

Central NH Regional Planning Commission

28 Commercial Street, Suite #3

Concord, NH, 03301

Tel: (603) 226-6020

www.cnhrpc.org



Transportation Advisory Committee

August 7, 2020

DRAFT Minutes

9:00 A.M.

Attendees	
Harry Wright, Town of Bradford	Richard Moore, Town of Chichester
David Cederholm, City of Concord	Karen Hill, City of Concord
Donna White, Town of Dunbarton	Betsy Bosiak, Town of Epsom, TAC Chair
David White, Town of Hopkinton	Tim Blagden, Town of Warner
Nate Miller, SNHPC	Cindy Yanski, Mid State Mobility Manager, CAPBMCI
Lucy St. John, NHDOT Bureau of Planning	

Commission Staff: Craig Tufts, Dean Williams, Katie Nelson, Matt Baronas, Mike Tardiff

Introductions

The meeting began at 9:03 AM, called to order by the Chair, Betsy Bosiak. Mike Tardiff then read a statement pursuant to Executive Order 2020-04, authorizing the TAC to meet electronically. All TAC members and guests present introduced themselves.

Review and Approve Minutes of the June 5th, 2020 TAC Meeting

A motion was made to accept the minutes of the June 5th, 2020 TAC meeting.

M/S/Passed Tim Blagden/Karen Hill

Abstentions – Donna White

NHDOT Ten Year Plan Update

Mike Tardiff noted that the NHDOT FY2021-2030 Ten Year Transportation Improvement Plan was recently approved by the legislature and signed into law. With that TYP update ending the new FY2023-2032 TYP update begins. Dean Williams presented the changes to this update cycle, explaining how the nine RPC's have been working on changing the project scoring criteria and project proposal form over the past few months. Each of the nine RPC's use the same criteria and form to evaluate Ten Year Plan projects. Dean reviewed some of the reasons why the criteria were revised and refined, including the need to make the criteria apply to all modes of transportation. He also briefly discussed the new criteria noting the difference between the need and impact criteria. Richard Moore questioned how the equity and environmental justice criteria would be applied. Dean responded that projects in communities with census data or other information identifying

traditionally underserved populations would receive more points than projects in more affluent areas. The accessibility criteria would give a project more points for including ADA infrastructure or including accessibility for multiple modes.

Dean reviewed the scoring process, explaining how projects would receive more points (1-10 scale) if they had an impact on a specific criterion or if there is a high need for a project based on a criterion. Projects that are not relevant to specific criteria are given a score of one. Projects with a negative impact are given a zero. He continued by reviewing the previous criteria and weights, then, using the results of the TAC survey, he displayed how the weights would change. Due to there being 15 different criteria, the weights are distributed more evenly. Dean shared a table displaying the criteria ranking from the highest to lowest weights based on the survey results. Tim Blagden mentioned that he wished to see more forward-thinking criteria including adaption to smart cars and infrastructure projects differing from the typical projects that are programmed. Dave White seconded that he felt the criteria would not do much to change the outcome of types of projects that make it into the TYP. Dean responded that the Mobility Intervention criteria, which ranked as the 3rd highest weighted criteria, would address the forward-thinking projects including Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) infrastructure projects. Richard Moore responded that he felt the driver for ITS projects would be highly dependent on the consumer habits. Tim Blagden added that he wished to see a criterion specific to public health. Dean pointed out that each criterion is intended to apply to all modes of transportation where public health would most likely only apply to bicycle and pedestrian projects.

A motion was made to use the following criteria weights presented based on the survey results.

M/S/Passed Tim Blagden/Betsy Bosiak

Local and Regional Economic Development - The degree to which a project supports economic development needs and opportunities at the local and regional level.	4.46	7.8%
Safety Measures - A forward-looking analysis of how the improvements proposed as part of a project would improve safety performance for all modes.	4.38	7.6%
Accessibility - The degree to which a project ensures accessibility by all potential users.	4.31	7.5%
Mobility Intervention - A forward-looking analysis of how the improvements proposed as part of a project would improve the mobility performance for all modes.	4.31	7.5%
Facility Importance - The importance of the facility to the local and the regional transportation system (e.g. available of alternate routes, connections to important origins and destinations, etc).	4.23	7.4%
Mobility Need and Performance - A historical analysis of the mobility need and performance (e.g. level of congestion, delay, etc) of a location for all modes.	4.17	7.3%
Support - The degree of documented support for the project at the local, regional, or statewide level.	4.15	7.2%
Equity and Environmental Justice - The degree to which a project benefits traditionally under-served populations.	3.85	6.7%
Safety Performance - A historical analysis of the safety performance (i.e. crash history) of a location over the past five (5) year period for all modes.	3.77	6.6%
Traffic Volume – The volume of vehicles, pedestrians and bicycles currently using the infrastructure.	3.62	6.3%
State of Repair - The degree to which the project improves infrastructure condition in the project area (e.g. pavement condition, bridge condition, etc).	3.62	6.3%
Hazard Mitigation - A forward-looking analysis of how the natural hazard mitigation measures proposed as part of a project would reduce hazard risks.	3.38	5.9%
Freight Movement - The degree to which the project impacts the movement of goods.	3.23	5.6%
Maintenance - The degree to which the project impacts NHDOT and/or municipal maintenance requirements.	3.08	5.4%
Hazard Risks - An analysis of the natural hazard risks (i.e. flood history) to a transportation facility	2.77	4.8%

Betsy Bosiak questioned how other RPC's compared to us. Nate Miller of SNHPC responded that their TAC participated in a similar exercise utilizing survey results submitted by TAC members. The overall weights were not too dissimilar for SNHPC than they were for CNHRPC.

Dean reviewed the schedule for the 2023-2032 TYP update explaining that the next step would be to send out project solicitations to the towns in August, asking for reaffirmation of support for existing projects and completed project proposal forms for new projects by October 1st. CNHRPC will submit a list of preliminary projects to NHDOT by November 6th with engineering estimates. Over the coming winter, CNHRPC will meet with NHDOT staff and finalize the project prioritization by the end of March 2021. Following that, NHDOT will develop a draft 2023-2032 TYP and begin the GACIT process in the Summer/Fall of 2021.

Statewide Asset Data Exchange (SADES)

Dean informed the TAC that CNHRPC staff have been working closely with the town of Pembroke regarding their road maintenance and repair plan, regularly updating and providing reports for budgets. They also began to implement a SADES Road Surface Management System (SRMS) in Allenstown. The road surface windshield survey and initial mapping has been completed, although due to COVID19 limiting in person meetings and staff changes, the forecasting portion of the plan has been delayed. Bradford has also asked to set up an SRSMS program and will begin this fall or next spring.

CNHRPC staff also began a Culvert and Closed Drainage System (CCDS) program in Pembroke to assist them with budgeting for the road improvements. Tim Blagden asked if the data was available. Dean responded that the SRSMS data is only available to those with access, but CNHRPC develops reports and maps for towns with completed programs and is available to share information with them. The CCDS viewer is available for the public and can be found on the NHDOT website here:

<https://www.nh.gov/dot/org/projectdevelopment/planning/gis-data-catalog/>

Rail Trail Pedestrian and Bicycle Count Data

Craig Tufts presented on the Rail Trail Pedestrian and Bicycle Count data from this spring and early summer. He described how the data is collected on rail trails and then presented the data collected. Data included daily average counts and daily totals broken out by direction, bicycles and pedestrians. Trends observed from the data showed people using the trails in the morning and afternoon during the weekdays with steady use throughout the day on weekends. The nicest weather days had the highest number of users.

Next Meeting Date

The next TAC meeting was scheduled for October 2nd, 2020 at 9:00 A.M.

Meeting Adjournment

A motion was made to adjourn the TAC meeting at 10:25am.

M/S/Passed Unanimously Betsy Bosiak/Dave White