



**SALEM-PLAISTOW-WINDHAM
TAC Committee Meeting
MINUTES**

Atkinson Town Hall
Friday, September 28, 2001

Members Present: Ellen Faulconer, Chair, Kingston; Marilyn Senter, Plaistow; Steve Laurin, Newton; Paul Sullivan, Atkinson; Bill Scott, Salem; Becky Ohler, NHDES; and Subramanian Sharma, NHDOT.

Staff Present: Dave Walker, Scott Bogle and Roxanne Rines, RPC.

Meeting opened at 9:35 a.m.

I. Introductions

Everyone introduced themselves and stated where they were from.

2. Communications

The communication file was distributed. Ohler handed out an ozone summary sheet, which outlined the exceedences for the summer.

3. Approval of August 3, 2001 minutes.

Motion: Senter made a motion to accept the minutes of August 3, 2001, as written. Sullivan seconded the motion. GACIT was misspelled in the document. **Motion carried with the change and with Faulconer and Laurin abstaining.**

4. TAC Meeting Schedule

Walker stated the next years meeting dates are scheduled. The November 30th meeting will be in Salem, at that time we will decide on the next location.

5. CMAQ Project Proposal Evaluation

Walker reviewed the CMAQ projects received in order of staffs ranking of the criteria:

2 - Salem - CMAQ Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) - To complete an adaptive signal control system on their major corridors, Route 28 and Pelham Road as well as Main Street. The town will provide a 35% match and manage the project themselves. It has good air quality impacts and reductions. This needs to be on a rush schedule, so that it is implemented prior to the I-93 construction; however, is up to the state.

4 - DOT - Windham Traffic Signal Coordination - coordinate three signals on Route 111, 80/20 match, slight air quality improvements and some congestion relief.

5 - DOT/DOS - ITS Initiative, Emissions Inspection and Maintenance Program - this will set up a Commercial Vehicle Information System Network (CVISN), to monitor heavy duty diesel trucks. 80/20 match, there would be some positive air quality impacts and reduced congestion at the weigh stations. There isn't a cost benefit because staff wasn't able to calculate the benefits, which hurts its score.

Sharma stated the project is part of a national initiative CVO (Commercial Vehicle Operations). Federal Highways has money available to help states implement master plans. **Walker** stated the argument is that it will allow greater enforcement of emission violations along with reducing the idling time and lines at the weigh stations.

3 - DES - Diesel Vehicle Compliance Assistance/Outreach Program - This is an outreach program. **Ohler** stated the project is a 60/40 match. This program will target the vehicles that the above project does not, either for practical or political reasons.

Senter asked why project #5 doesn't target school buses? **Ohler** stated DOS is an enforcement agency and they are reluctant to fine school systems. DES does not have to cite violators, they can identify vehicles and get an agreement with them to fix the problem.

There was discussion about school/bus systems that have been involved with compliance assistance before. **Ohler** stated the funds will buy a diesel testing opacity meter which tests the vehicles opacity. The state has limits as to a vehicles opacity level based on the age of the vehicle.

1 - DES - Statewide Support for Clean Air Action/Ride Free Days - This project is to reimburse transit operators when they offer free ride days. DES supports up to 13 days a year, it is an 80/20 match. **Walker** continued that on days when the free rides are in effect, you get significant pollutant reductions.

Members discussed that there are no benefits to the SPW region because transit service isn't available. **Walker** stated when the I-93 service begins, this will be a positive aspect to add. **Ohler** stated the project is statewide, that why this MPO is seeing the project.

Senter stated she supports #2 before #1 because the region gets no benefit from #1. **Faulconer** suggested ranking the projects as #3, #2, #4, #1 and #5. After further discussion it was decided to switch projects 4 and 5. **Scott** further explained Salems' project.

There was more discussion about air quality benefits and how those are calculated. **Ohler** stated after DOT receives the projects they are sent to DES. DES is responsible for reviewing the air quality analysis and making sure the correct methodology and emission factors were used. The committee further discussed where the projects should rank.

Motion: **Laurin** made a motion that the projects be ranked as follows: CM-4, CM-1, CM-2, CM-3, and CM-5 and that TAC recommend the above ranking to the Policy Committee for approval and to forward the document to DOT. **Senter** seconded the motion. **Motion carried with DOT and DES abstaining.**

DRAFT

6. GACIT Hearings

Walker stated there are two hearings in the region, October 23 at the Salem High School and October 24, at the Plaistow Public Library. This is the only chance for public comments on the proposed 10-year plan. He asked if the committee wants the MPO to take a position on any projects that are on the list.

Faulconer asked if staff had reviewed the dates to make sure none of them had been changed? **Walker** stated as far as staff knows the Hunt Road/Newton Junction Road project has not been delayed.

Senter stated NH and Massachusetts share Route 125 and Massachusetts is looking into adding signals on their side. She continued that this would benefit Plaistow and asked how DOT feels about funding a project that is not in its' state; however, NH would benefit? **Sharma** stated it is an interesting question. Senter gave more details about the project. **Sharma** suggested the idea be taken to Bob Greer first.

Walker stated one of the questions staff will ask at the GACIT hearing is how the 111 Bypass and the I-93 project will be coordinated. He continued that at the Policy Meeting, they will decide what or how staff should approach the hearings.

Walker recommended that towns attend the GACIT hearings to speak on behalf of their individual projects. He asked if members had any other comments besides the above two that they want voiced at the hearings?

Scott stated if traffic starts seeking alternate routes during I-93 construction and the bypass, it will cause problems. He stated that if I-93 is pushed back the bypass could be completed sooner, so that when I-93 is constructed, Shadow Lake is not inundated with traffic.

Senter stated it makes sense to have Shadow Lake done first. **Walker** stated both projects are slated to start at the same time.

Motion: **Senter** made a motion to recommend to the Policy Committee that the draft 10-year plan stay as is without any changes in dates unless projects are moved ahead. **Sullivan** seconded the motion.

Walker stated that I-93 and the 111 Bypass are on the same schedule; however, some of the pieces have been moved. **Scott** stated I-93 was not a project when the Bypass project was introduced. If both projects are under construction at the same time it will cause problems.

Scott stated he will write a letter addressed to the GACIT committee explaining Salems' position. **Walker** stated he is going to call Jeff Brillhart before the Policy meeting asking for his take on the projects.

Senter amended her motion to include that the Shadow Lake Bypass project be completed prior to the I-93 construction beginning. **Sullivan** seconded the amendment. **Amendment carried with DOT & DES abstaining. Motion carried with DOT & DES abstaining.**

DRAFT

7. RATIS & ITS

Sharma stated this initiative started in 1995, the three New England Governor's (Maine, New Hampshire and Maine) met and decided they should work together. In 1997, a steering committee was established with representatives from the states DOTs; private sector and state tourism agencies.

The vision of the program is to be a comprehensive traveler and tourist information system serving the entire Tri-state region; enhance traffic operations and motorist safety and to build a strong public /private partnership. He further reviewed how the program will be implemented.

Sharma continued that all the big mid-western states are already using the system, we would just be buying into their system. It would be a coalition of states working together. NH has been testing our system the last couple of months. He concluded that hopefully the program will be available prior to the start of I-93 construction.

8. Long Range Transportation Plan Update

Walker stated the update was adopted and it has been forwarded to the state. Federal Highways has the document and they will let us know if there are any problems. At the next TAC meeting there will be a discussion on the full update.

9. Project Updates

I-93 - Walker stated this item was discussed earlier.

Boston to Portland Rail - Bogle stated the tracks are being tested by Amtrak; the arrival and departure times are still being discussed.

Greater Derry/Greater Salem Regional Transportation Council - Bogle stated the kick-off meeting was well attended. The surveying of the different agencies will begin within the next couple of weeks.

SPW website - Walker stated there is a link from the rpc website: www.rpc-nh.org/spw and that Scott maintains the site.

NH 125 Epping - Walker stated Epping has a very large development coming in north of the intersection of 125 and 101. The developer is willing to put in a traffic signal and do the roadway improvements. There is also a project in the State 10-year plan and they are not interested in moving their project ahead so that both improvements could be done at the same time.

Staff is looking into conducting a corridor study (similar to what was done in Kingston), it could be the entire corridor or just a portion. There is a possibility that the study could be funded under the SPR program.

Walker stated MPO staff, Town of Salem staff and DOT met with Cisco representatives about using part of their lot for a park & ride lot. Cisco has 400 parking spaces with easy ingress and egress for busses. Assuming details can be worked out, the service could begin before the I-93 construction.

DRAFT

10. Adjourn

Motion: **Senter** made a motion to adjourn at 12:15 p.m. **Ohler** seconded the motion. **Motion carried.**

Motion adjourned at 12:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Roxanne M. Rines
Recording Secretary

DRAFT