John L. Salomone
Town Manager

TOWN OF NEWINGTON

131 CEDAR STREET
NEWINGTON, CONNECTICUT 06111

MAYOR STEPHEN WOODS

NEWINGTON TOWN COUNCIL

Conf. Room L-101 (Lower Level) – Town Hall
131 Cedar Street

AGENDA
July 9, 2013
7:00 P.M.

I. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

II. ROLL CALL

III. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION – IN GENERAL **(In Person/Via Telephone)**

IV. REMARKS BY COUNCILORS

V. CONSIDERATION OF OLD BUSINESS **(Action May be Taken)**
- A. OPM Grant: Building Bridges Between Youth and Police Program

VI. CONSIDERATION OF NEW BUSINESS (Action May Be Taken Only by Waiving the Rules.)
- A. Report: MDC Blasting Project
- B. Discussion: Grant Funding, Garfield Street Reconstruction
- C. Discussion: Town Hall/Community Center Architect Selection
- D. Consideration of Canceling the August 27, 2013 Town Council Meeting

VII. RESIGNATIONS/APPOINTMENTS **(Action May Be Taken)**
- A. Appointments to Boards and Commissions
  1. Affordable Housing Monitoring Agency
  2. Balf-Town Committee
  3. Building Code Board of Appeals
  4. Central Connecticut Health District Board of Directors
  5. Newington Commercial Façade Easement Rehabilitation Loan Program Committee
  6. Clem Lemire Artificial Turf PBC
  7. Committee on Community Safety
  8. Conservation Commission
  9. Development Commission
  10. Downtown Revitalization Committee
  11. Employee Insurance and Pension Benefits Committee
  12. Environmental Quality Commission
  13. Board of Ethics

Phone: (860) 665-8510 Fax: (860) 665-8507
townmanager@newingtonct.gov
www.newingtonct.gov

14. Fair Rent Commission
15. Firehouse Expansion Project Building Committee
16. Housing Authority Board of Directors
17. Human Rights Commission
18. Library Board of Directors
19. NHS Track Renovations Project Building Committee
20. Open Space Committee
21. School Improvements Project Building Committee
22. Standing Insurance Committee
23. Tri-Town Community Access Cable Committee
24. Vehicle Appeals Board
25. Youth-Adult Council (Mayoral Appointment)
26. Zoning Board of Appeals

VIII. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS **(Action Requested)**
A. June 25, 2013

IX. WRITTEN/ORAL COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE TOWN MANAGER, OTHER TOWN AGENCIES AND OFFICIALS, OTHER GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES AND OFFICIALS AND THE PUBLIC

X. COUNCIL LIAISON/COMMITTEE REPORTS

XI. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION – IN GENERAL **(In Person/Via Telephone)**
(3 MINUTE TIME LIMIT PER SPEAKER ON ANY ITEM)

XII. REMARKS BY COUNCILORS

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

AGENDA ITEM: V.A.

DATE: 7-9-13

RESOLUTION NO._____

RESOLVED:

That the Newington Town Council hereby approves the acceptance of a grant of $10,000 from the Office of Policy and Management for purposes of funding a Building Bridges Between Youth and Police program and authorizes John L. Salomone, Town Manager, to make, execute and approve on behalf of the Town of Newington any and all contracts and amendments with regard to said grant.

MOTION BY:_____

SECONDED BY:_____

VOTE:_____

John Salomone
Town Manager

TOWN OF NEWINGTON

131 CEDAR STREET
NEWINGTON, CONNECTICUT 06111

OFFICE OF THE TOWN MANAGER

MEMORANDUM

To:	Newington Town Council
From:	John Salomone, Town Manager
Date:	July 05, 2013
Re:	MDC Project – Church Street

At the June 25 Town Council meeting, information was requested regarding the MDC blasting/project that will take place on Church Street later this month. Town Engineer Chris Greenlaw and an MDC representative will be in attendance at the July 9 Council meeting to discuss the project and address any Council questions.

Phone: (860) 665-8510 Fax: (860) 665-8507
townmanager@newingtonct.gov
www.newingtonct.gov

TOWN OF NEWINGTON

131 Cedar Street Newington, Connecticut 06111

John Salomone
Town Manager

Office of Town Engineer

Christopher Greenlaw P.E.
Town Engineer

Memorandum

To:	John Salomone, Town Manager
From:	Christopher Greenlaw, Town Engineer
Date:	July 05, 2013
Re:	CRCOG STP Urban Application (Phase II) – Garfield Street Reconstruction

---

The Capital Region Council of Governments (CRCOG) has solicited applications for Phase II of the STP Urban Project funding. The STP Urban (Phase II) funding is dedicated to projects proposing full depth reconstruction efforts including related appurtenances; walks, lighting, etc. CRCOG has set aside approximately $22,500,000 dollars for this Phase II solicitation. Each project (candidate) is allotted up to a maximum project cost of $2,500,000 for each application. Provided that the requirements and rating criteria are successfully met, a short list of Towns (Projects) will be categorized and notified accordingly. One of the requirements of the application is a council resolution. This resolution will acknowledge that the Town of Newington, upon successful award of funding will participate up to 10% or $250,000 dollars of the total Project costs. We (upon your authorization), will participate in this application process and propose that the Garfield Street Reconstruction Project be submitted.

Phone: (860) 665-8570 Fax: (860) 665-8577
www.newingtonct.gov

STP-Urban

Phase 2 Application Guidelines

Town or Agency: _____

Street: _____ Route No.: _____

Project Title or Name: _____

Contact Person: _____Phone Number: _____

Each proposal must include the following:

- ☐ **Resolution of the Town Council**
- ☐ **Completed Application Parts 1, 2 and 3 for Capital Improvement Projects**
- ☐ **Completed Application Parts 3 and 4, and your own cost estimate for Studies or other Nontraditional Projects** (an electronically fillable version of Part 4 is available on CRCOG's website)

General requirements:

- ☐ **Roadway Reconstruction project cost cannot exceed $2,500,000 total** ($2,000,000 federal share); **$3,500,000 total** ($2,800,000 federal share) **for City of Hartford projects**
- ☐ **Pavement Rehabilitation/Stand-Alone Sidewalk project cost cannot exceed $1,000,000 total** ($800,000 federal share)
- ☐ **Bicycle/ Pedestrian project costs cannot exceed $700,000 total** ($560,000 federal share)
- ☐ **Roads must be on the Federal-Aid system** (with the exception of off-road trails)

(Check your federal functional classification map or call Robert Aloise at 860-522-2217 x214)

- Urban areas: federal functional classification of ***collector*** or higher
- Rural areas: federal functional classification of ***minor collector*** or higher

- ☐ **Return 3 copies of this completed application to CRCOG by <u>4:00 p.m. on Wednesday, July 17, 2013</u>**

Return to: Jennifer Carrier
Director of Transportation
CRCOG
241 Main St.
Hartford, CT 06106

Part 1:

Project Description Guidelines

Each proposal must be fully and clearly defined. At a minimum the applicant must supply the following materials for each proposal:

I. Written Description of Proposed Improvement

Provide a brief written description of the proposed improvement and why it is needed.

II. Project Location Map

Indicate the general location of the project on a suitable map. (an 8 ½" x 11" sheet is adequate)

III. Preliminary Project Plans

Preliminary project plans, drawn at a scale of 1" = 100 feet or larger, should be submitted. The following items should be depicted on the plan or plans.

- All proposed improvements
  - drainage
  - culverts
  - sidewalks
  - traffic signals, etc.
- Existing edge of pavement
- Proposed new edge of pavement
- Project limits
- Existing property lines
- Proposed new property lines
- Utilities

This plan should be considered as a "conceptual" or "sketch" plan in which a high degree of accuracy is not required. An adequate base map for the plan would be your town assessor's maps (usually available on an air photo base at 1" = 100 feet) or an MDC quadrangle map (1" = 200 feet) enlarged to 1' = 100 feet.

IV. Preliminary Cross-Section

Provide one or more typical cross-sections (not to scale) depicting the following:

1. Pavement width (federal guidelines require at least 30 feet)
2. Sidewalk location and width
3. Utility pole placement
4. Snow shelf location and width
5. Right-of-way lines

V. Roadway Data

Provide the following information:

1. Traffic volumes: daily and peak hour

2. Speed data: posted speed, average vehicle speed, 85th percentile speed
3. Accident data (including pedestrian and bicycle accident data): latest 3 years available
4. Local design standards

VI. General

Provide the following information:

1. Any reports or engineering studies
2. Any news articles or public comments on the problem or project

VII. Additional Questions

In addition to the basic materials requested above, the applicant should answer the questions below which are intended to address basic issues about existing conditions, project management, impacts on private property, utilities, wetlands, etc. You may provide your answer in the space provided below or submit separate answer sheets.

(a) Functional Classification

Indicate the functional classification of the road as designated for the Federal-Aid system[1].

Urban Areas	Rural Areas
☐ Principal Arterial	☐ Principal Arterial
☐ Minor Arterial	☐ Minor Arterial
☐ Collector	☐ Major Collector
☐ Local (not eligible)	☐ Minor Collector
	☐ Local (not eligible)

(b) Design

1. Has any survey or design work already been done? Explain

2. Will the design be done by town forces or by a consulting firm?

(c) Rights-of-Way

1. Existing ROW (feet):

   Proposed ROW (feet):

   (50 feet is the minimum allowed in most federal projects)

2. Generally describe the nature and extent of the ROW impacts (e.g. 10-15 strip takes, 1 total)

[1] http://www.ct.gov/dot/LIB/dot/Documents/dpolicy/policymaps/fcl/pdf/fclpdf.pdf

3. If you anticipate that there will be ROW impacts, please supply the following:
    a. a copy of the zoning map for the area, and
    b. a copy of the assessor's map for the project area (including the parcel numbers)

4. How many takings will result in nonconforming lots that will require a zoning variance?

5. Do you anticipate any problems obtaining the zoning variance?

6. How many families and/or businesses will be displaced ?

(d) Pavement

1. Existing pavement type and width:

2. Will existing pavement be left as is, overlaid, reconstructed or recycled?

3. Proposed new pavement structure. Describe type & depth of each course including the base.

A typical DOT estimated pavement section is:

collectors	**arterials**	
3"	**4"**	HMA 0.5 inch
4"	**5"**	HMA 1.0 inch
12"	**12"**	Suitable subbase

(e) Utilities

1. List all utilities and their owners within the project area (gas, water, sewer, electric, telephone, cable TV, etc.) and indicate whether underground or overhead.

2. If any of these utilities are likely to be affected by the project, please explain the nature and extend of the impact.

3. Are there any plans to expand or improve existing utilities within the next five years?

(f) Storm Water Drainage System and Under Drains

Explain any existing storm water drainage problems, including any ponding or erosion issues, or deficiencies in inlet or culvert capacity. If you propose to modify, replace, or install a system, please indicate the nature and extent of improvements. Provide a rough estimate of the improvements needed (e.g. length of new storm sewer pipe, number of new catch basis, etc.)

(g) Culverts, Bridges & Other Crossings

Identify any existing crossings that are likely to be modified (e.g. extended), rehabilitated, or replaced as part of the project. Indicate the type of improvement needed and the reason for it. If any existing crossings have inadequate hydraulic capacity, please indicate:

(h) Railroad Grade Crossings

Identify any existing at-grade crossings and indicate if any modifications are needed.

(i) Sidewalks

Provide a rough estimate of the number of linear feet of sidewalk to be replaced or constructed. Specify the type of material and whether or not the sidewalk fills a gap or connects pedestrian destinations.

What percentage of the above is for "replacement" of existing sidewalk?

If you are submitting a stand-alone sidewalk project, identify the pedestrian user (i.e. elementary school children).

(j) Parks, Cemeteries, Historic Structures

Identify any parks, cemeteries, or historic structures that are likely to be affected by the project.

(k) Wetlands

Identify any wetlands that are likely to be affected by the project (Locate them on a map if that is more appropriate).

(l) Hazardous or Contaminated Sites

Identify any known or suspected sites that are likely to be affected by the project. If the project includes work in the vicinity of a gas station or other facility with underground storage tanks, the locations should be identified. (Locate them on a map if that is more appropriate).

(m) Traffic Signals

Identify any intersections where traffic signals will need to be modified, replaced, or installed. If it is an old signal you should consider replacement rather than modification in your cost estimate. Indicate who is responsible for maintenance, ownership, and electrical cost.

(n) Curbing

Provide a rough estimate of the number of linear feet of new curbing to be installed. Specify the type of curbing. If you are going to reuse existing granite curb, please indicate.

(o) Retaining Walls

If you anticipate using retaining walls, please provide a rough estimate of the height, length, and type of materials.

(p) Transit, Pedestrians, and Bicyclists

Identify existing Transit, Pedestrian and Bicycle usage in the project area, any area generators (schools, employers, recreational areas, etc.), and any transit stops in or near the project. Indicate if the area is identified in CRCOG's or the Municipality's bike or pedestrian plans, if the project in on the CRCOG bike network[2], and how the project will affect bike suitability as categorized on CTDOT's Bicycle Map[3].

Generator	Yes	No	TBD	Generator	Yes	No	TBD
Residential Areas (R)				Shopping Centers (M)			
Parks (P)				Hospitals/Clinics (H)			
Recreational Areas (RA)				Employment Centers (E)			
Churches (C)				Government Offices (G)			
Schools (S)				Local Businesses (B)			
Libraries (L)				Industrial Plants (I)			
Existing Bicycle Trails (BP)				Bus Routes (BR)			
Planned Bicycle Trails (PBP)				Public Trans. Facilities (T)			
Existing Sidewalks (SW)				Other (O)			

Include a map or location plan to illustrate the respective generator(s) using the letter codes identified above.

Identify if the proposed project supports the region's transit system and, if it is supportive, explain why.

Indicate if the proposed project supports bicycle mobility and safety and, if it is supportive, explain why.

Describe if the project closes any gaps in any existing system, or provides any unique or primary access between important destinations, such as: across a natural or manmade barriers; into or out of developments or employment center; or between communities or other significant destinations such as a university campus or recreational facility)

[2] http://www.crcog.org/transportation/bicycle/bp_plan.html

[3] www.ctbikemap.org/bikemap.html

(q) Environmental Justice

Identify if the project is within the environmental justice target area.

Explain how this project could potentially benefit low income and/or minority neighborhoods.

(r) Stakeholder Information

Provide a list of homeowners, business owners and community groups that may be affected or have concerns / inputs regarding the proposed project. Indicate if the any stakeholders have been contacted regarding the project and if there is any local stakeholder or public support.

Stakeholder Name	Role (e.g. community group, homeowner)	Phone No.

(s) Safety and Security

Identify if the project is on an emergency evacuation route and/or serves an emergency shelter.

(t) School Zone Safety

Identify if the project will address safety concerns in a school zone, and if so, explain how.

(u) Green Infrastructure

Identify if the project will incorporate any green infrastructure initiatives, and if so, explain.

(v) Leverages other Finances

Identify if the project has any existing financing in place. Identify the funding source, amount, and if additional STP-Urban funding will result in full funding of the project.

Part 2:

Cost Estimating Guidelines

All proposals for CRCOG's STP-Urban Program must include a cost estimate based on the general procedures provided below.

In order to develop a program of projects that we can finance within the limits of available funds, we must receive project cost estimates that are reasonably accurate and not subject to significant increases upon completion of design. Therefore, we are requiring the following:

1. **Detailed Estimate Required.** All estimates must be developed from a detailed list of construction contract items, estimated quantities of those items, and unit prices based on recent bid prices for similar projects. The sample cost data supplied in this document are in **English units**, however, a town may prepare its quantity and cost estimate using **Metric units**.
   - *Individual Unit Costs.* The recommended unit prices included in these guidelines are based on average unit prices for road improvement projects awarded by the Connecticut Department of Transportation (CTDOT). If a town chooses to use a different set of unit prices it must document that the prices are based on recent bids for projects that are similar in nature and scale. (pages 14 & 15)
   - *Composite Costs.* Some composite costs are included to simplify the cost estimating procedure. You may choose to use the composite costs in lieu of individual items and quantities. The composite costs are on page 16.
2. **Include Itemized Cost Sheet with Application.** An itemized cost estimate sheet must be included as part of the proposal.
   - A town may substitute its own cost estimating form for the list of contract items included in the guidelines.
3. **Use Specified Cost Factors.** All estimates must include the specified factors for minor items, inflation, contingencies, incidentals, and trafficperson hourly rates.
   - *Minor Items (30% or less)*: Minor items include materials and services not normally identified *early* in the design process. If a town has completed some design work and has developed a detailed list of items, and good estimates of quantities, the town may reduce the minor item factor from 30 percent to 15 percent. A town that has final plans available may reduce this factor to 0 percent. If less than 30 percent is used, justification must be provided. If structure costs are estimated with composite items, then Minor Items are not to be applied to the structure costs.
   - *Inflation (4% per year – assume 4 years)*
   - *Contingencies (10%)*
   - *Incidentals (25% - 30%)*: Incidentals include construction survey, construction inspection, redesign necessitated by problems found in the field, materials testing, & miscellaneous items. On small projects (less than $1,000,000) use 30 percent. On large projects (over $1,000,000) use 25 percent.

- *Trafficperson :* In many instances this item is largely underestimated. During the estimating process, Towns need to first determine who will be on site during construction (Police Officers or Uniformed Flaggers) and how long their services will be needed. In come cases, town ordinances dictate who controls construction project traffic. The estimated hours need to be multiplied by the following rates: State, Town (City) Police Officer - $75 per hour; Uniformed Flagger - $55 per hour.

  Example: Assume a construction duration of 5 months (100 days) and a need for 1 Police Officer and 1 Flagger.

  Police Officer: (100 days) x (8 hrs/day) x ($75/hr) = $60,000

  Flagger: (100 days) x (8 hrs/day) x ($55/hr) = $44,000

  Total Trafficperson Cost = $104,000

4. Lump Sum Items.

Environmental Considerations – Often times environmental contamination and treatment is overlooked or underestimated. Controlled materials handling and disposal are just a couple of the items that need to be considered when estimating projects. If you identified know or suspect sites under item (l) – Hazardous or Contaminated Sites on page 6 you must include the 'Environmental Considerations' multiplier in your estimate. If you are confident that there is no evidence of past or present contaminants, you do not need to include the environmental multiplier.

Cost Summary: PE, ROW, & Construction Costs

TOWN: _____

PROJECT: _____

1. Traditional Roadway Project on "Local" Road

	COST	Federal Share		State Share		Local Share	
Design [A]			80%		10%		10%
R.O.W. [E]			80%		10%		10%
Construction [B]			80%		10%		10%
TOTAL			---		---		---

2. Traditional Roadway Project on "State" Road

	COST	Federal Share		State Share[C]		Local Share[C]	
Design [A]			80%		20%		0%
R.O.W. [E]			80%		20%		0%
Construction [B]			80%		20%		0%
TOTAL			---		---		---

3. Pavement Rehabilitation / Stand-Alone Sidewalk Projects

	COST	Federal Share		State Share		Local Share	
Design			0%		0%	----	100%
R.O.W. [D] [E]			80%		0%		20%
Construction [B]			80%		0%		20%
TOTAL			---		---		---

[A] Typically 16 to 20% of Construction Costs (10% to 12% for Design, 6% to 8% for CTDOT Oversight)

[B] Enter Construction Cost from line 17 of construction cost summary sheet (page 13).

[C] Minimum State Share shall be 10%. On State roadways, CTDOT may increase the State Share to 20% to absorb a portion of (or all of) the traditional 10% Local Share.

[D] Stand-Alone Sidewalk Projects only.

[E] Include additional 10% for CTDOT Right-of-Way Administrative Costs.

Cost Summary: PE, ROW, & Construction Costs

4. Bicycle/Pedestrian Projects

Funding of off-road bike, pedestrian, or mutli-modal trails is eligible under this STP-Urban category. Wholesale streetscape projects and sidewalk rehabilitation projects are not considered eligible at this time. A project's streetscape elements such as benches and decorative lighting may be deemed non-participating and require local funding.

	COST	Federal Share		State Share		Local Share	
Design [(A)]			80%		0%		20%
R.O.W. [(E)]			80%		0%		20%
Construction [(B)]			80%		0%		20%
TOTAL			---		---		---

[(A)] Typically 16 to 20% of Construction Costs (10% to 12% for Design, 6% to 8% for CTDOT Oversight). Municipalities have the option of fully funding design costs in order to fully allocate the limited federal funding towards right-of-way and construction phases.

[(B)] Enter Construction Cost from line 17 of construction cost summary sheet (page 13).

[(E)] Include additional 10% for CTDOT Right-of-Way Administrative Costs.

Cost Summary: Construction Costs

Town: _____

Project: _____

1.	**Construction Items** (from your itemized estimate)		
	Lump sum items (estimate as % of line 1 using percentages suggested below)		
2.	**Clearing & grubbing**	**2%**	
3.	**Mobilization**	**7%**	
4.	**Maintenance & Protection of Traffic** (not including Trafficperson)	**4%**	
5.	**Construction Staking**	**1%**	
6.	**Environmental Considerations** (See page 10)	**12%**	
7	**Minor Items** (30% or less. See page 9)	**30%**	
8.	**Total Contract Items** (Sum of lines 1 thru 7)		
9.	**Contingencies** (10 % of line 8)	**10%**	
10.	**Contract items & contingencies** (Add lines 8 & 9)		
11.	**Inflation** (16% of line 10 - 4% per year for 4 years)	**16%**	
12.	**Contract items with contingencies and inflation** (Add lines 10 & 11)		
13.	**Incidentals** (30% of line 12; 25% for projects over $1,000,000)	**30%**	
14.	**Trafficperson** (See page 10)		
15.	**Utilities** (enter only if on State roads or MDC)		
16.	**Railroad force account**		
17.	**TOTAL CONSTRUCTION COST** (sum of lines 12 thru 16)		

For supplemental cost estimating information, see CTDOT website:
http://www.ct.gov/dot/lib/dot/documents/dcontractdev/ESTIMATING_ENGLISH.pdf

Individual Construction Items & Prices

1. PAVEMENT

	Unit	Cost/unit
HMA (0.25 inch to 1.0 inch) <100 tons	ton	120.00
HMA (0.25 inch to 1.0 inch) 100 - 1,000 tons	ton	100.00
HMA (0.25 inch to 1.0 inch) >1,000 tons	ton	70.00
Subbase	C.Y.	30.00
Processed aggregate base	C.Y.	35.00
Rolled gravel base	C.Y.	30.00
Formation of subgrade	S.Y.	3.00
Cut pavement - bituminous	L.F.	2.00
Cut pavement - concrete	L.F.	5.00
Material for tack coat	GAL.	2.00
Milling of Bit. Concrete 0-4"	S.Y.	5.00
Reclamation (10" Maximum Depth)	S.Y.	8.00
Pavement Recycling (4" Maximum Depth)	S.Y.	6.75
Removal of concrete pavement	S.Y.	11.00

2. EARTHWORK

Earth excavation - less than 500 cy	C.Y.	15.00
Earth excavation - 500 to 2,500cy	C.Y.	12.00
Earth excavation - 2,500 to 5,000cy	C.Y.	10.00
Earth excavation - more than 5,000 cy	C.Y.	8.00
Rock excavation - less than 500 cy	C.Y.	60.00
Rock excavation - 500 to 2,500cy	C.Y.	50.00
Rock excavation - 2,500 to 5,000cy	C.Y.	40.00
Rock excavation - more than 5,000 cy	C.Y.	30.00
Borrow - less than 500 cy	C.Y.	30.00
Borrow - 500 to 5,000cy	C.Y.	20.00
Borrow - more than 5,000 cy	C.Y.	15.00

3. DRAINAGE

Catch basin	EA.	2,500.00
Double grate catch basin	EA.	4,000.00
Complex basin (CM-2)	EA.	5,200.00
Catch basin top	EA.	650.00
Reset Catch basin	EA.	900.00
Manhole (new)	EA.	2,700.00
Manhole (reset)	EA.	600.00
Abandon Manhole or Catch basin	EA.	1,500.00
Class "A" concrete	C.Y.	900.00
Bedding material (< 100 cy)	C.Y.	40.00
Bedding material (100-1,000 cy)	C.Y.	30.00
Bedding material (>1,000 cy)	C.Y.	20.00
Riprap	C.Y.	75.00
Trench excavation (0'-4' deep)	C.Y.	10.00
Trench excavation (0'-10' deep)	C.Y.	12.00
Trench excavation (0'-15' deep)	C.Y.	15.00

Trench excavation (0'-20' deep)	C.Y.	18.00
Rock in trench excavation	C.Y.	100.00
Paved ditch	S.Y.	50.00
Sedimentation control system	L.F.	5.00
Sedimentation Chamber (10'x4')*	EA.	35,000.00
Sedimentation Chamber (13'x7')*	EA.	40,000.00
Sedimentation Chamber (18'x12')*	EA.	50,000.00
12" R.C. pipe	L.F.	45.00
15" R.C. pipe	L.F.	45.00
18" R.C. pipe	L.F.	55.00
24" R.C. pipe	L.F.	65.00
30" R.C. pipe	L.F.	80.00
36" R.C. pipe	L.F.	110.00
42" R.C. pipe	L.F.	120.00
48" R.C. pipe	L.F.	150.00
24" R.C. culvert end	EA.	1,000.00
30" R.C. culvert end	EA.	1,300.00
36" R.C. culvert end	EA.	1,500.00

4. GUIDE RAIL

Metal beam rail (type R-B 350)	L.F.	25.00
Metal beam rail (type R-B 350) - End Anchorage	EA.	1,000.00
Metal beam rail (type R-B 350) - Bridge Attachment (trailing end $700 ea.)	EA.	2,500.00
Three-cable guide railing (I-beam post)	L.F.	12.00
Merritt Parkway Guiderail (local roads only)	L.F.	60.00
Anchorages	EA.	1,000.00
Precast conc. median or Jersey barrier (21" X 45")	L.F.	100.00
Precast conc. median or Jersey barrier (30" X 45")	L.F.	120.00
Temporary precast conc. barrier (24" X 32")	L.F.	40.00

5. OTHER ITEMS

Bituminous concrete curbing (if new, consider adding pavement)	L.F.	5.00
Concrete curbing	L.F.	27.00
Granite curbing	L.F.	30.00
Reset granite curbing	L.F.	21.00
Cut concrete sidewalk	L.F.	5.00
Concrete sidewalk	S.F.	10.00
Concrete sidewalk(stamped/dyed)	S.F.	20.00
Brick sidewalk	S.F.	25.00
Concrete paving brick	S.F.	22.00
Bituminous concrete sidewalk	S.Y.	34.00
Bituminous concrete driveway	S.Y.	40.00
Sodding	S.Y.	10.00
Turf establishment	S.Y.	2.00
Furnish & place topsoil	S.Y.	5.00
Traffic signals - new ($225,000 if part of a city system)	EA.	110,000.00
Traffic signals- modification ($80,000 if major modification)	EA.	30,000.00
Temporary Signalization ($35,000 if not at existing signal)	EA.	3,500.00
Street lighting	L.F.	45.00

* Required per Stormwater Phase II General Permit (see DEP/DOT guidelines)

Selected Composite Items & Prices

1. PAVEMENT

(unit prices include HMA, tack coat, and formation of subgrade; excavation not included and must be calculated separately)

	unit	<4,000	4,000 - 40,000 SF	>40,000 SF
Arterial composite pavement cost: 4" HMA 0.5 inch on 6" HMA 1.0 inch on 14" Subbase in earth (in 20" rock)	S.F.	9.50 (12.25)	8.00 (9.75)	6.75 (8.00)
Collector composite pavement cost: 3" HMA 0.5 inch on 6" HMA 1.0 inch on 10" Subbase in earth (in 20" rock)	S.F.	7.75 (10.75)	6.50 (8.50)	5.50 (7.00)

	unit	<8,000 SF	8,000 - 80,000 SF	>80,000 SF
Overlay: 2" HMA 0.5 inch with tack coat (min. overlay)	S.F.	1.60	1.30	1.10

	unit	<5,000 SF	5,000 - 50,000 SF	>50,000 SF
Overlay: 3" HMA 0.5 inch with tack coat (structural)	S.F.	2.40	2.00	1.6

	unit	<4,000 SF	4,000 - 40,000 SF	>40,000 SF
Overlay: 4" HMA 0.5 inch with tack coat (structural expressway)	S.F.	3.10	2.60	2.10

2. STRUCTURES

	unit	unit price
Bridges - New (per sq. ft. of deck area)	S.F.	380.00
Bridges - Deck rehabilitation (per sq. ft. of deck area)	S.F.	100.00
Bridges - Deck replacement (per sq. ft. of deck area)	S.F.	130.00
Bridges - New superstructure-including deck (per sq. ft. of deck area)	S.F.	180.00
Bridges - Removal of superstructure over roadway	S.F.	55.00
Bridges - Removal of superstructure over water or rail	S.F.	75.00
Concrete Modular Walls / Mechanically Stabilized Earth Walls (sf estimate of exposed face)	S.F.	60.00
Cast-in-place concrete wall (sf estimate of exposed face)	S.F.	100.00
Precast box culverts (Estimate per sq. ft of top face; Length X Width)	S.F.	210.00

3. DRAINAGE

(Unit prices include surface runoff and CB's; doesn't include cross culverts or sedimentation chambers)

	unit	unit price
Compact Urban Area - Full Drainage Improvement (total cost / area of pavement)	S.F.	6.60
Suburban Area - Full Drainage Improvement (total cost / area of pavement)	S.F.	4.40
Suburban Area - Upgraded Drainage & Rural Drainage (total cost / area of pavement)	S.F.	2.20

Rev. 2/13

Part 3:

Project Rating Information

Part 3 outlines the *rating information* an applicant must provide for each proposal. The data will be used to rate your project on the basis of the predetermined criteria. Please provide full documentation for each of the criteria listed below.

1. Structural Improvement: Pavement, Drainage, Bridge/Culvert (15 points)

The structural improvement rating provides an indication of the extent to which the project will help correct or reduce a structural problem with a road, a bridge, or a culvert. A town must provide documentation of: (1) the existing structural problems, and (2) how the proposed project will correct the problem. The town should provide any available deficiency ratings such as the town's own pavement condition inventory or the State's ratings on local bridges. Photographs would also be helpful. The town should also describe how the project will address each of the deficiencies it identifies.

For pavement projects, please attach core or test pits data to provide a representative sample of the existing roadway conditions. If varying pavement conditions exist along roadway indicating the possibility of different pavement conditions, a core/test pit should be performed in each roadway section. Pavement thickness and type, subbase thickness and type, and the presence of fines and/or groundwater should be noted.

CRCOG staff will review the documentation on each project. They will then rate each project based on their professional judgment, the general criteria listed below, and the town's documentation.

General criteria: (indicate existing conditions & conditions after improvement)

Roadway Pavement:	pavement condition rating (e.g., good, fair, poor)
Roadway Drainage System:	adequacy of subsurface drainage system (water in base?) adequacy of surface drainage system (icing or ponding?)
Bridges & Culverts:	bridge condition rating (super structure, deck) hydraulic capacity (adequate for 25, 50, or 100 year flood?)

When assigning a project rating, staff will consider the range of existing problems (pavement, drainage, and culvert/bridge), the severity of the problems, and the degree to which the problem will be reduced.

2. Traffic Improvement: Flow, Safety, & Geometrics (15 points)

The traffic improvement criterion provides an indication of whether or not the proposed project will help improve traffic flow, traffic safety, or roadway geometrics. The applicant must provide documentation of: (1) the nature and severity of the existing problems, and (2) how the problems will be corrected by the proposed project. CRCOG staff will review the documentation and determine whether the improvement qualifies as major, moderate, minor, or none.

Points to address in documentation:

	Existing Problem	Proposed Improvement	Appropriate Criteria
Traffic Flow	Is there an existing **congestion** problem? What is the severity of the problem?	Will the proposal reduce the congestion problem? To what degree will it reduce it?	**Level-of-service (LOS)** before & after the proposal is implemented. Highway Capacity Manual procedures recommended but not required.
Traffic Safety	How many **accidents** occurred in the last **3 years**? Provide accident records, summary of accident types, or collision diagrams.	How many of those accidents would the proposed project have eliminated (**3 years**)?	Expected **accident reduction** over a **3-year** period.
Roadway Geometry	Are there any **geometric deficiencies** on the road? Examples: excessive grade, substandard width, excessive horizontal curvature, poor sight line, improper super elevation. Describe the problems & their severity.	Will the proposed project correct the problem and to what degree?	Indicate degree of improvement in appropriate measure such as: expected improvement in sight distance, or increase in design speed from 25 to 35 mph.

3. Traffic Volume or Transit Ridership (15 points)

This criterion provides a general indication of the number of people who benefit from the proposed project. Measurement method is dependent on the type of project proposed. For roadway improvement projects, the applicant must supply data on either the annual average daily traffic (AADT) or the peak hour volume of traffic (PHV). For transit projects, the applicant must supply data on the number of transit riders who will benefit from the project. For projects other than road or transit improvements, the applicant must provide some other estimate of the number of people who will benefit and give an explanation of how the estimate was prepared. Submit documentation on one of the following:

1. **ADT,**
2. **PHV,**
3. **Transit Riders**

When using ADT, the score is calculated by the following formula:

Score = ADT/12,000 x 15

(where ADT = Average Daily Traffic, and the maximum ADT that will be considered is 12,000)

4. Regional Significance (15 points)

Regional significance provides an indication of how widespread or localized the *transportation* benefits of the project are. The applicant must describe the area of impact of the project. For

example, does the project benefit only a very small area, an entire town, multiple towns, or most of the region? A proposal can also receive rating points if it helps improve access to regional **public** facilities such as hospitals, colleges, and airports; on an evacuation route; or to an emergency shelter.

The applicant should provide documentation on (1) the size of the area that benefits from the proposed project, and (2) information on any regional **public** facilities that benefit from the proposed project. The documentation should demonstrate how the area or regional facilities benefit.

CRCOG staff will review the documentation and determine whether the project qualifies as regional, subregional, townwide, or localized.

5. Other Benefits (6 points)

Proposals can receive up to six extra points if the proposed project has any of the benefits listed below.

- **Environmental & Historic Preservation** (maximum 2 points)

  If the project will have a positive environmental impact, or will serve to advance recognized historic preservation goals of the community, the project is eligible for additional points. When considering environmental benefits, CRCOG staff will consider a wide range of potential environmental improvements such as air quality, water quality & flow, wetlands mitigation, open space improvements, etc.

- **Economic Development** (maximum 2 points)

  Projects that help the economic development goals of the community will receive additional points.

- **School Zones** (maximum 2 points)

  Projects that assist in addressing vehicular, pedestrian, or bicycle safety in school zones.

6. Municipally Owned Arterial or Collector Road (10 points)

A proposal will be awarded 10 extra points if the project is located on an arterial or collector road that is owned by the municipality (as versus State ownership).

7. Sustainability (17 points)

Proposals can receive up to 17 extra points if the proposed project has any of the benefits listed below.

- **Traffic Calming** (maximum 3 points)

  If the project will have a positive effect on reducing vehicular travel speeds, altering driver behavior and/or reducing the negative effects of automobile use, the project is eligible for additional points. When considering traffic calming benefits, CRCOG staff will evaluate a wide range of potential traffic calming improvements such as speed humps, reduced lane width, streetscaping elements, or other measures appropriate to the type of street. Proposals should indicate the severity of the existing problem and the degree to which the proposed improvements will reduce the problem.

- **Transit Supportive** (maximum 3 points)

  If a proposal benefits the region's transit system or transit users it can receive up to an extra three points. Proposals should indicate if bus shelters are being proposed or if sidewalks to bus stops are being improved or installed.

- **Pedestrian Supportive** (maximum 3 points)

  Proposals that improve pedestrian mobility and/or safety will receive up to three additional points. Proposals should indicate pedestrian measures that are being proposed such as new

sidewalks, crosswalks, or pedestrian traffic signal equipment and how the measures will improve pedestrian safety.

- **Bicycle Supportive** (maximum 3 points)

  If the project helps to improve the mobility and safety of bicyclists, or helps achieve the goals of the Regional Bicycle Plan, it can receive up to an extra three points. Proposals should indicate how bicycle provisions (i.e. pavement striping to provide exclusive bicycle lane) will advance the vision of safety, convenience and improved linkages. Considerations should be given to the viability of reducing vehicle lane widths (for example from 12' to 11'), where appropriate, to provide additional shoulder width for cyclists.

- **Green Infrastructure** (maximum 5 points)

  If the project includes the implementation of new technologies and methodologies that reduce environmental impacts associated with transportation infrastructure, it can receive up to an extra five points. These new initiatives seek to reduce stormwater runoff and associated pollutants, promote the use of recycled materials, bring natural elements into streets, reduce "heat island" effects, and improve the access and accommodations for pedestrians and bicycles.

  Green Streets strategies include the use of permeable pavement, bioslopes and bioswales, bioretention cells, and vegetated filter strips to reduce and filter stormwater runoff. Additional strategies to reduce environmental impacts include use of reclaimed or recycled pavements and integration of natural elements into streets. Additional strategies to reduce environmental impacts include use of in-place reclaiming of existing pavements for use as a road granular base on lower-volume roads, partial depth cold-in-place recycling of pavements up to 8,000 ADT, use of reclaimed asphalt pavement (RAP) into hot-mix-asphalt, warm-mix asphalt (WMA) technology, and integration of natural elements into streets.

8. Derived from Corridor Study (4 points)

A proposal will be awarded up to four extra points if the project is the result of a recommendation from a corridor study initiated through CRCOG.

9. Environmental Justice (8 points)

A proposal will be awarded up to eight extra points if the proposed project benefits low income and/or minority neighborhoods. A map of the environmental justice target areas reflecting 2010 census data is attached to this document.

10. Leverages other Finances (5 points)

A proposal will be awarded up to five extra points if the proposed project leverages other finances. Leveraging other finances is defined as using STP-Urban funds to supplement other existing funds to fully fund a project. The number of points awarded will depend on how complete the planning or design processes are. To receive points, the existing funding must be secure and cannot be in the form of an earmark. With difficult financial times expected, multiple funding sources will offer great flexibility towards completion of projects.

It is up to each applicant to provide a description and explanation of how they meet any of these criteria. CRCOG staff will review each application and determine the number of points warranted for the benefits described by the applicant.

Rating Criteria (Nontraditional; Bicycle and Pedestrian; Pavement Rehabilitation / Stand-Alone Sidewalk Project):

Since the proposed project rating system might not be well suited to rating nontraditional, bicycle and pedestrian projects, pavement rehabilitation projects, and stand-alone sidewalk projects, CRCOG staff will evaluate these project using selected rating criteria listed below.

Nontraditional projects will be evaluated on an individual basis. Projects that demonstrate air quality benefits and environmental justice goal advancement will be given special consideration. CTDOT is currently in the process of updating their policies for initiating studies. It is anticipated that up to two (2) selected studies will be forwarded to CTDOT each October for review, approval, and initiation.

Pavement rehabilitation projects will be evaluated on, but not limited to, the following criteria: structural deficiencies including existing roadway issues, pavement deficiencies, and above surface drainage issues (such as ponding); traffic volumes based on average daily traffic (ADT) or peak hour volume of traffic (PHV); regional significance including how widespread or localized the benefits of the project are; whether the project was derived from a corridor study; and project location in relation to environmental justice areas. In support of complete streets, considerations should be given to the viability of reducing vehicle lane widths (for example from 12' to 11'), where appropriate, to provide additional shoulder width for cyclists.

Bicycle and Pedestrian projects and Stand-alone sidewalk projects primarily rated on their ability to improve bicycle and pedestrian mobility and safety. These projects will be evaluated, but not limited, to the following criteria: the user (i.e. elementary school children, handicap individuals, teenagers, commuters), whether or not the improvement fills a gap or connects destinations, right-of-way impacts, safety benefit to the community, and the effectiveness in providing alternatives to driving. Whether or not the project was derived from a corridor study, and addresses environmental justice issues will also be considered.

Draft Resolution for 07/09/2013 – Garfield Street Reconstruction

A Resolution to Submit an Application to CRCOG for Garfield Street Reconstruction

WHEREAS, the Capital Region Council of Governments has solicited municipal projects in order to distribute $22,500,000 million in Federal funding that is expected to be available for road improvement projects through the Federal Surface Transportation Program; and

WHEREAS, Garfield Street is eligible for funding under this program.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that, the Newington Town Council hereby authorizes the Town Manager, John Salomone to submit an application for funding up to the amount of $2,500,000 to the CRCOG Transportation Committee to Reconstruct Garfield Street from the Garfield Street Bridge east toward Audubon Ave; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that, should funding for said plan be approved, the Newington Town Council will fund 10% of the design, ROW and construction costs of this project of $250,000 as required by project guidelines.

John Salomone
Town Manager

TOWN OF NEWINGTON

131 CEDAR STREET
NEWINGTON, CONNECTICUT 06111

OFFICE OF THE TOWN MANAGER

MEMORANDUM

To: John Salomone, Town Manager

From: Jeff Baron, Director of Administrative Services

Date: July 03, 2013

Re: Town Hall/Community Center Architect

The Town Hall Renovations Project Building Committee met on July 1st and discussed the qualification statements received from those firms interested in becoming the Project Architect for the Town Hall Renovations and Community Center project. Thirteen firms submitted qualifications statements in response to the Town's request. The Project Building Committee agreed to interview three of those firms, Amenta/Emma Architects of Hartford, Jacunski Humes Architects of Berlin, and Kaestle Boos Associates of New Britain. These interviews will be held on July 15th.

This project is expected to involve the construction of a new Mortensen Community Center, to house the Parks and recreation Department and its activities, along with renovations to those sections of the Town Hall that are in need of improvement to address code violations, HVAC/plumbing/electrical deficiencies, significant roof leaks, and other issues that have been identified in previous studies of the building. Downes Construction of New Britain will serve as Construction Manager at Risk for this project and the Committee is now looking to make a recommendation to the Town Council on selection of an architect to develop the necessary plans and complete the design team.

The Committee expects to make a formal recommendation to the Town Council shortly after the interviews are completed. Please place this matter on the Town Council's agenda for discussion at the Council's July 9th meeting and for action on the Council's July 23rd meeting, in order to keep this project moving forward in a timely manner. The Committee hopes to be able to request approval for a referendum date from the Town Council for early 2014. To meet this schedule an architect should be retained by August 1 in order to have the time needed to work with the Construction Manager and the Committee to develop plans to a sufficient level that the Construction Manager can provide effective estimates and generate the Guaranteed Maximum Price necessary for the referendum.

TOWN OF NEWINGTON

TOWN HALL RENOVATION PROJECT BUILDING COMMITTEE

MEETING MINUTES

July 1, 2013

LOWER LEVEL CONFERENCE ROOM L101, TOWN HALL

I. Call to Order –the meeting was called to order at 5:40 PM by Chairperson McBride.

II. Roll Call – Members present: Scott McBride, Chairperson; Myra Cohen; Beth DelBuono; Pam Raynock; Jen Win-Johnson and Bill DeBlasio. Others present: Members of the public; Lou Jachimowicz, Chief Finance and Operations Officer; and Jeff Baron, Director of Administrative Services.

III. Public Participation – None.

IV. Approval of Prior Meeting Minutes – Mrs. Cohen made a motion that the minutes of the June 3, 2013 meeting be approved as presented. A second to the motion was provided by Mr. DeBlasio. The motion passed unanimously.

V. Determine Architect Respondents to be Interviewed – Thirteen firms responded to the Town's Request for Qualifications. All thirteen were determined to be qualified. Based on their individual review of the thirteen qualifications statements, each member identified the firms that they preferred, generally based on the information in each statement and projects of a similar nature each firm had been involved with previously. The Committee agreed by consensus to interview three firms. They are, in alphabetical order, Amenta/Emma Architects of Hartford, Jacunski Humes Architects of Berlin, and Kaestle Boos Associates of New Britain.

VI. Architect Interview Process – Interviews will be held in Conference Room L101 on Monday July 15, 2013. The meeting will start at 5:30 PM and the first interview at 5:45. Mr. Baron will schedule interviews and prepare questions. The questions will be distributed to the entire Committee. Fee proposals will be requested for the previous business day, July12th, and will also be distributed to the Committee members for review prior to the interviews. The format will be similar to the Construction Manager interviews. Each firm will be asked to address their pre-referendum experience, provide a list of their current projects, to discuss their occupied building experience, and the method that they use to present information to the citizens of the Town about the project.

VII. Any Other Business Pertinent to the Committee – Mrs. Cohen stated that it was now her opinion that the proposed location of the Community Center was too far away from the other Town buildings to be considered part of the Town Hall campus. She feels the architect should be allowed to consider relocating the bus garage and exploring the possibility of putting the new Community Center at that location. Mr. McBride noted that this concept had already been discussed and that the decision had been reached on the location for the Community Center. He encouraged members to look forward and focus on the matters in front of them rather than looking backwards and revisiting topics and matters that had already been decided.

VIII. Public Participation – Rose Lyons, 46 Elton Drive. She feels that she has been following the procedure pretty well to date. She asked the Committee to verify that the architect was being hired to design both the Town Hall and the Community Center. She asked if there was a timeline for the referendum. She noted that she had favored changes earlier that included taking the library's plans into account.

Don Woods, 82 Ivy Lane, Chairman off the Board of Parks and Recreation. He asked if, during the process for the new Community Center, the entire potential for the site would be considered or just what is being done today. He noted that the Mill Pond pool and the fully accessible playground were not planned to be relocated until after the project was completed. Their requirements would need to be accommodated.

IX. Committee response to public participation – Mr. Baron stated that the architect would be doing the design for both the Town Hall and the Community Center. The architect, as part of their investigation, would be informed about the Town's future plans to relocate the pool and the playground, as well as the library and the need for improved parking. Mr. McBride stated that whatever is done will be done in the best interests of the Town and the entire campus. The referendum is anticipated for February. An architect will not be selected until the end of July at the earliest. A November referendum is no longer realistic.

X. Adjournment – the meeting adjourned at 6:40 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Jeff Baron

Jeff Baron
Director of Administrative Services

John Salomone
Town Manager

TOWN OF NEWINGTON

131 CEDAR STREET
NEWINGTON, CONNECTICUT 06111

OFFICE OF THE TOWN MANAGER

MEMORANDUM

To:	Newington Town Council
From:	John Salomone, Town Manager
Date:	July 3, 2013
Re:	Consideration of Canceling an Upcoming Meeting

The subject of cancelling the August 27 Town Council Meeting is on Tuesday evening's agenda for discussion, followed by possible action on July 23 or August 13. The Council has, in the past, voted to cancel an August meeting if there are no pressing matters for consideration. A special meeting can be called in the event of any emergency or pressing matter that may arise after the cancellation.

Phone: (860) 665-8510 Fax: (860) 665-8507
townmanager@newingtonct.gov
www.newingtonct.gov