

Memo

December 2021 Policy meeting
Notes on agenda items

Nondiscrimination and Environmental Justice plan

Nancy O'Connor and Colin Lentz want your feedback on the draft outline of SRPC's Nondiscrimination and Environmental Justice plan. This is a required document for Metropolitan Planning Organizations and concerns nondiscrimination in our outreach and planning practices relevant to regulations under Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act. We'd like the updated document to be more than a "box-checking" exercise and be more specific in addressing underrepresented populations in the region.

Please review the draft outline and consider two things:

Do the goal and objectives under item #2 need expansion or refinement

- Do they need additional language?
- What specific actions can we take as an MPO to make sure that everyone in our region is at least able to access information?

Examples of inclusive efforts or suggestions for how to improve

- Do you have any examples of ways Strafford MPO has conducted an especially inclusive process?
- Please share thoughts on how we can make our planning and outreach efforts more inclusive and reach a wider audience that normally would not be represented

Bike Ped Plan Survey

SRPC staff are working on a Bike Ped/Active Transportation plan for the region. One of the first steps is to get meaningful input from stakeholders to inform policy objectives and implementation strategies in the plan. Please review the included survey questions and consider if they will help guide effective bike/ped transportation improvements in the region.

Strafford Metropolitan Planning Organization

Combined meeting of the MPO Policy Committee Meeting & SRPC Commissioners

Friday, December 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: 858 0237 2877

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	
2. Staff Communications	1 mins
3. Items Requiring a Vote 3.1 Approve draft minutes from November 18 th 2021	5 mins
4. Items for Discussion 4.1 How can we make the planning process more inclusive and incorporate more voices? – updates to SRPC’s Nondiscrimination & Environmental Justice Plan 4.2 Will the questions in the draft survey for the SRPC Regional Bike/Ped Plan help us define policy goals objectives?	30 mins
5. Other Business & Updates from Staff 5.1 Ten Year Plan update	5 mins
6. Commissioner Roundtable – Local priorities for 2021 and how can SRPC help achieve them?	20 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, November 19, 2021,
9:00 – 11:00 AM
Strafford Regional Planning Commission
Hybrid Meeting
Rochester, NH

DRAFT

1. Introductions

Chair David Landry called the meeting to order and asked for introductions.

Members attending in person: Bill Fisher; Farmington, Tom Crosby; Madbury, Richard Michaud; Somersworth, Joe Boudreau; Rochester, Barbara Holstein; Rochester, Michael Williams; COAST, Glenn Davison; DOT, Michael Bobinsky; Somersworth, Dave Landry; Dover

SRPC staff members attending in person: Colin Lentz and Jennifer Czysz

Members participating remotely: Tim White; DES, Peter Nelson; Newmarket

Staff participating remotely: Rachel Dewey, Stephen Geiss, Jackson Rand, Nancy O'Connor, Blair Haney and Megan Taylor-Fetter

2. Staff Communications

J. Czysz distributed a memo to members regarding a Legislative Service Request that is relative to municipal representation on regional planning commissions. She explained that there is no action required today, it is being brought to the members attention for future discussion. J. Czysz explained that while the language is not yet available, representatives from SNPC had a chance to speak with one of the prime sponsors and learned that this proposal, as it is submitted, is to change the current tier that determines the number of commissioners appointed from each municipality. For the majority of our communities, that would cut representation in half. For other RPC's this proposed change would create an imbalance of representation between smaller and larger communities. J. Czysz shared statistics on what current representation is and how that would change if this bill is approved. She explained that while we do not need to take immediate action, Commissioners are urged to review this with their communities. J. Czysz stated this will be discussed at the upcoming Commission

meeting so that SRPC has direction to advocate one way or another when the Legislature convenes in January.

3. Items Requiring a Vote

3.1 Approve draft minutes from October 15th 2021

B. Fisher pointed out a minor correction to which his vote was not included in a motion. M. Bobinsky MOVED to approve the minutes of October 15, 2021 , M. Williams SECOND, All members present and remote voted unanimously in favor.

3.2 Approve Transit Safety Targets

C. Lentz shared a memo on the Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan. He explained that transit providers are required to set targets for safety to look at the number of injuries and fatalities, the rate of those occurrences and the number of safety events and the reliability of the system. He further explained that MPO's are also required to set those. COAST has set targets in their updated safety plan. C. Lentz stated that the proposed action is to recommend that the MPO Policy Committee support those targets. COAST has a good record with no fatalities, low injury rates, and good system reliability.

M. Williams MOVED to approve the Transit Safety Targets as presented, M. Bobinsky SECOND. All members present and remote voted unanimously in favor.

4. Items for Discussion

4.1 Investing in Infrastructure & Jobs Bill Overview

C. Lentz stated that the President just signed an infrastructure bill authorizing 500 billion dollars in new spending. He shared a page from the National Association of Counties website and stated it is a useful site for information on the different funding programs and the individual pieces of the bill. C. Lentz stated that the bottom line now is to have projects ready to go. Any number of projects that are potentially in each municipality could have a funding program that is in the infrastructure bill. The bill includes a bit more equity for smaller communities. There are programs that bundle projects relevant to multiple communities. C. Lentz concluded that getting projects ready to go is the order of the day.

4.2 Planning and project development for funding readiness

C. Lentz stated that the GACIT Phase is not finished, there is one more meeting but we are looking at the project development timeline. C, Lentz continued we need to get a list of preliminary projects by June. SRPC has a contract with VHB for engineering support. C. Lentz stated that he spoke with the project manager

at VHB and they require about six months to go through projects so VHB should have a list of preliminary projects by June. At the December TAC meeting there will be discussion on a new and approved approach to projects and their development. The next big part for Policy and TAC is to look at the quantitative process and agree that it makes sense.

J. Czysz asked G. Davison if at the GACIT hearings, the current Ten Year Plan as proposed was looking at portions of the infrastructure bill and developing a fiscal constraint for the Ten Year Plan, so some of what is in the infrastructure bill is already incorporated in the current Ten Year Plan that's working its way through the system. Is that correct?

Glenn answered that J. Czysz was correct. NHDOT used the bill put forward by the Environment and Public Works congressional committee to develop the fiscal constraint for the draft Ten Year Plan. The final infrastructure bill included additional funds: 45 mil for bridges and 2.5 additional money for electric vehicle infrastructure development. NHDOT is working with GACIT to bring that money into the Ten Year Plan based on their recommendations. NHDOT is recommending that additional funds be used to advance underfunded projects.

J. Czysz asked G. Davison to clarify if the changes that GACIT is working on right now with NHDOT, is that going to pull in the bridges and electric vehicle infrastructure funds pools of funding or are they going to remain separate from the plan?

G. Davison responded that the bridge funds will be incorporated but they need to discuss the electric vehicle funds further.

The members engaged in conversation on provisions and funding for existing projects.

C. Lentz stated he reached out to Northern New England Rail to meet with them to ask what projects they have for rail improvements.

P. Nelson suggested that the SRPC website include a set of resources on what is happening with this infrastructure budget.

4.3 Infrastructure resilience: Planning strategies and how pay for proactive improvements as a region

C. Lentz stated that it is imperative we do something about improving the resilience of infrastructure against storms, old culverts, old bridges, infrastructure in general; we need to take a proactive approach. C. Lentz stated it is going to be expensive. Multiple communities may rely on a piece of infrastructure not within their borders. Is there a way to think about collectively funding projects. The big picture steps are to complete an inventory of

vulnerable infrastructure and then develop and authorize rapid-approval funding.

B. Fisher expressed concern that his community, Farmington, already struggles to fund their own projects.

P. Nelson suggested a starting point would be to create a data base on the SRPC website of vulnerable infrastructure and the communities impacted. In addition, create a system for calculating the risk impact for priority setting.

Discussion ensued on the potential use of the travel model for identifying the priority of vulnerable infrastructure.

5. Other Business & Updates from Staff

C. Lentz informed the committee that the final GACIT meeting has been rescheduled to December 8 at 2:30 p.m.

6. Commissioner Roundtable – Updates from your community

K. Kasper stated that the Town of Lee is excited about new bike lanes in the community.

T. Crosby stated that the new bridge will be completed by the end of the year.

M. Williams stated COAST does not run on Thanksgiving Day.

J. Czysz stated that she has been meeting with municipalities as part of a 'road tour'. Several meetings are scheduled for December. Commissioners will be invited to attend those meetings in their communities. This is part of an initiative to learn what the needs of communities are and to provide information on what SRPC has to offer.

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

There were no citizens attending

8. Adjournment

M. Williams MOVED to adjourn seconded by R. Michaud. All in favor , none opposed

Nondiscrimination and Environmental Justice Plan

1. Introduction

a. Nondiscrimination Provisions

- i. **Title VI** of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 prevents against discrimination on the basis of race, color or national origin
- ii. 1970 Uniform Act (42 U.S.C. 4601) requires fair, equitable treatment of persons who will be displaced due to federally funded activities
- iii. Section 162(a) of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1973 prohibits discrimination based on sex (gender).
- iv. Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 prohibits discrimination based on a handicap or disability
- v. The Age Discrimination Act of 1975
- vi. Civil Rights Restoration Act of 1987 extends the applicability of Title VI to **all** SRPC programs and activities
- vii. 23 CFR Part 200 FHWA Title VI Program Implementation and Review Procedures
- viii. 49 CFR Part 21 US DOT's Title VI related regulations
- ix. Executive Order 13166 Improving Access to Services for Persons with Limited English Proficiency (LEP)

b. Environmental Justice

- i. Executive Order 12898, Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations.
- ii. Fair treatment and meaningful involvement of all people with respect to our programs, policies and activities.
- iii. Assess and address disproportionate adverse health and environmental effects of their programs, policies and activities on minority and low-income populations.
- iv. Policy Statement and Notice to the Public

That no person shall on the grounds of race, color, national origin, sex, age, and handicap/disability, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be otherwise subjected to discrimination under any program or activity conducted by the recipient regardless of whether those programs and activities are federally funded or not. (to be signed by the SRPC Executive Director)

2. Title VI and Environmental Justice Policy Goal and Objectives

a. Goal

Provide information to the public to allow active participation in the transportation decision-making process.

b. Objectives

- i. Develop and implement an outreach program to educate members of the public about transportation, land use and air quality issues and their interrelationships; and about the transportation planning process and how they can be involved in it.
- ii. Solicit the participation of local officials, community groups, and individual citizens in the transportation planning process.
- iii. Reach out to under-represented persons and groups, including low-income, minority populations and Limited English Proficiency groups through local Limited English Proficiency community leaders to ensure that decisions are made with their input take into consideration.
- iv. Inform the public of the federally funded transportation projects for each fiscal year.
- v. Provide notice to the public that the Strafford Regional Planning Commission operates its programs or conducts its planning activities subject to the nondiscrimination requirement under Title VI and those members of the public can request additional information regarding the obligations of the Planning Commission
- vi. Continually identify and implement ways to improve its public input process.
- vii. Ensure no person is denied access to or participation in MPO programs
- viii. Avoid disproportionate high and adverse impacts on communities
- ix. Improve the public involvement process
- x. Involve the public by providing opportunities early and often in the transportation planning and decision-making process
- xi. Document public involvement process, comments, and responses

3. General Title VI Requirements

a. Title VI Assurances

- i. Procedurally, what is to be completed, by whom and when?
- ii. Incorporation into solicitation for bids, requests for proposals and contracts
- iii. The Certifications and Assurances can be found in Appendix #

b. Notification Procedures for Protected Title VI Beneficiaries

- i. Standard notice language
- ii. Where and when notice language is provided
- iii. A copy of the public notice can be found in Appendix #

c. Nondiscrimination Coordinator

- i. Name of the Title VI Coordinator and their contact information
- ii. Coordinator's responsibilities
 - a. The Title VI/Nondiscrimination Coordinator should actively participate in the development/update efforts and should be included in the approval process
 - b. The Title VI/Nondiscrimination Coordinator should monitor how the agency implements the plan¹

d. Title VI Complaint Procedures

¹ Recommendations from NHDOT Title VI Sub-recipient Technical Guide

- i. Where and how can a complain be filed?
- ii. Complaint investigation by trained personnel
- iii. Maintenance of an official record of investigations, complaints and lawsuits
- iv. Report out of past investigations, complaints and/or lawsuits
- v. Distribution of procedures to staff
- vi. Online posting of procedures and forms
- vii. Official complaint procedures and forms can be found in Appendix #

4. The Strafford Region

This and the following sections is the core of the plan that SMPO develops to ensure we are in compliance with federal regulations. Description of the region as well as demographic data will identify protected populations. We can then use project examples, outreach techniques and plans and general considerations in all planning processes for populations that may face barriers. This will demonstrate our commitment to including all people in our planning process.

a. Region Overview

- i. Geographic location
- ii. Total population (2020 Decennial Census)
- iii. Communities in the region, population densities, and unique characteristics
 - a. The tri-cities make up the urbanized core
 - b. Durham as home to the University of New Hampshire
 - c. Somersworth as home to Little Indonesia

b. Narrative description of Strafford MPO's work

- i. What does an MPO do?
- ii. What types of projects may fall under this program?
- iii. What types of decision points are there in the transportation planning process?

c. Inclusive Public Participation

- i. What kinds of public input are considered and offered?
- ii. What people are affected by transportation decision making?
- iii. How can people be affected by these decisions?
- iv. What types of barriers exist for people to be involved in these decisions?
- v. How does it affect our region?
- vi. How can we address barriers and make decision making open and inclusive for all?

d. Data Development and Procedures

- i. Procedures for the collection of statistical data (race, color, national origin, sex, disability, and age) of participants in and beneficiaries of SRPCs programs (e.g., relocatees, impacted citizens and affected communities).
- ii. Methodology of how we collect, store and present data.
 - a. Use demographic information and other tools for Title VI and environmental justice compliance with regard to future mobility projects
 - b. Obtain demographic data on public meeting participants
 - c. Send correspondence to community leaders, community-based organizations, or local data-collecting agencies requesting their assistance in identifying the

demographics of the population affected by the agency's programs and activities²

5. Demographic Profile of the SRPC Region

a. Title VI Protected Classes

- i. Race (map, data table)
- ii. Color (map, data table)
- iii. National origin (map, data table)

b. Environmental Justice Populations

- i. Low income (map, data table)
- ii. Minority (map, data table)
- iii. Foreign born (map, data table)
- iv. Limited English Proficiency (map, data table)

c. Other Federal and State protected classes

(those not already included above)

- i. Age (map, data table)
- ii. Disability (map, data table)
- iii. Sex (map, data table of gender; discussion of pregnancy, sexual orientation, and gender identity)
- iv. Religion or creed (discussion, data if available)
- v. Veteran status (discussion, data if available)
- vi. Genetic information (discussion, data if available)
- vii. Citizenship (discussion)
- viii. Marital status (discussion, data if available)
- ix. Sexual orientation (discussion, data if available)

6. Planning for Equity and Environmental Justice

This section will describe how we take equity into account across all of our planning functions. How do we make sure that all people in the region, regardless of any barriers they may face, are included in and invited to access all transportation decision making points. This should highlight outreach techniques-Point to PPP-brief examples of innovative/accommodating outreach and all persons have a right to view SRPC plans and discuss environmental problems.

a. Equity Tools

- i. Actions to ensure and equitable transportation decision making process (see p. 65-66 of the [SRPC MTP](#))
- ii. Public participation tools
- iii. Public noticing and translation
- iv. Hold meetings and other convenings at sites accessible by public transit
- v. Others

b. Public Participation Plan

- i. Public Participation Plan (reference, summary, [link to document](#))
- ii. Inclusion of minority, low-income, or other non-traditional stakeholders
- iii. Stakeholders list and contact information

² Recommendations from NHDOT Title VI Sub-recipient Technical Guide

c. Language Assistance Plan

- i. Introduction
- ii. Four Factor Analysis
 - a. Prevalence of LEP persons
 - b. Frequency of contact with LEP persons
 - c. Importance of SRPC activities and services to LEP persons
 - d. Resources available and cost
- iii. Services and Monitoring

d. Affirmative Action Program

- i. Adopt [NHDOT's Disadvantaged Business Enterprise](#) (DBE) program by reference

e. Americans With Disabilities Act

- i. All SRPC meeting locations will be accessible to people of all abilities
- ii. Pedestrian accessibility mapping efforts at SRPC and [NHDOT](#)

f. Case Studies and Project Examples

Looking at current projects, how have we created access or provided accommodations to all of our populations for each? For each project below, provide a project description, which population(s) it affects or considers, listing of accommodations. Looking at both current and past projects, show examples of what considerations we took into account to make sure all populations were invited to the decision-making process.

- i. Summary Matrix (where and how various Title VI and EJ tools have been used within SRPC transportation planning and projects)
- ii. TAP project scoring
- iii. MTP project evaluation
- iv. Dover Equity
- v. Outreach and Engagement example
- vi. Community Voices
 - a. Stories-use MTP survey data to illustrate how public perceive SRPC's inclusiveness and how they find information. Use public notices, response, newspaper articles to illustrate how we reach people
 - b. Interviews-reach out to communities (through commissioners) and conduct interviews with individuals who have engaged with the decision-making process.
 - c. Solicit feedback from communities on improvements to inclusive practices, new methods of information dissemination and capitalize on local connections.

g. Annual Work Plan and Reports

Mechanisms to ensure effective and efficient implementation, compliance and enforcement of nondiscrimination and Environmental Justice requirements.

Annual Work Plan

- Planned initiatives
- Annual review and update of data, equity tools, case studies, and contact lists

Annual report

- Monitor compliance of Title VI and Environmental Justice requirements

- Progress toward implementation of the plan’s goal and objectives

7. Appendices:

- Title VI Notice to the Public
- Title VI Certifications and Assurances
- Title VI Complaint Form and Investigative Procedures

Resources and References:

<https://www.justice.gov/crt/fcs/newsletter/Spring-2015/TitleVIandEJ>

<https://www.epa.gov/environmentaljustice/title-vi-and-environmental-justice>

http://strafford.org/uploads/documents/governance/difference_btwn_ejand_titlevi_2013.pdf

<http://strafford.org/engage/civil-rights/>

<https://www.nh.gov/dot/org/administration/ofc/documents/ada-titleII-transition-plan.pdf>

<https://www.nh.gov/dot/org/administration/ofc/index.htm>

NHDOT Requirement	SRPC Outline Section
1. Policy Statement	2 Policy Statement and Notice
2. Assurances	Appendix B Certifications and Assurances
3. Coordinator	4c Nondiscrimination Coordinator
4. Nondiscrimination plan	Entirety of the document..
5. Complaints process	4d Title VI Complaint Procedures and Appendix C Complaint Form
6. Complaints list	4d Title VI Complaint Procedures
7. LEP Accommodations	7c Language Assistance Program
8. EJ	6 b EJ Populations & c Other protected classes, 7 Planning for Equity and Environmental Justice, 8 Annual Work Plan and Report
9. Public Participation	7b PPP, 8 Annual Work Plan and Report
10. Data collection & analysis	5d data development and procedures, 6 Demographic Profile
11. Bids and RFPs	4a Title VI Assurances, Appendix B Certifications and Assurances
12. Contract Provisions	4a Title VI Assurances, Appendix B Certifications and Assurances
13. Affirmative Action	7d Affirmative Action Program
1. Annual Reporting	8 Annual Work Plan and Report

Active Transportation in the Strafford Region

Thank you for taking our survey!

Strafford Regional Planning Commission is developing a plan to improve spaces for “active transportation” in the region, but we need your input. Active transportation includes getting around by foot, bicycle, wheelchair, rollerblades etc. Think human power, not gas power.

We want to promote and improve active transportation in the region for multiple reasons:

- We think neighborhoods and downtowns should be designed for people, not just cars.
- Active transportation means healthy exercise
- More people walking and biking helps reduce vehicle emissions
- Streets that are designed to be safe for walking and biking are safer for everyone
- Streets that safe for everyone create a better sense of community and are great for business!

[CLICK HERE](#) to discover a new outdoor recreation site near you.

Gauging activity levels

- How often do you walk, bike, or use another form of active transportation?
 - A few times a year
 - A few times in the nicer seasons
 - Couple times a month
 - Every week
 - Multiple times a week
- What best describes your level of interest in active transportation?
 - Leisurely walks around the neighborhood or park
 - Stroll down to the local coffee shop or restaurant
 - Quick bike trip to the store
 - I’m an active runner/jogger
 - I sometimes bike for fun on recreation or rail trails
 - I have a carbon fiber bike and I regularly break the sound barrier on my rides
 - Other
- Where do you usually like to bike or walk or use other forms of active transportation?
 - In my neighborhood
 - To a local park
 - Local businesses
 - To take care of errands
 - Other
- Would you choose to use active transportation more often if there were safer, better facilities like sidewalks and trails?
- Which of the following destinations are you most likely to walk or bike to if there was a safe route?
 - Local parks or other recreation sites
 - Schools

- My job
- Grocery shopping
- Restaurants or other entertainment
- Other suggestions

Barriers to active transportation

- What are the primary barriers that keep you or your family members from using active transportation in your community?
 - There are no safe places to walk or ride near where I live
 - There's no place to secure my bike at my destination
 - The places I need to get to are too far away for walking/biking to be practical
 - I don't know many places that are meant for biking and walking
 - There's a major road or other barrier between where I live and where I'd like to bike/walk to – Please tell us about the barrier [comment area for open response]
 - Other

- Are there places where you regularly see people walking or biking on a road that are unsafe for them? Please tell us where:

- Some people temporarily or permanently need wheelchairs or other devices but they still deserve the same level of access as people who can walk independently. Are there barriers in your community that prevent people with disabilities from enjoying the same things as people who can walk independently? Please tell us where and provide specific examples, such as:
 - Lack of sidewalks
 - No curb ramps on sidewalks
 - Private establishments like restaurants or theaters aren't accessible
 - Public establishments like parks or the library aren't accessible

Priorities for Improvements

- How should funding for new projects be prioritized?
 - Focus on filling gaps or fixing “bad” spots (e.g. dedicated crossing on an unsafe road that separates neighborhoods)
 - Think local: improve walkability and bikeability WITHIN communities
 - Think regional: Improve connections over larger distances BETWEEN communities
- What types of improvements for biking and walking are most important to you and your community?
 - Safer crossings that link neighborhoods
 - Dedicated multi-use recreation trails
 - Dedicated lanes or paths along specific roads (e.g. NH108 or NH125)
 - Expanded local sidewalk networks
 - More walkable and bikeable downtowns
 - Other suggestion

Innovation and Technology

- There are new technologies and techniques focused on making biking and walking safer and more convenient. Which are these do you think would benefit your community or the region most
 - The latest safety technology to alert drivers to the presence of pedestrians and cyclists
 - Public bike docking systems that give people access to a bike for short periods
 - Other suggestions

Do you have specific project ideas you'd like us to develop with your community?

- Are there places in the region that you think are well designed for active transportation
- Are there specific destinations you think more people would bike/walk to if there was a safer route?
- Are there improvements to existing bicycle and pedestrian facilities that we should consider (extension of a rail trail or sidewalk)?

Anything else that you want to ask or tell us about?

Demographic questions

- Municipality
- Age
- Etc.

Wrap-up and contact info