

Strafford MPO Policy Committee Meeting

Friday, July 15, 2022 9:00 – 10:30 AM

Hybrid Meeting (Conference Rm 1A, SRPC Office & via Zoom)

In accordance with RSA 91:A, the Commission requires a minimum of an in-person quorum. To organize this, the Commission staff will confirm the necessary in-person attendance. It is the preference of the Commission that others participate via Zoom, however, guests may attend the meeting at the SRPC Office. All participants, both in-person and virtual, can communicate contemporaneously. View the remote access information below.

Meeting URL: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/85802372877>

Meeting ID: 858 0237 2877

Telephone-only Access: +1 646 558 8656

These instructions have also been provided at www.strafford.org. If anybody is unable to access the meeting, please email mtaylorfetter@strafford.org or call 603-994-3500 (x115).

Agenda Item	Time	Pre-Meeting Task/Notes
1) Introductions	1 minute	
2) Staff Communications	5 minutes	
3) Public Hearing – 2022 Nondiscrimination Plan	20 minutes	Review draft plan prior to meeting LINK
4) Action Items [require a vote] a) Approve draft minutes from June 17, 2022 b) Approve 2022 Nondiscrimination Plan	5 minutes	Review draft minutes prior in packet
5) Discussion Items a) Updates on the Ten Year Plan Process b) Updates to the SRPC Strategic Plan	30 minutes	Review draft strategic plan and TYP information in packet
6) Other Business & Updates from Staff	5 minutes	None
7) Commissioner Roundtable Updates, from your community	10 minutes	None
8) Citizen's Forum		
9) Adjourn		

Reasonable accommodations for people with disabilities are available upon request. Include a detailed description of the accommodation you will need along with your contact info. Please make your request as early as possible; allowing 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 when speaking.

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.



Memo

Strafford MPO Policy Committee meeting

July 15th 2022

Preview of agenda items

Updated Nondiscrimination Plan

The meeting will include a public hearing for the updated Nondiscrimination plan. It can be reviewed [here](#)

Ten Year Plan Process

The same criteria from the previous TYP round will be used to score candidate projects this round (attached in the packet). SRPC will be able to weight criteria according to regional goals/objectives. Review of all candidate TYP projects by a licensed engineer is now required.

SRPC staff have been meeting with municipal staff to discuss projects and three candidates have been submitted for engineering review. SRPC will be adapting an online survey/form for candidate projects. If you have likely candidate projects, contact Colin Lentz ASAP (clentz@strafford.org)

Critical first deadline: ranked list of project due to NHDOT by November 11th 2022.

- NHDOT will review RPC projects from November-December.
- SRPC staff will be meeting with NHDOT staff in January/February to discuss results of NHDOT project review.
- Final prioritized (and fiscally constrained) project list due to NHDOT by March 31st 2023

NHDOT is currently discussing regional allocations of funding for candidate projects. More information will be provided at the meeting.

SRPC Strategic Plan

SRPC will be updating its strategic plan for the 2023 Fiscal year. Please review the strategic plan included in the meeting packet.

STRAFFORD

Metropolitan Planning Organization

Policy Committee Meeting Combined Meeting of the Stafford EDD & Strafford MPO

Meeting Minutes

Friday, June 17, 2022

9:00 – 11:00 AM

Stafford Regional Planning Commission

Hybrid Meeting

Rochester, NH

1. Introductions

9:16 Chair David Landry called the meeting to order. and asked for introductions.

Committee members present: Bill Fisher, Farmington; Katrin Kasper, Lee; Barbara Holstein, Rochester; Rick Michaud, Somersworth; David Landry, Dover; Tom Crosby, Madbury; Michael Bobinsky, Somersworth; Michael Williams, COAST; Donald Hamann, Rochester; Joe Boudreau, Rochester; Evan McDougal, Wakefield; Michael Bobinsky, Somersworth; Herb Ueda, Rollinsford; David Landry, Dover.

Committee Members participating remotely: Peter Nelson, Newmarket; Glen Davison, DOT, Steve Diamond, Barrington; Dawn Genes, Lee; Ricky DiCillo, DES;

Staff members present: Jen Czysz, Colin Lentz,

Staff attending remotely: Rachel Dewey, Jackson Rand, Stephen Geis, James Burdin, Tyler Distefano,

Guest attending remotely: Donna Benton, Dover; Brian H., Dover Riverwalk.

At 9:20 a.m. the meeting convened as the Strafford Metropolitan Planning Organization

2. Public Hearing Amendment 4 to the 2021-2024 TIP

At 9:20 a.m. D. Hamann MOTIONED to open the Public Hearing SECONDED by T. Crosby, All members were in agreement to open the Public hearing.

The Public hearing opened for the proposed Amendment #4 to the adopted 2021-2024 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). The TIP is a prioritized list of federal and state funded regional transportation projects programmed for the next four years. The amendment is necessary to account for project changes and to maintain consistency with the 2021-2024 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). SRPC is conducting this process in accordance with the Strafford MPO's public involvement procedures and federal and state regulations. Amendment #4 impacts projects listed in

the 2021-2024 TIP which is part of the 2021-2045 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) for the region.

C. Lentz provided a summary of the amendments to the TIP which includes several state programs and two local projects with proposed changes. The new projects advancing through the TIP are the Milton sidewalk project and the widening of a portion of Route 11 in Rochester. New projects added to the MTP out years are the Dover Central Avenue Complete Streets and UNH South Drive project.

C. Lentz asked for questions or comments. There were no questions or discussions.

T. Crosby MOTIONED to close the Public Hearing SEONDED by M. Bobinsky. All in Favor. The Public Hearing Closed at 10:32 am

3. Action Items

a. Approve draft minutes of May 20, 2022

Bill Fisher MOTIONED to approve the May 20, 2022 minutes as written seconded by M. Bobinsky. A roll call vote was taken: B. Fisher, T. Crosby, K. Kasper, M. Bobinsky, B. Holstein, M. Williams, H. Ueda, D. Landry, P. Nelson, S. Diamond, R. DiCillo, G. Davison voting IN FAVOR. E. McDougal, D. Hamann, J. Boudreau, M. Richardson, D. Genes ABSTAIN. There were no objections. The motion passed with a majority in favor.

b. Amendment 4 to the 2021-2024 TIP

C. Lentz asked the members to entertain a vote to approve.

D. Hamann MOTIONED to approve Amendment 4 to the TIP SEONDED by E. McDougal. A roll call vote was taken: B. Fisher, T. Crosby, K. Kasper, M. Bobinsky, B. Holstein, M. Williams, H. Ueda, D. Landry, P. Nelson, S. Diamond, R. DiCillo, G. Davison, E. McDougal, D. Hamann, J. Boudreau, M. Richardson, D. Genes voting IN FAVOR. The motion passed with all members in favor.

4. Discussion Items

Updates to the draft nondiscrimination plan (including Limited English Proficiency and Environmental Justice)

C. Lentz explained that as a recipient of federal dollars, the MPO needs to conform to the Title VI Act and provide equitable access to the process. the public comment period for the updates is open until July 15, 2022. A formal vote to approve will take place at the July Policy Meeting. This latest draft of the Nondiscrimination plan includes new information and analysis of people with Limited English Proficiency (LEP) and populations that fall under Environmental Justice provisions. Both sections include description of demographics, geography, and action steps by SRPC. LEP equity considerations include things like translating documents; Environmental Justice requires consideration of disproportionate impacts from transportation planning and equitable distribution of benefits.

C. Lentz asked members to contact him if they have any questions.

5. Adjourn the MPO Policy Meeting

At 10:00 a.m. the Stafford Economic Development portion of the meeting adjourned.

At 10:00 a.m. the meeting convened as the Stafford Regional Planning Commission & EDD Board of Directors

Public Hearing: 2022 Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (CEDS)

J. Burdin explained SRPC staff have completed a draft of the Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy 2022 and released it for the required 30-day public comment period. Staff also presented an overview of the CEDS 2022 to commissioners at the May 13, 2022 joint SRPC/Policy Committee meeting. As part of the noticed public comment period, notice was also given for a public hearing at the June 17, 2022 joint SRPC/Policy Committee meeting.

Staff compiled a record of all comments received during the public comment period. This record also indicates what changes, if any, have been made to the plan in response or any recommendations staff has for commissioners to consider during discussion and adoption. Staff recommends that all four projects be included in the adopted CEDS.

J. Burdin recommended to the Commissioners to open a public hearing and accept comments from any members of the public present in person or electronically. After comments by the public are complete, the Commissioners should discuss adoption of the CEDS, including any final edits to the plan that are desired prior to adoption. Staff requests that the Commission approve a motion to adopt the Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy 2022 update (either as written or as amended by Commissioners).

At 10:05 a.m. M. Bobinsky MOTIONED to open the Public Hearing for the 2022 CEDS SECONDED by D. Hamann. ALL IN FAVOR.

M. Bobinsky thanked J. Burdin for the explanation on the Spaulding Turnpike Exit Ten project and the description of SRPC being a sponsor of this project at this stage. M. Bobinsky stated for the record that as the project moved forward and goes into the planning stage, the implementation component is more involved with the three cities. He expressed appreciation for the level of effort that staff has put into the project.

There was a brief discussion on the Town of Farmington's Levy and the potential for the designation of downtown Farmington as a floodplain zone. B. Fisher explained the levy is in good shape and has been inspected and has passed all requirements put forth by the Army Core of Engineers. This is just a matter of the Army Core of Engineers and FEMA working together to come to a resolution.

At 10:10 a.m. D. Hamann MOTIONED to close the Public Hearing SECONDED by K. Kasper. ALL IN FAVOR

J. Czysz requested Item 2-d, Motion to adopt the 2022 CEDS Update, be brought forward.

D. Hamann MOTIONED to accept the 2022 Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (CEDS) SECONDED by M. Bobinski. A roll call vote was taken: B. Fisher, T. Crosby, K. Kasper, M. Bobinsky, B. Holstein, H. Ueda, D. Landry, P. Nelson, S. Diamond, G. Davison, E. McDougal, D. Hamann, J. Boudreau, M. Richardson, D. Genes voting IN FAVOR. There were no objections. The motion passed with all members in favor.

1. Action Items

a. Minutes from February 24, 2022

D. Hamann MOTIONED to approve the minutes of February 24, 2022 as written SECONDED by T. Crosby. ALL IN FAVOR. The motion passed with all members in favor.

b. Adopt FY 2023 Budget recommended by the Executive Committee

J. Czysz highlighted items on the proposed FY 2023 Budget and pointed out the minor changes that have been made, including when it is expected that projects will end and what is needed for staffing next fiscal year.

J. Czysz explained that some shifts between the current year and the upcoming FY 2023 between the various revenue streams are due to more grants coming in from federal sources that state. The expense table reflects some basic shifts to staffing levels as well as in the contracted work. On the revenue side there is an increase due to Lee and Milton becoming dues paying communities.

On the expense side, there are changes in the staffing line and it reflects annual salary adjustments. The allocation for professional development has increased to \$1000 per staff member.

D. Hamann MOTIONED to adopt the FY 2023 Budget SECONDED by T. Crosby. A roll call vote was taken: B. Fisher, T. Crosby, K. Kasper, M. Bobinsky, B. Holstein, H. Ueda, D. Landry, P. Nelson, S. Diamond, G. Davison, E. McDougal, D. Hamann, J. Boudreau, M. Richardson, D. Genes voting IN FAVOR. There were no objections. The motion passed with all members in favor.

c. Elect FY2023 Officers & Executive Committee members

J. Czysz reported that the current 7 members of the Executive Committee have expressed interest and willingness to continue on the Executive Committee. The current officers have agreed to continue in their roles. The committee has two alternate seats to fill. Katrin Kasper of Lee has offered to be appointed as an alternate.

Current members are:

David Landry, Dover, Chair

Peter Nelson, Newmarket, Vice Chair

Tom Crosby, Madbury, Secretary, Treasurer

Donald Hamann, Rochester

Barbara Holstein, Rochester
Michael Bobinsky, Somersworth
William Fisher, Farmington

D. Hamann MOTIONED to accept the Slate of Officers as recommended by the Executive Committee with K. Kasper joining as an alternate. SECONDED by T. Crosby. A roll call vote was taken: B. Fisher, T. Crosby, K. Kasper, M. Bobinsky, B. Holstein, H. Ueda, D. Landry, P. Nelson, S. Diamond, G. Davison, E. McDougal, D. Hamann, J. Boudreau, M. Richardson, D. Genes voting IN FAVOR. The motion passed with all members in favor.

d. Adopt the 2022 CEDS Update

This item was moved to item #1

2. Other Business & Updates from Staff

J. Czysz reported that the Annual Meeting takes place next week and that all business items normally addressed have been covered today at this meeting. This is because this is the first in person meeting in two years and the focus will be on the panelist presentation and recognitions.

J. Boudreau reported on the Resiliency Committees upcoming meeting.

3. Commissioners' roundtable

B. Fisher reported that if the Army Core of Engineers and FEMA cannot come into agreement regarding the Farmington Levy, it will increase the 100 year floodplain by 75 percent. The ACE has approved the levy and it is just a matter of FEMA and the ACE coming to an agreement. He reiterated that the Levy is in good shape.

S. Diamond reported that at the Little Bay Road, he saw a bicyclist use the crossing button, but traffic did not yield to allow the bicyclist safe passage across. He asked if there a way of clarifying who has the right of way at rotaries and to add signage to that effect. G. Davison answered he will bring this concern to the Bureau of Traffic.

H. Ueda thanked Colin for his extensive visit with the Selectmen. His assistance was hugely helpful and the Board was impressed by the services provided by SRPC.

4. Citizens Forum

There was no citizens comment.

5. Adjourn

M. Bobinsky MOTIONED to adjourn SECONDED by D. Hamann. All in favor. Meeting adjourned.

NH TEN YEAR PLAN: Regional Project Review

NEW HAMPSHIRE'S "TEN YEAR PLAN"

The *New Hampshire 10-Year Transportation Improvement Plan* ("Ten Year Plan") is a fiscally-constrained program of state- and federal-funded transportation projects. The *Ten Year Plan* is updated biennially, pursuant to the requirements of New Hampshire RSA 240.

The *Ten Year Plan* includes projects related to roadway improvements, bicycle and pedestrian travel, public transportation, aviation, and natural hazard resiliency.



REGIONAL PROJECT REVIEW PROCESS

As part of the biennial update of the *Ten Year Plan*, each of the nine New Hampshire Regional Planning Commissions (RPCs) leads a process to identify and prioritize transportation projects in their respective regions for inclusion in the *Plan*.

Projects eligible for consideration through the regional review process:

- ⇒ **Asset management projects** (e.g., bridge rehabilitation, bridge replacement, pavement/base/subbase repair/replacement);
- ⇒ **Bicycle and pedestrian improvements** (e.g., sidewalks, bike trails, multi-use paths; traffic calming improvements);
- ⇒ **Infrastructure-related travel demand management projects** (e.g., park and ride lots, transit or HOV lanes, priority signalization, bus shelters, intermodal transportation centers);
- ⇒ **Planning studies** assessing the need for future projects;
- ⇒ **Roadway improvements** (e.g., operational improvements, access management, intelligent transportation systems, widening, technology operation improvements).

FEDERAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Under the *Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act* (FAST Act), state DOTs and Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) are required to use **performance measures** to work toward specific targets in support of **national goals for transportation management** in all federally-funded projects and programs.

The Ten-Year Plan Criteria detailed in this packet reflect these federal performance measures. Relevant federal performance measures are noted with each criterion.

PROJECT REVIEW CRITERIA

The criteria included in this packet are intended to help RPC's prioritize projects in their respective regions. A list of criteria is provided in the table to the right.

Each RPC may assign weights to different criteria to reflect regional priorities. Weights should be assigned to criteria prior to scoring projects.

For each project, a score should be assigned for each criterion in order to develop an overall project score. **Detailed scoring procedures are provided on page 2 of this packet.**

Each RPC should clearly define the specific scoring process that will be used prior to scoring projects.

CRITERION	SUB-CRITERIA
Economic Development	Local & Regional; Freight Movement
Equity, Environmental Justice, & Accessibility	Equity & Environmental Justice; Accessibility
Mobility	Mobility Need & Performance; Mobility Intervention
Natural Hazard Resiliency	Hazard Risk; Hazard Mitigation
Network Significance	Traffic Volume; Facility Importance
Safety	Safety Performance; Safety Measures
State of Repair	State of Repair; Maintenance
Support	n/a

For each criterion, the following reference table is provided in order to standardize & guide project reviews:

REGIONAL EVALUATION CONSIDERATIONS

This column includes the factors that should be considered in order to evaluate and rank proposed Ten Year Plan projects. *Depending on data availability, some considerations may not be evaluated for all projects.*

POTENTIAL RESOURCES & DATA SOURCES

This column includes data and established resources for best practices that can be used to justify project rankings. *Not all sources of data will be available for each project. It is left to the discretion of each RPC as to which sources to consult.*

Note: project review criteria and associated scores are intended to inform the regional project prioritization process. RPCs may consider other factors, such as project costs and timelines, when deciding final regional priorities.

NH TEN YEAR PLAN: *Regional Project Review*

PROJECT SCORING PROCEDURES

A score shall be assigned for each criterion. Criteria scores should then be multiplied by criteria weights. The weighted criteria scores should then be summed to develop the final project score.

RPCs should make reasonable attempts to assign a defensible score to each project for each criterion. *Criteria shall not be skipped when scoring a project.* If a defensible score cannot be developed for a particular criterion due to data/information limitations, RPCs should 1) use their best judgement to assign a score; and 2) record any relevant data/information limitations.

If a criterion is irrelevant to the project, a score of 1 out of 10 should be assigned for that criterion.

EVALUATING PROJECT NEED & PROJECT IMPACT

There are two types of project evaluation criteria: 1) criteria that assess the need for a project; and 2) criteria that assess the impact of a project. For example, looking at the history of crashes at an intersection can help evaluate the need for a safety improvement project, while looking at Crash Modification Factors for the proposed improvements can help evaluate the impact that the project will have on safety.

The table below presents the project scoring scales for evaluating project need and project impact. Additionally, each criterion in this packet is labeled to indicate if it is evaluating need or impact.

PROJECT SCORING SCALES

SCORE	PROJECT <u>NEED</u>		PROJECT <u>IMPACT</u>		CRITERION RELEVANCY
10	There is a very high need for the project under this criterion.	OR	The proposed project would deliver a significant improvement under this criterion.	-	---
5	There is a moderate need for the project under this criterion.	OR	The proposed project would deliver a moderate improvement under this criterion.	-	---
1	There is minimal/no need for the project under this criterion.	OR	The proposed project would deliver minimal/no improvement under this criterion.	OR	The proposed project is not relevant to this criterion.
0	---	-	The proposed project would result in a negative impact under this criterion.	-	---



Definition: the degree to which a project supports economic development needs and opportunities at the 1) **local** and 2) **regional** level; and 3) the degree to which the project impacts the movement of goods (**freight**).

REGIONAL EVALUATION CONSIDERATIONS

POTENTIAL RESOURCES & DATA SOURCES

Local & Regional Economic Development **IMPACT**

- Does the project directly relate to a documented community revitalization or economic development effort?
- Does the project improve mobility and/or accessibility to and from a regional employment hub?
- Does the project improve mobility and/or accessibility to and from a regional tourism destination?
- Does the project support the implementation of a regional economic development plan?

Resources:

- Local, regional and statewide economic development plans and documents
- Transit system maps
- Bicycle network/route maps
- Sidewalk network maps
- Online isochrone tools
- Regional *Comprehensive Economic Development Strategies*
- Economic-related chapters and goals of *Regional Plans*

Freight Movement **IMPACT**

- Does the project implement a high priority freight improvement project as identified in the NH State Freight Plan or an adopted Regional Transportation Plan?
- Does the project improve a freight bottleneck location as identified in the NH State Freight Plan or an adopted Regional Transportation Plan?
- Would the project improve freight transportation on a Critical Urban Freight Corridor (CUFC) or Critical Rural Freight Corridor (CRFC) candidate location as identified in the NH State Freight Plan (or as previously recommended by a MPO/RPC for future inclusion in the NH State Freight Plan)?
- Would the project improve Truck Travel Time Reliability on the Interstate system or other National Highway Freight Network Route?

Resources:

- State Freight Plan
- Regional Long-Range Transportation Plans
- Critical Urban Freight Corridor (CUFC) Candidate Location List
- Critical Rural Freight Corridor (CRFC) Candidate Location List
- Truck Travel Time Reliability (TTTR) Index Data from the National Performance Management Research Data Set (NPMRDS)

Federal Performance Measures Addressed

Federal Highway Administration System Performance Measures: 1) truck time travel reliability on the Interstate System.

Definition: the degree to which 1) a project benefits traditionally-underserved populations (**equity & environmental justice**); and 2) ensures **accessibility** by all potential users.

REGIONAL EVALUATION CONSIDERATIONS

Equity & Environmental Justice

IMPACT

- Would the project provide transportation infrastructure benefits to an identified concentration area for minority population, low-income population, limited English proficiency population, disabled population, or other traditionally-underserved population group as identified in a local, regional, or statewide Title VI or Environmental Justice Program?
- Would the project expand transportation choices or enhance alternative modes of transportation in an identified concentration area for minority population, low-income population, limited English proficiency population, disabled population, or other traditionally-underserved population group?
- Does the project implement transportation-related recommendations resulting from a local, regional, or statewide Community Health Improvement Plan (CHIP) or other comprehensive public health analysis?
- What is the impact of the project on air quality? Are air quality impacts disproportionately affecting traditionally underserved populations?

Accessibility

IMPACT

- Does the project incorporate Universal Design considerations to ensure that all users, including those with mobility impairments, visual impairments, hearing impairments or other disabilities can fully access and utilize the facility?
- Does the project incorporate accessibility upgrades or remove barriers to access?
- Does the project improve coordination between transportation service providers or between modes of transportation to improve access to essential services, particularly for elderly and disabled populations?"

POTENTIAL RESOURCES & DATA SOURCES

Resources:

- Regional and Statewide Title VI and Environmental Justice Programs
- Community Health Improvement Programs
- Region-specific Demographic Analyses
- US 13 CFR Part 301.3 Economic Distress Criteria (<https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/CFR-2018-title13-vol1/xml/CFR-2018-title13-vol1-part301.xml#seqnum301.3>)
- Northern Border Regional Commission annual distress criteria reports
- CMAQ air quality analysis tools
- MPO regional emissions analyses
- RPC review of project scope

Resources:

- Conceptual Designs for Proposed Projects
- Local, Regional, or Statewide ADA Transition Plans
- Public Transit-Human Service Transportation Coordination Plans

Federal Performance Measures Addressed

Federal Highway Administration System Performance Measures: 1) on-road mobile source emissions reduction.

Definition: 1) an historical analysis of the mobility **need** and **performance** of a location for all modes, and 2) a forward-looking analysis of how **interventions** proposed as part of a project would improve the mobility performance for all modes.

REGIONAL EVALUATION CONSIDERATIONS

Mobility Need & Performance

NEED

Facility Purpose

- What is the federal functional classification of the project area (i.e., is high mobility an underlying function of the facility)?
- Is the facility a local, regional, or statewide connection?

Planning

- Are the mobility needs in the project area defined in a local, regional, or state plan?

Motor Vehicles

- For projects addressing mobility need for vehicle travel, what is the project area's performance relative to congestion or delay, and if available, what is person throughput for a defined time period?

Rail and Transit

- For projects addressing mobility need for rail and transit, what is transit's performance relative to congestion or delay, and if available, what is ridership for a defined time period (throughput)?

Bicycle and Pedestrian

- For projects addressing mobility need for bicycle and pedestrian travel, what is project area's performance relative to delay, and if available, what is traffic for defined time period (throughput)?

POTENTIAL RESOURCES & DATA SOURCES

Resources:

Functional Classification

- Federal Functional Classification (NHDOT GIS Roads Layer)
- FHWA Highway Functional Classification Guidance: https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/planning/processes/statewide/related/highway_functional_classification/section00.cfm

Planning

- Master Plans, Corridor Studies, Long Range Transportation Plans, MPO Congestion Management Process, etc.

Motor Vehicles

- Level of Travel Time Reliability (LOTRR) based on FHWA's National Performance Management Research Data Set (NPMRDS).
- Level of Service (LOS) related measures such as volume to capacity ratio, average travel speeds, average vehicle spacing, average delay at signal, field observation of traffic flow characteristics based on Highway Capacity Manual guidance.
- Throughput analyses based on local average vehicle occupancy data, regional model vehicle occupancy data or National Highway Travel Survey vehicle occupancy data multiplied by traffic data for defined time period.
- Regional and Statewide ITS architectures

Rail and Transit

- For projects addressing rail & transit mobility: Rail or transit operator report regarding on-time performance, ridership data, passenger surveys.

Bicycle and Pedestrian

- For projects addressing bicycle & pedestrian mobility: pedestrian/bicyclist intercept surveys, pedestrian signal timing data, pedestrian/bicyclist activity through project area for defined time period; bicyclist level of traffic stress.

Federal Performance Measures Addressed

Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) System Performance Measures: 1) reliable person-miles traveled on the Interstate System; 2) reliable person-miles traveled on the non-Interstate National Highway System.

Definition: 1) an historical analysis of the mobility **need** and **performance** of a location for all modes, and 2) a forward-looking analysis of how **interventions** proposed as part of a project would improve the mobility performance for all modes.

REGIONAL EVALUATION CONSIDERATIONS

Mobility Intervention

Motor Vehicles

IMPACT

- For projects addressing motor vehicle mobility, to what extent will the project provide congestion relief or mobility benefits?

Rail and Transit

- For projects addressing transit mobility, to what extent will the project impact a transit service's on time performance and/or improve transit user throughput (ie. the number of transit users moving through the project area in a given time period)?

Bicycle and Pedestrian

- For projects addressing bicycle or pedestrian mobility, to what extent will the project reduce bicyclist/pedestrian delay and/or improve bicyclist/pedestrian throughput (ie. the number of bicyclists/pedestrians moving through the project area in a given time period)?

Federal Performance Measures Addressed

Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) System Performance Measures: 1) reliable person-miles traveled on the Interstate System; 2) reliable person-miles traveled on the non-Interstate National Highway System.

POTENTIAL RESOURCES & DATA SOURCES

Resources:

RPC/MPO, NHDOT or independent evaluation of mobility interventions expressed in scope of work and project purpose. Including but not limited to the interventions listed below.

Motor Vehicles. Including but not limited to:

- *Intersection improvements:* signal optimization, roundabouts, addition of turning lanes, etc.
- *Road improvements:* HOV lanes, addition of breakdown lanes or shoulder widening, add lanes in merge areas, widen ramps, add exit lanes, ITS speed harmonization, ramp metering, etc.
- *Mode shift measures:* transit, park and ride lots, bike lanes, etc.
- *Capacity improvements:* adding lanes, access management measures [curb cut consolidation, left turn lanes, two way left turn lanes, medians, etc.]

Rail & Transit. Including but not limited to:

- Transit signal priority; dedicated transit lanes; improvement to sidewalk or bicycle connectivity to transit stops; transit stop improvements.

Bicycle and Pedestrian. Including but not limited to:

- *Bicycling interventions:*
 - ◆ New/improved bike lane
 - ◆ Widening of outside lane/shoulder
 - ◆ New off-street or parallel facility
 - ◆ Access management improvements (medians, elimination/consolidation of curb cuts)
 - ◆ Sight distance improvements
 - ◆ Intersection improvements for bicyclist
 - ◆ Improvements to speed differential between on street bicyclists and vehicles
 - ◆ Signage and road markings
- *Pedestrian interventions:*
 - ◆ New/improved sidewalk
 - ◆ New/improved off-street or parallel facility
 - ◆ Intersection improvements for pedestrians (new or improved crosswalks, medians/pedestrian refuges, new or improved pedestrian signals)
 - ◆ Access management (medians, limitation of curb cuts)
 - ◆ Removal of pedestrian conflicts (utility poles, etc.)
 - ◆ New or improved buffer between road and pedestrian facility (green buffer, on-street parking, trees, etc.)

Definition: 1) an analysis of the **natural hazard risks** (i.e. flood history) to a transportation facility, and; 2) a forward-looking analysis of how the **natural hazard mitigation** measures proposed as part of a project would reduce hazard risks.

REGIONAL EVALUATION CONSIDERATIONS

Natural Hazard Risk

NEED

Hazard Risk

- Are natural hazards in the project area documented in a plan, study, or database?
- Have natural hazards previously impacted transportation infrastructure and/or mobility in the project area? How frequently?
- Are natural hazard risks anticipated to increase in severity/impact (for example, due to anticipated impacts of climate change)?

Natural Hazard Mitigation

IMPACT

Hazard Mitigation - All Projects

To what extent does the project mitigate or adapt to known natural hazards in the project area? Does the project propose in-kind replacement of hazard-prone infrastructure?

- Mitigate (highest score): project eliminates or substantially reduces risk from known natural hazard (e.g., relocates infrastructure away from flood hazard area).
- Adapt (moderate score): project addresses known natural hazard but does not entirely mitigate risk (e.g., reinforces infrastructure in place).
- In-kind (lower score): project simply replaces hazard-prone with same/similar infrastructure (e.g., replace stream culvert with culvert of same dimensions).

Hazard Mitigation - Additional Stream Culvert & Bridge Project Considerations

- Is the project responsive to stream characteristics, such as flood propensity, slope, bankfull width, and orientation to roadway?

POTENTIAL RESOURCES & DATA SOURCES

Resources:

Hazard Risk

- Local plans: Hazard Mitigation Plans, Master Plans, Capital Improvement Plans, Emergency Operations Plans, etc.
- Regional plans: Regional Transportation Plan, Corridor Studies, River Corridor Management Plans, Watershed-Based Plans, Regional Plan, Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy, etc.
- Local and Regional Vulnerability Assessments
- Results of studies or assessments, such as geotechnical studies, fluvial geomorphology studies, SADES-based assessments, etc
- Hydraulic capacity modeling results/reports
- FEMA Flood Hazard Maps
- Regional studies on anticipated impacts of climate change on natural hazard risk

Resources:

Hazard Mitigation - All Projects

- RPC review of project scope
- Section 6.4 of FHWA's *HEC 17: Highways in the River Environment - Floodplains, Extreme Events, Risk, and Resilience, 2nd Edition* <https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/engineering/hydraulics/pubs/hif16018.pdf>
- Section 3.4 FHWA's *HEC 25: Highways in the Coastal Environment: Assessing Extreme Events: Volume 2 - 1st Edition* <https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/engineering/hydraulics/pubs/nhi14006/nhi14006.pdf>

Hazard Mitigation - Stream Culvert & Bridge Projects

- NH SADES stream crossing assessment data
- Hydraulic capacity modeling results/reports
- North Country Council *Stream Crossings for Flood Resiliency & Ecological Health*: http://www.nccouncil.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/08/NCC-Stream-Crossing-Guide_FINAL.pdf

Definition: the extent to which the project area is regionally-significant based on 1) **traffic volume**; and 2) the **importance of the facility** to the local and the regional transportation system.

REGIONAL EVALUATION CONSIDERATIONS

Traffic Volume

NEED

Vehicular volume

- What is the present-day traffic volume in or near the project area?
- How does the traffic volume in the project area compare to other traffic volumes in the region?
- Have traffic volumes increased, decreased, or stayed about the same over time?

Bicycle & pedestrian volume

- What is the measured or estimated present-day bicycle and pedestrian volume on or near the impacted facility?
- What is the relative demand for pedestrian and bicycle trips based on development density, presence/lack of current ped-bike facilities, etc.?

Facility Importance

NEED

Origins and Destinations

- Does the facility move people or goods between major locations/destinations?
- Is the project area proximate to key transportation facilities, such as airports or transit/intermodal facilities?

Network Centrality

- To what degree is the project area "central" to the local and regional transportation network?
- Would traffic increase on other areas of the transportation network if the project is not implemented (e.g., would more drivers use alternate routes)?

Alternate Routes

- What would be the increase in travel time if travelers were detoured around the project area?
- Is the proposed project located on a defined or obvious evacuation route?

POTENTIAL RESOURCES & DATA SOURCES

Resources:

Vehicular volume

- NHDOT Transportation Data Management System <https://nhdot.ms2soft.com/tcds/tsearch.asp?loc=nhdot>
- Regional Planning Commission traffic count databases

Bicycle & pedestrian volume

- Regional Planning Commission bicycle & pedestrian count databases
- Pedestrian & Bicycle Information Center; Counting & Estimating Volumes <http://www.pedbikeinfo.org/topics/countingestimating.cfm>
- Congestion Mitigation & Air Quality (CMAQ) analysis tools
- Strava data

Resources:

Origins and Destinations

- Local, regional and statewide transportation planning documents
- Priority pedestrian and bicycle transportation corridors identified in the *Statewide Pedestrian and Bicycle Transportation Plan*
- Transit system maps
- Bicycle network/route maps
- Sidewalk network maps
- Online isochrone tools

Network Centrality

- Regional Planning Commission transportation model (if available)
- RPC review of road networks
- GIS database with "Network Analyst" license/module

Alternate Routes

- Google Maps Travel Time calculator
- RPC travel time analysis (if available)
- Documentation of evacuation route designation or other connectivity-related metric in statewide, local or municipal plans

Definition: 1) a historical analysis of the **safety performance** (i.e. crash history) of a location over the past five (5) year period for all modes, and; 2) a forward-looking analysis of how the **countermeasures** proposed as part of a project would improve safety performance for all modes.

REGIONAL EVALUATION CONSIDERATIONS

Safety Performance

NEED

Crash data considerations (past 5 years):

- What is the number of passenger vehicle crashes at the location?
- What is the severity of passenger vehicle crashes at the location?
- What is the crash rate at the location?
- What is the number of non-motorized (pedestrian and bicycle) crashes at the location?
- What is the severity of non-motorized (pedestrian and bicycle) crashes at the location?
- What is the number of transit vehicle crashes at the location?
- What is the severity of transit vehicle crashes at the location?

Additional safety performance considerations:

- Was the location identified through local, regional, or statewide network screening?
- Was the location the subject of a previous Road Safety Audit due to crash history?
- Was the project referred to the TYP from the HSIP program due to scope/cost?
- Were improvements implemented over the past five-year period that have changed (or could change) the safety performance of the location?

POTENTIAL RESOURCES & DATA SOURCES

Resources:

Crash data

- State (NHDOS) Crash Database
- Fatality Analysis Reporting System (FARS) Database
- Crash Reports from Local Police Departments
- Crash Data from Local Transit Agencies

Additional safety considerations

- Network Screening Summaries from the NHDOT Bureau of Highway Design
- Completed and Pending Road Safety Audit (RSA) Reports
- HSIP Program Summaries from the NHDOT Bureau of Highway Design

Federal Performance Measures Addressed

Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Safety Performance Measures: 1) number of fatalities; 2) rate of fatalities; 3) number of serious injuries; 4) rate of serious injuries; 5) number of non-motorized fatalities and serious injuries.

Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Performance Measures: 1) number of reportable public transportation fatalities and public transportation fatality rate per total vehicle revenue miles by mode; 2) number of reportable public transportation injuries and public transportation injury rate per total vehicle revenue miles by mode; 3) number of reportable public transportation events and public transportation event rate per total vehicle revenue miles by mode; 4) mean distance between major public transportation mechanical failures by mode.

Definition: 1) a historical analysis of the **safety performance** (i.e. crash history) of a location over the past five (5) year period for all modes, and; 2) a forward-looking analysis of how the **countermeasures** proposed as part of a project would improve safety performance for all modes.

REGIONAL EVALUATION CONSIDERATIONS

Safety Measures

IMPACT

Highway and Bridge Safety Measures:

- How significant/effective are the Crash Modification Factors (CMFs) for key project design elements?
- Has a Benefit-Cost analysis been developed as part of a Road Safety Audit or other special study? If so, how compelling is the Benefit-Cost ratio?
- Are Proven Safety Countermeasures (as sanctioned by the FHWA Office of Safety) included in the project's design?

Rail & Transit Safety Measures:

- Does the project involve safety improvements to an existing at-grade Railway-Highway crossing?
- Does the project eliminate an existing at-grade Railway-Highway crossing?
- Does the project implement improvements identified in a local or statewide Public Transit Agency Safety Plan (PTASP)?

Pedestrian Safety Measures:

- Are Safe Transportation for Every Pedestrian (STEP) countermeasures (as sanctioned by the FHWA Office of Safety) included in the project's design?
- How significant/effective are the pedestrian-related Crash Modification Factors (CMFs) for key project design elements?

Bicycle Safety Measures

- Would the project improve Bicycle Level of Traffic Stress (LTS) from a Level 3 or 4 to at least Level 2?
- How significant/effective are the bicycle-related Crash Modification Factors (CMFs) for key project design elements?

POTENTIAL RESOURCES & DATA SOURCES

Resources:

Highway and Bridge Safety Measures:

- Crash Modification Factor Clearinghouse (www.cmfclearinghouse.org/)
- AASHTO Highway Safety Manual (www.highwaysafetymanual.org/)
- Completed or pending Road Safety Audits
- FHWA Proven Safety Countermeasures (www.safety.fhwa.dot.gov/provencountermeasures/)

Rail & Transit Safety Measures:

- NHDOT Bureau of Highway Design Railway-Highway Crossing Improvement Priorities
- Local or Statewide Public Transit Agency Safety Plans (PTASPs)

Pedestrian Safety Measures:

- FHWA Safe Transportation for Every Pedestrian (STEP) Countermeasures (https://safety.fhwa.dot.gov/ped_bike/step/resources/)
- Crash Modification Factor Clearinghouse (www.cmfclearinghouse.org/)

Bicycle Safety Measures

- Bicycle LTS Model Data (as developed by MPOs or as developed for rural areas in the NH Statewide Pedestrian and Bicycle Transportation Plan).
- Crash Modification Factor Clearinghouse (www.cmfclearinghouse.org/)

Federal Performance Measures Addressed

Federal Highway Administration Safety Measures: 1) number of fatalities; 2) rate of fatalities; 3) number of serious injuries; 4) rate of serious injuries; 5) number of non-motorized fatalities & serious injuries.

Federal Transit Administration Safety Measures: 1) number of reportable public transportation fatalities and public transportation fatality rate per total vehicle revenue miles by mode; 2) number of reportable public transportation injuries and public transportation injury rate per total vehicle revenue miles by mode; 3) number of reportable public transportation events and public transportation event rate per total vehicle revenue miles by mode; 4) mean distance between major public transportation mechanical failures by mode.

Definition: 1) the degree to which the project improves infrastructure condition in the project area (**state of repair**); and 2) the degree to which the project impacts NHDOT and/or municipal **maintenance**.

REGIONAL EVALUATION CONSIDERATIONS

POTENTIAL RESOURCES & DATA SOURCES

State of Repair

NEED

- What is the condition of the infrastructure that is being addressed? For roadways, this includes pavement, sub-base, and base materials.
- Does the project address the underlying causes of current infrastructure conditions?

Resources:

- NHDOT Pavement Condition Index (if current)
- SADES assessment data
- Geotechnical studies/reports
- Information requests from NHDOT offices: District Engineers, Bridge Maintenance Bureau, etc
- *NHDOT Transportation Asset Management Plan*

Maintenance Considerations

IMPACT

- Does the project address an infrastructure issue that currently requires increased maintenance activity/costs due to poor or dangerous infrastructure conditions?
- Does the project propose significant new/expanded transportation assets that will add significant new/additional maintenance liabilities for NHDOT (e.g., new roadway/bridge construction)?
- Are there buried utilities (water, sewer, drainage) in the project area? If so, are any needed upgrades/maintenance incorporated into the overall project scope? *Note: buried utility improvements are typically not Ten Year Plan-eligible (funded locally).*

Resources:

- NHDOT Pavement Condition Index (if current)
- SADES assessment data
- Geotechnical studies/reports
- Information requests from NHDOT offices: District Engineers, Bridge Maintenance Bureau, etc.
- Narrative from applicant
- Utility capacity/condition studies
- Capital Improvements Plans

Federal Performance Measures Addressed

Federal Highway Administration State of Repair Measures: 1) percentage of pavement on the Interstate System in good condition; 2) percentage of pavement on the Interstate System in poor condition; 3) percentage of pavement on the non-Interstate National Highway System (NHS) in good condition; 4) percentage of pavement on the non-Interstate National Highway System (NHS) in poor condition; 5) percentage of bridges on the National Highway System (NHS) in good condition; 6) percentage of bridges on the National Highway System (NHS) in poor condition.

Federal Transit Administration Transit Asset Management Measures: 1) percentage of rolling stock revenue vehicles meeting or exceeding their useful life benchmark; 2) percentage of non-revenue service vehicles meeting or exceeding their useful life benchmark; 3) percentage of facilities rated below 3.0 on the Transit Economic Requirements Model (TERM) scale; 4) percentage of track segments with performance restrictions.

Definition: the degree of **support** for the project at the local, regional, and statewide level.

REGIONAL EVALUATION CONSIDERATIONS

Support

NEED

Local Support

- Does the project support goal(s) of locally-adopted plan? Higher scores given to projects that are specifically defined in plans, and/or address specific plan goals/needs/issues.

Regional Support

- Does the project support goal(s) of a regional plan? Higher scores given to projects that are specifically defined in plans, or address specific plan goals/needs/issues.

Statewide Support

- Does the project support goal(s) of a statewide plan? Higher scores given to projects that are specifically defined in plans, or address specific plan goals/needs/issues.

Emergent Needs

- Does the project address an emergent need(s) (*identified after the previous TYP project solicitation*) that could have significant regional impacts if not addressed?

Public Involvement

- Has there been recent public discussion or input opportunities regarding this project?
- Do recent public input/discussions show support for the project?

POTENTIAL RESOURCES & DATA SOURCES

Resources:

Local Support

- Master Plan
- Capital Improvements Plan
- Hazard Mitigation Plan
- Other local plan (Bike-Ped Plan, Sub-Area Plan, etc)
- NHDOT Road Safety Audit reports

Regional Support

- Long Range Transportation Plan/Regional Transportation Plan
- Corridor Study
- Coordinated Public Transit and Human Services Transportation Plan
- Regional Plan
- Scenic Byway Corridor Management Plan
- Transit Operations Plan
- River Corridor Management Plan
- MPO Congestion Management Process Plans

Statewide Support

- *Statewide Long-Range Transportation Plan*
- *Statewide Strategic Transit Assessment*
- *Statewide Pedestrian and Bicycle Transportation Plan*
- *Strategic Highway Safety Plan*
- *Statewide Freight Plan*
- *Statewide Rail Trail Plan*
- *NHDOT Transportation Asset Management Plan*

Emergent Needs

Emergent issue/need is documented by one or more of the following:

- Letter from NHDOT District Engineer
- Letters from municipal boards or committees
- Letters from subject-area experts
- Results of studies and assessments

Public Involvement

- Minutes and meeting summaries from local board meetings and/or community outreach events
- Other documentation of public involvement