

MINUTES
STRAFFORD REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

May 20, 2011
Conference Room
Strafford Regional Planning Commission
150 Wakefield Street
Rochester, NH

Members Present: Edmund Jansen, Jr., Chairman, Rollinsford; Lou Vita, Vice Chairman, Middleton; C. Thomas Crosby, Secretary-Treasurer, Madbury; Sandra Keans, Rochester; Kenn Ortmann, Rochester.

Others Present: Commissioner Robert Jaffin, Rochester

Staff Present: Cynthia Copeland, Linda Osburn.

Chairman Jansen noted a quorum and called the meeting to order at 8:03 AM.

1. Minutes of April 15, 2010 Executive Committee Meeting

Chairman Jansen entertained a motion to approve the minutes of the April 15, 2011 Executive Committee meeting. Vita made the motion to approve the minutes as written and Ortmann seconded the motion. The motion passed with Crosby abstaining.

2. Draft Financial Reports for April 2011

Copeland referenced the draft April 2011 financial reports of income of \$39,419.39, expenses of \$47,664.18, receivables of \$60,708.71 and payables of \$11,168.78. Copeland discussed income, payables and receivables. Osburn stated that the Northwood dues had been paid. Copeland stated that the FY 2012 invoices for membership dues had been sent out. Copeland discussed the income through April and stated that the \$32,469 income was due to the indirect rate reimbursement check received from the Unified Program Work Plan (UPWP) contract. Keans joined the meeting at 8:07 AM. Vita asked if dues invoices had been sent to all communities. Osburn responded that all communities received a letter regarding the dues amounts. She stated that five communities- Brookfield, Dover, Farmington, Milton, Wakefield, responded that they would not be paying membership dues this year. Osburn stated these five communities were not sent dues invoices as the accountant had advised that the receivable would not be collectable. Copeland stated that staff billed 82% of hours last month.

3. FY 2012 Budget Recommendation to Commissioners at Annual Meeting on May 26, 2011

Copeland stated that the original budget in the mailed meeting packet was incorrect and discussed the draft budget that showed a surplus of \$2,757 with income of \$674,914 and expenses of \$672,157. She stated that she used a \$1 placeholder for doubtful contracts and was trying to use the SRPC dues for the best value if the contracts required a cash match. Copeland reviewed the Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy application and the possible sources of matching funds required. Copeland discussed contracts with the Conservation Law Foundation and the Targeted Block Grant,

604(b) Clean Water Act, Fluvial Erosion, Broadband Mapping and Planning, and Hazard Mitigation. Copeland discussed Park and Ride Study and the Metropolitan Planning Organization contract for the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) and stated that the funds were increased by the allocation of \$100,000 in State Planning and Research Funds; she stated that the Federal Highways Administration and Federal Transit Administration funds would be blended into one contract. Copeland stated that a request has been submitted for a no-cost extension to the current UPWP contract to update the Intelligent Transportation Plan. Keans asked if the Fluvial Erosion contract was signed and Copeland responded that it had been signed and would use Federal Emergency Management Agency funds to educate landowners about fluvial erosion.

Ortmann suggested a review of the broad line items rather than each line item. Copeland discussed the increase in the unemployment compensation expense, and stated there were 7 full time staff and 2 intern staff members. Ortmann noted that health insurance expense was lower and Copeland responded that a staff member was taking the health incentive. Ortmann discussed the savings from paying health incentive costs versus the health insurance costs. Copeland stated that she estimated the highest scenario with expenses and the lowest scenario with revenues. Ortmann noted that the postage expense was lower and asked if that was due to electronic usage. Copeland responded yes, and that she was annoyed that the postal meter costs is one half of the postage expense and will be considering alternatives. Osburn noted that the equipment rental line item included the postage equipment rental and maintenance. Vita asked if the Internet was used for advertising and communication and included the website. Copeland stated that the costs for the website consultant were separate and located in the contracted work website consultant line item.

Copeland stated that she asked Osburn to update the business plan charts and graphs. She discussed the revenues composition that demonstrated the changes in local, state and federal contracts, and how dependent the commission is on federal dollars. Copeland reviewed the charts and graphs depicting revenues by sources, expenses by categories, fund balances, and cash and receivables from 1988-2010. She stated that she could send the charts to the Executive Committee members and stated that Osburn would be working on a productivity chart. Copeland stated that currently SRPC was the least expensive regional planning commission in the state. She discussed how the contracts are changing and how the major funder was changing from non-lapsing funds to lapsing funds; if funds were not spent, that meant that the funds were not needed and would be returned to the funder at the end of the contract period. Copeland stated that SRPC would be paying for an update to the Intelligent Transportation Systems update for both Strafford and Rockingham Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPO) as it was a mandated corrective action and Rockingham did not have the funds to pay their share. She stated that SRPC was using toll credits as match and that being the lowest priced organization was not to the benefit or advantage of SRPC. Copeland stated that no longer being able to depend on the carryover of funds had changed the game and discourages frugality.

Copeland discussed a transportation funding reauthorization bill that would require that all MPOs be in areas of over 200,000 in population with no grandfather clause to protect existing MPOs. Copeland stated that the last reauthorization bill dissolved MPOs with population under 100,000 but contained a grandfather clause to protect existing MPOs. She stated that the population of the Strafford MPO was 140,000. Copeland stated that the National Associations of Development Organizations (NADO) and the Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations (AMPO) were working with members of Congress to add a grandfather clause for all existing MPOs, and that last week the NH Department of Transportation stated that the bill would dissolve MPOs under the 200,000 population threshold unless the state governor and Secretary of Transportation grant approval of the MPO based on a track record of compliance and commitment to go forward. Ortmann asked what would happen if the Strafford MPO were dissolved. Copeland responded that the state would

run the MPO and SRPC would become a rural organization. Copeland stated that she would use local dues to fund time to contact Congressman Guinta and Senator Ayotte to discuss. She stated that Federal Highways was expanding the scope of work to include land use items.

Copeland stated that the UPWP contract was 85% of the budget, and Keans suggested inviting local members of Congress to the Annual Meeting next week. Copeland stated that the housing bubble started later and ended earlier in the Strafford area than in the rest of the state, and that the area was recovering faster. She stated that consultants were looking for local work and that the federal Department of Transportation was expanding work.

Chairman Jansen entertained a motion to recommend the FY 2012 budget to the Commissioners at the Annual Meeting on May 26, 2011. Ortmann made the motion and Crosby seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Copeland asked for advice for presenting the budget to the Commissioners. Ortmann suggested stating that the Commission is effective and efficient and there are challenges with federal and state budget changes to funding. Discussion ensued regarding spending funds, lack of carryover funds, potential punishment for efficiency, and the need to have a different business plan model and strategy every year. Chairman Jansen stated that there were discussions in the 1980s regarding planning commissions being too small and Rockingham and Strafford merged; he asked if there would be an effort to merge groups. Copeland responded that was the path being considered. Copeland stated that she wanted the Executive Committee members to be cognizant of the organization's status.

4. FY 2012 Slate of Officers Recommendation to Commissioners at Annual Meeting May 26, 2011

Crosby stated he would volunteer to be the Secretary/Treasurer for the next fiscal year. Ortmann volunteered to be a member of the Executive Committee for the next fiscal year. He noted that Rick McMenimen had resigned and that he would miss McMenimen. Copeland noted that Brian Tapscott of Somersworth had indicated his interest in serving as an Executive Committee member. Ortmann asked Chairman Jansen if he would serve as Chairman for the next fiscal year and Jansen agreed. Ortmann asked Vice Chairman Vita if he would serve as Vice Chairman for the next fiscal year and Vita agreed. Ortmann asked Keans if she would serve as an Executive Committee member next year and Keans agreed. Commissioner Jaffin stated his interest to serve if any openings from the Rochester community became available. Ortmann noted that there was one additional opening on the Executive Committee to be recruited at the Annual Meeting on May 26, 2011.

Ortmann made the motion to recommend the slate of officers to the Commissioners for FY 2011 Edmund Jansen, Jr., Rollinsford, Chairman; Lou Vita, Middleton, Vice Chairman; C. Thomas Crosby, Madbury, Secretary/Treasurer, and Executive Committee members Kenn Ortmann, Rochester, and Sandra Keans, Rochester. Keans seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Copeland stated that Commissioners from non-dues paying communities could be officers and Executive Committee members but did not have a vote per the bylaws. Ortmann stated the members should be from dues paying communities in order to vote. Ortmann thanked the officers for their service.

5. Approval of Strafford Metropolitan Planning Organization April Administrative /Informational Revisions

Chairman Jansen noted the request from the NH Department of Transportation to process administrative modifications to the 2011-2014 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).

1. STATEWIDE, BRPPI- Preservation, BRIDGE REHABILITATION, PAINTING, PRESERVATION & IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS- E-19. Funding increase requested for an additional \$1.055 million. Various funding shifts in FY 2011-2014 for all phases.
2. STATEWIDE, CRDR- Various Routes, CULVERT REPLACEMENT/ REHABILITATION & DRAINAGE REPAIRS (Annual Project) E-19. Funding increase requested for an additional \$50,000. Various funding shifts in FY 2011-2014 for all phases.
3. STATEWIDE, MOBRR, Municipal, MUNICIPAL OWNED BRIDGE REHABILITATION & REPLACEMENT PROJECTS (Federal, State, Local Funds) (Annual Project), E-19. Various funding shifts in FY 2011-2014 for all phases.
4. STATEWIDE. PRRCS- Pavement, PAVEMENT RESURFCING, REHABILITATION & CRACKSEAL PROGRAM & RELATED WORK (Annual Federal Resurfacing Program) E-10. Funding decrease requested removing \$525,000 from overall program. P Various funding shifts in FY 2011-2014 for all phases.
5. STATEWIDE, RR-RCS- Rail, RECONSTRUCTION OF CROSSINGS, SIGNALS & RELATED WORK (Annual Project) E-1. Funding increase requested for an additional \$370,000. Various funding shifts in FY 2011-2014 for all phases.
6. STATEWIDE, SSRR- Pavement, SECONDARY SYSTEM RECLAMATION/REHAB WITH VARIOUS PAVEMENT TREATMENTS [Parent] E-10. Funding increase for an additional \$60,000. Various funding shifts in FY 2011-2014 for all phases.

Copeland stated that the projects were all statewide projects and that she recommended the administrative modifications.

Ortmann made a motion to concur with the recommendation of the Executive Director to approve the April Administrative modifications, and Crosby seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

6. Possible May Monthly Minor Administrative/Informational Revisions

Copeland stated that there were no May monthly minor administrative/informational revisions.

7. Executive Director Evaluation FY 08, 09, 10, 11

Ortmann stated that he was part of a review subcommittee that met to conduct an Executive Director evaluation and did not complete the evaluation due to alternating conflicting scheduling issues. He discussed the process of evaluation and the use of an analytical and objective process rather than the previous narrative process that he found difficult to use. Ortmann suggested that another Executive Committee member become involved and settle the evaluation process used. Copeland stated that the Executive Director had the right to be evaluated the same way as staff and the staff who complete Part A section that described what the employee had accomplished in the past fiscal year, and Part B that described what the employee planned to accomplish in the next fiscal year. She stated she felt the narrative process was the most appropriate, that she would like to have the issue resolved, and that four years was a long time with no increase. Copeland stated that she received a review the first year

she was employed at SRPC, and that she received a review that covered the years 2004-2007. She stated that she had been patient, that she had produced a lot of work and that the situation was a challenge. Vita asked what action the committee should take. Ortmann stated that he had been the chair of the review subcommittee with members Jansen and Crosby, and suggested a third person for the subcommittee who felt comfortable with the process. Copeland stated she updated the business plans as part of the evaluation process. Ortmann stated that in order to move ahead using the narrative process, he would need to be replaced with someone comfortable with the narrative process. Vita volunteered for the review subcommittee, and Ortmann asked Jansen and Crosby if they would remain on the review subcommittee. Jansen and Crosby agreed and Vita volunteered to be the chair of the review subcommittee. Jansen stated that the review subcommittee would schedule a meeting. Copeland stated that she would put together a four-year summary. Vita set the review subcommittee meeting for Friday, June 3, 2010 at 8:00 AM at the Strafford Regional Planning Commission office. Copeland stated that she would send the review subcommittee something before the meeting. Keans left the meeting at 9:07 AM in order to attend the New Hampshire Rail Authority meeting. Vita stated that there was a bill in the legislature regarding the number of people that need to be laid off before a notice of layoff must be sent.

8. Updates

a. NH Rail Authority

Copeland stated that Keans had left to attend the NH Rail Authority meeting and that Keans thought New Hampshire might receive some of the federal transit funds that Florida turned down.

b. NHARPC Legislative Committee

Ortmann stated that he would send out an additional summary sheet of legislative activity. He stated that the Senate voted to limit the power of the NH Rail Authority and the bill would go to conference between the Senate and House for agreement and then the Governor's signature. Ortmann stated that if no agreement was reached, then the bill died and the NH Rail Authority remained as it was. He discussed the Legislative Breakfast scheduled for May 24, 2011 at 8:00 AM, and that in an attempt to be proactive, the NHARPC was hoping to get information on planning commissions to the legislators.

c. FEMA Mitigation Grants for Community Mitigation Planning

Commissioner Jaffin suggested attendance at the 7th Annual Preparedness Conference on June 16, 2011 at the Radisson Hotel in Manchester. Vita discussed the last meeting of the FEMA Mitigation Grant subcommittee meeting of members Jaffin, Vita and Crosby and the deadline to supply innovative ideas. Jaffin stated that the subcommittee would have to move quickly after the June 16th conference, and stated that he would have some information for the next meeting.

9. Executive Director Report

Copeland discussed the project solicitation for the Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy document. She stated that the communities of Dover, UNH Cooperative Extension, Somersworth and Rochester had responded and submitted projects. Copeland stated that an intern had been hired for data collection tasks.

10. Other Business

Ortmann noted McMenimen's resignation and that he had contacted McMenimen. Ortmann read an email from McMenimen that stated he had enjoyed being at the Executive Committee meetings, and stated that McMenimen would be missed. Copeland stated that an Executive Committee member was usually given a letter of appreciation and a gift at the Annual Meeting, but McMenimen was not attending the Annual Meeting this year. Vita suggested a letter be sent to the Town of Newmarket.

Ortmann made a motion to request that staff send a letter to the Town of Newmarket recognizing and appreciating the service of Rick McMenimen and requesting another Commissioner appointment. Vita seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Copeland stated that McMenimen did not feel he could carry Newmarket's portfolio unless he was an elected official.

Ortmann stated that Jaffin had invited him to be on a panel at an Emergency Management Conference on May 13, 2011. He stated that the panel consisted of partners that are not usually heard from in emergency management including regional planners, Public Service and Waste Management. Ortmann thanked the staff for providing resources that were available at the regional planning commission such as data, maps and copies of reports and manuals. He stated he talked about regional planning commissions and thanked Jaffin for the opportunity.

Ortmann discussed the impacts of the State budget cuts as the legislators decided what to cut and what not to cut from the budget. He stated that if the state cut funding for positions where a bottleneck already existed, it would hinder the effort to pull us up by our bootstraps. Ortmann asked Vita to ask the questions of the state legislators, and let them know that if there were already a chokepoint, eliminating people in those positions would only hamper the economic recovery.

No other business was discussed at the meeting.

11. Adjourn

Chairman Jansen entertained a motion to adjourn the meeting. Ortmann made a motion to adjourn and Crosby seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously and the meeting adjourned at 9:30 AM.

Respectfully submitted,

Linda Osburn
Bookkeeper

Minutes approved on June 17, 2011, 2011.

By: 