

Bethany - Branford - East Haven - Guilford - Hamden - Madison - Meriden – Milford New Haven - North Branford - North Haven - Orange - Wallingford - West Haven - Woodbridge

## SOUTH CENTRAL REGIONAL COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

Carl Amento, Executive Director

## **SCRCOG MEETING NOTICE**

## **January 27, 2010**

at

127 Washington Avenue, 4th Floor West, North Haven, CT 06473

## 10 AM

## Full SCRCOG Agenda materials can be found at our website www.scrcog.org

- Presentation: DEP Proposed Streamflow Regulations, Pro: Rep Mary Mushinsky and Martin Mador, Political Director, Sierra Club Conn. Chapter. Con: Carlene Kulisch, Consultant, RWA & Betsy Gara, Exec. Dir., CT Waterworks Assoc.
- 2. Legislative Reports
  - a) State Representatives and Senators
  - b) Congressional Staff
- 3. Minutes of November 18, 2009 and December 15, 2009 Secretary, First Selectman Edward Sheehy

Page 3 - 7

4. Treasurer's Report month ending December 31, 2009
Treasurer, First Selectman Anthony DaRos

- Page 8 9
- 5. Nominating Committee Report for Calendar Year 2010 Officers and Committees (enclosed)
- Page 10

- 6. Election of Officers
- 7. Adopt a resolution to appoint SCRCOG Bank Signatories

Page 11

8. Transportation Committee Report, Chairman, Mayor William Dickinson

Page 12 - 22

- a) Adopt 2010-2013 TIP Amendment Two and resolution
- b) Solicitation for Transportation planning proposals for 2010-2011 and 2011-2012 UPWP
- 9. Report by RGP Executive Director Ginny Kozlowski
- 10. Appoint an RGP Board member
- 11. Adopt an amendment to ByLaws (second reading)

Page 23

12. Adopt a resolution authorizing the Executive Director to sign pass through grants from CT

Page 24

State agencies

## (Continuation of January 27, 2010 SCRCOG Agenda)

- 13. Adopt a resolution to appoint the Executive Director as the new Retirement Plan Administrator Page 25
- 14. Appoint Executive Director to Coastal TIA and I-91 TIA
- 15. Statewide Project # 170-2830, 511 Traveler Information System letter of response (enclosed)
- 16. Executive Director's Report
- 17. Roy Piper DEMHS Region 2 Coordinator
- 18. Regional Cooperation/Other Business
- 19. RPC Action Tables (Nov 09, Dec 09, Jan 10)

Page 26-28

20. Adjournment

Special needs: Hearing impaired closed audio loops and/or sign language interpreter and limited English proficiency translator will be provided upon two weeks notice. Agenda can be requested in a language other than English by contacting SCRCOG.



Bethany - Branford - East Haven - Guilford - Hamden - Madison - Meriden - Milford New Haven - North Branford - North Haven - Orange - Wallingford - West Haven - Woodbridge

## SOUTH CENTRAL REGIONAL COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS Carl Amento, Executive Director

TO: **SCRCOG Board** 

FROM: First Selectman Edward Sheehy, SCRCOG Secretary

DATE: **November 23, 2009** 

**SCRCOG Minutes of November 18, 2009** SUBJECT:

Present:

Bethany First Selectwoman Derrylyn Gorski

Branford First Selectman Anthony DaRos – *Treasurer* Guilford First Selectman Carl Balestracci, Jr., Chairman

Hamden Scott Jackson, Chief Administrative Officer / Proxy for Mayor Craig Henrici

First Selectman Fillmore McPherson Madison

Meriden Lawrence Kendzior, City Manager / Proxy for Mayor Michael Rohde

Milford Mayor James L. Richetelli, Jr. New Haven Mayor John DeStefano, Jr. Mayor Anthony Candelora North Branford First Selectwoman Janet McCarty

North Haven

Orange First Selectman James Zeoli - Vice Chairman

Mayor William Dickinson, Jr. Wallingford

West Haven Mayor John Picard

SCRCOG Staff Judy Gott – *Executive Director* 

Albert Ruggiero, Stephen Dudley, James Rode, and Eugene Livshits

## Guest Presenters:

Louis Mangini, Congressional Aide to Congresswoman Rosa DeLauro; and Roy Piper, DEMHS Region 2 Coordinator

#### Other Guests:

Richard Branigan, Town Manager of North Branford; Stephen P. Livingston, Field Coordinator for the Connecticut Department of Transportation; Jean Stimolo, Executive Director of Rideworks; Thomas Cariglio, UI Company; William Villano, Workforce Alliance; Joanne Wentworth, North Branford Town Council; Carlene Kulisch, Kulisch Consulting, LLC and the Regional Water Authority; Mary Bigelow, Greater New Haven Transit District Board of Directors; Justin Fanjoy, DEMHS Intern; Miriam E. Brody and Nancy Ciarleglio, League of Women Voters.

The November 18, 2009 meeting of the South Central Regional Council of Governments was called to order by Chairman Balestracci, Jr. Upon direction of the Chairman, self introductions of all attendees followed.

### ITEM 1 – Legislative Reports

Louis Mangini, Congressional Aide to Congresswoman Rosa DeLauro, reported that congress decided another one-month continuing resolution would be done for the FY-2010 transportation budget and a couple of outstanding budget bills might be resolved next month, or held until next January. Whatever bills remained would be incorporated into an omnibus bill or three to four other budget bills and passed then. He reported further that no progress had been made on the eighteenmonth extension.

127 Washington Avenue, 4th Floor West North Haven, Connecticut 06473-1715 Website: www.scrcog.org

## SCRCOG Agenda January 27, 2010

The proposed closures of some Greater New Haven Area post offices were briefly addressed by Mr. Mangini. He reported that there is no set timeline on how this is going to be played out. However, movement on the second phase probably would not occur until next year. Consideration would be given to facilities in medium-sized municipalities, or all other municipalities. Currently there doesn't appear to be any criteria other than the post offices in jeopardy having short term leases that can be terminated. First Selectman Zeoli asked whether affected municipalities would be notified of their post office's closure, or left autonomous. In response, Mr. Mangini stated that a list would be sent out and they would respond to it.

## ITEM 2 – SCRCOG Minutes of October 28, 2009

Chairman Balestracci, Jr. requested a motion for approval of the minutes. No additions or corrections were put forward. Mayor Richetelli, Jr. moved to adopt the minutes of October 28, 2009 as presented. The motion, seconded by Mayor Picard, was passed by unanimous vote.

## ITEM 3 - Treasurer's Report for Month Ending October 2009

SCRCOG Treasurer, First Selectman DaRos, referenced the *Treasurer's Report for October* on pages six and seven in the agenda packet. He noted that activity for October was a litter higher due to the extra payroll period. Page six revealed \$67,767 in the Bank of America and \$572,333 in the CT Short-Term Investment Fund (STIF) account.

First Selectman DaRos offered a motion to accept the *Treasurer's Report for the month ending October 2009*. First Selectwoman Gorski seconded, and the motion passed by unanimous vote.

## ITEM 4 – Adopt FY 2010-2011 Preliminary Dues

Based on current operations, Executive Director Gott reported that municipal dues would remain the same (rounded to the next hundred dollars). The only variation would be if a municipality had a change in population.

## ITEM 5 – Adopt January to December 2010 SCRCOG Calendar for Monthly Meetings

Executive Director Gott stated that SCRCOG By-laws require the Board meet monthly on the fourth Wednesday, except in November when it's scheduled on the third Wednesday and in December on the second Wednesday. Transportation Committee Meetings are adjusted based on availability of schedule.

A motion to approve the SCRCOG Meeting Calendar for 2010 was made by First Selectwoman Gorski. First Selectman Zeoli seconded. Upon unanimous vote, the motion passed.

## ITEM 6 – Appoint Nominating Committee for 2010

Chairman Balestracci, Jr. thanked First Selectwoman Derrylyn Gorski for serving as the prior Chair of the Nominating Committee.

A motion nominating Mayor Elect Scott Jackson (Hamden), Mayor James Richetelli, Jr. (Milford), and First Selectman Fillmore McPherson (Madison) as members to the 2010 Nominating Committee was offered by Mayor Picard and seconded by First Selectman Zeoli. Upon unanimous vote, the motion was carried.

## ITEM 7 – Amend Bylaws Regarding Regional Planning Commission Membership

Chairman Balestracci, Jr. noted that the proposed amendment was on page 10 in the agenda packet. Executive Director Gott stated that under the current by-laws of the Regional Planning Commission, staff members of municipal Planning and Zoning Commissions are not permitted appointment to the Regional Planning Commission. This amendment would allow this option. She recommended that the amendment be acted on at SCRCOG's January meeting because procedure requires changes to the by-laws be brought before SCRCOG twice.

127 Washington Avenue, 4th Floor West North Haven, Connecticut 06473-1715 Website: www.scrcog.org

## ITEM 8 – Resolution Terminating Tax Sheltered Annuity 403 (b) / PFG Contract No. 438586

Executive Director Gott reported that for approximately ten years SCRCOG employees have not been permitted to invest in the 403(b) tax sheltered annuity offered through the Principal Financial Group by the IRS. Only two employees have funds in it. Termination of this contract and movement of those funds into other vehicles for the two employees was recommended. This would be a cost saving measure for SCRCOG and both employees have consented. SCRCOG's pension attorney, Sharon Freilich of Brenner, Saltzman and Wallman, LLPA, is making certain that IRS regulations for all SCRCOG pension contracts are being met. It was advised by First Selectman Zeoli that documents be drafted by an attorney acknowledging agreement for the transfer of employees' funds out from this tax sheltered annuity. Termination of this contract would become effective November 30, 2009.

Chairman Balestracci, Jr. read aloud SCRCOG's prepared resolution (on page 11 in the agenda packet). A motion was offered by Mayor Richetelli, Jr., seconded by First Selectwoman Gorski, to approve the resolution authorizing termination of Tax Sheltered Annuity Contract No. 438586 with the Principal Financial Group. With no further comments or questions, the motion passed by unanimous vote.

## ITEM 9- Transportation Committee Report

Chairman of the Transportation Committee, Mayor Dickinson, Jr. reported that the Committee had met and recommended adoption of two resolutions. Both resolutions concern the conversion of Route 34 from an expressway to an at-grade boulevard between I-95 and Park Street in New Haven. The resolution for *Amendment One* is for the 2010-2013 TIP. *Amendment Thirty* is for the 2007-2011 TIP. A *Supplement to Amendment Thirty* (State Projects 0092-0642 and 0173-0399) was distributed. It details the pavement rehab project for Congress Avenue in New Haven and the installation of epoxy pavement markings on state routes at various intersections in District 3. Mr. James Rode added that unobligated 2009 stimulus funds are being moved to 2010 to advance these projects.

## a. Resolution re 2007-2011 TIP Amendment Thirty

## b. Resolution re 2010-2013 TIP Amendment One

Mayor Dickinson, Jr. offered a motion to approve both *Amendments Thirty* and *Amendment One* with the addition of *State Projects 0092-0642 and 0173-0399*. Proxy for Mayor Henrici, Scott Jackson, seconded. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

### ITEM 10-DEMHS Region 2 Coordinator

DEMHS Region 2 Coordinator, Roy Piper, announced that Betsy Hard, Bloomfield's former Police Chief, was recently appointed the new Deputy Commissioner of the Department of Emergency Management and Homeland Security. She took office on November 6, 2009 replacing former Deputy Commissioner, Wayne Sandford.

Mr. Piper stated that the Regional Emergency Planning Team (REPT) held their quarterly meeting last Monday and *Version 1.0* of the *Region 2 Regional Emergency Support Plan* was approved. This *Plan* will be reviewed and updated regularly.

Over the past few months DEMHS has been operating in a heavy monitoring mode regarding the H1N1 virus. Mr. Piper reported that it has been relatively quiet. Vaccine for both the regular flu and the H1N1 flu, as it becomes available to the state, is being distributed to various health departments and clinics.

## ITEM 11 – Regional Cooperation / Other Business

### RGP / GNHCVB

Chairman Balestracci, Jr. announced that he and five other SCRCOG officials, i.e. Mayor John DeStefano, Jr., Mayor John Picard, First Selectwoman Derrylyn Gorski, and First Selectman Edward Sheehy attended a meeting with the Regional Growth Partnership. Mayor DeStefano, Jr. then reported on what had transpired.

127 Washington Avenue, 4th Floor West North Haven, Connecticut 06473-1715 Website: www.scrcog.org

## SCRCOG Agenda January 27, 2010

Recommendations for the two organizations were presented by Mayor DeStefano, Jr. The Regional Growth Partnership, a separate corporate entity created approximately fifteen years ago, is comprised of those five SCRCOG officials noted by the Chairman and roughly the same number of private business members. The RGP promotes regional economic development, identifies and remediates brownfields, and participates in CEDS, a planning document that qualifies us for receiving federal funding.

Mayor DeStefano, Jr. announced that RGP membership has been declining. Participant towns, East Haven, Hamden, Madison, North Haven, New Haven and Woodbridge, have contributed \$80,000 voluntarily, with matching funds from the Regional Leadership Council. The RGP is the only point for collaboration on a regional basis with chief elected officials and businesses.

Suggestions given to preserve the RGP as a separate corporate entity include: maintain voluntary contributions from participating municipalities, relocate the RGP here, and request the RGP Executive Director report to its Board for policy direction and administratively to SCRCOG's Executive Director.

The other organization which promotes tourism business, the Greater New Haven Convention and Visitors Bureau, is a statutory entity existing in this state. It has accumulated assets from various sources. As a short-term strategy, Mayor Stefano, Jr. felt the staff of GNHCVB should be asked how it could keep the organization going until June 30. Long-term strategies suggested would be to conform their district via legislation to resemble SCRCOG's region and have their Executive Director relocate here.

## CMED - South Central CT Regional Emergency Medical Communications System

Chairman Balestracci, Jr. announced that First Selectman Gorski accepted the position of CMED Chairman. He referenced an educational workshop for new members and recommended greater participation.

## ITEM 12 - Adjournment

A motion to adjourn was offered by Mayor Picard and seconded by Chairman Balestracci, Jr. Upon unanimous vote, the meeting concluded at 11:04 A.M.

Submitted by Judy Gott, Executive Director of SCRCOG In the absence of SCRCOG Secretary, First Selectman Edward Maum Sheehy

> 127 Washington Avenue, 4th Floor West North Haven, Connecticut 06473-1715 Website: www.scrcog.org



Bethany - Branford - East Haven - Guilford - Hamden - Madison - Meriden - Milford New Haven - North Branford - North Haven - Orange - Wallingford - West Haven - Woodbridge

## SOUTH CENTRAL REGIONAL COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS Carl Amento, Executive Director

TO: SCRCOG Board

FROM: First Selectman Edward Sheehy, SCRCOG Secretary

DATE: **December 15, 2009** 

SUBJECT: Minutes of Special SCRCOG Meeting - December 15, 2009

Present:

Bethany First Selectwoman Derrylyn Gorski

Branford Fran Walsh, Board of Selectmen / Proxy for First Selectman Anthony DaRos

East Haven Paul Hongo, Proxy for Mayor April Capone Almon

Hamden Mayor Scott Jackson

Meriden Lawrence Kendzior, City Manager / Proxy for Mayor Michael Rohde

Milford Lisa DiLullo / Proxy for Mayor James L. Richetelli, Jr.

New Haven Mayor John DeStefano, Jr. North Branford Mayor Anthony Candelora

Orange First Selectman James Zeoli – Acting Chairman

West Haven James Burns, Chief of Staff / Proxy for Mayor John Picard

Woodbridge First Selectman Edward Sheehy - Secretary

Absent:

Guilford First Selectman Joseph Mazza
Madison First Selectman Fillmore McPherson
North Haven First Selectman Michael Freda
Wallingford Mayor William Dickinson, Jr.

At 9:10 A.M. the December 15, 2009 Special Meeting of the South Central Regional Council of Governments was called to order by Acting Chairman, James Zeoli.

## Item 1: Seek SCRCOG Board approval to offer a candidate the position of Executive Director

A motion was offered by First Selectman Edward Sheehy, seconded by Mayor John DeStefano, Jr. to move to *Executive Session* at 9:12 A.M. Upon unanimous vote, the motion passed.

At 9:55 A.M. a motion by Mayor John DeStefano, Jr., seconded by First Selectman Edward Sheehy, was made to return to regular session, noting that no votes were taken during *Executive Session*.

Mayor John DeStefano, Jr. presented a motion to support Carl Amento for the SCRCOG Executive Director position. First Selectwoman Derrylyn Gorski seconded. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

## **Item 2: Adjournment**

Upon a motion made by First Selectman Edward Sheehy and seconded by First Selectwoman Derrylyn Gorski, the board unanimously voted to adjourn. The meeting concluded at 9:57 A.M.

127 Washington Avenue, 4th Floor West North Haven, Connecticut 06473-1715 Website: www.scrcog.org Equal Opportunity Employer

## TREASURER'S REPORT

## BALANCE SHEET - December, 2009

ASSETS	
Cash and Investments	
Bank of America	86,713
Connecticut Short-Term Investment Fund - SCRCOG	572,736
STIF - Shoreline Greenways Trail	71,049
STIF - Economic Development Web Portal Development	44,164
Total Cash and Investments	774,662
Accounts Receivable	
Municipal Dues - FY09/10	0
Connecticut Department of Transportation	136,621
DEMHS - Homeland Security Planning	105
Safe Routes to School	14
Shoreline Greenways Trail - Federal Share	5,032
Amount for Accrued Leave	8,652
Pre-Paid Expense & Other Receivables	11,663
Total Accounts Receivable	162,087
Property and Equipment	
COG Equipment	122,503
Less, Accumulated Depreciation	-110,870
Total Property & Equipment	11,633
TOTAL ASSETS	948,382

Liabilities	
Deferred Revenue - Municipal	75,550
RPI Grant - Economic Development Web Portal	19,229
Shoreline Greenways Trail - Municipal Share	70,992
Total Current Liabilities	165,771
Fund Balance	
Fund Balance - July 1, 2009	794,585
Amount for Accrued Leave	8,652
Investment in Equipment	11,633
Fund Change	-32,259
Fund Balance - December 31, 2009	782,611

Phone: (203) 234-7555

Fax: (203) 234-9850

Mail: camento@scrcog.org

## Statement of Resources and Expenditures - December, 2009

Resources	FY 09 Budget	Month of Dec, 2009	To Date
Municipal Contribution	151,100	12,592	75,550
ConnDOT - Transportation Planning			
U.S. Dept of Transportation	994,429	40,485	260,716
Transportation ConnDOT	122,556	5,061	32,589
Connecticut Office of Policy & Management			
RPI Grant - Econ. Dev. Web Portal	42,624	6,318	24,893
Emergency Response Planning			
DEMHS - FY 07 NHASH Grant	39,895	0	2,500
Shoreline Greenway Trails Planning Study			
U.S. Department of Transportation # H074	212,976	0	0
U.S. Department of Transportation # H103	70,992	0	0
Municipal Share	70,993	0	0
Interest	15,000	197	1,024
TOTAL	1,720,565	64,652	397,272

Expenses	FY 09 Budget	Month of Dec, 2009	To Date
Labor & Benefits	645,700		311,616
Salaries		30,485	195,508
Fringe Benefits		14,476	116,108
Print & Reproduction	2,900	0	0
Travel	14,300	611	2,310
Data Process	32,700	50	4,981
General Operations	165,000		84,157
Rent	99,100	8,312	57,791
Postage & Telephone	8,500	316	2,543
Office Supplies	4,100	356	847
Equipment Maintenance	18,400	981	4,282
Publications	900	285	285
Insurance	13,100	0	12,100
Professional Services	11,800	804	2,512
Meeting Expenses & Advertising	8,800	1,282	3,611
Miscellaneous & Equipment Use	300	127	187
Consultant	404,500	0	0
Capital Purchase	1,000	0	0
NHASH Grant	39,895	0	2,500
RPI Grant - Web Portal	42,624	5,920	21,470
Shoreline Greenway Trail	354,961	0	0
Contingencies	16,985	0	0
TOTAL	1,720,565	64,004	427,034

Phone: (203) 234-7555

Fax: (203) 234-9850

Mail: camento@scrcog.org



Bethany - Branford - East Haven - Guilford - Hamden - Madison - Meriden - Milford New Haven - North Branford - North Haven - Orange - Wallingford - West Haven - Woodbridge

## SOUTH CENTRAL REGIONAL COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

Judy Gott, Executive Director

To: South Central Regional Council of Governments Members January 18, 2010

From: Nominating Committee:

Mayor James Richetelli, Jr., Mayor Scott Jackson, First Selectman Fillmore McPherson

Subject: Nominating Committee Report for Calendar Year 2010 Officers and Committees

## **SCRCOG Board Officers**

Chairman: James Zeoli

Vice Chairman: Edward Sheehy Secretary: Anthony DaRos Treasurer: John Picard

#### **Personnel Committee**

- 1. James Zeoli, Chair
- 2. Edward Sheehy
- 3. Derrylyn Gorski
- 4. James Richetelli

## **Transportation Committee**

- 1. William Dickinson, Chair
- 2. John DeStefano
- 3. Anthony DaRos
- 4. Scott Jackson
- 5. Michael Freda
- 6. April Capone Almon

## **Executive Committee**

1. Chairman: James Zeoli

Vice Chairman: Edward Sheehy
 Secretary: Anthony DaRos

4. Treasurer: John Picard

5. Immediate Past Chair Derrylyn Gorski\*

6. Member at Large: John DeStefano

7. Member at Large: William Dickinson

8. Member at Large: James Richetelli

## **Public Safety/Domestic Preparedness**

- 1. Fillmore McPherson, Chair
- 2. Anthony Candelora
- 3. Michael Freda
- 4. Joseph Mazza

## **Open Space Committee**

- 1. April Capone Almon, Chair
- 2. Joseph Mazza
- 3. Fillmore McPherson
- 4. Anthony Candelora

(Legislative Committee: Recommend incorporating this into Executive Committee)

## \*Note since there will be no new prior chair for EC, in the past the prior, prior Chair remains

127 Washington Avenue, 4th Floor West North Haven, Connecticut 06473-1715

Website: www.scrcog.org

Equal Opportunity Employer



Bethany - Branford - East Haven - Guilford - Hamden - Madison - Meriden – Milford New Haven - North Branford - North Haven - Orange - Wallingford - West Haven - Woodbridge

# SOUTH CENTRAL REGIONAL COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS Carl Amento, Executive Director

olutio	

	ral Regional Council of Governments Bank Signatories	
Whereas:	On January 27, 2010 the South Central Regional Council of Governments elected new officers for calendar year 2010, and	
Whereas:	SCRCOG <i>by-laws</i> identify the Chairman, Vice Chairman, Secretary, Treasurer and Executive Direct signatories on all bank account for the South Central Regional Council of Governments.	tor a
Now, therefor	ore be resolved by the South Central Regional Council of Governments:	
Appoints Jam SCRCOG bar	mes M. Zeoli, Edward M. Sheehy, Anthony DaRos, John M. Picard, and Carl Amento as signatories on ank accounts.	all
Certificate:		
	gned duly qualified and acting Secretary of the South Central Regional Council of Governments certifies g is a true and correct copy of a resolution adopted at a legally convened meeting of the SCRCOG on Jar	
Date: January	ry 27, 2010  By:  Secretary, First Selectman Anthony DaRos	

127 Washington Avenue, 4th Floor West North Haven, Connecticut 06473-1715 Website: www.scrcog.org

## **South Central Regional Council of Governments**

# FFY2010-FFY2013 Transportation Improvement Program Amendment Number 2

Project 0043-0124 2005-0022 Main St Signal Replacement Program

Municipality New Haven

**Changes** ConnDOT informed us that project funds are increased 14.4% to a cost of \$840,000 federal.

This revision is based on the latest cost estimates. This will be reflected in the next STIP

update. We have been asked to adjust our TIP accordingly

Project 0059-0158 2010-A2\_1 Guilford Pavement Preservation

Municipality Guilford

Changes Amendment 2 adds new project to be funded with STP-Urban Stimulus (STPRR) funds. This is

the pavement preservation project on Stepstone Hill Rd which was on the list of projects

recommended last September.

Project 0092-0570 2003-028 Long Wharf Boathouse (I-95) Construction

Municipality New Haven

**Changes** Amendment 2 moves PE funding from FFY11 to FFY10

Project 0092-0642 2007-0116 Pavement Rehab Congress Avenue

Municipality New Haven

**Changes** Amendment 2 increases funds based on revised estimate

Project 0092-0643 2007-0117 Traffic Control Signal Controllers

Municipality New Haven

**Changes** ConnDOT informed us that project funds are increased 8.6% to a cost of \$3,258,000 federal

(previously \$3,000,000 federal). This revision is based on the latest cost estimates. This will be

reflected in the next STIP update. We have been asked to adjust our TIP accordingly

Project 0170-2776 2007-077 STPA Funds for Eng/Scope & Proj development

Municipality Statewide

Changes Amendment 2 moves unobligated funding from FFY09 to FFY10

Project 0300-0149 2010-A2 2 NHL-Positive Train Control-FY2010

Municipality New Haven

**Changes** Amendment 2 adds new project for a Positive Train Control System designed to monitor train

activity, prevent collisions, control headway spacing, enforce speed restrictions and advise of

hazards.

## **Amendment Number 2**

State Project 0043-0124

**SCRCOG #2005-022** 

**Municipality** East Haven

Proposed

Project Name Main St Signal Replacement Program

**Description** Replace five 30 year old (approx) signals. 4 on Main St 1 on Messina Dr. Existing signals are town owned and in need of upgrade

Current TIP Funding (In Thousands)											
Funding	Phase		Prior	2010	2011	2012	2013	FYI			
STPNH	ROW	Federal	72								
		State	18								
	CON	Federal		734							
		State		184							
Total Cost	\$1,008		90	918	0	0	0	0			
Proposed TIP Funding (In Thousands)											

Proposed TIP Funding (In Thousands)												
Funding	Phase		Prior	2010	2011	2012	2013	FYI				
STPNH	ROW	Federal	72									
		State	18									
	CON	Federal		840								
		State		210								
TIP Funds	\$1,140		90	1,050	0	0	0	0				

## **Amendment Notes**

ROW moved from 2006 to 2007 by FY05 TIP Amend 13 due to design delays and other project priorities. FY07 TIP Amend 9 increases cost by 20% based on final engineer's estimate. FY07 TIP Amend 13 Moves Row to FFY08. FY07 TIP amend 16 moves CON out of FFY08 to FFY09. FY07 TIP Amend 19 moves ROW phase from FFY08 to FFY09. FY07 TIP Amend 22 moves CON phase from FFY09 to FFY10. FY07 TIP Amend 27 increases ROW funds. Updated 12/09 Project carried to FY10 TIP. FY10 TIP amend 2 Con funds increased 14.4%

## Amendment Number 2

State Project 0059-0158

SCRCOG #2010-A2\_1

**Municipality** Guilford

Proposed

Project Name Guilford Pavement Preservation

**Description** Pavement Preservation of Stepstone Hill Rd from Rte 77 to Valley Shores Rd with an Approximate project length of 4,200 ft.

## **Current TIP Funding (In Thousands)**

Proposed TIP Funding (In Thousands)												
Funding	Phase		Prior	2010	2011	2012	2013	FYI				
STPRR	CON	Federal		550								
		Local		3								
TIP Funds	\$553		0	553	0	0	0	0				

## **Amendment Notes**

FY10 Amendment 2 introduces new Project

## Amendment Number 2

State Project 0092-0570

**SCRCOG #2003-028** 

Municipality New Haven

Proposed

Project Name Long Wharf Boathouse (I-95) Construction

Description Construct deck structure and municipal Boathouse on Parcel H (Long Wharf Dr and Canal Dock Rd); incorporating architectural features salvaged from the former Yale Boathouse.

Current TIP Funding (In Thousands)										
Funding	Phase		Prior	2010	2011	2012	2013	FYI		
STPA	ENG	Federal			2,100					
		State			525					
	CON	Federal						18,400		
		State						4,600		
Total Cost	\$25,625		0	0	2,625	0	0	23,000		

Proposed TIP Funding (In Thousands)													
Funding	Phase		Prior	2010	2011	2012	2013	FYI					
STPA	ENG	Federal		2,100									
		State		525									
	CON	Federal						18,400					
		State						4,600					
TIP Funds	\$25,625		0	2,625	0	0	0	23,000					

## **Amendment Notes**

FY05 PE introduced per actual FY04 obligation by Amend 2; total PE obligation \$6.0 million. Move PE phase \$2,100,000 of STP-Anywhere funds and \$525,000 of state funds from FY05 to FY06 per FY 05 TIP Amend 10 total project cost \$30M. FY07 TIP Amend 1 moves PE phase again from 06 to 07. FY07 TIP Amend 5 attempted to move PE and CON phase out to FY08 was not approved. FY07 TIP Amend 8 moves only Con phase to FFY08 and adds \$12.5M FFY09 funds to fully fund project estimates. FY07 TIP Amend 13 request moved ENG to FFY08, moved AC Entry out 1 year to FFY09 and moved CON out 2 years to FFY10 and FYI. Denied pending more information FY07 TIP Amend 14 approves change. FY07 TIP Amend 24 Moves unobligated funds from FFY08 to FFY09. FY10 TIP moves project CON to FYI. FY10 TIP Amend 2 moves PE funds from FY11 to FY10

## **Amendment Number 2**

State Project 0092-0642

SCRCOG #2007-0116

Municipality New Haven

Proposed

Project Name Pavement Rehab Congress Avenue

**Description** Three inch mill and overlay on Congress Ave from Davenport to Vernon. Adjustments to catch basins and man hole covers. Work on curbing, line striping and loop detectors included

Current TIP Funding (In Thousands)												
Funding	Phase		Prior	2010	2011	2012	2013	FYI				
STPRR	CON	Federal		600								
Total Cost	\$600		0	600	0	0	0	0				

Proposed TIP Funding (In Thousands)									
Funding	Phase		Prior	2010	2011	2012	2013	FYI	
STPRR	CON	Federal		844					
TIP Funds	\$844		0	844	0	0	0	0	

### **Amendment Notes**

FY07 TIP Amendment 26 adds new project funded with STP Urban Stimulus Project moved into FY10 TIP. FY10 TIP Amend 2 increases funds based on new estimate

State Project 0092-0643

SCRCOG #2007-0117

Municipality New Haven

Proposed

**Project Name** Traffic Control Signal Controllers

**Description** Project for the replacement of 102 controllers, communication end equipment and integration into existing Naztec ATMS.NOW central control system

Current TIP Funding (In Thousands)								
Funding	Phase		Prior	2010	2011	2012	2013	FYI
STPRR	CON	Federal		3,000				
Total Cost	\$3,000		0	3,000	0	0	0	0

Proposed TIP Funding (In Thousands)									
Funding	Phase		Prior	2010	2011	2012	2013	FYI	
STPRR	CON	Federal		3,258					
TIP Funds	\$3,258		0	3,258	0	0	0	0	

## **Amendment Notes**

FY07 TIP Amendment 26 adds new project funded with STP Urban Stimulus Project moved into FY10 TIP. FY10 TIP Amend 2 DOT informs us that the cost estimate increased 8.6%

## **Amendment Number 2**

State Project 0170-2776

SCRCOG #2007-077

Municipality Statewide

Proposed

Project Name STPA Funds for Eng/Scope & Proj development

**Description** Surface Transportation Program funds for Engineering / Scoping and project

development

Current TIP Funding (In Thousands)										
Funding	Phase	•	Prior	2010	2011	2012	2013	FYI		
STPA	ENG	Federal	120							
		State	30							
Total Cost	\$150		150	0	0	0	0	0		

Proposed TIP Funding (In Thousands)									
Funding	Phase		Prior	2010	2011	2012	2013	FYI	
STPA	ENG	Federal		120					
		State		30					
TIP Funds	\$150		0	150	0	0	0	0	

### **Amendment Notes**

FY07 TIP amend 16 introduces new project, FY07 TIP Amend 24 Moves funds from FFY08 to FFY09. FY10 TIP Amend 2 moves funds from FFY09 to FFY10

State Project 0300-0149

SCRCOG #2010-A2\_2

Municipality New Haven

Proposed

Project Name NHL-Positive Train Control-FY2010

**Description** The Railroad Safety Act of 2008 has mandated installation of Positive Train Control

Systems. System designed to montior train activity, prevent collisions, controll

headway spacing, enforce speed restrictions and advise of hazards.

## **Current TIP Funding (In Thousands)**

Proposed TIP Funding (In Thousands)									
Funding	Phase		Prior	2010	2011	2012	2013	FYI	
5309C	ENG	Federal		5,200					
		State		1,300					
TIP Funds	\$6,500		0	6,500	0	0	0	0	

## **Amendment Notes**

FY2010 TIP Amend 2 introduces new project



Bethany - Branford - East Haven - Guilford - Hamden - Madison - Meriden - Milford New Haven - North Branford - North Haven - Orange - Wallingford - West Haven - Woodbridge

### SOUTH CENTRAL REGIONAL COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

#### Resolution

Fiscal Year 2010-Fiscal Year 2013 Transportation Improvement Program Amendment Two

- 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 2010-Fiscal Year 2013 Transportation Improvement Program on October 28, 2009, 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 2010-2013 Transportation Improvement Program and the Region's Long-Range Transportation Plans, May, 2007); and
- Whereas: The Council, on October 28, 2009, 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—2007 to 2035, (May, 2007); 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*.

Fax:

Phone: (203) 234-7555

(203) 234-9850



Bethany - Branford - East Haven - Guilford - Hamden - Madison - Meriden - Milford New Haven - North Branford - North Haven - Orange - Wallingford - West Haven - Woodbridge

## SOUTH CENTRAL REGIONAL COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

# Resolution Fiscal Year 2010-Fiscal Year 2013 Transportation Improvement Program Amendment Two (Continued)

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

The *Program Amendment Two* 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 **January 27, 2010**.

Date: <b>January 27, 2010</b>		
• /	Secretary	

Phone: (203) 234-7555

Fax:

(203) 234-9850



Bethany - Branford - East Haven - Guilford - Hamden - Madison - Meriden - Milford New Haven - North Branford - North Haven - Orange - Wallingford - West Haven – Woodbridge

## SOUTH CENTRAL REGIONAL COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

Carl J. Amento, Executive Director

January 13, 2010

## **ARRA New Haven Urban Funds (STPRR)**

Once amendment 2 to the FY 2010-2013 TIP is adopted, the following will be the funds obligated by CDOT by March 2, 2010 to fully utilize the allocation of **\$14,048,105**.

Project 92-585 Quinnipiac 1	<b>Obligation</b> \$6,952,710	(obligated 9-10-09- low bid will allow for future release of balance of obligation)
92-641 Quinnipiac 2	\$2,445,500	oongavion)
92-642 Congress Pavement Rehab.	\$ 843,700	
92-643 New Haven Controllers	\$3,258,000	
59-158 Guilford -Stepstone/No. Mad. Pavement Perservation	\$ 548,195	

Total \$14,048,105

Per CDOT schedule, remaining four projects are to be bid during January and February. Per ARRA requirements, any excess funds in these projects may be de-obligated and re-obligated to additional projects between March 2, 2010 and September 2, 2010.

CDOT continues to process remaining requests from SCRCOG September 2009 priority list to utilize remaining ARRA and FY 10 STP Urban Funds.

127 Washington Avenue, 4<sup>TH</sup> Floor West North Haven, Connecticut 06473-1715

Website: www.scrcog.org

Equal Opportunity Employer



Bethany - Branford - East Haven - Guilford - Hamden - Madison - Meriden - Milford New Haven - North Branford - North Haven - Orange - Wallingford - West Haven – Woodbridge

### SOUTH CENTRAL REGIONAL COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

Carl J. Amento, Executive Director

### **MEMORANDUM**

To: SCRCOG Mayors and First Selectmen Transportation Technical Committee

From: Stephen B. Dudley, P.E., Transportation Planner

Re: FY 2010-2011 and FY 2011-2012 UPWP Planning Projects

Date: January 12, 2010

We are beginning preparation of the new two year Unified Planning Work Program.

As in the past, we are requesting that proposals for planning projects be submitted for consideration and inclusion in the UPWP. These planning studies will be accomplished by a consultant funded by our annual planning allocation from FHWA and CDOT.

Previous proposals have resulted in planning documents that have been useful for both the state and local officials as they strive to improve the region's transportation system.

We have not yet been advised of our anticipated planning allocations and will evaluate the proposals and estimated costs and include as many as possible in each year of the UPWP.

We must consider a preliminary UPWP during March to meet normal approval schedules. Please submit your planning proposals to me not later than **Wednesday**, **February 17**, **2010**.

If you have any questions or desire assistance in formulating your proposals, please contact me.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

127 Washington Avenue, 4<sup>TH</sup> Floor West North Haven, Connecticut 06473-1715

Website: www.scrcog.org

Equal Opportunity Employer



Bethany - Branford - East Haven - Guilford - Hamden - Madison - Meriden - Milford New Haven - North Branford - North Haven - Orange - Wallingford - West Haven – Woodbridge

### SOUTH CENTRAL REGIONAL COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

Draft Minutes Transportation Committee January 13, 2010

Transportation Committee members	Transportation Technical Committee
Wallingford, Mayor William Dickinson, Chair	East Haven, James Staunton
North Haven, First Selectman Michael Freda.	Guilford, Jim Portley
Branford, Janice Plaziak proxy for First Selectman	Hamden, Bob Brinton
Anthony DaRos	Madison, Mike Ott
East Haven, Tara Pisaturo Pelatowski Proxy for Mayor	New Haven, Dick Miller
April Capone Almon	North Branford, Kurt Weiss
New Haven, Michael Piscitelli, proxy for Mayor John	North Haven, John Bodwell
DeStefano	Wallingford, John Thompson
	West Haven, Abdul Quadir
Guests	
Jean Stimolo, Rideworks	Donna Carter, GNHTD
Stephen Livingston, ConnDOT	Vic Marques, CTTRANSIT
Karyn Gilvarg, New Haven	Lou Mangini, Congresswoman DeLauro's Office
Ken Shooshan-Stoller, FHWA	
SCRCOG Carl Amento, James Rode, Stephen Dudley,	

Mayor Dickinson began the meeting at 12:07 PM.

### Item #1

Minutes of the November 10, 2009 meeting were unanimously adopted on a motion by J.Portley/ J.Plaziak.

#### Item #2

The discussion of FY2010 –FY2013 TIP Amendment 2 began with an update of the STP Urban Stimulus (STPRR) fund obligations. S. Dudley presented a summary sheet which showed how the region's \$14,048,105 in STPRR funds was to be obligated among 5 projects. These 5 projects were #92-585, #92-641, #92-642, #92-643 and #59-158. There was further discussion regarding STPRR and STP-Urban funds available for pavement preservation projects in FFY10. J. Rode presented a supplemental to FY2010 –FY2013 TIP Amendment 2 regarding project #43-124 and then presented the 6 projects in the amendment packet. D. Miller made the motion to approve FY10 TIP Amendment 2 with the inclusion of project #43-124. J Portley seconded, the motion was approved.

#### Item #3

J. Rode presented the status on current urban projects included in the agenda package. FY2010 –FY2013 TIP Amendment 2 included fund increases to 3 of the Urban projects and The remaining STPRR funded projects are expected to be advertised in the next month or so. D. Miller reported that the location of a 42" water main has slowed work on #92-561 the State Street: Mill River Bridge Replacement project

## Item #4

S. Dudley discussed preparations for the 2010-2011 and 2011-2012 UPWP. He asked those present to develop planning projects to be included and submit proposals by Wednesday, February 17, 2010.

#### Item #5

J. Plaziak made a motion to adjourn, meeting adjourned at 12:55 PM.

By-Laws, South Central Regional Council of Governments February 28, 2001

the Commission's finding and, as initially received by the Council, shall constitute the sole basis for Council review.

Appeals by parties to Regional Planning Commission findings conducted under this Article shall be acted on by a majority of the members of the Council present at the next Council meeting. The Council shall consider the findings of the Commission regarding any such matter and the nature of the appeal but shall be entitled to take any action regarding such matter as it shall deem appropriate. If no appeal is filed, then the findings of the Commission shall be deemed the findings of the Council.

- D. Other Referrals. Other referrals or requests for comment to determine consistency with regional plans and policies, arising as a result of federal or state law or regulation, shall be addressed by the Commission. Matters pertaining to surface transportation planning, generally falling within the purview of 23 USC 134 and 49 USC 1602, shall however be addressed directly by the Council.
- E. Submission of Commission Action to the Council. Reports, plans and policies of the Commission, other than Commission findings in response to referrals under Sections C and D of this Article X from which no appeal has been taken as herein provided, shall be presented to the Council as proposals at the next regular meeting of the Council, and the Council shall act upon such submission (by adopting, rejecting, modifying or referring the same back to the Commission for further consideration) at the earliest practicable point in time.
- F. Membership and Representation. Each member of the Council shall appoint one representative to the Regional Planning Commission. The representative shall be an elector, and member of that member's planning commission. The representative shall be appointed by the planning commission with the concurrence of the appointing authority. Each member may also appoint an alternate who shall be an elector of such member and who shall be appointed by such planning commission with the concurrence of the appointing authority. The alternate shall, when the representative of the member from which he is appointed is absent, have all the powers and duties of the representative. The representative and alternate shall serve until a successor is appointed by the appointing authorities.

Each representative shall be entitled to one vote in the affairs of the Commission but shall not be entitled a vote in the affairs of the Council.

- G. Resignation. In the event a representative or alternate of the Commission resigns, a copy of the letter of resignation shall be filed with the Secretary of the Council and the Secretary of the Commission, and sent to the appointing authority of the member represented by such resigning party.
- H. Meetings of the Commission. Unless otherwise specified by resolution of the Commission, the regular meetings of the Commission shall be held on the second (2nd) Thursday of each month subject to the right of the Chairperson of the Commission to cancel regular meetings in the absence of any business to come before any such meeting. Times and places of meetings shall be established by the Commission.
- Special Meetings. Special meetings of the Commission shall be held by call of the Council Chairperson or the Commission Chairperson or by petition of the Commission Secretary from not

Inserted: , and staff for or

Formatted: Font: Book Antiqua



Bethany - Branford - East Haven - Guilford - Hamden - Madison - Meriden - Milford New Haven - North Branford - North Haven - Orange - Wallingford - West Haven - Woodbridge

## SOUTH CENTRAL REGIONAL COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS Carl Amento, Executive Director

Resolution of the South Central Regional Council of Governments authorizing Execution of Agreements with Connecticut State Agencies.

**Resolved**, that the Executive Director, Carl Amento, is hereby authorized to act on behalf of the South Central Regional Council of Governments in negotiating and executing all appropriate and necessary contractual instruments with Connecticut state agencies.

Such contracts are for the purpose of obtaining financial assistance to carry on mutually agreed upon programs in the South Central planning region.

Dated at North Haven, Connecticut on January 27, 2010

Secretary, First Selectman Anthony DaRos

127 Washington Avenue, 4th Floor West North Haven, Connecticut 06473-1715 Website: www.scrcog.org



Bethany - Branford - East Haven - Guilford - Hamden - Madison - Meriden - Milford New Haven - North Branford - North Haven - Orange - Wallingford - West Haven - Woodbridge

## SOUTH CENTRAL REGIONAL COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS Carl Amento, Executive Director

## Resolution

South Central Regional Council of Government
<b>Appointment of Retirement Plan Administrator</b>

	al Regional Council t of Retirement Plan				
Whereas:	The South Centra Financial Services	_	ouncil of Governments offers a group retirement plan through the Principal ime staff, and		
Whereas:			Plan Administrator is required to executed certain plan amendments and compliance with the Internal Revenue Service code, and		
Whereas:	as: The retirement of Executive Director Judy Gott, has left the SCRCOG Group Retirement Plan without a Plan Administrator.				
Now, therefor	re be resolved by the	South Centra	al Regional Council of Governments:		
Carl Amento,	Executive Director,	is hereby app	pointed Plan Administrator for SCRCOG's Group Retirement Plan.		
Certificate:					
			retary of the South Central Regional Council of Governments certifies that olution adopted at a legally convened meeting of the SCRCOG on January		
Date: January	y 27, 2010	By:			
			Secretary, First Selectman Anthony DaRos		

127 Washington Avenue, 4th Floor West North Haven, Connecticut 06473-1715 Website: www.scrcog.org

Nove	mber 2009	Regional Planning Commission	n (RPC) Action	Table
Ref.	Received	Description	Adjacent RPC Towns	Abridged RPC Action
2.1	9/29/09	Town of Hamden: Revision of the Town's Zoning Regulations/Map	Bethany, Woodbridge, New Haven, North Haven, Wallingford	By resolution, the RPC has determined that the proposed Zoning Regulation Amendments do not appear to cause negative inter-municipal impacts to towns in the South Central region nor do there appear to be negative impacts to the habitat or ecosystems of the Long Island Sound.
2.2	10/19/09	Town of North Haven: Proposed Zoning Regulation Amendments to Section 4.4.1.38 (Adult Rehabilitative and Educational Facility)	Hamden, New Haven, East Haven, North Branford, Wallingford	By resolution, the RPC has determined that the proposed Zoning Regulation Amendments do not appear to cause negative inter-municipal impacts to towns in the South Central region nor do there appear to be negative impacts to the habitat or ecosystems of the Long Island Sound.
2.3	10/13/09	Town of Berlin: Proposed Zoning Regulation Amendments to add new Section XI.BB (Mixed Income Housing Development) to the Town's Zoning Code	Meriden	By resolution, the RPC has determined that the proposed Zoning Regulation Amendment does not appear to cause negative inter-municipal impacts to towns in the South Central region nor do there appear to be negative impacts to the habitat or ecosystems of the Long Island Sound. The recommendation is based on the fact that the "Mixed Income Housing Development" can only be located on existing GC and GI-2 Zones in Berlin
2.4	11/2/09	City of Meriden: Proposed Zoning Text Amendments for Single and Two Family Residential District Lot and Bulk Requirements, Yards, Grading and Driveways.	Wallingford	By resolution, the RPC has determined that the proposed Zoning Regulation Amendments do not appear to cause negative inter-municipal impacts to towns in the South Central region nor do there appear to be negative impacts to the habitat or ecosystems of the Long Island Sound.

3.2

Phone: (203) 234-7555

Fax: (203) 234-9850

Mail: camento@scrcog.org

The 2010 RPC Meeting Schedule has been adopted

Dece	December 2009 Regional Planning Commission (RPC) Action Table					
Ref.	Received	Description	Adjacent RPC Towns	Abridged RPC Action		
2.1	10/26/09	Regional Water Authority: Application for a disposition of a single-family dwelling unit at 501 Derby Ave, Orange, CT to any party for one dollar. The dwelling would be moved to an approved residential building lot on class III RWA Land at 499 Derby Ave, Orange, CT	Milford, New Haven, West Haven, Woodbridge	By resolution, the RPC has determined that the proposed disposition of the single-family dwelling unit at 501 Derby Ave, Orange, CT for the purpose of relocation to 499 Derby Ave, Orange CT does not appear to have any negative impacts. The proposed action will relocate a building with historical significance to a designated Class III RWA Lot, while restoring the vacated building lot designated as Class I RWA Land.		
2.2	10/29/09	Town of Stratford: Proposed Zoning Regulation Amendments to Sections 4, 5 and 12 of the Town's Zoning Regulations	Milford	By resolution, the RPC has determined that the proposed Zoning Regulation Amendments increase the maximum building coverage and height while reducing the side and rear yard setbacks, which may lead to an increase in impervious surface cover. This could create a negative impact to Long Island Sound due to storm-water runoff. Deleting the provisions in Section 4.1.6.11 will discourage pedestrian traffic to the commercial areas. In Section 12.5.2 it may be appropriate to keep two parking spaces for two bedroom apartments. There do not appear to be any negative intermunicipal impacts to the Towns in the South Central Region.		
2.3	11/10/09	Town of Clinton: Proposed Zoning Regulation Amendments to add Sections 3.7.4, 3.17.3, 9.20, 24.1.46, 24.2.46, and 28.8.7 (Farm Tourism)	Madison	By resolution, the RPC has determined that the proposed Zoning Regulation Amendments do not appear to cause any negative impacts to the Towns of the South Central Region nor do there appear to be any negative impacts to the habitat or ecosystem of the Long Island Sound.		
2.4	11/12/09	Town of Bethany: Proposed Thirteen Lot Subdivision Application for a property located at 26 and 46 Mesa Drive	Hamden, Woodbridge	By resolution, the RPC has determined that the proposed Subdivision Application does not appear to cause negative inter-municipal impacts. This is on the condition that the August 29, 2008 approval with additional conditions from the Inland Wetlands Commission is followed. The Commission should carefully review the application to make sure the proposed excavation, grading and/or filling will not cause adverse stormwater runoff to adjacent properties.		

Ionu	ory 2010 Do	egional Planning Commission	(DDC) Action Tol	blo	
Ref.	Received	Description	Adjacent RPC Towns	Abridged RPC Action	
2.1	12/3/09	City of West Haven: Proposed Zoning Map Amendment to adopt a Planned Village District Overlay Zone	Milford, New Haven, Orange	By resolution, the RPC has determined that the proposed Zoning Map Amendment does not appear to cause any negative impacts to the Towns of the South Central Region nor do there appear to be any negative impacts to the habitat or ecosystem of the Long Island Sound.	
2.2	12/7/09	Town of Berlin: Proposed Zoning Regulation Amendment to add new Subsection IV (A) 16 (f) to Berlin's Zoning Code	Meriden	By resolution, the RPC has determined that the proposed Zoning Regulation Amendment does not appear to cause any negative impacts to the Towns of the South Central Region nor do there appear to be any negative impacts to the habitat or ecosystem of the Long Island Sound.	
2.3	12/11/09	Town of Bethany: Proposed Zoning Regulation Amendments to Section 8.3.B.3 – Notice to Abutting Property Owners; Section 14.1.B.5.e – Zoning Variances; Section 14.3.C – Public Hearings	Hamden, Woodbridge	By resolution, the RPC has determined that the proposed Zoning Regulation Amendments do not appear to cause any negative impacts to the Towns of the South Central Region nor do there appear to be any negative impacts to the habitat or ecosystem of the Long Island Sound.	
2.4	12/18/09	Town of Guilford: Proposed Zoning Regulation Amendments to Article IX – Site Plan Review and Article XVIII – Shopping Center Zone District	Branford, Madison, North Branford	By resolution, the RPC has determined that the proposed Zoning Regulation Amendments do not appear to cause any negative impacts to the Towns of the South Central Region nor do there appear to be any negative impacts to the habitat or ecosystem of the Long Island Sound.	

Phone: (203) 234-7555

Fax: (203) 234-9850

Mail: camento@scrcog.org

South Central Connecticut Regional Water Authority 90 Sargent Drive, New Haven, Connecticut 06511-5966 203-562-4020 http://www.rwater.com

# Position Paper Proposed DEP Stream Flow Standards and Regulations South Central Connecticut Regional Water Authority

The Connecticut Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) has formally proposed regulations establishing new stream flow standards for all streams in the state. These regulations would require public water utilities to substantially increase the amount of water released to streams downstream of their active supply reservoirs, while imposing additional restrictions on groundwater withdrawals from public water supply wells.

The goal of the regulation to balance the many diverse and legitimate uses of the state's waters while promoting healthy streams is admirable, and a well crafted stream flow regulation could greatly enhance overall management of the State of Connecticut's water resources. The South Central CT Regional Water Authority (SCCRWA) has a long history of caring for natural environments. We are more aware than ever that our operation – how we do business – influences the quality of natural environments. Water is a key element for a prosperous and healthy community.

While the goal of the proposed regulations is laudable, we believe the stream flow regulations do not meet the statutory mandate of "recognizing and providing for the needs and requirements" of public health, public safety, and water supply. We will be asking the DEP to address many specific technical concerns in the proposed regulations and we believe it is imperative that the DEP revise its proposed regulations to balance environmental, public health, safety and economic interests and meet the public water supply needs of the residents of the State. Specifically, we cannot support the regulations as drafted until the following recommendations have been adequately addressed:

- 1. The benefits of the regulations to stream flow would be enjoyed by many constituents that are not necessarily public water supply customers including the agricultural community, fishermen, hikers, canoeists, private well users, and others who derive direct use or enjoyment of the state's rivers and streams. However under the proposed regulation, public water utility customers would bear the cost of compliance. It is estimated that 15 to 20 million dollars in capital improvements would be borne by SCCRWA customers through higher water rates to offset the impact of the regulations on the SCCRWA's water system.
  - Therefore, we believe the State of Connecticut needs to develop a mechanism to equitably share the cost of the regulations among all citizens and businesses that derive legitimate benefits from the State's streams and rivers.
- 2. There will be a very significant and costly difference in complying with the Class 1, 2, 3 or 4 stream designation requirements. Under the proposed regulation, the regulated community will not know what classification the DEP will assign to each stream until after the regulations become law. The DEP has verbally said the likely outcome of the classification process will result in streams with public water supply withdrawals being classified as Class 3 or 4. The SCCRWA estimate of 15 to 20 million dollars for capital improvements needed to comply with the proposed regulation assumes the Class 3 designation for all of its surface water sources. The capital improvement cost resulting from a Class 1 or 2 designation for these same surface water sources would exceed 100 million dollars.
  - The DEP should bring more certainty to impacts on public water utilities and their customers by designating streams identified as existing or future public water supplies in

SCCRWA Position Paper – DEP Stream Flow Regulations Page 2 of 2

approved public water utility Water Supply Plans as Class 3 or 4 by rule within the proposed regulations.

- 3. The current fiscal analysis attached to the proposed regulation prepared by the DEP does not adequately identify or quantify the costs of implementing and complying with the regulation by the state's citizens, state agencies, and municipalities, among others.
  - o The DEP needs to complete an analysis of the cost of these regulations to the state's citizens, including water ratepayers, businesses, and industry and evaluate how these costs may affect Connecticut's future economic development.
- 4. Much work has been accomplished by the DEP and its Scientific and Technical Workgroup on the needs of aquatic life. However, limited analysis has been done to determine what quantity of water the State's constituents will need now and in the future.
  - A comprehensive water-needs study, including analysis of actual consumptive use from both groundwater and surface water sources to determine the quantity of water needed now and in the future for use by the people and businesses of the state, should be completed by the DEP prior to the adoption of the proposed regulations;

We respectfully request your support for our recommendations listed above by providing testimony (written or verbal) to the DEP in accordance with the schedule outlined below.

We will be submitting these recommendations along with extensive technical comments at the DEP public hearing, which begins at 9:00 AM on January 21, 2010 at the DEP headquarters, 79 Elm Street, Hartford, CT. The DEP will also be accepting written comments through February 4, 2010. For more information concerning the SCCRWA's position on the proposed stream flow regulations contact Tom Chaplik at 203-401-2725 or <a href="mailto:tchaplik@rwater.com">tchaplik@rwater.com</a> or visit our website at www.rwater.com.

December 17, 2009



## **Developing Streamflow Regulations in Connecticut**

Water utilities have long been stewards of the environment. We recognize the importance of protecting the water resources of the state. We have demonstrated this through our longstanding practices of source water protection, water quality monitoring, forest management, and open space preservation. We take our responsibility seriously and routinely work with other stakeholders to provide for the stewardship of the water resources of the state. We stand ready to work with stakeholders and policymakers to develop balanced regulations that provide for environmental stewardship and meet the needs of the residents of the state.

The legislature, in recognizing the limitations of the existing minimum streamflow standards, through Public Act 05-142 directed the Department of Environmental Protection to adopt new streamflow regulations that would apply to all rivers and streams, promote and protect usage for recreation, and be based on natural variations of flow and best available science.

The water industry did not oppose this legislation as we saw the environmental value of regulating all dams in the state and were assured by the following statutory language requiring the regulations be developed:

- "..... recognizing and providing for the needs and requirements of public health, flood control, industry, public utilities, water supply, public safety, agriculture, and other lawful uses of such waters..."
- "further recognizing and providing for stream and river ecology, requirements of natural aquatic life, natural wildlife and public recreation...." and
- may provide special conditions or exemptions for extreme economic hardship, agricultural use, or "as necessary to allow a public water system ..... to comply with the obligations as set forth in the regulations of CT State agencies."

It was apparent that the legislature expected DEP to draft regulations that adequately balance the many competing demands placed on our waters. CWWA cannot support proposed regulations that fail to balance environmental, public health, safety and economic interests and meet the needs of the residents of the state. Nor would such proposed regulations satisfy the directive of the legislature.

The current draft regulations provide for a stream classification system which will impose reservoir release requirements and groundwater withdrawal limits for existing public water supply sources based on the stream classification. Exceptions are allowed where flow management plans are developed and approved by the Department.

The Department plans to develop stream classifications over a 5 year period with compliance required in designated basins within 5 years of basin classification. The current process lacks any mechanism to prioritize the basins or compliance schedules or any process for a cost-benefit analysis of the costs (monetary and social) of compliance as compared to the environmental outcomes. DEP should make available data relative to the proposed regulation's impact on aquatic life and allow policymakers to determine whether the costs are justified relative to the perceived environmental benefit.

Not knowing at the onset how streams will be classified makes it virtually impossible for any of the stakeholders to accurately assess the impacts or benefits of the proposed regulations.

**CWWA** continues to recommend that DEP first proceed with the basin classification process before promulgating the streamflow standards. This would allow all parties to assess the actual impacts and benefits to plan for their needs without relying on assumptions, which may or may not be appropriate, depending on a stream's classification.

Based on the best available information and reasonable assumptions regarding the classification of most streams, CWWA believes the regulations, as currently proposed, could have a severe impact on the delivery of public water service in the state. It would limit the amount of water supplies available for public health, safety, industry and recreation and jeopardize the ability of public water suppliers to meet their obligations to serve their customers and our communities. As a result they could:

- limit water utility safe yield and available supply and result in reductions in the margin of safety for many companies, which in some cases will mean the difference between a supply surplus and a deficit
- affect water quality and aesthetics for our customers
- impact our ability to meet basic public health and safety needs of our communities,
   i.e. sanitation, fire protection
- significantly increase customer rates, including those for municipal fire protection, to cover the costs for utilities to comply
- undermine economic recovery and job growth impacting existing businesses and limiting growth and economic development in communities;
- impose frequent and lengthy water use restrictions on customers to limit demand during certain periods to provide for releases
- require the development of new sources, if available, and limit the likelihood of interconnections and plans for regional water supply solutions
- limit ability for communities to plan or consider water supply and smart growth policies as they consider their future
- require substantial, costly infrastructure modifications and additional personnel to comply
  ensure compliance with the monitoring and reporting requirements
- impose costly burdens for compliance on towns and cities with municipal water departments
- require water company customers to bear the costs of compliance while there is clearly a broader public benefit and many stakeholders served by the implementation of the regulations

It is difficult to see how the proposed regulations meet the intent of the legislation or whether utilities' can reasonably be expected to comply with them. There are not sufficient conditions or exemptions to allow for compliance with other regulatory obligations including those of DPH, DPUC, and OCC. It is not clear if additional sources are even available or could be permitted to offset the loss of supplies. As important, is whether the environmental benefits support the costs and if the significant uncertainty and risk created by the regulations is acceptable for the citizens of the state.

CWWA stands ready to work with stakeholders and policy makers to develop balanced regulations that meet the mandate of the statute and the needs of the resident of Connecticut. These are important regulations but there is still more work to do before they can be adopted.



# Streamflow Regulations Impact on Connecticut's Town and Cities

Water plays a vital role in our daily lives - it provides for the health and welfare of citizens in ways ranging from disease prevention to fire suppression and helps create jobs, attract industry and investment. However, draft streamflow regulations proposed by the state Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) will require water utilities and other large water users to release more water into streams and limit groundwater withdrawals in order to protect the state's aquatic life. The Connecticut Water Works Association (CWWA), a trade association of municipal, private and regional water utilities, is very concerned that the regulations fail to balance the need to protect aquatic life with the need to provide for public health and safety, industry, and recreation. CWWA therefore opposes the draft regulations, which will:

#### ■ Jeopardize Public Health & Safety in our Communities

By requiring public water suppliers to release significant quantities of water during certain periods of the year, the proposed regulations will jeopardize the ability of public water suppliers to meet the public health and safety needs, i.e. sanitation and fire suppression, of our communities.

#### ■ Undermine Connecticut's Economic Recovery and Job Growth

A safe, reliable water supply is critical to the day-to-day operations of existing businesses and to the viability of new commercial enterprises and residential developments. Unfortunately, in some communities, the draft streamflow regulations may result in a moratorium on water service connections, halting or slowing economic development and construction.

# ■ Impose Costly Burdens on Towns and Cities

Compliance with the draft regulations will impose significant costs on municipal water departments. Although the brunt of these costs must be reflected in water rates, some costs will be passed on to towns and cities and their taxpayers. In addition, communities facing a moratorium on new home construction and business growth will not be able to generate sufficient tax revenues to address expected cuts in state aid and lower property tax revenues.

#### **■** Significantly Increase Customer Rates

In order to comply with the regulations, water utilities and other large diverters will have to modify their dams and infrastructure to modulate the volume of water flow and release the range of flows required by the regulations. In addition, many utilities may be forced to develop new sources of supply and incur significant increases in operational costs. The magnitude of these costs is likely to be several hundred million dollars.

# ■ Require Municipalities to Assist in Enforcing Frequent and Lengthy Water Use Restrictions on Customers

Customers will be faced with more frequent and longer periods of water use restrictions under the draft regulations. Utilities will have to rely upon towns to enforce these water use restrictions, which can be burdensome. In addition, restrictions may disrupt certain activities and impose burdens on businesses that depend heavily upon water, such as manufacturers and hospitals.

#### ■ Divert Resources Away from Needed Infrastructure Improvements

Water utilities are replacing aging infrastructure in order to provide reliable, safe water supplies to businesses and consumers but financing infrastructure replacement has been a significant challenge for utilities. Unfortunately, streamflow regulations will force utilities to divert scarce resources away from needed infrastructure replacement to regulatory compliance.

# en'il I bina nivoli d'artiferantesi i gri boltanti

The property of the state of the second of t

# and the second of the color of the late of

place of the control of the firm of the standing of the standi

#### egware & that these expressed to accompanie of an absorption for an explain! All

A consequence of the constant of the constant

#### 강하면 보선 생생님 집 생물을 보면 보냈다. 사람이 되었다.

Principliates with the destroyed between a first part of and an increasing angular special control of the continues of the destroyed by the control of the c

#### A DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPERTY OF THE PROPERTY

the first facility with the epocacion over application of the facility of the community of the companies of the community of

# A Strophine Standard Charles on Contract the Entereding from Contract Act, 1976, 1977, 1977, 1977, 1977, 1977, The relations on Constraints

In the record of the second of the experience of the second of the se

#### The second state of the second second

White dillines a anequating aging an increasione are at an area with indices and some amplied in a unaquent and space and another and analysis and an area of the space and area of the space and area of the space and areas of the space and areas of the space and areas of the space of the space and areas of the sp

Audubon Connecticut
Connecticut Forest and Park Association
Connecticut Fund for the Environment
Connecticut League of Women Voters
Farmington River Watershed Association
Housatonic Valley Association
The Nature Conservancy
Quinnipiac River Watershed Association
Rivers Alliance of Connecticut
Sierra Club Connecticut Chapter
Trout Unlimited



Contact:
 Margaret Miner(RA) (203) 788-5161
Mary Mushinsky(QRWA) 203-430-0921
David Sutherland(TNC) 860-508-0222
Lynn Werner(HVA) 860-672-6678

January 20, 2010

# CONNECTICUT ENVIRONMENTAL GROUPS UNITE FOR EFFECTIVE STREAMFLOW REGULATIONS

#### No River Left Behind

After forty years of waiting, environmental groups across the state agree that the streamflow regulations proposed by the Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) constitute the first and most essential step toward addressing Connecticut's water supply management problem. If we fail to complete and implement them, we are condemned to repeat our past: years of expensive case-by-case litigation.

# • A Long History of Effort Finally Shows Some Promise

For decades, the General Assembly, other state officials and advocates have sought to provide streamflow protections. Then in 2005, the General Assembly updated prior, inadequate statutes by passing a law requiring the DEP to develop new regulations to protect both river flows and supply for all of society's various water needs. The draft regulations have the potential to be the first measure in 40 years to come close to meeting those goals.

These draft regulations were written to establish a clear set of environmental goals for the rivers and streams of Connecticut. We wish to ensure that these public-trust natural resources continue to provide the water to support our communities, our environment, and our economy. We also want them to survive as viable environmental habitats. Unless we have appropriate goals for the health of our rivers, we will continue to manage water in a piecemeal, first-come, first-served manner with no proper provisions for our environment or future water needs. The need for reform of the state's management of water resources is not controversial. Taking this first step apparently still is for some. These regulations are the first step in the process of instituting comprehensive statewide water planning.

This public process for the proposed streamflow regulations must be allowed to proceed to conclusion. This process allows the DEP to hear comments and make changes to the draft regulations that are necessary to benefit both the state's environment and water consumers.

The draft regulations are good. Connecticut's environmental groups agree that these regulations put people first – they ensure that water needed for fire and other emergencies are not affected, that dams used for flood control are exempt, and that adequate water for communities will be available

during droughts. These regulations are based on the best available science and are responsive to extensive expert input from all stakeholders.

The draft regulations are not yet perfect, however. There are serious deficiencies which must be improved for both the environment and water suppliers. For example:

- As proposed, rivers designated Class 4 would have no environmental standards to protect them and would essentially be abandoned. We should leave no river without environmental standards.
- The regulations need to provide more flexibility to water suppliers by providing a less costly method to demonstrate compliance through site specific management plans.

Accordingly, we strongly support the adoption of regulations. We recognize that there are many improvements that will be proposed and many areas in which all stakeholders can find common ground. We look forward to DEP improving them through the public comment process. But, we emphasize that now is the time to move forward, not backwards.

# • Connecticut has enough water to go around -if we manage it wisely.

With 45 inches of rainfall a year, Connecticut does not have a water shortage. We have enough water almost all of the time. Connecticut does, however, have a water supply management problem. We have built our water supply infrastructure without adequate attention to long term viability of our water supply sources – our freshwater aquifers and streams.

Most water utilities are operating with outdated business plans which depend on selling more and more water, at a time when most customers are trying to conserve. A rainy summer means an additional decline in water sales and revenue. Many leaders of both the water-supply industry and environmental organizations agree that reform is needed to provide for more stable revenue and infrastructure investment for water utilities, and protection for natural waters. We are confident that this is what these regulations will do, at minimal and acceptable cost.

### • What good is clean water if we allow our streams to run dry?

Since the passage of the federal Clean Water Act almost 40 years ago, we as a state have invested in making sure that all Connecticut waters are clean and safe. We continue to make progress to achieve the national goal of fishable and swimmable waters. But these investments will fall short if we don't equally ensure that we keep sufficient water in the rivers. What good are clean water goals if there is too little water in the river to accomplish them?

Through this regulations process, DEP is developing science-based environmental standards to protect the flows and water levels in Connecticut's rivers and streams. These flow regulations offer the opportunity to put in place a balanced, reasonable, and long-awaited measure to protect river flows and water levels with flexible requirements reflecting modern science and substantial input from water suppliers and other water users.

# • We are committed to a water management approach which provides clean, safe and sustainable water for our communities, our economy and our environment.

These regulations will improve the transparency and predictability of the regulatory system and will help guide future water supply development to the most appropriate areas.

We pledge to work with all interested parties to improve the proposed regulations. But, now that we have invested four years in this process, we must go forward with them and ensure that strong, effective, and balanced regulations are completed and then implemented.



#### **Connecticut Division**

November 16, 2009

NUV 23 2009

COUTH CENTRAL REGIONAL

Mr. Edward M. Sheehy, Secretary South central Regional Council of Governments 127 Washington Avenue – 4<sup>th</sup> Floor West North Haven, Connecticut 06473-1715

628-2 Hebron Avenue Suite 303 Glastonbury, CT 06033 860.659.6703 860.659.6724 Fax Connecticut@fhwa.dot.gov

In Reply Refer To: HPR-CT

Subject: Statewide Project # 170-2830, 511 Traveler Information System

Dear Mr. Sheehy,

Thank you for your letter of October 28, 2009 which requested that Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) review its decision to allow the Connecticut Department of Transportation (CTDOT) to include the subject project as a statewide project in the draft Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2010-2013 Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP).

In our process to form a decision on the STIP and the 511 Traveler Information System, we utilized our planning regulations and appropriate guidance. In addition, upon coordination with the CTDOT, we learned there was varying support of the 511 System at some MPOs. FHWA wanted to be assured that the proper process was followed and all federal requirements were met. With this intent in mind, Ms. Eloise Powell of my staff engaged our headquarters Office of Planning. The Office of Planning for Oversight and Stewardship confirmed that a project, such as the 511 Traveler Information System, was not required to be in each individual Metropolitan Planning Organization's Transportation Improvement Program. Of course, it would be most effective and beneficial for the traveling public to have all MPO regions functioning with 511, but it is not required. Parallels to this situation can be seen in the long existing rideshare activities where the MPO where the service originates endorses the activity while the service is enjoyed by the entire state of Connecticut as well as neighboring states. At this time, FHWA understands that 10 of the 11 MPOs have endorsed Project # 170-2830, 511 Traveler Information System

FHWA truly believes that the implementation of a nationwide 511 Traveler Information System is an important tool to help alleviate recurring and non-recurring traffic congestion. The information gained by the traveler is also demonstrated to improve safety for the traveling public within metropolitan and rural areas of our nation. Transportation agencies are struggling to



Fig. 1

# BEES & S. VOM

4.1

a.

e gran<sup>e</sup>

o topo en la serie de la serie

" I n

E De la Santa de la Carte de l

The state of the s

squeeze more capacity out of their systems and improve their operations, with less and less Federal and State funds available. Research conducted by FHWA and other organizations on deployed 511 Traveler Information Systems has revealed a broad range of benefits including benefits to the traveling public, to the deploying agencies, and to the overall transportation system. A very recent example of the benefits of 511 Traveler Information Systems to the traveling public is the indefinite closure of the Bay Bridge in San Francisco, CA. The 511 system has been able to provide people daily information on alternative driving routes and increased transit routing during this emergency situation to help alleviate congestion, avoid construction areas, and diffuse driver frustration.

The use of Congestion Mitigation Air Quality (CMAQ) funds for 511 Traveler Information Systems and up to three years of operating costs are allowable under the FHWA's CMAQ Final Program Guidance, November 17, 2008, under Category D, *Eligible Project and Programs, No. 4b-Congestion Reduction & Traffic Flow Improvements, and No. 7-Travel Demand Management.* The FHWA made a CMAQ eligibility determination for the 511 Traveler Information Systems as submitted by the CTDOT on September 3, 2008.

Between June and September 2009, the CTDOT sent a Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Amendment to the eleven Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) and four Rural Planning Organizations (RPOs) requesting the 511 Traveler Information System be approved. As of this time, ten of the eleven MPOs and all four RPOs approved the TIP Amendment to add the 511 Traveler Information System to the TIPs/FFY 2007-2010 STIP. These officials see the benefits of such a system to their traveling public. With these MPO TIP approvals, the CTDOT could have proceeded with the implementation of this project in all MPO approved areas, because there are no Federal Regulations requiring unanimity of all MPOs to implement a project of this nature. The CTDOT and the FHWA continues to want to work with your MPO and take the time to provide additional information to your MPO members in an effort to demonstrate the benefits of this system. There is a point in any process where a decision must be made to move forward for the benefit of the majority. It is unfortunate that your MPO has not seen the benefits of getting started with the 511 System.

Though your organization may not agree, FHWA maintains the process is within the federal regulations. Therefore, we have advised the CTDOT to add a statewide 511 Traveler Information System project to the draft FFY10-13 STIP since a year had lapsed since the last TIP Amendment action, and notify the MPOs and RPOs of this action, which CTDOT has done. We also advised the CTDOT that if an MPO no longer approved of the 511 Traveler Information System at the conclusion of the MPO meetings to approve the FFY10-13 TIPs/STIP, then that MPO area would not have 511 services provided by the CTDOT in its MPO region. This is in keeping with the spirit of the Federal Metropolitan Planning Regulations and the majority of the MPOs and RPOs votes to have 511 Traveler Information Services in their regions in CT.

In your letter you requested an analysis of "the added value of this product". There are no federal requirements for state DOTs to prove the added value for CMAQ projects, there is a requirement that that CMAQ projects demonstrate air quality/congestion benefits. Though there are no added value requirements, the 511 Traveler Information System has demonstrated benefits. FHWA has completed a benefit-cost analysis as part of the rulemaking for Real-time System Management Program (SAFETEA-LU Section 1201). This analysis has demonstrated the benefits to adding 511 to Travel Information Systems, i.e. Traffic Management Systems.

The study calculated the cost savings to the traveling public to be a ratio of 2.5. This benefit-cost ratio is considered, by FHWA, to be very conservative, assuming only  $1/10^{th}$  of the delay reduction attributed to the traveler information system.

In response to your statement "SCRCOG further believes CMAQ funds should not be used for this purpose based on the backlog of other needs currently awaiting funding", the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program is restricted to projects and programs in air quality nonattainment and maintenance areas for ozone, carbon monoxide (CO), and particulate matter (PM-10, PM-2.5) which reduce transportation related emissions [23 USC 149(a)]. Often traditional transportation projects, i.e. resurfacing, bridge rehabilitation, replacement, do not meet the restrictions of the CMAQ Program. The FHWA, with the CTDOT, will continue to work with SCRCOG to review the backlog of projects in your region and look for opportunities to address these needs.

Sincerely yours,

Amy Jackson Grove
Division Administrator

cc: Joseph Marie, Commissioner, CTDOT James P. Redeker, CTDOT Mike Lonergan, CTDOT Robbin Cabelus, CTDOT Maribeth Wojenski, CTDOT The Control of the Co

1 - 1 - 2 - 1

1



155 Burr Street New Haven, CT 06512 P 203-466-8833 F 203-466-1199

December 15, 2009

Honorable M. Jodi Rell, Governor State of Connecticut State Capitol Hartford, CT 06103

Dear Governor Rell:

In accordance with Section 15-120g et. seq. of the Connecticut General Statutes, the Tweed New Haven Airport Authority filed its annual report as required on September 29, 2009. I am pleased to send the remaining item, Enclosure B - Annual Financial Report of Tweed-New Haven Airport Authority for Fiscal Year 2008-2009, which we indicated would be sent under separate cover. The FY09 Audit was approved by the Authority on December 9, 2009.

You will be glad to hear that Tweed is about to complete a multi-year construction program to build Runway Safety Areas at each end of the main runway, carried out with over \$26M in Federal Aviation Administration discretionary grant dollars. The Authority is grateful for help from several State agencies in achieving these infrastructure improvements. We look forward to your continued support for Tweed-New Haven Airport as a vital component of the State's transportation system.

If there are any questions concerning this report please feel free to contact us.

Sincerely,

Susan Godshall

Administrative Director

RECEIVE

DEC 1 6 2009

80UTH CENTRAL REGIONAL COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

Enclosure

cc: Kevin P. Johnson & Robert G. Jaekle, Auditors of Public Accounts

Mayor John DeStefano, Jr., New Haven

Mayor April Capone Almon, East Haven

Judy Gott, Executive Director, South Central Region COG

Rep. Cameron Staples, Finance Revenue & Bonding Committee

Sen. Eileen M. Daily, Finance Revenue & Bonding Committee

PORT ALL TOTAL

# Solakian, Caiafa & Company, LLC

**Certified Public Accountants** 

Michael Solakian, CPA

71 Harrison Avenue Branford, CT 06405-3607 USA

TEL: (203) 483-8115 FAX: (203) 483-0367

EMAIL: solakian@solakiancaiafa.com WEB: www.solakiancaiafa.com

# TWEED-NEW HAVEN AIRPORT AUTHORITY

Government-wide Financial Statements and Single Audit Reports

Year ended June 30, 2009

RECEIVE

DEC 1 6 2009

SOUTH CENTRAL REGIONAL COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

The State of the S

Programme Control Section 5

Carl Land Laboration

DEC 1 8 2009

Total State

# Government-wide Financial Statements and Single Audit Reports

# Year ended June 30, 2009

# **Table of Contents**

ille and the second of the sec	<u>Index</u>
Independent Auditors' Report	
Management's Discussion and Analysis	1 - 7
Government-wide Financial Statements:	
Statement of Net Assets	8
Statement of Activities	9
Fund Financial Statements:	
Balance Sheet-Governmental Fund Type and Account Groups	10
Statement of Revenues, Expenditures and Changes in Fund Balance-Governmental Funds	11
Notes to Financial Statements	12 - 21
Schedules and Reports	
Revenues, Expenditures and Changes in Fund Balances -Budgetary Comparison Schedule	22
Schedule of Expenditures of State Financial Assistance and Related Notes	23
Schedule of Findings and Questioned Costs – State Financial Assistance	24 - 25
Report on Compliance and on Internal Control Over Financial Reporting Based on an Audit of Financial Statements Performed in Accordance with Government Auditing Standards	26 - 27
Report on Compliance with Requirements Applicable to Each Major Program, on Internal Control over Compliance in Accordance with the State Single Audit Act	28 - 29

# arrogad when area's but received because it is a little of the community of

#### HIGH AN SHITE BODGE OF F

# et erective day.

Trimplet the enterprett of temperature	
atroprimators, to a second	

# Solakian, Caiafa & Company, LLC

Certified Public Accountants

#### INDEPENDENT AUDITORS' REPORT

Michael Solakian, CPA

71 Harrison Avenue Branford, CT 06405-3607 USA

TEL: (203) 483-8115 FAX: (203) 483-0367

EMAIL: solakian@solakiancaiafa.com WEB: www.solakiancaiafa.com

To the Board of Directors
Tweed-New Haven Airport Authority:

We have audited the accompanying financial statements of the governmental activities and each major fund of *Tweed-New Haven Airport Authority*, as of and for the year ended June 30, 2009, which collectively comprise the Authority's basic financial statements as listed in the Table of Contents. These financial statements are the responsibility of the Authority's management. Our responsibility is to express an opinion on these financial statements based on our audit.

We conducted our audit in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America and the standards applicable to financial audits contained in Government Auditing Standards, issued by the Comptroller General of the United States. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the financial statements are free of material misstatement. An audit includes examining, on a test basis, evidence supporting the amounts and disclosures in the financial statements. An audit also includes assessing the accounting principles used and significant estimates made by management, as well as evaluating the overall financial statement presentation. We believe that our audit provides a reasonable basis for our opinions.

In our opinion, the financial statements referred to above present fairly, in all material respects, the respective financial position of the governmental activities of *Tweed-New Haven Airport Authority*, as of June 30, 2009, and the respective changes in financial position, where applicable, thereof for the year then ended in conformity with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America.

In accordance with Government Auditing Standards, we have also issued our report dated November 25, 2009 on our consideration of the Tweed-New Haven Airport Authority's internal control over financial reporting and on our tests of its compliance with certain provisions of laws, regulations, contracts and grant agreements and other matters. The purpose of that report is to describe the scope of our testing of internal control over financial reporting and compliance and the results of that testing and not to provide an opinion on the internal control over financial reporting or on compliance. That report is an integral part of an audit performed in accordance with Government Auditing Standards and should be considered in assessing the results of our audit.

The management's discussion and analysis on pages 1 through 7 is not a required part of the basic financial statements but is supplementary information required by accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America. We have applied certain limited procedures, which consisted principally of inquiries of management regarding the methods of measurement and presentation of the required supplementary information. However, we did not audit the information and express no opinion on it.

Our audit was conducted for the purpose of forming opinions on the financial statements that collectively comprise the Authority's basic financial statements. The accompanying supplemental schedules listed in the table of contents are presented for purposes of additional analysis and are not a required part of the basic financial statements. Such information has been subjected to the auditing procedures applied in the audit of the basic financial statements and, in our opinion, is fairly stated in all material respects in relation to the basic financial statements taken as a whole.

Soldier, Carofa + Company, LLC November 25, 2009

ALTERIAL MELL

La Electric Carlo Contra Periode Property Contra Periode Property Contra Contra

e mix

# Management Discussion and Analysis

#### Year ended June 30, 2009

Tweed-New Haven Airport Authority ("Authority") offers readers the following overview and analysis of our financial activities for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2009 (FY09). Complete financial information begins on page eight.

# Financial Highlights

• Net assets including the Restricted Funds exceeded liabilities by \$1,126,685 at the close of the fiscal year. Of this amount, \$476,086 is unrestricted and available to meet ongoing and future obligations of the airport and \$578,071 is restricted for capital projects. Additionally, the Restricted Passenger Facility Charge Fund totals \$72,528. The unrestricted asset balance is low compared to other airports of this size and scope.

General fund revenues for FY09 were \$2,578,607, an increase of \$551,825 over FY08. This is an increase in revenue of 27%, due in large part to one-time government reimbursements and other income of \$556,828. General fund revenue from Government Reimbursements was primarily comprised of reimbursements by the Federal Aviation Administration for project-related legal expenses.

In addition, the Restricted Capital Projects Fund received government reimbursements from the Connecticut Department of Transportation to reimburse the Authority for capital project costs paid in prior years. The combined total of Government Reimbursements and Other Income for the General Fund and the Restricted Capital Projects Fund totaled \$1,134,855. This represents a three-fold increase over reimbursements of \$375,344 received in FY08.

- Operating subsidies from the State of Connecticut ("State") decreased in FY09 by \$30,000 as compared to FY08. This is due to a 5% recession in State grants implemented by Executive Order of Governor M. Jodi Rell. Additionally, the City of New Haven ("City") subsidies decreased by \$90,000 over FY08 due to action by the New Haven Board of Aldermen. These subsidies represented 65% of the airport revenues in FY07, 69% of airport revenues in FY08, and 50% of airport general fund revenues in FY09. Governmental operating support continues to be essential for the near future. The State legislature approved \$1.5M in operating support for the airport for each of the next two fiscal years. The State subsidy for FY10 was subsequently reduced to \$1,425,000 by Executive Order of Governor M. Jodi Rell, mandating 5% across the board reductions. City support is also expected for FY10.
- General Fund expenses for FY09 were \$2,427,257, or \$350,817 less than FY08. Salaries and benefits were \$122,106 (11%) less than the budget figure of \$1,110,251. Other General fund airport operations including maintenance, security, utilities, insurance and administrative expenses totaled \$741,730. This total is slightly less than budget of \$752,725 for these items. These expenses were higher in FY08 due to the cost of nonrecurring mandatory security requirements not reimbursed by the Transportation Security Administration.

# **Management Discussion and Analysis**

#### Year ended June 30, 2009

# Financial Highlights (Continued)

Marketing expenses of \$189,188 represent an ongoing community campaign to build awareness and ridership at Tweed, including newspaper ads, radio and billboards. This figure also includes expenses for professional air service consultants retained to assist the Authority in securing new scheduled air service. This amount was consistent with the amounts spent on marketing and air service development in FY08 and FY07.

Management fees paid to AvPORTS, the airport operator, were \$6,556 more than the amount paid in FY08 based on the contractual annual percentage increase of 3%. AvPORTS has full responsibility for all Airport operations, including operating and management staff, maintenance, accounting, and project planning.

Authority management expenses include executive and administrative direction provided by the staff of the Greater New Haven Chamber of Commerce, reimbursed by the Authority. The Executive Director manages all non-aviation Authority functions including government affairs and community relations. Administrative services include contracts and agreements, grants, leases, RFPs, public reports and board of directors' support.

Professional fees include general corporate legal services, legal services related to capital projects, accounting and the independent auditor. Total expenses for these services in FY09, paid in part from the General Fund and in part from the Restricted Capital Projects Fund were \$449,187. Legal costs were \$434,569, about the same as legal costs in FY08, due to a successful federal court action to secure the right to undertake Runway Safety Area improvements. The accountants' and auditors' fees remained level.

In summary, controllable costs were close to or under budget and extraordinary legal costs were reimbursed by FAA, to assure construction of FAA-mandated Runway Safety Areas, a multi-year \$28M capital project.

• The Balance Sheet indicates that Cash and Equivalents were \$785,225 on June 30, 2009. The Airport has no debt and no long-term liabilities.

Management believes that future cash flow from operations and concessions, together with public subsidies, contractual FAA and DOT reimbursements and possible short-term bridge loans will be adequate to meet its anticipated financial obligations as set forth in the approved FY10 Operating Budget. The Authority has taken steps to replace reduced subsidies from the City of New Haven with additional on-airport revenue, including additional rental car agencies and a corporate advertising program in the passenger terminal, as well as a contribution from the business community and substantially higher state subsidies at the General Assembly.

## **Management Discussion and Analysis**

### Year ended June 30, 2009

#### **Basic Financial Statements**

Our main financial statements consist of the General Fund, a Restricted Capital Project Fund and a Restricted Passenger Facility Charges Fund which may be spent only with prior FAA approval. The financial statements are prepared on the accrual basis of accounting. Revenues are recognized when earned and expenditures are recorded when the related liability is incurred.

The Balance Sheet presents information on the Authority's assets and liabilities. Total General Fund assets were \$959,963, with no long-term liabilities or debt. At the end of FY09, Restricted Capital Project Fund assets were \$471,030 subject to a transfer of \$107,041 from the General Fund. Restricted Passenger Facility Charge Fund assets were \$72,528. See table below:

			20	009	
		General Fund	Restricted Fund (Passenger Facility <u>Charges)</u>	Restricted Fund (Capital Projects)	Total
Assets					
Cash and equivalents	\$	241,667	72,528	471,030 \$	785,225
Accounts receivable, net		281,519	•		281,519
Prepaid expenses	_	436,777		<del></del>	436,777
Total assets	\$_	959,963	72,528	471,030 \$	1,503,521
Liabilities and Fund Balances					
Accounts payable and accrued expenses	s	376,836		s	376,836
Due to/(from) other funds	_	107,041		(107,041)	<u> </u>
Total Current Liabilities	<u> </u>	483,877	<del> </del>	(107,041)	376,836
Fund balance	_	476,086	72,528	578,071	1,126,685
Total liabilities and fund balances	s_	959,963	72,528	471,030 \$	1,503,521
			20 Restricted Fund	008	
		General Fund	(Passenger Facility Charges)	Restricted Fund (Capital Projects)	Total
Assets		_rund_	Charges	(Capital Projects)	10tai
Cash and equivalents	s	458,013	27,629	131,683 \$	617,325
Accounts receivable, net		210,512	•	•	210,512
Prepaid expenses	_	619,063		<del></del>	619,063
Total assets	\$ <u></u>	1,287,588	27,629	131,683 \$	1,446,900
Liabilities and Fund Balances					
Accounts payable and accrued expenses	<b>s</b> _	643,427		<u> </u>	643,427
Total Current Liabilities	_	643,427			643,427
Fund balance	=	644,161	27,629	131,683	803,473
Total liabilities and fund balances	s_	1,287,588	27,629	131,683 \$	1,446,900

# **Management Discussion and Analysis**

#### Year ended June 30, 2009

# **Basic Financial Statements (Continued)**

The Authority does not hold any capital assets. Capital assets including land and buildings belong to the City of New Haven. Net assets are shown below:

Assets	Governmental <u>Activities</u>
CURRENT ASSETS	
Cash and equivalents	\$ 241,667
Accounts receivable, net	281,519
Prepaid expenses	436,777
	959,963
NONCURRENT ASSETS	
Restricted cash: Passenger facility charges	72,528
Restricted cash: Capital projects	471,030
	543,558
Total assets	\$ 1,503,521
Liubilities	
Accounts payable and accrued expenses	\$376,836_
Net Assets	
Restricted for passenger facility charges	72,528
Restricted for capital projects	578,071
Unrestricted	476,086
Total net assets	\$1,126,685

The Statement of Revenues, Expenditures, and Changes in Fund Balance reports the Airport's operating and non-operating revenues and expenses for the fiscal year. The difference is combined with the prior fund balance to give the year-end fund balance. The Fund Balance for the General Fund was \$476,086 at the end of FY09, compared to a fund balance of \$644,161 at the end of FY08. Government reimbursements totaling \$319,425 shown as Interfund Transfers were reallocated to the Restricted Capital Project Fund. The fund balance for the Restricted Capital Projects Fund was \$578,071 at the end of FY09 compared to a fund balance of \$131,683 at the end of FY08.

	2009						
Total revenues	\$ General <u>Fund</u> 2,578,607	Restricted Fund (Passenger Facility Charges) 154,076	Restricted Fund (Capital Projects) 580,537	s	<u>Total</u> 3,313,220		
Total expenses	2,427,257	109,177	453,574	_	2,990,008		
Revenues in excess of Expenditures	151,350	44,899	126,963		323,212		
Fund balances - beginning of year	644,161	27,629	131,683		803,473		
Interfund transfers	(319,425)		319,425	_	-		
Fund balances - end of year	\$ 476,086	72,528	578,071	\$_	1,126,685		

# **Management Discussion and Analysis**

## Year ended June 30, 2009

# **Basic Financial Statements (Continued)**

		2008						
and the second		General Fund	Restricted Fund (Passenger Facility Charges)	Restricted Fund (Capital Projects)	Total			
Total revenues	\$	2,026,782	151,967	375,344 \$	2,554,093			
Total expenses		2,778,074	304,973	<u> </u>	3,083,047			
Expenditures in excess of revenues		(751,292)	(153,006)	375,344	(528,954)			
Fund balances - beginning of year		1,146,792	185,635	-	1,332,427			
Interfund transfers		248,661	(5,000)	(243,661)				
Fund balances - end of year	s	644,161	27,629	131,683 \$	803,473			

The Fund Balance for the Passenger Facility Charge (PFC) Restricted Fund was \$72,528 at the end of FY09, compared to \$27,629 at the end of FY08. PFCs are used for eligible airport capital projects authorized under FAA regulations including security fencing and property acquisition for the purpose of controlling obstructions in protected air space.

The Statement of Revenues, Expenses and Changes in Fund Balance – Budgetary Comparison Schedule, a supplementary schedule, reports the operating revenue and expenses and non-operating revenue and expenses and compares them against budgeted amounts. General Fund revenues exceeded expenditures during 2009 by \$151,350. However, expenditures exceeded revenues by \$751,292 in 2008. Positive operating income for FY09 is largely attributable to reimbursements received from FAA for legal services in connection with the Runway Safety Areas, an FAA-funded infrastructure project. Fees for eligible legal services will be reimbursed by FAA more routinely in the future.

		2009 Budget	2008 Budget
Takal	•		
Total revenues	Ъ	2,333,200 \$	2,514,268
Total expenses	X	2,565,631	2,514,268
Expenditures in excess of revenues	\$_	(232,431) \$	- Tu
	_		

The Statement of Activities represents fiscal activities from operations and grants. The results of these activities, when added to the Authority's net assets at the beginning of the year, equals net assets of \$1,126,685 at the end of the current fiscal year. Activities for FY09 are determined by subtracting program revenues and operating grants and contributions from expenses. Total Governmental Activities equaled \$316,324 and Investment Income was \$6,888 for a Change in Net Assets of \$323,212. In comparison, total Governmental Activities for FY08 were (\$554,272) and Investment Income was \$25,318 for a Change in Net Assets of (\$528,954).

# Management Discussion and Analysis

# Year ended June 30, 2009

# **Basic Financial Statements (Continued)**

Higher figures for FY09 are primarily the result of the Authority's successful efforts to secure government reimbursements for funds expended on capital projects, both current and completed.

The statement of activities can be broken down into revenues and expenses and program or function as follows:

# Revenues by major functions:

			2009	
	Program	Grants and		
Functions/Programs:	Revenues	Contributions	Investment income	Total Revenue
Primary government-governmental activities:				
Airport operations \$	620,841	1,280,000	6,888 \$	1,907,729
Airport parking lot	116,890	•	•	116,890
Government reimbursements and other income		1,134,855	tend in the second of	1,134,855
Passenger facility charges	153,746	<u>-15</u>	<u> </u>	153,746
Total Revenue	891,477	2,414,855	6,888 \$	3,313,220
	Program	Grants and	2008 Investment income	Total Revenue
	Revenues	Contributions	investment income	Total Revenue
Functions/Programs:		n pomi side alma	dhe deblases and	aniloker svii
Primary government-governmental activities:				
Airport operations \$	448,539	1,400,000	25,318 \$	1,873,857
Airport parking lot	155,197	XIII IUVI DIIII	official in any	155,197
Government reimbursements	Y and the	375,344	Villad grade Inc	375,344
Passenger facility charges	149,695	<u> </u>		149,695
Total Revenue \$	753,431	1,775,344	25,318 \$	2,554,093

# Expenses by major functions:

		2009		2008
Functions/Programs:		Expenses		Expenses
Primary government-governmental activities:				2 III -
Airport operations	\$	2,990,008	\$	3,083,047
Airport parking lot				
Passenger facility charges	_	-		-
Total Expenses	\$_	2,990,008	_\$	3,083,047

# **Management Discussion and Analysis**

### Year ended June 30, 2009

# **Factors Impacting Future Periods**

There are a few issues that impact the Authority as a whole. A significant issue has been the decline in funding from the City of New Haven and its effect on the Authority's financial position. The Authority continues to work with the City of New Haven and strives to identify alternative sources of funding, specifically the business community and the State of Connecticut (State). With respect to State funding, the Authority advocates every year for inclusion of an operating subsidy in the State budget and was successful in securing \$1.5 Million each year for FY10 and FY11. The Authority is confident that State support will continue. In addition, other sources of revenue have been identified in the form of new marketing opportunities and competitive fee increases. The Authority enjoys strong support from the local community and expects this support will help weather any funding shortfalls.

# **Analysis and Conclusions**

Fiscal year 2009 was an important year for Tweed as it continued a significant multi-year infrastructure development. In 2007 the Authority received Department of Environmental Protection permits for construction of Runway Safety Areas at each end of the main runway. Since then, the Authority has received FAA grant funds of over \$28M for this project. The project is expected to be completed by the end of calendar year 2009.

US Airways ridership benefited on a long-term basis from corporate fare restructuring announced in February 2007, resulting in near-parity between US Airways fares at Tweed and nearby larger airports. Year-over-year US Airways enplanements are watched closely and remain relatively stable, in spite of economic uncertainty in the air industry. Between July 1, 2008 and June 30, 2009, a total of 33,438 US Airways passengers departed from Tweed, about 3% fewer than the previous year.

Management continues to identify and pursue appropriate air carriers and new routes/destinations with the objective of securing additional scheduled air service in the future to give air travelers more daily flights and more options. The completion of the Runway Safety Area project will improve the Authority's ability to draw airline interest in new service. With service by at least two airlines and a mid-term goal of 20 to 30 scheduled flights per day, the Authority's expectation is that reliance on government operating subsidies will gradually lessen.

# Contacting the Authority's Financial Management

This financial report is designed to provide interested parties with a general overview of the Authority's finances and to show the Authority's accountability for the money it receives. If you have questions about this report or need additional financial information, contact the Authority's Office, at 155 Burr Street, New Haven, CT 06512

# **Statement of Net Assets**

# June 30, 2009

. Assets	G	overnmental <u>Activities</u>
Current assets:		
Cash and equivalents	\$	241,667
Accounts receivable, net		281,519
Prepaid expenses		436,777
Total current assets	_	959,963
Restricted assets:		
Cash-Passenger Facility Charges		72,528
Cash-capital projects		471,030
Total restricted assets		543,558
Total assets	\$	1,503,521
Liabilities and Net Assets		
Current liabilities:		
Accounts payable and accrued expenses	\$	376,836
Total liabilities		376,836
Net assets:		
Restricted for passenger facility charges		72,528
Restricted for capital projects		578,071
Unrestricted		476,086
Total net assets	_	1,126,685
Total liabilities and net assets	\$_	1,503,521

See accompanying notes to basic financial statements.

Statement of Activities

Year ended June 30, 2009

			Net (Expense) Revenue	Net (Expense) Revenue and Changes in Net Assets
Functions/Programs: Primary government-governmental activities:	Expenses	Program Revenues	Grants and Contributions	Primary Government- Total Governmental <u>Activities</u>
Airport operations	\$ 2,990,008	620,841	1,280,000	(1,089,167)
Airport parking lot	1	116,890		116,890
Government reimbursements	é	12	1,134,855	1,134,855
Passenger facility charges	•	153,746		153,746
Total governmental activities	\$ 2,990,008	891,477	2,414,855	316,324
	General revenues:	:SS:		
	Investment income	eu eu		6,888
	Change in net assets	sets		323,212
	Net assets-beginning of year	ing of year		803,473

Net assets-end of year

# Balance Sheet-Governmental Fund Type and Account Groups

June 30, 2009

		General Fund	Restricted Fund (Passenger Facility <u>Charges)</u>	Restricted Fund (Capital Projects)	Total (Memorandum Only)
Assets					
Cash and equivalents	\$	241,667	72,528	471,030	785,225
Accounts receivable, net		281,519	-	-	281,519
Prepaid expenses and other assets	_	436,777	-	-	436,777
Total assets	\$_	959,963	72,528	471,030	1,503,521
Liabilities and Fund Balances					
Accounts payable and accrued expenses	\$	376,836	-	-	376,836
Due to/(from) other funds		107,041		(107,041)	- X <del>-</del>
Fund balance	_	476,086	72,528	578,071	1,126,685
Total liabilities and fund balances	\$_	959,963	27,629	471,030	1,503,521
			Reconciliation o	f governmental fun	d balances:
			Total fund balan	ces	1,126,685
			Reconciling item	s	
			Net assets of gov	rernmental activities	1,126,685

# Statement of Revenues, Expenditures and Changes in Fund Balance-Governmental Funds

# Year ended June 30, 2009

	General <u>Fund</u>	Restricted Fund (Passenger Facility <u>Charges)</u>	Restricted Fund (Capital Projects)	Total (Memorandum Only)
Revenues:				
Government reimbursements	\$ 556,828	n - Plater March	578,027	1,134,855
Concessions, fees and rentals	737,731	153,746	eret etale.	891,477
City of New Haven subsidy	710,000	Manager 1		710,000
State of Connecticut subsidy	570,000	1000	10 0	570,000
Interest and investment income	4,048	330	2,510	6,888
Total revenues	2,578,607	154,076	580,537	3,313,220
Authority expenses:				
Professional fees	56,402	2	392,785	449,187
Management and performance fees	225,104		14- 7 (5) (42)	225,104
Marketing and promotional expenses	189,188		- Interest	189,188
Authority management	178,606	-	game de financia	178,606
Airport operations:				
Salaries and benefits	988,145	- and - and -		988,145
Maintenance	223,608	109,177	60,789	393,574
Utilities	231,562	e iggir grejj <sup>e</sup> e or e.	0 0 0 0 1 2 1 0 1	231,562
Security	202,555	- ·	-9 Jan 5175	202,555
Bad debts	48,082		1980	48,082
Insurance	42,399			42,399
Administration and office expenses	41,606	- 11-11-11-11-11-11-11-11-11-11-11-11-11		41,606
Total expenses	2,427,257	109,177	453,574	2,990,008
Revenues in excess of expenses	151,350	44,899	126,963	323,212
Fund balances - beginning of year	644,161	27,629	131,683	803,473
Interfund transfers	(319,425)	or scentillas 20 or	319,425	in a minimum
Fund balances - end of year	\$ 476,086	72,528	578,071	1,126,685
Reconciliation of Statement of Revenues, Expen	ditures and Chan	ges in Fund Balance:		
Total net change in fund balances-governmental fu	unds			323,212
Reconciling items				
Change in net assets of governmental activities				323,212

See accompanying notes to basic financial statements.

#### Notes to Financial Statements

# Year ended June 30, 2009

# (1) Summary of Significant Accounting Policies

### Background and Reporting Entity

The 1997 Connecticut General Assembly enacted an "Act Concerning the Establishment of the Tweed-New Haven Airport Authority (Authority)" [Public Act 97-271] at the request of the City of New Haven (City), the Greater New Haven Chamber of Commerce, the Regional Leadership Council, the Regional Growth Partnership, Yale University and area businesses as a way to improve air service for the Southern Connecticut area.

The import of this legislation is the creation of the Authority to maintain and improve Tweed-New Haven Airport (Airport) as an important economic development asset for the region. The Authority shall exercise such powers as:

- Maintain, manage, supervise and operate the Airport;
- Maintain a working relationship with the state, municipalities and conduct business as a regional airport;
- Charge reasonable fees for service;
- Enter into contracts, leases and agreements for goods and services;
- Contract for construction and reconstruction of airport projects;
- Make plans and studies in conjunction with the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) and other state and federal agencies;
- Plan and enter into contracts with municipalities, the state, businesses and other entities to finance operations and debt, including compensation of the host municipalities;
- Employ staff, borrow funds, issue and sell bonds;
- Acquire property by purchase or lease;
- · Prepare and issue budgets; and
- Exercise all other powers granted by law.

The Authority held its first Board of Directors (Board) meeting on July 31, 1997 at which time it adopted, in accordance with Public Act 97-271, its Bylaws, elected officers, approved an Affirmative Action Statement and adopted a draft of its Written Procedures. At the Board meeting held on September 10, 1997, the Board adopted the Written Procedures as originally proposed. The Board also has the primary accountability for fiscal matters. Therefore, the Authority is a financial reporting entity as defined by GASB in its Statement No. 14, "The Financial Reporting Entity." There are no component units included within the reporting entity.

#### **Notes to Financial Statements**

# Year ended June 30, 2009

# (1) Summary of Significant Accounting Policies (continued)

The Authority meets on a monthly basis and conducts its business. Over this time the Authority has:

- Adopted a Strategic Plan and an Updated Master Plan.
- Initiated a marketing campaign and secured new commercial air service.
- Adopted a Plan of Operations, Budget and Capital Improvement Plan for each fiscal year of operations.
- Negotiated a Lease and Operating Agreement with the City ("Lease and Operating Agreement") effective July 1, 1998 thru June 30, 2023. The Authority will pay \$1 for the entire twenty-five year lease term.
- Bid and negotiated a management agreement with Macquarie Aviation North America (d/b/a AvPorts) from July 1, 1998 through June 30, 2018.
- Received and administered approximately \$9.8 million in Federal Aviation Administration entitlement grant funds for Airport projects.
- Secured environmental approvals and construction permits for a Runway Safety Area project and obtained approximately \$27.5 million in federal discretionary money for the project in FY09 and FY10. Construction began in April 2008 and will be largely completed by the end of calendar 2009.

#### Government-wide and Fund Financial Statements

The Statement of Net Assets and the Statement of Activities are government-wide financial statements. They report information on all of the Authority's non-fiduciary activities. Governmental activities include programs supported primarily by grants and other intergovernmental revenues. Business-type activities include operations that rely to a significant extent on fees and charges for support.

The Statement of Activities demonstrates how other people or entities that participate in programs the Authority operates have shared in the payment of direct costs. The "Grants and Contributions" column includes amounts paid by organizations outside the Authority to help meet the operational requirements of a given function. If revenue is not program revenue, it is general revenue used to support all of the Authority's functions.

All interfund transactions between governmental funds are eliminated on the government-wide statements. Interfund activities between governmental funds and fiduciary funds would remain on the government-wide Statement of Activities.

The fund financial statements provide reports on the financial condition and results of operations for three fund categories – governmental and two special revenue funds.

#### **Notes to Financial Statements**

#### Year ended June 30, 2009

# (1) Summary of Significant Accounting Policies (continued)

### Measurement Focus, Basis of Accounting, and Financial Statement Presentation

The government-wide financial statements use the economic resources measurement focus and the accrual basis of accounting. Revenues are recorded when earned and expenses are recorded when a liability is incurred, regardless of the timing of the related cash flows. Grants and similar items are recognized as revenue as soon as all eligibility requirements imposed by the provider have been met.

Governmental fund financial statements use the current financial resources measurement focus and the modified accrual basis of accounting. With this measurement focus, only current assets, current liabilities and fund balances are included on the balance sheet. Operating statements of these funds present net increases and decreases in current assets (i.e., revenues and other financing sources and expenditures and other financing uses).

The modified accrual basis of accounting recognizes revenues in the accounting period in which they become both measurable and available, and it recognizes expenditures in the accounting period in which the fund liability is incurred, if measurable. The expenditures related to certain compensated absences and claims and judgments are recognized when the obligations are expected to be liquidated with expendable available financial resources. The Authority considers all revenues available if they are collectible within 60 days after year end.

Miscellaneous revenues are recorded as revenue when received in cash because they are generally not measurable until actually received. Investment earnings are recorded as earned, since they are both measurable and available.

Grant funds are considered to be earned to the extent of expenditures made under the provisions of the grant. Accordingly, when such funds are received, they are recorded as deferred revenues until related and authorized expenditures have been made. If balances have not been expended by the end of the project period, grantors sometimes require the Authority to refund all or part of the unused amount.

The Authority applies all GASB pronouncements as well as the Financial Accounting Standards Board pronouncements issued on or before November 30, 1989, unless the pronouncements conflict or contradict GASB pronouncements. With this measurement focus, all assets and all liabilities associated with the operation of these funds are included on the fund Statement of Net Assets.

#### **Notes to Financial Statements**

# Year ended June 30, 2009

# (1) Summary of Significant Accounting Policies (continued)

# Funds and Account Groups

The accounts of the Authority are organized on the basis of funds, each of which is considered a separate accounting entity. The operations of each fund are accounted for with a separate set of self-balancing accounts that comprise its assets, liabilities, fund equity, revenues, expenditures or expenses, as appropriate. Government resources are allocated to and accounted for in individual funds based upon the purposes for which they are to be spent and the means by which spending activities are controlled.

The financial statements in this report consist only of the General Fund and two Special Revenue Fund account groups due to the nature of the Authority's activities.

# Fund Categories - Governmental Funds

The General Fund is the general operating fund of the Authority and operates under a legal budget. It is used to account for all financial resources except those required to be accounted for in other funds.

The Special Revenue Fund (Passenger Facility Charge or PFC fund) is used to account for collection of passenger facility charges and payment of related capital improvements of the airport. Passenger facility charges are fees collected for federally approved airport improvements and expenditures. The PFC account is a restricted fund that may be spent only in connection with FAA application and approval procedures.

The Special Revenue Fund (Restricted Capital Project Fund) is comprised of FAA and DOT reimbursements received for prior payments made by the Authority from time to time to contractors and consultants from capital bond funds allocated to the Authority by the City of New Haven. Since such funds were appropriated for capital projects, these reimbursement funds from FAA and DOT are intrinsically restricted to capital project use. Assets were transferred to this fund during the year ended June 30, 2008.

# **Budgets and Budgetary Accounting**

The Board of Directors proposes and approves a budget for the upcoming fiscal year. The operating budget includes proposed expenditures and the means of financing them. The budget is prepared on the modified accrual basis of accounting.

#### Income Taxes

The Authority is exempt from federal and state income taxes.

#### **Notes to Financial Statements**

Year ended June 30, 2009

# (1) Summary of Significant Accounting Policies (continued)

#### Cash Equivalents

The Authority considers cash equivalents, primarily certificates of deposit, to be those investments with original maturities of three months or less.

#### Prepaid Expenses and Other Assets

Prepaid expenses and other assets represent the following at June 30, 2009:

Prepaid expenses	\$ 50,092
Deposit	10,000
Other assets	376,685
	\$ 436,777

Prepaid assets consist primarily of payments for improvements that are to be recognized as expenses in the subsequent fiscal year. Other assets and deposit represent real estate purchased for future use in the runway safety area project.

#### Restricted Assets

Funds collected from passenger facility charges are restricted as to use by approval of the FAA. Additionally, the cash in the capital project fund is restricted to airport capital improvements.

# Date through Which Subsequent Events Have Been Evaluated

Subsequent events have been evaluated through November 25, 2009, which is the date the financial statements were available to be issued.

## Total Columns on Statements

Total columns on the general purpose financial statements are captioned "Memorandum Only" to indicate that they are presented only to facilitate financial analysis. Data in these columns do not present financial position, operating results or cash flows in conformity with generally accepted accounting principles.

#### (2) Reconciliation of Government-wide and Fund Financial Statements

The Balance Sheet-Governmental Fund Type and Account Groups provides the reconciliation between the fund balance for total governmental funds on the governmental fund balance sheet and the net assets for governmental activities as reported in the government-wide statement of net assets. There were no major reconciling items for 2009.

(Continued)

#### **Notes to Financial Statements**

#### Year ended June 30, 2009

# (2) Reconciliation of Government-wide and Fund Financial Statements (Continued)

At June 30, 2009, \$107,041 was due to the Capital Projects fund for reimbursement for cash expenses deposited into the General fund. This amount was properly included as a reduction of the Capital Projects fund balance.

During fiscal 2008, interfund loans totaling \$248,661 were not reallocated to the capital project restricted funds and therefore were shown on the financial statements as General Funds. There is no effect on restricted net assets as shown. These interfund loans were reallocated to capital project restricted funds in FY09.

The Statement of Revenues, Expenditures and Changes in Fund Balance-Governmental Funds provides a reconciliation between the net changes in fund balance as shown on the governmental fund statement of revenues, expenditures, and changes in fund balances and the changes in net assets of governmental activities as reported on the government-wide statement of activities. There were no major reconciling items for FY09.

# (3) Cash and Equivalents

Cash and equivalents, for both the General Fund and the Restricted Funds, consisted of the following in the Statement of Net Assets at June 30, 2009:

Deposits	\$	309,139
Certificates of Deposit	XIIII	476,086
i gostina – tima i	\$	785,225

Custodial credit risk is the risk that in the event of a bank failure, the Authority's deposits may not be returned to it, or it will not be able to recover collateral securities that are in the possession of an outside party. The Authority does not have a deposit policy for custodial credit risk. As of June 30, 2009, the carrying amount of the Authority's deposits was approximately \$785,000, and the bank balance was approximately \$2,200,000. As of June 30, 2009, approximately \$1,950,000 of the District's deposits with financial institutions in excess of federal depository insurance limits were held in uncollateralized accounts. All of the cash was on deposit with private financial institutions.

In the event that a financial institution becomes insolvent and is placed under FDIC receivership, this collateral is subject to the FDIC requirements for perfecting security interest under Federal law. In the opinion of the State Attorney General, these requirements have not been met.

# **Notes to Financial Statements**

## Year ended June 30, 2009

# (4) Restricted Assets

Restricted assets consist of cash relating to PFCs which are restricted for expenditures for federally approved Airport improvement projects, and government reimbursements restricted for use on future capital projects

# (5) State and Municipal Funding for Fiscal Years 2009 and 2010

The Authority received its annual funding during the fiscal year ended June 30, 2009 from the City (\$710,000) and the Connecticut Department of Transportation (\$570,000).

The City has also received or is entitled to receive certain grants-in-aid from the FAA to be used in carrying out certain programs at the Airport. In accordance with Section 5.2 of the Lease and Operating Agreement, the City has assigned its rights to the grants-in-aid to the Authority. It is also understood that these grants are covered under the City's Single Audit requirements. Total grants received from the FAA by the Authority for various projects and remitted to the City during the year ended June 30, 2009 totaled approximately \$11,400,000.

The 2008 Connecticut General Assembly (State) authorized \$600,000 in operating funds for the Authority for the year ended June 30, 2009, contingent on the City continuing its subsidy at its prior level. This amount was subsequently reduced by an across the board 5% reduction in State grants by Executive Order of Governor M. Jodi Rell. The City's approved fiscal 2009 operating budget, as amended, provided \$710,000 to the Authority on or before June 30, 2009.

Both the State and City of New Haven approved fiscal year 2010 operating subsidies for the Airport in the amounts of \$1,500,000 and \$550,000, respectively. The State subsidy was subsequently reduced to \$1,425,000 by Executive Order of Governor M. Jodi Rell, mandating 5% across the board reductions. These operating subsidies, together with new revenue secured by the Authority from additional concessions and fees, will enable the Authority to achieve adequate operating revenue for the year ending June 30, 2010.

#### (6) Transfer of Personal Property and Airport Assets

In accordance with Section 4.1 of the Lease and Operating Agreement, the City of New Haven transferred and conveyed to the Authority all of its rights, title and interest in and to all tangible personal property (generally all the furnishings, materials, equipment and other tangible property located at the Airport). The Authority can use this personal property, including any assets acquired during the lease term, in connection with its operation of the Airport. The fair market value of identifiable tangible property as of June 30, 2009 is approximately \$1,000,000.

Upon the expiration of the Lease and Operating Agreement, Section 4.2 states that the Authority's right, title and interest in any and all Airport assets then in existence shall immediately vest in the City of New Haven.

(Continued)

### **Notes to Financial Statements**

### Year ended June 30, 2009

### (6) Transfer of Personal Property and Airport Assets (Continued)

Since the Authority does not have the power of condemnation, Section 9.2 of the Lease and Operating Agreement provides that the City of New Haven may exercise its right and power to take certain additional property (in the event the Authority deems it necessary or advisable) by eminent domain, and the Authority shall pay any and all acquisition costs.

### (7) Passenger Facility Charges

The Authority's application to impose PFC's was approved by the FAA on July 16, 2001, as amended from time to time. During the fiscal years ended June 30, 2009 and 2008, the Authority collected approximately \$153,000 and \$149,000 of PFC revenue, respectively.

### (8) Management Agreement

The Authority entered into a management agreement with AvPORTS on July 1, 1998 to manage the operations of the Airport for a period of ten years. On July 1, 2004 an amendment and Restatement of the Agreement was signed, extending the term though 2018. On April 9, 2008 the Authority approved the assignment of the Management Agreement from Macquarie Aviation North America 2, Inc. (d/b/a AvPORTS) to AFCO AvPORTS Management LLC. AvPORTS is primarily responsible for general operations, maintenance and repair services, construction management, air service development, and aviation support functions.

The agreement with AvPORTS specifically provides for the following:

- AvPORTS bills the Authority on a monthly basis for all labor and operating costs.
- AvPORTS receives an annual fixed fee (\$337,655 for fiscal year 2009) that increases by 3% each year. Effective July 1, 2004, \$100,000 of the annual fixed fee (subject to a 3% increase each year) is spent on air service development services, including outside experts and consultants, under a plan approved by the Authority.
- AvPORTS is also entitled to various incentive fees under certain circumstances, such as additional air carriers and increased enplaned passengers.

### (9) Risk Management

The Authority is exposed to various risks of loss including torts; theft of, damage to, and destruction of assets; errors and omissions; injuries to employees; and natural disasters. The Authority purchases directors' and officers' liability insurance, and AvPORTS purchases all other insurance coverage for the Airport.

### Notes to Financial Statements

### Year ended June 30, 2009

### (10) Contracts and Commitments

The Authority has entered into various short-term and long-term agreements with certain airlines, car rental companies, taxi cab companies, the Fixed Base Operator and other parties related to general aviation services. The following represents some of the more significant long-term contracts:

- Piedmont Airlines, Inc. (Piedmont and d/b/a U.S. Airways Express) executed a lease with the Authority in June 2000 with options for successive renewal years at the option of the airline. During 2004 the lease was renewed until terminated by Piedmont.
- The Authority granted Northeast Ramp, LLC (Northeast) the right of ingress to and egress from the Airport for the period May 1, 2000 to May 1, 2030. An Access Fee of \$7,560 per year is due for the period May 1, 2000 to May 1, 2005. For the remaining 25 years of the agreement, the Access Fee will be adjusted by a formula utilizing a certain Consumer Price Index, but in no event would the fee be less than the previous term.
- The Authority has entered into a long-term rental arrangement with the Fixed Base Operator (Robinson Aviation) for various hangars and related real property. Total rental payments to the Authority are \$72,865 per year. Robinson Aviation also provides aircraft fueling, aviation services and maintain the leased ramp area. Robinson Aviation has exercised an option on additional land for construction of a new hangar within the next two years.
- The Authority has negotiated a lease with the United States General Services Administration for space in the passenger terminal to be used by the Transportation Safety Administration. The lease for the period July 1, 2007 through June 30, 2009 provides a rental payment of \$300 per month, equal to \$3,600 per year.
- The Authority has entered into two agreements to purchase real estate for future use in accordance with the approved Airport Master Plan. The amount of the deposit on 48 Holmes Street is \$10,000 and the balance of the purchase price of \$245,000 is due and payable in May 2010. The amount of the deposit on 56 Holmes Street (paid after the end of fiscal 2009) is \$5,000 and the balance of the purchase price of \$202,500 is due and payable on January 31, 2010.

### **Notes to Financial Statements**

### Year ended June 30, 2009

### (11) Contingent Liabilities

The Authority has received State of Connecticut and municipal grants for specific purposes that are subject to review and audit by the grantor agencies. Such audits could lead to requests for reimbursement to the grantor Authority for any expenditures disallowed under terms of the grant. Based on prior experience, Authority management believes such disallowances, if any, will not be material. In addition, the continued existence of the Authority is dependent on future state and municipal funding.

In addition, the Authority has contingent liabilities with respect to pending litigation, claims and disputes which existed at June 30, 2009. The total liability with respect to such matters, if any, is not presently determinable; however, it is the opinion of the Authority management that any liabilities resulting there from will not have a material adverse effect on the Authority's financial position.

Subsequent to fiscal 2009, the Authority was sued for unspecified damages and equitable relief by the Fixed Base Operator, Robinson Aviation, in connection with runway closures necessitated by the Federal Aviation Administration during the construction of the Runway Safety Area Project. This matter is pending in State court as of the date of this audit. The Authority believes that it has made every effort to maintain the availability of Runway 02-20 for scheduled commercial service and for general aviation (GA) service during the construction project, consistent with FAA regulations and safety mandates. The Authority intends to vigorously defend this action and believes any loss that may occur from this matter will not have a material effect on the financial statements of the Authority. Therefore, no provision has been made in the financial statements at June 30, 2009 related to this claim.

Revenues, Expenditures and Changes in Fund Balance-Budgetary Comparison Schedule

Year ended June 30, 2009

\$	General Fund	Restricted Fund (Passenger Facility Charges)	Restricted Fund (Capital Projects)	Total (Memorandun Only)	Budgeted Amounts- <u>Original &amp; Final</u>
Kevenues:	000 733		200 823	330 101 1	000
Government renmoursements	220,828		2/8/07/	1,134,833	300,000
S		153,746	9 9	891,477	899,700
	\$ 710,000			710,000	550,000
State of Connecticut subsidy	570,000			570,000	570,000
Interest and investment income	4,048	330	2,510	6,888	13,500
Total revenues	2,578,607	154,076	580,537	3,313,220	2,333,200
Authority expenses:					
Professional fees	56,402		392,785	449.187	95,000
Management and performance fees	225,104		d d	225,104	337,655
Marketing and promotional expenses	189,188			189,188	80,000
Authority management	178,606			178,606	190,000
Airport operations:					
Salaries and benefits	988.145	•		988.145	1,110,251
Maintenance	223,608	109.177	60.789	393.574	147,611
Utilities	231,562			231,562	306,850
Security	202,555	1 1		202,555	96,413
Bad debts	48,082			48,082	2,163
Insurance	42,399			42,399	81,736
Administration and office expenses	41,606			41,606	117,952
Total expenses	2,427,257	109,177	453,574	2,990,008	2,565,631
Revenues in excess of expenses	151,350	44,899	126,963	323,212	(232,431)
Fund balance - beginning of year	644,161	27,629	131,683	803,473	
Transfers	(319,425)		319,425		
Fund balance - end of year	\$ 476,086	72,528	578,071	1,126,685	

See accompanying notes to basic financial statements.

### Schedule of Expenditures of State Financial Assistance

### Year ended June 30, 2009

State Grantor  Pass-through Grantor	State Grant Program  Identification Number	Total <u>Expenditures</u>
Major Program		
Department of Transportation	1201-5000-026	\$ 570,000
Total state financial assistance		\$ <u>570,000</u>

### NOTES TO SCHEDULE

Various departments and agencies of the State of Connecticut have provided financial assistance to the Authority through grants and other authorizations in accordance with the General Statutes of the State of Connecticut. These financial assistance programs consist of Department of Transportation funds.

### SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT ACCOUNTING POLICIES

The accounting policies of the Authority conform to generally accepted accounting principles as applicable to tax-exempt authorities. The following is a summary of the more significant policies relating to the aforementioned grant programs.

### Basis of Accounting

The financial statements contained in the Authority's annual audit report are prepared on the accrual basis of accounting. The following is a summary of such basis:

- · Revenues are recognized when earned.
- Expenditures are recorded when incurred.

The Schedule of Expenditures of State Financial Assistance, contained in this report, is prepared based on regulations established by the State of Connecticut Office of Policy and Management. In accordance with these regulations (Section 4-236-5), certain grants are not dependent on expenditure activity, and accordingly, are considered to be expended in the fiscal year of receipt. These grant program receipts are reflected in the expenditures column of the Schedule of Expenditures of State Financial Assistance.

### Schedule of Findings and Questioned Costs - State Financial Assistance

### Year ended June 30, 2009

### I. Summary of Audit Results

Financial Statements	
Type of auditor's report issued: Unqualified	
Internal control over financial reporting:	
Material weakness(es) identified?	yes X_ no
• Significant deficiencies identified that are not	V
considered to be material weaknesses?	yes X none reported
Noncompliance material to financial statements r	oted?yes _Xno
State Financial Assistance	
Internal control over major programs:	
Internal control over major programs:  • Material weakness (es) identified?	yes _Xno
• Significant deficiencies identified that are not	
considered to be material weaknesses?	yes X none reported
Type of auditor's report issued on compliance for	major programs: Unqualified
Any audit findings disclosed that are required to lof the Regulations to the State Single Audit Act?	pe reported in accordance with Section 4-236-24 yes X no
• The following schedule reflects the major progra	ams included in the audit:
	ate Grant Program  entification Number Expenditures
Department of Transportation	1201-5000-026 \$ <u>570,000</u>

## II. Summary of Findings Related to Financial Statements Required Under Generally Accepted Government Auditing Standards

- We issued reports, dated November 25, 2009, on compliance and on internal control over financial reporting based on an audit of financial statements performed in accordance with *Government Auditing Standards*.
- Our report on compliance indicated no reportable instances of noncompliance.
- Our report on internal control over financial reporting indicated no instances of material weaknesses or significant deficiencies.

### III. Findings and Questioned Costs for State Financial Assistance

No findings or questioned costs are reported relating to state financial assistance.

the rest to the difference of a self-to-plant and the second of the seco

a Paper a received a men

The matrix of a second of the matrix of the second of the

The second of th

raport 1985 de la come de la come

28

### Solakian, Caiafa & Company, LLC

Certified Public Accountants

Michael Solakian, CPA 71 Harrison Avenue Branford, CT 06405-3607 USA

TEL: (203) 483-8115 FAX: (203) 483-0367

EMAIL: solakian@solakiancaiafa.com WEB: www.solakiancaiafa.com

# REPORT ON INTERNAL CONTROL OVER FINANCIAL REPORTING AND ON COMPLIANCE AND OTHER MATTERS BASED ON AN AUDIT OF FINANCIAL STATEMENTS PERFORMED IN ACCORDANCE WITH GOVERNMENT AUDITING STANDARDS

To the Board of Directors
Tweed-New Haven Airport Authority:

We have audited the financial statements of Tweed-New Haven Airport Authority (Authority) as of and for the year ended June 30, 2009, and have issued our report thereon dated November 25, 2009. We conducted our audit in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America and the standards applicable to financial audits contained in *Government Auditing Standards*, issued by the Comptroller General of the United States.

### **Internal Control Over Financial Reporting**

In planning and performing our audit, we considered the Authority's internal control over financial reporting as a basis for designing our auditing procedures for the purpose of expressing our opinion on the financial statements, but not for the purpose of expressing an opinion on the effectiveness of the Authority's internal control over financial reporting. Accordingly, we do not express an opinion on the effectiveness of the Authority's internal control over financial reporting.

A deficiency in internal control exists when the design or operation of a control does not allow management or employees, in the normal course of performing their assigned functions, to prevent, or detect and correct misstatements on a timely basis. A *material weakness* is a deficiency, or combination of deficiencies, in internal control, such that there is a reasonable possibility that a material misstatement of the entity's financial statements will not be prevented, or detected and corrected on a timely basis.

Our consideration of internal control over financial reporting was for the limited purpose described in the first paragraph of this section and was not designed to identify all deficiencies in internal control over financial reporting that might be deficiencies, significant deficiencies or material weaknesses. We did not identify any deficiencies in internal control over financial reporting that we consider to be material weaknesses, as defined above.

### **Compliance and Other Matters**

As part of obtaining reasonable assurance about whether the Authority's financial statements are free of material misstatement, we performed tests of its compliance with certain provisions of laws, regulations, contracts, and grant agreements, noncompliance with which could have a direct and material effect on the determination of financial statement amounts. However, providing an opinion on compliance with those provisions was not an objective of our audit, and accordingly, we do not express such an opinion. The results of our tests disclosed no instances of noncompliance or other matters that are required to be reported under *Government Auditing Standards*.

This report is intended solely for the information and use of the audit committee, management, others within the Authority and federal awarding agencies and pass-through entities and is not intended to be and should not be used by anyone other than these specified parties.

Solatian, Course Congrang, LLC November 25, 2009

### Solakian, Caiafa & Company, LLC

Certified Public Accountants

Michael Solakian, CPA

71 Harrison Avenue Branford, CT 06405-3607 USA

TEL: (203) 483-8115 FAX: (203) 483-0367

EMAIL: solakian@solakiancaiafa.com WEB: www.solakiancaiafa.com

# REPORT ON COMPLIANCE WITH REQUIREMENTS APPLICABLE TO EACH MAJOR PROGRAM, ON INTERNAL CONTROL OVER COMPLIANCE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE STATE SINGLE AUDIT ACT

To the Board of Directors
Tweed-New Haven Airport Authority:

### Compliance

We have audited the compliance of Tweed-New Haven Airport Authority with the types of compliance requirements described in the Office of Policy and Management Compliance Supplement that are applicable to each of its major state programs for the year ended June 30, 2009. The major state programs are identified in the accompanying Schedule of Expenditures of State Financial Assistance. Compliance with the requirements of laws, regulations, contracts and grants applicable to each of its major state programs is the responsibility of the Authority's management. Our responsibility is to express an opinion on compliance based on our audit.

We conducted our audit of compliance in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America; the standards applicable to financial audits contained in *Government Auditing Standards*, issued by the Comptroller General of the United States; and the State Single Audit Act (C.G.S. Sections 4-230 to 4-236). Those standards and the State Single Audit Act require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable assurance about whether noncompliance with the types of compliance requirements referred to above that could have a direct and material effect on a major state program occurred. An audit includes examining, on a test basis, evidence about Tweed-New Haven Airport Authority's compliance with those requirements and performing such other procedures as we considered necessary in the circumstances. We believe that our audit provides a reasonable basis for our opinion. Our audit does not provide a legal determination on Tweed-New Haven Airport Authority's compliance with those requirements.

In our opinion, Tweed-New Haven Airport Authority complied, in all material respects, with the requirements referred to above that are applicable to each of its major state programs for the year ended June 30, 2009.

### Internal Control Over Compliance

The management of the Authority is responsible for establishing and maintaining effective internal control over compliance with requirements of laws, regulations, contracts and grants applicable to state programs. In planning and performing our audit, we considered the internal control over compliance with requirements that could have a direct and material effect on a major state program in order to determine our auditing procedures for the purpose of expressing our opinion on compliance, but not for the purpose of expressing an opinion on the effectiveness of internal control over compliance. Accordingly, we do not express an opinion on the effectiveness of the Authority's internal control over compliance.

(Continued)

A control deficiency in an entity's internal control over compliance exists when the design or operation of a control does not allow management or employees, in the normal course of performing their assigned functions, to prevent or detect noncompliance with a type of compliance requirement of a state program on a timely basis. A significant deficiency is a control deficiency, or combination of control deficiencies, that adversely affects the entity's ability to administer a state program such that there is more than a remote likelihood that noncompliance with a type of compliance requirement of a state program that is more than inconsequential will not be prevented or detected by the entity's internal control.

A material weakness is a significant deficiency, or combination of significant deficiencies, that results in more than a remote likelihood that material noncompliance with a type of compliance requirement of a state program will not be prevented or detected by Tweed-New Haven Airport Authority's internal control.

Our consideration of the internal control over compliance was for the limited purpose described in the first paragraph of this section and would not necessarily identify all deficiencies in internal control that might be significant deficiencies or material weaknesses. We did not identify any deficiencies in internal control over compliance that we consider to be material weaknesses, as defined above.

### Schedule of Expenditures of State Financial Assistance

Solchin, Carefe . Company, LLC

We have audited the general purpose financial statements of Tweed-New Haven Airport Authority as of and for the year ended June 30, 2009, and have issued our report thereon dated November 25, 2009. Our audit was performed for the purpose of forming an opinion on the general purpose financial statements taken as a whole. The accompanying Schedule of Expenditures of State Financial Assistance is presented for purposes of additional analysis as required by the State Single Audit Act and is not a required part of the general purpose financial statements. Such information has been subjected to the auditing procedures applied in the audit of the general purpose financial statements and, in our opinion, is fairly stated, in all material respects, in relation to the general purpose financial statements taken as a whole.

This report is intended solely for the information and use of the audit committee, management, the Office of Policy and Management, and state awarding agencies and pass-through entities and is not intended to be and should not be used by anyone other than these specified parties.

November 25, 2009