



STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
DEPARTMENT OF
TRANSPORTATION
BUREAU OF HIGHWAY
DESIGN



NHDOT Statewide Pedestrian and Bicycle Transportation Plan and Economic Impact Study

Combined Complete Streets Advisory Committee Monthly Meeting

& Project Advisory Committee Meeting #5

Meeting Date: 24 July 2019

Notes Issued by Alta Planning + Design – (updated 20190725)

Attendees: Craig Tufts - Central NH Regional Planning Commission (CSAC Chair),
Tim Blagden – Concord Lake Sunapee Rail Trail, Amanda-Joe W. Paulino – Bureau of Highway Design,
Kathleen Mullen – Public Health, Steve Workman – Transport NH, Sylvia von Aulock - SNHPC,
Maddie Dilonno - SNHPC, Simon Corson – Town of Amherst, Scott Bogle - RPC, Phil Goff - Alta,
Larry Keniston – Bureau of Highway Design, Sally Gunn – Bureau of Highway Design,
Elizabeth Strachan - NHDES, Alex Belensz - NCC, Colin Lentz - SRPC;
Connecting by phone: Dave Topham GSW, Greg Bakos - BWANH and Chuck Redfern - NHRTC

NOTES ON MEETING:

The Minutes of [April 24, 2019](#) Meeting and the [June 2019 Update](#) were approved.

Pedestrian safety PSA

The Pedestrian safety PSA message [Audio](#) began playing across participating [NHAB member stations](#) (radio stations only) on July 15 and will run through August. The Committee suggested some ways to leverage the Audio. Tim Blagden, for example, will try to get an interview on NHPR (likely Laura Knoy) based on the airing of the Audio on participating NHAB radio stations from July 15 to August 9. Tim hopes to roll the occasion of the airing of the audio across New Hampshire into a potential hour-long Exchange Program that would include news and discussion about the NHDOT's Pedestrian and Bicycle Transportation Planning and Economic Impact study outreach and public opportunities. Tim suggested that an Exchange or similar type of interview could possibly include Phil Goff from Alta Planning + Design. Dick Arcand will post the audio on NHDOT channels at his earliest convenience so that the pedestrian safety audio can be seamlessly shared with and by NHPR, regional planning commissions, pedestrian advocacy groups, DES, DHHS, etc. Simon Corson offered to contact college radio stations. Once NHDOT posts the primer and audio, others can seamlessly re-post, relay, or otherwise use the Audio along with any primer that NHDOT social media channels provide to draw in attention. Tim Blagden, for example, will try to get an interview on NHPR (likely Laura Knoy) based on the airing of the Audio on participating NHAB radio stations from July 15 to August 9. Tim hopes to roll the Audio into a potential hour-long "The Exchange" Program potentially to include news about the NHDOT's Pedestrian and Bicycle Transportation Planning and Economic Impact study outreach and public opportunities, possibly bringing on Phil Goff from Alta Planning + Design as well. Scott discussed possibly partnering with the New Hampshire Highway Safety Office toward a broader campaign using the tag line "Scan the

Street for Wheels and Feet.” Larry will specifically contact Jennifer Tramp at New Hampshire Department of Safety’s Office of Highway Safety.

MPOs’ Level of Traffic Stress analysis (Scott Bogle)

In early August, Plymouth State will have preliminary results from the network analyses and the MPOs will choose one or more of the sample analyses to incorporate into their long range transportation plans and use in project identification and prioritization. The network analyses correlate to performance measures such as access via low stress network to employment opportunities, pre-K through college educational institutions and community civic and recreational facilities. A fourth measure, segment centrality, identifies road links that are common to the routing of the greatest number of origin-destination pairs. The research report is due at the end of September, and findings will be presented through one or more FHWA organized peer sharing webinars. The five RPCs/MPOs have completed the collection of road attribute data needed to establish the LTS ratings and they will forward their results to Alta this week for use in the Statewide Pedestrian and Bicycle Transportation plan. There was brief discussion on challenges with data collection, and some unexpected LTS ratings in initial model outputs due to poor available data. Sylvia brought up that the use of posted speed limit rather than prevailing speed underestimated stress levels on many roads. Scott noted that the public input sessions and ArcOnline interactive mapping tool were designed to catch these areas where more accurate speed data could be crowdsourced. In the long term it will be important to have accurate shoulder data collected as part of routine road inventory, and eventually better prevailing speed and AADT info can be hopefully obtained through cell phone data. Other parameters such as intersection configuration and Lidar-based slope data can hopefully also improve future iterations of the model.

Legislative and other updates (Dave Topham):

- As of 8/18, NH will be the 22nd state to formally legislate clarifying the status of e-bikes and how e-bikes fit into the New Hampshire bicycling community. Class I and II e-bikes (up to 20 mph and <750 watts) will generally be allowed on both streets and rail trails (can still be prohibited by land managers and property owners, including municipalities). The State default is that Class I and Class ii e-bikes may be used wherever conventional bicycles are allowed.
- For the OHRV issue, funds have been found to take drone footage Statewide to show the impact of OHRVs on residents.
- As of 7/12/2019, up to \$200,000 was approved for the update of the 2005 Statewide Trails Plan. A consultant selection committee has been formed and they hope to move forward soon. The project must begin by end of 2019-20 fiscal year and the report will need to be completed one year later (6/30/2021).
- Dave announced that registration for the all-day Saturday October 26 Rail Trail Conference is now open. From the State, the Conference Agenda features Taylor Caswell (DNCR Division of Travel and Tourism), Shelley Winters (NHDOT Rail and Transit) and Chris Gamache (DNCR Trails Bureau).

Data Collection Equipment and Capabilities

Larry agreed to discuss data collection further with Tim Dunn and Glenn Davison to better understand the capabilities of the equipment and what kind of shoulder data, if any, the Department will collect.

Next CSAC meeting September 25, 2019 1:00 – 3:00 PM Room 205 Materials and Research building.

Note - no August CSAC or PAC meeting.

Statewide Pedestrian and Bicycle Transportation Plan and Economic Impact Study Discussion (Phil Goff) Phil Goff provided a [slide presentation](#) that includes the overall project schedule to-date, the fall public meeting schedule, updated versions of the Statewide Connectivity Analysis maps and Sidewalk Inventory/Recommendations maps.

(Fall meeting summary:

- Strafford RPC: 9/8, Sunday at Dover Farmer's Market (10 am – 2 pm)
- Nashua RPC: 9/15, Sunday at Nashua Farmer's Market (10 am – 2 pm)
- Southwest RPC: 9/17, Tuesday at Keene Public Library (6 – 8 pm)
- UVLSRPC: 9/18, Wednesday at UVLSRPC offices, Lebanon (5 – 7 pm)
- Lakes RPC: 9/19, Thursday in Meredith Community Center (6 – 8 pm)
- North Country Council: 9/22, Sunday at Littleton Farmer's Market (10 am – 1 pm)
- Southern NH PC: 9/24, Tues at Manchester Public Library (6 – 7:45 pm)
- Rockingham RPC: 10/2, Wednesday at Portsmouth Public Library (6:30 – 8:30 pm)
- Central NH RPC: TBD, December 2019 or January 2020)

Committee members should defer promoting these events until after NHDOT's Front Office approves the schedule and overall format of the events (expected on Monday July 29.)

Following approval from the Department's front office expected on 7/29, Alta will provide each RPC with a meeting flyer promoting the outreach event in each respective region. Two Alta staff will attend each of the eight public events scheduled for September and early October and each respective RPC will be asked to provide up to 2 additional staff, depending on expected demand.

Phil described the format for the public meetings and the outreach events. Both will use similar materials—PPT slides for the meeting and boards for the outreach events—and collect community comments on both the draft Vision and Goals for the plan, and the recommended walk/bike network. Similar materials will be made available as a “Meeting in a Box” for RPCs and municipalities to set up supplemental public meetings/outreach events in their regions. These will be staffed exclusively by RPCs and perhaps municipal staff. The Meeting in a Box materials will be available by the end of August for Planning Commission regions as requested and the supplemental Meetings in a Box should be held between September 1 and October 15. Summary notes from the Meetings in a Box should be sent to Phil before 10/31/19 for incorporation into the plan's recommendations. Alta will maintain www.nhpedbikeplan.com as a channel for public input via survey and interactive mapping up until October 9, 2019. The web page will continue to connect interested stakeholders to the planning process meetings, news, etc. at least through the completion of the project around February 28, 2020.

Regarding the format of the meetings, Phil asked if Committee members felt that we should be asking the public to weigh-in on potential roadway treatment options, ranging from signage to wider shoulders to shared use paths for each of the designated corridors in the Connectivity Analysis. If not, what are some other ideas to elicit productive input from the public? Comments are presented below.

- Colin – I don't think we should include recommendations for each connectivity corridor. When we had a public meeting for our LTS effort, we asked people to tell us (SRPC) what was “wrong” with key corridor in the region and people told us what the problems were with particular roads. We should do the same for this plan and have them also tell us what the particular issue is, e.g. the shoulder is too narrow. Ask public open-ended questions.

- Tim – perhaps we can ask both ‘what is wrong with a particular corridor’, but also give them the option to choose a roadway recommendation to improve bicycling conditions?
- Alex – the problem with asking the public for their desired recommendation is that most will say they want a shared use path along each problematic road, which is not feasible.
- Craig – many people don’t know what it means to include an 11’ travel lane or a 6” shoulder stripe...I think we should keep it simple.
- Kathleen – we should make sure attendees understand the financial costs of and human suffering associated with crashes and injuries involving peds and bicyclists, compared to the cost of building paths, which is much cheaper. Like so many places in Europe, NH residents would probably be more supportive of spending money on walk/bike infrastructure if they knew it would save \$\$ In the long run. Larry agreed to set up a telephone conference with Kathleen and Phil in order to go over the data that Kathleen submitted earlier. Health of the Community is measured by the ability of citizens to self-mobilize (walk or bicycle).
- Sally – Yes, that’s true but the trick is to get Legislators to understand that. We are a low-tax state and we don’t have much money to build paths and wider shoulders.
- Tim – Kathleen, don’t give up...these are important issues to focus on.
- Amanda – let’s not forget that if ped and bike facilities are provided, more people will use them and walk and bike numbers will increase.
- Scott – is it possible to provide a list of prioritized corridors when going out to the public in September? (Phil: no, prioritization will not occur until after the meetings and the LTS analysis results are in.)
- Colin – Let’s simply ask the public to let us know which are the most important corridors to prioritize for improvements. It would be good to know too if the emphasis should be network saturation vs more widely-distributed connectivity.
- Phil – we can give attendees three green dots and have them place them on the roadways that are illustrated in the Connectivity Analysis maps.
- Craig – each dot can represent the most important corridors for improvements irrespective of the potential improvement, either roadway/shoulder widening or sidepath.
- Sylvia – In order to avoid confusion, don’t ask meeting attendees to place different colored dots on the map to represent different treatments, for example. Let’s provide people meeting attendees many photographs of the types of treatment possible...make the break out groups as visual as possible, don’t describe improvements but show people! Comparisons are good too...i.e. here’s a road with a shoulder and one without, here’s a road with sidewalks and one without, etc.
- Steve – I agree that we should keep the format simple and let the public tell us which roadways are most unsafe and help the team with prioritization.
- Sally – We shouldn’t provide treatment recommendations...just let them tell us which roads are the highest priority for improvements. Let’s not get bogged down in the various shoulder, bike lane and path options for the state highways.
- Phil – OK, I’m hearing this loud and clear.
- Simon – We can tell people at the meetings, that if they want to provide additional, more-detailed comments, they can go to the project web site and use the online input map.

- Colin – The visuals can help people become better advocates for the ped/bike projects many of us would like to see more of. I would also like to see visuals in the slide presentation that help people understand the reduced cone of vision that results in driving at higher speeds.
- Scott – Let’s not forget that one of the roles for advocacy groups and individuals is to ensure there is turnout by local officials to the statewide meetings.
- Liz – Ideally, police would come to the meetings as well to learn how to lead pedestrian and bicycle safety efforts in their normal activities.
- Sally – when we have the break out groups, we should have both the Connectivity Analysis and the sidewalk recommendations maps.
- Phil – I think its best to have the Connectivity Analysis maps only and people can let us know about their priorities and whether those corridors should have paths, bike lanes and/or sidewalks to improve safety.
- Sally – Alta should rethink showing the many previously planned and funded routes in light green and light blue, and focus only on funded projects.
- Phil – this has been discussed previously...these were originally given to us by each RPC, but we recognized that the category was too broad, and some very hypothetical trail projects were included. We culled the light green future trails category, so the ones that show currently are strongly supported or feature a lot of planning work, even if they are yet to be funded. Also, its important to note that the future planned/funded projects will be listed in the recommended project matrix just like the Connectivity Corridor roadways. The distinction, therefore, is mostly graphical for the maps to indicate that they have ben previously planned by RPCs and did not arise from this planning study specifically.
- Sylvia – all of the maps should have a small NH map with the inset box marked off so people don’t get too confused (Phil: yes, good idea.) I also think we still have some problems with the legibility of the maps. They should all be the same scale and the NCC map should be broken into two pieces at the same scale as the other maps. We should also remove the green path lines in Massachusetts in the sidewalk maps.
- Phil – because we are still working simultaneously in GIS and Illustrator when making the maps, the linework is not ideal. When we get to a point where no additional iterations will be needed, we can then be more creative with line styles, showing not just different colors but a variety of dashed lines, dotted lines, etc. That will make them more legible, that admittedly, at a statewide scale, it can be challenging to see the details. Readers will need to rely not only on the maps but the accompanying project tables as well. With regards to breaking up the NCC map, the six insets that we have today were established early on and we prefer to stick with what we have even though the scale is the same with only 5 of the 6 maps. We are too far along at this point to create an additional map. It’s a very time-consuming process.
- Alex - Meeting attendees may not relate well to jargon such as “11-foot travel lanes” or a “6-inch wide white stripes.” Regarding the sidewalk maps, in NCC the last 2-3 TAP rounds included sidewalk projects that ideally should be part of your recommendations. I will send you the TAP applications. Perhaps the same can be done in other regions?

Prior to the end of the meeting, Phil reminded attendees that he would like to have their comments on the respective sidewalk assessment and recommendations maps within the next two weeks. The

Connectivity Analysis maps should be in good shape—except the links that were inadvertently left out of the Concord area, as pointed out by Craig—so comments there should be minimal.

Meeting adjourned at 3:25 pm – Next combined CSAC/PAC meeting September 25 1:00 to 3:00 PM