



**NRPC APPROVED MINUTES**  
**NRPC TRANSPORTATION TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING**  
**06/9/10**

**Members Present:**

Steve Dookran - City of Nashua  
Joe Mendola (A) - City of Nashua  
Jean Marie Kennamer (A) - City of Nashua  
Mark Sousa - Nashua Transit  
Louise Woodworth (A) - Nashua Transit

Rick Seymour - Town of Merrimack  
Dave Lent (A) - Town of Merrimack  
Jeff Babel - Town of Hollis  
Bill Parker - Town of Milford  
Roger Houston - City of Nashua

**Staff Present**

Tim Roache, Assistant Director  
Kerrie Diers, Executive Director  
Steve Wagner, Regional Planner

Matt Waitkins, Field Data/Transportation Planner  
Karen M. Baker, Administrative Assistant  
Patrick Blaisdell, Intern

**Others Present**

Skip Skoglund, Greenman-Pedersen, Inc.  
Kristi Gillette, Nashua Transit

Chris Skoglund, NHDES  
Nick Alexander - NHDOT

**CALL TO ORDER AND INTRODUCTIONS**

Tim Roache opened the meeting at 12:08 with introductions.

**APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FROM THE APRIL 14TH 2010 MEETING**

Roache referred to the minutes of April 14, 2010 included in the agenda packet as Attachment 1 and asked for a motion to approve. Sousa moved to approve the April 14th, 2010 minutes with a second from Kennamer. All were in favor and the motion passed.

**TE WRAP UP**

Roache provided Power Point presentation on the Transportation Enhancements Process Summary with a brief discussion to follow. He explained it is a Federal Transportation funding program designed to provide an opportunity for improvements to the transportation system for non-motorized uses and a way for lower priority projects to be incorporated into the federal and state Transportation Planning Process. Below are the highlights:

**2009-2010 TE HISTORY, PROGRAM & PROCESS**

- Began in 1991
- As of 2004, NH completed 8 funding rounds (over 260 projects)
- In 2006 program was financially overcommitted and DOT declared a moratorium on additional projects
- New Guideline Goals established in 2009 by DOT with intent of improving project proposals, more accurate estimates, public involvement, bonus points and regional ranking influencing project selection
- Applicants/Communities to provide Letters of Interest
- Provide project concept and cost estimate
- Submit application to RPC and DOT

**NRPC REGIONAL PROCESS**

- NRPC staff scores & ranks projects using TTAC approved criteria developed by NRPC
- Project rankings submitted to DOT

## **NHDOT PROCESS**

- DOT staff ranks projects against criteria guidelines, applies regional bonus points with goal being top ranked project from each region to be funded and submits ranking to TEAC

## **TE ADVISORY COMMITTEE AND PROCESS**

The TEAC Advisory Committee is comprised of representatives from Executive Council, NHDOT, State Historical Resources Div., RPC Designees, Governor's Office, House Speaker, Senate President, DRED and the NH Municipal Assoc. The Advisory Committee reviews the projects, holds public meetings, and independently ranks the projects. 2009/2010 anticipated funds available were around \$7 million over 2 years with a total of 17 projects being funded.

Roache pointed out the tiered regional rankings submitted to DOT as well as a list of the final TEAC Rankings and summarized the TE presentation. He said NHDOT developed a process with the goal of using the RPC ranking criteria to fund the top ranked project from each region. He stated that it was not evident that the TEAC considered the regional scores and the proposed NHDOT project rankings. Roache felt that NHDOT should be encouraged to develop an agreement with the TEAC to include the regional and NHDOT ranking in the final project selection process.

He added that he would also present this concern to the full Commission and asked for comments and/or questions. There were concerns/comments from Sousa, Parker, Kennamer, and Dookran. Some suggestions from the group were to write a letter to NHDOT suggesting the above and to mathematically incorporate the RPC and DOT rankings so that it counts for something; have TEAC throw out the highest and lowest scores; each MPO get a certain amount of money for a project; or have the regional and DOT scores weighted into the TEAC Process.

Parker motioned with a second from Sousa to recommend to the full Commission that the NRPC write a letter to NHDOT expressing concern with the TE Process and suggesting that NHDOT require the TEAC to factor in the regional and state scores when selecting projects. All were in favor and the motion passed.

Alexander commented on the 2 processes (TE and CMAQ) specifically pointing out the fact that CMAQ has applications which are ranked and sent to the Statewide Advisory Committee which houses representatives from all 9 RPC's and how there is an opportunity to change the TE process and for the TEAC to change its process if the CMAQ process goes well.

## **S/TIP AMENDMENT 5**

Roache summarized the S/TIP Amendment 5 memo included in the agenda packet and informed that he would be looking for a motion to recommend to the full Commission for approval. He pointed out that there were 5 projects in the NRPC region:

<b>Hollis</b>	Ash Street/Rte. 130 sidewalk (needs increase in funding)
<b>Nashua</b>	101A Widening (funding adjustment to project scope)
<b>Nashua</b>	CMAQ project tied to rail (park-n-ride)
<b>Nashua</b>	CMAQ project to expand closed loop system (delay in construction)
<b>Pelham</b>	Town Center intersection improvements (funding adjustment on project total)

He added that there were various statewide projects listed in the amendment that were either rolling back or moving forward to the next fiscal year. There would be no changes to the air quality and DOT has demonstrated that fiscal constraint has been met.

Motion to recommend S/TIP Amendment 5 to the full Commission for approval came from Sousa and was seconded by Babel. All were in favor and the motion passed.

Dookran wanted to go on record regarding the Nashua 101A Widening project saying that it was originally a state project/state funded project and included parts of Milford and now it is not and the City is on the hook for \$500,000 with no anticipated funding and there is a problem rectifying the numbers with B Landry at DOT. Additionally the State is pulling away \$300,000. Dookran also pointed that this was not an amendment but a proposed amendment. Roache commented that the City fully expects to pay something.

Alexander said this project constantly changes and he did not feel comfortable saying that the State took away money. He added that the project has been difficult to follow and there were discrepancies of what the City has for project cost and what the State has. He concluded that the primary reason for the amendment is for R.O.W. and preliminary engineering funds which have to happen by 2011 to avoid further delays and that discrepancies can be ironed out later on. Dookran felt it was hard to explain what's happening with the numbers on this project and that is why he wanted to go on the record about this. Mendola informed that the City had opportunity to work on the preliminary design, preliminary engineering and R.O.W and that they have the money for this.

#### **LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN (LRTP) UPDATE**

Roache informed the group that NRPC would be doing an update to the LRTP in the fall and rather than asking for new projects to be included in the LRTP, he would be writing a letter (see draft example included in agenda packet) to the selectmen chairs in each of the towns in the region as an opportunity to weigh in on the LRTP and get them thinking about it. He added that there was nothing in the outer years of the LRTP (2020-2035) and what this letter would do is seek input from the communities on which projects are priorities and which ones there is still a need for. These would then go into Ten Year Plan, then to into the LRTP. The final step would be getting them to DOT as priorities to be included in the DOT Ten Year Plan.

#### **TTAC MEMBERSHIP UPDATE**

Roache informed the group of a letter that would be going out to the Mayor, Selectmen Chairs, and Town Council Chairs in the region with a list of current TTAC members for the towns to appoint or re-appoint or appoint new members. He added that the intent was to make sure everyone is getting represented. Additionally, Roache said that it is all part of the process to revamp the MPO process (voting vs. non-voting members), He added that looking forward this will include the Prospectus, Public Participation Policy, and coming up with a MPO Policy Committee to meet 6 times a year which all changes will come through for the MPO Process. The current TTAC members will be copied on the letter.

Houston questioned if was State Law for the MPO nomination of TTAC members because he thought that PB's nominate TTAC. Diers said that TTAC members are nominated by communities and that it reads that way in the NRPC Bylaws. Roache concluded saying that the municipalities have through September to get their responses back to NRPC and that this process needs to be formalized because somewhere down the road, there will be some money and we will want to have voting and non-voting members clarified. Diers informed that NRPC was looking at the RCC as a standing subcommittee along with TTAC and the Executive Committee.

#### **OTHER BUSINESS:**

Roache informed the group on the work that NRPC and the City were working on with the Town of Tyngsboro and NRCOG on getting some work done on the Exit 36S Ramp. He added that Secretary Mullen from MA was also involved and they were looking for planning funds and later construction funds.

Houston motioned to adjourn with a second from Kennamer. The meeting adjourned at **1:17pm**.