



NRPC TRANSPORTATION TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
06/17/09
APPROVED

Members Present:

Bill Parker, Town of Milford
Steve Laurin, Town of Merrimack
Roger Houston, City of Nashua
Steve Dookran, City of Nashua
Joe Mendola, City of Nashua
Mark Sousa, Nashua Transit
Louise Woodworth, Nashua Transit
Kristi Gillette, Nashua Transit
Bruce Berry, Town of Amherst

Jeff Babel, Town of Hollis
Tad Putney, Town of Brookline
Jean Marie Kennamer, City of Nashua
John Cashell, Town of Hudson
Gary Webster, Town of Hudson
Jeff Gowan, Town of Pelham
Jeffrey Santacruce, Greenman-Pedersen
William Rose, NH DOT

Others Present

Tim Roache, Principal Transportation Planner
Julie Chizmas, Transportation Planner
Jared Arikian, NRPC Intern
Karen M. Baker, NRPC Administrative Assistant

CALL TO ORDER AND INTRODUCTIONS

Tim Roache opened the meeting at 12:08 and proceeded with introductions around the table.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FROM THE MAY 20TH 2009 MEETING

Roache referred to the minutes of May 20th 2009 included in the agenda packet and asked for a motion to approve. Laurin referred to the 3rd paragraph on pg 2 to remove the word “still”, add the word “up” and remove the “p”, and add language after “categories” he had said, to read “and at the next Commission meeting, Commission needs to evaluate and come up with the top 3 priorities”. Gowan moved to approve the minutes as amended with a second from Parker. All were in favor and the motion passed.

2009-2012 STIP AMENDMENT #2

Roache referred to the STIP Amendment #2 memo included in the agenda packet and briefly summarized what it included. He explained that the NRPC recently received STIP Amendment #2 to the adopted 2009 -2012 Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) from the New Hampshire Department of Transportation (NHDOT). STIP Amendment #2 proposes changes to projects in all Metropolitan Planning Areas in the state. Below is a list of the proposed changes in projects in the Nashua Region:

- Hudson Train Depot – Relocation & Restoration of former Hudson Train Depot
- Nashua 101A – Widening from Celina Ave intersection to Amherst Street mall
- Nashua to Boston Intercity Bus Service – Constr. of 2000 sq ft passenger & ticketing facility at Exit 8
- Statewide – Various projects (guardrail replacement, pavement resurfacing & bridge inspection/rehabilitation)

Roache also informed that a legal notice was placed in the Nashua Telegraph accepting public comment through July 6th, 2009 and that a public hearing would be held at the Commission meeting that evening. Additionally, a motion to recommend to the Commission contingent on any significant comment prior to July 6th from TTAC was needed. He added that a Rockingham RPC project triggered the air quality conformity determination and that would be incorporated into the Statewide summary, but there was no impact for the NRPC region to air quality. Roache did say that fiscal constraint would be maintained. Sousa motioned to recommend STIP Amendment #2 to the Commission for approval contingent on any significant public comment prior to July 6th, 2009, with a second from Kennamer. All were in favor and the motion passed.

2011-2014 TIP AND TEN YEAR PLAN (TYP) UPDATE

Roache passed around a Ten Year Plan Update memo and summarized saying the best approach is for NRPC is to make recommendations to DOT on what they think the priorities for the region are. He referred to the top ten list starting on page 2. Roache asked for some type of consensus or agreement of the list for recommendation to DOT. He also said not expect this list to radically change the TYP.

Dookran asked about the proposed Exit 36 S project. Roache said it was not in the TYP yet. It was in the L RTP and felt it would probably be turnpike funds & some funding from MA. He added that it could be moved up, but it may be at the expense of something else. Dookran also had concern with the connection for the potential Nashua Landing area for rail and wondered if this should be considered. Roache referred to the letter he sent to DOT on projects not currently in the TYP in order to keep them on the DOT radar.

Cashell had concerns with Sagamore Bridge & Lowell Road adding that this should be 2 lanes North & South. Additionally, there was an air quality issue at Lowell Road & Wason due to the congestion there. He felt these were two big issues for Hudson and should be squeezed into the TYP. Roache said this would be a new project and suggested CMAQ funding to do an air quality analysis to check for the benefit. He felt there could be an issue getting DOT to add a new project to the TYP.

Mendola asked if the 2 RT 130 projects listed were far enough apart for construction. Roache felt they were.

Webster referred to a Hudson sidewalk project where they went back to DOT to get the project half paid for and was thinking of applying for CMAQ, TE, or SRTS funding to finish the project, adding that it is ready to go. Roache said this was more applicable to the TE discussion coming up.

Roache asked the TTAC to endorse the priority list. Houston asked Dookran if he wanted to switch a project out. Roache did not feel this was realistic for the 10 year window. Gowan suggested adding specificity (earmarked funds) to the list. Sousa motioned to recommend the priority list to DOT with a letter generated by NRPC & Staff. Kennamer seconded. All were in favor and the motion passed.

TRANSPORTATION ENHANCEMENTS (TE) FUNDING

Roache reviewed the Transportation Enhancements (TE) Funding memo. The funding round started June 1st and will require a letter of intent to DOT indicating that you will be applying for TE funds. This new round will only require 1 copy of the application and an electronic copy as opposed to the multiples required in past years. Dookran asked if there was a sample letter of intent as an example available. Rose of DOT said no and informed the group of some of the requirements and particulars of the program. First he said if a municipality chooses a project from their list that has not moved, due to lack of action by the community for no good reason, and it is still on the DOT list, it will be scrutinized and DOT will be looking to the community to finish the project first before they will give money for another project. Roache asked members around the table if their towns had any ideas for projects that they would apply for TE funding.

Hudson – 2 projects – Tie in existing sidewalk that is partly on town, partly on state property & fill in holes of sidewalk or lack of due to bike path.

Nashua had 4 in mind.

Rose said this would be very competitive at the regional level and that they will pick the number 1 projects from each of the regions to keep the distribution statewide equitable. Roache referred to the criteria used to score projects with land use served by the projects as one of the criteria. Putney asked if roads traveled numbers could be revisited due to the fact that no many towns will have that kind of volume. Roache said they would be open to tweaking this and maybe using population instead. Roache said he would also take a look at the criteria used in last round and get it out to everyone. Houston asked if the

budget source mattered. Rose said that federal funds could not be used. Houston wanted clarification on the 20% match for the funding source. Rose said last word from DOT was federal funds could not be used for matching funds when applying for TE funding. He added that the expectation is that you have 100% of the funds to pay for the project and that it is a reimbursement process. Rose said there would be no delay once awards were made and that they were ready to go.

Babel asked if historic preservation included buildings. Roache said it would have to be transportation related (not for town hall restorations or center of town colonial homes).

Rose informed the group that the municipally managed workshop was not going to be a full day course but maybe 1 ½ hour course and there would be about ½ dozen across the state. He referred to a website www.enhancements.org which had examples of all types of TE projects.

Roache said that NRPC could assist with the applications, data, etc. Houston asked how much TE funds there were and if there was a project size limit. Rose said there was 6 million in TE funds and there was no size limit, but don't try for a 3 or 6 million dollar project. He added that phasing was an option, and also suggested getting help when doing their estimates. Parker asked if the letter of intent had to include the estimate. Rose said that an initial non-binding estimate must be included with the letter of intent. Also, all applications will go to the DOT and the RPC at the same time.

Roache reminded the group that there would be a public involvement component as well and that NRPC would have to certify that there was some type of public involvement or support in the application. He added that he would like to see documentation referencing this (public meeting, discussed in some type of forum, etc.). Roache confirmed with Rose the new requirement this round of having close to full time construction cost. Dookran said there could be projects that may have been forgotten and asked Rose if they had a list of projects. Rose said he was working on a list (to remove projects). He added that there was a status list available on the DOT website.

Dookran asked what NRPC does with the letters of intent. Roache said it was part of the DOT structure and it also informs NRPC of what kind of involvement will be necessary from NRPC.

The meeting adjourned at **1:14pm**.