


**APPROVED MINUTES**  
**NRPC TRANSPORTATION TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING**  
**04/10/13**

**Members Present:**

Jeff Babel, Town of Hollis DPW  
 Kyle Fox, Town of Merrimack  
 Sarah Marchant, Town of Amherst  
 Jeff Gowan, Town of Pelham  
 John Cashell, Town of Hudson  
 Jason Hoch, Town of Litchfield  
 Wayne Husband, City of Nashua  
 Steve Dookran, City of Nashua

**Others Present:**

Paul Lockwood, NH DES  
 Nick Alexander, NHDOT  
 Leigh Levine, FHWA

**STAFF PRESENT**

Tim Roache, MPO Coordinator	Kerrie Diers, Executive Director
Julie Chizmas, Senior Transportation Planner	Karen Baker, Program Assistant

**CALL TO ORDER AND INTRODUCTIONS**

Tim Roache opened the meeting at 12:06 with introductions.

**APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FROM THE MARCH 13, 2013 MEETING**

Roache referred to the minutes of March 13<sup>th</sup>, 2013 included in the agenda packet as Attachment 1 and asked for a motion to approve. Babel moved to approve the March 13<sup>th</sup>, 2013 minutes with a second from Gowan. Dookran asked if the phrase “a member” was intentional. Baker replied that it was used because she was unaware who made the comment. There was not further discussion and the motion passed with all in favor.

**PROJECT SELECTION AND PRIORITIZATION PROCESS: POST-MORTEM DISCUSSION**

Roache spoke of the short time frame for this last process due to the fact that the quarterly Commission meeting was on March 20<sup>th</sup>, when everything had to be complete for Commission approval. He added that NRPC is the only RPC that has its first quarterly commission meeting in March. Roache also informed the group that a new round of project solicitation will start in the fall after the GACIT meetings and for the group to keep him and Chizmas informed of any additional information on the projects out there. Chizmas summarized the project priority process saying that she would like to keep the good things about the process moving forward and dump the bad things. She provided a post-mortem project prioritization presentation for discussion amongst the group. She referred to the 12 steps taken during the last process:

1. 2011 NRPC solicited for new projects
2. TTAC Transportation Vision developed
3. NHDOT established criteria & NRPC set weights
4. TTAC confirmed list of projects to be scored: 2013 – 2022 Ten Year Plan federally funded projects
5. TTAC formed Scoring Subcommittee
6. NRPC staff developed fact sheets
7. NRPC staff developed look-up tables for each of the 20 sub-criteria to guide point allocation
8. NRPC “pre-scored” the objective criteria and provided scoring template for subcommittee
9. Subcommittee scored, discussed, revised and prioritized projects
10. TTAC recommended approval of prioritized projects to the Commission who approved
11. NHDOT provided list of projects to score, look-up tables to guides point allocation and scoring template for RPCs to use
12. NRPC developed crosswalk to convert “NRPC Scores” to “NHDOT Scores” for use with NHDOT scoring template

Chizmas provided the list on projects selected and scored onscreen as Roache asked the group if they felt the projects supported the vision. The group said "Yes", adding that there was rail, sidewalk, and multi-model projects included in the list. Chizmas pointed out that safety was the highest ranking criteria and they struggled on scoring the mix of projects. Husband commented that bridges could get heavily skewed. Chizmas said the crash rate was looked at but was not good for a functionally obsolete bridge. Babel gave an example comparing projects and Chizmas elaborated and said that consistency should be the focus. Lockwood asked why there were no transit projects in the list. Roache answered that transit projects were not included in this (no state aid highway projects or federally funding projects). Cashell felt that next time, a workshop would be good so no one feels left out. Chizmas said there was talk of having one this round, but there was a limit on time, but for the next round there could be project sponsors. Roache suggested putting the project on the agenda and having a TTAC representative provide info on any new details regarding the project and to have it more ready.

Chizmas provided a summary of the last 8 years of the current Ten Year Plan (TYP). She added that Southwest, Strafford and some of the other RPCs were light on projects in the TIP and that only Federal Aid Highway projects for those regions were shown. She pointed out the spike in the projects listed in the TYP in 2020 mostly due to the 101 & 101A projects which have been around since 2001. Roache reviewed project beyond the TYP adding that this balance keeps just rolling over and this is where the needs are. He informed the group that only the projects that have been put through fiscal constraint are listed in the presentation. Levine wanted to know if the costs are being adjusted for these rollovers. Chizmas said that she has included inflation in the numbers. Another question posed to the group was if every community should have a project and how do you get a project into the plan. Chizmas provided a visual on the process:

Access Needs – Develop Alternatives – Compile Supporting Data – Score and Prioritize Projects – Submit TYP  
Priorities to DOT - Move through TYP (rescore/ reprioritize) – Advance into TIP - Implement

Roache asked some questions to the group in relation to assessing your needs.

How can we make the solicitation process work well?

What information can we provide?

MAP-21 and State Funding: what is eligible for what?

Roadway and intersection data (condition, crash history, traffic, bridge rating, etc.)

Who do we target?

Who in each community should we reach out to?

Are there groups we are missing?

What works best for project submittals?

Paper forms?

Web-based forms?

Require presentations before the TTAC?

Lastly, look at potential problems and make sure your Select Boards are aware of the projects being submitted and get it listed in the MTP.

#### **IMPROVING THE PROJECT SOLICITATION PROCESS**

Roache asked for input on how to hold the workshop for the next project solicitation process. Marchant felt it would be good if NRPC came to the Towns/City and felt it less likely that they would come to Merrimack for a workshop. Gowan asked for ideas on how to deal with support at the town level from a CC member but different support on another level. Roache said to first get everyone on the same page. Hoch suggested first putting out there what is eligible and prompt the question "I have a problem" and referred to today's solution for 20 years out and elaborated some with an example. Roache added that you can accept problems as part of the process and identify the problems and find a solution moving forward. Dookran summarized the Nashua process and referred to a glitch in the last scoring process adding that different information was shared differently amongst departments. Roache referred to a web based pdf for understanding projects and how you prefer to bring the projects forward. Roache liked an idea presented where the towns present a project to the

NRPC. Dookran said that is how it used to be done when they had to present to DOT. Cashell suggested elected or appointed representatives to do the presentations. Both Hoch and Marchant liked this idea. Roache also liked this idea and suggested having those representatives be at the GACIT hearings.

**NRPC WEBSITE: HOW CAN IT SERVE YOU?**

Chizmas informed the group of NRPC's effort to modernize its online identity and Sara Siskavich came in to provide some information on where we would like to go and what we are doing to implement this. Cashell suggested looking at what Lebanon NH has done with their website. Gowan asked if it was being done in-house and Siskavich said it would go out as an RFP. If you know of a website with great content or design, send the link to Sara. Content and applications currently that would be important are:

**What CONTENT is helpful?**

- NRPC products and services
- Publications
- Funding Opportunities
- Workshops/Training Opportunities
- Community specific resources

**What APPLICATIONS are helpful?**

- Mapping
- Custom Reports
- Other?

Siskavich explained what we NRPC would like to do and provided some examples of what was out there, specifically some websites in Massachusetts. She pointed out the layers, backgrounds, open source, functionality, of a few sites and referred to the limitations currently experienced when navigating the NRPC site. Roache asked if most do or do not use the NRPC website. Marchant and Gowan said they use it for publications. Chizmas referred to a form online which lets you put your information right in for project solicitation as being the type of usability, adding we would like to make the site less clunky and more informational and easy to use. Husband wanted to know if getting access to raw data for traffic volume reports as well as crash data. Currently what they get is filtered from the PD and DOT crash database and the report that they get back is not really useful. Chizmas said that there is potential for misrepresentation with the data and issues with driver privacy, liability, and legal issues if served up to the general public. There was a question as to who the general audience of NRPC is. Chizmas said general public, state, municipal, elected officials and data people. Lockwood suggested a Survey Monkey survey for input on revamps or updates to the website. Roache referred to a questionnaire which he sent out to Commissioners with not much feedback. Siskavich explained what the RFP requested in relation to details and what we are looking for to have done and how we would like to use what we have but put it into a more modern venue. Chizmas provided some examples of Quick Link layouts. Lockwood informed the group of how he uses the NRPC website. Roache added that we would need control over basic functions. Gowan said that would be important to include that in the RFP. He also asked that we send Pelham the RFP as he had some firms in mind. Another suggestion was to have all information in one spot for all projects with the ability to access data. Roache asked the group to provide any additional input to NRPC.

**STAFF AND PROJECT UPDATES**

Chizmas passed around the Project Advertising Schedule updates. Dookran informed the group of the SRTS project that would be presenting to the preservation alliance on Monday for Charlotte Ave for traffic calming and a sidewalk.

Motion to adjourn came from Dookran with a second from Gowan. The meeting adjourned at 1:15 pm.