May 2010
CENTRAL CONNECTICUT REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
FINANCIAL REPORT AND CASH FLOW STATEMENT

REVENUES	Budget	Current Month	Year To Date	Balance	% Received
Paratransit Administration/Contractor	1,030,000	101,629	1,142,338	-112,338	110.91%
Paratransit Advertising	1,000	0	0	1,000	0.00%
Transportation Planning Grant	600,923	25,871	275,249	325,674	45.80%
Municipal Contributions	91,500	0	91,500	0	100.00%
Miscellaneous Revenues	4,200	1	34,242	-30,042	815.29%
CEDS - USEDA	64,000	0	16,000	48,000	25.00%
CEDS - Municipality	40,000	0	40,000	0	100.00%
CERT	8,000	0	9,467	-1,467	118.34%
SGIA	1,000	0	9,500	-8,500	950.00%
Hazard Mitigation	1,000	0	0	1,000	0.00%
Berlin/NB Solid Waster - RPI	255,160	21,565	247,454	7,706	96.98%
Pequabuck River Dam	100,000	0	50,000	50,000	50.00%
R5EPT	2,000	0	2,263	-263	113.15%
Budgeted Revenues	2,198,783	149,066	1,918,014	280,769	87.23%
83.00% completed					

EXPENDITURES	Budget	Current Month	Year To Date	Balance	% Used
Salaries/Payroll Taxes/Workers Comp.	409,425	22,091	336,515	72,910	82.19%
Retirement/Administration	16,159	1,795	9,697	6,462	60.01%
Health/Life & ST Disability Insurance	111,883	6,011	95,846	16,037	85.67%
Directors & Officers/Liability/Bonding Ins.	5,000	0	5,000	0	100.00%
Accounting/Legal	12,560	3,000	12,000	560	95.54%
Paratransit Contractor	950,000	94,390	1,066,596	-116,596	112.27%
Equipment Service Contracts/Maintenance	5,500	195	2,179	3,321	39.62%
Equipment/Software Purchases	28,800	200	11,365	17,435	39.46%
Rent	30,016	2,515	27,501	2,515	91.62%
Office Cleaning	3,800	250	3,000	800	78.95%
Office Renovations	1,500	0	1,500	0	100.00%
Telephone/Postage	6,500	467	4,464	2,036	68.68%
Supplies	9,500	0	2,250	7,250	23.68%
Conferences	4,500	0	4,202	298	93.38%
Training/Workshops/Seminars	4,700	752	2,990	1,710	63.62%
Travel in State/Meetings/Forums	11,000	527	11,000	0	100.00%
Dues/Subscriptions	11,326	1,157	5,913	5,413	52.21%
Publications	300	12	12	288	4.00%
Advertising	4,000	150	967	3,033	24.18%
Pequabuck River Dam	90,000	9,923	26,807	63,193	29.79%
Berlin/NB Solid Waster - RPI	251,964	21,565	246,533	5,431	97.84%
Miscellaneous Expenditures	9,400	492	5,333	4,067	56.73%
Contingency	220,950	0	0	220,950	0.00%
Budgeted Expenses	2,198,783	165,492	1,881,670	317,113	85.58%

CASH ON HAND					
Checking Acct. Balance - BOA				64,301	
CT State Treas.Short-Term Investment Fund				4,140	
Money Market - BOA				81,542	
CD - Thomaston Savings Bank				99,833	
CD - Webster Savings Bank				97,766	
	TOTAL CASH ON HAND			347,582	

June 2010
CENTRAL CONNECTICUT REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
FINANCIAL REPORT AND CASH FLOW STATEMENT

REVENUES	Budget	Current Month	Year To Date	Balance	% Received
Paratransit Administration/Contractor	1,030,000	107,618	1,249,956	-219,956	121.35%
Paratransit Advertising	1,000	0	0	1,000	0.00%
Transportation Planning Grant	600,923	36,719	311,968	288,955	51.91%
Municipal Contributions	91,500	0	91,500	0	100.00%
Miscellaneous Revenues	4,200	71	34,313	-30,113	816.98%
CEDS - USEDA	64,000	0	16,000	48,000	25.00%
CEDS - Municipality	40,000	0	40,000	0	100.00%
CERT	8,000	0	9,467	-1,467	118.34%
SGIA	1,000	0	9,500	-8,500	950.00%
Hazard Mitigation	1,000	0	0	1,000	0.00%
Berlin/NB Solid Waster - RPI	255,160	0	247,454	7,706	96.98%
Pequabuck River Dam	100,000	0	50,000	50,000	50.00%
R5EPT	2,000	0	2,263	-263	113.15%
Budgeted Revenues	2,198,783	144,408	2,062,422	136,361	93.80%
100.00% completed					

EXPENDITURES	Budget	Current Month	Year To Date	Balance	% Used
Salaries/Payroll Taxes/Workers Comp.	409,425	20,477	356,992	52,433	87.19%
Retirement/Administration	16,159	0	9,697	6,462	60.01%
Health/Life & ST Disability Insurance	111,883	0	95,846	16,037	85.67%
Directors & Officers/Liability/Bonding Ins.	5,000	0	5,000	0	100.00%
Accounting/Legal	12,560	0	12,000	560	95.54%
Paratransit Contractor	950,000	100,813	1,167,409	-217,409	122.89%
Equipment Service Contracts/Maintenance	5,500	824	3,003	2,497	54.60%
Equipment/Software Purchases	28,800	42	11,407	17,393	39.61%
Rent	30,016	0	27,501	2,515	91.62%
Office Cleaning	3,800	250	3,250	550	85.53%
Office Renovations	1,500	0	1,500	0	100.00%
Telephone/Postage	6,500	18	4,482	2,018	68.95%
Supplies	9,500	0	2,250	7,250	23.68%
Conferences	4,500	298	4,500	0	100.00%
Training/Workshops/Seminars	4,700	1,710	4,700	0	100.00%
Travel in State/Meetings/Forums	11,000	0	11,000	0	100.00%
Dues/Subscriptions	11,326	0	5,913	5,413	52.21%
Publications	300	0	12	288	4.00%
Advertising	4,000	0	967	3,033	24.18%
Pequabuck River Dam	90,000	1,450	28,257	61,743	31.40%
Berlin/NB Solid Waster - RPI	251,964	0	246,533	5,431	97.84%
Miscellaneous Expenditures	9,400	0	5,333	4,067	56.73%
Contingency	220,950	0	0	220,950	0.00%
Budgeted Expenses	2,198,783	125,882	2,007,552	191,231	91.30%

CASH ON HAND					
Checking Acct. Balance - BOA				88,632	
CT State Treas.Short-Term Investment Fund				4,142	
Money Market - BOA				81,610	
CD - Thomaston Savings Bank				99,833	
CD - Webster Savings Bank				97,766	
	TOTAL CASH ON HAND			371,983	

July 2010
CENTRAL CONNECTICUT REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
FINANCIAL REPORT AND CASH FLOW STATEMENT

REVENUES	Budget	Current Month	Year To Date	Balance	% Received
Paratransit Administration/Contractor	1,319,340	0	0	1,319,340	0.00%
Transportation Planning Grant	577,392	0	0	577,392	0.00%
Municipal Contributions	91,500	21,646	21,646	69,854	23.66%
Miscellaneous Revenues	6,200	35	35	6,165	0.56%
CEDS - USEDA	48,000	0	0	48,000	0.00%
CERT	8,000	0	0	8,000	0.00%
Pequabuck River Dam	10,000	0	0	10,000	0.00%
R5EPT	500	126	126	374	25.20%
Budgeted Revenues	2,060,932	21,807	21,807	2,039,125	1.06%

8.33% completed

EXPENDITURES	Budget	Current Month	Year To Date	Balance	% Used
Salaries/Payroll Taxes/Workers Comp.	380,931	26,698	26,698	354,233	7.01%
Retirement/Administration	12,461	1,363	1,363	11,098	10.94%
Health/Life & ST Disability Insurance	125,634	5,925	5,925	119,709	4.72%
Directors & Officers/Liability/Bonding Ins.	6,000	3,355	3,355	2,645	55.92%
Accounting/Legal	14,500	0	0	14,500	0.00%
Paratransit Contractor	1,229,340	0	0	1,229,340	0.00%
Equipment Service Contracts/Maintenance	4,500	0	0	4,500	0.00%
Equipment/Software Purchases	23,650	415	415	23,235	1.75%
Rent	30,180	5,030	5,030	25,150	16.67%
Office Cleaning	4,200	250	250	3,950	5.95%
Telephone/Postage	6,500	1,031	1,031	5,469	15.86%
Supplies	7,500	73	73	7,427	0.97%
Training/Workshops/Seminars/Conf.	10,500	497	497	10,003	4.73%
Travel in State/Meetings/Forums	13,000	315	315	12,685	2.42%
Dues/Subscriptions	11,326	3,725	3,725	7,601	32.89%
Publications	300	0	0	300	0.00%
Advertising	4,000	0	0	4,000	0.00%
Pequabuck River Dam	10,000	0	0	10,000	0.00%
Miscellaneous Expenditures	9,400	27	27	9,373	0.29%
Contingency	157,010	0	0	157,010	0.00%
Budgeted Expenses	2,060,932	48,704	48,704	2,012,228	2.36%

CASH ON HAND					
Checking Acct. Balance - BOA				65,245	
CT State Treas.Short-Term Investment Fund				4,142	
Money Market - BOA				81,644	
CD - Thomaston Savings Bank				99,833	
CD - Webster Savings Bank				97,766	
	TOTAL CASH ON HAND			348,630	

CENTRAL CONNECTICUT REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
225 N MAIN STREET, SUITE 304, BRISTOL CT 06010 • WWW.CCRPA.ORG • 860.589.7820(p) • 860.589.6950(f)

MEMORANDUM

TO: Program, Finance and Personnel Committee
FROM: Carl J. Stephani, Executive Director
DATE: August 20, 2010

FOR AGENDA: September 2, 2010

SUBJECT: Municipal Dues for FY2011-2012

The CCRPA was formed under Chapter 127 of the Connecticut Statutes. Section 8-34a of Chapter 127 notes that "Any town, city or borough participating in a regional planning agency shall annually appropriate funds for the expenses of such agency in the performance of its purposes. Such funds shall be appropriated and paid in accordance with a dues formula established by the regional agency."

The Agency's formula for the calculation of its municipal dues assigns each jurisdiction a certain proportion of the total dues in the following way:

1. POPULATION: Half of the total amount of dues collected is calculated on the basis of the percentage of the Region's population in each jurisdiction. To calculate that amount for each jurisdiction, the total amount of dues to be collected is divided in half. That amount is then multiplied by the percentage of the Region's population in each member jurisdiction. For example, if our total municipal dues were $100,000, a town that had 25% of the Region's population would pay 25% of $50,000, or $12,500 for this portion of the formula. (The population percentages for each of the Region's cities/towns are noted in the attached table entitled "Municipal Dues Calculator"). The population figures used are the most recent estimates prepared by the Connecticut Office of Policy and Management
2. LAND AREA: A quarter of the total amount of dues collected is calculated on the basis of the percentage of the Region's land area in each jurisdiction. To make that calculation a procedure is followed that matches what was described in the preceding paragraph with the exception of the "half" being changed to a "quarter," and the multiplier being the percentage of land area.
3. GRAND LIST: Finally, a quarter of the total amount of dues collected is calculated on the basis of the percentage of the value of the Region's most recent Equalized Grand List in each jurisdiction as provided by the Connecticut Office of Policy and Management.

The attached table shows the results of the dues formula calculations for FY2011-2012, based on the same total $91,500 municipal dues that has been collected from the member municipalities for more than the past decade. Individual member dues vary slightly each year as each town's proportion of the region's population and grand list totals change.

On that basis, it is my

RECOMMENDATION

that your Committee

Recommend that the Agency Board approve the municipal dues amounts and allocation formula for FY2011-2012 noted in the attached Table.

cc: Agency Board Members

Attachment: FY11/12 "Municipal Dues Calculator"

L:\Committees\!PFP\Supporting Documents\0902FY2011-12 dues.wpd

CCRPA MUNICIPAL DUE$ CALCULATIONS FOR FY 2011-2012

CCRPA Town List	Pop. Estimate July 1, 2008	Town's Percent of Region Pop.	Town Due$ Per Region Pop.	Assessment Year Oct. 1, 2007 to Sept. 30, 2008 Equalized Net Grand List	Town's Percent of Region ENGL	Town Due$ Per Region ENGL	Town Land in Square Miles	Town's Percent of Region Area	Town Due$ Per Square Miles	Town Total Due$ Fiscal 11/12	Town's Percent of CCRPA Due$	Town Total Paid Fiscal 10/11
Berlin	20,364	8.8%	$4,009	$3,211,952,015	13.4%	$3,064	26.5	16.2%	$3,705	**$10,778**	11.8%	$10,698
Bristol	60,927	26.2%	$11,996	$6,164,454,137	25.7%	$5,880	26.5	16.2%	$3,705	**$21,581**	23.6%	$21,709
Burlington	9,150	3.9%	$1,802	$1,300,774,610	5.4%	$1,241	29.8	18.2%	$4,167	**$7,209**	7.9%	$7,084
New Britain	70,486	30.3%	$13,878	$4,136,232,104	17.2%	$3,945	13.3	8.1%	$1,860	**$19,683**	21.5%	$19,748
Plainville	17,221	7.4%	$3,391	$2,219,047,278	9.3%	$2,117	9.9	6.1%	$1,384	**$6,891**	7.5%	$6,873
Plymouth	11,969	5.2%	$2,357	$1,153,756,485	4.8%	$1,100	21.7	13.3%	$3,034	**$6,491**	7.1%	$6,534
Southington	42,250	18.2%	$8,318	$5,796,798,062	24.2%	$5,529	35.9	21.9%	$5,020	**$18,867**	20.6%	$18,855
Total	232,367	100.0%	$45,750	$23,983,014,691	100.0%	$22,875	163.6	100.0%	$22,875	**$91,500**	100.0%	**$91,501**
			$45,750			$22,875			$22,875	**$91,500**		

Source: CT. Dept. of Public Health

Source: CT. Office of Policy & Management

Source: CCRPA

Updated 6/18/09

CENTRAL CONNECTICUT REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
225 N MAIN STREET, SUITE 304, BRISTOL CT 06010 • WWW.CCRPA.ORG • 860.589.7820(P) • 860.589.6950(F)

MEMORANDUM

TO: Program, Finance and Personnel Committee
FROM: Carl J. Stephani, Executive Director

DATE: August 20, 2010

FOR AGENDA: September 2, 2010

SUBJECT: Recommendation to the Agency Board Regarding a Personnel Policy Amendment and Related Budget Revisions for the Regional Planner Position

The resignation of our Senior Planner/Assistant Director leaves us with a number of staffing options. We could either: (1) re-fill that position and keep the same organizational structure; or, (2) re-structure our organization to better reflect the current needs of the organization.

When we established the Senior Planner/Assistant Director position on June 3, 2010, we also established the position of Senior Planner/Information Technology. We did that largely because we had two extraordinarily talented people who we wanted to retain by providing them with more responsibilities and a higher salary.

With the departure of the Senior Planner/Assistant Director we still have our Senior Planner/Information Technology who is fully qualified, capable and willing to assume the responsibilities of an "assistant director" under the auspices of "other duties as assigned". We do not have the need at this point for two Senior Planners.

Instead of another Senior Planner, we need the knowledges, skills, and abilities appropriate to a regional planner; we also need a second regional planner full-time, instead of half-time as in the current budget.

In anticipation of our discussion of this proposal with you, we have posted notice of a Regional Planner vacancy. On the basis of our recent experience recruiting a Transportation Planner, however, we realized that the $39,000 annual salary we offered for that position limited our potential applicants. A more appropriate salary for a Regional Planner in this Region would be $42,000, and we have taken the liberty of advertising the vacancy with a salary of "up to $42,000.., conditional on Agency approval". If you concur with that recommendation, then our current Transportation Planner's salary should be increased to match that amount.

Because there is no Regional Planner currently on staff, the Personnel Policy was

amended in June to remove that Classification Description.

On that basis, it is my

RECOMMENDATION

that your Committee

Recommend that the Agency Board:

1. Amend the Personnel Policy to add the attached Regional Planner Classification Description; and,
2. Amend the adopted budget to:
   a. Set the Regional Planner salary at $42,000; and,
   b. Increase the Transportation Planner salary by $3,000 to match the salary of the Regional Planner.

Discussion

These proposed changes will require adjustments to the budget, however, because of savings we are accruing by not filling the Senior Planner position, and from surplus amounts remaining in our Health Insurance line by under-enrollment in our health insurance program, these changes could be made with no net budget impact.

cc: Agency Board

Attachment(s): Regional Planner Classification Description

POSITION DESCRIPTION
TITLE: Regional Planner

Minimum Knowledge/Qualifications:
Bachelors degree from an accredited college in planning (urban, regional, or spatial), environmental/natural resources (science, policy, or management), or transportation (planning or policy), plus one year of experience; or a bachelors degree in a closely related field with two years' experience; or other combinations of education and experience which may be judged equivalent by the Executive Director; Master's Degree preferred

General Duties:
- Completes transportation, land use, and economic development (e.g. CEDS) projects
- Reviews and prepares zoning and subdivision referral reviews
- Collects and analyzes data
- Prepares memoranda, reports, presentations, and other documents
- Represents the Agency and undertakes public outreach and participation
- Provides support to Agency staff
- Assists with GIS and website projects
- Organizes, analyzes, and retrieves data
- Communicates ideas in oral and written form
- Understands land use and land subdivision practices, land use-transportation interrelationships, planning, zoning, and transportation analysis techniques, planning/programming procedures
- Participates in all appropriate Agency and outside organizational meetings
- Performs other duties as assigned

Special/Knowledge/ Skills/Abilities:
- Sustainability and environmental protection
- Land conservation and air and water quality
- Land use, subdivision, and zoning practices
- Transportation systems, including pedestrian/cyclist/transit planning
- Economic development
- Relationships and linkages between these subjects
- Environmental, transportation, and economic trends/challenges and practicable solutions
- Ability to touch-type 40 wpm, proficiency with word processing, spreadsheet, data processing, GIS software and statistics packages (e.g. Word, Excel, Access, SQL, ArcGIS, SPSS)
- Research, analysis, and visualization techniques (including statistical analysis)
- Spoken and written English; Public speaking and engagement
- Physical and legal ability to travel from site to site and carry out all assigned duties

Supervised by: Senior Planner
Supervision exercised: None

CENTRAL CONNECTICUT REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
225 N MAIN STREET, SUITE 304, BRISTOL CT 06010 • WWW.CCRPA.ORG • 860.589.7820(p) • 860.589.6950(f)

memorandum

TO: Program, Finance and Personnel Committee
FROM: Carl J. Stephani, Executive Director
DATE: August 20, 2010

FOR AGENDA: September 2, 2010

SUBJECT: Budget Amendment

Since your approval of the FY2010-2011Agency Budget on June 3, 2010, a number of changes have taken place which suggest an amendment to the budget. Those changes relate to:

REVENUES		
Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA)with Bristol - Incentive Housing Zone (IHZ)	$15,000	
Paratransit System Advertising	$1,000	
	Total	$16,000
EXPENDITURES		
Contract services for CPC referral reviews	$3,500	
Telephone system	$3,500	
IT System Server (increase over $5,000 already budgeted)	$3,500	
Pedestrian Counters	$2,500	
	Total	$13,000

REVENUES

- Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA)with the City of Bristol - At your regular meeting on November 6, 2008, you authorized staff to execute an intergovernmental agreement (IGA) with the City of Bristol to provide the City with technical assistance regarding their Incentive Housing Zone. That work was to be funded by a State grant which was delayed because of the State's budget difficulties. Because of those delays the Bristol/CCRPA IGA was not signed until February 18, 2010, when work began on phase one of the project, the Housing Market Analysis. That work is being done by the University of Connecticut Center for Real Estate and is nearing completion. The City has indicated in a number of meetings held this summer that they would like to utilize $15,000 of the State grant to fund the Agency to prepare the IHZ ordinance language for them. Because of uncertainties regarding the City's intentions regarding this grant, this $15,000 was not included in the Agency budget adopted in June.

- Paratransit Advertising - On November 5, 2009, the Agency Board authorized execution of a contract with Trans-Ad Outdoor, Ltd., for the provision of paratransit advertising; i.e. advertising posted on the vehicles used to provide paratransit services in the Region. Since then Trans-Ad has sold some advertising which should provide some revenue to the Agency during this fiscal year. At the time of the preparation of this year's budget we did not have any estimate from Trans-Ad of the potential income from this activity. Since then they have been able to test the market and it appears that there will be some revenue to the Agency

from them this year. Although this is a rough estimate, based on our discussions with Trans-Ad, we feel it would be conservative to include a revenue line in the budget of $1,000 in relation to this advertising.

EXPENDITURES

- Contract services for CPC referral reviews - In the Spring of this year we began an experiment with the CPC that seemed to be very successful; e.g. we contracted with a private consultant, Mr. Margus Laan, to provide staff CPC staff support. The results of that experiment were not known until after the adoption of this year's annual budget, and no funding was provided in the budget for the continuation of that contract. Now that the test has been run and the results have proven of great benefit to the Agency; and now that Mr. Laan has agreed to continue to provide consulting services to the CPC for the remainder of this fiscal year, we need to identify that as a regular budget expenditure by amending the budget to include it. Based on our experience in the Spring, we estimate that we will require approximately $350 each month the CPC meets to purchase Mr. Laan's services; for an annual total of $3,500.

- Telephone system - On October 4, 2001, the Agency Board authorized the purchase of a telephone system for approximately $5,000. That system has been in use for nearly nine years and it has become somewhat outdated in its own right. The most distressing feature of the system is that it requires the services of a licensed technician to make such simple adjustments as to change the message related to an office closure due to inclement weather or other emergency. The cost of managing the system we have is high, with each visit by our telephone consultant costing at least $300; in recent years, we have had to have him in multiple times a year. In other words, running the existing phone system is costing us as much as buying a new one. This is money lost, because, as the system ages, the probability of failure increases, and when complete failure does occur, the Agency will be obligated to buy a new system.

  Telephone technology has improved over the past decade such that a new system, costing less than what our current system originally cost, could have the following advantageous features:

  1. Programming - Agency staff would no longer need to rely on an outside consultant for system management (e.g., configuring holidays, changing extensions, etc.).
  2. Better reachability - a new system could boost our inbound phone capacity by 50%, greatly reducing the incidence of busy signals when people call the office.
  3. Call statistics - a new system could give staff comprehensive information on call wait times, frequency of pickup/voice mail, and so forth. The federal government is requesting/requiring that paratransit grant recipients provide these data.
  4. Remote access - to voice mail via e-mail for staff when they are on business trips
  5. Ease of use - the system we currently have is not user-friendly, and staff finds it difficult to use its features; everything from voice mail to transfer/parking/conference calls.
  6. Separation of paratransit/regional planning calls - a new system could allow staff to give paratransit customers paratransit-only numbers, prompts, and information, rather than mixing them in with all other inbound calls; in the past, this has been a source of confusion, as many paratransit customers, some of whom are elderly or cognitively challenged, expect a transit district, not planning agency when they call.

  We have secured competitive bids for a new system which could be purchased for no more than $3,500 and are prepared to purchase a new system as soon as this budget amendment is acted upon by the Board.

- IT System Server (hardware/software) - at your June 3, 2010, meeting we recommended, and you approved, a budget for this year that provided $5,000 to replace our computer system server. After further consideration we recognize that the type of server we need, including new server software, will cost more in the range of $8,500; hence the recommendation to add $3,500 to the budget line for the new server.

  The typical life cycle of a server is 3 years. To economize, we have squeezed 5 years out of our server. By industry standards, we are thus overdue for a new server. The server's

warranty expires next Spring. Dell provides us with 4-hour express support and repairs. After expiration of the warranty, replacement parts will have to be bought at Agency expense. Given the age of the server, replacement parts (which are proprietary) are likely to be hard to find, if not unavailable. The risk of system failure increases with age. The server runs Windows Server 2003. This operating system will soon be five generations old. Microsoft ceased offering mainstream support on this product on July 13, 2010. Because of "bugs" in that software, which Microsoft will no longer attempt to fix, our installation of Windows Server 2003 can be expected to eventually crash. To avoid costly downtime (reinstallation of the operating system entails 2-3 days of downtime for the entire Agency, and the turnaround time for purchase of a new server is 1-2 weeks), we need to order a new server in advance.

- Pedestrian Counter - We are charged by the federal government with planning for the region's transportation system, which includes all modes - not just cars. This includes pedestrians, cyclists, and transit riders. Our municipalities are required by the state's Complete Streets law (passed last year) to integrate all modes into every aspect of the transportation system, from planning and design to operation. Our data collection practices do not reflect this multimodal focus: they are skewed 100% in favor of the automobile. At present, we only collect data on vehicle counts, speed, type, etc. (we use this data for our own planning, and we provide raw data to our towns at their request for their purposes). Nobody in the Region counts pedestrians (or cyclists); as a result, they are invisible: we are unable to quantify the extent or describe the character of walking and biking in the region. As a result, we use traffic counts to plan for and support improvements for automobiles, but we have no such evidentiary basis to draw upon for projects beneficial to pedestrians and cyclists. Purchase of a pedestrian counter will be provided directly by our Transportation Planning Grant.

- Regional Planner - With the departure of our Senior Planner/Assistant Director, if we under-fill that position with a Regional Planner we have an opportunity to accrue some budget savings that could be used, with some other minor budget adjustments to the Health Insurance line, to bring the budgeted ½ time Regional Planner up to a full-time position at $42,000 annual salary (to be matched for the Transportation Planner). The budget adjustments required to make these changes are noted in the "Salaries & Payroll Taxes," and "Health/Life Insurance STD" lines, and will not result in any net change in the budget, as reflected in the "Contingency" budget line, which remains the same.

On that basis, it is my

RECOMMENDATION

that your Committee

Recommend that the Agency Board approve the amendments to the FY2010-2011 Budget described above and noted in the attachment.

c: Agency Board

Attachment: Budget showing proposed changes

Central Connecticut Regional Planning Agency
Fiscal Year 2010-2011

	ADOPTED BUDGET as of June 30, 2010	PROPOSED BUDGET for September 2, 2010
Revenues		
Municipal Contributions	91,500	91,500
Transportation Planning Grant	577,392	577,392
Paratransit Admin./Contractor	1,319,340	1,319,340
Paratransit System Advertising	0	1,000
R5EPT	500	500
CEDS	48,000	48,000
Pequabuck River Dam Removal	10,000	10,000
Bristol IHZ	0	15,000
CERT Support	8,000	8,000
Miscellaneous Revenues	6,200	6,200
Total Revenues	2,060,932	2,076,932
Expenses		
Salaries & Payroll Taxes	380,931	390,056
Retirement/Administration	12,461	12,461
Health/Life Insurance/ STD	125,634	119,764
D&O/Liability/Bonding Ins.	6,000	6,000
Accounting/Legal	14,500	14,500
Paratransit Contractor	1,229,340	1,229,340
Equipment Service Cont./Maint.	4,500	4,500
Equipment /Software Purchases	23,650	32,895
Telephone System $3,500		
Server $3,500		
Ped. Counters $2,450		
Rent	30,180	30,180
Office Cleaning	4,200	4,200
Telephone/Postage	6,500	6,500
Supplies	7,500	7,500
Training/Workshops/Sem./Conf.	10,500	10,500
Travel in State	13,000	13,000
Dues/Subscription	11,326	11,326
Publications	300	300
Advertising	4,000	4,000
CPC Referral Consultant	0	3,500
Pequabuck River Dam Removal	10,000	10,000
Miscellaneous Expenditures	9,400	9,400
Contingency	157,010	157,010
Total Expenses	2,060,932	2,076,932

CENTRAL CONNECTICUT REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
225 N MAIN STREET, SUITE 304, BRISTOL CT 06010 • WWW.CCRPA.ORG • 860.589.7820(P) • 860.589.6950(F)

DRAFT

September 2, 2010

To Whom it May Concern:

At its regular meeting on September 2, 2010, Town of Southington Staff gave the Central Connecticut Regional Planning Agency (CCRPA) Governing Board a presentation on the "Plantsville Beautification Project" plans dated April 2010, prepared by Weston & Sampson Engineers, Incorporated. The CCRPA Board appreciates the amount of effort and concentration that went into the preparation of these documents, and the potential they have to focus future efforts to improve the public community spaces in Plantsville, and to provide an attractive framework for the private development that will occur there.

The depth of thought and analysis upon which these plans are based provide a strong foundation upon which to base future Plantsville community development activities and projects.

The Agency wishes the Town well in its future work toward the realization of the lofty goals and visions contained in these plans, expresses its strong support for their implementation, and stands ready to provide assistance to the Town in that regard to the extent funding becomes available.

Yours very truly,

Carl J. Stephani
Executive Director

L:\Agency Board\!Supporting Documents\0902 PLantsville PLan Support.wpd

Project 0170-2758

PROJECT JUSTIFICATION:

PAVEMENT MANAGEMENT TASKS FOR A 3-YR TERM TO BE PERFORMED ON NHS ROADWAYS THROUGH 6/1/10 INCLUDE ANNUAL PAVEMENT CONDITION EVALUATION AND REPORTING, ANALYSIS OF PAVEMENT PERFORMANCE TRENDS AND REMAINING SERVICE LIFE, DEVELOPMENT OF OPTIMIZATION TOOLS FOR THE REHABILITATION AND RESURFACING PROGRAMS, OTHER WORK AS REQUIRED.
PC34007. PREVIOUS PROJECT WAS 170-2617.

Project 0170- 2759

PROJECT JUSTIFICATION:

PAVEMENT MANAGEMENT TASKS FOR A 3-YR TERM TO BE PERFORMED ON NON-NHS ROADWAYS THROUGH 6/1/10 INCLUDE ANNUAL PAVEMENT CONDITION EVALUATION AND REPORTING, ANALYSIS OF PAVEMENT PERFORMANCE TRENDS AND REMAINING SERVICE LIFE, DEVELOPMENT OF OPTIMIZATION TOOLS FOR THE REHABILITATION AND RESURFACING PROGRAMS, OTHER WORK AS REQUIRED.
PC34007. PREVIOUS PROJECT WAS 170-2616.

Region	FACode	Proj#	TempP#	AQCd	Rte/Sys	Town	Description	Phase	Year	Tot$ (000)	Fed$ (000)	Sta$ (000)	Loc$ (000)	Comments
70	NHS	0170-2758	0170-E130	X6	VARIOUS	STATE-WIDE	PAVEMENT MANAGEMENT ANALYSIS & DATA COLLECTION FOR NHS ROADWAYS. AC CONV	PE	2010	530	424	106	0	NEW PROJECT (WAS IN 2007 STIP)
70	STPA	0170-2759	0170-E134	X6	VARIOUS	STATE-WIDE	PAVEMENT MANAGEMENT ANALYSIS & DATA COLLECTION FOR NON-NHS ROADWAYS - AC CONV.	PE	2010	470	376	94	0	NEW PROJECT (WAS IN 2007 STIP)

REGIONS 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13

CODE KEY

01 Move projects from one year in the STIP to another year in the STIP
02 Fiscal constraint issues
03 Adjust existing projects for design schedule changes
04 Adjust existing projects for revised cost estimates
05 New Project
06 New Phase
07 Administrative Requirement
08 Delete phase
09 Delete project
10 Correction

Project 170-2868

Project Description (short): 27 (30 Characters)	UNDERWATER CE BR INSPECTION
Project Description (long): 253 (254 Characters)	Statewide: to fund various locations underwater inspection ON/OFF System Bridges. All inspections are being handled by an underwater consultant. This renewal project is for three years expiring 6/30/2012. It replaces 170-2687 which expires 06/30/2009.

Justification: 424 (1333 Characters)	The National Bridge Inspection Standards require the Department to complete an underwater inspection of all structures over 20 feet in length that crosses a water course. The structures that have water depths over 2.5 feet or a restricted access are completed by consultants. Bridge Safety and Evaluation manages this project. It is estimated that $2,856,260 will be required to fund this project over a three year period.

Region	FACode	Proj #	AQ Cd	Rte/Sys	Town	Description	Phase	Year	Tot $ (000)	Fed $ (000)	Sta $ (000)	Loc $ (000)	Comments	code for change
70	**BRX**	**0170-2868**	X6	VARIOUS	STATE-WIDE	CE BRIDGE INSPECTION - UNDERWATER ON/OFF	PE	2010	952	762	190	0	NEW PROJECT	**5***
70	**BRX**	**0170-2868**	X6	VARIOUS	STATE-WIDE	CE BRIDGE INSPECTION - UNDERWATER ON/OFF	PE	2011	952	762	190	0	NEW PROJECT	**5***

***New Project**

REGIONS 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13

Project 0110-0133

Project Description (short): 30 (30 Characters)	Pedestrian Safety Improvements
Project Description (long): 136 (254 Characters)	Pedestrian Safety Improvements in the area of Harry S. Fisher Elementary School and Eli Terry Jr. Middle School in the Town of Plymouth.
Justification: 417 (1333 Characters) Project Manager: Scott A. Roberts Project Engineer: Nick Ozkan	This project involves pedestrian safety improvements in the Town of Plymouth under the Safe Routes to School program (SRTS). Funding is 100% Federal and the project is capped at $455,000 with the maximum reimbursement to the City at $389,700. Approximately $25,000 of SRTS funding is req'd to cover the Dept's PE review and approximately $40,300 of SRTS funding is req'd to cover the Dept's Construction oversight.

RECEIVED

JUN 17 2010

Region	FACode	Proj#	AQCd	Town	Description	Phase	Year	Tot$ (000)	Fed$ (000)	Sta$ (000)	Loc$ (000)	Comments	code for change
09	SRSI	0110-0133	**X6**	PLYMOUTH	PEDESTRIAN SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS	PE	2010	25	25	0	0	NEW PROJECT	**5***
09	SRSI	0110-0133	**X6**	PLYMOUTH	PEDESTRIAN SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS	CON	2011	430	430	0	0	NEW PROJECT	**5***

***New Project**

CENTRAL CONNECTICUT REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
225 N MAIN STREET, SUITE 304, BRISTOL CT 06010 • WWW.CCRPA.ORG • 860.589.7820(p) • 860.589.6950(f)

MEMORANDUM

TO: Agency Board
FROM: Carl Stephani, Executive Director
DATE: August 20, 2010

FOR AGENDA: September 2, 2010

SUBJECT: Confirmation of appointment of Standing Committee Members and Chairs

The Agency's Bylaws establish the Program, Finance, and Personnel (PFP), and the Comprehensive Plan Committee (CPC) as Standing Committees. Bylaws Section V.D states that:

> "The Chairperson [of the Agency Board] shall be responsible for selecting all standing committee members and chairpersons, subject to confirmation by the Agency Board."

Bylaws Section VI.A states that:

> "Standing Committees shall be appointed at, or after, the Annual Meeting…"

Our Annual Meeting was held on June 3rd and Chairman Dudek has selected the following Standing Committee members and chairs for your confirmation:

	Chief Elected Official Rep. (PFP)	PC Rep. (CPC)	Representatives Appointed by the Town Councils for Towns with populations exceeding 50,000 - not on any standing committee
Berlin	Bart Bovee	Dennis Kern, Treas.	
Bristol	John Pompei, Vice Chair	Donald Padlo	Tim Furey
Burlington	Peter McBrien	Paul Rachielles	
New Britain	Donald Naples, Secretary	Steven P. Schiller	Craig Diangelo
Plainville*	David Dudek, Chair	Jennifer Bartiss-Earley	
Plymouth	Stephen Mindera	Carl Johnson	
Southington	vacant	Rudy Cabata	Paul Bedard

The Agency's Bylaws also establish a "Legislative Activity Committee" (LAC). Several years ago we used to appoint the full Agency Board as the LAC, but we have not done so recently; instead we have just dealt with individual legislative proposals as needed at the regular Board meeting. At the June 3rd Agency Board meeting it was suggested that the LAC be reconstituted for the coming legislative session. Chairman Dudek has not appointed members to the LAC at this time in anticipation of the discussion of the subject at this meeting.

On that basis, it is my

RECOMMENDATION

that your Board

Confirm the Standing Committee appointments noted above for FY2010-2011, or make appropriate adjustments.

CENTRAL CONNECTICUT REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
225 N MAIN STREET, SUITE 304, BRISTOL CT 06010 • WWW.CCRPA.ORG • 860.589.7820(P) • 860.589.6950(F)

MEMORANDUM

TO: Agency Board
FROM: Carl J. Stephani, Executive Director

DATE: August 20, 2010

FOR AGENDA: September 2, 2010

SUBJECT: Agency Representation on the R5EPT Board

On December 4, 2008, your Board appointed Melon Wedick to serve as the CCRPA representative on the R5EPT Steering Committee, which advises the R5EPT board, which itself is composed of the Chief Elected Officials from the 43 towns which lie within DEMHS Region V. Because Melon is leaving CCRPA, it would be appropriate to designate another of our technical staff to replace Melon.

On that basis, it is my

RECOMMENDATION

that your Board

Designate John Tricarico as the Agency's representative on the DEMHS R5EPT Steering Committee.

cc: Mayor Vinnie Festa

CENTRAL CONNECTICUT REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
225 N MAIN STREET, SUITE 304, BRISTOL CT 06010 • WWW.CCRPA.ORG • 860.589.7820(P) • 860.589.6950(F)

MEMORANDUM

TO: Agency Board
FROM: Carl J. Stephani, Executive Director

DATE: August 26, 2010

FOR AGENDA: September 2, 2010

SUBJECT: Information - Update: Waterbury Rail and Busway

You have asked to be kept up-to-date as far as developments related to the Busway and the Waterbury rail projects. In that regard, please see the following articles on the Busway, and on Congressional earmarks, which include our requests for funding NEPA scoping and a "Small Starts" grant application for the Waterbury rail project.

BUSWAY

"DODD, LIEBERMAN ANNOUNCE OVER $14 MILLION IN FUNDING FOR TRANSIT IMPROVEMENTS
08.23.10
WASHINGTON—Senators Chris Dodd (D-CT) and Joe Lieberman (ID-CT) today announced the awarding of $14,767,906 in four federal grants for transit improvement projects throughout Connecticut. The Connecticut Department of Transportation was granted the funds by the Federal Transit Administration for a series of projects benefitting Hartford, West Hartford, New Britain, Newington and Bridgeport.

"For years, we have been working to provide faster, more direct and reliable transit service to the most congested corridors and cities in Connecticut," said Dodd. "These funds not only bring us one step closer to completing the New Britain-Hartford Busway, but will also make critical improvements to the Bridgeport Intermodal Transportation Center, and help create jobs by continuing to grow Connecticut's fuel cell industry."

"It's important that we continue to spur economic activity in the state as the economy struggles to climb out of this recession," said Lieberman. "These projects will create work and make intra- and inter-city travel throughout the state more convenient and efficient."

Two grants totaling $5,930,112 will be used for land acquisition, professional services, and site work for the New Britain-Hartford Busway. The proposed Bus Rapid Transit facility would run along a 9.4 miles of active and inactive rail corridors between New Britain

and Hartford; provide service to New Britain, Newington and West Hartford; and include 11 stations with amenities.

Another grant provides $4,530,694 to CTTransit for fuel cell bus upgrades, purchasing an additional fuel cell bus, and facility improvements in Hartford.

The final grant provides $4,307,100 for improvements to the Bridgeport Intermodal Transportation Center, including a parking garage expansion."
Source: Senator Lieberman's Office

"HARTFORD COURANT - BUSWAY GRANTED $6M FOR LAND ACQUISITION
Wednesday, August 25, 2010 11:24 PM EDT
By James Craven
Staff Writer

NEW BRITAIN — With nearly $6 million more in federal funding released for the New Britain-Hartford busway, interest is growing in exactly where the buses will make their way through different parts of the city.

Although the buses will not run on city streets, the part of the line running through at least three local cemeteries has raised concerns the state Department of Transportation hopes to put to rest.

According to Judd Everhart of the DOT, the utmost respect will be in place while work is done in or near any cemetery.

"Let me say first and foremost, that there will be no disruption of any graves or anything like that in either Fairview Cemetery or St. Mary's Cemetery," Everhart said.
*

The busway will allow rapid transit on a 9.4-mile corridor between downtown New Britain and downtown Hartford, passing through Newington and West Hartford.

The busway will enter Fairview Cemetery at about 197 Smalley Ave. and continue northward along an abandoned rail line through the cemetery before exiting under Route 9.

Although early discussion evaluated the construction of a noise and visual barrier, that idea was abandoned by the DOT, city officials and the Cemetery Association earlier this year.

The current plan calls for the busway to run behind a 10-foot stone retaining wall topped by a 42-inch barrier.

Although the buses will be visible, the lower barrier was considered more visually pleasing than an 11-foot barrier on top of the stone wall.

During peak commuting hours, buses will pass through the cemetery every two to three minutes, according the DOT plan.

The busway follows an abandoned railroad right-of-way from New Britain to approximately 2,000 feet south of Newington Junction. From there, the busway corridor lies within the active Amtrak railroad right-of-way and is, for the most part parallel to the active Amtrak rail line.

A total of 11 transit stations will serve the users of the busway.

The project developers are coordinating with Central Connecticut State University to make provisions for a 12th station stop to support the proposed East Campus expansion.

A multi-use trail for bicycles will be constructed adjacent to the north/west side of the busway from downtown New Britain to the Newington Junction Station in Newington.

Earlier this week, U.S. Sens. Chris Dodd and Joe Lieberman announced that nearly $6 million became available for land acquisition, site work and professional services for the project."

"From: Sanders, Michael A [mailto:Michael.Sanders@ct.gov]
Sent: Friday, August 20, 2010 3:17 PM
To: Carl Stephani
Cc: Wright, Grayson A; Redeker, James P; Rivers, Lisa A; Lawrence, Maureen S
Subject: RE: Busway update

The project is progressing. 100% design submittals are due September 8. Review of those submittals will be completed and the project will be entered into the DOT's "bid machine" in November. FTA is still reviewing our submittals for the Full Funding Grant Agreement ...with the delay in receiving the FFGA, that will probably put off the start of utility work to the early winter and spring, and full construction into next summer."

WATERBURY-BERLIN RAIL

"The CT Mirror; August 23,2010; AN EARMARK FOR EVERYTHING FROM FATHERHOOD TO THE F-22A; By Deirdre Shesgreen
WASHINGTON -- Connecticut's congressional delegation has collectively submitted hundreds of earmark requests totaling more than $1 billion for fiscal year 2011.

The spending pleas range from relatively small line items, such as $75,000 for a fatherhood initiative that Rep. Chris Murphy submitted on behalf of a Danbury community program to more eye-popping sums such as the $160 million Sens. Chris Dodd and Joe Lieberman are seeking for Pratt & Whitney to make 15 spare engines for the F-22A Raptor.

So-called "earmarks," the special funding provisions that direct federal money to certain projects, may have become a pejorative word in some circles. And the public may be increasingly anxious about federal spending run amok.

Sen. Joseph I. Lieberman at Goodwin College in East Hartford. He is seeking $500,000 for the private college. (Mark Pazniokas)

But while Congress has moved to significantly reform the federal funding process, the new scrutiny and sour political climate hasn't seriously dampened the congressional appetite for snagging federal funds.

Connecticut's House and Senate members staunchly defend their spending requests, saying they are vital to protecting home-state interests and promoting economic growth. They say each request is carefully considered and heavily vetted, with only the most meritorious getting through.

"I won't leave it up to bureaucrats in D.C. to advocate for those [projects] that will have big impacts on our communities," said Murphy, a Democrat who hopes to get more than $60 million worth of federal funds for his 5th District. "I have encouraged Congress to tighten its budget ... so there will be fewer dollars for just as many worthy projects this year, but that doesn't mean I will stop fighting for economic development opportunities for the state."

Critics say the earmark process is more influenced by political muscle than project merit. For example, House and Senate leaders typically get more earmarks than rank-and-file members. Vulnerable incumbents also usually fare well, since an extra few million in federal funding to brag about back home can help bolster their re-election bids.

But defenders of these spending provisions say that eliminating earmarks would just shift spending decisions to Executive Branch officials, who don't necessarily know what the residents of Meriden or New Haven need. Lieberman and others also note that earmarks-even though they have gotten a lot of public attention-represent just a tiny slice of the federal budget, less than 1 percent of discretionary spending.

"Earmarks are a very small fraction of the federal budget," so they do not really contribute to out of control spending, Lieberman said. He noted that the Constitution gives Congress the power of the purse, and says he feels it is his representational duty to put in funding requests for needy constituents.

A spokesman for Dodd, Bryan DeAngelis, said the senator's office receives hundreds of requests for federal money every year, and the staff carefully reviews each project to see if it will create jobs or provide important services to benefit constituents.

Lieberman and Dodd top the delegation's spending request list with nearly $800 million each in specific appropriations, while Murphy and Rep. Jim Himes, D-4th District, are on the lower-end of the spending scale. (Lieberman also submitted funding requests for several national programs, asking, for example, for $50 million for the Teach for America program.) Many of the delegation's requests are overlapping, as lawmakers seek to shore up the prospects of a request by signaling delegation-wide support. But the range of spending requests reflects the scale of power in Congress, with senators and House leaders like Reps. John Larson, D-1st District, and Rosa DeLauro, D-3rd District, who sits on the House Appropriations Committee, likely to channel a larger pot of money back home because of their clout.

It's nearly impossible to say how the sums sought by Connecticut lawmakers stack up against other members of Congress, said Steve Ellis, vice president of Taxpayers for Common Sense, a nonpartisan group that has fought for greater transparency and limits on earmarks. While lawmakers now have to make their spending requests public, they do so in different formats. And there's no central database, making it hard to tally up and rank all 535 members of the House and Senate, Ellis noted.

Last month, the Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee approved a bill to create a searchable online database of all House and Senate earmark requests, with additional information about the project's intended beneficiary and updates about which ones get funded. As Ellis' group has described it, the bill would give taxpayers "cradle-to-grave knowledge of all these pet projects."

Lieberman, chair of that panel, voted in favor of bill. But it may not be a priority for this Congress, as lawmakers scramble to finish an already packed agenda before the fall campaigns.

Democrats have already significantly revamped the appropriations process. Since the 111th Congress began, lawmakers have had to post all their earmark requests on their websites, listing the amount requested and the justification. In the House, leaders have also trimmed back to total federal dollars that can be devoted to earmarks and instituted a ban on all earmarks for for-profit companies.

Rep. Rosa DeLauro is seeking $156 million in earmarks. (Mark Pazniokas)

House Republicans earlier this year called for a complete moratorium on earmarks, which most of their rank-and-file members are abiding by. But it expires at the end of this year, and it's unclear what GOP leaders would do if they win control of the House in the November elections. Republicans oversaw an explosion in earmarks when they were in power (disgraced Republican lobbyist Jack Abramoff once described the appropriations committees as "earmark favor factories"). But these spending provisions have tarnished both parties.

Ellis said the reforms, while not enough, have had an impact. He said the GOP ban in the House has led to a general decrease in earmarks in that chamber, although because many spending bills remain in limbo, it's too early to make a definitive assessment. Plus, the Senate has not been as eager as the House to limit these provisions. For instance, senators are still free to seek earmarks for for-profit companies.

Dodd and Lieberman have both done so. In addition to the Pratt & Whitney funds, for example, they are also hoping to snag $20 million so Electric Boat can put unmanned vehicles into its submarines. And among other requests, Lieberman has asked for funding for several drug companies, including nearly $10 million for New Haven's Keren Pharmaceuticals to develop a new way to combat strains of pandemic flu.

Lieberman said his office has trimmed its request list in light of the new attention to earmarks. "We've cut some out along the way that we thought wouldn't stand up in this climate," he said. His staff takes a closer look at requests from back home, he said, so "you're not going to be embarrassed by the fact that you asked for it."

Lieberman said he also conveys a new message to supplicants in Connecticut. "We tell people at home that it's getting harder and harder" to get earmarks approved, he said.

In the wake of the reforms, the delegation also drafted a guide for interest groups seeking federal funds, explaining how the process works and what information they have to provide.

"It used to be that someone would send you a sentence or two [about why they wanted federal money] and you submitted it like that," said Josh Zembik, a spokesman for Rep. Joe Courtney, D-2nd District. "Now, there are all these requirements. It's a much more cumbersome process."

“But a better one,” he added. The new rules have created a more streamlined, smarter approach to seeking such funds. For example, Zembik said lawmakers try to determine exactly how much federal money is needed for a project and how much they can realistically get, so instead of asking for $10 million, they may seek $300,000.

Rep. John Larson is seeking $118 million in earmarks. Sen. Chris Dodd is asking for $767 million. (Mark Pazniokas). "This isn't John McCain's old pork list," Zembik said, referring to the Arizona senator who is a leading critic of earmarks. "These are good projects."

He cited, for example, the $750,000 that Courtney recently secured in a House spending bill to help the town of Sprague to improve a seniors' housing center. The funds would, among other things, make the facility wheelchair accessible, so that disabled residents can get into the building from all parking areas, which is currently not possible, Zembik said.

Other delegation members' lists are replete with worthy-sounding projects, such as funds to reduce youth violence, to foster cutting-edge university research, or to bolster the state's energy technology sector.

DeLauro, for example, is seeking $2.28 million for the University of Connecticut to develop animal vaccines and diagnostics to help control and prevent diseases and $2.4 million for the Nature Conservancy in New Haven to collect and analyze data on climate change. Himes is asking for $500,000 for the Sound Marine Skills in Branford to help increase production of soft-shell clams,

which he says will help support Connecticut's maritime industry. And Larson's list includes $330,000 for Bristol to help improve flood mitigation, as well as $4 million for an effort by the University of Hartford, working with other public and private manufacturing partners, to develop unmanned military technology.

Ellis said lawmakers now look for a "sweet spot" in the appropriations process. "It's like Goldilocks," he said. "You don't want to ask for too little. You don't want to ask for too much. You want to ask for just the right amount."

Still, he and others said some of the Connecticut delegation's requests were likely to get scaled way back, given the heightened scrutiny of federal spending and tough political climate in Washington.

"There's a lot of wishful thinking going on here," Ellis said of the long lists submitted by lawmakers like Lieberman and Larson.

Lieberman, for one, didn't argue with that. "You have to assume that you're not going to get most of them," he said.