

# Metropolitan Transportation Plan

## Long Range Transportation Plan for the Metro-Hartford Capitol Region

# Appendices







## **Appendices Table of Contents**

Appendix A	Air Quality Conformity	1
Appendix B	Performance Measures From 2019 MTP Update	36
Appendix C	Memoranda of Understanding	39
Appendix D	FHWA and FTA Funding Tables	101
Appendix E	Project List	109
Appendix F	Public Comments and Responses	117
Appendix G	Survey Results	124

# Appendix A



## Ozone and PM<sub>2.5</sub> Air Quality Conformity Determination

of the 2023-2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plans

and the 2021-2024 Transportation Improvement Programs, As Amended

**Connecticut Department of Transportation** February 2023

Page **1** of **34** 

Appendicies Page 2

## Table of Contents

1.		Executive Summary	3
2.		What is Transportation Conformity?	5
3.		Nonattainment and Maintenance Areas in Connecticut	5
	a.	Ozone Nonattainment Areas	5
	b.	PM2.5 Maintenance Area	7
	c.	Carbon Monoxide Attainment Areas	3
	d.	PM10 Attainment Area – Limited Maintenance	3
	e.	State of Connecticut Nonattainment/Attainment Maps	Э
4.		How Does Connecticut Demonstrate Conformity?1	1
	a.	Transportation Planning Work Program1	1
	b.	Interagency Consultation1	1
	c.	Public Consultation	2
	d.	Scenario Years12	2
	e.	Other Planning Documents1	3
5.		Latest Planning Assumptions and Emissions Model	3
	a.	VMT	3
	b.	Emissions Model14	4
6.		Conformity Tests and Air Quality Emissions Results	5
7.		Conclusions	7
8.		Contact Information	7
9.		Appendices	7

## 1. Executive Summary

This report documents the air quality conformity analysis of the 2023-2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plans (MTPs) and the 2021-2024 Transportation Improvement Programs (TIPs), as amended carried out under the regulations contained in the United States Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) final rule, published in the November 24, 1993 Federal Register, with subsequent amendments and additional federal guidance published by EPA, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA). The process involved consultation with affected agencies such as EPA, FHWA, FTA, the Connecticut Department of Energy and Environmental Protection (CTDEEP) and the Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) within the State of Connecticut. The air quality emissions analysis is a responsibility of the Connecticut Department of Transportation (CTDOT), acting as the MPO for this task.

"Conformity" is a requirement of the Federal Clean Air Act Amendments (CAAA) Section 176(c) (42 U.S.C.7506(c)) and EPA conformity regulations (40 CFR 93 Subpart A). These regulations require that each new MTP and TIP be demonstrated to conform to the State Implementation Plan (SIP) before the MTP and TIPs are approved by the MPO or accepted by the United States Department of Transportation (USDOT). This ensures that the MTP and TIPs are consistent with air quality goals and that progress is being made towards achieving and maintaining Federal air quality standards. A conformity determination is undertaken to estimate emissions that will result from an area's transportation system. The analysis must demonstrate that those emissions are within limits outlined in state air quality implementation plans.

Under the transportation conformity regulation, the principal criteria for a determination of conformity for transportation plans and programs are:

- The TIP and MTP must pass an emissions budget test using a motor vehicle emissions budget (MVEB) that has been found to be adequate by EPA for transportation conformity purposes, or an interim emission test;
- The latest planning assumptions and emission models specified for use in conformity determinations must be employed;
- The TIP and MTP must provide for the timely implementation of transportation control measures (TCMs) specified in the applicable air quality implementation plans; and
- Interagency and public consultation.

As the federal air quality districts for ozone and PM2.5 include several counties and various planning regions, the emission analysis must be coordinated to include the TIPs and MTPs of several regions.

The CTDOT performs this coordination role. Each region submits its draft TIP and MTP to the CTDOT and the CTDOT in turn combines the TIPs and MTPs for all appropriate regions and conducts the analysis on each pollutant's impact for each air quality district in relation to the established MVEBs.

For the 2023-2050 MTP and the 2021-2024 TIPs, as amended, summer day emission estimates for ozone precursors, volatile organic compounds (VOC) and nitrogen oxides (NOx), and annual emission estimates for particulate matter 2.5 microns or smaller (PM2.5) and NOx as a precursor were developed for years 2023, 2025, 2035, 2045, and 2050 forecast years. These emission estimates were calculated using EPA's Motor Vehicle Emission Simulator (MOVES3).

The results of this analysis, in Tables 1 and 2 below show that the 2023-2050 MTP and the 2021-2024 TIPs, as amended, mobile emissions are within the MVEBs for all forecast years per pollutant. This analysis

Page **3** of **34** 

provides a basis for a determination of conformity for the 2023-2050 MTP and the 2021-2024 TIP, as amended.

		Tons per day						
Year	Ozone Area	Cube Series 2		Budgets		Difference		
		VOC	NOx	VOC	NOx	VOC	NOx	
2022	CT Portion of NY-NJ-LI Area	15.28	18.56	17.6	24.6	-2.32	-6.04	
2025	Greater CT Area	13.58	16.30	15.9	22.2	-2.32	-5.90	
2025	CT Portion of NY-NJ-LI Area	13.89	15.54	17.6	24.6	-3.71	-9.06	
2025	Greater CT Area	12.42	13.67	15.9	22.2	-3.48	-8.53	
2025	CT Portion of NY-NJ-LI Area	8.66	8.36	17.6	24.6	-8.94	-16.24	
2035	Greater CT Area	7.78	7.47	15.9	22.2	-8.12	-14.73	
2045	CT Portion of NY-NJ-LI Area	7.47	7.65	17.6	24.6	-10.13	-16.95	
2045	Greater CT Area	6.74	6.82	15.9	22.2	-9.16	-15.38	
2050	CT Portion of NY-NJ-LI Area	7.03	7.61	17.6	24.6	-10.57	-16.99	
	Greater CT Area	6.35	6.80	15.9	22.2	-9.55	-15.40	

Table 1: Ozone Conformity - NOx and VOC Emissions Budget Test Results for Both 2008 and 2015 Ozone NAAQS

#### Table 2: PM2.5 Conformity - Direct PM2.5 and NOx Emission Budget Test Results

		Tons per year						
Voor	DNA2 E Area	Cube Se	Cube Series 2		Budgets		erence	
fear	PIVIZ.J Area	Direct PM <sub>2.5</sub>	NOx	Direct PM <sub>2.5</sub>	NOx	Direct PM <sub>2.5</sub>	NOx	
2023	CT Portion of NY-NJ-LI Area	205.36	5954.80	575.80	12,791.80	-370.44	-6837.00	
2025	CT Portion of NY-NJ-LI Area	192.15	5003.72	516.0	9,728.10	-323.85	-4724.38	
2035	CT Portion of NY-NJ-LI Area	143.73	2792.78	516.0	9,728.10	-372.27	-6935.32	
2045	CT Portion of NY-NJ-LI Area	125.72	2530.02	516.0	9,728.10	-390.28	-7198.08	
2050	CT Portion of NY-NJ-LI Area	127.35	2531.04	516.0	9,728.10	-388.65	-7197.06	

## 2. What is Transportation Conformity?

Transportation conformity is a planning process required by the CAA Section 176(c), which establishes the framework for improving air quality to protect public health and the environment. The goal of transportation conformity is to ensure that FHWA and FTA funding and approvals are given to highway and public transportation activities that are consistent with air quality goals.

The CAA requires that metropolitan transportation plans, TIPs, and Federal projects conform to the purpose of the SIP. Conformity to a SIP means that such activities will not cause or contribute to any new violations of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS); increase the frequency or severity of NAAQS violations; or delay timely attainment of the NAAQS or any required interim milestone. Conformity requirements apply in areas that either do not meet or previously have not met air quality standards for ozone, carbon monoxide, particulate matter, or nitrogen dioxide. These areas are known as "nonattainment areas" or "maintenance areas", respectively.

Connecticut contains nonattainment areas for ozone (O3) and maintenance areas for carbon monoxide (CO) and PM2.5.

For MTP and TIP conformity, the determination shows that the total emissions from on-road travel on an area's transportation system are consistent with the MVEBs and goals for air quality found in the state's SIP. A conformity determination demonstrates that implementation of the MTP or TIP will not cause any new violations of the air quality standard, increase the frequency or severity of violations of the standard, or delay timely attainment of the standard or any interim milestone.

This document was developed by the CTDOT to demonstrate that the MTP comply with the MVEBs for the nonattainment and maintenance areas that fall within the state's planning boundary. In accordance with EPA regulation 40 CFR 93 Subpart A, this conformity determination is being issued in response to the adoption of new MTPs.

In addition, the conformity determination demonstrates compliance with the congestion management process in transportation management areas (23 CFR §450.322), development and content of the MTP (23 CFR §450.324), and fiscal constraints for MTPs and TIPs (40 CFR §93.108-119).

## 3. Nonattainment and Maintenance Areas in Connecticut

#### a. Ozone Nonattainment Areas

Ozone is an extremely reactive, colorless gas comprised of three atoms of oxygen. Ozone exists naturally in a layer of the earth's upper atmosphere known as the stratosphere, where it shields the earth from the sun's harmful ultraviolet rays. However, ozone found close to the earth's surface, called ground-level ozone, is a component of smog and a harmful pollutant. Ground-level ozone is produced by a complex chemical reaction between VOCs and NOx in the presence of sunlight.

Mobile source NOx emissions form when nitrogen and oxygen atoms chemically react inside the high pressure and temperature conditions in an engine. VOC emissions are a product of partial fuel combustion, fuel evaporation and refueling losses caused by spillage and vapor leakage.

Exposure to ozone has been linked to a number of respiratory health effects, including significant decreases in lung function, inflammation of airways, and increased symptoms such as cough and pain when breathing deeply. High concentrations of ozone can also contribute to reductions in agricultural crop production and forest yields, as well as increased susceptibility of plants to disease, pests and other environmental stresses

Page 5 of 34

such as harsh weather. This pollutant alone contributes to the majority of unhealthy air quality days in Connecticut, as measured by the Air Quality Index (AQI).

EPA revised the ozone NAAQS in 2008 and again in 2015. The 2008 ozone NAAQS was established at 75 ppb and the 2015 ozone NAAQS revised the standard to 70 ppb. States and portions of states are then subsequently classified as attainment (meeting the standard) or one of the following classifications of nonattainment: marginal, moderate, serious, severe and extreme. The classifications indicate the severity of the exceedance are defined in rules that proceed a newly promulgated NAAQS. Connecticut is nonattainment for both standards and as such must contend with the subsequent nonattainment requirements for both standards. Under the 2008 standard the southwest portion of the state, known as the New York-Northern New Jersey-Long Island (NY-NJ-CT) ozone nonattainment area, is designated as Severe and the rest of the state, known as the Greater Connecticut ozone non-attainment area, is designated as Serious. Under the 2015 standard Connecticut's two nonattainment areas are designated as Moderate.<sup>1</sup>

Under the 2008 standard, the Connecticut ozone nonattainment areas were subsequently reclassified to moderate. EPA determined that 11 of the original marginal areas did not attain the 2008 ozone standards by the July 20, 2015 attainment date and that they must be reclassified as moderate. Both the Greater Connecticut and the Connecticut portion of the NY-NJ-LI nonattainment areas were two of the eleven areas.<sup>2</sup> The "bump- up" designation to moderate was effective on June 3, 2016.

In this action, the EPA also established a due date of January 1, 2017, by which states with newly reclassified moderate areas must submit SIP revisions to address moderate nonattainment area requirements for those areas. The reclassified areas must attain the 2008 ozone standards by the July 20, 2018 moderate attainment deadline. Neither of Connecticut's nonattainment areas measured compliance by the deadline. As such, on September 23, 2019, EPA reclassified both areas as serious under the 2008 standard.

On March 20, 2017, EPA notified CTDEEP that EPA had determined the 2017 MVEBs for the Greater Connecticut ozone nonattainment area, submitted as a SIP revision by CTDEEP to EPA on January 17, 2017, to be adequate for transportation conformity purposes. On May 31, 2017, EPA published its adequacy finding in the Federal Register (82 FR 24859) and the MVEBs became effective on June 15, 2017 for transportation conformity purposes.

On June 4, 2018, EPA published a final rule that designated new nonattainment areas for the 2015 Ozone NAAQS (83 FR 25776). These designations were effective on August 3, 2018. The Greater Connecticut nonattainment area is designated as marginal for the 2015 NAAQS while the Connecticut portion of the NY-NJ-LI nonattainment areas is designated as moderate. This analysis demonstrates conformity to the new 2015 Ozone NAAQS for both Connecticut non-attainment areas.

On October 1, 2018, EPA published a final rule approving certain SIP revisions relating to the 2008 8-hour Ozone NAAQS (83 FR 49297), including approval of the MVEB as shown in Table 3.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup><u>83 FR 25776</u>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> <u>81 FR 26697</u>

#### Table 3: Approved Motor Vehicle Emissions Budgets - Ozone

Voor	A*00	VOC	NOx	
Tear	Area	(tons/summer day)	(tons/summer day)	
2017	Connecticut portion of the New York- Northern New Jersey-Long Island, NY-NJ-LI Ozone Area	17.6	24.6	
2017	Greater Connecticut Ozone Area	15.9	22.2	

#### b. PM2.5 Maintenance Area

Fine particulate matter, also called PM2.5, is a mixture of microscopic solids and liquid droplets suspended in air, where the size of the particles is equal to or less than 2.5 micrometers (about one-thirtieth the diameter of a human hair). Fine particles can be emitted directly (such as smoke from a fire, or as a component of automobile exhaust) or be formed indirectly in the air from power plant, industrial and mobile source emissions of gases such as sulfur dioxide and nitrogen oxides.

The health effects associated with exposure to fine particles are serious. Scientific studies have shown significant associations between elevated fine particle levels and premature death. Effects associated with fine particle exposure include aggravation of respiratory and cardiovascular disease (as indicated by increased hospital admissions, emergency room visits, absences from school or work, and restricted activity days), lung disease, decreased lung function, asthma attacks, and certain cardiovascular problems such as heart attacks and cardiac arrhythmia. While fine particles are unhealthy for anyone to breathe, people with heart or lung disease, asthmatics, older adults, and children are especially at risk.

In December of 2004, EPA signed the final rulemaking notice to designate attainment and nonattainment areas with respect to the PM2.5 NAAQS, becoming effective April 5, 2005. In Connecticut, Fairfield and New Haven Counties were included in the New York-Northern New Jersey-Long Island, NY-NJ-CT PM2.5 nonattainment area. On June 20, 2007, PM2.5 budgets were found to be adequate for the early progress SIP. CTDEEP submitted a re-designation request and maintenance plan for the Connecticut portion of the NY-NJ-CT area on June 22, 2012. The plan demonstrated that Connecticut's air quality met both the 1997 annual and the 2006 24-hour PM2.5 NAAQS due to a combination of national, regional and local control measures implemented to reduce emissions and presented a maintenance plan that ensures continued attainment through the year 2025. The end of the maintenance period was established as 2025, consistent with the CAA section 175A (a) requirement that the plan provide for maintenance of the NAAQS for at least 10 years after EPA formally approves the re-designation request.

EPA subsequently determined that the 2017 and 2025 MVEBs in the maintenance plan were adequate for transportation conformity purposes and effective as of February 20, 2013. On September 24, 2013, EPA published its approval of the PM2.5 re-designation request, establishing October 24, 2013 as the effective date of re-designation to attainment/maintenance for Connecticut's portion of the NY-NJ-CT area for both the 1997 annual and 24-hours PM2.5 NAAQS. Table 4 summarizes Connecticut's current PM2.5 MVEBs.

#### Table 4: Approved Motor Vehicle Emissions Budgets – PM2.5

Year	Area	<b>Direct PM<sub>2.5</sub></b> (tons/year)	<b>NOx</b> (tons/year)
2017	Connecticut portion of the New York- Northern New Jersey-Long Island, NY-NJ-LI PM <sub>2.5</sub> Area	575.8	12,791.8
2025	Connecticut portion of the New York- Northern New Jersey-Long Island, NY-NJ-LI PM <sub>2.5</sub> Area	516.0	9,728.1

#### c. Carbon Monoxide Attainment Areas

Carbon monoxide is produced by the incomplete burning of carbon in fuels, including gasoline. High concentrations of CO occur along roadsides in heavy traffic, particularly at major intersections and in enclosed areas such as garages and poorly ventilated tunnels. Peak concentrations occur during the colder months of the year when CO vehicular emissions are greater and meteorological inversion conditions occur more frequently, trapping pollutants near the ground.

There were formerly three CO nonattainment areas in the state. These were the Southwestern portion of the state, the New Haven-Meriden-Waterbury area, and the Hartford-New Britain-Middletown area. The remainder of the state was in attainment for CO. Attainment was demonstrated in each of the nonattainment areas and, subsequently, they were designated as full maintenance areas. On September 13, 2004, EPA approved a CTDEEP submittal for a SIP revision for re-designation of these areas to limited maintenance plan status, thus eliminating the need for budget testing. Effective January 2, 2016, the Hartford-New Britain-Middletown area was in full attainment status. The New Haven-Meriden-Waterbury area completed the maintenance period effective December 4, 2018 while the Southwestern Connecticut area was effective May 10, 2019. In the future, "hot-spot" carbon monoxide analyses will not be performed to satisfy "project level" conformity determinations as the whole State of Connecticut is in attainment for CO.

#### d. PM10 Attainment Area – Limited Maintenance

EPA previously designated the City of New Haven as nonattainment with respect to the NAAQS for particulate matter with a nominal diameter of ten microns or less (PM10). The PM10 nonattainment status in New Haven was a local problem stemming from activities of several businesses located in the Stiles Street section of the city. Numerous violations in the late 1980's and early 1990's of Section 22a-174-18 (Fugitive Dust) of CTDEEP regulations in that section of the city led to a nonattainment designation (CTDEEP, 1994: Narrative Connecticut Department of Energy and Environmental Protection, State Implementation Plan Revision, For PM10, March 1994). Corrective actions were subsequently identified in the SIP and implemented, with no violations of the PM10 NAAQS since the mid-1990s.

On October 13, 2005, EPA published in the Federal Register (70 FR 59690), approval of a request by CTDEEP for a limited maintenance plan and re-designation of the New Haven nonattainment area to attainment for the PM10 NAAQS. This direct final rule became effective on December 12, 2005.

All construction activities undertaken in the City of New Haven are required to be performed in compliance with Section 22a-174-18 (Control of Particulate "Emissions") of the CTDEEP regulations. All reasonable available control measures must be implemented during construction to mitigate particulate matter

emissions, including wind-blown fugitive dust, mud and dirt carry out, and re-entrained fugitive emission from mobile equipment.

As with limited maintenance plans for other pollutants, emissions budgets are considered to satisfy transportation conformity's "budget test". However, future "project level" conformity determination may require "hot spot" PM10 analyses for new transportation projects with significant diesel traffic in accordance with EPA's Final Rule for "PM2.5 and PM10 Hot-Spot Analyses in Project-level Transportation Conformity Rule PM2.5 and PM10 Amendments; Final Rule (75 FR 4260, March 24, 2010) which became effective on April 23, 2010.

#### e. State of Connecticut Nonattainment/Attainment Maps



Figure 1: Connecticut Ozone Nonattainment Areas



1997 Annual & 2006 24-Hour PM 2.5 NAAQS - Effective October 24, 2013



#### Figure 3: Connecticut Carbon Monoxide Attainment Areas

## 4. How Does Connecticut Demonstrate Conformity?

#### a. Transportation Planning Work Program

CTDOT's FY 2023-2024 Transportation Planning Work Program contains a description of all planning efforts, including those related to air quality, to be sponsored or undertaken with federal assistance during FY 2023 and 2024. Included with this program are several tasks directly related to CTDOT's responsibilities under Connecticut's air quality SIP. Additional functions, such as those supporting the preparation of project level conformity analysis, are funded under project related tasks. This work program is available at CTDOT for review.

#### b. Interagency Consultation

The conformity rule requires that Federal, State, and local transportation and air quality agencies establish formal procedures to ensure interagency coordination on critical issues. Interagency consultation is a collaborative process between organizations on key elements of the transportation and air quality planning and provides a forum for effective state and local planning and decision-making.

Key organizations included in the interagency consultation are FHWA, FTA, EPA, CTDOT, CTDEEP and the MPOs.

Some goals of interagency consultation are to:

- Ensure all agencies meet regularly and share information;
- Identify key issues early in the process;
- Enable well-coordinated schedules for TIP/MTP conformity determinations and SIP development; and
- Allow collaborative decision on methodologies, assumptions, and conformity test selections.

A list of attendees and call-in participants of the Interagency Consultation Meeting is included in Appendix C along with a copy of the minutes from the meeting.

#### c. Public Consultation

The transportation conformity process must also include public consultation on the emissions analysis and conformity determination. This includes posting of relevant documentation and analysis on a "clearinghouse" webpage maintained through the interagency consultation process. All MPOs in the affected nonattainment or maintenance areas must provide thirty-day public comment periods and address any comments received. For this transportation conformity determination, all Connecticut MPOs will hold a thirty-day public comment period. If any public comments were received, they will be attached and can be found in Appendix E.

#### d. Scenario Years

The "Action Scenario" is the future transportation system that will result from full implementation of the MTP.

VOC/NOx emission analysis was conducted for ozone season summer day conditions for the following years:

- 2023 (Attainment year and near-term analysis year for both the Greater CT and CT portion of NY-NJ-LI Serious nonattainment areas under the 2008 and 2015 Ozone NAAQS)
- 2025 (Interim modeling year)
- 2035 (Interim modeling year)
- 2045 (Interim modeling year)
- 2050 (Metropolitan Transportation Plan horizon year)

PM2.5 emission analysis was conducted for the following years but for annual average conditions:

- 2023 (Attainment year and near-term analysis year)
- 2025 (Interim modeling year)
- 2035 (Interim modeling year)
- 2045 (interim modeling year)
- 2050 (Metropolitan Transportation Plan horizon year)

#### e. Other Planning Documents

The enacting of Section 81 of Connecticut Public Act 13-277 repealed Section 13b-15 of the Connecticut General Statutes, no longer mandating a biennial Master Transportation Plan effective July 1, 2013. The Department's Capital Plan has been expanded to include much of the project information that was formerly included in the Master Transportation Plan.

## 5. Latest Planning Assumptions and Emissions Model

#### a. VMT

Vehicle miles of travel (VMT) estimates were developed from CTDOT's statewide network-based travel demand model, Cube Series 2. The 2019 travel model network, to the extent practical, represents all state highways and major connecting non-state streets and roads, as well as the rail, local bus, and express bus systems that currently exist. Future highway networks for 2023, 2025, 2026, 2028, 2030, 2035, and 2045 and transit networks for 2023, 2025, 2028, 2030, and 2040 were built by adding MPOs TIP projects (programmed for opening after 2019) to the 2019 network year. These networks were used to run travel demand models and conduct emissions analyses for the years 2023, 2025, 2035, 2045 and 2050. Projects for each model analysis year for which network changes were required are listed in Appendix B.

It should be noted that the MPOs TIP projects, which have negligible impact on trip distribution and/or highway capacity, have not been incorporated into the network. These include, but are not limited to, geometric improvements of existing interchanges, short sections of climbing lanes, intersection improvements, transit projects dealing with equipment for existing facilities and vehicles, and transit operating assistance. Other projects that reduce the number of vehicle trips, VMT or both may not be included. Such projects include ridesharing and telecommuting programs, bicycling facilities, clean fuel vehicle programs or other possible actions. These types of considerations, while not explicitly accounted for in the travel demand model, will continue to reduce the emissions levels in the regions. Essentially, those projects that do not impact the travel demand forecasts are not included in the networks and/or analysis.

The network-based travel model used for this analysis is the model that CTDOT utilizes for transportation planning, programming and design requirements. This travel demand model uses demographic and land use assumptions based on the 2019 Connecticut Department of Public Health Annual Population Estimates and Connecticut Department of Labor 2019 employment estimates. Population and employment projections for the years 2020, 2030, 2040 and 2050 were developed by the Connecticut Department of Transportation, Travel Demand and Air Quality Modeling Unit.

The model uses a capacity constrained multi-class equilibrium approach to allocate trips among links. The model was calibrated using 2019 ground counts and 2019 Highway Performance Monitoring System (HPMS) Vehicle Miles of Travel data.

In addition, the Employer Commute Options (ECO) Program has been made available to all employers and is incorporated in the travel demand model. It is felt that this process is an effective means of achieving Connecticut's clean air targets. Funding of this effort under the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement (CMAQ) program is included in the TIP for FY 2021-2024. It is estimated that this program, if fully successful, could reduce VMT and mobile source emissions by 2% in Southwest Connecticut.

Peak hour directional traffic volumes were estimated as a percentage of the Average Daily Traffic (ADT) on a link-by-link basis. Based on automatic traffic recorder data, 9.0 percent, 8.5 percent, 8.0 percent and 7.5

percent of the ADT occurs during the four highest hours of the day. A 55:45 directional split was assumed. Hourly volumes were then converted to Service Flow Levels (SFL) and Volume to Capacity (V/C) ratios calculated as follows:

SFL = DHV / PHF \* N VC = SFL / C where: DHV = Directional Hourly Volume PHF = Peak Hour Factor = 0.9 N = Number of lanes C = Capacity of lane

Peak period speeds were estimated from the 2000 Highway Capacity Manual based on the design speed, facility class, area type and calculated V/C ratio. On the expressway system, Connecticut- based free flow speed data was available. This data was deemed more appropriate and superseded the capacity manual speed values. The expressway free flow speeds were updated in 2005.

For the off-peak hours, traffic volume is not the controlling factor for vehicle speed. Off-peak link speeds were based on the Highway Capacity Manual free flow speeds as a function of facility class and area type. As before, Connecticut-based speed data was substituted for expressway travel, where available, and was updated in 2005.

ShoreLine East, Hartford Rail Line, New Haven Rail Line, and its branch line schedules were updated in 2019 to reflect new headways and routes. Rail station boardings were then calibrated to a mixture of 2018 and 2019 actual counts for A.M. peak period, Midday off-peak, and Daily boardings along all Connecticut rail lines.

Two special cases exist in the travel demand modeling process. These are centroid connectors and intrazonal trips:

- Centroid connectors represent the local roads used to gain access to the model network from centers of activity in each traffic analysis zone (TAZ). A speed of 25 mph is utilized for these links; and
- Intrazonal trips are trips that are too short to get on to the model network. VMT for intrazonal trips is calculated based on the size of each individual TAZ. A speed of 20 to 24 mph is utilized for peak period and 25 to 29 mph for off-peak.

The Daily Vehicle Miles of Travel (DVMT) is calculated using a methodology based on disaggregate speed and summarized by inventory area, functional classification, and speed. The annual VMT and speed profiles developed by this process are then combined with the emission factors from the MOVES3 model to produce emission estimates for each scenario and time frame.

#### b. Emissions Model

For this transportation conformity analysis, the MOVES model, specifically MOVES3, was used to estimate on-road vehicle emissions for the action scenarios. MOVES is a state-of-the-science emission modeling system, developed by EPA, that estimates emissions for mobile sources at the national, county, and project level for criteria air pollutants, greenhouse gases, and air toxics.

MOVES estimates exhaust and evaporative emissions as well as brake and tire wear emissions from all types of on-road vehicles. It also uses a vehicle classification system based on the way vehicles are classified in the FHWA's Highway Performance Monitoring System (HPMS). Other parameters include VMT by vehicle and

Page **14** of **34** 

road type, vehicle hours traveled (VHT) by vehicle and road type, the number of each type of vehicle in the fleet, vehicle age distribution, model year, travel speed, roadway type, fuel information, meteorological data, such as ambient temperature and humidity, and applicable control measures such as reformulated gasoline (RFG) and inspection and maintenance (I/M) programs. Local inputs were cooperatively developed by CTDEEP and CTDOT, where applicable, using EPA recommended methods.

The HPMS Vehicle Mix file was updated to reflect the average vehicle mix for the 2015-2017 timeframe. A Three-year average was determined to be a more accurate representation of actual vehicle mix than the previous one-year counts as the CTDOT rotates traffic and vehicle counts on a three-year basis.

CTDEEP used local data from 2020 Connecticut registration data for 11 Motorcycle, 43 School Bus, and 54 Motor Home source types. Data from an EPA sponsored decode of 2017 state vehicle registration data was used for 21 Passenger Car, 31 Passenger Truck, 32 Light Commercial Truck, 51 Refuse Truck, 52 Single Unit Short-haul Truck, 53 Single Unit Long-haul truck source types. Local data from analyses of 2011 Connecticut registration data was used for 41 Intercity bus, 42 Transit Bus, 61 Combination Short-haul Truck and 62-Combination Long-haul Truck source types. These data sets were scaled to the project base year using the growth in MOVES Default VMT for the relevant time periods.

In November 2012, EPA confirmed by telephone to CTDEEP that future conformity determinations utilizing newer versions of MOVES can be made by comparing emission results to the existing budgets based on older versions of MOVES. As new MVEBs are determined by EPA to be adequate for each area, they will be used to make conformity determinations.

For the ozone analysis, MOVES was only run to obtain VOC and NOx emissions on a typical summer weekday to compare to the ton per summer day ozone MVEBs. For the PM2.5 analyses, an annual emissions run was conducted for PM2.5 and NOx to compare to the ton per year PM2.5 MVEBs. All runs also included the National Low Emission Vehicle (NLEV) program in 2020 and all future years.

## 6. Conformity Tests and Air Quality Emissions Results

For the NY-NJ-LI ozone nonattainment area, VOC and NOx transportation emissions from the Action Scenarios must be less than the 2017 transportation emission budgets if analysis year is 2017 or later.

For the Greater Connecticut ozone nonattainment area, VOC and NOx transportation emissions from the Action Scenarios must be less than the 2017 transportation emission budgets if analysis year is 2017 or later.

For the NY-NJ-LI PM2.5 maintenance area, PM2.5 and NOx transportation emissions from the Action Scenarios must be less than the 2017 transportation emission budgets if analysis year is between 2017 and 2024.

For the NY-NJ-LI PM2.5 maintenance area, PM2.5 and NOx transportation emissions from the Action Scenarios must be less than the 2025 transportation emission budgets if analysis year is 2025 or later.

No tests for CO are required because the CO areas have completed their Limited Maintenance Plans.

The following tables show the MOVES3 modeled emissions for both ozone and PM2.5 areas compared to the applicable MVEBs for each pollutant. In all cases, the MPOs TIPs meets the required conformity tests.

		Tons per day						
Year	Ozone Area	Cube Series 2		Budgets		Difference		
		VOC	NOx	VOC	NOx	VOC	NOx	
2022	CT Portion of NY-NJ-LI Area	15.28	18.56	17.6	24.6	-2.32	-6.04	
2025	Greater CT Area	13.58	16.30	15.9	22.2	-2.32	-5.90	
2025	CT Portion of NY-NJ-LI Area	13.89	15.54	17.6	24.6	-3.71	-9.06	
2025	Greater CT Area	12.42	13.67	15.9	22.2	-3.48	-8.53	
2025	CT Portion of NY-NJ-LI Area	8.66	8.36	17.6	24.6	-8.94	-16.24	
2055	Greater CT Area	7.78	7.47	15.9	22.2	-8.12	-14.73	
2045	CT Portion of NY-NJ-LI Area	7.47	7.65	17.6	24.6	-10.13	-16.95	
2045	Greater CT Area	6.74	6.82	15.9	22.2	-9.16	-15.38	
2050	CT Portion of NY-NJ-LI Area	7.03	7.61	17.6	24.6	-10.57	-16.99	
	Greater CT Area	6.35	6.80	15.9	22.2	-9.55	-15.40	

Table 5: Ozone Conformity - NOx and VOC Emissions Budget Test Results for Both 2008 and 2015 Ozone NAAQS

Table 6: PM2.5 Conformity - Direct PM2.5 and NOx Emission Budget Test Results

		Tons per year							
Voor	DNA2 E Area	Cube Series 2		Budgets		Difference			
rear	PIVIZ.5 Area	Direct PM <sub>2.5</sub>	NOx	Direct PM <sub>2.5</sub>	NOx	Direct PM <sub>2.5</sub>	NOx		
2023	CT Portion of NY-NJ-LI Area	205.36	5954.80	575.80	12,791.80	-370.44	-6837.00		
2025	CT Portion of NY-NJ-LI Area	192.15	5003.72	516.0	9,728.10	-323.85	-4724.38		
2035	CT Portion of NY-NJ-LI Area	143.73	2792.78	516.0	9,728.10	-372.27	-6935.32		
2045	CT Portion of NY-NJ-LI Area	125.72	2530.02	516.0	9,728.10	-390.28	-7198.08		
2050	CT Portion of NY-NJ-LI Area	127.35	2531.04	516.0	9,728.10	-388.65	-7197.06		

Emission Summary Tables are posted in Appendix D.

This analysis in no way reflects the full benefit in air quality from the MPOs TIPs. The network-based modeling process is capable of assessing the impact of major new highway or transit service. It does not reflect the impact from the many projects, which are categorically excluded from the requirement of conformity. These projects include numerous improvements to intersections, which will allow traffic to flow more efficiently, thus reducing delay, fuel usage and emissions. Included in the MPOs TIPs, but not reflected in this analysis, are many projects to maintain existing rail and bus systems. Without these projects, those systems could not offer the high level of service they do. With them, the mass transit systems function more efficiently, improve safety, and provide a more dependable and aesthetically appealing service. These advantages will retain existing patrons and attract additional riders to the system. The technology to quantify the air quality benefits from these programs is not currently available.

Changes in the transportation system will not produce significant emissions reductions because of the massive existing rail, bus, highway systems, and land development already in place. Change in these aspects is always at the margin, producing very small impacts.

As shown in this analysis, transportation emissions are declining dramatically and will continue to do so. This is primarily due to programs such as federal heavy-duty vehicle standards, reformulated fuels, enhanced inspection and maintenance programs, and Connecticut's low emissions vehicle (LEV) program.

## 7. Conclusions

CTDOT has assessed its compliance with the applicable conformity criteria requirements of the 1990 CAAA. Based upon this analysis, it is concluded that all elements of Metropolitan Transportation Plans conform to applicable SIP and 1990 CAAA Conformity Guidance criteria and the approved transportation conformity budgets.

### 8. Contact Information

Please direct any questions you may have on the air quality emission analysis to:

Connecticut Department of Transportation Bureau of Policy and Planning Division of Program Development and Forecasting Travel Demand / Air Quality Modeling Unit 2800 Berlin Turnpike Newington, CT. 06111 Email: <u>DOT.AQUnit@ct.gov</u>

All MOVES modeling files and run streams are available for review upon request. The files will remain available during the 30-day public review period.

## 9. Appendices

In addition to the information required for a conformity determination, the following is attached:

Appendix A:	Acronyms
Appendix B:	List of Projects Included in Conformity Analysis by Network Year
Appendix C:	Interagency Consultation Meeting
Appendix D:	Emissions Summary Tables
Appendix E:	Comments Received During Public Review Period

Appendix A

Acronyms

Acronym	Meaning
ADT	Average Daily Traffic
AQI	Air Quality Index
СААА	Clean Air Act Amendments (1990)
СО	Carbon Monoxide
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
CTDEEP	Connecticut Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
CTDOT	Connecticut Department of Transportation
CMAQ	Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program
DHV	Design Hourly Volume
DVMT	Daily Vehicle Miles of Travel
ECO	Employee Commute Option
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency
FHWA	Federal Highway Administration
FTA	Federal Transit Administration
FTP	File Transfer Protocol
FR	Federal Register
HPMS	Highway Performance Monitoring System
I/M	Inspection Maintenance Program
MTP	Metropolitan Transportation Plan
MOVES	Mobile Vehicle Emission Simulator
MPO	Metropolitan Planning Organization
MVEB	Motor Vehicle Emission Budget
NAAQS	National Ambient Air Quality Standards
NLEV	National Low Emission Vehicle
NOx	Nitrogen Oxides
PHF	Peak Hour Factor
PM <sub>2.5</sub>	Fine Particulate Matter less than 2.5 micrometers
PM <sub>10</sub>	Fine Particulate Matter less than 10 micrometers
SFL	Service Flow Levels
SIP	State Implementation Plan
STIP	Statewide Transportation Improvement Program
TAZ	Traffic Analysis Zone
ТСМ	Transportation Control Measure
TIP	Transportation Improvement Program
U.S.C.	United States Code
U.S. DOT	U.S. Department of Transportation
V/C	Volume to Capacity
VHT	Vehicle Hours Traveled
VMT	Vehicle Miles Traveled
VOC	Volatile Organic Compound

Appendix B

List of Projects Included in Conformity Analysis by Network Year

Page **20** of **34** 

#### 2023-2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan & 2021-2024 Transportation Improvement Programs

					Network
MPO	Project Number	Town(s)	Route/Street/Sys	Brief Project Description	Year
				Reconstruct interchanges 16 & 17; extend Pershing Drive & construct	
GBVMPO	0036-0179	Derby	RTE 8	local roads. Preliminary design completed	2023
				Reconstruct and widen Main Street from Bridge St. to Ausonio Dr. to 4	
GBVMPO	0036-0184	Derby	RTE 34	travel lanes	2023
				WATERBURY BRANCH SERVICE EXPANSION - OPERATING - FUNDS	
	0304-XXXX	Various	NHL	TRANSFER TO FTA	2023
			Cttransit		
CNVMPO	TBD	Waterbury	Waterbury	Add Route	2025
CNVMPO	TBD	Various	WBL	Expand Service	2025
		CT Transit-			
CNVMPO	TBD	Bristol	Various	Realign Service	2025
	320-0005PE				
	(Station) / 320-				
CRCOG	0008PE (Track)	Newington (HL)		320-0013CN - The Hartford Line Newington Station	2025
	320-0005PE				
	(Station) / 320-	West Hartford			
CRCOG	0008PE (Track)	(HL)		320-0014CN - The Hartford Line West Hartford Station	2025
	320-0005PE				
	(Station) / 320-				
CRCOG	0008PE (Track)	Windsor (HL)		320-0015CN - The Hartford Line Windsor Station	2025
	320-0005PE				
	(Station) / 320-				
CRCOG	0008PE (Track)	Enfield (HL)		320-0017CN - The Hartford Line Enfield Station	2025
	320-0005PE				
	(Station) / 320-				
CRCOG	0008PE (Track)	Enfield (HL)		320-0024CN - The Hartford Line Enfield Station - Short High Level	2025
			Albany Ave/Blue		
CRCOG	TBD	Hartford	Hills Ave	Transit Priority Treatments	2025
		Hartford/West			
CRCOG	TBD	Hartford	Farmington Ave	Transit Priority Treatments	2025
CRCOG	TBD	Hartford	Franklin Ave	Transit Priority Treatments	2025
CRCOG	TBD	Hartford	Main Street	Transit Priority Treatments	2025
CRCOG	TBD	Hartford	Park Street	Transit Priority Treatments	2025
			Burnside		
CRCOG	TBD	East Hartford	Ave/Main Street	Transit Priority Treatments	2025
GBVMPO	0015-0368	Bridgeport	Route 700	Improvement	2025
GBVMPO		Various	WBL	Operation Expansions	2025
GBVMPO		Seymour	WBL	Seymour Station Relocation	2025

					Network
MPO	Project Number	Town(s)	Route/Street/Sys	Brief Project Description	Year
			Route 58 - Black		l
			Rock Turnpike,		l
			Moritz Place and		l
GBVMPO		Fairfield	Whitewood Drive	Improvement	2025
			Route 25 at Pond		l
			View Plaza/Judd		l
001/0400			Road/Purdy Hill	Improvement at Pond View Plaza/Judd Road/Purdy Hill Road	2025
GBVIVIPO		Ivionroe	Road	Intersection	2025
			Koute 58 -		l
			Fairfield Woods		l
GBVMPO		Fairfield	Brookside Drive	Improvement	2025
GBVMPO		Fairfield	Route 58	Improvement	2025
GBVMPO		Seymour	New Road	Route 42 & Route 67 Connector	2025
				Rt. 9 / Rt. 17 Operational & Safety Improvements at Ramp (Reconfigure	
RiverCOG	0082-0316	MIDDLETOWN	RT 9 / RT 17	Rt 17 On-ramp to Rt 9 NB)	2025
RiverCOG		RiverCOG		581 alignment	2025
RiverCOG		RiverCOG		582 alignment	2025
RiverCOG		RiverCOG		583 alignment	2025
RiverCOG		RiverCOG		584 alignment	2025
RiverCOG		RiverCOG		585 alignment	2025
RiverCOG		RiverCOG		586 alignment	2025
RiverCOG		RiverCOG		587 new	2025
RiverCOG		RiverCOG		590 alignment	2025
RiverCOG		RiverCOG		640 new	2025
RiverCOG		RiverCOG		641 algnment	2025
RiverCOG		RiverCOG		642 alignment	2025
RiverCOG		RiverCOG		643 alignment	2025
RiverCOG		RiverCOG		644 alignment	2025
RiverCOG		RiverCOG		645 alignment	2025
				Add a second Meriden to Middletown run to provide 30 minute service	
RiverCOG		MTD		vs. 60 minute	2025
				Bradley Airport Service – Semi-express service to Bradley from Old	
				Saybrook with stops at park and ride lots and the Middletown bus	1
RiverCOG		ETD		terminal	2025
RiverCOG		MTD		Express bus service from Middletown to CT Fastrack in New Britain	2025
				RT 80 Service – Old Saybrook to North Branford service through	1
				Ivoryton, Winthrop, Killingworth, Madison, and Guilford with CT transit	
RiverCOG		ETD		New Haven connection	2025
RiverCOG		RiverCOG		Service frequency changes	2025

					Network
MPO	Project Number	Town(s)	Route/Street/Sys	Brief Project Description	Year
RiverCOG		RiverCOG		Service frequency changes	2025
RiverCOG		RiverCOG		Service frequency changes	2025
RiverCOG		RiverCOG		Service span changes	2025
RiverCOG		RiverCOG		Shuttles new	2025
RiverCOG		RiverCOG		Systemwide changes	2025
RiverCOG		RiverCOG		Systemwide changes	2025
RiverCOG		RiverCOG		Systemwide changes	2025
RiverCOG		RiverCOG		Xtra mile new	2025
RiverCOG		RiverCOG		Xtra mile new	2025
RiverCOG		RiverCOG		Xtra mile new	2025
	0085- 0146/0120-	VADIOUS	57.05		2025
SCCOG	0094	VARIOUS	RT 85	Rt. 85 Improvements	2025
50000			Douto 2	Interchange improvements at Exit 17, add eastbound on-ramp,	2025
SCLUG		COLCHESTER	Roule 2	westbound on-ramp	2025
SCRCOC	0070 0240	MEDIDEN	1 01 / 1 601 / BT 1E	WAS: I-91 / I-691 / Rt. 15 Operational Improvements	2025
SCRCOG	0079-0240	IVIERIDEN	I-91/I-091/KI 15	Lo1 / L691 / Rt 15 - Interchange Improve - EB to NB (B/O from 70-240) -	2025
SCRCOG	0079-0245	MERIDEN	L91 / L691 / RT 15	(Design_Ruild)	2025
Jeneou	0075 0245		1917109171119	I-91 / I-691 / Rt. 15 - Interchange Improvements - NB & NB to WB (B/O	2023
SCRCOG	0079-0246	MERIDEN	I-91 / I-691 / RT 15	from 79-240)	2025
SCRCOG	0106-0108	ORANGE	RT 1	Operational Lane from Milford to CT 114	2025
SCRCOG	320-0005PE (Station) / 320- 0008PE (Track)	North Haven (HL)		320-0012CN - The Hartford Line North Haven Station	2025
	0053-0189	GLASTONBURY	CT 17		2025
CNVMPO	PP0151-014	Waterbury	I-84	Elimination of I-84 Eastbound Exit 21?	2028
			Cttransit Bristol/New		
CNVMPO	TBD	Bristol	Britain	Add Route	2028
CRCOG	TBD	Manchester	I-84	Auxiliary lanes between Exits 62 and 63	2028
CRCOG	TBD	Manchester	I-84	Auxiliary lanes between Exits 63 and 64/65	2028
			Northern Bradley		
CRCOG	TBD	Windsor Locks	Connector	Bradley Airport-Northern Bradley Connector	2028
				Route 6 Corridor Study-Bolton Crossroads – Phase 1: Route 6-Route 44	
00000	TRO	D - It	Davis C	Connector	2022
	TBD	Bolton	Route 6	Duides Doulessment	2028
	0084-0114	Oxford/Wonroe	Kte 34	Bridge Replacement	2028
RiverCOG	0082-0318	MIDDLETOWN	RT 9	Rt. 9 Removal of Lights in Middletown	2028
SWRMPO	0102-0358	NORWALK	RT 7	Rt. 7 / Rt. 15 Interchange Reconstruction and Reconfiguration	2028

					Network
MPO	Project Number	Town(s)	Route/Street/Sys	Brief Project Description	Year
	0096-0208	Newtown	I-84	Climbing lane extension & Exit 9 on-ramp reconfiguration	2028
CNVMPO		Naugatuck	Route 8	Interchange 27 Improvements	2030
CNVMPO		Naugatuck	Route 8	Interchange 28/29 Improvements	2030
CNVMPO		Oxford	Route 34	Bridge Relocation	2030
CNVMPO		Waterbury	Huntingdon	Roadway Improvements	
			Avenue		2030
CNVMPO		Waterbury	Route 69	Roadway Improvements	2030
GBVMPO		Bridgeport	<b>Railroad Station</b>	Improvement	2030
			Route 58 - Black		
			Rock Turnpike and		
GBVMPO		Fairfield	<b>Burroughs Drive</b>	Improvement	2030
			Route 58 -		
			Burroughs Drive		
			and		
GBVMPO		Fairfield	Katona Drive	Improvement	2030
			Route 58 -		
			Shoprite to		
GBVMPO		Fairfield	Stillson Road	Improvement	2030
			Route 58 - Old		
			Navy to Fairfield		
GBVMPO		Fairfield	Woods Road	Improvement	2030
GBVMPO		Shelton	Constitution Blvd	Extend Constitution Blvd	2030
GBVMPO		Bridgeport	I-95	Improvement	2030
			Route 8 and		
GBVMPO		Bridgeport	Route 25	Improvement	2030
				Widening of Bridgeport Avenue to provide a consistent 4-lane cross	
				section with turn lanes from Trumbull town line to Constitution	
GBVMPO		Shelton	SR 714	Boulevard; includes advance traffic signal system & access management	2030
			Sandpit Rd		
			Corridor		
HVMPO	TBD	Danbury	Improvements	Sandpit Rd Corridor Improvements	2030
			West St Corridor		
HVMPO	TBD	Danbury	Improvements	West St Corridor Improvements	2030
				New Parallel 2-lane Route 2A Bridge (Add Second Span to Mohegan	
				Pequot Bridge, alternative F of the 2005 EIS, estimated at 119M(cost	
SCCOG		PRESTON	Route 2A	escalated 2%/25 years)	2030
SWRMPO	TBD	Norwalk	Various	Transit Service Connecting Wall Street and SONO	2030
SWRMPO		Stamford	1	Route 1 BRT Implementation	2030
SWRMPO		Sta		Stamford Trolley Bus and Network Upgrades	2030
CRCOG	TBD	Windsor Locks	Bradley Park Road	Bradley Airport-East Granby - Bradley Park Road Improvements	2035

					Network
MPO	Project Number	Town(s)	Route/Street/Sys	Brief Project Description	Year
			Buckland:		
			Redstone Rd		
CRCOG	TBD	Buckland	Extension	Buckland: Redstone Rd Extension	2035
CRCOG	TBD	Rocky Hill	Elm Street	Elm Street Connector Roadway	2035
GBVMPO		Monroe	Route 25	Improvement	2035
GBVMPO		Stratford	I-95	Improvement	2035
			Route 25; From		
			Route 111		
			(Trumbull) to the		
			Monroe-Newtown		
GBVMPO		Trumbull	town line.	Improvement	2035
		Danbury, Bethel,			
HVMPO	TBD	Newtown	84	I-84 Strategic Congestion Relief Projects	2035
				Widening last remaining section of US Route 1 from two lane to four	
SWRMPO	TBD	Norwalk	US 1 (Cross Street)	lane cross-section.	2035
				Canal Street MNRR Bridge Replacement and Complete Street	
SWRMPO	TBD	Stamford		Enhancements	2035
				Elm Street MNRR Bridge Replacement and Complete Street	
SWRMPO	TBD	Stamford		Enhancements	2035
00000				Greenwich Avenue MNRR Bridge Replacement and Complete Street	2025
SWRIVIPO	TBD	Stamford		Ennancements	2035
нумро	IBD	Danbury	HARTransit	Intermodal Hub	2040
111/14/200	TOD	Mantaur	Danbury Branch	The statement of the st	2040
HVIMPO	TBD	Various	Line		2040
SWRIVIPO	TBD	Norwaik	NID Mantaith Drive	Intermodal Hub	2040
	IBD	FARIVIINGTON	Nonteith Drive	New Bridge Crossing of the Farmington River	2045
GBVMPO		Trumbull	Route 25	Improvement	2045
GBVMPO		Bridgeport	Route 130	Improvement	2045
			Route 130 from		
			Kings Highway to		
		Fainfield	Shorenam Village	la nave ant	2045
GDVIVIPU		Pairfield	Drive	improvement	2045
CRVMDO		Eningeport,	1.05	Major	2045
GEVIVIPU		Pairfield	1-32	iviajor	2045
GBVMPO		Fairfield	I-95	Major	2045
GBVMPO	1	Ansonia	RTE 334	Relocate Route 334 to a new alignment	2045
	1			WAS: I-84 Widening from Danbury Exit 3 to Exit 8 Ramp Improvements	
HVMPO	0034-0349	DANBURY	I-84	NOW: I-84/Rt 7 Improvements (PEL Recommendations)	2045

					Network
MPO	Project Number	Town(s)	Route/Street/Sys	Brief Project Description	Year
		RiverCOG/Old			
RiverCOG		Lyme	I 95	Widening from the Baldwin Bridge to the Rocky Neck Connector	2045
			RT 9 Exit 19		
		RiverCOG/Crom	Southbound and		
RiverCOG		well	RT 372	Roadway improvements	2045
SCCOG		New London	I-95	Close exit 84E to Williams Street	2045
SCRCOG	TBD	Wallingford	Route 5	ADDITIONAL LANE	2045
SCRCOG	TBD	Branford	195 Exit 53	Interchange reconstruction	2045
				Was: Rt. 7 Reconstruction from Grist Mill Road to Rt. 33	
SWRMPO	TBD	NORWALK	RT 7	Now: Rt. 7 Improvements from Grist Mill Road to Rt. 33	2045

#### 2021-2024 Transportation Improvement Programs, As Amended

МРО	Project #	Town	Route/Street Number	Project Description	Network
	•				Year
			Chicago/Poquonnock/Mitc		
SECCOG		Groton	hell/Benham Intersection	Reconfigure the existing 5-way intersection to 4-way by closing Chicago access	2020
CNVCOG	0080-0128	Middlebury	RT63,64 & I-84	Route 63, 64, and I-84 WB Exit 17 Improvements	2023
CNVCOG	DOT0302XXX1	Various	NHL- Waterbury Branch	Waterbury Branch Expanded Service	2023
SECCOG	0044-0156	EAST LYME	I-95	I-95 Interchange 74 @ Rte 161	2025
CRCOG	0053-0189	GLASTONBURY	CT 17	NHS - Remove Brs. 00388 & 00389 & Revise CT 17 SB @ New London Tpk	2025
SECCOG	0057-0121	GRISWOLD	Carroll Road	Bridge Removal #04671	2025
SCRCOG/RiverCOG	0079-0245	MERIDEN/MIDDLETOWN	I-91/I-691/Route 15	Improve I-691 EB/I-91 NB	2025
SCRCOG	0079-0245	Meriden	I-91/I-691/RT15	I-91/I-691/Route 15 Interchange Improvement (Design-Build)	2025
RiverCOG	0082-0316	MIDDLETOWN	Rt 17 & Rt 9	Rt 17 Ramp to Rt 9 North Improvements	2025
RiverCOG	0082-0318	MIDDLETOWN	Rt 9	Traffic Signals Removal Rte 9	2025
RiverCOG	0082-0318	Middletown	RT9	Route 9 Signal Removal and Route 17 On-Ramp	2025
SECCOG	0085-0146	MONTVILLE/SALEM	Rt 85	CT85 Corridor Improvements	2025
WESTCOG	0102-0358	NORWALK	Rt 15 & Rt 7	Norwalk Rt 15/Rt 7 Interchange	2025
SCRCOG	0106-0108	ORANGE/MILFORD	US1	US 1 OPERATIONAL LANE	2025
SCROCG	PP_083_011	MILFORD	195 exit 38 -SR 796	Lane re-striping & dropping lanes for exits	2025
WESTCOG	PP_096_007/0096-0208	NEWTOWN	I84E exit 9	lane addition before and after exit	2025
SCRCOG		New Haven		New Haven Downtown Crossing Phase 4 – Temple Street Crossing	2025
SECCOG		Norwich	I-395/RT 97	Int Ramp Improvements Exit18 & new arterial road connecting Lawler Lane/Canterbury Tpke/Rt 97	2025
SCRCOG/RiverCOG	0079-0240	MERIDEN	I-91/I-691/Rt15	Reconfig I-91/I-691/Rt15 Inter	2035
SCRCOG	0079-0246	MERIDEN	I-91/I-691/Route 15	Improve I-91 NB/I-691 WB/15 NB	2035
SCRCOG	0092-0689	NEW HAVEN	RT 69	CT-15 INT 59 Improvements	2035
SCRCOG		New Haven		New Haven, Bus Rapid Transit	2035

Appendix C

Interagency Consultation Meeting

Page **27** of **34** 

#### Interagency Consultation Meeting 2023 -2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plans 2021-2024 Transportation Improvement Programs, as amended Connecticut Department of Transportation October 11, 2022 Virtual Meeting

#### Attendees:

Name	Organization	Name	Organization
Rob Aloise	CRCOG	Kevin Tedesco	CTDOT
Pete Babich	CTDEEP	Maribeth Wojenski	CTDOT
Paul Farrell	CTDEEP	Grayson Wright	CTDOT
Paul Kritzler	CTDEEP	Ariel Garcia	EPA
Brent McDaniel	CTDEEP	Eric Rackauskas	EPA
Allison Burch	CTDOT	Kurt Salmoiraghi	FHWA
Matthew Cegielski	CTDOT	Eril Shortell	FHWA
Andrew Correia	CTDOT	Meghan Sloan	METROCOG
		Richard Donovan	
Graham Curtis	CTDOT		NVCOG
Steven Giannitti	CTDOT	Robert Haramut	RIVERCOG
Caroline Kieltyka	CTDOT	Sam Gold	RIVERCOG
Kimberly Lesay	CTDOT	James Rode	SCRCOG
Jennifer Pacacha	CTDOT	Laura Francis	SCRCOG
		Rebecca Andreucci	
Marissa Pfaffinger	CTDOT		SCRCOG
Sara Radacsi	CTDOT	Kate Rattan	SECCOG
Taylor Reed	CTDOT	Kristin Floberg	WESTCOG
		Todd Fontanella	
Pamela Sucato	CTDOT		WESTCOG
Zachary Taylor	CTDOT		

The Interagency Consultation Meeting was held to review projects submitted for the MPOs MTPs.

The Conformity Documents will be electronically distributed to the MPOs, FHWA, FTA, EPA and CTDEEP. The MPOs will need to hold a 30-day public review and comment period. At the end of this review period, the MPO will hold a Policy Board meeting to endorse the Air Quality Conformity determination.

There was also a brief discussion on the travel demand model and emissions software planning assumptions employed in the conformity analysis.

The schedule for the Transportation Improvement Programs Conformity Determination Analysis is as follows:

Page 28 of 34

- MPOs transmit signed and dated Concurrence Form to <a href="mailto:bot.AQUnit@ct.gov">mailto:bot.AQUnit@ct.gov</a>
- CTDOT Travel Demand Model Unit performs the air quality analysis and sends the Air Quality Conformity Determination Report electronically to all MPOs
- MPOs advertise and hold a 30-day public review and comment period for the Air Quality Conformity
- MPOs hold a Policy Board meeting approving and endorsing the Air Quality Conformity and transmit resolutions to <u>DOT.AQUnit@ct.gov</u> after Policy Board meeting.

It is important that all MPOs follow this schedule to ensure that the MPO TIPs Conformity Determinations can go forward on schedule.

#### PLANNING ASSUMPTIONS

#### Ozone and PM<sub>2.5</sub> 2023 -2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plans 2021-2024 Transportation Improvement Programs October 11, 2022

Planning Assumptions	Frequency of Review*	Responsible	Date of Last
for Review		Agency	Review
Socioeconomic Data	At least every 5 years	CTDOT	2019 ACS Data
DMV Vehicle Registration Data	At least every 5 years	CTDEEP	2020
State Vehicle Inspection and Maintenance Program	Each conformity round	CTDEEP	Same as currently approved I&M SIP
State Low Emission Vehicle Program	Each conformity round following approval into the SIP	CTDEEP	Same as SIP
VMT Mix Data	At least every 5 years	CTDEEP	2018**
Analysis Years – Ozone	Each conformity round	CTDOT/CTDEEP	2023, 2025, 2035, 2045, and 2050
Analysis Years – PM2.5	Each conformity round	CTDOT/CTDEEP	2023, 2025, 2035, 2045, and 2050
Emission Budget – PM2.5	As SIP revised/updated	CTDEEP	2018: PM2.5 575.8 NOx 12,791.8 2025: PM2.5 516.0 NOx 9,728.1
Emission Budget – Ozone	As SIP revised/updated	CTDEEP	NY Area: VOC 17.6 NOx 24.6 Gr. CT: VOC 15.9 NOx 22.2
Temperatures and Humidity	As SIP revised/updated	CTDEEP	Х
Control Strategies	Each conformity round	CTDEEP	Х
HPMS VMT	Each conformity round	CTDOT	2019

\* Review of Planning Assumptions does not necessarily prelude an update or calibration of the travel demand model.

\*\* Local data was developed from an analysis of Connecticut's 2020 motor vehicle registration data and an EPA sponsored analysis of 2017 state registration data for the 2017 NEI.

\*\*\* Data available 2018 based on an average of 2015-2017

Appendix D

**Emission Summary Tables** 

Page **31** of **34** 

	Dollutanto				20	23 Emissio	on Quantiti	es (Tons/Day)				
	Pollulants	NY/	'NJ/CT Non-	Attainment /	Area	Greater CT Non-Attainment Area						Statowido
ID	Name	Fairfield Middlesex New Haven Subtotal Hartford Litchfield New London Tolland Windham Subtotal						Statewide				
1	Hydrocarbons	7.49761	1.58752	6.86757	15.95269	7.45335	1.79726	2.42111	1.40483	1.06468	14.14122	30.09392
3	Nox	8.31101	1.94505	8.30699	18.56304	8.59803	1.72408	2.93624	1.86321	1.17385	16.29541	34.85845
79	NM Hydrocarbons	6.82696	1.43883	6.21601	14.48180	6.77893	1.64724	2.20183	1.27069	0.97088	12.86959	27.35139
87	VOC	7.20293	1.51737	6.55660	15.27690	7.15180	1.73919	2.32360	1.34022	1.02563	13.58044	28.85733

	Dollutanto		2025 Emission Quantities (Tons/Day)									
	Pollulants	NY/NJ/CT Non-Attainment Area				Greater CT Non-Attainment Area						Statowido
ID	Name	Fairfield	irfield Middlesex New Haven Subtot			Hartford Litchfield New Londor			Tolland	Windham	Subtotal	Statewide
1	Hydrocarbons	6.85249	1.44348	6.27376	14.56973	6.86114	1.65164	2.20994	1.28430	0.97609	12.98311	27.55283
З	Nox	6.96814	1.62375	6.94906	15.54095	7.20910	1.45914	2.44405	1.56762	0.99021	13.67010	29.21105
79	NM Hydrocarbons	6.21431	1.30179	5.64942	13.16553	6.21527	1.50889	2.00156	1.15618	0.88627	11.76818	24.93371
87	voc	6.55682	1.37299	5.95969	13.88950	6.55781	1.59320	2.11234	1.21967	0.93630	12.41933	26.30882

	Dollutanta				20	35 Emissio	on Quantiti	es (Tons/Day)				
	Pollulants	NY/	/NJ/CT Non-	Attainment /	Area		Grea	ter CT Non-At	tainment	t Area		Statowido
ID	Name	Fairfield Middlesex New Haven Subtot			Subtotal	Hartford Litchfield New London Tolland Windh				Windham	Subtotal	Statewide
1	Hydrocarbons	4.31574	0.91653	4.06115	9.29342	4.37394	1.06271	1.40833	0.82987	0.63875	8.31360	17.60702
3	Nox	3.71770	0.85835	3.78811	8.36416	3.90376	0.81447	1.31609	0.87087	0.56340	7.46859	15.83275
79	NM Hydrocarbons	3.83650	0.80709	3.56808	8.21168	3.87383	0.95419	1.24911	0.72918	0.56780	7.37411	15.58579
87	VOC	4.04757	0.85116	3.76359	8.66231	4.08528	1.00697	1.31765	0.76901	0.59945	7.77835	16.44067

	Dollutanta		2045 Emission Quantities (Tons/Day)									
	Pollulants	NY/NJ/CT Non-Attainment Area Greater CT Non-Attainment Area							Statowida			
ID	Name	Fairfield	Middlesex	New Haven	Subtotal	Hartford	Litchfield	New London	Tolland	Windham	Subtotal	Statewide
1	Hydrocarbons	3.75481	0.80811	3.55420	8.11712	3.83215	0.92828	1.22659	0.73588	0.56156	7.28444	15.40156
3	Nox	3.38181	0.78317	3.48293	7.64792	3.56989	0.75050	1.18853	0.80255	0.51192	6.82339	14.47130
79	NM Hydrocarbons	3.30113	0.70324	3.08079	7.08515	3.35468	0.82500	1.07657	0.63899	0.49473	6.38996	13.47511
87	VOC	3.48315	0.74170	3.24974	7.47459	3.53759	0.87053	1.13566	0.67386	0.52228	6.73992	14.21451

	Dollutanta		2050 Emission Quantities (Tons/Day)									
	Pollutants	NY/	/NJ/CT Non-	Attainment	Area		Grea	ter CT Non-At	tainment	t Area		Statowida
ID	Name	ame Fairfield Middlesex New Haven Subtot			Subtotal	Hartford	Litchfield	New London	Tolland	Windham	Subtotal	Statewide
1	Hydrocarbons	3.54954	0.76720	3.37479	7.69153	3.64248	0.87579	1.16062	0.69925	0.53603	6.91417	14.60570
3	Nox	3.36407	0.78128	3.46194	7.60729	3.55550	0.74675	1.17904	0.79852	0.51985	6.79966	14.40695
79	NM Hydrocarbons	3.09742	0.66213	2.90225	6.66179	3.16576	0.77296	1.01150	0.60252	0.46782	6.02056	12.68235
87	vlvoc	3.26787	0.69825	3.06101	7.02713	3.33781	0.81544	1.06687	0.63528	0.49377	6.34917	13.37630
County	Total Energy Consumption	2023 Pollutant Emission Quantities (Tons/Year)										
-----------	--------------------------	--	----------------	-----------	----------	-----------						
	91	NOx	PM 2.5									
	(Joules/Year)	3	110	116	117	County						
		Oxides of Nitrogen	Engine Exhaust	Brakewear	Tirewear	Total						
Fairfield	4.10E+16	2978.00095	69.95757	23.26821	11.75533	104.98112						
New Haven	4.18E+16	2976.79827	67.55929	20.89200	11.93136	100.38265						
Totals	8.28E+16	5954.79922	137.51686	44.16021	23.68670	205.36377						

	Total Energy Consumption	2025 Pollutant Emission Quantities (Tons/Year)				
County	91	NOx	PM 2.5			
	(Joules/Year)	3	110	116	117	County
		Oxides of Nitrogen	Engine Exhaust	Brakewear	Tirewear	Total
Fairfield	3.96E+16	2505.49710	62.84222	23.67016	11.87296	98.38534
New Haven	4.05E+16	2498.21842	60.37604	21.31198	12.07314	93.76116
Totals	8.01E+16	5003.71552	123.21826	44.98214	23.94610	192.14650

	Total Energy Consumption	2035 Pollutant Emission Quantities (Tons/Year)				
County	91	NOx	PM 2.5			
	(Joules/Year)	3	110	116	117	County
		Oxides of Nitrogen	Engine Exhaust	Brakewear	Tirewear	Total
Fairfield	3.53E+16	1384.70658	35.61356	25.05515	12.41077	73.07947
New Haven	3.61E+16	1408.07716	34.74381	23.21220	12.69190	70.64792
Totals	7.14E+16	2792.78375	70.35737	48.26735	25.10267	143.72739

County	Total Energy Consumption	2045 Pollutant Emission Quantities (Tons/Year)				
	91	NOx PM 2.5				
	(Joules/Year)	3	110	116	117	County
		Oxides of Nitrogen	Engine Exhaust	Brakewear	Tirewear	Total
Fairfield	3.47E+16	1219.70728	25.28174	23.75982	12.44799	61.48956
New Haven	3.59E+16	1310.30994	25.51365	25.35450	13.36136	64.22951
Totals	7.06E+16	2530.01722	50.79539	49.11432	25.80936	125.71907

	Total Energy Consumption	2050 Pollutant Emission Quantities (Tons/Year)				
County	91	NOx PM 2.5			.5	
	(Joules/Year)	3	110	116	117	County
		Oxides of Nitrogen	Engine Exhaust	Brakewear	Tirewear	Total
Fairfield	3.55E+16	1251.89360	22.83946	28.28492	13.35578	64.48016
New Haven	3.63E+16	1279.14334	22.81905	26.34851	13.70328	62.87084
Totals	7.18E+16	2531.03694	45.65850	54.63344	27.05906	127.35100

Appendix E

Comments Received During Public Review Period

# Appendix B

Appendicies Page 36

# Initial FHWA Performance Targets from 2018 MTP

			Initial State
	Dorformanco Aroa	Derformance Measure	Targets Set
FriwA Category	Ferformance Area	# Estalition	257
		Fatality Pata par 100 Mil VMT	0 822
DM1 Safaty	Injurios & Estalitios	# Sorious Injurios	0.825
Pivi1-Salety	injuries & rataities	# Serious Injunes	1,571
		# Non Motorized Estalition & Socious Injurios	3.05
		# Non-Wotonized Fatalities & Senious Injuries	280
		% IS Pavements in Good Condition	64.4%
PM2-	Pavement Condition	% IS Pavements in Poor Condition	2.6%
		% Non-IS Pavements in Good Condition	31.9%
Infrastructure		% Non -IS Pavements in Poor Condition	7.6%
	Bridge Condition	% NHS Bridge Deck Area in Good Condition	26.9%
		% NHS Bridge Deck Area in Poor Condition	5.7%
	Performance of NHS	% Reliable Person-Miles on IS NHS	72.1%
		% Reliable Person-Miles on Non-IS NHS	76.4%
	Freight	TTTR on IS	1.83
		On-Road Mobile Source Emissions Reduction: VOC	30.14
	Env Suctoinability	On-Road Mobile Source Emissions Reduction: NOx	102.37
DM2 System		On-Road Mobile Source Emissions Reduction: PM2.5	2.674
Reliability		On-Road Mobile Source Emissions Reduction: PM10	
richability		On-Road Mobile Source Emissions Reduction: CO	
	Non-SOV (Hartford UZA)	% Non-Single Occupancy Vehicle	
	Non-SOV (Springfield		Not
	UZA)	% Non-Single Occupancy Vehicle	for CRCOG
	PHED (Hartford UZA)	Peak Hour Excessive Delay per Capita	in 2018
	PHED (Springfield UZA)	Peak Hour Excessive Delay per Capita	2015

# FTA TAM Targets from 2019

	Rolling Stock/Equipment		Facilities	
FTA Goals for Transit Asset	FY2020 Target Percentage of Vehicles Meeting or Exceeding		Rated below 3 on TERM Scale in Passenger/Parking	
Management			and Maintenance	
(TAM)	Useful Life Benchmark (ULB)		Facilities	Infrastructure
	Bus	14.0%		
	Cutaway, Minivan/Van, Automobiles, Sports Utility vehicles	17.0%		
TAMP Tier II*	Trucks/Rubber Tire vehicles	7.0%	0.0%	N/A
	Over the Road Bus	14.0%		
	Commuter Locomotive, Passenger coach and self-propelled passenger rail car	17.0%		2.00 % Commuter rail segments w/ performance restrictions
CTDOT**	Steel Wheel Vehicles	0.0%	0.0%	
	Bus	14.0%		
CTtransit New	Cutaway, Minivan/Van, Automobiles, Sports Utility vehicles	17.0%		
Britain	Trucks/Rubber Tire vehicles	7.0%	0.0%	N/A
CTtransit NB,	Over the Road Bus	14.0%		
DATTCO	Bus	14.0%	0.0%	N/A
CTtransit	Articulated Bus, Over-the-Road Bus, Bus	14.0%		
Hartford Division	Automobiles	17.0%		
(HFTD)	Trucks/Rubber Tire vehicles	7.0%	0.0%	N/A
Greater Hartford	Cutaway	17.0%		
Transit District	Automobiles, SUVs	20.0%		
(GHTD)	Trucks/Rubber Tire vehicles	7.0%	0.0%	N/A

# Appendix C

# AGREEMENT Regarding Transportation Planning & Funding In the Hartford Urbanized Area

#### Section I. Purpose of Agreement

As required by 23 CFR Sec. 450.314(a), The Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), the State, and the providers of public transportation shall cooperatively determine their mutual responsibilities in carrying out the metropolitan planning process, and 23 CFR Sec. 450.314 (e). If more than one MPO has been designated to serve an urbanized area, there shall be a written agreement among the MPOs, the State, and the public transportation operator(s) describing how the metropolitan planning processes will be coordinated. Therefore, an Agreement must be established among the four Councils of Governments (COG) within the Hartford Urbanized Area, as well as the Connecticut Department of Transportation (CTDOT). The urbanized area is defined using the most recent Census blocks and population data. The Hartford Urbanized Area is defined as the towns, cities and suburbs in the region surrounding the City of Hartford. The population of the Hartford Urbanized area is over 200,000 and therefore is considered a Transportation Management Area (TMA). The attached map outlines each TMA in Connecticut. The COGs include the Capitol Region Council of Governments (CRCOG), the Naugatuck Valley Council of Governments (NVCOG), the Lower Connecticut River Valley Council of Governments (RiverCOG), and the Northwest Hills Council of Governments (NHCOG). The purpose of this Agreement is:

- 1. to define the method for distributing metropolitan planning funds received by the CTDOT from the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) for transportation planning within the Hartford Urbanized Area;
- 2. to define the method for the development of financial plans for the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP), the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and the list of obligated projects along with the coordination involved in Air Quality Conformity and Congestion management;
- to define the method for distributing and administering FHWA Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STBG) suballocated funds, Transportation Alternatives Set-Aside suballocated funds, FTA Section 5307 funds, and FTA Section 5310 funds earmarked for, or attributable to, the Hartford Urbanized Area; and
- 4. to define the responsibilities of each COG for carrying out its own transportation planning program and for coordinating with the other COGs in the Hartford Urbanized Area.

#### Section II. Distribution of Planning (PL) Funds among MPOs

CRCOG, NVCOG, and RiverCOG are the designated MPOs for their respective regions. As such they are entitled to a portion of the Metropolitan planning funds from the FHWA (known as PL funds) and the FTA (known as Section 5303 funds) through a statewide process administered by CTDOT. The funds will continue to be distributed according to a method developed by CTDOT in cooperation with all the MPOs in Connecticut. The method is based primarily on the total population in each urban planning region (not just the urbanized area within the region). Each MPO receives a share of the planning funds generally proportionate to its share of the combined population of all the urban planning regions in the

#### Version: 12-15-2017

state. The shares are adjusted to ensure that the smallest urban regions receive a funding level that is at least equal to the minimum needed to carry out a basic urban transportation planning program.

NHCOG, as a rural region, receives a portion of Connecticut's State Planning and Research funds along with a portion of FTA section 5304 funds. Distribution of those funds is outside of the scope of this Agreement.

# Section III. MTP, TIP, Obligated projects list, Air Quality Conformity, Congestion Management Process

A financial plan is documentation required to be included with a metropolitan transportation plan and TIP that demonstrates the consistency between reasonably available and projected sources of Federal, State, local, and private revenues and the costs of implementing proposed transportation system improvements.

MTP development – Each MPO shall receive from the CTDOT a financial plan with anticipated funding allocations for the 25 year period along with a list of major projects that are regionally and or statewide significant being funded with FHWA and FTA funds and to be included in the MTP. The formula used to calculate the anticipated funding allocation was developed in coordination with the MPOs throughout the state. Any changes to this formula will also be developed in coordination with the MPOs.

TIP development - Each MPO shall receive from the CTDOT a draft list of proposed projects for the MPOs use in the development of the draft TIP. Coordination between the MPOs and CTDOT on additions or deletions to this list will occur. The MPO will develop their TIP financial plan based on the projects they include in the TIP. Once approved, all MPOs TIPs are sent to the CTDOT for their use in the development of the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP).

Obligated projects list – Each MPO shall receive from the CTDOT, a listing of all federally funded projects that were obligated or awarded in a given federal fiscal year. The MPOs must publish, or otherwise make available for public review, an annual listing of projects for which federal funds have been obligated in the preceding year by the end of the first quarter of the next fiscal year. This listing must be consistent with the funding categories identified in the TIP.

Air Quality Conformity - The CTDOT, acting on behalf of the MPOs, must demonstrate conformity for all federally funded projects in the MTPs and TIPs located in either nonattainment or maintenance areas. In order to receive federal transportation funds, the CTDOT and the MPOs must cooperatively work to develop and endorse an Air Quality Conformity Determination report, which certifies to the federal government that all TIPs and MTPs within the State of Connecticut collectively conform to the requirements of the Clean Air Act.

Coordination of the Congestion Management Process for the Hartford TMA - As required by 23 CFR 450.320(a), the MPOs agree to develop and implement a Congestion Management Process as an integrated part of the metropolitan transportation planning process. CRCOG, as the largest MPO in the TMA, will take the lead on gathering and analyzing relevant data. Periodically, CRCOG, in consultation with the other MPOs and CTDOT, will develop a CMP report that analyzes the performance of key corridors in the TMA. The MPOs and CTDOT will work cooperatively to develop and implement strategies to address and mitigate congestion. Each MPO will work with CTDOT to develop such strategies into projects for inclusion in their respective Long Range Transportation Plans and Transportation Improvement Programs. Each MPO will also ensure that congestion management strategies are considered in corridor and special studies carried out by the MPO.

## Version: 12-15-2017

#### Section IV. Distribution of STBG Suballocated Funding for the Hartford UZA

The Surface Transportation Block Grant program (STBG) provides flexible funding that may be used by States and localities for projects to preserve and improve the conditions and performance on any Federalaid highway, bridge and tunnel projects on any public road, pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure, and transit capital projects, including intercity bus terminals. Urbanized Area Boundaries are established following each decennial census. The boundaries distinguish between urban and rural places for funding and system classification purposes. The census defined boundary is used to set the MPO/TMA threshold and is the basis for funding distribution among urbanized areas. A percentage of the State's STBG apportionment is suballocated to areas of the State based on their relative share of the State's population, and is divided into three categories – urbanized areas with population over 200,000, areas with population of 5,000 or less, and areas of the State with a population of 5,001 to 200,000. This Agreement concerns the over 200,000 Hartford Urbanized Area funding. Suballocation of urbanized area funding is calculated by FHWA and apportioned to the State by urbanized area.

Prior to authorization of the State funded Local Transportation Capital Improvement Program (LOTCIP) in November of 2013, COGs submitted applications to CTDOT for funding on behalf of municipalities and STBG funds attributable to the Hartford Urbanized Area were divided among the four COGs by CTDOT based on population within the Census defined urbanized area. Given the availability of LOTCIP funds for municipal projects of regional significance, projects under the STBG are and will continue to be coordinated and programmed at the Urbanized Area level between CTDOT and the COGs ensuring projects are evaluated based on purpose and need, merit and regional benefit. At a minimum, the coordination will occur during CTDOT's Capital Plan preparation and as needed throughout the Fiscal Year.

In the event that the LOTCIP funds are not authorized for a given year or the program is discontinued, CTDOT will work cooperatively to prioritize the advancement of regional LOTCIP projects using available transportation funds. Should the LOTCIP program be discontinued, CTDOT will work with the COGs on a solution to transition back to the federal STBG program. Funding targets under the STBG would be reflective of populations within the Census defined urbanized area and collaboratively developed with the COGs.

Designated TMAs are allowed to utilize STBG suballocated funds anywhere within the planning region boundaries. CRCOG and RiverCOG have been designated as TMAs, therefore, can utilize the Hartford Urbanized Area funding anywhere within its regional boundaries. One exception, however, exists for RiverCOG due to the merger of the prior planning regions (Midstate and CT River Estuary) and the inclusion of the Midstate towns within the designated Hartford TMA and the CT River Estuary towns within the designated New Haven TMA. The Hartford Urbanized Area funding can be used anywhere within the RiverCOG boundaries that include the prior Midstate towns. If Hartford Urbanized Area funds are to be used within the RiverCOG boundaries of the towns that are part of the New Haven TMA, a formal request through FHWA would be required to transfer the funds to the New Haven Urbanized Area funding source.

NVCOG's primary funding source under the STBG comes from the Waterbury Urbanized Area (referred to as STP Other), which has been designated based on 2010 census results as an area of the State with population of 5,001 to 200,000, therefore, has not reached the threshold for designation as a TMA. NVCOG includes three towns (Plymouth Bristol, and Thomaston) that are located within the Hartford Urbanized Area. Because NVCOG is not a designated Hartford TMA, the Hartford Urbanized Area funding can only be used on eligible projects located within the Hartford urbanized areas within Plymouth, Bristol and Thomaston.

NHCOG is one of two Rural regions located within Connecticut. NHCOG's primary funding source under the STBG comes from the Torrington Urban Cluster (referred to as STP Other), which has been designated based on 2010 census results as an area of the State with population of 5,001 to 200,000. NHCOG also includes towns that reside within the Hartford Urbanized Area – Barkhamsted, Litchfield,

3

New Hartford, and Burlington. Because NHCOG is a rural region and not designated part of the Hartford TMA, the Hartford Urbanized Area funding can only be used on eligible projects located within the Hartford urbanized areas within the four towns listed above.

# Section V. Solicitation of Projects for the Transportation Alternatives (TA) Set-Aside Funds for the Hartford UZA

The TA Set-Aside authorizes funding for programs and projects defined as transportation alternatives, including on- and off-road pedestrian and bicycle facilities, infrastructure projects for improving non-driver access to public transportation and enhanced mobility, community improvement activities such as historic preservation and vegetation management, and environmental mitigation related to stormwater and habitat connectivity; recreational trail projects; safe routes to school projects; and projects for planning, designing, or constructing boulevards and other roadways largely in the right-of-way of former divided highways. The four COGs agree to assist CTDOT with soliciting projects for the TA Set-Aside Program. For funds suballocated to urbanized areas with populations of over 200,000, the MPOs representing the urbanized areas are responsible for developing the competitive process and selecting/prioritizing projects in consultation with CTDOT. CRCOG and RiverCOG are the only regions with a population over 200,000, therefore, are responsible for the competitive process to select projects under the Hartford Urbanized Area TA Set-Aside funding source within their respective regional boundaries. NVCOG and NHCOG have towns within the Hartford Urbanized Area and two towns are located within the Hartford TMA boundaries (Plymouth and Bristol). CRCOG and RiverCOG agree to coordinate with NVCOG and NHCOG to consider proposed projects for the TA-Set-Aside program located within eligible areas of NVCOG and NHCOG. NVCOG and/or NHCOG will submit applications to CTDOT for the Hartford Urbanized Area TA Set-Aside funding source should coordination result in agreement between CRCOG. RiverCOG, NVCOG and NHCOG that a portion of funding will be provided to progress a project in NVCOG or NHCOG located within the Hartford Urbanized Area.

#### Section VI. Distribution of FTA 5307 Funds for the Hartford UZA

The Urbanized Area Formula Funding program (5307) makes Federal resources available to urbanized areas and to the Governors for transit capital and operating assistance and for transportation related planning in urbanized areas. The four COGs and the CTDOT Bureau of Public Transportation agree to distribute Section 5307 funds from the FTA in the manner described below. The FTA Section 5307 funds attributable to the Hartford Urbanized Area will be pooled with all other Section 5307 funds in Connecticut and administered as a statewide program by CTDOT, following procedures specified in FTA Circular 9030.1E (as amended). CTDOT will coordinate as necessary with Transit Operators and the COGs when developing its capital investment priorities for public transportation. The annual 5307 program will be adopted by the MPOs into their respective TIPs.

This continues the procedure previously agreed to by all COGs in the state. It recognizes the inefficiency of trying to program large and infrequent capital purchases when individual regions are limited to small annual appropriations for their respective regions and/or urbanized areas. An example of this is the difficulty of programming funds for replacement of buses when the buses have a minimum 12-year life cycle and appropriated funds are typically available only for 4 years.

#### Version: 12-15-2017 Section VII. Coordination and Administration of FTA 5310 Funds for the Hartford UZA

Under the MAP-21 transportation legislation, FTA Section 5317, New Freedom Program, was absorbed into Section 5310 and administration of the program became flexible within a given Urbanized Area. The Section 5310 program provides formula funding to states for the purpose of assisting private nonprofit groups in meeting the transportation needs of older adults and people with disabilities when the transportation service provided is unavailable, insufficient, or inappropriate to meeting these needs. The four COGs agree that the administration of Section 5310 will be the responsibility of CTDOT who will coordinate with the COGs. The COGs and CTDOT will collaborate on the development and periodic update of the required Coordinated Public Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan.

#### Section VIII. Basic Responsibilities of Each MPO

Each of the three MPOs will conduct each of the following basic transportation planning activities as outlined in the "Statement of Cooperative MPO/State/Transit Operators Planning Roles & Responsibilities"

- 1. Preparation of an annual Unified Planning Work Program that lists and describes all transportation planning studies and tasks to be completed during the year.
- 2. Preparation and update of a long range, multi-modal metropolitan transportation plan.
- 3. Preparation and maintenance of a short-range transportation improvement program (TIP).
- 4. Financial planning to ensure plan and program are financially constrained and within anticipated funding levels.
- 5. Conduct of planning studies and system performance monitoring, including highway corridor and intersection studies, transit system studies, application of advanced computer techniques, and transportation data collection and archiving.
- 6. Public outreach, including survey of affected populations, electronic dissemination of reports and information (website), and consideration of public comments.
- 7. Ensuring the transportation planning process does not have a significant or disproportionate impact on low income, minority and transit dependent Title VI populations.
- 8. Ensuring plans, projects and programs are consistent with and conform to air quality goals of reducing transportation-related emissions and attaining National Ambient Air Quality Standards.
- 9. Adhere to all required Planning Regulations as outlined in 23 CFR part 450 and in 49 CFR part 613.
- 10. Cooperatively develop and implement a Congestion Management Process for the Hartford Urbanized Area.

As a non-MPO COG, NHCOG is not required to develop the above, but may wish to do so to better coordinate transportation planning activities.

#### Section IX. Coordination among COGs and CTDOT

It is the goal of the four COGs to conduct their transportation programs in a manner that ensures their plans and programs are mutually supportive of major projects, programs, and policies to improve the transportation system in the Hartford Urbanized Area.

#### Version: 12-15-2017

<u>Coordination of Planning Activities</u>. The three MPOs in the Hartford UZA (CRCOG, NVCOG, and RiverCOG) agree to coordinate their regional transportation plans, transportation improvement programs (TIPs), and annual work programs. The coordination efforts will include the exchange and review of annual work programs, regional transportation plans, and TIPs. Staff of the three MPOs will meet at least annually to review each other's planning programs and to identify projects or programs of mutual interest or potential conflict. NHCOG will be included in all correspondence and invited to annual meetings, but it is not critical that they attend annual meetings.

<u>Coordination of the STBG Suballocated Program</u>. Since the establishment of the state funded Local Transportation Capital Improvement Program (LOTCIP) in November 2013, the Department and the COGs have agreed to meet annually to coordinate project selection for the STBG. The intent of these annual meetings is:

- To review projects currently programmed using STBG funds within the COG and to identify any areas of under-programming, with the primary focus on the next federal fiscal year.
- To identify Department projects that appear to be good candidates for STBG funding to address any under-programming concerns in the upcoming fiscal year and to solicit the COG's comments regarding the best candidates from a regional perspective.
- To discuss the status of any projects being scoped by the Department.

<u>Coordination of the Capital Plan/Project Selection Process.</u> CTDOT will send a <u>draft</u> of a proposed 5year Capital Plan (the Plan) to the COGs for review and comment in the summer of each calendar year. The draft may reflect input that the Department received from the COGs during the COG consultation process on the previous year's plan. This consultation process consists of annual meetings with each COG to address comments and concerns and potential selection of projects for the outer years of the Plan.

Moving forward the CTDOT will coordinate with the COGs on developing a project selection process to ensure consideration of fiscal constraint, federal funding restrictions, regional priorities, environmental justice, project readiness and ensuring a state of good repair. The selection process will be transparent and will align with the Department's and COGs mission and vision.

CTDOT is responsible for effectively managing the federal resources entrusted to it and for maximizing the use of these federal resources. Obligating 100% of the obligation limitation (ceiling) provided each fiscal year by Congress is critical to maximizing the use of federal funding. The STBG suballocated program is an important component in the obligation of 100% of ceiling, and CTDOT assumes obligation of 100% of the current fiscal year apportionment in its Capital Plan to accomplish this. Because the TIP/STIP is a critical part of the project funding/implementation process as required by Title 23, the COGs play an important role in the process to ensure maximum use of federal funds. At a minimum, CTDOT will meet annually with each COG. This meeting will be to discuss overall programming within the STBG to enhance coordination, provide project details for new projects determined to be good candidates, and understand regional needs and priorities as outlined in each COGs response to the DRAFT 5-Year Capital Plan. Additional coordination meetings may be needed to ensure that any programming shortfalls that may occur as a result of schedule and cost changes occurring throughout the fiscal year are cooperatively addressed which may result in the need to provide timely approval near fiscal year-end to move a project into the STBG suballocated program or process an Advance Construction (AC) conversion utilizing STBG Hartford Urbanized Area funding. If there are no options for addressing a programming shortfall within the Hartford Urbanized Area within the current fiscal year, funding will carry forward into the next fiscal year and CTDOT will work with the COGs to program these funds.

<u>Coordination of the selection of performance targets for each metropolitan area.</u> According to 23 CFR 450.314(h), The MPOs, Operators of Public Transportation and the CTDOT must mutually agree upon and document the roles and responsibilities for conducting performance-based planning and programming in an Agreement. Therefore, the MPOs, transit operators and CTDOT agree to meet to

#### Version: 12-15-2017

discuss setting performance targets, include performance measures and performance targets in the MTP and Transportation Improvement Plans, coordinate reporting of these performance targets to the United States Department of Transportation (USDOT) and develop a separate performance management agreement

#### Section X. Coordination of Transit and TDM Planning

It is the goal of the parties to this Agreement to conduct their planning activities in a manner that supports multiple modes of transportation throughout the Hartford Urbanized Area.

<u>Coordination of the Locally Coordinated Public Transit – Human Services Transportation Plan</u> (LOCHSTP). In support of the FTA 5310 program, the parties to this Agreement agree to coordinate on developing and maintaining the LOCHSTP for the Hartford Urbanized Area. As the designated recipient of funds under the 5310 program, CTDOT will continue to take the lead role in ensuring that locally coordinated plans throughout the state are developed in a consistent fashion. The four COGS in the Hartford Urbanized Area will work with CTDOT to update and maintain the plan.

<u>Coordination of Transit Planning Activities</u>. The parties agree to participate, as needed, in CT *transit's* Bus Service Review Committee. The parties will assist with demographic data evaluation and municipal coordination. The parties also agree to cooperate on initiatives that seek to maintain and improve security and safety of transit facilities within the Hartford Urbanized Area.

<u>Coordination of Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Strategies</u>. The parties agree to work collaboratively to develop TDM strategies and work toward implementing them. CTDOT will take a lead role in developing and implementing TDM strategies that seek to incentivize, and inform the public of, alternatives to single occupancy vehicles. The COGs and transit operators will assist CTDOT with evaluating such strategies and, where appropriate, implementing them.

#### Section XI. Amendment

This Agreement may be amended as jointly deemed necessary or in the best interest of all parties, including Federal Transportation agencies.

Nothing contained in this Agreement is intended to or shall limit the authority or responsibilities assigned to signatory organizations under Connecticut law, federal law, local ordinance, or charter.

#### Section XII. Periodic Review of Agreement

This Agreement will be reviewed periodically so that it remains current in describing the roles and responsibilities of the impacted COGs and CTDOT relative to the Hartford Urbanized Area. The Agreement will be assessed at a minimum in the year following each federal certification review of the TMA regions' planning process to capture any changes in federal transportation authorizations, federal regulations and guidance, changes in State regulations pertaining to transportation, and comments that were part of the certification review.

Marcia a lecler c

Marcia Leclerc, Mayor CRCOG Chairperson

Mark Lyon NHCOG Chairperson

Neil O'Leary, Ma∮or NVCOG Chairperson

lemsu

Bonnie Reemsnyder, First Selectwoman RiverCOG Chairperson

Vicki Shotland Executive Director, GHTD

Lisa Seymour Administrator, MAT

Joseph Comerford Executive Director, Estuary TD

ame.

James P. Redeker Commissioner, CTDOT

Date

5/1/18

Date

Date

28/18

Date

5-18-18

Date

Date

Date

Date

#### **MEMORANDUM of UNDERSTANDING**

by and among

#### CAPITOL REGION COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS PIONEER VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

Commonwealth of Massachusetts Department of Transportation (MassDOT) Connecticut Department of Transportation (CTDOT)

Connecticut Transit (CT*transit*), Franklin Regional Transit Authority (FRTA), Greater Hartford Transit District (GHTD) and Pioneer Valley Transit Authority (PVTA)

concerning

THE EFFECT of the URBANIZED AREA DESIGNATIONS of the 2010 CENSUS on COORDINATION among METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATIONS, STATES, and PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION OPERATORS

WHEREAS, the Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs), States, and public transportation operators, hereinafter referred to as the "Parties," having responsibility for portions of the Springfield, Massachusetts (MA)-Connecticut (CT) (Springfield, MA-CT) Urbanized Area (UZA), conduct a continuing, comprehensive, and cooperative (3C) multimodal transportation planning process as provided for by the Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act of 2015 and its provisions under Title 23 U.S. Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) and Title 49 U.S. CFR; and

**WHEREAS**, the Springfield, MA-CT UZA, hereinafter referred to as the "UZA," has been expanded as a result of the 2010 Decennial Census, and now contains or extends into two contiguous existing Metropolitan Planning Areas (MPAs)<sub>1</sub> in Massachusetts and Connecticut; and

**WHEREAS**, the UZA has a population of over 200,000 individuals and is designated as a Transportation Management Area (TMA). As such, the transportation planning processes of MPOs within the UZA are subject to review and certification by the FHWA and FTA once every four years.

<sup>1</sup> The term "metropolitan planning area" or "MPA" is used to describe the geographic area determined by agreement between the MPO for the area and the Governor, in which the metropolitan transportation planning process is carried out.

**WHEREAS**, the Parties seek to participate in this memorandum of understanding (MOU), to the extent that it is not in conflict with any law, existing agreement or procedure, to effectively coordinate the metropolitan planning processes for the transportation system within the UZA.

WHEREAS, if more than one MPO has been designated to serve the UZA, there shall be a written agreement among the MPOs, States, and public transportation operators describing how the metropolitan planning processes will be coordinated to assure the development of consistent metropolitan transportation plans and transportation improvement programs across MPA boundaries, particularly in cases where a proposed transportation investment extends across the boundaries of more than one MPA. The planning processes for affected MPOs should, to the maximum extent possible, reflect coordination of data collection, analysis, and planning assumptions across MPA boundaries; and

**WHEREAS**, more than one MPO serves the UZA, the MPOs, States, and the providers of public transportation shall jointly agree upon and develop specific written provisions for cooperatively developing and sharing information related to transportation performance data, the selection of performance targets, the reporting of performance targets, the reporting of performance to be used in tracking progress toward attainment of critical outcomes for the region of the MPO(s), and the collection of data for their State asset management plan for the National Highway System (NHS); and

NOW, THEREFORE, the Parties agree as follows:

#### Article 1. Transportation Planning and Coordination Responsibilities

#### **General Agreement**

- 1. Each MPO retains responsibility and authority for the metropolitan planning process carried out in its MPA.
- The Parties recognize an obligation to cooperate in coordinating planning matters of shared interest across MPA boundaries within the UZA for consistency in the development of metropolitan transportation plans (MTPs), Transportation Improvement Programs (TIPs), and for the coordination of Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) activities.
- 3. If inconsistencies or conflicts arise, the relevant parties shall meet and employ their best efforts to develop a satisfactory resolution. (See Article 2.)

#### **Responsibilities of All Parties**

4. Share available information, such as GIS layers, shapefiles, databases, and other applicable electronic data along common boundaries for the purpose of travel demand model development, calibration, and other analytical

applications as requested, practicable, and subject to agency-level policies, procedures, and agreements.

- 5. Coordinate the collection and analysis of data regarding travel patterns to, through, and among adjacent MPAs. Examples include traffic counts, household surveys, and "big data" acquisition (e.g., cell phone origin-destination data or travel speed data).
- 6. Share and coordinate the latest estimates, projections, and planning assumptions related to population growth, employment, land use, travel, transit, congestion, and economic activity for long-range planning applications, such as congestion management processes.
- 7. Exchange information and expertise in matters of mutual concern this includes each agency ensuring the notification of, and participation in, meetings concerned with matters of mutual interest, and collaboration on projects and studies with other parties that share transportation corridors, service routes, and assets spanning MPA boundaries.
- Demonstrate transportation conformity using existing MOUs and processes in place. The roles and responsibilities concerning transportation conformity for Massachusetts are described in the Massachusetts Air Quality Memorandum of Understanding, dated October 4, 2019 and in the Air Quality Conformity Interagency Consultation Process for Connecticut (Dated June 2010, Revised November 2018).

#### State DOT Responsibilities

- 9. Coordinate with relevant State DOTs and MPOs concerning the collection of performance data, the selection of performance targets, the reporting of targets and actual achievement of performance related to those targets, for the applicable Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) performance measures. Specific performance management concerns for the UZA include, but are not limited to the following:
  - a. Coordinating with relevant State DOTs and MPOs serving portions of the NHS network within the UZA, as indicated by FHWA's Congestion Mitigation Air Quality (CMAQ) Traffic Congestion Measure Applicability Table

(https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/air\_quality/cmaq/measures/cmaq\_ applicability/october\_2019/#toc494364637), to ensure consistent use of reporting segments and travel time data sets to calculate travel timebased measures.

- b. Coordinating with relevant State DOTs and MPOs concerning a common data collection method to be used for the Percent of Non-SOV Travel measure in portions of the UZA containing the NHS network when applicable.
- c. Coordinating with relevant State DOTs and MPOs to establish single UZA targets that represent performance of the NHS network for each of the

following measures: 1) Annual Hours of Peak Hour Excessive Delay (PHED); and 2) Percent Non-SOV Travel when applicable.

- d. Establishing joint procedures for coordinated target setting and reporting in the UZA for congestion mitigation and air quality (CMAQ) Traffic Congestion Measures and other performance measures, as needed.
- e. Sharing baseline, progress, and full performance period reports pertaining to Traffic Congestion and Air Quality performance measures and targets.
- 10. Coordinate strategies to maintain transportation investments spanning State boundaries within the UZA.
- 11. Forecast and allocate funding for transportation planning and programming in the portion of the UZA within the State.

#### **MPO** Responsibilities

- 12. Coordinate CMAQ Traffic Congestion Measure performance requirements applicable to the UZA with adjoining MPOs and the State DOT. MPO coordination activities should include, but are not limited to:
  - a. Coordinating with relevant State DOTs and MPOs serving portions of the UZA with NHS segments, as indicated by FHWA's Congestion Mitigation Air Quality (CMAQ) Applicability Table (https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/air\_quality/cmaq/measures/cma q\_applicability/october\_2019/#toc494364637), to ensure consistent use of reporting segments and travel time data sets to calculate travel timebased measures.
  - b. Coordinating with relevant State DOTs and MPOs concerning a common data collection method to be used for the Percent of Non-SOV Travel measure in portions of the UZA with NHS segments when applicable.
  - c. Coordinating with relevant State DOTs and MPOs to establish a single UZA target that represents performance of the NHS for both Annual Hours of Peak Hour Excessive Delay (PHED) and Percent Non-SOV Travel performance measures when applicable.
  - d. Reporting progress toward target achievement as required by the relevant State DOT and sharing with MPOs and public transportation operators, as requested.
- 13. Conduct cross-boundary coordination of matters affecting the Congestion Management Process, including monitoring activities and the sharing of relevant data as agreed upon between PVPC and CRCOG during annual state coordination efforts.
- 14. Coordinate strategies to maintain transportation investments spanning MPO boundaries within the UZA.

15. <u>TMA Requirements</u>: The transportation planning processes of MPOs within the UZA are subject to TMA requirements at 23 CFR 450.336(b), administered by the FHWA and FTA at least once every four years. Where the UZA overlaps into an adjacent MPA serving another urbanized area that is not a designated TMA, the adjacent urbanized area shall not be treated as a TMA. The MPO parties under this agreement with MPA boundaries that include a portion of the UZA are responsible for meeting the TMA requirements, as they apply to the transportation planning process for that portion of the UZA.

#### Regional Transit Authority (RTA) Responsibilities

- 16. Coordinate with relevant MPOs as appropriate to share service information, ridership data, and other data for use in the planning process, including in the congestion management process.
- 17. Coordinate with relevant MPOs on planning and programing for investments, including services, that cross MPA boundaries.

#### Article 2. Process for Dispute Resolution

#### Process for Dispute Resolution

Each Party will ensure appropriate cooperation and consultation on plans, programs, and projects affecting two or more parties. If inconsistencies or conflicts arise, the Parties shall meet and employ their best efforts to develop a satisfactory resolution at the lowest staff level possible and in a timely manner. Disputes not resolved at the staff level will be addressed at the executive level. After exhausting all efforts to address an unresolved matter, the Parties in dispute agree to apprise the respective FHWA and FTA authorities.

#### Article 3. Amendment, Termination, and Supersession of Agreement

MassDOT, on behalf of the Parties hereto, is the designated custodian of this MOU. As such, MassDOT shall be responsible for coordinating reviews and executing all amendments, including discussion and consultation forums related to its content.

This MOU will be reviewed at least once every four years.

This MOU may be amended, whenever deemed appropriate, by endorsement of all Parties. Any party to this MOU may propose an amendment at any time. The Parties agree to consult to determine the extent and appropriateness of such proposed amendments.

This MOU does not replace or supersede any existing planning agreement, or portion thereof, unless otherwise stated herein.

This MOU supersedes the 2015 Cooperative Agreement between the Capitol Region Council of Governments and the Pioneer Valley Planning Commission.

CERTIFICATION OF THE URBANIZED AREA DESIGNATIONS of the 2010 CENSUS on COORDINATION among METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATIONS, STATE DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION and PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION OPERATORS

This document certifies that the below signatories hereby endorse the 2020 Memorandum of Understanding concerning The Effect of the Urbanized Area Designations of the 2010 Census on Certification Requirements and Coordination of Metropolitan Planning Organizations.

10/19/2020 Date

Stephanie Pollack, Secretary and CEO Massachusetts Department of Transportation (MassDOT); Chair, Pioneer Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization (PVMPO)

Joseph J. Giulietti, Commissioner Connecticut Department of Transportation (CTDOT); Connecticut Transit (CTtransit)

Lyle Wray, Executive Director Capitol Region Council of Governments (CRCOG)

ste 1a

Tina Cote, Administrator Franklin Regional Transit Authority (FRTA)

Vicki L. Shotland, Executive Director Greater Hartford Transit District (GHTD)

Sandra Sheehan, Administrator Pioneer Valley Transit Authority (PVTA)

<u>5-11-2020</u> Date

5-11-2020

New York Metropolitan Transportation Council North Jersey Transportation Planning Authority Western Connecticut Council of Governments Connecticut Metro Council of Governments Naugatuck Valley Council of Governments South Central Regional Council of Governments Lower Connecticut River Valley Council of Governments Orange County Transportation Council Lehigh Valley Planning Commission

## MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING (MOU) FOR COORDINATION OF TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ACTIVITIES IN THE MULTI-STATE NEW YORK-NEW JERSEY-CONNECTICUT-PENNSYLVANIA METROPOLITAN REGION

This Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) is made and entered into by and among the New York Metropolitan Transportation Council (NYMTC) and the Orange County Transportation Council (OCTC) in the State of New York; the North Jersey Transportation Planning Authority (NJTPA) in the State of New Jersey; the Western Connecticut Council of Governments (WestCOG), Connecticut Metro Council of Governments (METROCOG), Naugatuck Valley Council of Governments (NVCOG), South Central Regional Council of Governments (RiverCOG) in the State of Connecticut, and the Lehigh Valley Planning Commission (LVPC) in the State of Pennsylvania; collectively referred to hereinafter as "the PARTIES".

**WHEREAS**, the PARTIES acknowledge that portions of the multi-state New York-New Jersey-Connecticut-Pennsylvania metropolitan region are characterized by socio-economic and environmental interdependence, as evidenced through shared ecosystems, interconnected transportation systems and inter-related patterns of employment and population; and,

**WHEREAS**, the PARTIES are within or are adjacent to a federally-designated Transportation Management Area (TMA) and together constitute one of the nation's largest commuter-sheds; and, **WHEREAS**, 23 U.S.C. 134 and Section 8 of the Federal Transit Act require that Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) be designated for metropolitan regions and that they maintain a continuing, cooperative and comprehensive transportation planning process that results in plans and programs that consider all transportation modes and supports metropolitan community development and social goals; and,

**WHEREAS**, a key role for MPOs is to serve as forums for cooperative transportation planning and decision-making in metropolitan areas; and,

WHEREAS, 23 CFR 450.314(d) states that, where more than one MPO has authority within a metropolitan planning area or a nonattainment or maintenance area, there shall be an agreement between the state department(s) of transportation and the MPOs describing how their planning processes will be coordinated to assure the development of an overall transportation plan for the metropolitan planning area, and that in nonattainment or maintenance areas, the agreement shall include State and local air quality agencies; and,

**WHEREAS**, this MOU supersedes a previous Memorandum of Understanding, executed by the then parties in 2008, in response to recommendations from the FHWA/FTA Transportation Planning Certification Reviews for NYMTC (Januarý 2007) and NJTPA (January 2006), and to which the signatories were New York Metropolitan Transportation Council, North Jersey Transportation Planning Authority, South Western Region Metropolitan Planning Organization, Greater Bridgeport/Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization, and Housatonic Valley Council of Elected Officials; and,

**WHEREAS**, it has subsequently been determined that, because of organizational changes, census boundary changes, and consistent with good planning principles, participation in this MOU by additional, adjacent MPOs would be advisable; and,

**WHEREAS**, this MOU constitutes a multi-state, multi-party agreement which addresses the requirements of 23 CFR 450.314(d) for the PARTIES, as well as complying with other relevant provisions of the Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act (Pub. L. No. 114-94), the most recent federal surface transportation legislation; and,

**WHEREAS**, the PARTIES agree to follow this MOU in order to ensure coordination in the development of the mandated products of the metropolitan transportation planning process including the process for meeting attainment of National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS); and,

WHEREAS, this MOU is intended to ensure that the products of each respective MPO

transportation planning process take into account the impacts of the plans and programs developed by the other MPOs; helps avoid duplication of effort; reflects consistency of approaches where possible; and ensures the consideration of the interests of all participating MPOs;

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that the PARTIES hereto agree to perform in good faith, and to the extent practicable and appropriate, the activities of <u>voluntary</u> coordination, cooperation and consultation amongst themselves, as follows:

#### General

1. Hold an annual meeting of the Executive Directors and appropriate key managers of the several MPOs and Councils of Government (COGs) which are PARTIES to this agreement, while encouraging participation by interested MPO/COG member agency representatives, including but not limited to, the public transit operating agencies, the various state departments of transportation, and the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey, to discuss and review the areas of coordination, cooperation and consultation as outlined in this MOU. The purpose of the annual meeting will be to engage in discussions of mutual interest with a focus on the development of their federally-required planning products and analyses. The annual meeting will also serve as a mechanism for assessing this MOU and for discussing further expectations and approaches, as appropriate.

2. Cooperate in efforts toward achieving, where possible, general consistency of planning products, analyses and tools through informal communication and document exchange.

3. Participate, to the extent practicable, in the transportation planning process of the other PARTIES through such activities, as are deemed appropriate, as technical committee memberships and/or meeting participation, including the use of the PARTIES' public participation processes and involvement in regional studies, as well as through informal and ongoing communications regarding same.

4. Exchange information to the extent that a particular COG/MPO develops such information or transportation planning products at the COG/MPO, rather than at the state, level. If the information or transportation product is developed at the state level, the COG/MPO agrees to encourage the exchange of such information as appropriate by the state agency that does develop such information or transportation planning product.

#### **Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)**

1. As individual MPOs/COGs, make available UPWP documentation and products, as appropriate, to the other PARTIES.

2. Exchange information, as appropriate, including DRAFT copies of the UPWP, and maintain communication among the PARTIES regarding how best to achieve coordination and consistency among the planning products and analyses.

3. Discuss opportunities for collaborative activities that could be incorporated as tasks and/or products and thereby included in the Work Programs of the PARTIES, as appropriate, for the upcoming year.

4. Consider that the several MPOs/COGs which are PARTIES to this agreement will not necessarily be at the same stage of UPWP development at the same time, and that coordination will be tempered by the schedule of each MPO's/COG's planning process.

#### Modeling and Data

1. Exchange modeling information at appropriate levels of geography, attempting where possible to relate the data to the MPOs'/COGs' existing analysis and forecasting tools.

2. Share data and forecasting as appropriate, including socio-economic, census, forecast and survey data and results; trip tables and travel demand model assumptions; and model validation data, state line traffic volumes and traffic volumes at the external boundaries of the other agencies' models.

3. Consult, as appropriate, in the development of enhanced travel demand models and/or post-processors.

4. Examine and utilize opportunities for joint development of new modeling applications for the region as appropriate.

5. Exchange information, data, measurements and forecasts as needed regarding compliance with federal rules and regulations pertaining to Transportation Performance Management (TPM).

#### **Transportation Plan**

1. During the development of the Long-Range Transportation Plan, consult as appropriate all PARTIES regarding key elements of the plan such as principles, scenarios, strategies, major project assumptions and key issues.

2. Exchange information, including DRAFT copies of the Long Range Plans and proposed

amendments, and maintain communication among the PARTIES, including affording each other the opportunity to review and comment on projects proposed in the Long Range Plan, especially on projects that border, or have a significant impact upon, other PARTIES' MPO jurisdictions.

3. Identify "boundary" projects and programs which impact the planning areas of two of more of the PARTIES.

4. Jointly develop a "metropolitan region" overview section for use as appropriate by the PARTIES in their respective Plans.

5. Consider that the several MPOs/COGs which are PARTIES to this agreement will not necessarily be at the same stage of plan development at the same time, and that coordination will be tempered by the schedule of each MPO's/COG's planning process.

#### **Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)**

1. Consult in the development of TIPs, as appropriate.

2. Exchange information, including DRAFT copies of the TIP and proposed amendments, and maintain communication among the PARTIES, including affording each other the opportunity to review and comment as appropriate on draft projects proposed in the TIP, especially on projects that border, or have a significant impact upon, other PARTIES' MPO jurisdictions.

3. Identify "boundary" projects and programs which impact the planning areas of two of more of the PARTIES.

4. Jointly develop a "metropolitan region" overview section for use as appropriate by the PARTIES in their respective TIPs.

5. Consider that the MPOs/COGs will not necessarily be at the same stage of TIP development at the same time, and that coordination will be tempered by the schedule of each MPO's planning process.

#### **Transportation Conformity**

1. Exchange information, as appropriate, on the design concept and the design scope of projects that should be included in the regional emissions analysis.

2. Consult on the assumptions used in the regional emissions analysis by each affected MPO/COG.

3. Exchange information, including DRAFT copies of the Transportation Conformity Determinations, and maintain communication among the PARTIES as appropriate.

4. Participate as appropriate in Interagency Consultation Groups (ICG) for adjoining MPOs.

5. Consider that the several MPOs/COGs which are PARTIES to this agreement will not necessarily be at the same stage of Conformity Determination development at the same time, or face the same relevant regulations and emissions tests, and that coordination will be tempered by the schedule of each MPO's/COG's planning process.

#### Adopted:

New York Metropolitan Transportation Council Adopted Resolution # 450 June 27, 2017

North Jersey Transportation Planning Authority Adopted Resolution #A-728 May 8, 2017

Western Connecticut Council of Governments Adopted Resolution # August 17, 2017

Connecticut Metro Council of Governments Adopted Resolution #

September 28, 2017

Naugatuck Valley Council of Governments Adopted Resolution **# 2018 - 01** 

September 8, 2017

South Central Regional Council of Governments Adopted Resolution #

July 26, 2017

Lower Connecticut River Valley Council of Governments Adopted Resolution #

April 26, 2017

Orange County Transportation Council Adopted Resolution # 2017- 06

June 12, 2017

Lehigh Valley Planning Commission Adopted Resolution # A

July 19, 2017

#### Individual Agency Signature Page

for

### MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING (MOU) FOR COORDINATION OF TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ACTIVITIES IN THE MULTI-STATE NEW YORK-NEW JERSEY-CONNECTICUT-PENNSYLVANIA METROPOLITAN REGION

New York Metropolitan Transportation Council North Jersey Transportation Planning Authority Western Connecticut Council of Governments Connecticut Metro Council of Governments Naugatuck Valley Council of Governments South Central Regional Council of Governments Lower Connecticut River Valley Council of Governments Orange County Transportation Council Lehigh Valley Planning Commission

Agency Name:	NEW YORK METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTA	TION COUNCIL
Resolution # / D	ate (if Applicable): <u>#450</u>	

Signatu	re; Bo m.	
Title: _	EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR	
Date:	OCTURNIR 17, 2017	

#### NEW YORK METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COUNCIL

Jasé M. Rivers, P.R. Executive Disector

#### PROGRAM, FINANCE AND ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE (PFAC)

#### **RESOLUTION #450**

#### AUTHORIZATION TO ENTER INTO A MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING WITH NEIGHBORING METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATIONS/COUNCILS OF GOVERNMENT

WHEREAS, the New York Metropolitan Transportation Council (NYMTC) is a regional council of governments which is the metropolitan planning organization for New York City, Long Island and the lower Hudson Valley; and

WHEREAS, per 23 CFR 450.312(f), in multistate metropolitan areas, the Governors with responsibility for a portion of the multistate metropolitan area, the appropriate MPO(s), and the public transportation operator(s) are strongly encouraged to coordinate transportation planning for the entire multistate metropolitan area; and

WHEREAS, per Resolution #249 on January 17, 2008, the Program, Finance and Administration Committee (PFAC) adopted a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between neighboring MPOs in New York, New Jersey and Connecticut; and

WHEREAS, through similar actions of four other MPOs, the Metropolitan Area Planning (MAP) Forum was created as a consortium of MPOs in a multistate metropolitan area; and

WHEREAS, the recent reorganization of councils of government (COGs) by the State of Connecticut and the desire of additional MPOs and COGs to join the MAP Forum have necessitated the review and revision of the original MOU which created the MAP Forum; and

WHEREAS, the revised MOU must now be signed by the MPOs and COGs which will constitute the MAP Forum; and

WHEREAS, NYMTC continued involvement with the other MPOs and COGs in the multistate metropolitan region will help fulfill the requirements of 23 CFR 450.312(f), as well as continuing to enhance NYMTC's planning process.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT** PFAC authorizes the Executive Director of NYMTC to sign the revised MOU on behalf of NYMTC, thus continuing NYMTC's participation in the MAP Forum.

This resolution shall take effect on the twenty-seventh day of June, two thousand and seventeen.

#### ADOPTED: June 27, 2017

"I hereby certify that the above is a true copy of Resolution #450, Authorization 16 Enter into a Memorandum of Understanding with Neighboring Metropolitan Planning Organizations/Council of Gavernments, and was motioned by Ms. Naomi Klein, representing the Mid-Hudson South Transportation Coordinating Committee and seconded by Ms. Karin Sommer, representing the New York City Transportation Coordinating Committee This Resolution was adopted and possed unanimously."

Ron Epitem, PFAC Chair

#### THE METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

25 BEAVER SIREEL & SLITE 201 & NEW YORK & NEW YORK & 10004 + 212.383.7200 + WWW. NINTC. ORG

#### **Individual Agency Signature Page**

for

## MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING (MOU) FOR COORDINATION OF TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ACTIVITIES IN THE MULTI-STATE NEW YORK-NEW JERSEY-CONNECTICUT-PENNSYLVANIA METROPOLITAN REGION

New York Metropolitan Transportation Council North Jersey Transportation Planning Authority Western Connecticut Council of Governments Connecticut Metro Council of Governments Naugatuck Valley Council of Governments South Central Regional Council of Governments Lower Connecticut River Valley Council of Governments Orange County Transportation Council Lehigh Valley Planning Commission

Agency Name	NORTH	JORSOY TRA	NSPORTATIO	N PLANNING
<b>Resolution</b> # /	Date (if Applic	able): <u>A - 728</u>	5/8/17	
Signature:	mary K Mur	pu/mol-		
Title: <u>Pa</u>	ECUTUE J	DIRECTOR		
Date:	6/8/17			

#### RESOLUTION A-728: APPROVAL OF A MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING FOR COORDINATION OF TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ACTIVITIES IN THE MULTI-STATE METROPOLITAN REGION

WHEREAS, the North Jersey Transportation Planning Authority, Inc. (NJTPA) has been designated by the Governor as the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the northern New Jersey region; and

WHEREAS, a key role for MPOs is to serve as a forum for cooperative transportation planning and decision-making in metropolitan areas; and

WHEREAS, 23 CFR 450.314(d) states that, where more than one MPO has authority within a metropolitan planning area or a nonattainment or maintenance area, there shall be an agreement between the state department(s) of transportation and the MPOs describing how their planning processes will be coordinated to assure the development of an overall transportation plan for the metropolitan planning area, and that in nonattainment or maintenance areas, the agreement shall include State and local air quality agencies; and,

WHEREAS, this MOU supersedes a previous MOU, executed by the then parties in 2008, in response to recommendations from the Federal Highway Administration and the Federal Transit Administration Transportation Planning Certification Reviews for the New York Metropolitan Transportation Council (NYMTC) (January 2007) and the NJTPA (January 2006), and to which the signatories were NYMTC, NJTPA, South Western Region Metropolitan Planning Organization, Greater Bridgeport/Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization, and Housatonic Valley Council of Elected Officials; and,

WHEREAS, it has subsequently been determined that, because of organizational changes, census boundary changes, and consistent with good planning principles, participation in this MOU by additional, adjacent MPOs and Councils of Government (COGs) would be advisable; and,

WHEREAS, this MOU constitutes a multi-state, multi-party agreement which addresses the requirements of 23 CFR 450.314(d) for the PARTIES, as well as complying with other relevant provisions of the Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act, the most recent federal surface transportation legislation; and,

WHEREAS, the PARTIES to this MOU will now include: NJTPA; NYMTC; Western Connecticut Council of Governments; Connecticut Metro Council of Governments; Naugatuck Valley Council of Governments; South Central Regional Council of Governments; Lower Connecticut River Valley Council of Governments; Orange County Transportation Council (NY); Lehigh Valley Planning Commission (PA); and WHEREAS, the above referenced MPOs and COGs have collaborated to prepare this MOU for the coordination of transportation planning activities in the multi-state New York, New Jersey and Connecticut metropolitan region; and

WHEREAS, the attached MOU is intended to ensure that the products of each respective party's transportation planning process takes into account the impacts of the plans and programs developed by the other MPOs and COGs; and

WHEREAS, any material additions, deletions or changes to the attached MOU as adopted by the NJTPA will require the action of the NJTPA Board of Trustees, as well as that of the other MPOs and COGs.

WHEREAS, no action authorized by the NJTPA shall have force or effect until ten (10) days, Saturdays, Sundays and public holidays excepted, after a copy of the minutes of the meeting of the Board of Trustees has been delivered to the Governor for review, unless prior to expiration of the review period the Governor shall approve same, in which case the action shall become effective upon such approval;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the North Jersey Transportation Planning Authority hereby approves the attached Memorandum of Understanding for Coordination of Transportation Planning Activities in the Multi-State Metropolitan Region involving the aforementioned Metropolitan Planning Organizations and Councils of Government whereby these parties agree to perform in good faith various activities of voluntary coordination, cooperation and consultation amongst themselves, with regard to the metropolitan transportation planning process.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, that copies of this resolution and the attached be forwarded to the New Jersey Department of Transportation and NJ TRANSIT for submission to the Federal Highway Administration and Federal Transit Administration. The New York Metropolitan Transportation Council; Western Connecticut Council of Governments; Connecticut Metro Council of Governments; Naugatuck Valley Council of Governments; South Central Regional Council of Governments; Lower Connecticut River Valley Council of Governments; Orange County Transportation Council (NY); and Lehigh Valley Planning Commission (PA).

#### Certification

I hereby certify that the above is a true copy of a resolution adopted by the North Jersey Transportation Planning Authority at its scheduled meeting held on May 8, 2017.

Mary K. Murphy

Mary K. Murphy Executive Director, NJTPA

#### Individual Agency Signature Page

for

### MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING (MOU) FOR COORDINATION OF TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ACTIVITIES IN THE MULTI-STATE NEW YORK-NEW JERSEY-CONNECTICUT-PENNSYLVANIA METROPOLITAN REGION

New York Metropolitan Transportation Council North Jersey Transportation Planning Authority Western Connecticut Council of Governments Connecticut Metro Council of Governments Naugatuck Valley Council of Governments South Central Regional Council of Governments Lower Connecticut River Valley Council of Governments Orange County Transportation Council Lehigh Valley Planning Commission

Agency Name:	WESTERN CONNER	TILUT CON	UNCOL OF	GOVERNMEN	Ũ
Resolution # / D	ate (if Applicable):	AUGUST I	7,2017		

	Gi.A.	
Signatu	ure:	-
Title: _	EXECUTIVE PIREPOR	
Date: _	SEPTEMBER 11, 2017	

# Western Connecticut COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS



## CERTIFIED RESOLUTION

Approval of the Memorandum of Understanding for Coordination of Transportation Planning Activities in the Multi-State New York-New Jersey-Connecticut-Pennsylvania Region

I, David Gronbach, Secretary of the Western Connecticut Council of Governments (henceforth the "Council"), do hereby certify that the following is a true and correct copy of a resolution duly adopted at a meeting of the Council, duly held and convened on August 17, 2017 at which a duly constituted quorum of the Council was present and acting throughout and that such resolution has not been modified, rescinded or revoked and is at present in full force and effect.

BE IT RESOLVED, that Chairman Jayme Stevenson or Vice Chairman Susan Chapman are hereby authorized to direct Executive Director Francis Pickering to act on behalf of the Council in executing the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) for Coordination of Transportation Planning Activities in the Multi-State New York-New Jersey-Connecticut-Pennsylvania Metropolitan Region.

IN WITNESS THEREOF, the undersigned has affixed his signature and the Corporate Seal of the Council This Seventeenth Day of August, 2017, in the Town of Ridgefield, Connecticut.

in

David Gronbach, Secretary Western Connecticut Council of Governments



1 Riverside Road, Sandy Hook, CT 06482

Visit us online at **westcog.org** Telephone/fax 475-323-2060

#### **Individual Agency Signature Page**

for

## MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING (MOU) FOR COORDINATION OF TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ACTIVITIES IN THE MULTI-STATE NEW YORK-NEW JERSEY-CONNECTICUT-PENNSYLVANIA METROPOLITAN REGION

New York Metropolitan Transportation Council North Jersey Transportation Planning Authority Western Connecticut Council of Governments Connecticut Metro Council of Governments Naugatuck Valley Council of Governments South Central Regional Council of Governments Lower Connecticut River Valley Council of Governments Orange County Transportation Council Lehigh Valley Planning Commission

Agency	Name: CONNECTICUT METRO COUNCIL OF
Resolu	ition #/ Date (if Applicable): Sept. 28, 2017 GOVERMENTS
Signat	UPE: TIMOTHY HERBST (ATTACHED)
Title:	CHAIRMAN
Date:	SERT. 28, 2017
# Adopted:

New York Metropolitan Transportation Council:

Adopted Resolution #

North Jersey Transportation Planning Authority

Adopted Resolution #

Western Connecticut Council of Governments

Adopted Resolution #

Connecticut Metri Council of Governments Adopted Resolution # SEDTEMBER 28,2017

Naugatuck Valley Council of Governments

Adopted Resolution #



# Draft Minutes Regular Meeting Connecticut Metropolitan Council of Governments Thursday, September 28th, 2017 at 10:00am MetroCOG Conference Room Bridgeport, Connecticut

#### Name Representing Joseph Ganim, Mayor (Ken Flatto, Proxy) Bridgeport Adam Dunsby, First Selectman Easton Michael Tetreau, First Selectman (Thomas Dubrosky, Proxy) Fairfield Timothy Herbst, First Selectman, Chairman Trumbull Patrick Carleton, Deputy Director MetroCOG Matthew Fulda, Executive Director MetroCOG Colleen Kelleher, Deputy Finance Director MetroCOG Meghan Sloan, Planning Director MetroCOG Larry Ciccarelli, Administrative Services Director MetroCOG Sara Radacsi (teleconference) CTDOT

1

# Minutes

# I. Call to Order

This was a regular meeting of the Connecticut Metropolitan Council of Governments. It was called to order by the Chair, First Selectman Herbst, at 10:08am.

A motion to nominate First Selectman Dunsby to be Secretary Pro-Tem was made by First Selectman Herbst and seconded by Mr. Flatto. The motion Carried unanimously.

# II. Public Participation

There was no public participation.

# III. Approval of Meeting Minutes

a. June 29<sup>th</sup>, 2017

A motion to approve the minutes from June 29<sup>th</sup> was made by First Selectman Dunsby and seconded by Mr. Flatto. The motion carried unanimously.

b. August 30<sup>th</sup>, 2017

A motion to approve the minutes from August 30<sup>th</sup> was made by First Selectman Dunsby and seconded by Mr. Flatto, The motion carried unanimously.

# IV. Communications and Announcements

- a. State FY 2019 Planning Studies Mr. Fulda explained the state was accepting planning study proposals and that he had already had discussions with town staff. The deadline for proposals is November 30<sup>th</sup>, 2017.
- **b.** Financials

Mr. Fulda explained that MetroCOG is tracking well for the year and there were no updates.

## V. Action Items:

a. LOTCIP: Stratford Complete Streets

Mr. Fulda requested a vote to program \$2 Million that has been on hold for Main Street.

A motion to approve the allocation and planning was made my Mr. Flatto and seconded by First Selectman Dunsby. The motion carried unanimously.

 b. MOU for the Coordination of Transportation Planning Activities in the Multi-State NY-NJ-CT-PA Metropolitan Region.
Mr. Fulda explained that the MOU was voluntary and extended the areas from the

Mr. Fulda explained that the MOU was voluntary and extended the areas from the current MOU.

Ms. Sloan commented that it builds on larger perspectives.

A motion to approve the MOU was made by First Selectman Dunsby and seconded by Mr. Dubrosky. The motion carried unanimously.

#### **VI. Other Business**

Mr. Flatto requested a board resolution supporting the Amazon application.

A motion to approve a letter of support for the regional Amazon headquarters was made by Mr. Flatto and seconded by Mr. Dubrosky. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Fulda commented that a draft letter to the Legislators was sent to the board and he was waiting on comments.

First Selectman Dunsby inquired about the status of Auditor selection.

Mr. Fulda explained that MetroCOG chose King, King and Associates and an MOU was with the lawyer. He confirmed that they would start in November and would not have a problem getting an extension if necessary.

### VII. Adjourn

A motion to adjourn was made by First Selectman Dunsby and seconded by Mr. Dubrosky. The meeting was adjourned at 10:24am

 $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ 

Respectively submitted,

Adam Dunsby MetroCOG Secretary Pro Tem

#### Individual Agency Signature Page

for

# MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING (MOU) FOR COORDINATION OF TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ACTIVITIES IN THE MULTI-STATE NEW YORK-NEW JERSEY-CONNECTICUT-PENNSYLVANIA METROPOLITAN REGION

New York Metropolitan Transportation Council North Jersey Transportation Planning Authority Western Connecticut Council of Governments Connecticut Metro Council of Governments Naugatuck Valley Council of Governments South Central Regional Council of Governments Lower Connecticut River Valley Council of Governments Orange County Transportation Council Lehigh Valley Planning Commission

Agency Name: Naugatuck Valley Council of Governments Resolution # / Date (if Applicable): NVCOG Resolution 2018-01

Signature:

Title: Executive Director

Date: September 8, 2017



#### **RESOLUTION 2018-01**

#### APPROVAL OF

# MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING FOR COORDINATION OF TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ACTIVITIES IN THE MULTI-STATE METROPOLITAN REGION

I certify that the following is a true copy of the vote of the Naugatuck Valley Council of Governments at its meeting on September 8, 2017 in Waterbury, Connecticut, at which a quorum was present.

WHEREAS, the Naugatuck Valley Council of Governments has been designated as the Metropolitan Planning Organization for the Waterbury Urbanized Area.

WHEREAS, the NVCOG conducts the federal transportation planning process in accordance to US DOT guideline and regulations, and 23 CFR 450.314(d) states that, where more than one MPO has authority within a metropolitan planning area or a nonattainment or maintenance area, there shall be an agreement between the state department(s) of transportation and the MPOs describing how their planning processes will be coordinated to assure the development of an overall transportation plan for the metropolitan planning area, and that in nonattainment or maintenance areas, the agreement shall include State and local air quality agencies.

WHEREAS, the NVCOG is a member of the Metropolitan Area Planning Forum, a consortium of MPOs and COGs in the multi-state planning area in New York, New Jersey, Connecticut and Pennsylvania that voluntarily coordinate transportation planning activities in the multi-state region.

WHEREAS, the MOU signed in 2008 needs to be revised and updated to reflect organization changes in membership, census boundary changes, and consistent with good planning principles.

**BE IT RESOLVED,** that the NVCOG endorses the attached Memorandum of Understanding for Coordination of Transportation Planning Activities in the Multi-State Metropolitan Region to perform, in good faith, various activities of voluntary coordination, cooperation and consultation amongst the affiliated MPOs and COGs, with regard to the metropolitan transportation planning process, and authorizes the Executive Director to sign the MOU on behalf of the NVCOG.

Dated at Waterburg \_, Connecticut, on September

Agency: Naugatuck Valley Council of Governments

Signed

Thomas Dunn, Treasurer

ANSONIA · BEACON FALLS · BETHLEHEM · BRISTOL · CHESHIRE · DERBY · MIDDLEBURY · NAUGATUCK · OXFORD · PLYMOUTH PROSPECT · SEYMOUR · SHELTON · SOUTHBURY · THOMASTON · WATERBURY · WATERTOWN · WOLCOTT · WOODBURY

Appendicies Page 75

#### **Individual Agency Signature Page**

for

# MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING (MOU) FOR COORDINATION OF TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ACTIVITIES IN THE MULTI-STATE NEW YORK-NEW JERSEY-CONNECTICUT-PENNSYLVANIA METROPOLITAN REGION

New York Metropolitan Transportation Council North Jersey Transportation Planning Authority Western Connecticut Council of Governments Connecticut Metro Council of Governments Naugatuck Valley Council of Governments South Central Regional Council of Governments Lower Connecticut River Valley Council of Governments Orange County Transportation Council Lehigh Valley Planning Commission

Agenc	Name: SOUTH CENTRA REGIONA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENB
Resolu	ition # / Date (if Applicable): JULY 26, 2017
Signat	ure:
Title:	EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
Date:	JVLY 26,2017



#### SOUTH CENTRAL REGIONAL COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

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

Carl J. Amento, Executive Director

# SCRCOG MEETING NOTICE & AGENDA July 26, 2017 – 10:00 A.M. Location: 127 Washington Avenue, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor West North Haven, CT 06473 Full agenda materials can be found at our website – <u>www.scrcog.org</u>

1.	Call to Order and Introductions – Mayor Toni Harp, Chairwoman	
2.	Adoption of 6/28/17 SCRCOG Minutes – First Selectman James Cosgrove, Secretary	Pages 2-4
3.	Treasurer's Report for month ending 6/30/17 – Mayor Edward M. O'Brien, Treasurer	Pages 5,6
4.	Transportation Committee Report – Mayor William Dickinson, Chairman	Pages 7-12
	a. Ozone Air Quality Conformity Resolution	Pages 7,8
	b. PM 2.5 Air Quality Conformity Resolution	Pages 9,10
	c. 2018-2021 TIP Resolution	Pages 11, 12
5.	Resolution Authorizing the Executive Director to Execute on Behalf of SCRCOG a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) for Coordination of Transportation Planning Activities in the Multi-State New York-New Jersey-Connecticut-Pennsylvania Metropolitan Region	Pages 13-20
6.	Congressional Reports – Louis Mangini, Aide to U.S. Representative Rosa DeLauro; Evan Johnson, Aide to U.S. Senator Christopher Murphy	
7.	State Legislative Reports- Michael Muszynski, Advocacy Manager, CCM; Kathryn Dube, Director of Legislative Services, Council of Small Towns (COST)	
8.	SCRCOG Executive Director's Report - Carl Amento, Executive Director	
9.	Grant Opportunities—Carl Amento, Executive Director	Attachment
10.	Upcoming Events—Carl Amento, Executive Director	Attachment
11.	Report on Utility Tree Trimming Practices: Stump Grinding and Clean up/Disposal- Carl Amento, Executive Director	
12.	REX Development Report – Ginny Kozlowski, Executive Director, REX Development	Pages 21-23
13.	DESPP/ DEMHS Report	
14.	Regional Planning Commission July Action Table	Page 24
15.	Regional Cooperation/Other Business	
16.	Adjournment	

The agenda and attachments for this meeting are available on our website at <u>www.scrcog.org</u>. Please contact SCRCOG at (203) 234-7555 for a copy of agenda in a language other than English. Auxiliary aids/services and limited English proficiency translators will be provided with two week's notice.

La Agenda y Adjuntos para esta reunión están disponibles en nuestro sitio web en <u>www.scrcog.org</u>. Favor en contactar con SCRCOG al (203) 234-7555 para obtener una copia de la Agenda en un idioma distinto al Inglés. Ayudas/servicios auxiliares e intérpretes para personas de Dominio Limitado del Inglés serán proporcionados con dos semanas de aviso.

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

SOUTH CENTRAL REGIONAL COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

Planning for Our Region's Future

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

Carl J. Amento, Executive Director

TO:	SCRCOG Board Members
FROM:	First Selectman James Cosgrove, Secretary
DATE:	July 6, 2017
SUBJECT:	SCRCOG Minutes of June 28, 2017

#### Present:

First Selectwoman Derrylyn Gorski
Janice Plaziak, proxy for First Selectman James Cosgrove
Mayor Joseph Maturo
First Selectman Joseph Mazza, Vice Chairman
Patrick Donnelly, proxy for Mayor Curt Leng
Debra Milardo, proxy for First Selectman Thomas Banisch
Guy Scaife, proxy for Mayor Kevin Scarpati
Mayor Benjamin Blake, Immediate Past Chairman
Mayor Toni Harp, Chairwoman
Michael Paulhus- proxy for Mayor Michael Doody
First Selectman Michael Freda
Mayor William Dickinson
Mayor Edward O'Brien, Treasurer
Betsy Yagla, proxy for First Selectwoman Ellen Scalettar

SCRCOG Staff Stephen Dudley, James Rode, Eugene Livshits, Christopher Rappa, Rebecca Andreucci

Guests: Lori Vitagliano, Regional Water Authority (RWA); Miriam Brody, Hamden-North Haven League of Women Voters; Barbara Malmberg, REX Development; Kimberly Dunham and Mary Ann Bigelow, Greater New Haven Transit District; Michael Muszynski, CT Conference of Municipalities (CCM); Elizabeth Gara, Council of Small Towns (COST); Michael Piscitelli, City of New Haven; Richard LoPresti, Avangrid; Daniel Burns, Eversource; Lou Mangini, Office of U.S. Representative Rosa DeLauro; Evan Johnson, Office of U.S. Senator Christopher Murphy; Ellen Graham Office of U.S. Senator Richard Blumenthal; Nan Birdwhistall, MurthaCullina; Christine Walsh, Nadia Lynch, Frankie Fortunata, and Nick Dostal, City of Milford; John Wardzala, The Kennedy Center

#### 1. Call to order and Introductions

Chairwoman Mayor Harp called the meeting to order at 10:04 a.m. All present introduced themselves.

#### 2. Adoption of May 24, 2017 SCRCOG meeting minutes

First Selectman Mazza presented the Minutes of the SCRCOG meeting of May 24, 2017, which were included in the agenda packet at pages 2-5. He moved for their approval. Mayor Maturo seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

#### 3. Treasurer's Report for month ending May 31, 2017

Mayor O'Brien presented the Treasurer's Report for the month ending May 31, 2017, which was included in the agenda packet at pages 6-7. Cash and Investments totaled \$587,000 with \$482,000 due from CTDOT.

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



#### SOUTH CENTRAL REGIONAL COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

Planning for Our Region's Future

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

Carl J. Amento, Executive Director

TO:	SCRCOG Board Members
FROM:	First Selectman James Cosgrove, Secretary
DATE:	August 14, 2017
SUBJECT:	SCRCOG Minutes of July 26, 2017

#### Present:

Bethany	First Selectwoman Derrylyn Gorski
Branford	First Selectman James Cosgrove
East Haven	Mayor Joseph Maturo
Guilford	First Selectman Joseph Mazza, Vice Chairman
Hamden	Patrick Donnelly, proxy for Mayor Curt Leng
Meriden	Guy Scaife, proxy for Mayor Kevin Scarpati
Milford	Mayor Benjamin Blake, Immediate Past Chairman
New Haven	Mayor Toni Harp, <i>Chairwoman</i>
North Haven	First Selectman Michael Freda
Wallingford	Mayor William Dickinson
West Haven	Mayor Edward O'Brien, Treasurer
Woodbridge	First Selectwoman Beth Heller
SCRCOG Staff	Carl Amento, Stephen Dudley, James Rode, Albert Ruggiero, Eugene Livshits, Christopher Rappa, Rebecca Andreucci

Guests: Lori Vitagliano, Regional Water Authority (RWA); Miriam Brody, Hamden-North Haven League of Women Voters; Ginny Kozlowski and Barbara Malmberg, REX Development; Josh LeCar and Mary Ann Bigelow, Greater New Haven Transit District; Michael Muszynski, CT Conference of Municipalities (CCM); Elizabeth Gara, Council of Small Towns (COST); Michael Piscitelli, City of New Haven; Richard LoPresti, Avangrid; Lou Mangini, Samantha Hicken, and Julie Gill, Office of U.S. Representative Rosa DeLauro; Evan Johnson, Office of U.S. Senator Christopher Murphy; Nan Birdwhistall, MurthaCullina; John Wardzala, The Kennedy Center; Jason Jackson, City of New Haven; Jennifer Siskind, Food & Water Watch; Mark Zaretsky, New Haven Register

#### 1. Call to order and Introductions

Chairwoman Mayor Harp called the meeting to order at 10:05 a.m. Chairwoman Harp welcomed Woodbridge First Selectwoman Beth Heller to her first SCRCOG meeting. All present introduced themselves.

#### 2. Adoption of June 28, 2017 SCRCOG meeting minutes

Chairwoman Mayor Harp presented the Minutes of the SCRCOG meeting of June 28, 2017, which were included in the agenda packet at pages 2-4. She moved for their approval. Mayor Maturo seconded the motion, which passed unanimously, except for First Selectwoman Heller who abstained.

\_\_\_\_\_

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

# 3. Treasurer's Report for month ending June 30, 2017

Mayor O'Brien presented the Treasurer's Report for the month ending June 30, 2017, which was included in the agenda packet at pages 5-6. Cash and Investments totaled \$1,002,862 with approximately \$422,000 of that total committed for specific projects. There is also \$122,366 due from CTDOT. Mayor O'Brien moved for acceptance of the Treasurer's Report. First Selectwoman Gorski seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

## 4. Transportation Committee Report

Mayor Dickinson presented the recommendations of the Transportation Committee found on Pages 7-12 of the agenda packet. Mayor Dickinson moved for adoption of the Ozone Air Quality Conformity Resolution found on Pages 7-8 of the agenda packet. First Selectman Mazza seconded the motion, which passed unanimously. Mayor Dickinson moved to adopt the PM 2.5 Air Quality Conformity Resolution on Pages 9-10 of the agenda packet. First Selectwoman Gorski seconded, the motion, which passed unanimously. Mayor Dickinson moved for approval of the 2018-2021 TIP Resolution on page 11-12 for discussion purposes. First Selectman Mazza seconded. Mayor Dickinson indicated that he was not in favor of the expenditure of \$2.7 million for Project # 0092-0647- New Haven Area CCTV Upgrades. The motion passed with all in favor except, Mayor Dickinson voted against.

#### 5. <u>Resolution Authorizing the Executive Director to Execute on Behalf of SCRCOG a Memorandum of</u> <u>Understanding (MOU) for Coordination of Transportation Planning Activities in the Multi-State</u> New York-New Jersey- Connecticut- Pennsylvania Metropolitan Region

The Resolution and the MOU are on pages 13-21 of the agenda packet. Mayor Maturo moved to approve the Resolution. Mayor O'Brien seconded, and the Resolution was approved unanimously.

## 6. Congressional Report

Lou Mangini from Congresswoman DeLauro's Office noted that the Congresswoman's annual meeting with local mayors and first selectmen would be on Tuesday, August 1<sup>st</sup> at noon at Brazi's Restaurant. Mr. Mangini also reported on an Interior Department bill which awards \$8 million to the improvement of Long Island Sound. Evan Johnson from Senator Murphy's Office also reported on healthcare and gave updates on FEMA and other grant opportunities.

## 7. State Legislative Report

Michael Muszynski from CCM remarked on the continuing lack of a state budget. Payments to municipalities normally made on September 1 may be delayed. Elizabeth Gara from Council of Small Towns (COST) noted that the House had approved the state employee union concession package. It is still pending in the CT Senate. She pointed out that the General Assembly had overridden the Governor's veto of The affordable housing bill.

## 8. SCRCOG Executive Director's Report

Executive Director Amento distributed several items, including:

- (1) The CT Cybersecurity Strategy which refers to Municipalities on pages 18-19;
- (2) An article on the selection of Transit America Services and Alternate Concepts to operate the Hartford Line. New service which will double the current number of roundtrips will begin in May of 2018. The Governor announced the selection at Wallingford Station on Monday. Stephen Dudley and James Rode attended on behalf of SCRCOG; and
- (3) An update on QBridge Construction.

Amento also reported that Focus Groups have begun to meet to develop information for the Regional Plan of Conservation and Development. Individual meetings with municipalities have begun to solicit input for the Regional Hazard Mitigation Plan Update.

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

3

Director Amento and SCRCOG Regional Planner Rebecca Andreucci have been actively involved in the development of actions for municipal certification points in the Sustainable CT program. Director Amento is working on developing an internship program with the University of New Haven which would provide interns to SCRCOG municipalities from Masters in Public Administration program with students receiving course credit for the internships.

#### 9. Grant Opportunities

Grant Opportunities were included in the agenda packet as an attachment.

#### 10. Upcoming Events

Upcoming Events were included in the agenda packet as an attachment. One additional item was distributed, Long Island Sound Nitrogen Strategy Meetings, one of which will be held at SCRCOG on August 15<sup>th</sup> at 2 pm.

#### 11. REX Development Report

Ginny Kozlowski of REX Development reviewed the REX report at Pages 22-24 of the agenda packet. REX has continued with its international recruitment efforts including meetings with Chinese and Brazilian business people. An international business competition, Venture Clash, will be coming to New Haven in the next few weeks. The SCRCOG mayors and first selectmen will be receiving invitations to a social meeting with the Regional Leadership Council at the CT Open Tennis Tournament on August 22<sup>nd</sup> at 5:30 pm.

#### 12. DESPP/ DEMHS Report

Deputy Director Dudley reported that Bob Kenny would be providing support to the region until John Field is able to return.

#### 13. Regional Planning Commission July Action Table

The June Action Table was reviewed.

#### 14. Regional Cooperation/Other Business

First Selectman Freda asked whether any SCRCOG municipalities have taken back their PSAs from the ambulance company servicing their town. West Haven Mayor O'Brien said that it was under consideration. Milford Mayor Blake noted that the City of Milford was the first to utilize legislation that permitted the City to take over the PSA. The City was able to achieve \$1 million in new revenue without additional personnel or equipment. Milford transports ALS calls, and Nelson Ambulance transports BLS calls. A private billing service is used. Meriden City Manager Scaife noted that the City let out its PSA contract for both ALS and BLS and gets a percentage of fees billed and collected. Mayor Dickinson noted that Wallingford had tried taking over transport and that the financial results were disappointing. Ultimately, they had to cancel the municipal service and go back to a PSA service provider.

#### 15. Adjournment

First Selectwoman Gorski moved to adjourn, Mayor O'Brien seconded. The meeting was adjourned at 10:58 am.

Respectfully submitted,

First Selectman James Cosgrove, Secretary

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

## Individual Agency Signature Page

for

# MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING (MOU) FOR COORDINATION OF TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ACTIVITIES IN THE MULTI-STATE NEW YORK-NEW JERSEY-CONNECTICUT-PENNSYLVANIA METROPOLITAN REGION

New York Metropolitan Transportation Council North Jersey Transportation Planning Authority Western Connecticut Council of Governments Connecticut Metro Council of Governments Naugatuck Valley Council of Governments South Central Regional Council of Governments Lower Connecticut River Valley Council of Governments Orange County Transportation Council Lehigh Valley Planning Commission

Agenc	y Name: LOWER CT. RIVER VALL	En COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS
Resolu	ition # / Date (if Applicable):	26,2017
Signat	ture: BONNIE REEMSNYDER	
Title:	CHAIRMAN	-
Date:	APRIL 26, 2017	



145 Dennison Road Essex, CT 06426 860/581-8554 FAX: 860/581-8543 www.rivercog.org Chester, Clinton, Cromwell, Deep River, Durham, East Haddam, East Hampton, Essex, Haddam, Killingworth, Lyme, Middlefield, Middletown, Old Lyme, Old Saybrook, Portland, Westbrook

# Lower Connecticut River Valley Council of Governments and Lower Connecticut River Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization

#### APPROVED MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

Wednesday, April 26, 2017

#### **RiverCOG Members:**

Chester:	Lauren Gister *
Clinton:	Bruce Farmer
Cromwell:	Anthony Salvatore *
Deep River:	Angus McDonald, Jr. *
Durham:	Laura Francis *
East Haddam:	Emmett Lyman *
East Hampton:	Michael Maniscalco *
Essex:	Norm Needleman
Haddam:	Lizz Milardo *
Killingworth:	Cathy lino *
Lyme:	Ralph Eno
Middlefield:	Ed Bailey * (9:23)
Middletown:	Daniel Drew - Joseph Samolis proxy *
Old Lyme:	Bonnie Reemsnyder
Old Saybrook:	Carl Fortuna *
Portland:	Susan Bransfield *
Westbrook:	Noel Bishop *

#### **MPO Members:**

Middlesex Chamber of Commerce: Darlene Briggs Estuary Transit District: Joe Comerford Middletown Area Transit: Andrew Chiaravallo

#### **Others Present:**

Pat Bandzes, Eversource Edgar Wynkoop, DOT Maureen Goulet, CRCOG Purchasing Daniel Giungi, CCM Carol Conklin Frank DeFelice, RPC Stephanie Warren, RPC Samantha Sojka, Eversource Andy Brydges, Eversource John Guszkowski

\* Members Present

Lower CT River Valley COG and MPO Minutes of the April 26, 2017 Meeting Page Two

#### **Staff Present:**

Samuel Gold, AICP Judy Snyder Rob Haramut Torrance Downes Dan Bourret Margot Burns Janice Ehle/Meyer Jon Curtis Nate Hougrand

#### **1. CALL TO ORDER, INTRODUCTIONS, PUBLIC SPEAKING**

Vice Chairman Michael Maniscalco called the meeting to order at 9:08 a.m. at the RiverCOG offices, 145 Dennison Road, Essex, CT. Roll call was taken by Sam Gold, Executive Director and guests were introduced.

Frank DeFelice, Lower CT River Valley Regional Planning Committee Chairman, said that the towns need to have representatives come to the RPC meetings. Judy Snyder will e-mail the COG members the attendance records of their representatives.

a. Eversource Clean Energy Communities Update

Pat Bandzes, Eversource, introduced Samantha Sojka and Andy Brydges. Ms. Sojka said that she will give a brief update of the information in the folder that everyone has in front of them for their specific town. Every town has signed a non-legally binding pledge for their town's municipal and board of education buildings to reduce and save energy by 2018 as shown on the first page. On the next page the bronze, silver and gold categories show what the town has achieved and how many points were received towards the grant. A description of how the town can earn points that can be redeemed, an application form, and an example of projects other towns have used their grants for is included.

Andy Brydges said that this year Eversource is offering the opportunity for building operator certification training and Eversource will subsidize the total cost for one employee per town to attend that training. He said there is also an instructional sheet stating the application process for an Energy Star certification for your town in the folder.

b. Election Monitor

Carol Conklin, Election Monitor for the RiverCOG, updated the members on the position. She stated that a Bill was introduced to kill the position of the regional election monitor. Sam Gold asked if the Secretary of State had added money for this position. Ms. Conklin said that as of now no. Laura Francis asked if there had been any consequences to the COG that chose to not participate in this program. Mr. Gold said no. Mr. Maniscalco thanked Ms. Conklin for the update.

Lower CT River Valley COG and MPO Minutes of the April 26, 2017 Meeting Page Three

c. Capitol Region COG Purchasing Council, Maureen Goulet, Project Manager

Maureen Goulet distributed brochures explaining what the Capitol Region Purchasing Council (CRPC) does and the benefits of this program. Towns can purchase goods and services individually or in a group bidding process. CRPC also offers other cooperative programs to its members in the areas of energy and construction services for a small fee.

#### 2. LCRVMPO BUSINESS

a. Approval of Minutes of the March 22, 2017 LCRVCOG and LCRVMPO Meeting

Upon motion of Noel Bishop, seconded by Carl Fortuna, it was unanimously voted to approve the minutes of the March 22, 2017 LCRVCOG and LCRVMPO meeting.

- b. Transportation Updates
  - i. 2015 TIP amendment #36, Statewide transportation demand management program, project 0170-3450

Upon motion of Tony Salvatore, seconded by Lauren Gister, it was unanimously voted to approve the 2015 TIP amendment #36, Statewide transportation demand management program, project 0170-3450.

ii. FY16 FTA Section 5310 program MARC, Cromwell, Middlefield, ETD, review and prioritization

Robert Haramut discussed the ranking of the three lift assist/handicapped bus vehicle grant applications. The three traditional applications for the Hartford TMA were MARC ranking at 86 points, Cromwell at 76 points and the Durham/Middlefield project ranked at 63. The Cromwell application did not include answers for two questions, causing the ranking to be lower, once that was corrected the ranking increased to 86 points, same as MARC.

Robert Haramut stated that for the New Haven TMA there were no bus applications submitted however we did receive one from Joe Comerford at Estuary Transit District for operating funds for the mid-shore extension route and another application from North East transit in Meriden for diala-ride trips, including trips to Middletown. These two applications together are about \$10,000 over what the New Haven TMA is allotted so Mr. Haramut is assuming they are both going to move ahead. The Meriden Service is dial-a-ride from the transit district and is included because the RiverCOG does have towns that fall into the New Haven TMA.

Laura Francis said because Middlefield is in one district and Durham is in another is one district better than another and would it be better if the town with the better district took the lead or could each town submit the same application in their separate districts. Mr. Haramut will look into that.

Upon motion of Noel Bishop, seconded by Lauren Gister, it was unanimously voted to approve the rankings for Cromwell and MARC at 86 and Durham/Middlefield at 63.

Lower CT River Valley COG and MPO Minutes of the April 26, 2017 Meeting Page Four

#### iii. Draft UPWP

Robert Haramut gave an overview of the draft Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) for regional transportation planning. The RiverCOG members will vote on this issue at their next meeting.

Sam Gold said that on Page 30, it states that the percentage of money received will be Federal 80%, State 10% and local towns 10%. However, the RiverCOG has received notification from DOT that the funds are limited and will not be available to make the 10% match with the towns.

#### iv. 2018 Draft TIP Update

The RiverCOG members will vote on this issue at their next meeting.

Noel Bishop asked how the 2018-2021 project list is developed and can the numbers be prioritized (attachment #1). Robert Haramut said that the transit districts have been working on this with the DOT.

v. Transportation Alternative Program Update (TAP)

Robert Haramut said that six projects were submitted with Haddam further ahead and ready to start Phase II which will start from Route 154 to Eagle Landing rather than Phase 1 which would start at Eagle Landing and go to the bridge, including the sidewalks (attachment #2).

Susan Bransfield asked what the next steps are for the Portland and Durham projects. Robert Haramut said Old Saybrook and Westbrook also are waiting for sidewalk jobs on state roads, but there is no funding source at this time. The towns have to wait for the next round of TAP funding or try to get some of the funding through LOTCIP. LOTCIP is not really designed as a sidewalk program but DOT may allow the towns to do a small amount of work here and there.

vi. Municipal Grant Program Update

Robert Haramut said that the Municipal Grant applications are available, with maintenance agreements, and to sign off and mail the maintenance agreement to Joe Comerford at the 9 Town Transit or Andy Chiaravallo at the Middletown Transit District.

vii. Route 66 and Route 81 Corridor Studies

Robert Haramut said that there were three RFQ responses for each of the studies and these projects will be going to the interview process shortly.

viii. Bus Ridership Counts

Sam Gold said that a training session is scheduled for Thursday at the RiverCOG for the people working on the bus ridership counts. These people will ride each bus, on each route, count the passengers getting on, getting off and where these locations are. The results of these counts will determine peak travel times, the possible rescheduling of some routes and this data will lead into

Lower CT River Valley COG and MPO Minutes of the April 26, 2017 Meeting Page Five

an operation study. Mr. Gold stated that he had met with DOT officials and it was determined that there is a value of moving forward with the operation study. There has been substantial growth in bus ridership. The RiverCOG would use \$200,000 - \$300,000 of its highway urban money and the state would match this. The 9 Town Transit can use the data in the study to determine the planning of a new maintenance facility.

#### 3. LCRVCOG BUSINESS

a. Appointment of a FY17 Auditor - Michaud, Accavallo, Woodbridge & Cusano, LLC

Sam Gold asked the members to make a motion to appoint the firm of Michaud, Accavallo, Woodbridge and Cusano, LLC as the auditors for the FY 2017 RiverCOG audit.

Upon motion of Susan Bransfield, seconded by Noel Bishop, it was unanimously voted to approve the audit firm of Michaud, Accavallo, Woodbridge and Cusano, LLC, to conduct the fiscal year 2017 audit for the Lower CT River Valley Council of Governments and the Lower CT River Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization.

b. GrowSmart Implementation Proposal

Jon Curtis said that the RiverCOG and Ninegret Partners had a meeting with stakeholders to prioritize recommendations from the GrowSmart Regional Economic Growth Strategies report. The two priorities that emerged from that meeting are first to study and plan for the creation of a regional development authority to help with redevelopment and other large projects with regional impact and secondly to assess the feasibility of creating a makers space in the region where small businesses and individuals can join for a membership fee and use tools and equipment to help them grow their business. Ninegret Partners proposal fee is \$50,000, however \$5,000 has already been paid to Ninegret for running the prioritization meeting.

Upon motion of Carl Fortuna, seconded by Tony Salvatore, it was unanimously voted to authorize the RiverCOG to enter into a contract with Ninegret Partners for \$45,000 for the two implementation projects.

c. RiverCOG Office Space

Sam Gold announced that the building in Haddam had been chosen as the RiverCOG's new office location. A letter of intent to lease part of the building will be sent shortly to the realtor and once accepted an inspection of the property will be done. The lease to own agreement will be for 5 years with a 5 year renewal clause.

Upon motion of Lizz Milardo, seconded by Ed Bailey, it was unanimously voted to authorize the RiverCOG to enter into a lease to own agreement for 7 Island Dock Road, Haddam, CT.

Lauren Gister asked Mr. Gold what the timeframe is. Mr. Gold stated this will be as soon as possible with a July moving date.

Lower CT River Valley COG and MPO Minutes of the April 26, 2017 Meeting Page Six

Laura Francis said that the towns may have furniture the RiverCOG might want and should check with the towns before purchasing new furniture.

Noel Bishop thanked members and staff for all their hard work on this endeavor.

d. MOU to Join the Metropolitan Area Partnership (MAP) Forum

Sam Gold explained that MAP is led by the New York Metropolitan Transportation Committee and this organization was leading the movement against the federal regulations to change the structure of the MPOs. Mr. Gold started that he has been an informal member going to their meetings since some of our towns are part of the New Haven Urbanized Area. The NYMTC is looking to expand their partnership. This would be voluntary with meetings quarterly. Their membership extends from Connecticut to Pennsylvania. Mr. Gold said he has enjoyed working with them and there is no cost associated with joining the committee.

Upon motion of Cathy lino, seconded by Carl Fortuna, it was unanimously voted to authorize the Chairman Bonnie Reemsnyder to enter into the MOU to join the Metropolitan Area Partnership.

e. RiverCOG Budget Update

Sam Gold said that because of the state's budget uncertainty the COG budget has been delayed. He said that next month he will have a draft budget to present.

f. Legislation Update

Sam Gold said that a letter was sent yesterday to be presented at the hearing on HB7322 (attachment #3). He is concerned because it gives a lot of power to the Connecticut Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations over the COGs funding and the work that is being done. Mr. Gold is going to try to be appointed to ACIR, but the recommendation was to have all the COGs have some kind of role on the ACIR and be sure that each region in Connecticut is represented.

Mr. Gold also submitted a letter in opposition to the sale tax exemption removal on non-profits.

Mr. Gold stated that the MPO federal rule is going to a vote in the House today to be repealed.

Tony Salvatore asked for a list of bills that are of concern to the COG. Mr. Gold said that HB7322 is probably the most detailed where the COG could get involved. Most concerning was that it would mandate that every COG develop a regionalization cooperation plan or study. Mr. Gold said that staff sharing does not always mean a reduction in the total cost.

Daniel Giungi, CCM, stated that CCM does not necessarily agree with the bill.

Lizz Milardo asked if there was anything new on the toll issue on Connecticut roads. Mr. Gold said that he hasn't heard anything. He said that his view, when he testified was neutral.

Lower CT River Valley COG and MPO Minutes of the April 26, 2017 Meeting Page Seven

g. Regional Plan Update

Jon Curtis said that FHI will be ready for the workshop kick off in late June for the Regional POCD and meanwhile pop-up events are planned.

h. Resiliency Plan Update

Margot Burns said that the second workshop was last week in Old Lyme Town Hall and the technical explanation of the modeling of the flood resiliency data. The third and last workshop will be in Middletown on May 9<sup>th</sup>.

i. Mobilitie Update

Jon Curtis said that a meeting was held with the Mobilitie spokesperson Brian Gaudet. Mobilitie has changed from the 120' poles originally discussed to poles 30'-40' with small canisters. Mr. Gaudet expressed his willingness to work with each town individually. Tony Salvatore asked if there were rules for cell companies to abide by and can the towns tax them. Mr. Curtis stated that towns have negotiated payments from the cell companies for these canisters.

#### 4. CHAIRMAN'S AND EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORTS

Sam Gold said the River COG budget is on target.

#### 5. OTHER BUSINESS

a. DEMHS Update

Torrance Downes said that Region 2 is in the process of negotiating a budget for 2017. Presently Region 2 is operating under two grants, 2015 and 2016. At the next meeting the ECF chairs will propose their projects and decide priorities with the money available. Mr. Downes stated that Hughes Net Satellite Service has been used for emergency purposes and paid for by Region 2 for several years. As of July 1<sup>st</sup> this service will become the responsibility of the municipalities.

Sam Gold stated that Al Alper, Absolute Logic will make a presentation at the May COG meeting.

Laura Francis asked the members of Region 2 to please be sure to have representation at the DEMHS meetings. The budget was not approved at the last meeting due to a lack of a quorum.

Margot Burns said that she had gone to UCONN'S Avery Point campus for the kick off of the State's Blue Plan for Long Island Sound. The plan is intended to protect the Sound's natural resources and traditional human uses. She wanted the members to be aware that committees are being formed and work has started on the planning document for Long Island.

Carl Fortuna said he met with Carol Fitzsimmons, CIRMA to discuss cybercrime coverage which starts at \$15,000. He recommends that the members review their policies.

Lower CT River Valley COG and MPO Minutes of the April 26, 2017 Meeting Page Eight

# 6. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 10:53 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Judith Snyder Recording Secretary

N:\agendas minutes2017\LCRVCOG\LCRVCOG 4.26.17 draft

#### Individual Agency Signature Page

for

# MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING (MOU) FOR COORDINATION OF TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ACTIVITIES IN THE MULTI-STATE NEW YORK-NEW JERSEY-CONNECTICUT-PENNSYLVANIA METROPOLITAN REGION

New York Metropolitan Transportation Council North Jersey Transportation Planning Authority Western Connecticut Council of Governments Connecticut Metro Council of Governments Naugatuck Valley Council of Governments South Central Regional Council of Governments Lower Connecticut River Valley Council of Governments Orange County Transportation Council Lehigh Valley Planning Commission

Agency Name:	OLANGE	COUNTY	TRANSPE	ORTATION	CONVCIC
Resolution # / Da	ate (if Applicat	ole): _201	7-06	6/12/17	
Signature: <u>5</u> e	E ATTACK	leis			
Title:					
Date: 6 12	- 17				

South Central Regional Council of Governments Adopted Resolution #

Lower Connecticut River Valley Council of Governments Adopted Resolution #

Orange County Transportation Council Adopted Resolution # OCTC 2017-06

MM.

Lehigh Valley Planning Commission Adopted Resolution #



# ORANGE COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COUNCIL

## Resolution 2017-06

## Approve Memorandum of Understanding for Coordination of Planning Activities in the Multi-State New York-New Jersey-Connecticut-Pennsylvania Metropolitan Region

WHEREAS, the Orange County Transportation Council (OCTC) has been designated by the Governor of the State of New York as the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) responsible, together with the State, for the comprehensive, continuing, and cooperative transportation planning process for Orange County; and,

WHEREAS, in order to enhance the scope and quality of its regional transportation planning, OCTC wishes to formalize its involvement with the other MPO's in the multi-state New York-New Jersey-Connecticut-Pennsylvania metropolitan region through a Memorandum of Understanding between participating MPOs; and,

WHEREAS, the participants in this Memorandum of Understanding will include the New York Metropolitan Transportation Council (NYMTC) in the State of New York; the North Jersey Transportation Planning Authority (NJTPA) in the State of New Jersey; the Western Connecticut Council of Governments (WestCOG), Connecticut Metro Council of Governments (METROCOG), Naugatuck Valley Council of Governments (NVCOG), South Central Regional Council of Governments (SCRCOG), and Lower Connecticut River Valley Council of Governments (RiverCOG) in the State of Connecticut, and the Lehigh Valley Planning Commission (LVPC) in the State of Pennsylvania; and,

WHEREAS, this Memorandum of Understanding will formalize mechanisms for coordinated planning which are now undertaken informally for metropolitan transportation planning.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED,** that OCTC hereby approves the attached Memorandum of Understanding between OCTC and participating MPOs for signature by Chairman Steven Neuhaus.

CERTIFICATE: The undersigned duly qualified Secretary of the Orange County Transportation Council certifies that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of a resolution adopted by the voting members of the Council on June 12, 2017.

Date: 6/12/17

By:

Todd B. Westhuis, P.E., Secretary Orange County Transportation Council

## Individual Agency Signature Page

for

# MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING (MOU) FOR COORDINATION OF TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ACTIVITIES IN THE MULTI-STATE NEW YORK-NEW JERSEY-CONNECTICUT-PENNSYLVANIA METROPOLITAN REGION

New York Metropolitan Transportation Council North Jersey Transportation Planning Authority Western Connecticut Council of Governments Connecticut Metro Council of Governments Naugatuck Valley Council of Governments South Central Regional Council of Governments Lower Connecticut River Valley Council of Governments Orange County Transportation Council Lehigh Valley Planning Commission

Agency Name:	LEHIGH	VALLEM	PLANI	NING	COMP	MISSION
Resolution # / Da	ate (if Applica	ble): <u>Reso</u>	LYTON	A of	F JUM	19,2017
Signature: Se	DE ATTACK	ler				
Title:		an a				
Date: JULY	19,201-	7				



LIESEL DREISBACH Chair

STEPHEN REPASCH Vice Chair

JOHN DIACOGIANNIS Treasurer

BECKY A. BRADLEY, AICP Executive Director

# **RESOLUTION A of JULY 19, 2017:**

# APPROVAL OF A MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING FOR COORDINATION OF TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ACTIVITIES IN THE MULTI-STATE METROPOLITAN REGION

- **WHEREAS,** the Lehigh Valley Planning Commission (LVPC) is the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the Lehigh Valley region; and,
- WHEREAS, the Lehigh Valley Transportation Study is organized within the LVPC to manage and comply with federal requirements for metropolitan planning as outlined in 23 CFR 134; and,
- WHEREAS, a key role for MPOs is to serve as a forum for cooperative transportation planning and decision-making in metropolitan areas; and,
- WHEREAS, it has subsequently been determined that, because of organizational changes, globalization and technological innovations, evolving transportation patterns and modes and consistent with good planning principles, participation in this MOU by additional, adjacent MPOs and Councils of Government (COGs) would be advisable; and,
- WHERAS, this MOU constitutes a multi-state, multi-party agreement which addresses the requirements of 23 CFR 450.314(d) for the PARTIES, as well as complying with other relevant provisions of the Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act, the most recent federal surface transportation legislation; and,
- WHERAS, the PARTIES to this MOU will now include: North Jersey Transportation Planning Authority; New York Metropolitan Transportation Council; Western Connecticut Council of Governments; Connecticut Metro Council of Governments; Naugatuck Valley Council of Governments; South Central Regional Council of Governments; Lower Connecticut River Valley Council of Governments; Orange County Transportation Council (NY); Lehigh Valley Planning Commission (PA); and

- WHEREAS, the above referenced MPOs and COGs have collaborated to prepare this MOU for the coordination of transportation planning activities in the multi-state New York, New Jersey, Connecticut and Pennsylvania metropolitan region; and
- WHEREAS, the attached MOU is intended to ensure that the products of each respective party's transportation planning process takes into account the impacts of the plans and programs developed by the other MPOs and COGs; and
- WHEREAS, any material additions, deletions or changes to the attached MOU as adopted by the LVPC will require the action of the LVPC Executive Committee, as well as that of other MPOs and COGs.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that the Lehigh Valley Planning Commission Executive Committee hereby approves the attached Memorandum of Understanding for Coordination of Transportation Planning Activities in the Multi-State Metropolitan Region involving the aforementioned Metropolitan Planning Organizations and Councils of Government whereby these parties agree to perform in good faith various activities of voluntary coordination, cooperation and consultation amongst themselves, with regard to the metropolitan transportation planning process.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that copies of this resolution and the attached be forwarded to the Lehigh Valley Transportation Study Technical and Coordinating Committees for consensus before the Memorandum of Understanding shall take effect. If consensus is not reached with the Lehigh Valley Transportation Study the Memorandum of Understanding shall be null and void. If changes are requested to this resolution and attachments, amendments shall be brought back to the LVPC Executive Committee for consideration and action at the next regularly scheduled meeting.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** should consensus be reached among the LVPC Executive Committee and LVTS Technical and Coordinating Committees allowing the Memorandum of Understanding to take effect the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation and Lehigh and Northampton Transportation Authority will also be provided copies of the same for submission to the Federal Highway Administration and Federal Transit Administration. Additional copies of the same will be forwarded upon consensus of the Lehigh Valley Transportation Study to the North Jersey Transportation Planning Authority, New York Metropolitan Transportation Council; Western Connecticut Council of Governments; Connecticut Metro Council of Governments; Naugatuck Valley Council of Governments; South Central Regional Council of Governments; Lower Connecticut River Valley Council of Governments; and Orange County Transportation Council (NY).

Jusan Sherbeck-arthon

Liesel Dreisbach, Chair, LVPC

John Diacogiannis, Treasurer, LVPC

# Certification

I hereby certify that the above is a true copy of a resolution Adopted by the Lehigh Valley Planning Commission At its scheduled meeting held on July 19, 2017.

Becky A. Bradley,

Executive Director, LVPC

Appendicies Page 97

## Special Addendum 2020-01

## Metropolitan Area Planning Forum (MAP Forum)

# 2017 MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING (MOU) FOR COORDINATION OF TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ACTIVITIES IN THE MULTI-STATE NEW YORK-NEW JERSEY-CONNECTICUT-PENNSYLVANIA METROPOLITAN REGION

Effective April 7, 2020, this Special Addendum to the MAP Forum MOU contains the following three (3) changes, which reflect the inclusion of the Capitol Region Council of Governments (CRCOG), Hartford, Connecticut as a member of the MAP Forum:

1. On page 1, the list of signatories now includes the following agencies:

New York Metropolitan Transportation Council North Jersey Transportation Planning Authority Western Connecticut Council of Governments Connecticut Metro Council of Governments Naugatuck Valley Council of Governments South Central Regional Council of Governments Lower Connecticut River Valley Council of Governments Orange County Transportation Council Lehigh Valley Planning Commission Capitol Region Council of Governments

2. On page 1, the first paragraph now reads as follows:

This Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) is made and entered into by and among the New York Metropolitan Transportation Council (NYMTC) and the Orange County Transportation Council (OCTC) in the State of New York; the North Jersey Transportation Planning Authority (NJTPA) in the State of New Jersey; the Western Connecticut Council of Governments (WestCOG), Connecticut Metro Council of Governments (METROCOG), Naugatuck Valley Council of Governments (NVCOG), South Central Regional Council of Governments (SCRCOG), Lower Connecticut River Valley Council of Governments (RiverCOG), and Capitol Region Council of Governments (CRCOG) in the State of Connecticut; and the Lehigh Valley Planning Commission (LVPC) in the State of Pennsylvania; collectively referred to hereinafter as "the PARTIES".

3. Following page 44, the CRCOG Authorizing Resolution, dated February 26, 2020 and the CRCOG Individual Organization Signature Page, dated March 3, 2020 (below) are added.

# Individual Organization Signature Page

# for the

# MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING (MOU) FOR COORDINATION OF TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ACTIVITIES IN THE MULTI-STATE NEW YORK-NEW JERSEY-CONNECTICUT-PENNSYLVANIA METROPOLITAN REGION

Organization Name: Capitol Region Council of Governments

Resolution # / Date (please attach): February 26, 2020

Name: Lyle D. Wray Signature: \_ **Title: Executive Director** Date: March 3, 2020



# **AUTHORIZING RESOLUTION**

# FOR CRCOG TO JOIN THE METROPOLITAN AREA PLANNING (MAP) FORUM

WHEREAS, the Metropolitan Area Planning (MAP) Forum includes nine Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPOs) and Councils of Government (COGs) in the New York-New Jersey-Connecticut-Pennsylvania metropolitan region that are characterized by socio-economic and environmental interdependence, as evidenced through shared ecosystems, interconnected transportation systems, and inter-related patterns of employment and population; and,

WHEREAS, the member MPOs and COGs of the MAP Forum are party to a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) that constitutes a multi-state, multi-party agreement which addresses the requirements of 23 CFR 450.314(d) for the MPOs, as well as complies with other relevant provisions of the Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act (Pub. L. No. 114-94); and,

WHEREAS, the purpose of the MOU is to ensure coordination in the development of mandated products of the metropolitan transportation planning process including the process for meeting attainment of National Ambient Air Quality Standards; and,

WHEREAS, this MOU is also intended to ensure that the products of each MPO's transportation planning process take into account the impacts of the plans and programs developed by the other MPOs; helps avoid duplication of effort; reflects consistency of approaches where possible; and ensures the consideration of the interests of all participating MPOs; and,

WHEREAS, parties of the MOU agree to perform in good faith, and to the extent practicable and appropriate, activities of voluntary coordination, cooperation, and consultation amongst themselves; and,

WHEREAS, it has been determined that participation in this MOU by additional, adjacent MPOs would be advisable; and,

WHEREAS, the Capitol Region Council of Governments (CRCOG) is adjacent to the existing boundaries of the MAP Forum and shares a Transportation Management Area (TMA) with two of the MAP Forum's member COGs; and,

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that CRCOG's Executive Director, Lyle D. Wray, is authorized to act on behalf of the Capitol Region Council of Governments in joining the Metropolitan Area Planning Forum and becoming party to the associated Memorandum of Understanding.

## CERTIFICATE

I certify the above is a true copy of a resolution adopted by the Policy Board at its meeting held on February 26, 2020.

BY:	Auto	DATE:	2-26-2020	
	Lori L. Spiełman, Secretary			

Andover / Avon / Berlin / Bloomfield / Bolton / Canton / Columbia / Coventry / East Granby / East Hartford / East Windsor / Ellington / Enfield / Farmington Glastonbury / Granby / Hartford / Hebron / Manchester / Marlborough / Mansfield / New Britain / Newington / Plainville / Rocky Hill / Simsbury / Somers South Windsor / Southington / Stafford / Suffield / Tolland / Vernon / West Hartford / Wethersfield / Willington / Windsor / Windsor Locks

# **Appendix D**

Appendicies Page 101

Appendix D summarizes the Highway and Transit related Funding and Revenues for CRCOG's 2023-2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan, including how these were inflated. In general, the following summarizes the utilized procedures:

- 1. Projects identified by CTDOT for inclusion in the MTP were estimated with timelines and inflation factors as determined appropriate by CTDOT
- 2. Projects identified by CRCOG for inclusion in the MTP were estimated with timelines estimated by CRCOG and an inflation factor of 3.73% annually.
- 3. CTDOT estimated anticipated available <u>statewide highway funding</u> of \$53.6 billion (state plus federal funds) for 2023-2050 by inflating current annual statewide highway funding of \$1.8 billion by 1.5% each fiscal year through 2050 and aggregating all 28 years.
- Of the \$53.6 billion, CTDOT used methodologies including planned major projects, Vehicle Miles Traveled, Average Travel Time Index, and Lane Miles to estimate anticipated <u>CRCOG</u> <u>highway funding</u> totaling \$11,013,900,517 for 2023-2050, consisting of \$2,093,589,046 for System Improvements, 5,366,186,725 for System Preservation, and \$3,554,124,746 for Major Projects of Statewide Significance (Projects appear in Appendix E).
- 5. CTDOT estimated anticipated available <u>statewide transit funding</u> for 2023-2050 available transit funding of \$17 billion statewide (state plus federal funds) by inflating current annual funding of \$500 million by 1.5% each fiscal year through 2050 and aggregating all 28 years.
- 6. A list of major expected 2023-2050 transit projects was identified, totaling over \$12.1 billion statewide. CRCOG specific transit projects appear in this MTP's Appendix E. For fiscal constraint purposes, of the \$17 billion available statewide, <u>CRCOG transit funding</u> of \$2.92 billion was determined by aggregating CRCOG's major transit projects with CRCOG's share (by population, or 28%) of the statewide transit funding that is in excess of funds needed for major transit projects (\$17 billion minus \$12.1 billion).

# ALLOCATION OF ANTICIPATED FUNDS TO CONNECTICUT METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATIONS AND RURAL COUNCILS OF GOVERNMENTS (2023-2050) FOR METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLANNING (MTP) PURPOSES

CTDOT's Office of STIP, Coordination and Modeling allocated estimated funds to Connecticut's 8 Metropolitan Planning Organizations and 2 Rural Councils of Governments (MPO/RCOGs) for the period 2023-2050 as follows:

- 1. CTDOT calculated the total estimated funds for Connecticut (\$53,570,365,877) for the period 2023-2050 by compounding the estimated federal and state funds for FFY 2023 \$ 1,600,000,000 at 1.5% for 28 years.
- 2. Funding for transportation projects was divided among two project categories:
  - <u>System Preservation projects</u>: projects such as repaving roadways, bridge repair or replacement, and any other form of reconstruction in place.
  - <u>System Improvement projects</u>: projects that enhance safety, improve mobility, increase system productivity or promote economic growth.
- 3. Of the total estimated funds (\$53,570,365,877), Major Projects of Statewide Significance culled from the State's Long-Range Plan (\$17,632,713,000) were deducted.
- 4. Of the balance of the total estimated funds (\$35,937,652,877), 60% was allocated for System Preservation (\$21,562,591,726), and forty percent (40%) was allocated for System Improvement (\$14,375,061,151).
- 5. Five percent (5%) of the System Preservation funds were distributed equally to each of the MPO/RCOGs and 3.8% of the System Improvement funds were distributed equally to each of the MPO/RCOGs. This provided each of the 10 MPO/RCOGs with a minimum allocation of funds.
- 6. CTDOT used weighted variables to distribute the remainder of the System Improvement and System Preservation funds. The variables used were Vehicle Miles of Travel (VMT), Average Travel Time Index (AVR TTI), and Lane Miles (LM).
  - For System Improvement funds: .25 weight for VMT and .75 weight for AVR TTI.
  - For System Preservation funds: .25 weight for VMT and .75 for LM.
- 7. The amounts allocated to these variables (VMT, AVR TTI and LM) for each category (System Preservation and System Improvement) were then distributed to each MPO/RCOGs in proportion to its respective percentage to the total of the variables.

#### Summary of amount allocated to each MPO/RCOG

The amount estimated for System Improvement for each MPO/RCOGs is the initial minimum allocation (3.8%), plus the amount allocated from the VMT and AVR TTI calculation. The amount estimated for System Preservation for each MPO/RCOG is the initial minimum allocation (5.0%), plus the amount allocated from the VMT and LM calculation.

The estimated amount available to each MPO/RCOG for planning proposes, over the next twenty-eight years, is the sum of the MPO/RCOG's total allocation for System Improvements plus its total allocation for System Preservation and total of identified Major Project in that MPO/RCOG.

# ALLOCATION OF ANTICIPATED FUNDS TO CONNECTICUT METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATIONS AND RURAL COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS 2023-2050

# 2023-2050 Distribution Less Major Highway Projects

	SYSTEM	SYSTEM		
	IMPROVEMENTS	PRESERVATION		
Distribution	Weigh	nts		
Vehicle Miles of Travel	0.25	0.25		
Average Travel Time Index	0.75	0		
Lane Miles	0	0.75		
			MAJOR	
			PROJECTS OF	TOTALS
MPO RCOG			STATEWIDE	TUTALS
			SIGNIFICANCE	
Southwestern	1,669,433,548	1,747,056,056	3,551,000,000	6,967,489,604
Housatonic Valley	1,326,474,379	1,471,267,100	510,000,000	3,307,741,480
Northwest Hills	1,076,511,890	1,560,076,229	25,853,000	2,662,441,120
Central Naugatuck Valley	1,442,523,998	1,919,343,647	3,154,250,000	6,516,117,645
Greater Bridgeport Valley	1,589,615,928	1,857,721,926	816,360,000	4,263,697,854
South Central	1,711,170,302	2,761,695,013	2,658,825,254	7,131,690,570
Capitol	2,093,589,046	5,366,186,725	3,554,124,746	11,013,900,517
Lower Connecticut River Estuary	1,207,553,894	1,539,576,637	1,630,000,000	4,377,130,532
Southeastern	1,271,894,963	2,069,344,128	1,732,300,000	5,073,539,091
Northeastern	986,293,202	1,270,324,264	-	2,256,617,466
Totals	14,375,061,151	21,562,591,726	17,632,713,000	53,570,365,877

Note: System Improvements are projects which enhance safety, improve mobility, increase system productivity or promote economic growth.

System Preservation are projects such as repaving roadways, bridge repair or replacement and any other form of reconstruction in place.
#### 2023 MTP information email 4

#### Wojenski, Maribeth C < Maribeth.Wojenski@ct.gov>

Thu 6/16/2022 2:28 PM

To: Francis R. Pickering <fpickering@westcog.org>;Kristin Hadjstylianos <khadjstylianos@westcog.org>;NHCOG Director <rphillips@northwesthillscog.org>;Rick Dunne <rdunne@nvcogct.gov>;Mark Nielsen <MNielsen@nvcogct.gov>;NVCOG Asst Director <jlecar@nvcogct.gov>;mfulda <mfulda@ctmetro.org>;pcarleton <pcarleton@ctmetro.org>;msloan <msloan@ctmetro.org>;'SCRCOG director' <camento@scrcog.org>;Jim Rode <jrode@scrcog.org>;Matt Hart <mhart@crcog.org>;Rob Aloise <raloise@crcog.org>;Samuel Gold <SGold@rivercog.org>;rharamut@gmail.com <RHaramut@rivercog.org>;SECCOG director <jbutler@seccog.org>;Amanda Kennedy <akennedy@seccog.org>;kate rattan <krattan@seccog.org></a>

Cc: Lesay, Kimberly C <Kimberly.Lesay@ct.gov>;Etuka, Rose A <Rose.Etuka@ct.gov>;Giannitti, Steven J <Steven.Giannitti@ct.gov>;Wright, Grayson A <grayson.wright@ct.gov>;Radacsi, Sara <Sara.Radacsi@ct.gov>;Pacacha, Jennifer <Jennifer.Pacacha@ct.gov>;Cara Radzins <cradzins@crcog.org>;Tim Malone <tmalone@crcog.org>;Richard Donovan <RDonovan@nvcogct.gov>;Rebecca Andreucci <randreucci@scrcog.org>;Jim Larkin'

<jim.larkin@neccog.com>;Salmoiraghi, Kurt (FHWA) <kurt.salmoiraghi@dot.gov>;Carrier, Jennifer (FHWA) <jennifer.carrier@dot.gov>;Shortell, Erik (FHWA) <erik.Shortell@dot.gov>;Sirmin, Leah (FTA) <leah.sirmin@dot.gov>;Eucalitto, Garrett T. <Garrett.Eucalitto@ct.gov>;Meyers, Darren E

<Darren.Meyers@ct.gov>;Fallon, James A <James.Fallon@ct.gov>;Kuljis, Yure E <Yure.Kuljis@ct.gov>;Curtis, Graham <Graham.Curtis@ct.gov>

1 attachments (47 KB)

2023 MTP listing of major projects 02162022 - transit.xlsx;

Hello everyone

The Final Rule on Statewide and Nonmetropolitan Transportation Planning and Metropolitan Transportation Planning was published on May 27, 2016 and sets forth Transportation planning requirements for State DOTs, Metropolitan Planning Organizations and Nonmetropolitan Planning Organizations.

23 CFR 450.324 outlines the requirements for each MPO in the development of a Metropolitan Transportation Plan (previously known as a Long Range Transportation Plan). Please refer to chapter 6 in the *CTDOT Handbook for Councils of Governments and Metropolitan Planning Organizations* for a full description of the federal requirements.

To assist the MPOs (and the Rural COGs if they decide to produce a long range plan), the Department is providing the following information:

#### **EMAIL 4**

#### FTA Funds

Maintaining the transit system in a state of good repair will require the majority of the transit funds available.

It is estimated that there could be approximately \$17 billion of federal and state funds available over the next 28 years. This number is based on a yearly total of federal and state funds of approximately \$500 million with a yearly increase of 1.5% The breakout of Rail vs Bus generally equates to a 70/30 split, therefore approximately \$12 billion could be available for Rail projects and \$5 billion available for Bus projects.

Attached, please find a listing of Rail and Bus projects that the Department would like to be included in your MTP. Although this list does not reflect the full program of anticipated funding levels, coordination with transit providers statewide will continue to evaluate cost, project schedules and project needs.

Please forward this information on to staff handling the MTP.

Thank you

#### Maribeth Wojenski

Transportation Assistant Planning Director CTDOT Bureau of Policy and Planning STIP, Coordination and Modeling Telephone (860) 594-2045 Cell (860) 302-2796

Email address: maribeth.wojenski@ct.gov



EXPECTED REVENUE FOR RAIL TRANSIT PROJECTS PER MPO								
FEDERAL FL	FEDERAL FUNDS AND STATE SHARE							
	total anticipated							
МРО	funding	FTA share	state share	state funded				
SWMPO	\$2,103,000,000	\$1,682,400,000	\$420,600,000	\$1,275,000,000				
НУМРО				\$8,000,000				
GBVMPO	\$448,000,000	\$358,400,000	\$89,600,000	\$18,000,000				
NVMPO				\$35,000,000				
LCRVCOG				\$25,000,000				
SCRCOG	\$1,200,000,000	\$960,000,000	\$240,000,000	\$168,500,000				
CRCOG				\$256,500,000				
SECCOG				\$13,000,000				
EXPECTED FEDER	AL REVENUE FOR R	AIL TRANSIT PROJI	ECTS - MULTIREGION	AL				
FEDERAL FU	JNDS AND STATE SH	ARE		STATE FUNDED ONLY				
	total anticipated							
МРО	funding	FTA share	state share					
NEW HAVEN LINE - ML (MPOS 1,7,8)	\$85,000,000	\$68,000,000	\$17,000,000	\$9,000,000				
NEW HAVEN LINE - SYSTEMWIDE (MPOS 1,2,5,7,8)	\$1,150,000,000	\$920,000,000	\$230,000,000	\$719,000,000				
SHORELINE EAST (MPOS 11,13)				\$5,000,000				
DANBURY LINE				\$12,000,000				
WATERBURY BRANCH				\$80,000,000				
HARTFORD LINE - VARIOUS				\$186,000,000				
METROCOG,SCRCOG - NHLine	\$2,300,000,000	\$1,840,000,000	\$460,000,000					
EXPECTED FEDE	RAL REVENUE FOR	TRANSIT PROJECTS	S - TRANSIT DISTRICTS	•				
FEDERAL FU	JNDS AND STATE SH	ARE		STATE FUNDED ONLY				
	total anticipated							
TRANSIT DISTRICT	funding	FTA share	state share					
CTtransit - Hartford	\$824,015,000	\$659,212,000	\$164,803,000					
CTtransit - New Britain Division	\$1,805,000	\$1,444,000	\$361,000					
CTtransit - New Haven	\$387,380,000	\$309,904,000	\$77,476,000					
CTtransit - Stamford	\$156,910,532	\$125,528,426	\$31,382,106					
CTtransit - Waterbury	\$87,376,250	\$69,901,000	\$17,475,250					
Estuary Transit District	\$475,000	\$380,000	\$95,000					
Greater Bridgeport Transit Authority	\$219,387,500	\$175,510,000	\$43,877,500					
Greater Hartford Transit District	\$20,200,000	\$16,160,000	\$4,040,000					
Greater New Haven Transit District	\$70,968,750	\$56,775,000	\$14,193,750					
Housatonic Area Regional Transit	\$3,610,000	\$2,888,000	\$722,000					
Middletown Area Transit	\$6,710,000	\$5,368,000	\$1,342,000					
Milford Transit District	\$855,000	\$684,000	\$171,000					

Northeastern Connecticut Transit District	\$760,000	\$608,000	\$152,000	
Northwestern Connecticut Transit District	\$2,555,000	\$2,044,000	\$511,000	
Norwalk Transit District	\$117,598,750	\$94,079,000	\$23,519,750	
Southeast Area Transit	\$2,090,000	\$1,672,000	\$418,000	
Valley Transit District	\$7,950,000	\$6,360,000	\$1,590,000	
various	\$56,734,000	\$45,387,200	\$11,346,800	
Windham Region Transit District	\$25,982,500	\$20,786,000	\$5,196,500	
Windham Regional Transit District + UConn	\$23,500,000	\$18,800,000	\$4,700,000	
WRTD (UConn)	\$23,100,000	\$18,480,000	\$4,620,000	

# **Appendix E**

Appendicies Page 109

Project #	Town	МРО	Route	Project Description A C		Construction Completion Date	Cost
0063-0716	Various	CRCOG	I-84	NOW: I-84/I-91/Greater Hartford Area - Safety and Capacity Improvements (GHMS PEL Recommendations)	Y	11 to 27	\$3,490,000,000
TBD	Wethersfield/Glastonbury	CRCOG	Route 2	Putnam Bridge Rehab/Replacement	N	11 to 27	\$602,160,000
TBD	Buckland	CRCOG	Buckland: Redstone Rd Extension	Buckland: Redstone Rd Extension	Y	11 to 27	\$492,150,000
TBD	Manchester/South Windsor	CRCOG	I-84	Buckland HOV Ramps	Y	11 to 27	\$185,280,000
TBD	Manchester	CRCOG	Buckland Street	Single Point Interchange at Buckland Street/Buckland Hills Drive	Y	11 to 27	\$133,170,000
TBD	Manchester/South Windsor	CRCOG	I-84	Additional WB exit-ramp at Exit 63; other WB ramp improvements	Y	11 to 27	\$108,852,000
TBD	Manchester	CRCOG	I-84	Auxiliary lanes between Exits 62 and 63	Y	5 to 10	\$106,536,000
TBD	Simsbury, Bloomfield, Hartford, East Hartford	CRCOG	Various	Complete East Coast Greenway through CRCOG	Ν	11 to 27	\$64,848,000
TBD	Bolton	CRCOG	I-384 / Rt 6 / Rt 44	Interchange reconfiguration for safety and connectivity improvements	Y	11 to 27	\$57,900,000
TBD	Windsor	CRCOG	I-91	Day Hill Rd Interchange Improvements	Y	5 to 10	\$34,740,000
TBD	Windsor Locks	CRCOG	Northern Bradley Connector	Bradley Airport-Northern Bradley Connector	Y	5 to 10	\$34,740,000
TBD	Farmington	CRCOG	Monteith Drive	New Bridge Crossing of the Farmington River	Y	5 to 10	\$30,000,000
TBD	Buckland	CRCOG	Realignment of Pleasant Valley Road	Buckland: Realignment of Pleasant Valley Road	Y	5 to 10	\$25,707,600
TBD	Wethersfield	CRCOG	Rt 15	Wethersfield - Rt 15 / Rt 175 Interchange	Y	5 to 10	\$24,318,000
TBD	East Windsor	CRCOG	Route 5	Address deteriorated traffic operations under the future Build scenario south of Southern Auto Auction	Y	11 to 27	\$18,995,400
TBD	Avon	CRCOG	Rt 44	Avon - Rt 44 between Rt 167 and Climax Road	Y	5 to 10	\$18,528,000
TBD	Windsor Locks	CRCOG	Rt 75	Bradley Airport-Better Roadway Access (Rt 75 Backage Roads)	Y	5 to 10	\$17,370,000
TBD	Various	CRCOG	Various	Bicycle and Pedestrian Projects-Advance other trails	N	5 to 10	\$13,896,000
TBD	Coventry	CRCOG	Route 6	Route 6 Corridor Study-Coventry Ridge – Phase 1: Site Access (Future Reloc. South Street)	N	5 to 10	\$11,580,000
TBD	Columbia	CRCOG	Route 6	Route 6 Corridor Study-Lighthouse Corners – Phase 1: Roundabout	Y	5 to 10	\$11,580,000
TBD	East Windsor	CRCOG	Route 5	Address deteriorated traffic operations under the future Build scenario north of Southern Auto Auction	Y	11 to 27	\$11,188,620
TBD	East Windsor	CRCOG	Route 5	Address deteriorated traffic operations under the future Build scenario	Y	5 to 10	\$10,474,920
TBD	Bolton	CRCOG	I-384/US-6/US-44	Safety and Connectivity Improvements through Bolton Notch	N	5 to 10	\$10,000,000
TBD	New Britain/Newington	CRCOG	RT 9/175	Interchange Improvements - Route 9 Ramps and Route 175/Fenn Road	Y	5 to 10	\$10,000,000

Project #	Town	МРО	Route	Project Description		Construction Completion Date	Cost
TBD	East Hartford	CRCOG	US-5	Complete Streets: Improve Conditions for Active Transporation Users - approx. Pitkin St. northerly to Burnside Ave.	N	5 to 10	\$10,000,000
TBD	Canton	CRCOG	Rt 44	Canton - Rt 44 improvements (Rt 177 to Rt 167)	Y	11 to 27	\$9,264,000
TBD	Windsor Locks	CRCOG	Rt 75	Bradley Airport-Route 75 Improvements (PE and CON)	Y	5 to 10	\$8,685,000
TBD	East Windsor	CRCOG	Route 5	Provide turn lanes at signalized intersections, and address other existing deficiencies	Y	1 to 4	\$8,125,200
TBD	Coventry	CRCOG	Route 6	Route 6 Corridor Study-Coventry Ridge – Phase 2: Relocated South Street	N	11 to 27	\$8,106,000
TBD	Various	CRCOG	Various	Bicycle and Pedestrian Projects-Other bike/ped programs	N	5 to 10	\$8,106,000
TBD	Manchester	CRCOG	I-84	Auxiliary lanes between Exits 63 and 64/65	Y	5 to 10	\$7,146,018
TBD	Andover	CRCOG	Route 6	Route 6 Corridor Study-Historic Andover – Phase 1: Village Streets East	Y	5 to 10	\$6,948,000
TBD	West Hartford	CRCOG	North Main	West Hartord Corridor Study - North Main Street off-road Bike Path to Town Center	N	5 to 10	\$6,235,830
TBD	Rocky Hill	CRCOG	Route 3	Cromwell Ave Improvements from Elm St to New Britain Ave	Y	11 to 27	\$6,137,400
TBD	Canton	CRCOG	Rt 44	Canton - Rt 44 improvements (from Dowd Ave to Rt 177)	Y	11 to 27	\$5,790,000
TBD	Somers	CRCOG	Rt 190	Somers - Rt 190 at Maple St / School Street		11 to 27	\$5,790,000
TBD	Windsor Locks	CRCOG	Various	Bradley Airport-Improved transit (Study, implementation; bus connection to rail)	N	11 to 27	\$5,790,000
TBD	Columbia	CRCOG	Route 6	Route 6 Corridor Study-Lighthouse Corners – Phase 2: Village Streets		11 to 27	\$5,790,000
TBD	Farmington	CRCOG	Route 4	Route 4 at Talcott Notch Road and Old Mountain Road – Old Mountain Road Realignment (or Roundabout)	Y	1 to 4	\$5,770,125
TBD	East Windsor	CRCOG	Route 5	Address expected traffic operational deterioration at Route 140 intersection under the Base scenario by providing additional intersection capacity. Provide new signalized intersection at	Y	5 to 10	\$5,709,600
TBD	West Hartford	CRCOG	Bishops Corner	West Hartford - Bishops Corner intersection improvements	Y	11 to 27	\$5,512,080
TBD	Canton	CRCOG	Rt 44	Canton- Rt 44 Improvements (from Dyer Ave to Dowd Ave)	Y	11 to 27	\$5,442,600
TBD	East Windsor	CRCOG	Route 5	Address existing traffic operational deficiencies at South Water Street and lack of bicyclist, pedestrian and transit amenities	Y	1 to 4	\$5,270,400
TBD	Vernon	CRCOG	Rt 74	Vernon - Reconstruct Rt 74 (Orchard to Elm)(146-184)	Y	5 to 10	\$5,211,000
TBD	Columbia	CRCOG	Route 6	Route 6 Corridor Study-Columbia – Route 66 East Roadway Improvements	Y	11 to 27	\$5,211,000
TBD	Rocky Hill	CRCOG	Route 3	Study Area Sidewalk and Pedestrian Facility Improvements	N	5 to 10	\$5,095,200
TBD	Farmington	CRCOG	Route 4	Munson Road at SR 531 and 16 Munson Road	N	1 to 4	\$4,649,550
TBD	Simsbury	CRCOG	Nod Road	Simsbury - Nod Road Reconstruction	Y	5 to 10	\$4,400,400
TBD	Meriden/Southington	CRCOG	I-691	I-691 RBC Project - Meriden/Southington - MP 1.9 to MP 4.85		5 to 10	\$4,124,746

Project #	Town	МРО	Route	Project Description A C		Construction Completion Date	Cost
TBD	Farmington	CRCOG	New Britain Ave	Farmington - New Britain Avenue Reconstruction	Y	5 to 10	\$4,053,000
TBD	Bolton	CRCOG	Route 6	Route 6 Corridor Study-Bolton Crossroads – Phase 2: Village Streets West	Y	11 to 27	\$4,053,000
TBD	Rocky Hill	CRCOG	Elm Street	Elm Street Connector Roadway	Y	11 to 27	\$3,705,600
TBD	Windsor Locks	CRCOG	Bradley Park Road	Bradley Airport-East Granby - Bradley Park Road Extension	Y	11 to 27	\$3,705,600
TBD	Enfield	CRCOG	Rt 190	Enfield - Rt 190 Improvements between mall and Hazardville	Y	11 to 27	\$3,474,000
TBD	Bolton	CRCOG	Route 6	Route 6 Corridor Study-Bolton Crossroads – Phase 1: Route 6-Route 44 Connector	Y	5 to 10	\$3,474,000
TBD	Bolton	CRCOG	Route 6	Route 6 Corridor Study-Bolton Crossroads – Phase 3: Village Streets East	Y	11 to 27	\$3,474,000
TBD	Andover	CRCOG	Route 6	Route 6 Corridor Study-Historic Andover – Phase 2: Village Streets West	Y	11 to 27	\$3,474,000
TBD	Farmington	CRCOG	Route 4	Overall Pedestrian, Bicycle, Transit and Commuter Facilities Improvements	Ν	1 to 4	\$3,345,000
TBD	Vernon	CRCOG	Rt 74	Vernon - Reconstruct Rt 74 (Maple to Harlow) (146-165)	Y	5 to 10	\$3,242,400
TBD	Windsor	CRCOG	Rt 305	Windsor - Rt 305 (Interchange 37 to Brookville Rd)	Y	11 to 27	\$3,010,800
TBD	Rocky Hill	CRCOG	Route 3	Study Area Bicycle Facility Enhancements	Ν	5 to 10	\$2,895,000
TBD	East Hartford	CRCOG	Silver Lane	Roundabout at Route 15 Off-Ramp	Ν	5 to 10	\$2,787,500
TBD	Bloomfield	CRCOG	(East Newberry Road)	Bloomfield - Rt 305 (East Newberry Road)	Y	11 to 27	\$2,779,200
TBD	Windsor Locks	CRCOG	Bradley Park Road	Bradley Airport-East Granby - Bradley Park Road Improvements	Y	11 to 27	\$2,779,200
TBD	Rocky Hill	CRCOG	West Street	West Street / Interstate 91 Interchange Improvements	Y	5 to 10	\$2,663,400
TBD	Rocky Hill	CRCOG	Brook Street	Brook Street Neighborhood Streetscape and Multimodal Improvements	Y	11 to 27	\$2,663,400
TBD	Tolland	CRCOG	Rt 74	Tolland - Rt 74 Repair Deck and Pain Bridge over 84)(142-148)	Y	5 to 10	\$2,547,600
TBD	East Windsor	CRCOG	Route 5	Intersection under the Base scenario by providing additional intersection capacity.	Y	11 to 27	\$2,525,400
TBD	Avon	CRCOG	Farmington town line	Avon - S-Curve improvement at Farmington town line	Y	11 to 27	\$2,431,800
TBD	Canton	CRCOG	Rt 44	Canton - Rt 44 improvements (New Hartford TL to Rt 179)	Y	11 to 27	\$2,431,800
TBD	Somers	CRCOG	Rt 190	Somers - Rt 190 at Route 83	Y	11 to 27	\$2,431,800
TBD	Windsor	CRCOG	Rt 305	Windsor - Rt 305 (Addision Road and Marshall Phelps)	Y	11 to 27	\$2,431,800
TBD	Manchester	CRCOG	Rt 83	Manchester - Int Improv at Route 83 (76-199)	Y	5 to 10	\$2,316,000
TBD	Newington	CRCOG	Rt 175	Newington - Rt 175 - Fenn Road / Cedar Street Improvements	Y	5 to 10	\$2,316,000
TBD	Bolton	CRCOG	Route 6	Route 6 Corridor Study-Bolton Crossroads – Route 6 Speed Mitigation	Y	5 to 10	\$2,316,000

Project #	Town	МРО	Route	Project Description	Added Capacity	Construction Completion Date	Cost
TBD	Andover	CRCOG	Route 6	Route 6 Corridor Study-Historic Andover – Pedestrian and Speed Mitigation Improvements	N	5 to 10	\$2,316,000
TBD	Farmington	CRCOG	Route 4	South Road (SR 531) at Middle Road	N	5 to 10	\$2,230,000
TBD	Glastonbury	CRCOG	Glastonbury - Traffic Signal System	Glastonbury - Traffic Signal System (CMAQ)	Y	5 to 10	\$2,200,200
TBD	East Windsor	CRCOG	Route 5	Approach to the Newberry Road signalized intersection. Address existing N   bicyclist, pedestrian and transit deficiencies by providing a sidepath along Route 5, with sidewalks N   providing key connections to developments along with transit stops. N		1 to 4	\$2,196,000
TBD	East Windsor	CRCOG	Route 5	Address existing bicyclist and pedestrian deficiencies by provided a sidepath N   along Route 5 and pedestrian connections towards Warehouse Point and residential developments on N   Route 140 Route 140		1 to 4	\$2,031,300
TBD	Enfield	CRCOG	Rt 192	Enfield - Rt 190 Int Improv (Taylor/Scitico and Broad Brook Rd)	Y	11 to 27	\$1,852,800
TBD	Simsbury	CRCOG	Rt 10	Simsbury - Rt 10 between Ely Lane and Wolcott Rd	Y	11 to 27	\$1,852,800
TBD	East Hartford	CRCOG	Silver Lane	Ornamental Street Lighting N		5 to 10	\$1,784,000
TBD	Wethersfield	CRCOG	Road	Wethersfield - Nott St to Arrow Road (Ped improv, access mgmt)	Y	11 to 27	\$1,737,000
TBD	Farmington	CRCOG	Route 4	SR 531 at Colt Highway Roundabout	N	1 to 4	\$1,695,246
TBD	Farmington	CRCOG	Route 4	Route 4 at SR 508 (I-84 Ramps)	N	1 to 4	\$1,672,500
TBD	East Hartford	CRCOG	Silver Lane	Pedestrian Portion of Side Path (5' Concrete)	N	5 to 10	\$1,672,500
TBD	East Hartford	CRCOG	Silver Lane	Buffer Strip (2' - 3' Hardscape)	N	5 to 10	\$1,672,500
TBD	Farmington	CRCOG	Route 4	Middle Road at Munson Road	N	11 to 27	\$1,561,000
TBD	Rocky Hill	CRCOG	Cromwell Ave/West St/France St	Cromwell Ave/West St/France St Intersection Improvements- (Phase 2)	Y	11 to 27	\$1,505,400
TBD	Rocky Hill	CRCOG	Cromwell Ave	Cromwell Avenue / Brook Street Intersection Improvements	Y	5 to 10	\$1,505,400
TBD	Simsbury	CRCOG	Rt 10	Simsbury - Rt 10 at Ely Lane and Hoskins Road	Y	11 to 27	\$1,505,400
TBD	East Windsor	CRCOG	Route 5	Realign Main Street to reduce intersection skew, improving traffic operations and safety, incorporate bicyclist and pedestrian improvements recommended in Alterernative Main-1		5 to 10	\$1,372,500
TBD	East Windsor	CRCOG	Route 5	Road to address deteriorating operations in the future base and build scenarios.	Y	11 to 27	\$1,317,600
TBD	Rocky Hill	CRCOG	West Street	West St / Main St Intersection Improvements	Y	5 to 10	\$1,273,800
TBD	Farmington	CRCOG	Office Square Driveway	Farmington - Post Office Square Driveway		11 to 27	\$1,158,000
TBD	Granby	CRCOG	Rt 10	Granby - Rt 10 at Meadown Brook Road Y		11 to 27	\$1,158,000

Project #	Town	МРО	Route	Project Description	Added Capacity	Construction Completion Date	Cost
TBD	Simsbury	CRCOG	Rt 10	Simsbury - Rt 10 at Rt 185	Y	11 to 27	\$1,158,000
TBD	Bolton, Andover, Columbia	CRCOG	Route 6	Route 6 Corridor Study-Hop River Trail Surface Improvements	Ν	5 to 10	\$1,158,000
TBD	Enfield	CRCOG	Rt 191	Enfield - Rt 190 / Maple Street traffic and safety improvements	Y	11 to 27	\$1,042,200
TBD	Rocky Hill	CRCOG	Cromwell Ave/West St/France St	Brook St / Henkel Way Intersection Improvements	Y	5 to 10	\$926,400
TBD	Columbia	CRCOG	Route 6	Route 6 Corridor Study-Lighthouse Corners – Route 66 East Flooding Mitigation	Ν	5 to 10	\$868,500
TBD	East Windsor	CRCOG	Route 5	South Main Street, Address bicyclist and pedestrian deficiencies	N	1 to 4	\$823,500
TBD	West Hartford	CRCOG	Rt 44	West Hartford - Rt 44 / Steele Road improvements	Y	11 to 27	\$810,600
TBD	East Hartford	CRCOG	Silver Lane	RFFBs	Ν	5 to 10	\$780,500
TBD	Columbia	CRCOG	Route 6	Route 6 Corridor Study-Columbia – Cards Mill Road Intersection Improvements	Y	5 to 10	\$694,800
TBD	Rocky Hill	CRCOG	Cromwell Ave	Cromwell Avenue / Inwood Road Intersection Improvements	Y	5 to 10	\$579,000
TBD	East Hartford	CRCOG	Silver Lane	Widening to Implement Road Diet (Shoulders)	Ν	5 to 10	\$557,500
TBD	East Hartford	CRCOG	Silver Lane	Separate Traffic Signals at Aldi and Silber Lane Plaza	Ν	5 to 10	\$557,500
TBD	East Hartford	CRCOG	Silver Lane	Traffic Signal Upgrades between Aldi and Forbes Street	Ν	5 to 10	\$557,500
TBD	East Hartford	CRCOG	Silver Lane	Bike Path Portion of Side Path (5' Asphalt)	Ν	5 to 10	\$446,000
TBD	Wethersfield	CRCOG	Rt 175	Wethersfield - Route 175 at Willow Street	Y	5 to 10	\$347,400
TBD	Rocky Hill	CRCOG	Cromwell Ave/West St/France St	Cromwell Ave/West St/France St Intersection Improvements- (Phase 1)	Y	5 to 10	\$289,500
TBD	East Hartford	CRCOG	Silver Lane	Signalization Improvements at Mercer Avenue	N	5 to 10	\$278,750
TBD	East Hartford	CRCOG	Silver Lane	Revise Parking at Carl's Barbeque	Ν	5 to 10	\$278,750
TBD	East Hartford	CRCOG	Silver Lane	Signalization Improvements at Simmons Road	N	5 to 10	\$278,750
TBD	East Hartford	CRCOG	Silver Lane	Raised Refuge Islands	N	5 to 10	\$250,875
TBD	Wethersfield	CRCOG	Rt 175	Wethersfield - Rt 175 at Silas Deane Highway	Y	5 to 10	\$231,600
TBD	East Hartford	CRCOG	Silver Lane	ADA-complaint Sidewalk Ramps	Ν	5 to 10	\$223,000
TBD	East Hartford	CRCOG	Silver Lane	Pedestrian Bridge over Willow Brook	Ν	5 to 10	\$223,000
TBD	Bolton, Andover, Columbia	CRCOG	Route 6	Route 6 Corridor Study-Route 6 Side Road Intersection Improvements	Y	5 to 10	\$115,800
TBD	East Hartford	CRCOG	Silver Lane	ADA-compliant Push Buttons and Signals	N	5 to 10	\$111,500
TBD	East Hartford	CRCOG	Silver Lane	Signalization Improvements at Roberts Street	N	5 to 10	\$111,500
TBD	East Hartford	CRCOG	Silver Lane	Bike Path Signing and Striping	N	5 to 10	\$100,350
TBD	East Hartford	CRCOG	Silver Lane	Textured / Mountable Refuge Islands	Ν	5 to 10	\$89,200

Project #	Town	MPO	Route	Project Description	Added Capacity	Construction Completion Date	Cost
TBD	Bolton, Andover, Columbia	CRCOG	Route 6	Route 6 Corridor Study-Park and Ride Lot Improvements		5 to 10	\$86,850
TBD	East Hartford	CRCOG	Silver Lane	Route 15 On-Ramp	Y	5 to 10	\$83,625
TBD	East Hartford	CRCOG	Silver Lane	Marked Crosswalks	N	5 to 10	\$61,325
TBD	Rocky Hill	CRCOG	Route 3	Study Area Transit Facility Improvements	N	5 to 10	\$57,900
TBD	Bolton, Andover, Columbia	CRCOG	Route 6	Route 6 Corridor Study-Express Bus Improvements	N	5 to 10	\$57,900
TBD	Bolton, Andover, Columbia	CRCOG	Route 6	Route 6 Corridor Study-Gateway Signing (Bolton, Andover, Columbia)	N	5 to 10	\$46,320
TBD	Columbia	CRCOG	Route 6	Route 6 Corridor Study-Columbia – Hop River Trail Access Improvements, Route 66 East	N	5 to 10	\$34,740
TBD	Bolton, Andover, Columbia	CRCOG	Route 6	Route 6 Corridor Study-Program of Hop River Trail Signing Improvements	N	5 to 10	\$34,740
TBD	Bolton, Andover, Columbia	CRCOG	Route 6	Route 6 Corridor Study-Program of Bicycle Safety Improvements	N	5 to 10	\$17,370
TBD	Andover	CRCOG	Route 6	Route 6 Corridor Study-Historic Andover – Pedestrian and Speed Mitigation Improvements	N	5 to 10	\$5,790
TBD	East Hartford	CRCOG	Silver Lane	Bus Shelters		5 to 10	\$557,500
TBD	East Hartford	CRCOG	Silver Lane	Bus Pull-outs		5 to 10	\$289,900
TBD	Hartford	CRCOG	Albany Ave/Blue Hills Ave	Transit Priority Treatments		5 to 10	\$4,174,722
TBD	Hartford/West Hartford	CRCOG	Farmington Ave	Transit Priority Treatments		5 to 10	\$9,532,512
TBD	Hartford	CRCOG	Franklin Ave	Transit Priority Treatments		5 to 10	\$7,309,746
TBD	Hartford	CRCOG	Main Street	Transit Priority Treatments		5 to 10	\$7,014,510
TBD	Hartford	CRCOG	Park Street	Transit Priority Treatments		5 to 10	\$1,123,596
TBD	East Hartford	CRCOG	Burnside Ave/Main Street	Transit Priority Treatments		5 to 10	\$6,372,319
320-0005PE	Newington (HL)	CRCOG		320-0013CN - The Hartford Line Newington Station		5 to 10	\$55,000,000
320-0005PE	West Hartford (HL)	CRCOG		320-0014CN - The Hartford Line West Hartford Station		5 to 10	\$55,000,000
320-0005PE	Windsor (HL)	CRCOG		320-0015CN - The Hartford Line Windsor Station		5 to 10	\$55,000,000
320-0005PE	Enfield (HL)	CRCOG		320-0017CN - The Hartford Line Enfield Station		5 to 10	\$55,000,000
320-0005PE	Enfield (HL)	CRCOG		320-0024CN - The Hartford Line Enfield Station - Short High Level		5 to 10	\$35,000,000
320-0005PE	Various (HL)	Various		Phase 3B		5 to 10	\$186,000,000
310-0072	Various	Various		PIDS, Connectivity and Improvements to SLE and the Hartford Line		5 to 10	\$5,000,000

Project #	Town	МРО	Route	Project Description	Added Capacity	Construction Completion Date	Cost
TBD	CTtransit - Hartford	CRCOG		Infrastructure improvements to accomodate electric vehicles and bring facility up tp state of good repair		5 to 10	\$499,815,000
TBD	Windham Region Transit District	CRCOG / SECOG/ NECOG		Infrastructure improvements to accomodate electric vehicles and bring facility up tp state of good repair		5 to 10	\$25,982,500
TBD	WRTD (UConn)	/SECOG/ NECOG		Infrastructure improvements to accomodate electric vehicles and bring facility up tp state of good repair		5 to 10	\$23,100,000
TBD	Greater Hartford Transit District	CRCOG		Infrastructure improvements to accomodate electric vehicles and bring facility up tp state of good repair		5 to 10	\$20,200,000
TBD	CTtransit - New Britain Division	CRCOG		Infrastructure improvements to accomodate electric vehicles and bring facility up tp state of good repair		5 to 10	\$1,805,000
TBD	CTtransit- Hartford	CRCOG		Fixed bus replacement - battery electric buses		5 to 10	\$324,200,000
TBD	Windham Regional Transit District + UConn	SECOG / NECOG		Fixed bus replacement - battery electric buses		5 to 10	\$23,500,000
TBD	Various	Various		Park & Ride Lot Repairs & Improvements		5 to 10	\$56,500,000
TBD	Various	Various		Park & Ride Lot Shelter Replacement		5 to 10	\$100,000,000

# Appendix F

Appendicies Page 117

Name / Affiliation	Comment	Response
Ethan Frankel, Bike West Hartford	I would like to see more coordination between what CRCOG is doing and the efforts of organizations like Bike West Hartford. We would really like concentration on connecting routes between West Hartford and Hartford on major arterial roads like Farmington Ave which once had a trolley coming all the way out to the Reservoir in West Hartford! A protected bike lane would be the dream that would get commuters and everyday people moving back and forth by bike and on foot.	We encourage bike/ped groups to attend CRCOG's Bike/Ped Sub Committee to be involved on a regional level for active transportation issues, https://crcog.org/transportation- committee/bike-ped-subcommittee/. Farmington Avenue is identified in our current regional complete street network. CRCOG plans to revisit its Complete Street Plan and network in the near future and will be taking a closer look at Farmington and other such streets, especially those that cross municipal boundaries, that can serve as key bike connections; recognizing that infrastructure that crosses city/town lines and providing protected bike facilities may require CRCOG assistance to implement.
Peter Souza, Town of Windsor	The four towns around Bradley did a preliminary study possible rail connection routes from Windsor Locks station to airport about 8 years ago. If Jen in Windsor Locks does not have I can try to find a copy for you. Also, Windsor staff is very much interested in the Route 20 Corridor Study so please let me know how we can help.	CRCOG is aware of the Bradley Light Rail Feasibility Study and will review its recommendations. We will also ensure that Windsor is involved in the Route 20 Corridor Study.
Dimitris Koutoumbas, CTDOT	Is there feasibility/discussion for a future connection to Bradley airport from Hartford line?	CTDOT has implemented bus service that meets trains at Windsor Locks station and then travels to Bradley Airport. Previous non-CRCOG studies have considered rail alternatives.
Dimitris Koutoumbas, CTDOT	Is there any role for CRCOG in expanding secure bike storage/parking facilities at major transit hubs?	There is consideration for enhanced bike parking facilities through the Transit Priority Corridors study, though secure facilities are not specifically discussed.
Aaron Goode,	There is currently a stalemate in closing the gaps in the Farmington Canal Heritage Trail in Southington and Plainville because of a legal issue with ROW acquisitions for bike-ped and trail projects. CRCOG needs to advocate for a statutory fix to this problem that has the potential to impair trails projects not just in central CT but across the state	CRCOG is aware of this, and we are considering this for our legislative agenda.
Jay Stange, Transport Hartford	https://www.ghsa.org/resources/news-releases/GHSA/Ped-Spotlight-Full-Report22 https://www.vox.com/23178764/florida-us19-deadliest-pedestrian-fatality-crisis Two links above talk about excellent research on the deadly nature of high speed arterials which were the location of 60% of pedestrian deaths in 2020.	Thank you for these resources.
Bill O'Neill,	I hope that CRCOG/ConnDOT Bolton Notch Eastern Gateway project receives a high priority for construction. As you know, this project includes a commuter lot and provides a safe multi-use trail connecting the East Coast Greenway and a proposed trail to UConn. The project would enhance economic development as well as mixed- modal transportation. Completing the East Coast Greenway from Hartford east to Rentschler Field would also energize safe transportation within CRCOG. Closing the gap in the multi-use trail system from Rte 83 in Manchester east to River Front Recapture would strengthen the bike/ped system.	Thank you for your comments, CRCOG is in support of improved bike and ped connectivity throughout the region. The ECG gap in East Hartford is currently being studied as part of the Capitol Region ECG Study, as well as the other last remaining ECG gaps in our region, https://crcog.org/capitol-region-ecg-study/.
Peter Souza, Town of Windsor	Looking at improvements to East-West Connections within Windsor: 1) Bloomfield Avenue (State Route 305), possibility of a new corridor study in conjunction with Bloomfield. 2) Exit 38, specifically the access from Day Hill Road to Interstate 91 Northbound. Also, need for an assessment of how the future of autonomous vehicles fit into the process of improved mobility in the Capitol Region	Day Hill Road interchange was in our previous MTP update, and CRCOG should request a meeting with CTDOT to get this back on their radar. Autonomous Vehicles will be discussed in our Emerging Technologies chapter, but we are waiting to see how the technology evolves to better understand what infrastructure requirements are necessary.
Ethan Frankel, Bike West Hartford	How can we have more regional coordination between local groups like Bike West Hartford and CRCOG?	Joining CRCOG's Bike/Ped Sub Committee is the best way to be involved on a regional level for active transportation issues, https://crcog.org/transportation-committee/bike-ped- subcommittee/
Jay Stange, Transport Hartford	Has CRCOG looked at the maintenance backlog for bridges, interstates, and state- owned roads in the region? Does CRCOG have a method for prioritizing those maintenance concerns over new construction projects, such as capacity increases on highways? I'm advocating for no new highway construction or lane expansion until state is caught up on maintenance backlog	Most funding is available for any maintenance or new construction. Our bridge conditions have improved over the past four years, though there are many bridges still deficient around the state. Most of the deficient bridges are municipal bridges and ones that are less than 20 feet long, because neither are eligible for federal funds. The state system is in fairly good shape, and a lot of funds are spent on maintenance. Generally, new construction has been limited to pinch points in the highway system. It seems you and CTDOT are on the same page with this, and CRCOG is too. CRCOG doesn't advocate for bulk capacity improvements for highways. It's more about specific pinch locations to reconfigure things so they operate better.

Name / Affiliation	Comment	Response
Kevin Sullivan, Bike/Walk Wethersfield	Happy to see some focus of federal money towards congestion mitigation. Good to see an emphasis on transit-oriented development, can also dovetail with more complete streets policies, as more bikeable and walkable streets is a positive for economic development. Appreciate going beyond the East Coast Greenway to create a trail network, but want to see further development of on-street bicycle facilities	Thank you for your comments.
Jay Stange, Transport Hartford	Would like to see a study to look at future design strategies or modification for high- speed arterial roadways, considering that these roadways tend to have the highest numbers of pedestrian fatalities. This study can then influence design guidelines with CTDOT to ensure these roadways are not built in the future. CRCOG should get behind the policy of maintaining and building of streets, continue to maintain and improve the highway system, and should get out of the game of supporting high speed arterial roadways	It's definitely an issue. CRCOG will be updating our Regional Transportation Safety Plan, and your suggestion is something we can examine within the plan. As for an independent study, they all have to be vetted through CRCOG's Transportation Committee and Policy Board. What we can study is limited to our funding and capacity. We can examine your concerns more in our safety plan update and determine if we need to also consider an independent study.
Jay Stange, Transport Hartford	Could you all give an update on where you are considering spot improvements for congestion issues?	I-84 in West Hartford, adding a new bridge across the Farmington River in Farmington, a lot of other pinch point improvements are being identified by CTDOT through the Greater Hartford Mobility Study
Jay Stange, Transport Hartford	Should try to encourage mode shift away from single occupancy vehicles. Simply converting all buses to electric will have a non-effect on emissions without encouraging more people away from single occupancy vehicle usage.	Thank you for your comments.
Cindy Jacobs, Resident of Wethersfield	Looking to see if a future study can be targeted at the Silas Deane Highway, which is a high-speed arterial with schools, businesses, and housing located along this corridor. Would also like to see a multi-use trail gap filled between Hartford, Wethersfield, and Rocky Hill. Finally, Brainard Airport is not considered a priority, residents have some concerns regarding tree clearing and additional issues that may occur with a proposed runway expansion.	All corridor studies are selected via a competitive selection process. If the Towns would like to submit an application for a study of Silas Deane Highway, we would be happy to consider it. Thank you for your additional comments, as well.
Tim Garceau, Professor at CCSU	Would like to see CRCOG go beyond the current performance based assessment mechanisms and look more at other modes for assessment rather than just roads. Look more at last-mile connectivity to and from transit hubs, especially to schools like CCSU.	CRCOG did receive and prioritize a study of Cedar Street in New Britain and Newington. However, that's been put on hold for a number of reasons and hopefully can be initiated in the future.
Tim Garceau, Professor at CCSU	In regards to the roundabout screening study, is this led by CRCOG or another organization?	CRCOG is leading this study with a consultant, and CTDOT is involved as well.
Jennifer, Resident of Glastonbury	I live in a community with an absence of high frequency transit, such as CTfastrak. How is this looked at from a long range perspective and what kind of conversations do you have when it comes to improving transit? Looking to also see how this can also relate to Transit Oriented Development and affordable housing.	CRCOG has completed two recent transit studies (Comprehensive Service Analysis, Transit Priority Corridors Study). The challenge in less dense areas is that demand is low, so service is infrequent, which makes it less attractive, which leads to less ridership, and so on. An alternative consideration would be flex service or microtransit, which will be discussed in the MTP. The state now requires all municipalities to complete affordable housing plans. We also have an inventory of CRCOG communities that have submitted their affordable housing plans on our website. We also have available on our website an affordable housing study that was completed last year.
Jay Stange, Transport Hartford	According to a YouTube video, trucks do about 90% of the damage to interstate highways, and yet pay for a small percentage of highway construction and maintenance. Are there more defined numbers to help back this up that CTDOT or CRCOG have access to? Would like to see a greater freight shift to rail transport.	In pavement design, the surface is mostly designed for trucks and buses, with cars being inconsequential.

Public Comments and Responses						
Name	Organization	Comment	Response			
Maureen Goulet	Resident of Manchester	Thank you and the rest of the CRCOG staff for your work on this plan. I would like to make sure that the Metropolitan Transportation Plan includes planning to expand the CTFastrak East of the River.	Chapter 2 (Transit and Rail System) does include the following recommentation: "Advance the second phase of CTfastrak expansion east of Hartford."			
Emma Petersen	Town of Manchester	The CTfastrak Expansion Study and Hartford Comprehensive Service Analysis make several references to the benefits and justifications for expanding CTfastrak East into Manchester. Please consider explicitly including a reference to Manchester in this section by including a phrase like "to Downtown Manchester, through central Manchester, along street in Manchester" in the following sentence. "Phase 2 would create BRT service along Silver Lane and/ or Burnside Avenue in East Hartford with limited stop service, branded vehicles, onboard Wi-Fi, enhanced shelters, real-time bus arrival information, intersection, and roadway treatments to speed up service, and off-board fare payment."	The completed and approved studies that are referenced do not include expansion of CTfastrak all the way into Downtown Manchester. As such, we are not in a position to add that specific recommendation within the MTP at this time. However, CRCOG Staff will coordinate with representatives from Manchester, CTDOT, and CTtransit related to the Town's interest in this potential service expansion.			
Emma Petersen	Town of Manchester	In support of these recommendations, I am attaching a brief selection from the chapter on Transportation in Manchester's draft update to its Plan of Conservation and Development. You will find public feedback and several maps that support Manchester's importance in the radial network as well as a desire for increased frequency and connections that could be made with crosstown connections. I would also like to make a specific reference to recommendation #7. The Hartford CSA document refers to a service design of route 86 that travels primarily along Hale Road, Sheldon Road, Broad Street, and Center Street in Manchester. (See attached for referenced material) This route design would provide a critical crosstown connection between Manchester and South Windsor as promoted earlier in the draft plan, provide service to a Manchester corridor that is anticipating transformational developments, and service the area's major grocery stores as key destinations in a census tract with a median household income that is roughly 90% of Manchester's AMI and about 75% of Hartford County.	Thank you for sharing this information. CRCOG does remain committed to its support of the recommendations from the Hartford CSA, including the routing recommendations in Manchester.			
Emma Petersen	Town of Manchester	Trails: I've always felt there has been a disconnect on inter-town trail build out and maintenance. The state and CROCG have been supportive of completing connections (especially the ECG) but the support ends with the completion of construction. The long-term viability of greenways and trails lies with ongoing maintenance and the current approach is to leave that to the local municipality. This results in a disparate approach and level of service with respect to maintenance and user experience. Each town is left to decide the level of resources to put toward maintenance. Form a sustainability and equity perspective, I believe CRCOG should support a more regional or even statewide approach to ongoing maintenance.	CRCOG will have an opportunity to consider adding a component to assess regional maintenance opportunities in an upcoming on/off-road regional trail and complete streets prioritization study, which is anticipated to be initiated in late 2023. Once finalized, the recommendations from that study will be incorporated into future versions of the MTP.			
Emma Petersen	Town of Manchester	The image of the Bradley Roadway Plan is illegible.	Thank you for bringing this to our attention. This image will be corrected so that it shows more clearly.			
Emma Petersen	Town of Manchester	The section on Truck traffic just touches on the growing issue of insufficient truck facilities. The recommendations focus on 30,000-foot level solutions but there needs to be some effort put into the more local issues that trucks have on municipalities and provide recommendations on how to solve some of the 'overnight' on-street and illegal truck parking issues.	More local solutions will be considered in an upcoming Warehousing Land Use and Traffic Impact Study, which is anticipated for initiation in late 2023. Once finalized, the recommendations from that study will be incorporated into future versions of the MTP.			
Emma Petersen	Town of Manchester	The title of recommendations #1 and #6 make it seem as though the content is very similar, but it is not.	In Chapter 6 (Freight Transport System), Recommendation 1 " Explore Developing and Improving Parkand Rest Stop Facilities in the Region" will be changed to "Support CTDOT's Statewide Truck Parking Study," and Recommendation 6 will remain as "Explote Improving Parking and Rest Stop Facilities in the Region."			

Emma Petersen	Town of Manchester	Please consider referencing the content of "Electric Mobility for All - A Feasibility Study of Electric Transportation Options for Low- to Moderate- Income Residents in Connecticut". The vehicle electrification case study is very interesting and illustrates an example of where notions of road charging and EV infrastructure are heading in the future. However, there are now concrete recommendations available through this feasibility study and the product of collaboration between CTDOT and Eversource. Link to Report: https://rmi.org/insight/electric-mobility-options-for- residents-in-connecticut/	Thank you for sharing this information. The study and its recommendations will be used as a support document when CRCOG conducts its Regional Electric Vehicle Study in the future.
Emma Petersen	Town of Manchester	Buckland Hills would no doubt play an important role in Fastrak East as a transit hub. Please consider strengthening the language in the short-term recommendation highlighted on this page to recognize the importance of implementing changes.	Recommendation 20 on page 02.18 will be updated to "Support the implementation of improvements to make the Buckland Hills Park and Ride a transit hub. Such improvements would support future enhancements to transit service, including the potential expansion of CTfastrak service."
SB Chatterjee		CRCOG should support Brainard Airport staying open for the long term.	This falls outside the scope of the MTP, as our focus within this document is predominately surface transportation that serves the airports in our region. Please share your comments regarding operations at Bainard Airport with the City of Hartford and/or the Connecticut Airport Authority. Additionally, you may find the Hartford Braindard Airport Property Study project website helpful: https://hartfordbrainardairportstudy2023.com
Casey Moran		One omission I noticed is the proposed North Hartford station, would be great have that incorporated into the planning document. Would really help transform the north-end by providing increased mobility and access to jobs and catalyze investment in the area	The potential for such a station is being investigated as part of CTDOT's Greater Hartford Mobility Study. CRCOG will continue to monitor the analysis related to the additional of an additional rail station in North Hartford.
Casey Moran		In addition to transit access (great idea to through run fastraks) to the airport, can we get a safe bike route that ties into the upcoming trail improvements	We will consider this in our upcoming on/off- road regional trail and complete streets prioritization study, which is anticipated for initiation in late 2023. Once finalized, the recommendations from that study will be incorporated into future versions of the MTP.
Casey Moran		Emerging technologies talks a lot about electric vehicles (cars) but should also include a discussion about electric bikes and the rebate program	We have added some discussion about e-bikes and the upcoming Connecticut rebate program on page 07.9.

### **CTDOT and FHWA Comments and Responses**

Comment	Response	
Confirm MPOs consulted with State and local agencies for land use management, natural resources, environmental protection, conservation and historic preservation in developing the MTPs	CRCOG reached out to solicit input and provide review opportunities to all CRCOG municipalities, and to various State agencies for land use management, natural resources, environmental protection, conservation and historic preservation, including: DEEP, DEMHS, OPM, CTDOT, DECD, and DESPP	
Confirm that TMA Certification Review findings, especially corrective actions, were incorporated into the plans	Although the region's MTP was not specifically addressed in the summary section of the February 1, 2022 Hartford TMA Certification Review Report, guidance was provided in section 4.4, Metropolitan Transportation Plan stating that " <i>Recommendations related</i> <i>to the MTP are included in Freight Planning and Performance Management sections.</i> " Additionally, some MTP recommendations were cited in the Financial Planning. The Freight Planning, Performance Management, and Financial Planning sections of the MTP were updated accordingly.	
Confirm that MPOs are revisiting and updating regional TAM and PTASP performance targets as appropriate with each TIP/MTP update	Chapter 8 contains the most recent regional measures of performance (baseline or results) and the most recent regional TAM performance targets, which have been updated since the prior 2019 MTP. Appendix B also contains prior TAM performance targets. Chapter 8 contains the most recent regional measures of performance (baseline or results) and the most recent regional PTASP performance targets. This is the first round of required PTASP measures and therefore ther are no prior performace targets to be included in Appendix B.	
Confirm what the transit financial estimates include and how that compares to typical revenues and expenditures; plans should be explaining what the numbers they provide represent	Aggregated anticipated statewide Transit capital funding over the next 5 years, per the CTDOT 5 year capital plan, is explained on page 10.2 and shown in figure 10.1 as exceeding \$4B (or exceeding \$800M/year). This level of capital investment far exceeds the approximately \$250M/year of currently available FTA funding, necessitating a significant state funding share. Future available federal plus state funding through 2050 was estimating by CTDOT by assuming and inflating a \$500M of annual funding (which would requiring a state share approximating the level of available Federal FTA funds), further explanation of this will be included in Appendix D. Of the resulting \$17B statewide, \$2.9B of capital funding is expected for the CRCOG region, determined as explained on page 10.10. The matching \$2.9B of expected major regional capital expenditures are summarized in Figure 10.5. Operations and Maintenace budgeting, of which a significant portion is required for Transit Operations, is discussed on Page 10.11	
We encourage MPOs to review the Environmental Justice Resources summary document provided to CTDOT in December 2022 to continue to enhance benefits and burdens analyses and equity in transportation planning documents	CRCOG reviewed this document during the preparation of the MTP.	

Clarity should be given on population and employment data sources other than 'CTDOT'. Also, it is also not clear in the text for population as two numbers are provided and both are implied to be state sources.	On page 01.4, "over 970,000" will be changed to "approximately 970,000". On page 01.14 under "Key Demographic Assumptions for the Capitol Region's MTP", the first paragraph will be replaced with the following: "Employment and population forecasts for CRCOG have been provided by the CTDOT Travel Demand and Air Quality Modeling Unit, which developed them using several data sources including the Connecticut Department of Public Health for population as well as the Connecticut Department of Labor and the US Census Bureau's Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics program for jobs. These forecasts reveal a region that has been relatively flat in terms of population and jobs growth. However, while the average annual population growth rate is only projected to be approximately 0.3% through 2050, changes in the composition of the population are expected to be significant, requiring considerations when planning the region's transportation future." For Figures 01.10 and 01.11, the source will be updated to "CTDOT Travel Demand and Air Quality Modeling Unit Forecasts (last updated in January 2023)."
The system performance report should include baseline performance data, not just targets.	In Chapter 8 of the MTP, Statewide Targets, which have been adopted by CRCOG as its own targets, are given in addition to statewide and CRCOG Performance Measures that describe current progress. From our understanding of past Federal Guidance on performance measures, a <i>performance measure in general</i> is a quantifiable description of current system performance computed in accrodance with federal guidance (such as CFR 23 490 Subparts A-H) and a performance target is set based off either past measures of performance or consulting them and must be in the same "scale" or "format". For example, a LOTTR target must be interpretable in the same manner as an LOTTR measure. <i>Thus, current baseline performance is described by current CRCOG and statewide performance measures</i> , which are then compared with the statewide targets. Targets from 2018 MTP are available for reference in Appendix B.
Revenue and cost estimates must use inflation rates to reflect year of expenditure dollars based on reasonable financial principles and information, cooperatively developed – this is not clear and should be improved.	Additional detailed information regarding revenue estimates and inflation rates will be added to Appendix D and a reference to Appendix D will be provided in the Chapter 10 (Financial Plan) text. In general, Highway and Transit Revenues were estimated and inflated by CTDOT by inflating and aggregating estimated current Highway Revenues of \$1.8B and Transit Revenues of \$500M by 1.5% per year through 2050. CRCOG applied recent 4 year CPI increases atop the previously inflated cost estimates that appeared in 2019 MTP.

# Appendix G

#### What is your primary mode of transportation to work?



#### What is your primary mode of transportation to run errands?



#### What is your primary mode of transportation for leisure activities?



Why do you choose your primary transportation mode?



35



#### What are your key concerns for mobility and access in CRCOG?

#### What mode is your FIRST priority for funding in the region?







What mode is your THIRD priority for funding in the region?



# How often have you used public transportation in the CRCOG region in the last 12 months?



#### Improvements that would make you use transit more frequently?



Please indicate whether or not you agree with the following statement: "Even though I may or may not personally use public transportation (rail, bus, paratransit van), I support the public transportation systems in my community."



Which mass transit systems in CRCOG region have you used?



Appendicies Page 131

How often have you ridden a bicycle in the last 12 months?



Why have you not ridden a bicycle in the last 12 months?





Which of the following would encourage you to walk more in the next 12 months?



## Please indicate whether or not you agree with the following statement: "Even though I may or may not personally walk often, I support pedestrian improvements in my community."



State Gas Tax



Appendicies Page 134

-





Tolls





#### Which of the following policies is your FIRST priority for funding in the region?

Which of the following policies is your SECOND priority for funding in the region?







#### How many people are in your household?

Does your household include elderly people, age 65 and over?





## Does your household include children, age 17 and under?

Does your household include any people with disabilities?



### How many cars does your household have?



#### Which of the following best describes your current employment status?



### What is your gender?


## What is your total gross household income?



## Which of the following best describes your race?







