

# Strafford Metropolitan Planning Organization Policy Committee Meeting



**Friday, September 18<sup>th</sup> 2020 9:00 – 10:30 AM**  
Remote Zoom Meeting

The Chair of SRPC has found that, due to the State of Emergency declared by the Governor as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic and in accordance with the Governor's Emergency Order #12 pursuant to Executive Order 2020-17, SRPC and committees thereof are authorized to meet electronically.

Please note that there is no physical location to observe and listen contemporaneously to this meeting, which was authorized pursuant to the Governor's Emergency Order.

SRPC is utilizing Zoom for this electronic meeting. All members of the Committee have the ability to communicate contemporaneously during this meeting through this platform, and the public has access to contemporaneously listen and, if necessary, participate in the meeting as follows:

Online Access: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/85240887267>

Telephone-only Access: 1-646-558-8656 and Meeting ID: 852 4088 7267

These instructions have also been provided on the SRPC website at [www.strafford.org](http://www.strafford.org). If anybody has a problem accessing the meeting, please email [clentz@strafford.org](mailto:clentz@strafford.org). In the event the public is unable to access the meeting, the meeting will be adjourned and rescheduled.

- 1. Introductions**
- 2. Staff Communications**
- 3. Action Item(s) [Motion required]**
  - 3.1. Draft minutes from August 21<sup>st</sup>, 2020
  - 3.2. Ten Year Plan Project ranking results
    - Criteria weights averaged from TAC and Policy
    - Project ranking recommended by TAC
- 4. Project Updates**
  - 4.1. Ten Year Plan progress and next steps
    - Volunteers for project scoring sub-committee
- 5. Other Business**
  - 5.1. Commissioner roundtable
- 6. Citizen's Forum** – Citizens of the Strafford region are invited to speak on the subject matter of the meeting. Statements shall be limited to three minutes
- 7. Adjournment**

Reasonable accommodations for people with disabilities are available upon request. Include a description of the accommodation you will need including as much detail as you can. Also include a way we can contact you if we need more information. Make your request as early as possible; please allow at least 5 days advance notice. Last minute requests will be accepted but may be impossible to fill. Please call (603) 994-3500 or email [srpc@strafford.org](mailto:srpc@strafford.org).

## Rules of Procedure

*Strafford Regional Planning Commission  
Strafford Metropolitan Planning Organization, and  
Strafford Economic Development District*

### **Meeting Etiquette**

Be present at the scheduled start of the meeting.

Be respectful of the views of others.

Ensure that only one person talks at a time. Raising your hand to be recognized by the chair or facilitator is good practice.

Do not interrupt others, or start talking before someone finishes.

Do not engage in cross talk.

Avoid individual discussions in small groups during the meeting. When one person speaks, others should listen.

Active participation is encouraged from all members.

When speaking, participants should adhere to topics of discussion directly related to agenda items.

When speaking, individuals should be brief and concise.

The Strafford Regional Planning Commission & Metropolitan Planning Organization holds both public meetings and public hearings.

For public meetings, guests are welcome to observe, but should follow proper meeting etiquette allowing the meeting to proceed uninterrupted. Members of the public who wish to be involved and heard should use venues such as citizen forum, public hearings, public comment periods, outreach events, seminars, workshops, listening sessions, etc.

## Strafford Metropolitan Planning Organization Policy Committee

### Meeting Minutes

**Friday, August 21<sup>st</sup> 2020 9:00 – 11:00 AM**

Strafford Regional Planning Commission  
Virtual Meeting Via Zoom  
Rochester, NH

The meeting was called to order at 9:05am

Prior to beginning the meeting, the Chair read the following statement:

As Chair of the Strafford MPO Policy Committee I have found that, due to the COVID-19/Coronavirus crisis and in accordance with Governor Sununu's Emergency Order #12 pursuant to Executive Order 2020-15, this Committee is authorized to meet electronically. Please note that there is no physical location to observe and listen contemporaneously to the meeting, which was authorized pursuant to the Governor's Emergency Order. However, in accordance with the Emergency Order, this is to confirm that we are:

*a) Providing public access to the meeting by telephone, with additional access possibilities by video or other electronic means;*

We are utilizing the Zoom platform for this electronic meeting. All members of the Committee have the ability to communicate contemporaneously during this meeting through the Zoom platform, and the public has access to contemporaneously listen and, if necessary, participate in this meeting through dialing the following phone # 1-646-558-8656 and meeting ID 852 4088 7267, or by clicking on the following website address:

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/85240887267>

*b) Providing public notice of the necessary information for accessing the meeting;*

We previously gave notice to the public of how to access the meeting using Zoom, and instructions are provided on the SRPC website at [Strafford.org](http://Strafford.org), and clicking on the link for the May Policy Committee.

*c) Providing a mechanism for the public to alert the public body during the meeting if there are problems with access;*

If anybody has a problem, please call 603-559-3500 (ext. 102) or email Colin at:

[clentz@strafford.org](mailto:clentz@strafford.org).

*d) Adjourning the meeting if the public is unable to access the meeting.*

In the event the public is unable to access the meeting, we will adjourn the meeting and have it rescheduled at that time. Please note that all votes that are taken during this meeting shall be done by Roll Call vote.

Let's start the meeting by taking a Roll Call attendance. When each member states their presence, also please state whether there is anyone in the room with you during this meeting, which is required under the Right-to-Know law.

### **1. Attendance:**

#### Committee Members

Tim White (NHDES), Bill Fisher (Farmington), Mark Richardson (Somersworth), Don Hamann (Rochester), Victoria Parmele (Northwood), Michael Williams (COAST), Joe Boudreau (Rochester), Peter Nelson (Newmarket), Barbara Holstein (Rochester), Wayne Burton (Durham), Michael Bobinsky (Somersworth), David Landry (Dover), Steve Diamond (Barrington), Glenn Davison (NHDOT).

#### Staff

Jennifer Czysz, Colin Lentz, Nancy O'Connor, Jackson Rand, Stephen Geis

### **2. Staff Communications**

C. Lentz said Alaina Rogers had started with SRPC on the summer data collection team and been helping Kyle Pimental, and was recently hired as a full-time staff member. Alaina had successfully applied for a grant to study coastal resilience in Dover. The project will be focused on climate impacts to vulnerable populations in Dover.

J. Czysz added that SRPC is working on applying for CARES Act funds through the Economic Development Administration. Those funds would help SRPC hire a temporary dedicated position to organize economic recovery in the region. SRPC has received a preliminary approval and is working on finalizing the contract process.

### **3. Action Item(s)**

3.1 Minutes from June 19, 2020 [VOTE]

M. Williams made a motion to approve the minutes as written.

Seconded by M. Bobinsky

Vote: unanimous in favor (via roll call vote)

### **4. Project Updates**

4.1 Ten Year Plan progress and next steps

C. Lentz reviewed the draft weighting of project scoring criteria. He explained that TAC members had proposed weightings as individuals and he had compiled them into an average. He used the polling feature in zoom to present multiple choice questions related to the Ten Year Plan criteria.

1. Do you think these weights will help us accurately and objectively score projects?

Answer 1: Yes, they are representative of regional priorities

Answer 2: No, I think the weights could be adjusted

*The majority of members responded that the criteria were representative of regional priorities. A couple felt the weightings could be adjusted.*

2. Each of the sub-criteria is weighted approximately 50/50 (e.g. safety performance vs. safety measures). Do you agree with this?

Answer 1: Yes, each of the sub-criteria are equally valuable

Answer 2: I think we should discuss different weightings for the different sub-criteria

Answer 3: I'm not sure; need more information

*Most members felt the sub-criteria were equally valuable.*

3. What do you think about this approach in general? If we were going to develop our own criteria and scoring process, what would you change?

Answer 1: There are too many criteria

Answer 2: There are criteria I think should be added

Answer 3: This approach works well for this task

Answer 4: We need a completely different approach

*Most members felt this approach was appropriate for the task.*

Members discussed the applicability of the criteria, especially with the emergence of COVID-19. C. Lentz explained the rationale behind the criteria. Most members were comfortable with the proposed weighting on primary criteria. C. Lentz gave more detail on the individual sub-criteria and put them in context with the candidate projects. He noted that the average weight for sub-criteria was 50/50.

C. Lentz noted that SRPC staff are working on getting access to crash data and detailed demographic data. These are important for two criteria: Safety; and Environmental Justice, Equity, & Accessibility. He said state agencies are working to prepare crash data for sharing and RPC access with the passage of HB1182, and Rachel Dewey is working on a universal database that will help staff analyze detailed demographic data.

M. Bobinsky said he thought the “state of repair” criteria should be given more weight. He suggested that 3% be taken from the “mobility” criteria and added to “state of repair”. Several members concurred.

V. Parmele asked how much the criteria weighting changed this round compared to last round. C. Lentz responded that they were very close compared to last round. He asked for follow-up about the suggested additional weight on “state of repair”, noting that the NHDOT maintenance districts and municipalities are bearing the cost of infrastructure maintenance separately from new project development. In addition, any project that involves a new configuration will likely improve the condition of the pavement or infrastructure by default. Members discussed the need to maintain existing infrastructure before building new infrastructure.

W. Burton asked for clarification on what “network significance” means. C. Lentz said it’s really getting at the number of people served; a route like NH125 will score higher because it is a regional route that handles more volume than a local road.

C. Lentz noted that discussion and questions from committee members were addressing the fact that the criteria were not mutually exclusive. Many of the criteria have an overlapping relationship (for instance the state of repair of a road will have an impact on the safety if that road is in very poor condition).

J. Czysz added that the criteria were developed in collaboration with NHDOT and the other 8 RPCs so that a consistent approach would be used across the state. RPCs are able to weight the criteria according to regional priorities. She reminded committee members that TAC members drafted the criteria weights and the Policy committee can request the TAC members take a second look at the weightings. J. Czysz suggested that Policy members could use the criteria weighting template that TAC used to generate alternative weightings.

W. Burton asked what the deadline was for this decision. C. Lentz said NHDOT needs a list of projects by November 6<sup>th</sup>, which means the Policy Committee needs to vote at their meeting on October 16<sup>th</sup>. The list needs to include ranked projects that fit within the regional allocation [\$4,901,449], plus one or two additional projects as a contingency.

C. Lentz asked what Policy members preferred to do in order to resolve criteria weighting considerations. He reiterated that the committee could request that TAC reconsider the weights with greater emphasis on “state of repair”, or he could send Policy members the weighting template for them to fill out, and he would incorporate the recommended changes. The recommended changes would be shared with TAC as well at their September meeting.

M. Bobinsky suggested that C. Lentz send Policy members the weighting template. He added that he was sensitive to the fact that the TAC already spent time to weight the criteria. He had some suggested tweaks but didn’t want to completely undo the TAC’s work. C. Lentz said he would send the weighting template to the Policy committee right after the meeting ended.

C. Lentz said he could send the weighting template to Policy and include the candidate projects so members would have some context for how criteria would be applied.

#### 4.2 Timing for updating the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)

C. Lentz explained that following the approval and signing of the Ten Year Plan by the Governor on July 24<sup>th</sup>, NHDOT had begun developing a draft STIP. The STIP comprises the next four years of projects in that Ten Year Plan. NHDOT is planning on developing a draft STIP to review by MPOs around October/November, from there the MPOs develop regional TIPs (Transportation Improvement Program. The MPOs are planning on getting their TIPs approved near the end of March. C. Lentz said he would provide more detail in the future.

### 5. Discussion Items

#### 5.1 Metro Plan updates

C. Lentz reminded the committee that every MPO has a Metro Plan, which is a comprehensive regional plan for transportation needs that covers the next 20 years. It is based on federal requirements and programs specific transportation projects based on data and available funding.

C. Lentz said the updated Metro Plan would have far less text and include more focused data analysis. Staff are working on a database of metrics that apply to regional planning and many of them are transportation related. He said the Metro Plan will include those metrics as snapshots of important data trends. This includes demographics, traffic volumes, safety trends, etc. The metrics will help pair data trends and proposed projects. For instance, what kinds of projects should be prioritized in the future to support the rising senior population. C. Lentz added that staff are working on implementing several new analysis tools that will enable staff and committee members to develop and propose needed transportation projects.

C. Lentz said he wanted to focus on the draft written content at this meeting. The Metro Plan written content is focused around eight overarching themes and each theme is currently less than four pages long. This is intended to set the context of transportation challenges in the region and allow the reader to match those challenges to the data snapshots in the plan. He posted several poll questions for committee members using zoom:

1. Were these the right themes?

Answer 1: There are too few (doesn't cover range of topics)

Answer 2: There are too many (they could be condensed)

Answer 3: Just the right amount; covers relevant topics

The majority of members said they thought it was the right range of themes to cover issues relevant to the region.

2. What do you think about theme content?

Answer 1: Right amount of information

Answer 2: Trying to say too much in short space

Answer 3: Good length but provide more detail

Majority of members were split: they thought the themes contained the right amount of information, but also thought more detail could be included.

3. What do you think about the implementation sections ("What We Can Do")?

Answer 1: They present reasonable strategies for implementation

Answer 2: They could include more ambitious strategies

Answer 3: Good strategies but I need more detail

Majority of members said the strategies were good, but more detail should be provided.

With the time left in the meeting, C. Lentz proposed postponing detailed discussion of the draft Metro Plan themes till next meeting. He provided the polling results and requested that committee members follow up with him if they had specific suggestions or requests for the themes. C. Lentz the Metro Plan needed to be complete and approved by the end June 2021. Staff are working on individual components of the plan so committee members can review each individual component rather than trying to review the entire plan at once.

## 6. Other Business

### 6.1 POP! Data Collection training

J. Rand and N. O' Connor gave a presentation on SRPC's project Promoting Outdoor Play (or POP!). N O' Connor explained that POP! Was the evolution of a separate project looking at access

to recreation facilities (Pathways to Play), which was funded by the NH Children's Health Foundation. A goal of that project was to address childhood obesity and increase access to places for outdoor activity. As a pilot project from Pathways to Play, data were compiled to create multiple maps of demographics and local recreation sites in Somersworth. SRPC staff applied again to NH Children's Health Foundation to take the information developed through Pathways to Play and develop online maps and resources that will help people reach more outdoor recreation opportunities throughout the region. She said POP! will include a full assessment of over 400 local recreation sites in the region to be included in an online map. SRPC is looking for local volunteers to go to their nearby park and complete an assessment using a smartphone survey app.

J. Rand gave a presentation on how to use the smartphone app he had developed and conduct local assessments of their local recreation sites. He walked members through downloading and using the app to conduct surveys at local recreation sites. He demonstrated how an online story map and dashboard will look for users. Members discussed how to use the data and made recommendations how to implement the results of the survey and maps.

7. **Citizen's Forum** – Citizens of the Strafford region are invited to speak on the subject matter of the meeting. Statements should be limited to three minutes.

No members of the public were present to provide comments

## 8. **Adjournment**

B. Fisher made a motion to adjourn; seconded by D. Hamann

The meeting was adjourned at 11:30am



## September 2020 Policy meeting preview

### Summary of decision points

---

The Ten Year Plan criteria weighting and preliminary list of projects are the main topics for the September Policy meeting. There are two main items to be discussed and voted on:

- Project scoring criteria weights
- Preliminary list of candidate projects to be submitted to NHDOT for engineering review

#### Criteria

Policy members submitted suggested changes to the project scoring criteria following their August meeting. Policy members suggested moving some weight from the “mobility” criteria and adding it to the “state of repair” criteria. Colin Lentz incorporated those suggestions and averaged them with previously developed TAC weights. While weighting change adjusted the project scores it did not affect the ranked order of candidate projects. TAC reviewed the Policy recommended changes and averaged criteria weights at their September meeting (please see comparison in a separate attachment “TAC&PolicyWeightingComparison.PDF”).

**TAC Recommendation:** That Policy approve the averaged weights.

**Policy Action:** discuss and approve the selected weights.

#### Projects

See attachment “ProjectScoring&Allocation.PDF.” At this time we need to select a preliminary list of projects to submit to NHDOT for an engineering review and assessment. The list can include all projects that fit within the regional allocation of \$4.9 million, plus an additional two projects as a contingency.

Please note that the cost estimates are very conservative and may be adjusted following NHDOT’s engineering review. At this time, the project estimates use the higher end of potential costs, include the 10% NHDOT indirect costs as applicable, and have been inflated to reflect their potential inclusion in years 9 and 10 of the TYP. The combined total of the Rochester, Barrington, and Farmington projects is slightly over the regional allocation of 4.9 million.

#### **TAC recommendation:**

Submit the following list of projects to NHDOT for engineering review:

- Projects approximately within the regional allocation:
  - Rochester (L14001) Route 11 and Nashoba Drive: to replace an existing TYP project
  - Barrington (L01001) NH125 and NH9 Intersection: \$761,944
  - Rochester (L14002) Route 11: \$3,620,000
  - Farmington (L05001) Route75, 153 Downtown Corridor: \$1,233,902
- Two contingency projects
  - Milton (09001) Dawson Street and Silver Street: \$543,200
  - Durham (L04001) Main Street/NH155A/Mast Road Intersection: \$969,600

DOT cannot commit to reviewing all projects due to staffing and time constraints. As a result, not all projects can be submitted at this time. The New Durham project, the lowest ranked, was not recommended by TAC for engineering review submission.

**Policy Action:** Discuss and select projects to submit to NHDOT for engineering review (projects equating to our \$4.9 million allocation plus two contingency projects).

**Considerations as part of the Policy discussion:**

- What projects are included in the preliminary list based on scores and cost estimate?
- Do we only include the two projects that fit comfortably within the regional allocation, or do we also include Farmington which would be slightly over the regional allocation?
- Approve TAC's recommendation that the Milton and Durham projects be included as the two "contingency" projects?

**Candidate projects arranged in order of preliminary scoring.**  
**Running Total shows cumulative project costs for comparison to regional allocation**

Municipality	Project Code	Route/Road	Estimated Scope	Need for Project	Total Score (out of 100)	High Estimated Cost	Running Total
Rochester	L14001	Route 11 (Farmington Rd) & Nashoba Drive	Install traffic signal at Nashoba Dr with pedestrian crossing and safety improvements. Sidewalks connecting to North Main St south of NH16.	Increasing traffic and congestion in this section of NH11 poses a challenge for safety and access management. Nashoba drive is the outlet for Cochecho Estates (approx.. 200 unit residential park). Rising traffic volumes and congestion on NH11 have increased access and safety challenges for vehicles and pedestrians.	61.37	\$2,700,000	This funding is already included in the TYP. City is requesting a project-for-project swap. Does not apply to regional allocation.
Barrington	L01001	NH125 and NH9 intersection	Install 5 foot wide concrete sidewalks along westbound side of NH9: approximately 2,750 linear feet from Christmas Lane to Barrington Middle School. Includes ADA accessible crossings for all four legs of NH125/NH9 Intersection.	The intersection currently has no pedestrian facilities. This is a barrier to economic development in an area where several small businesses operate and more commercial and residential development is planned or anticipated. The lack of pedestrian facilities is also a safety hazard for students walking to the town middle school.	56.94	\$761,944	\$761,944
Rochester	L14002	Route 11 (Farmington Rd)	Widen 3,200 feet of NH11 to a four lane configuration from beginning of existing three lane section north of the Spaulding Turnpike off/on ramp, to the Rochester Toyota entrance (appx. 390 feet south of Crane Drive).	NH11 is highly congested and regular periods due to northbound tourist travel, visitors to nearby large commercial development, and general local traffic.	53.84	\$3,620,000	\$4,381,944
<b>Safely within the regional allocation</b>							
Farmington	L05001	Route 75, 153 Downtown corridor	New sidewalks in three separate sections that will expand the connected sidewalk network: appx 1500 ft along Elm St westbound between Main St and Lone Star Ave; appx 1500 feet along Main St southbound (NH153) between Paulson Rd and public safety building; and appx 910 feet along Main St northbound between Lincoln St and Webster St.	Farmington is in the process of revitalizing their downtown. Improved walkability and bikeability will be critical for economic development and creating a sense of place. The downtown is currently a barrier to students walking to local schools due to lack of safe, modern pedestrian crossings.	52.12	\$1,233,902	\$5,615,846
<b>Slightly over the regional allocation</b>							
Milton	L09001	Dawson Street and Silver Street	Construct 2,770 linear feet of sidewalk to enhance pedestrian connectivity between the town center, school, and other community church. 1,320 feet of sidewalk on Dawson St; 1,450 feet of sidewalk on Silver St. Close heavily skewed part of northern triangle intersection of Dawson St and NH125. (scope elements and cost estimate are based on engineering report from Underwood Engineers Inc.)	No sidewalks or pedestrian safety facilities currently exist. Project area is in a residential area of the main village center, near the main St, schools, and a church. Town has planned coordinated utilities upgrades for stormwater management.	49.58	\$543,200	\$6,159,046
Durham	L04001	Main St/NH 155A/Mast Road Intersection	Intersection safety improvements. Signal or roundabout are potential alternatives. ***	Traffic is increasing due to continued development surrounding UNH campus. Main St is a primary route for local access to campus and downtown from the west; NH155A traffic is increasing.	47.53	\$969,600	\$7,128,646
New Durham	L40003	Route 11 & Tash Road	Intersection Realignment to make approaches perpendicular to Route 11, add center turn lanes	The heavily skewed intersection configuration is a safety hazard for transitioning from a high-speed road to a low-speed local road.	40.22	\$679,000	\$7,807,646
<b>Total Regional Allocation</b>					<b>\$4,901,449</b>		
<b>Total project cost estimates (minus New Durham)</b>					<b>\$7,128,646</b>		

\*\*\*Durham cost estimate is for a roundabout, a signal should be about half as much  
All costs are based on a maximum estimate, they include indirects, engineering, ROW, and inflation cost estimates

**TAC Weights**

Safety	1.86
Mobility	1.53
Network Significance	1.53
State of Repair	0.99
Natural Hazard Resilience	1.05
Equity, Environmental Justice, & Accessibility	1.05
Economic Development	1.09
Support	0.90
<b>Total points have to add up to 10 →</b>	<b>10.0</b>

**Weight changes suggested by Policy**

Safety	1.93
Mobility	0.87
Network Significance	1.52
State of Repair	1.90
Natural Hazard Resilience	1.03
Equity, Environmental Justice, & Accessibility	0.78
Economic Development	1.05
Support	0.95
<b>Total points have to add up to 10 →</b>	<b>10.0</b>

**TAC & Policy Averaged Together**

Safety	1.90
Mobility	1.20
Network Significance	1.52
State of Repair	1.45
Natural Hazard Resilience	1.04
Equity, Environmental Justice, & Accessibility	0.91
Economic Development	1.07
Support	0.93
<b>Total points have to add up to 10 →</b>	<b>10.0</b>



# Project #L01001: NH9/NH125 Pedestrian Improvements in Barrington

Submitted by Marcia Gasses on 263471078

On NH9 from Christmas Ln. to Haley Dr.

## Other Location Notes

2,750 Feet, 0.52 miles

## Project Information

### Scope

Install 5 foot wide concrete sidewalks along westbound side of NH9: approximately 2,750 linear feet from Christmas Lane to Barrington Middle School. Includes ADA accessible crossings for all four legs of NH125/NH9 Intersection, and a pedestrian-activated rectangular rapid flashing beacon at the middle school.

### Support

Supported by Select board (Letter pending). Sidewalks at this location are a priority in the approved Master Plan.

### Information

No sidewalks exist in the town center. Need pedestrian facilities for economic development, in preparation for ongoing residential growth and to link to Middle School

### Purpose

The purpose of this project is to make the intersection of NH9 and NH125 safer and more accessible to pedestrians.

### Need

The intersection currently has no pedestrian facilities. This is a barrier to economic development in an area where several small businesses operate and more commercial and residential development is planned or anticipated. The lack of pedestrian facilities is also a safety hazard for students walking to the town middle school.

## Additional Information

### Alternative Options Considered

### Extent of public involvement efforts to date

This is a local planning effort involving the Planning and Select Boards

### Extent of anticipated future public involvement efforts

Unknown

### Is the project listed as a priority in a local or regional plan?

Sidewalks in general, and specifically at this location are prioritized in the Master Plan.

[https://www.barrington.nh.gov/sites/g/files/vyhlif2766/f/uploads/chapter\\_5\\_trans](https://www.barrington.nh.gov/sites/g/files/vyhlif2766/f/uploads/chapter_5_trans)

## Project Type

Highway Improvement

Asset Management

**Bicycle/Pedestrian Improvements**

Planning Studies

Travel Demand Management

## Funding Estimates

Engineering	\$90,000
Right-of-way	\$58,000
Construction	\$670,511
Structures	
Capital	
Operating	

---

### Total Cost

*Cost estimate source: Developed with SRPC staff. Construction cost includes indirects. Project cost inflated to FY2031.*

### Local Match

TBD

# Project #L01001: NH9/NH125 Pedestrian Improvements in Barrington

portation.pdf

Will the project be managed locally?

Yes

Additional evidence of the need for the project

---

## List of attachments

Photo	Yes	Local/Master Plans	Yes
Maps	Yes	Regional Planning Studies	No
Scope	No	Corridor Studies	No
Cost Estimate	Yes	Development Studies	No
Conceptual Designs	No	Special Studies	No
Turning Movement or Traffic Count Data	No	Crash Data	No
Bicycle/Pedestrian Surveys	No	Transit Operator Data	No

# Project #L04001: Main Street/NH 155A/Mast Road Intersection in Durham

Submitted by Michael Behrendt on 8/7/2020 12:56:00 PM

On Main Street and Mast Road intersection from to

## Other Location Notes

not applicable

## Project Information

### Scope

Intersection safety improvements. Signal or roundabout are potential alternatives

### Support

Durham Traffic Safety Committee; Durham Town Administrator, Public Works Director, Police Chief, Fire Chief, and Town Planner.

### Information

It was identified as an intersection of concern as far back as the 2000 Transportation Master Plan. Since that time it has been discussed frequently as an important intersection that needs to be upgraded. With significant development in recent years of large student housing projects in close proximity to the intersection the need for improvements has become prominent.

### Purpose

The purpose of this project is to improve safety and efficiency at the intersection. Traffic is increasing significantly due to continued development surrounding the UNH campus, especially with large student housing projects. Main Street is the primary route for access to campus and downtown from the west.

### Need

Traffic has increased significantly in recent years. This is the intersection of major routes into and out of town and the UNH campus. The current configuration is inadequate to accommodate future growth.

## Additional Information

### Alternative Options Considered

A conventional expansion of the intersection with improved turn lanes is also contemplated but a roundabout is deemed the likely best approach.

### Extent of public involvement efforts to date

Discussions to date have mostly centered around professional staff and the Durham Traffic Safety Committee, including conversations with Steve Pesci, UNH Transportation Planner.

### Extent of anticipated future public involvement efforts

We will reach out to the public through the Town's weekly electronic newsletter and in discussions with the Planning Board.

## Project Type

**Highway Improvement**

**Asset Management**

**Bicycle/Pedestrian Improvements**

**Planning Studies**

**Travel Demand Management**

## Funding Estimates

Engineering	\$105,000
Right-of-way	\$75,000
Construction	\$789,600
Structures	
Capital	
Operating	
<b>Total Cost</b>	

*Cost estimate source: Colin Lentz, SRPC Transportation Planner.*

*NOTE - estimate is for roundabout, signal will be about half as much. Construction cost includes indirects and inflation.*

### Local Match

Yes.



# Project #L04001: Main Street/NH 155A/Mast Road Intersection in Durham

Is the project listed as a priority in a local or regional plan?

It is a high local priority and specified in the UNH Campus Master Plan.

Will the project be managed locally?

Yes.

Additional evidence of the need for the project

We will provide more information later.

---

## List of attachments

Photo	No	Local/Master Plans	No
Maps	No	Regional Planning Studies	No
Scope	No	Corridor Studies	No
Cost Estimate	No	Development Studies	No
Conceptual Designs	No	Special Studies	No
Turning Movement or Traffic Count Data	No	Crash Data	No
Bicycle/Pedestrian Surveys	No	Transit Operator Data	No

# Project #L05001: Farmington sidewalk expansion in Farmington

Submitted by Arthur Capello on 263471078

On NH153 (Elm St), NH153 (Main St), Main St from to

## Other Location Notes

4260 Feet, 0.08 miles

## Project Information

### Scope

New sidewalks in three separate sections that will expand the connected sidewalk network: appx 1500 ft along Elm St westbound between Main St and Lone Star Ave; appx 1500 feet along Main St southbound (NH153) between Paulson Rd and public safety building; and appx 910 feet along Main St northbound between Lincoln St and Webster St.

### Support

Extending sidewalks in the downtown is supported in the Master Plan, and through downtown revitalization efforts.

### Information

### Purpose

The purpose of this project is to increase bicycle and pedestrian safety and improve the streetscape in the downtown.

### Need

Farmington is in the process of revitalizing their downtown. Improved walkability and bikeability will be critical for economic development and creating a sense of place. The downtown is currently a barrier to students walking to local schools due to lack of safe, modern pedestrian crossings.

## Additional Information

### Alternative Options Considered

### Extent of public involvement efforts to date

This project is supported by the Select Board.

### Extent of anticipated future public involvement efforts

Unknown

### Is the project listed as a priority in a local or regional plan?

This project is directly supported by the Master Plan and local downtown revitalization efforts.

### Will the project be managed locally?

Yes

## Project Type

Highway Improvement

Asset Management

### **Bicycle/Pedestrian Improvements**

Planning Studies

Travel Demand Management

## Funding Estimates

Engineering	\$148,068
Right-of-way	
Construction	\$1,085,834
Structures	
Capital	
Operating	
<hr/>	
<b>Total Cost</b>	

*Cost estimate source: Developed with SRPC staff. Project cost inflated to FY2031*

### Local Match

Unknown

# Project #L05001: Farmington sidewalk expansion in Farmington

Additional evidence of the need for the project

---

## List of attachments

Photo	Yes	Local/Master Plans	Yes
Maps	Yes	Regional Planning Studies	No
Scope	No	Corridor Studies	No
Cost Estimate	Yes	Development Studies	No
Conceptual Designs	No	Special Studies	No
Turning Movement or Traffic Count Data	No	Crash Data	No
Bicycle/Pedestrian Surveys	No	Transit Operator Data	No

# Project #L09001: Silver & Dawson St improvements in Milton

Submitted by Bruce Woodruff on 263471078

On Silver St and Dawson St from to

## Other Location Notes

2770 feet, 0.52 miles

## Project Information

### Scope

Construct 2,770 linear feet of sidewalk to enhance pedestrian connectivity between the town center, school, and other community church. 1,320 feet of sidewalk on Daweson St; 1,450 feet of sidewalk on Silver St. Close heavily skewed part of northern triangle intersection of Dawson St and NH125. (scope elements and cost estimate are based on engineering report from Underwood Engineers Inc.)

### Support

The project is included the approved town capital improvement program

### Information

### Purpose

The purpose of this project is to improve pedestrian accessibility between the town center and schools. Paired with utilities upgrades.

### Need

No sidewalks or pedestrian safety facilities currently exist. Project area is in a residential area of the main village center, near the main St, schools, and a church. Town has planned coordinated utilities upgrades for stormwater management.

## Additional Information

### Alternative Options Considered

Extent of public involvement efforts to date

Extent of anticipated future public involvement efforts

Is the project listed as a priority in a local or regional plan?

Will the project be managed locally?

yes

Additional evidence of the need for the project

## Project Type

Highway Improvement

### **Asset Management**

### **Bicycle/Pedestrian Improvements**

Planning Studies

Travel Demand Management

## Funding Estimates

Engineering	\$60,000
Right-of-way	\$32,000
Construction	\$451,200
Structures	
Capital	
Operating	
<hr/>	
<b>Total Cost</b>	

*Cost estimate source: Developed with SRPC staff. Construction costs include indirects and inflation.*

### Local Match

Unknown

# Project #L09001: Silver & Dawson St improvements in Milton

---

## List of attachments

Photo	Yes	Local/Master Plans	Yes
Maps	Yes	Regional Planning Studies	No
Scope	No	Corridor Studies	No
Cost Estimate	Yes	Development Studies	No
Conceptual Designs	No	Special Studies	No
Turning Movement or Traffic Count Data	No	Crash Data	No
Bicycle/Pedestrian Surveys	No	Transit Operator Data	No

# Project #L10003: Rt 11 & Tash Rd Intersection Improvements in New Durham

Submitted by Scott Kinmond on 7/23/2020 8:25:00 PM

On NH Route 11 & Tash Rd from to

[Other Location Notes](#)

## Project Information

### [Scope](#)

Intersection Realignment to make approaches perpendicular to Route 11, add center turn lanes

### [Support](#)

New Durham Select Board- David Swenson, Char, Cecile Chase Vice Chair and Dorothy Veisel Selectman. Police Chief Shawn Bernier, Fire Chief Peter Varney, DPW Manager / Road Agent Don Vachon and Scott Kinmond, Town Administrator

### [Information](#)

### [Purpose](#)

The purpose of this project is to increase traffic safety.

### [Need](#)

The heavily skewed intersection configuration is a safety hazard for transitioning from a high-speed road to a low-speed local road.

## Additional Information

### [Alternative Options Considered](#)

### [Extent of public involvement efforts to date](#)

### [Extent of anticipated future public involvement efforts](#)

### [Is the project listed as a priority in a local or regional plan?](#)

### [Will the project be managed locally?](#)

### [Additional evidence of the need for the project](#)

The heavily skewed intersection configuration is a safety hazard for transitioning from a high-speed road to a low-speed local road.

## Project Type

**Highway Improvement**

**Asset Management**

**Bicycle/Pedestrian Improvements**

**Planning Studies**

**Travel Demand Management**

## Funding Estimates

Engineering	\$75,000
Right-of-way	\$40,000
Construction	\$500,000
Structures	
Capital	\$50,000
Operating	\$14,000

### **Total Cost**

*Cost estimate source: SRPC*

### [Local Match](#)

# Project #L10003: Rt 11 & Tash Rd Intersection Improvements in New Durham

---

## List of attachments

Photo	No	Local/Master Plans	No
Maps	No	Regional Planning Studies	No
Scope	No	Corridor Studies	No
Cost Estimate	No	Development Studies	No
Conceptual Designs	No	Special Studies	No
Turning Movement or Traffic Count Data	No	Crash Data	No
Bicycle/Pedestrian Surveys	No	Transit Operator Data	No

# Project #L14001: Safety Improvements to NH Rt 11 in Rochester

Submitted by Peter C. Nourse on 8/11/2020 2:40:00 PM

On NH Rt 11 from Spaulding Turnpike to Nashoba Dr.

## Other Location Notes

This project is to install a traffic signal at NH Rt. 11 and Nashoba Dr. Included is a pedestrian crossing and new sidewalk on NE side of NH Rt 11 from signal to Spaulding overpass, approx. 5,000'.

## Project Information

### Scope

In 2020, DOT gave a verbal approval for Rochester to substitute this NH Rt 11 improvement project for an approved project in the TYP. That approved project was No. 40647 NH 125 and Lowell St Intersection Improvements; \$2.057M; PE 2023; Construction 2026. It is the City's understanding that a NH Rt 11 project for the same value can be substituted for this project and was verbally approved. The issues on NH Rt 11 for the City are a priority over the approved TYP project and relief is needed currently.

### Support

Oct 2019 GACIT hearings where State Senator, citizens, businesses and myself testified. Also, residents of Cocheco Estates MHP have requested a signal since about 2011.

### Information

A signal is needed. The capacity of NH Rt 11 is inadequate for the peak hour traffic. Residents of Cocheco Estates find it very difficult to exit the MHP due to traffic loads. The 2009 CLD study envisioned 5 signals along NH Rt 11. This included 1 at Nashoba (Cocheco Estates). In 2019 DOT stated that the warrants were very close for a signal. These warrants will be met once properties of Northgate Apartments are subdivided and land is developed. Also the Granite Ridge development will have its Marketplace Blvd. enter Rt. 11 at Northgate Apartments. See 2009 CDL development study of Granite Ridge.

### Purpose

Pedestrian safety improvements: NH Rt 11 is used by many pedestrians. There are no ped facilities. Pedestrians can be seen at all hours attempting to cross the road. This project proposes to have a signal and crosswalk at Nashoba Dr./Northgate Apartments (future Marketplace Blvd.). It also proposes new sidewalk starting at the new signal and along the NE side of NH Rt 11 to the Rt. 16 overpass where a sidewalk exists. The signal will provide residents of Cocheco Estates the ability to safely exit the MHP. This signal was supported in the 2009 CLD study and is supported in the joint City-DOT MOU.

### Need

See previous sections.

## Project Type

Highway Improvement

Asset Management

Bicycle/Pedestrian Improvements

Planning Studies

Travel Demand Management

## Funding Estimates

Engineering	\$50,000
Right-of-way	\$50,000
Construction	\$2,000,000
Structures	\$50,000
Capital	\$0
Operating	\$0
<b>Total Cost</b>	<b>\$2,150,000</b>

*Cost estimate source: \$2.057M is the value assigned to the current, approved TYP project No. 40647. It is understood that this exchange project value cannot exceed this figure. City has retained HTA to perform a scope and budget for the concepts presented here. This is not anticipated until Fall 2020.*

### Local Match

City accepts the 80-20 split of TYP projects.



# Project #L14001: Safety Improvements to NH Rt 11 in Rochester

## Additional Information

### Alternative Options Considered

The NH Rt 11 corridor from Spaulding to Farmington TL has significant capacity and safety issues beyond the value of this project as this project is a proposed substitution for an existing TYP project. It is believed that the new signal and new sidewalk could be executed for the exchange budget value of \$2.057M.

### Extent of public involvement efforts to date

GACIT hearings Oct 2019. Public officials, businesses, residents. Cocheco Estates MHP has requested relief since 2011.

### Extent of anticipated future public involvement efforts

Every TYP GACIT hearing will see this as a regional priority. Project has SRPC support.

### Is the project listed as a priority in a local or regional plan?

This is a large City priority.

### Will the project be managed locally?

preferred.

### Additional evidence of the need for the project

See other sections. There are several other docs that this survey limits the addition of.

---

## List of attachments

Photo	Yes	Local/Master Plans	Yes
Maps	Yes	Regional Planning Studies	No
Scope	No	Corridor Studies	Yes
Cost Estimate	No	Development Studies	No
Conceptual Designs	No	Special Studies	No
Turning Movement or Traffic Count Data	No	Crash Data	No
Bicycle/Pedestrian Surveys	No	Transit Operator Data	No

# Project #L14002: Capacity Enhancements for NH RT 11 in Rochester

Submitted by Peter C. Nourse on 8/3/2020 3:51:00 PM

On NH RT 11 from Spaulding Turnpike to Farmington town line; 12,000'+/-

## Other Location Notes

approx. 12,000 LF of NH RT 11.

## Project Information

### Scope

Widen 3,200 feet of NH11 to a four-lane configuration from beginning of existing three lane section north of the Spaulding Turnpike off/on ramp, to the Rochester Toyota entrance (appx. 390 feet south of Crane Drive).

### Support

See attached documentation. It is supported by the City, local businesses, public officials and SRPC.

### Information

CLD Corridor Study 2009. City letter to DOT. 2019 Granite Ridge Traffic Impact Study. SRPC letter of support 2019. Northgate Apartments subdivision. Attached.

### Purpose

Traffic capacity enhancement is needed on this stretch of RT 11. The 2009 CLD study envisioned double travel lanes for each direction. Currently there is only one travel lane and a central turn lane. Due to the increasing number of businesses including the expansion of the Granite Ridge retail development, and being a byway to recreational destinations north, this stretch of RT 11 has significant capacity issues. The 2019 Granite Ridge traffic study indicates that Sat peak hour trips will increase by 1,000 hourly. Residents at Cocheco Estates (Nashoba Dr.) have a very difficult time exiting their mobile home park onto RT 11. Additionally, there are no pedestrian facilities and pedestrians are seen often attempting to cross Rt 11.

### Need

Roadway configuration is under capacity for current and future traffic loading. Pedestrian facilities such as sidewalks and crossings are needed for safety.

## Additional Information

### Alternative Options Considered

The City in 2020 received permission from DOT to make a project substitution for a project on RT 11 to take the place of an existing TYP project for the same value of \$2.057M. Project to be replaced is 40647 Intersection Improvements to NH Rt 125 and Lowell St. City wishes to forgo this project and accelerate at least some improvements to RT 11. City has retained HTA to provide a scope and budget for such a substitution. It is anticipated that with approx. \$2M budget that a signal could be installed at Nashoba Dr. and perhaps sidewalks extended from the interchange up to Nashoba. However, this is a small portion of the approx. 12,000 LF of RT 11 which needs capacity improvements.

## Project Type

Highway Improvement

Asset Management

Bicycle/Pedestrian Improvements

Planning Studies

Travel Demand Management

## Funding Estimates

Engineering	\$500,000
Right-of-way	\$300,000
Construction	\$2,820,000
Structures	\$0
Capital	\$0
Operating	\$0
<b>Total Cost</b>	<b>\$3,620,000</b>

*Cost estimate source: City Retained HTA to perform scoping of the substitute project for value of \$2.057M. The value to address the 12,000 LF +/- of the corridor is unknown. Construction cost includes Indirects and inflation.*

### Local Match

City is good with the 80-20 match.

# Project #L14002: Capacity Enhancements for NH RT 11 in Rochester

## Extent of public involvement efforts to date

Very. 2019 GACIT hearings where several businesses, myself and Senator Gray advocated for capacity and safety improvements. SRPC submitted a letter in Aug 2019 to the GACIT Committee citing emphasis for corridor studies, especially for RT 11.

## Extent of anticipated future public involvement efforts

Each GACIT hearing will see similar input. This issue is considered Rochester's chief transportation issue.

## Is the project listed as a priority in a local or regional plan?

This is a local and regional issue. It is the City's chief transportation issue. We understand DOT will be looking to conduct corridor studies on other major roadways. Not sure what RT 11's priority is. However, we know without a study that there is an existing problem.

## Will the project be managed locally?

Preferred.

## Additional evidence of the need for the project

2019 Steven Pernaw Traffic Impact Study for Granite Ridge. 2017 City letter to DOT advocating for Nashoba signal. 2019 SRPC letter to GACIT Committee on need. 2009 CLD Corridor Study. 2020 TFM drawings for Northgate subdivision.

---

## List of attachments

Photo	No	Local/Master Plans	No
Maps	No	Regional Planning Studies	No
Scope	No	Corridor Studies	No
Cost Estimate	No	Development Studies	No
Conceptual Designs	No	Special Studies	No
Turning Movement or Traffic Count Data	No	Crash Data	No
Bicycle/Pedestrian Surveys	No	Transit Operator Data	No

# Project #L01001: NH9/NH125 Pedestrian Improvements in Barrington

Submitted by Marcia Gasses

On NH9 from Christmas Ln. to Haley Dr.

## Other Location Notes

2,750 Feet, 0.52 miles

## Safety

Notes on Safety Performance

SAFETY DATA PENDING.

There is currently no pedestrian infrastructure. NH125 is currently a significant barrier to pedestrian travel. This is the most cost-effective approach for these circumstances.

14.3 of 19 possible points

Notes on Safety Performance Measures

Installing sidewalks where none exist will have a significant impact. Installation of a rectangular rapid flashing beacon (RRFB) can reduce pedestrian crashes by up to 40%.

## Mobility

Notes on Mobility Need

This project is focused on mobility for pedestrians. Travel time for vehicles is consistent and nominal over the past 4 years (NPMRDS)"

8.9 of 12 possible points

Notes on Mobility Intervention

Minimal impacts to vehicle mobility. Focus is on pedestrian mobility which will increase dramatically.

## Network Significance

Notes on Traffic Volume

2019 AADT (NHDOT)

NH9 east: 9466

NH9 west: 9822

NH125 north: 14742

NH125 south 17095

No ped data. High-volume roads unsafe for pedestrians; expecting increased demand for ped facilities.

11.4 of 15.3 possible points

Notes on Facility Importance

NH125 is a principal arterial

NH9 is a func class 5 major collector

Critical in-town destinations from residential origins.

Central route for all modes.

## State of Repair

Notes on State of Repair

This is new infrastructure

1.9 of 14.4 possible points

Notes on Maintenance

New local maintenance cost for new sidewalks

## Natural Hazard Resilience

Notes on Hazard Risk

No impacts

2.6 of 10.5 possible points

Notes on Hazard Mitigation

No impacts

## Equity, Environmental Justice, and Accessibility

Notes on Equity and Environmental Justice

EJ DEMOGRAPHIC DATA PENDING

New sidewalks will improve accessibility significantly where sidewalks do not currently exist.

5.9 of 9.2 possible points

Notes Accessibility

Several residential developments are planned in the vicinity; particular the NE and SE quadrants of the intersection. Currently there is no sidewalk through the intersection and no sidewalk connecting to the school.

## Economic Development

### Notes on Local and Regional Impact

The NH9/NH125 intersection is the center of Barrington's economic growth, with several local businesses and several planned residential developments. Pedestrian improvements will be vital to continued improvement of the town center.

## Support

### Notes on Local Support

This project is supported by the Select Board and sidewalks in the town center are specifically mentioned in the master plan

4.3 of 10.7 possible points

### Notes on Freight Mobility

NH125 is a major freight route in the region. The proposed project will not result in significant increased delays. Any additional delays will likely be periodic at regular times.

7.7 of 9.2 possible points

# Project #L04001: Main Street/NH 155A/Mast Road Intersection in Durham

Submitted by Michael Behrendt

On Main Street and Mast Road intersection from to

## Other Location Notes

not applicable

## Safety

### Notes on Safety Performance

This location has not seen a high crash rate but traffic volumes are rising due to housing growth.

11.9 of 19 possible points

### Notes on Safety Performance Measures

This project is proactively addressing anticipated safety issues. Roundabout in these conditions expected to reduce all crashes by 30%; serious crashes by 13%. Signal estimated to reduce angle crashes by over 60%

## Mobility

### Notes on Mobility Need

Congestion does not appear to be an issue over the past 4 years. This is a safety-focused project.

6 of 12 possible points

### Notes on Mobility Intervention

Roundabout would improve vehicle mobility (including transit) by creating continuous flow. A signal would increase wait times for Main St traffic. Pedestrian mobility will not be impacted because the path is parallel but separate.

## Network Significance

### Notes on Traffic Volume

2019 AADT (NHDOT)  
Mast Rd (NH155A): 4044  
Main St: 12679  
Mast Rd: 562

No Ped data. Pedestrian path is separate and connected to concentrated student housing.

9.3 of 15.3 possible points

### Notes on Facility Importance

Main St: func class 4 minor arterial  
NH155A: func class 5 major collector  
Mast Rd: local  
Central route for vehicles and pedestrians.

## State of Repair

### Notes on State of Repair

Road segments are in fair condition

3.6 of 14.4 possible points

### Notes on Maintenance

No significant maintenance impact

## Natural Hazard Resilience

### Notes on Hazard Risk

The project is well outside flood zones.

2.6 of 10.5 possible points

### Notes on Hazard Mitigation

The adjacent wetland may be impacted or mitigation required.

## Equity, Environmental Justice, and Accessibility

### Notes on Equity and Environmental Justice

The proposed improvements primarily concern vehicle safety and flow.

2.2 of 9.2 possible points

### Notes Accessibility

Existing pedestrian facilities are excellent and separate from vehicle right of way.

## Economic Development

Notes on Local and Regional Impact

Limited economic development. Project mitigates congestion from increased traffic from continued residential development (student housing and Lee residents).

2.6 of 10.7 possible points

Notes on Freight Mobility

Minimal freight traffic. Roundabout will ensure consistent traffic flows and will incorporate truck accommodations.

## Support

Notes on Local Support

The 2012 Campus Master Plan specifically mentions a roundabout at this intersection. Intersection safety improvements (including a roundabout) are supported by town and university staff.

9.2 of 9.2 possible points

# Project #L05001: Farmington sidewalk expansion in Farmington

Submitted by Arthur Capello

On NH153 (Elm St), NH153 (Main St), Main St from to

## Other Location Notes

4260 Feet, 0.08 miles

## Safety

### Notes on Safety Performance

This project will increase the walkable network for local students.

11.8 of 19 possible points

### Notes on Safety Performance Measures

Federal resources (STEP) suggest installation of a pedestrian median island can reduce pedestrian crashes by 32%.

Crash modification factor studies say 40-50%

## Mobility

### Notes on Mobility Need

This project is focused on mobility for pedestrians. Travel time for vehicles is consistent and nominal over the past 4 years (NPMRDS).

8.9 of 12 possible points

### Notes on Mobility Intervention

Project will improve safety more than mobility but will reduce mobility barriers for pedestrians.

## Network Significance

### Notes on Traffic Volume

2019 AADT (NHDOT)

Main St (N): 1204

Elm St: 3033

Main St (S): 7900

Project is inside 1.5 mile no-school busing zone; any students walking from south/east side of town will pass through.

9.3 of 15.3 possible points

### Notes on Facility Importance

Minor and major collectors. Critical in-town destinations from residential origins. Central route for all modes.

## State of Repair

### Notes on State of Repair

New infrastructure

1.9 of 14.4 possible points

### Notes on Maintenance

Some new local maintenance cost.

## Natural Hazard Resilience

### Notes on Hazard Risk

No Impact

1.3 of 10.5 possible points

### Notes on Hazard Mitigation

No Impact

## Equity, Environmental Justice, and Accessibility

### Notes on Equity and Environmental Justice

EJ DEMOGRAPHIC DATA PENDING. Project will increase safety and accessibility for local students who are not in busing zone (1.5mi).

Area with low vehicle access + low food access + low income?

7 of 9.2 possible points

### Notes Accessibility

Lack of ped infrastructure is a barrier for local school students. Busing zone (1.5mi radius) does not include downtown. Project will improve access to bus route.



## Economic Development

Notes on Local and Regional Impact

Downtown is a focal point in master planning for revitalization. Project impacts most of established Economic Revitalization Zone.

4.3 of 10.7 possible points

Notes on Freight Mobility

NH11 is nearest major freight corridor. Truck speed and congestion are consistently good since 2016. NH75 through downtown currently slows vehicles and trucks. Project design will not impact local first/last mile delivery over current configuration.

## Support

Notes on Local Support

Expansion of the sidewalk network is directly called for in the Transportation and Economic Development chapters of the Master Plan. The Master Plan notes the importance of sidewalks because of the concentration of dense residential near the downtown.

7.7 of 9.2 possible points

# Project #L09001: Silver & Dawson St improvements in Milton

Submitted by Bruce Woodruff

On Silver St and Dawson St from to

Other Location Notes

2770 feet, 0.52 miles

## Safety

Notes on Safety Performance  
Safety data pending

9.4 of 19 possible points

Notes on Safety Performance Measures  
Sidewalks reduce pedestrian crashes. Lighting and visibility are critical as well. Street lights present along street currently.

## Mobility

Notes on Mobility Need  
Local need for increased pedestrian mobility and safety

6 of 12 possible points

Notes on Mobility Intervention  
Project will improve safety more than mobility but will reduce mobility barriers for pedestrians.

## Network Significance

Notes on Traffic Volume  
2019 AADT (NHDOT)  
Silver St: 611  
Dawson St: 611  
No ped data

5.9 of 15.3 possible points

Notes on Facility Importance  
Both class 5 local roads

## State of Repair

Notes on State of Repair  
New infrastructure

3.6 of 14.4 possible points

Notes on Maintenance  
Some new local maintenance cost for extended sidewalks

## Natural Hazard Resilience

Notes on Hazard Risk  
Stormwater flows into town center and reservoir. The sidewalks are paired with sewer and stormwater upgrades.

5.2 of 10.5 possible points

Notes on Hazard Mitigation  
Flood control in Milton affects downstream communities.

## Equity, Environmental Justice, and Accessibility

Notes on Equity and Environmental Justice  
DEMOGRAPHIC DATA PENDING. Need to confirm demographics data re: vehicle access, low food access, and income.

5.9 of 9.2 possible points

Notes Accessibility  
This project will increase accessibility to neighborhood anchor institutes (schools and church). Project will connect to existing sidewalks in the town center.

## Economic Development

Notes on Local and Regional Impact  
Project will create more localized walkability near the town center.

4.3 of 10.7 possible points

Notes on Freight Mobility  
No freight impact

## Support

9.2 of 9.2 possible points

Notes on Local Support

This project is included in the approved Capital Improvements Program.

# Project #L10003: Rt 11 & Tash Rd Intersection Improvements in New Durham

Submitted by Scott Kinmond

On NH Route 11 & Tash Rd from to

Other Location Notes

## Safety

Notes on Safety Performance  
Safety data pending

9.4 of 19 possible points

Notes on Safety Performance Measures  
Realignment of minor road will increase sight distance for traffic joining NH11.

## Mobility

Notes on Mobility Need  
Mobility will not be affected.

3 of 12 possible points

Notes on Mobility Intervention  
No mobility impacts

## Network Significance

Notes on Traffic Volume  
2019 AADT (NHDOT)  
Tash Rd: 91  
NH11: 12833

7.6 of 15.3 possible points

Notes on Facility Importance  
Tash: local road  
NH11: func class 4 (minor arterial)

## State of Repair

Notes on State of Repair  
Road segments are in fair condition.

3.6 of 14.4 possible points

Notes on Maintenance  
No significant maintenance impact

## Natural Hazard Resilience

Notes on Hazard Risk  
No Impact

3.9 of 10.5 possible points

Notes on Hazard Mitigation  
No Impact

## Equity, Environmental Justice, and Accessibility

Notes on Equity and Environmental Justice  
EJ demographics data pending.

2.2 of 9.2 possible points

Notes Accessibility  
Primarily focused on safety; accessibility not impacted.

## Economic Development

Notes on Local and Regional Impact  
Limited economic development impact.

2.6 of 10.7 possible points

Notes on Freight Mobility  
No freight impact

## Support

7.7 of 9.2 possible points

Notes on Local Support

This project was developed with town staff and Tash Rd safety improvements are supported by the Master Plan.

# Project #L14001: Safety Improvements to NH Rt 11 in Rochester

Submitted by Peter C. Nourse

On NH Rt 11 from Spaulding Turnpike to Nashoba Dr.

## Other Location Notes

This project is to install a traffic signal at NH Rt. 11 and Nashoba Dr. Included is a pedestrian crossing and new sidewalk on NE side of NH Rt 11 from signal to Spaulding overpass, approx. 5,000'.

## Safety

Notes on Safety Performance

Safety data pending. Extensive study by CLD consultants.

14.3 of 19 possible points

Notes on Safety Performance Measures

Traffic signal will increase safety overall but will increase likelihood of read-end crashes.

## Mobility

Notes on Mobility Need

Slight decrease in mobility for vehicles due to additional wait time at new signal.

8.9 of 12 possible points

Notes on Mobility Intervention

New signal will increase safety for turning movements at Nashoba but will also increase delay for NH11 traffic.

## Network Significance

Notes on Traffic Volume

2019 AADT (NHDOT)

NH11: 25189

Nashoba Dr: (Cocheco Estates: 170 units)

11.4 of 15.3 possible points

Notes on Facility Importance

This is a central route between Rochester, Farmington, and northern destinations.

## State of Repair

Notes on State of Repair

Road segments are in good or fair condition

3.6 of 14.4 possible points

Notes on Maintenance

No significant maintenance impact

## Natural Hazard Resilience

Notes on Hazard Risk

No Impact

2.6 of 10.5 possible points

Notes on Hazard Mitigation

Project is well outside flood zones. Stormwater may flow to Cocheco River without proper on-site treatment.

## Equity, Environmental Justice, and Accessibility

Notes on Equity and Environmental Justice

Demographic data pending

7 of 9.2 possible points

Notes Accessibility

Slight decrease in mobility for vehicles due to additional weight time at new signal.

## Economic Development

Notes on Local and Regional Impact

Recent increases in traffic have resulted in unsafe turning conditions for Cocheco Estates residential development at Nashoba Dr. Signalization will increase delay for freight traffic.

6 of 10.7 possible points

Notes on Freight Mobility

Recent increases in traffic have resulted in unsafe turning conditions for Cocheco Estates residential development at Nashoba Dr. Signalization will increase delay for freight traffic.

## Support

7.7 of 9.2 possible points

Notes on Local Support

Project is a major priority for the city. Congestion and safety improvements in this section of NH11 are directly called out in the 2020 Master Plan

# Project #L14002: Capacity Enhancements for NH RT 11 in Rochester

Submitted by Peter C. Nourse

On NH RT 11 from Spaulding Turnpike to Farmington town line; 12,000'+/-

## Other Location Notes

approx. 12,000 LF of NH RT 11.

### Safety

Notes on Safety Performance

Safety data pending. This project is focused on congestion relief

4.7 of 19 possible points

Notes on Safety Performance Measures

Conversion to two-way left turn lane can decrease crashes by 30-50%

### Mobility

Notes on Mobility Need

This project is focused on mobility for vehicles. Additional lanes will increase vehicle mobility.

12 of 12 possible points

Notes on Mobility Intervention

Additional lanes will reduce congestion and increase vehicle throughput.

### Network Significance

Notes on Traffic Volume

2019 AADT (NHDOT)  
NH11: 25189

15.2 of 15.3 possible points

Notes on Facility Importance

This is a central route between Rochester, Farmington, and northern destinations.

### State of Repair

Notes on State of Repair

Road segments are in good or fair condition

3.6 of 14.4 possible points

Notes on Maintenance

Additional lanes will increase state maintenance cost.

### Natural Hazard Resilience

Notes on Hazard Risk

No risk

2.6 of 10.5 possible points

Notes on Hazard Mitigation

The project is well outside flood zones. Additional pavement from widening will increase stormwater which could flow to Cocheco River without proper on-site treatment.

### Equity, Environmental Justice, and Accessibility

Notes on Equity and Environmental Justice

Demographic data pending

1 of 9.2 possible points

Notes Accessibility

This project is focused on vehicle mobility and will reduce pedestrian accessibility.

### Economic Development

Notes on Local and Regional Impact

Multi-phase project.

Commercial development has increased traffic along NH11 between NH16 interchange and Sterling Dr (Walmart).

7 of 10.7 possible points

Notes on Freight Mobility

Severe, regular, periodic congestion is a growing problem. AM and PM congestion, plus severe congestion on Fridays (northbound) and Sundays (southbound).



## Support

7.7 of 9.2 possible points

Notes on Local Support

Project is directly supported in the Master Plan

# Summary of Project Scores

Project Number	Safety Performance	Safety Measures	Mobility Need	Mobility Intervention	Traffic Volume	Facility Importance	State of Repair	Maintenance	Hazard Risk	Hazard Mitigation	Equity	Accessibility	Local Impact	Freight Mobility	Support	Total Score
L14001	0.073	0.07	0.055	0.034	0.064	0.05	0.017	0.019	0.013	0.013	0.032	0.038	0.05	0.01	0.077	0.614
L01001	0.073	0.07	0.055	0.034	0.064	0.05	0	0.019	0.013	0.013	0.021	0.038	0.033	0.01	0.077	0.569
L14002	0.024	0.023	0.074	0.046	0.086	0.066	0.017	0.019	0.013	0.013	0.01	0	0.05	0.02	0.077	0.538
L05001	0.048	0.07	0.055	0.034	0.043	0.05	0	0.019	0	0.013	0.032	0.038	0.033	0.01	0.077	0.521
L09001	0.048	0.046	0.037	0.023	0.043	0.016	0.017	0.019	0.026	0.026	0.021	0.038	0.033	0.01	0.092	0.496
L04001	0.073	0.046	0.037	0.023	0.043	0.05	0.017	0.019	0.013	0.013	0.01	0.012	0.016	0.01	0.092	0.475
L10003	0.048	0.046	0.018	0.012	0.043	0.033	0.017	0.019	0.026	0.013	0.01	0.012	0.016	0.01	0.077	0.402