

## MEMORANDUM

To: MPO Technical Advisory Committee  
 From: Scott Bogle, Senior Transportation Planner  
 Date: September 16, 2016  
 RE: **Transportation Alternatives Program Proposal Evaluation**

September 2<sup>nd</sup> was the deadline for submittal of proposals for the second funding round of the Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP). Seven full proposals were received from communities in the RPC region. In aggregate these proposals request \$4,541,502 in federal funding and have a total project cost of \$5,776,677.

Statewide 46 applications were submitted requesting a total of \$25 million in federal funding. This compares to the approximately \$5.4 million pool available statewide for the two year funding round. If divided equally among the nine planning regions, this would equate to approximately \$600,000 per region, though there is not an explicit criterion for geographic distribution in this funding round, and relatively little weight is placed on regional project rank.

RPC just received project proposals from NHDOT, and staff are in the process of reviewing them between now and the July 22<sup>nd</sup> TAC meeting. We will bring staff rankings to the meeting. The statewide ranking system is much the same as in the last round, with two exceptions. First, the prior criterion for multi-modal connections was eliminated, because relatively few communities statewide have bus service. The six points previously assigned to that criterion have been reassigned to Safety. Second, the Socioeconomic Benefits criterion has been restructured to focus on economically disadvantaged communities. The criteria are summarized below.

| Category               |     | Criterion                 | Weight |
|------------------------|-----|---------------------------|--------|
| Potential for Success  | 37% | Project Readiness         | 13%    |
|                        |     | Financial Readiness       | 17%    |
|                        |     | Feasibility               | 7%     |
| Safety                 | 22% | Stress Analysis           | 13%    |
|                        |     | Improve Safety Conditions | 14%    |
| Project Connectivity   | 18% | Project Connectivity      | 18%    |
| Socioeconomic Benefits | 12% | Low Income Communities    | 12%    |
| RPC/MPO Rankings       | 6%  | RPC/MPO Rankings          | 6%     |
|                        |     |                           | 100%   |

As with prior rounds of TE and CMAQ funding, staff have prepared individual summary/scoring sheets for each project, including staff comments, information on projects' consistency with or listing in local and regional plans, and local support. A map for each project accompanies the summary sheet.

Because some of the proposals are very long (100+ pages) we are not making copies of full proposals for each TAC member. However, the original documents are available for review at the RPC offices and we are working to get them up on the RPC website by Tuesday. If you have questions in advance of the TAC meeting please contact at 778-0885 or [sbogle@rpc-nh.org](mailto:sbogle@rpc-nh.org).

### **Requested Action**

Staff ask TAC members to review the project summary sheets and develop your own project rankings for discussion and adoption at the September 22<sup>nd</sup> TAC meeting. TAC rankings will be brought to the October MPO meeting for adoption of final regional rankings, which in turn will be sent to NHDOT to incorporate in the Statewide ranking and project selection process.

## Statewide Project Evaluation Criteria Transportation Alternatives Program

|   |
|---|
| <b>POTENTIAL FOR SUCCESS</b>  |
| <p>1. <u>Project Readiness &amp; Support (13%)</u> - Is the project part of a local and/or regional plan and effort, and has it been endorsed by local and regional bodies and advocacy groups? That is, did you build your case about the importance of this project to many constituents like conservation commission, planning board, other local group? Is it part of a regional plan such as a corridor study? Is it part of a local master plan or other planning document? Is it specifically identified in the RPC Long Range Transportation Plan? (Number of constituents and/or planning documents will be used for scoring)</p>  |
| <p>2. <u>Financial Readiness (17%)</u> - Is there a written commitment to bring this project forward for approval of funds at town meeting, through capital reserve funds, through inclusion in the capital improvement plan, etc. or are there funds already raised/appropriated and dedicated to this project?</p>  |
| <p>3. <u>Feasibility (7%)</u> - Address historic, cultural, environmental, maintenance, possible areas of contamination, and other related issues that may impact the project's ability to succeed. Applicant should discuss issue and how it will be addressed. Discuss impacts to project timeline and possible financial impacts</p>   |
| <b>SAFETY</b>   |
| <p>4. <u>Level of Traffic Stress Analysis (13%)</u> - Measure current stress level versus expected outcome for proposed project. Based on the scale below, describe the existing stress level of the project area and then describe the expected stress level for the proposed improvement. All applications make their own assessments of LTS before/after project.</p> <p><i>A - Facility is reasonably safe for all children.</i></p> <p><i>B - Facility can accommodate users with basic skills and knowledge of traffic.</i></p> <p><i>C - Facility requires an intermediate level of skill and knowledge of traffic to use comfortably.</i></p> <p><i>D - Facility requires an advanced level of skill and knowledge of traffic to use comfortably.</i></p> <p><i>E - Facility is generally not suitable for pedestrians or bicyclists.</i></p> |
| <p>5. <u>Improve Safety Conditions (14%)</u> - Improvement over existing safety conditions - are there very specific actions that are being taken to improve safety. What specific safety improvements will be made? How many people will benefit from the proposed safety improvements? If there is information, (road safety audit, corridor study, etc.) to support it, please provide it in pdf format with your application.</p>   |
| <b>PROJECT CONNECTIVITY</b>   |
| <p>6. <u>Connectivity (18%)</u> - Does the project fill a vital gap in an existing transportation network or phased plan? Does it provide a standalone new facility that did not exist previously? What different destinations does it link together? Describe in detail all connections, and if part of a phased plan what will the proposed improvement accomplish?</p>   |

|   |
|---|
| <b>SOCIOECONOMIC BENEFITS</b>   |
| 7. <u>Equity (12%)</u> - Is the project located in an area where improved mobility and access can be provided to underserved populations? Will the project contribute to improved public health? (Note: projects in counties with obesity rates over 30% will be considered for additional points under this sub-criterion). How will the project serve vulnerable users (elderly, children, minorities, people with disabilities etc.) |
| <b>RPC/MPO RANKINGS</b>   |
| 8. <u>Regional Ranking (6%)</u> – Regional rankings will be incorporated in statewide project score   |

## Transportation Alternatives Program 2016 Application Round

### Full Applications Received from RPC Region Communities

| #             | Municipality | Description  | Estimated<br>Project Cost | Federal TAP<br>Funds<br>Requested |
|---------------|--------------|--|---------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| RPC-TA16-1    | Exeter       | Sidewalk improvements on Winter Street, Spring Street and Epping Road, including crossing improvements at two locations on Epping Road   | \$ 541,261                | \$ 433,009                        |
| RPC-TA16-2    | Hampton      | School zone sidewalk improvements along Winnacunnet Road (NH101E) and High Street (NH27)   | \$ 1,000,000              | \$ 800,000                        |
| RPC-TA16-3    | New Castle   | Shoulder bicycle route and sidewalks on NH1B   | \$ 755,000                | \$ 604,000                        |
| RPC-TA16-4    | Plaistow     | Construct 2800' of sidewalk in Village Center District on both sides of NH121A from railroad tracks to crossing of Little River, building on earlier SRTS sidewalk construction.                               | \$ 984,616                | \$ 787,693                        |
| RPC-TA16-5    | Portsmouth   | Maplewood Avenue Complete Streets project including sidewalk widening, bike lanes, crosswalk improvements and traffic calming between Congress and Vaughan Streets   | \$ 850,800                | \$ 600,800                        |
| RPC-TA16-6    | Salem        | Sidewalk and bicycle lane construction on Veterans Memorial Parkway (VMP) from Geremonty Drive to Lawrence Road, and from Salem Bike/Ped Corridor to existing stretch of sidewalk on VMP.                      | \$ 1,000,000              | \$ 800,000                        |
| RPC-TA16-7    | Stratham     | Construct sidewalk and bike lane improvements on Winnicut Road from NH33 to Tansy Lane (900'), and on NH33 from Winnicut to Piper's Landing (450'). Also includes street lighting, landscaping and bike racks. | \$ 645,000                | \$ 516,000                        |
| <b>Totals</b> |              |  | <b>\$ 5,776,677</b>       | <b>\$ 4,541,502</b>               |

**Rockingham Planning Commission****2016 Transportation Alternatives Program Project Summary and Evaluation Sheet**

|  |                          |              |  |                        |
|--|--------------------------|--------------|--|------------------------|
| <b>Evaluation<br/>(See Criteria Sheet)</b>     |                          |              | Project Location: Exeter   | Project ID: RPC-TA16-1 |
| Criterion                                      | Staff<br>Score           | TAC<br>Score | Project Title: Sidewalk improvements on Winter & Spring Streets and Epping Road  |                        |
| 1. (13pts)<br>Project<br>Readiness             |                          |              | Applicant: Town of Exeter  |                        |
| 2. (17pts)<br>Financial<br>Readiness           |                          |              | <b>Brief Project Description:</b><br><br>As part of a town wide pedestrian improvement project, Exeter is seeking to connect sidewalks on Winter Street, Spring Street and Epping Road (NH 27). The project will also provide a safer pedestrian crossing at the intersection of Warren Street and Epping Road and at the intersection of Brentwood Road (NH 111-A) and Epping Road. The general goal of this project is to eliminate gaps in existing sidewalks that will enhance and promote pedestrian use and safety.<br><br>The proposed sidewalk on Epping Road will connect an existing sidewalk on the western side of Epping Road to a sidewalk that was required as part of a recent site plan approval of the Planning Board. Will connect to new Great Bay Kids daycare center. The proposed sidewalk on Winter Street will connect an existing sidewalk on Winter Street to an existing sidewalk on Epping Road. On Spring Street, the project proposes two short sections of sidewalk that connect the existing sidewalk along this roadway. |                        |
| 3. (7 pts)<br>Feasibility                      |                          |              |  |                        |
| 4. (13 pts)<br>Safety - Stress<br>Analysis     |                          |              |  |                        |
| LTS<br>Now<br><b>C</b>                         | LTS<br>After<br><b>A</b> |              |  |                        |
| 5. (14 pts)<br>Improve<br>Safety<br>Conditions |                          |              |  |                        |
| 6. (18 pts)<br>Project<br>Connectivity         |                          |              | Total Project Cost: \$541,261 [\$433,009 Federal]  |                        |
| 7. (12 pts)<br>Socio-Econ<br>Benefits          |                          |              | Source of Match: \$108,252 (Selectmen commit to 2017 warrant article)  |                        |
| 8. (6 pts)<br>RPC/MPO<br>Rank                  |                          |              | Federal Percentage: 80%  |                        |
|  |                          |              | Non-Federal Percentage: 20%  |                        |
|  |                          |              | Municipally Managed? Yes   |                        |
|  |                          |              |  |                        |
| Total  |                          |              | Other Comments:  |                        |
| Staff<br>Ranking                               |                          |              | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The project is generally listed in the Master Plan, specifically the 2017-2022 Capital Improvement Program and the Epping Road portion of the project is specifically mentioned in Epping Road study.</li><li>• Letters of support from Planning Board and Economic Development Commission</li><li>• No likely resource constraints impairing project</li></ul>  |                        |
| TAC<br>Ranking                                 |                          |              |  |                        |

**Rockingham Planning Commission**  
**2016 Transportation Alternatives Program Project Summary and Evaluation Sheet**

| Evaluation<br>(See Criteria Sheet)       |                       |            | Project Location: Hampton  | Project ID: RPC-TA16-2 |
|--|-----------------------|------------|--|------------------------|
| Criterion                                | Staff Score           | Your Score | Project Title: School Zone Safety Improvements   |                        |
| 1. (13pts)<br>Project Readiness          |                       |            | Applicant: Town of Hampton & SAU 90  |                        |
| 2. (17pts)<br>Financial Readiness        |                       |            | <b>Brief Project Description:</b><br><br>Project includes two stretches of sidewalk in Hampton's town center school zone: 1) Winnacunnet Road/NH101E from Centre School to Mill Road (approx. 1,570'); and 2) along the north side of High Street/NH27 from Tobey Road to Five Corners (approx. 1160')<br><br>With four schools within a half-mile radius, students and parents use the sidewalks in town to walk and/or bike to school. However, based on surveys conducted as part of the Safe Routes to School (SRTS) Travel Plan, there are many students and parents that do not use the sidewalks or roadways because they do not feel these routes are safe. With the Center School (K-2nd), Town Hall, Town Library, Marston School (3-5th), Hampton Academy (6-8th), the High School, a Historic Church and the Fire Station connected by Winnacunnet Road and High Street, these routes are not only used by the Town's school aged children but residents and visitors too. |                        |
| 3. (7 pts)<br>Feasibility                |                       |            |  |                        |
| 4. (13 pts)<br>Stress Analysis           |                       |            |  |                        |
| LTS Now<br><b>C</b>                      | LTS After<br><b>A</b> |            |  |                        |
| 5. (14 pts)<br>Improve Safety Conditions |                       |            |  |                        |
| 6. (18 pts)<br>Project Connectivity      |                       |            |  |                        |
| 7. (12 pts)<br>Socio-Econ Benefits       |                       |            | Total Project Cost: \$1,000,000 [\$800,000 Federal]  |                        |
|  |                       |            | Source of Match: \$200,000 proposed through 2017 Warrant Article   |                        |
|  |                       |            |  |                        |
| 8. (6 pts)<br>RPC/MPO Rank               |                       |            | Federal Percentage: 80%  |                        |
|  |                       |            | Non-Federal Percentage: 20%  |                        |
|  |                       |            | Municipally Managed? Yes   |                        |
|  |                       |            |  |                        |
| Total                                    |                       |            | Other Comments:  |                        |
| Staff Ranking                            |                       |            | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Public Input &amp; Plan Consistency: Identified in Hampton SRTS Travel Plan (2015); school zone sidewalk improvement generally identified in Hampton Master Plan.</li> <li>Preliminary screening identified no natural or historic resources likely to be adversely affected. No known hazardous materials sites.</li> <li>Selectmen have committed in attached letter to endorse Warrant Article for match in 2017</li> <li>Project is proposed jointly by Town of Hampton and Hampton School District, with Town as lead agency.</li> </ul>   |                        |
| TAC Ranking                              |                       |            |  |                        |

# Rockingham Planning Commission

## 2016 Transportation Alternatives Program Project Summary and Evaluation Sheet

| Evaluation<br>(See Criteria Sheet)             |                          |              | Project Location: New Castle  | Project ID: RPC-TA16-3 |
|--|--------------------------|--------------|---|------------------------|
| Criterion                                      | Staff<br>Score           | TAC<br>Score | Project Title: Route 1B Bicycle & Pedestrian Safety Improvements  |                        |
| 1. (13pts)<br>Project<br>Readiness             |                          |              | Applicant: Town of New Castle   |                        |
| 2. (17pts)<br>Financial<br>Readiness           |                          |              | <b>Brief Project Description:</b><br><br>Project adds approx 2' feet of shoulder width to NH1B in two segments:<br>1) Wild Rose Lane to intersection of Main Street (approx. 2700 feet); and<br>2) River Road to the Causeway (approx. 2700 feet). Also includes 5' wide bituminous sidewalk with granite curbing between Wild Rose Lane and Beach Hill Road (approx 1100 feet). The additional shoulder width will bring average shoulder width along the corridor from a current one foot to approximately three feet. The proposed section of sidewalk will extend the New Castle SafePath sidewalk the remainder of the way from the Wentworth neighborhood to New Castle Common and beyond to the Beach Hill Road neighborhood.<br><br>Purpose is to improve safety for all users of the state highway, and particularly vulnerable road users including the many people walking, running and riding bicycles along the corridor. In addition to adult walkers and riders, elementary school students attending Trefethen school will also benefit from the proposed project, which includes shoulder widening in the school zone. |                        |
| 3. (7 pts)<br>Feasibility                      |                          |              |   |                        |
| 4. (13 pts)<br>Stress<br>Analysis              |                          |              |   |                        |
| LTS<br>Now<br><b>D</b>                         | LTS<br>After<br><b>B</b> |              |   |                        |
| 5. (14 pts)<br>Improve<br>Safety<br>Conditions |                          |              | Total Project Cost: \$755,000 [\$604,000 Federal]   |                        |
| 6. (18 pts)<br>Project<br>Connectivity         |                          |              | Source of Match: \$151,000 (Selectmen will support warrant article)   |                        |
| 7. (12 pts)<br>Socio-Econ<br>Benefits          |                          |              | Federal Percentage: 80%   |                        |
| 8. (6 pts)<br>RPC/MPO<br>Rank                  |                          |              | Non-Federal Percentage: 20%   |                        |
|  |                          |              | Municipally Managed? Yes  |                        |
|  |                          |              |   |                        |
| Total  |                          |              | Other Comments:   |                        |
| Staff<br>Ranking                               |                          |              | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NH1B is a State Bicycle Route, U.S. Bicycle Route 1, the New Hampshire Coastal Byway, and the on-road route for the East Coast Greenway.</li> <li>Based on the StravaMetro data on bicycle and running/walking use purchased by NHDOT this is one of the most heavily traveled bicycle routes in New Hampshire, second only to adjoining segments of Route 1A in Rye.</li> <li>Identified in NH Coastal Byway CMP (2015), NHSG Conceptual Design (2009)</li> <li>Letters from Selectmen, Consv Comm, Heritage Comm, Health Dept, SABR, ECGA</li> <li>Coordinate scheduling w/water main and resurfacing</li> </ul>   |                        |
| TAC<br>Ranking                                 |                          |              |   |                        |



**Rockingham Planning Commission****2016 Transportation Alternatives Program Project Summary and Evaluation Sheet**

| <b>Evaluation<br/>(See Criteria Sheet)</b>     |                          |               | Project Location: Plaistow  | Project ID: RPC-TA16-4 |
|--|--------------------------|---------------|---|------------------------|
| Criterion                                      | Staff<br>Score           | Your<br>Score | Project Title: Plaistow Village Center Sidewalks  |                        |
| 1. (13pts)<br>Project<br>Readiness             |                          |               | Applicant: Town of Plaistow   |                        |
| 2. (17pts)<br>Financial<br>Readiness           |                          |               | <b>Brief Project Description:</b><br><br>Construct sidewalk in Village Center District on both sides of NH121A from railroad tracks to crossing of Little River (1155 linear feet x 2 sides of street). Also construct 1,950' of sidewalk on east side of Main Street/NH121A from southern boundary of prior SRTS project to Plaistow Public Library. Total linear footage of sidewalk proposed is 3,105. Connects to SRTS and Town-funded sidewalks on Main Street from Elm Street to Davis Park connecting to Pollard School.<br><br>Also includes improved crosswalk configurations at three locations with curb extensions, landscaping work, and lighting to create a clearly delineated area of public ROW for pedestrians to provide physical separation from motor vehicles.<br><br>The purpose/goal of this project is to significantly improve pedestrian, bicycle and vehicle safety along Main Street in the Village Center District. This area is highly travelled by children, adults, older adults and individuals with disabilities to access Town Hall, school buildings, library, recreation center, post office, business and residence. |                        |
| 3. (7 pts)<br>Feasibility                      |                          |               |   |                        |
| 4. (13 pts)<br>Stress<br>Analysis              |                          |               |   |                        |
| LTS<br>Now<br><b>D</b>                         | LTS<br>After<br><b>A</b> |               |   |                        |
| 5. (14 pts)<br>Improve<br>Safety<br>Conditions |                          |               |   |                        |
| 6. (18 pts)<br>Project<br>Connectivity         |                          |               |   |                        |
| 7. (12 pts)<br>Socio-Econ<br>Benefits          |                          |               | Total Project Cost: \$984,616 [\$787,692 Federal]   |                        |
| 8. (6 pts)<br>RPC/MPO<br>Rank                  |                          |               | Source of Match: \$196,923 (Selectmen's warrant article, \$50K reserve)   |                        |
|  |                          |               |   |                        |
|  |                          |               | Federal Percentage: 80%   |                        |
|  |                          |               | Non-Federal Percentage: 20%   |                        |
|  |                          |               | Municipally Managed? Yes  |                        |
|  |                          |               |   |                        |
| Total  |                          |               | Other Comments:   |                        |
| Staff<br>Ranking                               |                          |               | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Public Input &amp; Plan Consistency: Partially implements recommendations of Main Street Traffic Calming Study (2011) and PlanNH Study in 2012. Consistent with Master Plan.</li><li>Preliminary screening indicates no likely resource conflicts</li></ul>   |                        |
| TAC<br>Ranking                                 |                          |               |   |                        |

**Rockingham Planning Commission****2016 Transportation Alternatives Program Project Summary and Evaluation Sheet**

| <b>Evaluation<br/>(See Criteria Sheet)</b>     |                          |               | Project Location: Portsmouth  | Project ID: RPC-TA16-6 |
|--|--------------------------|---------------|---|------------------------|
| Criterion                                      | Staff<br>Score           | Your<br>Score | Project Title: Maplewood Avenue Complete Streets Project  |                        |
| 1. (13pts)<br>Project<br>Readiness             |                          |               | Applicant: City of Portsmouth   |                        |
| 2. (17pts)<br>Financial<br>Readiness           |                          |               | <b>Brief Project Description:</b><br><br>The proposed Maplewood Avenue Complete Streets Project includes sidewalk widening, bike lane creation, travel lane reductions, traffic calming along 0.25 mile corridor between Congress Street and Vaughan Street. Improvements will increase bicycle and pedestrian safety by providing dedicated bicycle lanes, reducing traffic speeds by eliminating a vehicle lane, increasing pedestrian visibility, and decreasing pedestrian crossing distance at intersections. Connects to COAST and Wildcat transit routes running along Maplewood Ave.<br><br>Section from Hanover to Vaughan Streets currently under development as part of PortWalk project. Connects to Middle St/Lafayette Road bicycle lane project being funded under SRTS. Maplewood is the connector route to the Rockingham Bike Bridge over the Spaulding Turnpike connecting downtown to Pease TradePort |                        |
| 3. (7 pts)<br>Feasibility                      |                          |               |   |                        |
| 4. (13 pts)<br>Stress<br>Analysis              |                          |               |   |                        |
| LTS<br>Now<br><b>C</b>                         | LTS<br>After<br><b>A</b> |               |   |                        |
| 5. (14 pts)<br>Improve<br>Safety<br>Conditions |                          |               |   |                        |
| 6. (18 pts)<br>Project<br>Connectivity         |                          |               |   |                        |
| 7. (12 pts)<br>Socio-Econ<br>Benefits          |                          |               | Total Project Cost: \$850,800 [\$600,800 Federal]   |                        |
|  |                          |               | Source of Match: \$150,200 in CIP and approved City Budget  |                        |
|  |                          |               |   |                        |
| 8. (6 pts)<br>RPC/MPO<br>Rank                  |                          |               | Federal Percentage: 80%   |                        |
|  |                          |               | Non-Federal Percentage: 20%   |                        |
|  |                          |               | Municipally Managed? Yes  |                        |
|  |                          |               |   |                        |
| Total  |                          |               | Other Comments:   |                        |
| Staff<br>Ranking                               |                          |               | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Public Input &amp; Plan Consistency: Based on feasibility study by Portsmouth Planning Department in 2014, at request of Portsmouth Traffic Safety Committee in 2013. Ranked as high priority in 2014 draft Portsmouth Bike/Ped Master Plan.</li><li>Private developer also legally committed to provide a share of sidewalk improvements</li><li>Project is located in Portsmouth Historic District. No significant natural resource impacts. Wholly within existing paved right of way</li></ul>  |                        |
| TAC<br>Ranking                                 |                          |               | Project selected for funding in last Ten Year Plan cycle, but programmed too late to take advantage of significant private funding linked to adjacent development   |                        |

**Rockingham Planning Commission**
**2016 Transportation Alternatives Program Project Summary and Evaluation Sheet**

| Evaluation<br>(See Criteria Sheet)       |                       |            | Project Location: Salem  | Project ID: RPC-TA16-7 |
|--|-----------------------|------------|--|------------------------|
| Criterion                                | Staff Score           | Your Score | Project Title: Veteran's Memorial Parkway Sidewalks  |                        |
| 1. (13pts)<br>Project Readiness          |                       |            | Applicant: Town of Salem   |                        |
| 2. (17pts)<br>Financial Readiness        |                       |            | <b>Brief Project Description:</b><br>The proposed project includes the construction of two segments of 5' sidewalk and the creation of a 4' bicycle lane in either direction on Veterans Memorial Parkway. The first segment will connect the existing sidewalk on Route 28 to the existing sidewalk on Veterans Memorial Parkway. The length of segment one is approx. 750'. The second sidewalk segment runs along Veterans Memorial Parkway from Geremonty Drive to Lawrence Road and is approx.. 1500' in length. The bicycle lanes will span the entire length of Veterans Memorial Parkway, approximately one mile.<br><br>This project will further enhance and provide additional non-motorized travel within the community of Salem. This project will increase safety for pedestrians and bicyclists who already use the road on a daily basis. This project will also grant further pedestrian and bicyclist access to the Bike-Ped Corridor, retail stores and other businesses on Route 28. Many of the pedestrians in the area are residents of several senior housing properties and visitors of the senior center on Veterans Memorial Parkway, for whom safety and mobility are major concerns. |                        |
| 3. (7 pts)<br>Feasibility                |                       |            |  |                        |
| 4. (13 pts)<br>Stress Analysis           |                       |            |  |                        |
| LTS Now<br><b>D</b>                      | LTS After<br><b>A</b> |            |  |                        |
| 5. (14 pts)<br>Improve Safety Conditions |                       |            |  |                        |
| 6. (18 pts)<br>Project Connectivity      |                       |            | Total Project Cost: \$1,000,000 [\$800,000 Federal]  |                        |
| 7. (12 pts)<br>Socio-Econ Benefits       |                       |            | Source of Match: \$200,000 proposed through 2017 Warrant Article   |                        |
| 8. (6 pts)<br>RPC/MPO Rank               |                       |            | Federal Percentage: 80%  |                        |
|  |                       |            | Non-Federal Percentage: 20%  |                        |
|  |                       |            | Municipally Managed? Yes   |                        |
| Total                                    |                       |            | Other Comments:  |                        |
| Staff Ranking                            |                       |            | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Public Input &amp; Plan Consistency: Identified in Veterans Memorial Parkway Corridor Study (2002); Salem Sidewalk Master Plan (2001)</li> <li>Preliminary screening identified adjacent prime wetlands areas, but do not anticipate direct impacts.</li> <li>Letters of support from Selectmen, Senior Center, Salem FD, Salem PD, Salem SAU, BWANH</li> <li>LTS improvements estimated for Section 1 as improving from E to C; and for section 2 improving from C to B.</li> <li>Traffic increase anticipated on Veterans' Memorial Parkway due to redevelopment of Rockingham Park.</li> </ul>   |                        |
| TAC Ranking                              |                       |            |  |                        |

**Rockingham Planning Commission**  
**2016 Transportation Alternatives Program Project Summary and Evaluation Sheet**

| Evaluation<br>(See Criteria Sheet)       |                       |            | Project Location: Stratham  | Project ID: RPC-TA16-8 |
|--|-----------------------|------------|---|------------------------|
| Criterion                                | Staff Score           | Your Score | Project Title: Town Center Sidewalks Phase II   |                        |
| 1. (13pts)<br>Project Readiness          |                       |            | Applicant: Town of Stratham   |                        |
| 2. (17pts)<br>Financial Readiness        |                       |            | <b>Brief Project Description:</b><br><br>Construct sidewalk and bike lane improvements on Winnicut Road from NH33 to Tansy Lane (900'), and on NH33 from Winnicut to Piper's Landing (450'). Also includes curb/gutter, street lighting, landscaping and bike racks.<br><br>The work proposed is Phase II of a project initiated with TE request in 2009 and constructed in 2016. Work on Winnicut Road was part of the scope of the original TE project, so most engineering and design work is already completed for this segment.<br><br>The purpose of this TAP request is to connect an established commercial park with the Town Center business and, with overall completion of the request, the residential areas and recreational trails beyond the Town Center as well. |                        |
| 3. (7 pts)<br>Feasibility                |                       |            |   |                        |
| 4. (13 pts)<br>Stress Analysis           |                       |            |   |                        |
| LTS Now<br><b>C</b>                      | LTS After<br><b>A</b> |            |   |                        |
| 5. (14 pts)<br>Improve Safety Conditions |                       |            |   |                        |
| 6. (18 pts)<br>Project Connectivity      |                       |            |   |                        |
| 7. (12 pts)<br>Socio-Econ Benefits       |                       |            | Total Project Cost: \$645,000 [\$516,000 Federal]   |                        |
|  |                       |            | Match: \$129,000 Selectmen will support CIP approp. for 2017-2018   |                        |
|  |                       |            |   |                        |
| 8. (6 pts)<br>RPC/MPO Rank               |                       |            | Federal Percentage: 80%   |                        |
|  |                       |            | Non-Federal Percentage: 20%   |                        |
|  |                       |            | Municipally Managed? Yes  |                        |
| Total                                    |                       |            |   |                        |
| Staff Ranking                            |                       |            | Other Comments:<br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Public Input &amp; Plan Consistency: In Town Center Revitalization Master Plan; generally consistent with Town Master Plan (2009), Gateway Commercial Business District Master Plan (2008)</li> <li>Letters from Selectmen, Planning Board, Heritage Commission, Town Center Revitalization Committee.</li> <li>There are no known natural hazards (wetlands, streams, flood plain) within the immediate project area. Some adjacent historic buildings, but set well back and work proposed is all within state ROW.</li> </ul>  |                        |
| TAC Ranking                              |                       |            |   |                        |