

MEMO

Strafford MPO Policy Committee

September 17th Meeting

To: Policy Committee members

From: Colin Lentz

Greetings Policy members –

Action Items Requiring a Vote:

- The primary action item for the September meeting is adopting the regional priorities to be communicated through the GACIT and legislative phases of the development of the Ten Year Plan. Please review the regional priorities included in the packet. I've highlighted sections I added per the discussion at the August Policy meeting. After listening to that discussion, I have modified my presentation to focus on high-level and cutting-edge challenges and opportunities in the region. I will do a "dress rehearsal" of that presentation at the September meeting for feedback.
- An update to the MPO bylaws was presented at the August meeting for review. It comprised new language to address virtual meeting participation in compliance with New Hampshire RSA 91-A. The committee will need to vote on the proposed changes

Other Items for Discussion

- I will give a presentation highlighting the results of our study of the economic impacts of COAST. The final report of that study is being modified per request of our regional agency partners. The current version focuses heavily on COAST; a future version will include more detailed analysis of impacts from UNH Wildcat Transit.
- NHDOT's scoring results for proposed TAP projects are included in the meeting packet. This constitutes a recommendation from NHDOT as to what projects should be funded through the Ten Year Plan. The recommendation will be discussed by GACIT in the coming weeks.

Strafford Metropolitan Planning Organization

Combined meeting of the MPO Policy Committee Meeting & SRPC Commissioners

Friday, September 17th 2021 9:00 – 10:30 AM
 Hybrid In-Person/Zoom Meeting

In accordance with RSA 91:A and the potential absence of a renewal to the Governor’s Executive Order allowing quorums virtually, all meetings of the Commission now require an in-person quorum. The Commission is advising that most committee members still attend meetings virtually, aside from the minimum number of members needed for a quorum. To organize this, the Commission staff will reach out prior to each meeting to Commissioners, confirming their in-person attendance. It is the preference of the Commission that all other attendees participate via Zoom, however, guests may attend the meeting at the SRPC Office, Conference Room 1A, 150 Wakefield Street, Rochester, NH.

In doing so, all participants have the ability to communicate contemporaneously during this meeting as follows:

[Click here to access the meeting online](#)

Telephone-only Access: +1 646 558 8656 and Meeting ID: 833 2937 9249

These instructions have also been provided on the SRPC website at www.strafford.org. If anybody is unable to access the meeting, please email clentz@strafford.org or call (603) 994-3500 (ext 102).

1. Introductions	5 mins
2. Staff Communications	5 mins
3. Action Items 3.1 Approve draft minutes from August 20 th 2021[VOTE] 3.2 Approve the proposed updates to the MPO bylaws – specifying provisions for virtual meetings in compliance with RSA 91-A 3.3 GACIT letter & presentation – are regional transportation challenges and goals represented?	30 mins
4. Discussion Items 4.1 Summary of results of SRPC and RPC study of the Economic Benefits of COAST	20 mins
5. Other Business 5.1 NHDOT scoring results for TAP projects	5 mins
6. Commissioner Roundtable – Updates from your community	10 mins
7. 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	
8. 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.

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 20, 2021, 9:00 – 11:00 AM

Strafford Regional Planning Commission
Hybrid Meeting
Rochester, NH

The meeting was called to order at 9:09am

1. Attendance and Introductions:

Committee Members

In person attendees: D. Hamann (Rochester), B. Fisher (Farmington), Peter Nelson (Newmarket), Wayne Burton (Durham), Barb Holstein (Rochester), Joe Boudreau (Rochester), Glenn Davidson (NHDOT), Dave Landry (Dover)

Members participating remotely: S. Diamond (Barrington), Victoria Parmele (Northwood) Charlene Andersen (Nottingham)

Mike Bobinsky (Somersworth)-Excused

Staff

Staff attending in person: Jennifer Cztsz, Rachel Dewey, Megan Taylor-Fetter,

Staff participating remotely: Natalie Moles, Jackson Rand, Nancy O'Connor

Public participating remotely: Katrin Kasper (Lee)

2. Action Items

Approval of the Draft 06-18-2021 Policy Committee Meeting Minutes

J. Czysz noted that the date listed on the header of draft minutes was incorrect and that the minutes presented were the 06-18-2021 minutes. D. Hamann motioned to approve the minutes with the date amended, seconded by B. Fisher. A roll call vote was taken: D. Hamann, B. Fisher, P. Nelson, W. Burton, B. Holstein, G. Davidson, V. Parmele, J. Boudreau, D. Landry all in favor, none opposed.

3. Discussion Items

Ten Year Plan Priorities and GACIT

9:15am: Steve Diamond joined the meeting remotely.

J. Czynsz stated that the intention of this short presentation is to ask the Policy Committee members to confirm a set of regional priorities for the development of the Ten-Year Plan and to give feedback and guidance on how to represent their communities throughout the GACIT and legislative process.

J. Czynsz continued: SRPC has moved forward with the projects approved and voted on by the Committee in late 2020. SRPC would like to share with the Executive Counselors what is important in this region and what our priorities are at the upcoming legislative public hearings. A large portion of what will be shared is the Long-Range Transportation Plan or Metropolitan Plan that was adopted in June.

D. Landry asked G. Davidson if dates have been set for the GACIT public hearings. G. Davis answered that dates are still tentative but should fall somewhere around the second week of September.

D. Landry stated that the dollars involved are set. G. Davis added that we are not advocating for more money but rather to look at how to best invest the money that we have and to make the counsel aware of the priorities.

J. Czynsz stated it is critical that the priorities are communicated and advocated for at the hearings. Staff member C. Lentz will represent the Commission at the hearings.

P. Nelson stated that what is missing from this plan is the connection between transportation projects to clean energy and the electrification of transportation.

J. Czynsz responded that although those objectives are not included in the adopted goals, they can be integrated in the presentation and incorporated into the next iteration of the draft plan. She added that the Increase to Economic Resilience is a good connection to electrification.

Commission members held a brief discussion on the importance of presenting the topics of clean energy and electrification and the connection they have to transportation plans.

S. Diamond stated that he is in favor of turnpike funding being used to support COAST. He continued by saying that there is an easy argument to be made around minimizing the impact on the Turnpike itself and diversifying our modes of transportation. S. Diamond stated that an unfunded mandate with the Americans with Disabilities Act is burdening coast-so one way or another that does need to be funded. S. Diamond continued: DOT considers rail bridges to be off network. Given the importance of rail – he is in favor of categorizing this infrastructure as part of the transportation network. Although prohibitively expensive to increase capacity by having more lines, the speed of existing lines could be improved to provide more capacity.

T. White thanked SRPC for pointing out the importance of the development of alternative fuels, the need for the development of charging stations, the emphasis on air quality, and references to electrification in the letter to the counselors. T. White offered his assistance to SRPC and for staff and to contact him.

D. Landry asked G. Davidson for clarification on how regional priorities get incorporated into proposed projects and translated down as line items.

G. Davidson replied that the regional priorities are incorporated primarily through the regional process of project development and prioritization. The Ten Year Plan is one way of turing regional priorities into infrastructure improvements. [The MPO committees are responsible for reviewing projects and ensuring that they reflect regional goals and objectives]. G. Davison added that larger, multi-regional projects are part of the statewide discussion among GACIT members during the present phase of the Ten Year Plan process. D. Landry suggested that it would be beneficial for RPC members to coordinate to ensure they are speaking to GACIT members about a similar set of challenges and goals. G. Davison agreed.

W. Burton expressed concern over the current employment rates, the housing market and how it is a major influence on the need for transportation. J. Czysz added that due to the current labor shortage, COAST is not able to hire drivers which causes a cut in routes further compounding the problem.

Members discussed the growing trend for remote employment and how that connects transportation to broadband and the need for high-speed internet. Additionally, how telecommuting saves energy, money, and time.

P. Nelson asked G. Davidson if DOT provided on-line access to projected plans and goal setting to which G. Davidson replied yes. P. Nelson added that he would like to see SRPC find ways to present that information in a public forum through the website.

J. Czysz told members she would welcome any specific questions or comments and to please contact herself or C. Lentz.

4. **Other Business** **Highlights from the Transit Study**

D. Landry recommended tabling the discussion on the highlights from the Transit Study to the September Meeting. The Committee agreed.

Updates to the MPO Bylaws

J. Czysz explained that currently 91A requires a quorum of members to be physically present at meetings of public bodies under non-emergency situations. In the case of hybrid meetings, an in-person quorum is still required, however additional Commissioners may attend, participate, and vote remotely. For the duration of hybrid meetings, all motions must take place via a roll call vote. In the case of emergency as in the pandemic, the governor can waive requirements for an in-person quorum. The chair can only waive the requirements if a declare an emergency if for instance critical business needs to be acted on.

J. Czysz explained that the By-laws have been lightly updated to allow for remote participation and voting during meetings. Several commissioners have requested to continue remote

participation due to health concerns. Under State law, remote participants can only vote if enabled in our bylaws. The process for amending the bylaws requires a 20-day notice prior to a vote. The Commission can vote on the proposed changes at the September meeting. The Commission by-laws contain the same proposed amendments.

The members discussed the options for lowering the quorum requirements and other scenarios. It was determined that the only solution would be to amend the bylaws as presented.

5. **Staff Communications**

J. Czys informed the Commission that SRPC received notice a \$100,000 ARPA grant allocated by GOPHER. Contracted through the Department of Business and Economic Affairs and the Office of Economic Development. The funds will go towards preparing the Housing Need Assessment and Fair Housing Equity Assessment. SRPC will be working with the 8 other regional planning commissions as well as the state. The first three months will be developing a methodology to include a fair share analysis.

J. Czys thanked the members for their participation last month in the exercise presented by the economic development staff to determine priorities for implementation of the CEDS plan. The results, included with the meeting packet, will direct staff towards priorities.

6. **Commissioner RoundTable**

P. Nelson informed the members that the Town of Newmarket Counsel passed a resolution for the Town to join the Community Power Coalition of New Hampshire. In addition, Newmarket accepted a Solarized Newmarket project and lastly P. Nelson has been working on a free application that will hopefully benefit the community and provide a live connection to an online data base.

S. Diamond reported that there was an air quality alert related to the fires out west and although we don't have control over that type of situation, we do have influence on air quality related to transportation in this area. He added that this current situation should encourage us to move forward with air quality mitigation.

7. **Adjournment**

D. Hamann motioned to adjourn the meeting seconded by B. Fisher. A roll call vote was taken: D. Hamann, T. Crosby, B. Fisher, P. Nelson, W. Burton, B. Holstein, G. Davidson, V. Parmele, S. Diamond J. Boudreau, D. Landry all in favor, none opposed.

**STRAFFORD
METROPOLITAN PLANNING
ORGANIZATION
BYLAWS**



ADOPTED: September 27, 2007

Revisions ADOPTED: May 29, 2008

Revisions ADOPTED: January 28, 2010

Revisions Recommended: September 28, 2010

Revisions ADOPTED: November 18, 2010

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ARTICLE I: ORGANIZATION

- SECTION A: NAME
- SECTION B: AUTHORIZATION
- SECTION C: SMPO AREA
- SECTION D: PRINCIPAL OFFICE
- SECTION E: ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

ARTICLE II: POLICY COMMITTEE

- SECTION A: NAME
- SECTION B: PURPOSE
- SECTION C: RESPONSIBILITY
- SECTION D: MEMBERSHIP
- SECTION E: OFFICERS
- SECTION F: MEETINGS

ARTICLE III: EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

- SECTION A: NAME
- SECTION B: PURPOSE
- SECTION C: RESPONSIBILITY
- SECTION D: MEMBERSHIP
- SECTION E: OFFICERS
- SECTION F: MEETINGS

ARTICLE IV: TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

- SECTION A: NAME
- SECTION B: PURPOSE
- SECTION C: RESPONSIBILITY
- SECTION D: MEMBERSHIP
- SECTION E: OFFICERS
- SECTION F: MEETINGS

ARTICLE V: STRAFFORD MPO STAFF

SECTION A: EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

SECTION B: STAFF MEMBERS

SECTION C: RECORDING CLERK

ARTICLE VI: GENERAL

SECTION A: ABSENTEEISM

SECTION B: REMOVAL

SECTION C: MAILINGS

SECTION D: ORDER OF BUSINESS

SECTION E: SPECIAL MEETINGS

SECTION F: VOTING

SECTION G: ADOPTION/AMENDMENT SMPO DOCUMENTS

SECTION H: PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

ARTICLE VII: REPEALER

ARTICLE VII: AMENDMENTS

STRAFFORD METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION BYLAWS

Adopted: September 27, 2007

Revisions Adopted: May 29, 2008

Revisions Adopted: January 28, 2010

Revisions Recommended: September 28, 2010

Revisions Adopted: November 18, 2010

ARTICLE I: ORGANIZATION

A. NAME:

The name of this organization shall be the Strafford Metropolitan Planning Organization (SMPO) and shall hereafter be referred to as the SMPO. The SMPO consists of the Strafford Regional Planning Commission (SRPC) and those appropriate State and local agencies necessary to approve transportation plans and programs.

B. AUTHORIZATION:

The authorization for this Organization is set forth in an Executive Order dated August 10, 2007, whereby SRPC was designated as the cognizant Metropolitan Planning Organization for the New Hampshire portion of the Rochester-Dover Urbanized area, pursuant to the Federal Highway Act of 1964.

C. STRAFFORD METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION AREA:

The following communities constitute the SMPO area: Barrington, Brookfield, Dover, Durham, Farmington, Lee, Madbury, Middleton, Milton, New Durham, Newmarket, Northwood, Nottingham, Rochester, Rollinsford, Somersworth, Strafford and Wakefield.

1. Urbanized Communities include: Dover, Durham, Madbury, Newmarket, Rochester, Rollinsford and Somersworth.
2. Non-Urbanized Communities include: Barrington, Brookfield, Farmington, Lee, Middleton, Milton, New Durham, Northwood, Nottingham, Strafford and Wakefield.

D. PRINCIPAL OFFICE:

The principal office of the SMPO is located at SRPC Office at 150 Wakefield Street, Suite 12, Rochester, NH 03867 Office Hours: 8:30 am to 5:00 pm. Monday-Friday, Telephone: (603) 994-3500 Fax: (603) 994-3504
Email: SRPC@strafford.org; Website: www.strafford.org.

E. ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE:

The SMPO fiscal year shall be July 1st through June 30th. The organization shall consist of three (3) committees: (1) The SRPC/SMPO Executive Committee, (2) The SMPO Policy Committee and (3) The SMPO Technical Advisory Committee. Additional committees and subcommittees shall be formed as deemed necessary.

F. PURPOSE:

The purpose of these bylaws is to inform the public of the nature of the SMPO's business, operations, delegation of authority, internal organization and other related matters. Additionally, the intent is to provide procedures and policies for the SMPO and to insure the accomplishment of the planning tasks within a cooperative framework properly related to comprehensive planning on a continual basis.

ARTICLE II: POLICY COMMITTEE

A. NAME:

The Policy Committee shall hereafter be referred to as the "Policy Committee".

B. PURPOSE:

The purpose of the Policy Committee shall be to provide a forum for the development of regional transportation policies for the SMPO and to act as a vehicle to coordinate the implementation of these policies.

C. RESPONSIBILITIES:

1. The Policy Committee is responsible for carrying out the metropolitan transportation planning process as required by the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act – A Legacy for Users (SAFTEA-LU) and related federal implementing regulations. This responsibility is carried out through oversight of the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) and through the development, review and approval of the Prospectus, the Metropolitan Transportation Plan, the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), and the Air Quality Conformity Determination. SMPO activities related to these responsibilities include, but are not limited to the following:
 - (a) Establish the policy directions of the SMPO through its adopted plans and policy statements.
 - (b) Establish procedures and requirements whereby federal transportation funds will be allocated and made available in cooperation with the New Hampshire Department of Transportation (NHDOT).
 - (c) Adopt, review and/or revise the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP), Prospectus, Metropolitan Transportation Plan, TIP and Conformity Determination.
 - (d) Review and comment on individual projects, programs, plans and reports relative to the adopted transportation policies and positions.

- (e) Request, review and endorse technical reports and studies prepared by the SMPO staff or consultants.
- (f) Ensure compliance with the provisions of the Clean Air Act Amendment (CAAA) of 1990 through periodic conformity evaluation and a determination.
- (g) Adopt, review and/or revise policies relative to the findings of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), including technical reports and memoranda.
- (h) Provide a mechanism to facilitate and broaden public involvement in transportation planning and decision-making processes.
- (i) Coordinate and prioritize transportation projects to be implemented with Federal and/or State assistance.
- (j) Monitor and participate in transportation policy making activities with the NHDOT and the transportation or other relevant committees of the New Hampshire General Court.
- (k) Collaborate in the development of public transit and multi-modal plans.

D. MEMBERSHIP:

1. Voting Members:

- (a) Each dues paid member community within SRPC will be represented by their appointed regional planning commissioners. Each commissioner shall have one vote. Communities are entitled to appoint as many voting representatives as permitted per RSA 36:46, III.

Barrington (2)	Madbury (2)	Nottingham (2)
Brookfield (2)	Middleton (2)	Rochester (4)

Dover (4)	Milton (2)	Rollinsford (2)
Durham (3)	New Durham (2)	Somersworth (3)
Farmington (2)	Newmarket (2)	Strafford (2)
Lee (2)	Northwood (2)	Wakefield (2)

- (b) Communities that have not paid annual dues to SRPC shall have one representative, and one alternate, equal to one vote.

- (c) There shall be one voting member or designee from each of the following agencies:
 - i. New Hampshire Department of Transportation (NHDOT)
 - ii. New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services-Air Resources Division (NHDES-ARD)
 - iii. Cooperative Alliance for Strafford Regional Transportation (COAST)
 - iv. University of New Hampshire (UNH)

The appointing authority is permitted and encouraged to designate one alternate for each appointed representative. An alternate shall have voting privileges in the absence of the voting representative.

Revisions Adopted 11/18/10

2. Non-Voting Members:

- (a) Each of the following may appoint a non-voting member:
 - i. Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)
 - ii. Federal Transit Administration (FTA)
 - iii. New Hampshire Department of Transportation-Bureau of Aeronautics (NHDOT-Aeronautics)
 - iv. New Hampshire Department of Transportation – Bureau of Rails and Transit (NHDOT-BRT)

 - v. New Hampshire Office of Energy and Planning (NHOEP)
 - vi. Rockingham Planning Commission (RPC)
 - vii. Southern Maine Regional Planning Commission (SMRPC)
 - viii. Maine Department of Transportation (Maine-DOT)
 - ix. New Hampshire Transit Association (NHTA)
 - x. Federal Railroad Administration (FRA)
 - xi. Pease Development Authority/New Hampshire Port Authority (PDA/NHPA)

The appointing authority is permitted and encouraged to designate one (1) alternate for each appointed representative.

- (b) The Committee may authorize additional non-voting members.

3. Quorum:

- (a) A quorum of the Policy Committee shall be deemed as representing no less than one-third (1/3) rounded plus one of the dues paid municipalities with appointed Commissioner(s) and voting agencies per (1) (C). Current state law [91:A] requires a quorum to be physically present at meetings of public bodies under nonemergency situations.
- (b) For the purposes of a quorum, one (1) appointed representative per municipality or voting agency present at the meeting would be counted.
- (c) Motions shall be carried by a simple majority of the voting power present after having established a quorum. In the case of hybrid meetings¹, an in-person quorum is required, however additional Commissioners may attend, participate and vote remotely. For the duration of each hybrid meeting motions must take place via roll call voting.

5. Terms and Re-Appointment:

- (a) The appointment of municipal representatives shall be in compliance with RSA 36:46, Paragraph III. Appointments to the Policy Committee shall run with the Commissioner's terms.

¹ For the purpose of the SRPC Bylaws a hybrid meeting is defined as a meeting having an option to attend both in-person and virtually.

- (b) In the event that a Policy Committee member resigns, notification of their resignation shall be filed with SRPC and the appointing body. The municipality or voting agency shall receive a notice from SRPC so that a new appointment can be made.

E. OFFICERS:

1. Election of Officers

The Officers of SRPC will function as the Officers of the Policy Committee per the SRPC bylaws. Vacancies in office shall be filled immediately by the regular election procedure described in the SRPC bylaws.

2. Positions:

- (a) The Chairperson shall preside at all meetings and shall have the power to call special meetings, establish agendas, establish and appoint committees and their members.
- (b) The Vice-Chairperson, if the Chairperson is unable to attend the meeting, shall be acting Chairperson and shall have the same powers granted to the Chairperson.
- (c) The Secretary/Treasurer, if the Chairperson or Vice-Chairperson is unable to attend the meeting, shall be acting Chairperson and shall have the same powers granted to the Chairperson. The Secretary/Treasurer shall be responsible for such financial duties as are customary to the office.

F. MEETINGS:

The Policy Committee meetings are held on the third Friday of every month immediately after the SRPC Executive Committee meeting at the SRPC office and at the call of the Chairperson.

ARTICLE III: EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

A. NAME:

The SRPC Executive Committee shall hereafter be referred to as the EC.

B. PURPOSE:

The purpose of the EC shall be to facilitate the administration of the SMPO, ensure that TAC policy and planning recommendations are brought before the Policy Committee, and ensure that the decisions of the Policy Committee are implemented.

C. RESPONSIBILITIES:

The duties of the EC will include, but not be limited to the following:

- 1. Ensure that the directives of the SMPO voting membership are carried out.

2. Oversee the affairs of the SMPO between its regular meetings and to act on behalf of the Policy Committee in emergencies. An emergency is defined as an action necessary to carry out the responsibilities of the SMPO, when waiting for a regular Policy Committee meeting would jeopardize the SMPO's ability to carry out its responsibilities.
3. Determine, with the assistance of the Executive Director and the TAC, the UPWP scope and content, and to transmit it to the Policy Committee for final approval. Recommend the biennial UPWP scope of work and budget to the Policy Committee for approval.
4. Oversee the operating expenditures of the SMPO as recommended by the Executive Director.
5. Provide a report of its activities and/or minutes prior to Policy Committee meeting.

D. MEMBERSHIP:

The members of the EC shall consist of seven (7) members: Chairperson, Vice-Chairperson, Secretary/Treasurer, and four (4) members elected at the SRPC Annual Meeting. The EC shall include representation from both large and small communities.

E. OFFICERS:

Officers of SMPO serve on the EC in accordance with their respective terms of office. The At-Large Members of the EC shall be elected each year for a one (1) year term commencing after July 1st of that year.

1. Election of Officers:

The SMPO officers shall consist of a Chairperson, Vice-Chairperson and a Secretary/Treasurer per SRPC bylaws. Each officer shall serve a one (1) year term based on annual elections at the Annual Meeting. Vacancies in office shall be filled immediately by the regular election procedure found in the SRPC bylaws.

2. Positions:

- (a) The Chairperson shall preside at all meetings and shall have the power to call special meetings, establish agendas, establish and appoint committees and their members.
- (b) The Vice-Chairperson, if the Chairperson is unable to attend the meeting, shall be acting Chairperson and shall have the same powers granted to the Chairperson.
- (c) The Secretary/Treasurer, if the Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson are unable to attend the meeting, shall be acting Chairperson and shall have the same powers granted to the Chairperson. The Secretary/Treasurer shall be responsible for such financial duties as are customary to the office.

3. Vacancy:

In the event of an officer vacancy between annual elections, the EC shall elect an At-Large Member of the EC to serve until the next Annual meeting. The EC shall fill at-large member vacancies from the Commission. Such appointments shall expire at the end of the fiscal year.

F. MEETINGS:

- 1 The EC meetings are held on the third Friday of every month at 8:00 am at the SRPC Office. Special meetings can be called at the request of the Chairperson or the Executive Director. Notices of EC meetings shall be noticed on website and at the SRPC office.
- 2 Quorum: The voting power of the EC shall consist of a total of seven (7) votes. A majority of the voting power (4) shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business at meetings. For regular business, voting is limited to appointed Executive Committee officers and members, including alternates replacing appointed members. Current state law [91:A] requires a quorum to be physically present at meetings of public bodies under nonemergency situations.

In the case of hybrid meetings², an in-person quorum is still required, however additional Commissioners may attend, participate and vote remotely. For the duration of each hybrid meeting motions must take place via roll call voting.

ARTICLE IV: TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

A. NAME:

The SMPO Technical Advisory Committee shall hereafter be referred to as the “Technical Advisory Committee”.

B. PURPOSE:

The purpose of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) is to provide the SMPO with technical assistance and recommendations concerning transportation issues that have a bearing on the SMPO’s continued, comprehensive, and coordinated transportation planning process. The TAC is hereby established as a standing committee of the SMPO.

C. RESPONSIBILITY:

The TAC will review and make recommendations to the SMPO Policy Committee on transportation planning efforts in the SMPO area as follows:

- 1 Updates, revisions and amendments to the Metropolitan Transportation Plan to assure that recommended activities identified in the Metropolitan Transportation Plan are considered in the development of the annual work plan, Transportation Improvement Plan, air conformity determination, and other required documents of the SMPO.
2. Development of a comprehensive public transportation system in the region by understanding the necessary components as well as developing funding models and indicators of success.
3. Policy recommendations related to the public transportation systems.
4. Contents of the biennial Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP) update.

² For the purpose of the SRPC Bylaws a hybrid meeting is defined as a meeting having an option to attend both in-person and virtually.

5. Technical planning/engineering studies to be considered in the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP).
6. Scoping reports and planning studies.
7. Development and implementation of the Public Participation Plan.
8. Guidance to UPWP and TIP related to issues or projects that arise from the long term planning.
9. Development of and coordination of project and issues that are of regional significance and or require the perspective that spans communities.
10. Any other activities as requested by the SMPO Policy Committee.

The TAC, without SMPO Policy Committee approval, may:

1. Evaluate and prioritize technical assistance for the SMPO members.
2. Review and suggest revisions to staff and consultant technical assistance work.
3. Establish subcommittee(s) to address significant areas of interest

D. MEMBERSHIP:

The TAC shall include representative from the SMPO communities, federal, state and interested agencies.

1. Voting Members:
 - (a) There shall be one (1) voting member or designee from each of the following: (The appointing authority is permitted and encouraged to designate one (1) alternate for each appointed representative. An alternate shall have voting privileges in the absence of the voting representative).
 - i. Each SRPC community represented on the SMPO
 - ii. NH Department of Transportation (NHDOT), District 6, or District 3
 - iii. NH Department of Environmental Services – Air Resources Division (NHDES-ARD)
 - iv. Cooperative Alliance for Strafford Regional Transportation (COAST)
 - v. University of New Hampshire (UNH)
2. Non-voting member:
 - (a) Each of the following may appoint a non-voting member: (The appointing authority is permitted and encouraged to designate one (1) alternate for each appointed representative).
 - i. Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)
 - ii. Federal Transit Administration (FTA)
 - iii. New Hampshire Department of Transportation – District 6
 - iv. New Hampshire Department of Transportation – District 3
 - v. New Hampshire Department of Transportation – Bureau of Aeronautics
 - vi. New Hampshire Department of Transportation- Bureau of Rails and Transit
 - vii. Southern Maine Regional Planning Commission (SMRPC)
 - viii. Rockingham Planning Commission (RPC)
 - ix. Maine Department of Transportation (Maine-DOT)
 - x. Pease Development Authority (PDA)/New Hampshire Port Authority (NHPA)
 - xi. Guilford Railroad or Pan Am Railways
 - xii. Federal Railroad Administration (FRA)

- xiii. Northern New England Passenger Rail Authority (NNEPRA)
- xiv. New Hampshire Transit Association (NHTA)
- xv. Transportation Center or Park and Ride Terminal Operator
- xvi. Alliance for Community Transportation (ACT)
- xvii. Strafford Regional Area Bicycle Routes (SABR)
- xviii. Bike-Walk Alliance of New Hampshire (BWANH)
- xix. New Hampshire Motor Transport Association
- xx. Seacoast Commuter Options
- xxi. C&J Trailways

(b) The Committee may authorize additional non-voting members.

3. Quorum:

(a) A quorum of the TAC shall be deemed as representing no less than one-third (1/3) rounded plus one of the municipal membership and voting agencies who have made appointments. Current state law [91:A] requires a quorum to be physically present at meetings of public bodies under nonemergency situations.

(b) Motions shall be carried by a simple majority of the voting power present after having established a quorum. In the case of hybrid meetings³, an in-person quorum is required, however additional Commissioners may attend, participate and vote remotely. For the duration of each hybrid meeting motions must take place via roll call voting.

4. Vacancy:

In the event that a Committee member resigns, notification of their resignation shall be filed with SRPC and the appointing body. The municipality or voting agency shall receive a notice from SRPC so that a new appointment can be made.

5. Terms and Re-Appointment:

The appointment of each representative shall be a period of two years. Appointments shall be certified in writing by the appointment authority prior to the start of the fiscal year (July 1st).

E. OFFICERS:

1. Election of Officers:

At the first Committee meeting after the start of the fiscal year, the election of officers will take place. The TAC Officers shall consist of a Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson. Nominations for Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson shall be made from the floor and can include only voting members. The Chairperson will serve a one (1) year term. Vice-Chairperson will take over the role of Chairperson after the one (1) year term. Vacancies in office shall be filled immediately by the regular election procedure.

2. Positions:

³ For the purpose of the SRPC Bylaws a hybrid meeting is defined as a meeting having an option to attend both in-person and virtually.

- a) As a qualification for office, the Chairperson shall have served at least one (1) year as a representative on the SMPO. The Chairperson shall preside at all
- b) meetings and shall have the power to call special meetings, establish agendas, establish and appoint committees and their members.
- c) The Vice-Chairperson, if the Chairperson is unable to attend the meeting, shall be acting Chairperson and shall have the same powers granted to the Chairperson.

F. MEETINGS:

The MPO TAC meetings are held monthly on the first Friday of the month at 9AM and at the call of the Chairperson. Meetings are held in the SRPC office.

ARTICLE V: STRAFFORD METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION STAFF

A. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR:

The Executive Director shall:

1. Be responsible to the SMPO Committees for carrying out directives.
2. Carry out all aspects of the regional transportation planning program.
3. Manage contracts with consultants for the purpose of implementing the adopted UPWP.
4. Recommend changes to the Bylaws and Prospectus.
5. Be responsible for the administration of the office.
6. Hire and manage staff.
7. Be in charge of all general correspondence of the SMPO.
8. Be responsible for receiving all moneys due the SMPO.
9. Assist the Recording Clerk, and in this manner be responsible for:
 - (a) Keeping minutes of regular and special meetings of the SMPO.
 - (b) Notifying members of their election to office or appointment to committees.
10. Prepare an annual budget to be reviewed by the EC prior to submission for approval at the Annual Meeting of Commission.
11. Prepare a biennial UPWP to be reviewed by the EC prior to submission for approval by the Policy Committee.
12. Disburse the funds in accordance with the budget and as authorized.
13. Keep accounts, which shall at all times be open to inspection.
14. Undertake such other duties as the SMPO shall assign.
15. Maintain files of job descriptions and responsibilities for additional staff.

B. STAFF MEMBERS:

1. Staff shall be responsible for having the TAC develop and review documents, amendments, and reports in a timely fashion.
2. Staff shall be responsible for providing all recommendations to the SMPO Policy Committee through the Executive Director with a written record of recommendations by the TAC, and/or a formal recommendation signed by the TAC Chairperson.
3. Undertake such other duties as the SMPO may assign.

C. RECORDING CLERK:

The Recording Clerk shall keep the minutes and records, preparing the agenda of regular and special meetings, provide the notice of all meetings, arrange proper and legal notice of hearings, attend to correspondence, and such other duties as are normally carried out by a recording clerk.

Notice of Meetings: Committee meeting information and materials shall be posted at least five days prior to the meeting.

ARTICLE VI: GENERAL

General Policies shall apply to all committees and participants of the SMPO.

A. REMOVAL:

Members and alternates shall serve at the pleasure of their respective legislative bodies and may be removed during their term by their respective legislative bodies.

B. MAILINGS:

Members will be sent meeting notification, agendas, and appropriate documents via e-mail or mail one (1) week prior to the actual meeting date, except in the case of special meetings.

C. ORDER OF BUSINESS:

1. The normal order of business at regularly scheduled meetings of the Committee shall be as follows:
 - (a) Call to order
 - (b) Introductions
 - (c) Staff Communications
 - (d) Action Items
 - (e) Discussion Items
 - (f) Project Updates
 - (g) Other Business
 - (h) Adjournment
2. The normal order of business may be changed at the discretion of the Chairperson.

D. SPECIAL MEETINGS:

Special meetings may be called by the Chairperson or by a majority of the Committee.

E. VOTING:

Voting shall be by voice vote; however, upon the request of at least one (1) voting member, voting shall be by roll call. In the case of hybrid meetings⁴, an in-person quorum is still required, however additional Executive Committee members may attend, participate and vote remotely. For the duration of each hybrid meeting motions must take place via roll call voting. In the event of a tie vote, the motion before the Committee shall fail.

F. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT:

In order to maintain a comprehensive, coordinated, and continuing transportation planning process, and to ensure that the concerns of area citizens are addressed throughout all projects, programs, plans, and reports developed by the SMPO, the SMPO may use, but is not limited to the following procedures:

1. Establish advisory committees as appropriate, to include such functions as goals and objectives, environmental impact, intergovernmental relations, office relocation, network planning, etc.
2. Use the news media, public access cable channels, and Internet to provide public informational programs, which are conducted to ensure that citizens are well informed about opportunities and problems in the planning areas and regarding the status of planning.
3. Use informal working sessions with citizens representing geographic areas and inclusive facets of the community for an exchange of views regarding planning programs.
4. Conduct public hearings at which plans, programs, policies, and proposals are presented for public input.
5. Conduct all regular and special Committee meetings in accordance with the provisions of New Hampshire Revised Statutes Annotated, Chapter 91-A.
6. Maintain a database of interested citizens or other private entities.
7. Fulfill all requirements of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act – A Legacy for Users (SAFTEA-LU) as required by the Joint Federal
8. Highway Administration and the Federal Transit Administration Planning Rule – 23 CFR Part 450.316 (b) (1 & 2) regarding the public involvement process when carrying out the activities of the SMPO.
9. All published data and/or reports shall be made available to public and agencies.

ARTICLE VII: REPEALER

Any other conflicting resolution adopted prior to the date of the adoption of these Bylaws is hereby repealed.

ARTICLE VIII: AMENDMENTS

⁴ For the purpose of the SRPC Bylaws a hybrid meeting is defined as a meeting having an option to attend both in-person and virtually.

Revisions Adopted 11/18/10

- A. Any section herein contained may be amended by resolution of the voting representatives of the Policy Committee at any legally constituted and noticed meeting provided the following:
 - 1. The proposed amendment is presented in writing to the Policy Committee representatives at least thirty (30) days prior to the date of the meeting at which they are to be enacted;
 - 2. The resolution adopting the amendment passes by an affirmative vote of at least two-thirds (2/3) of the members present and voting.
- B. These bylaws shall be revised, updated, or amended as the circumstance dictates.
- C. Bylaw amendments shall become effective upon passage.

SMPO Policy Chairperson

Date

SMPO Policy Vice-Chairperson

Date

SMPO Policy Secretary/Treasurer

Date

September 17th 2021

Dear Executive Councilors:

The goal of this letter is to communicate transportation priorities identified by municipal and agency representatives and staff who make up the Strafford MPO that are relevant to the development of the 2023-2032 Statewide Ten Year Transportation Improvement Plan.

The Strafford Regional Planning Commission serves 18 New Hampshire municipalities as a Metropolitan Planning Organization (Strafford MPO) in regional transportation planning and project development. This includes Wakefield, Brookfield, Middleton, Milton, and New Durham in District 1; Strafford, Farmington, Rochester, Somersworth, Rollinsford, Dover, Madbury, and Durham in District 2; Northwood, Nottingham, Barrington, and Lee in District 4; and Newmarket in District 3. Agencies such as the Cooperative Alliance for Seacoast Transportation (COAST), University of New Hampshire (UNH), and the New Hampshire Departments of Transportation (NHDOT) and Environmental Services (NHDES) are also active members of the Strafford MPO.

Below is a broad range of transportation challenges, opportunities, and goals. While they are written from a transportation lens, many of the issues have a direct connection to economic development. The importance of a functioning transportation system to a healthy economy cannot be overstated; whether it is people getting to work, freight traveling to markets, or tourists visiting for the weekend.

Multimodal Network Development

Assets and Opportunities:

The Strafford region has the richest mix of public transportation options in New Hampshire: fixed-route and demand-response bus service, passenger rail, intercity bus, and a growing network of bicycle routes. These options allow residents to reach destinations for education, health care, employment, nutrition, recreation, and civic engagement. Municipalities are emphasizing development of local bicycle and pedestrian routes.

Challenges:

- Many people cannot afford housing near employment opportunities, which increases transportation costs for working families.
- Workforce mobility is also a challenge for employers.
- As the region grows, managing traffic congestion will be an increasing challenge without greater investment in a multimodal system.
- Accessible transportation services are lacking for people with disabilities and the rising numbers of seniors.

We advocate for:

- Increased consideration of multimodal development in the Statewide Ten Year Plan – moving people and freight, not just cars.
- Increased transportation options for people with disabilities, seniors, and those recovering from opioid addiction.

- Support for communities to implement local and regional multimodal trail networks that incentivize non-motorized modes of transportation, contribute to economic development, and promote healthy activity.

Public Transit

Assets and Opportunities:

SRPC recently studied COAST's impact on the economy and found it is responsible for at least \$25.8 million in economic benefits to southeast New Hampshire. The study included interviews with many business owners and human service agency staff who said their clients and employees rely on public transit for their livelihood. SRPC is working with UNH staff to incorporate analysis of the economic impact of Wildcat Transit's role in providing access the UNH – the largest employer in the Strafford region. The region has a good network of demand response transportation providers who give seniors and people with disabilities access to essential services.

Challenges:

- Restaurant and hotel managers in cities like Portsmouth said their employees cannot afford to live in the communities where they work and rely on public transit.
- Public transit lacks meaningful state funding for operating support and federal funding has not kept pace with costs and demand. However, operating costs for transit providers have increased significantly for the past decade.
- Under the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), COAST is required to provide door-to-door transportation for people in its service area who cannot reach bus stops because of a disability. Demand for this service has grown by 880% since 2009. This has resulted in a 645% increase in cost to COAST; ADA service now represents 25% of COAST's operating budget.
- COAST's access to federal funds relies on local matching funds from municipalities in its service area.
- COAST is currently ineligible for turnpike funds.

We advocate for:

- Increased capital and operating support for public transit providers that more closely reflects their needs and ensures consistent, responsive service for users. Sustained support of public transit operating costs is critical for the growing urban areas of New Hampshire.
- Transit providers like COAST and UNH Wildcat to be considered as an eligible recipient of turnpike funds due to their contribution to its level of service. We ask that the council discuss the use of turnpike toll credits for matching federal dollars for public transit.
- For people with disabilities who rely on COAST's ADA service for their transportation needs and for whom alternatives are unavailable or unaffordable.
- The municipalities who benefit from public transit to continue their economic development goals.
- Increased support for the Southeast Regional Coordinating Council which coordinated a range of demand-response transportation services for seniors and people with disabilities.
- Seacoast residents who take public transit because it is more cost-effective and better for the environment, because they are in a one-car family, or because they cannot drive.

Turnpike

Assets and Opportunities:

New Hampshire's turnpikes are a model for self-sufficient transportation systems. The turnpike generates its own revenue through user fees and helps NHDOT leverage federal funds while state matching funds are limited.

We advocate for:

- Completion of the Newington-Dover project. As the Southern gateway to the Strafford region, the Little Bay Bridges and adjacent highway infrastructure are a critical access point for commuters, freight traffic, and visitors.
- Safe and reliable access across the Piscataqua River for pedestrians and cyclists.
- Completing the feasibility study of an Exit 10 off the Spaulding Turnpike between Rochester and Dover.
- Completion of the all-electronic tolling conversion of the Dover and Rochester toll plazas.

Rail

Assets and Opportunities:

The seacoast region is the only part of New Hampshire with passenger rail service that connects residents to metropolitan centers in neighboring states. Passenger rail has significant potential for expansion but continues to be a missed opportunity for New Hampshire.

Challenges:

- The Amtrak Downeaster service receives no financial support from New Hampshire, yet is at-capacity transporting New Hampshire residents for employment and recreation in Boston, MA and Portland, ME.
- At-grade rail crossings present a complex safety challenge for several Strafford region communities.

We advocate for:

- Increased support for passenger and commuter rail development. This could lead to significant benefits for highway congestion reduction, access to jobs, and local and regional economic development.
- For "off network" rail bridges to be considered part of the critical transportation network and for investment to increase their capacity and speed limits.
- Increased collaboration with the New England Passenger Rail Authority to continue improving passenger rail service in the Seacoast. This includes projects (such as improved rail siding) to increase the frequency and reliability of service, greater access through park and rides and public transit connections, and incentives for local transit-oriented development.

Safety

Assets and Opportunities:

The potential reduction in loss of life, not to mention the economic and social costs, of unsafe highways cannot be ignored. The Highway Safety Improvement Program provides much-needed direct access to funding for local safety improvements through a straight-forward, timely process; Strafford MPO has had great success helping municipalities access funding.

Challenges:

- Safety and accessibility for vulnerable users like cyclists, pedestrians, and people with disabilities is inconsistent across a network that still favors cars and trucks.
- Regional Planning Commissions and even state agencies that play a role in improving transportation safety do not have adequate access to crash records and other data they need to identify dangerous areas and find solutions.

We advocate for:

- Continued support of local and state efforts to improve safety and connectedness of the transportation network. Safety improvements for all users of the statewide highway network is a top priority of Strafford MPO.
- Adoption of a wider range of countermeasures that enable public safety officers to keep public highways safe.

Infrastructure Resilience

Assets and Opportunities:

New Hampshire has an opportunity to prepare for climate change and mitigate its impacts. NHDOT developed a Transportation Asset Management (TAM) Plan assessing risks to transportation infrastructure from various threats. Regional Planning Commissions have analysis tools and expertise that can help coordinate local and statewide planning efforts to improve resilience.

Challenges:

- Climate change is already affecting New Hampshire’s transportation infrastructure. Major storms are occurring at higher frequencies and past events have revealed vulnerabilities of roads and bridges. The seacoast has seen increased flooding, sea level rise and storm surge.
- A transportation system dependent largely on a single travel mode cannot respond effectively to sudden disruption or damage to the system (such as a large storm or other disaster).
- The preparedness of individual municipalities may depend on limited local resources. This variability in local preparedness is a regional concern if major routes travel through small communities.

We advocate for:

- Using NHDOT’s TAM plan, modeling tools from Regional Planning Commissions, and local vulnerability assessments to identify the most vulnerable links in the network to mitigate inevitable impacts of climate change, ensure recovery can be rapid and effective, and to prioritize infrastructure investments.
- Investing in multi-modal networks. A transportation network with multiple options for traveling between destinations reduces the economic and social impact of severe weather events and reduces the cost of emergency response and recovery.
- Investment priorities in the Ten Year Plan should focus on infrastructure resilience – especially where critical roads, bridges, and rails are vulnerable to impacts. This includes supporting local efforts to increase transportation resilience.

Corridors

Assets and Opportunities:

The current Ten Year Plan contains funding for corridor studies starting in 2021. There are several corridors that are priorities of the Strafford MPO: NH 125, NH11, US4, and NH108. Strafford MPO will be

working with partner regional planning commissions and NHDOT to develop a regional process for prioritizing corridors. These corridors serve an important purpose for regional and interstate commerce and are primary routes for residents and visitors.

- NH108 provides important local connectivity between the urbanized cities of Dover, Rochester, and Somersworth, linking the Strafford region to the University of New Hampshire, Newmarket, and the Great Bay. NH108 could be considered the “spine” of the Strafford region, and some of the greatest potential for economic development and mobility improvements exist along the corridor.
- NH11 is an important regional route that links the City of Rochester through Farmington and New Durham to Alton. It is the primary northbound alternative to NH16 in the region and it carries large numbers of tourism traffic to the Lakes region.
- US4 provides a direct link from the Strafford region to Concord.
- Route 125 is an important link for several rural communities, including Barrington.

Challenges:

- US4 bisects the Town of Northwood, effectively separating it into northern and southern halves and creating a barrier to local travel. Careful consideration to balance local planning priorities and freight traffic along US4 is critical for Northwood’s local economy, safety, and quality of life.
- NH125 is the only alternative to NH16 for direct north-south travel and it links the City of Rochester to NH101 in Epping. NH125 carries high volumes of freight traffic. High traffic volumes and speeds conflict with local development efforts. One critical bottleneck is the intersection of NH125 and NH9; a local nexus point of commercial and residential development in Barrington.
- In recent years the Route 11 corridor has experienced significant congestion related to local commercial development.

We advocate for:

- Support for comprehensive corridor planning based on collaboration between, NHDOT, Regional Planning Commissions, and municipalities. This is needed to ensure that economic development, local transportation, tourism access, and freight movement do not conflict as corridors grow.

Alternative Fuels

Assets and Opportunities:

Alternative fuels have tremendous potential for positive impacts to public health and safety, cost of living, local and statewide economic development, and ultimately security of the transportation system.

Challenges:

- Ground-level ozone continues to be a serious health problem in New Hampshire (especially during the hot summer months, when the tourism season is in full-swing and people want to enjoy the rural New Hampshire experience). About half of all emissions that cause ground-level ozone to form come from on-road vehicles.
- The I93 capital corridor has seen recent investment in alternative fuels infrastructure, but a gap exists between the Dover-Rochester-Somersworth urbanized area and tourism destinations in the eastern White Mountains. As more people switch to alternative fuel vehicles, they will be limited by the availability of fueling stations; we want them to come contribute to our economy.

- Strafford MPO members have acknowledged and discussed the need to consider continued impacts to revenue generation from increased vehicle fuel efficiency and alternative fuels development.

We advocate for:

- Protecting clean air for visitors and residents by promoting adoption of alternative fuels should be a top priority.
- Development of infrastructure for electric vehicles. This has the benefit of using the existing power grid. Electric vehicle charging infrastructure is a significant opportunity for public-private-partnerships, and is being requested by private users, businesses, and municipalities. This emerging market requires increased collaboration between transportation and electric utilities stakeholders.
- Alternative fuels development to be considered as an investment priority supported by the Ten Year Plan.

Individual Projects

The projects in the Strafford region currently in the Ten Year Plan remain priorities for the Strafford MPO. One of these includes funding in FY2028 for a study at NH155 and Madbury Rd in Madbury (project #41596). This intersection is a significant safety hazard and a priority for the towns of Durham and Madbury. We would like the study to be advanced as rapidly as possible.

Strafford MPO submitted five projects that are included in NHDOT's draft Ten Year Plan. These projects were developed in collaboration with municipalities and prioritized for the draft plan by the Strafford MPO Policy Committee:

1. **Rochester:** Widen 3,200 feet of NH11 north of NH16 to four-lane configuration.
2. **Rochester:** Install new traffic signal at Nashoba Dr. and NH11; including new sidewalks from Nashoba Dr to NH16 overpass.
3. **Barrington:** Install new sidewalks at NH125 and NH9 between schools and businesses.
4. **Farmington:** Expansion of local sidewalk network along three routes connecting to downtown.
5. **Milton:** Pedestrian and safety improvements along Dawson and Silver Streets; includes locally funded utilities upgrades.

Transportation Alternative Program Round 4

Project Ranking	TAP Application ID	Sponsor Town / City	Description	Total Score	Population Region	Fed \$ Requested	Fed \$ Requested Running Sum	Notes
1	21-13TAP	Claremont	Upgrade and replace 1,400 LF of sidewalk along Broad Street. Const. 1,950 LF of pedestrian path at Manadnock Park	82.26	5,000 - 200,000	\$663,073	\$663,073	
2	21-28TAP	Nashua	Const. 10' wide multi-use path and reconstruct and existing path linking the Nashua Riverwalk with the Nashua Heritage Trail	78.92	>200,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,663,073	
3	21-07TAP	Rochester	Const. 6,400 LF of new ADA compliant sidewalk along Portland Street.	78.84	5,000 - 200,000	\$720,000	\$2,383,073	
4	21-06TAP	Warner	Const. 8' wide multi-use path for 3,750 LF along NH Route 103.	78.8	<5,000	\$840,888	\$3,223,961	
5	21-08TAP	Manchester	Const. 4,800 LF of multi-use path along Canal Street.	77.36	5,000 - 200,000	\$1,000,000	\$4,223,961	
6	21-01TAP	Laconia	Reconstruct 4,300LF of sidewalk on Elm St. to meet ADA standards, Reconstruct and widen 4,300LF on the other side of Elm St. to create a 8' wide ADA compliant multi-use path	76.4	5,000 - 200,000	\$1,000,000	\$5,223,961	
7	21-14TAP	Concord	Const. 1.79 miles of 10' wide paved multi-use path between Sewalls Falls Rd. and Boscawen Town line.	74.64	5,000 - 200,000	\$1,000,000	\$6,223,961	Project ends at town line which is a dead end. A side street exists short of the town line. Not sure of funding the trail from that point to town line.
8	21-26TAP	Merrimack	Const. 3,600 LF of sidewalk along the class IV portion of the US Route 3.	73.72	>200,000	\$1,000,000	\$7,223,961	
9	21-05TAP	Waterville Valley	Reconstruct 3,406 LF of roadway to include a dedicated bike/ped lane on Valley Rd, Tecumseh Rd, and Snow's Brook Rd.	73.56	<5,000	\$824,443	\$8,048,404	Reclaim and repave portion of project is not eligible per FHWA response.
10	21-31TAP	Rye	Const. sidewalk, shoulder expansion, bike lanes and cross walks on Washington Road for 1,900 LF	72.44	5,000 - 200,000	\$740,000	\$8,788,404	Road Diets are eligible per FHWA response
11	21-15TAP	Derry	Const. 1,900 LF of Rail Trail Improvements from the existing Derry Rail Trail to the Londonderry town line.	71.9	>200,000	\$660,000	\$9,448,404	
12	21-19TAP	Keene	Const. 4,100 LF of rail trail from Eastman Avenue to the Northern side of NH Route 101.	70.76	5,000 - 200,000	\$515,280	\$9,963,684	Project dead ends and they want to build a scenic overlook. Not sure if this would be eligible under TAP. Steet connection exists prior to dead end.
13	21-17TAP	Newport	Reconstruct 2,800 LF of dilapitated Pedestrian Sidewalks along NH Route 11/103	69	<5,000	\$574,400	\$10,538,084	
14	21-18TAP	Gorham	Reconstruct 3,200 LF of existing sidewalk along US Route 2 and construct 1,200 LF of new sidewalk to readh the rail trail parking lot	68.66	5,000 - 200,000	\$781,040	\$11,319,124	
15	21-23TAP	Durham	Construct bicycle and pedesrian improvements along Madbury Road.	68.28	5,000 - 200,000	\$880,000	\$12,199,124	
16	21-16LOI	Dover	Create Trail and Bridge to connect with TAP round 2 Community Trail Project.	67.12	5,000 - 200,000	\$550,000	\$12,749,124	This project goes from a current project to a steet. Not sure why it is needed as it makes same connection as existing project.
17	21-20TAP	Hopkinton	Const. 1,400 LF of sidewalk and bike lane along NH Rte 103. Const. 1,900 LF of sidewalk along NH Route 127	65.58	<5,000	\$716,000	\$13,465,124	
18	21-30TAP	Plymouth	Reconstruct sidewalks to ADA standards, and const. new sidewalks on Main St, Russell St, and Pleasant St. for approx 2,300LF	65.54	<5,000	\$360,000	\$13,825,124	
19	21-22TAP	Berlin	Construct 1,760 LF of new sidewalk along Hutchins Street	65.34	5,000 - 200,000	\$606,320	\$14,431,444	
20	21-33TAP	Windham	Construct multi-use path for 2.27 miles along the Greenway Recreational Trail	64.24	>200,000	\$960,000	\$15,391,444	
21	21-11TAP	Bradford	Replace 1,160 LF of sidewalk along West Main St. Const. 2,400 LF of rail trail improvements parallel to NH Route 103	63.68	<5,000	\$820,000	\$16,211,444	
22	21-32TAP	Salem	Const. 5' wide paved Sidewalk on Cluff Road for 1,300 LF	63	>200,000	\$520,000	\$16,731,444	
23	21-21TAP	Henniker	Const. 2,900 LF of sidewalk along NH Route 114 and Rush Road	62.2	<5,000	\$405,600	\$17,137,044	
24	21-29TAP	New Boston	Const. Tunnel under Parker Road to create a safe multi-use path for all age users	61.86	<5,000	\$488,000	\$17,625,044	This project may have better option then a tunnel. Look at ADA path vs tunnel
25	21-24TAP	Litchfield	Const. 5,000 LF of new 5' wide sidewalkon Pinecrest Road.	61.2	>200,000	\$650,000	\$18,275,044	
26	21-10TAP	Belmont	Const. 8' wide mulit-use path along Daniel Webster Highway. Const. 1,220 LF of 8' wide multi-use path on wood deck on Helical Piles Westerly of RR Tracks.	59.8	5,000 - 200,000	\$1,000,000	\$19,275,044	Bureau of Traffic has concerns with the road crossing because of the location of existing signals
27	21-27TAP	Moultonborough	Const. 9,800 LF of a 5' wide pathway along Moultonborough Neck Road	59.24	<5,000	\$560,000	\$19,835,044	
28	21-09TAP	Hinsdale	Pedestrian safety improvements along School Street.	56.46	<5,000	\$681,600	\$20,516,644	This doesn't seem to have any transportation benefit. It is a traffic calming plan on school property
29	21-34TAP	Wilton	Construct 100' long Pedestrian Bridge over Stony Brook.	53.6	>200,000	\$600,000	\$21,116,644	this project doesn't seem to have any transportation benefit. It is for a park area.
30	21-25TAP	Amherst	Const. 19,530 ft of multimodal facilities with significant portions to be built in coordination with programmed and funded road construction	53.56	>200,000	\$768,000	\$21,884,644	
31	21-04TAP	Bedford	Const. 3,800 LF of new curbed sidewalk along Old Bedford Road.	53.2	5,000 - 200,000	\$400,000	\$22,284,644	
32	21-12TAP	Bristol	Construct 0.7 miles of rail trail improvements along the Pemigewasset River	49.8	<5,000	\$959,589	\$23,244,233	This project seems to be a dead end to a trail system. No Transporation element. Project is not eligible for TAP funds
33	21-03TAP	Pelham	Const. Sidewalks Along Old Bridge Steet. Construct small path and Pedestrian bridge over Beaver Brook to NH Rte 38.	49.08	>200,000	\$897,920	\$24,142,153	Part of project moves pedestrians away from road over a ped bridge. Not likely to be used as a transportation feature.
34	21-02TAP	Northumberland	Restore a 126' long x 21' wide wooden covered bridge.	47.18	<5,000	\$1,000,000	\$25,142,153	This is a bridge restoration. An alternative bridge exists very close to this bridge.