



MINUTES
NRPC TRANSPORTATION TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
08/19/09
APPROVED

Members Present:

Bill Parker, Town of Milford
Roger Houston, City of Nashua
Steve Dookran, City of Nashua
Joe Mendola, City of Nashua
Mark Sousa, Nashua Transit
Lucy St. John, City of Nashua
Kristi Gillette, Nashua Transit

Jeff Babel, Town of Hollis
Tad Putney, Town of Brookline
Jean Marie Kennamer, City of Nashua
John Cashell, Town of Hudson
Bruce Berry, Town of Amherst
Jeff Gowan, Town of Pelham
Jeffrey Santacruce, Greenman-Pedersen

Others Present

Tim Roache, Principal Transportation Planner
Julie Chizmas, Transportation Planner
Matt Waitkins, Transportation Planner
Karen M. Baker, NRPC Administrative Assistant

CALL TO ORDER AND INTRODUCTIONS

Tim Roache opened the meeting at 12:12 and proceeded with introductions around the table.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FROM THE MAY 18TH 2009 MEETING

Roache referred to the minutes of June 17th 2009 included in the agenda packet and asked for a motion to approve. Sousa moved to approve the minutes of June 17, 2009 with a second from Houston. All were in favor and the motion passed.

TRANSPORTATION ENHANCEMENTS (TE) PROCESS AND DRAFT SCORING CRITERIA

Roache reminded the group that the deadline for TE applications was less than a month away. He also reminded the group of the last TE workshop being held that evening at the DOT in Concord at 6:30pm which if anyone had not attended a workshop, this was the last and a requirement of the TE process. In addition, the deadline for applications is 3:00pm on Tuesday, September 15th. Postmarked applications will NOT be accepted, but an E-version would be okay with the paper copy to follow.

Chizmas clarified some discrepancies emailed to her from William Rose at DOT that were brought to his attention regarding the Guidance Review Document and slide presentation shown at the workshops:

- Deadline for submission of applications to both the RPC's & NHDOT is 3pm (**NOT** 3:30pm as shown on slide presentation) on Tuesday, September 15. The Guidance Document clearly identifies a 3:00pm deadline
- Postmarked by September 15th will **NOT** count as the meeting submission deadline. Only E-versions of the application w/all attachments scanned in will be accepted with paper copy to follow
- Hours of operation at DOT's John O Morton Building are from 8am-4pm.
- There is a discrepancy re: points under criterion #2. The application identifies a maximum 10.5 points available (each item worth 1.5 points), while the guidance identifies each item as being worth 2.5 points apiece for a total of 15 points. There are 7 sub criteria under criterion #2, 15 points is not possible ($7 \times 2.5 = 17.5$). For scoring purposes, the points assigned to criterion #2 in the application will be the awarded amount.

Also noted during this discussion:

- There is one project not eligible from the Town of Hollis

- One State project in the amount of \$55,000 was not included in the summary of projects

Chizmas proceeded to review the scoring criteria included in the agenda packet and asked if anyone had any questions or issues with the criteria that would be used to score the applications. Roache added that the goal was to make it fair to everyone. Parker asked if there was going to be any weighting in the categories. Roache said he would like to keep it simple. Putney said it could easily be over-engineered.

Roache said he would like to find 2 to 3 Commissioners from the full Commission to use this criteria to score and preferably from a town that does not have a project with the hope of setting up a neutral scoring process. Houston wondered if a smaller town would be bias against the bigger towns in the region. He added that whoever is chosen should be familiar with the region as well as the criteria in order to balance it out. Santacruz referred to an instance where all the Commissioners were required to ride to all the different towns in the region to see where the projects were. Putney asked if they would be scoring as individuals or as a group. St. John understood some concerns that Houston had with urban population and area vs rural population and area and offered some suggestions.

Roache wanted to make sure everyone was comfortable with the criteria as presented. Putney asked if Roache knew how other regions in the same situation with urban vs. rural have addressed this and suggested checking with Keene and the smaller towns that surround Keene. Roache said he could add 1 or 2 more criteria regarding population density and traffic. Roache asked the group to use the current criteria as a core to build their applications and that he would search other criteria to address their concerns. Houston suggested a special meeting to address the concerns. Roache reminded the group that there is 45 points on the line at the State level for the top ranking project and said that he would get a consensus via email first and if needed, he would call a special meeting.

Roache reminded the group of DOT's public input process requirement and emphasized to the group that they have documentation that this was done. St. John asked if something more current was necessary. Roache said it has to be specific to the application being submitted for this round of TE projects. Chizmas re-emphasized the importance of the public input process requirement and read from the DOT Guidance document.

In response to St. John's questions, Roache clarified that there was the possibility of only 1 project being accepted per RPC region, but there is also the possibility of getting 2 projects accepted per region based on the how much is in the budget. St. John asked if there was an application limit dollar amount. Chizmas said there is 6 million in funds and the suggestion is that if it is a large project, that is be broken into segments or phased over several TE rounds. Roache asked there were any further questions and reminded that group that NRPC staff was available to help.

3RD BRIDGE CROSSING OVER THE MERRIMACK RIVER

Roache informed the group that this agenda item was included today because it was one of the items on the agenda 50 years ago with NRPC. He continued saying that he wanted to form a sub-committee to look at previous discussions, components, etc and that it would also be talked about at the Executive Committee and full Commission level. He referred to a discussion he had recently with a member of the Hudson BOS who said that part of this issue with a 3rd bridge crossing over the Merrimack River is that there was never any discussion between both sides on where the bridge should go.

Houston asked if there has been any discussion of resurrection of the North Bridge. Roache said not to his knowledge and last word he heard was before Williams left, that Beazer was looking to resurrect.

Roache continued that he wants to have more discussions to see if there are any unturned stones and to try to find a way to let people know that there will be an impact to someone if there is not a 3rd bridge crossing. Political support at the local level would be necessary to iron out the issues.

TTAC MEMBERSHIP UPDATE

Roache passed around a copy of a prospectus which explained how the TTAC membership was structured at this time and he referred to the NRPC By-Laws (available on our website) which outline the regulations. All of which can have implications on the TE Process as well as other important processes. Roache wanted everyone to understand this and wanted to know who is casting vote when it comes to TE or when it comes to money. He passed around a spreadsheet of everyone in TTAC and how they are designated (mailing, voting, alternate, etc.). He informed the group that he would be sending letters to the towns regarding appointments, reappointments, resignations for TTAC members by Board of Selectmen, Town Council, or Board of Aldermen with the hope to have the membership list sorted out by Fall. Sousa suggested a letter to the Mayor instead of the BOA to get the process done quicker. Houston thought there might be something in the RSA's that says Nashua Planning Board appoints TTAC members, but would check into this. Parker asked if Roache would want an alternate. Roache said "Yes".

ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATION POLICY

Roache informed the group that once the TTAC appointments have been nailed down, NRPC would be switching over to electronic copies for TTAC mailings. Sousa said that NTS recently had this same discussion and felt it was a good idea. Houston and Dookran had some concerns saying they prefer paper copies. Roache said they could be made available for those with concerns.

ACTION ITEM: ENDORSEMENT OF THE HOLLIS SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL APPLICATION

Waitkins reviewed the SRTS steps for applying for funding and the three different types of applications and dollar amounts associated. The Hollis application was for a Travel Plan which was reviewed by NRPC staff and scored 47 out of 50 points. He added that the task force (which is one of the requirements) was well represented. Roache said NRPC stands to benefit by TTAC endorsing the application because we do the travel plan and will get paid for it. After further discussion, it was moved by Jeff Babel and seconded by Jeff Gowan the NRPC Transportation Technical Advisory Committee endorse the Town of Hollis Safe Routes to School Travel Plan application. All were in favor and the motion passed.

Waitkins concluded saying the Hollis application will go to the SRTS Coordinator at NHDOT with the recommendation to approve funding. He reminded the group that the next round for SRTS will be September 12th and that no match is required to apply.

Houston motioned to adjourn with a second from Jean Marie Kennamer. The meeting adjourned at **1:15pm.**