


NRPC APPROVED MINUTES
NRPC TRANSPORTATION TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
02/11/15

Members Present:

John Cashell, Town of Hudson
 Tad Putney, Town of Brookline
 Jeff Gowan, Town of Pelham
 Jodie Levandowski, Town of Milford
 Wendy Hunt, Milford Improvement Team
 Kyle Fox, Town of Merrimack

Todd Welch, City of Nashua
 Wayne Husband, City of Nashua Traffic
 Chris Clow, City of Nashua NTS

Others Present:

Paul Lockwood, NHDES
 Linda Dusenberry, NHDOT
 Carol Macuch, NHDOT

STAFF PRESENT

Tim Roache, MPO Coordinator
 Matt Waitkins, Field Data/Transportation Planner
 Jen Czysz, Senior Regional Planner
 Karen Baker, Program Assistant

CALL TO ORDER AND INTRODUCTIONS

Tim Roache opened the meeting with introductions at 12:10.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FROM THE JANUARY 14, 2015 MEETING

Roache referred to the minutes of January 14, 2015 included in the agenda packet as Attachment 1 and asked for a motion to approve. Gowan moved to approve the January 14, 2015 minutes with a second from Putney. All were in favor with 1 abstention from Levandowski.

TEN YEAR PLAN (TYP) PROJECT PRIORITIES – CONTINUED DISCUSSION

Roache explained that NRPC has begun the process of updating its project priorities for consideration in the States TYP. He added this list is due to DOT by the end of March, but directed a question to DOT representatives if NRPC could get their list of projects to them in April. Macuch said they were waiting for guidance from new Commissioner for DOT. She added that the projects that are in the current TIP and draft STIP are not included and that they are waiting for federal approval on the STIP.

Czysz referred to the TYP Projects Review memo in the TTAC agenda packet and explained that the projects listed are in the NRPC Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) and/or the TYP and as of yet do not have funding in the Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP). These projects should be reviewed and re-submitted if they are still important their community with a focus on Federal Aid eligible projects. Czysz said she hoped to have the form out by the end of the week for communities to resubmit their projects. Roache reviewed some of the projects listed asking the representative from of the Town present if there was still a purpose and need for those projects, starting with the Nashua Main Street project #16309. He added that if the project is still important, it should be updated or redefined as appropriate. Husband was not aware of the scope for this project and felt that the 101A project was more important. Roache referred to the Nashua Broad Street (NH130) project # 13931 adding that funding was asked to be returned on this project because there had been no activity. Roache continued to review the projects asking the group to re-evaluate them and determine if they are still important for their communities. Hunt said she did not want Milford project number #14492 to fall through the cracks and elaborated some. When asked about the Brookline project, Putney said the need had not decreased. Roache questioned the Hollis 4 Corners project adding that there was not enough money to do the full project due to the amount of right of way needed. Husband commented on his own experiences traveling through the four corners saying that he felt there was a safety issue and that left turn phases are needed there. Roache said he would engage some conversation with Hollis on this. Gowan asked if questioned if local match was still needed on projects that are State road to State road. Roache said 20% non-federal local match would still be needed. He pointed out that most of the Hudson projects listed were mostly programmatic (TAP or CMAQ) so they

not necessarily score them because the money would be coming from either CMAQ or TAP. Other projects such as the Capitol Corridor & the Merrimack River Crossing would not be ranked because Roache felt there should be a policy statement from the Commission on them. Cashell commented on the need for Hudson project #LRTP7. Roache suggested putting it into a CMAQ or TAP application process rather than resubmitting it. He said there is a need but the project is too big and too much money is needed. He suggested maybe a policy level statement as well. Roache reminded the group that all projects whether new or a resubmit, should be done through the Google form.

Czys passed around copies of the Draft Transportation Project Submission Form and reviewed with the group. She welcomed any comments to make the form better. She added that the goal of the form was to make sure project information collected directly related to the scoring criteria, making sure local and regional goals connect. She commented that the form asks for the project cost, but it is not used to score the project but important to have in there. Project approval was also important to have. The form can be edited, but nothing can be attached, so attachments will have to be emailed. Gowan said he would like to see the intersection improvements project in Pelham in the TYP. There was a question if the Dept. of Safety reports on intersections with bad safety issues are used when scoring projects. Roache said they do look at them and that NRPC has their own safety data which is slightly outdated.

LOCAL PUBLIC AGENCY (LPA) DISCUSSION

Roache summarized the process and pains in using the LPA to implement a project: The New Hampshire Department of Transportation (NHDOT) is a federal funds recipient of Surface Transportation Program (STP) funds through the Federal Highways Administration (FHWA). NHDOT makes a portion of the total STP funding available to municipalities and other project sponsors (local project sponsors or sub-recipients) to develop, improve, and enhance New Hampshire's transportation network. Projects that receive such funds are referred to as Local Public Agency (LPA) projects. The funds are made available for a variety of projects. LPA projects are managed and match funded (as necessary) to implement eligible projects at the local level.

Roache referred to a meeting with the NH congressional delegation which included comments received from real experiences when using the LPA process to implement a project. At this meeting he was asked to pass along successful and not so successful instances to DOT to be reviewed and set up a stakeholder group. He added that the Broad Street Parkway was not a good example to pass along due to the large size of the project. Husband talked about a bike/pedestrian project which was a SRTS project he was involved with that was very successful, but the administration portion was just as costly as the project. Roache commented that it seems the burden is the same regardless of the size of the project, especially for towns without technical staff. He added that another source of frustration is all the other projects that get sucked into the LPA. He asked if there was a way to separate other pieces or projects so as not to have it delayed so much. Fox commented that it was a fairly new process and not many projects have been built under it. There was further discussion from Waitkins and Husband on the process and from Macuch on how the whole process came about.

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS FROM SECRETARY FOXX

Czys informed TTAC of the two initiatives from Transportation Secretary Foxx:

1. **Mayor's Challenge for Safer People, Safer Streets** - Secretary Foxx is challenging mayors and local elected officials to take significant action to improve safety for bicyclists and pedestrians of all ages and abilities over the next year. Mayors' Challenge participants will be invited to attend the Mayors' Summit for Safer People, Safer Streets in March, and their cities will spend a year helping their communities undertake seven activities to improve safety. The challenge is based on the 2010 USDOT Policy Statement on Bicycle and Pedestrian Accommodation.

2. **“Beyond Traffic: Trends and Choices” – A 30 Year Outlook on the Future of Our Nation’s Infrastructure:** A new forward-looking analysis from the U.S. Department of Transportation outlining the trends that are likely to shape the needs of our transportation system over the next three decades. Beyond Traffic is offered to the public as a draft to ignite a national conversation about the future of the U.S. transportation system and to objectively frame critical policy choices that need to be made.

Lockwood’s take on the Mayor’s Challenge was that he felt towns would look at this and ask what it is in it for them. Czysz said she could not find incentives to participating in the program, but said it would yield safer streets and reduce the risk of accidents within a community.

Waitkins informed the group that all the goals and objectives outlined in the Mayor’s Challenge are included in the update he is working on to the Bike and Pedestrian Plan.

OTHER BUSINESS

Roache asked if anyone had anything new to discuss. Putney asked how many representatives Roache had signed up for the Energy Facilities Advisory Committee (EFAC). Roache said he had 9.

Gowan motioned to adjourn with a second from Levandowski. The meeting adjourned at 1:02 pm.