lyme never mind the ecosystem...The old bridge is beautiful and so is the route. Use that route.
Danaf_Ar	"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.
Danenhower_SI	This plan to run the railroad through the center of Old Lyme is ludicrous! ... This will be a further waste of tax payers money and totally disjoint the center of one of the most beautiful towns in CT...forget it!!!!!!
Daneshfar_AI	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.
Dangremond_Ma	Please do not put a railroad line through the middle of Old Lyme. I urge you not to accept the Tier 1 draft statement. It is a very bad idea. This plan will ruin our wonderful historic town.
Dangremond_Sa	As a resident of the Town of Old Lyme, I am submitting testimony in opposition of the Northeast Corridor Future Tier 1 Draft Environmental Impact Statement Alternative 1 Proposal. My concern lies in the fact that this proposal will significantly alter my livelihood and decimate the beautiful and historic community of Old Lyme. I urge you to look at other solutions to improve the Northeast Corridor. Thank you.
Darin_An	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.
Darmon_Su	Alternative 1 will be detrimental to the Town of Old Lyme. I oppose this.
Davey_Ny	I oppose Alternative 1 as it will unnecessarily disrupt the campus of the Lymne Academy of Art at the University of New Haven. Any modernization of the transportation corridor should be restricted to the area of existing easements.
Davidson Cragoe_Ca	I strongly oppose Option 1, which would be highly damaging to the histoirc town of Old Lyme.
Davidson Cragoe_Ca	Why is it not possible to have a similar route that runs along the line of the existing line, further to the south?
Davidson_Ab	I think this is a horrible idea. I have lived in Old Lyme for many years and my family many years before that. If something needs to be changed it should be to the existing railroad lines. Not creating new railways through the historic district of Old Lyme.
Davidson_Ni	We will NOT allow such travesty in our town.
Davidson_Pa	I write to oppose, in the strongest possible terms the proposed rerouting of the Amtrak through the middle of Old Lyme, CT (Tier 1 Draft EIS). Old Lyme is first, a residential area. Second it is an important Historic District with many homes, galleries and museums of historic importance. Third, the proposed route runs through the one shopping area in the district. All of these would be adversely affected and nothing gained.
Davies Kane_Ca	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.
Davis_Ea	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.
Davis_Ha	The plan adds a bridge between the existing rail bridge and the interstate 95 bridge. Thus creating a triangle with one point at the opening of Ragged Rock, another to the east at the DEEP landing and the last just south of the 95 bridge and on the east bank of the Connecticut River. Piling and supports for the new bridge will only add more obstacles for boats to avoid in the triangular holding pen between the rail bridges. Both rail bridges will need to lift a section to allow taller boats to pass under. To allow boats to pass under both bridges without stopping, they will need to remain open for longer periods of time and thus not allow access for trains to cross. If both bridges do not remain open to allow all boats to clear both rail bridges, boats will become trapped between the bridges and face the difficulties navigating in a small triangular space in a moving current with other boaters in a congested area. Thus not achieving the Goal 2 to minimize conflicts with marine traffic and train delays due to bridge operations.
Davis_Ha	The adverse impact on the population, land use, or economic activities will be devastating. The town currently has tracks to the south and potentially tracks to the north. Not only will this provide stereo train noise for those in the middle of town but also eliminate continuity with the residential and business community. Some will be on the other side of the tracks while others will be in the middle. Since the water levels are low in the downtown location they will be elevated to a level that one side will not be able to see someone on the other side. The tracks for all intents and purposes will be a wall dividing the town. The town 's Post office, food store, shopping mall and gas station will be segregated to the north from the town government and those in the middle of the tracks. Thus not achieving the Goal 3 Objective to minimize impacts to cultural resources.

Table JJ–29: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Old Lyme (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment
Davis_Ha	For all of the reasons above, the town will potentially be sandwiched between two rail tracks with increased noise pollution, environmental pollution, decreased mobility on the water and land, and the consumption of developable land needed to install the new track. This will have a negative impact on new development, property values and population/employment growth. Thus not achieving the Goal 3 Objective to minimize impacts to cultural resources and permanent and temporary impacts to the surrounding environment.
Davis_Je	Although I am greatly in favor of expanding mass transit, I am opposed to destroying a college campus and a vital art community to do so. I oppose Alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridor Futures proposal because it will destroy the campus of Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts. I urge you to find alternative routes for this project. Thank you.
Davis_Jo	"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."
Davis_Pa	I can't imagine it might be possible for someone to even think about destroying this beautiful place in Old Lyme with a railway!
Davis_Rob	After going to meetings - I'm totally against option 1 which goes through the Old Lyme Historic district !!!!
Davis_St	Alternative 1 is a cultural disaster for southeastern New England and should be dropped immediately!!!
De Loach_An	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.
de Selding_An	Alternative 1 would totally decimate the town of Old Lyme, leveling a critical blow to one of the finest arts communities in the country. The citizens of CT will pay far too heavy a price for little to no gain, as will the citizens of East Lyme and the environment.
Deak_Kr	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.
Dean	"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."
Dean_Fr	In addition, it is your obligation to properly inform the public of your proposed action which does not seem to be the case!
Debisschop_Ma	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.
DeBlasiis_Su	I am AGAINST a new railway thru the historic town of Old Lyme. This plan would ruin the Historic District and decimate the towns only commercial center!
DeBruyn_El	Implementing a high-speed railway over the Connecticut River and through the Old Lyme marshland ecosystem will impact ALL of us. ...think of our fragile marshland ecosystem, home to numerous endangered species such as the osprey we all have grown to know and love! Our osprey population thrives in Old Lyme because we have preserved its home, but implementing this railroad will introduce noise, pollutants, vibrations and habitat fragmentation that will impact the survivorship of this and all marshland species.
DeBruyn_El	Others in the Northeast may benefit from the convenience of this railroad at no cost, but it is us, the residents of Old Lyme, who have to bear its destructive burden on our marshland home.
Deignan_Sa	I am a student of the Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts of the University of New Have, and I oppose Alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridor Futures proposal because it will destroy the campus, negatively impact the long standing cultural heritage of Old Lyme, and destroy fragile wetland.
Delayo_An	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.
Delgafo_Si	I stand my opposition against NEC Alternative 1. Please do not ruin the beautiful history and natural surroundings of Old Lyme, CT, along with its historic art college, Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts. Thank You!
Delinks_Ch	Fix I95 and every other piece of existing vital infrastructure first, then reduce our taxes. I don't care how much V.P. Biden or Gov. Malloy love riding on trains.
DeLopez_Ge	Adamantly opposed to alternative 1. One of the last beautiful places on earth!!!!
DeMarco_Jo	Please do not put the line through the Lyme school! Our future should not be to the detriment of our history!
Demery_Mi	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.
Dempsey_El	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.
Denkowicz_St	I strongly oppose Alternative 1 which would build a new rail bridge between the existing rail bridge and the Baldwin Bridge (I95). The tracks in this location would destroy the historic and exceptionally lovely town of Old Lyme.
DeRisio_Ma	Stop Alternative One through Old Lyme.
DeRisio_Ma	Alternative One will adversely impact Old Lyme by: _ cutting through our Historical District _ permanently alter our open spaces, conservation land wetlands, and natural habitats _ destroy our Art College, and K-12 school campuses _ impose hardships on property owners and negatively impact the Town's tax base

Table JJ–29: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Old Lyme (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment
Desi_El	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 think you should consider other options that won't destroy this phenomenal educational community, endanger the federally protected areas of the Connecticut River Estuary and ruin the aesthetic quality of Old Lyme 's nationally recognized historic district. Please consider other options that will not have such an impact on this very special community.
Desillier_El	The environmental and economical impact of Tier 1 would be devastating for the town of Old Lyme. Maintain the rail infrastructure that is already in place. Drop Tier 1 from NEC plan.
Deutermann	We are emphatically opposed to having a train run through the historic village of Old Lyme, CT.
Deutermann	We are vehemently opposed to the plan to run train tracks through the village of Old Lyme CT.
Deutermann_Di	We are vehemently opposed to the plan to run a high speed train through the heart of Old Lyme. We are a small historic community of museums, schools and colleges, and environmentally sensitive wetlands.
Devaney_Me	I oppose the building of a new railroad bridge over the ct river causing much change to old Lyme!
Devins_Ma	To achieve that end, however, it is not necessary to eradicate an historic small town and the precious environmental infrastructure that we strived to maintain. AMTRAK lied about ACELA and its impact. Former Govenor Abe Ribicoff fought to keep the lower CT river valley pristine to be considered national resource and treasure. There must be other alternatives to improve transportation on the northeast corridor with less devastating impact on towns and the environment.
Devins_Ma	As a resident ofthe Town of Old Lyme, I am submitting testimony in opposition to the Northeast Corridor Future Tier I Draft Environmental Impact Statement Alternative 1 proposal. My concern lies in the fact that this proposal will significantly alter my livelihood and decimate my community. I therefore request that the proposed rail changes that affect Old Lyme be removed from 'Alternative I' and I urge you to look at other solutions regarding improving the Northeast Corridor. Thank you.
Devins_Ma	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 ofwetlands, open space, and natural resources.
DeVore_Sa	You cannot interfere with the river's bird sanctuary. You can not interfere with the historical facilites. The struggle is very difficult. The railroad will need to develop into space North of route 95. Each inch in A A Land preserves is sacred. Do not touch it...do not think about it. Yes we love your, our railboard. But keep it in its place...away from the three art reservations in existence. The river is sacred. The highway leads through the hilly farmlands of connecticut...
Diamond_Sa	I oppose yet another bridge at the mouth of the Connecticut River and slicing through the center of the town of Old Lyme, which is already bifurcated by I-95. Please reconsider for the sake of the environmental and social detriment to the community.
Diamond-Wamby_St	We are writing as afamily to voice our opposition to NRC Future Alternative 1. As residents of Old Lyme we want to add oursupport to the voices at town hall and all of the organizations in town whowrote to you against the plan on February 10, that letter enumerates very wellthe burden to our community the proposed plan would bring. NEC Future Alternative 1would be the death knell for the town of Old Lyme. The noise and emissions pollution would makethe most historic section of town unlivable. The pollution of the LieutenantRiver would contribute to the poisoning of the wells we all use, again, makingthe town unlivable. After 250 years of settlement our historic homes would haveno value. Life for the flora, fauna and citizens will be irreparably damaged. We request that the NECFuture Alternative 1 be removed from further consideration.
DiCamillo_Jo	I am writing to express my apprehension and opposition to the Tier 1 draft EIS, Alternative 1, for the NEC, the plan to move the path of the existing train tracks in Old Lyme Connecticut to the historic village center.
DiCamillo_Jo	Rerouting the train tracks will impact the longest river in New England, the 410 mile long Connecticut River and its watershed. Old Lyme lies at the environmentally sensitive mouth of the river where it flows into Long Island Sound. The river and its adjacent tributaries, salt marshes and fresh water wetlands are teeming with wildlife, migratory fish, birds, threatened and endangered species. The islands within it, and the banks beside it provide breeding grounds for nesting birds while natural vegetation helps to prevent erosion. The entire river system has the distinction of being named America's first and only National Blueway and is included in the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service National Wildlife Refuge System. What happens in this area could have an adverse effect on the entire watershed, and damage the great progress of dedicated conservation groups and individuals within our town and the state to educate and protect wildlife habitat and the environment.
DiCamillo_Jo	When one considers the size, cost and scope of this project, the number of scheduled public hearings in Connecticut was limited and certainly not convenient to the residents of southeastern Connecticut.
DiCamillo_Jo	I urge you to develop a new strategy. Come visit our town, tour the Connecticut River, and listen to our comments before a decision is finalized.
DiCamillo_Jo	With concern for the heritage, the habitat, the economy and future of the Old Lyme community, I strongly oppose this plan [Alternative 1].
DiCamillo_Le	After reviewing this project, one would immediately understand construction of this proposed railway would completely devastate our town [Old Lyme] in many ways... The stated purpose of this upgrade to the railway is efficiency and cost effectiveness . I have studied the proposed new route and believe the most efficient and cost effective route would be to upgrade the existing section of railway from New Haven through Hartford and Worcester to Boston. This portion of the railway and the proposed section are the same distance between New Haven and Boston. The current railway located along the coast line could be upgraded to accommodate local trains from New Haven to Providence RI. As State and Federal representatives of our town as well as those charged with the construction of Alternative 1 of the NEC FUTURE Plan, I expect you to protect our town from the negative impact this upgrade project would have on our town, visitors and especially residents.

Table JJ–29: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Old Lyme (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment
DiCamillo_Le	The cost to purchase these sites for construction of the railway would be hundreds of millions of dollars. More importantly, there are absolutely no options when faced with the relocation and reconstruction of our schools, Churches, Art College, government, commercial, residential and cultural sites. We have beautiful tree lined streets with quiet residential neighborhoods. The noise and visual pollution of a railway moving at high speeds through this area would have a negative impact on property values and quality of life for a large portion of Old Lyme residents.
DiCamillo_Le	Our town is located at the confluence of the Connecticut River and Long Island Sound. This location not only adds to the beauty of our town but is also home for many protected wildlife and plant species as a result of the many fresh water wetlands and salt water marshes throughout our town. Our residents are extremely protective of our town's resources and the Inland Wetlands and Watercourse Commission is charged with eliminating any activity having a negative impact on this fragile environment of wetlands and wildlife. In fact, the Connecticut River has been designated as a National Blueway and National Wildlife and Refuse area by the Federal Government. Consequently, the River, tributaries and surrounding wetlands must be given the protections afforded to them under this act.
DiCamillo_Le	A meeting with Old Lyme town officials and residents must be scheduled prior to any final decisions. Previous meetings were not well publicized and were scheduled in locations inconvenient for our residents.
Dickey_La	Please do not build a high-speed train through the historic district of Old Lyme. It would destroy an area of our town that is important for our local commerce and our cultural heritage. Please do not place this scar upon us.
Dickey_Mi	I am writing to voice my opposition to Alternative 1. It seems that someone just took a ruler and pen and drew a line without any regard to the consequences. The routing of Alternative 1 would obliterate the main street and surrounding areas within Old Lyme. This area would impact the historical district, Lyme Art Association, Lyme Art Academy, and the only shopping area in the town. Alternative 1 would not only destroy the heart of the town, it would also completely change the character of the town.
Dickinson_Co	Please, not through historic Old Lyme. there are better options.
Dickinson_Da	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.
DiFazio_Li	A s a lifetime resident of Old Lyme ,I would be very devastated to have a train ,Amtrak or whatever ,run through our town spoiling the architecture,history and charm. Please please please reconsider
Dilone_Od	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.
Dimmling_Le	The strong downward impact on property values here because of the urbanizing effect of more rail lines is another real negative for our community. An additional rail line will drastically change the character of this charming neighborhood.
Ding_Ji	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.
Dinihanian_Ja	I oppose Alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridor Futures proposal because it will destroy the campus of Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts of UNH.
Dion_Ja	I recently read where the FPA is proposing to build railroad tracks which goes through the property of Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts in Old Lyme, CT. I oppose this for many reasons but primarily that it would most certainly destroy the college campus in its entirety.
Dixon_Ri	I am especially disturbed by the proposals for track realignment from the Connecticut River to the RI border, especially in Mystic and Old Lyme (Alternative 1). It seems to me that you best start over by getting local input first. I oppose it as it is now configured.
Dixon_Ro	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.
Dobi_Ha	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.
Dockum_Jo	The Lyme Academy of Fine Arts is at a central hub with the Florence Griswold Museum, The old Lyme Inn and the Bee and Thistle. Running a rail track through this area and destroying a fine art school in the process is reckless and shows a complete disregard for the community. There is already rail service through this part of the state and THAT land should be expanded, elevated and adapted rather than leaving a legacy of destruction through the heart of a community. In fact, improving the current infrastructure to be more wildlife friendly would be a much better way of making this transition not only feasible to implement, but even attractive to bothersome taxpayers.
Dolan_De	I am completely against a new rail. It would disrupt our beautiful scenery.
Donaghue_Jo	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.
Dornfried_Ma	I live in Lyme CT and cannot believe that you would consider violating the town of Old Lyme for a train. The houses and properties are historic and create a charm that cannot be duplicated. Please reconsider Alternative 1.
Dorros_Ke	The idea of DESTROYING the campus of this unique gem is beyond my comprehension. And to devastate the beautiful town of Old Lyme is equally absurd. Please DO NOT PROCEED WITH THIS INSANE PLAN.
Douglas_Sc	My wife and I are apposed
Douglas_We	This is ridiculous! You will spoil a pristine area! I am highly apposed!
Dowd_Ch	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.

Table JJ–29: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Old Lyme (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment
Dowdye_M	"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."
Dowty Beech_Ra	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.
Driscoll_Ri	Please don't build a railway here
Drown_Ba	Please do not advance alternative 1. It will decimate the heart of our community in Old Lyme. A little faster trip is not worth tearing about our historic district, or damaging our local ecosystem. Please look into improving the current location of the rail line.
Drummond_Jo	As a resident of Old Lyme Connecticut I am writing to express my opposition to alternative 1. This new segment of track would bisect our small downtown area and impact both the ecosystem and traffic flow of our town.
Drummond_Ki	I am strongly opposed to Alternative #1 as a proposed rail investment option. It will devastate the center of Old Lyme, our small community, is dangerous being located to close to an area of high, young pedestrian traffic, and damages unique environments and historic buildings.
Dubee_Jo	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.
Duffy_De	If we have learned nothing else, taking private land for public improvement should be a decision that is extensively and in an honest and completely open manner. This has not been the case as it was only made known to the very town that has the greatest impact just recently. Shame on those trying to bully their way through.
Duffy_De	The option which cuts through Old Lyme iwould decimate a beautiful small town that already deals with ills of interstate 95 in addition to a train route.
Dunbar_Ju	This proposed plan to re-route the train through Old Lyme center, which is a historic town, would be a crime especially when elevation could be done on the present tracks.
Dunham_Am	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.
Dunlap_Ho	I am writing this letter in opposition to alternative 1.What kind of alternative is it to destroy the heart of an historic small town with a rail line, when there is already a rail line close by? Is it really worth a few minutes of travel time to destroy the heart of a beautiful town?
Dunlap-Ta	please allow more time for public comment, discussion and information gathering for the effected communities involved.
Dunn_De	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.
Dunn_He	I earnestly oppose Alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridor Futures proposal because it will destroy the campus of the Lyme Academy of Fine Art - a college of the University of New Haven.
Duplessis_Li	There must be a better route than to destroy so much of the social, cultural and physical environment.
DuPont_Da	I oppose Alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridor Futures proposal because it will destroy the beautiful campus of Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts of the University of New Haven. As an alumni I am proud of my university and do not want anything to harm it.
Durant_Ro	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.
Durgin_Sc	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.
Durland_Ma	No to the Amtrak route change through Old Lyme, CT.
D'Urso_Fr	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.
Dutton_Le	I vehemently 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.
Dworak_Br	I oppose Alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridor Futures proposal. If enacted, it will ruin the campus of Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts of the University of New Haven.
Dworak_Fr	I am opposed to alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridor Futures proposal because it will the campus of the Lyme Collage of Fine Arts of the University of New Haven
Dyczkowski_Be	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.
E_Ka	No to Alternative 1.
E_Ka	By all means leave the shore line the way it is and divert the project along the 91 corridor and inland.
Eder_Ei	In addition to having very limited improvements for the future Alternative 1 plan, goes through sensitive marsh lands, both the Connecticut and Lieutenant rivers as well as Historic Old Lyme. THIS IS AS INTELLIGENT AS PUTTING A THRUWAY THROUGH CENTRAL PARK! A fantastic historical area and beautiful waterways would be forever destroyed.

Table JJ–29: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Old Lyme (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment
Edmondson_Ju	I am strongly against changing the Amtrack Rail lines from the current location to the proposed new lines cutting through the heart of Old Lyme. This would not only affect the Historic District but also the vital commercial area of our small town.
Edson_Pa	I oppose Alternative 1 to the Federal Rail Administration's proposed configuration of the new high speed rail between Washington, D.C. and Boston.
Edwards_AI	Opposed to Alternative 1 for the higher speed rail.
Edwards_De	"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."
Edwards_Ra	My family is ABSOLUTELY against the Federal Rail Alternative 1. It would completely ruin the historic center of Old Lyme and destroy our town. We are strongly opposed to the plan and definitely Alternative 1.
Eells_Wa	The town of Old Lyme would be severely impacted by Alternat#1.
Eells_Wa	We need time and a voice in this project.
Ehresman_Jo	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.
Ehrlich_Pa	The idea of a new route through Old Lyme and area is horrible. It is important for nature conservation and has been a center for the arts. Much of the area has historical sites. The consequences of the disruption and destruction would be catastrophic.
Eilertsen_Ed	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.
Eio_Pe	The Old Lyme community feels blindsided by the news of this proposal - particularly since of the 11 public hearings held between mid-December and mid-January, the nearest to Old Lyme were 30-40 miles away in Hartford and New Haven. This despite the fact that Old Lyme is clearly the town most likely to be severely impacted. It would appear that our elected representatives have done little to communicate details of the proposals locally and indeed several of them have apparently been as much in the dark as the local populace. Given this situation, the window for public comment (now extended to February 16th) is inadequate.
Eio_Pe	the intended new rail bridge crossing Connecticut river diagonally immediately south of the I 95 highway bridge would route all rail traffic in a swathe through the heart of Old Lyme's historical district causing irreparable damage to the integrity of local art institutions, inns and the town's shopping center on Hall's road. We urge that the FRA seek alternative routes to meet future railroad needs that avoid irreversibly desecrating the heart of one of Connecticut's most treasured historical towns.
Ejara_De	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.
Ekram_Kh	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.
Elgart_Ma	Please do not do this to one of the last great places in the Western Hemisphere. So few pristine places exist ..we beg you to find another spot for your railroad.
Elhaddad_Ka	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.
Ellen_Ma	To create another line that may get there faster is absurd
Elliott_Ca	It is completely insane to consider ruining the history, landscape and integrity of Old Lyme with the proposed relocation of the rail path. The small increase in speed attained is not commensurate with the destruction. No one needs to be in that much of a hurry!
Elliott_Ca	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.
Ellis_Ro	Please rethink this outrageous plan to destroy the beautiful towns (especially Old Lyme) and disturb the environmental habitats of salt marshes and inlets along the Connecticut shoreline. Consider the fact that traffic on I-95 in the area has not improved after years of disruption for "improvements" and a new bridge costing millions of dollars! Leave the tracks where they are so as not to disrupt I-95 with years more of construction nearby which is sure to delay EVERYONE trying to go between Washington and Boston.
Elvgren_An	Related to the proposal to run a line through the center of Old Lyme, Connecticut, I am adamantly opposed. At the earliest possible time, please take discussion of this option off the table
Ely_Dw	This will destroy Old Lyme - a jewel of the state.
Ely_Ma	There already is one rail line going through town and along the shoreline Why not expand or upgrade that one, along the same roadbed.??
Ely_Ma	Please do not put this concrete and steel eyesore in Old Lyme Connecticut.

Table JJ–29: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Old Lyme (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment
Emblin_Ru	I am a resident of Lyme and Lyme/Old Lyme's beautiful historical district and natural beauty of the river estuary were some of the primary reasons we chose this area. We depend on the services provided by the commercial district and support many of the small businesses in the area. Running a rail line through the middle of this area would not just destroy a town, the livelihood of many of its residents, make real estate values plunge dangerously, adversely impact a college campus, and more, it is also a huge step backward in terms of protecting extremely fragile ecosystems along the Connecticut River and Long Island Sound. In this day and age of climate change discussions and environmental disasters all over the world, can we really afford this destruction? Would the area not be better served by improving the existing line and ancient draw bridge?
Embree_Di	Apart from cutting a Historic District in two at Old Lyme, Alternative 1 would have severe repercussions on the Connecticut River Estuary, which has received one of the highest designations in the nation.
Emery_Pa	This is absolutely irresponsible and unthinkable. You need to make the rails you have in existence work before you start destroying historic property and towns to create more. Fix what you already have..
Engdall_Ca	This would ruin the town of Old Lyme and greatly affect the future of its growth and land preservation. This is not ok for anyone in Old Lyme
Engdall_Ca	This would ruin the town of Old Lyme and greatly affect the future of its growth and land preservation. This is not ok for anyone in Old Lyme
English_Sh	"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." Please consider my opinion!!
Ennico_Do	I am in opposition to 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.
Erickson_Ca	Alternative 1 of the plan to redirect and modernize the rail system would be devastating to the historically important town of Old Lyme CT. Old Lyme is the home of American Impressionism. The town actively celebrates this fact through its museums, galleries, art schools and associations. The nearby hotels and restaurants support the celebration of the artistic history of the town as well. Putting aside the devastation to the character of the town of Old Lyme, Alternative 1 would create an irreversible and tragic loss of American history. The homes, the businesses, the educational institutions affected would effectively erase American Impressionism from the US map. Old Lyme is a town of historical importance and locating a high speed rail through the heart of the town would guarantee its loss as a National Treasure forever.
Ermler_Pa	please don't harm the entire state further by putting a high speed rail in the middle of the beautiful town of Old Lyme.
Esmailpour_Am	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.
Esposito_Ka	"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.
Esty_Ja	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 am also opposed to the effect it will have on Old Lyme
Eswood_Al	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.
Eswood_Lo	I oppose that part of Alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridor Futures proposal that will destroy the campus of Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts of the University of New Haven.
Eswood_Lo	We are against the proposal number 1. What are the thinking of? This will run our town
Etherington_Ka	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.
Etter_El	I've looked at the 3 alternatives for NEC FUTURE project. I didn't see enough detail on the site to know exactly where the new rail line would be located in Old Lyme. Unfortunately, it looks like southeast CT has been offered a lose-lose proposition. If the area is to have any improvement in rail service at all, however minor, it will have to accept a rail line going through the historic and scenic Old Lyme community... I would suggest looking for a way to improve service in our area without cutting a destructive path through one of the loveliest and most vibrant towns in CT. I think our community might be able to support that. Surely, there's a way to do this important work.
Evans_Li	I do NOT agree with the plans to build new train tunnels, bridges, and other highly intrusive and environmentally detrimental transportation lines through Connecticut. Saving 30 minutes of travel time from New York to Boston seems to be very small reward for upending hundreds of thousands of residents, not to mention the terrible impact on many small coastal communities like Old Lyme. Please reconsider your plans for this change. progress in the name of progress alone does not benefit ANYONE in society, nor in the environment.
Evans_Ti	Not in favor of this. Incredibly unnecessary and disrespectful to this community.
Evers_So	Alternative 1 is an ineffectual bandaid to a far greater problem. If rail is to be an effective travel alternative, as it is in Europe, then the NEC needs to invest and bring rail travel into the 21st century AND not destroy history and beauty (Old Lyme) in the process.
Facinelli_Je	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.
Faenza-Ta	I am against this project. Old Lyme has many historic buildings and nature spots. This would be very bad for the environment.
Fairfield-Sonn_Jo	As a resident of the Town of Old Lyme, I am submitting testimony in opposition to the Northeast Corridor Future Tier 1 Draft Environmental Impact Statement "Alternative 1" proposal. My concern lies in the fact that this proposal will significantly alter my livelihood and decimate my community. ...I 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.

Table JJ–29: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Old Lyme (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment
Fairfield-Sonn_Jo	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.
Fairfield-Sonn_Ly	As a resident of the Town of Old Lyme, I am submitting testimony in opposition to the Northeast Corridor Future Tier 1 Draft Environmental Impact Statement "Alternative 1" proposal. My concern lies in the fact that this proposal will significantly alter my livelihood and decimate my community. ...I therefore request that the proposed rail changes that affect Old Lyme be removed from 'Alternative I' and I urge you to look at other solutions regarding improving the Northeast Corridor.
Fairfield-Sonn_Ly	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.
Fairfield-SonnJr_Ja	As a resident of the Town of Old Lyme, I am submitting testimony in opposition to the Northeast Corridor Future Tier 1 Draft Environmental Impact Statement "Alternative 1" proposal. My concern lies in the fact that this proposal will significantly alter my livelihood and decimate my community. ...I therefore request that the proposed rail changes that affect Old Lyme be removed from 'Alternative I' and I urge you to look at other solutions regarding improving the Northeast Corridor.
Fairfield-SonnJr_Ja	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.
Fairfield-SonnSr_Ja	As a resident of the Town of Old Lyme, I am submitting testimony in opposition to the Northeast Corridor Future Tier 1 Draft Environmental Impact Statement "Alternative 1" proposal. My concern lies in the fact that this proposal will significantly alter my livelihood and decimate my community. ...I therefore request that the proposed rail changes that affect Old Lyme be removed from 'Alternative I' and I urge you to look at other solutions regarding improving the Northeast Corridor.
Fakhoury_Zi	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.
Fallon_Jen	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.
Fallon_Jenn	Do. Not. Do. This. A fast train through the middle of a historic town is not an option.
Falstrom_An	I oppose Alternat 1 of the Northeast Corridor Futures proposal. It would have a devastating effect on one of the most beautiful and unspoiled New England villages on the CT coastline. The Lyme Academy of Fine Arts and the Florence Griswold Museum- both with missions based on the aesthetic beauty of this area, will be severely impacted by this proposal. This town is a treasure and a high speed train intersecting it would be heartbreaking for all.
Falstrom_Jo	It makes little sense to me to not choose the other alternatives that go through the population centers while destroying one of the few unspoiled and truly beautiful towns filled with history. It's a commuter rail system. Run the lines where there are the most potential commuters.
Fanelli_St	This is an absolutely ridiculous proposal with astonishing environmental and financial devastation to a historically significant part of the State of Connecticut
Fanelli_St	My vote is no
Faniola_Jo	We strongly oppose the proposed route through the center of our historic town....find a less intrusive route...not through our tiny village center!!!! There are only a small number of beautiful little towns left.....don't scar ours forever!!!!!!
Farman_Ne	The proposed plan would destroy [Old Lyme,] one of the most historic towns in southern New England. Obviously, little thought was put into this plan, other than hovering over a map.
Farnham_Ke	This is a small, fragile community with an even more fragile ecosystem. This is why we moved here and we are all required as residents to respect it. My family has been here for five generations because of the community and historical rural feel, and destroying any of that would be such an injustice to our New England town.
Farricielli_Jo	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.
Faticoni_Ba	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.
Faugno_Jo	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.
Faustine_Ke	I strongly oppose Alternative 1 of the NEC futures proposal because it would destroy the campus of Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts.
Feakins_Ka	Second, this alternative will devastate the town of Old Lyme--ecologically and economically. We have important salt marshes, bird s, rivers all of which would be affected. The town's historic district would be also adversely affected and the quality of life for its residents. Why don't we spend our hard earned tax dollars on fixing things that are broken rather than on another experiment on high speed rail that, to date,hasn't turned out well.
Fearnley_Ke	I am concerned at the economic and environmental impact to the Old Lyme and surrounding area. This small community will suffer irreparable damage and has not been given a voice to the impact.

Table JJ–29: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Old Lyme (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment
Feeney_Au	I can't really find the words to discribe this awful idea who ever came up with this surely does not live even 50 miles of here and has no idea of how much we love our peaceful town and that last thing we need is a another train rail driving through a precious Eco system that we try to protect and bringing unwanted attention to a town that is perfect the way it is so please if I were you I wouldn't even think of trying put that disgusting idea of a project
Feeney_Ma	This is crazy, thru the district of old lyme ...
Feeney_Ma	This is crazy, ... there are preserves for animals that live there
Feinberg_An	I am writing to express my concern with and opposition to the Alternative 1 of the draft EIS for the NEC plan to improve rail service.
Feinberg_An	First and foremost, this plan would destroy our community because the path of the railroad would cut through the heart of our community. We are a small town with a small village center which houses the Lyme Art Academy, a four year art college, the famous Florence Griswold Home and Museum,the Lyme Art Association, as well as our schools,town hall,library and historic houses. Many of these are sites of historic significance and the individual organizations have worked diligently to continue with their legacy and maintain the physical structures... This area is extremely important to our history, economy, character and sense of community... This plan would impact our only commercial area, which houses our grocery store, pharmacy and many small businesses. And the plan also impacts many properties along the way, as it is an entirely new track, cutting through several neighborhoods, not to mention wetlands, open space and areas of archaeological significance... This plan could potentially impact the historic District, our schools, wetlands, rivers and have a drastic economic effect on the town and its' citizens.
Fenelon_Ma	"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."
Fenn_An	Old Lyme, as a cultural mecca (including Lyme Art Association, Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts, The Florence Griswold Museum, The Bee and Thistle Inn and Spa, The Cooley Gallery, not to mention the historic homes and the families that inhabit them, would be ruined. The historical significance of this quiet CT town far outweighs any perceived necessity for an extra rail line. The logical conclusion would be to shore up the existing line, a less expensive and far less destructive solution.
Ferdinandson_AI	As a graduate of the University of New Haven and a past Alumni Association President, 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.
Ferguson_Ev	The fact that you have not consulted local communities before issuing your proposals speaks how little you actually value the comments of those of us who live in the area.
Ferragamo_J	Finding an alternate route for the train tracks would allow the completion of this excellent college therefore giving students the opportunity of an amazing and worthy education. Please reconsider.
Ferrebee_Lo	This is another example of "Big Government" trying to ram something down out throats that would be detrimental to small interests. This is the beginning of socialism. We stand up now or forget it.
Field_El	" 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. "
Fields_He	I am glad to gear that your plans for the future are right on track!! As a summer resident on the Shoreline of Old Lyme , Connecticut, we have seen much devastation from two major storms.Putting the railroad more inland to insure its safety from the rising seas is a smart thing to do.
Filbert_Ji	As a resident of Old Lyme,Ct I am opposed to Alternative 1 which would allow tracks through the middle of Town. We need to preserve the character of Old Lyme, including The Historic District, The Lyme Arts Academy, Lyme Art Association and The Florence Griswold Museum.
Finley_Cy	A high speed rail through Old Lyme would do irreparable damage to a protected conservation area. The proposal rips through a historic district. Old Lyme is filled with federally designated environmental and cultural areas. Please stand by these protected areas.
Finneran_An	Why disturb the town of Old Lyme in order to expand the railroad? The people of Old Lyme strongly protest this project. This town has been an art center for centuries , a historic landmark ,peaceful , a welcome retreat for all to enjoy. Find an open space....do not destroy Old Lyme, Ct.
Fiorillo_El	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.
Fisher_Em	I am writing to express my strong opposition to further consideration of "Alternative 1" for the expansion of rail service in the northeast. This plan would destroy our town, its environment, its historic district and even its commercial district. Please take this plan off the table.
Fiske_Di	I wish to voice my HUGE concern over the proposed additional rail line from DC to Boston that would not provide enough benefit to justify destroying the historic center of Old Lyme. Please don't tear down New England town centers. They are the reason so many of us choose to move to this area in the first place. If the coastal towns of Connecticut become merely corridors for I-95 and more and more rail lines, you will lose much more that the charm of the place. You will lose most of your residents - who will choose to live elsewhere.
Fiske_Ed	This rail line would not support ehat Old Lyme is all about. Old Lyme is a town where time has stood still and that is the way we want to keep it!!
Fitton_DG	I am very concerned over the impact a new high speed rail will have on both the property values and effect on wild life. A plan such as the Tier 1 would ruin a town that has steeped itself in history and pride. I understand the desire to cross the Connecticut River at such an elevation that would eliminate the need for a moveable bridge and perhaps mirror the I-95 Baldwin Bridge. Why not do it alongside the existing right of way, that has already been impacted well over a 100 years ago.

Table JJ–29: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Old Lyme (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment
Fitton_Jo	We have never been happier then building our beautiful dream home on the Lieutenant River off of Lyme Street! We love the peace and serenity of the natural marsh and to watch our ospreys come back each year to nest and have their Babies. It is one of the few communities that have a wide main street with a library, schools, art academy, historic Florence Griswold museum, galleries, church, plus ice cream shop and chocolate shop. A wonderful place to ride our bikes with our 10 grandkids safely. To put a speeding train in the middle of this beautiful place seems so absurd! I beg you not to ruin one of Connecticut's treasures.
Fitzgerald_Di	I oppose Alternative 1 of the NEC plan. The Lyme Academy College of Fine arts is part of Connecticut's history and heritage. This is the time to avoid making a huge mistake.
Fitzgerald_Ka	I am opposed to destroying a college campus and a vital art community to do so. I oppose Alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridor Futures proposal because it will destroy the campus of Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts. I urge you to find alternative routes for this project.
Fitzgerald_Ki	"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."
Fitzgerald_Wi	Recently, AMTRAK released its proposal for Alternative 1, a high speed rail link going through Old Lyme, Connecticut. We live in this beautiful little town on the Connecticut shoreline, and wish to express out complete opposition to this plan. It cuts through our small town, and will destroy not only our home, but large swaths of valuable wetlands, multiple small businesses, historic and cultural sites, and will completely divide our historic center. Without doubt, there can be other well thought out proposals to repair and replace these existing structures that do not completely devastate our town, and others along the shore.
Fitzgerald_Wi	Our selectwoman and other elected officials have noted that they were not included in the planning of this or other alternatives; in fact, they were not even consulted or informed that the plan was being prepared. Taxpayer dollars were allotted and spent to produce a plan that does not include any consideration of the economic, social, and environmental impact to citizens in the affected areas. Surely, those of us most affected should have some voice in the planning.
Flanagan Locke_Ka	This is a beautiful historic village with greatly admired institutions. They serve as the center piece of community life and as well as tourism. It would be a disaster if this project were allowed to proceed as planned.
Flinter_Jo	Please consider the beautiful CT shoreline when thinking about expansion of the shoreline railway. The least expensive route is usually not the best.
Fliss_An	"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." My son is a student at UNH, and we do not want to see the great forward progress of the University damaged by a shortcut.
Flynn-Ta	A high speed rail through Old Lyme would do irreparable damage to a protected conservation area. The proposal rips through a historic district. Old Lyme is filled with federally designated environmental and cultural areas. Please stand by these protected areas.
Fogg_Na	[Old Lyme] is a peaceful old town with ancient historical homes you would destroy. You can not bulldoze through a town like that without their approval and you do not have it I can assure you.
Fogg_Ru	This railway upgrade proposal (Tier 1 Draft EIS) is nothing short of disastrous. The character of Old Lyme and the neighboring communities would be totally destroyed. Property values would plummet as well as the quality of life, which has been evolving for over 350 years.My family and I are completely opposed to it. The mere fact that this plan nearly came in under the radar is utterly disgraceful. Shame on the people who came up with this flawed plan!
Fogliano_Su	I urge you to strongly reconsider moving the track system closer to I-95 in Old Saybrook-Old Lyme. What you are proposing for the Town of Old Lyme with an alternative rail route will DESTROY much of our town's history, our marine environment, and our town's business center. I believe that fixing your existing infrastructure will prove not only more cost effective but less damaging to the environment and to many many communities along the NE Corridor.
Folta_Ed	No railway route should be approved that will encroach upon or diminish the historical areas in and around Old Lyme and its estuary.
Folta_Ed	Too many important stakeholders were unaware of this proposed action until recently. Please postpone votes until more stakeholders can become involved and town meetings and public charrettes can be held.
Fontes_Roy	No tracks
Forbis_Al	Please seek an alternative to draft/plan 1 now under discussion
Forbis_Jo	I am writing to express my concerns and opposition to Alternative 1 of the draft EIS Tier 1 NEC FUTURE proposal.
Forbis_Jo	First, the new line would effectively bifurcate the Old Lyme Historic District and the cluster very fine arts organizations that reinforce Old Lyme role as the home of American Impressionism and that are one of the key attractions for residents and visitors to Old Lyme. As sketched on the high level map, the line would plow through the Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts and potentially harm the Lyme Art Association and the Florence Griswold Museum campus structures.
Forbis_Jo	The width and height of the proposed four line track as it passes over I 95 would significantly visually and audibly disrupt the village and its aesthetics.
Forbis_Jo	Second, an additional bridge over the Connecticut River Estuary and its apron of salt marshes raises a multitude of environmental concerns, as it would cause disruption to the river, its wetlands, and the habitats of a multitude of wildlife species. The Connecticut River is the only major river delta in the northeast with natural sandbars and salt marshes at its mouth rather than commercial harbor development. Numerous tributaries also flow down from its vast watershed with hills and steep ledges in the northern and central part of the town to drain into the Connecticut River Estuary. The Town of Old Lyme's preserved Open Space includes large areas of state-owned tidal marshes along the Connecticut River. Alternative 1 could significant impact these areas. The Connecticut River has been recognized nationally and internationally as a special natural resource. The tidal marshes at the river mouth are acknowledged as "Wetlands of International Significance" under the international Ramsar Treaty. The Nature Conservancy designated the River Estuary as one of their "Last Great Places." The Connecticut River became one of fourteen rivers in the United States designated as an "American Heritage River" by President Clinton.

Table JJ–29: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Old Lyme (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment
Forte_St	3. It is a given fact that property values will drop like a stone. Not only for all the housing in the vicinity of the proposed rail, but for the entire village affected by this proposed service.
Foster_Em	I highly oppose the NEC Alternative 1 that would destroy the campus of Lyme Academy College. While I am a proponent of expanded rail use in New England, this disruption would permanently alter the community of Old Lyme in a negative way. I attended Lyme Academy from 2008 - 2012 and am an active member of the Alumni. This school is extremely valuable and a rare gem in the art community. I can't imagine its survival after such a blow. I hope that there is another way that this can be rectified.
Foster_Mo	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.
Foster_Mo	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.
Frankel_Li	Alternative 1 would severely impact the commercial and historical districts of Old Lyme. Please reconsider destroying the heart of the Old Lyme community. This would surely be the result of Alternative 1 were pursued.
Franzius_Fr	Representative Joe Courtney, the New London Day have opened our eyes and ears to the possibility the town of Old Lyme being railroaded right through their tiown, as if it didn't matter if the Railroad tracks would send house after house crashing that town's heritage into photographs that could be seen only on paper or in computers.
Frazier_Ri	Any sane person who visits the area of Old Lyme CT that will be affected by Alternative 1 would quickly recognize the devastation that would be visited upon the landscape and heritage of that community. Deploying such devastation under the guise of an overall objective of life quality improvement is nothing short of madness.
Frederick_Jo	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.
Freidenburg_Ke	Please don't ruin Old Lyme by implementing Alternative 1! This plan makes little sense and significantly damages the character and historic nature of a beautiful town.
Fried_Gi	"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." Such an effort will be a waste of my taxpayer money and will not improve anything that cannot be accomplished by moving the rail a mile or two away.
Friedmann_La	Although I recognize the need for improved rail service for the future of our country and that sea level rise will impact rails near the water, I am asking you to seek an alternate solution to expansion of the NEC through Old Lyme, CT. The plan for Alternative 1 would destroy the artistic heart of this historic town. Old Lyme is the home of revered artists of the past and hopeful artists of the future. The Florence Griswold Museum, The Lyme Art Association and the Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts are a destination for art lovers, a vital part of Connecticut's tourism and beloved by those who live in this small community. I have to believe that creative engineers and planners can develop a solution to preserve creative artists.
Frost_Su	While high speed rail is an idea I can support, I do not support a plan that ruins one of the most beautiful stretches of coast/land in the country. This plan is not well thought out and the cost is astronomical. Why not start with improving the current infrastructure, beginning with the bridge between Old Saybrook and Old Lyme that spans the Connecticut River? It is an accident waiting to happen...
Fugger_Br	" 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. "
Fuller_Ga	I want to voice my objections to the proposed new rail line that would go through the center of Old Lyme, Connecticut. The plan as proposed would bi-sec Lyme Street and cause devastating effects to our community and our natural resources. It would also have a negative impact on the surrounding natural environment as well as the historical, economic, cultural, and archaeological heart of Old Lyme. It is imperative that the present plan be revised and the proposed rail line be rerouted to another location. This rerouting is important for the future of Old Lyme. It would leave our community intact and not divided by a rail line.
Fulton_Ka	Due to the location of Alternative 1...I strongly request this alternative be dropped from consideration in the future railroad expansion projects.
Fung_Ke	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.
Furgueson_Mi	My property in Lyme would NOT be directly impacted by Alternative 1 but, none the less, I have significant concerns about this particular proposal and how it would negatively impact the southeastern Connecticut region.
G_An	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.
Gaffaney_Te	THIS IS A VERY VERY BAD IDEA! HOW CAN YOU RUN A HIGH SPEED RAIL STRAIGHT THROUGH AN FEDERALLY RECOGNIZED HISTORIC DISTRICT? THIS WILL GUT OLD LYME! AND WHAT IS THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ON THE LT RIVER?
Galbo_St	Keep the tracks where they are and do not destroy this historic community.
Gallagher_Ro	As a longtime Old Lyme resident, I strongly appose to the Alternitive 1 plan to go through the heart of Historic Old Lyme. I fully agree improvements need to take place in the NE corridor but please find anther pathway.
Galli_Ja	As a local resident I strongly oppose Alternative 1 in view of the environmental, economic and aesthetic damage that would be caused.
Gallicchio_Ju	I oppose alternative 1 as it will decimate the charming, vital and historic town of Old Lyme, as well as many of its economic draws to the region. Although I am not an Old Lyme resident, I often go to the attractions in Old Lyme (museums and galleries) as well as its many shops. I question why the info provided only lists the "benefits" of the 3 options and none of the negatives.
Gambardella_Ro	... we oppose Alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridor plan as it will severely impact the integrity of the satellite campus for the arts.

Table JJ–29: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Old Lyme (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment
Gara_El	COST opposes the Federal Rail Administration 's NEC Draft Plan, which proposes to extend the railroad through Old Lyme 's downtown. Many smaller communities in Connecticut have downtowns that are vital to their community 's history, economy, character and charm. These areas should be preserved in ways that will strengthen our communities and local economies, not torn apart by rail lines.
Gara_El	COST is also concerned that federal authorities failed to work with local communities in developing the draft plan. This top-down approach has resulted in a seriously flawed plan which fails to coordinate and balance transit planning with other important state and local goals including nurturing economic development, preserving the quality of life in our communities, and protecting the state 's natural resources and aquatic habitats... COST urges authorities to reject the draft plan and develop a collaborative process that engages municipal officials, residents. and businesses in outlining recommendations for enhancing rail lines without undermining Connecticut 's small towns.
Gardner_Sc	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.
Garrett_Da	I would like to oppose the possibility of any changes to the Old Lyme, CT Historic District, including the passing of high speed trains through the area. The residents have worked very hard to keep that region from being lost to modern society, and would appreciate being able to keep it that way.
Garrett_Li	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.
Garvey_Da	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.
Garvin_Sa	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.
Gaskell_Jo	I am opposed to the proposed route of Alternative 1 through Old Lyme, CT... People choose to live, worship and recreate in Old Lyme because of its charm, natural setting and beauty. Don't ruin it!
Gaskell_Jo	The path will damage salt marsh and the wildlife that lives there. It will seriously alter the character of downtown Old Lyme, one of the oldest settlements in the USA. An Art College will be lost, property values will plummet, and the uniqueness of this New England village will be forever drowned out by the roar of daily train traffic.
Gaskell_Su	How could you possibly consider rerouting the train through the center of historic Old Lyme, the birthplace of American Impressionism and the country's largest artist colony ... The local tourist economy, and the livelihoods of many would also be severely impacted. NO TO ALTERNATIVE ONE - NO to the proposed new segment through the center of Old Lyme.
Gaskell_Su	The new segment would not only destroy the historic nature of the town, it would uproot the Lyme Arts Academy and run adjacent to the new Old Lyme High School. From an environmental standpoint, this proposal is equally troublesome. The train would be re-routed through pristine marshlands that are the backbone of downtown Old Lyme and home to indigenous wildlife . Local residents would see their homes altered irreparably; property values would plummet.
Gates_Ch	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 Alternative 1 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.
Gatti_Ro	I oppose Alternative 1 because it would run right through Old Lyme Arts School and an historic section.
Gaulin_Ro	Americans have a love affair with their automobiles. You are a century and a half too late in persuading citizens to use trains. Why would you embark on destroying the quaint community of Old Lyme, CT in order to lay track that would see very little if any increase use. Who thinks of these foolish ideas such as you propose????
Gauthier_Gr	Alternative 1 "new route" from Old Saybrook, CT to Kingston, RI is a terrible, poorly planned idea. Did any of the architects actually look at aerial photos (never mind visit) of the proposed route?
Gauthier_Gr	You're bisecting the public water supply in Groton, CT which also serves New London & Montville, CT.
Gaynor_Ma	Alternative 1 brings little gain and much damage to a community and environment.
Geer_Ge	I oppose Alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridor Futures proposal. Building a main rail line through the middle of a college campus will do nothing but destroy that campus. It makes no sense.
Gendron_Sh	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.
Genovese_Ca	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.
Gentry_Ad	I believe the Tier 1 Draft EIS, the plan to build a high speed train through Old Lyme, is a mistake....In short, I feel that the plan to run a train line through Old Lyme has pronounced negative consequences for the town of Old Lyme, without creating any positives to offset/counterbalance them. For that reason, among others, I feel it is the wrong choice, and I hope it never comes to pass.
Germain_Wi	I oppose the new railroad through the campus.
Gerster_Pe	While in favor of maintaining the vital infrastructure such as the Rail Roads I'm in opposition of the government making sweeping decisions without the benefit of local input and therefore local support. I find this study as a typical case in point where local support is no being actively pursued but if anything being denied. I again restate that I understand the need for upgrades and improvements but I also believe this is not something that should be mandated to a local community without their proper participation and or support.

Table JJ–29: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Old Lyme (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment
Gerster_Pe	...a simple explanation of the findings. The especially relevant to the defined effect to the local community such as Old Lyme.
Geshel_Kr	Do not go through with the changes to the rail system.... Preserve Lyme Street and it's surroundings of Old Lyme & Lyme
Geshel_Kr	The powers that be should be ashamed of themselves for not appropriately addressing the changes with the local community within a reasonable time frame (60 days minimum would have been a start) and current outreach methods that touch the local community of busy, hard working families...what cowards.
Getek_Ke	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.
Ghirardi_La	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. Furthermore, I do not see any need for another rail line.
Gianetti_Iv	I am apposed to Alternative 1, which I understand would cut a swath through historic Old Lyme, CT.
Gibson_Jo	We are against the proposal number 1. What are the thinking of? This will run our town.
Gibson_Lo	We are against the proposal number 1. What are the thinking of? This will run our town.
Gilbert_Mi	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.
Gilleran_Ti	I do not support this proposed plan. As a tax payer in Connecticut I will not support any rail changes over the Connecticut River.
Gilliland_Ri	I support any efforts to maximize the use of the public rail system but not to the level where historical villages (Old Lyme) would be adversely affected.
Gingolaski_Ma	I think this railroad corridor change that is proposed for Connecticut should not happen.
Gingras_Ka	As a resident of Old Lyme, CT, I am strongly opposed to the NEC Future Alternative 1 plan.
Gingras_Pa	The rudimentary map of the Alternative 1 Plan looks like it creates a new route for a train directly through my neighborhood in Old Lyme, CT (the Western side of Ferry Road). Could there be a more specific map presented, which shows the exact location of the new route?
Gingras_Pa	...the map shows the new train route running through the heart of Old Lyme, a centuries-old town with rich history and cultural resources. It is unimaginable that the town's center would be destroyed in the name of innovation. Surely there must be another route to consider, one which has a far lesser impact on our historic and important seaside town.
Gintoff Vautrain_Su	I am writing regarding your plan to run the railroad directly through our town, Old Lyme, CT. While I have a direct concern- it would literally become my next door neighbor- running right next to our property line- I have many more reasons for this causing a HUGE concern for our community. You see, we are a small, historical, arts driven town- and this proposal will run straight through the heart of it. You will disturb what makes us a community, what people come to visit- what makes us great. You will ruin historic buildings, destroy land designated as Open Space, preserved for walking and enjoying the fruits of our history and nature. We are so proud of what we have built here- running a railroad directly through it all is just so very wrong. Our entire sense of community will be ripped open, property values will substantially decrease, protected land, animals, wildlife will be lost forever. Please, please, find another route
Gionfriddo_Da	Oppose Alternative 1! This plan will destroy the fabric of a historic New England shoreline community; the town of old Lyme, CT and all its New England charm that brings people into CT. Additionally plan offers no substantial benefit other than a few minutes of time to get between CT and RI which does not help us New Englanders who need to slow down and enjoy what we have. Just a really bad idea that should not even have been provided as an option.
Gionfriddo_Th	What a Disgrace. We own a house a few miles away in Old Lyme and this is why we enjoy this beautiful town. To think the Federal government could come and destroy the character of this town is terrible. My husband having lived in Old Lyme since 1966, he thinks it's a shame to destroy the charm of this town!!!!!!
Girasoli_Ca	I would like to express my opposition to the proposed Alternative 1 that the FRA is considering in the Town of Old Lyme. I'm not a resident of the beautiful Town of Old Lyme but visit the town numerous times during the year. I'm not against the high-speed rail track but what is proposed, that will impact the local environment is without merit. The FRA has to have an alternative proposal that will have the least impact on the town. What the FRA is proposing is unacceptable. What has taken the Town of Old Lyme over 300 years to accomplish, the FRA wants to destroy it. This will end up in the courts for a long time to come.
Girty_Br	Option one would be disastrous for Old Lyme and the surrounding region. The High Speed rail should not be run through the historic district.
Glacken_Cy	Certainly a more thoughtful and constructive alternative can be found that destroying the character of an historic town, its arts and cultural assets, irreplaceable wetlands and wildlife.
Gladwell_Na	I am strongly opposed to Amtrak's High Speed railroad changing its shoreline route to cross over Lyme St in Old Lyme. I teach at Lyme Academy College and live in town. Old Lyme is an historic town with historic architecture, a Museum, art Association and Fine Arts College.
Glaski_El	I absolutely oppose Alternative 1
Gleason_Al	This rail system would disrupt our small town [Old Lyme] cutting through our historical district and art academy. This is why people move here... For the small town atmosphere. You would be ruining it for all those who live here. Please re consider your plans.

Table JJ–29: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Old Lyme (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment
Godfrey_Cy	I am absolutely opposed to NEC Alternative 1 - do NOT destroy Old Lyme with high speed rail through tits historic district!!
Goggans_Th	The proposed expansion route of passenger rail service through Old Lyme is not a reasonable, equitable, or workable plan... Allowing a new rail expansion to wantonly destroy this town, it's history and instutions, and the very residents' lives and livelihood should not be considered or allowed in any way. Catching the train is already extremely easy via the Old Saybrook station right across the CT river. Why would the immeasurably precious and irreplaceable life and history if an entire town, one whose history, cultural contributions, and institutions stretch back to before our country's founding be discarded and obliterated for a few minutes savings in travel convenience?
Goggans_Th	This expansion would literally destroy massive swaths of delicate and protected wetlands, demolish three vitally important and institutions at the core of this country's historical fine art development, as well as obliterate the very structure and homes of one of this nation's oldest towns. If any individual or business were to interfere with the wetlands in question, they would be charged, fined, and even imprisoned. If the irreplaceable institutions of Old Lyme, the Florence Griswold Museum, the Lyme Art Association, and the Lyme Academy College of Fine Art, were damaged or altered without approval for Historic accuracy, those responsible would also face severe legal repercussions. If any landowner or business changes the land or their buildings in the Historic registry without approval, they would be fined severely.
Golbazi_Al	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. This is a beautiful college with years of history.
Golden_Jo	This proposal must not be allowed to take place. A more northerly route through more rural and less historic areas should be considered instead.
Goldstein_Ja	...I oppose Alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridor Futures proposal if it potentially impacts, harms and/or directly involves, in any way, the campus of Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts of the University of New Haven."
Gonci_Doi	As long term residents and voting tax-payers of Old Lyme, CT, my husband and I would like to note our vigorous opposition to the proposed rail proposal option which would, in effect, eviscerate this town. It is illconceived and incredibly short-sighted. It would not only destroy what commercial areas we have but also our historical and cultural centers. This particular option should be scuttled and resources devoted to other 'visions' for addressing the NE Corridor needs.
Gonci_Don	Old Lyme is one of the first incorporated townships in Conn. with a rich historic past... While upgrading the rail line is so important for economic and environmental reasons, the upgrade must not be done in a way that impacts the character of this state. There is already a rail path which the town has adapted to..the focus should be on its upgrade. It would be absolutely wrong to construct a new railbed line in such a historically and environmentally sensitive area. Alternative 1 should no longer be considered a viable approach.
Good_Co	Please do not destroy a town that has been on the banks of the Connecticut River for over 350 years. There are other, less destructive alternatives.
Good_Da	Alternative 1 would have a devastating impact on our Old Lyme community, and even as it would destroy our town, it would provide minimal improvement to high speed rail service. We may be a small community but we're more than just a dot on the map. If you pursue Alternative 1 I guarantee you will be met with massive resistance!
Goodrich_Er	Alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridor Futures Proposal, involving a rerouting of the current trackbed across the Connecticut River between Old Saybrook and Old Lyme, and across New London County, represents a radical alteration of rural and semi-rural areas of significant environmental, historical and touristic importance to the State and the region. The unique nature of the lower Ct Valley region has been repeatedly recognized by governmental action and private activity, recently, most notably, through the preservation of over 1000 acres of undeveloped land primarily in Old Saybrook and not far from the expanded roadbed. In addition, the rerouting would literally destroy the historic 18th and 19th century village of Old Lyme, with significant cultural and educational resources adjacent to or literally in the path of the proposed roadbed. Other alternatives, without a direct and disastrous impact on irreplaceable coastal features and historic settings, should be explored more fully and favored over Alternative 1.
Gordon_Th	As long time residents of Old Lyme, CT, we must add our strong objections to your ill-advised proposal to add a track that would run through our town. (Alternative 1)
Gordon_Th	Alternative 1 will impinge on wetlands,
Gorin_Th	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 Village of Old Lyme's historic Lyme Street architecture, as well as the protected lands of the Connecticut River estuary. Alternative 1 is a completely outrageous and destructive concept. What were you thinking???
Gormley_El	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.
Gorton_Gl	I am opposed to Alternative 1, which would negatively impact the historic district of Old Lyme, CT.
Gotowka_Ch	I do not think that Plan one is a considerations as it will alter important historic properties not to mention forever change the character of a most CT beautiful town. [Old Lyme]
Gotowka_Th	I am writing to express my grave concern with and opposition to Alternative 1 of
Gotowka_Th	This ill-conceived plan provides no economic benefit or convenience to local Old Lyme commuters or residents.
Gotowka_Th	...it will cause considerable and irreversible harm to an environmentally sensitive area; and result in a devastating impact to businesses, museums and schools.
Gotowka_Th	...the plan would hinder access by resident’s to the Town’s small shopping district, which includes the Town’s only grocery store.
Gotowka_Th	I find it incredible that you would unveil such a devastating plan without input or review by impacted residents or town officials.
Gourlay_El	We are against the proposal number 1. What are the thinking of? This will ruin our town.

Table JJ–29: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Old Lyme (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment
Gourlay_Ma	I am very, very concerned about the proposed Tier 1 Draft EIS. Not only will it destroy the Old Lyme Campus of the University of New Haven, but will destroy many of the historic buildings in Old Lyme. I have lived here for fifty six years and treasure the careful attention given to retaining our special small town.
Grab_La	I oppose alternative 1, which cuts through the Lyme College of arts and surrounding watershed areas. It is a ridiculous cultural and environmentally unfriendly option. What are you people thinking?
Grad_Ri	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.
Graff_Br	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.
Gragg_Ma	Either Alternative 2 or 3 make a lot of sense by increasing access to markets and passengers currently not served. Alternative 1 is a terrible idea, destroying historic communities (Lyme) with very little increase in benefit to riders. Please do not choose Alternative 1.
Graham_Ka	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.
Granberg_Al	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.
Grant_Ja	As a resident of Connecticut I take great interest in visiting the areas of historic interest which are in our state. I frequently go to Old Lyme just for the pleasure of enjoying the past and the present simultaneously. It's not a time warp--it's an opportunity to think about our roots--politically, culturally, architecturally--and they are all combined! A rail line through this area would be a crime against the many individuals and organizations who have worked so hard to protect an area in the public interest.
Grant_Ja	I do not support Alternative # 1
Grant_Ms	" 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. "
Gravell_Em	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 would suggest finding an alternative route for the rail in Old Lyme that does not interfere with the historic campus.
Grayson_Sa	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.
Graziosi_Ti	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.
Green_Ca	Administrator Finberg MUST come and see the impact on the very small villages of Lyme & Old Lyme! Impossible. You have to go into the field
Green_Se	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.
Greenberg_Al	What an outrage to consider destroying the commercial heart of this quiet town and bringing the rail tracks through the center of its historic arts district. I am all for improving the efficiency of our rail system, but there must be another way to achieve this. The economic impact on Old Lyme would be devastating and would reverberate well beyond its borders.
Greene_Vi	I live in Old Lyme - the reason is, that as a classic New England town, it has a lot of history and character. Please take into account what Alternative 1's rail bridge would do to the home I and many people love. Thank you for taking this into consideration.
Greenho_Br	I live very close to I95 in Old Lyme and am strongly opposed to rail development along the 95 corridor near Old Lyme Center. The construction and prolonged use of rail, high speed rail and rail maintenance would negatively impact our quality of living and environmental health. Please consider upgrading the current rail line through Old Lyme as the ONLY sensible alternative.
Greenwood_Ma	Please do not put railroad tracks through Lyme Academy of Art
Greenwood_Sa	Having this rail line through Old Lyme will RUIN the amazing, historic shoreline town. WHY would you do this???? NO NO NO NO
Gregory_Mi	I am totally against Alternative #1! I live in the center of Old Lyme and am horrified that this plan is even being considered!
Gregory_Sh	Please do not destroy our beloved town of Old Lyme.
Greiner_Di	"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 can also cause unforeseen damage to environmental areas.
Greiner_Di	Maybe a railway providing much needed rail transportation along the N I91 to Hartford, Providence, and Boston would be a better fit for this project!
Greiner_Te	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.

Table JJ–29: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Old Lyme (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment
Gresh_Jo	Not in my back yard. Might just as well run it through the White House Rose Garden. The plan is absurd and ridiculous for anyone who lives within ten miles of the proposed line through Old Lyme's beautiful town center. Ironically, it goes right past the Scenic Road sign. They can take that sign down as soon as they start construction excavation. Take a ride out Route 84 through Waterbury for a preview of what Old Lyme will look like for ten years during construction and forever after. Who's going to benefit from it? The handful of rich politicians who ride the rails from Boston to Washington. Let them fly, drive, or ride the rails as they are, including restoration of the Draw bridge. The cost is peanuts for a government that prints 88 billion dollars worth of funny money per month for QE 1, QE 2, QE 3....Who's going to lose? Everyone else.
Grethel_Da	The absolute absurdity and incredibly destructive effect in every way the Alternative 1 would have on our treasured community plan is mind-boggling, and I vigorously oppose it. I plead with the decision makers to come see our town with its treasured history, unique architecture, unique natural beauty instead of being destroyed, must be preserved for the future. I believe from a visit by any sane decision maker will conclude that this very special place for the state and country should be preserved. Please do not destroy this rare gem of a town and community and take it away from our current and community and generations to come.
Griffin_Re	We do not want any eminent domain here in Old Lyme, and we would like to preserve our waterfront.
Griffis_An	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. PLEASE, don't propose any plan which will expand the train line from its current footprint in the Old Lyme area. It is a historic and exquisite town. It would be grossly negligent of the Rail Plan to run any tracks though this town. Just keep and maintain your existing tracks and bridges in Old Lyme. Do NOT add new.
Griffis_An	If you need to increase passenger traffic to the Boston area, then do that through central Connecticut - NOT by laying additional rail track through coastal Connecticut.
Griffiths_Ma	Alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridor Futures fails to deliver much needed connectivity to Hartford CT, and would succeed in harming an environmentally unique and sensitive estuary area in Old Lyme along with threatening a gem of an Art school at the Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts.
GriggsSr_Th	I oppose that part of Alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridor Futures proposal that will destroy the campus of Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts of the University of New Haven. This is too valuable to be lost. Alternative 1 is the most reasonable of the alternatives, but it does have challenges such as this. Please work to fine tune this alternative to protect as much as possible of the wonderful Connecticut / Rhode Island shoreline.
Griswold_Da	As a member of the founding family in the town of Old Lyme, I must voice my opposition to the Alternative 1 proposal from NEC Future Tier 1 Draft EIS. ... Not only have the citizens of Old Lyme preserved the buildings and historical sites but even more important, they have preserved the ecosystem at the mouth of the Connecticut River and its tributaries such as the Lieutenant River; the largest of its kind on the entire northeast coast. ... To try and implement Alternative 1 would be extremely costly. There would be a high cost to placate property owners and there would be legal rulings and challenges from a variety of organizations to protect the environment that would tie this project up for years in litigation. The better plan would be to upgrade the existing lines. For far less money and construction time, the track curves could be straightening out and raised where required. ...our family and many others have invested too much to allow this terrible proposal to destroy all we and our friends hold dear. We will pursue all available options to stop Alternative 1.
Griswold_Ev	I am not in favour of sacrificing culture, history and beauty for speed. Gandhi taught us that there is more to life than making it go faster. I love trains. Slow to medium trains where you can watch the countryside slide by. No to Option 1 and desecrating the Town of Old Lyme.
Griswold_Jo	While Alternative 1 seems attractive based on cost alone, it does cutural, economic and envirnmental damage to many shoreline areas. It does not provide the added access, mobility nor economic benefit of either of the inland routes. The siting of the I-95 corridor was a terrible mistake for Connecticut in the 1950s. Let's not make the same mistake again.
Griswold_Ti	While the detailed information about the NEC Future Tier 1 option is scant, it appears the option provides that four new railroad tracks will be built adjacent to I-95 through the center of Old Lyme. I have not heard the precise route proposed for the tracks nor how wide an area will be required for the tracks. I have heard the area of impact of this proposal will be about 5,000 feet wide. It appears the tracks will eliminate the Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts and will eliminate many other commercial and residential structures and possibly the Regional High School as it passes through town. The area of impact will certainly have a negative impact on hundreds of commercial and residential properties. All of this adversity will severely devalue the assessed value of the affected properties and the sum total of this will have a severe impact on the Town's financial condition. As a consequence of this, there will be a large tax burden shift from the impacted properties to the other properties in town. I fully expect that there will be some tax payers who will decide to sell their real estate in order to avoid these tax hikes and the related negative effects caused by the construction and the presence of the NEC Future Tier 1. I am confident that other residents will write about other negative aspects of the NEC Future Tier 1 plan, so I shall conclude by stating the economic impact of this plan will cause the Town irreparable harm. The loss of value from the affected properties cannot be replaced and the tax burden shift to other properties could begin the death spiral for this beautiful treasure of a community. While the goal of NEC Future is noble - make passenger rail from Boston to New York viable , the Tier 1 plan is ill conceived, has been poorly communicated and must be drastically modified or abandoned.
Griswold_Wi	As a 70+ year resident of Old Lyme, I strongly oppose changing the rail line through the town. It would seemthat the present track location could be enhanced to take high speed trains. To pin this on Global Warming is a myth, I vote NO.
Groth_An	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.
Groth_An	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.

Table JJ–29: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Old Lyme (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment
Groth_Ke	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.
Groth_Ke	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.
Groth_Ma	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.
Groth_Ma	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.
Groth_Sy	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.
Groth_Sy	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.
Grundon_Te	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.
Guerriero_De	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.
Guizol_Ja	No to alternative #1. We must preserve our heritage!!!!
Gumkowsk_Fr	Please do not single out Old Lyme for destruction of the heart of this town and the history it holds. I understand the need for high speed rail but consider and choose another option soas not to scar a beautiful, important and beloved community. I have lived in towns on the Connecticut shoreline most of my life, and in Old Lyme 20 years. There is no justification to rip this beautiful andscape, home of artists and historians, to shreds to save a few minutes for a commuter. I travel to New York often on the Shoreline East/Metro North. The SLE leg alongside marshes and rivers is a meditation that all riders should be directed to rather than forcing new (sure to be underutilized) tracks through Old Lyme. Please reconsider Tier 1.
Gundry_Ja	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.
Gurpide_Ro	I oppose Alternative 1 of the NEC proposal because it would doubtless destroy the campus of the Lyme Academy College. It would certainly have a negative impact upon the integrity of the surrounding shoreline and the town of Old Lyme.
Hackenjos_Pa	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.
Haddad_Su	I oppose Alternative 1 of the New England Corridor Futures proposal because it will destroy the campus of the Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts of the University of New Haven as well as destroying the charming character of that portion of Old Lyme.
Hadlock_Ke	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.
Haff_Ca	This plan makes no sense! Why does it make sense to completely destroy the historic town of Old Lyme, CT in order to save approximately 30 minutes on a trip from DC to Boston via Amtrak! This plans would go through the middle of our town taking our taking out all the schools along with the Lyme Arts Academy and all their buildings. This plan has to be stopped.

Table JJ–29: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Old Lyme (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment
Haff_Ro	We are a small town with very little 'central community' area, and what we do have is extremely important to our history, economy, character and sense of community. This plan would impact our only commercial area, which houses our grocery store, pharmacy and many small businesses. Our village center, which is directly off of the commercial area, houses the Lyme Academy of Fine Arts, as well as the famous Florence Griswold Museum and the Lyme Art Association. All are sites of historic significance and the individual organizations have worked diligently to continue with their legacy and maintain the physical structures. It is beyond comprehension that these buildings would be considered of little importance as this project moves forward. But the plan also impacts many properties along the way, as it is an entirely new track, cutting through several neighborhoods, not to mention wetlands, open space and areas of archaeological significance. I am very upset by the lack of community briefing. I am very upset the this plan would decrease the value of my home and the values for the entire town. It is of no benefit to the Town of Old Lyme. This is not an acceptable plan, period!
Hageman_Ba	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.
Haikalis_Ge	Regularize opportunities for public input. An ongoing program for public input would greatly enhance the nature of planned improvements; both capital investments and operational strategies...
Hale_Ma	I strongly urge you not to have any negative impact upon the historic town of Old Lyme and the surrounding area. I am expanding this concern in a letter to Senator Blumenthal
Hall_Ba	The proposed High speed rail would destroy Old Lyme. People came to Old Lyme to see where time had stopped. Please do not destroy our town. Consider connecting our cities. Hartford, capital of CT, needs to be connected to Providence, Boston, and New York. Thank you.
Hall_Br	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.
Hallman_Ha	No railway through historic Old Lyme! It is dangerous and unnecessary.
Hallwood_Ba	I strongly opposed Alt 1...Please seek another alternative as you will ruin Old Lymes wildlife including swallow migration resting place.
Hamilton_El	I am opposed to the plans to route the new high-speed rail line through the center of Old Lyme.
Hamilton_El	It would destroy the tranquility of our historic district, upend several historic homes (including my own, which was built in the 1660s and is believed to be the second oldest home in town) and further contribute to the noise etc. that living in such close proximity to a major highway already brings. We urge you to find another solution to the problem, as this would significantly and negatively impact businesses, homeowners and the town of Old Lyme itself.
Hamilton_Fr	The recent NEC proposal would inordinately effect Old Lyme while leaving other communities relatively unharmed. It will ruin a bucolic and historic place. As New Englanders, we are all for commerce and progress but that does not mean that we should bluntly erase the past in its name. The historical places which I mentioned (including the Flo Gris which is a National Historic Landmark) would be decimated by the NEC proposal. There has to be a better path forward that leaves these institutions untouched. I implore you to rethink the proposal as it will destroy the town that so many of us hold so dear.
Hamilton_Ma	Please do not use alternative
Hamilton_Ma	I am opposed to the plans to route the new high-speed rail line through the center of Old Lyme.
Hamilton_Ma	It would destroy the tranquility of our historic district, upend several historic homes (including my own, which was built in the 1660s and is believed to be the second oldest home in town) and further contribute to the noise etc. that living in such close proximity to a major highway already brings. We urge you to find another solution to the problem, as this would significantly and negatively impact businesses, homeowners and the town of Old Lyme itself.
Hamilton_Pa	Is 25 minutes of saved time on a train trip reasonable justification for the destruction of the historic village of Old Lyme,
Hanasen_S	I am not in support of the NEC FUTURE rail proposal for the reasons stated in first Selectwoman Bonnie Reemsnyder's letter.
Hancock_Jo	62 billion dollars to save a few minutes on a train ride in the NEC??? And by doing so, ruining the historic, pristine town of old lyme?
Hancock_Jo	?? Have ANY of the proponents been to Old Lyme? If they had, they would never propose such an incredulous idea of a train tracks running through the middle of this town!!!!... Something is dreadfully amiss here for the proponents of this plan to even be thinking of such a far reaching impact on so many levels for our town of Old Lyme.
Hangasky_Jo	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.
Hannifan_Me	I am fervently AGAINST a high speed rail route they are talking about putting through old Lyme .
Hansen_Fe	Leave Old Lyme the way it is
Hansen_Ma	I am opposed to Alternative 1's route through Old Lyme, CT's Historic District. It would devastate the town and destroy it's character. It would wipe out part of the business district and destroy tourism in the area. Please keep the route in the same location, it's not bothering anyone there.
Hanson_Li	" 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. "

Table JJ–29: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Old Lyme (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment
Hargraves_Jo	I remain completely opposed to this plan, which would represent a disastrous mistake, at one stroke destroying the charm of a historic village (Old Lyme), which has been carefully preserved for many years, And making for the next decade a giant traffic problem for its residents.
Hargraves_Jo	Everyone I know is horrified that this plan seems to have taken on so much reality, without ever having informed the local people who would be affected by it
Harlukowicz_Ji	"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."
Harnsberger_Ja	I am emailing to express my opposition to Alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridor Futures proposal. Part of its route will pass through the Lyme Academy of Art, which will have a devastating impact on the viability of a longstanding educational institution.
Harra_Br	Protesting Taxation without representation is as old as the towns of Lyme/Old Lyme! we've learned something from Robert Moses v. Jane Jacobs in NY & on Long Island. The Railroaders should too.
Harris_Do	To consider historical sites, such as the Old Lyme Inn and the Florence Griswold Gallery to put in rail tracks in that are is unthinkable. Not only that, but, if you are on that side of the Lieutenant River you would have to continue down the center of commercial real estate. Why wouldn't you utilize the current path of the railroad close to the current railroad tracks off of Ferry Rd. Taking down historical building is not progress in my opinion.
Harris_Ed	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.
Harris_Pa	Old Lyme has an important history that is the very heart of this region. Alternative 1 would gut the very essence of the town and provide very little variation to the current route.
Harrison_Ba	I support Alternative #1. It moves the train tracks north and away from the environmentally sensitive shoreline and wetlands in Old Lyme. This is best for the environment. The environment in Old Lyme is more important than the ambiance.
Harrison_Ba	"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.
Harrison_Br	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.
Harrison_Ka	I support alternative 1. It is best for the environment - especially in Old Lyme
Harritt_Jo	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.
Hart_Al	To destroy a town , and an Historic District for a marginal increase in rail speed (at an incredible cost) seems an absurd trade off.
Hart_St	I am strongly opposed to the plan to run the new high speed rail line through the town of Old Lyme.
Harty_Le	I have strong concerns about Alternative 1, which would run through the heart of Old Lyme (both the business and cultural districts) as well as wetlands. While I appreciate that there is no perfect solution, this plan would be so detrimental it should not even be considered.
Harvey_Ma	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.
Haskell_Su	I can't believe that anyone in their right mind would propose such a preposterous idea!! And all to save 30 minutes off the trip from DC to Boston!! For openers, how much will this monstrosity cost? I lived in Old Lyme for almost 40 years,and the charm, history, sense of community, and residents are too important to destroy by a high-speed train running through the town.
Hatch_Re	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 well as the beautiful historic district of Old Lyme, and encroach on the protected estuaries in the area.
Hayward_Ma	Absolutely ridiculous that you would chose to run the rail line through the middle of downtown Old Lyme destroying historic buildings and ruining our beautiful town... not to mention the environment impact on sensitive wetlands. I vigorously oppose this plan! Awful, awful idea.
Healey_Al	As a visitor to Old Lyme, the potential plan for the new railroad cutting through the center is extremely disturbing and objectionable.
Healy_Br	I do not support alternative 1. It would destroy old Lyme and comes at too great of a cost (old Lyme art Academy, Florence Griswold, historic homes, etc). I am vehemently against it. We must protect our historic towns.
Hegger_Jo	" 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. "
Heiser_Jo	I think that Alternative 1 for rail improvements thru Connecticut should not be considered! I would split the wonderful old community of Old Lyme in half while destroying it's small commercial area as well as many historic buildings and homes. We should be preserving our historical treasures not destroying them!!!
Henderson_Jo	From what I have read about Alternative 1 of the three high-speed railtrack routes proposed by the Federal Railroad Authority (FRA) in their Northeast Corridor (NEC) Future plan it strikes me as absurd to devastate Old Lyme in order to shave 30 mins from a 6-hour journey. The impact of a high-speed railtrack through the heart of town would be totally devastating for our community- ... I do fervently oppose this option.

Table JJ–29: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Old Lyme (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment
Henderson_Jo	Please consider that damage to the heart of our town, to our historic buildings (many on the National historic Landmarks list or National Historic Register) and to our marshlands would be irreparable.
Hendryx_An	As someone raised in Old Lyme and and a Branford, Ct resident looking to purchase a home in Old Lyme I feel this zoning change will destroy the town and charm of Old Lyme.
Hendryx_Be	Registration of strong opposition to the FRA proposal 'Alternative 1' high-speed rail track routes (NEC) specific to Old Lyme, CT
Hepburn_Ai	I am appalled at the proposed route of the new rail through the peaceful town of Old Lyme, Ct. Especially with no input from the community!
Herard_Pa	I oppose alternative #1 it will destroy the campus and ecosystems in the area. this is unacceptable and should NOT be an option!!!!
Hernandez_La	We oppose alternate 1!
Herold_He	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.
Hewitt_Je	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.
Hewitt_Je	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.
Hickman_Ma	The proposal to put a high speed rail through Old Lyme would be devastating economically and esthetically to the entire SE CT area.
Hilger_Je	Unacceptable compromise of historic old Lyme. Completely irreversibly damaging. We will never let it happen.
Hill_Pa	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
Hill_Ra	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 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.
Hill_We	I would like to voice my opposition to the Route Alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridor plan for the development of a high speed rail system. This route goes right through the center of the beautiful historic and cultural district of Old Lyme, virtually destroying the town. This is an important destination for artists and tourists as well as a thriving community.
Hillman-Ta	This location is a historical landmark.
Hincks_Cl	Alternative I Railroad Plan through Old Lyme would negatively affect the downtown business and the historic district in addition to negatively affecting property values of surrounding real estate. This plan is of no value to Old Lyme residents who do not need nor want to access Boston or New York faster. Rebuild the existing RR bridge as was done in Niantic, CT.
Hine_Ja	I am absolutely horrified at the proposal for high speed trains through the heart - the whole - of this wondrous place. I have lived here for 54 years and raised my family here. The whole community has grown in size but not in character. The residents care deeply about their property, their community, their institutions, their environment ... and the world. I applaud the idea of improving public travel options, having grown up in Europe ... but this is truly a ridiculous proposal. Communities in Europe have been kept intact while efficient public transportation continues to improve. With all the land available in this part of the world surely there are enough creative minds who can design a better solution for Southern Connecticut?
Hird_Fr	" 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. "
Hodge_Be	"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."
Hoff_Wa	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.
Holder_Ju	The old Lyme historic area is very important and irreplaceable , past colony for old Lyme painters and a present draw for artist of today. The Florence Griswold museum a treasure chest of history . Leave it be. I love trains but do not disturb this area.
Holland_Do	I have lived in the shoreline area for almost 60 years. Environmental concerns me the most, however what about infrastructure and how it changes the landscape of the historical Connecticut River Valley? I feel there is much more to learn before anything is brought forward to a vote.
Hollifield_Su	I am greatly opposed to Alternative 1 of the NEC FUTURE plan which would route a rail line through Old Lyme, Connecticut.
Holmes_Al	The impact of this tier 1 plan through Old Lyme , CT would be a tragedy to this town and unacceptable !!
Holmes_Da	The destruction of a historic downtown in the small village of Old Lyme, CT is something that future generations will not be able to preserve if a rail system encroaches on a village that has become an anomaly in CT and the nation. The route does not appear to provide a vast relief to traffic congestion nor enhanced ridership for such a route. Please reconsider as many individuals travel to the are annually to experience small town America.
Holszanska_Ma	I, a full time resident of the Lyme- Old Lyme community, vehemently oppose Option1 of the proposed high speed Amtrack track.

Table JJ–29: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Old Lyme (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment
Holszanska_Ma	This option would destroy not only ... but also the delicate biodiversity of CT River, and it's marshes.
Holszanska_Ma	I...vehemently oppose Option1...
Holszanska_Ma	This option would destroy not only the character of our beautiful historical and cultural town...
Holt_Pa	In Old Lyme, I am appalled at the prospect of the rail line being re-routed north of its present corridor to dissect Lyme Street just south of I-95.
Holt_Pa	Further, the proposed re-routing would require a longer railroad bridge than the current one, traversing the Connecticut River diagonally, and a less direct routing to New London. i very much hope that another, more efficient, route can be adopted or the present one be maintained so as to minimize the environmental and cultural damage to Old Lyme.
Honigberg_Je	I strongly 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. This is a vital part of the community.
Hornbake_De	I want to affirm the position to the devastating impacts of the NEC FUTURE proposal to Old Lyme, the region and the nation. Any proposals should be future oriented in all aspects not just economic expediency.
Hosack_Su	I am opposed to ruining the character of Old Lyme for a questionable benefit.
Hoss_Mi	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. Old Lyme is such a beautiful town, do not destroy the beauty.
Hostetler_Gr	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
Houlihan_Li	Please find a way to route this train without destroying the salt marshes and historical village of Old Lyme, Connecticut. It is a beautiful town already bisected by I-95. Its riparian and tidal areas are necessary for wildlife and to buffer the effects of storm surges and for beauty.
Hoy_An	... as well as a significant source of our economic vitality (Old Lyme)
Hoy_An	To carelessly destroy our physical heritage--which belongs to all citizens of the state and New England--would be unconscionable. That's what a railroad cut through our shoreline would do.
Hoyt_La	Oppose additional or new high speed railway through the town of Old Lyme.
Hoyt_La	Upgrade existing railway to lesson environmental impact to the CT River, area wetlands, historical sites & buildings, the town of Old Lyme and surrounding lower CT River towns.
Hoyt_St	Old Lyme is a small, beautiful and very historic town. I fear that these values and more could be dramatically compromised by Alternative 1. Please do not go down a path that will bifurcate and completely change the face of a community that looks much as it did hundreds of years ago.
Hubbard_An	Please reconsider. Old lyme is a small town with lots of historic charm. Putting in a high speed railroad will destroy the reason we chose old Lyme as our home. This will also impact families that will end up with the railroad in their backyards or worse, have to relocate. The businesses that will be affected, schools and museums will have an impact on the entire town. Putting this railroad here is selfish and unnecessary.
Huck_Sa	I am strongly opposed to the proposed Alternative 1 that will add a rail route through the heart of Old Lyme. The route will affect the town's main area of retail, schools, historic and cultural district, wetlands area, and residential neighborhoods. The impact would be hugely negative to the town and its residents.
Hufford_Ao	My name is Aoife. I'm a student at the Lyme-Old Lyme High School, which, as I'm sure you are aware, is located at 69 Lyme Street, in Old Lyme, Connecticut. Right where you plan to add a new railroad track. Again, I am a high school student. I'm only 14 - I don 't know how you all figure out what you do with the railroad systems, or why. But I think what you're planning is, to put it frankly, utterly ridiculous. I see no point, nor benefit, to building tracks in our town. If you could provide a reasonable explanation for all this, then yes - It would make sense. But I fail to see one. Adding a track wouldn't make any commutes faster or easier, and really that's all you're going for. What else would be the purpose? Perhaps to destroy our local National Historic Landmarks, one of which you plan to bulldoze? Or maybe you think that damaging our wetlands and preserves will be beneficial? Doing this under "eminent domain" is a lie as well. In order to use that, you 'd have to be benefiting our community. I'd like to see you explain how these railroads will do that. I can see you have really thought this plan through. The railroads are a great idea - that half an hour you can shave off of commutes definitely makes up for the horrific damage and actions you will complete in building them. Good job! Who needs such important historic monuments? We 're destroying them across the country anyway, right? Nothing lost here! I hope you can continue to come up with these absurd plans to destroy our history, so that you can build your unnecessary train tracks. After all, that's what we really need.
Hufford_El	I Strongly Apposed Alternative 1
Hufford_Fi	I am very upset to hear that you will be tearing down the Lyme Art Academy. My first reason is, how will cars and people be able to get through Lyme Street to get to the main road. When Halloween comes around that will be very dangerous for little children and teenagers to cross the railroad in the dark. My second point, is that many kids have gotten into the art show. For example, I have gotten in since 2nd grade and would like to continue. I am sure that goes for many other artists. Also, they are probably many kids who are interested in attending the Art Academy when they are older. Finally, the railroad is very close to the LOLMS and LOLHS. Therefore, distracting kids from learning. My sister and I, attend the middle school and high school and it will be very annoying to hear the trains go by every other hour. To conclude I think it is very detrimental to the town and community of Lyme-Old-Lyme adding a railroad and tearing down the Lyme Art Academy.
Hufford_Wa	Reject the proposed rail line thru Old Lyme - do not destroy one of the finest remaining examples of a New England town

Table JJ–29: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Old Lyme (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment
Hughes_Le	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.
Hunt Spak_Te	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.
Hunt_Fa	I adamantly oppose Alternative 1. This option not only rips a high-speed hole right through our town of Old Lyme but essentially much of the Connecticut Shoreline as well.
Hunt_Ka	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.
Hunt_Ke	Please say no to the train!
Hunter-Putsch_Sh	I oppose aAlternative 1. Of the Northeast Futures proposal because it will destroy the campus of Lyme Academy of Fine Arts of the University of New Haven. I am the former Vice President for Academic Affairs and Dean of the College for 13 years!
Huntley_Lo	I am emailing in opposition to the following: NEC Future's Alternative 1 which is an option presented for the Northeast Corridor that proposes to run new tracks from Old Saybrook to Kenyon, R.I. - including right near Interstate 95 in Old Lyme. ... The strength of this town is in its history and dedication to its preservation. The Art Colony at the Florence Griswold home, now a Museum, came to be because of this dedication; the American Tonalists and Impressionistic artists came here seeking to paint en plein aire in the Colonial Revival era the town cherished. ... I urge you to reconsider, and reject, NEC Future's Alternative 1.
Huntley_Wi	I am emailing in opposition to the following: NEC Future's Alternative 1 which is an option presented for the Northeast Corridor that proposes to run new tracks from Old Saybrook to Kenyon, R.I. - including right near Interstate 95 in Old Lyme. ... The strength of this town is in its history and dedication to its preservation. The Art Colony at the Florence Griswold home, now a Museum, came to be because of this dedication; the American Tonalists and Impressionistic artists came here seeking to paint en plein aire in the Colonial Revival era the town cherished. ... I urge you to reconsider, and reject, NEC Future's Alternative 1.
Hurley_Pa	I strongly oppose the new link through Old Lyme CT
Hurst_El	I have visited friends in Old Lyme many times, and have always been in love with its historic beauty. To slap a railroad through the middle for such little gain time and at such a cost seems to me to be the worst of ventures.
Hutchinson_Na	The proposed path of the new rail segment described in Alternate 1 for CT/RI would have a devastating impact on the Town of Old Lyme because it would run directly through the heart of this small, historic town, and bisect its Historic District... The NEC Future project must avoid the devastating impacts to the Cultural and Historic Properties in the Old Lyme Historic District and the Old Lyme town center that are proposed by Alternative 1.
Hyland_Ch	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.
Hyland_Ri	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_Br	I do not support alternative 1. It would destroy old Lyme and comes at too great of a cost (old Lyme art Academy, Florence Griswold, historic homes, etc). I am vehemently against it. We must protect our historic towns.
Ierardi_Jo	I oppose alternative option 1 because of its negative effect. On old Lyme And UNH.
Ierna_Al	As a former resident of Old Lyme for over 30 years and growing up on Lyme st, I consider this an absurd proposal. Ruining the integrity of a beautiful town, and endangering its residents.. To save such a small amount of time does not make sense, to destroy so much property.
Igelbrink_Ca	This is to express my strong opposition to the proposed plan.
Igelbrink_Ca	...there is an inadequate consideration of the economic costs associated with the proposed spur through the town of Old Lyme, which has a minimal economic base and must rely on its visual appeal to retirees, therefore making it essentially unviable.
Immordino_Pe	The Town of Old Lyme has many important historical buildings as well as one of the most advanced Congregational Churches, the membership of which includes Lowell Wiechert and many other famous individuals. We think that the plan to run the high speed rail through this town, sacrificing these buildings, would be a mistake.
Inglis_Al	This will be a complete disaster for our area Old Lyme-Lyme. Why not build a new route for Amtrak 20 miles north or route the rail through Hartford then East to Boston? We are fully developed and all of our towns are exactly the way they were before rails even came through. Why not make the rails move instead of the towns?
Irving_Er	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.
Isbell_Ma	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.
Israel_An	It would be criminal to destroy the town of Old Lyme for the proposed rail extension. This town is a piece of American history that you want to dessimate to shave hardly any time off a trip along the corridor, at an unbelievable cost. But the real cost would be the ruination of an historic hamlet. This must not be allowed. It is a symptom of greed and thoughtlessness and was proffered without any public forum which is in and of itself criminal.
Jackson_Ca	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.
Jackson_Ch	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.

Table JJ–29: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Old Lyme (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment
Jackson_Ka	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.
Jackson_MT	Dear FRA, alternative 1 seems an affront to the aesthetic nature of the Old Lymn area and the Connecticut River estuary. The I-91 industrial corridor would benefit extensively from rail access and so would the rail company. Do the right thing for the Old Lymn area and pick an alternative to #1.
Jackson_Wi	"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."
Jacobus_Le	I am totally apposed to the Alternative 1 of the planning of the rail project that will destroy the campus of the Lyme Academy of Art as well as damage the campus of the distinguished Florence Griswold Museum. You must find another path that will cause less destruction to one of Connecticut's most beautiful areas.
Jacques_Cl	"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."
Jafarian_Al	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.
James-Hart_Di	HOWEVER destroying the historic downtown area of Old Lyme, CT. for the sake of increasing speed of service; is unconscionable.
James-Hart_Di	And the fact this this was put into a plan without consulting town officials makes this option even more unbelievable.
Jamison_Am	Please do not consider Option #1- the towns that would be affected by the proposed new rail bridge across the Connecticut River are lovely, quaint and historic and would be greatly disfigured by additional train tracks!
Jasinski_Ke	" 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. "
Jason_Le	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.
Jean Hale_Ma	What is missing in your proposal is any engagement with the people encroached upon by your first proposal for OldLyme, Connecticut. I would like you to list for me just how you discussed these changes with the citizens of that lovely small town. This kind of behavior is just why so many people feel alienated by the government. It's a reality that comes home to roost, when in fact it is the citizens who pay the salaries of your organization. I urge you to rethink this. It is a fact that the rail system is outmoded, but the country has been built up around it, and this is what we are stuck with. By the way you need to do better that foisting off so called public meetings miles away from those who are impacted as samples of public opinion. Shame on you.
Jean-Baptiste_M	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.
Jennifer	"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." Please consider other alternatives that will help the fine arts school and the community.
Jermainne_Le	Please DO NOT proceed with plans to change the railroad bridge tracks over the CT River and through Old Lyme and surrounding towns! This is catastrophic!
Jess	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.
Jette_Su	As a resident of Old Lyme, I am submitting testimony in opposition to the Northeast Corridor Future Tier 1 Draft Environmental Impact Statement Alternative 1 proposal. ... Therefore I request that the proposed rail changes affecting Old Lyme be removed from Alternative 1 and I urge you to look at other solutions regarding improvements to the Northeast Corridor.
Jette_Su	Moving the Amtrack tracks inland through Old Lyme would have severe social and environmental impacts on our town. 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 Gruswold Museum , and the 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. I also cannot ignore the safety issue and concern for young members of our community that this proposal would create by moving the tracks into the village area. Many of our school aged children walk from school, meeting their caregivers at the library or other areas along the proposed route. This proposal would take away that feeling of safety that we have here in our community.
Jewett_An	I live in the center of Old Lyme and am opposed to Alternative 1.
Jewett_Em	Please do not destroy this incredible town and community by adding a new line through Old Lyme?
Jiseph_El	It is imperative that this new rail system not interfere with historic landmarks in Old Lyme, including the world famous Lyme Art Academy, of which I am an alumni. Alternate routes should be considered.
Joffray_Do	Do not ruin the historic town of Old Lyme with this plan
Joffray_Su	I can't believe that this plan for the railroad was produced with any understanding of the incredible damage it would do to the Town of Old Lyme and the wetlands and wildlife around the area. We retired to Old Lyme because it was the center of the Connecticut impressionists and has blossomed into a town with an art museum, art college, the oldest art association and a variety of fine galleries. It also is graced by the shoreline and several rivers which are filled with birds and wildlife. Roger Torrey Peterson lived here. An annual gathering of Tree Swallows over the river is a nation event. Please come here and visit this beautiful town, and you will see that destroying it would be a tragedy.
Johnson_Ab	This is ridiculous Stop

Table JJ–29: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Old Lyme (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment
Johnson_Da	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.
Johnson_Di	... we oppose a new rail path through the heart of our small town.
Johnson_Di	Audubon Connecticut's Stewart Hudson has submitted a letter that includes a chart of municipally owned Open Space along the corridor of the NEC EIS proposed alternatives, In addition to those included in the chart, the Town of Old Lyme has three Open Space parcels purchased with State of Connecticut, Nature Conservancy and municipal funds: Champlain North, Champlain South and Ames. These properties can be seen at http://www.mapgeo.com/OldLymeCT/ . Click on the Open Space layer. In addition, the Town holds a Conservation Easement on a portion of the property of Lyme Academy College, that is directly in the path of the proposed Old Lyme to Kenyon, R.I. Alternative 1.
Johnson_Do	I live in Old Lyme. I have heard very little about this proposed rail line going through our beautiful, quaint, historic town. I am outraged at the idea. I watched it on the news tonight and heard that it was supposed to save approximately one half hour for passengers by making a more direct rail line for higher speeds. That is an extremely small amount of time for the amount of damage it would do to so many people, places, and things. I also heard that there was no real consideration given to the environmental impact it would cause. I can't believe that anyone would spend that amount of money to gain one half hour off travel time and disrupt the lifestyle of so many people as well as not having any concerns regarding the ecological damage that would be caused by such an impact on the wildlife that depends on these areas. I also feel that this proposal has not been highly publicized in an effort to minimize public opposition. I strongly oppose any such changes to the rail line. This rail line has been in existence for years and people have managed just fine. The amount of money and the destruction that it would cause to make any of the proposed changes is immeasurable.
Johnson_Jo	This plan is unbelievably costly and not well thought out. The impact on communities and wildlife is in no way worth the small amount of time that would be saved by passengers by making a more direct route for trains to go faster. People have been living with this for years and have survived. This idea is tremendously costly in every way to so many people and the state in general. The losses that would be incurred are outrageous compared to the savings of a minute amount of time that would be realized. This is a tremendously poorly thought out idea. It also seems to be something that is trying to be pushed through without letting people really know how it would impact them until it was almost too late to even comment. It would destroy Old Lyme and the historic district as well as many businesses and landmarks. The cost to the environment would be huge as well. The rail system should be left the way it is. The cost is way too great in every area.
Johnson_Mi	I oppose proposed alternative 1 that will involve changes to the historic character of Old Lyme and hope that other options will be considered.
Johnson_Mi	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.
Johnson_Mo	" 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. "
Johnson_Na	Do not destroy the beauty of our Historical towns. Improve the rail lines already in existence.
Johnson_Re	I oppose option 1 of the northeast futures project as it will destroy the campus of the Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts of the University of New Haven.
Johnson_Ro	I strongly oppose the proposed construction running through the center of Old Lyme, CT.
Johnson_Sc	Old Lyme is one of the most preserved towns in the state ... Preserving the culture by strict building regulation. Protecting wildlife that thrives in the rivers, streams and salt marshes. To build this railroad would disrupt this town in so many ways. It would disfigured the towns image and sever it thriving ecosystem. Please vote no on continuation of this project, it simply should not be built.
Johnston_Am	I have lived in old Lyme my entire life and am the 4th generation to do so. We have decided to raise our family in the beautiful town because of its quaintness, the historic downtown of Lyme Street without the hustle and bustle. There is so much history in this town examples being the Lyme art academy, the Florence Griswold museum and the many original historic homes in this town make it what it is today as it has been for many generations. This train that is being proposed will ruin all of these qualities that this town has. I strongly oppose this from happening, I would hate for our future generations to not experience the tranquility this town has to offer. Please consider history, and community, that would be ruined forever if this went through.
Johnston_Sh	I am toldly against this proposal it will ruin the old town of old Lyme! I am for progress! This is terrible! Give the town a voice against this!
Jokl_To	I strongly oppose Alternative 1 of the NEC Future proposals.
Jones_Do	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.
Jones_Ja	This would be an abomination and a travesty to put this railway through the historical village of Old Lyme, closing a very special and rare gem of an art college and desecrating the 'sacred ground' American Art history. As an artist and alumni of the college I am deeply appalled that this could even be considered.
Jones_Sa	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.
Jose_Ka	This alternative 1 would be an absolute disaster for the state of Ct. It would economically, ecologically. and historically destroy one of our proudest communities. Already there is a train line that runs through this town. Certainly another option that is far less destructive can be decided upon!
Jose_Ro	I support smart and sensible high speed railroad development in the Northeast, but not at the cost associated with alternative 1 for Old Lyme, Ct....The town's character as we know it would be changed and damaged forever. The prime motivating factors for people to move to Old Lyme would disappear. The town would suffer untold hardships. I am opposed to Alternative 1.

Table JJ–29: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Old Lyme (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment
Jose_Ro	The Town of Old Lyme is situated on both the Ct. river and Long Island Sound and therefore has extensive environmentally sensitive areas along its western border on the Ct River estuary and Lieutenant River. The town and state have worked and continue to work arduously to protect these areas. Alternative 1 would change and damage these areas forever, the vistas, landscapes and waterways as we know them would be gone.
Joseph_Me	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.
Joy_Me	I am contacting you to make my opposition known to Alternat 1 proposal. Please count my vote towards the opposition of this proposal
Judith	Please revise the plan to have the railroad destroy the Old Lyme historic district! A rail line is already existing and please use it! Heritage is important even in this high speed age!
Junga_Ra	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.
Jungkeit_Ra	I think replacing the CT River Bridge is a safe and sensible idea...
Jungkeit_Ra	...I think that building or rerouting the tracks and ripping up parts of these Shoreline towns is thoughtless....Please put more thought into an effective rail system that actually meets the mass transport needs of more people.
Jungkeit_St	One of the versions of the plan cuts directly through the center of Old Lyme, and it would simply destroy properties, grounds, and ecological areas that make this town beautiful, and unique. Please consider a less destructive alternative.
Junyao_Yu	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.
Kahl_Mi	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.
Kahn_Am	I oppose Tier 1 Draft Environmental Statement. This would kill the beauty, economy and citizens of this historic area.
Kammrath_Br	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.
Kapinos_St	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."
Karimi_Bi	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.
Karter_El	Alternative 1 that would run through the heart of the small town of Old Lyme CT would destroy our town. It would be much easier to run the tracks around the town farther north.
Kasliw_Di	I am totally opposed to the plan to build a rail line through historic Old Lyme. This would be like running a train line through Wiklismsburg, VA. Old Lyne is extremely historic and relevant to American art history. Please do not do this!
Kasmin_Ka	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.
Kaufman_Al	Alternative One would destroy a uniquely beautiful, historic town and the birthplace of American Impressionism. Please find another way to achieve the rail. (commentor lives in Lyme, CT)
Kautz_Ka	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 because it would endanger federally protected areas of the Connecticut River estuary.
Keeley_Li	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!
Keenan_Pa	"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."
Kelleher_Ca	I think the drawbacks vastly outweigh the benefits. Please abandon this idea of high speed rails in CT.
Kelley_Jo	We oppose Alternative 1 role of rail service through Old Lyme, CT.
Kelly_Be	no!!! What a crazy idea when the train already has usable track that creates the prettiest ride from old saybrook to providence ri. It would be devastating to old lyme
Kelly_Jos	I am opposed to Alternative 1 as it would destroy the Town of Old Lyme. Our Historic District and business district are important to the continued success of this community and that plan would ruin the town and future property values.
Kelly_Joh	I oppose Alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridor Futures proposal
Kennally_Li	Please do not opt for Option 1. Old Lyme is a beautiful, residential, historic area. Thank you.
Kenny_Ma	I am totally opposed to Alternative 1 as it would destroy the environment of our beautiful, small, historic town.
Kent_E	I do not support the high speed rail through the Old Lyme Historic District. Our beautiful towns need preservation!
Kenyon_Br	While an additional track between Old Saybrook and Kenyon RI may be appropriate to help relieve congestion, we strongly object to a route which would impact the historic district of Old Lyme. This town is a New England treasure which should not be "run over" by a railroad.

Table JJ–29: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Old Lyme (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment
Keogh_Ci	This plan will ruin our beautiful town [Old Lyme], I am totally against this change.
Keogh_Th	Please take Alternative 1 off the table. It will destroy our beautiful town.
Kerr_Ch	I am just voicing my opposition of the Alternate ! plan for the new rail system through the town of Old lyme
Kiely_Sa	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.
Kindel_De	The new railway alternative #1 will destroy the charm of Old Lyme. The government has already ploughed through the southeastern Connecticut shoreline with the existing railway and I-95, ibscuring the beautiful water views and splitting townsand cities. Try going further inland if you must, but stop destroying the natural and historic blessings of the Connecticut shoreline.
King_Am	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.
Kirk_Co	Please do not do anything that would hamper the work of Lyme Academy it has been an essential unique part of many artists. It would a pity to loose such a gem.
Kirkpatrick_Ga	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.
Klarnet_Ka	I vehemently object to the plan I happen to know the most about as it runs RIGHT THROUGH THE tiny, HISTORIC village of Old Lyme, the sole, barely adequate, essential commercial resource for the mostly retired, fixed income inhabitants on the east side of the Connecticut River. This plan is absolutely unacceptable by every environmental, civic and demographic standard.
Klarnet_Ka	You can consider this my comment. Only I wouldn't have been so polite: "In the space of just a few short weeks, the residents of Old Lyme have become aware of a menace in their..." As published in LymeLine.com on Feb. 11 by Olwen Logan.
Klein_D	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.
Klemenz_Ti	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.
Klimas_Pa	STOP. Leave this historic area alone NO need
Klimczak_Ja	I THINK THE PLAN FOR A NEW RR TRACK COMING THRU THE HISTORICAL DISTRICT OF OLD LYME IS INSANE.
Klinck_St	Alternative 1 would devastate our community going right through the center of town.
Knauff_Gr	As residents of Old Lyme, Connecticut, we oppose the plan and request that the Federal Railroad Administration immediately take Alternative 1 out of consideration as a means to update the Northeast Corridor rail service. We oppose Alternative 1 for several reasons. First, Alternative 1 does not take into consideration the historical impact on the Town of Old Lyme, a small New England town rich in history and culture. Old Lyme has been deliberately preserved for future generations who should have opportunities to see and learn about important historical figures and events. The Alternative 1 plan would create a new railway that would destroy the rich history and character of our community. Second, Alternative 1 would have a devastating environmental impact on Old Lyme. The proposed path of the new railway would ruin marshes, rivers and wetlands that have been carefully preserved for future generations. While we believe in progress and understand the need for improvements in the northeast corridor, there is also an obligation to limit the environmental impact of such progress. Alternative 1 does not create a responsible environmental plan and should not be considered.
Knauff_Gr	Third, the citizens in the towns affected by Alternative 1 were not given sufficient or reasonable notice about the existence of the NEC study and its affect on the communities in southeastern Connecticut. The Old Lyme First Selectwoman was not notified of the NEC Future Study, notice to the public was less than minimal, and there were no public hearings in the towns along the Alternative 1 sector that includes the Town of Old Lyme. The closest opportunity for comment was a hearing in Hartford, almost an hour away from our community. For these reasons alone, Alternative 1 cannot be considered a viable alternative and should be eliminated from consideration.
Knight_Ma	"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."
Knight_Ra	I oppose Alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridor Future proposals because it will destroy the campus of Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts of the University of New Haven.
Knight_We	I oppose Alternative 1 of the NEC FUTURE Tier 1 Draft EIS
Knobelsdorff_Ka	I found out that the possible route for the railroad would go right through the Lyme Academy of Fine Art campus. It would be very sad to lose such a unique and special school. I attended there in the late 80s and continue to take part in school activities. Please consider finding an alternate route that would not destroy such a great school.
Knowlton_Dr	I would oppose Alternative 1 on all levels.
Koch_Er	Thank you for the opportunity to express our thoughts and concerns regarding the proposed Alt. #1 plan and its impact on the Town of Old Lyme and the surrounding areas....we cannot support Alt. #1
Kohan_Cy	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 also oppose this plan as it will destroy one of the most scenic and historic towns in Connecticut.

Table JJ–29: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Old Lyme (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment
Kohan_Ti	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.
Kohn_Ly	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.
Koif_Ni	There surely are less destructive solutions.
Koif_Va	DO NOT CUT THROUGH OLD LYME, CT (Alt.#1). This is the HOME OF AMERICAN IMPRESSIONISM and is part of our NATIONAL HERITAGE in Art. A railway through the heart of this iconic small town would destroy the town as well as a national treasure.
Kolber_St	There is no doubt that the proposed Old Saybrook to Kenyon Bypass would destroy the Town of Old Lyme, its historical buildings and sites, and lay waste to the fragile ecosystem of riverine marshes and wetlands and their associated wildlife of the area. To what end?
Konno-Leonffu_Ka	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 am an Alumni of the University of New Haven, but have also taken many college credited courses at the Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts while I worked as an animator and art director for many years. It would be a real shame to put such a fine arts educational institution in danger. The proposed Alternative 1of the Northeast Corridor Futures proposal would put the students in danger and would also destroy the beautiful and peaceful setting in which they create their amazing artwork. The fine arts being created at the Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts is on par with the best art schools in big cities like New York City. I know, I am a graduate of Pratt Institute in NYC. Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts is a wonderful gem and asset not only to Old Lyme, but to all of Connecticut as well. Please look at other possible alternatives instead of putting this wonderful CT asset in jeopardy.
Koptonak_Im	Please DO NOT destroy our little town by putting a rail line the ought the heart of Old Lyme. To destroy the commercial and historic districts of our town for the rail line is unfair, unwise and unjust.
Koral_Ja	Ple4ase do not build a new rail bridge between the existing rail bridge and the Baldwin Bridge, cutting through Old Lyme.
Koral_Ja	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.
Korsmeyer_RR	We are strongly opposed to Alternative 1, which routes the NEC straight through the historic heart of Old Lyme.
Korst_Ji	We have read about the proposal for adding a new railroad bridge between the existing rail bridge and the Baldwin Bridge (Alternative 1) through the town of Old Lyme. We are very much opposed to this plan.
Korst_Ji	Old Lyme is a beautiful town with emphasis on historical architecture and a 4-year accredited Art Academy, as well as the nationally known Florence Griswold Museum, a National Landmark. This proposed plan would destroy the character of the town and the opportunities for tourism which is very important for the State of Connecticut.
Kosmina_Ja	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.
Kotnik_Mo	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.
Koty_St	I am against Alternative 1 because of the environmental effect new construction will cause along the Ct/RI shoreline.
Krall_El	The Lyme Art Academy is one of the few traditional and academic fine art institutions in the country. It serves college students as well as the community. Bisecting the campus will destroy it. There must be another way to add a rail system without destroying the school.
Krall_Ph	I oppose any change to the route of the rail line. We should focus on improving the existing line. The future is likely to bring a decline in physical travel and more efficient use of the roads.
Krasney_El	Please note that I am voicing my opposition to Alternative #1 for the current rail upgrade proposal.
Krasney_El	To sacrifice our arts and historical buildings, drive through the heart of the educational area of our city, and destroy the wetland habitat is appalling.
Kratzert_Se	Please don't go through with this!
Kuhn_As	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.
Kuhn_Le	I would not like to see the high speed rail project take place. I rent a beach house in old lyme yearly and love the town just the way it is. not necessary to have it. we have Amtrak already
Kunstadt_Ca	The significant enrichment to the history, arts and culture of CT. is at risk! 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 community of Lyme is shallow and empty without institutions such as this one which brings an extended population to the town as well as being a direct connection to its wonderful past.
Kuppelmeyer_Lo	I oppose the Alternative 1 of the FRA's Northeast Corridor Futures proposal. I believe it will destroy the beauty of the area.
Kurpaska_Do	My family has liver on Old Lyme since 1965. This plan would destroy the very definition of Old Lyme. We have a small commercial area and historic downtown district. They would be decimated. Not to mention the impact on sensitive ecological areas. We treasure the feeling and quiet of this town. I believe every resident will physically block this project if it even resembles it's current path.

Table JJ–29: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Old Lyme (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment
Kurtz Lansing_Am	The proposed new rail section between Old Saybrook, CT, and Rhode Island would have a devastating effect on the town of Old Lyme, CT...
Kurtz Lansing_Am	...town of Old Lyme, CT, whose Historic District would be largely obliterated by the new construction. This area is on the National Register of Historic Places, and the adjacent Florence Griswold Museum is a National Historic Landmark. It is hard to comprehend that in the aftermath of the devastating effect on our historic fabric wrought by the construction of interstates in the 1960s, that we seem to have learned nothing and find ourselves back in the same position today. Old Lyme is a small, historic town that attracted artists to form an art colony there at the turn of the twentieth century. What a blow to that legacy to construct a huge railroad bridge and set of tracks that would necessitate the tearing down of the historic buildings that attracted the artists. Much of the town's economic vitality as a tourist attraction depends on this historic connection. And the impact on the Lower Connecticut River estuary will be devastating as well.
Labrecque_Da	"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."
LACFA_Petition	Stop Alternative One from destroying the quality of life In Old Lyme. The proposed new rail lines will: # Destroy homes and businesses # Damage and significantly change the Lyme Art Academy College, Lyme Art Association, Florence Griswold Museum # Negatively impact our schools, our library and a large segment of our Historic District # Forever harm and alter privately owned real estate and rights # Destroy wetlands, open space and natural resources
LACFA_Tagliatela	On behalf of the Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts Board of Trustees, I write in opposition to the proposed NEC Futures Alternative 1 high-speed rail expansion project.
LACFA_Tagliatela	Foremost from the institution's perspective, alternative 1 will destroy the entire campus of the Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts. The mission of Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts is to educate aspiring artists through a rigorous studio curriculum rooted in figurative and representational art, an important and unique educational mission that is embraced at only a few select institutions in the county. Additionally, the John Sill House, 1817~ located on the Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts property, and immediately in the path of the rail proposal, has been documented by both the Colonial Dames's book, "Old Houses of Connecticut," 1915, the WPA "census of old buildings in Connecticut," 1938 and again in 1985, the Historic American Buildings Survey by the National Park Service. The building would be destroyed under alternative 1... Alternative 1 also bisects the historic town of Old Lyme, a town that is on the National Register of Historic Places...
LACFA_Tagliatela	Looking to a broader context of the proposal and the area, alternative 1 will have deleterious effects on the local environment of the CT River Estuary and Lieutenant River...
LACFA_Tagliatela	Finally, from an even broader perspective, it seems that for the state of Connecticut and travelers coming to this entire region, Alternative 2 provides more flexibility and expansion of high-speed rail services to inland locations like Hartford, CT, and between Hartford and Providence, RI. The existing rail corridor along Connecticut's coastline must be preserved and upgraded but serves the local areas quite well and efficiently.
LaConti_Ca	This proposal will decimate the Connecticut shoreline - the one main tourist attraction in the state. Historic homes and museums that are among the oldest in the country will be destroyed. This also spells trouble for the already suffering economy. Additionally, we have significant concerns about the environmental impact of such a plan. We vote no!
Lacourciere_Ow	This email is in regard to the NEC Future Alternative One Project that affects Old Lyme, CT. As a resident of the town, I strongly oppose this initiative and respectfully request your consideration in eliminating this course of action from your plans. Thank you,
Lacourciere_Ra	We are writing this letter to respectfully urge you to cease any developing plans for the proposed rail through the center of Old Lyme, CT. The town center is home to many historical landmarks, quaint shops, and unique tourist destinations. We strongly oppose any plan that would disrupt and/ or destroy the downtown that so many people have worked to build and maintain for many years. By changing the charm of our historical New England town, this plan would potentially harm both the environment and the local economy. Thank you for listening to our opinions and we ask that you keep them in mind when moving forward.
LaGambina_Jo	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.
Lahm_Da	I am writing to you to oppose the commuter rail line that has been proposed to run from Old Saybrook, Connecticut to Kenyon, Rhode Island.
Lahm_Da	Of course then there is the issue of location of the tracks. The proposed pathway looks more like the roller-coaster at an amusement park than a serious mass transit proposal. Build a rail bridge diagonally across the Connecticut River from close to the current rail bridge on the West Bank to almost the Baldwin Bridge on the Old Lyme side? From the air this will look like some giant Zorro has left his mark on the mouth of the Connecticut River. The piers and pilings will ruin a pristine recreational boating area. Further inland the path somehow jumps I95 at approximately the Lyme Art Academy. The structure to carry a train over the highway will be enormous and be over sixty feet tall. Not to mention the approach structures. Unlike roller-coasters real trains do not deal well with sharp inclines. The ramp for this overpass would have to start at the river bank and be in the range of 120 feet wide. Just the first mile and a half of this project lays waste to the character of the South Eastern Connecticut Shoreline.
Lamb_Cy	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.
Lamberto_Ki	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.
Lambrecht_Sc	You are nuts. Sacrifice the charm of this town? I can't believe the thought process with the federal railroad commission. This ain't New York
LaMesa_Sa	I can only assume after a long day someone simply drew a line on a map to get themselves home quickly. Alternative one would destroy a swath of Connecticut and New England history in Old Lyme, CT. Please reconsider this travesty blithely called Alternative 1.
Lander_An	I am opposed to the proposed Alternate A rail line. ... Recently it has come to light that a new rail line may beconstructed through this area destroying our town. From the moment the line crosses theConnecticut River and it will be destroying numerous homes as it continues fromthe river to the other side of the town. It will also be destroying commercial establishments and as I understandit our transfer station. It will foreverchange this town, OUR TOWN! It will not be a community that attracts tourists, tourists interested in art and culture.

Table JJ–29: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Old Lyme (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment
Lander_Ma	Bad, bad, bad, at least as far as Old Lyme CT is concerned. A third bridge across the Connecticut River? Bad!. Tracks laid through the heart of Old Lyme's officially designated historic district? Bad! Likely necessity of using I 95 for construction access? Bad! Wiping out the Old Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts along with several historic houses? Bad! This project would kill the Historic District of Old Lyme. I am writing this as a private citizen who lived much of his life in Old Lyme, who still owns property there and who has the unique perspective on this as Co-Chair of the Old Lyme Historical Society.
Lander_Ma	I have already signed a letter, as an officer of the local historical society, from several town organizations opposing alternative 1. I am now contacting you as a long-time, former, resident of Old Lyme and present taxpayer. I see nothing good about this proposal.
Lander_Ma	The CT River does not need a third bridge in a half-mile (have the Coast Guard and Army Corps of Engineers been brought into this?), there would be severe environmental repercussions for the railroad crossing wetlands and forests. The historic district would be sliced in half by what can only be an industrial looking embankment or trestle, the now world-famous Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts of the University of New Haven would be lost forever along with its primary building, the 200 year-old Sill House, one of Old Lyme's architectural treasures. The almost mile-wide impact zone would forever affect the town with noise and even the years-long construction project itself would create untenable noise, dirt and dust, wear and tear on local roads as well as on the already burdened I 95.
Lander_Ma	I am further bothered by the process up to this point. No one seems to have been made aware of this until a matter of a few weeks ago- no public announcements, no meetings, no information to state and local officials. ...I ask you to provide an opportunity for local residents to be heard in a meeting and then to reconsider this proposal which offers nothing to Old Lyme except negative consequences.
Lane_An	Alternative 1 is ridiculous. To upgrade an out of date, expensive, dilapidated railroad system in the northeast corridor by destroying historical towns because it's cheaper is absurd. If the Federal government is serious about upgrading its antiquated system then do it right. I have no confidence our government can do any major capital project right and any alternative that may be chosen will be rife with cost overruns, delays and disappointing results. Just look at the Acela plan vs actuality. I am not in favor of Alternative 1. It will destroy the fabric of our town. Where the existing tracks are in Old Lyme are not on the water and do not impact historical neighborhoods. CT's governor is already driving corporations out of CT. Don't drive long standing residents out too. The plan is short sighted and ill conceived.
Lane_Li	This proposed railway would be horrific to Old Lyme. Please do not let this happen to our beautiful town.
Lane_Li	Also I feel the property value here in Old Lyme will be compromised greatly.
Lane_Te	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.
Lang_Su	This can't be! That you are considering blasting through close to our beloved First Congregational Church of Old Lyme, the most photographed and the most painted church in the US! The quiet town where artists have come for years, because the light is so unusual, no matter the time of day. Where hundreds paddle the Lt. River, enjoying the pristine scenery with rustling grasses and osprey feeding their young. The Old Lyme route is not the best alternative. It's the worst, for the character of the town, for the history of the town, for the welfare of the town. Who would want to buy close to the new railroad?
Langley_Ch	I vote No on Alternative 1. I am a resident of Old Lyme CT, Alt. 1 would affect our town in a negative manner. Building new lines through our historical district and through natural wildlife habitats would be detrimental. We've already had multiple deaths from Amtrak trains in our town, we don't want to increase this risk. Our town gets a lot of tourism from our academy and museums, the building of the lines and the lines themselves would change the existing buildings that bring in tourism and education opportunities to our town. We already have issues with summer population congesting our I-95 corridor which in turn congest our only road through town, I feel that the addition of a rail line would only increase congestion.
Langlois_St	I " VEHEMENTLY 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."
Lanteri_Mi	The population will be dropping in the northeast with all the baby boomers retiring and getting out of New England so why do it now? Every one I know as soon as they retire they leave Ct. I cant imagine Boston being any different. I know I am dying to leave. Our school population is even dropping in Old Lyme and we are now stuck paying for a new high school.
Lantz_Ke	I am absolutely against this plan. It would devastate the town of Old Lyme in many regards. Preserving the history, charm and the business community is what this town is all about. This rail would take all of that away.
LaRocca_Ja	this plan would devastate a small town for the sake of saving a few minutes of time travel.....the costs of construction, environmental impact and social destruction far out weigh the current transportation that is currently in place....planners need to rethink this plan and find an alternative rather than rip through the center of our community.
Larocca_Ka	Old Lyme is a beautiful, quiet, oceanside town rich with history and timeless, picturesque beauty. American Impression began in the Lyme area because so many painters and artists flocked to capture these sunlit mashes and light-speckled forests. I strongly encourage you to reconsider the location of these train tracks and do not disturb Old Lyme with new industry and developments. I spent 4 wonderful years at Lyme Academy and my family owns a beach house along the Lyme coast. Preserve the peace, the beauty and the environment; do not build.
Laroche_Da	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.
Laroche_Ke	I strongly oppose Alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridor Futures proposal. This alternative will destroy the campus of Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts of the University of New Haven.
Larson_Eli	Old Lyme is a national gem. Nature and man fashioned us to be an iconic New England shoreline town with a setting rich in beauty and culture. With sand bars at the mouth of the Connecticut River, it was never destined to be a port city, but, instead, became the home of sea captains, agriculture, and the home of American Impressionism! It would be terrible to run the railroad right through this historic village.
Larson_Eli	The map and information you provided to us so late in this process are not specific enough to actually help us understand exactly where the rail would run, so how can we respond other than in the negative?

Table JJ–29: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Old Lyme (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment
Larson_Eli	Old Lyme is a national treasure. Nature and man have made it a beautiful, iconic New England coastal gem, a center of culture and historic homes. Surely we can address the transportation needs without destroying the nature of this special place.
Larson_St	Please do not cut through the heart of Old Lyme CT and Lyme Academy with the current Amtrack expansion plan. Doing so would destroy efforts spanning the lifetimes of several generations which have made this area a unique cultural oasis.
Lasser_Jo	This is a terrible idea that will wreck the social and economic fabric specifically of Old Lyme and will have serious negative impact on, at the very least, all the surrounding communities, if not all the communities in Connecticut along the northeast corridor.
Laudano_Da	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.
Laurence_Ch	I am NOT for the plan that wants to bring the rail system through the town of Old Lyme. We have a designated Historic District & a world class museum. This would drastically impact those two entities
LaViola_Jo	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.
Lawless_Da	Alternative 1 is an abomination! It would destroy Old Lyme-one of the most beautiful towns in New England. Do NOT pass Alternative 1.
Layton_Sa	I strongly oppose the railway being constructed along the shoreline in Connecticut, especially through Old Lyme's historic district. I was raised in Old Lyme and after leaving for several years, I moved back to the area and now work in Old Lyme. This area is such a special and unique place with a long history, and constructing a high-speed railway through the center of it will have disastrous effects on the unique historic elements of the town, as well as the tourism that feeds this small beach town in the summer.
Lazare_Ma	Old Lyme is an elegant residential community. Extending a noisy railroad through this suburban area would destroy the historic nature and atmosphere.
Lebel_Ry	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.
Lebovitz-Miller_Em	The proposal to route AmTrak high speed trains in the northeast corridor through Old Lyme is horrible. The center of Old lyme is a pristine village that has maintained it's serene nineteenth century character. The proposal to bring trains through the center would destroy its character. Technology and greed have destroyed much of the natural beauty of this country. The need to shave a few minutes off a train ride should not be the cause of destroying a village like Old Lyme. I would urge all who participate in this decision to visit The center of Old Lyme, stroll along Lyme street, take in the beauty of the remaining architectural gems and gardens, and listen to the birds before making a decision that could irreversibly destroy such a historic location.
Lechause_Wi	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.
Lee_De	Sadly, though, Alternative 1 will not benefit to those of us living here in southeastern CT, especially in the Old Lyme area. In fact, our quality of life would surely decline as a result of the loss of so many of our community's assets. The geographic, geologic and historical significance of this community should merit more consideration, as should the human beings living here. There will undoubtedly be more pragmatic comments made by others than mine; but, please consider my heartfelt concerns for our quality of life.
Lee_La	I would like to express my deep concern about the possibility of Alternative 1 actually moving forward. That plan would devastate much of the business and historic sections of Old Lyme. We don't have much to begin with and running a rail line right through the middle of it is a ludicrous idea.
Lee_Ry	...the proposed railway would cut right through the middle of everything ...and that includes the intangible sentiment of what the center of Old Lyme means to people, and has meant to our residents for hundreds of years.
Leeson_Pe	I strongly oppose the Plan me to reroute the train tracks through Old Lyme and the river and marsh area. I would think that in light of rising sea waters a more inland route would make much more sense.
Lefurge_Ma	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.
Leger_Ma	NOT through the Historic District of Old Lyme. This should not even be a consideration. ... Having commuted many years to Manhattan aboard MetroNorth I vote absolutely NO to any proposal for train tracks that traverse any part of historic Old Lyme.
Leger_Ma	Is the benefit (minutes gained) worth the loss of natural environment and history?
Lehman_Er	I urge you to change your route for the high speed rail so that it does not impact the Connecticut River estuary, and does not require the Lyme Art Academy campus to be destroyed. As a historian and constant booster of Connecticut and our quality of life, I am shocked, quite frankly, that such a plan would be approved at all. Find another way.
Leimgruber_Je	I can't imagine a more horrible thought than destroying one of the most beautiful, vibrant, natural bits of the shoreline with yet more train infrastructure. Old Lyme is home to wild birds and other wildlife and MUST NOT be destroyed like so many other CT Shorline towns... No no no no
Leistman_Ma	It is your responsibility to inform the public of how you intend to spend our dollars on such projects and yet I have heard very little about it nor opportunities for public response hence this email.
Lemaire_Ja	O 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.

Table JJ–29: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Old Lyme (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment
Lender_An	"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."
Lenhart_Ma	The highways and railways should be built inland, where they don't have to curve the shore, go over a dozen bridges, and are subject to flooding. Now they want to rip through the historical and cultural charm of the shore as well. Just proves once again that the state ignores the quality of life in southeastern Connecticut. Route it through Hartford.
Lenihan_Pa	The Tier 1 impact proposal demonstrates lack of clear thought of planning for the immediate and future impact to the town of Old Lyme and the state of Connecticut.
Lennard_Ka	It would devalue Old Lyme beyond measure.
Leonardo_St	The Tier 1 Draft EIS is the worst idea I have ever heard. Old Lyme is a historic district that is an important hub for cultural events and is an area that brings tourists to the region. Let's not forget that it's an area with schools and homes that this horrible plan will adversely affect the citizens that reside and visit here. Destroying a populated town for a train is shortsighted and a terrible idea. Whoever came up with this ridiculous plan obviously never came to the area to see the lovely town they are planning on destroying. I highly suggest you come up with a new plan that actually makes sense, because this one should have never been considered in the first place.
Levin_J	We live in the village of Old Lyme and didn't know of the NEC FUTURE's horrific plans for our town until a few days ago. Your intention of ruining an historic village is unthinkable. Please, please consider another alternative.
Levy_El	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.
Lewis_Na	I am opposed to the proposal as it will destroy the campus of Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts.
Lewis_St	I oppose Alternative 1 of the NE Corridor Futures proposal because it will destroy the campus of the Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts of the University of New Haven.
Liang_Ji	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.
Licht_Ni	" 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. "
Lidstrom_Jo	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.
Ligon_La	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.
Lincoln_Pa	Please reconsider any plans to use the shorelines especially in Old Lyme for rail system proposals through the art campus.
Lindholm_El	I am opposed to having a railroad go through the UNH satellite campus in Old Lyme, CT.
Lipeika_Ka	Please do not put alternative 1 Rail line in downtown Old Lyme and ruin our historical landmarks.
Lipp_Ka	Please don't consider redirecting Amtrak through the historic area of Old Lyme. If the contract had originally gone to UTC and the proposed turbo train that would have been made here in America instead of the electric powered Acela built in France, this would not be an issue. The views of the water would never have been impacted and the speeds of the trains would have been faster.
Listorti_Jo	While I am in favor of improved rail service in the area including old Lyme, ct, I am NOT in favor of the destruction of historic buildings, etc that are part of the proposed Alternative 1.
Littlefield_Da	Tier 1 is a bad idea! It would gut the economic district of Old Lyme and would due damage to the local environment. Also it would damage the historic district and change the culture of t town. It would destroy a town that is nearly 400 years old. Stop the stupidity. Stop the rail plan of Tier 1.
LLanos_Al	"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."
Lofstad_La	I strongly oppose alternative I plan which would go right though the heart of Old Lyme CT and the heart of the residents of this town. Our history and culture would be destroyed. This community has long been an important art destination and the home of American Impressionism. History and culture should be preserved at all cost. Do you really need to destroy our town for the sake of saving 30 minutes? Yes train travel is important and surely there are other alternative routes that will not destroy our town. Look to Europe, they mange to have high speed railroads without destroying history and culture. Thank you for considering my opinion.
Logan_Ol	I strongly oppose the NEC Future Alternative #1.
Lomasky_Le	Rail is already heavily subsidized and there are few to no railroads that have stayed solvent, despite this tax aid. To use these subsidies to further increase the presence of expensive infrastructure, while destroying landmarks, such as the UNH art school in Old Lyme is unconscionable. Please do not undertake this project. Rail has been a financial dead end in countless countries around the world. If this project did not require subsidization and was part of a company that didn't require subsidies and would not result in terrible destruction of cultural assets, it would be another story, but, as it stands, this appears to be a fool's errand.
Long_A	As a frequent rail traveler along the Northeast corridor, I am aware that improvements to service are certainly needed -- but not at the expense of an historic town. The proposed plan to situate expanded high speed rail lines through Old Lyme, CT must NOT be accepted.
Long_Da	The plan to run the railroad directly through the heart of Old Lyme,CT would destroy the town, the Art Academy, Florence Griswold Museum and many fine homes not the mention the environmental impacts. Old Lyme is a town of historic value good back to fifteen years after the Mayflower landed in the 1600's. We citizens of Old Lyme can not let this happen.

Table JJ–29: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Old Lyme (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment
Long_Ma	Please do not send this rail through our history, especially the Lyme Academy.
Lord_Pa	I oppose Alternative A because of the impact to downtown Old Lyme and several important museums there.
Lovejoy_Ti	I am writing to tell you that I M against Alternative 1, the adding of high speed tracks from Old Saybrook, through -- and I mean right through Old Lyme -- to New London and Mystic
Lower_Wi	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.
Lu_Ma	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.
Lubrano_Li	I oppose Alternative 1 of the NE Corridor Futures proposal because it would destroy Lyme Academy College of Fine Art.
Luce_Ja	Having grown up in Old Lyme, it would be heart breaking to have such a beautiful historical town, the birth place of American Impressionism, be carved up by a new rail system. The town would surely loose its unique character if a new rail line were to be built through the center of town. I am against the proposal 100% and hope and pray in never happens. The transportation gains, in my opinion,are dubious, are far outweighed by the desires of the town people to preserve Old Lyme like it has always been.
Ludington_Ka	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.
Ludington_To	Concerning the proposal for a NEC egment that would run almost exactly through the center of Old Lyme, CT, I can see no necessity for that exact location. One should note that the location would harm a small, historic village which brings many visitors to the town and region. Please, please rethink the proposal
Luering_Er	I cannot believe that you would destroy a picturesque New England village that is historical in nature yet vibrant still. This is where the fine art painters of American Impressionism started. Plowing through an abandoned mill town is understandable, but this is ridiculous and an insult to the people who cherish this historic place for many reasons, not the least of which that it supports an active art colony and Fine Arts College to this day. This is paramount to destroying assets for no apparent reason, except for just because I can . Please rethink your project. We MUST hold our history and the archeological importance sacred.
Lukens_Ja	Please eliminate Option 1 from your consideration, as the slight improvement in travel time provided by a high speed rail in the NE sector is no justification for the destruction of the beautiful coastal village of Old Lyme which is such an important part of the history of the arts in our country.
Luna_Br	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.
Lundy_Je	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.
Lussier_Ka	Any plan that places a rail line through the center of Old Lyme must be reconsidered.
Lussier_Ka	To do so would ruin not only the environment but the very character of one of the most charming towns in the northeast.
Lyman_Ch	Alternative 1 looks like a disaster. It will cut through both the the historic and commercial districts of Old Lyme, CT, damaging wetlands along the way.
Lyman_Ch	I cannot understand why this proposal has been sprung on the community (Old Lyme) with so little warning.
M	not to add more lines in Old Lyme, CT
M_Ca	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.
MacClintock_Do	"As a former student of the LACFA, I strongly 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. "
MacDonald_Ka	I fear this plan (Tier 1) will decimate the Town of Old Lyme and significantly impact our shoreline neighbors. It does not take into account the cultural and economic impact to our town and its residents.
MacDonald_Ka	I am disturbed that the plan was released with no conversation with our local officials and feel that the comment period is not sufficient for residents, businesses and environmental organizations to have time to review this huge, complex document and make an appropriate response.
Machado_La	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.
Machnik_Da	We do not need or want this track through the heart of our historical town find another way!
Machnik_Jo	We do not need or want this track through the heart of our historical town find another way!
Mackay_Da	No state is more impacted than Connecticut in each of the proposed Alternatives... You could not possibly pick a more intrusive and disruptive route for high speed rail than what you've currently proposed for Old Lyme under Alternative 1. Our concern is that other new routes and right of way across Connecticut would be similarly disruptive for historic and environmental resources in other Connecticut communities.

Table JJ–29: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Old Lyme (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment
Mackay_Da	we have already co-signed comments submitted by a diverse partnership of organizations focused on Old Lyme, Connecticut. These comments reflect grave concerns for the proposed new rail crossing of the Connecticut River between Old Saybrook and Old Lyme, and the resultant impact on historic, cultural and environmental resources of national and international import.
Mackey_Ca	As a 35 year resident of Old Lyme CT, I strongly oppose Alternative 1, which would ruin our historic small town. Also, as a frequent rider of the train, I don't believe any of these alternatives are necessary at all!! It is a waste of money!!
Mackin_De	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." Not to mention the Florence Griswold Museum. Also my daughter has been employed at the Old Lyme Inn for quite a few years. The Inn is a beautiful historic Inn. There is so much history and charm in this area there surely must be an alternative route. This plan would also greatly affect the natural balance of the estuaries and wooded areas. I HIGHLY OPPOSE this plan.
MacKinnon_Ma	i am vehemently opposed to the proposed rail line through the midfle of bucolic Old Lyme. There has to be a way to use existing rail corridors to get a hi speed rail dine without destroying our towns.
Madappanahalli_Ak	" 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. "
Maffucci_Ja	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.
Mager_Gu	"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."
Magnussen_Ja	The proposed track through Old Lyme would be an absolute disaster for the towns historical district, shopping center and the Art Academy. I cannot urge you enough to find another solution.
Magnussen_Kr	The price of progress in updating the rail lines is not worth the loss of the home of American Impressionism-Old Lyme CT.
Magnussen_Kr	Everything about this plan was underhanded as the town government and citizens of Old Lyme knew nothing about this until just recently.
Mahar_Br	"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."
Main_Ed	I grew up in Old Lyme, CT, and my father (age 93) still resides at the address listed below. We are shocked and dismayed to find out that the center of our historic town would even be considered for a rail route. Perhaps the designers of the proposal have never walked where the tracks would go?
Maits_Sc	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... 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.
Majors_For	Alternative one looks like it will be detrimental to Old Lyme and it's historic district for very little improvement in the corridor.
Malaguti_Je	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.
Malaguti_Je	I would like this project to pause and be brought to the public, especially local communities before moving forward at all.
Malchodi_Th	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.
Malcolm_De	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!
Malewicki_De	"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."
Malhotra_Ak	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.
Malicka_An	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.
Mallory_Di	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... 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.
Mallory_Di	I stand with my town in opposing Alt 1.

Table JJ–29: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Old Lyme (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment
Mallory_Di	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.
Malon_Ka	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.
Mandeville_Do	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.
Mandeville_Mo	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.
Mandrile_Ce	"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."
Mangham_Ro	" 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. "
Mango_Sa	Do not compromise the town of Old Lyme by allowing tracks to be built through the town....It is a beautiful, idyllic setting and deserves to be preserved...
Manson_Ka	I own land and house in Old Lyme on the Four Mile River adjacent to the railroad... 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.
Marano_Ja	" 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. "
Margaret_Se	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.
Margules_Ho	Figure outr a way to put the RR in a place that does not distroy Olsd Lyme
Margules_Ma	This is a bad idea.
Mari_Br	"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."
Markmaitree_Ti	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.
Markovic_Ve	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.
Markowitz_Te	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.
Marks_Ba	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.
Marsh_Al	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. 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.
Marsh_Al	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.
Marsh_Ed	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?
Marsh_Ge	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. 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.

Table JJ–29: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Old Lyme (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment
Marsh_Ge	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.
Marsh_Li	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.
Marsh_So	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. 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.
Marsh_So	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.
Marshall_Ca	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.
Martel_Ju	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.
Martel_Ju	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.
Martell_Do	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.
Martin_Fr	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!
Martin_Ma	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.
Martinez_Ch	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.
Martinez_Ti	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.
Masih_Pa	"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."
Mason_Ma	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.
Massa_Le	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.
Massa_Ma	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.
Massa_Ma	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.
Massa_Mi	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.

Table JJ–29: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Old Lyme (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment
Massa_Mi	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.
Mastromarino_An	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.
Matano_Ma	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.
Matarese_Ki	There is no better route than plowing through a historic district and impacting a fragile ecosystem. Digesting. All for a 30 minute train ride.
Mateer_Ju	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.
Mathews_Ed	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.
Mathur_Vi	"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."
Matthew_Ji	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.
May_Da	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.
May_Jo	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!
Mayoros_Ja	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.
Mayoros_Ja	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.
Mazerolle_Mi	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.
Mazerolle_Mi	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.
Mazzalupo_Ma	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.
McAdams_Ke	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.
McAndrew_Ri	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.
McAraw-Ta	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....Do not use plan 1.
Mcbeth_Pa	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?
Mcbeth_Pa	Spending money on this nonessential project , destroying a historic village and property values is an outrage.
McCaffrey_Ly	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 overwhelming damage to the environment makes this an outrageously ridiculous idea.
McCall_Ka	I am very disturbed by Alternative 1, and what would be a horrible impact on the beautiful and historic town of Old Lyme.
McCarthy_Hi	I oppose Option 1. I believe it will have a detrimental impact on the town of Old Lyme.

Table JJ–29: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Old Lyme (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment
McCarthy_Ju	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.
McCarthy_Ke	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 million), 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.
McCarthy_Li	It would destroy homes, businesses, The Lyme Art Academy as well as have a very big negative impact on our fragile wetlands.
McCarty_An	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.
McCawley_Su	Come see what we have and you won't want to change a thing.
Mcclave_Ja	The environmental and residential impact would outweigh any positive.
McCormack_Va	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!
McCreedy_Ja	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.
McCullough_Fr	I am concerned and shocked at the proposed path of alternative 1. ... the proposed route is too destructive.
McDonald_He	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!!!!!!!!!!!!!!
McDonough_Ka	"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.
McFadden_Da	I oppose the alternative 1 option to route a high speed train across the Connecticut River alongside the Baldwin Bridge.
McGee_Gl	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.
McGee_Su	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.
McGill_Pa	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.
McGlinchey_Ke	...the current plan will effectively eliminate the historically and culturally significant village center of Old Lyme. Please consider removing Alternate 1 from consideration.
McGlinchey_Tr	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.
McGlinchey_Tr	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.
McGrath_Su	I am opposed to putting rail service through a historical and arts centered part of Old Lyme,CT.
McGuire_Br	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.
McInerney_Ei	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.

Table JJ–29: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Old Lyme (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment
McInerney_Ja	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.
McIntyre_An	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!
McKee_Aa	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!
McKee_Jo	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 poorly laid out "plan".
McKee_Ma	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.
McKeever_Ka	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.
McKeon_Ma	Strongly opposed to Alternative 1. It makes no impact on increased passenger use and stands to disrupt our community irreversibly.
McKeon_Ma	...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...
McKie_Ba	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...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.
McKie_Ba	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!
McKie_Ba	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.
McKillop_Pe	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.
Mcknight_Cr	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.
McKnight_Ni	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. ... 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. ... 3) We need economic development in Connecticut and Alternative #1 just won 't get us there. ... 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.
McKnight_Ni	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.
McKnight_Ro	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.
McKnight_Su	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:
McKnight_Su	1) The proposed new bridge and rail will bisect the charming and historic village of Old Lyme, ruining its unique character... 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.
McKnight_Su	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.
McKnight_To	I strongly believe that Alternative 1 will rob Connecticut of more than it will give us.... forever...I would strongly urge you to consider the cost of Alternative 1 in terms of things which truly matter, like history, heritage, endangered ildlife, and enchanting phenomenon like the murmuration, which will no longer be possible.

Table JJ–29: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Old Lyme (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment
McKnight_To	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:
McKnight_To	1) The proposed new bridge and rail will bisect the charming and historic village of Old Lyme, ruining its unique character... 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.
McKnight_To	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.
McKnight_To	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.
McLean_Ma	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. ... 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.
McLean_Ma	If the intention of [Alternative 1] 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.
McMahon_Ca	I am opposed to NEC Future Alternative I.
McMullen_Jo	"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.
McNair_Ma	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?
McNatt_Ka	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.
McNerney_De	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.
McNiff_Da	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.
McQuade_Ju	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!!
McQuade_Su	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... Amtrak use the tracks that are currently in place!
McQuade_Tr	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... Moving lines inland vs. having it teeter on the edge of the shore? Exciting possibility.
Meghan	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.
Mellos_Ge	"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."
Menzin_Ca	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.
Mercado_Me	[Alternative 1 through the center of Old Lyme, CT] 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.

Table JJ–29: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Old Lyme (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment
Mergy_Le	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
Merjave_Co	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.
Merrill_Ma	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.
Merrill_Po	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.
Merton_Mi	I oppose Alternative 1.
Mesham_Na	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.
Meyer_Ca	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.
Michel_Br	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.
Middleton-Ta	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. "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."
Mikki_Sa	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.
Mikki_Sa	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.
Milardo_Mi	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 !!!
Miles_Lo	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
Miller_Co	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.
Miller_Je	"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."
Miller_La	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.
Miller_Pa	I do not support alternative 1. Aside from the impact on old lyme, I believe more connectivity is important.
Miller-Aird_Cy	I was just told about the proposal to build a high speed train through the center of our historic downtown (Old Lyme). I am shocked and saddened by that option. I think the idea to destroy a downtown just to improve the speed of a train between NY and Boston reprehensible.
Miller-Murphy_Ri	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.
Millhiser_Vi	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.
Mills_Ro	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.
Minetti_Tr	"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."
Miranda_Pa	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.
Miranda_St	I strongly oppose Alternative 1 of the NEC futures proposal because it would destroy the campus of Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts.

Table JJ–29: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Old Lyme (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment
Mirmahboub_Po	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.
Misiaszek_Ar	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.
Mitchel_Pe	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....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.
Mitchell_AI	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.
Mitchell_AI	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.
Mitchell_Pa	The destruction of Old Lyme, CT in favor of NEC's Alternative 1 is an abomination.
Mitchell_Sa	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.
Mletschnig_Jo	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!
Mock_Br	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.
Mol_Na	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. 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.
Mol_Na	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. he real estate value of our property would be greatly impacted.
Monagle_Je	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.
Monson_Ki	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 Florence 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.
Montanaro_Ja	I am writing to raise concerns regarding NEC Future Alternative 1. The Environmental and Ecological impacts of this proposal have not been adequately considered by the FRA. The importance of the Connecticut River estuary has been recognized globally, particularly as a Wetland of International Importance by the Ramsar Convention: CONNECTICUT RIVER ESTUARY AND TIDAL RIVER WETLANDS COMPLEX Connecticut River Estuary & Tidal Wetlands Complex State Wildlife Management Areas, State Parks. The longest and largest river system in New England. Shifting sandbars have preserved the river's extraordinary assemblage of natural and undisturbed plant and animal communities. The site includes open water; fresh, salt and brackish tidal wetlands; floodplains, river islands, beaches, and dunes. The system serves as essential habitat for numerous regionally, nationally, and globally rare or otherwise significant species and forms an extensive biological corridor that links marine and estuarine waters of the Atlantic Ocean. Many migratory and Neotropical bird species nest or winter in the marshes, which regularly support over 10,000 individuals, consisting of 18 species of waterfowl. Two million people live in the river basin that supports active commercial and recreational fisheries, various tourist facilities and activities. Hunting and trapping represent considerable revenues to the state. Ramsar site no. 710. Most recent RIS information: 1995. NEC Future Alternative 1 proposes significant disturbance and destruction of the estuary. The impacts that NEC Future will have on this delicate ecosystem, and the community that has worked tirelessly to protect it, must be more carefully considered
Moore_Le	Alterntive 1 would not only ruin our Town of Old Lyme but also would destroy the historical structures that make our community so unique. Lyme Art Association, the Florence Griswold Museum, Lyme Academy....it is unthinkable.
Moore_St	The Alternative 1 proposal for the Old Lyme area is INSANE. Move it north about 10 miles, where there's plenty of space and a need for another bridge to replace the ferry (make it a bridge for both vehicles and trains) Alternative 1 would not only destroy the town of Old Lyme, but also disrupt I95, since all the building machinery would use 95.

Table JJ–29: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Old Lyme (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment
Moore_St	Alternative 1 is a no-brain rejection in my view. To converge rail construction with an overloaded highway that will itself be under construction until 2017, monopolize traffic and roadways through the main commercial artery of Old Lyme. Since neither Old Lyme or Niantic will be getting a high-speed rail stop, there's plenty of room further north to pass over the CT river with a shorter span and less-occupied real estate.
Morgan_Da	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.
Morgen_Ev	The impact of the high speed railway cutting through Old Lyme CT would be devastating to this historic town and famous art colony, and to the mouth of the Connecticur River which is a federally protected Heritage River and home to nesting Ospreys. Please find another route!!
Moriarty_Ji	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.
Morris_Ba	I oppose Alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridor Futures proposal because it will destroy the campus of Lyme Acadmy College of Fine Arts of the University of New Haven. my daughter recently graduated from UNH. I am confident that good alternatives are available which would not be so destructive and detrimental to this historic area.
Morris_Li	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.
Morris_Mi	I oppose Alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridor Futures proposal because it will destroy the campus of the Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts of the University of New Haven.
Morrison_Joh	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.
Morrissey_Ch	This is ridiculous. It sounds destroy the beautiful of a quaint, historic new england town. An artist haven! I'm outraged and disgusted at this proposition.
Morrissey_Je	I am totally against alternative 1. Do NOT destroy Old Lyme. Project our towns and our shores.
Moye_Pa	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.
Mueler_Jo	The proposed plan will have a dramatic negative impact on the CT estuary encompassed w/in the proposed railway infrastructure along the CT shoreline. The impact has not only local but worldwide significance for migratory birds. As stewards of our environment, we need to be responsible and thoughtful when considering changes to the our regional environmental ecosystem w/ extended impact to connected environmental habitats.
Mueler_Jo	the cultural impact on the Old Lyme and other shoreline communities would be devastating. Many of us as long term residents of the community have worked tirelessly to maintain the exceptional cultural, scholastic and living environment offered to us as residents of vibrant shoreline CT communities.
Mueller_Ei	I am appalled that the FRA committee would seriously consider endorsing Option1 which would have the rail tracks run directly through the heart of the Old Lyme community. Your proposal would bring environmental risks to the area as well as negative financial impact to the town and Lyme Art academy. I would welcome the opportunity to share my concerns with a representative of the FRA.
Muir_Ka	when are people going to stop destroying beautiful old towns? NO TRAINS THROUGH OLD LYME
Mulcahy_Do	I am shocked and totally dismayed by what I have just read. To casually destroy the beauty and history of the town is unacceptable. [Old Lyme]
Mulligan_Ri	Do not approve Alternative 1. That proposal would significantly alert that Old Lyme historic district, which is a gem. It would despot the Lyme Art Academy and the entire art district. I oppose Alternitive 1.
Mundy_Te	Your proposed route through Old Lyme is very destructive to the fabric of the community, its conservation resources and the natural setting of the place. Please reconsider and INVOLVE our local leaders.
Munukoti_Di	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.
Murphy_Kar	This plan is completely irresponsible and illogical . Why would you choose one of the most pristine areas in our state in an historic village and destroy it with this clearly not well thought out plan.. Which by the way we can ill afford !!! Just what we need .
Murphy_Kat	I absolutely approve of saving our wonderful coastline.
Murphy_Ke	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.
Murphy_M	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.
Murphy_Mary	I am against the NEC placing a rail line through the Lyme Academy of Fine Arts. The state of Connecticut has a history of ruining Connecticut's shoreline, beautiful historic areas, beautiful farm land vistas and historic old buildings with highways and oil tanks . Please do not allow this to happen to another beautiful historic area in CT.
Murray_Bo	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.
Muscato_Ni	I am writing to voice concerns about alternative 1.

Table JJ–29: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Old Lyme (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment
Muscato_Ni	The proposed new rail line through old Saybrook, Old Lyme and East Lyme will disrupt not only individual households but the safety and quaintness of these small New England towns. Many families chose these towns to live in because of the safety and small town feel. Adding mass transit rail lines completely changes the safety and environment of these towns.
Myers_Da	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.
Myers_Ro	I have lived in Lyme/Old Lyme since 1993. I cherish this community, and the people that live here who are stewards of its history, beauty and culture. It is a devastating thought that a high speed rail could devastate the history, beauty and culture that we and generations before us have worked hard to preserve for our children. This high speed rail proposal brings the train dangerously close to the Middle School and high school campuses and would ruin the safety of Lyme Street that our students currently enjoy. Importantly, the shopping center hub of our town would be destroyed. Significant hardship to our rural community. Please dismiss the Tier 1 plan.
Nadler_Ji	I oppose Alternative 1 for the high speed rail through Old Lyme CT. Why would you want to ruin a beautiful bucolic town like Old Lyme?
Narkis_Jo	Find another alternative. Old Lyme should remain as it isn't: a historic treasure
Nash_El	I oppose Alternate 1 of the northeast Corridor proposal because it will destroy the Lyme Academy Fine Arts campus of University of New Haven
Nazro_Ju	Do not let this project get a foot hold! Old Lyme with it's historic museums and plain beauty needs to be preserved.
Necklas_Mi	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. Please be aware that the deadline for comments is Tuesday, Feb. 16, so please act now and share this information your with friends, colleagues and family. Thank you for helping us protect and preserve Lyme Academy College of the University of New Haven.
Neill_Ma	Please don't destroy a school with your proposed rail line. You would take an important piece of history away from American citizens.
Nelson_Da	Rerouting the tracks to follow Rt 95 will put the noisy train through our historic district [in Old Lyme]. The Lyme Art academy will be torn up if it is south of 95. If north of 95 our only shopping center will be wiped out.
Nelson_Da	What a mess. A long diagonal bridge across the CT river, then wiping out some homes, then disturbing coastal wetlands, then ruining the Lyme Art Academy and then over historic Lyme Street. A wide swath with many gantry poles holding overhead wires. Worse yet frequent bullet trains accelerating or decelerating through this area. Yes I am for modern high speed efficient transportation, but not at this kind of expense here or elsewhere.
Nelson_Kay	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.
Nelson_Le	I am 63 years old. I grew up in Old Lyme when it was a small town. It is still a beautiful town and I have relatives living there. To destroy the historic district in Old Lyme would be a travesty. Please rethink this. I am planning on moving back in the near future.
Nelson_Pa	A new rail line is a must; there is really no need to ut the heart out of Old Lyme, in order to complete the task.
Newbegin_Br	I oppose Alternative 1 of the FRA's Northeast Corridor Futures proposal because it will destroy the campus of Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts of the University of New haven
Newton_Ka	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.
Nguyen_Be	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.
Niblack_He	No, no, no to Alternative I and the effect it will have on the Old Lyme community.
Nickerson_Co	It's going to destroy old lymes historical district and harm our marsh lands. There needs to be another option than alternative 1.
Niichel_Ca	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--my alma mater.
Nilsson_Le	The lower CT River valley was called one of the last great places and I believe building a bridge across it between the bridges will ruin it forever. And the town of Old Lyme was almost ruined by I95 cutting straight through it and a new High Speed railway will certainly destroy what is left of that corner of town. What is wrong with where the tracks are now?
Nocito-Gobel_Je	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.
Noniewicz_El	A very poor idea to totally level a quaint and wonderful New England town. Do not go thru Lyme
Norris_La	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. This fine arts campus is vitally important to the students, surrounding community, and UNH family. Please reconsider some other alternatives that do not place the railroad through our beloved Lyme Campus.
Noujaim_Na	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.
Novack_Ka	I oppose Alternative 1.
Novick_Ba	This is to register my opposition to Alternative 1.

Table JJ–29: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Old Lyme (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment
Novorio_Da	I would hope this does not take place. Our beautiful, peaceful shoreline towns certainly don't need any more tracks and bridges. The charm of this area is the unobstructed water views and people travel here just for that. I say no. I don't think this was presented with enough thought or information to our shore towns.
Noyes_Ba	As a resident of Old Lyme, CT I am opposed to Alternative 1 of the rail plan. This plan would very adversely affect the Old Lyme historical preservation district and have an extremely negative impact on the whole town and shoreline area.
Noyes_El	It is a place of historical significance as well as of personal significance. I strongly feel that NEC Future Alternative 1 will disrupt the integrity of Old Lyme and threaten the historical significance and beauty of the town, river, and surrounding areas. I urge you to please consider alternative options and not follow through with the NEC Future Alternative 1 plan.
Noyes_Jo	I find it outrageous that Alternative 1 for the Amtrak high speed rail line would reroute the rail line through the historic district of Old Lyme, Connecticut. There are a four-year college, pristine waterways, an art association, a museum that's on the national historic register, and many old houses in the Old Lyme historic district. The historic district, the town's tourism industry (for which the art peace of the historic district is a major draw), and the estuarine environment would all be immensely disrupted by the proposed new route. Keeping the rail line south of the downtown historic district-- where it is now located-- is a much more sensible alternative.
Nunn_Ry	implementing this plan of putting a high speed rail over the Connecticut river and through the town will ruin property values, people's mortgages, the economy of the area to say the least... Please reconsider the placement for this high speed rail because it effects and will hurt the entire area
Nystrom_Br	Alternative 1 is just a band aid. We need to focus on the future and growth!. You cannot divide one of CT's most quaint towns (Old Lyme).
O'Bryan_Er	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.
O'Dell_Da	Alternative 1 which cuts through the center of Old Lyme is a travesty for our small town.
Ofsharick_Mo	I am in complete opposition of a railway being built through my college, and why wouldn't I be? It's simply disgusting, not to mention unnecessary. This is a historic location with a unique campus that benefits its students. It may be small, but that doesn't lessen its importance. Please reject alternative 1 to run a railroad through Lyme Academy.
Ogden_De	The proposed train cutting across the Town of Old Lyme will be devastating to the in many ways.
Ogden_De	It would not only affect the environment which has seen the osprey and bald eagle population grow but also destroy the historical attributes of the Town (Old Lyme).
Ogorzalek_Ma	Please do not destroy our community, Old Lyme, in your work on expanding rail service! Listen, Listen to our leaders.
Olsen_Ja	I am vehemently opposed to the railway being moved. This would be devastating to the wildlife and ecology of Old Lyme.
Olsen_Ja	I am opposed to Alternative One.
Olsen_Ka	Please find a better eay that will not impact Old Lyme and the historic areas.
Olson_Cy	Against line running through Old Lyme.
Olson_Ma	I am very opposed to Alternative 1 of the three high-speed rail-track routes proposed by the Federal Railroad Authority (FRA) in their Northeast Corridor (NEC) Future plan that puts a rail line through the historic area of Old Lyme, CT. This proposed railroad would basically destroy the nature of the town. In addition, the location is very close to the pre-school, middle school, and high school, creating an unnecessary risk to the children.
O'Marra_Se	I am strongly against your plans to run high speed rail, a financially disastrous investment, through our town, Old Lyme, CT.
O'Meara_Wi	I am vehemently opposed to adoption of Alternative I which would in effect destroy the Town of Old Lyme, both physically as well as economically. The public school system would abruptly cease The campus of the University of New Haven branch would be totally destroyed as well as the business district. Surely other alternatives must be adopted. The 30 million expenditure for fact finding is an absolute travesty. I cannot begin to even imagine the planning thought process without even any prior consultation with Town representatives. Shame on you all around!
Opila_Je	I oppose Alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridor Futures.
Opila_Je	It would be more beneficial to build a rail way that provides access to Hartford or to preserve the Old Lyme community.
Oppelt_Fre	I hope the proposed rail line is elevated to go over Route 156 and Lyme Street in Old Lyme, CT.
Orlando_Da	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.
Oros_Ra	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.
Ortoleva_Tr	I am directly opposed to Proposal Alt 1, to place new rr tracks in Old Lyme. It is a misguided use of taxpayer money , will affect all aspects of our community , destroy wetlands, affect safety of community!
Orzech_Ju	Totally against running the proposed rail line - it destroys the character of the town I own property in!!!!

Table JJ–29: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Old Lyme (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment
Orzech_Ma	Dumb,dumber and this proposal the dumbest!!!Cutting through the historic district of Old Lyme, CT would be a travesty, totally unthinkable to any one who knows even a smidgen of the history of this beautiful town!
O'Shea_Ma	Tier 1 through the lovely town of Old Lyme is absolutely out of the question.
O'Shea_Ma	It would ruin one of the most beautiful and historical towns in the country.
O'Shea_Ma	Please under no circumstances consider tier 1 which would put train tracks right through the center of beautiful Old Lyme.
Ossmann_Er	I implore you to refrain from the forward progress of this plan.
Ossmann_Fr	Please consider my opposition to "Alternative #1". Transportation by rail routing through the southern Connecticut towns would radically impact the environment and character of the towns involved. Many areas are on the historic register and once gone cannot be replaced.
Ossmann_Ma	This expenditure is totally unnecessary. To destroy a shore line town is also unnecessary. I am against this venture. This venture will change the S.E. shoreline, destroy it forever, and will also be detrimental to the environment.
Ostapeck_Ga	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.
Ostering_Cy	I oppose Alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridor Futures proposal. It destroys the Lyme Academy of Arts community. It also endangers federally protected areas of the CT river estuary, and can have a severe impact on the endangered glass eel population. It ruins the aesthetic quality of the Old Lyme historic district, and overall, the impact far outweighs the benefits. I fear this is simply greed at play.
Ouellette_Th	Please protect Old Lyme CT from high speed train!! A high speed train running through and disrupting the very core of this community is absurd and unfair to the citizens that have built their lives and businesses here.
Overend_Gr	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.
Overton_Ri	I oppose Alt1 of the NEC plan as it will impact negatively both the campus of Lyme Academy and the Old Lyme eco structure. More effective alternatives exist.
Oz_Ar	There is nothing which I can compare to the teaching and preserving of the arts. Railway tracks can be relocated at will and sometimes the alternative is better than the original. please reconsider and spare the University.
P_Es	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.
Pacelli_Da	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.
Padgett_Joh	This proposal appears to have been drafted with no input from the people who live in the towns that would be directly affected by this change. NEC Future Alternative 1 creates an irrevocable fissure which will destroy the legacy and integrity of how the town 's natural beauty, cultural assets, and historic character all complement each other for the benefit of the region, and the nation as a whole. We request that NEC Future Alternative 1 be removed from further consideration.
Pantuso_He	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.
Papowitz_Me	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.
Pappalardo_Fr	Alternative 1 is a disastrous option and would destroy the town of Old Lyme. I believe it is poorly conceived and was prepared without any input form the communities it would affect. I am vehemently oppose to Alternate 1
Paradis_An	Please respectfully reconsider running a train line through this quaint community, which has many tourist destinations.
Parillo_To	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.
Park_Eu	" 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. "
Parkinson_An	I can,t begin to understand how consideration would be given to the tier 1 environmental impact statement. first it would destroy a outstanding historic district that includes the Florence Griswold Museum, the Lyme Art Academy,and man y historic houses. I am also stunned by the lack of information given out earlier. It as though was to get it by those effected before they could do anything about it.
Parks_Me	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.
Parmelee_Ka	Seems really absurd to go through an Historic District.
Parodi_Su	This will devastate our landscape and conservation efforts of a historically and environmentally rich town. The impact will be far reaching and vehemently opposed. This is an outrage to even propose to construct this through our community, through the our nature preserves. People have worked hard for many years to preserve the integrity of our community, please do not devastate us.
Parry_Re	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.

Table JJ–29: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Old Lyme (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment
Pasay_Am	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 well as endanger the federally protected areas of the Connecticut River Estuary.
Pastel_Ka	As properties owners in old Lyme we are outraged that the FRA has proceeded on this proposal in a rather secretive matter. The idea of building a rail road thru this historic,envirionmentaly sensitive.region is nothing short of outrageous..ALtenative one should be taken off the table.
Patlolla_Ra	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.
Paulis_Ma	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 believe alternative routes would make more sense and be less intrusive on existing infrastructure.
Pease_Da	As a former member of the Board of Trustees of the Lyme Academy College of Art, an artist and a long time teacher of art (in Pennsylvania and Connecticut), I am writing to express my concern and opposition to any plan which would necessitate running railway tracks near or through the Academy grounds. I believe something of this nature is part of what is referred to as Alternative 1 of the FRA's NE Corridor Futures proposal. I am opposed to this plan.
Pecka_Pa	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.
Pellett_Oc	No plan that cuts through a historic district is acceptable in my book. I am especially concerned about a plan that would cut through Old Lyme CT; a small historic town on CT's eastern shore...destroying a historic district is not good for the town, the state or the railroad.
Peltenburg-Brechneff_Ch	This proposal even though much needed is cruel to the Lyme community and would be very destructive to life in this historical town. There has to be a better plan.
Penfield_Th	Alt.# 1 would destroy a very large portion of the historical value of our town. Highly opposed to this alternative. Highly in favor of upgrades to NE corridor rail without historic demolition.
Pennie_Ki	As a resident of the Town of Old Lyme, I am submitting testimony in opposition to the Northeast Corridor Future Tier 1 Draft Environmental Impact Statement "Alternative 1" proposal. My concern lies in the fact that this proposal will significantly alter my livelihood and decimate my community. ...I therefore request that the proposed rail changes that affect Old Lyme be removed from 'Alternative I' and I urge you to look at other solutions regarding improving the Northeast Corridor.
Pennie_Ki	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.
Penniman_Ch	The Tier 1 option of destroying the town of Old Lyme, CT to reduce train travelers' time through CT is totally irresponsible. The FRA should upgrade the infrastructure in the existing rail corridor to reduce impact to the surrounding communities and to the environment.
Penniman_Cl	Alt 1 would have significant negative environmental, economic, and cultural impacts on Old Lyme,CT. It would cut through the historical center of the town. The proposed route would significantly impact sensitive wetland habitats along both the Connecticutur and Lieutenant Rivers in Old Lyme. The wetlands are part of the internationally-recognized, ecologically important wetlands complex in the lower tidal Connecticut River.
Percy_Ma	This would be absolutely devastating to the beautiful and historic town of Old Lyme. All that has been accomplished to make our community the place to come to learn about history of American Impressionism at the Florence Griswold Museum and the Lyme Art Association and the Lyme Art Academy would be absolutely ruined...Pleases don't consider this proposal.
Perks_Mi	Why are we only just hearing about this rail reroute proposal when it has been in the planning stage for so many months/years. This plan to re-direct the track through the CENTER of our historic town will devastate the community and local economy. The route across the Connecticut River Estuary will negatively impact this Nationally important river estuary. There must be a way to accomplish the high speed rail without impacting our town and estuary in such a devastating way. Please rethink this plan, visit our town and see the impact this will have first hand.
Perks_Sa	I am shocked that citizens of Old Lyme have not been informed until very recently of FRA proposal to cut through the heart of our historic, artistic and exceptional town of citizens concerned with historic and environmental issues. This path would destroy the economy and many of the historic buildings (1700's, 1800's) listed on the National Register of Historic Buildings that we are so proud of including The Florence Griswold Museum (1850), the Lyme Art Association (1914) and the Lyme Art Academy (1976). This would also destroy the delicate marshlands at the mouth of the Connecticut River estuary, one of the most important estuaries in the USA for migratory fish and bird life. Please reconsider this proposal and please visit and listen to the citizens of our town before more planning takes place to improve only slightly the speed of the trains along the shoreline. This is a lot of destruction for 20-30 minutes of saved time.
Perks_Sa	Shocked that citizens of Old Lyme have not been informed until very recently of FRA proposal to cut through the heart of our historic, artistic and exceptional town of citizens concerned with historic and environmental issues...please visit and listen to the citizens of our town before more planning takes place to improve only slightly the speed of the trains along the shoreline. This is a lot of destruction for 20-30 minutes of saved time.
Perks_Sa	This path would destroy the economy and many of the historic buildings (1700's, 1800's) listed on the National Register of Historic Buildings that we are so proud of including The Florence Griswold Museum (1850), the Lyme Art Association (1914) and the Lyme Art Academy (1976). This would also destroy the delicate marshlands at the mouth of the Connecticut River estuary, one of the most important estuaries in the USA for migratory fish and bird life. Please reconsider this proposal
Perl_Su	Besides being a waste of money it would spoil one of Connecticut's loveliest towns.

Table JJ–29: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Old Lyme (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment
Perlini_Pa	This proposal is absolutely ridiculous and will impact the whole shore line and surrounding towns. This has been done without involving the community and is almost criminal! [Lyme]
Perreten_Sa	Not enough time for comment!! We only just heard about this! Do NOT destroy the character and history of any shoreline towns....of any towns.
Perry_An	To change the face of a town like Old Lyme is just wrong. Alternatives must be considered quite seriously. Is all of this disruption and cost to the lives of people and the environment worth 1/2 savings in traveling time? Seems the money could be spent in other ways.
Perry_Ba	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.
Perry_Na	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. This campus is a beautiful and important landmark for Old Lyme and it should be preserved.
Perugini_Te	I oppose Alternative 1
Perumalla_Ra	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.
Peruzzotti_Ca	This plan makes no sense!
Peruzzotti_St	Why not use the area alongside the present tracks. The proposed plan has obviously not well thoughtout.
Peters_Do	Against. I don't want railroad tracks cutting through town.
Peters_Do	Seems pretty sneaky that something this huge has not been spoken of before.
Petersen_Ro	I am strongly opposed to the tier 1 proposal for new tracks to run through the town of Old Lyme, CT.
Petersen_Ro	... Florence Griswold Museum, Old Lyme Art Association, and the Lyme Art Academy all of which are vital to the town's economy.
Peterson_Ch	"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."
Peterson_Er	I am very much opposed to the construction of a railroad that goes through my undergrad's campus... It was bad enough when the University of New Haven bought the Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts, but don't drive the stake through by literally removing my college from its historic location
Peterson_Pe	"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."
Petition_Various	Stop Alternative One from destroying the quality of life In Old Lyme. The proposed new rail lines will:" # Destroy homes and businesses # Damage and significantly change the Lyme Art Academy College, Lyme Art Association, Florence Griswold Museum # Negatively impact our schools, our library and a large segment of our Historic District # Forever harm and alter privately owned real estate and rights # Destroy wetlands, open space and natural resources
Petrecca_Ma	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.
Petrella-Wilson_Ro	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.
Petrone_Sc	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.
Pfeffer_Ja	Please do not place a high speed train through its center.
Pfeiffer_Jo	My first level of concern is generated by the apparent surprise nature of the proposal and how far along the plan has apparently gone without adequate local input. This relates to the process of how the plan has been administered and indicates an underlying lack of care for the people along the corridor. Why have we only found out at this juncture, and been informed about critical engineering aspects that clearly have direct and significant impact upon us? Similarly, why have our perspectives only been sought at the eleventh hour and not been appropriately weighed and incorporated into the initial planning? This approach is at variance to our established American democratic process.
Pfeiffer_Jo	In Old Lyme any readjustment to the Amtrak corridor will have significant environmental and social effects that will undoubtedly impact our quality of life. Old Lyme Historic District reflects our community as already having
Pfeiffer_Jo	Proposed adjustment to the Amtrak Corridor will once again impact our town and Historic District . One possible plan - the I-95 path, would virtually cut the Old Lyme Historic District in half. The provisions by which Amtrak intends to remedy this situation is unclear. As noted in the example above, the nature of the redesign and the ensuing engineering will have sweeping impacts both within and beyond the confines of the Historic District. There will be environmental and social consequences.
Piasio_C	Please do not ruin our beautiful town of Old Lyme!
Picard_Ga	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.
Pierson_Ro	Alternative 1 as sketched out appears likely to be highly disruptive to some very old, picturesque communities, such as those around the mouth of the Connecticut River. If that route is selected, this adverse impact should be addressed.

Table JJ–29: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Old Lyme (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment
Pietrangel_i_Je	"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."
Pillari_Al	I am highly against this idea to run a rail track through Old Lyme Ct. This town is built on simple living and a calm neighborhood... There is already a railway to get from these states and back .Just because it is not the quickest way does not mean another one is needed.
Pillari_Al	Adding a rain system here would impact the schools greatly. The Lyme academy College of Fine arts is known for its quiet location and secluded area for dedicated study with zero distractions. You will also be cutting down trees which as everyone knows is a danger to animal habitats.
Pinn_Ed	I oppose the Tier 1 proposal as it would severely impact the appearance of our rural community and destroy the quality of life we residents and visitors enjoy in Old Lyme
Pinn_Li	I am not in favor of this plan!
Pinney_El	This structural plan will DEFACE the natural beauty, disrupt the environmental nature, and aesthetics of the town of Old Lyme. I VOTE EMPHATICALLY NO to this plan.
Pinney_Na	I have lived in Old Lyme CT for 30+ years. The proposed plan would ruin our historic town, the Home of American Impressionism and a place that draws people from all over for the art and beauty of what this town offers. The impact on the neighborhoods and wetlands would be detrimental.
Peruzzotti_St	I am totally against the plan that the FRA has proposed. (commentor from Groton, CT)
Pinney_Na	Please reconsider the new proposed route, the location of where the tracks now should suffice without disrupting the area [Old Lyme] any further.
Pinto_Ju	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.
Piros_Je	Please leave Old Lyme and Milford out of your plans to reroute the railroads. Our shorelines and the Long Island Sound are in enough trouble as it is... VERY BAD IDEA! I can't believe I heard that just the planning of this project cost MILLIONS! Haven't you got better things to do with your time and money???? Geez.....
Pitruzzello_Ca	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.
Plante_Sa	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.
Plumley_Ch	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.
Poglitsch_Ro	As a resident of Old Lyme CT I strongly oppose alternative number 1. While there is no doubt that the rail crossing over the Connecticut River needs to be modernized, rerouting it across the saltwater marshes of the Lieutenant River and through the historical district of Old Lyme would be ecologically and historically disastrous, not to mention destructive to the town itself, economically and to the residents, with erosion of property value. While alternative one is the least expensive and most plausible alternative, it makes the least ... closing, please consider the harm that would be done to the area by choosing alternative one, and realize the benefits of the other alternative. Cost benefit wise, it would seem to me that any of the alternatives to alternative one would be a wiser, more beneficial to all, choice.
Poirier_Al	I am opposed to Alternative 1 because it will damage the Lyme Art School of the University of New Haven, and also the Florence Griswold Museum, the Old Lyme Inn, and many other historic buildings in Old Lyme - in addition it would be damaging to the town's economic center.
Pompea_Ch	This plan to route the railroad through the quite beautiful town of Old Lyme would be a shame . This would dramatically effect the Lyme Art Academy which is a wonderful jewel for the state of Ct Say no to Alternative one
Porto_Re	"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."
Post_Na	Please, vote NO to alternative 1.
Potter_Bo	...I am very concerned about the NEC proposal to re-route and build a new train track through the center of our historic village [Old Lyme].
Potter_Bo	I am also surprised that so little communication and public discussion has been organized and shared by NEC, particularly the rationale for building and re-routing new train tracks vs the existing route.
Pough_De	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. 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.
Pranulis_Su	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.
Pratt_Di	The Florence Griswold Museum is the gem of Old Lyme, CT as well as being a national treasure. Nearby are the Lyme Art Association, the Lyme Art Academy, the Old Lyme Inn, the Bee & Thistle Inn, and the Old Lyme Congregational Church. These 6 establishments make up a unique center of 18th & 19th C architecture that offer fine dining, fine art, and classical music among their offerings. It is absurd to consider ruining this quintessential New England town center by building railroad tracks through it.

Table JJ–29: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Old Lyme (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment
Prentice_Ja	I strongly oppose Alternative 1 of the three high-speed railtrack routes proposed by the Federal Railroad Authority (FRA) in their Northeast Corridor (NEC) Future plan. I am an alumna of the Lyme Academy of Fine Art and my time spent in Old Lyme allowed me to cultivate a deep appreciation for the unique character of the town. The town has great significance in the history of American art. To gut this town in the way proposed would destroy a national treasure.
Prestia_Ga	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.
Preston_Ba	Your first order of business should be to Eliminate Alternative 1. This option would destroy the artistic, historical, cultural and environmental heart of Old Lyme. If you lived here, you would realize why I and others are Opposed to Alternative 1. Cheapest and easiest are not the best answers to the NEC Future.
Preston_Da	This very large project is dropped on this town with a very short time allowed for comment.
Preston_Da	The proposal would destroy our historic village as well as several long established educational and museum facilities. It would seriously disrupt conservation lands that have been designated as one of the last great places by The Nature Conservancy. We firmly believe there will be enormous resistance to these plans which will result in delays, huge legal and other costs, before the proposal is finally defeated if it is pursued. Please don't waste the taxpayers money in its pursuit.
Price_Na	Please do not implement the Tier 1 Draft EIS that would totally destroy the historic village of Old Lyme, Ct. A high speed facility is probably essential but not as essential as a location of such historic value to the country not to mention the harm it would cause to this fragile environment.
Proctor_Al	I oppose Alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridor Futures proposal as it would destroy the campus of the Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts of the University of New Haven.
Proctor_Ro	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.
Proestakis_Gu	I strongly 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.
Przyborski_Kr	However, Alternative 1 of the proposal is problematic. I believe Alternative 1 should be abandoned in light of these concerns. Other alternatives that push the rail inland make far more sense.
Przyborski_Kr	Our aquatic areas are under direct assault from a number of fronts. Old Lyme is a veritable treasure trove of natural coastal niches. Building a rail line through this area would threaten an ever shrinking coastline. Several years ago I worked with my students on an American Eel research project on a tributary of the Connecticut River in Old Lyme. The early life stages of this embattled species are known as glass eels. Most coastal areas are seeing significantly reduced numbers of this life stage due to dam construction and marine pollution. However, in the area of Old Lyme glass eels can be found in staggering numbers in April. This is a very important area for the preservation of this species.
Przybylek_Lu	"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."
Pucciano_Jo	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 graduate of the University of New Haven's MBA program; a former candidate for Congress in CT3 and a former Chair of the Better Business Bureau of South Central Connecticut, I believe alternative 1 will adversely impact the aesthetic quality of Old Lyme 's nationally recognized historic district.
Pullen_Ma	Alternative 1 will destroy the historic district of Old Lyme. It will destroy the historic Lieutenant River. It's planned to measure 5,000 ft. wide! The State of CT cannot permit this to happen to the very historic Old Lyme, CT. This should not and cannot be built.
Puryear_Me	"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."
Pusateri_Pa	" 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. "
Putney_Ma	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.
Puzone_Jo	"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."
Qua_Sa	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, endanger the federally protected areas of the Connecticut River Estuary and ruin the aesthetic quality of Old Lyme 's nationally recognized historic district. These changes will also have a strong negative impact on this community's economic sustainability. Other alternatives must be considered.
Quagliani_Ro	I am opposed to Alternative 1 as this will be a travesty to the fabric and feel of this small community.
Quigley_Sa	As a resident of Lyme, CT, I am writing to voice my opposition to Alternative #1.
Quinn_Ju	"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."
Quinn_Ry	The alternative 1 through old lyme is terribly damaging to both the estuarial marshes of the region and the downtown of old lyme there needs to be a different route.
Quinn_To	"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."
Rabus_Ba	"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."

Table JJ–29: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Old Lyme (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment
Radowiecki_Ki	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.
Raff_Pa	I am opposed to Alternate 1 which will ruin the beautiful fine arts campus, nature conservation areas, and the historic sites of Old Lyme. I am an avid train commuter so I appreciate the necessity to have a comprehensive rail system, but please find an alternative route for this proposal.
Raffile_Ba	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.
Ragsdale_Jo	Alternative # 1 should be removed from consideration. The destruction of historic towns like Old Lyme is very shortsighted, and the environmental impact to the Ct. River watershed is unforgivable.
Rahaman_Sa	I think that such a charming town as Lyme should be speared the unnecessary noise that a high speed train will create. People move to the area to enjoy quiet contentment and therefore- this will directly affect real estate sales in Lyme
Raible Birth_Su	Please do not allow the rail system plan to cut through Old Lyme. We are a historic town that birthed American Impressionism and we have an accredited Art Academy now to continue that heritage. Your actions will forever change the face of Old Lyme. We are too fragile an environment to support your plan without destruction.
Ralph_Ka	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.
Ramella_Sh	As a member of the Lyme-Old Lyme community, I strongly oppose the FRA Alternative 1 rail track plan that will dissect the heart of the Town of Old Lyme, CT. This proposed track would not simply be going through part of a town, it would be cutting through the central hub of a small but very vibrant community, damaging the environment and destroying the historic nature of this town. Lyme Street, which the proposed track would dissect, is the heart of this small town where three schools are located along with the town hall, town library, art academy, art association, youth services bureau, and many small businesses owned by local citizens. The towns of Lyme and Old Lyme come together on this one street as one community to share schools, athletics, a Memorial Day parade, a decades long tradition trick-or- treating event, annual youth art shows, musical concerts, an outdoor market, and countless other community events. A high speed track cutting in half the street that brings a community together would serve only to damage the very fabric of that community. The impact on nature, community, property values, historic buildings, and the very essence of what makes this small town so special would be detrimental. Please abandon Alternative 1.
Rane_Al	I attended School at Lyme Academy College of Fine arts. Don't destroy the school.
Ranelli_J	the plan that would put a new section of rail through the town of old lyme seems ill-considered in terms of its impact on the quality of life and its lack of promise as a solution to the area's, indeed the state's public transportation problems...these failings seem self-evident from a look at the map, (which shows a lack of regard for a cultural and civic history that might, if it came in a plain brown wrapper instead of an official document, be seen as vandalism)...
Rapport_Ge	Your proposal to drive a highspeed train line through the heart of one of Connecticut's most attractive towns and through a section of the town which includes the Florence Griswold Museum, a National Historic Landmark and a nationally known museum renowned for its collection of American art, is a travesty. There must be other alternative routes that you should consider before embarking on an plan which seems to have come from Attila the Hun.
Rapport_Ja	Thank you for giving all of us the opportunity to comment on your proposal,even if it is late in the game. Alternative 1 should not be allowed to happen: the thought of new railroad track cutting through Old Lyme, one of the most beautiful towns on the shoreline -- and through its Historic District and near the Florence Griswold Museum and the Lieutenant River, is horrific. Did anyone from the FRA actually take a look at the proposed site? Hard to believe. Please, please rethink this proposal!
Rapuano_Ma	"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."
Rasie_Sy	I want rail. And something has to give However whoever did the planning knows zero about our State. Certainly you don't have to destroy an entire town to do this.
Raslavsky_Jo	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.
Rathkey_Ju	I strongly oppose this proposal to put a rail line through the heart of Old Lyme village. Our community is steeped in history - we are the birthplace of American Impressionism - and a rail line through the center of town would have devastating consequences to our community and our historic district would be ruined. Please consider an alternative to this plan. Thank you.
Rau_Da	I attended the press conference at the Florence Griswold Museum in Old Lyme (where I work at the Director of Education & Outreach) and was impressed by the information from town members and concerned citizens who addressed how the proposed plan would devastate the very special place that is Old Lyme. Visitors from all over the country (and world) come to visit the Florence Griswold Museum and often remark what a "magical" and "charmed" place the village is. These kinds of places are few and far between. We strive to maintain the specialness of the town for those seeking a genuine New England experience and a visit to a place steeped in natural beauty and a respect for the past. To put in a rail system that obliterates this would impact generations of visitors as well as those who call this corner of world "home." I do hope those in charge will seek less damaging plans to move this program forward.
Rayel_Ba	As a 40 year resident of Old Lyme I ask you to consider the negative impact on our town if Alternative One were put in effect. Please dismiss this option.
Reaback_Ro	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.
Read_Ju	Please do not expand the Train through the center of Old Lyme. We are a very small town with a small town center. You will be eliminating our commercial district, fire department, college and historic district. You will be decimating our town. Please find a route around our community center.
Reardon_An	I am horrified by the idea that your brilliant designers intend to decimate the town of Old Lyme, CT. I strongly object and hope that you will can that part of your plans for the rail system. Old Lyme is a beautiful center of culture, history and art in this area, and none of the changes that you plant to implement are worth touching any part of Old Lyme.

Table JJ–29: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Old Lyme (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment
Reardon_Ba	I live along the Connecticut shoreline, and my family uses the train system often. However, I strongly object to your plans to destroy Old Lyme, Connecticut for your purposes. Old Lyme is a a very important part of our local cultural heritage, and also a vital part of the Connecticut River and Long Island Sound ecosystem. The rail changes that you have proposed would wreck centuries of contributions that local individuals have made toward improving these aspects of Connecticut life. Reconsider your plans for the rail system, and stop the changes that you have proposed for Old Lyme, Connecticut.
Reardon_Cr	Old Lyme is one of the last untouched, old world havens for historians, artists, and naturalists on the Connecticut shoreline. To build this rail alternative through town would destroy the quiet, pristine nature of this small community that is celebrated around the country. Please find another route. A railroad that connects lands with no stories, culture, or reverence is no rail for the people. This is not what we want.
Recchia_Th	I oppose Alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridor Futures proposal because it will destroy the campus of Lyme Academy of Fine Arts of the Univ. of New Haven and ruin the national recognized historic district. More importantly it will endanger the federally protected area of the Connecticut River Estuary.
Records_Be	Alternative 1 does not take into consideration the town of Old Lyme and its needs. Please look at other choices that provide the opportunity for transit while preserving the shoreline towns of Connecticut with the least disruption.
Redlich_Ka	I am opposed to 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 seems like there are better solutions for the expansion. ... Alternative # 1 would not only harm the beautiful Lyme Academy of Fine Arts Campus but would not expand the cities served by public transportation or Amtrak.
Reed_Eu	"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."
Refici_Br	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
Regan_Ni	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.
Reid_Ro	I feel that plan Alternative 1 would have a TERRIBLE impact on the way of life in the small town of Old Lyme CT. Going right through the historic section within less than a mile our our schools would totally change the character of our town with only saving a little time from DC to Boston. PLEASE reconsider
Reilly_Ur	As an alumni of the University of New Haven and a citizen of Connecticut with all it's history, I oppose Alternative 1 of the New England Corridor futures proposal because it will destroy the campus of Lyme Academy College of the Fine Arts of the University of New Haven and endanger the federally protected areas of the CT River Estuary.
Reim_Br	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...Running these train tracks through a campus will look awful and take away from what is currently a great college campus.
Reis Lishing_Jo	It's very difficult to comment on this plan because it is obviously ridiculous. One does not decide to destroy a whole historical area to run a train through it. Whoever put this plan together did not do his or her homework regarding the Old Lyme area. There is not one positive aspect to destroying the Old Lyme historical area. Please go back and research this plan a bit more and bring back a viable one. This plan should be removed from the drawing board immediately.
Remond_Ch	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.
Remond_Wa	"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."
Remond_Wa	"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."
Renault-Ta	"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."
Reneson_Li	I am a resident of Lyme....and this Tier 1 railway proposal would virtually destroy the town of Old Lyme. It's inconceivable that the Tier 1 proposal is on the table. A 5,000ft wide rail road track that would knock down a historic area?
Reynolds_Ha	I am against "alternate 1" it will be very disruptive in the town of Old Lyme and directly impact the character of what the center of our town. Old Lyme was known as an art colony and the Lyme Art Association and Florence Griswold Museum are a huge part of our history and should not be disturbed.
Reynolds_Le	Old Lyme does not need the proposed changes in NEC
Reynolds_Th	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.
Rhian_Gl	I oppose Alternative 1 of the North East Corridor Futures Proposal because it will destroy the campus of Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts of the University of New Haven where my daughter is presently a sophomore.
Rice_Je	Project plan specifics need to be transparent to each community and the environment they could potentially affect, keeping the public well-informed at all times.
Rice_Ki	I strongly object to your plan to build a new bridge over the Connecticut river and and tracks into Old Lyme, Connecticut. You will be destroying our beautiful and historic town. Please reconsider this terrible plan.
Rich_An	There has got to be another option than essentially wiping out a historic town and Artist colony with many lovely tourist attractions But to wipe out an entire historic district is just wrong wrong wrong!!! Come up with another alternatives!

Table JJ–29: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Old Lyme (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment
Richard_Be	This is a waste of federal funds. Did you learn nothing from the Acela train nonsense? People don't train in the USA , because there is no way to get around After you get off the train. This isn't Europe, where the trains are government owned and run... And rail stations are bus, subway and taxi stations as well. Trains are the same cost as flying, and far too time consuming to use. Digging up scenic shoreline areas to make more useless track will not endear people to ride Amtrack, either. The service is poor annoying to use, and expensive.... So we DRIVE, instead.
Richardson_Ly	I am strongly opposed to the proposed Amtrak route which would go through the middle of Old Lyme. This is a beautifully historic town and should be historically preserved.
Richardson_Sa	Clearly this is a beautiful, quiet, rural historic town and any such development would need to be highly sensitive to their needs. However, we badly need to improve efficiency and reliability of the line - not just for the sake of time-saving, but to make a resilient commuter rail system that serves the whole Northeast and gets more people out of their cars and into public transportation. So, please address Lyme's concerns, but please also underscore the importance of not succumbing to NIMBYism and of maintaining perspective on these larger goals.
Richardson_Th	I oppose ALT One
Rickard_Jo	The prosed line crossing through the village of Old Lyme near the point where I-95 crosses concerns me because of the proximity to the Florence Griswold Museum, the Lyme Art Assn., and the Lyme Academy campus, dividing them. The present line crossing south of the village is both established and away from the historic village.
Rickey_Sa	I wish that a path without impact on Connecticut's historical districts would be made.... Please find a different path.
Ridel_El	The people of towns like Old Lyme need to be heard before any changes can be implemented.
Ridgway_Wi	The initial plan for alternative 1 has at least two problems crossing the Connecticut River. First the plan goes right thru the historic heart of the Town of Old Lyme and either the renowned Florence Griswold Museum and/or the Lyme Art Academy depending upon where it crosses route 95. This makes no sense and ignores cultural guidelines. Second, the bridge crosses the river diagonally, which unnecessarily increases its cost and length plus complicating boat traffic.
Rieder_We	As a resident of the neighborhood for more than 35 years, a member of the Florence Griswold Museum and the First Congregational Church of OL, and a participant of activities at the Lyme Academy and Art Association, I cannot believe that this pristine, treasured area would be violated by a major railroad through way. The idea is appalling and a travesty for this beautiful, historic community, and I strongly oppose it.
Riggio_Mi	Alternative 1 which calls for a new rail to be run through the historic town of Old Lyme would be a mistake. We would lose something we would never be able to recapture. The tranquility of one of Connecticut's most beautiful towns. The people of Old Lyme will never allow it.
Ringquist_Ch	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.
Riodriguez_Pa	But I do not wish to see historic communities, such as Old Lyme, CT, destroyed in the process.
Rivera_Sh	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.
Rivers_Pa	Destroy an historic New England town to save a few minutes for commuters who never look out the window?
Rivers_Ye	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.
Robb_Er	I think that moving the trackt o a new bridge and running it along I-95 is an insult to all who live here. I am not aware of any issues with flooding on this section of track certainly in the time I have lived here, and I don't recall it ever happening when I was a kid growing up here.
Robbins_Sh	I understand that the proposed alternative path for the new railway will be through the historic center of Old Lyme. This is unacceptable.
Roberts_Bi	I'd just heard about some of the developing network enhancement ideas related to Southeastern Connecticut from Rep. Joe Courtney. Like him (and you folks, obviously!), I'm a big supporter of rail -- my wife rides the Shoreline East to New Haven and MetroNorth to Norwalk daily -- but it's imperative that the towns potentially affected have the opportunity to be fully briefed and comment before studies get too far along. I'm sure that is something in your plans, but sooner rather than later is probably a good idea. Thanks for listening!
Roberts_Ke	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.
Roberts_Su	This is a total farce. Amtrak is bankrupt, the natural scenery has already been destroyed with the electrification debacle and now you want to destroy the rest of our little town. And for what purpose ??? There is not enough to be gained to make any of us give you a thumbs up! This is a shameful act.
Robillard_Ro	Please find another solution than running the line through historic Old Lyme, CT. Please.
Robinson_El	As a resident of the Town of Old Lyme, and the Co-Chair of the Roger Tory Peterson Estuary Center Board of Directors of the Connecticut Audubon Society, I am writing to express my concerns and opposition to Alternative 1 of the draft EIS Tier 1 NEC FUTURE proposal... The town, the nation and the world recognizes the unique ecological value and the fragility of Old Lyme's estuary location. Universally, this bioregion is heralded for its conservation and economic value, its scenic beauty and the resources that have been dedicated to its protection in perpetuity. Purposely destroying America's natural and cultural heritage safeguarded for centuries here in Old Lyme, would be a travesty for our town and our country.

Table JJ–29: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Old Lyme (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment
Robinson_El	Summary Table S-4 correctly identifies our county and town for high potential ecological resource impact from NEC Future Alternative 1. The installation of a massive bridge structure with its long approaches will seriously impact the Town of Old Lyme and its greatest natural resource, the Connecticut River Estuary (CRE). Such large scale, human induced, habitat disturbance and destruction will jeopardize the ecological sustainability of this nationally and internationally recognized estuarine ecosystem. It will also impact the Lieutenant River, the nine towns of the Lower Connecticut River Valley, and the sensitive hydrological dynamics of Long Island Sound.
Robinson_John	However, community input into these projects is an absolute requirement. I am disappointed that this was not one of the first considerations.
Robinson_John	Any improvements to the rail system must be done in a way that does not sacrifice the character and composition of local communities. Cutting through towns that are home to numerous cultural landmarks and National Register of Historic Place Buildings, is wrong. Progress must not destroy our past.
Robinson_Rev Mark	Please DO NOT develop alt plan 1 as it would destroy the Connecticut river estuary surrounding Old Saybrook and Old Lyme, and the remarkable community of Old Lyme with the Lyme Art Academy being destroyed.
Roche_Je	I am opposed to any construction in Old Lyme other than the replacement of existing track where they currently lay.
Roche_Mi	I support improvements for the northeast rail corridor but not with the propose damage it would cause to our community of Old Lyme, Ct. Please work on another alternate or ungrade existing rail lines to save our historic districts, open space, wetlands and the heart of our town from this upheaval.
Rockwell_Cy	We oppose the plan (Alternative 1) to build railroad tracks that will run through University of New Haven's Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts property in Old Lyme, CT. This will do irreparable damage to that campus.
Rodgers_Be	I do not agree with the plan to connect Old Lyme, Ct.into the north east railway system. It would destroy the town.
Rodgerson_Ke	Levelling an art school in CT when there are very few left in the region is extraordinarily short-sighted. The project needs to be oriented around retaining the educational institution and the historic structures that comprise it and sustaining both the jobs and educational opportunities the school has provided for over 50 years.
Rollins_Mi	This plan will destroy the town of Old Lyme Connecticut. It is completely unacceptable. I do NOT support the plan to destroy a town.
Roman_Ev	To run a rail line through Old Lyme will ruin everything the people in Ct hold dear {prime wetlands,flora and wildlife and for WHAT !!!??? There is a shore line already which can't or just isn't maintained or upgraded. Start there.UCONN wants the new rail for convince what at the ruin of everything else.
Romano_M	Opposed to Alternative 1. It would destroy Old Lyme, CT and surrounding shoreline.
Romano_Ma	The impact of this proposal on the town of Old Lyme is unacceptable. We are a small town with little political pull, but the proposed track would go right through our historic, small downtown and would impact the art college on Lyme Street as well as the historic art museum nearby. We already have a swath of track that runs along the coast and through our wetlands, but the town has survived in spite of that (even without the benefit of a station or a stop in our town). The last thing we need is another rail corridor just a mile away.
Rooney-Ta	Alternative 1 is simply insufficient for long term growth and healthy economic development of the Northeast. Given the very real concerns for resiliency in the face of climate change, Alternative 1 is downright dangerous to the environment and to our economy.
Roosevelt_Ro	Please REMOVE Alternative 1 from the NEC Future plan to destroy the town and retail spaces for Old Lyme, CT for a new Rail line. I love trains but this is truly an amazingly UnAmercian plan.
Root_Th	The very suggestion to run a rail line through the heart of Old Lyme, Conn., is utterly outrageous. The area is one of the nation's most historically significant art sites.
Roper_Am	Old Lyme is my hometown. A high speed rail through the heart of this Historic town is heart breaking. This needs to be rethought out.
Roser_Na	I am writing to voice my opposition to Alternative 1 which would destroy the character of the town of Old Lyme, Connecticut. It would negatively impact our quality of life as it also impacts our school and library as well as our historic districts. Thank you for reconsidering this alternative.
Ross_Ca	Alternative 1 would decimate Old Lyme town.
Ross_St	I would like to know who developed the proposal for NEC Future Alternative 1. Also, I would like to know if the person, or persons, who included this alternative actually visited and physically looked at what their proposal would destroy and disrupt.
Ross_St	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.
Ross_We	Do not go through the Historic Area of Old Lyme, CT!
Rossi_Mi	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.
Roth_Em	I am a supporter of public transit in CT. I don't live near the Lyme historic and scenic areas that would be destroyed by this project. However, this plan is an insensitive outrage that raises questions of all those involved in directing this project. This plan destroys CT treasures that can never be replaced. Shame!

Table JJ–29: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Old Lyme (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment
Roth_Th	Any plans that involve rerouting the already existing tracks at the Connecticut River crossing are absurd. Your plan to decimate historical, beautiful, natural wildlife that has attracted even French impressionist painters for hundreds of years is disgusting.
Roy_Jo	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.
Royston_Ri	I am writing to state my objection to the proposed Alternative 1 plan.
Royston_Ri	it will also blight one of the most unspoiled areas of natural beauty in New England.
Royston_Tr	Any proposal to run a rail line of any sort through the heart of Old Lyme, Connecticut is appalling. It would destroy one of the most beautiful and historic towns in the United States.
Rucker_Jo	I do not agree with the new tracks coming thru town (Old Lyme). It would destroy the ambiance of the town.
Rudnick_St	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.
Rueb_Bi	The Tier 1 Draft Environmental Impact Statement does not consider the ecological and sociological damage from the proposed Amtrak route. Surely, planners can develop a less devastating route for the train and a bridge which will could be located adjacent to the current one so that no land needs to be seized by Eminent Domain...We have protected marshlands, swallows which return yearly as they migrate south and beautiful historic buildings which will be impacted.
Rueb_Sa	As residents of Old Lyme, we are disheartened by the proposed changes in the Amtrak route which would negatively impact the town of Old Lyme and disturb the estuaries nearby. We selected this quiet community for its beauty and tranquility. We don't need a train running next to the Old Lyme Shopping Center which comes at an exorbitant cost. As you can see, we live along the Lieutenant River which is a beautiful spot that resonates with visitors to The Florence Griswold Museum, nearby inns, and cayakers and fishermen who enjoy this beautiful spot along with the wildlife who inhabit the area.
Rueb_Sa	You have wasted taxpayer dollars for a small proposed return and you have disregarded residents and their representatives during the planning phase... Please consider residents of our town when you amend your plan and plan for a higher railroad bridge across the Connecticut River, if this is the issue.
Rueb_Sa	find a way not to destroy the town of Old Lyme.
Rueb_Sa	This plan of rerouting Amtrak through the town of Old Lyme is ill-advised... Please re-think the strategy and build a higher bridge in its present location.
Rumm_He	I strongly disagree with the new proposal to put new tracks that cut through Old Lyme, CT. This idea will destroy historic buildings and homes. it would also destroy the town ideal of open space, conservation and preserving heritage.This is completely inconceivable.
Rumm_Ph	I am strongly against this railroad construction. Destroying the quaint, historical town of Old Lyme does not seem to balance with saving train passengers 30 minutes of travel time. At a cost of \$66 billion dollars for construction this would translate to a cost of 2.2 billion dollars per minute of travel saved. Does this make economic sense? How many homes and businesses would be torn down? How will schools be effected? How will Old Lymes environment be preserved?
Rummel_Su	I oppose Alternative 1 as it would greatly impact the Old Lyme Art Academy
Rumskas_Ma	Just improve the line that exists. Old Lyme is the oldest town on this side of the river. This would be a great loss to the history of CT. We are not a commercial based town. Change it in a larger town! They are insane!!! I have lived here 42 years. I have seen this town change and not all for the better. This cannot happen!
Rupp_Ti	The new segment of rail proposed for the NEC will greatly disrupt the beauty and peacefulness of this historic area of the country. I propose leaving the NEC as it is and instead build a line that goes from NYC up through Hartford and on to Boston. The biggest problem is getting from Boston to NYC quickly. I live in Old Saybrook and it is only a quick 2 hour trip to either city, it is fast and easy just as it is. I work in NYC and have clients come from Boston to NYC frequently and they have no problem with Amtrak as it is. They say that it is an easy trip.
Russell_Pa	This plan will destroy and distort the historic community here in Old Lyme. Leave the tracks where they currently are. As a resident of Old Lyme I am completely opposed to this plan!
Russell_Sh	I am against the tier 1 draft as it will adversely affect the historic and beautiful Lyme street. It will lower the house values in old Lyme and displace people from their homes.
Russo_De	Absoultely Not.. Keep our shoreline towns as charming as they are... also can be very dangerous, The train ride thru these shoreline towns are just beautiful.. Who thinks up these crazy ideas !!!!
Russo_Fr	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.
Ryan_Ei	FRA: your current plans will heavily affect many people in southeastern Conn. in the worst way. People's beloved family homes could be lost, as well as historic sites and the tourism that is so vital to our State as well as the local economies.
Ryan_Li	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.
Ryan_Wi	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.
Ryder_Je	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.

Table JJ–29: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Old Lyme (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment
Rye_Re	As a current student at Lyme Academy College of Fine Art and a frequent patron of businesses, life and culture in Old Lyme, it is absolutely necessary to that historic and artistic community that the rail NOT run through the Connecticut River estuary or the historic district of Old Lyme or the Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts. This area is a priceless gem to Connecticut that should not be tread through or treated lightly.
Ryland_Ca	it would appear that the public scoping process failed to include the public of the affected communities!
Rynne_Ma	I oppose Alternative 1. I do want to see the character and charm of Old Lyme destroyed.
Rysz_Ro	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.
S_Pa	As a resident of Old Lyme, CT, I find the Alternate 1 plans to build new tracks to be unnecessary and extremely harmful to the community. Wildlife in the area would be greatly disrupted. Likewise, the cultural landscape will be damaged. The proposed plan would put tracks through a quaint downtown area that represents the best of New England. Our town is home to small but prestigious art institutions, featuring artwork inspired by the very scenery that Alternate 1 would destroy. I appreciate the work of the FRA, consider myself a novice Railfan and frequent local areas for train watching. That being said, I see no need to change the current system that is in place. The CT shoreline is well covered by local, regional and national rail service. If anything, the NEC plans should be focused inland toward the central part of the state. Please reject Alternative 1 and spare Old Lyme and the rest of southeast CT from the aggravation and destruction that would be inevitable with the plan.
Sabbatino_Li	Please do not allow the rail to negatively affect these communities in any way. Find a better solution working with the towns people.
Sadlon_Pa	Do not ruin our town of Old Lyme. This plan will not benefit anyone. Use the route of the existing tracks.
Sadowski_Su	Keep the town authentic and real. Noisy, fast trains are horrible.
Sadowski_VI	I would like to register my strong opposition to current NEC proposal. Surely a less severe impact on our town and its historic heritage can be found. Any improvements to the corridor should be confined to the existing foot print.
Sagalski_Da	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.
Salafia_Je	The plan for Old Lyme is horrible!!! How can you cut thru town? How can you take entire streets out and the Lyme Arts academy and the historical district? You are going to ruin the Connecticut River. The view is going to be horrible with a huge bridge cutting across the entire river area. Please I urge you to rethink this plan. Use the existing route!!! This will ruin Old Lyme, CT.
Saliby_Lo	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.
Salk_Gi	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.
Salm_Jo	Please do not consider Alternative 1. This plan will cut in half the very historic center of our small town of Old Lyme. This section of Old Lyme is central to our history economy, character and sense of community. Our shoreline is precious and one of the last remaining areas of untouched,non industrial shoreline in the state.
Sam	I would also like to strongly oppose Alternative 1. When not living at UConn, I live in Old Lyme,Connecticut. Alternative 1 would take the small town I grew up in and bisect it, placing busy railroads alarmingly close to the schools, shops, and businesses that stimulate Old Lyme's economy. This is in addition to the heinous molestation of the natural resources and lands, much of which are protected from development, that are unique to the Lower Connecticut River Valley, one of the most beautiful parts of this country.
Sampara_Ka	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.
Sandora_Sh	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
Sanket_Aa	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.
Sanket_Aa	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.
Sankow_EI	No!!!! Please no railway thru the middle of Old Lyme CT
Santacroce_Ka	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, endanger the federally protected areas of the Connecticut River Estuary and ruin the aesthetic quality of Old Lyme 's nationally recognized historic district.
Santos_GI	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.
Saparamad_Su	" 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. "
Sardo_Br	as well as cut through a marshland in Old Lyme
Sardo_Br	Please do not utilize alternative 1.

Table JJ–29: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Old Lyme (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment
Sargent_Jo	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.
Sarlin_Mi	I am opposed to Alternative 1 because of the disruption it will cause to the shoreline communities in around the Connecticut River.
Saulnier_Su	The plan for Old Lyme is horrible!!! How can you cut thru town? How can you take entire streets out and the Lyme Arts academy and the historical district? You are going to ruin the Connecticut River. The view is going to be horrible with a huge bridge cutting across the entire river area. Please I urge you to rethink this plan. Use the existing route!!! This will ruin Old Lyme, CT.
Saunders_Ka	I oppose Alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridor Futures proposal because it will destroy the campus of Lyme Academy of Fine Arts of the University of New Haven. Better alternatives are proposed and should be considered.
Savino_Da	Old Lyme is a precious asset for both Connecticut in the nation. It has a significant his store cool presents that would be destroyed by a proposal to bisect it with a new rail service. There must be a better alternative that allows for the expansion of rail service in the area without damaging the time and particularly damaging the campus of the Lyme Academy in fine arts
Scaife_Ga	" 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. "
Scaife_Ga	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.
Schavoir_Su	Ruining Old Lyme and its history would be criminal! Find another route and leave the beauty, history and fragile marshes alone!
Schechtel_Ro	This plan is too destructive to the town of Old Lyme. This is an historic site and to run a train line through it is sheer madness.
Scheibner_An	in Stonington, I fail to see that anything except better coordination and efficiency is needed to make better use of existing rail beds. If doing more infrastructure enhancement is needed, then do it but it will only further destroy what is left of our wildlife and woodland areas to put in a new rail line so close to the present one.
Scheinblum_Br	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.
Schellens_Ja	Alternative 1 must not be allowed to move forward as proposed. A plan that would cut through the heart of Old Lyme, specifically through the historic Lyme Street areathe cultural center of our town, is unthinkable. I am a regular Amtrak user, and this plan will shave off very little time, and destroy the heart of our charming town. Improve the current rail system - absolutely. Cut through the heart of Old Lyme as outlined in Alterantive 1 - absolutely not. A very ill conceived plan that must have been developed by folks unfamiliar with the irreplaceable history that would be destroyed in Old Lyme.
Scherer_Th	The Conservation Commission feels that the NEC Future Alternative 1 threatens the tenets of our stated mission and we would like to join the Selectmen in our opposition to the proposed NEC Future Alternative 1.... Please also add the Old Lyme Conservation Commission's name to the list of organizations requesting that NEC Future Alternative 1 be removed from further consideration.
Schiff_Ka	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.
Schiller_Ka	"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."
Schirmeiet_Be	Please do not choose to run the proposed railway through historic Old Lyme act and he Lyme Fine Art Academy.
Schmidt_Ma	Putting a track through Lyme Academy would destroy a historic campus and harm important educational institution. There has to be a better option. Don't do this.
Schneider_El	I oppose Alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridor Futures proposal because it will destroy the campus of Lyme Academy of Fine Arts of the University of New Haven. Not only will it destroy a growing, unique and vital educational institution, it will destroy an historic and irreplaceable landmark of the area. As a life-long resident of Connecticut (Norwalk/Trumbull) who was also employed by state government in Hartford for many years, I can attest to the fact that there is significantly more critical need for a direct rail service to go further north to Hartford and then on to Boston. It is unbelievable that Connecticut's capital is not served by mass transit connecting it to other population centers!
Schonberger_Ro	As a resident of Old Lyme CT I find Alternative 1 for the Proposed High Speed Rail TOTALLY UNEXCEPTABLE. Please register my opposition.
Schroeder_Da	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.
Schroeder_Na	As a former retail business owner on the main street --- one who continues to be involved and care about the community --- I find it difficult to believe that this could even be under consideration. This HISTORIC District area it would destroy IS the heart of the community. Please, please, reconsider. Find another route. One that does not destroy at least three historic buildings, museums and library, and/or impact access to them.
Schwartz_Ri	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.
Schweizer-Kaplan_An	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.
Sciocchetti_Ju	This entire process has been done in poor fashion and should be extended . That being said its obvious why they are being sneaky, nobody wants it and it's not necessary. This house is against it!!!!
Scott_He	As a life long resident of Old Lyme as well as the daughter and granddaughter of life time residents I absolutely oppose this plan
Scott_He	will destroy the downtown area of Old Lyme, the historic district, the schools Pre-K, 6-12 as well as the Lyme Academy of Fine Arts (college) and bring no benefit, financial or otherwise to the area.

Table JJ–29: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Old Lyme (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment
Scott_He	This plan will also have a huge and I believe negative impact on the fragile eco system in the estuary at the mouth of the Connecticut River.
Scott_Ri	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.
Scranton_Em	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.
Scranton_Li	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.
Seaman_Sa	"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."
Seaver_Ch	I have already objected to the First Alternative. And have just discovered the tracks would destroy the campus of Lyme Academy. This is totally unacceptable.
Sedgwick_Ro	Please do not run the rail lines through the town of Old Lyme and its fragile surrounding ecosystem. If they crossed the river further north they could join the I-95 corridor on the north side. You currently show the new rail route crossing from the south to the north side of the highway, beyond Old lyme to the east. The rails could join the corridor there and avoid the destruction of this unique and historic area.
Seene_Sa	I strongly disagree with Alternative 1 as it adds a new track through the heart of Old Lyme, CT. Old Lyme is a beautiful town with significant historical and environmental value...We would be devastated to see the historical wholeness of the town compromised for a railroad track, especially when so many other alternative routes exist.
Seligson_Ka	Alternative 1 is a terrible idea - eviscerating lovely scenic and historic areas always, always results in a net loss, culturally and economically.
Semple_Jo	I am steadfastly opposed to Alternative #1.
Senejani_AI	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.
Senning_Jo	Plan One as proposed is one of the most, if not the most, rediculus prosed plans I have ever seen. The section of track to be relocated is hardly the worst of all the sections in guestion!!!! To propose to relocate it through one of the most historic and beucolic sections of Old Lyme must have come from a total idiot. As an attorney I will personally see that this will never happen in my lifetime or that of my children. Never ending Litigation will ensue if this proposal is not dropped promptly.
Sexton_Ge	"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."
Shah_Mi	"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."
Shamansky_Ca	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.
Shannehan_Do	The proposal for a rail extension and station in Old Lyme, Ct is very troublesome and in my opinion misguided. Certainly replacing the bridge over the CT River has great merit and could be done similar to the 1-95 Bridge Replacement in New Haven, side-by-side with no shut down of traffic. What are your plans fro the railroad bridge in Norwalk, CT? That one is frightening. I would think your first priority would be to figure how to straighten the tracks t run the Acela at its rated speed, but not at the expense of a single area around Old Lyme, East Lyme, Niantic etc. ... Southeastern Connecticut doesn't need more bad news to an already rapidly deteriorating state in economic decline and a population that is migrating out of the state (See the current population trends for CT). I don't see how this will have a positive and long lasting value to this area.
Shannehan_Ka	This would be a travesty to the town of Old Lyme- Destroying the historical area which comprises Lyme Art Academy, Florence Griswold Museum,etc. not to mention its affect on real estate values in this beautiful seaside town.
Sharma_Ra	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.
Shea_Ge	Alt 1 makes no sense at all. It cuts up Old Lyme with very few benefits for the future of rail travel.
Shea_Th	Please, no new rail lines through Old Lyme, CT. This would completely devastate a cultural heritage site.
Sheehan_Jo	NEC Future Alternative 1 needs significant modification. It should not pass through the heart of Old Lyme and destroy the historic structures residing there. You should consider a more northerly route to miss that section of Old Lyme by crossing he CT River more to the north in Old Saybrook and the meet the Thames River as currently planned.
Shehu_Pe	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."
Shensie_Ed	This project is so unnecessary and a total waste of money for Conn.
Shepard-Tambini_Ph	I am an 80 year old woman who has lived in Old Lyme since 1939. If you have ever visited OLD LYME ,you would never ,ever, conceive of such the rape of our beautiful historic town!!!! I feel like I am living in the OLD WEST fighting the government about railroads. As the great granddaughter of David C. Shepard of St Paul Minn. whose company built 600 miles of the Great Northern Railroad I say SHAME ON YOU!!!!
Sheridan_Ph	I am very concerned about the environmental impact as well as the way the community of Old Lyme will be affected by alternative 1. By choice, Old Lyme has remained quiet and has a historic and art based Main Street that offers a quaint lifestyle to its population. As a homeowner I am very opposed to the change that is being proposed for the railroad.

Table JJ–29: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Old Lyme (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment
Sheridan_Ph	I am very concerned about the environmental impact as well as the way the community of Old Lyme will be affected by alternative 1. By choice, Old Lyme has remained quiet and has a historic and art based Main Street that offers a quaint lifestyle to its population. As a homeowner I am very opposed to the change that is being proposed for the railroad.
Sherman_Cl	I am very concerned about the environmental impact as well as the way the community of Old Lyme will be affected by alternative 1. By choice, Old Lyme has remained quiet and has a historic and art based Main Street that offers a quaint lifestyle to its population. As a homeowner I am very opposed to the change that is being proposed for the railroad.
Shinkle_Ja	We as residents of Old Lyme, CT, oppose Alternative 1 for high speed rail between New York City and Boston, particularly the proposed segment from Old Saybrook, CT to Providence, RI. That segment will cause a new high speed rail line to be built from Old Saybrook over the Connecticut River and through the heart of the 350-year-old town of Old Lyme. This project will damage the cultural, educational, civic, business and environmental assets and attributes that constitute the historical heritage and current life of our community.
Shippee_Pa	Although rail transportation indeed requires updating, the suggested routing through our town [Old Lyme] is absolutely unthinkable. Our citizens are extremely conscious of the environmental and historic and cultural nature of this area and have worked diligently to maintain that quality of life. There must be another way than your current proposal.
Shippee_Pa	Please see www.lymeline.net , and publisher Olwen Logan's comments which reflect the opinions of citizens of the Town of Old Lyme....its history and way of life you are suggesting to destroy....at tremendous costs.
Shippen_Ge	I live in Wyoming yet I love to visit Old Lyme College of Fine Art in Old Lyme, Connecticut. As a former visiting professor I know first hand what a valuable resource the College is to Connecticut and the field of Art. As an artist, I spent parts of 6 summers traveling to Old Lyme to work and teach. The setting of the school which was built with special attention to its unique surroundings and historical placement will be lost! Old Lyme with its river estuaries and surrounding country are so ideal for an art school. It's unique history as a place where artists have worked and continue to work brings character to the region. The Florence Griswold Museum is unparalleled in its 19th Century a American Art collection. You must consider all this, Americas history is being destroyed in this move to put a high speed rail line there. SOS! Save Our School!!!!
Shirer_Do	Please rethink this proposal (Alternative 1) to find a more viable alternative.
Shirley_Ch	I am opposed to Alternative 1, as it will take away the historic culture of Old Lyme.
Shriver_Ri	I am firmly opposed to FRA's option 1 that would destroy my home town. (Old Lyme)
Shriver_Ri	the project as designed would have a major negative impact on one of the world's environmental treasures, the Connecticut River Estuary, a unique area that has been restored and preserved with great public and private effort.
Shriver_Ri	There is a better solution to this problem, but those most affected by the FRA plan have not had time to help develop a better way.
Shugrue_Mi	As a member of a neighboring town I'm highly opposed to this potential plan. Southeastern CT small town character is constantly being eroded and degraded. Pushing through historic Old Lyme simply is unacceptable at any level.
Shyloski_N	Why would this rail be of value to the shoreline when Hartford would gain so much more from this venture?
Sicilia_Ja	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.
Sicuranza_Ki	Alternative 1 is presented as a "maintenance" proposal yet threatens to irrevocably alter the entire town of Old Lyme, CT. I see no benefit gained for such a huge cost. Needless to say, I am adamantly opposed to this option.
SigmanYoung_Lo	The local communities must be consulted and all factors considered before plans are made. Haste makes very angry citizens!
Signora_Ky	By building the Northeast Corridor track through Old Lyme, many people, including myself, believe that the plan would destroy the iconic reputation of many historic landmarks located in the Old Lyme area, including the Florence Griswold Museum, the Lyme Art Association, and the Lyme Academy of Fine Arts, located right down the street from the Lyme Old-Lyme High School. Not to mention that the project is estimated to cost around \$62 billion dollars, as well. Adding this train track to Old Lyme would greatly hurt our local economy and greatly diminish Old Lyme's well-known reputation as a small, rural town.
Signora_Mc	Regarding Alternative One for Old Lyme, CT I am very concerned about the high speed rail going through town for a few different reasons. The first one is that this isn't even going to help anyone in Old Lyme. Connecticut is a pass through state, so unless we go way out of our way, we aren't even going to board this train
Signora_Mc	The second concern of mine is the environmental issues. We cannot risk polluting/ damaging the Connecticut River Estuary. Everyone should be worried about that. ...The Federal Railroad Administration has completely ignored the protective designations that have been set on many places in Old Lyme, as they are Historical Districts. An example of this is that if they decide to use Alternative 1, it will destroy one of the most historic places in Old Lyme, the John Sill House on the campus of the Lyme Academy of Fine Art.
Signora_Wa	From my standpoint, it is very clear that the impact of the segment for Old Lyme, CT has not been fully researched to appreciate what this will do to our community. It appears someone simply drew a convenient line along the shoreline next to i95. This proposed segment goes right through the historic downtown area. Please take the time to visit Old Lyme to actually see the ramifications of this proposal. Thank you for your consideration.
Silk_Ed	Alternative #1 is not acceptable due to the negative impact that the new section of track that is to run from Old Lyme through to the Rhode Island. The planned insertion of the new track the entire length of Old Lyme, even if it involves aerial suspension of track, will permanently disrupt a number of existing commercial and private sites, protected open space and also disturb numerous historic and cultural landmarks unique to Old Lyme.
Simerson_Go	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 town of Old Lyme likewise should not be impacted this way.

Table JJ–29: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Old Lyme (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment
Simerson_Go	The northern alternatives are better.
Simler_Su	Exactly where will the tracks begin to veer north in Old Saybrook and where will the new bridge leave OS? How will it impact OS's Mariner's Way development? Where exactly will the new bridge join Old Lyme? How high will the bridge need to be and where will the "ramp" that gives track the necessary gentle slope to climb that height begin and end. How is a bridge that crosses the CT River on a diagonal practical? What is the exact path to be taken through the heart of Old Lyme and towns to the east?
Simler_Su	The thought of devastating the heart of Old Lyme to make it easier and faster for people to pass by and our state is extremely upsetting. Small towns are what make Connecticut. Don't trample over us.
Simpson_Ja	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.
Sims_Vi	You can't build this because it would destroy the wetlands of Old Lyme, therefore disrupting several ecosystems as well as interrupting the absorption of ground water, blocking the natural process of water filtration. These ecological services provide enormous monetary benefits to the residents of Old Lyme and the surrounding areas. The taxes would also go up for residents.
Sinay_Ma	The plan which proposes to eliminate the main commercial area and the historic district of Old Lyme is very poorly thought out Well publicized hearings need to be held locally with environmental, engineering, tourism etc impacts
Sinclair_Li	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.
Skahan_Sh	Nuts!
Skwarek_An	i would be totally opposed to the running a trail way through old lyme
Slaney_He	Alternative one (the option that routes through the historic district of Old Lyme, CT) is a travesty. You would be decimating the culture and income of an entire community (tourism is a huge part of the local economy) for little purpose other than convenience. For shame. Come on, NEC. Get your act together and start more actively informing the locals in CT. The first Alternative is not the way to go.
Slater_Ja	Pure madness to destroy one of the most beautiful historic small towns in Ct.
Slenker_Ja	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.
Sloane_Da	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 the other important features of this community. I have frequently visited this area and it is a local treasure with both historic and aesthetic significance. ...The shoreline area as a tourist area is very important to Connecticut and the less disturbance it gets, the better.
Smith_Da	We are vehemently opposed to Alternative 1 and the consequent destruction of a national treasure, Old Lyme.
Smith_Fr	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.
Smith_Kar1	I am strongly opposed to alternative one. As a resident of Old Lyme, I am against the destruction of our only commercial area as well as our beautiful historic district.
Smith_Kar2	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. Please try to find an alternate solution that will not impact this program that supports so many young artists and provides a learning opportunity for students of all ages in the arts for surrounding communities
Smith_Kat	I am writing to echo the comments delivered by various Lyme/Old Lyme organizations on February 10, 2016, opposing the plans outlined in Alternative 1. This alternative would be devastating to the towns of the shoreline.
Smith_Ro	As a resident of Old Lyme, I am submitting testimony in opposition to the Northeast Corridor Future Tier 1 Draft Environmental Impact Statement "Alternative 1" proposal.My concern lies in the fact that this proposal will significantly alter the rives of residents of Old Lyme and decimate my community. The impacts to my community include the potential destruction of homes, businesses, the Old Lyme Historic District {which includes our schools,LibrarY,the Florence Griswold Museum, The Lyme Academy of Fine Arts and many, the Town Hall and many businesses. In addition it would have significant environmental impacts including the removal of wetlands, open space and natural resources.
Smith_Te	The high speed line through Old Lyme is a terrible idea. Speed should not trump our history and quality of life.
Smith_Te	The high speed line through Old Lyme is a terrible idea. Speed should not trump our history and quality of life.
Smith_Te	The high speed line through Old Lyme is a terrible idea. Speed should not trump our history and quality of life.
Smith_Ti	The small straightening of the route suggested by this change would not warrant the huge disruption of historic Old Lyme. I am completely against this land grab.
Smolinski_Jo	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.
Snitkin_Mi	...avoiding what would be a devastating and destructive route through Old Lyme and beyond proposed in #1
Snow_Ca	I write to oppose Tier 1 EIS Alternative 1 not only because of its obvious detrimental impact on the local economy, environment, and cultural history, but also for the local community that it will impact as they engage in a long battle to fight its imposition (that in the end will benefit no one but the teams of attorneys who will engage in this conflict). Please withdraw Alternative 1 from consideration.

Table JJ–29: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Old Lyme (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment
Snurkowski_Ja	This plan will devastate our small town (Old Lyme), ruining it's character and history. My family and I highly oppose routing a train through the middle of our town's main street, disrupting a college, residences, a museum, and wetlands.
Solanki_Ma	I support Alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridor Futures proposal because it will allow more passengers to travel major cities between Boston and Washinton DC. It will definitely help to reduce lots of traffic on I-95 and that needs to be done cause I-95 is being too much conjugated. Also it will help to prevent environmental pollution since more people will travel by Northeast Corridor. It will help university students commuting between main campus and the campus of Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts of the University of New Haven.
Solanki_Ma	I support Alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridor Futures proposal because it will allow more passengers to travel major cities between Boston and Washinton DC. It will definitely help to reduce lots of traffic on I-95 and that needs to be done cause I-95 is being too much conjugated. Also it will help to prevent environmental pollution since more people will travel by Northeast Corridor. It will help university students commuting between main campus and the campus of Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts of the University of New Haven.
Solari_Sh	I urge the powers that be to STOP the plan for high speed rail through CT. It would negatively impact the environment, ecology, and cultural landscape of our CT, in particular Old Lyme, CT.
Somers_Wi	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.
Somerville_Do	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.
Somppi_Ja	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.
Sonusi_Op	" 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. "
Soos_An	I strongly oppose The Alternative 1 proposal that would necessitate cutting a wide swath through Old Lyme, CT.
Sorbello_Sa	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.
Soroko_Be	I oppose the proposed alternate train route through the Old Lyme Historic District, the ecologically sensitive CT River estuary and the Old Lyme College of UNH campus.
Sorrells_Da	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.
Sorrentino_Ch	"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."
Soucy_Su	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.
Spall_Ma	" 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. "
Spall_Ra	"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."
Sparkman_Am	Alternative 1 will uproot strong, stable, vibrant, and historically and culturally rich communities between Old Saybrook and Stonington. History, culture and stability don't run much deeper than in that corridor... You will destroy communities that have roots as deep as the origins of this nation. You will destroy small communities that will not survive being cut in half or having to endure years of disruption. You will destroy the very essence of New England life. Choose a different alternative!
Speirs_Mi	Why?Why would you choose to destroy an historic town that already has a train route, just to transport people 30 minutes faster? Besides the danger of speed, the danger of destroying centuries of history and charm and peaceful living seems like a terrible choice. Have you lived here? Is the need for speed so great that you can't find a more sensible alternative? Why? At what cost is this considered progress? Can we only move into the future by destroying our past? I hope not . Please don't destroy what is irreplaceable when surely there are other options available. Please reconsider the alternatives
Speirs_Sa	As someone who has grown up in Old Lyme, studied biology and has produced environmental impact statements, this is not something I would be supporting. A new rail line will only negatively impact the current habitat and animals residing there. As it will be throughout the construction of this new rail way.
Spence_Al	I oppose this plan. Disrupting a community, an established college and the surrounding environment is bad for CT
Spina_Ma	As a resident of Old Lyme, CT, I would like to strongly protest the proposed route of Alternative 1 in the FRA NEC plan. The route would take the rail line directly through the village of Old Lyme, destroying the Lyme Art Academy, Florence Griswald Museum, and the community character of the village area.
Spina_Su	I cannot believe the stupidity of the plan to place a high speed train through the center of a historic and beautiful cultural center (Old Lyme); of one of Connecticut's most famous art communities. In addition it will cut through a college campus and be across the street from a high school, middle school and elementary school. What on earth are you people thinking? Leave the tracks where they are. No one likes you as it is.
Spinato_Di	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.

Table JJ–29: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Old Lyme (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment
Spoltore_Ja	This is to support the document submitted by Bonnie Reemsnyder, First Selectwoman of Old Lyme CT in espressing significant concerns and opposition to the NEC Future rail proosal for Old Lyme CT. Although we support the need for upgrades it our nation's passenger rail infrastucture and improvement in the existing railway, we are strongly against the devastating disruption to the town of Old Lyme CT with the proposed changes. We strongly request review of the current proposal and seek an alternative that would not disrupt the existing town.
Spooner_Ch	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.
Spratt_Ja	I join my fellow citizens in disbelief that any federal or State agency would seriously consider Alternative 1, rerouting high-speed rail lines over a new bridge crossing the Connecticut River, across the saltwater marshes at the Lieutenant River and through the historical district of Old Lyme. I can assure Amtrak that there will be vigorous opposition to NEC Future plan Alternative 1.
Spratt_Ja	Alternative 1 would essentially destroy the Old Lyme Historic District, the character of our community and result in significant environmental and economic damage to our region without any potential regional benefits.
Spratt_Ja	We need/demand to have Alternative 1 removed from any further consideration NOW! This is not just about NIMBY (we already have the Amtrak running through Old Lyme), the Old Lyme Historic District in and of itself is a national treasure. The historic district and marshlands targeted by the NEC Alternative 1 plan are the center of this important historical community of American colonial and maritime history, architecture, art and nature history. The Old Lyme community through many, many generations of preservation minded citizens has carefully protected and maintained the historical character of the district and wetlands which make up part of the district to preserve and protect our historical and nature resources as a whole ecosystem for future generations. Our Art College, Museums, wetlands, open spaces, galleries and architecture is a testament.
Spratt_Ja	...Alternative 1 would result in the loss of critical habitat for migratory birds, aquatic and marshland wildlife, endangered species, flood control protection and the visual corridors which inspired the American Impressionism Art movement.
Sreebhashyam_Sa	Please avoid the rail road through the Lyme university campus.
St. Germain_Kr	We vehemently oppose Alternате 1. ...Take Alternате 1 off the table.
Stanard-Ta	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.
Standart_Cl	Alternative 1 is a terrible idea.
Standart_Jo	This is a classic example of a poorly conceived, wreckless plan that will distory communities, institutions and businesses with no real gain. I am against plan 1.
Stanley_Ja	As an employee of the Florence Griswold Museum for the past 16 years I was devastated to learn of the Proposed Northeast Corridor High Speed Rail Route which would cut through the Old Lyme Historical District and completely destroy this historic village. As a citizen I am asking NEC officials to please include the residents of Old Lyme in identifying a revised plan that would not impact the beautiful CT river and surrounding marshlands. Please consider improving the existing Amtrak corridor.
Stanton_An	No,no,no! Your idea to put a new high speed rail line through Old Lyme Ct is beyond insane. To destroy our community so you can shave minutes off a train trip is ludicrous. I sincerely hope you drop this asinine plan. Lyme Old Lyme will not stand by quietly while you attempt to destroy our towns!
Steadman_Be	My first question is why am I just now learning of this proposal, through a email newsletter from Congressman Courtney, who apparently was also not made aware until recently of the construction of a new route between Old Saybrook, CT and Kenyon, R.I.? I would like to see more information provided and public hearings held in the effected communities.
Steed_Ro	Noooo - this not only cuts right through the campus of Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts, but the proposed route would cut through the CT Audubon's planned Roger Tory Peterson perserve, plus the property in Pomfret and possibly Trail Wood....Ugg! Too many sensitive preserves - there has to be an alternative route.
Steiner_Re	Any modernization of the the Amtrak Northeast Corridor should NOT in any way impact the historic district of Old Lyme, or the town itself in any way (!)... Not only will the cultural heritage and aesthetic beauty of Old Lyme be destroyed, but our community and home values will be decimated... We are hopeful other alternatives will be proposed - which respect the lives, communities and property values of local residents.
Steiner_Re	It is completely without conscience that the Federal Government and the Federal Railroad Administration has quietly tried to push this through without taking into consideration the local community or public input.
Steiner_Tr	This is a ridiculous plan and should be scrapped completely... the idea of building a completely new track system and then go directly through environmentally sensitive areas at a time like this is unbelievable. More exposure to the public should for discussion should be given. I am completely against this.proposal and feel it does nothing beneficial to or for the area.
Steinman_Lo	Please do not consider option 1.
Steinman_Lo	Wildlife would also be a huge factor as well.
Stephenson_Ka	Absolutely not! Our town will be ruined.
Stephenson_Su	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. Not only will it destroy the campus of a fabulous college, but it will negatively impact the flora and fauna of the protected wetlands of the area; lastly, the historical district will be ruined if this proposal goes forward.
Stevens_Ba	The proposed plan would be another tragedy leading to the destruction of beautiful, small town America (Old Lyme).

Table JJ–29: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Old Lyme (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment
Stevens_Se	The proposed rail project would not only besmirch the beauty of the environment that fosters learning at Lyme Academy but the farms nearby would be affected (and its workers) as well.
Stevenson_Mi	My life in Connecticut has been greatly enriched by land sanctuaries, historical renovation and repurposing. It is evidence of short term thinking to destroy these things by neglecting to have a respect for their long term advantages to the state and to its people
Stewart_Ro	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.
Stock_Ma	A homeowner in Old Lyme, I live directly in the path of your proposed ALTERNATIVE 1 rail track. I am in shock that any branch of government would consider such a destructive measure. Your plan for our Old Lyme community would decimate our town economically, historically, ecologically, and educationally. Our town/village is home to historical and cultural treasures: Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts, Lyme Art Association, The Historical Society, and Florence Griswold Museum to name a few. Our Nature Conservancy works to protect and preserve the ecological treasure of our vast wetlands and marches. The history of America is represented in historically preserved, century-old homes and churches. The proposed threatens all this. ... Instead of spending all those tax dollars on your study I would like to suggest you use that money to improve the already existing rail system that services the Acela and Metro North trains. I stand adamantly opposed to the Alternative 1 of the EIS rail service.
Stock_Ma	I question the lack of transparency your organization has exercised regarding this rail system and its extreme negative impact on our community. And I find it unconscionable for the Old Lyme government officials to have learned about your "study" through the "grapevine" just a handful of days ago.
Stockmal_Ju	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.
Stoddard_Er	I oppose Option 1 as it will hurt the town of Old Lyme
Stokes_Ab	I strongly oppose Alternative 1.
Stoller_Ma	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.
Storer_St	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.
Stratman_Ro	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.
Stratman_Ro	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.
Straut_An	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. There are a number of other options that do not involve the campus or downtown. Making the best environmental and ecological choice should not always be about money,
Strehlow_Kr	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.
Stroli_Al	I vehemently oppose this plan. It will destroy the natural resources and cultural fabric of Connecticut.
Stroud_Gr	The plan to build an additional rail route across the Connecticut River and through downtown Old Lyme, would destroy the scenic and environmentally sensitive marshes that were the subject of American Impressionism, it would physically destroy the current and important Old Lyme Art Academy which builds on that earlier movement, and which is the heart of new American realist painting, it would destroy the town of Old Lyme which maintains the historic legacy of this movement and remains an important tourist hub and gateway for New London County.
Stroud_Gr	What sense is there in the current and successful work by the Nature Conservancy, and others, to protect the Connecticut River watershed, if the actual outlet, rich with wildlife, including eagles and osprey, is destroyed? The plan is not just destructive, it's absurd.
Struwas_Da	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.
Stula_Na	I absolutely oppose the train being rerouted to go through the historic district of Old Lyme, CT. This is an ill-conceived plan on the basis of several issues
Sullivan_Ce	I find the NEC Future EIS report very troubling in so many respects that I can't construct an argument in favor of proposals and plans that entail ANY further build or expansion beyond the existing railroad infrastructure.
Sullivan_Ce	Further, the disregard for the historic character, the local/regional economy and the natural environments of places that would be invaded for new track and connections is downright contemptuous of the residents of those areas. I am concerned particularly about the proposals that would have line extensions cut through my town of Old Lyme, CT and I know no one who was ever consulted about these proposals at any stage of their formulation.
Sullivan_Je	This town is a very rare and special hamlet nestled along the Connecticut River. The schools, art institutions, history, open space and aggressively sound environmental planning make Old Lyme an exceptional community. To deliberately destroy the town's historic and commercial districts is not rationally feasible. How the FRA can consider allowing Amtrak to destroy this town is immoral if not outright criminal. Amtrak bleeds money and has been greatly subsidized, (\$45 billion?), by the federal government and is STILL losing money. How can the FRA justify allowing a serially dissolute company dictate the destruction of fiscally responsible historic jem of a town??? Yes we need to upgrade the transportation infrastructure. Tier 1 Draft EIS is not a fiscally sound plan, and should not merit any serious consideration.
Sullivan_Ro	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.

Table JJ–29: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Old Lyme (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment
Sullivan_Sa	Please reexamine you plan to take more space in the Northeast for railroad expansion. Please visit the areas in Connecticut where you are proposing an expansion and meet with elected officials and townspeople to hear their concerns firsthand.
Sulmasy_Lo	I am most strongly in opposition to Alternative 1 as it prescribes a devastating change in the rail line through the Town of Old Lyme's educational and historical areas for virtually no gain in overall route time or service. While I am strongly for the improvement and expansion of the rail service, this change does nothing to enhance access throughout Connecticut and New England.
Sumoski_Da	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.
Sun_Hu	"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."
Sutherland_Al	The lack of thought applied to the proposed Old Saybrook - Kenyon section of Alternative 1 is astonishing, regardless of how preliminary the proposal is. A route that drives through the heart of the historic district of Old Lyme and residential areas of East Lyme with no prior consultation with local leaders suggests at best a callous urban-focused thought process that has no consideration for the effects on more rural areas. That impression is only enhanced by the fact that the route also ignores the topology of the area, running parallel to a famously hilly portion of I-95, totally incompatible with rail track. We are presented with an image of a random bureaucrat armed with a map, a marker pen and no interest in the consequences of their decision. Alternative 1 should be abandoned.
Sutson_At	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.
Svigals_Ph	I strongly oppose alternative one as it will destroy the campus of the Lyme Academy of Arts, a community institution and an essential educational asset to the State.
Swarts_Jo	I am vehemently opposed to any rail project which will have any impact on our shoreline communities.
Sweenwy_Jo	The other issue, we've heard it already tonight, the people in Old Lyme are quite upset at how a rerouting of 95 through Old Lyme could be very upsetting to their community.
Sweet_De	Do not de face Old Lyme with a track right through this beautiful, quaint, historic CT town.
Szarkowicz_Ji	I oppose Alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridor Futures proposal because it will destroy the campus of Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts.
Szymczyk_Do	I strongly oppose the Alternative 1 proposal being considered by NECFuture to update the railway corridor between Washington DC and Boston. ...I leave it to people more experienced than me to advise you of the additional historic and environmental impact of the proposed rail corridor through Old Lyme. But if you take that five minute drive and take the time to understand how a small town works, you will be as certain as I am that a new mile-wide rail corridor cutting through our collective heart would cause serious and irreparable harm to Old Lyme. I am therefore writing to express my strong opposition to the Alternative 1 proposal that would lay down railroad tracks through our shoreline towns, and, most specifically, through Old Lyme, Connecticut.
Szymczyk_Er	NEC Future Alternative 1 is insane and I vehemently oppose this project. NEC Future Alternative 1 will destroy historical landmarks as well as have an horrendous impact on the estuaries of the area.
Tafoya_Wi	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.
Talerico_Li	As much as I would like to see trains as an alternative to cars on RT95 having it ruin the Lyme Academy of Fine Arts school property as well as the surrounding natural habitat is not worth it. Fine an alternative but save the gem of a school and our surrounding living water ways.
Tambis_Ch	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.
Tannen_Er	I am vehemently opposed to the proposal to install high speed rail through the historic village of Old Lyme.
Taylor_An	Alternative 1 plan for Old Lyme and its impact on surrounding communities will be catastrophic. People live here for the beauty of nature and the "relative" peace and quiet of an historical town. This is a terrible idea whose time has not come. History will not look kindly on you should you proceed with this proposal.
Taylor_Cr	I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed re-routing of rail service through Old Lyme (Alternative 1).
Taylor_Cr	Based on renderings for Alternative 1, the proposed railroad route would cut immediately through one of our favorite land trust properties Champlain North, and the 16.5 foot oak tree, vernal pools, and wildlife that inhabit the preserve.
Taylor_Cy	Option 1 would completey devastate the town of Old Lyme, how many homes, not to mention the historical district, and the college would be destroyed? There must be a better way more closely following the current tracks.
Taylor_Wi	As a New England native of 10 generations, I oppose Alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridor Futures proposal because it will not only destroy the campus of Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts of the University of New Haven, it will adversely impact this historically significant venue. Please work with these folks to find an acceptable alternative.
Teller_Ca	I oppose the NEC Alternative 1..
Tellier_Li	I am writing to voice my opposition to alt. 1 regarding rail expansion that would cut through the historic district of Old Lyme. While I do enjoy traveling by rail, I find it hard to believe that anyone would seriously entertain destroying an area that is so important to the tourist industry of south eastern Connecticut. There must be another way.

Table JJ–29: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Old Lyme (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment
Tellier_Li	I am writing to voice my opposition to alt. 1 regarding rail expansion that would cut through the historic district of Old Lyme. While I do enjoy traveling by rail, I find it hard to believe that anyone would seriously entertain destroying an area that is so important to the tourist industry of south eastern Connecticut. There must be another way.
Terry_Ro	please don't do this, it will ruin the quiet lil town i've loved
Terry_Ro	NOT THROUGH OLD LYME PLEASE
Terwilliger_Ma	Alternative #1 is flawed in two major senses. First, it is the least likely of the three so-called "Action Plans" to achieve any significant improvement in high speed rail service between New York and Boston. Second, Alternative #1 will utterly demolish the town of Old Lyme, turning one of the oldest and most storied towns of this state into a hollow shell. As a resident of Old Lyme, I am dismayed at the prospect of my town's destruction. As a citizen of the republic, however, I am *even more dismayed* at the cynical abandonment of the goals of high speed rail in the Northeast Corridor that Alternative #1 clearly represents. Worse, the acceptance of Alternative #1 will slam the door on all further efforts to improve rail transit in the Northeast Corridor for a generation or more. "Small reforms are the greatest enemies of large reforms" is a commonplace of politics. Alternative #1 is a classic example of a "poison reform:" one whose main impact is to forestall meaningful change. Alternative #1 would destroy every vestige of the town that attracted these painters (men and women) to what is now, was once, and (God willing) may yet be a remarkably beautiful place. Alternative #1 demands the death of Old Lyme: a sacrifice that might be worthy, if only the object were worthy of such a price. But, in fact, the sacrifice of our town's life would only serve to temporarily advance the careers of a few politicians while it undermines the happiness of future generations throughout the Northeast! That is an unworthy sacrifice. Alternative #1 is simply not right.
Tetu_Em	I oppose option 1 and any plan cutting through historic Old Lyme, CT.
Thereault_Ed	Running a high speed rail one through the environmentally sensitive estuaries and historic landscape of old Lyme is ludicrous. While public transit is a much needed piece of infrastructure, it serves no purpose to destroy a town and an ecosystem to do so. Visitors from around the world come to the lower CT River valley and the mouth of the Lieutenant River to eagle and osprey watch, visit the landscapes made famous by the American impressionists of the Old Lyme School, and visit the 18th and 19th century inns and museums the remain much as they were when Childe Hassam, Willard Metcalf and their fellow painters came to stay at Miss Florence's boarding house.
Thereault_Ed	Running a high speed rail one through the environmentally sensitive estuaries and historic landscape of old Lyme is ludicrous. While public transit is a much needed piece of infrastructure, it serves no purpose to destroy a town and an ecosystem to do so. Visitors from around the world come to the lower CT River valley and the mouth of the Lieutenant River to eagle and osprey watch, visit the landscapes made famous by the American impressionists of the Old Lyme School, and visit the 18th and 19th century inns and museums the remain much as they were when Childe Hassam, Willard Metcalf and their fellow painters came to stay at Miss Florence's boarding house.
Thiyagarajan_Ne	"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."
Thompson_Br	I strongly oppose Alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridor Futures proposal because it will destroy irreplaceable cultural assets and one of Connecticut's most historic communities.
Thompson_Cl	Old Lyme is one of the most beautiful, peaceful, historic towns, bordered by Long Island Sound and the Connecticut River and has drawn its character for centuries from an artist colony which developed there BECAUSE of the beauty and tranquility of the area. It is a unique gem visited by thousands of tourists yearly now and I can't believe there isn't some way of improving the rail service without destroying the heart of this classic, uniquely American historic town-- PLEASE TRY!
Thompson_Ge	I assume rumors are accurate and this is a \$60 billion project. The nation can not afford it. Certainly this will fail the fiscal test. This project tears up the greater Lyme community with its museums, traditions, history and beauty.....improve the current line is a better way
Thompson-Ta	The proposal is so outrageous and muddle-headed that several people to whom I forwarded it thought it was some kind of early April fool's joke. To run a rail line through [Old Lyme,] an historic village would be so deleterious to the village that we would all be impacted severely. Hard to believe that anyone even came up with this.
Tiano_Ro	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.
Tichy_Ka	I am in strong opposition to Alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridor Futures proposal because it will effectively destroy the campus of Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts of the University of New Haven. This university is a dynamic and expanding successful academic institution in the state of Connecticut. Please give this institution a chance to prosper and grow. Its graduates make Connecticut proud and are gainfully employed in many industries throughout this state. I respectfully propose that an alternate route be adopted, one that will not negatively impact the University of New Haven.
Timpanelli_Ca	Old Lyme /Old Saybrook are one of the states most beautiful areas- to destroy the nature of these areas to gain 35 minutes of travel time is appalling !
Toce_Ri	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
Todd_Jo	Please do not desicrate the pristine historic town and environs of Old Lyme, CT- we need preservation for ourselves and those to come- so few left....and this one is a gem!
Todisco_Lo	I oppose alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridor proposal, because it will destroy the Lyme Academy campus of the University of New Haven.
Toth_Ch	I oppose Alternative 1
Tozzi_Te	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.
Tran_El	" 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. "

Table JJ–29: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Old Lyme (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment
Tremaglio_Ra	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.
Trigiani_Ad	This is unacceptable! Find another route for the train tracks! Lyme Academy is hallowed ground for artists and art and the future!
Tupper_Tr	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.
Turkowski_AI	I am opposed to the proposed railroad plan that would disrupt the small businesses, historic and educational buildings and the beauty of Old Lyme, CT. Figure out a better plan please.
Turner_Bi	"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."
Turner_Su	"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."
Tuttle_Jo	No train ! No plan will be accepted by me for this awful request. Please save Old Lyme from this intrusion.
Twining_Ed	As an old Lyme resident and a traveler on Amtrak I strongly oppose the alternate 1 proposal to reroute the train tracks through the center of old Lyme. Not only does it destroy the historic areas of our town but it only shaves 20 minutes off the entire travel time from New York to Boston. In an effort to straighten out track for a high speed rail it also removes one of the most scenic rides along this corridor as well as forgoes local shoreline stops after Old Saybrook. I urge the FRA to rethink this specific proposal, Alt. 1. If such a significant amount of funds only shortens the trip by 20 minutes where is the value gained? Especially at the cost of the destruction of the historic district of Old Lyme
Twining_Ed	As an old Lyme resident and a traveler on Amtrak I strongly oppose the alternate 1 proposal to reroute the train tracks through the center of old Lyme. Not only does it destroy the historic areas of our town but it only shaves 20 minutes off the entire travel time from New York to Boston. In an effort to straighten out track for a high speed rail it also removes one of the most scenic rides along this corridor as well as forgoes local shoreline stops after Old Saybrook. I urge the FRA to rethink this specific proposal, Alt. 1. If such a significant amount of funds only shortens the trip by 20 minutes where is the value gained? Especially at the cost of the destruction of the historic district of Old Lyme.
Twining_Edi	As a resident of old Lyme I am against alternative 1 that runs amtrac through the heart of our town.
Twining_Edi	But the proposed Alt 1 option is an expensive gesture that does not justify its cost. It relocates the train route away from the shoreline which will increase I95 traffic. Auto traffic along the highway is already over crowded. Making the shoreline less accessible by train is therefore not of use to this area. If the aim is to improve train travel through CT we need an option that can actually do this in a substantial way. Cutting half an hour off travel time is not substantial enough to justify demolishing an art academy and bisecting a town center. Please do not approve this Alt 1 proposal.
Twohill_Ca	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.
Tycz_Mi	I strongly oppose alternative 1 (Tier 1 Draft EIS) of FRA's Northeast Corridor Futures proposal. As a student, graduate, & nearby longterm homeowner this plan decimates both the natural & historic environment of a CT. gem.
Tyler_Ke	This planning process has not been publicized nearly enough to the public.
Ullrich_Ti	How can you even consider running a giant rail line through the heart of a community with residential streets, houses and schools on both sides! I find this idea ridiculous to the extreme.
UNewHaven_Kaplan	I write on behalf of the Board of Governors of the University of New Haven and Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts' Board of Trustees to strongly oppose the "Alternative 1" Federal Rail Administration's proposed upgrades to the Northeast Corridor rail system that would negatively affect Lyme Academy and the town of Old Lyme, Connecticut... NEC Future Alternative 1 would cause irreparable damage to the campus, the town, the community and the environment.
UNewHaven_Kaplan	The University of New Haven and Lyme Academy College merged in 2014, so we share a common future. We eagerly sought this partnership because of the institution's legendary role in preserving and promoting representational art and the town's status as the cradle of American Impressionism. The College is a jewel in the landscape of art institutions, one that retains a strong emphasis on classical academic approaches to art. It draws students and faculty from around the world and provides the local community unparalleled resources for artistic education and cultural immersion... The campus is located in Old Lyme's Historic District, which is on the National Register of Historic Places. Further, the John Sill House (1817), a structure noted on the Historic American Buildings Survey by the National Park Service, is located on Lyme Academy College's campus and in the direct path of the proposed rail lines.
Urbach_AI	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.
Urbanski_EI	I oppose NEC alternative 1.
Ursini_Ka	I live in Old Lyme & want my town to have some input on these changes. Improve the rail lines we already have - do NOT add any new ones!! The improvements must be done in a way that does not sacrifice the character and composition of local communities by cutting right through them. Old Lyme needs to be allowed a voice. Again I say, improve the rail lines we already have - do NOT add any new ones!!
Vaillancourt_St	I think this plan yes would be lovely for those who were able to use it, but mother nature would not benefit at all. Our osprey population is rather large and we would love to keep it that way. I grew up in Old Lyme and visit frequently... I would hate for this railway to change that for myself and for the wildlife.
Valentin_Pe	"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."
Vallambroso_An	We are completely against any rail line extending through the Town of Old Lyme, Connecticut. The existing line is sufficient to address any current or future needs in our opinion.

Table JJ–29: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Old Lyme (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment
Valles_Da	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.
Van Der Aue_Ka	it appears that several rivers, wetland areas, marshlands and reservoirs will also be affected. There is no detail as to how these proposed changes will be carried out without having a deleterious effect on wildlife. In fact, the report states that No field investigations occurred as a part of this analysis, (S.7.3) a statement we find surprising.
Van Ness_Ad	In this plan, the local communities gets nothing positive, all negative for zip 06371. No community wants 2 rail lines going through it.
Van Vliet_Tr	Why on earth would you destroy an historic town's heart to speed up a train by mere 30 minutes? This an awful idea and whoever proposed it ought to have their head examined They clearly are not in touch with reality. Was a feasibility study conducted? Because if it had been you would know that more harm and damage would come from doing this than good. Do not ruin the historic downtown of Old Lyme.
Vanasse_Pa	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.
Varga_Br	"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."
Vasiloff_Je	Please do not allow this train to destroy the natural wetlands and the beautiful town of Old Lyme.
Vautrain_Ed	As you are probably aware at this point, the plan to run a high speed train through downtown Old Lyme is ridiculous on too many levels. Why would the townspeople ever allow this to happen? Answer - they wouldn't. Wrong town, wrong time. This town has too much pride and awareness to allow such a foolhardy occurrence. But let's play devils advocate. How would such a train benefit Old Lyme? Hmmm. Convenience? Nope. Usability? Nope. Tourism? No. Unless you are planning on paying for education in old Lyme for the life of the train then I suggest you reconsider the laying of your tracks.
Vecchio_Ro	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.
Velez_Ma	The tier one alternate will completely destroy the heart of one of Connecticut's jewels of the shoreline. It would decimate the historic district, ruin the art community, including the Florence Griswold museum complex which by the way is the home of American Impressionism and a great tourist and school attraction for the state of CT, tier one would literally destroy our town by putting the rail through its heart. This would be the worst move CT could do to itself and the people of old Lyme. There has to be another resolution.
Velez_Ma	The tier one alternate will completely destroy the heart of one of Connecticut's jewels of the shoreline. It would decimate the historic district, ruin the art community, including the Florence Griswold museum complex which by the way is the home of American Impressionism and a great tourist and school attraction for the state of CT, tier one would literally destroy our town by putting the rail through its heart. This would be the worst move CT could do to itself and the people of old Lyme. There has to be another solution.
Velez_Ro	I'm totally oppose the movement of the rails through the Town of Old Lyme.
Velez_Ro	[in the Town of Old Lyme], Although the turnpike is close by It's a noise I can live with. This would not be True if it was Amtrak. I'm all too familiar with the noise from the train and would never be able to sleep through the noise. It Sounds like a bomb going off. When it hits The currant bridge over the Ct. River.
Velez_Ro	Do not destroy the natural beauty of this special place [Old Lyme].
Venable_Ba	I am absolutely opposed to the #1 alternate plan
Venable_Ba	it makes me very angry that this huge issue was not brought before this community until it was almost too late to comment.
Verille_Pa	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.
Veronneau_Pa	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.
Vesga_Da	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.
Villanova_An	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.
Villanova_Ro	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.
Violette_Lo	I oppose Alternate 1 of the Northeast Corridor future proposal because it we will destroy the campus of Lyme Academy College of fine arts of the University of New Haven!! This would also destroy the beauty of this property and its surrounding areas that have been a huge important part of Old Lyme!!
Visgilio_Jo	I want to express my deep concern regarding your Alternative 1 plan. This option will decimate our college and the legacy of its founder, Elizabeth Gordon Chandler....Please reconsider this path - one can never replace the cultural footprint of a place and Alternative 1 would change forever the landscape of Old Lyme.
Visgilio_Jo	The impact to the communities of Lyme and Old Lyme in your Alternative 1 solution will be disastrous.
Visgilio_Jo	...your approach to gain community input is quite questionable.

Table JJ–29: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Old Lyme (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment
Visgilio_We	The tier one alternate will completely destroy the heart of one of Connecticut’s jewels of the shoreline. It would decimate the historic district, ruin the art community, including the Florence Griswold museum complex which by the way is the home of American Impressionism and a great tourist and school attraction for the state of CT, tier one would literally destroy our town by putting the rail through its heart. This would be the worst move CT could do to itself and the people of old Lyme. There has to be another solution.
Vita_Pa	I think this so called plan should go back to the drawing board. The people that wrote it seem to have no understanding or regard for CT or its people. The community of Old Lyme is a national treasure not just a CT treasure. How can you plan to do more damage to Long Island Sound?
Vlock_Ji	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.
Volpe_Br	The current proposed route for the new Amtrak train track appears to cross the Connecticut river from the current site in Old Saybrook across the marchland along the east bank and then to the I95 highway. I write to ask about the environmental impact of a high speed rail through a major section of the march land?
von Reichenbach_Su	I am resident of Old Lyme, CT and horrified to learn of the study called NEC FUTURE, a study that would even consider putting Railroad tracks through the middle of this beautiful and thoughtfully restored, historic, old town. ...From what I understand, not only would the NEC FUTURE proposal to build new RRtracks destroy landmarks, cultural institutions, and ruin the fabric of this town as it nowis, it would compromise the quality of our individual lives and singularly change the dynamic of Old Lyme, actually ruin the character of this unique town (whichbrought many of us to live here), in that one single stroke of building newrailroad tracks where this proposal indicates. This must not be allowed tohappen.
Votto_Di	Alternative 1 &2 is a terrible idea in such a small community.
Wahab_Li	I am emailing to express my opposition to Alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridor Futures proposal in its current form. It is slated to pass through the Lyme Academy of Art, and the negative impacts of high speed train travel through an historic campus will lead I fear to the closure of the college.
Welles_De	I would like to know specifically how this plan affects Old Lyme, CT. It seems to me from what little I have been able to learn the proposed new route will cut through the heart of the historic district. Where is this information available?
Wakeman_Ca	The NEC's Tier 1 Draft proposing that Amtrak relocate its bridge across the Connecticut River does irreparable damage and must be stopped immediately. This costly plan would eviscerate an irreplaceable historic community while unacceptably and unnecessarily destroying fragile coastal ecosystems... The existing Amtrak bridge across the Connecticut River should be modernized but not relocated.
Waldron_Li	Improving the rail lines is a step forward in the transportation needs of the northeast, however, cutting it through historic towns is the wrong way to go about it. There are plenty of alternatives available that would bypass the beautiful downtown areas. Going a little further north of the shoreline is a much better alternative and impacts far fewer people, businesses and local landmarks. No one will stand for seeing their beautiful downtown areas cut in half by a train, the best solution is to find a plan B that would appeal to everyone.
Waldron_Ma	The plan to build a rail bridge through Old Lyme, an historic and beautiful town, is incredibly awful. Are you trying to upset people? Ridiculous not to use the old route.
Waldron_Ma	It is absurd to think about decimating a major tourist center filled with art and historic charm - Old Lyme - to make up for past mistakes.
Walewski_Th	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.
Walker_Ma	"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."
Wallace_Br	I am writing to you this day to strongly object to your proposal known as Alliterative 1 which would decimate the historic town of Old Lyme and the Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts in particular. All for what appears to be a possible savings of a few minutes for your passengers. Please note that I will continue to oppose this proposal as long as it takes to see it defeated.
Walsh_Do	Routing a rail line north of the existing line across the Connecticut River would effectively wipe out the historic town of Old Lyme CT and in the process destroy many peoples occupations and way of life. Is this line intended to get people to Boston a few minutes faster and/or make a lot money for some connected major construction and law firms? I see also the north route would pretty much keep the EPA out of the FRA’s hair.
Walters_Ba	the plan to decimate the center of Old Lyme to do so seems a bit excessive.
Warburg_Mi	It seems poorly considered to have high speed rail service going through historical areas such as Old Lyme. These areas were not designed for high speed rail and it seems incongruous to make them deal with the consequences of noise pollution and disruption of the environment. Small towns and communities (many of them historically important) don't need to sacrificed when alternative routing of rail lines is possible. In effect this is forcing urbanization upon rural and small communities which is a tragic consequence that can be avoided.
Ward_Ri	I initially supported the concept of this project but due to the total disregard of the historical and environmental impact this plan would cause (in particular to the Town of Old Lyme, CT). I can no longer do so. I certainly understand and get the "big picture" but work still needs to be done in the South East CT area from the CT River to the RI state line.
Ward_Sp	...the building of this rail would impact myself, the people of Old Lyme, and the beautiful natural settings that we and hundreds of species of wildlife both enjoy.
Wargo_Ma	Please do not cut thru this beautiful historical town for this rail project
Warren_La	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.

Table JJ–29: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Old Lyme (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment
Warren_La	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.
Warren_Th	As an Alumni of UNH, I oppose Alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridor Futures proposal. It will destroy the campus of Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts of the University of New Haven.
Wassmer_Ka	The bridge span proposed into Old Lyme will cost billions to repair. Not to mention the destruction of a Historic town . I'm sure it's cheaper to run it this way after this town, but keeping the train along the same Corridor as the one that's there now will be better for the people.
Watson_Su	I am totally against the Alternative 1 proposal.
Watts_Do	I oppose putting train tracks through the property of Lyme Academy. The campus will be severely impacted in a very negative way by the proposal.
Waytkus_Li	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.
Weatherby_Su	Alt. #1will forever change the historical town of old lyme, ct. It will require the destruction of art museums and historical homes . I am opposed to alt. #1
Weaver_Wi	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 further support the town of Old Lyme's objections as stated in the selectmen's statement opposing the railroad routing through the town.
Weeks_Jo	I can't believe you would even consider destroying an historic town in New England. I am appalled that you would damage the estuaries of the Connecticut River. I completely oppose the new Amtrak route through Old Lyme.
Weeks_Sa	Railroad tracks running through the middle of town for high speed trains? I am 100% opposed. I think that folks in the area are generally in favor of any improvement in transportation but this option is not it. We do need improvement to the infrastructure so I hope a fair resolution can be reached as destroying our town in the process is not.
Weicker_Cl	As a resident of the town of Old Lyme, Connecticut and co-chair of the Connecticut Audubon Society's Roger Tory Peterson Estuary Center Board, I am writing to express my concerns and opposition to Alternative 1 of the EIS Tier 1 NEC Future proposals. As currently drafted Alternative 1 proposes a new railroad bridge across the Connecticut River Estuary and creates a new high speed line(s) through the town of Old Lyme. It simply is not possible to minimize the impact that construction of a high speed rail line(s) and new bridge over the Connecticut River would have on the town of Old Lyme, the shoreline, and life in other towns adjacent to the River. The new line would effectively bifurcate the historic district of Old Lyme destroying the integrity of one of the oldest and most picturesque towns in the State of Connecticut.
Weicker_Cl	A new bridge over The Connecticut River Estuary, named as one of" One of the World's Last Great Places in the Western Hemisphere" by the Nature Conservancy, raises a multitude of environmental concerns as it would cause disruption of the river, its wetlands, and the habitats a number of rare and threatened species and other wildlife. Home to the osprey which were nearly extinct just a few decades ago, the bald eagle (likewise nearly extinct but resurgent) and a stopover for migrating species, it is impossible to believe that the environmental impact would not be substantial. Your own ecological assessments recognize the impact on Connecticut's ecologically sensitive habitats.
Weicker_Cl	Finally, a word about aesthetics and economics. There has long been a nexus between the River and the well being of the surrounding communities. Essex, Old Saybrook, Old Lyme and other communities along the river are steeped in history dating to pre-Revolutionary days and, whether it was the shipping trade in the 18th century which gave rise to today's boatyards and marinas, or the Old Lyme Art Colony this nexus exists today. Boating enthusiasts and fishermen flock to the River each season to enjoy its beauty and access to Long Island Sound. Art enthusiasts likewise visit the towns along the River to view their historic homes and the museums and galleries creating a thriving tourist industry. Thus, the appreciation of the aesthetics of our river valley communities continues in the 21st Century as it did in the 19th and 20th Centuries. The new bridge would not only create a visual obstruction but also poses real dangers to the economies of our river communities.
Weinstein_Ma	I have 20 years of experience in eminent domain law, and I am in opposition to Alternative 1. It would have significant negative effects on Old Lyme, CT including its sensitive ecology as well as the Lyme Academy of Fine Art. An alternative route that causes less environmental and social impacts should be selected.
Weiss_Je	The plan to run a rail line straight through the middle of the Old Lyme historic district beggars belief. On the face of it, if one weren't familiar with the area, it would seem absurd--a blueprint for the displacement and destruction of one of this country's venerable art communities and its zealously maintained legacy is incredible. ...There needs to be a thoughtful alternative to this proposed--and reckless--disruption of flora, fauna, lives and legacies.
Weiss_Sh	Really? One of the most beautiful New England towns should be preserved for future generations to enjoy!!! Please do not ruin it!
Wells_Be	To do Alternative 1 would destroy the historic town of Old Lyme CT. It would demolish the Lyme Academy of Fine Art, run within 100 feet to Lyme High School and Middle School, run perilously close to the Florence Griswold Museum (the home of American Impressionism) and do grave damage to the CT River and the Lieutenant River. It is also a short-sighted plan, as Alternatives 2 and 3 would bring changes needed for future rail growth.
Wells_Pr	I am of the impression that this study has not thoroughly explored the damage that all of these ideas create. Has anyone looked at the Historic district in Old Lyme. Milford??? Really???? Do you realize the clam and oyster industry this would affect? I am totally opposed to all of these ideas.
Wenzel_Da	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.
Wenzel_Da	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.
Wertheimer_Sh	To those who are involved with the planning of the new train tracks through Old Lyme, you need to come visit this beautiful, historic town to see what you plan to tragically demolish.
West_Ho	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.

Table JJ–29: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Old Lyme (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment
Whelan_Da	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.
Whelan_Ro	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.
Whipple_Ti	"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."
White_Ka	I join those who 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.
White_Me	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.
Whitehead_Fa	This is the most ridiculous plan I have heard of in a long time. You will ruin the entire Town of Old Lyme, not to mention the value of surrounding Shoreline towns with this idea. We don't need a faster train, Amtrak. Just stick with what you have.
Whitehead_Fa	No!terrible idea -stick with what you havewe don't need a faster train.....you will ruin the Shoreline
Whiting_Ry	I oppose Alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridor Futures proposal. There has got to be an alternative to destroying Lyme Academy's campus.
Whitley_Jo	The proposed plan would be disastrous for the town of Old Lyme. Cutting diagonally through the heart of this town would damage the very nature of this fine community. Additionally, the proposed widening of I-95 would be greatly hampered as well with the planned location of the new rail line. I am strongly opposed to the current plans for the Northeast Corridor Rail Investment Plan.
Wholean_Ni	Please do not run a high speed train through our beautiful, historic district in Old Lyme, Connecticut!
Widham_Kr	Take this ridiculous idea for a huge offense to the estuary environment and the cultural value of Old Lyme OFF your agenda. The idea is conceived din a vacuum of reality! Rail lines can be expanded and raised in their current situations, which will not destroy other areas of our towns!
Widmann_Ch	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.
Wiggin_Jo	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.
Wilcox_Ja	This FRA project proposal for the NEC is misguided in it's concept and execution through Lyme/Old Lyme, CT. How could anyone in their right mind propose destroying the center of such an historic New England town? It would be devastating. NO...Please stop. No new train is worth it.
Wilder_Jo	The plan you at Amtrak have will pretty much destroy Old Lyme for good...But let's not kid ourselves, the Acela is not the TGV, and not affordable for most riders. Having used Amtrak for decades, it seems to have problems which go on and on. Tearing apart the Connecticut countryside, even giving UCONN a station and rail line in addition will not help things. It is not the fault of the north east corner of Connecticut the UCONN is in the middle of nowhere. So they play basketball well, who cares? I have lived in Old Lyme all of my 49-years, and have seen many changes. But, we have still retained a rural setting for the most part. Please keep your new rail lines out of here.
Wildey_An	Not a good plan to loose the Lyme academy's destroy historic Old Lyme. Find another solution
Willauer_Ge	As one who uses train service to NY and am a board member of the Florence Griswold Museum and member of the First Congregational Church of Old Lyme it is unacceptable to think of this project which would destroy this nationally recognized historic district.
Williams_Sy	There is no question that our infrastructure is decaying. The current rail bridge connecting Old Saybrook to Old Lyme was built in 1907, replacing an earlier one built in 1870. With a 109 years under its belt, the bridge owes us nothing and probably should be replaced.
Williams_Sy	...to route new train tracks through one of New England’s most picturesque villages would be criminal. Old Lyme is a place that reminds one of Daniel Webster’s observation in Dartmouth College versus Woodward: It is, sirs, a small college, but there are those that love it. Residents of Old Lyme feel the same way toward their village, with its neatly maintained homes along its main street, Lyme Street - a few with paddocks and horses, and with institutions like the Florence Griswold Museum, the Lyme Art Academy, the Lyme Art Association and its two historic inns, the Bee & Thistle and the Old Lyme Inn. They represent history that cannot be replaced. Trains traveling 150 to 200 miles per hour through the center of town would destroy what has taken over three hundred years to construct. Don’t do it!
Williamson_Ca	The proposed rail track through Old Lyme Center is preposterous. This is bureaucracy at its worst, with thoughtless destruction to artistic, academic, historic and environmental habitats. Old Lyme Center is a New England Treasure and must NOT be disturbed.
Wilmerding_Ga	That proposed in Alternative One through the Town of Old Lyme destroys ecological, historic, business and cultural sites. Rather than move and expand rail corridors in sensitive wetlands and parks, which act as buffers to saltwater incursion and filter mainland runoff...
Wilmerding_Ga	The NEC study is exciting, though disturbing in communication omissions. Incorporating needs, creative input and wisdom from local residents and communities early in the design process is critical to successful outcomes and vibrant futures.
Wilson_Jen	NO on Alternative 1!!!

Table JJ–29: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Old Lyme (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment
Wilson_Jer	" 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. "
Wilson_Jo	"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."
Winnick_Je	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.
Winiger_Br	Save art! Find another route!
Winston_Fr	I oppose the FRA plans to change the town of Old Lyme. The impact will forever change this historic small town for ever.
Wiswell_Ja	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.
Withers_Ca	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. Please seek other alternatives.
Wizeman_Ka	The current plan would impact the pristine beauty of Old Lyme.
Wnek_Su	The NEC changes that are proposed will have an extremely negative impact on the town of Old Lyme.
Wnek_Su	The fact that Old Lyme residents were not informed of the proposal is disturbing. It seems like these proposals were made without considering the towns they will impact.
Wojcik_Ch	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.
Wolf_Le	Please do not consider such a plan to cut through the beautiful town of Old Lyme.
Wolf_St	I am opposed to Alternative of the proposal. I live on the shoreline of Connecticut. Alternative 1 would drastically alter the shoreline towns which are historic and environmentally sound. Alternative 1 would render some towns unlivable and have a significant impact on the real estate values of those communities. It would be criminal to destroy these towns.
Wolman_Ma	I object to Alternative 1 because it will ruin a beautiful campus, effectively destroy a small but vital art college and have a significant negative impact on Old Lyme, a beautiful scenic New England town. I am a fairly frequent rider on Amtrak and am very supportive of enhancing our nation's train systems. However, it should be done in a constructive and not destructive manner. Thank you for considering this.
Wood_Pe	"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." This Campus is unique and a "one of a kind" area.
Woods_Ba	AGAINST
Woolfson_Ma	Please do not move this railway through the beautiful historic districts of our charming little CT towns. I take the train to Boston several times/year and it's quite pleasant to ride by the coves and over the nice rivers ...
Woolley_Da	The Democratic Town Committee of the town of Old Lyme, Connecticut, strongly supports the need to make improvements to our country’s aged rail infrastructure, and we acknowledge that modernization and efficiencies are needed on the northeast corridor. However, these improvements must be made in a manner that does not cause catastrophic harm to our communities. We therefore vigorously oppose Alternative 1, as proposed in the Tier 1 Draft Environmental Impact Statement, because of the irreparable environmental, economic, social and historical damage it would impose on our town and our region. ... We urge the FRA to eliminate Alternative 1 and focus on Alternatives that will truly advance the future of the NEC while sparing the sensitive natural heritage of the Connecticut River Estuary and Old Lyme’s 350-year-old culture.
Woolley_Da	This area inspired the American Impressionists, who made a home in what is now the Florence Griswold Museum in Old Lyme. The Alternative 1 rail would run through our National Historic District showcasing this heritage, as well as our business district. Our economy, our arts community and our quality of life would be severely, negatively impacted.
Wormser_Ri	I strongly oppose any railroad tracks running through the Lyme Academy College of arts in Old Lyme Connecticut. Student needs must be given priority.
Wright_Ga	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.
Wright_Wi	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.
Wurst_St	Rerouting through old Lyme will destroy the character of the town and its historic significance. This plan needs to be reconsidered or denied.
Xenikakis_De	I oppose Alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridor Futures proposal. It's pertinent that we keep historic buildings, such as the campus of Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts, in order to create innovation and opportunities for individuals.
Yale_Si	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 of the University of New Haven
Yao_Li	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.
Yasuhara_Ke	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.
Yawman_Da	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.

Table JJ–29: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Old Lyme (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment
York_Ja	I oppose Alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridors Futures proposal because it will destroy the campus of Lyme Academy of Fine Arts.
You_Yu	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.
Yourke_Ka	A plan that destroys the Lyme Academy of Fine arts is not in the best interests of the population!
Yu_Ti	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.
Zabilansky	Strongly oppose as it would destroy the rural and historic character of the town. This would ruin the whole cultural character of the town on Lyme St.
Zajac_Ro	Alternative 1 does nothing to expand rail service throughout the northern portion of the northeast corridor. In effect it really is almost the same as the do-nothing alternative. As such, the environmental impact is extensive and unnecessary relative to the potential gain in ridership. This line will go through some of the most environmentally sensitive, untouched and scenic areas of southeastern Connecticut and indeed will impact significant coastal zones in the Old Lyme, Niantic and New London areas. some of these areas are particularly prone to the effects of sea level rise, and the environmental impact statement does not address the whole question of coastal squeeze. Also, without detailed maps to assess the actual route that is shown for alternative 1, it is not possible to quantitatively assess the environmental and other types of impacts. Indeed environmental impacts should be solely assessed not on a total area basis, but on the impacts relative to the scale of the project. In short, Alternative 1 is really a joke. It does nothing to expand rail service to areas that really need it and should have it. In addition, given this situation the environmental impacts through the southeastern portion of Connecticut would be severe, thus making this a very poor alternative.
Zande_We	Although I do not live in Old Lyme, I was horrified to here of this plan! There has to be a better way than destroying this beautiful town.
Zankowska_Iz	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.
Zavatone_Ma	Please leave this beautiful harbor alone. We have adequate transportation infrastructure between the existing railroad tracks and the highway / please don't add to the noise, the combustion, and certainly please don't disrupt thus beautiful space.
Zawacki_Ga	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.
Zdonek_An	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.
Ziaks_Da	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.
Ziehmaye_Ka	"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.
Zielinski Meffert_Je	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
Zint_Mi	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.
Ziolkovski_Je	I have lived in Old Lyme for 40 years. I am raising a family in this beautiful town which is much simpler and less commercial than surrounding towns. The landscape is breathtaking as we drive from one area of town to another. I strongly oppose this Tier 1 plan that would cut a new area of railway right through the town. I can't even imagine the impact this would have on our small town. Historically, environmentally to name a few.
Ziolkovski_Je	I have lived in Old Lyme for 40 years. I am raising a family in this beautiful town which is much simpler and less commercial than surrounding towns. The landscape is breathtaking as we drive from one area of town to another. I strongly oppose this Tier 1 plan that would cut a new area of railway right through the town. I can't even imagine the impact this would have on our small town. Historically, environmentally to name a few.
Zito_Ch	I oppose Alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridor Futures proposal because with a growing population and climate concerns...Furthermore, I oppose Alternative 1 because it will destroy the campus of Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts of the University of New Haven.
Zott_Ro	This proposal would be a disaster to friends in Connecticut -- a state where I lived from 1994-2014. The line would run right through the school campus of the Lyme College of Art, destroying the historic school and the jobs upon which their livelihood depends.
Zrenda_Jo	the negative impact of this tier 1 rail proposal far exceeds the benefits it would provide. Homeowner losses, historical losses, wildlife losses, environmental harm, let alone the integrity of the entire Town of Old Lyme being torn apart. This plan is simply not acceptable
Zygnerski_Ev	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.
Anonymous_009	Please stay out of Old Saybrook Old Lyme areas, -go the direct route. -Pick up the city's who actually need or want the service. -we already have a train/bus service -diversify, hit some of the route don't copy an existing system... - please do not add complications to the already hectic beach traffic and congestion avoid the shoreline - wetlands will be disrupted - historic areas disturbed -Wildlife will be displaced... We don't want the tracks, the traffic, the station, none of it. Hartford Springfield is a better option for everyone

Table JJ–29: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Old Lyme (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment
Anonymous_016	Running a railway through the center of Old Lyme will ruin the charm of this little town. Lyme Street is what makes Old Lyme unique, not to mention all of the history that's taken place there. It's the home of American Impressionism and so much more to so many people, including me. I grew up in Old Lyme and can't imagine a railway running through the center of town. If the railway doesn't impact the historic district of Old Lyme I'd be more open to the idea. The historic district is the backbone of this town, where small businesses and art thrive and taking that away is not right.
Anonymous_017	Please reconsider changing the location of the rail through the historic district in Old Lyme, CT. The preservation of property values in this area town is personally very important to me.
Anonymous_017	The proposed changes would create huge problems in our little town, [Old Lyme], because the proposed routes would block pedestrian access to Lyme street, cause issues with travel to and from Old Lyme schools, would cut off the old lyme schools from local conveniences on main street, and would cause unnecessary noise near our schools and beloved historic landmarks.
Anonymous_018	This will ruin the historical downtown Old Lyme and cross right near where my children go to school. There must be an alternative to keep it close to where it exists now.
Anonymous_019	I strongly oppose the Northeast Corridor rerouting high-speed rail lines over a new bridge crossing the Connecticut River, across the saltwater marshes at the Lieutenant River and through the historical district of Old Lyme. It would devastate not only the local wildlife, but also the historic Art Colony.
Anonymous_021	As a resident of the Town of Old Lyme, I am writing to express my opposition to Alternative 1 of the NEC plan to improve rail service between Washington D.C. and Boston...I therefore implore you to abandon Alternative 1 of the NEC plan and seek alternative, more reasonable solutions for improving rail service in the region that will not have such devastating consequences.
Anonymous_021	As a resident of Lyme Street (which runs through the heart of Old Lyme’s historic village center), my family and I will be directly effected by the proposed NEC plan. The path of the proposed railway would not only cut through the heart of this community and effect major educational and cultural institutions such as the Lyme Academy of Fine Arts and the Florence Griswold Museum, but could quite literally cut through the heart of our historic home (c. 1880) which along with many other homes on Lyme Street have been lovingly and painstakingly restored to their original grandeur. The proposed railway will not only decimate the character and charm of Old Lyme (and our historic village center), but also depress property values in the general vicinity for decades to come. Of course, all of this pales in comparison to the impact on the environment and, most importantly, the health and well-being of my children and my children’s children who will be forced to live and attend school (the majority of educational institutions in Old Lyme sit on Lyme Street) so close to a high-speed rail line.
Anonymous_025	This rail way will destroy the Eco system that we all love in Old Lyme. It is also set to go through some of the only marsh land that is left on the Old Lyme shore
Anonymous_031	I strongly disagree with the addition of these train tracks through the center of Old Lyme, CT. You will be destroying a small town for no real reason. Reducing the time it takes to get to DC from Boston by only 30 minutes is not reason enough to do so.
Anonymous_033	Please do not do this... The disruption this would cause would ensure the better part of a generation would not have adequate access to easily take advantage our beautiful area. Not to mention the destruction of historic properties in affected towns. All this to shave 30 minutes round trip? Boondoggle!
Anonymous_034	I am opposed to the high speed rail through Old Lyme.
Anonymous_036	I am against having our town of Old Lyme destroyed by this train. This is not the answer.
Anonymous_038	I am against Alternative 1 of the three high-speed rail track routes proposed by the Federal Railroad Authority (FRA).
Anonymous_039	You are fucking stupid if you go on building this new railroad. You have a perfectly fine, working one already which doesn't infer severely with the lives of Old Lyme citizens. If you're on board with this idiotic idea, I'm assuming your an old, white, male republican piece of shit, because that group seems to have the WORST ideas ever. I can't wait until that group dies out. I digress though. Don't be a bunch of dipshits and fuck up people's lives, you foul pricks.
Anonymous_039	You are...stupid...building this new railroad. You have a perfectly fine, working one already which doesn't infer severely with the lives of Old Lyme citizens...
Anonymous_042	What a terrible idea alternative 1 is! Don't destroy a beautiful and historic town like Old Lyme -- you can't ever get it back!
Anonymous_044	Proposing to build a line through downtown Old Lyme, CT would destroy the town. GO AROUND!!!
Anonymous_045	Strongly OPPOSE Alternative 1!!
Anonymous_046	Ruin Old Lyme....and two of its treasures . Why?
Anonymous_046	The beauty of Lyme is that it is quite (quiet)
Anonymous_048	tier one would be the most impactful on the residents of Old Lyme
Anonymous_049	I would fight against passage of Alternative 1
Anonymous_049	I don't even want to imagine the damage that would be done to historic Old Lyme were this alternative to be implemented.
Anonymous_050	Do not do it! I oppose

Table JJ–29: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Old Lyme (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment
Anonymous_051	Those of us living in Lyme and Old Lyme (or anyone who recognizes the importance of historic buildings and towns) are horrified to learn of a possible plan to run train tracks through our beautiful, quaint town center. Unfathomable. Please don't destroy and disrupt this town.
Anonymous_052	I oppose it
Anonymous_053	You will not, at any cost, move your rail line anywhere near my property. (Old Lyme)
Anonymous_054	Please do not destroy the economic and historic lifeblood of Old Lyme.
Anonymous_057	no action alternative. The idea of building new rail lines through the most highly populated area of the county is absurd. Would displace many home owners (eminent domain or fair market value) and destroy long existing towns along the corridor. Work with what you already have.
Anonymous_059	I adamantly OPPOSE Alternative 1 that will destroy historic Old Lyme and several historic landmarks.
Anonymous_060	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.
Anonymous_061	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.
Anonymous_062	"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."
Anonymous_063	"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."
Anonymous_064	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.
Anonymous_065	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.
Anonymous_067	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.
Anonymous_067	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.
Anonymous_068	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.
Anonymous_069	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.
Anonymous_070	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.
Anonymous_071	How could anyone in his/her right mind think of ruining an historic New England village.
Anonymous_072	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.
Anonymous_073	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.
Anonymous_074	I am a resident of Old Lyme, CT. The new proposed rail line would decimate the town and negatively effect the town. I chose to move to this town due to its quiet nature. Having a house away from the existing rail line was a must for me. The new rail line would be in close proximity to my residence, and would cause annoyance. On a second note, this will greatly effect the value of my house. I hope Amtrak or the state is planning on buying my house from me should this poor idea actually goes through.
Anonymous_075	"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."
Anonymous_076	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.
Anonymous_077	" 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. "
Anonymous_078	Do not destroy the Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts!! It is a very important establishment and part of the community.
Anonymous_079	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.
Anonymous_081	" 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. "
Anonymous_082	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.
Anonymous_083	"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."

Table JJ–29: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Old Lyme (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment
Anonymous_083	Old Lyme is a gorgeous New England town. This project will destroy the quaint small town character of this shoreline community. Please do not deface the history of this town for a railway system that has no benefit to the residents.
Anonymous_084	"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."
Anonymous_085	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.
Anonymous_086	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.
Anonymous_087	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.
Anonymous_088	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. 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.
Anonymous_089	"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."
Anonymous_090	This would destroy our community! Please do not destroy our home.
Anonymous_091	" 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. "
Anonymous_092	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.
Anonymous_093	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.
Anonymous_094	The proposed railway that would pass through historic Old Lyme and its unique wetlands is an insult to the town's peoples intelligence and to the integrity of the town itself. Yes, this is the cheapest solution, but that does not mean best solution!
Anonymous_094	It's proposal in itself shows the utter disconnect between corporation and community, and makes it blatantly obvious that there was VERY little if not no research done on the part of The NEC in regards to the environmental and community impact of beautiful, unique, and historic Old Lyme.
Anonymous_095	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.
Anonymous_096	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.
Anonymous_100	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.
Anonymous_102	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.
Anonymous_103	Following through with plans intending to build a rail road system that has a location on the south end of Old Lyme will not accomplish the goals of fixing CT economy. Implementing this plan will only disrupt the well preserved wildlife in old lyme that has captured attention on a national scale....As i do support the investment into infrastructure as a soild plan to fix the economy in the state, bisecting a historic district and compromising a wildlife community that has been so so strategically protected is simply a waste of precious resources especially seeing as the reward for doing so will not be profitable.
Anonymous_105	I oppose Alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridor Futures proposal
Anonymous_106	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.
Anonymous_107	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."
Anonymous_108	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.
Anonymous_109	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.
Anonymous_111	I oppose this plan as it would ruin the beautiful village of Old Lyme, as well as many other peoples' lives by having their property taken by eminent domain.
Anonymous_112	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.
Anonymous_113	I am concerned with the impact of Alternative 1 on Old Lyme, CT. The area that the new rail would cross (historic Old Lyme and the Lyme Academy of Fine Arts) would certainly be affected. I would not personally be in favor of this.
Anonymous_114	I vigorously object to the proposed alternative 1 routing. This proposal both will devastate an environmental jewel, a historic and unique town in American artistic culture and yet deliver mediocre improvement to high speed rail transportation.

Table JJ–29: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Old Lyme (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment
Anonymous_115	The town of old Lyme is so culturally significant to not only Connecticut, but our country, that to destroy it for the purpose of faster transit, or anything for that matter, is a disgrace. Our rich heritage in the arts, maritime culture, and connecticut's history makes it ludicrous to think this is even a viable option. I was born in old Lyme, have lived and called this town home my entire life. To see it destroyed for high speed rail would be an insult to my family, and my life. The loss of old Lyme would a loss of immeasurable proportions, and I will do all I can to see that it does not happen.
Anonymous_116	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.
Anonymous_117	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.
Anonymous_118	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.
Anonymous_119	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.
Anonymous_120	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.
Anonymous_121	I am opposed to Alternative 1. Adding a new rail bridge between Old Saybrook and Lyme would cut a swath through a lovely historic town and ruin the town's rural feel. Please do not do this to our beautiful, historic, and bucolic riverfront environs.
Anonymous_122	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.
Anonymous_123	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.
Anonymous_124	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.
Anonymous_125	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.
Anonymous_126	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.
Anonymous_127	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.
Anonymous_128	As a resident of Lyme, CT, I am writing to voice my opposition to Alternative #1.
Anonymous_129	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.
Anonymous_130	Please do NOT send new rail tracks through Old Lyme, CT.
Anonymous_131	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.
Anonymous_132	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.
Anonymous_133	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.
Anonymous_138	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.
Anonymous_139	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.
Anonymous_140	Any redesign of rail corridors that impacts a community should have full disclosure of the plan and opportunity for the FRA and the community to work together to reach a solution that will benefit all. A situation like the one in Old Lyme CT, where the new railway would decimate the existing center of the town is certainly not a boon for the community the rail line would pass through. The Northeast part of the country is fairly heavily populated, and a plan that plows through existing communities without regard for who or what is being displaced is irresponsible. Historic areas and open space have value.
Anonymous_141	As a homeowner in Old Lyme, I live directly in the path of your proposed Alternative 1 rail track. I am in shock that any branch of government would consider such a destructive measure. Your plan for our Old Lyme community would decimate out town economically, historically, ecologically and educationally. Our town/village contains the Old Lyme Art Academy, Lyme Art Association, The Historical Society and the Florence Griswold Museum in addition to the endless wetlands and marshes preserved by our Nature Conservancy Association. This does not include the destruction possibly elimination of our residential area which include historically reserved century old homes. I question the lack of transparency your organization has exercised regarding this rail system and its extreme negative impact on or community. I find it unconscionable for the Old Lyme government officials to learn about your study thru the grapevine just a handful of days ago. Instead of spending all those tax dollars on your study I would like to suggest you use that money to improve the already existing rail system that services the Acela and Metro North trains. I am greatly opposed to the Alternative 1 of the EIS rail service.
Anonymous_141	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.
Anonymous_144	"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."

Table JJ–29: Stakeholder Comments (Individuals, Special Interest Groups, Education, Other): Old Lyme (continued)

Stakeholder ID	Comment
Anonymous_145	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.
Anonymous_146	I am opposed to plan #1, that has rail line going through the heart of old lyme. You just electrified the existing line as well as updated it! Why would you consider of going through the middle of our town?????????
Anonymous_147	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 also the historic main street which is a treasure in the state of CT.
Anonymous_148	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.
Anonymous_150	I am totally opposed to the new rail line going through the coastal historic areas of Old Saybrook and especially old Lyme. that Alternative #! would ruin historical and environmentally protected areas.

Source: NEC FUTURE team, 2016