


NRPC APPROVED MINUTES
NRPC TRANSPORTATION TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
10/8/14

Members Present:

John Cashell, Town of Hudson
 Jason Hoch, Town of Litchfield
 Kyle Fox, Town of Merrimack
 Jodie Levandowski, Town of Milford
 Raymond Blethen, Nashua Transit
 Kristi Gillette, Nashua Transit
 Louise Woodworth, Nashua Transit

Wayne Husband, City of Nashua
 Colleen Mailloux, Town of Amherst
 Sarah Marchant, Nashua Community Development
 Jeff Gowan, Town of Pelham

Others Present:

Linda Dusenberry, NHDOT
 Leigh Levine, FHWA

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 at 12:05 with introductions.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FROM THE AUGUST 13, 2014 MEETING

Roache referred to the minutes of August 13, 2014 included in the agenda packet as Attachment 1 and asked for a motion to approve. Gowan moved to approve the August 13, 2014 minutes with a second from Hoch. Minutes were approved with 1 abstention.

DRAFT 2015-2018 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

Czysz passed around a handout that showed NRPC projects in the Draft STIP and compared this with the previous STIP. Page 4 of the handout was NRPC projects not in the current including the Milford NH101A/NH 13 improvements project and the Nashua Broad Street Parkway & Nashua Transit System projects. Roache had concerns with the projects in the TIP and them matching up with the Towns listing of the project & budget. He asked the members to review the projects and let him know if anything was missing that would need to be addressed. Gowan asked when and why the construction phase for the Main Street Bridge in Pelham was moved from 2017 to 2018. Dusenberry said this probably occurred during fiscal constraint. Roache also had concerns with projects possibly being overlooked since there seem to be the same consistent cycle of towns that have projects listed (Pelham, Nashua, Milford, Hudson) in the TIP. He questioned if this is where we want to be as far as investment for the region. He asked for any thoughts from the group. He used the Rockingham region as a comparison with the Nashua Region, adding that there is 273million in projects listed in the TIP. He pointed out that the Nashua Region has more miles of road and felt that we may be hung up on larger projects in the Nashua region even though all are equally as important (ex. River Crossing). Hoch compared the ratio of investment in home maintenance to home value to that of transportation investments relative to assets as an example. Sarah Marchant thought it was a requirement to report your miles of road as part of municipal assets reporting to the Department of Revenue Administration. Roache asked the group to make sure the projects listed in the TIP were correct and to let him know of anything that needed to be corrected. This would help in avoiding amendments for incorrect project information. Marchant questioned where part 3 of the BSP was as she did not see it listed and if money had to be spent before the end of 2015. Roache addressed this question. Roache said he would be looking for approval of the TIP in December and a public comment period would open in mid-November.

TAP PROGRAM – SCORING CRITERIA AND PROCESS

Roache informed the group of the 4 towns that submitted TAP projects as Amherst, Brookline, Merrimack and Nashua which equaled about 6% worth of money. He provided a handout to the group to be used as

an aid to deal with the scoring process. He informed the group of his volunteers who agreed to review the applications and be part of the scoring process as Levandowski-Milford, Gowan-Pelham, & Cashell-Hudson and an NRPC staff member.

He added that he wanted to make sure everyone was on the same page when scoring and not have wildly different idea of what the criteria is. He asked the group how they wanted to approach this. The handout provided gave an example of a way to assign points and Roache reminded the group of the importance of being consistent with our approach. Marchant suggested using 10, 7, 5, 2 to maintain consistency. Hoch commented that there should be a place for range & exact. As an example, he suggested using 10 for having all the money in hand and 2 if not. Blethen suggested having a top, bottom and middle ground score. Czysz suggested using 0 through 4. Hoch suggested creating a consistent expectation with a minimum number of 0 and a percentage used for other but to also have a consistent top number.

Roache said he would get scoring committee together after he gets the applications out to the scoring group. Diers informed that our scores would be used as another seat at the table with DOT once we get our final scoring to them. Roache suggested a cover sheet explaining our scoring and how we came up with it in case it is very different from what DOT has even though we would be using the same Decision Lens criteria as DOT. He added that we have a month to get everything scored and done for our region projects.

Levine questioned the 200,000 plus. Roache said all the projects were eligible for the money with the exception of areas over 200,000 populations and then there would be a sub-allocation of money that may be looked at to fund, possibly from different pots. Diers elaborated some on this saying that MPO policy is that you we have to as an MPO approve projects applications with the 200,000 population that are not in our region. We have not worked those details out yet. Roache referred to Londonderry and Windham who have also submitted projects and are eligible for that same pot of money. Diers questioned whether we should be scoring our own projects. Roache said he would get back to the group.

Cashell motioned to adjourn with a second from Fox. The meeting adjourned at 12:47 pm.