METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
theRPC.org

156 Water Street | Exeter, NH 03833
603-778-0885 | www.theRPC.org

RPC Transportation Advisory Committee
April 25, 2024
12:00-2:00 PM

RPC Offices
156 Water Street, Exeter, NH

Location: https://goo.gl/maps/X9AvHrcfy2SivYDx7
There is an elevator available via the Center Street entrance.

Virtual Participation via Zoom
https://us02web.zoom.us/j/87679618928?pwd=YjNqT3NBak82dm4rWldYRzBka2tjdz09
The full zoom invitation is on page 2

Agenda

1. Introductions
2. Minutes of 3/28/2024 Meeting (**Attachment #1**) — ***[Motion Required]*** (5 minutes)
3. COAST Update – Rad Nichols, COAST (30 Minutes)
4. Regional Master Plan – Transportation Related Feedback from March Commission Meeting – Mikayla Jerominek (15 Minutes)
5. LRTP Survey Update – Mikayla Jerominek (5 Minutes)
6. 2025 Project Selection Criteria Review (**Attachment #2**) – Dave Walker (45 minutes)
7. Agency and Community announcements and updates (20 minutes)
8. Open discussion/Comments

TAC MEETING SCHEDULE For 2024 (Next meeting highlighted)

~~January 25~~	~~April 25~~	July 25	October 24
~~February 22~~	**May 23**	August 22	December 5***
~~March 28~~	June 27	September 26	

***Off Schedule

Rockingham Planning is inviting you to a scheduled Zoom meeting.

Topic: Transportation Advisory Committee Meeting
Time: Jan 25, 2024 12:00 PM Eastern Time (US and Canada)
Every month on the Fourth Thu, 10 occurrence(s)
Jan 25, 2024 12:00 PM
Feb 22, 2024 12:00 PM
Mar 28, 2024 12:00 PM
Apr 25, 2024 12:00 PM
May 23, 2024 12:00 PM
Jun 27, 2024 12:00 PM
Jul 25, 2024 12:00 PM
Aug 22, 2024 12:00 PM
Sep 26, 2024 12:00 PM
Oct 24, 2024 12:00 PM

Please download and import the following iCalendar (.ics) files to your calendar system.
Monthly: https://us02web.zoom.us/meeting/tZMrcOCurzMjGNzkdtvdDW_Aiq-ZUY5fL_yD/ics?icsToken=98tyKuGvqDwjHNWduRuPRpwEBI_CXe7zmFxEjY1HlxvxFSR3VTzXP_MPCIdGRd78

Join Zoom Meeting
https://us02web.zoom.us/j/87679618928?pwd=YjNqT3NBak82dm4rWldYRzBka2tjdz09

Meeting ID: 876 7961 8928
Passcode: 925821

One tap mobile
+16469313860,,87679618928#,,,,*925821# US
+19292056099,,87679618928#,,,,*925821# US (New York)

Dial by your location
• +1 646 931 3860 US
• +1 929 205 6099 US (New York)
• +1 301 715 8592 US (Washington DC)

Meeting ID: 876 7961 8928
Passcode: 925821

Find your local number: https://us02web.zoom.us/u/kbayLFkjSk

ROCKINGHAM PLANNING COMMISSION
theRPC.org

156 Water Street | Exeter, NH 03833
email@theRPC.org | 603-778-0885

MINUTES
Rockingham Planning Commission
MPO Technical Advisory Committee
RPC Offices, 156 Water Street, Exeter NH
March 28, 2024

Members Present: S. Kizza (Brentwood); A. Nolan (Epping); D. Sharples (Exeter); B. Dion (Greenland); J. Lavacchia (Hampstead); P. Coffin (Kingston); C. Cross (Newington); T. Moore (Plaistow); D. Seiglie (Rye); E. Eby (Portsmouth); R. Nichols (COAST); V. Partington, (NHDES); L. St. John (NHDOT); S. Pesci (UNH); L. Levine (FHWA).

Guests: K. Lucy (NHDES Coastal Program); K. Asadifakhr (UNH Dept. of Civil & Environmental Engineering)

Staff: D. Walker (Assistant Director); S. Bogle (Senior Transportation Planner)

1. **Introductions**
   Roll call attendance was taken. Walker indicated that the chair was not attending and that he would run the meeting.

2. **Minutes of 2/22/2024 Meetings**
   Minutes of the meetings were approved without discussion. ***Motion: P. Coffin; Seconded by B. Dion. Unanimous with L. St. John, D. Sieglie, and V. Partington abstaining***.

3. **NH Stream Crossing Initiative – K. Lucy and K. Asadifakhr**
   Lucy provided an overview of the NH Stream Crossing Initiative which is looking at prioritizing replacement of culverts in New Hampshire. Data collection has been taking place over many years and a nearly complete inventory is now available and those culverts that are older or undersized have been identified and assessed. The next step is to prioritize those stream crossings that need to be repaired or replaced with the goal of achieving optimal ecological, economic, and societal outcomes and Asadifakhr discussed that process. The project team is undertaking a survey to better understand how to best prioritize needs. The process that they will be using is a hybrid of methods used by other agencies and fits NH needs. The proposed scoring methodology was detailed and each site will be scored and rank for both environmental and transportation factors. Optimal sites will have both environmental and transportation scores that are high and the optimal combination of locations will be selected to maximize benefits, minimize costs. Locations will be prioritized based on watersheds. Stakeholder engagement includes surveys, workshops, and other interactions. Discussion included impacts of road closures on transit, environmental impacts, how municipalities might be best involved, and ensuring that impacts of these projects aren't disproportionately on disadvantaged communities. The team requested any information that TAC members might have regarding data sources, organizations and others that should be involved, challenges that communities are facing, and what tools/data/resources communities might need to facilitate replacement.

4. **TIP Amendment #5 – D. Walker**
   Walker provided an overview of the TIP amendment process and the projects included in Amendment #5. The amendment includes 3 projects and will be utilizing a 10-day comment period that will begin March 29. The Amendment will be considered for approval by the MPO Policy Committee at the April 10, 2024 meeting. The amendment proposes funding/timing changes to three projects. Walker briefly covered the details of each project change. There was a short discussion related to the delays to Exeter 40623 which Walker will follow up with NHDOT regarding. Fiscal constraint is maintained and air quality conformity is addressed according to current requirements. Walker recommended that the TAC endorse the changes in Amendment #5 and recommend approval to the MPO Policy Committee. A few questions were posed about the projects and programs. ***Motion P. Coffin; Seconded by B. Dion. Unanimous approval.***

5. **2025 Project Solicitation and Selection Process – D. Walker**
   Walker continued discussion of the project solicitation and selection process for the Long Range Transportation Plan and the next iteration of the State Ten Year Plan from the previous meeting. He reviewed the anticipated timeline, the process for communities to submit projects, an overview of the project selection criteria, and the need to have projects undergo a scope and cost estimate from an engineer. He covered the planned request for projects that will begin April 2 with projects due in early June, 2024. The submission process was covered as was the initial evaluation process. TAC considered options for setting the criteria weights. Discussion will continue next month with an in-depth look at the project selection criteria and starting the criteria weighting process.

6. **Regional Master Plan – Transportation Related Feedback from March RPC meeting – M. Jerominek**
   This item was tabled until the next meeting.

7. **MPO Safety Action Plan Development – D. Walker**
   Walker provided a short update on the development of Safety Action Plans (SAP) for the four New Hampshire MPOs. He covered the purpose of the SAP, the approach used, the components of the document, the public involvement process

8. **Agency Updates and Announcements – Multiple TAC Members**
   NHDOT is running a comment period on their public involvement process from April 1 to May 15, 2024. A notice was sent to Executive Directors and will be shared with TAC. NHDES is working on a Deisel Emissions Reduction Act RFP to go out in April.

9. **Project Updates**
   A project updates memo was provided to TAC members. Updates on the Ten Year Plan and project changes in the region were discussed, as were updates on the Safety Action Plan, NH Seacoast Greenway, and Federal Transit Administration FY24 apportionments.

Meeting adjourned at approximately 15:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
David Walker, Recording Secretary

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	POTENTIAL RESOURCES & DATA SOURCES
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.*	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.

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

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 0

SCORE	PROJECT NEED CRITERION		PROJECT IMPACT CRITERION		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.	-	- - -

Economic Development

NH TEN YEAR PLAN
Regional Project Review

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

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?

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?

POTENTIAL RESOURCES & DATA SOURCES

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*

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.

Equity, Environmental Justice, & Accessibility

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.

Mobility

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_classifications/section00.cfm

Planning

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

Motor Vehicles

- Level of Travel Time Reliability (LOTTR) 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.

Mobility (continued)

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 **IMPACT**

Motor Vehicles

- 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).

Natural Hazard Resiliency | NH TEN YEAR PLAN *Regional Project Review*

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

Network Significance

NH TEN YEAR PLAN
Regional Project Review

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

Safety

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.

Safety (continued)

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.

State of Repair

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

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?

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).*

POTENTIAL RESOURCES & DATA SOURCES

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*

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.

Support

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

METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
theRPC.org

156 Water Street | Exeter, NH 03833
603-778-0885 | www.theRPC.org

April 25, 2024 Project Updates

2025-2034 State Ten Year Plan: HB2024 containing the draft Ten Year Plan is making its way through the Legislature. The bill passed the House with several amendments listed below and was introduced in the Senate, where it was referred to the Senate Transportation Committee which held a hearing on April 16th. Between projects added, removed, and given budget increases in the House amendment, approximately $55 million was added to the bill. *(Dave Walker dwalker@therpc.org).*

Name	Number	Project Change	Source of Change
North Hampton	24457	Project added – Replace superstructure of bridge carrying US1 over B&M/CSX railroad	House Committee
North Hampton	43938	Project added – Replace 4'x4' stone/concrete box culvert in 2025 with $1M	House Committee
New Castle	44493	NH1B causeway rehabilitation from Goat Island to New Castle Island restored to the TYP having been inadvertently removed	House Committee
Salem	42884	NH28 signal operations project removed as it was advanced and completed already	House Committee
Hampton	40797	Ocean Blvd/NH1A project amended to add $2.3M	House Committee
Portsmouth	43760	I-95 soundwalls project amended to add $6.4M	House Committee

Safety Action Plan: The MPO completed a Request for Proposals (RFP) process in November and is in the process of bringing the selected consultant under contract for the project. A scope of work for the consultant has been finalized and a timeline for the project has been established to complete draft Action Plans late in 2024 with adoption by the MPOs in early 2025 which will be in time for communities to apply for implementation grant funding under the Safe Streets and Roads for All (SS4A) Round 4. The plan development process is underway with the consultant team starting the data collection and analysis, monthly steering committee meetings, and work starting on a survey. RPC staff will be engaging the TAC and Policy Committees as well as reaching out to communities and other stakeholders to engage on the development of the Plan. The Safety Action Plans will establish a goal of eliminating roadway fatalities and serious injuries for each agency and establish a planning structure and strategies for achieving that goal. The SS4A program includes approximately $1 billion annually for roadway safety improvements that will reduce fatalities and serious injuries. *(Dave Walker dwalker@therpc.org).*

Hampton 40797: This project is designing improvements to Ocean Boulevard in Hampton. A public information session was held on March 5, 2024 at 5:30 PM in the Seashell Complex

Banquet Room (180 Ocean Blvd, Hampton). The information session drew a large crowd (150 people) that provided input regarding options for various segments and intersections as well as meeting the needs for safety improvements and environmental protection. An Advisory Committee meeting was held on April 23, 2024 to relay the input from the public information session, discuss responses and options, and cover next steps in the project. The advisory committee was also notified that NHDOT had applied for a $20 million grant through the FHWA RAISE program to access some of the additional funding needed to implement the full project which will cost an estimated $40-$51 million. There is another public information session scheduled for May 9, 2024 at Winnacunnet High School. *(Dave Walker dwalker@therpc.org).*

NH Seacoast Greenway: Mileage markers every 1/10 mile were installed in Portsmouth in late March and will be installed this week in Greenland, Rye and North Hampton. RPC staff are currently working with the NHSG Alliance and corridor communities to develop a set of trail rules that will need to be adopted by all corridor communities and approved by NHDOT. Other combined RPC/NHSGA projects included development of a new trail website with funding from Hampton Chamber, development of an adopt a trail sponsorship program, a volunteer program and a bench donation program. RPC submitted a federal RAISE planning grant on 2/28 to accelerate the preliminary engineering and permitting for the Hampton-Hampton Falls Marsh causeway segment of the trail. This spring signage, flashing beacons (RRFBs) and overhead lighting will be installed at the at-grade crossings of Banfield, Ocean, and Breakfast Hill Roads. Opening anticipated in October 2024. *(Scott Bogle – sbogle@therpc.org)*

Statewide Rail Trail Data Network. RPC submitted an application for Congressionally Directed Spending (CDS) to Senator Shaheen, Congressman Pappas and Congresswoman Kuster to establish a network of 68 permanent counters on 35 rail trails statewide covering all nine planning commission regions. All nine RPCs and all three Economic Development Districts statewide submitted letters of support. *(Scott Bogle – sbogle@therpc.org)*

Seacoast Bike Month & CommuteSMART Seacoast B2B Challenge Planning: RPC is working with SABR, CommuteSMART Seacoast, SRPC and other partners to develop events for Seacoast Bike Month in May. RPC and SRPC have not organized the traditional bike/walk commuter breakfasts in May the past two years but Seacoast Area Bicycle Riders (SABR) is organizing a slate of activities. Planning is also underway for CommuteSMART Seacoast's May Business to Business (B2B) commuter challenge. *(Mikayla Jerominek – mjerominek@therpc.org)*

Newington-Dover 11238S: The project to rehabilitate/replace the General Sullivan bridge to maintain the bicycle and pedestrian access recently received a Rebuilding American Infrastructure with Sustainability and Equity (RAISE) grant from USDOT. The grant will provide $20 million to support the replacement of the General Sullivan Bridge with a new two-girder superstructure to re-open the multi-use path across Little Bay that provides a link between Dover and Newington and Portsmouth. The total cost of the project is estimated at $41 million and the grant funding will replace $20 million in Turnpike funding. *(Dave Walker dwalker@therpc.org).*

FTA FY24 Full Year Apportionments: FTA released full year apportionments for all FTA funding programs in early April. Staff have developed the annual split calculation for the Nashua Urbanized Area (UA) between CART/MTA, Nashua Transit System and Lowell Regional Transit

Authority. The Nashua UA split meeting will be this Friday. Staff are also working with COAST to understand and hopefully mitigate significant reductions in apportionment to the Portsmouth and Dover-Rochester UAs based on Exeter, Durham and South Berwick ME/Rollinsford NH having split off into their own independent UAs under new Census rules. While these new UAs are no less urban than they were, with no diminishment in need for transit service, their populations are not included in the FTA small urban apportionment formulas which are based on population and population density. RPC and COAST are consulting with CTAA to understand how many other small transit systems around the country experienced similar losses. *(Scott Bogle – sbogle@therpc.org)*

RPC region projects Advertising for Construction in April and coming months:

Ad Date	Project Number	Description
4/16/2024	Portsmouth 43760	I-95 Soundwalls/Privacy fence
4/23/2024	Salem 41750	Manchester & Lawrence Rail Line 0.3 miles of Bike-Ped trail along abandoned M&L rail line from Cluff Crossing to Rockingham Pk Blvd
4/24/2024	Salem 42884	Improve signal operation at 28 intersections
4/15/24	Fremont 23793	Martin Rd Bridge Replacement over Piscassic River
7/16/2024	Newton 29617	NH 108 safety and operational improvements to Rowe's Corner
9/17/24	Hampton-Portsmouth 26485A	NHSG rail trail from Drakeside Road to Hampton/North Hampton town line
10/15/2024	Plaistow 40645	NH 125 Signal Coordination
11/5/24	Raymond 44557	NH107 preservation efforts on 2-span bridge carrying NH107 over Lamprey River.

Regional Master Plan Update:

Staff have begun work on an update to the Regional Master Plan. The updated comprehensive regional plan will integrate content from the recently updated Regional Housing Needs Assessment. The regional plan will further address broadband, water and sewer infrastructure, economic investment, community development, public health, emergency preparedness, and sustainability/resiliency. RPC will develop a comprehensive, integrated plan that connects the gaps between these existing, specific planning topics to create a plan focused on identifying actions to increase the region's resiliency, vibrancy, and equity. *(Mikayla Jerominek – mjerominek@therpc.org)*

Long Range Transportation Plan:

Following the feedback session in February's TAC meeting, RPC staff has been working on the initial outreach survey for the Long Range Plan. A revised version is expected to be available for review in the coming weeks. General work on formatting, data collection, and mapping has continued with assistance from RPC's GIS staff. (Mikayla Jerominek – mjerominek@therpc.org)