1. Call to order and Introductions – Mayor John Picard, Chairman

2. **Presentation:** SCRCOG’s Quadrennial Transportation Planning Certification Review – Kenneth Shooshan-Stoller, Eloise Powell, Erik Shortell, *Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)*
   
3. Adoption of 8/28/2013 SCRCOG Minutes – First Selectman Michael Freda, Secretary
   
4. Treasurer’s Report for month ending 8/31/13 – First Selectman Fillmore McPherson, *Treasurer*
   
5. Transportation Committee Report – Mayor William Dickinson, *Chairman*
   
   a. Adopt Resolution to Approve 2012-2015 TIP Amendment Eighteen
   
   b. Update on Local Transportation Capital Improvement Program (LOTCIP) proposal

6. Resolution Appointing Milford Fire Chief Douglas Edo as SCRCOG Representative to DEMHS Region 2 Regional Emergency Planning Team (REPT) Steering Committee
   

8. SCRCOG Executive Director’s Report – Carl Amento, *Executive Director*

9. REX Development Report – Ginny Kozlowski, *REX Executive Director*

10. DESPP/DEMHS Report – John B. Field, Jr., *Region 2 Coordinator*

11. RPC Action Table for September

12. Regional Cooperation /Other Business

13. Adjournment
TO:       SCRCOG Board
FROM:     First Selectman Michael Freda, Secretary
DATE:     September 18, 2013
SUBJECT: SCRCOG Minutes of August 28, 2013

Present:
Branford                  First Selectman Anthony DaRos
Guilford                   First Selectman Joseph Mazza
Milford        Mayor Benjamin Blake
New Haven              Mayor John DeStefano
North Branford        Joanne Wentworth, proxy for Mayor Anthony Candelora
North Haven              First Selectman Michael Freda – Secretary
Wallingford             Mayor William Dickinson
West Haven             Mayor John Picard – Chairman
Woodbridge First Selectwoman Ellen Scalettar

SCRCOG Staff        Carl J. Amento – Executive Director, Stephen Dudley, James Rode, Al Ruggiero

Other Guests:  Genevieve Sherman, C-PACE Manager; Miriam Brody, Hamden-North Haven League of Voters; Donna Carter and Mary Bigelow, Greater New Haven Transit District; Barbara Malmberg, REX Development; Michael Paulhus, North Branford Town Manager; Edgar Wynkoop, CT DOT; John B. Field Jr, DESPP; Nathaniel Ellis, Grey Wall; Lori Vitagliano, Regional Water Authority; Pamela Hypolite, CTRides; William Villano, Regional Workforce Alliance; Atty. Nan Birdwhistell, Murtha Cullina LLP; Alicia Leite, Prime Engineers

1. Call to order and Introductions:
   Chairman John Picard called the meeting to order at 10:10 a.m. All present introduced themselves.

2. Presentation: Connecticut Property Assessed Clean Energy (C-PACE):
   Genevieve Sherman, C-PACE Manager, reviewed a PowerPoint presentation on the C-PACE program and urged the elected officials present to approve enabling legislation in their cities and towns.

3. Adoption of July 24, 2013 SCRCOG meeting minutes:
   First Selectman Freda presented the minutes as shown on Pages 2-4 of the agenda packet. First Selectman Freda moved that the minutes be approved. First Selectman Mazza seconded the motion. It was approved by all, except Joanne Wentworth and First Selectwoman Scalettar, who abstained.

4. Treasurer’s Report for month ending July 31, 2013:
   In First Selectman McPherson’s absence, Mayor DeStefano presented the Treasurer’s Report which is found on pages 5-6 of the agenda packet. The balance sheet shows that we have $405,460 in cash and investments and $135,673 due from CT DOT for transportation planning. Expenses seemed appropriate for the month. Mayor DeStefano moved for acceptance of the Treasurer’s Report. First Selectman Freda seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.
5. **Transportation Committee Report:**
In Mayor Dickinson’s absence, Senior Transportation Planner Stephen Dudley presented the Transportation Committee Report contained on pages 7-15 of the agenda packet. Mayor DeStefano moved for the approval of 2012-2015 TIP Amendment Seventeen. First Selectman Freda seconded the motion. It passed unanimously.

6. **Resolution Authorizing Executive Director to Execute Agreement for Acceptance of State Grant In Aid from OPM:**
Executive Director Amento reviewed the increased (from $12,000 to $125,000) state grant in aid (SGIA) from OPM detailed in the Resolution on pages 16-18 of the agenda packet. First Selectman Freda moved to approve the authorization. Mayor DeStefano seconded. The motion was approved unanimously.

7. **Congressional Reports:**
None of the Congressional representatives were in attendance because they were accompanying their respective members who were in recess and in their districts or in the state this week.

8. **SCROG Executive Director’s Report:**
Executive Director Amento reported that Alicia Leite, UNH graduate student in Public Administration and SCRCOG intern since January 2013, had accepted a position at Prime Engineering in Rocky Hill. Dominic Gillan, a graduate student in Geography at UConn is currently interning with SCRCOG and working on the Regional GIS program. SCRCOG’s Sustainability Planner Christopher Rappa came out of that UConn graduate program and facilitated an ongoing relationship with the department.

The NY-CT Sustainable Communities Plan is an execution plan for sustainable development for the region covering New York City, Long Island, lower Hudson River Valley, and the Stamford, Bridgeport and New Haven areas. It will produce a set of proposed regional actions in the areas of transportation, housing, economic development, environmental protection and land use in the Spring of 2014. The Regional Plan Association (RPA) from New York City is coordinating the regional planning effort, which was funded by a $3.5 million HUD grant. Specific funding to advance planning for the City of New Haven’s Union Station Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) project is included in the grant. SCRCOG has been actively involved in this process since its inception.

The Multi-Jurisdiction Hazard Mitigation Plan covering 10 SCRCOG municipalities which did not have plans has been released for public comment before being sent to DEEP and FEMA for final approval. Completion of the Plan is a pre-condition to apply for FEMA funding for hazard mitigation. SCRCOG is investigating further FEMA-funded projects to register SCRCOG communities in the Community Rating System (CRS) for the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) to lower flood insurance rates for residents, and collaborations with The Nature Conservancy and The CT Fund for the Environment for detailed studies of coastal resilience, flood protection in riverine areas, and natural resources (dunes, marsh, etc.) restoration.

SCRCOG will be moving forward as Lead Implementer of 7 of the goals of the recently-completed Regional Action Plan for the Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy.

SCRCOG is following up on the NAACP of Greater New Haven’s “Urban Apartheid” Report, presented to SCRCOG at the June meeting. SCRCOG is meeting with representatives of the NAACP and the Regional Workforce Alliance to address the issue of Job Access, transportation barriers to employment opportunities.

SCRCOG is exploring possible collaboration with DataHaven utilizing its data collection and analysis in conjunction with SCRCOG’s developing regional Geographic Information System (GIS) mapping capabilities. SCRCOG’s Executive Director has joined DataHaven’s Board of Directors.

The $600,000 state grant-funded Regional GIS Project has been launched with active participation from a Regional GIS Advisory Committee composed of representatives from SCRCOG member municipalities.
The state grant-funded Shared Services/Operations Study has been underway since early August. The consultants and the Executive Director have interviewed officials in 11 of the 15 cities and towns to date. So far, fruitful areas for shared services have focused on revenue maximization and reimbursement from federal and state programs, cost-saving measures, technology, cooperative purchasing, website development, grant finding and writing, and best practices. The study is expected to be completed and a report issued before year end.

A regional committee organized by SCRCOG is considering steps for implementation of a study recently completed under the Uniform Planning Work Program (UPWP) on coordinated Mobility Management in the region to meet the transportation needs of elderly and disabled citizens.

SCRCOG is joining with neighboring regions to work on a comprehensive multi-region Freight Plan.

SCRCOG is participating in an effort being coordinated by the Connecticut Association of Regional Planning Organizations (CARPO) to access newly-appropriated state grant funds to extend the Nutmeg Network broadband system to our region’s cities and towns.

9. **REX Development Report:**
   Executive Director Ginny Kozlowski was unable to attend due to her involvement in a site selector event. Barbara Malmberg from REX reported in her stead. Malmberg referred to REX Executive Director Kozlowski’s report which was distributed at the meeting.

10. **DESP/ DEMHS Report: Update on VEOCI emergency management software**
    John Field introduced Nathaniel Ellis from the New Haven-based software company Grey Wall. Grey Wall has created an emergency management software system called VEOCI that has been purchased by Region 2 of DEMHS for use by the region’s municipalities. The software was successful piloted by the City of New Haven. The software is now in use in 8 states and 4 countries. The region’s CEOs are encouraged to send their respective emergency management personnel for training on VEOCI in the next 6 weeks. Training consists of 2 sessions of 3 hours each. Mayor Dickinson asked John Field about the failure of the Everbridge emergency notification system during the last major storm. Field noted that the problem was with Comcast, not Everbridge, and he indicated that the issue is the subject of ongoing investigation.

11. **CTRides Quarterly Report:**
    Pamela Hypolite reviewed the CTRides Quarterly Report on pages 23-37 of the agenda packet.

12. **RPC Action Table for August:**
    The Action Table for August on pages 38-39 of the agenda packet was reviewed.

13. **Regional Cooperation/ Other Business:**
    None

14. **Adjournment:**
    First Selectman Freda moved for adjournment. Mayor DeStefano seconded the motion and all approved. The meeting adjourned at 11:05 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

_First Selectman Michael Freda, Secretary_
**ASSETS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cash and Investments</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Niagara Bank</td>
<td>79,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut Short-Term Investment Fund - SCRCOG</td>
<td>255,299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Cash and Investments</strong></td>
<td><strong>334,829</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accounts Receivable</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Dues - FY 13/14</td>
<td>66,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut Department of Transportation</td>
<td>321,178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut Office of Policy &amp; Management</td>
<td>125,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPA - Sustainable Communities</td>
<td>3,044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPM - RPI Grants</td>
<td>11,411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT DEEP - Regional Hazard Mitigation Plan</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount for Accrued Leave</td>
<td>11,058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Paid Expense &amp; Other Receivables</td>
<td>45,768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Accounts Receivable</strong></td>
<td><strong>583,859</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property and Equipment</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COG Equipment</td>
<td>19,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Property &amp; Equipment</strong></td>
<td><strong>19,940</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL ASSETS**

938,628

---

**LIABILITIES AND FUND BALANCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liabilities</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accounts Payable</td>
<td>6,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred Revenue - Municipal</td>
<td>142,171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred Revenue - GIA</td>
<td>125,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPI Grant - GIS Project</td>
<td>4,102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPI Grant - Shared Services</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Current Liabilities</strong></td>
<td><strong>278,192</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund Balance</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Fund Balance - July 1, 2013</td>
<td>675,755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount for Accrued Leave</td>
<td>11,058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment in Equipment</td>
<td>19,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Fund Balance</td>
<td>-46,317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Fund Balance - August, 2013</td>
<td>660,436</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL LIABILITIES AND FUND BALANCE**

938,628
### Statement of Resources and Expenditures - August, 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>FY 14 Budget</th>
<th>Month of Aug, 2013</th>
<th>To Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Municipal Contribution</strong></td>
<td>153,700</td>
<td>12,808</td>
<td>25,617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCRCOG Reserves - (for ROOF)</strong></td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ConnDOT - Transportation Planning</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Dept of Transportation</td>
<td>909,015</td>
<td>46,049</td>
<td>76,866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut Dept of Transportation</td>
<td>113,627</td>
<td>5,756</td>
<td>9,608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Connecticut Office of Policy &amp; Management</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Planning</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPI Grant - GIS Project</td>
<td>331,893</td>
<td>9,099</td>
<td>17,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPI Grant - Shared Services</td>
<td>40,923</td>
<td>15,793</td>
<td>21,098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emergency Response Planning</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESPP - FY 09 NHASH Grant</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustainable Communities Grant</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Communities Reg Planning Grant</td>
<td>13,384</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>2,176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REX Development</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reimbursement for SCRCOG Support</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interest</strong></td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>1,617,761</td>
<td>100,248</td>
<td>163,372</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenses</th>
<th>FY 14 Budget</th>
<th>Month of Aug, 2013</th>
<th>To Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Labor - Salaries &amp; Benefits</strong></td>
<td>638,683</td>
<td></td>
<td>107,324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries</td>
<td>42,723</td>
<td>76,412</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fringe Benefits</td>
<td>24,335</td>
<td>30,912</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Travel</strong></td>
<td>8,300</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data Process</strong></td>
<td>45,400</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8,376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Operations</strong></td>
<td>171,085</td>
<td></td>
<td>29,754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>16,663</td>
<td>24,995</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage &amp; Telephone</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>472</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print &amp; Reproduction</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Supplies</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>145</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment Maintenance</td>
<td>1,543</td>
<td>2,719</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>820</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance &amp; Professional Services</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>253</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Expenses &amp; Advertising</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>326</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous &amp; Equipment Use</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation Consultants</strong></td>
<td>402,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FEMA - PreDisaster Mitigation Plan</strong></td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>5,992</td>
<td>5,992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ROOF - Regional Foreclosure Protection</strong></td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional GIS Program</strong></td>
<td>194,300</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shard Services Study</strong></td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>14,655</td>
<td>14,655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contingencies</strong></td>
<td>102,993</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>1,617,761</td>
<td>106,916</td>
<td>161,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Changes</td>
<td>Reason</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0043-0129 2012-A10-3</td>
<td>Bike/Ped East Haven Shoreline Greenway Trail</td>
<td>Amendment 18 moves FD to FY14 and adds CON for FY15</td>
<td>Action is necessary maintain project schedule.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0092-0669 2013-A18-1</td>
<td>Rehab BR 03014 Rte 91 O/ Mill River and State St</td>
<td>Amendment 18 adds a new project</td>
<td>Project provides for rehabilitation of Bridge #03014A which carries I-91 NB over the Mill River and State St in New Haven. Work includes Substructure concrete repairs and Structural Steel Repairs both of which were found to be in poor condition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0098-0101 2013-A13-2</td>
<td>Replace Bridge 01127 O/ Farm River</td>
<td>Amendment 18 moves ROW to FY14</td>
<td>Action is necessary based on latest project schedule.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0100-0175 2010-A7-2</td>
<td>Sackett Point Bridge Replacement</td>
<td>Amendment 18 moves schedule out 1 year</td>
<td>Action is necessary based on latest project schedule.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0170-3066 2011-a16-3</td>
<td>Repair/ Replace overhead sign supports NHS routes</td>
<td>Amendment 18 increases CON funds and changes source</td>
<td>Action is necessary based on latest cost estimate for the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0170-3258 2013-A18-2</td>
<td>NHS pavement management Analysis FY14-16</td>
<td>Amendment 18 adds new project</td>
<td>This project provides funding for the department’s pavement management and analysis activities on NHS roadways for FY2014-FY2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0170-3259 2013-A18-3</td>
<td>Non NHS pavement management Analysis FY14-16</td>
<td>Amendment 18 adds new project</td>
<td>This project provides funding for the department’s pavement management and analysis activities on Non NHS roadways for FY2014-FY2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
South Central Regional Council of Governments
2012-2015 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
Amendment Number 18

Project 0171-0376  2013-A18-6  Install OSTA Traffic Signals
Changes Amendment 18 adds new project
Reason Project provides funding for the installation and revision of up to 5 traffic control signals in District 1 approved by the Office of State Traffic Administration. At this time, specific locations for signal projects have not been determined.

Project 0171-0377  2013-A18-7  Replace Traffic Signals
Changes Amendment 18 adds new project
Reason Project provides funding for the installation and revision of up to 10 traffic control signals in District 1. At this time, specific locations for signal projects have not been determined.

Changes Amendment 18 adds new project
Reason Project provides funding for the installation and revision of up to 5 traffic control signals in District 3 approved by the Office of State Traffic Administration. At this time, specific locations for signal projects have not been determined.

Project 0173-0437  2013-A18-5  Replace Traffic Signals
Changes Amendment 18 adds new project
Reason Project provides funding for the installation and revision of up to 10 traffic control signals in District 3. At this time, specific locations for signal projects have not been determined.
**State Project** 0043-0129

**Municipality** East Haven

**Project Name** Bike/Ped East Haven Shoreline Greenway Trail

**Description** Project is for design and construction of 4,800 ft Shoreline Greenway Trail in East Haven. This section is from Spray park on Cosey Beach Ave to D.C Moore School

### Current TIP Funding (In Thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>FYI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HPP</td>
<td>PD</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FD</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>132</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Cost** $245

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>FYI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HPP</td>
<td>PD</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FD</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CON</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>308</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>222</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TIP Funds** $690

### Proposed TIP Funding (In Thousands)

**Amendment Notes**

FY12 Amend 10 introduces new project. FY12 TIP Amend 18 moves FD to FY14 and add CON for FY15
South Central Regional Council of Governments
FFY2012-FFY2015 Transportation Improvement Program
Amendment 18

State Project 0092-0669  
Municipality New Haven

SCRCOG # 2013-A18-1
Proposed

Project Name Rehab BR 03014 Rte 91 O/ Mill River and State St

Description Substructure repair, structural steel repairs and painting of bridge #03014A which carries I-91 NB over Mill River, New Haven

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

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

**TIP Funds** $11,396  
0 0 0 130 450 10,816

Amendment Notes
FY 12 TIP Amend adds new project
South Central Regional Council of Governments
FFY2012-FFY2015 Transportation Improvement Program
Amendment 18

State Project 0098-0101
Municipality North Branford
Project Name Replace Bridge 01127 O/ Farm Riv
Description Replace Bridge 01127 which carries Route 80 over the Farm River in North Branford

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>FYI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STPNH</td>
<td>ROW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cost</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>FYI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STPNH</td>
<td>ROW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIP Funds</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amendment Notes

Amendment 14 introduces project. FY 12 TIP Amend 18 moves ROW to FY14
State Project 0100-0175  
Municipality North Haven  
Project Name Sackett Point Bridge Replacement  
Description Reconstruction of Sackett Point road/bridge over Quinnipiac River. Including widening and realignment of the approaches from Universal Dr to Republic Dr.

### Current TIP Funding (In Thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>FYI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STPNH</td>
<td>ROW</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>320</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>10,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Cost** $13,400  

### Proposed TIP Funding (In Thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>FYI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STPNH</td>
<td>ROW</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>320</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>10,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TIP Funds** $13,400  

**Amendment Notes**  
FY10 TIP Amend 7 introduces new project. FY12 TIP includes ongoing project. FY12 TIP Amend 12 moves funds to FY13. FY12 TIP Amend 18 moves schedule out 1 year.
South Central Regional Council of Governments
FFY2012-FFY2015 Transportation Improvement Program
Amendment 18

State Project 0170-3066
Municipality Statewide
Project Name Repair/ Replace overhead sign supports NHS routes

Description Repair or replace overhead sign supports do to deterioration and/ or end of useful life. Estimates are preliminary for 2014 actual locations based on Bridge safety priority list

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current TIP Funding (In Thousands)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Cost</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed TIP Funding (In Thousands)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHPP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TIP Funds</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Amendment Notes**
FY10 TIP Amend 16 adds new project. FY10 TIP Amend 23 splits ENG into PD/FD. FY 12 TIP Amend 18 increases CON funds and changes source
### State Project 0170-3258

#### Project Name
NHS pavement management Analysis FY14-16

#### Description
Pavement analysis and data collection for NHS roadways. Project is for a 3 year term 12/02/13 to 12/01/16 and replaces #170-2770 which expires 12/10/13

#### Current TIP Funding (In Thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>FYI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NHPP</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>AC-Entry</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td></td>
<td>224</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>448</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State</td>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>112</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TIP Funds**: $1,260

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>FYI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AC-Entry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Amendment Notes
FY 12 TIP Amend 18 adds new project

### State Project 0170-3259

#### Project Name
Non NHS pavement management Analysis FY14-16

#### Description
Pavement analysis and data collection for Non- NHS roadways. Project is for a 3 year term 12/02/13 to 12/01/16 and replaces #170-2771 which expires 12/10/13

#### Current TIP Funding (In Thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>FYI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STPA</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>AC-Entry</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td></td>
<td>240</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>582</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State</td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>145</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TIP Funds**: $1,541

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>FYI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AC-Entry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Amendment Notes
FY 12 TIP Amend adds new project
### State Project 0171-0376

**Municipality:** District 1  
**Project Name:** Install OSTA Traffic Signals  
**Description:** Installation and revision of traffic control signals approved by the office of State Traffic Administration (OSTA) in District 1 for FY2015

#### Current TIP Funding (In Thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>FYI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STPA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>180</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Proposed TIP Funding (In Thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>FYI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TIP Funds</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,250</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1,150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Amendment Notes:**
FY 12 TIP Amend 18 adds new project

### State Project 0171-0377

**Municipality:** District 1  
**Project Name:** Replace Traffic Signals  
**Description:** Traffic signal installation and revision at various locations in District 1 (district signal preservation) for FY 2015

#### Current TIP Funding (In Thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>FYI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STPA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Proposed TIP Funding (In Thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>FYI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TIP Funds</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2,400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Amendment Notes:**
FY 12 TIP Amend adds new project
State Project 0173-0436
Municipality District 3

**Project Name:** Install OSTA Traffic Signals

**Description:** Installation and revision of traffic control signals approved by the office of State Traffic Administration (OSTA) in District 3 for FY2015

### Current TIP Funding (In Thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>FYI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STPA</td>
<td>ROW</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CON</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>920</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>180</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Proposed TIP Funding (In Thousands)

| TIP Funds | $1,250 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 1,150 | 0 |

**Amendment Notes**

FY12 TIP Amend 18 adds new project

---

State Project 0173-0437
Municipality District 3

**Project Name:** Replace Traffic Signals

**Description:** Traffic signal installation and revision at various locations in District 3 (district signal preservation) for fy 2015

### Current TIP Funding (In Thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>FYI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STPA</td>
<td>ROW</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CON</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Proposed TIP Funding (In Thousands)

| TIP Funds | $2,500 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 2,400 | 0 |

**Amendment Notes**

FY 12 TIP Amend adds new project
Resolution
Fiscal Year 2012-Fiscal Year 2015 Transportation Improvement Program Amendment
Eighteen

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Program Amendment Eighteen 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 September 25, 2013.

Date: September 25, 2013

By: First Selectman Michael Freda, Secretary
South Central Regional Council of Governments
Resolution Re:
Appointment of Douglas Edo to Regional Emergency Planning Team Steering Committee

Whereas: SCRCOG is one of three planning regions representing the thirty municipalities comprising Region 2 under the Division of Emergency Management and Homeland Security; and

Whereas: Region 2 has established a Regional Emergency Planning Team (REPT) and a REPT Steering Committee (REPT SC); and

Whereas: Under the adopted bylaws, SCRCOG has three appointments of Emergency Management Directors to represent the Region as voting members on the REPT SC; and

Whereas: the appointment of Chief Douglas Edo of Milford has been proposed to fill the current vacancy,

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

That Chief Douglas Edo of Milford is hereby appointed to the REPT SC as a voting member representing SCRCOG

Certificate

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 Council of Governments on September 25, 2013.

Date: September 25, 2013

By: ______________________
First Selectman Michael Freda,
Secretary
Executive Director’s Report – September 18, 2013
Ginny Kozlowski

Brownfield Projects
- EPA Grant Application approved for additional supplemental funding for the Revolving Loan Fund - $350,000 Circuitwise
- Phase II of Atlantic Wire remediation continuing to wait for approval from EPA on the QAAP
- Developing a revised remediation schedule for remediation of Hamden Incubator Site

Business Development – Retention/Attraction
- Executing Memoranda of Understanding with Team Leaders for the Regional Action Agenda – on going
- Executing a regional Cash Mob program to support local retailers – (Madison, Guilford, Bethany, Wallingford, Milford, New Haven, West Haven, Hamden, New Haven, Hamden Branford, North Branford and East Haven held). The next location for the Cash Mob will be held at Sunflower Farm in Orange on Saturday, September 21.
- Drafting RFP response to Connecticut Innovations for continued support of Entrepreneurial Development Programs – award notification delayed until the end of September
- Co-hosted annual legislative luncheon in conjunction with the Arts Council of Greater New Haven at the Long Wharf Theatre with regional arts/culture/tourism organizations

Marketing
- Media Hits:
  - Travel with Kal: New Haven Open
  - Daily Food & Wine: Downtown Culinary Tour
  - Theday.com: Branford Rest Stop Job Fair
- Media Inquiries
  - AAA
  - Brand USA
  - Drive I-95
  - Freelance Writers (2)
  - Los Angeles Times
  - Sports Events Magazine
- Familiarization Trip
  - Hosted nine Austrian travel writers and tour operators referred by Discover New England
- Tradeshows
  - Greater New Haven Business Expo – November 21, 2013

Business Development
Continuing to Interview candidates for the Economic Development Project Manager position
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref. #</th>
<th>Received</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Adjacent RPC Towns</th>
<th>Abridged RPC Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>08/15/13</td>
<td><em>Town of Clinton:</em> Proposed Zoning Regulation and Zoning Map Amendment.</td>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>By resolution, the RPC has determined that the Proposed Zoning Regulation and Map Amendment does not appear to cause any negative inter-municipal impacts to the towns in the South Central Region nor do there appear to be any impacts to the habitat or ecosystem of the Long Island Sound.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>08/20/13</td>
<td><em>Town of Guilford:</em> Proposed Amendments to Table 5 (permitted uses in non-residential districts) of the Zoning Regulations</td>
<td>Branford, Madison, North Branford</td>
<td>By resolution, the RPC has determined that the Proposed Zoning Regulation Amendments do not appear to cause any negative inter-municipal impacts to the towns in the South Central Region nor do there appear to be any impacts to the habitat or ecosystem of the Long Island Sound.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>08/26/13</td>
<td><em>City of Derby:</em> Proposed Zoning Regulation Amendments to Article XI (Electronic Message Display Sign in P Zone and Article VIII (Flag Lots))</td>
<td>Orange, Woodbridge</td>
<td>By resolution, the RPC has determined that the Proposed Zoning Regulation Amendments do not appear to cause any negative inter-municipal impacts to the towns in the South Central Region nor do there appear to be any impacts to the habitat or ecosystem of the Long Island Sound.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>08/26/13</td>
<td><em>Town of Stratford:</em> Proposed Zoning Regulation Amendment to repeal Section 4.1.6.16 (Active Adult Housing Small Development)</td>
<td>Milford</td>
<td>By resolution, the RPC has determined that the Proposed Zoning Regulation Amendment does not appear to cause any negative inter-municipal impacts to the towns in the South Central Region nor do there appear to be any impacts to the habitat or ecosystem of the Long Island Sound.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>07/29/13</td>
<td><em>Town of Madison:</em> Proposed Plan of Conservation and Development.</td>
<td>Guilford</td>
<td>By resolution, the RPC has determined that the Proposed Plan of Conservation and Development appears to be consistent with the policy and statements of both the Regional and State Plan of Conservation and Development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>09/10/13</td>
<td><em>Town of Madison:</em> Proposed Zoning Regulation Amendment for a Nine Month Moratorium on Medical Marijuana Dispensaries and Producers</td>
<td>Guilford</td>
<td>By resolution, the RPC has determined that the Proposed Zoning Regulation Amendment does not appear to cause any negative inter-municipal impacts to the towns in the South Central Region nor do there appear to be any impacts to the habitat or ecosystem of the Long Island Sound.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Preface

MAP-21, Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (P.L. 112-141) is currently in effect at this writing as the authorizing and regulatory legislation for federally funded transportation planning activities. However, during the wide majority of the time covered in this review, the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act (SAFETEA-LU) of 2005 was the guiding legislation that set forth requirements for statewide and metropolitan transportation planning, following upon the predecessor Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (ISTEA) and Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21). The United States Department of Transportation (US DOT) issued planning regulations on November 14, 2007 implementing SAFETEA-LU requirements governing the transportation planning process. These requirements are presented in 23 CFR Part 450 and 49 CFR Part 613, Statewide and Metropolitan Planning Final Rule. The Metropolitan Planning Regulations are closely tied with the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 (CAAA) through the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency’s (EPA) Air Quality Conformity Regulations. The general requirements of periodic review by USDOT of statewide and metropolitan transportation planning processes are retained in MAP-21.

The metropolitan planning regulations require that the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Federal Transit Administration (FTA) jointly review and evaluate the transportation planning process conducted in each urbanized area or Transportation Management Area (TMA) with a population over 200,000 no less than every four years. This review includes meeting the requirements of the Metropolitan Planning regulations and, in air quality non-attainment or maintenance areas, evaluation of the process to ensure conformity of plans and programs to the EPA Air Quality Conformity regulations.

Upon completion of this review, FHWA and FTA will jointly Certify, Certify with Corrective Action or Decertify the Metropolitan Planning Process. This is the sixth certification review of the Metropolitan Transportation Planning Process for the New Haven Transportation Management Area (TMA). The first review was conducted on June 20 and 21, 1995, the second on July 23, 1998, the third on September 20, 2001, the fourth on November 3, 2004, and the fifth review was finalized on February 9, 2009. The on-site review was conducted on February 6, 2013 for the South Central Regional Council of Governments, representing a portion of the New Haven TMA.

The federal review team conducted a desk review of the major components of the transportation planning process and explored selected components of the planning process and major U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) initiatives in depth during the on-site review. This report identifies recommendations for consideration by the MPO for improvement and also highlights some of the positive practices of the MPO that can serve as examples to other states and planning organizations.

Certification Action

The FTA and the FHWA have determined that the transportation planning process conducted by the South Central Regional Council of Governments, representing a portion of the New Haven TMA, meets the requirements of the Metropolitan Planning Rule, 23 CFR Part 450 Subpart C and 49 CFR Part 613. The FHWA and the FTA, therefore, are jointly certifying the transportation planning process.
Executive Summary

As a result of this certification review, the Federal Highway Administration and the Federal Transit Administration find that the South Central Regional Council of Governments (SCRCOG) and its staff, in cooperation with the Connecticut Department of Transportation, Connecticut Transit, and the Greater New Haven Transit District are conducting a transportation planning process that produces valuable transportation planning products using the planning tools currently available.

The SCRCOG has an effective process that supports the application of technical innovation and cooperation with local communities to develop solutions to transportation problems and plans to address future regional needs.

Since the previous Certification review in 2009, the SCRCOG has devoted significant effort to enhancing the value of the metropolitan transportation plan as a useful planning tool for integrating transportation into a broader vision for regional land use and development, environmental protection, air quality, and economic growth, with greater emphasis on the role of transit, pedestrian, and bicycle modes, while continuing to address management strategies and physical improvements to ameliorate congestion on the region’s roadways. The metropolitan transportation plan provides effective direction for developing Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) projects, reflecting consideration of a wide range of multimodal alternatives. The SCRCOG is working on improving the linkage between the metropolitan plan and the TIP.

The SCRCOG planning process is hereby certified in accordance with 23 CFR Part 450 Subpart C [450.334(b)] and 49 CFR Part 613. Noted below are various recommendations and commendations relative to the Region’s planning process.

Summary of Recommendations and Commendations

Recommendations:

• The review team recommends that the SCRCOG update its regional bicycle and pedestrian plan within two years, ideally aligning this update with the next LRTP update, incorporating recommendations from the bike/pedestrian plan into the LRTP, and looking to the bike/pedestrian plan as a source for TIP projects.

• The SCRCOG should consider hosting another Transit forum to build upon successes and lessons learned from the first forum.

• Going forward under MAP-21, the review team recommends that the next update to the metropolitan transportation plan include measurable regional safety and operations goals and objectives based on CTDOT’s goals and targets when available. It is also recommended that applicable goals, objectives, and strategies in Connecticut’s SHSP, when available, should be integrated into the MPO’s next update to the metropolitan transportation plan, as well as the TIP, in order to highlight safety, which is a FHWA national focus area.

• The SCRCOG has identified some projects, strategies, and services to increase safety in its region regarding bicycle and pedestrian safety and traffic calming. Going forward under MAP-21, the review team recommends a more collaborative, comprehensive and data-driven (CTDOT’s CDIP safety data project which will offer more timely and
accessible data), approach to transportation safety planning in order to identify the most critical opportunities, strategies, and projects to enhance safety in the region.

- In conjunction with Task 2 (Safety Monitoring) in the SCRCOG’S UPWP, the review team highly recommends that the SCRCOG actively participates as a stakeholder and provides input to CTDOT on the development of an update to and the implementation of the Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP), which is currently underway by CTDOT in concert with stakeholder involvement.

- Going forward under MAP-21, the FHWA review team recognizes CTDOT needs to take the lead in planning for operations and ITS with consideration of the roles of the MPOs, and recommends that the state and all MPOs participate in NHI Planning for Operations training to raise awareness of roles of operations and ITS planning so the ability to identify regional strategies is realized.

- The review team recommends that the SCRCOG should meet, identify, discuss, and explore with CTDOT strategies and activities for assisting the SCRCOG region with resources to promote and implement needed safety and operations enhancements in the region, such as via a safety and traffic operations circuit rider program.

- The Region should continue to monitor freight issues and look for opportunities to work locally, regionally and statewide in freight planning activities, especially the aspects of through-truck freight movements.

- The SCRCOG should review and re-distribute the link to the Federal-Aid Project website for Local Public Agencies as another resource for their member municipalities.

- The SCRCOG and RiverCOG should continue to look for opportunities to strengthen coordination and resource sharing within the metropolitan planning process in the New Haven Urbanized Area. The two regions should engage in regular coordination meetings on tasks of mandated collaboration, as well as on topics of mutual interest for the benefit of the greater urbanized area. Coordination with other state MPOs should be considered as needed.

- New Memorandums of Understanding will need to be executed among any reconstituted MPOs in the TMA.

- Although RiverCOG is predominantly rural, the next CMP should encompass the entire TMA (including RiverCOG’s portion), as required in 23 CFR 450.320.

- The SCRCOG should continue to update and upgrade its technical capabilities, especially in light of requirements of MAP-21 and performance measures and targets.

- By October of 2014, the SCRCOG should amend its board structure to meet the specifically designated transit representation requirement outlined in MAP-21 section 5303 (d)(2)(B). Policy guidance on what does and does not constitute sufficient representation is forthcoming from FTA.
Commendations:

• The SCRCOG has consistently, over many years, collected data at the commuter lots in their region, which serves as a good indicator of commuting trends and is helpful in modal planning. Such practices are useful models for other MPOs to follow and should supplement state efforts in this area.

• The SCRCOG actively participated in the previous statewide traffic incident management statewide task force, has endorsed a number of ITS and traffic incident management projects in the region, has endorsed a number of traffic signal upgrade projects in the city of New Haven, and is also commended for its support and funding a few years ago that led to the development of a “Unified Response Manual for Highway Incidents in the State of Connecticut.”

• The SCRCOG is commended for compiling and analyzing data on traffic signal systems in Meriden and Wallingford and producing recommendations for improvements.

• Discussion during on-site review at the SCRCOG on February 6, 2013 and at RiverCOG on February 13, 2013 revealed that excellent coordination and cooperation exists between these two MPOs in this area.

• The regional planning staff provides an excellent resource to the member municipalities in the areas of planning and project implementation, and as a liaison for their members in working with CTDOT on roadway and transit projects.

• The high degree of coordination with REX Development reflects an agency commitment to incorporating economic development and transportation as envisioned by the FHWA eight planning factors and the HUD-EPA-DOT Six Livability Principles that enhances the COG’s overall planning program.

• The SCRCOG regularly produces a CMP report that provides useful data to track congestion, which can be used to justify projects.

Specific Items of Discussion at the On-site Review

In meeting the requirements of the Metropolitan Planning Regulations set forth in 23 CFR Part 450 and 49 CFR Part 613, Statewide and Metropolitan Planning Final Rule, Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) have the flexibility to focus their particular planning expertise on the needs that they define for their planning region through the planning process. The purpose of the on-site review meeting and associated public meeting attended by the review team was to assess the technical capability of the MPO staff in meeting these planning needs and their ability to involve planning partners and members of the public that may be affected by transportation investments in the transportation decision making process. In addition, the review team used these sessions to help assess the multi-modal nature of the MPO planning activities as well as their ability to respond to various DOT initiatives. The on-site review, of
which agenda can be found in Appendix A, was held on February 6, 2013, from 8:30 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. A list of persons who attended the review can be found in Appendix B.

**Review of Findings from 2009 Federal Transportation Management Area Certification Review**

There was one recommendation from the 2009 Federal Transportation Management Area Certification Review as follows:

“The Review Team recommends that the agency continue striving toward its goals in a coordinated, continuous, and cooperative manner and recommends that SCRCOG participate in any statewide freight advisory council activities as they are planned and participate in the FHWA sponsored CMP workshop scheduled for February 2009.”

The SCRCOG complied with the recommendation at that time, confirmed by the FHWA reviewers.

**Intermodal Transportation**

**Transit Planning**

**Observations:**
Transit planning in the SCRCOG region is done at the individual agency level, e.g. by Greater New Haven Transit District, CTTransit, Milford Transit District, Meriden Transit District, and Rideworks (which has been replaced by CTRides). The SCRCOG functions as the coordinator of transit programs that link the regional districts and transit entities, assesses demographic and land use policies that will impact the viability of transit services, and identifies new opportunities for transit service outside the existing route network and service areas. The Governors Transportation Initiative looks at rail needs and provides information on gaps in service.

The Locally Coordinated Public Transit Human Services Transportation Plan, which in Connecticut is referred to as LOCHSTP, provides additional means to help the SCRCOG identify the modal gaps in services and provide data to support transit linkages.

The SCRCOG also sponsored the Mobility Management Alternative Study and works with the Service Review Committee to identify and address service gaps.

The most prominent issue concerning transit service is the replacement of the regional Rideworks organization with the statewide CTRides organization that is to serve the region. The MPO stated that CTRides does not offer the same level of service that Rideworks provided, although they allowed that this problem may diminish as CTRides establishes itself and becomes more familiar with the region’s transit needs. The SCRCOG identified the advertisement for rail commuter service along the regional roadways as an example of one service that Rideworks had provided but which has not yet been provided by CTRides. Despite these declines in service, the SCRCOG is identifying solutions and improvements; the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) offers an opportunity to begin making these a reality.

The South Central Regional Council of Governments has witnessed a fundamental decline of transportation promotion services due to changing rideshare and transit promotion providers in
their region and has offered valuable insight on restoring promotional services to the Federal Agencies that can be used in their ongoing discussion with CTDOT of the deficiencies observed by many regions and the best means to bolster these promotional services.

Commuter lot counts continue to be a staple of the MPO’s work program.

In fall of 2010, the SCRCOG hosted a regional transit forum, which included a presentation on the current status and discussion of plans for improvement to the region’s multimodal (public and private bus service, rail, paratransit, telecommuting, bike/pedestrian) transportation system.

The SCRCOG has integrated transit planning and the Sustainable Communities Initiative (SCI) with Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) planning work, coordinating with the Southwestern Connecticut Regional Planning Agency and the Greater Bridgeport Regional Council. The MPO hopes to help realize projects out of this planning work. Part of the SCI planning work involves integration of multiple regional plans, such as the regional plan of conservation and development, the bicycle plan, etc.

**Recommendation:**
- The SCRCOG should consider hosting another Transit Forum to build upon successes and lessons learned from the first forum.

**Commentation:**
The SCRCOG has consistently, over many years, collected data at the commuter lots in their region, which serves as a good indicator of commuting trends and is helpful in modal planning. Such practices are useful models for other MPOs to follow and should supplement state efforts in this area.

**Livability, Sustainability, Active Transportation**

**Observations**
The SCRCOG and the New Haven region are in the midst of several significant efforts related to transit-oriented development (TOD), active transportation, and climate change adaptation.

One major project, undertaken as part of the NY-CT Sustainable Cities Consortium, aims to foster TOD around New Haven’s historic Union Station through targeted renovations, expanded parking, and a mix of land uses. The SCRCOG is also looking region-wide to identify areas where TOD might be viable based on density, transit ridership, and other factors. Possible related future projects may include circulator bus routes serving Union and State Street Stations; improved housing density and transit service along the Route 34 corridor; and an analysis of transportation mode shift potential in the New Haven region.

The SCRCOG developed a regional bicycle and pedestrian plan in 2007, and intends to include an update of this plan in its UPWP within in the next two years. Informed by the recommendations of this plan, the SCRCOG has been involved in efforts to improve bicycle and pedestrian safety along roadways in the region:
• **Spring Road in North Haven** – Based on analysis and outreach by the MPO, the Town decided to implement traffic calming treatment on this high-speed residential road, including narrower lanes and solar-powered speed limit signs.

• **Whalley Avenue/Route 10 in New Haven** – SCRCOG did a study and made recommendations for improved bicycle facilities and lane striping, but project is awaiting implementation by ConnDOT.

• **Bike/Ped Safety Gap Analysis** – Performed by a contractor in 2009, the study offers strategies for improving transportation safety in downtown New Haven.

As a coastal region facing sea-level rise and increased storm activity, SCRCOG is very cognizant of the threats of climate change. Unfortunately, 10 of its 15 member towns do not yet have hazard mitigation plans. As of the time of this writing, the SCRCOG was about half-way through working with those towns to develop a multi-jurisdiction plan. Once the multi-jurisdiction plan is complete, the SCRCOG intends to coordinate a region-wide update of the hazard mitigation plans, and then proceed to develop plans targeting specific aspects of the region’s infrastructure, such as transit.

**Recommendation:**

• The Review Team recommends that the SCRCOG update its regional bicycle and pedestrian plan within two years, ideally aligning this update with the next LRTP update, incorporating recommendations from the bike/pedestrian into the LRTP, and looking to the bike/pedestrian plan as a source for TIP projects.

**MPO Coordination with Partnering Agencies**

**Coordination with Transit Agencies**

**Observations:**
Representatives from the Greater New Haven Transit District and CTTransit relayed the nature of their partnership with the SCRCOG on transit planning activities such as mobility management, the Coordinated Public Transit Human Services Transportation Plan and the Transit Forum, which brought together a number of transit providers and users in the Greater New Haven area. The SCRCOG has worked with the transit providers in the region to review transit plans and routing schemes, and has held regular meetings with CTTransit on service reviews and transit capital.

**Coordination with Other MPOs**

**Observations:**
Since the New Haven TMA is composed of two MPOs, the RiverCOG (formerly the Connecticut River Estuary Regional Planning Agency) and SCRCOG are required to coordinate activities as they pertain to the TMA and the associated federal planning requirements. The two MPOs coordinate in production of their separate Long-Range Transportation Plans and UPWPs. Lately, they have worked together on the mobility manager project for transit coordination. Much of their coordinated activity for the TMA has been in the area of transit planning, such as the Locally Coordinated Public Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan.
It was noted that SCRCOG takes the lead in the area of the congestion management process and freight planning, but does so in coordination with RiverCOG. It was also noted that a strong relationship exists between the two regions in the area of security planning (DEMHS funded), and that RiverCOG contributed by developing a geo-spatial database of transportation structures, sites, and assets, along with their security attributes and vulnerabilities.

The SCRCOG’s involvement with the NY-CT Sustainable Communities Initiative was touched upon as an example of coordinated work efforts with other MPOs in the southwestern part of the state, mostly in terms of integrated planning efforts and TOD strategies. SCRCOG also works with the South Western Regional Planning Agency (SWRPA) on Sustainable Communities initiatives as they relate to Transit-Oriented Development, the Route 1 study, and the Shore Line East rail line.

SCRCOG is also a member of the Connecticut Association of Regional Planning Organizations (CARPO) which meets quarterly to discuss common issues relevant to Connecticut planning organizations.

Coordination with Others: REX Development, a public-private regional economic development agency sharing office space with the SCRCOG, outlined their role in the region and as a partner with SCRCOG where transportation meets economic development concerns, such as in the development of the Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (CEDS) for the region. In 2011, REX represented the first EDD in Connecticut. The two regional entities coordinate their work closely and collaborate on planning work at the intersection of economic development and transportation.

Conclusion
There are a number of areas and organizations that coordinate with SCRCOG in their transportation planning tasks in the TMA. Most critical of these coordinated efforts is with RiverCOG, which shares responsibility with SCRCOG for completing the federal requirements for MPOs serving a TMA. Coordinated activities have also included an extensive economic development working relationship with REX Development, which is supportive of one (economic vitality) of the eight required planning factors and one (enhance economic competitiveness) of the six livability principles.

Recommendations
- The SCRCOG and RiverCOG should continue to look for opportunities to strengthen coordination and resource sharing within the metropolitan planning process in the New Haven Urbanized Area. The two regions should engage in regular coordination meetings on tasks of mandated collaboration, as well as on topics of mutual interest for the benefit of the greater urbanized area. Coordination with other state MPOs should be considered as needed.

- New Memorandums of Understanding will need to be executed among any reconstituted MPOs in the TMA.
**Commendation**

- The high degree of coordination with REX Development reflects an agency commitment to incorporating economic development and transportation as envisioned by the FHWA eight planning factors and the HUD-EPA-DOT Six Livability Principles that enhances the COG’s overall planning program.

**Safety Planning, Intelligent Transportation Systems and Operations**

*Observations*

The following observations were derived as a result of the on-site certification review and a desk audit of the documents provided by SCRCOG.

Two of the planning factors that are required by Federal regulation to be considered in the metropolitan transportation planning process include those identified below. These are listed in SCRCOG’s Transportation Planning Work Program – Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) for fiscal years 2013 and 2014.

1. Increase the safety of the transportation system for motorized and non-motorized users.

2. Promote efficient system management and operation

The SCRCOG region has not taken full advantage of CTDOT’s local accident program by submitting applications to CTDOT per the State’s annual solicitation of Connecticut’s planning organizations, due to the extremely limited budget and program requirements. Additionally, very tight local budgets prevented member municipalities from participating, even though they regarded the aims of the program as important. This program targets highway safety improvement program funding for local safety improvements under this program. Only one project application for the local accident reduction program was submitted from the SCRCOG region in the last ten years, but the project was not selected by CTDOT because it was not safety related.

The SCRCOG’s Long Range Transportation Plan for 2011 – 2040 identifies a number of “Major Goals of the Plan” and “Major Policy Directions.” It is noted that the SCRCOG has not listed or identified any major goals or major policy directions for Safety or ITS and Operations in this plan.

Consistency between Connecticut’s SHSP and the SCRCOG’s metropolitan transportation plans is not apparent. The SCRCOG reported that it had reviewed the SHSP available at the time, and the Region believes that the actions identified under that plan are the responsibility of other governmental agencies to initiate.

The SCRCOG has six staff members. SCRCOG indicated that it has limited resources available to dedicate to fully exploring safety, ITS, and Operations opportunities and projects.

The SCRCOG has expended planning funds for conducting a regional traffic signal study and traffic signal inventory. The SCRCOG also has identified a work program in the UPWP that includes a traffic calming study and a traffic signal study in the town of Hamden, a sign inventory pilot program in the town of Wallingford, and a bike and pedestrian study in the city of East
Haven. The SCRCOG also discussed an interchange study for the Wilbur Cross Parkway, supported by the region through contract with consultants.

The shortcomings of the Local Accident Reduction Program were discussed and how the program could be improved and streamlined to protect local expectations and avoid the pitfalls of unforeseen cost increases.

The SCRCOG was not aware that FHWA had completed a program review in 2012 on traffic signal operations and maintenance involving a number of local agencies in Connecticut. Five observations and recommendations were made in the final FHWA/CTDOT program report that relate to planning for operations. FHWA agreed to forward the review to the SCRCOG.

**Recommendations**

- Going forward under MAP-21, the review team recommends that the next update to the metropolitan transportation plan include measurable regional safety and operations goals and objectives based on CTDOT’s goals and targets when available. It is also recommended that applicable goals, objectives, and strategies in Connecticut’s SHSP, when available, should be integrated into the MPO’s next update to the metropolitan transportation plan, as well as the TIP, in order to highlight safety, which is a FHWA national focus area.

- The SCRCOG has identified some projects, strategies, and services to increase safety in its region regarding bicycle and pedestrian safety and traffic calming. Going forward under MAP-21, the review team recommends a more collaborative, comprehensive and data-driven (CTDOT’s CDIP safety data project which will offer more timely and accessible data), approach to transportation safety planning in order to identify the most critical opportunities, strategies, and projects to enhance safety in the region.

- In conjunction with Task 2 (Safety Monitoring) in the SCRCOG’s UPWP, the review team highly recommends that SCRCOG actively participates as a stakeholder and provides input to CTDOT on the development of an update to and the implementation of the Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP), which is currently underway by CTDOT in concert with stakeholder involvement.

- Going forward under MAP-21, the FHWA review team recognizes the CTDOT needs to take the lead in planning for operations and ITS with consideration of the roles of the MPOs, and recommends that the state and all MPOs participate in NHI Planning for Operations training to raise awareness of roles of operations and ITS planning so the ability to identify regional strategies is realized.

- The review team recommends that the SCRCOG should meet, identify, discuss, and explore with CTDOT strategies and activities for assisting the SCRCOG region with resources to promote and implement needed safety and operations enhancements in the region, such as via a safety and traffic operations circuit rider program.

**Commendations**

- The SCRCOG actively participated in the previous statewide traffic incident management statewide task force, has endorsed a number of ITS and traffic incident management projects in the region, has endorsed a number of traffic signal upgrade projects in the city of New Haven,
and is also commended for its support and funding a few years ago that led to the development of a “Unified Response Manual for Highway Incidents in the State of Connecticut.”

- The SCRCOG is commended for compiling and analyzing data on traffic signal systems in Meriden and Wallingford and producing recommendations for improvements.

- Discussion during on-site review at the SCRCOG on February 6, 2013 and at RiverCOG on February 13, 2013 revealed that excellent coordination and cooperation exists between these two MPOs in this area.

Freight Planning

Observations:
Subject commenced with discussion of the New Haven Truck Route Study which identified preferred truck routes in the City, sensitive to residential neighborhood preservation. Freight focus has been on New Haven port and rail and roadway connections to port planning. The SCRCOG has kept the aspect of freight movement alive in the work progressing on the New Haven-Hartford-Springfield commuter rail activity. The region works with and monitors activity at the Port Authority of New Haven. Discussion ensued regarding the lack of diversified freight transportation options available in the region, despite a very active commuter rail system that parallels Interstate 95, and the prospects of the renewal of feeder barge concept for the region. The current UPWP contains tasks associated with studying expansion of Tweed-New Haven Airport’s potential for freight traffic.

Conclusion:
The SCRCOG is monitoring and involved in freight planning activity in the region. There is some hesitancy to put funds toward freight studies until some signals in the economy give encouragement to pursue projects to address freight movement issues.

Recommendation:
- The Region should continue to monitor freight issues and look for opportunities to work locally, regionally and statewide in freight planning activities, especially the aspects of through-truck freight movements.

Transportation Committee Discussion

Transportation Committee members (Mayor William Dickinson of Wallingford and First Selectman Anthony DaRos of Branford) relayed their experiences of working with the region as well as issues perceived working with state partners in transportation planning. Mayor Dickinson reported excellent working relationship with the SCRCOG and thanked them for their leadership and facilitation in working with the CTDOT, and the details of the Federal-Aid Program. Mr. DaRos commented how well the SCRCOG staff explained STIP amendments, their rationale and impact on the region. Bob Brinton, town engineer of Hamden, represented the Transportation Technical Committee of the SCRCOG, and reported on how the technical committee interacts with the Transportation Committee. In-depth discussion ensued related to project delivery and the Federal and state processes and the regulatory requirements that affect project delivery. Follow-up by CTDOT staff was seen as an area for potential improved communication.

Observations:
SCRCOG staff provides a strong resource for their member municipalities through attending to the data needs of the towns, understanding the local perspective to working in the federal processes, and providing liaison benefits to working with the CTDOT on planning priorities, and roadway and transit
projects. The region also brings public participation to their planning and implementation processes with their work with the member communities.

Conclusion:

Staff is attentive and proactive to the needs of the member municipalities and exhibits a deep knowledge of the Federal-Aid Program processes to deliver the best possible product for communities of the New Haven area.

Recommendation:
- The SCRCOG should review and re-distribute the link to the Federal-Aid Project website for Local Public Agencies as another resource for their member municipalities.

Commendation:
- The regional planning staff provides an excellent resource to the member municipalities in areas of planning and project implementation, and as a liaison for their members in working with CTDOT on roadway and transit projects.

Congestion Management Process

Observations:
The SCRCOG has been active in Congestion Management Process (CMP), and has produced several studies over a number of years. Since the last Certification Review, the June 2010 report was released. The study followed the FHWA guidelines for CMP formation: stating objectives, defining the network, establishing performance measures, and considering congestion mitigation strategies.

Conclusion:
Although, the 2004 Congestion Management Process was developed using travel time and speed data, the 2010 report relied on volume-to-capacity (V/C) ratios as a performance measure, which is readily available from the CTDOT. The CMP objectives are linked to the 2007 Long-Range Transportation Plan. While the CMP is required of all TMA MPOs, the SCRCOG reported that there has been difficulty implementing projects derived from CMP findings due to fiscal issues and competing priorities at the state level, compounded by the required metrics involved in producing the CMP. The SCRCOG is conscientiously conforming to the requirements of 21 CFR 450.320 and is producing CMP reports that will aid in project identification.

Recommendation:
- Although RiverCOG is predominantly rural, the next CMP should encompass the entire TMA (including RiverCOG’s portion), as required in 23 CFR 450.320.

Commendation:
- The SCRCOG regularly produces a CMP report that provides useful data to track congestion, which can be used to justify projects.

Building Technical Capabilities

Observations:
The SCRCOG is the only MPO in Connecticut that utilizes TELUS for TIP development and maintenance, and has since 2003. MPO staff attends user conferences. The SCRCOG is utilizing an OPM grant to build a regional web-based GIS and expand their current system, which contemplates a public interface, and will serve as a GIS tool for the member municipalities and regional transportation planning applications. Future plans, subject to funding, include exploring procurement of new aerial photography. The COG staff
has a basic understanding of TransCAD through training and has updated much of the data in the system. The primary use of the TransCAD data is to provide consultants with updated information to help streamline data compilation for corridor studies. Demographic and socio-economic data is updated annually using GIS. Pavement Management Systems have been popular among the region’s towns, which are generally interested in asset management activities.

**Conclusion:**
The SCRCOG values technical capabilities, and has worked to upgrade technical capabilities through procurement of planning tools and staff training.

**Recommendation:**
- The SCRCOG should continue to update and upgrade its technical capabilities, especially in light of requirements of MAP-21 and performance measures and targets.

**Public Participation Processes**

**Environmental Justice & Limited English Proficiency (LEP) Activities**
New Environmental Justice guidance is available through the FHWA, and there could be procedural legal risk if agencies are not following EJ guidance. The region reported that the LEP plan is in English and Spanish. Mapping information will be updated according to the Census 2010 data for LEP and EJ population clusters. No recent requests for translations services have occurred; however, the SCRCOG is prepared to provide such if requested. The SCRCOG reported that they are prepared to enhance their procedures and requested additional best practices available from other MPOs.

**Title VI CTDOT 2011 and 2012 Review Recommendations**
Title VI CTDOT Review took place in 2011 and 2012, and responses were done and requirements implemented in 2012, based on the 2011 and 2012 recommendations. A Title VI complaint form is on the website and also available in the SCRCOG office in both English and Spanish.

**Public Involvement**
The SCRCOG has an extensive distribution list that includes organizations representing minority groups and Limited English Proficiency population clusters for agendas and press releases. The SCRCOG is looking into more involvement in social media communications and event co-locating to accomplish public involvement goals. The Wallingford Circulator Route Transit Service Review was coordinated with outreach to social service agencies and the towns to modify the route to better serve transit-reliant populations. Regular meetings often draw outside groups interested in the subjects at the meetings. The COG is located on a regular bus route, allowing for public access to meetings.

**Planning Requirements Covered by this Review**

**Organization, Boundaries, Agreements/Contracts**

**Regulatory Basis**
Federal legislation (23 USC 134 and 49 USC 5303) requires the designation of a Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for each urbanized area with a population of more than 50,000 population. The policy board of the MPO shall consist of (A) local elected officials, (B) officials of local agencies that administer or operate major modes of transportation within the area, and (C) appropriate State officials. This designation remains in effect until the MPO is re-designated. The addition of jurisdictional or political bodies into the MPO or members to the policy board generally does not constitute a re-designation of the MPO.
As a result of TEA-21, 23 USC 134(b)(2) was modified with respect to Transportation Management Areas (TMA). Upon designation of a MPO as a TMA (rather than only when the MPO itself is (re)-designated), the policy board shall be structured to include (A) local elected officials, (B) officials of local agencies that administer or operate major modes of transportation within the area, and (C) appropriate State officials. Requirement: The organizational requirements for Metropolitan Planning Organizations are spelled out in Federal Regulation CFR 23 Section 450.310 (d). This structure is reiterated in MAP-21. To the extent possible there will be one Metropolitan Planning Organization for each urbanized area in the State, designated by the Governor through enabling State legislation. The MPO should have a defined organizational structure.

MAP-21 requires that MPOs serving TMAs must consist of representatives of public transportation providers in the region, effective within two years of the enactment date of the law (October 1st, 2012).

Observations:
The South Central Connecticut Planning Region is made up of the municipalities of Bethany, Branford, East Haven, Guilford, Hamden, Madison, Meriden, Milford, New Haven, North Branford, North Haven, Orange, Wallingford, West Haven and Woodbridge. The SCRCOG was formed and voting rights established under Sections 4-124i through 4-124p of the General Statutes of Connecticut, whereby each municipality has a single vote.

The 15 municipalities are represented on the policy board with one member each. Each member is the Chief Elected Official of the community. There is a Technical Board (composed of municipal staff representatives) and the Transportation Committee (composed of policy board members) that advises the policy board on transportation issues. There are multiple providers of transit in the region, and although they do not have voting privileges on the board and committees, coordination with the providers is maintained and active.

Conclusion:
The SCRCOG meets the requirements for organization and designation of 23CFR 450.310 (d), and is cognizant of recent requirements from MAP-21 that will necessitate some by-law modifications.

Recommendation:
• By October of 2014, the SCRCOG should amend its board structure to meet the specifically designated transit representation requirement outlined in MAP-21 section 5303 (d)(2)(B). Policy guidance on what does and does not constitute sufficient representation is forthcoming from FTA.

Boundary
Regulatory Basis:
Federal legislation 23 USC 134(e) requires boundaries of a metropolitan planning area to be determined by agreement between the metropolitan planning organization and the Governor.

Each metropolitan planning area shall encompass at least the existing urbanized area and the contiguous area expected to become urbanized within a 20-year forecast period; and may encompass the entire metropolitan statistical area or consolidated metropolitan statistical area, as defined by the Bureau of the Census. Requirement: CFR 23 Section 450.312 defines the boundary requirements for Metropolitan Planning Organizations.

Observations:
The boundaries of the MPO were designated by the Governor and are spelled out in enabling legislation. The MPO consists of the 15 contiguous municipalities in the Greater New Haven Region. The 2000 Census revised the New Haven Urbanized Area to include the geographic entities that comprise the Connecticut
River Estuary Regional Planning Agency (now Lower Connecticut River Valley Council of Governments). The urban boundary is delineated in the metropolitan transportation plan and the MPO website. The entire TMA is part of the NY-NJ-CT Moderate Nonattainment Area and all 15 member municipalities are entirely within the nonattainment area. Portions of the New Haven urbanized area spread into neighboring MPOs, of which the SCRCOG has Memorandums of Understanding in effect.

**Conclusion:**
The boundaries of the South Central Connecticut Region MPO are a contiguous geographic area with a finite boundary.

**Agreements and Contracts**

**Regulatory Basis:**
Federal legislation (23 USC 134) requires the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) work in cooperation with the State and public transportation agencies in carrying out a continuing, cooperative, and comprehensive (3C) metropolitan planning process. These agencies determine their respective and mutual roles and responsibilities and procedures governing their cooperative efforts. Federal regulation requires that these relationships be specified in agreements between the MPO and the State and between the MPO and the public transit operators:

“The MPO, the State(s), and the public transportation operator(s) shall cooperatively determine their mutual responsibilities in carrying out the metropolitan transportation planning process. These responsibilities shall be clearly identified in written agreements among the MPO, the State(s), and the public transportation operator(s) serving the MPA.” 23 CFR 450.314(a)

“If more than one MPO has been designated to serve an urbanized area, there shall be a written agreement among the MPOs, the State(s), and the public transportation operator(s) describing how the metropolitan transportation planning processes will be coordinated to assure the development of consistent metropolitan transportation plans and TIPs across the MPA boundaries...” 23 CFR 450.314(d)

The regulations also require an agreement between the MPO and any other agency responsible for air quality planning under the Clean Air Act (23 CFR 450.314 (c)).

**Observations:**
The SCRCOG has four Memorandums of Understanding, which help guide the transportation planning process:

a. Memorandum of Understanding Regarding Transportation Planning & Funding – New Haven Urbanized Area - September 11, 2002
b. Bridgeport-Stamford UZA Memorandum of Understanding – December 17, 2002
c. Bridgeport and New Haven-Meriden Urbanized Area STP Memorandum of Understanding – November 15, 1995
d. SCRCOG-Transit Operators Memorandum of Understanding – November/December 1996

**Conclusion:**
The SCRCOG has a number of MOUs that help to define the planning process. The description of roles and responsibilities in the UPWP now serves as the new MOU between the SCRCOG and the Connecticut Department of Transportation (CTDOT), as allowed under a 2004 change in federal regulations. MOUs will need updating, due to the effect of the 2010 Census and MAP-21.

**UPWP Development**

**Regulatory Basis:**
23 CFR 450.308 identifies the requirements for Unified Planning Work Programs (UPWPs) to be prepared in Transportation Management Areas. CFR 420.109 governs how FHWA planning funds are distributed to
the MPOs. MPOs are required to develop the UPWP in cooperation with the State and public transit agencies [450.308 (c)].

Elements to be included in the UPWP are:

- Discussion of the planning priorities facing the metropolitan planning area;
- Description of all metropolitan transportation planning and transportation-related air quality planning activities anticipated within the next 1- or 2-year period, regardless of funding source or agencies conducting activities, indicating:
  - Who will perform the work,
  - Schedule for completion of the work, and
  - Intended products; and
- All activities funded under Title 23 and the Federal Transit Act [450.308(b)]

Observations:
As part of the desk review the UPWP was reviewed. The UPWP introduction indicated that, “The Unified Planning Work Program is adopted in accord with federal code (23CFR Part 450.308) and governs the transportation planning activities of the Region. These planning activities include planning partners at the federal level of the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and, at the state level, the Connecticut Department of Transportation (CTDOT).”

The UPWP includes a list of all transportation related activities and issues that the SCRCOG will be involved in over the next two fiscal years, and outlines the challenges faced in the region under Key Issues, in the context of the eight federal planning factors. The UPWP lists the tasks necessary to carry out the objectives of the Long-Range Transportation Plan and elements of the transportation planning process. For each project or activity the SCRCOG outlines the funding sources, products that will be produced, the anticipated work schedule, and sponsoring agencies and participants.

Conclusion:
The SCRCOG meets the requirements of 23 CFR 450.308 for the UPWP.

Metropolitan Transportation Plan Development

Regulatory Basis:
The requirements for development of a Metropolitan Transportation Plan are spelled out in § 450.322 of 23 CFR Part 450 and 49 CFR Part 613, Statewide and Metropolitan Planning Final Rule. “The metropolitan transportation planning process shall include the development of a transportation plan addressing no less than a twenty year planning horizon as of the effective date... The transportation plan shall include both long-range and short-range strategies/actions that lead to the development of an integrated multimodal transportation system to facilitate the safe and efficient movement of people and goods.” 23 CFR 450.322 The transportation plan is to be updated every four years in non-attainment and maintenance areas to ensure its consistency with changes in land use, demographic, and transportation characteristics.

The regulation also identifies a number of required elements that must be addressed in the Metropolitan Transportation Plan, including:

- Demand analysis [23 CFR 450.322 (f) (1)];
- Congestion management strategies [23 CFR 450.322 (f)(4)];
- Pedestrian walkway and bicycle facilities [23 CFR 450.322 (f) (2)];
- System preservation [23 CFR 450.322 (f) (5)];
- Design concept and scope descriptions of all existing and proposed transportation facilities, in sufficient detail to permit conformity determinations in nonattainment and maintenance areas [23 CFR 450.322 (f) (6)];
• A multimodal evaluation of the transportation, socioeconomic, environmental, and financial impact of the overall plan [23 CFR 450.322 (f) (7)];
• Transportation enhancements [23 CFR 450.322 (f) (9)];
• “A financial plan that demonstrates how the adopted transportation plan can be implemented.” [23 CFR 450.322 (f) (10)]
• Public official and citizen involvement (in accordance with the requirements of 23 CFR 450.316), including participation during the early stages of plan development, availability of document for public review, and at least one formal public meeting in nonattainment TMAs [23 CFR 450.322 (i)];
• Conformity determination in nonattainment and maintenance areas 23 CFR 450.322(l)]

Observations:
The SCRCOG updated the metropolitan transportation plan in 2011. As a part of the plan development process, the SCRCOG convened stakeholders, interested parties and government officials to discuss the issues of growth and how they interplay with land use, transportation, and the environment.

The metropolitan transportation plan describes the region’s short-term, mid-term and long-term transportation planning needs, with corresponding goals and actions to the transportation system. The plan covers a 28-year time span. The plan responds to the eight Federal planning factors and serves as the basis for the plan. The plan discusses all modes of transportation, including fixed route public transportation, vehicular, rail, air, pedestrian and bicycle and contains conservation and development analysis for all communities within the region. The plan recognizes major goals: travel options, transportation funding, policy guidance, regional solutions, linking land use with transportation, aging infrastructure, economic vitality, congestion management process, preservation of existing transportation resources, and climate change.

Conclusions:
The metropolitan transportation plan is comprehensive and wide-ranging. It was developed with the intention of reaching a large diversified audience, including the public, the environmental agencies and organizations, public and private transit providers, and the freight community. The SCRCOG metropolitan transportation plan meets the requirements of 23 CFR, Section 450.322 and is the result of substantial local involvement and a robust planning process.

TIP Development/Approval/Amendments
Regulatory Basis:
The MPO is required, under 23CFR 450.324, to develop a transportation improvement program (TIP) in cooperation with the State and public transit operators. Specific requirements and conditions, as specified in the regulations, include:

“The MPO, in cooperation with the State(s) and any affected public transportation operator(s), shall develop a TIP for the metropolitan planning area. The TIP shall cover a period of no less than four years, be updated at least every four years, and be approved by the MPO and the Governor... The TIP must be compatible with the STIP development and approval process.” [23CFR 450.324(a)]

• Conformity determination by FHWA and FTA in non-attainment and maintenance areas. [23CFR 450.324(a)]
• Reasonable opportunity for public comment in accordance with 23CFR 450.316(a) and, in non-attainment TMAs, an opportunity for at least one formal public meeting during the TIP development process. [23CFR 450.324(b)]
• The TIP shall include a financial plan identifying projects that can be implemented using public or private sources. The State and the transit operator must provide MPOs with estimates of Federal and State funds available for the transportation system serving the metropolitan area. [23CFR 450.324 (h)]
• The TIP shall include: all transportation projects, including bicycle and pedestrian facilities, proposed for funding under Title 23, U.S.C., including Federal Lands Highway projects, but excluding safety projects funded under 23 U.S.C 402, emergency relief projects, and planning and research activities not funded with NHS, STP or MA funds; all regionally significant transportation projects for which FHWA or FTA approval is required and, for informational purposes, all regionally significant projects to be funded from non-Federal sources; only projects that are consistent with the Transportation Plan. [23CFR 450.324(c)]

• Information shall be provided as follows for each project included in the TIP: sufficient descriptive material to identify the project or phase; estimated total cost; the amount of Federal funds proposed to be obligated during each program year; proposed source of Federal and non-Federal funds; identification of funding recipient/project sponsor; in non-attainment and maintenance areas, identification of TCMs and sufficiently detailed description to permit conformity determination. [23CFR 450.324(e)]

• Projects that the State and MPO do not consider to be of appropriate scale for individual identification in a given program year may be grouped by function, geographical area, and work type. [23CFR 450.324(ff)]. In non-attainment and maintenance areas, classifications must be consistent with the exempt project classifications contained in the U.S. EPA conformity requirements. [40 CFR part 51]

• As a management tool for monitoring progress in implementing the Transportation Plan, the TIP shall identify the criteria and process for prioritizing the implementation of Transportation Plan elements through the TIP; list major projects implemented from the previous TIP and identify significant delays in implementation. [23CFR 450.324(l)(1) and (2)]

• In non-attainment and maintenance areas, the TIP shall describe progress in implementing required TCMs [23CFR 450.324(l)(3)];

Several other regulations govern different aspects of TIP development and implementation:

• 23CFR 450.326 addresses modification of the TIP, stating that the TIP can be modified at any time, subject to the following conditions:
• In non-attainment or maintenance areas, adding or deleting projects that affect emission levels requires a new conformity determination
• Public involvement opportunities are provided consistent with requirements for complete information, timely notice, full public access to key decisions, and other relevant provisions.

23CFR 450.326 also governs the relationship between TIP and STIP:
• A Governor- and MPO- approved TIP shall be included without modification in the STIP
• In nonattainment and maintenance areas, a conformity finding by FHWA and FTA must be made before incorporation in the STIP.
• In TMA, all Title 23 and Federal Transit Act funded projects not included in the first year of the TIP as an “agreed to” list of projects (except projects on the NHS and projects funded under the bridge, interstate maintenance, and Federal Lands Highways programs) shall be selected from the approved metropolitan TIP by the MPO, in consultation with the State and Transit operator. [23CFR 450.330 (a)]
• If the State or transit operator(s) wish to proceed with a project in the second or third year of the TIP, MPO project selection procedures must be followed unless expedited project selection procedures formally exist. [23CFR 450.330(a)]
• In non-attainment and maintenance areas, priority will be given to the timely implementation of TCMs included in the applicable SIP. [23CFR 450.330(e)] requires the publication of an annual listing of projects for which Federal funds have been obligated in the preceding year. This list shall be consistent with the categories identified in the TIP.
**Observations:**
The SCRCOG develops the TIP in coordination with the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). The Transportation Committee and the Governing Board of the SCRCOG review and determine whether the MPO accepts the TIP. The SCRCOG makes available the draft TIP for comments from federal and state agencies, the grantor agencies, member towns, the public, private and public transportation providers, neighborhood organizations, and environmental agencies and organizations. The TIP covers at least a four-year period (2012-2015). Projects in earlier years have a more immediate priority than later-year projects. A conformity determination has been made consistent with 23 CFR 450.324(b) and 23 CFR.330(b). Project detail is more than sufficient for analysis and modeling, the latter of which is provided by ConnDOT in collaboration with the SCRCOG.

The TIP identifies funding sources, an explanation of the funds, their corresponding eligibility requirements, formulas, and distribution. The TIP also includes project descriptions and programming history. The distribution of STP and Section 5307 funded projects does not represent a sub-allocation of funds, but regionally prioritized initiatives, as evidenced by existing regional criteria for STP-urban and transit enhancement project selection processes.

The SCRCOG has initiated and prioritized several Transportation Control Measures (TCMs) in the region, including support and programming for a vigorous and varied transit network. Also, there is an emphasis on programming alternative transportation facilities such as the Quinnipiac River Linear Trail and the Shoreline Greenway.

The TIP includes discussion of the process of TIP development and public involvement, as well as fiscal constraint. The State is coordinating with MPOs to ensure financial constraint of the TMAs’ TIPs.

**Conclusions:**
The SCRCOG develops and produces a TIP document and process that is compliant with the regulations with full descriptions and is informative to the region’s stakeholders. The SCRCOG utilizes the FHWA TELUS program for TIP development.

**Financial Planning**

**Regulatory Basis:**
There are two sections of CFR 23 which define financial requirements of MPOs they are Section 450.322(e)(10) and Section 450.324(h).

The provisions related to the Transportation Plan include the following requirements:

- Contain system level estimates of costs and revenue sources that will be expected to operate Federal-aid highways and public transportation;
- The MPO, Transit Operator and the State should cooperatively estimate funding sources required to support metropolitan transportation plan implementation;
- Include recommendations on other financing strategies; and
- For nonattainment and maintenance areas, the financial plan shall address the specific financial strategies required to ensure implementation of TCMs in the applicable SIP.

The provisions related to the TIP include the following requirements:

- Includes a financial plan demonstrating which projects can be implemented with current revenue sources and which projects require proposed revenue sources;
- Takes into account the costs of adequately maintaining and operating the existing transportation system;
- Developed by the MPO in cooperation with the State and transit operator;
- Developed with estimates of available federal and state funds provided by the state and transit operator;
• Includes only projects for which construction and operating funds can reasonably be expected to be available;
• Includes strategies for ensuring the availability of new funding sources;
• For the financial analysis, considers all projects funded with Federal, state, local private resources; and
• In nonattainment/maintenance areas, only includes projects for which funds are available and committed in the first two years.

**Observations:**
The SCRCOG notes that CTDOT is working on financial constraint of TIPs and the STIP on a coordinated statewide basis.

All projects contained in the TIP are consistent with the fiscally constrained metropolitan transportation plan and the CTDOT 20-year revenue estimate, which serves as the basis for TIP development and fiscal constraint and was used for the development of the metropolitan transportation plan. The TIP is prepared in cooperation with CTDOT and area transit operators. The TIP for Federal Fiscal Years 2012-2015 is financially constrained to the congressionally authorized funding for FHWA and FTA. The State of Connecticut and the municipalities of the Greater New Haven Region have committed to provide non-federal matching funds, as appropriate. The TIP contains a listing of transportation projects by federal funding categories that will be financed during the 4-year period from 2012 through 2015. The projects listed in the TIP are funded from reasonably expected public resources.

The TIP explains that its projections of reasonably available Federal funds are a portion of the expected authorizations to the State of Connecticut. CTDOT coordinates the TIPs of Connecticut MPOs and the rural regions of the state in the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), with projected total statewide funding equaling the expected federal authorization to the State of Connecticut. The majority of the federal funds in SCRCOG’s TIP will be matched from State funding resources. CTDOT has committed State of Connecticut Special Transportation Fund (STF) resources for this purpose. The TIP states that State resources are sufficiently available to match the costs of projects included in the TIP. Town/city government resources will match a relatively small amount of federal funds. Where local funds are indicated as sources in the TIP, the municipality or sponsoring entity has made a financial commitment to provide the necessary project funds for the match.

The TIP and the STIP, of which the TIP is a part, are financially constrained and the spending plan is based on reasonable projections of available statewide resources. As program and schedule changes are made to the TIP, the total expected federal authorizations and matching funds will be reallocated to reflect total statewide and regional program needs.

**Conclusion:**
The SCRCOG demonstrates financial constraint in both the metropolitan transportation plan and the TIP. Statewide coordination of financial planning is reasonably rigorous and assures significant reliability of the SCRCOG’s projections of funding availability.

**Air Quality**

**Regulatory Basis:**
Section 176 (c)(1) of the 1990 Clean Air Act Amendment (CAAA) states: “No metropolitan planning organization designated under Section 134 of Title 23, United States Code, shall give its approval to any project, program, or plan which does not conform to an implementation plan approved or promulgated under Section 110.” The Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 subsequently included provisions responsive to the mandates of the CAAA. Implementing regulations have maintained this strong connection. Provisions governing air quality-related transportation planning are incorporated in a number of metropolitan planning regulations, rather
than being the primary focus of one or several regulations. For MPOs that are declared to be air quality nonattainment or maintenance areas, there are many special requirements in addition to the basic requirements for a metropolitan planning process. These include formal agreements to address air quality planning requirements, requirements for setting metropolitan planning area boundaries, interagency coordination, Transportation Plan content and updates, requirements for a Congestion Management Process (CMP), public meeting requirements, and conformity findings on Transportation Plans and TIPs.

Sections of the metropolitan planning regulations governing air quality are summarized below:

- An agreement is required between the MPO and the designated agency responsible for air quality planning describing their respective roles and responsibilities (Also see Agreements and Contracts topic area) [23 CFR 450.314 (c)]
- The MPO is required to coordinate development of the Transportation Plan with the SIP development process, including the development of transportation control measures (see Regional Transportation Plan topic area). [23 CFR 450.322 (d)] The MPO shall not approve any Transportation Plan or program that does not conform with the SIP [23 CFR 450.322 (d)]
- In TMAs designated as nonattainment areas, Federal funds may not be programmed for any project that will result in a significant increase in carrying capacity for single occupant vehicles, unless the project results from a CMS meeting the requirements of 23 CFR part 500, subpart E. [23 CFR 450.320 (b)].
- The Transportation Plan shall identify SOV projects that result from a CMP meeting Federal requirements. [23 CFR 450.322 (f) (4)] and include design concept and scope descriptions of all existing and future transportation facilities to permit conformity determinations [23 CFR 450.322 (f)(6)]. The FHWA, FTA, and MPO must make a conformity determination on any new or revised Transportation Plan in nonattainment and maintenance areas (see Regional Transportation Plan topic area). [23 CFR 450.322(l)]
- In non-attainment and maintenance areas, the FHWA, FTA and MPO must make a conformity determination on any new or amended TIPs [23 CFR 450.324 (a)].
- In non-attainment TMAs, there must be an opportunity for at least one formal public meeting during the TIP development process [23 CFR 450.324 (b)]
- In non-attainment and maintenance areas, the TIP shall give priority to eligible TCMs identified in the approved SIP and shall provide for their timely implementation. [23 CFR 450.324(i) and 450.330 (b)]
- In non-attainment and maintenance areas, the TIP shall include all regionally significant transportation projects proposed to be funded with Federal and non-Federal funds [23 CFR 450.324 (d)] and identify projects identified as TCMs in the SIP [23 CFR 450.324 (e)(5)]. Projects shall be specified in sufficient detail to permit air quality analysis in accordance with U.S. EPA conformity requirements. [23 CFR 450.324 (e)(6)]
- In non-attainment or maintenance areas, if the TIP is amended by adding or deleting projects that affect transportation-related.

In TMAs that are non-attainment or maintenance areas, the FHWA and FTA will review and evaluate the transportation planning process to assure that the process is adequate to ensure conformity of plans and programs in accordance with procedures contained in 40 CFR part 93. Air Quality requirements are spelled out in 23 CFR Section 450.324(a). “In nonattainment and maintenance areas subject to transportation conformity requirements, the FHWA and the FTA, as well as the MPO, must make a conformity determination on any updated or amended TIP, in accordance with the Clean Air Act requirements and the EPA’s transportation conformity regulations (40 CFR part 93).”

Observations:
The metropolitan transportation plan was developed in consideration of the clean air control strategies of
the STIP and guidance of CTDOT’s air quality modeling staff and policy and planning section. A conformity determination was made pursuant to 40 CFR 51 or 93 before adoption by the MPO. The conformity determination was made on the TIP consistent with 40 CFR 51 or 93. Project detail is sufficient for analysis
and modeling. As noted in the discussion of the TIP, the SCRCOG indicates that state coordination would be necessary to give priority in the TIP to TCMs generally, although several TCMS are accorded priority in the current TIP.

**Conclusion:**
The SCRCOG uses an acceptable practice to determine air quality conformity in both the TIP and the Transportation Plan.

**Project Selection Procedures**

**Regulatory Basis:**
Requirement: CFR 23 Section 450, Subpart C – Metropolitan Transportation Planning and Program spells out a comprehensive planning process for MPOs to follow. Generally, the development and selection of projects for funding shall be completed through a comprehensive planning process with local input. Projects should be identified in the Transportation Plan and listed in the Transportation Improvement Program, and be developed through a continuing, cooperative, and comprehensive (3C) planning process.

**Observations:**
The SCRCOG’s project selection process does not rely on a formal criteria and scoring protocol. Rather, projects are vetted in committee and advanced, based on local commitment, financial viability and reasonableness for success and coordinated with the CTDOT. At each stage of a proposal’s review process, the SCRCOG’s public involvement procedures are implemented. Proposal submissions contain much of the level of detail required by the state engineering review in the Project Development Unit.

**Conclusion:**
The SCRCOG’s methodology for project selection and proposal review reflects a process which tries to assure local buy-in and commitment to project purpose and viability, while still conscious of public input. The focus is to concentrate on regionally significant projects that reflect community and local government support.

**Outreach/Public Participation**

**Regulatory Basis:**
The requirements for public involvement are set forth primarily in 23 CFR 450.316, which addresses elements of the public involvement requirements. Public involvement also is addressed specifically in connection with the Transportation Plan in 450.322 (i) and the TIP in 450.324(b).

Requirements related to the planning process generally are summarized in 450.316, as follows:

- A proactive process;
- Complete information;
- Develop a participation plan in coordination with all interested parties;
- Timely public notice of public involvement activities and information about transportation issues and processes;
- Full public access to key decisions and time for public review and comment;
- Early and continuing public involvement in developing the TIP;
- A minimum public comment period of 45 days before adoption or revision of the public involvement process;
- Minimum 30-day review period for Transportation Plan, TIP and major amendments in nonattainment areas classified as serious and above;
- Explicit consideration and response to public input;
- Consideration of the needs of people traditionally underserved by transportation systems, including low-income and minority households; consistency with Title VI of the Civil Rights
The requirements pertaining to the Transportation Plan (450.322(l)) are further elaborated as follows:

• Opportunity for public official and citizen involvement in the development of the Transportation Plan, in accordance with 450.316(a).

TIP related requirements [450.324(b)] include:

• MPOs must provide reasonable opportunity for public comment in accordance with the requirements of 450.316(a) and, in nonattainment TMAs, an opportunity for at least one formal public meeting during the TIP development process and provision for public review and comment.

Public involvement in the transportation planning process is a major feature of all federal transportation authorizing legislation. The metropolitan planning regulations state that, “The metropolitan transportation planning process shall include a proactive public involvement process that provides complete information, timely public notice, full public access to key decisions, and supports early and continuing involvement of the public in developing plans and TIPs”. To this end, MPOs must develop and adopt a formal public involvement process for planning and program development.

Observations:
The Public Participation Plan is evaluated annually to add mandates or suggestions from the US DOT or other federal agencies.

Conclusion:
The SCRCOG’s public involvement process meets the requirements of 23 CFR, Section 450.316, Section 450.322 and Section 450.324 and provides for significant participation by communities and other stakeholders in the planning process.

Self-Certification

Regulatory Basis:
According to 23 CFR 450.334 certification review by FTA and FHWA is required in TMAs, concurrent with the TIP submission, the state and MPO shall certify at least every four years that the metropolitan transportation planning process is being carried out in accordance with the following requirements:

• Section 134 of Title 23, U.S.C.;
• the Metropolitan Planning Regulation;
• Sections 174 and 174 (c) and (d) of the Clean Air Act;
• Title VI of the Civil Rights Act; and
• The provisions of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA).

Observations:
The current TIP, which covers the four-year period from 2012-2015, includes a self-certification by the MPO, in accordance with the applicable regulation.

Conclusions:
The SCRCOG successfully meets the self-certification requirements of 23 CFR 450.334.
Title VI and Environmental Justice Update

Regulatory Basis:
It has been the U.S. Department of Transportation’s (US DOT) longstanding policy to actively ensure non-discrimination under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Title VI states the “no person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or subjected to discrimination under a program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance.” Title VI bars intentional discrimination as well as disparate impact discrimination (e.g., a neutral policy or practice that has the effect of a disparate impact on protected groups). 23 CFR 450.334(a)(3) requires the FHWA and FTA to certify that the “planning process . . . is being conducted in accordance with all applicable requirements of . . . Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Title VI assurance executed by each State under 23 U.S.C 324 and 29 U.S.C. 794.”

Executive Order 12898, issued in 1994, further amplifies Title VI by providing that “each Federal agency shall make achieving environmental justice (EJ) part of its mission by identifying and addressing as appropriate, disproportionately high and adverse human health and environmental effects of its programs, policies, and activities on minority populations and low-income populations.” In compliance with Executive Order 12898, the US DOT Order on Environmental Justice was issued in 1997.

Observations:
The SCRCOG gave the federal team a progress report on Title VI and Environmental Justice activities as part of the desk review conducted for the Certification.

Conclusions:
Title VI and Environmental Justice Activities meet the requirements of 23 CFR 450.334(a)(3).

Management Systems

Regulatory Basis:
Under SAFTEA-LU regulations 23 CFR 450.320, a metropolitan-wide congestion management process (CMP) is required for new and existing multimodal transportation facilities in the TMA to ensure safe and efficient use of the system. Performance measures and strategies for congestion management should be reflected in the TIP and metropolitan transportation plan. The congestion management processes should include [23 CFR 450.320 (c)] the following elements:

- Methods to monitor and evaluate the performance of the multimodal transportation system identify the causes of recurring and non-recurring congestion
- Performance measures that are tailored to the locality
- Data collection system coordinated with other data collection efforts
- Congestion management strategies could include:
  - Demand management measures
  - Traffic operational improvements
  - ITS technologies
  - Additional system capacities
  - Identification of an implementation strategy and funding sources

Conclusion:
The SCRCOG has demonstrated effective coordination of technical resources with partner agencies and application of data to evaluate traffic conditions and solutions to congestion problems. The SCRCOG meets the requirements of 23 CFR 450. 320.
Intelligent Transportation Systems

Regulatory Basis:
The FHWA Final Rule and FTA Policy on Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Architecture and Standards were issued on January 8, 2001, to implement section 5206(e) of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21). This Final Rule/Policy requires that all ITS projects funded by the Highway Trust Fund and the Mass Transit Account conform to the National ITS Architecture, as well as to USDOT adopted ITS Standards. The Final Rule on ITS Architecture and Standards is published in 23 CFR Part 940. 23 CFR Part 940 states that:

- Regions implementing ITS projects at the time the Final Rule/Policy was issued must have a regional ITS architecture in place by April 8, 2005. Regions not implementing ITS projects at the time the Final Rule/Policy was issued must develop a regional ITS architecture within four years from the date their first ITS project advances to final design.
- All ITS projects funded by the Highway Trust Fund (including the Mass Transit Account), whether they are stand-alone projects or combined with non-ITS projects, must be consistent with the Final Rule/Policy.
- Major ITS projects should move forward based on a project level architecture that clearly reflects consistency with the National ITS architecture.
- All projects shall be developed using a systems engineering process.
- Projects must use USDOT adopted ITS standards as appropriate.

Compliance with the regional ITS architecture will be in accordance with USDOT oversight and Federal-aid procedures, similar to non-ITS projects.

Observation:
The SCRCOG has been involved in the regional ITS architecture project.

Conclusion:
The SCRCOG contributes to the continued development of ITS consistent with the regional ITS architecture required under the Final Rule on ITS Architecture and Standards [23 CFR Part 940]
Appendix A – On-Site Meeting Agenda

NEW HAVEN
TRANSPORTATION MANAGEMENT AREA (TMA) CERTIFICATION REVIEW

Agenda

FEBRUARY 6, 2013

South Central Connecticut Region Council of Governments

8:30 – 8:45   Introduction

8:45 – 9:45  Review Recommendations from 2009 Federal Transportation Management Area (TMA) Certification Review

9:45 – 10:15  Intermodal Transportation
-   Transit Planning and Livability
-   Safety Planning
-   Discussion with partnering agencies
   o   Coordination with ConnDOT, CT Transit, Transit District
-   Freight Planning

10:15 – 10:30   Break

10:30 – 11:15   Transportation Committee and Public Input
-   Discussion with Committee members and other interested persons regarding SCRCOG’s planning process

11:15 – 12:00 Building Technical Capabilities and Freight Planning

12:00 – 1:00   Lunch

1:00 – 2:00  MPO Coordination:  SCRCOG, LCRVCOG, COGCNV, GBRPA, Midstate
-   Overview of coordination efforts
-   Discussion with program managers: LCRVCOG, COGCNV, GBRPA, Midstate, and SCRCOG

2:00 – 2:30  Congestion Management Process (CMP)

2:30 – 3:00   ITS and Operations

3:00 – 3:15   Break

3:15 – 4:00  Update on Title VI Activities Since State/Federal Review
-   Environmental Justice & Limited English Proficient (LEP) Activities
-   Title VI CTDOT 2011/2012 Review Recommendations
-   Public Involvement

4:00   Public Input on Planning Process
### Appendix B – Sign-In Sheet for Attendees at the On-Site Review

#### South Central Regional Council of Governments

#### Federal Certification Review

#### Public Meeting Sign-In Sheet

**Wednesday, February 6, 2013**

**SCRCOG Office, North Haven**

**Conference Room**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Telephone No.</th>
<th>E-mail Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Elvis F. Boll</td>
<td>FHWA-CT</td>
<td>860-494-7666</td>
<td><a href="mailto:elvisf12345@gmail.com">elvisf12345@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ken Shaddey</td>
<td>FHWA-CT</td>
<td>860-494-7567</td>
<td>Kenneth王@shaddeyEng.com</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Tom M. Lee</td>
<td>FHWA-CT</td>
<td>860-494-7562</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Tom.M.Lee@FHWA.dot.gov">Tom.M.Lee@FHWA.dot.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Robert Ramirez</td>
<td>FHWA-CT</td>
<td>860-494-7562</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Robert.Ramirez@FDOT.gov">Robert.Ramirez@FDOT.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Nicolas Garcia</td>
<td>SCRCOG</td>
<td>860-377-3912</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nicolas.garcia@scrcog.org">nicolas.garcia@scrcog.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Nicholas Gauthier</td>
<td>SCRCOG</td>
<td>860-494-7666</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nikhil.gauthier@scrcog.org">nikhil.gauthier@scrcog.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Alicia Leete</td>
<td>SCRCOG</td>
<td>203-982-2187</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Alicia.Lee@SCRCOG.com">Alicia.Lee@SCRCOG.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Stephen Sally</td>
<td>SCRCOG</td>
<td>203-496-8624</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Sally@SCRCOG.org">Sally@SCRCOG.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Carl Amento</td>
<td>SCRCOG</td>
<td>203-496-8625</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Carl@SCRCOG.org">Carl@SCRCOG.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Chris Rappa</td>
<td>SCRCOG</td>
<td>203-496-8610</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Chris.Rappa@SCRCOG.org">Chris.Rappa@SCRCOG.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Eugene Livinski</td>
<td>SCRCOG</td>
<td>203-496-8626</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Eugene.Livinski@SCRCOG.org">Eugene.Livinski@SCRCOG.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. James Roda</td>
<td>SCRCOG</td>
<td>203-496-8628</td>
<td><a href="mailto:James.Roda@SCRCOG.org">James.Roda@SCRCOG.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Donna Carter</td>
<td>GNHID</td>
<td>203-837-6254</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Donna.Carter@GNHID.com">Donna.Carter@GNHID.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Scott Willis</td>
<td>CTTransit</td>
<td>203-982-2187</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Scott.Willis@CTTransit.com">Scott.Willis@CTTransit.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Barry Dinges</td>
<td>CTTransit</td>
<td>203-982-8107</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Barry.Dinges@CTTransit.com">Barry.Dinges@CTTransit.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Andrew Wernick</td>
<td>CTTransit</td>
<td>203-982-8101</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Andrew.Wernick@CTTransit.com">Andrew.Wernick@CTTransit.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Philip Fry</td>
<td>CTTransit</td>
<td>860-982-8101</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Philip.Fry@CTTransit.com">Philip.Fry@CTTransit.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
South Central Regional Council of Governments

*Federal Certification Review*

Public Meeting Sign-In Sheet, con’t.

*Wednesday, February 6, 2013*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Telephone No</th>
<th>E-mail Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21. Anthony Davis</td>
<td>Brantford</td>
<td>203 294 2070</td>
<td>adavis@brantford交错</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. W. Dickinson</td>
<td>WD</td>
<td>260 581-8559</td>
<td>w.dickinson@washington交错</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Jean Davies</td>
<td>LCRD</td>
<td>203 464 8604</td>
<td>jean@redevelopment交错</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Gunny Kozlowski</td>
<td>REX</td>
<td></td>
<td>gunny@redevelopment交错</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 25.                      |             |               |                      |
| 26.                      |             |               |                      |
| 27.                      |             |               |                      |
| 28.                      |             |               |                      |
| 29.                      |             |               |                      |
| 30.                      |             |               |                      |
| 31.                      |             |               |                      |
| 32.                      |             |               |                      |
| 33.                      |             |               |                      |
| 34.                      |             |               |                      |
| 35.                      |             |               |                      |
| 36.                      |             |               |                      |
| 37.                      |             |               |                      |
| 38.                      |             |               |                      |
| 39.                      |             |               |                      |
| 40.                      |             |               |                      |