

Bow-Concord I-93 Transportation Planning Study

Planning Group Meeting No. 1

MEETING MINUTES

DATE: February 10, 2006
DATE OF MEETING: February 1, 2006
LOCATION OF MEETING: Northeast Delta Dental Conference Center
Two Delta Drive, Concord, NH

ATTENDED BY:

<u>Name</u>	<u>Affiliation</u>
Patricia Sherman	Concord 2020
Peter Dearness	New England Southern Railroad
Laura Scott	Town of Pembroke, Town Planner
Harry Blunt	Concord Trailways
Patrick Miller	Jordan Institute
Terry Johnson	NH Celebrates Wellness
Henry Goode	NHDRED, Travel and Tourism
Rich Roach	Army Corps of Engineers
Rosemary Monahan	Environmental Protection Agency
Bill Klubben	Town of Bow, Town Planner
Tom Aspell	City of Concord, City Manager
Joanne Cassulo	NH Office of Energy and Planning
Bill O'Donnell	FHWA
Sharon Wason	Central NH Regional Planning Commission
Howard Moffett	River Connection
Tom Raffio	City of Concord, Citizen Representative
Rusty McLearn	Hampshire Hospitality
Bill Norton	Concord 2020
Nancy Girard	Conservation Law Foundation
Brian Tufts	Town of Pembroke, Selectman
Carol Murray	NHDOT, Commissioner
Jeff Brillhart	NHDOT, Asst. Commissioner
James Moore	NHDOT
Bill Cass	NHDOT
Don Lyford	NHDOT
Ansel Sanborn	NHDOT
Bill Hauser	NHDOT
Mark Hemmerlein	NHDOT
Bill Oldenburg	NHDOT
John Butler	NHDOT

<u>Name</u>	<u>Affiliation</u>
Nancy Mayville	NHDOT
Subramanian Sharma	NHDOT
Stephen Henninger	City of Concord, Asst. City Planner
Susan Leahy	Concord 2020,
Ed Roberge	City of Concord, City Engineer
Mike Donovan	City of Concord, Mayor
Nick Alexander	CNHRPC
Dick Lemieux	City of Concord, City Councilor
Roger Hawk	City of Concord, Community Development Director
Liz Durfee Hengen	Historic Preservation Consultant
Bill Flynn	Landscape Architect
Sally Oldham	CSS Consultant
Toni Gold	CSS Consultant
Steve Whitman	Moderator, Jeff H Taylor & Associates
Gene McCarthy	McFarland-Johnson, Inc.
Jed Merrow	McFarland-Johnson, Inc.

MEETING MINUTES:

The Agenda for the meeting is attached and the meeting generally followed the Agenda. These minutes are formatted to follow the Agenda Items.

A. Opening/Self Introductions

Steve Whitman opened the meeting and asked that everyone introduce themselves and mention who they represent.

B Introduction

Carol Murray, Commissioner of the New Hampshire Department of Transportation, gave a brief presentation on why this Planning Group was organized. Commissioner Murray first discussed the nature of growth in New Hampshire and its effect on travel. She described how transportation and land use are linked and how both areas need to be addressed during the I-93 study. She illustrated the problem by presenting land use maps of Rockingham County for 1962, 1974, and 1998, showing how open space has been converted to residential land use with cul-de-sac streets not connected to other new streets. She then discussed how the transportation needs in New Hampshire exceed the available revenues, even to simply maintain the status quo. She presented the Vision being developed as part of the State's Transportation Business Plan. Next she discussed how the NHDOT is implementing Context Sensitive Solutions (CSS) in its project development process, and noted that this Planning Group is part of that effort. She thanked everyone for attending and introduced the CSS presenters.

C. Context Sensitive Solutions Overview

Toni Gold of Project for Public Spaces began the overview of Context Sensitive Solutions (CSS). Toni explained the concept of CSS and that it focuses on solutions that balance the transportation and built environment with community, historical and environmental concerns. She went through the six-step project delivery process that will be used by the NHDOT. The process was described as a bridge, as illustrated in a graphic distributed before the meeting began. A copy has been included with these meeting minutes.

Sally Oldham of Oldham Historic Properties continued the overview with a presentation on Public Involvement. She discussed the important elements of successful communication including the NHDOT guidelines for public involvement, tips on good listening, and describing what it means to reach consensus. Sally then discussed problem statements and vision/goal statements. She gave examples of these that were developed during the CSS training at the NHDOT.

D. CSS and Bow-Concord

Ansel Sanborn of the NHDOT then discussed the specifics of how CSS will be integrated into the Bow-Concord Project. He noted that much of what has been done on the project has followed the CSS approach. However, NHDOT will revisit the completed steps to ensure conformance with the CSS approach before moving forward. Copies of the proposed schedule for Part A and B were distributed (they are also attached to these minutes). Ansel then presented the schedule for Part A. The schedule includes a series of monthly Planning Group Meetings. The first few meetings will address the Problem Statement, Goal Statement and Screening Criteria. Each of these will be discussed at one meeting and then confirmed at the following meeting. The intent is to reach a consensus on each of these components before developing alternatives. The goal is to begin developing alternatives by May.

In late May or early June a Public Meeting would be held to present the Problem Statement, Goal Statement and Screening Criteria to the public. The public would also be asked to comment on the alternatives that are being considered. Once comments have been received from the public, another Planning Group meeting would be held before summer to develop a range of alternatives to evaluate. The project team would then evaluate the alternatives throughout the summer. The transportation model for the region would be used to evaluate traffic implications, and impacts to cultural and environmental resources would be determined. The range of alternatives would be presented at a Planning Group Meeting in early fall and screened in the late fall with another Public Meeting to present the alternatives to the public. A reasonable range of alternatives would then be determined and Part A would be completed by the end of 2006.

Ansel discussed the schedule for Part B assuming the normal time required to determine a preferred alternative, circulate draft and final environmental documents, and receive a Record of Decision. This normal schedule results in a Record of Decision in Spring 2010. Ansel mentioned that the hope is that the CSS approach will accelerate this schedule by reaching consensus with the Planning Group and subsequent project groups or committees.

Ansel continued by presenting a new approach to how a project or projects could be implemented. The traditional approach for a project like Bow-Concord is for one large project to be constructed by the NHDOT at some future date with the hopes it will solve all the transportation problems for the design life. The new approach involves smaller projects and initiatives that can be implemented in phases by the NHDOT, local communities, and even the private sector. Some of these could be implemented sooner at a lower cost.

Ansel concluded his presentation by showing the growth that is expected to occur in the Central New Hampshire Region by the year 2030. There will be more people traveling in the region and each person will travel more than they do today. The expected patterns of growth will continue the trend of people living outside of Concord and traveling into Concord for work, shopping, recreation, etc.

Tom Aspell of Concord asked a question about the smaller community projects that were part of the new approach to project implementation. He asked whether these are community financed projects or the NHDOT will help finance them. Carol Murrery responded by saying the hope is that they will be collaboratively financed in the model of Brownfield sites. The financing could be from many sources, including the private sector, because multiple parties could benefit from the projects.

E. Dinner Break

There was a short break to allow everyone to get dinner.

F. Problem Statement Brainstorming

The “Project Challenges and Opportunities” document previously prepared for the project had been emailed to the Planning Group and was used as the basis for the brainstorming session. Steve Whitman opened the brainstorming and asked the Group if there were problems that should be added to the Challenges and Opportunities document.

Harry Blunt mentioned the impacts on communities as a result of increased mobility. He mentioned that growth affects communities in many ways, placing increased pressures on schools and infrastructure. Some felt these are secondary impacts. Harry also stated that these growth impacts occur regardless of the type of transportation mode.

Patrick Miller mentioned the effect transportation has on public health. Air, water quality, and health issues like obesity and asthma need to be considered. He also encouraged consideration of environmental restoration and enhancements.

Bill Klubben mentioned that the I-93/I-89 area is designated for economic development by the Town of Bow and it should be included under Economic Vitality. He later mentioned that the great views from I-93 are difficult to enjoy because of the need to pay attention to the road.

Roger Hawk mentioned that there is an East-West disconnect where I-89 ends and where I-393 begins. I-93 is used to connect these two East-West corridors.

Rosemary Monahan stated that the project should not try to resolve traffic problems associated with the special events that place enormous volumes of traffic on I-93.

Sharon Wason stated that quality of life needs to be mentioned, especially in terms of the unique regional culture in the area.

Pat Sherman mentioned that on I-93 there is no sense that one is arriving in the capital city.

Bill Norton noted that there is no mention of the state vision under community vision.

Tom Aspell stated that there is not the sense of urgency to get something done. He later asked that air travel be added to transportation choice.

Terry Johnson said that there should be a community education component. People don't realize that they are part of the problem and need to be part of the solution.

Rich Roach stated that one problem is that I-93 is too close to the river. He also mentioned that land use plans are sometimes in conflict. One example of this is at Garvins Falls where there are many ideas of what could be done there. He mentioned that other modes need to be considered even though with current NH laws other modes of transportation cannot be funded with gasoline tax revenues.

Steve Henninger mentioned that the development community has more impact on growth than the planning community and they should therefore have a voice in these discussions. It was mentioned that Bill Norton represents the development community.

Laura Scott mentioned that local zoning is a problem because it takes time for towns to revise zoning.

Steve Whitman closed the brainstorming session by stating that a Problem Statement would be drafted by the project team and would be distributed prior to the next Planning Group meeting.

G. Next Steps

Ansel mentioned that the next step would be to confirm a problem statement and begin brainstorming a goal statement. It was agreed to hold the next meeting on March 7 at 3:30 p.m. in the same location.

H Adjournment

Submitted by,
Gene McCarthy, P.E.
McFarland-Johnson, Inc.

Bow-Concord I-93 Transportation Planning Study

Planning Group Meeting No. 1
February 1, 2006
Wednesday, 3:30 p.m.

Northeast Delta Dental Conference Center
Two Delta Drive, Concord, NH

AGENDA

- A. Opening / Self Introductions
- B. Introduction (Carol Murray/Commissioner NHDOT)
- C. Context Sensitive Solutions Overview (Sally Oldham & Toni Gold)
- D. CSS and Bow Concord (Ansel Sanborn / NHDOT)
- E. Dinner Break
- F. Problem Statement Brainstorming (Steve Whitman / Moderator)
- G. Next Steps (Ansel Sanborn)
- H. Adjourn

The CSS Project Delivery Process

Excellence in Transportation Design

• Excellence in Transportation Design

1 Problem / Need

CSS

- Identify transportation problem or need
- Identify stakeholders
- Outreach & preliminary partnership-building

Products:

- Stakeholder lists
- Preliminary lists of transportation issues

2 Planning

CSS

- Bring in resource agencies; identify context
- Establish a multi-discipline team
- Discuss and develop consensus on a decisionmaking process, including plans for public involvement
- Develop and create consensus around a problem and need statement that includes community and environmental components
- Develop consensus on a project vision
- Agree on project limits

Products:

- Process Contract
- Problem Statement
- Vision Statement

3 Scoping

CSS

- Study the context
- Confirm the problem statement
- Develop criteria to evaluate alternatives
- Establish a wide range of preliminary alternatives; narrow to a range of reasonable alternatives
- Document environmental effects on the reasonable range of alternatives
- Apply evaluation criteria to alternatives
- Secure consensus on the best alternative
- Spin off related community development projects

Products:

- Evaluation criteria
- Reasonable range of alternatives
- Preferred alternative

4 Design

CSS

- Create a conceptual design
- Experiment
- Secure consensus on the conceptual design
- Secure official local approval
- Preliminary engineering of the selected alternative
- Experiment
- Final design of the selected solution
- Purchase ROW
- Negotiate community maintenance agreements
- Include in construction documents all agreements made during Planning, Scoping, and Design
- Prepare bid package

Products:

- Approved conceptual design
- Final Design
- Bid Package

5 Construction

CSS

- Advertise & bid project
- Award contract
- MPT plan & schedule to minimize disruption to residents & businesses
- Perform construction
- Coordinate, communicate on change orders and design details
- Open project

Products:

- A completed project that addresses the problem and fulfills the vision

6 M&O

CSS

- Make traffic adjustments
- Maintain community partnerships
- Monitor negotiated maintenance agreements
- Routine M & O activities
- Evaluate the project using the criteria
- Capture lessons learned to improve the process
- Provide feedback
- Provide input to new problems & needs identification

Products:

- Adjusted facility
- Captured lessons



Part A Schedule

Planning Group 1 February 1, 2006	{	Introduction CSS Overview Brainstorm Problem Statement
Planning Group 2 March 2006	{	Confirm Problem Statement Brainstorm Goal Statement
Planning Group 3 April 2006	{	Confirm Goal Statement Brainstorm Screening Criteria
Planning Group 4 May 2006	{	Confirm Screening Criteria Brainstorm Alternative Components
Public Meeting	{	Receive Public Comment on Problem Statement, Goal Statement, Screening Criteria & Alternative Components
Planning Group 5 June 2006	{	Develop Range of Alternatives to be Considered

Part A Schedule



July - August	{	Project Team Evaluates Alternative Components Perform Model Runs Determine Costs Determine Impacts
Planning Group 6 September 2006	{	Confirm Alternatives to be Screened Conduct Preliminary Screening
Public Meeting October 2006	{	Receive Public Comment on Reasonable Range of Alternatives
Planning Group 7 November 2006	{	Secure Consensus on Reasonable Range of Alternatives
December 2006	{	Complete Summary Report Complete Phase A

Part B Schedule



Winter 2007	{	Begin Part B Develop Detailed Alternatives Conduct Detailed Quantitative Screening Enhance Alternatives to be Competitive Select Preferred Alternative
Fall 2008	{	Publish Draft Environmental Document Hold Public Hearing Publish Final Environmental Document
Spring 2010	{	Record of Decision