



156 Water Street, Exeter, NH 03833
Tel. 603-778-0885 ♦ Fax: 603-778-9183
email@rpc-nh.org ♦ www.rpc-nh.org

RPC MPO Policy

Minutes

Brentwood Recreation Center
July 9, 2014

Members Present: Tim Moore, Chair, Plaistow; Barbara Kravitz, Hampton; Katherine Woolhouse and Gwen English, Exeter; Richard McDermott, Hampton Falls; Phil Wilson, North Hampton; Joan Whitney, Kensington; Glenn Coppelman, Kingston; Mike Turell and Robert Clark, Atkinson; Mary Allen and Jim Doggett, Newton; Mike McAndrew, New Castle; and Tom Jameson, NH DOT.

Others Present: Lisa Wilson, North Hampton.

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

7:05 p.m. Policy Meeting Opened

1. Welcome/Introductions

Attendees introduced themselves and stated what municipality they were from or the agency they represented. **Coppelman** thanked the Town of Brentwood for hosting the meeting.

2. Minutes from April 9, 2014, RPC Policy Committee

Motion: **Allen** made a motion to approve the minutes of April 9, 2014, as written. **Turell** seconded the motion. **Motion carried with McDermott abstaining.**

3. TIP Amendment #6

7:11 PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

Walker stated no public comment was received; he then reviewed the 8 projects and their changes. There was no discussion.

7:14 PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

Motion: **Doggett** made a motion to approve TIP Amendment #6. **McDermott** seconded. **Motion carried.**

4. Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) update

Tom Jamson, NH DOT, reviewed what past funding programs are included in the TAP and the amount of funding available, which is less. He then gave a powerpoint presentation while explaining how the program will work, what types of projects will be eligible and the funding amount of projects allowed.

He then reviewed the advisory committee membership; application process; criteria weighing; and scoring of projects. **Jamson** reviewed the application itself; gave deadlines for submittals; and schedule for project implementation. Discussion ensued about how much weight the regional ranking will be given during the committee's ranking.

5. Proposed Regional Rail Safety committee

Sinnott reviewed the SEA-3 project in Newington, explaining the safety concerns by municipalities. The regional impact committee met and found that the amount of propane being shipped will not increase much higher. Therefore, the quantitative risk will not change much.

After meeting with the Portsmouth Planning Department, staff has decided to form a regional rail safety subcommittee comprised of TAC members, who could then appoint an additional person who would like to be on the committee or has knowledge. The focus of the committee will be on regional rail safety questions and also a vehicle for doing research about how rail is administered and the movement of freight.

Sinnott continued that the City of Portsmouth would like the RPC to facilitate a regional forum on rail safety on the Portsmouth Branch and rail safety in general. He continued that staff also offered to do traffic counts at the crossing of the communities that ask. Discussion ensued about what products and how much are being shipped and the fact that companies do not have to diverge what is being shipped. There was a consensus of the members to do the above mentioned tasks. **Clark** recommended that before the next TAC meeting, staff notify TAC members of the subcommittee and solicit members so that the subcommittee can be created at the next TAC meeting.

Sinnott stated the next step in the process is for staff to contact DOT about organizing a subcommittee and then it's up to the TAC members to coordinate and solicit members.

6. Plaistow Rail Project Update

Sinnott gave a brief update. He continued that the MPO will have a presentation and update of the project for the communities of Plaistow, Atkinson, Hampstead, Kingston, Newton, East Kingston and possibly Sandown and Danville during the summer. DOT has a project update page on their website.

Clark read a letter he penned with his concerns about the layover station. He also read an article, stating that HDR did a transportation benefit-cost analysis in 2010 and questioned the objectivity of HDR to review their own study. He asked that the study to be reviewed by a different firm. He asked who will determine the next steps: NH DOT; Plaistow Selectmen; or will the people decide their own fate (as it should be). He has asked these questions repeatedly and believes the RPC has not taken an action.

Sinnott stated there isn't a precise answer to the question of who will make the decision. It would probably be the same analogy as any highway project, the DOT ultimately decides and towns do not get a vote as to whether they want the project or not. But usually the DOT will not undertake a project if there is a lot of strong local opposition and the need of the project.

Sinnott explained how the decision process works and that it will only cover about 10% of the total study funds. The ridership numbers and cost analysis benefit will all be taken into account.

Sinnott stated he will write a letter to Shelly at DOT about the above concerns. Discussion ensued.

7. NH 1A/1B Scenic Byway Plan Update

Bogle gave an update of the project, reviewed the results from the UNH survey and continued with an overview of the work needed to complete. Discussion ensued.

8. Transportation Scenario Planning for the Regional Master Plan: Modeling transportation impacts from population & employment scenarios

Walker stated he will be using the scenario planning outcomes in the Transportation Master Plan Chapter and the Long Range Transportation Plan. He continued that other staff will use sections of the scenario planning in their chapters. He explained what scenario planning is and how employment and population numbers are used. **Wilson** asked what is the purpose of a State Master Plan. **Sinnott** stated the reason for creating the State Development Plan is to look at some of the common policies, issues and recommendations that appear consistently throughout the regional plans. Someone at the state level has to decide what will be state policy. **Walker** asked members to send any comments or changes to him.

9. Project Status/Updates/Informational Items

A handout was distributed.

10. Review Adoption of RPC Personnel Policy Amendments

Doggett stated he found a mistake, an ed needs to be added to Article A, Item A, the word open.

Sinnott stated the Executive Committee also found two small changes: page P-3, the \$500 limit on conferences has been increased to \$1,000; and page P-12 under #3, the first sentence shall read "Individuals who are hired for specified period of time or for the completion of a specific project, regardless of the numbers of hours scheduled to work, provided such employment is anticipated to have a duration not less than 12 months and less than 35 hours per week".

Motion: **Doggett** made a motion to adoption the RPC Personnel Policy Amendments as amended above. **Whitney** seconded the motion. **Motion carried.**

11. Other Business; Next Meeting

Coppelman stated there will be a Commission meeting on August 13, 2014.

12. Public Comments

None.

13. Adjourn

Meeting adjourned at 9:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Roxanne M. Rines
Recording Secretary