


NRPC APPROVED MINUTES
NRPC TRANSPORTATION TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
10/09/13

Members Present:

Sarah Marchant, Town of Amherst
 Tad Putney, Town of Brookline
 John Cashell, Town of Hudson
 Jason Hoch, Town of Litchfield
 Kyle Fox, Town of Merrimack
 Stephen Dookran, City of Nashua

Joe Mendola, City of Nashua

Others Present:

Paul Lockwood, NH DES
 Linda Dusenberry, NH DOT
 Leigh Levine, FHWA
 Glenn Davison, NHDOT

STAFF PRESENT

Tim Roache, MPO Coordinator
 Julie Chizmas, Transportation Planner

Sara Siskavich, GIS Manager
 Karen Baker, Program Assistant

CALL TO ORDER AND INTRODUCTIONS

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

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FROM THE SEPTEMBER 11, 2013 MEETING

Due to the lack of a quorum, Roache tabled the minutes of September 11, 2013 until the next meeting.

PRESENTATION: GLENN DAVISON – NHDOT, PROJECT DATA VIEWER

Davison informed the group that the purpose of the project data viewer is to improve awareness and access to project information. In addition, it will support business needs to the DOT, RPCs and assist with plan design, basically a New Hampshire business one stop. It will provide quick online access to project information with the capability to search by region, address, key words and more. Davison navigated to the website at <http://gis.dot.nh.gov/projectviewer/>. He added that Project Viewer can show projects in planning and also in construction; you can highlight a single project or see all in one area. In addition, history of older projects is also available. Davison said that the most current information they have has been added into this database. He said it also provides the opportunity to give feedback to DOT if a project is wrong. Siskavich asked if there was a link to provide feedback. Davison said, currently there was not a link to do that, but the project manager listed under the project can be contacted. Siskavich also asked where the images were from and how old. Davison said they were Bing images from 2012. Davison continued by showing the group of the several ways to search using a word in a project, an address, or choosing an area. He added that there are also legends in Project Viewer as well as links to the project folder if available. Davison concluded and asked if there were any questions. Roache said he liked the historical component. Chizmas commented that the status is now always populated and suggested trying another way to find that if that is the case.

A member of the group asked if there was any plan to do traffic data in the Project Viewer. Davison said no but provided a sneak peek into another application that DOT was working on called "Roads". He briefed the group on some of the features this application had showing the layers available, crash locations, street lights, mile markers, street names, function class of roads and bridge information (red listed or not) amongst other bridge information. Davison said some were built on files and are updated quarterly in response to a question from Siskavich on what GIS web surfaces were behind the program. Siskavich then asked if those web services would be exposed. Davison said the idea is to build a library with the services. Lockwood asked if the soils came from USGS. Davison said USDA or one of the other services out there. Davison welcomed input on other web surfaces out there if folks felt they would be helpful. Siskavich suggested having an upfront touchy-feely introduction or data sources or maybe incorporate or link the TIP info to help explain the STIP. Davison said that was good feedback and would bring it back with him to DOT. Chizmas said capability to comment right from the viewer would also be good. Davison concluded his presentation and thanked everyone for their time.

TEN YEAR PLAN AND TIP UPDATES

TTAC REVIEW OF THE NRPC GACIT PRESENTATION AND HANDOUT

Roache revealed the presentation that NRPC would be presenting at the GACIT hearings that he would be attending. The presentation provided information on the process with DOT, the Region, the MPO roles and responsibilities, and the public involvement process. Also summarized were the data analysis aspect, the public outreach efforts, the results of what we heard about transportation including needs, and the plans including the MTP, developed using this data and input and how it all relates to the Ten Year Plan. The presentation also reviewed the process past Ten Year Plan processes and what is different this time; consistent criteria from both the NRPC and DOT used to establish the feasibility of projects to come up with a regional project list for submission to the DOT. He added that a subcommittee was formed with representatives from NRPC staff and five towns in the region that were provided handouts for comment describing the 22 projects that were to be scored and ranked.

Roache explained that Transit is not part of the TYP process as it is funding differently and relies heavily on local match. In addition, he pointed out that the new census numbers resulted in a reduction in funding for transit. Davison liked the “consistent” word used questioned the placement of the transit slides of the presentation. Levine suggested adding more info on the MPO slide. Lockwood asked if the 101A project would have ended up in the TYP if did not go through the project scoring process. Roache said no, but found out that it had regional support. He added that there was not funding, so projects in the current TIP were not looked at. Davison elaborated some on the process of the 101A getting into the TYP.

Dookran asked if this was the best process going forward. Roache commented that it was a big step in the right direction and it was a quantifiable process that would continue to evolve over time. Chizmas suggested a post-mortem discussion on how the process went after the TYP is signed off on. Davison spoke a little about the DOT process end, programmatic projects, and funding. Roache felt the DOT Decision Lens disappeared after the process and asked if it was gone. Davison said no but with the TYP the process is on hold right now. Fox commented on the two different perspectives, but how similar the ranking was. Chizmas said the focus from DOT was on NHS projects and their rating vs. the RPCs and gave an example of the Capitol Corridor which was not ranked due to the function class. Chizmas added that we did not know about the NHS factor when the project ranking was done and that it might have been done differently if we knew. Davison said that this was due to the amount of projects and the decision of DOT to rank the NHS projects first.

S/TIP AMENDMENT 3 (ACTION TO BE TAKEN AT THE NOVEMBER MEETING)

Chizmas reviewed S/TIP Amendment 3. She explained that there are 2 projects in the NRPC region for this amendment:

Nashua – NH 111, Project ID: 13117

Description: Construct Park and Ride and accessory facilities at up to two Nashua locations

Proposed Amendment: Delay \$2,450,000 in FY2016 Construction funds beyond the 2013 – 2016 TIP horizon year

Reason: Delayed per City of Nashua request

Total proposed 2013 – 2016 TIP funding: \$1,734,000

Wilton – NH 31, Project ID: 16128

Description: Bridge deck replacement over Souhegan River (Bridge ID 129/126) {Red List}

Proposed Amendment: Add \$1,308,000 in FY2014 Construction funding

Reason: Construction schedule advanced due to condition of the bridge deck

Total proposed 2013 – 2016 TIP funding: \$1,364,000

In addition there were various statewide projects. Chizmas informed the group that a legal ad was placed in the Telegraph and on the NRPC website and public comments will be accepted through November 1st. After the

public comment period and at the November meeting action will be required from TTAC to recommend approval of the proposed amendment #3 by the full Commission.

STAFF AND PROJECT UPDATES

Roache reminded the group of his idea to have TTAC representatives highlight a specific project going on in their community; a show and tell of projects going on in the region. Specifically, and for today's meeting, the Nashua East Hollis Street Roundabout Project would be highlighted. He passed around a few samples of the project brochure and explained that these are still in draft. He summarized the project by providing the background reason for the project which was brought on by a conference that the Nashua City Mayor went to on sustainability and how a stormwater and gateway issue was resolved by putting in a roundabout; specifically in the Normal, IL. He added that the Mayor felt this could possibly be a good fit for the Taylor Falls Bridge area due to the traffic and flooding issues. From this, they found and looked at opportunities and how to incorporate them all. Dookran added that the goal is to make it a gateway in both directions. He pointed out the levee issue and the flooding and sewerage combined that becomes a problem and how they are looking for some good solutions to this. Roache added that NRPC may still be involved with the project on a project management level depending on the LPA agreement. He added that this project was included in the TIP for 2015-2016 for construction, but it is not ready for design and that a planning phase should be done first. Cashell commented that he knows the benefits of roundabouts, but education is necessary so that folks that don't know can be informed. Roache said he could do a presentation on roundabouts to the Hudson Selectmen.

Chizmas pointed out the Advertising schedule included in the agenda packet.

The meeting ended at 1:38 pm.