

**RECORD OF DECISION**  
  
**FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**  
  
**for the**  
  
**Construction of a New Federal Courthouse**  
  
**Hartford, Connecticut**

**June 2025**

**ACTION**

The United States (U.S.) General Services Administration (GSA) published a Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) to examine the potential impacts from the proposed acquisition of a site in Hartford, Connecticut, and the subsequent design, construction, and operation of a new federal courthouse. The Final EIS describes the purpose and need for the project; alternatives considered; the existing environment that could be affected; the potential impacts resulting from each alternative; and proposed mitigation measures. As described in the Final EIS, GSA selects Alternative 2, Allyn Site, as the Preferred Alternative. This Record of Decision (ROD) documents the specific components and rationale for GSA's decision. This decision is based on the Final EIS issued in May 2025; the technical reports included as appendices to the Final EIS; comments from federal, state, and local agencies, stakeholders, members of the public, and elected officials; and other resources contained in the administrative record. The Final EIS is available on the project website at: [www.gsa.gov/hartfordcourthouse](http://www.gsa.gov/hartfordcourthouse).

Comments received during the Final EIS 30-day Wait Period are provided in Attachment 1 to the ROD, and GSA's responses to those comments are provided in the Errata Sheet attached to the ROD (Attachment 2).

**BACKGROUND**

The Abraham A. Ribicoff Federal Building and Courthouse (or Ribicoff Federal Building and Courthouse) in Hartford, constructed in 1963, does not have the capacity to accommodate the functions and operations of the U.S. District Court for the District of Connecticut (the Court). The Court currently operates at three facilities: the Richard C. Lee U.S. Courthouse in New Haven (its headquarters location), the Brien McMahon Federal Building and U.S. Courthouse in Bridgeport, and the Ribicoff Federal Building and Courthouse.

The Ribicoff Federal Building and Courthouse is located in downtown Hartford. The facility's gross square footage (GSF) is 365,542 and it contains 105 indoor secure parking spaces. The Ribicoff Federal Building and Courthouse houses the Court and several related federal agencies, including the U.S. Court of Appeals, U.S. Bankruptcy Court, U.S. Probation and Pretrial Office, U.S. Department of Justice – U.S. Attorney's Office, U.S. Trustee Program, trial and preparation space for the Federal Public Defender, and U.S. Marshals Service (together referred to as the Court Program). The Court Program utilizes eight courtrooms, 10 judges' chambers, and other court support spaces. The Ribicoff Federal Building and

Courthouse also houses federal agencies that are unaffiliated with the Court, such as GSA, U.S. Department of Agriculture Food and Inspection Safety Service, and Federal Bureau of Investigation. The current employee count at the Ribicoff Federal Building and Courthouse is 364, of which 88 are part of the Court Program. Presently, the facility receives approximately 200 to 500 daily visitors.

The Court's long-term facilities planning process and GSA's feasibility studies found functional and operational challenges at all of the Court facilities and concluded that relocation of the Court headquarters to a new courthouse in Hartford would provide efficiencies in judicial operations across the state. Relocating the headquarters would include 1) consolidating the main offices of some Court and related agencies and 2) moving the Bankruptcy Court in New Haven from leased space to the Richard C. Lee Courthouse. A new courthouse would house approximately 220 to 240 full-time employees. For the past several years, the Federal Judiciary Courthouse Project Priorities List included the identification of a new courthouse in Hartford as a top priority across the country.

A new courthouse, owned and managed by GSA, would meet the present and long-term requirements of the Court by accommodating its functions and operations in Hartford.

## **PURPOSE AND NEED**

The purpose of the project is to meet the current and long-term needs of the Court and related agencies by providing an adequate number of courtrooms, judges' chambers, and administrative office space in Hartford, Connecticut, and to ensure efficient judicial operations across the state.

The project is needed because the Ribicoff Federal Building and Courthouse in Hartford, which currently houses the Court, does not have the capacity to accommodate the Court's functions and operations. The Ribicoff Federal Building and Courthouse is inadequate in size and configuration for the Court's operations including deficiencies in judicial, detainee, and juror circulation, and overall facility security.

## **PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT, SCOPING, AND AGENCY COORDINATION EFFORTS**

The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process provides several opportunities for public involvement. Interested and affected parties may provide their views regarding the project, its possible effects on the natural and human environment, what should be addressed in the analysis and evaluation of the proposed alternatives, and the adequacy of the NEPA analysis. Public participation with respect to decision-making on the project is guided by GSA's implementing procedures for compliance with NEPA (GSA Order ADM 1095.1F, Environmental Considerations in Decision Making), and the GSA Public Buildings Service (PBS) NEPA Desk Guide.

GSA conducted public scoping as part of the NEPA process, which included hosting a scoping meeting prior to developing the Draft EIS. The public scoping period began with the publication of a Notice of Intent (NOI) to prepare an EIS in the Federal Register on May 26, 2023. GSA hosted a scoping meeting on Tuesday, June 6, 2023. GSA invited comments to obtain input from the public, agencies, and other interested parties on the proposed project including key topics that should be covered in the EIS, examples of potential adverse and beneficial effects from project activities, and any other relevant information. The

public provided input on several topics during the scoping period, including the proposed alternatives, community engagement, traffic and transportation, land use, and water resources.

The Asylum Hill Neighborhood Association (AHNA) is in the designated Neighborhood Revitalization Zone for the Asylum Hill area of the City of Hartford where Alternative 1, Woodland Site, is located. Members of the AHNA requested GSA to attend a community meeting to discuss the project with a focus on the Woodland Site as a potential location for the new courthouse. The meeting was held on November 28, 2023. Members of GSA and the Court attended. Meeting attendees made comments for GSA's consideration on several topics such as parking, traffic, safety, environmental issues, socioeconomics, and overall effects to the neighborhood.

GSA conducted a public hearing for the Draft EIS as part of the NEPA process and to inform the development of the Final EIS. GSA published a Notice of Availability (NOA) in the Federal Register on November 1, 2024, to invite the public to review and comment on the Draft EIS and to provide notification of a Draft EIS public hearing. GSA held the Draft EIS public hearing on Wednesday, November 13, 2024. Public comments included input on a variety of topics, including air quality, climate change, community engagement, design, environmental justice, hazardous materials, land use, socioeconomics, and traffic and transportation. All substantive comments were reviewed and incorporated into the Final EIS.

GSA invited the public to review and comment on the Final EIS with the publication of an NOA in the Federal Register on May 9, 2025, which marked the start of the 30-day Wait Period. Six commenters provided input on the Final EIS.

## **PROJECT ALTERNATIVES EVALUATED**

GSA identified two action alternatives that met the stated purpose and need of the proposed project and thus were analyzed in the EIS. Both alternatives involved the site acquisition, design, construction, and operation of a new federal courthouse in Hartford: (1) Alternative 1, Woodland Site, located at 61 Woodland Street and (2) Alternative 2, Allyn Site, located at 154 Allyn Street. Key features of the proposed courthouse under both action alternatives included (a) total building GSF of up to 281,000; (b) 11 courtrooms and 18 judges' chambers; (c) offices for the Court and related agencies; and (d) 66 secure parking spaces. GSA also analyzed a "No Action" alternative, which evaluated the effects that would occur if the Court continued to operate across the state at its current facilities in Hartford, New Haven, and Bridgeport (see 'Background' section). GSA has decided to implement Alternative 2, Allyn Site.

Under the action alternatives, the design of the new courthouse would conform to GSA's Core Building Standards, the *U.S. Courts Design Guide*, U.S. Marshals Service, U.S. Attorney's Office, and other relevant building codes and standards. The design of the new courthouse is anticipated to begin in mid-2026, and the 3-year construction period is likely to commence in 2027. The new courthouse is expected to be completed and fully occupied by 2030. Construction activities would include site preparation (e.g., excavation) and construction. The exact sequence and timeline of these activities would be determined during site design.

**Alternative 1: Woodland Site**

Under Alternative 1, Woodland Site, GSA would acquire up to 10.19 acres of land at 61 Woodland Street for the project. The Woodland Site is bounded by Asylum Avenue to the north, the North Branch Park River to the west, healthcare-related buildings along its southern perimeter, and Woodland Street to the east. The Woodland Site is in Hartford's Asylum Hill neighborhood, a block south of Saint Francis Hospital, and includes a portion of the North Branch Park River along its western boundary. The Woodland Site lies to the east of the University of Connecticut School of Law, separated by the North Branch Park River, and to the south of Classical High School, separated by Asylum Avenue. Developments to the east and south of the Woodland Site comprise a mix of commercial, residential, and religious buildings. The southwest portion of the Woodland Site is in the Asylum Hill National Historic District. Additionally, the site also abuts the Prospect Avenue and Seminary National Historic Districts, both of which lie adjacent to the western perimeter of the site. A portion of the Woodland Site, approximately 5 acres, is located within the 1 percent and 0.2 percent annual chance flood hazard areas.

The Woodland Site, constructed in 1950, currently includes a State of Connecticut office building, ancillary building, and a surface parking lot. Under Alternative 1, the existing buildings may be demolished or reused as part of the construction of the new courthouse. The project may contain up to two levels of underground secure parking, surface-level secure parking only, or a combination of the two. Construction would be limited to areas outside of the floodplain. Approximately 2 acres of the site would be excavated and graded in preparation for construction, and 0.25 acres would be used as a staging area. The project would generate approximately 74,000 to 100,000 cubic yards of excavated materials and up to 61,000 cubic yards of demolition debris. Construction would be limited to areas outside the floodplain. A new landscape plan would be developed for the site with native plantings. GSA would pursue options to provide additional parking due to the lack of available public parking in proximity to the Woodland Site.

**Alternative 2: Allyn Site (Preferred Alternative)**

Alternative 2, Allyn Site, located at 154 Allyn Street, is 2.19 acres and consists of ten tax parcels owned by one entity. The property lies downtown in the Hartford central business district, one block north of Bushnell Park, one block east of Union Station, southeast of the William R. Cotter Federal Building, and one block west of the XL Center. It is bounded by Church Street, to the north, High Street to the west, Allyn Street to the south, and mixed-use and religious buildings along its eastern perimeter. The Allyn Site is primarily surrounded by commercial buildings and parking spaces and is one block south-southeast of Interstate 84 (I-84). A portion of the Allyn Site is in the Ann Street National Historic District.

The Allyn Site is currently utilized as a surface parking lot with gates and contains 290 parking spaces and minimal landscaping. Under Alternative 2, a new courthouse will be constructed on the Allyn Site. The automatic gates for entry/exit of vehicles and the paved asphalt parking will be removed prior to construction. The new courthouse will contain up to two levels of underground secure parking. Excavation and grading will occur to prepare the foundation for the new courthouse and for the construction of the underground parking levels. The majority of the Allyn Site, approximately 2 acres, will be excavated and graded in preparation for construction and approximately 0.25 acres will be used as a staging area. GSA may lease a vacant paved area in the vicinity of the Allyn Site for staging purposes due to the limited space

available at the site. The project will generate approximately 50,000 to 75,000 cubic yards of excavated materials. A new landscape plan will be developed using native plantings. There appears to be adequate public parking in proximity to the Allyn Site; however, GSA may pursue options to provide additional parking, such as entering into a lease with a commercial parking operator.

### **No Action Alternative**

GSA also evaluated a No Action Alternative which assumes that site acquisition and subsequent design, construction, and operation of a new courthouse would not occur. The Court would continue to operate in multiple locations across the state at its current facilities in Hartford, New Haven, and Bridgeport. The Court would not relocate its headquarters to Hartford. GSA would complete minor repairs and renovations at the Court facilities, as needed. The No Action Alternative does not meet the stated purpose and need of the proposed project.

## **ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES**

Resources analyzed in the Final EIS included land use; utilities; traffic and transportation; air quality; solid and hazardous waste and materials; socioeconomics; protection of children's health and safety; cultural resources; geology, topography, and soils; water resources; and visual resources and aesthetics. Based on the analysis presented in the Final EIS, which considered and incorporated input from the public comments received on the Draft EIS, impacts from the Preferred Alternative on all resource areas would be less than significant (i.e., negligible, minor, or moderate).

**Table 1** summarizes the potential effects of the alternatives on each resource analyzed; refer to Chapter 3 in the Final EIS for additional details.

**Table 1. Summary of Potential Effects by Alternative**

<b>Resource</b>	<b>Alternative 1 – Woodland Site</b>	<b>Alternative 2 – Allyn Site (Preferred Alternative)</b>	<b>No Action Alternative</b>
Land Use	<p><b>Direct, long-term, minor, site-specific and localized, and beneficial</b> effects to land use because Alternative 1 would align with Hartford’s existing zoning designation and future land use goals for the Woodland Site and would partially align with the goals of the Asylum Hill Neighborhood Association (AHNA) Strategic Plan (e.g., increased building energy efficiency and conservation/restoration of the North Branch Park River).</p> <p><b>Direct, long-term, minor, localized, and adverse</b> effects to land use because the project would not align with the goals of the AHNA Strategic Plan focusing on incorporating neighborhood and neighborhood-serving development such as residences and retail spaces. Additionally, conversion of the site to a federally-owned property would remove it from Connecticut’s payment in lieu of taxes (PILOT) program which would affect its contributions to the city’s tax base. The total estimated PILOT grant revenue generated yearly from the Woodland Site is \$350,000.</p>	<p><b>Direct, long-term, moderate, site-specific and localized, and beneficial</b> effects to land use because Alternative 2 would align with Hartford’s existing zoning designations and future land use goals for the Allyn Site and would reduce the excessive amount of parking currently available in Hartford.</p> <p><b>Direct, long-term, minor, localized, and adverse</b> effects due to the conversion of the Allyn Site from taxable to a tax-exempt federal use. The total estimated yearly tax revenue at the Allyn Site is \$206,751.</p>	<b>No effects</b> to land use.
Utilities	<p><b>Direct, long-term, negligible, and regional</b> effects to utility networks and customers in the service areas. Effects would be both <b>beneficial</b> and <b>adverse</b>. Beneficial effects would result from the replacement of the existing building at the Woodland Site with a newer, more efficient building that would meet the latest building codes. Adverse effects would result from the increased demand for water and sewer services due to the higher count of daily visitors at the new building and the use of three-phase power which</p>	<p><b>Direct, long-term, minor, regional, and adverse</b> effects to utility networks and customers in the service areas as utility usage for a courthouse building would exceed that of the existing parking lot.</p>	<b>No effects</b> to utilities.

Resource	Alternative 1 – Woodland Site	Alternative 2 – Allyn Site (Preferred Alternative)	No Action Alternative
Utilities (contd.)	<p>would increase electricity consumption compared to existing levels.</p> <p><b>No effects</b> over the <b>short term</b>.</p>	<p><b>No effects</b> over the <b>short term</b>.</p>	
Traffic and Transportation	<p><b>Direct, short-term, moderate, localized, and adverse</b> effects to traffic and transportation during construction due to potential lane restrictions, closures, detours of usual traffic patterns, and the trips associated with haul trucks. The majority of construction personnel may commute in their personal vehicles due to fewer public transit options compared to the Allyn Site and lack of public parking. The Woodland Site experiences high traffic volumes, and the project would add to the traffic congestion at this site.</p> <p><b>Direct, long-term, minor, localized, and adverse</b> effects to traffic and transportation. Alternative 1 would generate +321 net average daily trips; +6 net AM peak hour trips; and +7 net PM peak hour trips. This is not expected to add substantially to the traffic at the Woodland Site.</p> <p><b>Direct, long-term, minor, localized, and adverse</b> effects would occur due to the potential lack of sufficient parking and limited public transit options near the site. However, GSA’s proposal to pursue options to provide additional parking, such as by entering into a lease with a commercial parking operator, would offset some of these adverse effects since the site currently does not offer any public parking.</p>	<p><b>Direct, short-term, minor, localized, and adverse</b> effects to traffic and transportation during construction due to potential lane restrictions, closures, detours of usual traffic patterns, and the trips associated with haul trucks. Compared to the Woodland Site, the Allyn Site is not considered congested based on traffic count data.</p> <p><b>Direct, long-term, moderate, localized, and adverse</b> effects to traffic and transportation. Alternative 2 would generate +2,851 average daily trips; +162 AM peak hour trips; and +145 PM peak hour trips. Adverse effects to traffic would be moderate due to the substantial increase in average daily trips and AM/PM peak hour trips in the vicinity of the Allyn Site from the project.</p> <p><b>Direct, long-term, negligible, localized, and adverse</b> effects to parking. Though there would be an increased demand for parking because of a new courthouse, adverse effects to parking would be minor due to the availability of abundant parking spaces in downtown Hartford and GSA’s proposal to pursue options to provide additional parking at the site. Additionally, the site is well-connected to public transit, highways, and city streets.</p>	<p><b>No effects</b> to traffic and transportation.</p>

Resource	Alternative 1 – Woodland Site	Alternative 2 – Allyn Site (Preferred Alternative)	No Action Alternative
Air Quality	<p><b>Direct, short-term, minor, localized, and adverse</b> effects to air quality during construction resulting from emissions of fugitive dust and criteria pollutants from activities at the construction site (e.g., demolition, grading, operation of construction equipment).</p> <p><b>Direct, short-term, negligible, regional, and adverse</b> effects to air quality during construction resulting from emissions associated with haul trucks and privately-owned vehicles (POVs).</p> <p><b>Direct, long-term, negligible, localized, and beneficial</b> effects to air quality during courthouse operation since the new facility would have fewer sources of criteria pollutants and be more energy efficient than the existing building.</p> <p><b>Direct, long-term, negligible, regional, and adverse</b> effects to air quality from increased POV use and the emission of pollutants from grid-supplied electricity at the energy source.</p>	<p><b>Direct, short-term, minor, localized, and adverse</b> effects to air quality during construction resulting from emissions of fugitive dust and criteria pollutants from activities at the construction site (e.g., demolition, grading, operation of construction equipment).</p> <p><b>Direct, short-term, negligible, regional, and adverse</b> effects to air quality during construction resulting from emissions associated with haul trucks and privately-owned vehicles.</p> <p><b>Direct, long-term, minor, localized, and adverse</b> effects to air quality during courthouse operation as criteria pollutant emissions for a courthouse building would exceed that of the existing parking lot.</p> <p><b>Direct, long-term, negligible to minor, regional, and adverse</b> effects to air quality. Negligible effects from increased POV use and minor effects from the emission of pollutants from grid-supplied electricity at the energy source. Unlike the Woodland Site, there is no current electricity consumption at the Allyn Site.</p>	<p><b>Direct, long-term, negligible, localized to regional, and adverse</b> effects to air quality due to building operations and POVs.</p>
Solid and Hazardous Waste and Materials	<p><b>Direct, short-term, negligible, site-specific, and adverse</b> effects from accidental spills of hazardous materials, such as from construction vehicles or as a result of removing the existing fuel storage tanks.</p> <p><b>Direct, short-term, moderate, localized, and adverse</b> effects from the generation and disposal of hazardous materials such as asbestos-containing materials, lead-based paint, and polychlorinated biphenyls present in the existing buildings at the Woodland Site. Such</p>	<p><b>Direct, short-term, negligible, site-specific, and adverse</b> effects from accidental spills of hazardous materials, such as from construction vehicles.</p> <p><b>Direct, short-term, moderate, localized, and adverse</b> effects from the generation of contaminated excavation waste due to the potential for contaminant runoff from standing waste.</p>	



Resource	Alternative 1 – Woodland Site	Alternative 2 – Allyn Site (Preferred Alternative)	No Action Alternative
Solid and Hazardous Waste and Materials (contd.)	<p>effects would also result from the generation of solid and hazardous construction and demolition waste due to the potential for contaminant runoff from standing waste.</p> <p><b>No long-term effects</b> on solid and hazardous waste and materials management from courthouse operations.</p>	<p><b>Direct, long-term, minor, localized, and adverse</b> effects would result from the increased solid and hazardous waste and materials management at the new courthouse compared to the existing parking lot.</p>	<p><b>Direct, long-term, minor, localized, and adverse</b> effects from the continued use of hazardous materials and the generation of solid and hazardous waste during building operations.</p>
Socioeconomics	<p><b>No effects</b> would be expected on population and housing since most short-term construction employees and long-term full-time employees of the new courthouse would likely not temporarily or permanently relocate to Hartford.</p> <p><b>Direct, long-term, negligible, localized, and beneficial</b> socioeconomic effects due to the facilitation of community engagement by providing opportunities for collaboration between the Court and students from University of Connecticut Law School and Classical High School.</p> <p><b>Direct and indirect, short-term, minor, regional, and beneficial</b> effects on labor and earnings due to hiring local construction workers from Hartford County and purchasing local materials and equipment.</p> <p><b>Direct and indirect, long-term, negligible, regional, and beneficial</b> effects on labor and earnings due to an overall increased economic activity in Hartford.</p>	<p><b>No effects</b> would be expected on population and housing since most short-term construction employees and long-term full-time employees of the new courthouse would likely not temporarily or permanently relocate to Hartford.</p> <p><b>Direct and indirect, short-term, minor, regional, and beneficial</b> effects on labor and earnings due to hiring local construction workers from Hartford County and purchasing local materials and equipment.</p> <p><b>Direct and indirect, long-term, minor, regional, and beneficial</b> effects on labor and earnings due to an overall increased economic activity in Hartford.</p>	<p><b>No effects</b> to socioeconomic resources.</p>

Resource	Alternative 1 – Woodland Site	Alternative 2 – Allyn Site (Preferred Alternative)	No Action Alternative
Socioeconomics (contd.)	<b>Direct, long-term, minor, localized, and adverse</b> economic effects due to the removal of Woodland Site and the associated PILOT grants from the tax base of the City of Hartford. The total estimated PILOT grant revenue generated annually from the Woodland Site is \$350,000.	<b>Direct, long-term, minor, localized, and adverse</b> economic effects due to the removal of Allyn Site from the tax base of the City of Hartford. The current total estimated yearly tax revenue at the Allyn Site is \$206,751.	
Protection of Children’s Health and Safety	<p><b>Direct, long-term, negligible, localized, and beneficial socioeconomic</b> effects due to the facilitation of community engagement by providing opportunities for collaboration between the Court and students from Classical High School.</p> <p><b>Direct, short-term, minor, localized, and adverse</b> effects to the health and safety of children at Classical High School and the Connecticut Technical Education and Career System due to noise from construction activities.</p> <p><b>Direct, short-term, minor, localized, and adverse</b> effects to the health and safety of children at Classical High School and the Connecticut Technical Education and Career System due to air emissions from construction activities.</p> <p><b>Direct, short-term, minor, localized, and adverse</b> effects to the health and safety of children due to increased traffic congestion from construction, which could increase the chance for vehicular collisions.</p> <p><b>Direct, long-term, negligible, localized, and adverse</b> effects to the health and safety of children due to slightly increased levels of traffic congestion associated with operation of the courthouse.</p>	<p><b>Direct, short-term, negligible, localized, and adverse</b> effects to the health and safety of children walking or playing in the Bushnell Park due to noise from construction activities.</p> <p><b>Direct, short-term, negligible, localized, and adverse</b> effects to the health and safety of children playing in the Bushnell Park due to air emissions from construction activities.</p> <p><b>Direct, short-term, minor, localized, and adverse</b> effects to the health and safety of children due to increased traffic congestion from construction, which could increase the chance for vehicular collisions.</p> <p><b>Direct, long-term, minor, localized, and adverse</b> effects to the health and safety of children due to increased levels of congestion associated with operation of the courthouse.</p>	<b>No effects</b> to the health and safety of children.

Resource	Alternative 1 – Woodland Site	Alternative 2 – Allyn Site (Preferred Alternative)	No Action Alternative
Protection of Children’s Health and Safety (contd.)	<b>No effects</b> to the health and safety of children due to detainees being transported to the courthouse for court proceedings.	<b>No effects</b> to the health and safety of children due to detainees being transported to the courthouse for court proceedings.	
Cultural Resources	<p><b>No effects</b> to archaeological resources due to extensive prior disturbance at the Woodland Site.</p> <p><b>Direct, permanent, moderate to major, localized, and adverse</b> effects on historic resources if the buildings on site are determined eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP): the former Phoenix Insurance Company Building (currently the state office building) and the former Perkins-Clark House Garage (currently the vacant ancillary building). After purchasing the site, if either of the buildings are determined eligible for the NRHP, GSA would pursue the Section 106 consultation process and develop mitigation measures as needed. <b>No effects</b> on historic resources if neither of the on-site buildings are determined eligible for the NRHP.</p> <p><b>Indirect, long-term, negligible, and localized</b> effects on the viewshed of historic resources in the vicinity of the Woodland Site. Effects may be adverse or beneficial depending on the design of the new courthouse.</p>	<p><b>Direct, permanent, negligible to moderate, site-specific, and beneficial or adverse</b> effects on archaeological resources. Beneficial effects would occur if the project activities led to the discovery of historically or culturally important resources. Adverse effects would occur if project activities led to the destruction of the discovered resources. <b>No effects</b> to archeological resources if none are found during project activities.</p> <p><b>No effects</b> on historic resources as none exist on the Allyn Site.</p> <p><b>Indirect, long-term, negligible, and localized</b> effects on the viewshed of historic resources in the vicinity of the Allyn Site. Effects may be adverse or beneficial depending on the design of the new courthouse.</p>	<b>No effects</b> to archaeological or historic resources.

Resource	Alternative 1 – Woodland Site	Alternative 2 – Allyn Site (Preferred Alternative)	No Action Alternative
Geology, Topography, and Soils	<p><b>No effects</b> to geology from excavation and site preparation activities.</p> <p><b>Direct, permanent, negligible, site-specific,</b> and <b>adverse effects</b> to topography due to grading and leveling activities.</p> <p><b>Direct</b> and <b>indirect, short-term, minor, site-specific,</b> and <b>adverse effects</b> to soils from site preparation activities and the presence of heavy machinery, resulting in soil detachment, wind and stormwater runoff, and erosion.</p> <p><b>Direct, long-term, minor, site-specific,</b> and <b>beneficial effects</b> from removing impervious surfaces with a goal of restoring soils to support native vegetation and a riparian habitat.</p>	<p><b>Direct, permanent, minor to moderate, localized,</b> and <b>adverse effects</b> to geology from the excavation of the underground parking levels. <b>No effects</b> to geology if rock excavation is not needed.</p> <p><b>No effects</b> to topography from minimal grading.</p> <p><b>Direct</b> and <b>indirect, short-term, minor, site-specific,</b> and <b>adverse effects</b> to soils from site preparation activities and the presence of heavy machinery, resulting in soil detachment, wind and stormwater runoff, and erosion.</p>	<b>No effects</b> to geology, topography, and soils.
Water Resources	<p><u>Surface Water and Stormwater</u> <b>Direct, short-term, minor, localized,</b> and <b>adverse effects</b> to surface waters and stormwater during construction-related activities from potential sediment/contaminant runoff from the site and accidental spills.</p> <p><b>Direct, long-term, negligible, localized,</b> and <b>adverse effects</b> due to the possible spills from maintenance activities at the new courthouse and <b>direct, long-term, minor, localized,</b> and <b>beneficial effects</b> due to the potential development of riparian cover and green infrastructure/Best Management Practices (BMPs) implementation to improve stormwater quality and reduce stormwater quantity.</p>	<p><u>Surface Water and Stormwater</u> <b>Direct, short-term, minor, localized,</b> and <b>adverse effects</b> to surface waters and stormwater during construction-related activities from potential sediment/contaminant runoff from the site and accidental spills.</p> <p><b>Direct, long-term, negligible, localized,</b> and <b>adverse effects</b> due to the possible spills from maintenance activities at the new courthouse.</p>	<b>No effects</b> to surface water, stormwater, wetlands, and floodplains.

Resource	Alternative 1 – Woodland Site	Alternative 2 – Allyn Site (Preferred Alternative)	No Action Alternative
Water Resources (contd.)	<p><u>Wetlands</u>  <b>Direct, long-term, minor, localized, and beneficial</b> effects to wetlands from potential re-establishment of hydrophytic vegetation due to the implementation of the new landscape plan. <b>No short-term effects</b> from construction are anticipated due to the proper implementation of required BMPs.</p> <p><u>Floodplains</u>  <b>Direct, long-term, negligible, localized, and beneficial</b> effects to floodplain resources because no construction would take place within the floodplain, except possible removal of some pavement.</p>	<p><u>Wetlands</u>  <b>No effects</b> to wetlands associated with the implementation of Alternative 2.</p> <p><u>Floodplains</u>  <b>No effects</b> to floodplains associated with the implementation of Alternative 2.</p>	
Visual Resources and Aesthetics	<p><b>Direct, short-term, minor, localized, and adverse</b> effects to visual resources from construction-related activities because they would alter the viewshed or physically alter the form of the land.</p> <p><b>Direct, long-term, minor, localized, and beneficial</b> effects to visual resources from the newly constructed courthouse. The building and facilities would mostly blend in with the other urbanized features in the landscape, and the new, modernized courthouse could be perceived as an enhancement or benefit to the landscape, based on the perspective of the observer.</p>	<p><b>Direct, short-term, minor, localized, and adverse</b> effects to visual resources from construction-related activities because they would alter the viewshed or physically alter the form of the land.</p> <p><b>Direct, long-term, minor, localized, and beneficial</b> effects to visual resources from the newly constructed courthouse. The building and facilities would mostly blend in with the other urbanized features in the landscape, and the new, modernized courthouse could be perceived as an enhancement or benefit to the landscape, based on the perspective of the observer.</p>	<p><b>No effects</b> to visual resources. The Ribicoff Federal Building and Courthouse is already an established feature in the landscape.</p>

GSA also evaluated the reasonably foreseeable effects that the alternatives, as well as other projects in the vicinity of the proposed courthouse sites, may have on the environment. Present and reasonably foreseeable future actions are included if they are expected to overlap in space and time with the scope of this Final EIS. Current and foreseeable future major actions in the vicinity of the alternatives include city and neighborhood development and revitalization plans, mixed-use development projects, energy development projects, transportation plans, riverfront transformation projects, and watershed management projects. These activities are anticipated to have effects ranging from short- to long-term in duration, negligible to moderate in magnitude, and site-specific to regional in extent, on the resources analyzed in the EIS. Effects would be both beneficial and adverse.

GSA considered the magnitude of current and foreseeable future effects of concurrent projects in the area and concluded that contributing adverse effects from any of the project alternatives would be less than significant (i.e., negligible, minor, or moderate), except potentially for cultural resources under Alternative 1 if either building on the Woodland Site is determined eligible for the NRHP.

## **MITIGATION MEASURES AND BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES**

GSA commits to the mitigation measures and BMPs as outlined below:

### **Land Use**

Mitigation is not applicable to land use, as there are no established best management practices for transfer of land ownership.

### **Utilities**

- Construction personnel would locate and mark utilities prior to demolition and site preparation.
- In the event of discovery of unmarked utilities, construction personnel would coordinate with utilities providers prior to construction activities.

### **Traffic and Transportation**

- The construction site would have adequate, clearly visible signage and markings for pedestrian/commuter safety and optimum traffic flow. Cones, barricades, or temporary fencing may be used to separate construction zones from traffic lanes.
- Project-related information, including road closures and traffic diversions, would be shared with the public. The construction contractor would coordinate such activities with local authorities.

### **Air Quality**

- The construction contractor would use water for dust control when grading roads or clearing land.
- Water would be sprayed on dirt roads, materials stockpiles, and other surfaces that could create airborne dust.
- Roadways would be paved (when feasible) and maintained well (e.g., periodic sweeping).
- Open hauling equipment (e.g., haul trucks) would be covered when conveying or transporting materials likely to create wind-blown dust.

### **Solid and Hazardous Waste and Materials**

- Additional surveys and subsurface investigation would occur to verify the presence of underground fuel storage tanks and to evaluate the level of contamination at the site. If further remediation is necessary, activities such as soil injection and drenching or soil removal and disposal would occur.
- Removal and disposal of fuel storage tanks, if needed, would be conducted using licensed contractors and all proper closure procedures.
- Accidental spills of hazardous materials (e.g., diesel fuel from vehicles, paint, solvents) would be minimized by implementing practices such as regular vehicle inspections and maintenance, proper storage of hazardous materials, maintaining a clean working environment, and adherence to a SPCC plan.
- Construction and demolition waste would be removed frequently to minimize contaminant runoff from standing waste.

### **Socioeconomics**

- There is no mitigation for project activities resulting in beneficial effects to socioeconomics. Additionally, there are no established best management practices for the removal of a land parcel from a city's tax base.

### **Protection of Children's Health and Safety**

- The GSA Project Manager would act as the point of contact to receive and address public concerns during construction. Project-related information would be shared with the public during the construction planning process.
- GSA would ensure that the construction contractor implements effective safety measures to protect the general public in the vicinity of the construction site, such as roadway closures, adequate signage, and crossing guards.

### **Cultural Resources**

- If archaeological resources were discovered during construction activities, all earth-moving activity within and around the immediate discovery area would be avoided until a qualified archaeologist can assess the nature and significance of the find. A Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) would be developed if it is determined that there are adverse effects on a discovered archaeological resource. The MOA would include mitigation measures to avoid or minimize effects to such resources.

### **Geology, Topography, and Soils**

- BMPs for rock excavation may include actively evaluating the condition of slopes and bedrock; installing additional support as needed; and developing controls.
- BMPs to control soil erosion and sedimentation, and to manage the risk of spills would include measures similar to the ones described under Solid and Hazardous Waste and Materials above and Water Resources below.

### **Water Resources**

- A Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) would be developed to document the BMPs to be used on the construction site to reduce or prevent the discharge of pollutants.
- BMPs to prevent or mitigate the escape of sediment include erosion control strategies during the construction phase, such as temporary seeding, use of silt fencing, installation of gravel construction entrances/exits, installation of temporary sediment basins, and other methods as determined during detailed design.
- BMPs to manage or mitigate the risk of spills include drop cloths, proper storage of chemicals, and immediate treatment of spill areas with absorbents and soil removal.
- Development or redevelopment projects involving federal facilities with a footprint that exceeds 5,000 square feet are required to use site planning, design, construction, and maintenance strategies for the property to maintain or restore, to the maximum extent technically feasible, the predevelopment hydrology of the property with regard to the temperature, rate, volume, and duration of flow.
- Permanent stormwater BMPs, such as detention ponds, vegetated swales, or level spreaders, would be installed in compliance with federal, state, and local law. These permanent stormwater BMPs would be regularly maintained by mowing, removing debris, and repairing damage to help maintain their long-term efficacy.

### **Visual Resources and Aesthetics**

The construction will take place in downtown Hartford, an urban environment where commuters are accustomed to such activities and associated visual conditions. As a result, no specific BMPs are proposed for effects to the viewshed.



## **DECISION**

As Regional Commissioner of U.S. General Services Administration, New England Region, Public Buildings Service, it is my decision to approve the Preferred Alternative, Alternative 2, Allyn Site.

## **PREFERED ALTERNATIVE AND ENVIRONMENTALLY PREFERABLE ALTERNATIVE**

The environmentally preferable alternative is the alternative that best promotes the national environmental policy expressed within NEPA. In general, this refers to the alternative that will result in the least damage to the environment and best protects natural, social, and cultural resources. Based on the Final EIS, Alternative 2, the Preferred Alternative, has been determined to be the environmentally preferable alternative because it will meet the project purpose and need while resulting in the fewest substantial, adverse environmental consequences.

The Allyn Site currently functions as a parking lot. This site is highly disturbed, does not contain any structures, and is contaminated from previous uses. While the site possesses moderate post-contact archaeological sensitivity, the likelihood of encountering such resources is very low due to previous ground disturbance. This site does not possess existing and enduring resource or environmental values whose long-term potential benefits would be sacrificed to provide for short-term value to the project. As such, Alternative 2 as analyzed in the Final EIS is the environmentally preferable alternative.

## **RATIONALE FOR IMPLEMENTING THE PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE**

The following considerations were weighed in reaching my decision. The Preferred Alternative, Alternative 2, Allyn Site, of the Final EIS, will meet the current and long-term needs of the Court and related agencies while addressing existing deficiencies in judicial, detainee, and juror circulation, and overall facility security. Alternative 2 furthers the purpose and satisfies the need for the project. Implementation of Alternative 2 will:

- Provide greater access and better connectivity to the courthouse due to the downtown location and availability of several public transit options. The Allyn Site is located on several bus lines, including local services, express services, the CTfastrak system, and the Hartford dash shuttle. The site lies one block to the east of the Union Station and provides easy rail connectivity to commuters. These modes of transportation enhance the site's connectivity for both local and regional visitors to the courthouse.
- Provide access and availability of adequate public transit options and parking amenities in the vicinity of the site that will help reduce substantial traffic congestion in the area. The roadways in downtown Hartford would sufficiently accommodate the projected traffic increase from the operation of a new federal courthouse. The City of Hartford has put several initiatives in place to mitigate congestion, such as the Complete Streets Plan, the Bicycle Master Plan, and Hartford400.
- Boost the economic activity of downtown Hartford due to proximity to numerous amenities located in the area. The site's urban setting provides easy access to these amenities via various modes of transport, including walking and cycling. The Allyn Site will be particularly beneficial for cultural and entertainment venues, dining and lodging services, and law firms and related

operations located in the central business district and will attract further businesses and investments in the area, thus revitalizing the city's downtown.

I have determined that Alternative 2, Allyn Site, will best provide efficiencies in judicial operations across the State of Connecticut and best meet the stated purpose and need for the project. My decision to approve Alternative 2 is based on a balancing of likely adverse impacts with the need to improve capacity to accommodate the Court's functions and operations, operational efficiency, effectiveness, and overall facility security. This decision takes into account resource concerns and public interests as analyzed in the Final EIS. I have reached this decision after careful consideration of the environmental analysis of the effects of Alternatives 1 and 2, and the No Action Alternative, in concert with the needs of the federal government and other stakeholders.

Record of Decision Approval:

Signature:  Date: 6/12/2025

Glenn Rotondo  
New England Region  
Regional Commissioner  
Public Buildings Service  
U.S. General Services Administration

**ATTACHMENT 1: COMMENTS RECEIVED ON THE FINAL EIS**



Hartford Courthouse <hartfordcourthouse@gsa.gov>

Hartford Courthouse EIS

1 message

Elijah Eelhajbey <eelhajbey@gmail.com>

Fri, May 9, 2025 at 4:44 PM

To: HartfordCourthouse@gsa.gov

The selection process on Allyn Street does not make sense when the city has been promoting business to return to downtown Hartford and taking away from parking and housing that already limited. This is the same corrupt process to continue to give money to the same developers that received \$100's of millions of dollars and it's in foreclosure. Woodland Street is an ideal spot already owned by the state and will not take away taxable income that the city already receives from Allyn street. The public was not properly notified and the process should be strap and investigation should be conducted as to why you seeking 2 acres when you can have 10.

Elijah El-Hajj-Bey  
(860)752-4218  
[eelhajbey@gmail.com](mailto:eelhajbey@gmail.com)

Sent from my iPhone





Hartford Courthouse <hartfordcourthouse@gsa.gov>

---

## RE: [EXT]Re: Hartford Courthouse EIS

1 message

---

**Tucker Adam C (CI)** <Adam.Tucker@ci.irs.gov>  
To: Hartford Courthouse <hartfordcourthouse@gsa.gov>

Tue, May 13, 2025 at 6:43 AM

Joe,

Thanks for the update. How do I figure out if IRS-Criminal Investigation is on the list of "various other agencies" that will occupy the courthouse?

Thanks,

[Chart, company name, funnel chart Description automatically generated]

Adam Tucker

Supervisory Special Agent

Hartford, CT – Group 8

Boston Field Office

Office: (860) 594-9079

Mobile: (954) 214-8330



Hartford Courthouse <hartfordcourthouse@gsa.gov>

---

## Question

1 message

---

**Fairman, Luke J** <Luke.J.Fairman@uscis.dhs.gov>  
To: "HartfordCourthouse@gsa.gov" <HartfordCourthouse@gsa.gov>

Thu, May 15, 2025 at 8:20 AM

Is there a finalized list of all federal agencies which will occupy the new courthouse after construction finishes?

My agency, USCIS, currently resides in the Ribicoff building and my coworkers and I are wondering whether we will remain in the Ribicoff or be transferred to the new courthouse once it's built.

Have those decisions been made, or are they still being made?

**Luke Fairman**

Immigration Officer

Fraud Detection & National Security

Department of Homeland Security/US Citizenship & Immigration Services

Hartford Field Office | 450 Main St, Hartford, CT 06103

| (p) (860) 728-2310 | (c) (860) 817-0752 | (f) (860) 728-2355 |

**WARNING:** This document is FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY (FOUO). It contains information that may be exempt from public release under the Freedom of Information Act (5 U.S.C. 552). This document is to be controlled, handled, transmitted, distributed, and disposed of in accordance with DHS policy relating to Sensitive But Unclassified (SBU) information and is not to be released to the public or other personnel who do not have a valid "need-to-know" without prior approval from the originator.

**Mr. Jack Sennott**

OBL, LLC-Owner, 100 Allyn Street  
Hartford, CT 06103  
Jack.Sennott@comcast.net  
860-559-7871

**May 17, 2025**

U.S. General Services Administration  
Attention: Joseph Mulligan  
JCK Federal Building  
230 S. Dearborn, Suite 3600  
Chicago, IL 60604

**Re: Public Comment on Proposed Site for New Hartford Federal Courthouse – Allyn Street**

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to submit my formal comment in response to the U.S. General Services Administration's proposed site selection for the new federal courthouse in Hartford, Connecticut. I am the property owner of 100 Allyn Street, which directly abuts the planned courthouse site.

I would like to express my support for the selection of the Allyn Street location for the courthouse. I believe this project will contribute positively to the vitality and redevelopment of downtown Hartford and support long-term civic and economic activity in the area.

That said, I would like to respectfully raise a key issue regarding the proximity of the new construction to our existing structure. Our property line ends at the foundation of our building, which sits directly on the lot line. As such, any courthouse development immediately adjacent to our property must consider the need for open space or setback between our building and any new construction.

Specifically, we request that either:

1. A permanent buffer or open space be included between the courthouse and our building, and that we retain access to that space for maintenance and safety purposes; or
2. That we be given the opportunity to purchase a narrow strip of land to create such a buffer ourselves.

Our intent is to ensure that both the courthouse and our property can coexist in a way that maintains safe, accessible, and sustainable use of the space between the structures. We would

welcome further dialogue with GSA planners and project managers to ensure a mutually beneficial solution.

Thank you for your consideration of this comment. I appreciate the opportunity to participate in this important planning process.

Sincerely,

**Jack Sennott**

Owner, 100 Allyn Street





Hartford Courthouse <hartfordcourthouse@gsa.gov>

## Information Request - 194 Allyn Street Court House Project

1 message

**Tamer Shaban** <Tamer.Shaban@propark.com>

Mon, Jun 2, 2025 at 12:27 PM

To: "HartfordCourthouse@gsa.gov" <HartfordCourthouse@gsa.gov>

Good afternoon,

I want to introduce myself and request some information regarding the [194 Allyn Street Court House Project](#). My name is Tamer Shaban and I am the Executive Vice President for Propark Mobility. I have attached a letter we received relating to the courthouse project in Hartford, CT. We have multiple parking lots and garages which we would like to offer spaces in, to see how we can assist with your construction parking.

If you can direct me to the correct person or project manager, it would be greatly appreciated.

Thank you for your assistance,

Tamer

**Tamer Shaban**

Executive Vice President



Cell 860.919.9397

Propark Mobility, HQ

One [Union Place](#)

[Hartford, CT 06103](#)

[www.propark.com](http://www.propark.com)



**GSA Notification Federal Courthouse in Hartford.pdf**

58K



**REGION 1**

BOSTON, MA 02109

June 3, 2025

General Services Administration  
Attention: Joseph Mulligan  
JCK Federal Building  
230 S. Dearborn, Suite 3600  
Chicago, IL 60604

RE: Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Construction of a New Federal Courthouse in Hartford, Connecticut (CEQ# 20250052)

Dear Mr. Mulligan:

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency has reviewed the above-referenced document. We are providing comments pursuant to our National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) review authority under Section 309 of the Clean Air Act. The CAA Section 309 role is unique to the EPA. It requires EPA to review and comment publicly on any proposed federal action subject to NEPA's environmental impact statement requirement.


Under the Preferred Alternative, the General Services Administration (GSA) would acquire land located at 154 Allyn Street (the Allyn Site) to support construction of a new courthouse in Hartford, Connecticut. The new courthouse would be owned and managed by the General Services Administration (GSA) and would be designed to "...meet the present and long-term requirements of the U.S. District Court for the District of Connecticut (the Court) by accommodating its functions and operations in Hartford."

EPA appreciates the General Service Administration's response to our 2024 comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). The Final EIS provides information regarding the selection of the Allyn Site as the preferred alternative and how site contamination will be addressed if encountered. We acknowledge the GSA's commitment to address stormwater runoff; implement best management practices (BMPs) to avoid and minimize construction period impacts; and continue community engagement during the construction process. We have no further comments on this EIS.

Thank you for the opportunity to review this Final EIS. If you have any questions, please email me at [timmermann.timothy@epa.gov](mailto:timmermann.timothy@epa.gov) or call me at (617) 918-1025.

Sincerely,

TIMOTHY  
TIMMERMANN



Digitally signed by  
TIMOTHY TIMMERMANN  
Date: 2025.06.03  
10:50:17 -04'00'

Timothy Timmermann, Director  
Office of Environmental Review

Thomas G. Ronalter 95 Dover Road, New Britain, CT 06052 860-209-6379

June 8, 2025

Mr. Robert Herman

Project Manager

Abraham A. Ribicoff Federal Building and U.S. Courthouse

450 Main Street, Suite 435

Hartford, CT 06103

Dear Mr. Herman,

Please accept this letter as my comments concerning the planned Hartford Federal Courthouse.

A thriving capital city is important to all of Connecticut. I am frequently in Hartford and have seen the progress and increasing vibrancy of the city. The location of the new Federal Courthouse is critical to continuing the current momentum. The proposed Allyn St. location is counterproductive to the future of this potentially vibrant mixed-use neighborhood and entire city.

Building key assets like courthouses in inappropriate locations harm a city's chances for future success. I realize in a built-up, historic city like Hartford, there are not always plentiful, adequate options to choose from. I have been disappointed by the options presented and especially the final offered location. I do applaud the GSA effort to create a sustainable building complex.

While building at the Allyn Street site may stimulate some economic activity, it is not the same quality of positive activity as a mixed-used neighborhood. A courthouse could be considered part of the "mix" in a mixed-use neighborhood, however, courthouses are not conducive to a quality residentially-centric mixed-use neighborhood.

Courthouses are not effective economic development tools. Courthouses go dark in the evening and on weekends. The formidable structure of a courthouse, and the required physical security features, do not promote the “sense of place” the CRDA and other developers seek to create a thriving place. Allyn Street already stares at the Peoples Arena backside. It does not need, and can’t tolerate, a courthouse too.

The Allyn area is important. While Pratt Street, Bushnell South and North Crossing receive the most attention now, as the city grows the Allyn corridor will become a critical neighborhood. Much effort and money is being spent to “create” new neighborhoods at Bushnell South and North Crossing. The North Crossing project area, while necessary and commendable, will never be the quality neighborhood Allyn area has the potential to be. It will never have the intimacy and inherent sense of place that the Allyn core already has the bones of. Allyn Street already is a neighborhood, albeit a broken one. The mostly renovated buildings from 111 and 179 Allyn (The Russell) and 28 High Street are physically and psychologically seeping into the neighborhood. These quality buildings are the “embers” of the broken neighborhood, waiting to be fanned and brought to fruition by quality in-fill development.

Bushnell South, while frequently discussed as a “new” neighborhood, is building on the existing area assets on Elm Street, Trinity Street and Capitol Avenue. These core blocks have similar such “embers” to work with within their broken neighborhood. The key projects of 55 Elm Street and the 18 and 30 Trinity Street are critical to the future development on Capitol Avenue. In both cases, the foundation of a great neighborhood is there. The Capital Region Development Authority (CRDA) is proving it with the renovations underway. Simply they are building on the assets present. Fanning the “embers” they have to create a thriving neighborhood.

The Capital Region Development Authority has the crucial responsibility for developing the “new” Bushnell South neighborhood. Mr. Freimuth and his Board were timely and adept at rejecting the new courthouse in the Capitol Avenue / Bushnell South area. They had such conviction that the CRDA purchased the property in question. If the talented Mr. Freimuth and his experienced CRDA Board, who are primarily responsible for the majority of the City’s decade of progress, viewed a new Federal Courthouse as undercutting the new Bushnell South neighborhood, then it seems reasonable to postulate the same detrimental effect it will have on creating a vibrant Allyn Street neighborhood.

The building of a Federal Courthouse on Allyn Street will thwart the development of such a future vibrant neighborhood. The Allyn Street area can become similar to the planned Bushnell South neighborhood but it will take time for that to come to fruition. But such a neighborhood can never evolve if a Federal courthouse is built there. The very advantages some have offered for locating the courthouse on Allyn Street are the very reasons it should not be built there, especially the Transportation Center. A diverse, mixed use neighborhood benefits much more from proximity to a transportation center than would a Federal courthouse. Additionally, Union Station will not remain a transportation center in the decades to come due to highway realignment.

I understand that Hartford had poor choices from the start of the federal process. I propose a site that has not been publicly considered.

I will use this opportunity to propose a new alternative site and project concept. I understand the limits of proposing a new proposed concept in the existing process. I will also be forwarding this letter’s content to Connecticut’s local, State and Federal elected officials.

I propose the Federal GSA evaluate / re-evaluate the block directly behind the current Ribicoff Courthouse. It is currently a parking lot for the Hartford Parking Authority. I will refer to this as the Sheldon Street site. I believe this location is even more appropriate considering limited funding issues and the possible need to scale back the project. This proposal maximizes location.

I understand part of the Courthouse project's current scope includes relocating the Court's District Headquarters, now located in New Haven, along with related agencies such as U.S. Marshals to the new Courthouse.

Integral to my proposal includes a total renovation of the current Ribicoff complex. A new, main courthouse with underground parking would be built on the current Sheldon Street parking lot. The current building is obsolete but if gutted it can be renovated into new spaces for appropriate court needs and all affiliated agencies. An elevated walkway would connect the new main courthouse with the renovated Ribicoff building. This connection of the new and renovated buildings will create a Federal Campus in downtown Hartford. Close to the city center but not wasting prime land better suited for other uses especially on Allyn Street. Since the most "green" building is the one already built, reuse of the Ribicoff building will add to the project's sustainability.

First, perhaps the Sheldon site had been considered earlier in the process but dismissed due to the sensitivity of the possible dislocation of some low-income housing. While such dislocation does not seem necessary from the land needed, if this was the reason, this low-density housing can be replaced and should not derail the higher density need of the courthouse. At most, five buildings north of Pulaski Mall would be needed. Appropriate land use is important for cities and the courthouse is the best use of this parcel of land.

Second, perhaps the Sheldon site was dismissed due to possible future UCONN expansion. If that were to happen, UCONN is the organization and appropriate land use that should be on Allyn Street! UCONN will soon have dormitory space on Pratt Street and future expansion can, and should, be apart from the Front Street campus, as in many urban college campuses.

Third, perhaps the total acreage considered available on Sheldon was considered inadequate. If that was the reason, the concept of a Federal campus utilizing a completely renovated Ribicoff building would allow a reduced footprint new building on the existing parking lot.



As has been spoken about publicly, building construction inflation may necessitate the downsizing of the project's scope. Renovation of existing buildings is more cost-effective, and sustainably "green", than new construction. Therefore, it seems reasonable to calculate that by utilizing the solid, core structure of the Ribicoff edifice while building a new, smaller courthouse at Sheldon and Prospect would allow the project to avoid a scope reduction. In fact, considering the massive square footage of the current Ribicoff Courthouse, it could be a case of too much space available in the Ribicoff. This should not be a deterrent to this proposal. Rather, it may allow for additional Federal consolidation and space for similar missioned State agencies. There may be enough synergy with the State's needs for the State to support the project. By reusing the existing courthouse, it will eliminate the need to demolish it, also reducing total cost.

The new main courthouse could be built first and occupied. Freed-up space in Ribicoff can then be used as flex space while renovations are completed.

I urge all officials involved in this planning process, including Connecticut's Senators and Congressional Representatives, to reconsider this process. The location of this complex will impact Hartford for decades, for better or worse. I ask all those with the authority to create a Federal Campus in Hartford, from Main Street down to Sheldon Street, to consider my proposal for the long-term benefit of Hartford, our beloved Capital City.

Thank you for your consideration.

Thomas G. Ronalter

**ATTACHMENT 2: ERRATA SHEET**

## **ERRATA SHEET DOCUMENTING GSA'S RESPONSES TO THE COMMENTS RECEIVED ON THE FINAL EIS**

### **1) Email from Elijah Eelhajbey, May 9, 2025**

**GSA Response:** Thank you for your comment, your concern about the Allyn Site is noted.

Throughout the NEPA process, GSA has worked to engage with the local communities and has provided opportunities for public participation through in-person meetings and public comment periods. Notification for the public meetings was accomplished using multiple channels of communication, including public press releases in English and Spanish on the GSA New England (Region 1) website; English- and Spanish-language advertisements in the local newspaper; English and Spanish radio announcements; and letters to interested parties identified through stakeholder analysis. Additionally, GSA issued press releases to several media outlets (e.g., radio stations, television stations, and newspapers) in the weeks leading up to the meetings and also notified the U.S. Congressional delegation. Both meetings were open to all members of the public. GSA offered multiple ways to submit comments, including comment forms, letters, emails, and spoken comments at the public meetings. All materials presented at the meetings were made available to the public on GSA's project website.

GSA has followed due process to inform and engage with the public for the proposed project. GSA will continue to coordinate with the community as the project progresses, and additional public meetings may be held.

### **2) Email from Adam Tucker (Internal Revenue Service), May 13, 2025**

**GSA Response:** Thank you for your comment. There are no plans to relocate agencies from the Cotter Federal Building to the new courthouse.

### **3) Email from Luke Fairman (U.S. Citizenship & Immigration Services, Department of Homeland Security), May 15, 2025**

**GSA Response:** Thank you for your comment. GSA is continuing to analyze the long-term strategic direction of the Ribicoff Federal Building and Courthouse. GSA will work with all tenants unaffiliated with the Court Program to ensure that their long-term housing requirements are met.

### **4) Email from Jack Sennott (Owner, 100 Allyn Street), May 17, 2025**

**GSA Response:** Thank you for your comment. We will consider your feedback for the site development phase and will continue communication with you.

### **5) Email from Tamer Shaban (Propark Mobility), June 2, 2025**

**GSA Response:** Thank you for your comment. GSA has noted your information should there be a need for parking lots and garages during the project.

**6) Email from Timothy Timmermann (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency), June 3, 2025**

**GSA Response:** Thank you, we appreciate your response.

**7) Email from Thomas Ronalter, June 8, 2025**

**GSA Response:** Thank you for your letter and interest in this effort. Our previous response, from the draft EIS review, is stated below, and best responds to your letter.

"The need for this project was determined based on the results of several studies conducted by the U.S. District Court for the District of Connecticut and GSA. The 2011 Long Range Facilities Plan developed by the Court and the feasibility studies conducted by GSA in 2017 and 2018 considered renovations to the Ribicoff FB and CH as two alternatives considered and dismissed (see Section 2.7 of the Final EIS). GSA and the Court have undergone a rigorous site assessment process to identify potential sites that best meet the minimum functional, operational, and security requirements for the courthouse. Based on discussions with the city and state officials, NEPA analysis conducted and documented in the Final EIS, and the public input received, GSA has identified Alternative 2 (the Allyn Site) as the preferred alternative for the construction of the new federal courthouse. It is anticipated that the federal courthouse, in combination with the mixed-use development proposed in downtown Hartford as outlined in the Hartford City Plan, would contribute positively to the economic growth of the neighborhood."