

RPC Technical Advisory Committee

December 16<sup>th</sup>, 2010

9:00-11:00 AM

**RPC Conference Room**

(Directions on reverse)

Refreshments will be available @ 8:30

1. Introductions
2. Minutes of 9/23/10 TAC meeting (**Attachment #1**)— [*motion to approve*]
3. Project Solicitation Process/Starting the next Long Range Plan update and State Ten Year Plan cycle (**Attachment #2**) — [*motion to endorse*]
4. Project Selection/Prioritization Process and Criteria (**Attachment #3**) — [*motion to approve*]
5. Amendments to Regional Coordination Plans for Derry-Salem and ACT regions (**Attachment #4**) — [*motion to endorse*]
6. Spaulding Express Bus Service
7. STIP Lean Review/TIP Amendment Procedures
8. CMAQ Update
9. Downeaster Supplemental Bus Service Update
10. Project Updates (**to be distributed at meeting**)

**TAC MEETING SCHEDULE (Through 2011)**

- September 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2010
- December 16<sup>th</sup>, 2010
- **January 27<sup>th</sup>, 2011**
- March 24<sup>th</sup>, 2011
- June 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2011
- September 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2011
- December 15<sup>th</sup>, 2011

There is **two hour on-street parking** along Water Street and Center Street. There is also long term parking in the lot on Center Street, by the Citizens Bank Drive-thru (Non-numbered spaces), and in the municipal lot behind the Town Offices. Handicapped parking spaces are available on the bottom floor of the parking structure adjacent to the RPC office as well as on Water Street in front of the RPC office.



**DRAFT**

## RPC TAC MEETING

### Minutes

September 23, 2010  
RPC Conference Room

**Members Present:** Jamie Steffen, Vice Chair, and Warren Bambury, Hampton; Norman Brown, Seabrook; Art Ditto, Rye; Tim Moore and Marilyn Senter, Plaistow; John Kennedy, Brentwood; Barbara White, Newton and East Kingston; Steve Parkinson, Portsmouth; Dean Shankle, Jr., Epping; Dirk Timmons, UNH; Tim White, SNHPC; Eric Abrams, DES; Nick Alexander and Carol Macuch, NH DOT; and Maria Stowell, PDA.

**Proxy Votes:** Mark Traeger, Sandown.

**Others Present:** Jon Frederick, Portsmouth; and Skip Skoglund, Greenman-Pedersen, Inc.

**Staff Present:** Dave Walker and Roxanne Rines, RPC.

**Meeting Opened at 9:04 a.m.**

#### 1. Introductions

Attendees introduced themselves and stated what municipality they were from or the agency they represented.

#### 2. Minutes of August 26, 2010, TAC Meeting

**Motion:** **Kennedy** made a motion to approve the minutes of August 26, 2010, as written. **Parkinson** seconded the motion. **Motion carried with Senter, Kennedy, White and Brown abstaining.**

#### 3. TIP, Plan and Air Quality Conformity

a. 2011-2014 TIP - **Walker** explained the TIP process. It includes all projects that are federally funded and regionally significant projects that will occur in the region, as well as statewide projects. The document must be fiscally constrained and meet air quality conformity. The tables include all projects, listed alphabetically, by location. **Walker** reviewed the tables included in the attachment; the budget for the region is \$766 million with statewide projects included.

Members gave corrections to the listed projects. **Walker** stated there will be a public hearing at the October 13th, MPO/Commission meeting in Hampton Falls and approval of the document. He reviewed the minor changes to the TIP that was currently approved. The document should be in place around the first part of January 2011.

- b. 2009-2035 Long Range Plan Amendment - **Walker** explained the long range plan amendment process. He continued that it includes all the projects that are expected to happen in the region during the time period of the document. This document must also be fiscally constrained and meet air quality conformity requirements. There were minimal updates needed to the fiscal constraint section and the project list as necessary.

**Walker** continued that full updates to the plan need to be completed every four years. Staff has been working with the other MPO's and DOT on how to come up with the best representation of the expectation of future dollars into the region. He explained how this was created. It was estimated that the RPC portion will be approximately \$13.4% of the total state funding received.

**Walker** reviewed the two tables that staff created as funding scenarios that include zero growth in resources beyond what's already included in the 10-year plan and the scenario that shows a growth rate equal to the inflation rate (3.2%). He then reviewed the funding numbers included in the tables. The estimated outcome is that staff expects to have enough resources available to complete the projects programmed.

**Walker** stated there are no big changes in the long range project list, just a few minor changes. This document as well will be adopted at the October meeting. Members gave staff changes to municipal projects in the document. Discussion ensued about the Travel America truckstop project that was pulled from Greenland. **Abrams** gave an update to truck traffic idling devices.

- c. Air Quality Conformity Determination – **Walker** explained the Southern NH non-attainment area for ozone. During updates staff must make a determination that the plans conform with federal air quality regulations and requirements. This is a joint process that is undertaken with the DOT and other MPO's because it is a shared non-attainment area. The area is all of the RPC, but portions of the other 3 MPO's, he then reviewed the document and stated the determination is that the document is in conformity with the standard for ozone. Discussion ensued about how high speed tolling is used in the model. Again, this document needs be adoption at the October meeting.

**Motion:** **Kennedy** made a motion to recommend the TIP, Plan and Air Quality Conformity documents be forwarded to the Policy Committee for their approval. **Senter** seconded the motion. **Motion carried with Shankle opposed.**

#### 4. Congestion Mitigation Process

**Walker** stated a framework for the process was adopted at the July 2010, MPO meeting. The process has been discussed many times at previous TAC and Policy meetings; therefore, he gave only a brief explanation. This will be an ongoing process that gets updated every year. He then reviewed the changes that were made. Discussion ensued with members asking questions about the process as Walker reviewed.

**Timmons** stated Wildcat Transit (UNH bus service) will be entering into an agreement with the Downeaster to implement discounted monthly Amtrack tickets to students who use the service between campus and Exeter, probably starting in January. **Timmons** stated he will get Walker the ridership numbers for this new service during February 2011.

**Walker** continued to explain changes he made in process. The final Congestion Mitigation Process document will be adopted at the October MPO meeting.

**Motion:** **Senter** made a motion to recommend the Congestion Mitigation Process document be forwarded to the Policy Committee for their approval. **Kennedy** seconded the motion.  
**Motion carried.**

**Walker** stated what will come out of the process is: corridor profiles every year, update corridors every other year (half done at a time), create a corridor committee and then create a regional report every other year that incorporates all the information above.

Discussion ensued about Atkinson citizens being concerned about the possible future Plaistow train layover facility.

#### 5. Project Solicitation Process/Starting the next Ten Year Cycle Plan

**Walker** stated DOT will be starting their next 10-year plan cycle this fall or winter. A project solicitation will go out to towns when staff is notified of the dates. He continued that there should be a minimum of new projects added to the current list. He wants to get better information about projects that are already in the plan. Staff will present their list of prioritized projects at a future TAC and Policy meeting where adjustments can be made.

**Walker** stated he is not discouraging towns from submitting projects that are important. All of the MPO's are working together to create a process that is uniform.

**Kennedy** asked about the corridor study of Route 125 through Brentwood? **Walker** stated it is still very high on the list, through the Highway Safety program DOT completed two signalization projects on 125, so staff has decided to wait. The corridor study will be completed at a future date. **Kennedy** spoke about road grades and how they affect trucks taking off from stops.

## 6. Project Updates

There was a brief discussion about project updates.

**Parkinson** stated he understands that the report about the three Portsmouth/Kittery bridges is at both the NH and Maine DOT offices for review.

**Walker** mentioned that the TAC meeting schedule for the remaining fiscal year is located at the bottom of the agenda.

Meeting adjourned at 10:52 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Roxanne M. Rines  
Recording Secretary

## MEMORANDUM

TO: RPC TAC  
FROM: David Walker  
RE: Project Solicitation  
DATE: December 10, 2010

---

The MPO is planning to solicit projects as we kick off the development of a new Long Range Plan and the State Department of Transportation begins the development of the next Ten Year Plan. While few resources are expected to be available for adding new projects to the Ten Year Plan, it is still a primary responsibility of the MPO to identify transportation needs in the region, even if they are not currently fundable. Ultimately, there are three steps to this process:

1. Review the projects currently listed in the Long Range Plan and State Ten Year Plan to ensure that they are addressing local and regional priorities.
2. Identify any transportation problems that are not being addressed by the current list of projects.
3. Establish the relative priority of transportation problems and projects for the region and transmit that information to NH DOT.

We started this process in 2009 with a prioritized a list of all the projects in the Long Range Plan that were not currently funded in the Ten Year Plan, and this will be using as a starting point for the current efforts. To facilitate this, we will be looking for a few things from communities:

1. **FOR PROJECTS CURRENTLY IN THE PLAN:** For projects already included in the Long Range Plan (on the attached list) all that is needed is verification from each community that the project is still deemed necessary. If the community has multiple projects, it is important that the community/organization clearly establish its priorities as the capacity available to program projects is limited.
2. **FOR NEW PROJECTS:** Projects that have not been previously submitted to the MPO need to include the information requested on the attached project proposal form (pages 1-3 of the attached form) to the extent that it is known. Cost estimates and other information should be completed as best as possible given current understanding of the project purpose, need, and scope. Due to the large number of projects already scheduled for funding, we recommend that only projects which have regional significance, or which address a critical transportation deficiency be submitted through this process.

As in past solicitations, TAC and Policy Committee members will receive the correspondence sent to their community and will be listed as a point of contact to help facilitate the discussions and prompt responses.

In the mean time, RPC staff will begin working on expanding the information and analysis available regarding projects currently in the Long Range Plan starting with those currently listed as the highest priorities. This will entail completing as much of the Project Initiation Report (attached form) as is feasible with a goal of being able to complete 1 to 2 page summary reports of each prioritized project for submittal to DOT and GACIT to aid them in their decision-making process.

No formal approval is necessary to begin this process however endorsement from the TAC regarding the steps outlined in this memo will allow staff to move forward and initiate the solicitation of projects. It is expected that letters will go to the communities in late December/Early January with a February return requirement. The MPO will be holding a public hearing at the January 12<sup>th</sup> meeting to “kick off” the process and to discuss the goals and objectives for this update.

Community	Street	Description	Base Cost (millions)	Federal Share	State Share	Local/ Other	Year of Estimate	Year of Const	Year of Const Cost (millions)	Federal Share	State Share	Local/ Other	Type	Project Score	Project Rank
INTERREGIONAL PROJECTS															
Seabrook	I-95	Increase Capacity on the Interstate 95 Exit 1 Interchange. Cost of widening the bridge is approximately \$5.1 million. \$2 million has been appropriated from the Turnpike Authority and the remainder will need to be funded with local or private funds. The signalization of southbound off-ramps are part of development mitigation responsibilities.	5.100	0.000	2.000	3.100	2008	2010	5.432	0.000	2.000	3.432	INTER-REGIONAL	89	1
Epping	NH 125	From Regional ITS Architecture: Signal coordination and control along congested corridor. Includes remote control of signals, network surveillance and monitoring, and emergency routing capabilities	0.522	0.418	0.104	0.000	2008	2012	0.592	0.474	0.118	0.000	INTER-REGIONAL	83	2
Plaistow	NH 125	From Regional ITS Architecture: Signal coordination and control along congested corridor. Includes remote control of signals, network surveillance and monitoring, and emergency routing capabilities	0.672	0.538	0.134	0.000	2008	2012	0.762	0.610	0.152	0.000	INTER-REGIONAL	83	3
Portsmouth	US 1 Bypass	Widen US 1 Bypass including improvements to interchanges. Does not include red list bridges in project #13455. Cost = Approx. \$28 million. Includes grade separated interchange in place of traffic circle. At grade intersection would be ~\$10.0 million less to construct.	28.000	22.400	5.600	0.000	2008	2020	40.862	32.689	8.172	0.000	INTER-REGIONAL	80	4
Hampton	NH 101	Reconfigure NH 101 interchange with US 1 along new alignment for US 1 that parallels B&M Railroad tracks. Estimated to cost approximately \$20 million in 2006. From US 1 Corridor Study.	20.000	16.000	4.000	0.000	2006	2020	31.085	24.868	6.217	0.000	INTER-REGIONAL	70	5
Epping	NH 125	Widen NH 125 from NH 27 north to NH 87.	3.360	2.688	0.672	0.000	2006	2019	5.060	4.048	1.012	0.000	INTER-REGIONAL	61	6
			57.654	42.043	12.511	3.100			83.792	62.689	17.672	3.432			

Community	Street	Description	Base Cost (millions)	Federal Share	State Share	Local/ Other	Year of Estimate	Year of Const	Year of Const Cost (millions)	Federal Share	State Share	Local/ Other	Type	Project Score	Project Rank
REGIONAL PROJECTS															
Seabrook	US 1	Add a 5th lane to US 1 in the vicinity of Railroad Avenue to create a consistent 5 lane cross-section From US 1 Corridor Study.	0.800	0.640	0.160	0.000	2006	2020	1.243	0.995	0.249	0.000	REGIONAL	76	1
Hampton Falls	US 1	Route 1 - Realign and add traffic signal at NH 84. Remove set of traffic signals at NH 88 EB and improve roadway for bi-directional travel on NH 88 adjacent to intersection. Add streetscape/ landscape improvements. From US 1 Corridor Study.	3.200	2.560	0.640	0.000	2006	2020	4.974	3.979	0.995	0.000	REGIONAL	72	2
Hampton	US 1	US 1/NH 27 intersection improvements including bridge over B&M RR (162-142). From US 1 Corridor Studv. \$4.468 Million	4.468	3.574	0.894	0.000	2006	2020	6.944	5.555	1.389	0.000	REGIONAL	62	3
Portsmouth	US 1	Widen and reconstruct Route 1 from Constitution Ave to Wilson Road	9.500	7.600	1.900	0.000	2006	2019	14.307	11.446	2.861	0.000	REGIONAL	62	4
Rye	US 1	Widen to five lanes and improve the Washington Road/Breakfast Hill Road intersection with US 1. Reduce vertical rise to the south to improve sight distance.	2.100	1.680	0.420	0.000	2006	2020	3.264	2.611	0.653	0.000	REGIONAL	54	5
Atkinson-Hampstead	NH 111	Reconstruct NH 111 from Central Street in Hampstead to the southernmost Atkinson / Hampstead town line (3.2 Miles). \$4.17 Million	4.170	3.336	0.834	0.000	2008	2020	6.085	4.868	1.217	0.000	REGIONAL	41	6
North Hampton	US 1	Connect Hobbs Road with Elm Road and discontinue north end of Elm Road. Provide traffic signal connection from mid-point of Elm road to US 1. From US 1 Corridor Study.	3.000	2.400	0.600	0.000	2006	2020	4.663	3.730	0.933	0.000	REGIONAL	41	7
North Hampton	US 1	Realign the southern and northern intersections of US 1 and North Road to the south, widen to 5 lanes at the intersection and install a traffic signal. From US 1 Corridor Study.	4.800	3.840	0.960	0.000	2006	2020	7.460	5.968	1.492	0.000	REGIONAL	40	8
Hampstead - Sandown	NH 121A	Safety Improvements And Shoulders For NH 121A Between NH 111 And Sandown/chester Town Line	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	2002	2035	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	REGIONAL	33	9
Brentwood	North Road	Realign the intersection of Prescott Road and North road from a "Y" alignment to a "T" alignment	0.080	0.000	0.080	0.000	2008	2010	0.085	0.000	0.085	0.000	LOCAL	27	10
			32.118	25.630	6.488	0.000			49.026	39.153	9.873	0.000			

Community	Street	Description	Base Cost (millions)	Federal Share	State Share	Local/ Other	Year of Estimate	Year of Const	Year of Const Cost (millions)	Federal Share	State Share	Local/ Other	Type	Project Score	Project Rank
LOCAL PROJECTS															
North Hampton	US 1	Widen intersection of US 1 and Atlantic Avenue (NH 111) to five lanes. Add raised median at intersection and improve pedestrian crossings. From US 1 Corridor Study.	1.000	0.800	0.200	0.000	2006	2020	1.554	1.243	0.311	0.000	LOCAL	63	1
Hampton	US 1	US1/Winnacunnet Rd - Realign the intersection to form a more standard "T-type" intersection and install a traffic signal, new curbing, sidewalk, crosswalks, and some streetscape amenities. From US 1 Corridor Study. Potentially may be signaled as part of development mitigation.	0.800	0.640	0.160	0.000	2006	2020	1.243	0.995	0.249	0.000	LOCAL	57	2
Stratham	NH 108	NH 108 / Bunker Hill Avenue: Signalization And Turn Lanes And Intersection Realignment. Source: 1999-2020 LRP	0.471	0.377	0.094	0.000	2002	2020	0.830	0.664	0.166	0.000	LOCAL	47	3
Hampton	NH 27	Reconstruct NH 27 from NH 101 interchange to bridge over B&M Railroad. Includes drainage, 4 foot shoulders, granite curbed sidewalks on both sides, and a traffic signal at Towle Farm Road	5.000	4.000	0.000	1.000	2009	2020	7.070	5.656	0.000	1.414	LOCAL	37	4
Hampstead	NH 121	Improve the intersection Of NH 121/ Derry Rd/ Depot Rd In Hampstead	0.250	0.000	0.200	0.050	2008	2020	0.365	0.000	0.292	0.073	LOCAL	34	5
Seabrook	US 1	Install a traffic signal at Rocks Road intersection with US 1	0.250	0.000	0.000	0.250	2008	2010	0.266	0.000	0.000	0.266	LOCAL	28	6
Brentwood	NH 111A	Reconfigure the intersection of NH 111A and Pickpocket Road from a "Y" to a "T" alignment	0.010	0.000	0.008	0.002	2008	2010	0.011	0.000	0.009	0.002	LOCAL	27	7
Sandown	Hale True Road	Reconstruct intermunicipal Road which connects NH 121A to Fremont Road between the Towns of Sandown and Chester.	0.181	0.000	0.000	0.181	2008	2012	0.205	0.000	0.000	0.205	LOCAL	15	8
Sandown	Hawkewood Road	Reconstruct intermunicipal Road that Connects NH 121A in Sandown to NH 111A in Danville.	0.266	0.000	0.000	0.266	2008	2012	0.302	0.000	0.000	0.302	LOCAL	15	9
			8.228	5.817	0.662	1.749			11.847	8.559	1.026	2.262			

Community	Street	Description	Base Cost (millions)	Federal Share	State Share	Local/ Other	Year of Estimate	Year of Const	Year of Const Cost (millions)	Federal Share	State Share	Local/ Other	Type	Project Score	Project Rank
<b>BRIDGE PROJECTS</b>															
Hampton	NH 1A	Replace Draw Bridge over Hampton River. Full cost expected to be approximately \$16 million. Currently programmed as a feasibility study only.	1.000	0.800	0.200	0.000	2006	2014	1.287	1.029	0.257	0.000	BRIDGE	68	1
Portsmouth	Maplewood Ave	Bridge: Maplewood Avenue over North Mill Road Br.#231/103. Source: NHDOT 2004 Bridge Aid Status Report	1.100	0.000	0.880	0.220	2008	2019	1.555	0.000	1.244	0.311	BRIDGE	46	2
Fremont	Martin Rd	Martin Road over Piscassic River - 155/133. Source: NHDOT 2002 Red List Bridge Summary	0.250	0.000	0.200	0.050	2008	2020	0.365	0.000	0.292	0.073	BRIDGE	36	3
South Hampton	Hilldale Ave	Bridge Replacement on Hilldale Avenue over Powwow River [069/066]	0.600	0.000	0.480	0.120	2008	2020	0.876	0.000	0.700	0.175	BRIDGE	36	4
Brentwood	South Road	Reconstruct South Road Bridge over Little River	0.540	0.000	0.432	0.108	2008	2020	0.788	0.000	0.630	0.158	BRIDGE	26	5
			3.490	0.800	2.192	0.498			4.871	1.029	3.125	0.717			
<b>TRANSIT PROJECTS</b>															
COAST	NH 16	COAST Spaulding Turnpike Express Service. <b>Recommend that the State provide Matching Funds for this project currently in the 10 Year Plan</b>	4.185	4.025	0.000	0.160	2009	2009	4.185	3.348	0.000	0.837	TRANSIT		
COAST	US1	Service along US 1 corridor from Portsmouth to Seabrook. Capital and three years operating. [future CMAQ].	1.200	0.960	0.000	0.240	2002	2012	1.644	1.315	0.000	0.329	TRANSIT	75	1
Private Transit Operator	NH101	Transit service between Portsmouth-Manchester-Manchester Airport. Capital and three years operating. [future CMAQ].	1.890	1.512	0.000	0.378	2008	2012	2.144	1.715	0.000	0.429	TRANSIT	70	2
Plaistow	TRANSIT	Construct rail platform and provide three years of operating subsidy for passenger Rail [00-20CM]	0.966	0.773	0.000	0.193	2004	2010	0.966	0.773	0.000	0.193	TRANSIT	67	3
COAST	TRANSIT	Regional brokerage initiative coordinating demand response service in Strafford and Eastern Rockingham Counties	0.298	0.238	0.060	0.000	2009	2010	0.308	0.246	0.062	0.000	TRANSIT	56	4
			8.539	7.508	0.060	0.971			9.247	7.397	0.062	1.788			
<b>Total Projects</b>			<b>110.029</b>	<b>81.799</b>	<b>21.912</b>	<b>6.318</b>			<b>158.783</b>	<b>118.827</b>	<b>31.758</b>	<b>8.199</b>			
<b>Ten Year Plan Recommended Only</b>			<b>42.547</b>	<b>28.198</b>	<b>9.998</b>	<b>4.351</b>			<b>60.378</b>	<b>41.429</b>	<b>13.935</b>	<b>5.015</b>			

# Project Initiation Report

Project Title

Route/Road/Location \_\_\_\_\_

Between \_\_\_\_\_

And \_\_\_\_\_

Applicant: \_\_\_\_\_

Community Contact: \_\_\_\_\_

Phone: \_\_\_\_\_ Email: \_\_\_\_\_

## **Project Description:**

[Type description here]

Vicinity Map

Show:

Project Location and Scope  
Topographical Features listed in Report  
North Arrow

**1. RECOMMENDATION/PROPOSAL**

[Type text here]

**2. BACKGROUND**

[Type text here]

**3. PURPOSE AND NEED STATEMENT**

**Need:**

[Type text here]

**Purpose:**

[Type text here]

**4. DEFICIENCIES**

[Type text here]

**5. CORRIDOR AND SYSTEM COORDINATION** (Coordination and consistency with corridor plans, congestion management Process, ITS Architecture, and Long Range Transportation Plan.)

[Type text here]

**6. ALTERNATIVES UNDER CONSIDERATION (VIABLE AND REJECTED)**

[Type text here]

**7. COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT**

[Type text here]

**8. OTHER CONSIDERATIONS REQUIRING DISCUSSION**

[Type text here]

**9. COST ESTIMATES**

Estimated Project Costs					
	Federal	State	Local	Private/Other	Total
<b>Engineering:</b>					
<b>Right of Way:</b>					
<b>Construction:</b>					
<b>Structures:</b>					
<b>Capital:</b>					
<b>Operating:</b>					
<b>Total:</b>					

**Preliminary Design Information:**

Does the project involve any of the following? Please check the appropriate boxes and delineate on an attached map, plan, or layout including any additional pertinent information.

Yes	No		Yes	No		Yes	No	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Widen existing roadway	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Ground disturbance	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Easements
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Increase number of through lanes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Road cut/fill	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Equipment staging
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	New alignment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Excavation: anticipated	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Temporary access road/detour
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Capacity increasing—other (e.g., channelization)			maximum depth _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Utility relocation
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Realignment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Drainage/culverts	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Right of way acquisition (if yes, attach map with APN)
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Ramp or street closure	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Flooding protection	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Disposal/borrow sites
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Bridge work	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Stream channel work	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Part of larger adjacent project
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Vegetation removal	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Pile driving	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Railroad
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Tree removal	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Demolition	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Is Project in the Long Range Plan:	Page #:	
Project Details as Noted in the Long Range Transportation Plan:		
Has a regional priority been assigned to the project?:		

**Setting**

Describe the project setting (Rural, Urbanizing, or Urban):
What is the Functional Classification of the facility?:
Describe the Forecasted 10 and 20 year VMT, AADT, and 5 Axle Truck data available.
Is there a corridor study for the roadway on which the project is occurring? Describe the recommendations for the corridor:
Is the project being proposed different from the recommendations in the corridor study?

**System Planning**

List any existing, planned or programmed projects (project forward 10 years) that may affect the proposed transportation improvements, including private development proposals.

Location	Year	Scope	Cost	Source

**Community Planning:**

What are the impacts to the community from the improvement project? Describe the public participation plans for the project:
Will a Context Sensitive Solutions process be utilized?

Does this corridor serve as a main street? What main street functions and features need to be protected or preserved?
Are traffic calming features being requested for this corridor? If so, describe them.
Describe the issues, concerns, and recommendations of the neighborhood/community groups?
How can the neighborhood/community group recommendations be incorporated into the project?
Describe any other related community planning issues

**Goods Movement Planning:**

Is the project located on a truck route or intermodal connector?
Is the project on a current and/or projected high truck volume route? How does the project take this demand into consideration?
Is the project located near a port? If so describe the port and discuss circulation needs:
List the airport located within ten miles of the project. Is the airport access on the same State highway as the project? Describe how this project improves the airport circulation?
Describe how this project will enhance the movement of goods, both locally and throughout the State:
Describe any special features being considered for the project to accommodate truck traffic, and at-grade railroad crossings?
How does the project integrate with other modes, e.g., rail, maritime, air?
Other Goods Movement issues?

**Transit:**

Name the local transit authority that operates within the corridor near the project.
Describe the transit authority's improvement plans that impact the corridor
Is the project near a transit center? Describe project improvements that accommodate transit facilities:
Describe the transit improvement options that may be considered?
Describe potential impacts to existing transit facilities.

**Bicycle Facilities:**

If bicycling is not prohibited on this route, are there continuous existing bicycle facilities (bicycle lanes or routes) or shoulder conditions suitable for bicycling within the project limits? If yes, describe.
If facilities suitable for bicycle travel on this route are discontinuous, describe deficiencies?
How does this corridor accommodate bicyclists (i.e., bicycle paths, lanes, routes)?
Does this corridor serve as a main street? If so, describe how this project will benefit parking/pedestrian crossing facilities/bicycle lanes.
Describe how this project will affect bicycle travel conditions.
Are there any designated bicycle facilities (lanes/routes/paths) proposed for this route by local agencies? If yes, describe.

Will the construction of a new freeway or modification to an existing freeway sever or destroy an existing facility open to bicycle travel? If yes, describe the alternate bicycle route that already exists or that will be provided as part of this project.

**Pedestrian Facilities**

How does this corridor accommodate pedestrians? Are there sidewalks, or are pedestrians forced to walk in the roadway?

Are land use conditions such that pedestrians regularly move along the highway? If yes, and continuous sidewalks do not exist, describe local or regional plans to provide continuous sidewalks.

**ADA Facility Improvements**

Does this corridor have ADA features to accommodate disabled pedestrians?

Describe the current availability of disabled access.

**Miscellaneous and Other Unique Features**

Describe any Unique Features not covered previously:

**Intelligent Transportation Systems:**

Identify/Describe the ITS components planned for this project.

The ITS components have to be part of the Regional or Statewide Architecture. Identify which applies to this project.

Document how the systems engineering analysis requirements are being met for the ITS components of this project.

**Traffic Forecasting, Analysis and Operations Scoping Checklist**

Generally describe and identify the existing and forecasted traffic in the vicinity of the project location. Analyze traffic data and determine what traffic operational conditions are anticipated. Identify any additional studies needed to accurately forecast and fully analyze the traffic operations as part of the project development and preparation of any environmental documentation.

What are the population and employment growth assumptions for the area of the project?

What are the buildout conditions of the community Master Plan? Have these been taken into account in producing traffic forecasts?

What are the existing Operational Conditions and Warrants supporting the need for the improvement? Include traffic volumes, turning movement, LOS Analysis, capacity analysis of all project components.

## Assessment of Potential Environmental Effects

	Yes	To Be Determined	No
<b>General</b>			
1. Will the project require future construction to fully utilize the design capabilities included in the proposed project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Will the project generate public controversy?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Noise</b>			
3. Is the project a Type I project as defined in 23 CFR 772.5(h); "construction on new location or the physical alteration of an existing highway, which significantly changes either the horizontal or vertical alignment or increases the number of through-traffic lanes"?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Does the project have the potential for adverse construction-related noise impact (such as related to pile driving)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Air Quality</b>			
5. Is the project in a NAAQS non-attainment or maintenance area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Is the project exempt from the requirement that a conformity determination be made? (If "Yes," state which conformity exemption in 40 CFR 93.126, Table 2 applies): _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Is the project exempt from regional conformity? (If "Yes," state which conformity exemption in 40 CFR 93.127, Table 3 applies): _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. If project is not exempt from regional conformity, (If "No" on Question #7) Is project in a metropolitan non-attainment/maintenance area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Is project in a CO non-attainment/maintenance area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Hazardous Materials/Hazardous Waste</b>			
9. Is there potential for hazardous materials (including underground or aboveground tanks, etc.) and/or hazardous waste (including oil/water separators, waste oil, asbestos-containing material, lead-based paint, ADL, etc.) within or immediately adjacent to the construction area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Water Quality/Resources</b>			
10. Does the project have the potential to impact water resources (rivers, streams, bays, inlets, lakes, drainage sloughs) within or immediately adjacent to the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. Is the project within a designated sole-source aquifer?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Coastal Zone</b>			
12. Is the project within the State Coastal Zone?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Floodplain</b>			
13. Is the construction area located within a regulatory floodway or within the base floodplain (100-year elevation of a watercourse or lake)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Wild and Scenic Rivers</b>			
14. Is the project within or immediately adjacent to a Wild and Scenic River System?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Biological Resources</b>			
15. Is there a potential for federally listed threatened or endangered species, or their critical habitat or essential fish habitat to occur within or adjacent to the construction area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
16. Does the project have the potential to directly or indirectly affect migratory birds, or their nests or eggs (such as vegetation removal, box culvert replacement/repair, bridge work, etc.)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
17. Is there a potential for wetlands to occur within or adjacent to the construction area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
18. Is there a potential for agricultural wetlands to occur within or adjacent to the construction area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

19. Is there a potential for the introduction or spread of invasive plant species?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Sections 4(f) and 6(f)</b>			
20. Are there any historic sites or publicly owned public parks, recreation areas, wildlife or waterfowl refuges (Section 4[f]) within or immediately adjacent to the construction area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
21. Does the project have the potential to affect properties acquired or improved with Land and Water Conservation Fund Act (Section 6[f]) funds?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Visual Resources</b>			
22. Does the project have the potential to affect any visual or scenic resources?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Relocation Impacts</b>			
23. Will the project require the relocation of residential or business properties?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Land Use, Community, and Farmland Impacts</b>			
24. Will the project require any right of way, including partial or full takes? Consider construction easements and utility relocations.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
25. Is the project inconsistent with plans and goals adopted by the community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
26. Does the project have the potential to divide or disrupt neighborhoods/communities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
27. Does the project have the potential to disproportionately affect low-income and minority populations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
28. Will the project require the relocation of public utilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
29. Will the project affect access to properties or roadways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
30. Will the project involve changes in access control to the State Highway System?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
31. Will the project involve the use of a temporary road, detour, or ramp closure?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
32. Will the project reduce available parking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
33. Will the project construction encroach on state or federal lands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
34. Will the project convert any farmland to a different use or impact any farmlands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Cultural Resources</b>			
35. Is there National Register listed, or potentially eligible historic properties, or archaeological resources within or immediately adjacent to the construction area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
36. Is the project adjacent to, or would it encroach on Tribal land?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## MEMORANDUM

TO: RPC TAC  
FROM: David Walker  
RE: Project Selection Criteria  
DATE: December 10, 2010

---

For approximately the last year, RPC staff has been working with the staff of the other NH MPOs to develop a common set of project selection criteria with the intent of establishing a more consistent and coordinated project selection and ranking process in southern New Hampshire. The effort was initiated from a common recommendation in the Planning Reviews that FHWA conducted for each of the MPOs over the last few years. That recommendation was to improve the project selection procedures and suggested that a combined effort of all of the MPOs would produce the best results. The result is a common project selection criteria framework that will be customized to the priorities of each individual region. This framework consists of three components:

1. **Initial Assessment:** This is a preliminary evaluation of the project that looks generally at the following aspects:
  - Whether the project is eligible for Federal or State funding.
  - Whether the project is an appropriate solution to an established need
  - Whether the project scale is reasonable given existing resources
  - Whether the project has demonstrated public support
    - Included in local and/or regional plans
    - Funding source(s) identified and/or committed
  - Other feasibility considerations:
    - Project is constructible and meets engineering criteria
    - Project is likely to receive required permits and approvals
    - Project conforms to regulations and plans for affected areas
2. **Core Criteria:** These six criteria relate directly to the benefit of the project as a transportation improvement. These criteria also take into account the SAFETEA-LU Planning Factors that should be considered when making decisions. These factors account for up to 100 points and some are weighted slightly higher than others to emphasize the importance of those particular factors in the region. The scores for each would be modified to reflect this weighting. The Core Criteria are:
  - 1) Mobility (15%)
  - 2) Accessibility (20%)
  - 3) Safety and Security (15%)

- 4) Transportation/Land Use coordination (20%)
  - 5) Preservation of existing infrastructure (15%)
  - 6) Addressing Congestion (15%)
3. **Modifiers:** The eight modifier criteria step beyond the transportation benefits of a project to consider the impacts of the proposal in a number of other important areas of concern for the region. These modifiers can increase or decrease the score of a project by as much as 40 points ( $\pm 5$  points each). The modifiers are currently the following:
- 1) Protecting natural resources
  - 2) Protecting historic and cultural resources
  - 3) Equitable distribution of costs and benefits
  - 4) Economic development
  - 5) Local support
  - 6) Cost effectiveness
  - 7) Leveraging of investments
  - 8) Discretionary

To some extent, the core criteria and modifiers can be changed and adjusted based on TAC input. Considerations of not only the criteria utilized, but how they are weighted, and the scoring methods used should be discussed. Particularly, staff is looking for input from TAC members regarding the following:

- Are the Core Criteria the right ones? What do you think of the weighting as shown?
- Are the Modifiers appropriate? Is there something missing or something that shouldn't be there?
- Is the distribution of points between Core and Modifiers a good balance?
- Should the modifiers be scored as discrete 5,0,-5 or as a range between 5 and -5?
- A criterion related to participation in the regional process has been left out of the discussion, should it be included as a modifier?

Direction from the TAC will shape the path forward as ideally the criteria will be in place and finalized prior to the project submittal deadline in February. A recommendation from the TAC to approve the criteria as shown or with specific changes would allow for consideration at the MPO Policy Committee meeting on January 12<sup>th</sup>, 2011.

---

## 12/06/10 DRAFT

### NEW HAMPSHIRE METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION TRANSPORTATION PROJECT SELECTION CRITERIA

#### **A. INITIAL FEASIBILITY ASSESSMENT**

All projects go through an initial assessment to ensure that projects being ranked are generally appropriately scoped, feasible, and fundable. Staff looks at the following to make this general determination:

- Project is eligible for Federal or State funding.
- Project is an appropriate solution to an established need
- Project scale is reasonable given existing resources
- Project has demonstrated public support
  - Included in local and/or regional plans
  - Funding source(s) identified and/or committed
- Other feasibility considerations:
  - Project is constructible and meets engineering criteria
  - Project is likely to receive required permits and approvals
  - Project conforms to regulations and plans for affected areas

#### **B. CORE TRANSPORTATION EVALUATION CRITERIA (100 Points)**

The MPO has developed a set of six criteria that establish the basic transportation related benefits of a project based around the concepts of mobility, accessibility, safety and security, coordination of transportation and land use development, preservation of existing infrastructure, and congestion reduction. These criteria count for as much as 100 points

##### **1. Improving Mobility for People and Freight (15%)**

Mobility is potential to get from one place to another, and is generally evaluated based on numbers of trips, travel speeds, and total travel distance and time. Improved mobility contributes to the development of a metropolitan area's economic base by quickly and efficiently moving people and goods. Projects that increase the capacity and/or efficiency of movement across or through the region's transportation system will score well in this criteria.

##### **HIGH IMPACT PROJECTS (10 POINTS)**

- Expansion of roadway capacity on congested inter-regional and regional corridors.
-

- Expansion of transit service along congested inter-regional and regional corridors.
- Expansion of freight capacity within and through the region.

MEDIUM IMPACT PROJECTS (5 POINTS)

- Projects that allow for more efficient and effective use of existing roadway capacity
- Projects that improve the reliability of travel

LOW IMPACT PROJECTS (1 POINT)

- Capacity improvements to low volume roadways
- Rehabilitation of existing transportation facilities

**Example project types:**

- **Projects that expand roadway capacity on congested corridors**
- **Projects that expand transit capacity on congested routes or routes with traffic congestion.**
- **Projects that remove congestion bottlenecks**
- **Projects that optimize existing capacity**
- **Projects that improve heavy truck routes/freight corridors**
- **Development of Transportation Demand Strategies**
- **Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) projects**

## **2. A More Accessible Region (20%)**

Accessibility is the ability of people to reach desired goods, services, activities and destinations that they want and enhancing access is a primary transportation goal. Affordable and efficient access removes limits and expands choices of where to work, live, shop, and recreate. Accessibility is affected by four factors: the ability to physically move, the availability of telecommunications and delivery services which can substitute for movement, the connectivity of the transportation system, and the distribution of land use.

HIGH IMPACT PROJECTS (10 POINTS)

- Provides new access to employment and/or housing opportunities for any or multiple modes of travel
- Provides new options for freight movement

MEDIUM IMPACT PROJECTS (5 POINTS)

- Improves quality or affordability of existing modes of transportation to connect people or freight to opportunities.

LOW IMPACT PROJECTS (1 POINT)

- Improves traffic speed and/or capacity through roadway capacity increases or congestion reduction.

**Example project types:**

- **New local or intercity transit services**
  - **Ridesharing and carpooling**
-

- **Improving transportation network connectivity, especially for non-motorized travel.**
- **Improving the quality and quantity of affordable travel modes (walking, cycling, ridesharing, public transit)**
- **Improvements to traffic flow**

### **3. A Safe and Secure Transportation System (15%)**

A safe and secure transportation network is the basis for an efficient transportation system. When an incident occurs in an unsafe area of the transportation network the entire transportation system can be affected. The integration of safety and security considerations for all modes of transportation should be a primary objective for projects proposed in the Metropolitan Transportation Plan.

#### HIGH IMPACT PROJECTS (10 POINTS)

- Reduces potential for accidents/incidents at high crash locations or at listed sites (5% report, “red-list” bridge, etc.)

#### MEDIUM IMPACT PROJECTS (5 POINTS)

- Improves/creates accommodations for non-motorized travel

#### LOW IMPACT PROJECTS (1 POINT)

- General safety improvements (lighting, striping, calming)

#### **Example project types:**

- Improvements to bridges on the NH DOT’s “Red List” or that have a National Bridge Inventory rating of “structurally deficient” or “functionally obsolete”
- Projects that decrease the number and severity of accidents
- Projects that improve sight distances or intersection safety
- Interchange improvements
- Traffic calming projects
- Projects that improve emergency access
- Improvements to lighting, guardrails, medians
- Improvements to transit shelters or other weather and traffic-protected waiting areas
- New or improved accommodations for non-motorized travel

### **4. Transportation and Land Use Connections (20%)**

The distribution of land use has a great impact on the transportation system and the need for travel. Generally projects that score well under this criterion will be those that coordinate the transportation and land use development processes to reduce congestion, promote connectivity between modes, or improve accessibility.

#### HIGH IMPACT PROJECTS (10 POINTS)

- Significantly improves interconnection of modes
  - Significantly enhances system integration/connectivity
-

- Enhances/provides linkage to major intermodal facility in other region
- Significantly enhances sustainable land development patterns

MEDIUM IMPACT PROJECTS (5 POINTS)

- Improves intermodal connections
- Enhances system integration/connectivity
- Enhances/provides linkage to an intermodal facility in other region
- Enhances sustainable development

LOW IMPACT PROJECTS (1 POINT)

- Little or no improvement in intermodal connections
- Little or no enhancement to system integration/connectivity
- Provides linkage to minor intermodal facility in other region

**Example project types:**

- Projects that improve intermodal connections
- Projects that support compact, mixed use development
- Projects that support investments in Brownfield redevelopment
- Projects that support shifting trips to bicycling and walking

## 5. Preserving Existing Infrastructure (15%)

Given limited resources available for transportation infrastructure, it is a high priority to fund projects that work to protect the existing infrastructure investment by addressing small problems before they require large and expensive fixes. General project characteristics that score well will be those that offset the need for repair or replacement of a facility or capital equipment through modernization, preventive maintenance, or through improved monitoring and evaluation.

HIGH IMPACT PROJECTS (10 POINTS)

- Results in a significant delay in need for major repair or replacement
- Results in a significant modernization of facility or fleet
- Results in a significant improvement in monitoring or system evaluation

MEDIUM IMPACT PROJECTS (5 POINTS)

- Results in a noticeable delay in need for major repair or replacement
- Results in a noticeable modernization of facility or fleet
- Results in a noticeable improvement in monitoring or system evaluation

LOW IMPACT PROJECTS (1 POINT)

- Results in little or no delay in need for repair or replacement
  - Results in little or no modernization of facility or fleet
  - Results in little or no improvement in monitoring or system evaluation
-

**Example project types:**

- Projects that address deficiencies in existing transportation infrastructure or services over new facilities
- Projects that improve the quality or more efficiently utilize existing infrastructure or services.
- Projects that support the shift of trips away from Single-Occupant-Vehicle trips.

**6. Addressing Congestion (15%)**

The Congestion Management Process (CMP) is a planning and project programming tool that aids in the effective management of the transportation system through identification and monitoring of congestion, as well as the development and implementation of operational and travel demand management strategies to address congestion. The role of the CMP in the project selection process is to provide system performance information to decision-makers and facilitate understanding of the severity of congestion issues and assessment of the effectiveness of implemented strategies as well as identify system investment priorities.

[RPC Only] The CMP is currently limited to the higher function, and most congested roadways in the region and includes I-93, I-95, NH 16, NH 101, NH 125, US 1 and US 1 Bypass, NH 28, NH 33, as well as portions of NH 107, 108, and 111. In addition, the RPC includes transit services originating or destined for points within the region from COAST, CART, C&J I-95 Boston/Logan Airport, Boston Express, and the Downeaster passenger rail service, including the Park and Rides and Stations served. In addition, there are several other park and rides in the region with no transit service that are still included in the CMP (Epping, Hampstead, Hampton, and Portsmouth Route 33).

[NRPC] The CMP is currently limited to the higher functioning roadways in the Region with the greatest traffic volumes. These roadways include F.E. Everett Turnpike/US 3, US3/Daniel Webster Highway, NH 101, NH 101A, NH 3A, NH 130, NH 13, NH 122, NH 111, NH 38, NH 102 and NH 128.

**HIGH IMPACT PROJECTS (10 POINTS)**

- Project addresses issues on a CMP transportation facility that is experiencing extensive incident related or recurring congestion (LOS F)

**MEDIUM IMPACT PROJECTS (5 POINTS)**

- Project addresses issues on a CMP transportation system or facility that is experiencing moderate incident related or recurring congestion (LOS D or E)

**LOW IMPACT PROJECTS (1 POINT)**

- Project addresses issues on a CMP transportation system or facility that is experiencing limited incident related or recurring congestion (LOS B or C)

**NO IMPACT PROJECTS (0POINTS)**

- Project is not on a CMP system or facility

**Example project types:**

- Projects that eliminate bottlenecks
- Projects that reduce travel times or improve travel time reliability
- Projects that create intermodal connections

**C. SCORE MODIFIERS**

Beyond the six core criteria there are a number of benefits and impacts that must be considered for each transportation project. These have been classified as Modifiers and will be used to assess the overall quality of a project in meeting the many goals and needs of the region. The approach is that each of the modifiers can increase or decrease the Core Criteria score by as much as 5 points. Taken together, these eight modifiers can increase or reduce a projects score by as much as 40 points. The approach is that while each of these modifiers alone may or may not be the reason to implement or reject a project, together they help identify the ancillary costs and benefits that factor into the ease of implementation, the need for mitigation or other important considerations.

**NOTE:**

- Not all projects will receive points from each of the modifiers.
- All points allocated in this section will make a clear reference as to **why** points were awarded or removed.
- There will be a clear indication as to **where**, in your project proposal, the information can be found that drove this determination.

**1. Protecting Our Natural Resources (±5 Points)**

Protection of natural resources in the region is an important goal. This criterion seeks to award or subtract points for project impacts on natural resources. Projects that are perceived to better protect or enhance natural resources and/or be more energy efficient will receive additional points while projects with negative impacts will have points subtracted.

Project types that will score well under this criteria include those that reduce or mitigate non-point source pollution, reduce the use of Single Occupancy Vehicles, increase connectivity for alternative transportation, encourage smart or compact growth patterns, increase efficiency or decrease air pollution, protect or enhance greenways/corridors, improve efficiency of the system, encourage use of alternative transportation, limit impervious surfaces, Projects that impact natural, resources in a negative manner will have points removed from their total.

---

## **2. Protecting Our Historic/Cultural Resources (±5 Points)**

Protection of historical and cultural resources is an important goal and this criterion seeks to award or subtract points for project impacts on these resources. Projects that are perceived to better protect or enhance historic and cultural resources will receive additional points while projects with negative impacts will have points subtracted.

Project types that will score well under this criteria include those that include provisions to directly preserve important historical and cultural resources, or for those that do have impacts to these resources, offer plans to minimize and mitigate those impacts.

## **3. Equitable Distribution of Benefits and Impacts (±5 Points)**

Projects proposed for the Metropolitan Transportation Plan should promote the social equity of the region, specifically for low-income, elderly, and minority residents. To achieve social equity projects should take into consideration their effect on these groups and ensure they strive to create livable communities that improve accessibility and mobility and encouraging compact/smart growth patterns in the region.

Projects that improve options for mobility impaired populations such as expansion of transit service, provision of multimodal connections, and projects that strive to create livable/walkable communities will score highest. Projects with adverse impacts to access or community cohesion for low income, minority, elderly, and/or other mobility impaired population will see points reduced.

## **4. Economic Development (±5 Points)**

All transportation projects have the potential to support economic development within a community or region. However, this information is generally difficult to quantify given the early planning nature of many of the projects under consideration for inclusion in the MPO Long Range Plan or State Ten Year Plan. An assessment will be made by staff on the potential for economic development resulting from each project.

## **5. Local Support (±5 Points)**

The importance of local support in shepherding a project through the development and implementation process cannot be understated. Projects that demonstrate strong local support both in terms of a commitment of matching dollars and an active and involved citizenry will receive bonus points. Historic support for transportation projects may also be considered in this criterion as an indicator of whether or not future support (and funding) will be available to match Federal and State funds.

## **6. A Cost Effective Solution (±5 Points)**

Given limited resources for addressing transportation improvement needs, it is important that investments be cost effective for the problems that are being solved.

---

Given the order-of-magnitude accuracy of planning estimates of project costs this may not be completely accurate and will rely somewhat on a subjective assessment of costs and benefits. Projects deemed to be more cost effective will receive bonus points while those that are uneconomical may see points deducted.

#### **7. Leveraging Investments (±5 Points)**

Occasionally, projects under consideration for prioritization may have been previously prioritized or had funds committed or programmed through prior transportation planning efforts. This includes projects that may be components of on-going improvements that have had funds obligated or encumbered in a previous TIP or projects included in the NH DOT Ten Year Transportation Improvement Plan signed into law by the Governor. Additionally, new funding sources may be identified by project sponsors, including funds earmarked for specific projects which do not affect base allocation, funds committed through public/private partnerships or through community investments. These projects will receive points based on their proven stakeholder and funding commitments from public and/or private sources.

#### **8. Discretionary Considerations (±5 Points)**

The goal of the MPOs is to achieve an equitable scoring criterion that will allow all types of projects to be represented on an even playing field regardless of their scale or classification. We are looking to ensure the complete spectrum of transportation projects are represented fairly and can compete for priority on the Long Range Plan based on their ability to serve the greatest public good and fulfill our regional goals. This modifier looks to add points to projects where the “true value” (to the community or otherwise) cannot be captured using the parameters we have established as our scoring criteria. To receive points in this section your project must demonstrate a high level of value that is outside our predetermined scoring criterion.