

## **Strafford Metropolitan Planning Organization Technical Advisory Committee Meeting**

**Friday, March 7<sup>th</sup> 2020      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. Review and approve draft minutes from December 6<sup>th</sup> 2019

**4. Discussion Items**

4.1. 2020 Highway Safety Performance Targets – regional and statewide trends and how they can inform planning

4.2. Metro Plan Projects & Scoring – Preparing for the next Ten Year Plan: preliminary discussion of methods, process, and projects

**5. Project Updates**

5.1. Legislative outreach – what we've been working on; hearings we've attended, and upcoming opportunities

**6. Other Business**

**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](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, December 6<sup>th</sup> 2019  
9 – 11 a.m.**

The meeting began at 9:05am

**1. Introductions**

Members: Gretchen Young (Dover), Michael Williams (COAST), Linda Dusenbury (NH DOT), Kelley Collins (Wakefield), Elizabeth Strachan (NHDES), Arthur Capello (Farmington), Jim Campbell (Rochester), Jon Hotchkiss (Middleton)

Staff: Colin Lentz

**2. Staff Communications**

**3. Action Item(s)**

**3.1. Minutes from November 1<sup>st</sup> 2019**

K. Collins made a motion to accept the minutes as written

Seconded by E. Strachan

Vote: Unanimous in favor (A. Capello abstained)

**3.2. Adopt draft TAC mission and goals**

C. Lentz reviewed a mission statement and goals that he had drafted and had been reviewed during the previous meeting. He noted that it was his goal to do more technical work directly with the committee rather than just having them review work staff does in the office.

K. Collins made a motion to adopt the draft TAC mission and goals.

Seconded by Arthur Capello

Vote: all in favor.

**4. Discussion Items**

**4.1. Review demographic data for the Metro Plan**

C. Lentz reviewed a draft set of maps he had provided prior to the meeting. The maps showed demographic information across the region. He said he wanted to make sure the maps showed what was needed to show where people were living throughout the region so the right questions could be asked in the Metro Plan. The maps would help the Policy committee start developing goals and objectives, so C. Lentz said he wanted to make sure they were accurate from the perspective of municipal staff. They showed demographics at the town level and the census block group level: total population, households below the poverty level, percentage of households that are "families" (as defined by the census), median and per-capita household income, the concentration seniors (65+) and 18 years or younger, and minority populations.

C. Lentz noted that data for the town of Durham will need some additional analysis and disclaimers since the high concentration of college students skews information (for instance, the student population shows up as people “below the poverty level” because of their lack of income). C. Lentz said the maps were based on 2010 Census data and he had avoided mixing data from American Community Survey because of its higher error rate. K. Collins asked how income level information is helpful once a household is above the poverty line (what’s the difference between a family that makes \$90,000 per year where two people drive and a family that makes \$120,000 and two people drive). C. Lentz said it was a good question; information about the types of households throughout the region and the trends in census data could be used in the Metro Plan to forecast what types of transportation improvements would be most appropriate. M. Williams asked if the census included the number of cars per household. C. Lentz said it did. He added that other SRPC staff were looking deeper into specific household types and demographics such as seniors.

C. Lentz said he would be working with SRPC staff to use the travel demand model to pair population data with projections on where people were driving daily. The population and travel information together are foundational to the Metro Plan and other regional plans.

#### **4.2. Universal transportation project development form**

Does this provide a good starting point for communities developing transportation projects?

C. Lentz provided a draft form for developing transportation projects. His goal was to improve the process for working with municipalities and other applicants to develop potential transportation projects and pair them with various funding sources (ten year plan, transportation alternatives, etc.). The draft form he presented was designed to compile overarching information about a potential project; separate forms and analysis would be needed to identify more specific information to refine the project. It included:

- Project title, location, scope, and need
- Nearby projects to be considered
- Target completion timeframe
- Project focus
- Level of local support for the project
- Additional project factors
- Contact information
- Other relevant information

C. Lentz wanted to confirm with municipal staff that the information on the form was readily available to them and that it would help form accurate project proposals.

M. Williams asked that “on an existing transit route” be added as an option for additional project factor. Other members pointed out a couple of typo and formatting issues.

C. Lentz said he would be reaching out to municipal staff to identify local project priorities to developed and refined for future funding opportunities.

## **5. Project Updates**

### **5.1. January regional workshop**

C. Lentz reminded committee members that there would not be an official TAC meeting in January. Instead SRPC would be holding a regional workshop focused on the link between transportation, housing, and economic development. The reason for this being that SRPC would be updating the Metro Plan, Regional Housing Needs Assessment, and Regional Economic Development Strategy so it made more sense to have one workshop for three plans rather than three separate workshops or other outreach efforts. The workshop was scheduled for Friday January 10<sup>th</sup> from 9:00 to 12:00 at the Strafford Community Action Partnership office in Dover. C. Lentz said he hoped TAC members could all participate along with other technical staff from municipalities and agencies who had been invited.

### **5.2. Ten Year Plan update**

C. Lentz said the Governor's Advisory Commission on Intermodal Transportation (GACIT) had approved a draft of the Ten Year Plan and submitted it to the Governor's office for his review. The Governor has until January 15<sup>th</sup> to review and submit his draft to the legislature. C. Lentz noted that the draft plan included a proposal to flex 25% of CMAQ program funds to FTA to support public transit.

C. Lentz added that the rescission provision in the federal transportation authorization (the FAST Act) had been repealed by Congress. The rescission would have required large amounts of federal funding to be sent back by every state based on a complex formula.

## **6. Other Business**

C. Lentz noted that he and Rachel Dewey would be attending a regional peer-sharing workshop in D.C the next week.

E. Strachan announced that the state Office of Strategic Initiatives (OSI) in partnership with NHDES had released a request for proposals for installation of new direct-current fast-chargers for electric vehicles along several major corridors throughout the state. The due date is January 24<sup>th</sup>. Installed chargers must be universally accessible to various electric vehicles. Detailed information is on the OSI website.

C. Lentz provided a quick preview of traffic analysis capability SRPC had gained through a cooperative purchase of data and tools from the National Performance Management Research Data Set (NPMRDS). The data set generates traffic data on highways across the country based on the movements of cell phones in vehicles. Location information is derived from phones with their Bluetooth activated as they travel along the highway. No personal information is collected or tracked, but the Bluetooth data are aggregated to allow users to analyze traffic on individual highways (including speed, volumes, congestion and other information) and show the difference between car and truck traffic. The NPMRDS dataset shows data for several highways in the Strafford region: NH16, NH202/US4, NH125, NH108, NH11, NH9. C. Lentz said this information and analysis power would be used for future regional planning and corridor analysis.

G. Young noted that Dover had just purchased two mobile units that sensed and collected the same Bluetooth data that the city could use to collect traffic data.

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 comments before the committee.

**8. Adjournment**

M. Williams made a motion to adjourn. Seconded by A. Capello

The meeting was adjourned at 10:10am

Minutes approved by

Print \_\_\_\_\_

Signed \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

2021-2030 NH Ten Year Plan Project Ranking Criteria		
Criteria Name	Description	Performance Targets
<b>Mobility</b>	<b>Definition:</b> Mobility is the potential to get from one place to another and is generally evaluated based on the numbers of trips, travel speeds, and total travel distance and time. Accessibility is the ability of people to reach desired employment, goods, services, and other destinations.	<b>Travel Time Reliability/ Peak Hour Travel Delay/Non-SOV travel(CMAQ)</b>
<b>Reduce Congestion</b>	<b>Definition:</b> The extent to which the project is intended to impact traveler delay upon completion.	
<b>Freight Mobility</b>	<b>Definition:</b> The degree to which the project impacts movement of goods.	
<b>Alternative Modes</b>	<b>Definition:</b> The extent to which the project impacts accommodations for alternative modes of travel including bicycle, pedestrian and transit, where so desired.	<b>Non-SOV travel(CMAQ)/Safety</b>
<b>Network Significance</b>	<b>Definition:</b> The extent to which the project is important to network connectivity based on current traffic volume, Tiers, functional system, and importance to the regional system, and availability of alternative routes.	
<b>Traffic Volume</b>	<b>Definition:</b> A measure of motor vehicle volume based on the NHDOT traffic data management system (eg. Average Annual Daily Traffic AADT).	
<b>Facility Importance</b>	<b>Definition:</b> The extent to which the facility moves people and goods between major locations. Considerations, Tiers	
<b>Safety</b>	<b>Definition:</b> The degree to which a project impacts traveler safety in relation to safety performance and the project's safety measures.	<b>Safety</b>
<b>Safety Measures</b>	<b>Definition:</b> The degree to which the scope of the project focuses on measures that increase safety (proposed improvements). Examples of safety measures include:- Improved guardrail, barrier, rumble strips, signing, striping- Improved sight distance, signalization, roundabouts- Protective measures for bicyclists and pedestrian Natural hazard mitigation measures..	
<b>Safety Performance</b>	<b>Definition:</b> A composite measure of 5-year average safety performance (e.g., History of crash rate, crash severity, etc.)	
<b>State of Repair</b>	<b>Definition:</b> The extent to which the project impacts the service life of the asset and the extent to which the project is required based on current asset condition.	<b>Pavement &amp; Bridge Conditions</b>
<b>Roadway Surface Life</b>	<b>Definition:</b> This criterion has two components reflecting the different approach to the management of roadways and bridges based around the facility condition and tier: Roadway Service Life: The extent to which the project impacts asset condition/service life of the facility (generally measured in years). For existing roadway facilities the measure applies to service life or asset condition. For new roadway facilities it applies to the total expected service life. "Keep Good Roads Good".	
<b>Bridge Asset Condition</b>	<b>Definition:</b> This criterion has two components reflecting the different approach to the management of roadways and bridges based around the facility condition:Bridge Asset Condition: The degree to which the project's assets require work based on existing asset conditions, as determined by management system ratings including Pontus (bridges), etc. Fix the "Worst First"	
<b>Support</b>	<b>Definition:</b> The degree to which a project has support by the RPC or Local, and feasibility of construction.	
<b>Resiliency</b>	<b>Definition:</b> Will the proposed project help address natural hazard mitigation measures?	

# Current Ten Year Plan Criteria Weighting

Mobility	16.4%	Reduce Congestion	11.3%
		Freight Mobility	5.1%
Alternative Modes	14.7%		14.7%
Network Significance	14.7%	Traffic Volume	8.6%
		Facility Importance	6.0%
Safety	19.4%	Safety Measures	9.7%
		Safety Performance	9.7%
State of Repair	15.0%	Roadway Surface Life	6.7%
		Bridge Asset Condition	8.3%
Support	10.1%		10.1%
Resilience	9.8%		9.8%
	100.0%		100.0%

