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Minutes Transportation Committee September 12, 2012

Transportation Committee Members

| Wallingford, Mayor William Dickinson, Chair |
| Branford, Janice Plaziak, Proxy for FS Anthony |
| DaRos |
| Guilford, FS Joseph Mazza |
| Madison, FS Fillmore McPherson |
| New Haven, James Travers, Proxy for Mayor John DeStefano |

Transportation Technical Committee

| Guilford, Jim Portley |
| Hamden, Robert Brinton |
| Milford, Gary Wassmer |
| New Haven, Richard Miller |
| North Branford, Kurt Weiss |
| North Haven, Jonathan Bodwell |
| Wallingford, John Thompson |
| West Haven, Abdul Quadir |

Guests

| Edgar Wynkoop, CTDOT |
| Lou Mangini, Congresswoman DeLauro’s office |

SCRCOG

James Rode, Stephen Dudley, Chris Rappa

First Selectman McPherson called the meeting to order at 12:15.

**Action Item #1**
Minutes of the August 8, 2012 meeting were adopted on a motion by J. Portley, seconded by G Wassmer.

**Action Item #2**
FY2012 –FY2015 TIP Amendment 8 included 2 projects. D Miller made a motion to recommend approval of Amendment 8. J. Portley seconded and motion passed unanimously.

**Informational Item #1**
S Dudley discussed a proposal from CDOT for a new State funded STP Urban program. CDOT is working on a plan to fund urban projects using state bond funding in place of federal STP Urban funds. This change in funding could streamline the program and reduce cost. S Dudley explained that this is a draft proposal and that comments were due by October 17th. Initial comments were discussed. This item will be added to the October agenda so that final comments can be forwarded to CDOT.

J Plaziak made a motion to adjourn, J Portley seconded, meeting was adjourned at 12:48 PM.
Project 0014-0183 2012-A9-1 I-95 FY13 Pavement Preservation Project Page 6

Changes Amendment 9 introduces a new project

Reason This project provides for the construction phase of the I-95 pavement preservation work in FY2013. Project will place 5/8" ultra-thin bonded hot mix asphalt (HMA) on I-95 in Branford

Project 0083-0262 2011-A15-3 Naugatuck Avenue Drainage Page 7

Changes Amendment 9 moves the ROW phase from FY12 to FY13

Reason Based on latest estimate the ROW cost is reduced and funds moved to current fiscal year

Project 0106-0121 2010-A12-3 Replace BR#02637 O/ Race Brook (U-20) Page 8

Changes Amendment 9 moves ROW phase from FY12 to FY13

Reason Based on latest estimate the ROW funds are moved to current fiscal year

Project 0170-3178 2012-A6-1 STPT Eligible Engineering Activities for CLE Page 9

Changes Amendment 9 moves the project start from FY12 to FY13.

Reason Based on revised schedule funds are moved to current fiscal year


Changes Amendment 9 moves funds to 2013 and increases amount.

Reason Based on revised schedule and project description funds are increased and moved to current fiscal year

Project 0171-0362 2011-A23-2 Epoxy Pavement Markings Non Interstate Routes Page 10

Changes Amendment 9 moves funds to 2013 and increases amount

Reason Based on revised schedule and project description funds increased and are moved to current fiscal year
State Project: 0014-0183
Municipality: Branford

Project Name: I-95 FY13 Pavement Preservation Project

Description: Place a 5/8" ultra-thin bonded HMA overlay on I-95 in the town of Branford. The design of this project is preformed under PN 170-3054

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current TIP Funding (In Thousands)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed TIP Funding (In Thousands)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TIP Funds: $1,700

Amendment Notes: FY12 Tip Amend 9 introduces project
State Project 0083-0262

Municipality Milford

Project Name Naugatuck Avenue Drainage

Description Project is for improvements to the city owned and maintained Naugatuck Ave storm drainage system

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current TIP Funding (In Thousands)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STPBS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Cost $4,340

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed TIP Funding (In Thousands)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STPBS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TIP Funds $4,320

Amendment Notes
FY 10 TIP Amend 15 introduces a new project. FY12 TIP includes ongoing project, FY12 TIP Amend 9 moves ROW to FY13
State Project 0106-0121

Municipality Orange

SCRCOG # 2010-A12-3

Project Name Replace BR#02637 O/ Race Brook (U-20)

Description Project involves replacement of BR# 02637 carrying Rte 114 over Race Brook in Orange. bridge is on list 21 due to scour and undermining of masonry abutments

Current TIP Funding (In Thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>FYI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STPA</td>
<td>ROW</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CON</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>960</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State</td>
<td></td>
<td>240</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Cost $1,250

Proposed TIP Funding (In Thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>FYI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STPA</td>
<td>ROW</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CON</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>960</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State</td>
<td></td>
<td>240</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TIP Funds $1,250

FY12 TIP includes ongoing project. FY12 TIP Amend 9 moves ROW to FY13
State Project 0170-3178  
Municipality Statewide  
Project Name STPT Eligible Engineering Activities for CLE  
Description Project funds federally eligible engineering activities of the Federal Transportation Enhancement Program including activities of CDOT's Consulting Liaison Engineer (CLE)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>FYI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STPT</td>
<td>PD</td>
<td>AC-Entry</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>832</td>
<td>832</td>
<td>832</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>208</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Cost</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,040</td>
<td>1,040</td>
<td>1,040</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed TIP Funding (In Thousands)</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>FYI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STPT</td>
<td>PD</td>
<td>AC-Entry</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>832</td>
<td>832</td>
<td>832</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>208</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TIP Funds</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,040</td>
<td>1,040</td>
<td>1,040</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amendment Notes  
FY12 Amend 7 introduces new project. FY12 TIP Amend 9 moves everything out 1 year.
South Central Regional Council of Governments  
FFY2012-FFY2015 Transportation Improvement Program  
Amendment 9

State Project  0171-0361  
Municipality  District 1  
Project Name  Epoxy Pavement Markings Interstate Routes (2012)  
Description  Installation of epoxypavement markings long lines, symbols and legends in District 1 on various interstate routes.

### Current TIP Funding (In Thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>FYI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-M</td>
<td>CON</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>952</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Cost</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$952</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>952</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Proposed TIP Funding (In Thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>FYI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-M</td>
<td>CON</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TIP Funds</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$3,200</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amendment Notes

Amendment 23 introduces new project FY12 TIP Amend 1 deletes state match, project is 100% federally funded. FY12 TIP Amend 9 moves funds to 2013 and increases amount.

State Project  0171-0362  
Municipality  District 1  
Project Name  Epoxy Pavement Markings Non Interstate Routes 2012  
Description  Installation of epoxypavement markings long lines, symbols and legends in District 1 on various Non interstate routes.

### Current TIP Funding (In Thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>FYI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STPA</td>
<td>CON</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>952</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Cost</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$952</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>952</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Proposed TIP Funding (In Thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>FYI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STPA</td>
<td>CON</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TIP Funds</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$1,500</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amendment Notes

Amendment 23 introduces new project FY12 TIP Amend 1 deletes state match, project is 100% federally funded. FY12 TIP Amend 9 moves funds to 2013 and increases amount.
Resolution
Fiscal Year 2012-Fiscal Year 2015 Transportation Improvement Program Amendment Nine

Whereas: U.S. Department of Transportation “Metropolitan Planning Regulations” (23 CFR 450) prescribe that each metropolitan planning organization maintain a financially constrained multi-modal transportation improvement program consistent with a State Implementation Plan for Air Quality (SIP) conforming to both U.S. Environmental Protection Administration-established air quality guidelines and SIP-established mobile source emissions budgets; and

Whereas: The Council, per 23 CFR 450.324 and in cooperation with the Connecticut Department of Transportation (ConnDOT) and public transit operators and relying upon financial constraints offered by ConnDOT, adopted a Fiscal Year 2012-Fiscal Year 2015 Transportation Improvement Program on January 25, 2012, after finding the Program conforming per U.S. Environmental Protection Administration (U.S. EPA) final conformity rule (40 CFR 51 and 93) and relevant Connecticut Department of Transportation air quality conformity determinations: Air Quality Conformity Reports: Fiscal Year 2012-2015 Transportation Improvement Program and the Region’s Long-Range Transportation Plans—2011 to 2040, (April, 2011); and

Whereas: The Council, on January 25, 2012, indicated that periodic Program adjustment or amendment was possible; and

Whereas: Projects referenced in the Program amendment (below) are consistent with the region’s long-range transportation plan (South Central Regional Long Range Transportation Plan—2011 to 2040, (April, 2011)); and

Whereas: Council Public Participation Guidelines: Transportation Planning have been observed during the development of the proposed Program amendment (below); and

Whereas: By agreement between the Council and the Connecticut Department of Transportation, public involvement activities carried out by the South Central Regional Council of Governments in response to U.S. Department of Transportation metropolitan planning requirements are intended to satisfy the requirements associated with development of a Statewide Transportation Improvement Program and/or its amendment; and

Whereas: Council of Governments’ review of transportation goals, projects and opportunities may result in further adjustment or amendment of the Program.
Resolution
Fiscal Year 2012-Fiscal Year 2015 Transportation Improvement Program Amendment Nine (continued)

Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved By the Council of Governments:

The Program Amendment Nine shall be transmitted to the Connecticut Department of Transportation, for inclusion in the State Transportation Improvement Program.

The undersigned duly qualified and acting Secretary of the South Central Regional Council of Governments certifies that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of a resolution adopted at a legally convened meeting of the South Central Regional Council of Governments on October 24, 2012.

Date: October 24, 2012. By:

Scott Jackson, Secretary
South Central Regional Council of Governments
Project 0025-0138  Route 42 Realignment
Description This project is for the reconstruction Route 42 intended to improve safety and drainage
Status Project continues. Construction funding is in the STIP for FY13. Bid date estimate is 2/13/13

Project 0059-H001  2012-A27-1  Long Hill Rd Reconstruction
Description 3600' of Long Hill Rd will be widened to 30', a new culvert installed @ Spinning Mill Brook and Right turn radius at Route 1 will be improved.

Project 0079-0210  1999-032  Gravel St: Reconstruction
Description Reconstruct Gravel Street from East Main Street to Baldwin Ave

Project 0079-0226  2007-048  Quinnipiac River Linear Trail Phase 2
Description Design and Construct 1.7 Miles of a 10ft wide Multi-purpose trail from Oregon Road to West Main St, Project will include 3 crossings over Sodom Brook. HPP earmark #3862

Project 0083-0262  Naugatuck Ave Drainage
Description Project is for improvements to the city owned and maintained Naugatuck Ave storm drainage system
Status Amendment 9 moves ROW phase to the current fiscal year.

Project 0092-0561  2003-011  State St: Mill River Bridge Replacement
Description Replace State Street Bridge over the Mill River

Project 0100-0175  2010-A7-2  Sackett Point Bridge Replacement
Description Reconstruction of Sackett Point road /bridge over Quinnipiac River Includes the widening and realignment of the approaches from Universal Drive to Republic Drive

Project 0156-0175  2007-072  Campbell Ave Streetscape Improvements
Description This project will provide for roadway and streetscape improvements to Campbell Ave from Captain Thomas Blvd to Route 1.

Project 0156-H017  2012-A27-2  Culvert Replacement Spring St and W Spring Street
Description Project is for the culvert replacements: Spring St over Club Creek and West Spring St over Cove River.
Draft Proposal for a Local Transportation Capital Program

September 11, 2012 RPO Coordination Meeting

The Department of Transportation (Department) is currently exploring the development of a new state funded Local Transportation Capital Program. The intent of this document is to present some of our ideas on key points in order to get valuable feedback from the Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPO). This is a draft proposal, the structure and requirements are still being vetted by the Department and we have no certainty that it will be passed by the Legislature.

Purpose:

To provide state monies to town governments in lieu of federal funds otherwise available through the federal transportation legislation. The new State program will be established with substantially fewer constraints and requirements than currently allowed in the federal program. This is intended to provide more efficiency for the Towns in the development and execution of construction projects, and also for the Department in its oversight role. The federal monies otherwise intended for the Town governments would be utilized by the Department for eligible activities on state owned assets.

The Department envisions two main benefits to this proposal; 1) the ability of the municipalities to perform capital improvements with less burdensome requirements, i.e. do it their way and 2) better utilization of state resources (staff) in the federal-aid program on more regionally significant improvements.

In order to administer the 30-40 million dollar Federal Highway Administrations (FHWA) STP-Urban program, the Department devotes a significant amount of resources that include staff from the Project Development Unit, Local Roads section and four district MSAT groups. Much of this effort is expended to ensure Federal Title 23 requirements are met as a condition for the use of Federal funds. In simple terms, Federal Title 23 requirements are designed so that a thorough, well thought out and lengthy process is followed to ensure that when any given project is built all interrelated issues such as design reviews, public involvement, environmental concerns, contracting requirements, etc. are properly vetted prior to construction. The Department regularly designs and oversees projects that meet these requirements on the State owned highway system. Under the current STP-Urban program many municipalities are not familiar with and find it burdensome, time consuming and expensive to produce projects that
• The STIP/TIP approval process could not be used by an MPO to leverage access to additional federal STP-Urban funds to be used on town-owned roadways. Penalty would be withholding of State funds in the new Local Transportation Capital Program.

The Department asks that the MPO’s review these topics and provide written comments to Hugh Hayward, Highway Design Local Road Section at Hugh.Hayward@ct.gov by October 17, 2012. Subsequent to the comments received, the Department may schedule a working meeting to further discuss the program.
Comments on Draft Proposal for a Local Transportation Capital Program 9-10-12

Stephen B. Dudley, P.E., Senior Transportation Planner

In general, the concept appears to be of great benefit to SCRCOG’s member municipalities, as well as to CDOT. As with most proposals, the actual details of the proposal will allow for a more thorough review of the benefits and liabilities of the proposal. General areas of concern or in need of clarification are noted as follows:

1. Certainty of funding – It goes without saying that the reliance on annual appropriations from the legislature is the primary cause for concern. This process, coupled with the utilization of bond funds rather than an actual pay-as-you-go appropriation, means several approvals must be obtained, leaving a high level of uncertainty for our member municipalities.
2. Definition of eligible projects/activities – It will be very difficult to have a fruitful discussion with our member municipalities without a clearer definition of the eligible activities for this program.
3. Fallout from lack of legislative action – How will the program function if, say two years from now, the legislature fails to act and we go back to the current approach? How will we make up for the lost time and get a new urban program up and running?
4. Sub-allocation – Does the department have guidelines on how the funds will be allocated – per capita, for example – or will the regions decide how they will utilize the funds?
5. Major projects – SCRCOG’s current urban program has a mix of projects of varying size and has accomplished several large municipal projects. It would appear that the change would preclude these major projects from happening.
6. Multi-year funding utilization and accounting – Will the Department account for funds on a regional basis or individual municipality basis? Will municipalities be allowed to “bank” several years of funds to allow for utilization on a larger project? Or will this be a regional accounting exercise? If regional funds are not fully utilized one year, can they be carried to a subsequent year? We expect that, if per capita sub-allocation is used, that the smaller municipalities in our region would not be able to accomplish much with an annual amount.
7. Current project status – Many urban projects are currently in varying phases. If the program is enacted, how will these be treated? Will the current projects be completed under the current program? Will continued projects costs be deducted from new regional allocations? Or will the Department finish out the current projects, fully fund the new program to the region and utilize the transition period to ramp up Department projects?
8. STIP/ TIP process – SCRCOG, over the years, has had different views on some projects which the Department had chosen to advance and not approved those projects for inclusion in the TIP. We expect that these disagreements might occur in the future and do not feel that the last bullet in your proposal applies to these kind of differing views. We feel that this point should be clarified to prevent arbitrary punishment of a region for lack of support for a favored Department project.

9. Department review of municipally prepared plans – The proposal does not define the level of department review during the design development process. It is assumed that the review will be minimal, if any, after the initial application. This point should be clarified prior to our discussion with our member municipalities.

10. Funding – How will engineering and right of way activities be compensated? The proposal outlines a grant for construction, but nothing for the activities prior to construction. Will these also be grants of reimbursements?

11. Process – The proposal notes that the regions will solicit, rank and submit projects to the Department. It is assumed that this will be the extent of the region’s activities and that the project, once scoped and accepted, will be accomplished under a municipal department agreement. This should be confirmed.

12. Construction process – It is assumed that the construction process will mirror current municipal processes, rather than Department procedures. We expect that it will not involve materials testing, daily reports, and the other myriad of department requirements. This assumption should be confirmed.

We hope to discuss this proposal with our Transportation Committee and Transportation Technical Committee at their meeting on Wednesday, September 12, asking them for additional comments by the October 10 meeting to forward to the Department by the requested date of October 17.

Additional areas for discussion will be forwarded as soon as identified.