AGENDA

I. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
II. ROLL CALL AND SEATING OF ALTERNATES
III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
IV. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION (For Items Not Listed On The Agenda; Speakers Limited To 2 Minutes)
V. ZONING ENFORCEMENT OFFICER REPORT
   Documents:
     JULY 2022.PDF
VI. REMARKS BY COMMISSIONERS
VII. PUBLIC HEARING
   A. None
VIII. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
   A. Approval Of Minutes Of July 27, 2022 Meeting
   Documents:
     TPZ MINUTES 07272022 REGULAR MEETING.PDF
IX. NEW BUSINESS
   A. TPZ To Comment On The Greater Hartford Mobility Study
   Documents:
     GREATER HARTFORD MOBILITY STUDY RECCOMENDATIONS.PDF
X. OLD BUSINESS
   A. None
XI. PETITIONS FOR PUBLIC HEARING SCHEDULING
   A. Petition 34-22: Special Permit (Section 6.2.5) For An Additional Free-Standing Sign On
XII. TOWN PLANNER REPORT

A. Future Agenda Form
   This document may be viewed in the TOWN ARCHIVE CENTER.

XIII. COMMUNICATIONS

XIV. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION (For Items Not Listed On The Agenda; Speakers Limited To 2 Minutes)

XV. REMARKS BY COMMISSIONERS

XVI. CLOSING REMARKS BY THE CHAIRMAN

XVII. ADJOURN
### Actions and Inspections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5/27/2021</td>
<td>spoke with resident who said rooster would be removed, and they will apply for a hen permit</td>
<td>Agreed to Resolve Violation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/1/2021</td>
<td>owner called to say rooster to be removed on 6/3/2021</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/10/2021</td>
<td>additional public complaint, rooster still onsite</td>
<td>Violation Notice Sent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/14/2021</td>
<td>complaint from neighbor rooster still on site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/15/2021</td>
<td>resident called to say rooster removed from property and will apply for zoning permits by the end of the week</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/15/2021</td>
<td>knocked no answer, left card</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/17/2021</td>
<td>owner applied for zoning permit</td>
<td>Progress Towards Compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/25/2021</td>
<td>inspected and approved permit, 4 hens on site</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/8/2022</td>
<td>Complaint received of rooster on property and approved coop location being moved. On site, knocked at door and no response. Notice sent to schedule inspection.</td>
<td>Violation Notice Sent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/11/2022</td>
<td>knocked at door, no response, left card for contact info. Owner called inspection scheduled for 7/18/2022.</td>
<td>Contact with Owner/Operator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/13/2022</td>
<td>owner called to say rooster removed. Has a plan to build new coop will inspect on Monday.</td>
<td>Progress Towards Compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/18/2022</td>
<td>onsite for inspection. Owner has removed all hens/chickens from the property. The coop still needs to be cleaned out.</td>
<td>Progress Towards Compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/1/2022</td>
<td>spoke with owner who said coop was cleaned. Will inspect on 8/2.</td>
<td>Progress Towards Compliance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chairman Domenic Pane called the July 27, 2022 regular meeting of the Newington Town Plan and Zoning Commission to order at 7:00 p.m.

I. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

II. **ROLL CALL AND SEATING OF ALTERNATES**

Commissioners Present

Chairman Domenic Pane  
Commissioner Bryan Haggarty  
Commissioner Garret Havens  
Commissioner Jonathan Trister  
Commissioner Stephen Woods  
Commissioner Hyman Braverman-A  
Commissioner Stuart Dzod-A  
Commissioner Thomas Gill-A

Commissioners Absent

Commissioner Anthony Claffey  
Commissioner David Lenares

Staff Present

Renata Bertotti, Town Planner

Commissioner Gill was seated for Commissioner Claffey and Commissioner Braverman was seated for Commissioner Lenares.

III. **APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

No Changes

IV. **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION** (For items not listed on the agenda; speakers limited to two minutes.)

None

V. **REMARKS BY COMMISSIONERS**

None
VI. PUBLIC HEARING:

A. Petition 31-22: Zoning Regulations Amendment (Sec. 4.4.5) to remove the setback requirements for detached mechanical units. Applicant Newington TPZ, Contact Renata Bertotti.

Renata Bertotti: You have received in your packet the regulation amendment. It is something that I had wanted to propose for probably several months. After I had been here about a year, I realized that one of the most frequent applications that ends up in front of our Zoning Board of Appeals is an application for the location of mechanical units, such as air conditioning, compressor units and things of that nature which are currently required to meet our normal setbacks. People normally do not have space next to their house because there are many locations, specifically where they cannot go next to the house to also meet the side and rear yard setbacks, frequently side yard setbacks. Because of that, we have drafted a regulation amendment which I will read that says, and it is located under Section 4.4.5 residential zoning districts and it says, under subsection E: “Detached mechanical units in R-7, R-12 and R-20 zones. Propane tanks, mechanical equipment, generators and similar components less than fifteen (15) square feet in size and located in a side or rear yard shall not be required to adhere to setback requirements provided no portion of the unit is located further than ten (10) feet from the principal structure or closer than five (5) to a property line. A plot plan shall be provided to verify location. For corner lots, the front yard shall apply only to the portion of the property where the main dwelling entrance is located and the general direction in which the principal building faces, as determined by the Zoning Enforcement Officer.”

This is exactly the kind of thing that we want to do with our zoning regulations where we have a lot of requests for relief of our rules that means that generally there is something in that rule that we need to take a look at, review and correct. We feel that five feet is a sufficient setback, the modern compressors and the modern AC units are much quieter than what used to be twenty or thirty years ago, which was the general sentiment as to why they were needing to meet like normal setbacks. We also received a letter from the Zoning Board of Appeals in support of this proposal. That really all there is to this small amendment to the Zoning Regulations, it’s pretty straightforward.

Chairman Pane: Very good. I'll go to questions from the Commissioners for the staff. Anybody have any questions.

Commissioner Gill: As far as generators, are we to understand that the generator can be put farther away from the house? How far away from the house can it be located?

Renata Bertotti: Under our regulations, we are saying no more than ten feet away from the house, and the intent of that really to not have these random, because this covers a number of detached units, meaning that we would not want to have people locating all kinds of mechanical equipment all over their yard. That is not the intent of this regulation. This is really for generators, AC units, things like that.
Commissioner Gill: Okay, because the concern I have is locating the generator farther away from their house where it ends up to be closer to somebody else’s property. There are requirements as far as a generator and the air conditioning unit that it can only be a certain distance away from the house. I think it should be put into there that the unit needs to be as close to the house as it can be by the requirements of the piece of equipment.

Chairman Pane: I think because of the side yards that is generally what is happening. A lot of these older houses, I notice that people have been coming in for waivers because they don’t have enough room on the side yard. You are correct, a generator can be X amount of feet away from the house, but if it is too far, we wouldn’t want it too close to the neighbor. Then in this regulation, she is claiming that it can’t be any closer than five feet to the property line.

Commissioner Gill: Okay, and the new air conditioning units need to be farther away from the house than what they used to be, but they are, like Renata said, they are extremely quiet.

Chairman Pane: Any other questions for staff?

Commissioner Trister: I have a question about the language choice in the proposed regulation. AC units, AC condensers, is there a reason we are not specifying that specifically in the regulation, we just have mechanical equipment, AC compressors, that kind of thing, but what else does mechanical mean?

Renata Bertotti: I think we kept it more general because I don’t know what kind of mechanical equipment is in the future. We are seeing all kinds of changes when it comes to these energy types of things. So I suppose we could be very specific and just limit this to generators and AC units and then modify our regulations if something comes up in the future. I have a sense that there are a lot of things that might be coming down, elements and mechanical things.

Commissioner Woods: I am assuming that these are for whole house generators, permanently installed? We’re not trying to regulate something that is in your garage that you only wheel it out to use it for the storm?

Chairman Pane: This is for a permanent installation.

Commissioner Woods: That’s what I thought.

Renata Bertotti: We don’t regulate temporary location for like twenty-four hours of use, things like that.

Chairman Pane: Any other questions? We’ll go to the public for the public portion of this. Anyone from the public wishing to speak in favor of the petition? Anyone wishing to speak in favor or in opposition?
Commissioner Braverman: What will the impact be to the insurance of the homeowner due to the location of the generator?

Renata Bertotti: I don't know, but I don't know that is affected by whether that location is secured by the variance or by the regulation.

Commissioner Braverman: Okay, just curious.
Chairman Pane: Anyone else?

Commissioner Haggarty: I'm not really familiar with stand-by generators or the size of them or how much you are trying to power, but it's fifteen feet, is that too restrictive for a whole home generator?

Renata Bertotti: I wouldn't think so, but........

Chairman Pane: That would provide plenty of room. Any other questions? Anyone from the public?

Commissioner Havens moved to close Petition 31-22 and move it to Old Business for consideration tonight. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Haggarty. The vote was unanimously in favor of the motion with seven voting YEA.

VII. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Commissioner Havens moved to approve the minutes of the July 13, 2022 regular meeting. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Woods. The vote was unanimously in favor of the motion with seven voting YEA.

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

A. TPZ to comment on the greater Hartford Mobility Study.

Chairman Pane: We received this in our packets and I think Renata is going to give us a briefing on this.

Renata Bertotti: It depends on how you would like to pursue this. We provided you the plan and you were provided a link for an on-line version of the website. There are over one hundred recommended alternatives, there are four that are location specific to Newington, but then there are like a bunch of other recommendations that include pedestrian and bicycle improvements that are more general in nature that also do apply to Newington. There are improvements to policy type of things that also could apply to Newington so unless you have reviewed those recommendations yourself and are prepared to comment and the only way I can see that happening is my pulling up the web site and going one by one tonight. I think it is perhaps more
efficient if you review the website my yourself and come prepared essentially comments yourself, so if you haven't had a chance to do that yet, perhaps you will have that for the next meeting. I will say that the recommendations tend to be general in nature and they are somewhat vague, for example, Route 175, one of the recommendations is reconstruct Route 175 which on that wording, we need something that the Commission feels is a great idea to do. Depending on what the DOT is thinking on the reconstruction of Route 175 implies. Then that implementation of that recommendation could trigger certain things that we may not be in support of. So what I would recommend, is review those, keeping in mind that they are general, and then when you provide your recommendations that this is a good idea, but we want to have input once you come up with something that is like going to create bike lanes and sidewalks then maybe that would be great, we would love that, but if this is something that is going to include roundabouts, then who knows how the community would feel about that. That maybe something that we need to think a little bit more about. I think that is the best that I would tell you.

Chairman Pane: Is the web information listed in here?

Renata Bertotti: It is, and I can send you the link and I can even show you, if you give me a second......

Chairman Pane: At your convenience, send us the link and if the other Commissioners, I've read most of it, but not all of it, and I haven't looked at the link yet, maybe we could continue to do that and then have it on the agenda for the next meeting to discuss in more detail.

Renata Bertotti: The website is very east to follow. If you go to the main screen, then go to alternatives and then click on it and then it is by the category, you can look by the location specific, you can look by what you want to look at, like bicycle stuff, it's well designed and user friendly for sure, but I think we need to frame our comments carefully.

Chairman Pane: Any questions concerning the Greater Hartford Mobility Study, so we will leave that on the agenda and will discuss it at our next meeting.

IX. OLD BUSNESS

Petition 31-22: Zoning Regulations Amendment (Sec. 4.4.5) to remove the setback requirements for detached mechanical units. Applicant Newington TPZ, Contact Renata Bertotti.

Commissioner Havens moved to approved Petition 31-22 Zoning Regulations Amendment (Sec. 4.4.5) to remove the setback requirements for detached mechanical units. Applicant Newington TPZ, Contact Renata Bertotti.
Findings:

1. Proposed amendment is consistent with the Plan of Conservation and Development.
2. The effective date of this regulation shall be fifteen days from the date of publication of the notice of decision.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Gill.

Commissioner Haggarty: Mr. Chairman, is the comment from the ZBA going to be part of the regulation about generator testing? The testing of generators conforming to local noise ordinances?

Chairman Pane: I think that can be added so that they don’t run the test programs at odd hours. In other words, some people start them up weekly, so they don’t start up at 5:00 in the morning, or late at night, they have to comply with the noise ordinance. Is the acceptable to the maker?

Commissioner Havens: It is acceptable.

Chairman Pane: And to the seconder?

Commissioner Gill: Yes.

Chairman Pane: It would be finding number three, or a condition?

Renata Bertotti: You will approve the regulation amendment with modification that we add the language to address that any testing of generators conform to the local noise ordinance.

The vote was unanimously in favor of the motion, with seven voting YEA.

X. PETITIONS FOR PUBLIC HEARING SCHEDULING

Renata Bertotti: We don’t have anything officially to schedule, but I do anticipate having some applications coming up.

XI. TOWN PLANNER REPORT

A. Newington Junction Historic Loop Report

Renata Bertotti: So this report is produced as a result of the grant that we received earlier this year. We got $10,000 and hired a consultant to look at the Newington Junction area and see if we can somehow promote that particular district and the homes that are located in it for this historic value and just cultural and historic value of that entire area. The consultant produced a report which I was frankly very happy with. The report includes a bit of history, and I really recommend that you read this because it is quite interesting and it is, and even the people who
know of Newington's history didn't quite know the information that she was able to find and provide, so it is quite interesting.

She also lists a number of properties that are of significant value. She is not listing all of the properties that are of historical value, but she is including a sort of sample of them. Then, the bulk of this report is a list of recommendations. The main recommendation, and this is actually the original idea going into this project was how can we promote this and how can we use this to include this historical area to have it as an education for children and make it something that we as a town can be proud of and can use as an element of ownership. Our consultant talks about these interpretative panels which are essentially signs that include information on this area that would be located in five different sections around Newington Junction area, and those signs would then include some other elements like you could use with your phone and you could take a tour and be informed on what you were walking by, and things like that. So we will definitely look into getting an implementation grant which is the second step of this project and it was a planned second step to try to see if we can try to see if we can get some money for these interpretative panels.

She also includes other recommendations, including how to work with schools, how to create this as a destination that we could advertise on social media and the town website. She talks about the importance of local historic districts and in particular in our case because when you have designated historic districts, that generally implies regulations, it implies that you have an historic commission that has to vote whenever there is a change to any home or any property that is located in that district. We feel by creation of this district through interpretive signage and some other measures we could create a district, a neighborhood that is not designed as an historic district commission but still provides the feel and elements for this area. So like, you walk in, you see the sign, you know where you are. That could, we hope entice people in the area to just keep their homes in better repair and showcase that section.

Some other recommendations that the consultant provided us was to create a preservation plan and this is town-wide preservation plan, that we could then perhaps include in our POCD, that could be something that we could consider. She talks about creation of historical district map and cultural resource maps, and she started a resource inventory. This is another thing that I know that I will want to look for grants for. There are grants available for these kind of things and as a Town we are so abundant with these historic houses, we really should take a good count and at least be aware of what we have.

Lastly, she talks about perhaps considering about becoming a certified local government, getting the certified local government status for the town which would open us up to some, and that would imply that perhaps a town owned property would have to be regulated historically so we could take one of our properties, one of the properties that the town owns, designate it as an historic district, and use that to become a certified local government which would open up to other grants and funding.

In the fall of this year, along with a bunch of other outreach things, we will also do an outreach to the property owners, in this area of town and get somebody from Preservation Connecticut to talk to the homeowners, hopefully there will be some interest there about what avenues are available at the state level and Preservation CT level for the property owners to obtain, to preserve their homes.
So that is what this report is about.

Chairman Pane: Thank you very much Renata, I think that report was very informative and love the idea of signing some of the properties and I hope that we can implement something like this. I think it would be really nice for the town to showcase the historical homes without putting a burden on the homeowner by making it a registered area. I think it's a great idea.

Commissioner Trister: I think, I like the idea of the codes, specifically think about taking a walk with the family, walk past something and I think it's a great idea and I'd like to see it implemented for sure.

B. Future Agenda Form

Renata Bertotti: Right now the only thing coming up is an applicant before the Zoning Board of Appeals for construction of a second floor addition that is close to the property line. What actually happened is the house is already within the setbacks, so the property owner plans to build a second floor and they need a variance because that whole portion of the house is encroaching.

XII. COMMUNICATIONS

A. CRCOG Letters

XIII. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION (For items not listed on the agenda, speakers limited to two minutes.

None

XIV. REMARKS BY COMMISSIONERS

None

XV. CLOSING REMARKS BY THE CHAIRMAN

None

XVI. ADJOURN

Commissioner Woods moved to adjourn the meeting. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Havens. The meeting was adjourned at 7:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Nonine Addis, Recording Secretary
MEMORANDUM
TO: Newington Town Plan & Zoning Commission
FROM: Michael D’Amato, AICP, CZEO
DATE: August 3, 2022
SUBJECT: Greater Hartford Mobility Study

As has been previously reviewed and discussed by the Commission, the CT DOT is currently conducting a Mobility Study for the greater Hartford Region. As part of that study, a list of alternative recommendations has been prepared of which they are seeking comment from various entities including the TPZ.

The complete list of alternatives can be found here, via their website, but those which are pertinent to Newington have been compiled and included in the attached table for review.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative Title</th>
<th>Alternative Type</th>
<th>Alternative Description</th>
<th>Staff Comment</th>
<th>TPZ Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rte 175 Operational Improvements</td>
<td>Improvement to Existing Infrastructure</td>
<td>Reconstruct Route 175 in Newington to provide operational and safety improvements, as well as robust multimodal facilities.</td>
<td>While this work would provide increased safety to bicycles and pedestrians, it is unclear if this would increase or decrease traffic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newington East-West Connection</td>
<td>New Infrastructure</td>
<td>Construct a new connection between Fenn Road and Alumni Road north of Route 175.</td>
<td>These improvements once completed could have a significant impact to traffic on Cedar St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newington to Wethersfield Greenway</td>
<td>New Infrastructure</td>
<td>Provide a greenway from Newington Junction to Wethersfield Cove that would connect the CTfastrak pathway, Newington Center, and a potential riverfront greenway at Wethersfield Cove. Alignment would potentially follow the Route 5/15 corridor.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Newington Rail Station</td>
<td>New Infrastructure</td>
<td>Investigate a Hartford Line station stop in Newington. This will include a high-level understanding of new ridership generation as well as possible locations for the station. The most proximal Hartford Line stations to Newington are the Berlin Station and Union Station in Hartford. The center of Newington is about five miles from each of these stops.</td>
<td>Providing extended service hours could increase the number of users per day which could result in decreased vehicle traffic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evening Transit Service Improvements</td>
<td>Improvement to Existing Services</td>
<td>Add additional service frequency after the PM peak and extend service into later into the nighttime hours.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Stop Enhancements</td>
<td>Improvement to Existing Infrastructure</td>
<td>Upgrade bus stops with elements such as shelters, seating, lighting, real-time bus information, and trash cans.</td>
<td>These improvements would make transit stops more appealing and useful, which could increase ridership and ultimately decrease vehicle traffic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Complete Streets Plans</td>
<td>Improvement to Existing Infrastructure</td>
<td>Review and implement components of Complete Streets Plans to guide and prioritize the development of bicycle and pedestrian facilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microtransit Initiatives Support</td>
<td>Improvement to Existing Services</td>
<td>Integrate microtransit with bus transit to help increase the reach of transit service and helps to solve first/last mile travel challenges. Microtransit includes small-scale travel modes focused on shorter trips.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Employment Centers Bus Service Improvements</td>
<td>Improvement to Existing Services</td>
<td>Improve bus service to the major employment centers located outside of downtown Hartford.</td>
<td>These services would benefit Newington residents who currently do not have transit options available to them if they work outside of Hartford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit-Oriented Development Support</td>
<td>Improvement to Existing Infrastructure</td>
<td>Provide support for Transit Oriented Development (TOD), mid- to high-density mixed-use development concentrated around high-quality transit service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Service Frequency Enhancements in Transit Priority Areas</td>
<td>Improvement to Existing Services</td>
<td>Provide more frequent transit service throughout the day within the transit focus area where fixed route service is most suited to rider's needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Priority Infrastructure Improvements</td>
<td>Improvement to Existing Infrastructure</td>
<td>Implement transit priority infrastructure includes items such as dedicated bus lanes, queue jumps, and transit signal priority.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Calming</td>
<td>Improvement to Existing Infrastructure</td>
<td>Add geometric or functional countermeasures to low-volume roadways to reduce speed and speed differential.</td>
<td>These improvements would increase pedestrian safety and would not contribute to increased traffic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuter Parking Policies Assessment</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>Review employee parking policies for major employers with large proportions of drive-alone commuters.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truck Parking Designation / Construction</td>
<td>Improvement to Existing Infrastructure</td>
<td>Construct or designate secure, convenient parking areas for long-haul truck traffic.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Type</td>
<td>Improvement Type</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Impacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>286K Freight Rail Capacity Upgrades</td>
<td>Improvement to Existing Infrastructure</td>
<td>Replace or retrofit fixed infrastructure to meet the 286K standard, including the Warehouse Point Bridge over the Connecticut River. The movement of freight throughout the state is critical. In Connecticut, most freight is moved by truck, with a substantially smaller portion being moved by rail freight. Rail freight in the state is in part limited by the lack of continuity with the national freight system due to weight restrictions on tracks within the GHMS study area. Under the New Haven-Hartford Springfield Rail Program the track infrastructure (ties, ballast and track) was upgraded to meet the 286K standards. However, certain bridges and culvert structures were not included as part of the NHHS rail program, meaning the line is not 286K compliant.</td>
<td>Increased rail/freight capacity could further support existing industrial businesses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartford Line Electrification</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>Explore longer-term goal of electrifying the Hartford Line, which would allow the operation of M8 electric multiple units (EMUs) and allow Amtrak to electrify their service on the line. The benefits and costs of electrification between New Haven and Union Station in Springfield, MA will be assessed. This alternative could be bolstered in the future by additional electrification investments from Connecticut's regional partners, including MassDOT and Amtrak. The Hartford Line currently operates diesel-hauled push/pull equipment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartford Rail Line Upgrades</td>
<td>Improvement to Existing Infrastructure</td>
<td>Complete all the work originally planned for the New Haven Hartford Springfield (NHHS) Rail Program line, including additional double tracking and station upgrades. The program was developed to facilitate the deployment of the Hartford Line rail service and included substantial upgrades to track and station infrastructure. Despite the immense amount of work completed to date, outstanding items remain.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-84/Route 9 to Route 4 Connector</td>
<td>New Infrastructure</td>
<td>Complete I-84 Interchange 39A and provide access to UConn Health Center and/or Route 4 (Farmington Avenue).</td>
<td>These improvements once completed could have a significant impact to traffic on Cedar St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-84 Capacity Improvements</td>
<td>Improvement to Existing Infrastructure</td>
<td>Add capacity in both directions on I-84 in Hartford. Revise interchanges to provide lane balance.</td>
<td>Improvements to capacity on I-84 could help to alleviate traffic on Cedar Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeways and Ramps Pedestrian Crossing Enhancements</td>
<td>Improvement to Existing Infrastructure</td>
<td>Improve pedestrian connections across freeways ramps throughout the Study Area.</td>
<td>These upgrades could improve pedestrian safety at Fenn Rd/Cedar St Intersection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>