

## AGENDA

### EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

Wednesday, August 23rd, 2017

6:00PM

RPC Conference Room  
156 Water St., Exeter, NH

- 
- 6:00 I. Call to Order; *Phil Wilson, Chair*
- 6:05 II. Minutes of July 26, 2017 meeting **MOTION TO APPROVE** *[Attachment 1]*
- 6:10 III. Financial Report  
A. Monthly Report for July, 2017 – *A. Pettengill, Business Manager* *[Attachment 2]*
- 6:20 IV. Management Tools Informational Discussion - *T. Roache, Executive Director*  
A. Draft Financial Dashboard *[Attachment 3]*  
B. Hours Allocation  
C. Project Budgeting
- 6:45 IV. Legislative Forum Update – *B. Kravitz, T. Roache*
- 7:00 VI. September Commission Meeting – *T. Roache*  
A. FY 18 Work Program  
B. Water Related Presentations  
C. Commissioner Handbook
- 7:30 VII. New/Other Business  
A. Executive Committee Meeting Logistics  
B. Communications Sub Committee  
C. Congestion Mitigation Air Quality Update *[Attachment 4]*  
D. Other Business
- VIII. Adjourn

# **ATTACHMENT 1**

**Minutes  
Rockingham Planning Commission  
Executive Committee**

**July 26, 2017  
RPC Conference Room, Exeter NH**

**Committee Members Present:** P. Wilson (Chairman); B. Kravitz-via phone (Vice Chair); J. Whitney (Secretary); M. Turell (Treasurer); G. Coppelman (Past Chair); M. McAndrew, L. Cushman, K. Woolhouse, R. McDermott, T. Moore (Members At Large)

**Staff:** C. Sinnott (Executive Director); T. Roache (Incoming Director); S. Bogle (Sr. Transportation Planner); A. Pettengill (Business Manager)

**I. Call to Order; Introduction to Tim Roache, Executive Director Designee**

Chairman Wilson called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. and introduced the incoming Director, Tim Roache. Introductions were made around the table.

**II. Minutes of June 28, 2017**

*Coppelman moved to approve the Minutes as presented; Turell seconded.  
**SO VOTED** (2 abstentions)*

**III. Results from Member Services Survey – S. Bogle, Sr. Transportation Planner**

Bogle distributed a new memo and survey summary in addition to Attachment #3. He explained that the staff developed a survey for communities of the services the RPC offers in order to find out what services are valued and what services the communities are searching for. The survey also attempts to gauge what communities see as pressing issues at the moment. Bogle stated that approximately 59 responses were received out of 300 emails sent, which ends up being a 16-20% response rate. Only 4 of our member towns hadn't responded at all, however staff is still attempting to reach someone in those towns. He noted that Danville and Salem (the only non-dues paying towns) were included and Danville responded with a request for contracted services. Bogle reviewed some of the questions asked and their responses.

Coppelman asked if there were any lightbulb moments from the responses and Bogle replied that most of the issues were already anticipated by staff. Issues like MS4 and GIS services seemed to be at the top of the list of requests. General consensus was to present the findings at the September Commission meeting.

#### **IV. Conversation with Tim Roache, Executive Director Designee**

Wilson introduced and welcomed Tim Roache, Executive Director Designee, former Executive Director at Nashua Regional Planning. Roache stated he was honored and humbled to have the opportunity to lead this Commission, especially since he's worked with, and looked up to Sinnott all these years. He commented on the Services Survey and noted that Nashua recently did the same type of survey and he stressed the importance of keeping up with your member community's needs, especially when communication and outreach are the toughest things to accomplish for a regional planning agency. He explained his plan to introduce himself to the region by visiting each community and his hope to use that face time to connect with their specific needs and match it to the services the RPC provides, much like he did previously at NRPC. Coppelman asked how long it was before results of those connections were evident and Roache estimated about two years later the makeup of the budget has changed significantly. He noted there also was a pipeline project that proved useful to prove to the towns why they pay their dues and demonstrated how sometimes a community is a donor town and sometimes a recipient town for regional type services. He noted that another possibility for the RPC is to become an electricity aggregator and coordinate reduced rate electricity purchases for the communities. Sometimes Nashua was saving a town double what they paid in dues in reduced rate electricity. He explained that the same type of thing can be done with propane, paper, etc. He also mentioned Nashua's GIS department has established live maps on its website and has exposed more data for towns to use and manipulate for their own mapping needs.

Roache stated that the longevity of staff at the RPC speaks to the quality of the work environment and its culture and communication. He also looks forward to sitting with each staff member and having a one on one discussion about their experience and what's working and what isn't within the agency. Discussion followed. Wilson thanked Roache for attending this evening and the Committee welcomed him to the RPC.

#### **V. Financial Report**

- A. June 2017 - Pettengill noted that June is the last month of the fiscal year and unaudited figures show \$44,590 in revenue not received and \$3,412 overspent on the expenses. Sinnott noted the deficit in revenue is due to a fair amount of delay that occurred with several contracts in FY 17. The good news is that most of that revenue will transfer to the new fiscal year and help that budget.
  - B. Year End Financial Summary - Sinnott stated that using the fund balance accrual and unobligated funds to offset this year's loss in revenue
-

translates into a deficit of approximately \$19,266 for the year. He explained it is always the goal to retain a fund balance each year with the expectation that you have a balance equal to two months worth of expenses, however, this is the second year that will not be possible and that creates a real strain on cashflow.

Sinnott reviewed Table 1 Funding FY 2017 and noted that FY 17 was the second year of the two year UPWP and that contract was only underspent by \$12k (which means we spent 99% of the grant was expended) and it's important to note that we did that without a transportation planner for half the year (Tom Falk retired), and with Dave Walker also having to spend time on the Highway Performance Measures SHRP2 grant. Sinnott reviewed specific state contracts that were underspent due to less progress than anticipated, therefore creating a deficit in funding for the year (NOAA SAIL-\$12k underspent; Highwater Mark Initiative-\$8300 underspent; Powwow River-\$15k underspent). Sinnott also reviewed Table 2 Expense Budget. Discussion followed on tools that could be used for project status monitoring in the future.

## **VI. FY 2018 Budget Update**

Sinnott referred to FY2018 Amendment #1 proposal and reviewed proposed changes to the adopted budget: new Circuit Rider service for Newfields; Brentwood MP TBG contract; North Hampton Historic Resources Mapping; placeholder for MS4 work since five communities have responded to date; additional 5310 funds to account for match reimbursement from COAST; Highway Performance Standards SHRP2 has some carryover funds into July; CART contract extended and increased to account for additional time; NHSEM: four towns have chosen RPC to do their hazard mitigation plans; SAIL adjusted based on what was expended in FY 17; Highwater Mark increase due to delay in start of project in FY 17. Overall this presents a relatively healthy budget, but an unhealthy fund balance. *Moore moved to adopt Amendment #1 to the FY 18 Budget as presented; Turell seconded. SO VOTED.*

## **VII. New/Other Business**

- A. Legislative Committee & Forum Update: November 8<sup>th</sup>/Unitil Headquarters in Hampton; LPC will meet August 9<sup>th</sup> to further plan/discuss
  - B. Tentative RPC Meeting Calendar: September Commission meeting – Moore to check with Plaistow, or Kingston as second choice
  - C. Update on Commissioner Handbook FY 18: Work Program needs to be on September agenda for adoption
  - D. Other: Whitney stated she is resigning as Commissioner for Kensington. She expressed how much she has learned and how many wonderful people she's met. Committee members thanked her for her involvement and stated their appreciation for her thoughtful insight and service to the Board; Kravitz asked about timeline for Communications Committee to
-

begin meeting and Wilson stated that it would be better to wait until the new Director has gotten his feet wet a little.

Meeting was adjourned at 8:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Annette Pettengill  
Recording Secretary

# **ATTACHMENT 2**

**Rockingham Planning Commission**  
**Financial Statement**  
**Budget vs. Actual**  
July 2017

	July 2017	YTD FY 18	FY 18 Budget Amend 1	Balance	% Budget
<b>RESOURCES</b>					
Federal Contracts	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Grants	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Local Dues	\$ 145,828	\$ 145,828	\$ 145,828	\$ -	100.0%
Other Income	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Local Planning Contracts	\$ 62,788	\$ 62,788	\$ 222,902	\$ 160,114	28.2%
State Contracts	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 975,540	\$ 975,540	0.0%
<b>Total RESOURCES</b>	<b>\$ 208,616</b>	<b>\$ 208,616</b>	<b>\$ 1,344,270</b>	<b>\$ 1,135,654</b>	<b>15.5%</b>
	<b>\$ 208,616</b>	<b>\$ 208,616</b>	<b>\$ 1,344,270</b>	<b>\$ 1,135,654</b>	<b>15.5%</b>
Newspaper/Media	\$ 85	\$ 85	\$ 1,000	\$ 915	8.5%
Contracted Printing	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,000	\$ 2,000	0.0%
Contracted Services	\$ 1,890	\$ 1,890	\$ 306,226	\$ 304,336	0.6%
Total Salaries	\$ 54,840	\$ 54,840	\$ 678,397	\$ 623,557	8.1%
Travel	\$ 244	\$ 244	\$ 9,500	\$ 9,256	2.6%
Reconciliation Discrepancies			\$ -	\$ -	
Payroll Processing Fees	\$ 42	\$ 42	\$ 500	\$ 458	8.4%
Janitorial	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,000	\$ 2,000	0.0%
Accounting	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 300	\$ 300	0.0%
Audit	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 9,250	\$ 9,250	0.0%
Bank & Service Charges	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 350	\$ 350	0.0%
**Dues & Subscriptions	\$ 180	\$ 180	\$ 7,000	\$ 6,820	2.6%
Employee Co Contrib of Benefits					
C Deferred Comp 457	\$ 2,481	\$ 2,481	\$ 34,009	\$ 31,528	7.3%
C Dental Insurance	\$ 700	\$ 700	\$ 11,453	\$ 10,753	6.1%
C Health Ins.	\$ 3,894	\$ 3,894	\$ 49,800	\$ 45,906	7.8%
C Life Insurance	\$ 84	\$ 84	\$ 1,100	\$ 1,016	7.6%
C LTD Insurance	\$ 131	\$ 131	\$ 1,881	\$ 1,750	7.0%
C NH Retirement 414E	\$ 3,133	\$ 3,133	\$ 42,657	\$ 39,524	7.3%
C STD Insurance	\$ 86	\$ 86	\$ 1,111	\$ 1,025	7.7%



**Rockingham Planning Commission**  
**Financial Statement**  
**Budget vs. Actual**  
July 2017

	July 2017	YTD FY 18	FY 18 Budget Amend 1	Balance	% Budget
<b>**Equipment</b>	\$ 56	\$ 56	\$ 7,000	\$ 6,944	0.8%
<b>**Equipment &amp; Software Maint.</b>	\$ 1,990	\$ 1,990	\$ 16,500	\$ 14,510	12.1%
<b>General Insurance</b>	\$ 294	\$ 294	\$ 4,625	\$ 4,331	6.4%
<b>Misc</b>	\$ (430)	\$ (430)	\$ 2,000	\$ 2,430	-21.5%
<b>**Office Supplies</b>	\$ 293	\$ 293	\$ 13,500	\$ 13,207	2.2%
<b>Payroll Expenses (C Portion)</b>					
<b>P/R Taxes - Other</b>	\$ 4,146	\$ 4,146	\$ 51,897	\$ 47,751	8.0%
<b>SUTA</b>	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 500	\$ 500	0.0%
<b>**Postage</b>	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,000	\$ 2,000	0.0%
<b>Rent</b>	\$ 4,161	\$ 4,161	\$ 50,752	\$ 46,591	8.2%
<b>Telephone &amp; Internet</b>	\$ 344	\$ 344	\$ 5,100	\$ 4,756	6.7%
<b>**Training &amp; Workshops</b>	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,000	\$ 3,000	0.0%
<b>Utilities</b>	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 7,000	\$ 7,000	0.0%
	<b>\$ 78,643</b>	<b>\$ 78,644</b>	<b>\$ 1,322,408</b>	<b>\$ 1,243,764</b>	<b>5.9%</b>
	\$ 129,973	\$ 129,972			
<b>Unobligated Funds</b>			\$ 1,863	\$ 1,863	
<b>Fund Balance Accrual</b>	\$ -		\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000	
			\$ -	\$ -	
	<b>\$ 129,973</b>	<b>\$ 129,972</b>	<b>\$ 1,344,271</b>	<b>\$ 129,973</b>	

NOTE: July 31st is 8% through the fiscal year

# **ATTACHMENT 3**

## NRPC FY 2017 DASHBOARD

February 1-28, 2017	
<b>TD Bank Checking</b>	
Beginning Balance	\$329,716.66
Deposits	94,636.88
Payments	107,408.49
<b>Ending Balance</b>	<b>\$316,945.05</b>
Tuesday, January 31, 2017	
Accounts Payable	\$54,497.07
Accounts Receivable	\$262,732.39
<b>Oversight Activities</b>	
Line of credit (\$30,000) activated?	No
Money Market	\$330,174.00
Audit Status	begins September

Key Statistics	
<b>Staff Presentations / Activities January and February</b>	
NH Rail Transit Authority Advisory Committee	
NH Association of Regional Planning Commissions	
CMAQ Advisory Committee	
Safe Routes To School! Presentation In Wilton	
MTP Workshop In Nashua	
Stormwater Coalition Meeting	
SHRP 2 Performance Based Planning Workshops	
<b>Website Stats</b>	
nashuarpc.org -- Sessions	1500 (+67)
nashuarpc.org -- Users	1005 (-49)
Live Maps -- Total Visits	2076 (-93)
Live Maps -- Unique Visitors	1167 (+14)
Constant Contact -- Number of Subscribers	403 (+4)
Constant Contact -- Average Newsletter Open Rate	30% (+1%)
Twitter Followers	370 (+1)
Facebook Likes	243 (-1)

Budget Narrative	
<b>TD Bank Balance/Cash on hand:</b>	We continue to have a healthy balance that supports two to three months of operating expenses.
<b>Payables and Receivables:</b>	Remains current to be paid/received within 30 days.
<b>NH DOT FY13 Adjustment:</b>	Provided updated information to NHDOT
<b>FY17 Working Budget:</b>	No Significant changes to the adopted budget

FY17 Working Budget			
Funding Sources FY17		Expenses	
Local Dues	\$163,000.00	Audit	\$11,300.00
Federal Contracts	90,000.00	Dues & Subscription	12,000.00
Grants	138,137.00	Employee Benefit	202,059.00
Local Planning Contracts	86,500.00	Gas	16,000.00
Other Income	2,000.00	Insurance	13,000.00
State Contracts	931,655.00	IT	5,000.00
		Legal	5,000.00
		Marketing	5,000.00
		Office Exp	8,500.00
		Other Exp	36,500.00
		Professional Services	213,650.00
		Rent & CAM	76,000.00
		Salaries	735,840.00
		Travel & Meeting Exp	9,500.00
		Utilities	12,000.00
<b>Working Budget</b>	<b>\$1,411,292.00</b>	<b>Total Expenses</b>	<b>\$1,361,349.00</b>

# **ATTACHMENT 4**



August 2, 2017

Hon. David Wheeler, Chair  
 Governor's Advisory Commission on Intermodal  
 Transportation  
 107 North Main Street  
 State House, Room 207  
 Concord, NH 03301

Ms. Victoria Sheehan  
 Commissioner  
 New Hampshire Department of Transportation  
 John O. Morton Building  
 PO Box 483 | 7 Hazen Drive  
 Concord, New Hampshire 03302-0483

**Re: Proposed 2018 - 2020 Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) Program Project Evaluation Process**

Dear Councilor Wheeler and Commissioner Sheehan,

New Hampshire's Regional Planning Commissions have joined together to express our mutual concerns with the proposed approach to evaluating and selecting Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) projects in this solicitation round. At the recent Ten-Year Transportation Improvement Plan kickoff meeting in Gilford, Regional Planning Commissions heard for the first time the proposed process. Although we understand the desire and need for process improvements, the new approach presented at last week's GACIT meeting does not consider regional project priorities or evaluation and omits the CMAQ Advisory Committee from the project evaluation process. In its place, it substitutes a ranking that will be made by the NHDOT alone before action by GACIT. Doing so leaves out input from RPCs whose long-established role have been to provide local context in this decision making. We believe you should have and consider that input before deciding on CMAQ projects. Proceeding without RPC input is inconsistent with both the Ten Year Plan process, and with federal guidance about how such decisions should be made.

Consideration of Regional Project Priorities

Historically, a portion of CMAQ project scoring has reflected the regional priority of proposed projects. This has allowed municipalities, working through their Regional Planning Commissions, to jointly determine local CMAQ priorities and ensure that those local priorities are fairly considered during the statewide project selection process.

NHDOT proposes that their own staff be solely responsible for reviewing and prioritizing all CMAQ applications. With the NHDOT providing selection criteria as well as project review and scoring, stakeholders may well perceive bias in favor of applications submitted by the NHDOT and against projects submitted by municipalities, transit providers, and other partner agencies. While we have faith that the Department would approach this in an honest and unbiased way, the appearance of this proposed process is problematic. We recommend a more balanced approach be used in the evaluation that includes consideration of local evaluation and prioritization as well as regional considerations.

### Role of the CMAQ Advisory Committee

Since the inception of the CMAQ Program in the 1990s, project selection has been overseen by a multidisciplinary Advisory Committee comprised of NHDOT staff engineers, NHDES air quality experts, Regional Planning Commissions, and Executive Councilors. This approach minimized project selection bias, ensured that all geographic areas of the state were engaged in the CMAQ program, and facilitated objective scoring of the technical aspects of CMAQ projects.

Several of our agencies recently participated on a CMAQ Advisory Committee subcommittee to review project eligibility, scoring criteria and application process for this funding round. At no point was there discussion or recommendation about a change in the role of the Advisory Committee. As far as we know the Advisory Committee itself has not been advised of this change.

With the proposed process, it is now unclear what role the CMAQ Advisory Committee has – though it seems it has none at least for the remainder of this funding round. Without the guidance of the CMAQ Advisory Committee, transparency and broad input regarding local and other state agency concerns will be lost. Furthermore, in our view, the new process will discourage communities from participating in the program, reinforce community perception of project selection bias for applications submitted by the NHDOT, and reduce capacity for the objective scoring of the technical aspects of CMAQ projects.

### Federal Guidance on the CMAQ Program

The proposed approach to CMAQ project selection appears inconsistent with federal guidance on the CMAQ program. The federal regulations governing the CMAQ Program (23 U.S. Code § 149, and 23 U.S. Code § 149 (d)) requires that *“programming and expenditure of funds for projects under this section shall be consistent with the requirements of sections 134 (Metropolitan Transportation Planning) and 135 (Statewide and Nonmetropolitan Transportation Planning) of this title.”*

Both sections 134 and 135 of Title 23 of U.S. Code require that there be a “continuing, cooperative, and comprehensive” (3C) process to develop and program transportation projects. Applying the 3Cs process to this program means it should involve “effective coordination among public officials at all levels of government.” The most recent Federal guidance on the CMAQ program says *“MPOs, State DOTs, and transit agencies should develop CMAQ project selection processes in accordance with the metropolitan and/or statewide planning process under 23 U.S.C. 134 and 135. The selection process should involve State and/or local transportation and air quality agencies.”* The changes proposed, which omit input from other agencies and levels of government, move the CMAQ process in the opposite direction.

Irrespective of this guidance, we would hope that GACIT would welcome input from RPCs about the CMAQ projects so that local and regional considerations are reflected in your decisions. These are not, after all, our projects, but we do have an important perspective about their potential value (or lack of value) in addressing congestion and air quality issues in our regions.

## Recommendations

Given the delays in beginning this round of funding, we understand that there may be too little time to carryout CMAQ project evaluation by the CMAQ Advisory Committee as has been done in the past, or for incorporating a full regional review process. We hope, however, that some modification in what has been proposed will be made to accommodate broader input into the process. To that end we recommend the following:

- That Regional Planning Commissions (at their option) score and prioritize projects proposed for their regions as well as any statewide projects, and submit their results to GACIT to consider in their evaluation. Scoring would be done using the NHDOT criteria as amended by GACIT, and within a timeframe established by NHDOT such that it does not delay the project selection timetable.
- That appropriate staff from NHDES Air Resources Division and Regional Planning Commissions assist and/or be consulted by NHDOT in developing the air quality scores for projects.
- That the CMAQ program return to a regular schedule of funding rounds to allow sufficient time in the schedule for full participation by the CMAQ Advisory Committee and the regional project review component going forward.

Please feel free to contact us with any questions about this letter or our recommendations.

Sincerely,

Tim Roache, Executive Director, Rockingham Planning Commission  
Sylvia von Aulock, Executive Director, Southern New Hampshire Planning Commission  
Jennifer Czysz, Interim Executive Director, Nashua Regional Planning Commission  
Cynthia Copeland, Executive Director, Strafford Regional Planning Commission  
Michael Tardiff, Executive Director, Central New Hampshire Regional Planning Commission  
Tim Murphy, Executive Director, Southwest Regional Planning Commission  
Jeff Hayes, Executive Director, Lakes Region Planning Commission  
Barbara Robinson, Executive Director, North Country Council  
Steve Schneider, Executive Director, Upper Valley Lake Sunapee Regional Planning Commission

CC: Hon. Joseph Kenney  
Hon. Andru Volinsky  
Hon. Russell Prescott  
Hon. Christopher Pappas  
NHDES Commissioner Robert Scott

---

Rockingham Planning Commission • Strafford Regional Planning Commission • Southwest Regional Planning Commission •  
Nashua Regional Planning Commission • Southern New Hampshire Planning Commission • Lakes Region Planning Commission •  
Central New Hampshire Planning Commission • Upper Valley Lake Sunapee Planning Commission • North Country Council