

construction in 2017

- Brookline – Southbound left turn lane from NH 13 onto Old Milford Rd - Ten Year Plan project with construction in 2026
- Nashua – East Hollis St Improvements east of Main St - Ten Year Plan project with construction in 2025

She also reviewed the new Regional Projects included in MTP that were submitted for consideration but not included in 2017 – 2026 TYP:

- Merrimack – DW Highway/Wire Road
- Nashua – Heritage Rail Trail Corridor East
- Nashua – Downtown West Gateway Project
- Nashua – Main Street Railroad Crossing Reconstruction
- Nashua – New Interchange connecting Broad Street Parkway to Franklin Street
- Pelham – Mammoth Rd/Sherburne Rd Improvements

She informed the group that NRPC placed a legal notice in the Nashua Telegraph and on the NRPC website. Public comments were accepted through December 9, 2016. NHDOT submitted comments correcting the funding scenario and revising the scope for the regional project in Nashua on East Hollis Street (project ID 16314) as follows:

- The funding has been corrected to show that NHDOT is providing the matching funds using Turnpike Toll Credits.
- The scope has been revised to read: Intersection improvements at the intersection of East Hollis Street and Bridge Street from C Street to the Hudson Town Line.

Chizmas informed the group that the Transportation Technical Advisory Committee (TTAC) discussed and reviewed the draft TIP and MTP Minor Update at their October and November meetings. A final discussion on the TIP and MTP projects as well as the public comments from NHDOT were reviewed at the December TTAC meeting and the TTAC passed a motion to recommend that the Nashua Regional Planning Commission adopt the draft 2017 – 2020 TIP and 2017 – 2040 MTP Minor Update.

A public hearing was opened at 7:10 by Chairman Hennessey.

Luszey felt the original language in the scope which brought it to Derry St. & Rte. 102 in Hudson as opposed to the DOT revision of the scope, be added back in. He added that both bridges are going to go red; how can we dovetail into this. Marchant was under the understanding that there was no federal dollars available for bridges. She added that there are some things we can do together and any study of the bridge is not necessarily about this and any info would be shared and we can work together. Luszey commented that they would have to appropriate money through taxes if there is no money.

Ruch asked if DOT asked for the scope revision. Marchant said there was a mix up in the funding and some residential housing that was proposed for the area. She added that the City needs to add two more legs to the intersection and the City is always willing to work with Hudson. She noted that the intersection improvements are in Nashua. Roache commented that this is why it is good to be involved with NRPC and to come to the meetings. Battis commented that there was a change in the legal notice in the Telegraph and proceeded to read it to the group. Marchant explained that was a conceptual idea and that Nashua has been working with Hudson all along, but that project does not exist. There was comment that you can't do a traffic study and stop halfway over the bridge. It was acknowledged that the project is in its early stages and the traffic analysis results will guide future scope amendments.

7:25pm: Boyd motioned with a second from Dell Orfano to close the public hearing.

Marchant motioned with a second from Dell Orfano to approve the 2017 – 2020 TIP and MTP with amended language based on public comments submitted by DOT; with discussion.

Luszey commented that it would be more appropriate to the original scope and not be to the Hudson Town line but to Rte. 102 and Derry Rd. in Hudson. He noted that it is a significant intersection with Routes 102, 3A, and 111 and that if traffic needs are not fully considered in the project scope, then Hudson could be adversely affected. It was again acknowledged that the project is in its early stages and the traffic analysis results will guide future scope amendments. Luszey said that if the original language is dropped then all bets are off.

Dell Orfano questioned the implication if you revert back to the original language with the study being on the Nashua side, and that changing it would expand the study to the other side of the bridge. Cysz commented that Marchant's analysis will look out to that but physical improvements would be just up to the bridge. Luszey commented on the improvements done to the lights on the Hudson side in anticipation of this.

There was further discussion from Marchant about the project and funding for Nashua. Hennessey asked what the ramifications of going back to original language in the face of DOT. Roache did not think it mattered at this point. He stated that the project will evolve and the scope will be amended multiple times through the planning process. Ruch felt it was important to ensure the TIP is accurate since it is a legal document but also ensure that Hudson's interests are not discarded.

Battis asked if the solution to this was to in the next iteration, Hudson submit a project for improvements to Derry Rd to Taylor Falls Bridge and then get it into the TIP. Roache said it can be done, but it would be more efficient to work through the current process.

Boyd asked if there was full communication from DOT to Hudson on this. Chizmas said no. Boyd felt that Hudson is correct and asked why we are having this adversarial conversation? There was further discussion on the bridge, capital improvements and the study expanding to the other side of the bridge. Roache briefly explained the process noting that traffic analysis has to be done and impacts to both sides of the bridge have to be studied. If there is a problem on the Hudson side, the scope gets amended with an increase in funding. Langdell asked if there was more info on this listing that DOT has. Chizmas pulled up the past TIP and noted that it is listed differently in the TYP. She also noted that the purpose and need was listed in DOT's database when it was first included in the TYP and it has evolved over the past TIPs. Langdell asked if there was another place where the request from Hudson is accurately documented. Chizmas said there is a place in the DOT database that says 3 different things. After further discussion Hennessey asked for a vote on the motion on the table:

TO accept the 2017 – 2020 TIP with amended language based on public comments submitted by DOT.

The motion **carried** with 6 opposed.

Langdell asked if there was any way to add language to make this known or to document. A suggestion was made to have the NRPC Commission write a letter to reflect the concerns of Hudson. After further discussion, Boyd motioned with a second from Kofalt:

THAT Commission writes a letter to the DOT Commissioner noting the Town of Hudson concerns over the changes to the scope of work to the Nashua East Hollis Street project (ID 16314).

The motion **carried**.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR:

There was no public present that wished to speak.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES – SEPTEMBER 21, 2016

The Chair asked if there were any comments on the minutes of September 21, 2016. Lynde noted a handful of grammatical errors where a word was missing or did not read correctly. After further discussion, Boyd motioned with a second from Dell Orfano:

THAT the minutes of September 21, 2016 be approved as amended.

The motion **carried** with 4 abstentions.

STRATEGIC STATEMENT (DISCUSSION/ACTION)

Roache informed the group that the Strategic Statement was presented to Commissioners and to the towns for discussion. Roache noted that there were some comments and suggestions from the towns which, if applicable, were incorporated into the document.

- Litchfield BOS requested there to be some type of annual or bi-annual review to track progress against the goals.
- Roache explained that the NRPC MPO programming authority does not give NRPC any fiduciary responsibility for the funds related to project construction. He clarified that the programming authority provides more control over projects that selected for the TIP and that no funding crosses the NRPC financial statements.
- Milford's Fred Elkind asked that grant writing be considered as an important component of the strategic plan.

Roache wanted to make sure the group was comfortable with the document and said he did not feel any action was necessary. Hennessey added that the Executive Committee believes the document is a blueprint of management strategies moving forward and will review every six months.

TRANSPORTATION ROUNDTABLE

Roache noted that there would not be a Commissioners Roundtable this evening and in place, a Transportation Roundtable discussion on the 2019-2028 Ten Year Plan (TYP) and the 2018-2019 UPWP. He started off by asking the group what they thought of the TYP and does it work for the region. He used the 101A project as his case and point. The project started in back in 1984 with 40 years to construction. He asked the group, does the plan work? He added that if we are going to go through this cycle again and not have 101A done, this is a problem. How do we go about getting these projects done? How do we do better as a group and Commission in determining the real needs and getting the message to the FHWA and NHDOT? He noted some top ranked regional project priorities:

- 101A Widening and Improvements
- 101 Widening and Improvements
- Third Bridge across the Merrimack River
- FE Everett Turnpike: Exit 36SB
- Passenger Rail

Boyd asked what is reasonable for each community in regards to needs, using 101A and Continental Blvd as examples. Lynde commented that in Pelham, there is an intersection of 2 roads that have had multiple accidents; Pelham is willing to pay for flashing lights, but there has been no response. He said blame the

legislature, not the DOT; funding is the big elephant. He added that we need a gas tax. Dell Orfano asked if other RPCs are having similar problems. Roache commented that Rockingham Planning Commission, as an example, had 6 projects in the last TYP, mostly complete streets and bicycle & pedestrian type projects but he is not sure that really addresses the priorities of the region. We are not getting anywhere with the big picture projects that address mobility throughout the region. So, yes, we are all in the same boat. Dell Orfano asked if body counts count. Chizmas said that fatal and severe injury is the criteria for specific highway safety improvements to get funding.

Ruch said either ignore the bigger needs or talk about how we can work with the legislators. She added that these are key economic development and quality of life issues. There was discussion on separating the small and larger projects. Marchant said it would be impossible to separate; some projects have not moved and you can't ask one community to put up the 20% match. She added it is the same story across the board; no mechanism for a match. She suggested all the communities getting together but all are broke with infrastructure projects. Roache noted that, in some cases, we are making decisions on a 15-16 year old planning documents.

Langdell commented that we want more businesses in Milford, but the roads need improvement, especially on 101a and we can't move people in and out. She said bring rail; start talking about that again. Rao noted that in the TIP and MTP, all the problems are have big solutions, so there is no funding for the small projects. He suggested having tiers so that DOT could fund both small and large projects. Dell Orfano suggested doing an econometric study and asked if the NRPC had experience to do that kind of a study. Roache noted that there is not money in the budget for that and was unsure if DOT would pay for such a study. As far as experience, he suggested knocking on doors of those who could benefit from it for help. Hennessey felt that health and safety should be a priority when determining our priorities and also noted economic development as another big issue.

There was discussion on how to form alliances. Kofalt felt there would be issues with multiple towns coming up with match and suggested the towns establishing reserve funds. He asked if some of the bigger projects could be broken down into bite size chunks. Chizmas noted that the 101A & 101 projects have had portions broken out into smaller projects. Roache said there is no reason that towns can't come together; we can facilitate. He also noted that it may depend on the project and you may end up paying more money when you phase projects and have to mobilize construction crews multiple times. You would have to decide if the additional cost is worth it. Marchant commented on the increase in cost over the 40 years of the 101a project that still has not been constructed.

Williams commented that asking towns to pay more for transportation can only be done through property taxes which are already pretty high. He commented that the state continues to downshift costs to the towns and that we need to push back at the state level. Hennessey commented that economic development has to be factored in. Langdell felt that capital reserve funds were a great idea, but not every town believes in them. Langdell asked if there has been discussion with other RPCs and the DOT Commissioner about this issue with the TYP. Roache said there have been discussions and it does not work the same way in other states and DOT is trying to improve this.

Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)

Roache asked the group what NRPC staff can do. He noted the planning emphasis areas for the 2018-2019 UPWP.

- MAP-21/FAST Act and Planning Final Rule – Compliance, Planning Performance Measures
- Urbanized Area Set-asides, Sub-allocation and Project Selection
- Congestion Management Process (CMP) Implementation
- Freight Planning

- Fiscal Constraint and Financial Planning
- Metropolitan and Statewide Travel Demand Model Maintenance
- Data Collection for HPMS and CMP Development, Maintenance and Monitoring
- Planning and Environment Linkages (PEL)
- Climate Change & Stormwater Impacts, Resiliency
- Livability and Sustainability
- Project Monitoring

Roache reviewed new tasks would be added into the UPWP. Under policy and planning for the MTP a task was added for corridors and the approach to take and not looking at them as contained singular systems. Dell Orfano said economics is part of the solution and that we should measure who benefits and have them contribute towards construction. Langdell asked if legislation enables other communities to participate in corridors. Marchant said you need direct rational to use tax dollars outside your borders. Langdell asked if there is a push to get state match. Roache said there is a push, but it gets hung up on toll credits. Lynde suggested asking business people to the table. He felt they could bring a lot of pressure to the legislature. Roache concluded noting that the draft UPWP is due to DOT in mid-January.

PROGRAM HIGHLIGHTS

Chizmas summarized the work done to date for intersection analyses that were conducted in Hudson and Pelham. Roache summarized the continuous improvements done to the NRPC Live Maps app which now has the 2015 Wildlife Action Plan Layers as well as the Household Hazardous Waste program that wrapped up in November. Czysz provided a brief summary of the local Master Plan updates being done in Wilton, Litchfield and Pelham. She also noted that Hollis had a warrant article for a Master Plan chapter update. NRPC Program Highlights are posted under the about/minutes-and-work-program-highlights section on the NRPC website.

Roache informed the group that the 34th Annual Legislative Forum will be on February 8, 2017 at the Nashua Marriott Courtyard with an Economic Development topic and a panelist discussion. He added this will be a good kickoff to NRPC's new services to support Economic Development by selling CDFA tax credits to raise money for the program.

ADJOURN

Motion to adjourn came from Boyd with a second from Young. The meeting ended at 8:46pm. The next Commission meeting will be held on Wednesday, March 15, 2017 at 7:00pm.

Respectfully submitted

Tim Roache, Official Recorder: _____