

 **APPROVED MINUTES**  
**NRPC TRANSPORTATION TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING**  
**12/12/12**

**Members Present:**

Jeff Babel, Town of Hollis DPW  
Jason Hoch, Town of Litchfield  
Kyle Fox, Town of Merrimack  
Sarah Marchant, Town of Amherst  
Jeff Gowan, Town of Pelham  
John Cashell, Town of Hudson  
Mark Sousa, City of Nashua NTS

Louise Woodworth, City of Nashua NTS  
Steve Dookran, City of Nashua  
Wayne Husband, City of Nashua  
Bill Parker, Town of Milford

**Others Present:**

Paul Lockwood, NH DES  
Karla Kemp, NHDOT

**STAFF PRESENT**

Tim Roache, MPO Coordinator  
Julie Chizmas, Senior Transportation Planner  
Matt Waitkins, Field Data/Transportation Planner

Kerrie Diers, Executive Director  
Camille Pattison, Principal Planner  
Mark Connors, NRPC Intern

**CALL TO ORDER AND INTRODUCTIONS**

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

**APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FROM THE OCTOBER 10 MEETING**

Roache referred to the minutes of October 10<sup>th</sup>, included in the agenda packet as Attachment 1 and asked for a motion to approve. Sousa moved to approve the October 10<sup>th</sup>, 2012 minutes with a second from Hoch. All were in favor.

**MPO PROJECT SELECTION CRITERIA REVIEW (ACTION ITEM)**

Roache reviewed the MPO Project Selection Criteria and said they had been looking at this and how to improve it. He added they would need everyone on the same page to be able to rank and score projects, but they were not there yet and that there is currently no consistent criteria used. He pointed out the criteria software used by NHDOT called Decision Lens which uses an analytical hierarchy process which sets priorities then scores and ranks them. DOT came up with a set of evaluation criteria to work with the software.

Roache said his hope is to accomplish draft criteria for the region using criteria from 2 years ago where they adopted 8 categories with sub-criteria under each to use in ranking of importance under each category. The first step is to determine which category is most important out of the eight. Lockwood wanted to know if there were some that were deal breakers or that bubble to the top. Chizmas said the subjects had to be judged for eligibility first and were not even included as an item to score. Roache added that maintenance and preservation was the focus when doing the 10 year plan and that region ranking will be considered and looked at by DOT. Babel felt the numbers would be all over the board adding that environment and safety would be high for him, but maybe not for the rest. Husband said that a project becomes a project because it is a high priority in any given project and you are not going to take politics out. Roache added that the rail project will get a score for each core criteria and economic development because it is a priority by the state. Projects can be ranked in a number of ways; we want an overall ranking.

Lockwood said his priorities would be improved congestion, then safety, environment, and economic development. Sousa's priorities were safety, mobility, and state of good repair and felt it could be dug into further and was something he would have to think about. There was some discussion from Chizmas and Kemp regarding looking at different bike/pedestrian, highway plans, etc. Kemp said they were in the process of evaluating which way those pieces could fit in, but the core 8 was good. Roache liked Sousa's idea of taking a look at it and having all rank it as a homework exercise. Gowan suggested doing something in Survey Monkey on this very question. Roache liked the idea and felt it would get the quickest response. Chizmas said she could do

this. Roache said he needed quantification of what the priorities are in the outer 2 years of the TIP through the existing Long Range Plan and would be considered for ranking since he would not be including new projects, but would be soliciting for new ones soon. A project summary would be provided and then the projects would be ranked for criteria in a future workshop. Roache added they would need to get approval from the Commission at the March meeting and the info to DOT by April for them to see our rankings.

Fox asked if one set of answers from each town because he could sit down with Comm. Dev. and Public Works and has it out as a town. Chizmas summarized that the Survey would be set up to include the Town, Position of person completing the survey, and the survey itself. When looking at the results, by town would primarily as well as other identifiers. Sousa said that everybody should be heard from, not just by town, but also by department. Roache said there would be averages by town. Gowan said there should also be individual feedback results. Chizmas said she would email the link to the survey to the TTAC representatives and have them distribute it to town officials. Roache said he would like to have the results back by Friday, December 28<sup>th</sup> in order to have the results to present to the TTAC on January 9<sup>th</sup>.

Kemp added that funding with MAP 21 is changing so drastically, that the DOT software will come out with an overall statewide program using the criteria developed by DOT.

Parker asked if the other RPCs were doing the same thing with the ranking criteria. Roache indicated that they were. He added that the ultimate goal is to have a summary of projects to be able to score with a prioritized list. There were issues with funding and highway monies being from a separate pot. Roache said in the end it is a policy decision with money and different types of projects based on our overall rankings.

Dookran asked how NRPC would be using the information gathered from the survey (input/backup to each item?), and that they could make stronger efforts in those areas. Roache said we are not scoring newly proposed projects so the criteria will not impact project solicitation this year. Dookran added that what is important to Public Works may not be as important to the MPO. Roache said it is not an easy process and not everyone is going to be happy.

#### **REVIEW OF TTAC ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES**

Roache referred to the memo included in the agenda packet adding that this was driven by the Bedford Toll project and the confusion on how the process works. He summarized the process by providing a PowerPoint presentation on the *Transportation Technical Advisory Committee Roles and Responsibilities*. He reviewed the MPO Purpose & Structure, the TTAC Role and Member Responsibilities and TTAC Moving Ahead into 2013.

Roache asked if there were any questions or comments:

Lockwood asked why the UPWP was mentioned in the presentation but not the TIP or the LRTP. Roache said he was just summarizing and reviewed the TIP and LRTP briefly. Diers explained that the UPWP was NRPC's funding plan that is done every 2 years and is written into NRPC's contract so if there is any input on other technical assistance that we don't provide, we can write into the UPWP for the next round.

Roache reminded TTAC members to keep communication with the TTAC forum on your locally managed projects and to keep NRPC informed. Additionally he asked that members to make sure their towns know what is going on also in regards to TTAC and the information provided. He referred to the MPO prospectus and the TIP Amendment procedures and suggested folks read up on this. He mentioned the Bedford Toll project and the motion to swap out one project for another. He added that it was a good priority, but you can't just do that. There is a procedure that has to be followed. Roache continued saying that NRPC is now a TMA and will be held to performance measures. Quorums will have to more cognoscente going forward and proxy votes or call in votes will not be accepted at public meetings/hearings. An alternate must be present. Legislators and Executive Council may also have to be noticed going forward.

Dookran felt that it was unfortunate that our decisions are so driven by funding and the DOT rules that it suppresses trying to get the right answers. Diers segued into the first Regional Plan Transportation workshop to

be held in February which will focus on what we see as really important for the future of transportation in New Hampshire and how do we get there. She added that there were a lot of comments regarding transportation that we received from our Regional Plan comment cards and that at the workshop that feedback will be available for you.

Roache informed the group that funding was not a criteria and to base your decisions on the need. He added that this will be a good opportunity to share ideas (ex. proposed Roundabout at Taylor Falls). Cashell questioned Diers' comment on how the projected population decline is going to affect us. Diers said there would be an Existing Trends and Population Conditions presentation and discussion as part of the transportation workshops.

Roache mentioned that he would like to have a TTAC member chair future meetings.

#### **LATEST ON MAP-21**

Roache provided a brief summary on Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century (MAP-21) a 2 year highway bill, through a FHWA PowerPoint presentation available at: <http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/map21/>. Chizmas provided a map outlining the adjusted MPO boundaries.

Diers referred to the balanced scorecard and customer satisfaction survey being conducted by Ansel Sanborn with NHDOT, with the NRPC Commission at the December 19<sup>th</sup> meeting. She said all are welcome to attend.

Kemp informed the group that 1 year after FHWA sets their Performance Measures, NHDOT will have to have theirs set. Roache said 180 days after DOT, the MPOs will have to have theirs set.

#### **PROJECT UPDATE ON EXIT 36S**

Pattison provided an update on the Exit 36S project. She informed the group that it is a joint effort with Northern Middlesex County of Governments in Massachusetts with a goal of developing a planning analysis and support to implement an Exit 36S. The project has a 2 year timeframe is being funding through a TCSP grant. She passed around copies of study area map, Project Overview, the Public Outreach Plan, and a marketing piece designed by Mark Connors, NRPC intern, which was being sent to the steering committee which consisted of NRPC & NMCOG staff, elected officials & legislative delegation from both NH & MA, and businesses in the study area. Additionally the marketing piece would go out in a Constant Contact E-News. Pattison also referred to other outreach that had been developed, specifically a Facebook and Twitter page as well as an Exit 36S webpage on the NRPC website. She asked folks to please like us on FB and Twitter. Pattison also informed the group that Connors would be compiling existing plans and explained this would provide an opportunity to locate an intermodal station near the border in which Jennifer DiNovo would design some renderings for on what this would look like.

Pattison said the next step would be to iron out the existing traffic and land use conditions. She added that in MA they are envisioning a restaurant area or food corridor. There will be a Steering Committee meeting in January to start the process and she would keep the TTAC up to date.

Dookran asked if there was a consultant for the project. Roache said No, just staff, but they would try and set aside some money for planning and get a level cost estimate from a consultant. He added that they did a similar thing for a Hudson project.

#### **STAFF AND PROJECT UPDATES**

Chizmas referred to the Project Advertising Schedule updates and distributed the Draft MPO Annual list of Obligated Projects for Federal Fiscal Year 2012.

Motion to adjourn came from Cashell with a second from Babel. The meeting adjourned at 1:35 pm.