

Update on Ten-Year Transportation Improvement Plan Criteria

SNHPC TAC Meeting
June 18, 2020

Nathan Miller, AICP
Deputy Executive Director





Background on TYP Criteria

- **The nine Regional Planning Commissions utilize the same set of criteria to evaluate and prioritize projects for inclusion in the Ten-Year Plan.**
 - The criteria are weighted individually by each region to reflect the unique needs/priorities of that region.
- **Following the completion of the recent 2021-2030 Ten-Year Plan update process, the nine Regional Planning Commissions began a collaborative process to review and update the criteria.**



Existing TYP Criteria (with SNHPC Weightings)

| Ten-Year Plan Criteria | | Definition | SNHPC Weighting (2021-2030 TYP) |
|-----------------------------|------------------------|---|--|
| Mobility | Reduce Congestion | The extent to which the project is intended to impact traveler delay upon completion. | 13.4% |
| | Freight Mobility | The degree to which the project impacts movement of goods. | 5.1% |
| Alternative Modes | | The extent to which the project impacts accommodations for alternative modes of travel including bicycle, pedestrian and transit, where so desired. | 11.0% |
| Network Significance | Traffic Volume | A measure of motor vehicle volume based on the NHDOT traffic data management system. | 8.3% |
| | Facility Importance | The extent to which the facility moves people and goods between major locations. | 8.7% |
| Safety | Safety Measures | The degree to which the scope of the project focuses on measures that increase safety. | 13.0% |
| | Safety Performance | A composite measure of 5-year average safety performance (e.g., crash rate, crash severity, etc.). | 10.4% |
| State of Repair | Roadway Surface Life | The extent to which the project impacts asset condition/service life of a roadway. | 17.3% (Total for State of Repair) |
| | Bridge Asset Condition | The degree to which a bridge requires work based on existing structural conditions, as determined by inspections and management system ratings. | |
| Project Support | | The degree to which a project has local, regional, or statewide support. | 8.3% |
| Resiliency | | The degree to which a project addresses natural hazard mitigation or adaptation measures. | 4.5% |



Changes Proposed for TYP Criteria

| EXISTING Ten-Year Plan Criteria | |
|------------------------------------|------------------------|
| Mobility | Reduce Congestion |
| | Freight Mobility |
| Alternative Modes | |
| Network Significance | Traffic Volume |
| | Facility Importance |
| Safety | Safety Measures |
| | Safety Performance |
| State of Repair | Roadway Surface Life |
| | Bridge Asset Condition |
| Project Support | |
| Resiliency | |



| PROPOSED Ten-Year Plan Criteria | |
|--|--------------------------------|
| Safety | Safety Performance |
| | Safety Measures |
| Mobility | Mobility Need & Performance |
| | Mobility Intervention |
| Network Significance | Traffic Volume |
| | Facility Importance |
| State of Repair | State of Repair |
| | Maintenance |
| Equity, Env. Justice, and Accessibility | Equity & Environmental Justice |
| | Accessibility |
| Economic Development | Local and Regional Econ. Dev. |
| | Freight Mobility |
| Natural Hazard Resiliency | |
| Project Support | |



Highlights of Proposed TYP Criteria Updates - Safety

- The structure of the safety criteria will remain the same.
 - Backward-looking “**Safety Performance**” sub-criterion focusing on the crash history at a project location.
 - Forward-looking “**Safety Measures**” sub-criterion focusing on the effectiveness of the countermeasure(s) being proposed as part of the project.
- Both the “Safety Performance” and “Safety Measures” sub-criteria have been expanded to more explicitly consider transit, pedestrian, and bicycle safety.



Highlights of Proposed TYP Criteria Updates - Mobility

- The structure of the mobility criteria have been adjusted.
 - Backward-looking “**Mobility Need and Performance**” sub-criterion focusing on the mobility history (e.g. congestion, delay, transit on-time performance, etc) at a project location.
 - Forward-looking “**Mobility Intervention**” sub-criterion focusing on the effectiveness of the improvements being proposed as part of the project.
- Both the “Mobility Need and Performance” and “Mobility Intervention” sub-criteria have been expanded to more explicitly consider transit, pedestrian, and bicycle mobility.



Highlights of Proposed TYP Criteria Updates – Network Significance

- The structure of the network significance criteria will remain the same.
 - **“Traffic Volume”** sub-criterion focusing on the level of utilization of infrastructure for both vehicular and bicycle/pedestrian traffic.
 - **“Facility Importance”** sub-criterion focusing on the importance of the project within the larger transportation network,
- The “Facility Importance” sub-criterion has been expanded to include consideration of major origins/destinations, network centrality, and availability of alternate routes.



Highlights of Proposed TYP Criteria Updates – State of Repair

- The structure of the state of repair criteria have been adjusted.
 - **“State of Repair”** sub-criterion focusing on the existing condition of the infrastructure asset (e.g. pavement condition, bridge condition based on inspection report, etc).
 - A new **“Maintenance”** sub-criterion to consider whether a proposed project would result in maintenance efficiencies/savings or new maintenance liabilities.
- The **“Maintenance”** sub-criterion also includes consideration for economies of scale that may be realized by combining locally-funded utility work into the project.



Highlights of Proposed TYP Criteria Updates – Equity, Environmental Justice, and Accessibility

- A new criterion has been added focusing on Equity, Environmental Justice, and Accessibility.
- The “**Equity and Environmental Justice**” sub-criterion will focus on the following:
 - Whether a project provides infrastructure improvements or transportation choices to a “traditionally-underserved population” identified in a Title VI or Env. Justice Program.
 - Whether a project implements recommendations from a Community Health Improvement Program (CHIP).
 - The impact of a project on air quality.



Highlights of Proposed TYP Criteria Updates – Equity, Environmental Justice, and Accessibility

- The “**Accessibility**” sub-criterion will focus on the following:
 - Whether a project incorporates Universal Design considerations to ensure that all users (e.g. those with mobility impairments, visual impairments, hearing impairments or other disabilities) can access and utilize the facility.
 - Whether a project incorporates accessibility upgrades identified in a local, regional, or statewide ADA Transition Plan.
 - Whether a project improves coordination between transportation service providers or between modes of transportation to improve access to essential services.



Highlights of Proposed TYP Criteria Updates – Economic Development

- A new criterion has been added focusing on Economic Development.
 - The “**Local and Regional Economic Development**” sub-criterion will focus on a project’s consistency with economic development plans (e.g. CEDS) and improving access to major employment and tourism destinations.
 - The “**Freight Mobility**” sub-criterion has been expanded to include the Critical Urban and Rural Freight Corridor recommendations provided by each of the nine RPCs.



Highlights of Proposed TYP Criteria Updates – Natural Hazard Resiliency

- The “**Natural Hazard Resiliency**” criterion has been expanded.
 - The criterion now includes more explicit consideration about whether a project mitigates the risk from a known hazard (e.g. relocates infrastructure away from a known hazard area) or adapts to a known hazard (e.g. reinforces infrastructure in place).
 - The criterion also improves the connectivity between local Hazard Mitigation Planning priorities and the Ten-Year Plan process.



Highlights of Proposed TYP Criteria Updates – Support

- The “**Support**” criterion remains largely the same and focuses on a project’s documented public support and local, regional, or statewide planning justification.
 - One additional item has been included in this criterion to allow for projects that are “emergent needs” that could have significant regional impacts if not addressed. (i.e. projects that have emerged suddenly and don’t have prior planning justification).



Next Steps

- The nine Regional Planning Commissions will be coordinating to finalize these criteria shortly.
- The next Ten-Year Plan solicitation will be coming soon. As part of that process, the TAC will need to set regional weights for the criteria in July.
 - To help develop a starting point for the regional criteria weighting, we will likely conduct an electronic survey of TAC members prior to the July meeting.



Questions?