

**Cost Review Sub-Committee Meeting
MIRA, 211 Murphy Road, Hartford, CT 06106
Monday May, 22nd 2017**

**DRAFT until
Endorsed by
the
Committee**

Name

Larry Baril
Jon Colman
Patrice Carson
Todd Penney
Tim Bockus
Tim Webb
John Cabibbo
Russ Arnold
Jim Ford
Sandy Fry
Jeff LaMalva
Derek Dilaj
Peter Hughes
Rob Trottier
Jim Sollmi
Jeff Bord
Keith Hayden
Jeff Doolittle
Rick Zulick
David Smith
Greg Sommer
Derrick Gregor
Gilbert Hayes

Organization

Avon
Bloomfield
Bolton
Coventry
East Hartford
Ellington
Enfield
Farmington
Hartford
Hartford
Manchester
Mansfield
Marlborough
New Britain
Rocky Hill
Somers
Southington
South Windsor
Stafford
Vernon
West Hartford
Wethersfield
GHTD

Guests

Mark Moriarty
Marc Nichol

New Britain
Riverfront Recapture

Staff

Jennifer Carrier
Rob Aloise
Cheryl Assis
Sotoria Montanari
Karen Stewartson

CRCOG
CRCOG
CRCOG
CRCOG
CRCOG

1. **Roll Call** – Mr. Jon Colman called the meeting to order at 11:30 a.m.
2. **Public Forum**- No one chose to speak
3. **Adoption of April 24th, 2017 Subcommittee Meeting Minutes** - A motion was made by Patrice Carson from the Town of Bolton, seconded by Jeffrey Doolittle from the Town of South Windsor, to accept the minutes from the April 24, 2017 meeting. This motion was passed unanimously.
4. **Transportation Alternatives Set-Aside, CTDOT Reviews Memo** – Rob Aloise reviewed the associated Subcommittee memo. Mr. Aloise indicated that region recently solicited for, selected, and submitted four (4) projects shown in the table below to CTDOT to utilize FFY2016-2020 Transportation Alternatives (TA) Set-Aside funding. Recently the region received CTDOT’s review comments and resulting programming selections. CTDOT has indicated that they received eight (8) TA Set-Aside applications for projects located within the Hartford Urbanized Area (four from CRCOG, three from RiverCOG, and one from Naugatuck Valley COG), but have selected only four of the eight for advancement. Three of the four projects were CRCOG’s top three priority projects (Rocky Hill, Hartford, and New Britain) and the remaining project was submitted by RiverCOG. Ellington’s project was not reviewed or identified for advancement by CTDOT.

CTDOT’s reviews resulted in cost increases for each of the three CRCOG projects, with Hartford’s being the most significant. The Hartford project’s increase which was primarily the result of CTDOT requiring the northern limit of the trail be extended to what they consider a logical terminus. Each municipality was contacted regarding CTDOT’s review, and each indicated to CRCOG that they could obtain the required increased match and would like to advance their project as scoped by CTDOT. CTDOT has requested that CRCOG consider and possibly approve the resulting agreed upon scope/cost changes and associated program funding revisions.

Project Priority	Town	Project	Estimated Federal Share		% change	CTDOT Review Comments
			Municipal Application	CTDOT Review		
1	Rocky Hill	Silas Deane Streetscape - Phase III	\$ 2,102,016	\$ 2,305,728	+9%	<i>Minor cost estimating adjustments</i>
2	Hartford	Hartford - Windsor Riverwalk Extension	\$ 1,237,200	\$ 2,529,494	+104%	<i>Project extension to logical termini needed</i>
3	New Britain	New Britain's "Stanley Loop Trail" (Phase 2)	\$ 853,600	\$1,179,628 (\$ 1,437,248*)	+38% (+68%)	<i>Cost estimating adjustments</i>
4	Ellington	Route 83 Corridor Sidewalks	\$ 1,920,000	-	-	<i>Not reviewed</i>
CRCOG Estimated Target = \$6.1 million			\$ 6,112,816	\$ 6,014,850 (\$ 6,272,470*)	-2% (+3%)	

* If New Britain design costs are participating, initial City application did not include design cost participation

The Ellington project was not reviewed by CTDOT, however, they are very interested in advancing their project. Therefore, CRCOG staff has been considering options that would allow its advancement, including those initially outlined in the subcommittee memo. In order to advance all four CRCOG projects, CRCOG staff recommends the following potential options in priority order for committee consideration:

1. Advance both the New Britain and Hartford projects as scoped by CTDOT, however pursue reallocating the Rocky Hill project's TA Set-Aside monies to the Ellington project, and allocating LOTCIP funding for the Rocky Hill project. However, CTDOT has preliminarily indicated that if monies are freed up due to Rocky Hill dropping out of the TA Set-Aside program, that there is no guarantee that those funds would be allocated to the Ellington project. CTDOT indicated that the Ellington project would need to compete with the other non-selected projects within the TMA, and if another project is selected the monies would go towards that advancing that non-CRCOG project.
2. For in prior option, if no commitment to the Ellington can be obtained from CTDOT, advance the Rocky Hill project with TA Set-Aside funding and either allocate LOTCIP funding to the Ellington project, or reserve funding for Ellington as the region's top priority project under the next TA Set-Aside solicitation.

Under either option the awarded LOTCIP funding would count against that municipality's limit of available projects/funding in the envisioned 2017 LOTCIP solicitation (Phase 2). Additionally, given the Hartford project's scope/cost increase and complexity, staff inquired regarding the appropriateness of revisiting the previously assigned priorities given to the CRCOG TA Set-Aside projects.

Due to the numerous unresolved issues, the committee decided to table the TA Set-Aside action until the June meeting. Prior to the June meeting, CRCOG staff was tasked the following:

- Obtain more formal municipal commitments to the increased municipal shares associated with the higher CTDOT cost estimates.
- Determine if CTDOT will be advancing all projects in parallel or if there will be delays based on assigned priority order.
- Further advocate CTDOT to allow the reassignment of the Rocky Hill project's funding to the Ellington project.
- Check with Ellington regarding their official position regarding the receipt of LOTCIP funds (following their June meeting)

Subsequent to these efforts, CRCOG staff plans to provide recommendations for action at the June committee meetings.

5. **STBG (previously STP-Urban) Program Summary** – Due to time constraints, this agenda item was removed and is scheduled to be reviewed at the Transportation Committee meeting.
6. **Other Business** - There were no other meeting discussion items.
 - The next Cost Review Subcommittee meeting is tentatively scheduled for Monday, June 26th, 2017 at 11:30 a.m.
7. **Adjourn**-The Meeting was adjourned at 11:55 a.m.