



## **NOTICE OF MEETING**

**WHO: NRPC Executive Committee**

**WHEN: Wednesday, August 19, 2020 6:00 pm**

**WHERE: 30 Temple Street, Suite 310, Nashua, NH 03060 (NRPC Commissioners and staff only) The Public may participate remotely via Zoom**

## **AGENDA**

1. Call to Order
2. Business:
  - a. Minutes: June 17, 2020 (**Action Required**)
  - b. Non-Public Minutes: May 20, 2020 (**Action Required**)
  - c. June/July Dashboard (**Action Required**)
  - d. FY20 Year-end Financials
  - e. July/Aug Dashboard (**Action Required**)
  - f. Slate of Officers and Executive Committee Membership
3. Transportation Programs
  - a. Ten Year Plan Project Solicitation
  - b. UPWP Updates
4. Project Updates
  - a. HHW
  - b. Brownfields
  - c. EDA Nashua Millyard & Wilton Collaborative Workspace Projects
  - d. Hudson Circuit Rider
  - e. Nashua Sidewalk Assessments
5. Other Business
  - a. Proposed Hudson Logistics Center/Circumferential Hwy
6. Nonpublic Session per NH RSA 91-A:3 (a).
7. Adjourn

*Next Meeting: September 16, 2020*



**DRAFT MINUTES  
NASHUA REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION  
Executive Committee  
June 17, 2020**

<b>Members Present</b>	<b>Members Absent</b>	<b>Staff Present</b>	<b>Others Present</b>
Karin Elmer, Chair Jim Battis, Vice Chair Tamara Sorell Tim Tenhave Sarah Marchant Janet Langdell (arrived 6:17)	Susan Ruch, Treasurer	Jay Minkarah, Executive Director Sara Siskavich, Assistant Director Mason Twombly	

**1. Call to Order**

Elmer called the meeting to order at 6:03 pm. She then took attendance by roll call.

**2. Business**

**a. Minutes: May 20<sup>th</sup>, 2020**

Tenhave requested several grammatical edits. He also requested that the name of the preferred audit firm be removed from the public minutes.

Tenhave moved to accept the minutes of May 20<sup>th</sup>, 2020, as amended. Tamara seconded. The motion passed 5-0-0.

**b. Non-Public Minutes: May 20<sup>th</sup>, 2020**

The non-public minutes were purposefully omitted from the public agenda. In lieu of an on-screen review of the document, the consensus was to table the item until the next Executive Committee meeting.

**c. May/June Dashboard and Financials (Action Required)**

Minkarah reviewed the balances and deltas in payables and receivables since last month. TD balance is relatively consistent, and CDs continue to edge up. The working budget reflects some adjustments on the revenue side, reflecting what we project we can reasonably draw down. Staff activities include our standard meetings, and staff completed refresher training in SADES. The building is open to staff but remains closed to the public. Most staff are reporting into the office at least part of the time and telecommuting the remainder of the week. We boosted newsletter subscribers last month, Facebook activity is robust, but Twitter is relatively flat.

The Profit and Loss report reflects 92% of the fiscal year. Minkarah highlighted several projects that are not commensurately drawn down but can be carried over and continued into next year. Local contracts are close to our target. Total revenues and expenses are at 78% and 79% respectively, putting us at a projected net positive position of \$39K for the year.

Battis moved to accept the dashboard and financials and place them on file for audit. Tenhave seconded. After no further discussion, the motion passed 5-0-0.

**d. Recommendation to Commission to Approve the FY21 Budget and Work Program**

Minkarah reviewed the proposed FY21 Budget. We have a very aggressive goal to draw 70% of the EPA Brownfields grant by November 2020 so that we can reapply so the budget amount for FY21 has increased. The HHW line is our best estimate considering potential COVID-19 impacts impacting future events. At the request of Battis, Siskavich reviewed the major change on the state projects represented by the NH Geodata Portal project, which also contributes to the increase in professional services passthrough on the expense side. At the request of Elmer, Minkarah explained the change in the miscellaneous line representing the continuance of a data subscription for vehicle probe data.

Battis made a motion to approve the FY21 budget. Marchant seconded. The motion passed 6-0-0.

**e. Recommendation to Commission to Approve FY22 Dues Allocation**

Minkarah reviewed the proposed FY22 Dues Allocation. This is not an increase, but it does reflect some nominal adjustments for each municipality based on the apportionment formula that reflects annual changes in population and valuation.

At Elmer's request, Battis made a motion to approve the recommended FY22 Dues Allocation. Langdell seconded. The motion passed 6-0-0.

At the request of Langdell, Minkarah and Siskavich briefly discussed NRPC's use of community-member dues for projects and grant match.

**f. Slate of Officers and Executive Committee Membership**

Elmer will be stepping down from the position of chair. Battis is willing to remain vice-chair or treasurer, and Marchant would also be able to take the role of treasurer. Considering Ruch's absence and that her intentions are not yet known, this item was tabled to next month.

**g. Audit RFP**

Battis motioned that we move forward with the recommended audit firm. Battis seconded. The motion passed 6-0-0.

**h. CD Roll-over**

The Committee reviewed the packet memo from Lafond regarding the expiration of one of our two CDs in July. Memo. Marchant moved, with a second from Langdell, that the maturing 19-month CD be rolled over into an 8-month CD with Bar Harbor Bank & Trust. The motion passed 6-0-0.

**3. Transportation Program Updates**

The major item here is that NRPC is soliciting projects for the Ten-Year Plan (TYP). This will be treated in depth at the Full Commission session.

**4. Adjourn**

With a motion from Battis, seconded by Tenhave, the Executive Committee adjourned at 6:47 by a vote of 6-0-0.

Next Meeting: July 15, 2020

# NRPC FY 2020 DASHBOARD

Jun-20		Key Statistics	
TD Checking		Staff Activities June/July	
Beginning Balance	\$250,643.57	Ten Year Plan criteria subcommittee - Matt HHW Coordinators zoom Meet - Mason Complete Streets Advisory Committee - Jay, Matt, Ryan NRPC Commission Meet - Jay, Sara, Mason, Gregg, Kate Nashua Riverwalk Planning Meet - Jay NRSWMD Quarterly Meeting - Mason, Jay, Cassie Transpo Planners Collaboratives Meet - Gregg & Matt GNUW Community Connections Forum Planning Meet - Jay Greater Nashua PHAC Executive Committee Meet - Jay NTS General Staff Meeting - Ryan Litchfield Affordable Housing Brainstorming Session - Jay RCC Patient Discharge Webinar - Sara, Matt, John, Mason Nashua Rail Committee - Jay Commutesmart NH Meeting - Gregg NTS Lo/No grant TIP/STIP Meet - Jay, Gregg & Matt 101A Rail trail subcommittee meeting - Matt TTAC - Gregg, Matt, Jay, Derek & Mason RPC Directors Remote Meeting - Jay NHDOT Interagency meeting - Gregg & Matt NEARC planning committee - Andrew Stay, Work, Play NH - John RPC Directors Remote Meeting - Jay	
Deposits & Credits			
Payments			
Ending Balance	\$250,674.39		
Bar Harbor Checking			
Beginning Balance	\$86,980.72		
Deposits & Credits			
Payments			
Ending Balance	\$100,623.82		
Tuesday, June 30, 2020			
Accounts Payable	\$1,358.00		
Accounts Receivable	\$187,232.84		
Oversight Activities			
Line of credit (\$75,000) activated?	No		
BHB CDs	\$271,475.83		
Audit Status	Complete		
Budget Narrative		Staff Education & Training - June/July	
BankBalances/Cash on hand:	We continue to have a healthy balance that supports over five months of operating expenses.		
Payables and Receivables:	Payables down very slightly; Receivables largely unchanged		
FY21 Working Budget			
Funding Sources		Expenses	
Local Dues	\$163,000	Audit	\$16,250
Federal Contracts	\$195,182	Dues & Subscriptions	\$8,214
Grants	\$220,548	Employee Benefits	\$162,828
Local Planning Contracts	\$66,511	GIS	\$17,700
Other Income	\$6,000	Insurance	\$11,870
State Contracts	\$1,017,358	IT	\$5,930
		Legal	\$2,500
		Marketing, Outreach, Annual Forum	\$7,390
		Office Expenditures	\$11,481
		Other Expenditures	\$68,652
		Professional Services	\$515,440
		Rent & CAM	\$89,375
		Salaries	\$720,068
		Staff Development	\$8,500
		Travel & Meeting Exp	\$11,800
		Utilities	\$10,600
Total revenues:	\$1,668,599	Total Expenses:	\$1,668,598
Pending Grant Applications	\$0	Delta	\$1

**Nashua Regional Planning Commission**  
**Profit & Loss Budget vs. Actual - EC**  
July 2019 through June 2020

	TOTAL				
	Jun 20	Jul '19 - Jun 20	Budget	\$ Over Budget	% of Budget
<b>Income</b>					
<b>2000 Local Dues</b>					
Local Dues Match	(31,684.28)	(121,575.78)	0.00	(121,575.78)	100.0%
2000 Local Dues - Other	13,583.37	163,003.00	163,000.00	3.00	100.0%
<b>Total 2000 Local Dues</b>	<b>(18,100.91)</b>	<b>41,427.22</b>	<b>163,000.00</b>	<b>(121,572.78)</b>	<b>25.42%</b>
<b>Federal Contracts</b>					
9011 EPA Brownfields	30,626.99	71,160.81	98,000.00	(26,839.19)	72.61%
9055 EDA	42,082.98	57,998.05	0.00	57,998.05	100.0%
9082 Hazard Mit	0.00	0.00	18,570.00	(18,570.00)	0.0%
<b>Total Federal Contracts</b>	<b>72,709.97</b>	<b>129,158.86</b>	<b>116,570.00</b>	<b>12,588.86</b>	<b>110.8%</b>
<b>Grants</b>					
6300 NRSWMD	6,920.73	165,660.42	241,450.00	(75,789.58)	68.61%
7516 NH Housing-GIS Support	0.00	2,447.87	4,648.00	(2,200.13)	52.67%
9025 EPA Healthy Communities	5,813.75	20,641.90	12,484.00	8,157.90	165.35%
<b>Total Grants</b>	<b>12,734.48</b>	<b>188,750.19</b>	<b>258,582.00</b>	<b>(69,831.81)</b>	<b>72.99%</b>
<b>Interest Income</b>	<b>30.82</b>	<b>6,475.55</b>	<b>6,000.00</b>	<b>475.55</b>	<b>107.93%</b>
<b>Local Planning Contracts</b>					
2112 Amherst Housing Needs	0.00	1,500.00	0.00	1,500.00	100.0%
2113 Amherst Ordinance Assess	0.00	1,000.00	0.00	1,000.00	100.0%
2139 Hudson CR	350.00	350.00			
2142 Hudson MP	1,833.79	19,378.00	19,378.00	0.00	100.0%
2150 Mason CR	918.55	7,043.17	5,000.00	2,043.17	140.86%
2152 Mason MP	2,995.27	5,829.00	0.00	5,829.00	100.0%
2176 Hollis Asset Mgmt Support	300.00	4,475.00	0.00	4,475.00	100.0%
2245 Litchfield CIP	0.00	1,942.55	0.00	1,942.55	100.0%
2250 Litchfield CR	836.50	11,198.23	18,000.00	(6,801.77)	62.21%
2361 MVD GIS	0.00	3,000.00	3,000.00	0.00	100.0%
2362 MVD Service Mapping	0.00	4,987.50	0.00	4,987.50	100.0%
2534 Nashua Ped/Bike Study	0.00	8,000.00	0.00	8,000.00	100.0%
2535 Nashua Enrollment Project	0.00	1,500.00	0.00	1,500.00	100.0%
2554 Pelham Master Plan	0.00	0.00	2,000.00	(2,000.00)	0.0%
2556 Pelham CIP	0.00	2,000.00	0.00	2,000.00	100.0%
2565 Pelham MS4 Field Support	693.75	1,218.75	2,000.00	(781.25)	60.94%
2610 Wilton CR	1,907.50	24,632.79	18,000.00	6,632.79	136.85%
2640 Wilton MP 4	2,023.04	2,023.04	0.00	2,023.04	100.0%
6600 REDC CEDS	0.00	1,500.00	0.00	1,500.00	100.0%
<b>Total Local Planning Contracts</b>	<b>11,858.40</b>	<b>101,578.03</b>	<b>67,378.00</b>	<b>34,200.03</b>	<b>150.76%</b>
<b>Other Income</b>					
8000 Pubs/Map Sales	120.00	2,238.00	1,800.00	438.00	124.33%
Other Income - Other	0.00	0.04			
<b>Total Other Income</b>	<b>120.00</b>	<b>2,238.04</b>	<b>1,800.00</b>	<b>438.04</b>	<b>124.34%</b>
<b>State Contracts</b>					
1000 NH OSI	0.00	11,111.00	11,111.00	0.00	100.0%
1200 NH Geodata Portal	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.0%
3000 DOT Highway Planning					
100 MPO ADMIN & TRAINING	7,584.13	114,357.82	72,000.00	42,357.82	158.83%
200 POLICY & PLANNING	22,180.00	145,983.78	173,250.00	(27,266.22)	84.26%
300 PUBLIC INVOLV & COORD	7,520.10	66,165.23	52,200.00	13,965.23	126.75%
400 PLAN SUPPORT	45,780.91	306,438.93	270,450.00	35,988.93	113.31%
500 TECHNICAL ASSIST & SUPPORT	19,490.26	211,746.78	156,119.00	55,627.78	135.63%
600 NASHUA TRANSIT EXP. STUDY	0.00	6,513.60	28,105.00	(21,591.40)	23.18%
3000 DOT Highway Planning - Other	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.0%
<b>Total 3000 DOT Highway Planning</b>	<b>102,555.40</b>	<b>851,206.14</b>	<b>752,124.00</b>	<b>99,082.14</b>	<b>113.17%</b>
3100 Transit Expansion	0.00	20,807.89	27,000.00	(6,192.11)	77.07%
3250 LTS - RPC	0.00	4,100.36	6,767.00	(2,666.64)	60.59%

**Nashua Regional Planning Commission  
Profit & Loss Budget vs. Actual - EC  
July 2019 through June 2020**

	TOTAL				
	Jun 20	Jul '19 - Jun 20	Budget	\$ Over Budget	% of Budget
3500 DOT 5310 SVTC	2,751.37	140,283.08	190,039.00	(49,755.92)	73.82%
3505 DOT/5310 Formula	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.0%
4430 CTAP Phase III TDM - CNHRP	619.02	9,210.20	16,000.00	(6,789.80)	57.56%
State Contracts - Other	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.0%
<b>Total State Contracts</b>	<b>105,925.79</b>	<b>1,036,718.67</b>	<b>1,003,041.00</b>	<b>33,677.67</b>	<b>103.36%</b>
<b>Total Income</b>	<b>185,278.55</b>	<b>1,506,346.56</b>	<b>1,616,371.00</b>	<b>(110,024.44)</b>	<b>93.19%</b>
<b>Expense</b>					
Depreciation	226.31	2,715.39	0.00	2,715.39	100.0%
Annual Forum	0.00	2,423.11	5,000.00	(2,576.89)	48.46%
Audit	0.00	15,900.00	15,900.00	0.00	100.0%
Bank Service Charges	0.00	250.00	250.00	0.00	100.0%
Capital Equipment	0.00	0.00	5,000.00	(5,000.00)	0.0%
Dues & Subscriptions	2,195.64	20,551.73	10,000.00	10,551.73	205.52%
Employee Benefits					
C Dental Insurance	618.98	7,364.67	7,507.00	(142.33)	98.1%
C Health Ins.	5,208.62	61,420.84	71,535.00	(10,114.16)	85.86%
C HSA Contribution	0.00	4,375.00	3,750.00	625.00	116.67%
C LTD Insurance	94.76	1,231.80	1,386.00	(154.20)	88.87%
C Retirement 401	1,773.51	20,724.10	22,600.00	(1,875.90)	91.7%
C Retirement 457	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.0%
C STD Insurance	214.88	2,483.25	2,750.00	(266.75)	90.3%
<b>Total P/R Taxes (Indirect)</b>	<b>4,015.67</b>	<b>54,682.88</b>	<b>57,383.00</b>	<b>(2,700.12)</b>	<b>95.3%</b>
<b>Total Employee Benefits</b>	<b>11,926.42</b>	<b>152,282.54</b>	<b>166,911.00</b>	<b>(14,628.46)</b>	<b>91.24%</b>
Equipment Maintenance	150.97	368.97	1,750.00	(1,381.03)	21.08%
GIS	1,475.00	17,669.90	18,000.00	(330.10)	98.17%
Insurance	912.21	867.73	11,740.00	(10,872.27)	7.39%
Internet Access/Telephone	512.18	8,326.20	6,840.00	1,486.20	121.73%
IT Service	279.94	5,032.23	5,500.00	(467.77)	91.5%
Janitorial	250.00	2,725.00	3,600.00	(875.00)	75.69%
Legal	0.00	1,599.50	2,500.00	(900.50)	63.98%
Legal Notices	0.00	973.30	0.00	973.30	100.0%
Marketing and Outreach	1,198.27	1,514.07	5,000.00	(3,485.93)	30.28%
Misc	7,685.23	11,088.47	4,130.00	6,958.47	268.49%
Office Expenses	1,686.58	13,827.00	16,750.00	(2,923.00)	82.55%
Payroll Expenses	0.00	0.00			
Postage	139.84	1,284.16	2,000.00	(715.84)	64.21%
Printing	493.00	5,916.00	6,500.00	(584.00)	91.02%
Professional Services	27,877.73	289,751.77	427,485.00	(137,733.23)	67.78%
Recruiting	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.0%
Rent & CAM	0.00	86,762.99	86,515.00	247.99	100.29%
Reserve Fund	0.00	0.00	21,730.00	(21,730.00)	0.0%
<b>Total Salaries</b>	<b>85,679.90</b>	<b>746,174.35</b>	<b>750,102.00</b>	<b>(3,927.65)</b>	<b>99.48%</b>
Small Equipment	1,120.48	7,712.53	5,950.00	1,762.53	129.62%
Staff Development	976.82	8,199.20	10,000.00	(1,800.80)	81.99%
Travel					
Meeting Expenses (Lunch etc.)	0.00	1,733.99	2,300.00	(566.01)	75.39%
Mileage & Travel	37.15	7,782.64	10,850.00	(3,067.36)	71.73%
Vehicle Exp (Gas,Rep,Ins,ect.)	62.98	301.02	1,000.00	(698.98)	30.1%
<b>Total Travel</b>	<b>100.13</b>	<b>9,817.65</b>	<b>14,150.00</b>	<b>(4,332.35)</b>	<b>69.38%</b>
Utilities	0.00	13,302.78	13,068.00	234.78	101.8%
<b>Total EXPENSES</b>	<b>144,660.34</b>	<b>1,424,321.18</b>	<b>1,616,371.00</b>	<b>(192,049.82)</b>	<b>88.12%</b>
<b>Total Expense</b>	<b>144,886.65</b>	<b>1,427,036.57</b>	<b>1,616,371.00</b>	<b>(189,334.43)</b>	<b>88.29%</b>
<b>Net Income</b>	<b>40,391.90</b>	<b>79,309.99</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>79,309.99</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Nashua Regional Planning Commission  
**Balance Sheet**  
As of June 30, 2020

	<u>Jun 30, 20</u>
<b>ASSETS</b>	
Checking/Savings	
1 TD Bank xx5715	250,674.39
2 Bar Harbor Bank xx1485	100,623.82
3 BHBT 19 Mo CD Maturity 7/6/20	206,399.37
4 BHBT 19 Mo CD Maturity 8/6/21	65,076.46
Petty Cash	<u>192.00</u>
Total Checking/Savings	622,966.04
Accounts Receivable	
Total Accounts Receivable	187,232.84
Other Current Assets	
FP Mailing Postage Account	96.76
Total Current Assets	810,295.64
Fixed Assets	
Accum Depr	-35,152.75
Vehicle	21,828.00
Fixed Assets - Other	<u>19,421.94</u>
Total Fixed Assets	<u>6,097.19</u>
Other Assets	
Prepaid Expense	22,922.16
Security Deposit	<u>8,341.67</u>
Total Other Assets	<u>31,263.83</u>
<b>TOTAL ASSETS</b>	<b><u><u>847,656.66</u></u></b>

Nashua Regional Planning Commission  
**Balance Sheet**  
As of June 30, 2020

	<u>Jun 30, 20</u>
<b>LIABILITIES &amp; EQUITY</b>	
Accounts Payable	
Total Accounts Payable	1,358.00
Credit Cards	
Bank of America -CC	3,069.46
Other Current Liabilities	
Accrued Payroll	32,471.30
Accrued Vaca Payable **offset	37,023.35
P/R Liabilities - Other	
C HSA Contributions	8,750.00
E Dental Insurance Withheld	154.55
E Health Insurance Withheld	413.71
E HSA Contributions	-8,750.00
E STD Insurance Withheld	31.44
Total P/R Liabilities - Other	599.70
Retainers	
Retainer-MS4 Coop. Agreement	20,000.00
Total Other Current Liabilities	90,094.35
Total Current Liabilities	94,521.81
Equity	
Retained Earnings	636,801.51
Vacation Bene Payable ** offset	37,023.35
Net Income	79,309.99
Total Equity	753,134.85
<b>TOTAL LIABILITIES &amp; EQUITY</b>	<b><u>847,656.66</u></b>



**Nashua Regional Planning Commission**  
**Profit & Loss Budget vs. Actual**  
July 2019 through June 2020

	Jul '19 - Jun 20	Budget	\$ Over Budget	% of Budget
<b>RESOURCES</b>				
<b>2000 Local Dues</b>				
Local Dues Match	(121,575.78)	0.00	(121,575.78)	100.0%
2000 Local Dues - Other	163,003.00	163,000.00	3.00	100.0%
<b>Total 2000 Local Dues</b>	<b>41,427.22</b>	<b>163,000.00</b>	<b>(121,572.78)</b>	<b>25.42%</b>
<b>Federal Contracts</b>				
9011 EPA Brownfields	76,008.25	98,000.00	(21,991.75)	77.56%
9055 EDA	57,998.05	0.00	57,998.05	100.0%
9082 Hazard Mit	0.00	18,570.00	(18,570.00)	0.0%
<b>Total Federal Contracts</b>	<b>134,006.30</b>	<b>116,570.00</b>	<b>17,436.30</b>	<b>114.96%</b>
<b>Grants</b>				
6300 NRSWMD	165,660.42	241,450.00	(75,789.58)	68.61%
7516 NH Housing-GIS Support	2,447.87	4,648.00	(2,200.13)	52.67%
9025 EPA Healthy Communities	20,641.90	12,484.00	8,157.90	165.35%
<b>Total Grants</b>	<b>188,750.19</b>	<b>258,582.00</b>	<b>(69,831.81)</b>	<b>72.99%</b>
Interest Income	6,958.56	6,000.00	958.56	115.98%
<b>Local Planning Contracts</b>				
2112 Amherst Housing Needs	1,500.00	0.00	1,500.00	100.0%
2113 Amherst Ordinance Assess	1,000.00	0.00	1,000.00	100.0%
2139 Hudson CR	350.00			
2142 Hudson MP	19,378.00	19,378.00	0.00	100.0%
2150 Mason CR	7,043.17	5,000.00	2,043.17	140.86%
2152 Mason MP	5,829.00	0.00	5,829.00	100.0%
2176 Hollis Asset Mgmt Support	4,475.00	0.00	4,475.00	100.0%
2245 Litchfield CIP	1,942.55	0.00	1,942.55	100.0%
2250 Litchfield CR	11,198.23	18,000.00	(6,801.77)	62.21%
2361 MVD GIS	3,000.00	3,000.00	0.00	100.0%
2362 MVD Service Mapping	4,987.50	0.00	4,987.50	100.0%
2534 Nashua Ped/Bike Study	8,000.00	0.00	8,000.00	100.0%
2535 Nashua Enrollment Project	1,500.00	0.00	1,500.00	100.0%
2554 Pelham Master Plan	0.00	2,000.00	(2,000.00)	0.0%
2556 Pelham CIP	2,000.00	0.00	2,000.00	100.0%
2565 Pelham MS4 Field Support	1,218.75	2,000.00	(781.25)	60.94%
2610 Wilton CR	24,632.79	18,000.00	6,632.79	136.85%
2640 Wilton MP 4	2,023.04	0.00	2,023.04	100.0%
6600 REDC CEDS	1,500.00	0.00	1,500.00	100.0%
<b>Total Local Planning Contracts</b>	<b>101,578.03</b>	<b>67,378.00</b>	<b>34,200.03</b>	<b>150.76%</b>
<b>Other Income</b>				
8000 Pubs/Map Sales	2,238.00	1,800.00	438.00	124.33%
Other Income - Other	0.04			
<b>Total Other Income</b>	<b>2,238.04</b>	<b>1,800.00</b>	<b>438.04</b>	<b>124.34%</b>
<b>State Contracts</b>				
1000 NH OSI	11,111.00	11,111.00	0.00	100.0%
<b>3000 DOT Highway Planning</b>				
100 MPO ADMIN & TRAINING	114,357.82	72,000.00	42,357.82	158.83%
200 POLICY & PLANNING	145,983.78	173,250.00	(27,266.22)	84.26%
300 PUBLIC INVOLV & COORD	66,165.23	52,200.00	13,965.23	126.75%
400 PLAN SUPPORT	306,438.93	270,450.00	35,988.93	113.31%
500 TECHNICAL ASSIST & SUPPORT	211,746.78	156,119.00	55,627.78	135.63%
600 NASHUA TRANSIT EXP. STUDY	6,513.60	28,105.00	(21,591.40)	23.18%
<b>Total 3000 DOT Highway Planning</b>	<b>851,206.14</b>	<b>752,124.00</b>	<b>99,082.14</b>	<b>113.17%</b>
3100 Transit Expansion	20,807.89	27,000.00	(6,192.11)	77.07%

**Nashua Regional Planning Commission**  
**Profit & Loss Budget vs. Actual**  
July 2019 through June 2020

	Jul '19 - Jun 20	Budget	\$ Over Budget	% of Budget
3250 LTS - RPC	4,100.36	6,767.00	(2,666.64)	60.59%
3500 DOT 5310 SVTC	161,245.28	190,039.00	(28,793.72)	84.85%
4430 CTAP Phase III TDM - CNHRP	9,210.20	16,000.00	(6,789.80)	57.56%
Total State Contracts	1,057,680.87	1,003,041.00	54,639.87	105.45%
Total RESOURCES	1,532,639.21	1,616,371.00	(83,731.79)	94.82%
Expense				
Depreciation	2,715.39	0.00	2,715.39	100.0%
EXPENSES				
Annual Forum	2,423.11	5,000.00	(2,576.89)	48.46%
Audit	15,900.00	15,900.00	0.00	100.0%
Bank Service Charges	250.00	250.00	0.00	100.0%
Capital Equipment	0.00	5,000.00	(5,000.00)	0.0%
Dues & Subscriptions	20,551.73	10,000.00	10,551.73	205.52%
Employee Benefits				
C Dental Insurance	7,364.67	7,507.00	(142.33)	98.1%
C Health Ins.	61,420.84	71,535.00	(10,114.16)	85.86%
C HSA Contribution	4,375.00	3,750.00	625.00	116.67%
C LTD Insurance	1,231.80	1,386.00	(154.20)	88.87%
C Retirement 401	20,724.10	22,600.00	(1,875.90)	91.7%
C STD Insurance	2,483.25	2,750.00	(266.75)	90.3%
P/R Taxes (Indirect)	54,682.88	57,383.00	(2,700.12)	95.3%
Total Employee Benefits	152,282.54	166,911.00	(14,628.46)	91.24%
Equipment Maintenance	368.97	1,750.00	(1,381.03)	21.08%
GIS	17,669.90	18,000.00	(330.10)	98.17%
Insurance	867.73	11,740.00	(10,872.27)	7.39%
Internet Access/Telephone	8,326.20	6,840.00	1,486.20	121.73%
IT Service	5,032.23	5,500.00	(467.77)	91.5%
Janitorial	2,725.00	3,600.00	(875.00)	75.69%
Legal	1,599.50	2,500.00	(900.50)	63.98%
Legal Notices	973.30	0.00	973.30	100.0%
Marketing and Outreach	1,514.07	5,000.00	(3,485.93)	30.28%
Misc	11,088.47	4,130.00	6,958.47	268.49%
Office Expenses	13,838.00	16,750.00	(2,912.00)	82.62%
Postage	1,284.16	2,000.00	(715.84)	64.21%
Printing	5,916.00	6,500.00	(584.00)	91.02%
Professional Services	315,561.41	427,485.00	(111,923.59)	73.82%
Rent & CAM	86,762.99	86,515.00	247.99	100.29%
Reserve Fund	0.00	21,730.00	(21,730.00)	0.0%
Total Salaries	746,174.35	750,102.00	(3,927.65)	99.48%
Small Equipment	7,712.53	5,950.00	1,762.53	129.62%
Staff Development	8,199.20	10,000.00	(1,800.80)	81.99%
Travel				
Meeting Expenses (Lunch etc.)	1,733.99	2,300.00	(566.01)	75.39%
Mileage & Travel	7,782.64	10,850.00	(3,067.36)	71.73%
Vehicle Exp (Gas,Rep,Ins,ect.)	293.02	1,000.00	(706.98)	29.3%
Total Travel	9,809.65	14,150.00	(4,340.35)	69.33%
Utilities	13,302.78	13,068.00	234.78	101.8%
Total EXPENSES	1,450,133.82	1,616,371.00	(166,237.18)	89.72%
Total Expense	1,452,849.21	1,616,371.00	(163,521.79)	89.88%
Net Income	79,790.00	0.00	79,790.00	100.0%

# Nashua Regional Planning Commission

## Balance Sheet

As of June 30, 2020

	Jun 30, 20	Jun 30, 19
<b>ASSETS</b>		
<b>Checking/Savings</b>		
1 TD Bank xx5715	250,674.39	134,556.31
2 Bar Harbor Bank xx1485	100,624.49	170,583.02
3 BHBT 19 Mo CD Maturity 7/6/20	206,788.72	202,231.32
4 BHBT 19 Mo CD Maturity 8/6/21	65,169.45	64,059.87
Petty Cash	200.00	200.00
<b>Total Checking/Savings</b>	623,457.05	571,630.52
<b>Accounts Receivable</b>		
Accounts Receivable	213,042.48	218,841.56
<b>Total Accounts Receivable</b>	213,042.48	218,841.56
<b>Other Current Assets</b>		
FP Mailing Postage Account	96.76	207.55
<b>Total Other Current Assets</b>	96.76	207.55
<b>Total Current Assets</b>	836,596.29	790,679.63
<b>Fixed Assets</b>		
Fixed Assets		
Accum Depr	-35,152.75	-32,437.36
Vehicle	21,828.00	21,828.00
Fixed Assets - Other	19,421.94	19,421.94
<b>Total Fixed Assets</b>	6,097.19	8,812.58
<b>Other Assets</b>		
Prepaid Expense	22,922.16	18,973.93
Security Deposit	8,341.67	8,341.67
<b>Total Other Assets</b>	31,263.83	27,315.60
<b>TOTAL ASSETS</b>	<b>873,957.31</b>	<b>826,807.81</b>

**Nashua Regional Planning Commission**  
**Balance Sheet**  
As of June 30, 2020

	Jun 30, 20	Jun 30, 19
<b>LIABILITIES &amp; EQUITY</b>		
<b>Accounts Payable</b>		
Accounts Payable	27,167.64	72,389.49
<b>Total Accounts Payable</b>	27,167.64	72,389.49
<b>Credit Cards</b>		
Bank of America -CC	3,080.46	1,447.70
<b>Total Credit Cards</b>	3,080.46	1,447.70
<b>Other Current Liabilities</b>		
Accrued Payroll	32,471.30	28,105.64
Accrued Vaca Payable **offset	37,023.35	29,871.85
<b>P/R Liabilities - Other</b>		
C HSA Contributions	8,750.00	4,375.00
E Dental Insurance Withheld	154.55	162.44
E Health Insurance Withheld	413.71	531.71
E HSA Contributions	-8,750.00	-4,375.00
E STD Insurance Withheld	31.44	31.57
<b>Total P/R Liabilities - Other</b>	599.70	725.72
<b>Retainers</b>		
Retainer-2245 Litchfield CIP	0.00	442.55
Retainer-MS4 Coop. Agreement	20,000.00	20,000.00
<b>Total Retainers</b>	20,000.00	20,442.55
<b>Total Other Current Liabilities</b>	90,094.35	79,145.76
<b>Total Current Liabilities</b>	120,342.45	152,982.95
<b>Total Liabilities</b>	120,342.45	152,982.95
<b>Equity</b>		
Retained Earnings	636,801.51	649,342.93
Vacation Bene Payable ** offset	37,023.35	29,871.85
Net Income	79,790.00	-5,389.92
<b>Total Equity</b>	753,614.86	673,824.86
<b>TOTAL LIABILITIES &amp; EQUITY</b>	<b>873,957.31</b>	<b>826,807.81</b>

# NRPC FY 2020 DASHBOARD

Jul-20		Key Statistics	
TD Checking		Staff Activities July/Aug	
Beginning Balance	\$250,674.39	Complete Streets Advisory Committee - Matt Partners for Performance NH - Gregg & Matt RCC Meeting - Matt & John NTS General Staff Meetings - Ryan UPWP Mid Contract Review Meet - Jay, Gregg, Matt & Sara HHW Collection, Nashua - Mason, Jay, John & Derek  Milford Transit Expansion - Jay & Matt Nashua Rail Committee (2) - Jay NHHFA Housing Code Initiative - John United Way Community Connections Forum - Jay NHLMV Stormwater Coalition (2) - Sara & Andrew Statewide Coordinating Council - Matt Inter-Agency Conference - Gregg	
Deposits & Credits			
Payments			
Ending Balance	\$250,706.24		
Bar Harbor Checking			
Beginning Balance	\$100,623.82		
Deposits & Credits			
Payments			
Ending Balance	\$78,059.79		
Friday, July 31, 2020			
Accounts Payable	\$2,987.38		
Accounts Receivable	\$356,469.76		
Oversight Activities			
Line of credit (\$75,000) activated?	No		
BHB CDs	\$272,425.77		
Audit Status	To begin this month		
Budget Narrative			
BankBalances/Cash on hand:	We continue to have a healthy balance that supports at least five months of operating expenses.		
Payables and Receivables:	Payables up slightly; Receivables up substantially		
FY21 Working Budget			
Funding Sources	Expenses		
Local Dues	\$163,000	Audit	\$16,250
Federal Contracts	\$195,182	Dues & Subscriptions	\$8,214
Grants	\$220,548	Employee Benefits	\$162,828
Local Planning Contracts	\$66,511	GIS	\$17,700
Other Income	\$6,000	Insurance	\$11,870
State Contracts	\$1,017,358	IT	\$5,930
		Legal	\$2,500
		Marketing, Outreach, Annual Forum	\$7,390
		Office Expenditures	\$11,481
		Other Expenditures	\$68,652
		Professional Services	\$515,440
		Rent & CAM	\$89,375
		Salaries	\$720,068
		Staff Development	\$8,500
		Travel & Meeting Exp	\$11,800
		Utilities	\$10,600
Total revenues:	\$1,668,599	Total Expenses:	\$1,668,598
Pending Grant Applications	\$0	Delta	\$1

**Nashua Regional Planning Commission**  
**Profit & Loss Budget vs. Actual - EC**  
July 2020

	Jul 20	Budget	\$ Over Budget	% of Budget
<b>RESOURCES</b>				
<b>2000 Local Dues</b>				
Local Dues Match	(4,535.18)	0.00	(4,535.18)	100.0%
2000 Local Dues - Other	13,583.33	163,000.00	(149,416.67)	8.33%
<b>Total 2000 Local Dues</b>	<b>9,048.15</b>	<b>163,000.00</b>	<b>(153,951.85)</b>	<b>5.55%</b>
<b>Federal Contracts</b>				
9011 EPA Brownfields	0.00	162,000.00	(162,000.00)	0.0%
9055 EDA	0.00	12,654.00	(12,654.00)	0.0%
9082 Hazard Mit	0.00	20,000.00	(20,000.00)	0.0%
<b>Total Federal Contracts</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>194,654.00</b>	<b>(194,654.00)</b>	<b>0.0%</b>
<b>Grants</b>				
6300 NRSWMD	3,286.83	216,605.00	(213,318.17)	1.52%
7516 NH Housing-GIS Support	0.00	3,000.00	(3,000.00)	0.0%
9025 EPA Healthy Communities	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.0%
<b>Total Grants</b>	<b>3,286.83</b>	<b>219,605.00</b>	<b>(216,318.17)</b>	<b>1.5%</b>
Interest Income	500.43	4,000.00	(3,499.57)	12.51%
<b>Local Planning Contracts</b>				
2139 Hudson CR	2,775.00	0.00	0.00	100.0%
2150 Mason CR	35.00	5,040.00	(5,005.00)	0.69%
2176 Hollis Asset Mgmt Support	875.00	3,600.00	(2,725.00)	24.31%
2250 Litchfield CR	412.50	18,000.00	(17,587.50)	2.29%
2361 MVD GIS	640.00	3,200.00	(2,560.00)	20.0%
2534 Nashua Ped/Bike Study	0.00	6,500.00	(6,500.00)	0.0%
2556 Pelham CIP	1,000.00	2,000.00	(1,000.00)	50.0%
2610 Wilton CR	2,082.50	18,000.00	(15,917.50)	11.57%
2640 Wilton MP 4	258.48	10,000.00	(9,741.52)	2.59%
<b>Total Local Planning Contracts</b>	<b>8,078.48</b>	<b>66,340.00</b>	<b>(58,261.52)</b>	<b>12.18%</b>
<b>Other Income</b>				
8000 Pubs/Map Sales	0.00	2,000.00	(2,000.00)	0.0%
<b>Total Other Income</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>2,000.00</b>	<b>(2,000.00)</b>	<b>0.0%</b>
<b>State Contracts</b>				
1000 NH OSI	0.00	11,111.00	(11,111.00)	0.0%
1200 NH Geodata Portal	0.00	40,000.00	(40,000.00)	0.0%
<b>3000 DOT Highway Planning</b>				
100 MPO ADMIN & TRAINING	4,646.10	40,595.00	(35,948.90)	11.45%
200 POLICY & PLANNING	12,064.84	217,544.00	(205,479.16)	5.55%
300 PUBLIC INVOLV & COORD	2,638.83	47,523.00	(44,884.17)	5.55%
400 PLAN SUPPORT	16,967.44	263,237.00	(246,269.56)	6.45%
500 TECHNICAL ASSIST & SUPPORT	9,034.54	126,871.00	(117,836.46)	7.12%
600 NASHUA TRANSIT EXP. STUDY	0.00	50,346.00	(50,346.00)	0.0%
<b>Total 3000 DOT Highway Planning</b>	<b>45,351.75</b>	<b>746,116.00</b>	<b>(700,764.25)</b>	<b>6.08%</b>
3500 DOT 5310 SVTC	0.00	206,140.00	(206,140.00)	0.0%
4430 CTAP Phase III TDM - CNHRP	0.00	21,944.00	(21,944.00)	0.0%
<b>Total State Contracts</b>	<b>45,351.75</b>	<b>1,025,311.00</b>	<b>(979,959.25)</b>	<b>4.42%</b>

**Nashua Regional Planning Commission**  
**Profit & Loss Budget vs. Actual - EC**  
July 2020

	Jul 20	Budget	\$ Over Budget	% of Budget
<b>Total RESOURCES</b>	66,265.64	1,674,910.00	(1,608,644.36)	3.96%
<b>Depreciation</b>	226.28	2,715.00	(2,488.72)	8.33%
<b>EXPENSES</b>				
<b>Annual Forum</b>	0.00	4,890.00	(4,890.00)	0.0%
<b>Audit</b>	0.00	16,250.00	(16,250.00)	0.0%
<b>Bank Service Charges</b>	0.00	250.00	(250.00)	0.0%
<b>Capital Equipment</b>	0.00	5,000.00	(5,000.00)	0.0%
<b>Dues &amp; Subscriptions</b>	1,352.66	7,410.00	(6,057.34)	18.26%
<b>Employee Benefits</b>				
<b>C Dental Insurance</b>	618.98	7,614.00	(6,995.02)	8.13%
<b>C Health Ins.</b>	5,208.62	67,340.00	(62,131.38)	7.74%
<b>C HSA Contribution</b>	0.00	4,375.00	(4,375.00)	0.0%
<b>C LTD Insurance</b>	94.76	1,166.00	(1,071.24)	8.13%
<b>C Retirement 401</b>	2,727.74	24,715.00	(21,987.26)	11.04%
<b>C STD Insurance</b>	214.87	2,643.00	(2,428.13)	8.13%
<b>Total P/R Taxes (Indirect)</b>	6,116.77	55,351.00	(49,234.23)	11.05%
<b>Total Employee Benefits</b>	14,981.74	163,204.00	(148,222.26)	9.18%
<b>Equipment Maintenance</b>	0.00	1,750.00	(1,750.00)	0.0%
<b>GIS</b>	1,475.00	17,700.00	(16,225.00)	8.33%
<b>Insurance</b>	964.79	11,870.00	(10,905.21)	8.13%
<b>Internet Access/Telephone</b>	887.74	8,400.00	(7,512.26)	10.57%
<b>IT Service</b>	277.73	5,930.00	(5,652.27)	4.68%
<b>Janitorial</b>	225.00	3,300.00	(3,075.00)	6.82%
<b>Legal</b>	196.00	2,500.00	(2,304.00)	7.84%
<b>Legal Notices</b>	0.00	1,000.00	(1,000.00)	0.0%
<b>Marketing and Outreach</b>	728.49	2,500.00	(1,771.51)	29.14%
<b>Misc</b>	349.55	12,264.00	(11,914.45)	2.85%
<b>Office Expenses</b>	440.73	11,302.00	(10,861.27)	3.9%
<b>Postage</b>	39.10	1,800.00	(1,760.90)	2.17%
<b>Printing</b>	728.85	6,650.00	(5,921.15)	10.96%
<b>Professional Services</b>	5.50	515,440.00	(515,434.50)	0.0%
<b>Rent &amp; CAM</b>	15,024.66	89,375.00	(74,350.34)	16.81%
<b>Reserve Fund</b>	0.00	23,015.00	(23,015.00)	0.0%
<b>Total Salaries</b>	47,110.41	723,545.00	(676,434.59)	6.51%
<b>Small Equipment</b>	439.00	5,950.00	(5,511.00)	7.38%
<b>Staff Development</b>	61.80	8,500.00	(8,438.20)	0.73%
<b>Travel</b>				
<b>Meeting Expenses (Lunch etc.)</b>	0.00	2,300.00	(2,300.00)	0.0%
<b>Mileage &amp; Travel</b>	0.00	8,500.00	(8,500.00)	0.0%
<b>Vehicle Exp (Gas,Rep,Ins,ect.)</b>	696.46	1,000.00	(303.54)	69.65%
<b>Total Travel</b>	696.46	11,800.00	(11,103.54)	5.9%
<b>Utilities</b>	1,754.00	10,600.00	(8,846.00)	16.55%
<b>Total Expense</b>	87,965.49	1,674,910.00	(1,586,944.51)	5.25%
<b>Net Income</b>	(21,699.85)	0.00	(21,699.85)	100.0%

Nashua Regional Planning Commission

Balance Sheet

As of July 31, 2020

Jul 31, 20

ASSETS

Current Assets

Checking/Savings

1 TD Bank xx5715	250,706.24
2 Bar Harbor Bank xx1485	78,059.79
3 BHBT 8 Mo CD Maturity 3/6/21	207,166.21
4 BHBT 19 Mo CD Maturity 8/6/21	65,259.56
Petty Cash	200.00

Total Checking/Savings 601,391.80

Accounts Receivable

Accounts Receivable 356,469.76

Total Accounts Receivable 356,469.76

Other Current Assets

FP Mailing Postage Account 57.66

Total Other Current Assets 57.66

Total Current Assets 957,919.22

Fixed Assets

Accum Depr -35,379.03

Vehicle 21,828.00

Fixed Assets - Other 19,421.94

Total Fixed Assets 5,870.91

Other Assets

Prepaid Expense 25,668.75

Security Deposit 8,341.67

Total Other Assets 34,010.42

TOTAL ASSETS 997,800.55



Nashua Regional Planning Commission

Balance Sheet

As of July 31, 2020

Jul 31, 20

LIABILITIES & EQUITY

Current Liabilities

Accounts Payable

Accounts Payable 2,987.38

Total Accounts Payable 2,987.38

Credit Cards

Bank of America -CC 7,424.29

Total Credit Cards 7,424.29

Other Current Liabilities

Accrued Vaca Payable \*\*offset 34,394.80

E United Way Withheld 15.00

Local Dues 149,416.67

P/R Liabilities - Other

C HSA Contributions 8,750.00

E Dental Insurance Withheld 181.08

E Health Insurance Withheld 636.28

E HSA Contributions -8,750.00

E STD Insurance Withheld 40.62

Total P/R Liabilities - Other 857.98

Retainers

Retainer-6300 HHW 50,789.42

Retainer-MS4 Coop. Agreement 20,000.00

Total Retainers 70,789.42

Total Other Current Liabilities 255,473.87

Total Current Liabilities 265,885.54

Total Liabilities 265,885.54

Equity

Retained Earnings 719,220.06

Vacation Bene Payable \*\* offset 34,394.80

Net Income -21,699.85

Total Equity 731,915.01

TOTAL LIABILITIES & EQUITY 997,800.55

# RPC 2023-2032 Ten Year Plan Approach

9 July 2020

1. **Confirmation of continued support for existing Ten Year Plan projects:** As with past TYP rounds, we are asking that RPCs confirm that existing projects in the TYP are still regional priorities.
  - a. If there are projects proposed to be removed, please provide confirmation that this is acceptable to the RPC(s) and town(s) impacted.
  - b. Projects that are no longer priorities may be removed from the TYP, and existing projects may be advanced in the TYP within the dollars for the removed projects and/or funding can be reallocated to new projects.
2. **Anticipated regional programming allocation:** Based on the success of the 2021-2030 TYP process, NHDOT is again proposing to allocate \$50M in funding in the draft 2023-2032 TYP to the 9 RPCs to use for regional project programming.

The Department continues to review the projects from the approved 2021-2030 TYP. The reality is that the Plan ultimately approved through the statutory process was reasonably constrained based on estimated appropriations in the FAST Act. As we know, we are currently in a federal funding reauthorization window and pandemic, meaning the actual amount of funding available may continue to be refined. As a result, the amount of funding available for new projects may be less than \$50M. How much less (if any) is still to be determined.

3. **Calculation of the Programming Allocation for each Region:**
  - a. NHDOT proposes to use the same methodology as was used for the 2021-2030 TYP to allocate funding on the basis of 50% Regional census population and 50% Federal-Aid Eligible (FAE) Lane Miles.
  - b. The budget allocation applies to new and existing, underfunded projects in the 2023-2032 TYP.
  - c. All new projects will be targeted for CON phase programming in 2031 & 2032. NHDOT will make recommendations on other necessary phases (PE/ROW/OTHER) based on appropriate project schedules and available funds to accomplish this.
  - d. All new project proposals must account for annual inflation (2.80%) and indirect costs (10%) in the proposed estimates.
4. **Engineering review required for all new projects:**
  - a. As we implemented in the 2021-2030 TYP process, all new projects proposed by RPCs for inclusion in the TYP will need to have undergone engineering review by a licensed professional engineer for completeness and accuracy. We continue to encourage/support RPC efforts to obtain the services of professional engineers through

on-call consultant contracts to support regional cost estimating efforts as well as other ongoing conceptual design work to support planning efforts.

For those RPCs that lack the services of a licensed professional engineer to perform these reviews, NHDOT will continue to provide additional review and comment.

**5. Evaluation criteria:**

- a. All proposed TYP projects for the 2023-2032 TYP will be evaluated utilizing the project evaluation criteria and application form developed by the TPC. Those criteria are attached to this document.
- b. All 9 RPCs will apply all of the project evaluation criteria to proposed projects consistently to evaluate those projects.  
*Please note:* Each RPC maintains the ability to weight criteria based on respective regional priorities.
- c. Each RPC prioritizes new projects to TYP by the criteria and weights and submit to NHDOT by November 6, 2020.  
Submittals *must* include a completed project application for each project submitted along with an initial understanding of project ranking using the evaluation criteria.
- d. November 2020 -February 2021 NHDOT estimate review committee will review top projects from each region to vet the scope and estimates. Comments from the Estimate Review Committee will be provided to RPCs for consideration in developing final list of regional projects.
- e. Individual RPCs meet with NHDOT over January - February 2021 to discuss:
  - Results of the NHDOT review of proposed projects.
  - NHDOT strategy re: development of the draft 2023-2032 NH TYP, including proposed approach to GACIT for 2023-2032 TYP.
  - RPC questions regarding the 2023-2032 TYP efforts
- f. Final list of regional priorities due to NHDOT by March 31, 2021.

6. **Presentation to Commissioner's Office:** Final list of projects to be presented to Commissioner's Office for their consideration by end of May 2021.

# NH TEN YEAR PLAN: *Regional Project Review*

## NEW HAMPSHIRE'S "TEN YEAR PLAN"

The *New Hampshire 10-Year Transportation Improvement Plan* ("Ten Year Plan") is a fiscally-constrained program of state- and federal-funded transportation projects. The *Ten Year Plan* is updated biennially, pursuant to the requirements of New Hampshire RSA 240.

The *Ten Year Plan* includes projects related to roadway improvements, bicycle and pedestrian travel, public transportation, aviation, and natural hazard resiliency.



## REGIONAL PROJECT REVIEW PROCESS

As part of the biennial update of the *Ten Year Plan*, each of the nine New Hampshire Regional Planning Commissions (RPCs) leads a process to identify and prioritize transportation projects in their respective regions for inclusion in the *Plan*.

Projects eligible for consideration through the regional review process:

- ⇒ **Asset management projects** (e.g., bridge rehabilitation, bridge replacement, pavement/base/subbase repair/replacement);
- ⇒ **Bicycle and pedestrian improvements** (e.g., sidewalks, bike trails, multi-use paths; traffic calming improvements);
- ⇒ **Infrastructure-related travel demand management projects** (e.g., park and ride lots, transit or HOV lanes, priority signalization, bus shelters, intermodal transportation centers);
- ⇒ **Planning studies** assessing the need for future projects;
- ⇒ **Roadway improvements** (e.g., operational improvements, access management, intelligent transportation systems, widening, technology operation improvements).

## FEDERAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Under the *Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act* (FAST Act), state DOTs and Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) are required to use **performance measures** to work toward specific targets in support of **national goals for transportation management** in all federally-funded projects and programs.

The Ten-Year Plan Criteria detailed in this packet reflect these federal performance measures. Relevant federal performance measures are noted with each criterion.

## PROJECT REVIEW CRITERIA

The criteria included in this packet are intended to help RPC's prioritize projects in their respective regions. A list of criteria is provided in the table to the right.

Each RPC may assign weights to different criteria to reflect regional priorities. Weights should be assigned to criteria prior to scoring projects.

For each project, a score should be assigned for each criterion in order to develop an overall project score. **Detailed scoring procedures are provided on page 2 of this packet.**

Each RPC should clearly define the specific scoring process that will be used prior to scoring projects.

CRITERION	SUB-CRITERIA
<b>Economic Development</b>	Local & Regional; Freight Movement
<b>Equity, Environmental Justice, &amp; Accessibility</b>	Equity & Environmental Justice; Accessibility
<b>Mobility</b>	Mobility Need & Performance; Mobility Intervention
<b>Natural Hazard Resiliency</b>	Hazard Risk; Hazard Mitigation
<b>Network Significance</b>	Traffic Volume; Facility Importance
<b>Safety</b>	Safety Performance; Safety Measures
<b>State of Repair</b>	State of Repair; Maintenance
<b>Support</b>	n/a

For each criterion, the following reference table is provided in order to standardize & guide project reviews:

REGIONAL EVALUATION CONSIDERATIONS	POTENTIAL RESOURCES & DATA SOURCES
This column includes the factors that should be considered in order to evaluate and rank proposed Ten Year Plan projects. <i>Depending on data availability, some considerations may not be evaluated for all projects.</i>	This column includes data and established resources for best practices that can be used to justify project rankings. <i>Not all sources of data will be available for each project. It is left to the discretion of each RPC as to which sources to consult.</i>

**Note: project review criteria and associated scores are intended to inform the regional project prioritization process. RPCs may consider other factors, such as project costs and timelines, when deciding final regional priorities.**

# NH TEN YEAR PLAN: *Regional Project Review*

## PROJECT SCORING PROCEDURES

A score shall be assigned for each criterion. Criteria scores should then be multiplied by criteria weights. The weighted criteria scores should then be summed to develop the final project score.

RPCs should make reasonable attempts to assign a defensible score to each project for each criterion. *Criteria shall not be skipped when scoring a project.* If a defensible score cannot be developed for a particular criterion due to data/information limitations, RPCs should 1) use their best judgement to assign a score; and 2) record any relevant data/information limitations.

If a criterion is irrelevant to the project, a score of 1 out of 10 should be assigned for that criterion.

## EVALUATING PROJECT NEED & PROJECT IMPACT

There are two types of project evaluation criteria: 1) criteria that assess the need for a project; and 2) criteria that assess the impact of a project. For example, looking at the history of crashes at an intersection can help evaluate the need for a safety improvement project, while looking at Crash Modification Factors for the proposed improvements can help evaluate the impact that the project will have on safety.

The table below presents the project scoring scales for evaluating project need and project impact. Additionally, each criterion in this packet is labeled to indicate if it is evaluating need or impact.

## PROJECT SCORING SCALES

SCORE	PROJECT <u>NEED</u> CRITERION		PROJECT <u>IMPACT</u> CRITERION		CRITERION RELEVANCY
10	There is a <b>very high need</b> for the project under this criterion.	OR	The proposed project would deliver a <b>significant improvement</b> under this criterion.	-	- - -
5	There is a <b>moderate need</b> for the project under this criterion.	OR	The proposed project would deliver a <b>moderate improvement</b> under this criterion.	-	- - -
1	There is <b>minimal/no need</b> for the project under this criterion.	OR	The proposed project would deliver <b>minimal/no improvement</b> under this criterion.	OR	The proposed project is <b>not relevant</b> to this criterion.
0	- - -	-	The proposed project would result in a <b>negative impact</b> under this criterion.	-	- - -

**Definition:** the degree to which a project supports economic development needs and opportunities at the 1) **local** and 2) **regional** level; and 3) the degree to which the project impacts the movement of goods (**freight**).

## REGIONAL EVALUATION CONSIDERATIONS

### Local & Regional Economic Development **IMPACT**

- Does the project directly relate to a documented community revitalization or economic development effort?
- Does the project improve mobility and/or accessibility to and from a regional employment hub?
- Does the project improve mobility and/or accessibility to and from a regional tourism destination?
- Does the project support the implementation of a regional economic development plan?

### Freight Movement **IMPACT**

- Does the project implement a high priority freight improvement project as identified in the NH State Freight Plan or an adopted Regional Transportation Plan?
- Does the project improve a freight bottleneck location as identified in the NH State Freight Plan or an adopted Regional Transportation Plan?
- Would the project improve freight transportation on a Critical Urban Freight Corridor (CUFC) or Critical Rural Freight Corridor (CRFC) candidate location as identified in the NH State Freight Plan (or as previously recommended by a MPO/RPC for future inclusion in the NH State Freight Plan)?
- Would the project improve Truck Travel Time Reliability on the Interstate system or other National Highway Freight Network Route?

## POTENTIAL RESOURCES & DATA SOURCES

### Resources:

- Local, regional and statewide economic development plans and documents
- Transit system maps
- Bicycle network/route maps
- Sidewalk network maps
- Online isochrone tools
- Regional *Comprehensive Economic Development Strategies*
- Economic-related chapters and goals of *Regional Plans*

### Resources:

- State Freight Plan
- Regional Long-Range Transportation Plans
- Critical Urban Freight Corridor (CUFC) Candidate Location List
- Critical Rural Freight Corridor (CRFC) Candidate Location List
- Truck Travel Time Reliability (TTTR) Index Data from the National Performance Management Research Data Set (NPMRDS)

### Federal Performance Measures Addressed

Federal Highway Administration System Performance Measures: 1) truck time travel reliability on the Interstate System.

# Equity, Environmental Justice, & Accessibility

NH TEN YEAR PLAN  
Regional Project Review

**Definition:** the degree to which 1) a project benefits traditionally-underserved populations (**equity & environmental justice**); and 2) ensures **accessibility** by all potential users.

## REGIONAL EVALUATION CONSIDERATIONS

### Equity & Environmental Justice

#### IMPACT

- Would the project provide transportation infrastructure benefits to an identified concentration area for minority population, low-income population, limited English proficiency population, disabled population, or other traditionally-underserved population group as identified in a local, regional, or statewide Title VI or Environmental Justice Program?
- Would the project expand transportation choices or enhance alternative modes of transportation in an identified concentration area for minority population, low-income population, limited English proficiency population, disabled population, or other traditionally-underserved population group?
- Does the project implement transportation-related recommendations resulting from a local, regional, or statewide Community Health Improvement Plan (CHIP) or other comprehensive public health analysis?
- What is the impact of the project on air quality? Are air quality impacts disproportionately affecting traditionally underserved populations?

### Accessibility

#### IMPACT

- Does the project incorporate Universal Design considerations to ensure that all users, including those with mobility impairments, visual impairments, hearing impairments or other disabilities can fully access and utilize the facility?
- Does the project incorporate accessibility upgrades or remove barriers to access?
- Does the project improve coordination between transportation service providers or between modes of transportation to improve access to essential services, particularly for elderly and disabled populations?"

## POTENTIAL RESOURCES & DATA SOURCES

### Resources:

- Regional and Statewide Title VI and Environmental Justice Programs
- Community Health Improvement Programs
- Region-specific Demographic Analyses
- US 13 CFR Part 301.3 Economic Distress Criteria (<https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/CFR-2018-title13-vol1/xml/CFR-2018-title13-vol1-part301.xml#seqnum301.3>)
- Northern Border Regional Commission annual distress criteria reports
- CMAQ air quality analysis tools
- MPO regional emissions analyses
- RPC review of project scope

### Resources:

- Conceptual Designs for Proposed Projects
- Local, Regional, or Statewide ADA Transition Plans
- Public Transit-Human Service Transportation Coordination Plans

### Federal Performance Measures Addressed

Federal Highway Administration System Performance Measures: 1) on-road mobile source emissions reduction.

**Definition:** 1) an historical analysis of the mobility **need** and **performance** of a location for all modes, and 2) a forward-looking analysis of how **interventions** proposed as part of a project would improve the mobility performance for all modes.

## REGIONAL EVALUATION CONSIDERATIONS

### Mobility Need & Performance

#### NEED

#### Facility Purpose

- What is the federal functional classification of the project area (i.e., is high mobility an underlying function of the facility)?
- Is the facility a local, regional, or statewide connection?

#### Planning

- Are the mobility needs in the project area defined in a local, regional, or state plan?

#### Motor Vehicles

- For projects addressing mobility need for vehicle travel, what is the project area's performance relative to congestion or delay, and if available, what is person throughput for a defined time period?

#### Rail and Transit

- For projects addressing mobility need for rail and transit, what is transit's performance relative to congestion or delay, and if available, what is ridership for a defined time period (throughput)?

#### Bicycle and Pedestrian

- For projects addressing mobility need for bicycle and pedestrian travel, what is project area's performance relative to delay, and if available, what is traffic for defined time period (throughput)?

## POTENTIAL RESOURCES & DATA SOURCES

### Resources:

#### Functional Classification

- Federal Functional Classification (NHDOT GIS Roads Layer)
- FHWA Highway Functional Classification Guidance: [https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/planning/processes/statewide/related/highway\\_functional\\_classifications/section00.cfm](https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/planning/processes/statewide/related/highway_functional_classifications/section00.cfm)

#### Planning

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

#### Motor Vehicles

- Level of Travel Time Reliability (LOTR) based on FHWA's National Performance Management Research Data Set (NPMRDS).
- Level of Service (LOS) related measures such as volume to capacity ratio, average travel speeds, average vehicle spacing, average delay at signal, field observation of traffic flow characteristics based on Highway Capacity Manual guidance.
- Throughput analyses based on local average vehicle occupancy data, regional model vehicle occupancy data or National Highway Travel Survey vehicle occupancy data multiplied by traffic data for defined time period.
- Regional and Statewide ITS architectures

#### Rail and Transit

- For projects addressing rail & transit mobility: Rail or transit operator report regarding on-time performance, ridership data, passenger surveys.

#### Bicycle and Pedestrian

- For projects addressing bicycle & pedestrian mobility: pedestrian/bicyclist intercept surveys, pedestrian signal timing data, pedestrian/bicyclist activity through project area for defined time period; bicyclist level of traffic stress.

### Federal Performance Measures Addressed

Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) System Performance Measures: 1) reliable person-miles traveled on the Interstate System; 2) reliable person-miles traveled on the non-Interstate National Highway System.



**Definition:** 1) an historical analysis of the mobility **need** and **performance** of a location for all modes, and 2) a forward-looking analysis of how **interventions** proposed as part of a project would improve the mobility performance for all modes.

## REGIONAL EVALUATION CONSIDERATIONS

### Mobility Intervention

#### Motor Vehicles

#### IMPACT

- For projects addressing motor vehicle mobility, to what extent will the project provide congestion relief or mobility benefits?

#### Rail and Transit

- For projects addressing transit mobility, to what extent will the project impact a transit service's on time performance and/or improve transit user throughput (ie. the number of transit users moving through the project area in a given time period)?

#### Bicycle and Pedestrian

- For projects addressing bicycle or pedestrian mobility, to what extent will the project reduce bicyclist/pedestrian delay and/or improve bicyclist/pedestrian throughput (ie. the number of bicyclists/pedestrians moving through the project area in a given time period)?

### Federal Performance Measures Addressed

Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) System Performance Measures: 1) reliable person-miles traveled on the Interstate System; 2) reliable person-miles traveled on the non-Interstate National Highway System.

## POTENTIAL RESOURCES & DATA SOURCES

### Resources:

RPC/MPO, NHDOT or independent evaluation of mobility interventions expressed in scope of work and project purpose. Including but not limited to the interventions listed below.

Motor Vehicles. Including but not limited to:

- Intersection improvements:* signal optimization, roundabouts, addition of turning lanes, etc.
- Road improvements:* HOV lanes, addition of breakdown lanes or shoulder widening, add lanes in merge areas, widen ramps, add exit lanes, ITS speed harmonization, ramp metering, etc.
- Mode shift measures:* transit, park and ride lots, bike lanes, etc.
- Capacity improvements:* adding lanes, access management measures [curb cut consolidation, left turn lanes, two way left turn lanes, medians, etc.]

Rail & Transit. Including but not limited to:

- Transit signal priority; dedicated transit lanes; improvement to sidewalk or bicycle connectivity to transit stops; transit stop improvements.

Bicycle and Pedestrian. Including but not limited to:

- Bicycling interventions:*
  - ◆ New/improved bike lane
  - ◆ Widening of outside lane/shoulder
  - ◆ New off-street or parallel facility
  - ◆ Access management improvements (medians, elimination/consolidation of curb cuts)
  - ◆ Sight distance improvements
  - ◆ Intersection improvements for bicyclist
  - ◆ Improvements to speed differential between on street bicyclists and vehicles
  - ◆ Signage and road markings
- Pedestrian interventions:*
  - ◆ New/improved sidewalk
  - ◆ New/improved off-street or parallel facility
  - ◆ Intersection improvements for pedestrians (new or improved crosswalks, medians/pedestrian refuges, new or improved pedestrian signals)
  - ◆ Access management (medians, limitation of curb cuts)
  - ◆ Removal of pedestrian conflicts (utility poles, etc.)
  - ◆ New or improved buffer between road and pedestrian facility (green buffer, on-street parking, trees, etc.)

**Definition:** 1) an analysis of the **natural hazard risks** (i.e. flood history) to a transportation facility, and; 2) a forward-looking analysis of how the **natural hazard mitigation** measures proposed as part of a project would reduce hazard risks.

## REGIONAL EVALUATION CONSIDERATIONS

### Natural Hazard Risk

NEED

#### Hazard Risk

- Are natural hazards in the project area documented in a plan, study, or database?
- Have natural hazards previously impacted transportation infrastructure and/or mobility in the project area? How frequently?
- Are natural hazard risks anticipated to increase in severity/impact (for example, due to anticipated impacts of climate change)?

### Natural Hazard Mitigation

IMPACT

#### Hazard Mitigation - All Projects

To what extent does the project mitigate or adapt to known natural hazards in the project area? Does the project propose in-kind replacement of hazard-prone infrastructure?

- Mitigate (highest score): project eliminates or substantially reduces risk from known natural hazard (e.g., relocates infrastructure away from flood hazard area).
- Adapt (moderate score): project addresses known natural hazard but does not entirely mitigate risk (e.g., reinforces infrastructure in place).
- In-kind (lower score): project simply replaces hazard-prone with same/similar infrastructure (e.g., replace stream culvert with culvert of same dimensions).

#### Hazard Mitigation - Additional Stream Culvert & Bridge Project Considerations

- Is the project responsive to stream characteristics, such as flood propensity, slope, bankfull width, and orientation to roadway?

## POTENTIAL RESOURCES & DATA SOURCES

### Resources:

#### Hazard Risk

- Local plans: Hazard Mitigation Plans, Master Plans, Capital Improvement Plans, Emergency Operations Plans, etc.
- Regional plans: Regional Transportation Plan, Corridor Studies, River Corridor Management Plans, Watershed-Based Plans, Regional Plan, Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy, etc.
- Local and Regional Vulnerability Assessments
- Results of studies or assessments, such as geotechnical studies, fluvial geomorphology studies, SADES-based assessments, etc
- Hydraulic capacity modeling results/reports
- FEMA Flood Hazard Maps
- Regional studies on anticipated impacts of climate change on natural hazard risk

### Resources:

#### Hazard Mitigation - All Projects

- RPC review of project scope
- Section 6.4 of FHWA's HEC 17: *Highways in the River Environment - Floodplains, Extreme Events, Risk, and Resilience*, 2nd Edition <https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/engineering/hydraulics/pubs/hif16018.pdf>
- Section 3.4 FHWA's HEC 25: *Highways in the Coastal Environment: Assessing Extreme Events: Volume 2 - 1st Edition* <https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/engineering/hydraulics/pubs/nhi14006/nhi14006.pdf>

#### Hazard Mitigation - Stream Culvert & Bridge Projects

- NH SADES stream crossing assessment data
- Hydraulic capacity modeling results/reports
- North Country Council *Stream Crossings for Flood Resiliency & Ecological Health*: [http://www.nccouncil.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/08/NCC-Stream-Crossing-Guide\\_FINAL.pdf](http://www.nccouncil.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/08/NCC-Stream-Crossing-Guide_FINAL.pdf)

# Network Significance

NH TEN YEAR PLAN  
Regional Project Review

**Definition:** the extent to which the project area is regionally-significant based on 1) **traffic volume**; and 2) the **importance of the facility** to the local and the regional transportation system.

## REGIONAL EVALUATION CONSIDERATIONS

### Traffic Volume

NEED

#### Vehicular volume

- What is the present-day traffic volume in or near the project area?
- How does the traffic volume in the project area compare to other traffic volumes in the region?
- Have traffic volumes increased, decreased, or stayed about the same over time?

#### Bicycle & pedestrian volume

- What is the measured or estimated present-day bicycle and pedestrian volume on or near the impacted facility?
- What is the relative demand for pedestrian and bicycle trips based on development density, presence/lack of current ped-bike facilities, etc.?

### Facility Importance

NEED

#### Origins and Destinations

- Does the facility move people or goods between major locations/destinations?
- Is the project area proximate to key transportation facilities, such as airports or transit/intermodal facilities?

#### Network Centrality

- To what degree is the project area "central" to the local and regional transportation network?
- Would traffic increase on other areas of the transportation network if the project is not implemented (e.g., would more drivers use alternate routes)?

#### Alternate Routes

- What would be the increase in travel time if travelers were detoured around the project area?
- Is the proposed project located on a defined or obvious evacuation route?

## POTENTIAL RESOURCES & DATA SOURCES

### Resources:

#### Vehicular volume

- NHDOT Transportation Data Management System <https://nhdot.ms2soft.com/tcds/tsearch.asp?loc=nhdot>
- Regional Planning Commission traffic count databases

#### Bicycle & pedestrian volume

- Regional Planning Commission bicycle & pedestrian count databases
- Pedestrian & Bicycle Information Center; Counting & Estimating Volumes <http://www.pedbikeinfo.org/topics/countingestimating.cfm>
- Congestion Mitigation & Air Quality (CMAQ) analysis tools
- Strava data

### Resources:

#### Origins and Destinations

- Local, regional and statewide transportation planning documents
- Priority pedestrian and bicycle transportation corridors identified in the *Statewide Pedestrian and Bicycle Transportation Plan*
- Transit system maps
- Bicycle network/route maps
- Sidewalk network maps
- Online isochrone tools

#### Network Centrality

- Regional Planning Commission transportation model (if available)
- RPC review of road networks
- GIS database with "Network Analyst" license/module

#### Alternate Routes

- Google Maps Travel Time calculator
- RPC travel time analysis (if available)
- Documentation of evacuation route designation or other connectivity-related metric in statewide, local or municipal plans

**Definition:** 1) a historical analysis of the **safety performance** (i.e. crash history) of a location over the past five (5) year period for all modes, and; 2) a forward-looking analysis of how the **countermeasures** proposed as part of a project would improve safety performance for all modes.

## REGIONAL EVALUATION CONSIDERATIONS

### Safety Performance

**NEED**

Crash data considerations (past 5 years):

- What is the number of passenger vehicle crashes at the location?
- What is the severity of passenger vehicle crashes at the location?
- What is the crash rate at the location?
- What is the number of non-motorized (pedestrian and bicycle) crashes at the location?
- What is the severity of non-motorized (pedestrian and bicycle) crashes at the location?
- What is the number of transit vehicle crashes at the location?
- What is the severity of transit vehicle crashes at the location?

Additional safety performance considerations:

- Was the location identified through local, regional, or statewide network screening?
- Was the location the subject of a previous Road Safety Audit due to crash history?
- Was the project referred to the TYP from the HSIP program due to scope/cost?
- Were improvements implemented over the past five-year period that have changed (or could change) the safety performance of the location?

## POTENTIAL RESOURCES & DATA SOURCES

### Resources:

Crash data

- State (NHDOS) Crash Database
- Fatality Analysis Reporting System (FARS) Database
- Crash Reports from Local Police Departments
- Crash Data from Local Transit Agencies

Additional safety considerations

- Network Screening Summaries from the NHDOT Bureau of Highway Design
- Completed and Pending Road Safety Audit (RSA) Reports
- HSIP Program Summaries from the NHDOT Bureau of Highway Design

### Federal Performance Measures Addressed

Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Safety Performance Measures: 1) number of fatalities; 2) rate of fatalities; 3) number of serious injuries; 4) rate of serious injuries; 5) number of non-motorized fatalities and serious injuries.

Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Performance Measures: 1) number of reportable public transportation fatalities and public transportation fatality rate per total vehicle revenue miles by mode; 2) number of reportable public transportation injuries and public transportation injury rate per total vehicle revenue miles by mode; 3) number of reportable public transportation events and public transportation event rate per total vehicle revenue miles by mode; 4) mean distance between major public transportation mechanical failures by mode.

**Definition:** 1) a historical analysis of the **safety performance** (i.e. crash history) of a location over the past five (5) year period for all modes, and; 2) a forward-looking analysis of how the **countermeasures** proposed as part of a project would improve safety performance for all modes.

## REGIONAL EVALUATION CONSIDERATIONS

### Safety Measures

#### IMPACT

#### Highway and Bridge Safety Measures:

- How significant/effective are the Crash Modification Factors (CMFs) for key project design elements?
- Has a Benefit-Cost analysis been developed as part of a Road Safety Audit or other special study? If so, how compelling is the Benefit-Cost ratio?
- Are Proven Safety Countermeasures (as sanctioned by the FHWA Office of Safety) included in the project's design?

#### Rail & Transit Safety Measures:

- Does the project involve safety improvements to an existing at-grade Railway-Highway crossing?
- Does the project eliminate an existing at-grade Railway-Highway crossing?
- Does the project implement improvements identified in a local or statewide Public Transit Agency Safety Plan (PTASP)?

#### Pedestrian Safety Measures:

- Are Safe Transportation for Every Pedestrian (STEP) countermeasures (as sanctioned by the FHWA Office of Safety) included in the project's design?
- How significant/effective are the pedestrian-related Crash Modification Factors (CMFs) for key project design elements?

#### Bicycle Safety Measures

- Would the project improve Bicycle Level of Traffic Stress (LTS) from a Level 3 or 4 to at least Level 2?
- How significant/effective are the bicycle-related Crash Modification Factors (CMFs) for key project design elements?

## POTENTIAL RESOURCES & DATA SOURCES

### Resources:

#### Highway and Bridge Safety Measures:

- Crash Modification Factor Clearinghouse ([www.cmfclearinghouse.org/](http://www.cmfclearinghouse.org/))
- AASHTO Highway Safety Manual ([www.highwaysafetymanual.org/](http://www.highwaysafetymanual.org/))
- Completed or pending Road Safety Audits
- FHWA Proven Safety Countermeasures ([www.safety.fhwa.dot.gov/provencountermeasures/](http://www.safety.fhwa.dot.gov/provencountermeasures/))

#### Rail & Transit Safety Measures:

- NHDOT Bureau of Highway Design Railway-Highway Crossing Improvement Priorities
- Local or Statewide Public Transit Agency Safety Plans (PTASPs)

#### Pedestrian Safety Measures:

- FHWA Safe Transportation for Every Pedestrian (STEP) Countermeasures ([https://safety.fhwa.dot.gov/ped\\_bike/step/resources/](https://safety.fhwa.dot.gov/ped_bike/step/resources/))
- Crash Modification Factor Clearinghouse ([www.cmfclearinghouse.org/](http://www.cmfclearinghouse.org/))

#### Bicycle Safety Measures

- Bicycle LTS Model Data (as developed by MPOs or as developed for rural areas in the NH Statewide Pedestrian and Bicycle Transportation Plan).
- Crash Modification Factor Clearinghouse ([www.cmfclearinghouse.org/](http://www.cmfclearinghouse.org/))

### Federal Performance Measures Addressed

**Federal Highway Administration Safety Measures:** 1) number of fatalities; 2) rate of fatalities; 3) number of serious injuries; 4) rate of serious injuries; 5) number of non-motorized fatalities & serious injuries.

**Federal Transit Administration Safety Measures:** 1) number of reportable public transportation fatalities and public transportation fatality rate per total vehicle revenue miles by mode; 2) number of reportable public transportation injuries and public transportation injury rate per total vehicle revenue miles by mode; 3) number of reportable public transportation events and public transportation event rate per total vehicle revenue miles by mode; 4) mean distance between major public transportation mechanical failures by mode.

**Definition:** 1) the degree to which the project improves infrastructure condition in the project area (**state of repair**); and 2) the degree to which the project impacts NHDOT and/or municipal **maintenance**.

## REGIONAL EVALUATION CONSIDERATIONS

### State of Repair

#### NEED

- What is the condition of the infrastructure that is being addressed? For roadways, this includes pavement, sub-base, and base materials.
- Does the project address the underlying causes of current infrastructure conditions?

### Maintenance Considerations

#### IMPACT

- Does the project address an infrastructure issue that currently requires increased maintenance activity/costs due to poor or dangerous infrastructure conditions?
- Does the project propose significant new/expanded transportation assets that will add significant new/additional maintenance liabilities for NHDOT (e.g., new roadway/bridge construction)?
- Are there buried utilities (water, sewer, drainage) in the project area? If so, are any needed upgrades/maintenance incorporated into the overall project scope? *Note: buried utility improvements are typically not Ten Year Plan-eligible (funded locally).*

## POTENTIAL RESOURCES & DATA SOURCES

### Resources:

- NHDOT Pavement Condition Index (if current)
- SADES assessment data
- Geotechnical studies/reports
- Information requests from NHDOT offices: District Engineers, Bridge Maintenance Bureau, etc
- *NHDOT Transportation Asset Management Plan*

### Resources:

- NHDOT Pavement Condition Index (if current)
- SADES assessment data
- Geotechnical studies/reports
- Information requests from NHDOT offices: District Engineers, Bridge Maintenance Bureau, etc.
- Narrative from applicant
- Utility capacity/condition studies
- Capital Improvements Plans

### Federal Performance Measures Addressed

Federal Highway Administration State of Repair Measures: 1) percentage of pavement on the Interstate System in good condition; 2) percentage of pavement on the Interstate System in poor condition; 3) percentage of pavement on the non-Interstate National Highway System (NHS) in good condition; 4) percentage of pavement on the non-Interstate National Highway System (NHS) in poor condition; 5) percentage of bridges on the National Highway System (NHS) in good condition; 6) percentage of bridges on the National Highway System (NHS) in poor condition.

Federal Transit Administration Transit Asset Management Measures: 1) percentage of rolling stock revenue vehicles meeting or exceeding their useful life benchmark; 2) percentage of non-revenue service vehicles meeting or exceeding their useful life benchmark; 3) percentage of facilities rated below 3.0 on the Transit Economic Requirements Model (TERM) scale; 4) percentage of track segments with performance restrictions.



**Definition:** the degree of **support** for the project at the local, regional, and statewide level.

## REGIONAL EVALUATION CONSIDERATIONS

### Support

NEED

#### Local Support

- Does the project support goal(s) of locally-adopted plan? Higher scores given to projects that are specifically defined in plans, and/or address specific plan goals/needs/issues.

#### Regional Support

- Does the project support goal(s) of a regional plan? Higher scores given to projects that are specifically defined in plans, or address specific plan goals/needs/issues.

#### Statewide Support

- Does the project support goal(s) of a statewide plan? Higher scores given to projects that are specifically defined in plans, or address specific plan goals/needs/issues.

#### Emergent Needs

- Does the project address an emergent need(s) (*identified after the previous TYP project solicitation*) that could have significant regional impacts if not addressed?

#### Public Involvement

- Has there been recent public discussion or input opportunities regarding this project?
- Do recent public input/discussions show support for the project?

## POTENTIAL RESOURCES & DATA SOURCES

### Resources:

#### Local Support

- Master Plan
- Capital Improvements Plan
- Hazard Mitigation Plan
- Other local plan (Bike-Ped Plan, Sub-Area Plan, etc)
- NHDOT Road Safety Audit reports

#### Regional Support

- Long Range Transportation Plan/Regional Transportation Plan
- Corridor Study
- Coordinated Public Transit and Human Services Transportation Plan
- Regional Plan
- Scenic Byway Corridor Management Plan
- Transit Operations Plan
- River Corridor Management Plan
- MPO Congestion Management Process Plans

#### Statewide Support

- Statewide Long-Range Transportation Plan*
- Statewide Strategic Transit Assessment*
- Statewide Pedestrian and Bicycle Transportation Plan*
- Strategic Highway Safety Plan*
- Statewide Freight Plan*
- Statewide Rail Trail Plan*
- NHDOT Transportation Asset Management Plan*

#### Emergent Needs

Emergent issue/need is documented by one or more of the following:

- Letter from NHDOT District Engineer
- Letters from municipal boards or committees
- Letters from subject-area experts
- Results of studies and assessments

#### Public Involvement

- Minutes and meeting summaries from local board meetings and/or community outreach events
- Other documentation of public involvement

Nashua Regional Planning Commission  
30 Temple Street Suite 310  
Nashua NH 03060

July 21 2020

**Re: Hudson, NH BUILD Grant for Hudson Boulevard Project**

Dear Nashua Regional Planning Commission,

Please accept this letter as a complete disapproval of the Hudson NH Boulevard or otherwise known as the Circumferential Highway proposed for Hudson New Hampshire.

Funding this project would be an utter waste of taxpayer dollars due to the fact that the project will hit massive complications with environmental impacts. These impacts can be reference in the Environmental Protection Agencies past report (Final Environmental Impact Statement – DEIS Comments and Responses 1993) on this project. Environmental impacts proposed by this project and the lack of due diligence on behalf of the NH DOT forced the Environmental Protection Agency to initiate a Clean Water Act section 404c Veto. The area proposed for this project is over 1000 acres of state, town and private lands which harbor wetlands, vernal pools, endangered species, rock ledges, brooks, ponds and scenic vistas.

Regardless of the need to reduce traffic congestion in the area, the proposed environmental impacts are still just as catastrophic as they were decades ago. With the degradations of our environmental protections nationwide it is imperative that this project be denied. Protecting the regions animal life, water shed and overall quality of life of the residents through access to existing hiking trails and recreational activities in the direct area are of the utmost importance.

Furthermore, previous studies have shown that the estimated congestions upon the projects opening will be the same as the current congestion on the existing infrastructure. This is due to the fact that the project will excel residential development in the region, further damaging the highly rated open spaces, water resources and rolling hillsides in southern New Hampshire. The idea that a new road will increase development in order to acquire more tax revenue is an unsustainable endeavor. On the contrary, maintaining our current infrastructure, balancing growth with the protection of our natural resources and being more cost effective with our tax dollars would be a far better initiative.

**\*Attached:** Images of the land in or around the proposed highway corridor

For additional references and resources please see;

<https://hudsonallianceforresponsibledevelopment.home.blog/circumferential-highway/>



**Brett Gagnon**

[BrettProtectingNH@Gmail.com](mailto:BrettProtectingNH@Gmail.com)

2020 NH State Representative Candidate

Local Conservation Commission Volunteer

And concerned resident