



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

Hampstead Town Hall
August 22, 2003

Members Present: Ellen Faulconer, Chair, Kingston; Marilyn Senter, Plaistow; Tom Case, Windham; Bill Scott, Salem; Becky Ohler, DES and Alaina Bailey DOT.

Others Present: Linda Harvey, citizen, Salem and John Englert, NNEPRA.

Staff Present: Dave Walker and Roxanne Rines, RPC.

Meeting opened at 9:35 a.m.

I. Introductions

Attendees introduced themselves and stated what municipality they were from or the agency they represented.

2. Communications

Walker stated DOT has temporarily changed the Hampton Tolls to a one-way collection system, a fee of \$2.00 northbound and free flowing southbound.

Walker stated the GACIT hearings have been tentatively scheduled for October 28th in either Salem or Windham and October 29th in Plaistow, both at 7 p.m.

3. Approval of March 28, 2003, minutes

Motion: **Senter** gave three grammatical corrections. **Senter** made a motion to accept the minutes with corrections. **Case** seconded the motion. **Motion carried.**

4. 2005-2007 TIP and 2005-2014 Ten Year Plan

Walker stated the DOT released a draft ten-year plan to the GACIT committee for their review. TAC needs to put together comments for GACIT based upon the changes the committee has seen to the SPW portion of the plan. Due to a variety of reasons, a large number of projects have either been delayed or removed from the plan. None of the spring projects the MPO submitted were added.

Faulconer asked how other towns feel about their projects being delayed? **Walker** stated he hasn't heard from other towns. Members discussed projects.

Scott stated if I-93 is constructed the town of Salem has an ITS project that would be built in two years, along with the Depot and the 111 Bypass. They are all related to I-93, so regardless of the money issue, if Salem does traffic counts before construction, none of them will be any good. Maybe there should be a relationship between projects to the extent that they be sequenced.

Bailey stated the DOT needs to know the above information and it should be pointed out. **Faulconer** stated she would like all of the information concerning Salem/I-93 be included in the MPO's comments.

Senter discussed project #13803 and a redevelopment project accepted by the town of Plaistow. Members discussed other projects being completed in the area.

Walker stated project #10044B, the Route 125 Kingston/Plaistow has been adjusted. DOT has formally added in phased construction for 2005-2006 and then the bulk of the project funding is moved to 2007, the project is growing in cost. He has concerns about the dollar amounts DOT has put in for phases 2 and 3, they seem almost arbitrary, there needs to be some definite work relating to the funding numbers.

Faulconer stated the Town of Kingston expects the TAC committee will not put this plan forward with a recommendation to accept the plan with project #10044B being changed. The town understands what DOT will do, but none the less they expect this committee will not recommend the plan. **Walker** stated there certainly will be comments, because in the spring when the MPO submitted the draft TIP, one of the comments was not to move this project.

Walker stated the MPO's job now is to address the draft and provide comments at GACIT. This is a very important comment for the towns of Kingston and Plaistow to make at GACIT, as well as the MPO. **Faulconer** stated that DOT District 6 has more applications for driveway permits for Route 125, all types of commercial activity is now interested in Kingston.

Scott stated now is a good time to implement impact fees. **Faulconer** explained the town's conflicts up till this point. Members continued to discuss issues with the Route 125 project funding.

Walker stated the 3 projects the MPO asked to be included in the plan were put into a section of the plan called "Projects for Future Consideration", which is the laundry list of projects that if any money becomes available will be considered for construction.

Walker stated bonding I-93 is being discussed at the state level with a GARVEE bond. He distributed information about bonds. If this bond is issued, the I-93 project will be completed faster and frees up a big chunk of money for other projects. When using a bond, more often your savings in construction in doing the project faster are greater than the cost of the interest of the debt financed, or at least it's a wash.

He continued that having a bond would require that the state take between 20 and 30 million dollars of its improvement money each year and put it into debt service. The state is looking into the numbers and Jeff Brillhart stated he will have some preliminary numbers next week, hopefully by the Policy meeting.

Walker stated another advantage is that now maintenance budgets are being cut, bonding the project would allow full restoration of maintenance budgets. **Bailey** stated the decision about the bond will not be decided by the GACIT hearings. **Walker** stated that money numbers will be available soon.

Walker reviewed his recommendations for comments to GACIT and recommended that each town make their own comments and present them at the hearings. **Scott** asked if the departments of DRED and OSP should be involved in the planning process of projects. **Walker** stated both departments get notices of our meetings; however, noone attends. More discussion ensued.

Walker stated he will put his recommendations and the other comments made at this meeting into a statement that the Policy committee will review at their meeting in September.

Motion: **Case** made a motion to send Walkers recommendation to the Policy committee for their review. **Faulconer** asked for an amendment to add "continue to argue strongly" to the comment about project #10044B. **Case** accepted the amendment. **Senter** seconded the motion and amendment. **Motion carried.**

Scott asked when Walker needs the towns comment letters? **Walker** stated the town can present their own comments at the GACIT hearings and that would probably be better.

6. 8-Hour Non-Attainment Area Boundaries and Related Information

Ohler stated the new 8-hour zone standard takes effect in 2004, effectively replacing the 1-hour standard. The 8-hour standard recognizes the fact that lower, but prolonged levels of ozone exposure are probably more damaging than single exposures.

She continued that the EPA has to designate non-attainment areas under the 8-hour standard by April 2004. The state submitted proposed boundaries; state EPA is proposing a single non-attainment area for the state of NH. EPA is trying to make it easier for MPO's to complete their models. She further explained other maps included in her handout.

The state of NH has told EPA that NH does not want to be tied to southern Massachusetts anymore. There was discussion about how the change will affect economic development within the region.

5. 2003-2004 TE/CMAQ Round

Walker reviewed the draft evaluation criteria for projects. **Walker** stated the Seacoast TAC made minor suggestions that would be good to incorporate into the SPW sheets. The biggest change since last round is in criteria #9, it contains new language "if the project is consistent with the Long Range Plan or included in a corridor study" it receives bonus points.

Another change is the introduction of a sliding scale, it has been set up with a rough scale for points with inbetween points being awarded. The suggestions from the Seacoast TAC were; criteria 1A, B & 2, get rid of the average and the overmatch bonus, the suggestion was made to give one point for every 5% above the 20% required match.

Case asked if towns ever give more match money than required? **Walker** stated it does occasionally happen and gave an example.

Faulconer stated she does not like the overmatch idea because it could be detrimental to smaller towns, they have trouble coming up with 20%, let alone more. **Walker** stated staff will be using the criteria sheet to evaluate the projects they have received along with air quality analysis, within the next month or so.

He continued that another meeting is needed probably at the end of September, to have a prioritized list of TAC recommended projects for the Policy committee. **Scott** asked if bonus points could be

given to projects over a certain funding size when the community gives more of a match? **Walker** stated once staffs evaluates the projects, TAC can always re-arrange the ranking of projects.

Walker stated staff was just trying to make the sheets consistent with the Seacoast, this is roughly based upon the state's criteria and how the TE and CMAQ committees evaluate the projects. Staff's goals this year was to make our ranking system consistent with the state.

Motion: **Senter** made a motion to approve the TE/CMAQ evaluation criteria sheet with changes from the Seacoast TAC committee. **Case** seconded the motion. **Motion 2-2-0 with Case and Scott voting to approve and Senter and Faulconer voting against.**

Motion: **Senter** made a motion to approve the TE/CMAQ evaluation criteria sheet with all the changes from the Seacoast TAC committee **except** the overmatch bonus. **Case** seconded the motion. **Motion carried.**

Motion: **Senter** made a motion to approve adding the overmatch bonus in the criteria of the TE/CMAQ evaluation criteria sheet. **Faulconer** seconded the motion. **Motion 1-3-0 with Scott voting to approve and Senter, Case and Faulconer voting against.**

7. Preliminary Journey to Work Data Tables from 2000 Census

Walker handed out a memo and stated that the MPO is just starting to get the Census Transportation Planning package from the census bureau. He explained the four attached tables to the memo. **Bogle** will be on the next agenda to further explain the information contained in the memo.

8. Project Updates

Walker reviewed his Atkinson/Plaistow/East Road/Timberlane School intersection study. He has given a draft to Atkinson and will get one to Plaistow. His conclusion is that there is a lot of traffic at both intersections and that they both fail. Whether signals at each end would work or not is questionable.

9. Discussion of Next Meeting

Walker stated another meeting is needed before October 15th, to discuss CMAQ projects; therefore, the next meeting will be the last Friday of the month, September 26, 2003.

John Englert, NNEPRA, stated his organization wants to become more involved with the NH MPO process. His organization sees passenger rail in New England very closely linked to NH, this is the future. The service does not serve NH as it should, in terms of service, frequency and schedules.

They work with Guilford on a daily basis. Their strategic business plan includes increasing the frequency of the Dover/Boston segment and adding a Plaistow station into the mix.

10. Adjourn

Meeting adjourned at 12:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted, Roxanne M. Rines