

UAWG Meeting Minutes
June 27, 2008

0905: Meeting convened of Urban Area Work Group for Region 3 / Capitol Region by UAWG Chair William Austin.

Attendees: John Shaw, Peter Vernesoni, Stephen Thal (for ESF-19), Don Janelle, Ken Loock, Laurie Ann Scotti, Bruce Lockwood, Keith Victor, Craig Hancock, Cheryl Assis, David Gofstein, George Brophy (for ESF-15) , Arnold Goldman, Carmine Centrella (recorder), Dan Scace, Richard Mulhall, Bill Austin, Mark Sirois, Rick Westman (for ESF-4), Katherine McCormack, Michael Varney (arrival appr. 1030), Dave Koscuk, Bruce Baxter, Lee Erdmann (left at 9:30), Kristin Dean, Bob Walsh, Dustin Rendok.

Introduction by B. Austin of meeting purpose, UASI Investment prioritization walk through of agenda and presentation of voting process to be used for prioritization of each discrete UASI expenditure while maintaining LETPP 25% minimum of overall investments. (see attached power point presentation). Review of each expenditure followed by 3 rounds of voting. Objective is to develop a prioritized list going forward once UASI grant award is announced. There are 5 UASI investments representing 60 component expenditures. Today the UAWG will be voting on those 60 discrete investments.

J.Shaw raised a concern stating that the individual investment workgroups should be the ones assigning or recommending project prioritization for the larger group (UAWG to approve). Disagreement and explanation from B. Austin regarding advocacy of each investment by those individuals who assisted with the development of the 5 UASI investments. What is important to workgroups may not be that important to the Region and it is important to complete the prioritization today vs. waiting until the award is announced. Further discussion from M. Sirois and R. Mulhall regarding the ability of the workgroups to maintain control of specific investments.

M.Sirois raised concern regarding overall process for this meeting on deciding of specific line items vs. percentage reallocations based on overall UASI award, and then having the investment work groups assign priority. B. Austin responded by walking through investment voting sheets. B. Austin speaks to the need for the UAWG to make those decisions per the UAWG Governance document. Nothing falls off the investment list per se but it is obvious the last line item investment (#60) will not be funded unless the Region receives its full grant request of \$ 16, 242,000.00. B. Austin states that this meeting is not necessarily about consensus but voting on a list of priorities.

Project prioritization process started with explanations of each investment justification by project leaders highlighting each line item and then making recommendations as to the highest priorities Investment 1 – B. Austin; Investment 2 – J. Shaw; Investment 3 – P. Vernesoni , M.Sirois, M. Varney; Investment 4 – L.A. Scotti; Investment 5 - B.Austin, A. Goldman . Results of the process were then reviewed.

D. Scace speaks to the need for the UAWG to make a motion to approve the results and what the results mean for CRCOG and the UAWG. Motion made by M. Varney, seconded by Keith Victor to accept the project prioritization as a result of today's process and that the results will be used as the work plan going forward once the UASI award is announced.

Floor open for discussion – re-emphasis / clarification that today's results are what will be used as the spending plan going forward depending on award and prioritization sheet matching the award to the

cutoff point on the sheet. Re-emphasis on the process and the project receiving the most votes as the region's number one priority. Depending on award and project cutoff if LETPP minimum is not met then the next highest LETPP line item will be moved above the project cutoff point to assure the 25% minimum.

Motion passes unanimously.

B. Austin reviews the next steps for the UAWG for deciding on equipment, needs of consulting services and RFP process. Further discussion regarding UASI investment project balances going forward. It was decided that line items either over or under budgeted will be dealt with as they occur.

Discussion took place as to what happens with project line items that do not receive funding or make the project cutoff point. Future investment workgroups through the UASI grant application process will either identify those line items as priorities or they will be dropped by those same groups. Further discussion on the overall flaws in the current UASI process and investment assignments vs. the need to develop a long range strategic plan first. It was emphasized that the Region needs to participate in a capabilities assessment as early as September '08 and use that process as the criteria for regional prioritization of future UASI grant applications.

Meeting adjourned: 12:27 pm