



## Strafford Metropolitan Planning Organization Technical Advisory Committee Meeting

Friday, May 3<sup>rd</sup> 2019      9:00 – 10:30 AM

Strafford Regional Planning Commission  
150 Wakefield Street, Suite 12, Conference Room 1A  
Rochester, NH

### AGENDA

1. **Introductions**
2. **Staff Communications**
3. **Action Item(s)**
  - 3.1. Minutes from April 5<sup>th</sup> 2019
4. **Discussion Items**
  - 4.1. Metropolitan Transportation Plan Development
    - Data for regional indicators
    - Project development, ranking, and selection
5. **Other Business**
6. **Citizen's Forum** – Citizens of the Strafford region are invited to speak on the subject matter of the meeting. Statements shall be limited to three minutes
7. **Adjournment**

Reasonable accommodations for people with disabilities are available upon request. Include a description of the accommodation you will need including as much detail as you can. Also include a way we can contact you if we need more information. Make your request as early as possible; please allow at least 5 days advance notice. Last minute requests will be accepted, but may be impossible to fill. Please call (603) 994-3500 or email [srpc@strafford.org](mailto:srpc@strafford.org).

## Rules of Procedure

*Strafford Regional Planning Commission  
Strafford Metropolitan Planning Organization, and  
Strafford Economic Development District*

### **Meeting Etiquette**

Be present at the scheduled start of the meeting.

Be respectful of the views of others.

Ensure that only one person talks at a time. Raising your hand to be recognized by the chair or facilitator is good practice.

Do not interrupt others, or start talking before someone finishes.

Do not engage in cross talk.

Avoid individual discussions in small groups during the meeting. When one person speaks, others should listen.

Active participation is encouraged from all members.

When speaking, participants should adhere to topics of discussion directly related to agenda items.

When speaking, individuals should be brief and concise.

The Strafford Regional Planning Commission & Metropolitan Planning Organization holds both public meetings and public hearings.

For public meetings, guests are welcome to observe, but should follow proper meeting etiquette allowing the meeting to proceed uninterrupted. Members of the public who wish to be involved and heard should use venues such as citizen forum, public hearings, public comment periods, outreach events, seminars, workshops, listening sessions, etc.

**Strafford Metropolitan Planning Organization  
Technical Advisory Committee Meeting  
150 Wakefield Street, Suite 12, Conference Room 1A  
Rochester, NH 03867**

**Meeting Minutes**

**Friday, April 5, 2019  
9 – 11 a.m.**

**1. Introductions**

Committee Members Present:

Michael Williams (COAST), Gretchen Young (Dover), Chris Parker (Dover), Elizabeth Strachan (NHDES), Linda Dusenberry (NH DOT), Dirk Timmons (UNH Wildcat), Jon Hotchkiss (Middleton), Bruce Woodruff (Milton), Scott Kinmond (New Durham), Kelley Collins (Wakefield), Marcia Gasses (Barrington)

Guests/Public Present: Tom Willard (Dover)

Staff: Jennifer Czysz, Colin Lentz

The meeting was called to order at 9:08am

**2. Staff Communications**

**3. Action Item(s)**

**a. Minutes from March 1st 2019**

C. Parker made a motion to accept the minutes as written  
Seconded by M. Gasses  
Vote: unanimous in favor

**b. Ten Year Plan candidate project scoring results**

C. Lentz provided an overview of the Ten Year Plan project development, ranking, and scoring process. He referenced a handout with a spreadsheet of candidate projects ranked in order, noting that project costs were added cumulatively in one column. This was compared to SRPC's regional apportionment of federal aid highway funding for new projects (\$4,901,449). C. Lentz explained that the proposed project in Dover (108 over the Bellamy) was above the regional allocation so it was not initially included in the cumulative total. J. Czysz noted that NHDOT said Dover was welcome to provide additional match beyond the 20% required for such projects if that project remained a priority for the region, but otherwise it was beyond what could be requested for new funding. C. Parker explained that the cost estimate for the Dover Bellamy project may include additional scope elements in addition to the roundabouts, and that the cost might be much lower than what was listed in the table. C. Lentz said NHDOT had conducted an engineering and cost assessment (separate handouts) based on the scope provided which only included the construction of the two roundabouts at either end of the bridge. J. added that NHDOT's cost estimates were "year of expenditure" dollars and included indirect costs.

| Priority Number | Municipality | Scope and Location Summary  | Project Cost Estimate  |
|-----------------|--------------|---|------------------------|
| 1               | Dover        | Safety and Congestion improvements at NH Route 108 over the Bellamy River                       | \$6,896,505            |
| 2               | Rochester    | Intersection improvements at the sequence of Charles St/NH 125 (Columbus Ave) and Old Dover Rd  | \$2,361,753.60         |
| 3               | Dover        | Pedestrian and accessibility improvements along Chestnut St                                     | \$204,551.20           |
| 4               | Somersworth  | Pedestrian improvements along W. High Street and High Street to connect schools to the downtown | \$1,157,142.40         |
| 5               | Northwood    | Intersection improvements at School St (107) & US 4/US 202 Intersection                         | \$1,002,694            |
| 6               | Rochester    | NH125/Columbus Ave bridge over Cocheco  | no cost estimate       |
| 7               | Dover        | Soundwalls at Exit 7 on Route 16 - Spaulding Tnpk   | Not part of allocation |
| 8               |              | Total of Selected Project Estimates (only highlighted projects)                                 | \$4,726,141            |
|                 |              | <b>Regional Allocation of Federal Aid Highway Funds</b>   | <b>\$4,901,449</b>     |

C. Lentz explained that based on the current cost estimates, projects 2, 3, 4, and 5 could be funded under the regional allocation, but Dovers Bellamy bridge project was too expensive by itself. He noted that the #7 project (soundwalls at exit 7 on the Spaulding Turnpike) was included on the list and did not require regional funds from the regional allocation; it was on the list so it could be eligible for the NHDOT soundwall program.

M. Williams asked what was required to move forward with a decision on the list of projects. C Lentz noted that the deadline for submitting the final list to NHDOT was May 1<sup>st</sup>, which left time for approval by the Policy committee at their April meeting. J. Czysz said the decision at this point came down to either submitting only the #1 project (Dover - NH108 bridge over the Bellamy) with the assumption that the city would be able to provide additional matching funds to make up the additional cost above the regional allocation, or submitting projects #2, 3, 4, and 5, which could all be funded under the regional allocation. C. Lentz noted that the Rochester bridge project (#6) did not have a cost estimate because NHDOT staff were only able to assess the top five projects in each region. The scope of the project focused on bridge widening and would likely have been well above the regional allocation. C. Parker said based on the number of question marks for the Bellamy Bridge project, he would recommend focusing on the Chestnut Street project and requested that SRPC continue working with Dover to develop the Bellamy Bridge project for future funding rounds.

**K. Collins made a motion to submit projects 2, 3, 4, and 5 as presented on the list for inclusion in the draft Ten Year Plan.**

**Seconded by C. Parker**

**Vote: Unanimous in Favor**

#### 4. Discussion Items

##### a. Ten Year Plan Project Development Process

C. Lentz asked for input from the committee on the process for identifying and selecting projects for the Ten Year Plan – and improving the Metro Plan to filter projects for various funding categories. He noted that the RPCs used the common set of project scoring criteria but

had weighted them according to regional priorities. This had not included criteria on environmental impacts and economic development, which had been difficult to quantify in past rounds. C. Lentz suggested that SRPC could adjust the weightings to make some criteria “threshold criteria” and focus on other planning goals. For instance, the “support” criterion could be made into a threshold criterion by zeroing its weight and requiring that all projects have a letter of support from the municipal governing body. That weighting could be shifted to other criteria that are more subjective. C. Lentz emphasized that the goal was to develop regionally-focused projects (potentially using a corridor approach) based on goals and objectives developed by the Policy committee. E. Strachan said she didn’t want smaller projects that would be beneficial for alternative mode improvements to be overshadowed by large regional projects. J. Czysz explained that the goal was not to only have large regional projects, but to ensure that projects in the Metro Plan were well-developed and were organized by funding source. In that way, the Metro Plan would have a range of projects, including for programs like TAP that focused on bike/ped projects. This would help SRPC prioritize projects well ahead of funding opportunities. She added that an overall goal was to ensure that projects are selected based on how well they match the goals and objectives in the Metro Plan.

C. Lentz said he would be reorganizing the Metro Plan so that the projects are sorted by possible funding source.

B. Woodruff said in the past he had emphasized the need to establish and prioritize goals and objectives. He asked if SRPC was aware of the amount of discretionary funding available for the NHDOT maintenance districts (now and estimates in the future). C. Lentz responded that he didn’t know off the top of his head, but that information should be available and easy to look up. B. Woodruff suggested that SRPC could coordinate more closely with NHDOT Districts 3 and 6 on future paving projects and align them with potential SRPC projects. C. Lentz noted that SRPC was going to have improved technical resources like a travel demand model in the future that would aid in project identification.

G. Young asked if an individual project could use multiple funding sources. C. Lentz said he wasn’t sure that a project could use multiple funding sources at one time, but a project could be strategically phased to fund specific project components under different funding sources. G. Young noted that complicated phasing would also require additional project management costs. B. Woodruff said he thought multiple funding sources could be used for a single project but that other funding sources couldn’t be used as the local match portion of a municipally managed project.

E. Strachan said that it was important to consider the weighting of project scoring criteria based on the scope and context of the project (for instance, freight mobility would be heavily weighted for a corridor improvement project, but not for a local bicycle/pedestrian safety project).

B. Woodruff asked how economic development and housing could be incorporated into the scoring criteria and process. C. Lentz reiterated the challenge of measuring economic development but said the TAC should work over the next year on a way to incorporate economic and environmental considerations into the project development and selection process.

5. **Other Business**

No other business

6. **Citizen's Forum** – Citizens of the Strafford region are invited to speak on the subject matter of the meeting. Statements shall be limited to three minutes.

No citizens brought items forward to the committee.

7. **Adjournment**

B. Woodruff made a motion to adjourn

Seconded by S. Kinmond

The meeting was adjourned at 9:45am

Minutes approved by

Print \_\_\_\_\_

Singed \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_