

Bow-Concord I-93 Transportation Planning Study

Planning Group Meeting No. 3

MEETING MINUTES

DATE: April 18, 2006
DATE OF MEETING: March 29, 2006
LOCATION OF MEETING: Northeast Delta Dental Conference Center
Two Delta Drive, Concord, NH

ATTENDED BY:

Planning Group Members

<u>Name</u>	<u>Affiliation</u>
Patricia Sherman	Concord 2020
Peter Dearness	New England Southern Railroad
Patrick Miller	Jordan Institute
Rich Roach	Army Corps of Engineers
Rosemary Monahan	EPA
Bill Klubben	Town of Bow, Town Planner
Eric Anderson	Town of Bow, Selectmen
Mike Donovan	City of Concord, Mayor
Tom Aspell	City of Concord, City Manager
Chris Northrop	NHOEP
Bill O'Donnell	FHWA
Carolyn Russell	NHDES
Howard Moffett	River Connection
Philip Hastings	City of Concord, Citizen Representative
Bill McGonagle	City of Concord, Citizen Representative
Nan Hagen	Main Street Concord
Mickey McIver	Concord Area Transit
Bill Norton	Concord 2020
Nancy Girard	CLF
Brian Tufts	Town of Pembroke, Selectman
Will Abbott	Forest Society
Sharon Wason	CNHRPC
Don Lyford	NHDOT

Others

<u>Name</u>	<u>Affiliation</u>
Bill Hauser	NHDOT
Mark Hemmerlein	NHDOT

Bill Oldenburg	NHDOT
Subramanian Sharma	NHDOT
John Cater	FHWA
Joung Lee	FHWA
Stephen Henninger	City of Concord, Asst. City Planner
Roger Hawk	City of Concord, Community Development Director
Liz Durfee Hengen	Historic Preservation Consultant
Bill Flynn	Landscape Architect
Steve Whitman	Moderator, Jeff H Taylor & Associates
Gene McCarthy	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. Welcome

Steve Whitman opened the meeting by welcoming and thanking everyone for attending. The minutes from Planning Group Meeting No. 2 were approved without comment. The approved minutes will be made available on the project website.

Steve reminded the group that “consensus” means that you can “live with it” not that you necessarily think it is great.

B Problem Statement Confirmation

Steve presented the Draft Problem Statement that had been distributed to the group before the meeting. He mentioned that there was a comment from James McConaha that the term “historic” should be used instead of “cultural”. All present agreed with this revision for both the Problem and Goal Statement. The Planning Group reached consensus on the Project Problem Statement, including members Tom Raffio, Terry Johnson, Laura Scott, James McConaha and Harry Blunt who were unable to attend but indicated their support in writing prior to the meeting. The statement reads:

Project Problem Statement

"Marked by aging infrastructure and limited transportation options, the Bow-Concord I-93 Corridor neither meets the varied transportation and safety demands of interstate highway users, nor appropriately balances those demands against the interests of the Capitol Region communities in their unique identities and visions, their economic vitality, preservation of and access to their natural and historic resources, and their quality of life. Future population and economic growth, in the region and beyond, will increase transportation demand and further exacerbate this problem."

C. Goal Statement Discussion

Steve presented the Draft Goal Statement that had been distributed to the group before the meeting along with the revised term “historic”. He asked if there were any comments to the statement as drafted. There were no comments and Steve asked if all present could “live with it”. All present agreed and reached consensus on the Project Goal Statement. Planning Group members Tom Raffio, Terry Johnson, Laura Scott, James McConaha and Harry Blunt were unable to attend but indicated their support in writing prior to the meeting. The statement reads:

Project Goal Statement

“The Bow-Concord I-93 Corridor should balance the needs of all users and the surrounding communities by providing a safe, affordable, reliable, environmentally acceptable and community compatible transportation system. The system will offer mobility choices and complement the unique character of the Capitol Region communities. It will support their economic initiatives, preserve and/or enhance their natural and historic resources, facilitate non-vehicular access, and sustain the communities’ quality of life, now and into the future.”

Steve mentioned that both the Problem and Goal Statements are living documents and can be revised or amended by the group in the future.

D. Alternative Screening Criteria

Since consensus was reached on the Problem and Goal Statement early in the meeting it was decided to begin discussing the Alternative Screening Criteria. Gene McCarthy distributed copies of the criteria developed in 2004 with the help of the two previous project committees. The Planning Group was given a few minutes to look over the criteria.

Gene then described the process undertaken to develop the criteria and the purpose of the criteria. The version distributed was the result of a Transportation Summit that was held in June 2004 with many of the Planning Group members in attendance. An earlier version of the criteria was used to test how it would work. A mock alternative was developed at the meeting and the criterion was used to screen it. The results and feedback from the summit were used to develop the current version, Draft Revision 3. Gene also emphasized that the criteria are not intended to select a preferred alternative. The objective for these criteria is to identify fatal flaws that would make an alternative unreasonable. This screening would act as the documentation for eliminating an alternative from future consideration.

Steve then asked for comments from the group. Mayor Donovan suggested including a summary for each category. Everyone liked this idea.

It was asked whether the visions and major elements of the Master Plans should be identified under Community Issues. Gene answered that the intent was for those representing each community to assess how an alternative addresses the visions of their master plan. The result of the discussion was that the communities’ representatives on the Planning Group would

perform the scoring for each community criterion, with assistance from their appropriate community boards.

Sharon Wason stated that the Regional Plan should be referenced under Community Vision.

A question was asked about the information needed to conduct the scoring. Gene mentioned that it was the project team's responsibility to provide the information, including safety issues and impact information.

It was asked whether it was reasonable to assume that a proposed alternative would have positive impacts for an issue if there were no criteria for it. This would not necessarily be the case.

Gene asked the group if they thought there was too much detail in the criteria. The group felt that the detail was fine. Gene asked if they liked the five level scoring criteria. Again the group was fine with the scoring levels. It was suggested that there should be an overall summary with a statement explaining the final result.

It was mentioned that there was no mention of air quality in the criteria. Bill Norton mentioned that freight transport is not in the criteria. Peter Dearnness asked for the rail service criteria to include the words "future passenger".

Carolyn Russell mentioned that the regional land use and transportation discussions raised in recent public meetings should be incorporated.

The process to screen each alternative was then discussed. The project team would perform the first scoring with assistance from members of the Planning Group. At a future meeting, Steve would ask if any member of the group had comments on the screening. The end result is that each alternative would have one screening document that reflects the consensus of the Planning Group.

It was decided that the project team would revise the Screening Criteria and distribute it to the group members prior to the next meeting.

E. Public Meeting Discussion

The dates for the series of public meetings will be:

Pembroke	May 18	Thursday Morning
Bow	May 18	Thursday Evening
Concord	May 20	Saturday Morning

F. Next Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled for April 18, 3:30 p.m. at Northeast Delta Dental. The project team felt it wise to keep this date and if sufficient progress is made at the meeting, the subsequent meeting scheduled for May 10 could be cancelled.

G Adjournment

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

Bow-Concord I-93 Transportation Planning Study

Planning Group Meeting No. 3
March 29, 2006
Wednesday, 3:30 p.m.

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

AGENDA

- A. Welcome
- B. Problem Statement Confirmation
- C. Goal Statement Discussion
- D. Public Meeting Discussion
- E. Next Meeting
- F. Adjourn

--	--