

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

Meeting Minutes

**Friday, December 6th 2019
9 – 11 a.m.**

The meeting began at 9:05am

1. Introductions

Members: Gretchen Young (Dover), Michael Williams (COAST), Linda Dusenbury (NHDOT), Kelley Collins (Wakefield), Elizabeth Strachan (NHDES), Arthur Capello (Farmington), Jim Campbell (Rochester), Jon Hotchkiss (Middleton)

Staff: Colin Lentz

2. Staff Communications

3. Action Item(s)

3.1. Minutes from November 1st 2019

K. Collins made a motion to accept the minutes as written

Seconded by E. Strachan

Vote: Unanimous in favor (A. Capello abstained)

3.2. Adopt draft TAC mission and goals

C. Lentz reviewed a mission statement and goals that he had drafted and had been reviewed during the previous meeting. He noted that it was his goal to do more technical work directly with the committee rather than just having them review work staff does in the office.

K. Collins made a motion to adopt the draft TAC mission and goals.

Seconded by Arthur Capello

Vote: all in favor.

4. Discussion Items

4.1. Review demographic data for the Metro Plan

C. Lentz reviewed a draft set of maps he had provided prior to the meeting. The maps showed demographic information across the region. He said he wanted to make sure the maps showed what was needed to show where people were living throughout the region so the right questions could be asked in the Metro Plan. The maps would help the Policy committee start developing goals and objectives, so C. Lentz said he wanted to make sure they were accurate from the perspective of municipal staff. They showed demographics at the town level and the census block group level: total population, households below the poverty level, percentage of households that are "families" (as defined by the census), median and per-capita household income, the concentration seniors (65+) and 18 years or younger, and minority populations.

C. Lentz noted that data for the town of Durham will need some additional analysis and disclaimers since the high concentration of college students skews information (for instance, the student population shows up as people “below the poverty level” because of their lack of income). C. Lentz said the maps were based on 2010 Census data and he had avoided mixing data from American Community Survey because of its higher error rate. K. Collins asked how income level information is helpful once a household is above the poverty line (what’s the difference between a family that makes \$90,000 per year where two people drive and a family that makes \$120,000 and two people drive). C. Lentz said it was a good question; information about the types of households throughout the region and the trends in census data could be used in the Metro Plan to forecast what types of transportation improvements would be most appropriate. M. Williams asked if the census included the number of cars per household. C. Lentz said it did. He added that other SRPC staff were looking deeper into specific household types and demographics such as seniors.

C. Lentz said he would be working with SRPC staff to use the travel demand model to pair population data with projections on where people were driving daily. The population and travel information together are foundational to the Metro Plan and other regional plans.

4.2. Universal transportation project development form

Does this provide a good starting point for communities developing transportation projects?

C. Lentz provided a draft form for developing transportation projects. His goal was to improve the process for working with municipalities and other applicants to develop potential transportation projects and pair them with various funding sources (ten year plan, transportation alternatives, etc.). The draft form he presented was designed to compile overarching information about a potential project; separate forms and analysis would be needed to identify more specific information to refine the project. It included:

- Project title, location, scope, and need
- Nearby projects to be considered
- Target completion timeframe
- Project focus
- Level of local support for the project
- Additional project factors
- Contact information
- Other relevant information

C. Lentz wanted to confirm with municipal staff that the information on the form was readily available to them and that it would help form accurate project proposals.

M. Williams asked that “on an existing transit route” be added as an option for additional project factor. Other members pointed out a couple of typo and formatting issues.

C. Lentz said he would be reaching out to municipal staff to identify local project priorities to developed and refined for future funding opportunities.

5. Project Updates

5.1. January regional workshop

C. Lentz reminded committee members that there would not be an official TAC meeting in January. Instead SRPC would be holding a regional workshop focused on the link between transportation, housing, and economic development. The reason for this being that SRPC would be updating the Metro Plan, Regional Housing Needs Assessment, and Regional Economic Development Strategy so it made more sense to have one workshop for three plans rather than three separate workshops or other outreach efforts. The workshop was scheduled for Friday January 10th from 9:00 to 12:00 at the Strafford Community Action Partnership office in Dover. C. Lentz said he hoped TAC members could all participate along with other technical staff from municipalities and agencies who had been invited.

5.2. Ten Year Plan update

C. Lentz said the Governor's Advisory Commission on Intermodal Transportation (GACIT) had approved a draft of the Ten Year Plan and submitted it to the Governor's office for his review. The Governor has until January 15th to review and submit his draft to the legislature. C. Lentz noted that the draft plan included a proposal to flex 25% of CMAQ program funds to FTA to support public transit.

C. Lentz added that the rescission provision in the federal transportation authorization (the FAST Act) had been repealed by Congress. The rescission would have required large amounts of federal funding to be sent back by every state based on a complex formula.

6. Other Business

C. Lentz noted that he and Rachel Dewey would be attending a regional peer-sharing workshop in D.C the next week.

E. Strachan announced that the state Office of Strategic Initiatives (OSI) in partnership with NHDES had released a request for proposals for installation of new direct-current fast-chargers for electric vehicles along several major corridors throughout the state. The due date is January 24th. Installed chargers must be universally accessible to various electric vehicles. Detailed information is on the OSI website.

C. Lentz provided a quick preview of traffic analysis capability SRPC had gained through a cooperative purchase of data and tools from the National Performance Management Research Data Set (NPMRDS). The data set generates traffic data on highways across the country based on the movements of cell phones in vehicles. Location information is derived from phones with their Bluetooth activated as they travel along the highway. No personal information is collected or tracked, but the Bluetooth data are aggregated to allow users to analyze traffic on individual highways (including speed, volumes, congestion and other information) and show the difference between car and truck traffic. The NPMRDS dataset shows data for several highways in the Strafford region: NH16, NH202/US4, NH125, NH108, NH11, NH9. C. Lentz said this information and analysis power would be used for future regional planning and corridor analysis.

G. Young noted that Dover had just purchased two mobile units that sensed and collected the same Bluetooth data that the city could use to collect traffic data.

7. **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 comments before the committee.

8. Adjournment

M. Williams made a motion to adjourn. Seconded by A. Capello

The meeting was adjourned at 10:10am

Minutes approved by

Print Jon B. Hotchkiss

Signed J. B. Hotchkiss Date _____