

BARRINGTON  
BROOKFIELD  
DOVER  
DURHAM  
FARMINGTON  
LEE  
MADBURY  
MIDDLETON  
MILTON



NEW DURHAM  
NEWMARKET  
NORTHWOOD  
NOTTINGHAM  
ROCHESTER  
ROLLINSFORD  
SOMERSWORTH  
STRAFFORD  
WAKEFIELD

## Strafford Metropolitan Planning Organization Technical Advisory Committee Meeting

**Friday, April 5<sup>th</sup> 2019      9:00 – 10:30 AM**

Strafford Regional Planning Commission  
150 Wakefield Street, Suite 12, Conference Room 1A  
Rochester, NH

### AGENDA

- 1. Introductions**
- 2. Staff Communications**
- 3. Action Item(s)**
  - 3.1. Minutes from March 1st 2019
  - 3.2. Ten Year Plan candidate project scoring results
- 4. Other Business**
- 5. 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
- 6. Adjournment**

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

## Rules of Procedure

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

### **Meeting Etiquette**

Be present at the scheduled start of the meeting.

Be respectful of the views of others.

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

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

Do not engage in cross talk.

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

Active participation is encouraged from all members.

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

When speaking, individuals should be brief and concise.

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

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

**Strafford Metropolitan Planning Organization  
Technical Advisory Committee Meeting  
150 Wakefield Street, Suite 12, Conference Room 1A  
Rochester, NH 03867**

**Meeting Minutes**

**Friday, March 1, 2019  
9 – 11 a.m.**

**1. Introductions**

Committee Members Present:

Michael Hoffman (Newmarket), Michael Williams (COAST), Dianne Smith (Brookfield), Glenn Davison (NHDOT), Jon Hotchkiss (Middleton), Beverly Cray (UNH Wildcat), Elizabeth Strachan (NHDES), Kelley Collins (Wakefield), Scott Kinmond (New Durham), Bruce Woodruff (Milton), Gretchen Young (Dover), Chris Parker (Dover), Shanna Saunders (Somersworth)

Guests/Public Present: Stephanie Verdile (Office of Strategic Initiatives), Erica Wygonik (Alta Planning), Anne Rugg (COAST)

Staff: Jennifer Czysz, Colin Lentz

**2. Staff Communications**

C. Lentz noted that Ken Mayo had resigned his position as SRPC's editor for a new job. He said SRPC and other RPCs would miss Ken's editorial skills but wished him well.

**3. Action Item(s)**

**a. Appointment of Interim Vice Chair**

M. Williams noted that it had been realized that the committee currently had a Vice Chair so the item was not necessary.

**b. Minutes from February 1<sup>st</sup> 2019 [VOTE]**

S. Kinmond made a motion to accept the minutes as written

Seconded by G. Young

Vote: unanimous in favor with B. Woodruff abstaining

**4. Discussion Items**

**a. 2020-2021 Unified Planning Work Program**

C. Lentz provided an overview of the draft Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) that had been submitted to NHDOT and FHWA for review. C. Lentz explained that the overall structure of the two-year work program had not changed, but some tasks were refined to be more specific. For instance, separate performance-based planning tasks were integrated into the Metro Plan and TIP worktasks since performance measures were central to those documents. He noted that some documents (such as the regional housing needs assessment) were due for

an update so additional hours were dedicated to them, while others (such as the Public Participation Plan) had recently been updated and required less time in the upcoming program. The UPWP also included some newly anticipated efforts such as review of local parking regulations. G. Young noted that parking regulation review would be timely related to local stormwater planning and MS4 [municipal separate storm sewer system] management in cities. G. Davison said NHDOT was planning to have UPWP comments back to the RPCs by the end of March.

#### **b. Ten Year Plan project scoring take-home sheet**

C. Lentz reminded members that the prospective Ten Year Plan (TYP) projects needed to be scored by TAC members in preparation for final ranking and approval. He noted that he and Jen would be meeting with NHDOT staff to review refined project scopes and cost estimates that had been developed by NHDOT engineering staff. He displayed the worksheet he had developed for TAC members to use for scoring the priority projects for TYP submission. C. Lentz explained the various criteria and demonstrated how to use the sheet to score projects. He noted that some of the criteria were pre-filled and did not require input from TAC members (such as traffic volumes).

B. Woodruff asked for clarification about the safety performance criterion. He said there are projects that are needed that would not be covered by the current criteria. C. Lentz agreed but noted that the scoring process needed to consider a wide range of projects across the region.

G. Davison clarified that the “safety performance” criterion looked at crash history, while the “safety measures” looked at what was specifically proposed in the project scope to improve safety (e.g. traffic signal or bike lanes).

J. Cysz noted that all nine RPCs were using the same project scoring methodology, but each region weighted the criteria based on regional priorities.

C. Lentz requested that TAC members score the projects and send him their results by March 29<sup>th</sup>.

#### **c. New Hampshire Statewide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan: Presentation from Alta Planning**

Erica Wygonik provided an overview presentation of the NH Statewide Bicycle & Pedestrian Plan that was currently under development. She presented overall goals and objectives, the plan development process, and several maps containing analysis of bicycle and pedestrian routes and sites. She noted that the statewide effort would take about a year.

E. Wygonik said the plan development process will include an extensive public engagement process includes meetings with all RPC TAC committees (or equivalent committee), six community meetings, and a website with an online survey and an interactive map. The map allows people to identify areas that are safety issues for bicycles and pedestrians, or places that are important destinations. The website also contains information for individuals to hold local meetings or workshops themselves: “Meeting in a Box”. This process would best be facilitated by an RPC.

E. Wygonik explained that the assessment process divided NH into six regions (the Strafford and Rockingham MPOs being treated as one region). Data analysis will include:

- Inventory of existing sidewalks, rail trails, paths, shoulder widths, and routes
- Strava Data [primarily recreational ride data]
- RPC and municipal bike/ped plans
- Other existing programs (such as CommuteSmart programs)

The plan will include several final products:

- analysis of bike/ped related policies and the NHDOT project development process.
- A statewide level of stress analysis
- Network improvement recommendations
- Project recommendations and prioritization
- Analysis of economic impacts of bike/ped improvements

C. Lentz noted that the four MPOs and Central NH Planning Commission were currently working on a joint level of stress analysis and modeling effort that would be coordinated with the statewide planning process.

E. Wygonik said a draft of the plan would be available in late October/early November. She asked for feedback on the goals and objectives, and the maps.

C. Lentz pointed out that the maps seemed to show shoulder access on major highways like I95 and the Spaulding Turnpike, where bicycles and pedestrians were prohibited.

D. Smith asked for clarification about what constituted a “gap” on the maps. E. Wygonik explained that the initial data analysis for the plan focused on identifying key destinations that would be hard to reach by a cyclist or pedestrian because of a lack of safe bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure. She stressed the value of people using the interactive map to identify gaps and important destinations that they wanted the planning effort to focus on.

E. Strachan noted that NH125 was not highlighted on the map but was a great north-south route for cyclists between Rochester and Epping.

M. Hoffman said he felt it was unsafe for cyclists to be on a state route without a separated bike lane. He asked if the plan was considering the electric scooters that were becoming more common. E. Wygonik said the plan currently focused on unpowered [human-powered] modes but recognized the growing role of e-bikes and similar vehicles.

S. Verdile that the shoulder width data from NHDOT were inaccurate. E. Wygonik acknowledged that it was very difficult to get accurate data on shoulder widths across the state.

G. Davison suggested that the plan development process should consider state and municipal bike/ped or complete streets policies. The RPCs promote local policies that compliment state policy.

C. Parker said that the current vision in the draft plan needs to be more succinct. Other members agreed that the vision was too long. J. Czysz asked what the process was for developing the vision, goals, and objectives. She wondered how much the public had been involved in the development of those plan elements – it seemed that the vision and goals had been developed by Alta. E. Wygonik said they hadn’t wanted to have an unstructured conversation with the public about the development of a vision and goals. The vision and goals

had been reviewed by an advisory committee, and they were open to input and adjustment, but needed to be finalized in order to move the project forward.

M. Williams said it was good to see that the plan highlighted the important link between bicycle and pedestrian trips and public transit. E. Wygonik thanked the committee for its input and said the Alta team could be contacted with any additional input. C. Lentz said committee members could contact him and he would send comments to E. Wygonik and the rest of the Alta team.

## **5. Project Updates**

C. Lentz noted that SRPC and the other partners had begun the interregional level of traffic stress analysis and modeling project.

## **6. Other Business**

C. Parker noted an upcoming meeting for the Dover-Rochester-Somersworth 108 complete streets project on March 18<sup>th</sup> at 7:00pm. C. Lentz noted that the three cities and SRPC had not heard anything about the meeting until a week before. S. Saunders said Somersworth staff had requested a second meeting because all city staff needed to be at a City Council meeting during the scheduled 108 project meeting. M. Williams noted that the meeting location was also not accessible on public transit during the meeting time.

- 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.

No citizens brought items forward to the committee.

## **8. Adjournment**

J. Hotchkiss made a motion to adjourn  
Seconded by K. Collins

The meeting was adjourned at 10:40