1. Roll Call – Jon Colman called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m.

2. Public Forum – No one from the public chose to speak.

3. Approval of September 24, 2012 Working Group Meeting Minutes – A motion was made by Russ Arnold, seconded by Bill Taylor, to accept the September 24th, 2012 Working Group Meeting Minutes. The motion was passed unanimously.

4. Discussion of ConnDOT’s Draft Proposal for a Local Transportation Capitol Program – Rob Aloise began by relaying the following information received in a phone conversation with Hugh Hayward of ConnDOT:

   - ConnDOT plans to fund the projects using 20-year bonds, and therefore the projects should be limited to those with similarly long service lives. A 15 year Pavement Rehabilitation project will likely still be eligible, however ConnDOT needs to put in place some mechanism that would ensure the majority of program results in long service life capital improvements.
   - ConnDOT’s budget has recently been submitted to OPM, but ConnDOT has not received OPM’s response.
   - ConnDOT is considering that, under this new program, projects on State Roads may need to be progressed through an internal ConnDOT design process.
   - It is not ConnDOT’s intent to send municipal project submissions throughout the Department’s Units for reviews, as is currently the case. It’s envisioned that ConnDOT’s review will be for service life and eligibility.
   - The proposed eligibility for 90% reimbursement of construction cost (plus 10% construction contingency) is intended to be the maximum amount reimbursed for construction. ConnDOT does not intend to entertain costs beyond this, such as for change orders that increase project costs beyond the contingency.
Jennifer Carrier explained that per the September 24th Working Group action item, CRCOG staff devised a potential new program process that incorporated that meeting’s findings. The program is explained in a DRAFT letter from CRCOG to ConnDOT and an accompanying Flow-Chart documenting the new project process. Jennifer indicated that we proceed by reviewing the DRAFT documents.

A. **Review of Draft Project Process Flow Chart** –
   Rob Aloise explained the DRAFT Flow Chart detailing a new project delivery process. The following comments were made:
   - An independent Consultant Liaison, potentially retained by CRCOG, should review projects for Eligibility and Service Life at the concept design phase, prior to the project initially being sent to ConnDOT. Following any necessary revisions, the project will be sent to ConnDOT along with certification of its Eligibility and Service Life.
   - Any DBE requirements should be standardized in the program, perhaps by a pre-determined chart that changes rates with project size.
   - The On-Call 35% review should be performed by an independent Consultant Liaison, potentially retained by the MPO.
   - Participating and Non-Participating Costs should be determined by CRCOG and/or their independent Consultant Liaison – either during Concept or Preliminary design.
   - The use of in-house Consultant Liaison Reviews could speed delivery times and free ConnDOT from these responsibilities.
   - Eliminate the word “Reimbursable” from the “Final Project Audit” flow-chart box, as it is preferred that the Grant be a draw down expenditures type.

B. **Review of Draft Letter to ConnDOT** – Jennifer explained the DRAFT letter detailing a new project delivery process. The following comments were made:
   - First Bullet – We should not give up STP-Urban funding until the State funding is secured (perhaps on an annual basis). The differences in State and Federal fiscal years will necessitate timing considerations.
   - Second Bullet – Indicate that eligibility criteria should not change from what it is currently.
   - Third Bullet – The municipality should be responsible for design even if the project includes a state owned roadway. The letter should propose that an Independent Consultant Liaison, potentially retained by CRCOG, will perform reviews of these projects.
   - Fourth Bullet – Eliminate the word “control”
   - Fifth Bullet – Revise to indicate a preference for the use of grants with payments on a draw down expenditures basis.
   - Closing Paragraph – Attach the Working Group minutes and indicate that further detailed comments are provided in them.
   - Do other regions agree with CRCOG’s suggestions? CRCOG indicated previous and planned future coordination with SCRCOG

**Action Items**
- CRCOG staff will revise the Letter and Flow Chart per this meeting’s comments.
- The revised documents will be presented at the October 15th Transportation Committee meeting.
- Following the Transportation Committee meeting, the documents will be finalized and sent to ConnDOT prior to the October 17th deadline.

5. **Adjourn**