

FY 2023-2032 Ten Year Plan Project Profile

PROJECT OVERVIEW

Municipality: Claremont

Location: Main Street (NH 12/NH 103) between Citizens St and Westside Ave (Phase I) ([Link](#))

Scope Summary: Full-depth reconstruction, new storm water, add sidewalk and bike lane. Move roadway away from Sugar River bank/water table. *This is the higher priority project out of the two proposals from Claremont.*

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

	Regional Evaluation Considerations	Analysis Results & Notes	Resources & Data Source(s) Consulted
Local & Regional	1. Does the project improve mobility and/or accessibility to and from a regional employment hub?	1. Project would create pedestrian and bicycle linkage from Citizens Street neighborhood to downtown Claremont, which would improve access to employment opportunities for residents without cars.	Project proposal
Freight Movement	1. Does the project implement a high priority freight improvement project as identified in the NH State Freight Plan or an adopted Regional Transportation Plan? 2. Does the project improve a freight bottleneck location as identified in the NH State Freight Plan or an adopted Regional Transportation Plan? 3. 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)?	1. NH State Freight Plan notes that project area experiences 501-1,000 trucks per day. 2. State Freight Plan lists the project area as a “medium priority” freight bottleneck. 3. Project area is listed as a candidate for Critical Rural Freight Corridor Designation.	NH State Freight Plan

EQUITY, ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE & ACCESSIBILITY

	Regional Evaluation Considerations	Analysis Results & Notes	Resources & Data Source(s) Consulted
Equity & Environmental Justice	1. 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?	1. Project would create pedestrian and bicycle linkage from Citizens Street neighborhood to downtown Claremont, which would improve access to employment opportunities for residents without cars. Census block shows low car access (9.3-37.5% households without access).	Project proposal NH DHHS
Accessibility	1. Does the project incorporate accessibility upgrades or remove barriers to access?	1. Project would add sidewalks where there are currently none. Proposal indicates this area sees pedestrian activity (connecting from Citizens St neighborhood to downtown).	Project proposal

MOBILITY

	Regional Evaluation Considerations	Analysis Results & Notes	Resources & Data Source(s) Consulted
Mobility Need & Performance	<p>1. What is the federal functional classification of the project area (i.e., is high mobility an underlying function of the facility)?</p> <p>2. Is the facility a local, regional, or statewide connection?</p> <p>3. Are the mobility needs in the project area defined in a local, regional, or state plan?</p> <p>4. 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?</p>	<p>1. Major collector</p> <p>2. Regional connection</p> <p>3. NH State Freight Plan, Claremont Truck Route Plan, Claremont Master Plan. Master Plan indicates need for complete streets in project area. Truck Route Plan identifies narrow shoulders and roadway condition as limiting truck/multi-modal mobility.</p> <p>4. No evidence of congestion in project area.</p> <p>5. Proposal indicates pedestrians use roadway where there are currently no sidewalks. Pedestrian delays could occur due to traffic/safety fears causing pedestrians to avoid using the road during peak times. No available data.</p>	<p>NHDOT Functional Class Map</p> <p>NH State Freight Plan</p> <p>Claremont Master Plan</p> <p>Claremont Truck Route Plan</p>

	5. 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)?		
Mobility Interventions	<p>1. For projects addressing motor vehicle mobility, to what extent will the project provide congestion relief or mobility benefits?</p> <p>2. 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)?</p>	<p>1. Improved roadway condition may have minor benefits. No current identified congestion/vehicle mobility issues.</p> <p>2. Project should encourage pedestrians who would not walk along this stretch of Main Street to utilize it. Project will encourage some bicyclists to use this stretch of road, but not the same benefit as a separated bike path.</p>	Project proposal

NATURAL HAZARD RESILIENCY

	Regional Evaluation Considerations	Analysis Results & Notes	Resources & Data Source(s) Consulted
Hazard Risk	<p>1. Are natural hazards in the project area documented in a plan, study, or database?</p> <p>2. Have natural hazards previously impacted transportation infrastructure and/or mobility in the project area? How frequently?</p> <p>3. Are natural hazard risks anticipated to increase in severity/impact (for example, due to anticipated impacts of climate change)?</p>	<p>1. No. Proposal notes several natural hazards – steep/eroding Sugar River embankment, erosion along Cemetery Brook, and high water table causing frost heaving/deterioration.</p> <p>2. Proposal notes that winter weather/high precipitation events damage roadway due to high water table (each winter).</p> <p>3. Flood/erosion impacts expected to increase due to increase in high-precipitation events.</p>	Project proposal

Hazard Mitigation	<p>1. 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?</p> <p>2. Is the project responsive to stream characteristics, such as flood propensity, slope, bankfull width, and orientation to roadway?</p>	<p>1. Proposed alternate #2 would move the roadway away from the Sugar River. Reconstruction of the road could move roadway out of water table.</p> <p>2. Proposal does not address stream culvert carrying Cemetery Brook under roadway in project area. If culvert is replaced it will need to meet new NHDES wetlands standards for culvert design. 2015 SADES assessment indicates culvert is partially compatible with stream.</p>	Project proposal NH SADES
--------------------------	--	---	------------------------------

NETWORK SIGNIFICANCE

	Regional Evaluation Considerations	Analysis Results & Notes	Resources & Data Source(s) Consulted
Traffic Volume	<p>1. What is the present-day traffic volume in or near the project area?</p> <p>2. How does the traffic volume in the project area compare to other traffic volumes in the region?</p> <p>3. Have traffic volumes increased, decreased, or stayed about the same over time?</p> <p>4. What is the measured or estimated present-day bicycle and pedestrian volume on or near the impacted facility?</p> <p>5. What is the relative demand for pedestrian and bicycle trips based on development density, presence/lack of current ped-bike facilities, etc.?</p>	<p>1. 4,800 AADT. Down slightly from 5,100 AADT in 2014.</p> <p>2. Moderate traffic volume, typical of downtown collector roadways in larger municipalities in the region.</p> <p>3. Traffic volumes may decline with planned North Street project/re-route.</p> <p>4. Proposal indicates there is pedestrian activity along roadway currently. No data.</p> <p>5. This stretch of Main St connects the relatively dense Citizens Street neighborhood to the rest of Main Street and downtown. Also provides connection to Twistback/Old Twistback Rd.</p>	NHDOT Traffic Data Management System Project proposal
Facility Importance	<p>1. Does the facility move people or goods between major locations/destinations?</p> <p>2. Is the project area proximate to key transportation facilities, such as airports or transit/intermodal facilities?</p> <p>3. To what degree is the project area “central” to the local and regional transportation network?</p>	<p>1. Project is important freight connection per NH State Freight Plan. Provides connection to downtown Claremont.</p> <p>2. Airport/Amtrak is nearby but Main St is not the primary access route.</p> <p>3. Main Street provides direct access to downtown but is paralleled by North St which is planned to be the primary east-west route in this area.</p>	NH State Freight Plan

	<p>4. Would traffic increase on other areas of the transportation network if the project is not implemented (e.g., would more drivers use alternate routes)?</p> <p>5. What would be the increase in travel time if travelers were detoured around the project area?</p> <p>6. Is the proposed project located on a defined or obvious evacuation route?</p>	<p>4. Yes – this route is planned to become the primary freight route through downtown Claremont, further deterioration of the road could encourage trucks to utilize other routes.</p> <p>5. Minimal – North Street is a parallel alternative route.</p> <p>6. Not a designated route. Would be one the primary routes of egress from downtown.</p>	
--	--	--	--

SAFETY

	Regional Evaluation Considerations	Analysis Results & Notes	Resources & Data Source(s) Consulted
Safety performance	<p>1. Crash history</p> <p>2. Was the location identified through local, regional, or statewide network screening?</p> <p>3. Was the location the subject of a previous Road Safety Audit due to crash history?</p> <p>4. Was the project referred to the TYP from the HSIP program due to scope/cost?</p> <p>5. Were improvements implemented over the past five-year period that have changed (or could change) the safety performance of the location?</p>	<p>1. Proposal indicates 28 crashes in project area but does not specify timeframe, severity, cause, or details of crashes.</p> <p>2. No.</p> <p>3. No.</p> <p>4. No.</p> <p>5. No.</p>	Project proposal
Safety Measures	<p>1. How significant/effective are the Crash Modification Factors (CMFs) for key project design elements?</p> <p>2. 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?</p> <p>3. Are Proven Safety Countermeasures (as sanctioned by the FHWA Office of Safety) included in the project's design?</p>	<p>1. Installing sidewalk on major collector associated with 78% reduction in crashes between pedestrians and vehicles/bicycles.</p> <p>2. No.</p> <p>3. Sidewalks are a Proved Safety Countermeasure as identified by FHWA.</p> <p>4. Likely yes. The project would have traffic calming benefits and would create a bicycle shoulder.</p>	Crash Modification Factors Clearinghouse FHWA Proven Safety Countermeasures

	4. Would the project improve Bicycle Level of Traffic Stress (LTS) from a Level 3 or 4 to at least Level 2?		
--	---	--	--

STATE OF REPAIR

State of Repair

	Regional Evaluation Considerations	Analysis Results & Notes	Resources & Data Source(s) Consulted
State of Repair	1. What is the condition of the infrastructure that is being addressed? For roadways, this includes pavement, sub-base, and base materials. 2. Does the project address the underlying causes of current infrastructure conditions?	1. Generally poor condition, including aging/damaged road base. 2. Yes – addresses old road base, high water table, and location along stream bank.	Project proposal
Maintenance Considerations	1. Does the project address an infrastructure issue that currently requires increased maintenance activity/costs due to poor or dangerous infrastructure conditions? 2. 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)? 3. Are there buried utilities (water, sewer, drainage) in the project area? If so, are any needed upgrades/maintenance incorporated into the overall project scope?	1. Proposal does not note increased maintenance costs due to current conditions, but could be true given roadway condition and erosion issues. 2. No. 3. Yes – new storm water and water mains.	Project proposal

SUPPORT

Support

	Regional Evaluation Considerations	Analysis Results & Notes	Resources & Data Source(s) Consulted
Support	<p>1. 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.</p> <p>2. 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.</p> <p>Statewide Support</p> <p>3. 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.</p> <p>Emergent Needs</p> <p>4. Does the project address an emergent need(s) (identified after the previous TYP project solicitation) that could have significant regional impacts if not addressed?</p> <p>5. Has there been recent public discussion or input opportunities regarding this project?</p> <p>6. Do recent public input/discussions show support for the project?</p>	<p>1. Project is specifically identified in local Master Plan and address several plan goals.</p> <p>2. Regional Transportation Plan identifies project as a priority project (p. 3-8).</p> <p>3. NH State Freight Plan identifies project area as Critical Rural Freight Corridor candidate and “medium priority” freight bottleneck.</p> <p>4. No.</p> <p>5. No. Master Plan was updated in 2017 and included public input.</p> <p>6. N/A</p>	<p>Claremont Master Plan</p> <p>UVLSRPC Regional Transportation Plan</p> <p>NH State Freight Plan</p>

FY 2023-2032 Ten Year Plan Project Profile

PROJECT OVERVIEW

Municipality: Claremont

Location: Main Street (NH 12/NH 103) between Elm St and Westside Ave (Phase II) ([Link](#))

Scope Summary: Full-depth reconstruction, new storm water, streetscape improvements include new sidewalks, landscaping.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

	Regional Evaluation Considerations	Analysis Results & Notes	Resources & Data Source(s) Consulted
Local & Regional	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> No. Improving streetscape could assist with revitalization in this area. Project would improve infrastructure condition, particularly sidewalks, but does not directly relate to a mobility <u>improvement</u>. 	Project proposal
Freight Movement	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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)? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> NH State Freight Plan notes that project area experiences 501-1,000 trucks per day. State Freight Plan lists the project area as a “medium priority” freight bottleneck. Project area is listed as a candidate for Critical Rural Freight Corridor Designation. 	NH State Freight Plan

EQUITY, ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE & ACCESSIBILITY

	Regional Evaluation Considerations	Analysis Results & Notes	Resources & Data Source(s) Consulted
Equity & Environmental Justice	1. 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?	1. Project would improve pedestrian and bicycle access to downtown by restoring degraded sidewalk and potentially providing traffic calming/safety benefits. Proposal indicates low access to vehicles in this area.	Project proposal NH DHHS
Accessibility	1. Does the project incorporate accessibility upgrades or remove barriers to access?	1. Upgrading sidewalks would ensure compliance with ADA standards.	Project proposal

MOBILITY

	Regional Evaluation Considerations	Analysis Results & Notes	Resources & Data Source(s) Consulted
Mobility Need & Performance	<p>1. What is the federal functional classification of the project area (i.e., is high mobility an underlying function of the facility)?</p> <p>2. Is the facility a local, regional, or statewide connection?</p> <p>3. Are the mobility needs in the project area defined in a local, regional, or state plan?</p> <p>4. 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?</p>	<p>1. Major collector</p> <p>2. Regional connection</p> <p>3. NH State Freight Plan, Claremont Truck Route Plan, Claremont Master Plan. Master Plan indicates need for complete streets in project area. Truck Route Plan identifies narrow shoulders and roadway condition as limiting truck/multi-modal mobility.</p> <p>4. No evidence of congestion in project area.</p> <p>5. Poor sidewalk condition may limit mobility for limited mobility residents.</p>	<p>NHDOT Functional Class Map</p> <p>NH State Freight Plan</p> <p>Claremont Master Plan</p> <p>Claremont Truck Route Plan</p>

	5. 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)?		
Mobility Interventions	<p>1. For projects addressing motor vehicle mobility, to what extent will the project provide congestion relief or mobility benefits?</p> <p>2. 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)?</p>	<p>1. Improved roadway condition may have minor benefits. No current identified congestion/vehicle mobility issues.</p> <p>2. Improving sidewalk condition may improve mobility for limited mobility residents. Traffic calming could increase the number of residents bicycling on the roadway.</p>	Project proposal

NATURAL HAZARD RESILIENCY

	Regional Evaluation Considerations	Analysis Results & Notes	Resources & Data Source(s) Consulted
Hazard Risk	<p>1. Are natural hazards in the project area documented in a plan, study, or database?</p> <p>2. Have natural hazards previously impacted transportation infrastructure and/or mobility in the project area? How frequently?</p> <p>3. Are natural hazard risks anticipated to increase in severity/impact (for example, due to anticipated impacts of climate change)?</p>	<p>1. No.</p> <p>2. No.</p> <p>3. No.</p>	Project proposal

Hazard Mitigation	<p>1. 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?</p> <p>2. Is the project responsive to stream characteristics, such as flood propensity, slope, bankfull width, and orientation to roadway?</p>	<p>1. No natural hazards in project area.</p> <p>2. No stream crossings in project area.</p>	<p>Project proposal</p> <p>NH SADES</p>
--------------------------	--	--	---

NETWORK SIGNIFICANCE

	Regional Evaluation Considerations	Analysis Results & Notes	Resources & Data Source(s) Consulted
Traffic Volume	<p>1. What is the present-day traffic volume in or near the project area?</p> <p>2. How does the traffic volume in the project area compare to other traffic volumes in the region?</p> <p>3. Have traffic volumes increased, decreased, or stayed about the same over time?</p> <p>4. What is the measured or estimated present-day bicycle and pedestrian volume on or near the impacted facility?</p> <p>5. What is the relative demand for pedestrian and bicycle trips based on development density, presence/lack of current ped-bike facilities, etc.?</p>	<p>1. 5,000 – 6,000 AADT.</p> <p>2. Moderate traffic volume, typical of downtown collector roadways in larger municipalities in the region.</p> <p>3. Traffic volumes may decline with planned North Street project/re-route.</p> <p>4. Proposal indicates there is pedestrian activity along roadway currently. No data.</p> <p>5. This stretch of Main St connects directly downtown Claremont.</p>	<p>NHDOT Traffic Data Management System</p> <p>Project proposal</p>
Facility Importance	<p>1. Does the facility move people or goods between major locations/destinations?</p> <p>2. Is the project area proximate to key transportation facilities, such as airports or transit/intermodal facilities?</p> <p>3. To what degree is the project area “central” to the local and regional transportation network?</p>	<p>1. Project is important freight connection per NH State Freight Plan. Provides connection to downtown Claremont.</p> <p>2. Airport/Amtrak is nearby but Main St is not the primary access route.</p> <p>3. Main Street provides direct access to downtown but is paralleled by North St which is planned to be the primary east-west route in this area.</p>	<p>NH State Freight Plan</p>

	<p>4. Would traffic increase on other areas of the transportation network if the project is not implemented (e.g., would more drivers use alternate routes)?</p> <p>5. What would be the increase in travel time if travelers were detoured around the project area?</p> <p>6. Is the proposed project located on a defined or obvious evacuation route?</p>	<p>4. Yes – this route is planned to become the primary freight route through downtown Claremont, further deterioration of the road could encourage trucks to utilize other routes.</p> <p>5. Minimal – North Street is a parallel alternative route.</p> <p>6. Not a designated route. Would be one the primary routes of egress from downtown.</p>	
--	--	--	--

SAFETY

	Regional Evaluation Considerations	Analysis Results & Notes	Resources & Data Source(s) Consulted
Safety performance	<p>1. Crash history</p> <p>2. Was the location identified through local, regional, or statewide network screening?</p> <p>3. Was the location the subject of a previous Road Safety Audit due to crash history?</p> <p>4. Was the project referred to the TYP from the HSIP program due to scope/cost?</p> <p>5. Were improvements implemented over the past five-year period that have changed (or could change) the safety performance of the location?</p>	<p>1. Proposal indicates crash history at Main Street/West Terrace intersection caused by vehicle speeds and driver inattention.</p> <p>2. No.</p> <p>3. No.</p> <p>4. No.</p> <p>5. No.</p> <p>Additional safety notes – significant number of curb cuts contributes to access management/safety challenges due to # of roadway access points.</p>	Project proposal
Safety Measures	<p>1. How significant/effective are the Crash Modification Factors (CMFs) for key project design elements?</p> <p>2. 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?</p> <p>3. Are Proven Safety Countermeasures (as sanctioned by the FHWA Office of Safety) included in the project's design?</p>	<p>1. Proposal is not specific enough to identify CMFs.</p> <p>2. No.</p> <p>3. Corridor access management (e.g., reducing curb cuts) is a sanctioned Proven Safety Countermeasure.</p> <p>4. Unclear. On-street parking is barrier for reducing level of stress.</p> <p>Additional safety notes – traffic calming measures should improve safety for all modes of travel.</p>	FHWA Proven Safety Countermeasures

	4. Would the project improve Bicycle Level of Traffic Stress (LTS) from a Level 3 or 4 to at least Level 2?		
--	---	--	--

STATE OF REPAIR

State of Repair

	Regional Evaluation Considerations	Analysis Results & Notes	Resources & Data Source(s) Consulted
State of Repair	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is the condition of the infrastructure that is being addressed? For roadways, this includes pavement, sub-base, and base materials. 2. Does the project address the underlying causes of current infrastructure conditions? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Generally poor condition, including aging/damaged road base. 2. Yes – addresses old road base and clay tile drainage. Roadway condition would appear to be result of deferred maintenance as opposed to environmental factors. 	Project proposal
Maintenance Considerations	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Does the project address an infrastructure issue that currently requires increased maintenance activity/costs due to poor or dangerous infrastructure conditions? 2. 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)? 3. Are there buried utilities (water, sewer, drainage) in the project area? If so, are any needed upgrades/maintenance incorporated into the overall project scope? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Proposal does not note increased maintenance costs due to current conditions, but could be true given roadway condition and erosion issues. Current layout makes snow removal challenging on sidewalks. 2. No. 3. Yes – new storm water, sewer, and water mains. 	Project proposal

SUPPORT

Support

	Regional Evaluation Considerations	Analysis Results & Notes	Resources & Data Source(s) Consulted
Support	<p>1. 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.</p> <p>2. 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.</p> <p>Statewide Support</p> <p>3. 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.</p> <p>Emergent Needs</p> <p>4. Does the project address an emergent need(s) (identified after the previous TYP project solicitation) that could have significant regional impacts if not addressed?</p> <p>5. Has there been recent public discussion or input opportunities regarding this project?</p> <p>6. Do recent public input/discussions show support for the project?</p>	<p>1. Project is specifically identified in local Master Plan and address several plan goals.</p> <p>2. Regional Transportation Plan identifies project as a priority project (p. 3-8).</p> <p>3. NH State Freight Plan identifies project area as Critical Rural Freight Corridor candidate and “medium priority” freight bottleneck.</p> <p>4. No.</p> <p>5. No. Master Plan was updated in 2017 and included public input.</p> <p>6. N/A</p>	<p>Claremont Master Plan</p> <p>UVLSRPC Regional Transportation Plan</p> <p>NH State Freight Plan</p>

FY 2023-2032 Ten Year Plan Project Profile

PROJECT OVERVIEW

Municipality: Canaan

Location: Northern Rail Trail over Indian River ([Link](#))

Scope Summary: Replace two Trestle Bridges on the Northern Rail Trail

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

	Regional Evaluation Considerations	Analysis Results & Notes	Resources & Data Source(s) Consulted
Local & Regional	1. Does the project improve mobility and/or accessibility to and from a regional tourism destination?	1. The project would replace existing infrastructure on a known tourism asset.	
Freight Movement		This project does not address freight	

EQUITY, ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE & ACCESSIBILITY

	Regional Evaluation Considerations	Analysis Results & Notes	Resources & Data Source(s) Consulted
Equity & Environmental Justice		Project replaces existing infrastructure that currently serves and connects users. This is not a motor vehicle route.	

Accessibility		Project replaces existing infrastructure and does not address improved accessibility.	
----------------------	--	---	--

MOBILITY

	Regional Evaluation Considerations	Analysis Results & Notes	Resources & Data Source(s) Consulted
Mobility Need & Performance	1. Is the facility a local, regional, or statewide connection?	1. The Northern Rail Trail is located on a State-owned asset. The connection is a pedestrian and bicycle facility that connects Canaan with major employment centers in Lebanon. This is a major tourist connection. Project does not address mobility improvements	
Mobility Interventions	1. For projects addressing bicycle and pedestrian mobility, to what extent will the project reduce bicyclist/pedestrian delay and/or improve bicyclist/pedestrian throughput?	1. Project does not address mobility. It is a bridge replacement project.	

NATURAL HAZARD RESILIENCY

Regional Evaluation Considerations	Analysis Results & Notes	Resources & Data Source(s) Consulted
------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------------------

Hazard Risk	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Are natural hazards in the project area documented in a plan, study, or database? Are natural hazard risks anticipated to increase in severity/impact? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Town had a Flood Hazard Reduction Engineering Study done at this location due to increased flood events. Natural hazards risks are anticipated to increase in this area based on historical data, projected data, and climate change impacts. 	Town of Canaan Flood Hazard Reduction Engineering Study of the Indian River
Hazard Mitigation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent does the project mitigate or adapt to known natural hazards? Is the project responsive to stream characteristics, such as flood propensity, slope, bankfull widths, and orientation to roadway? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Project adapts to natural hazards with improved infrastructure in the same location. Proposal addresses minor mitigation actions outside of the infrastructure area. Project proposal is responsive to the characteristics of the Indian River as a result of the Flood Hazard Reduction Engineering Study. The proposal includes increasing the span of the bridges to better fit the stream and prevent debris from piling up and blocking streamflow. These improvements are projects to prevent flooding in surrounding area. 	Town of Canaan Flood Hazard Reduction Engineering Study of the Indian River

NETWORK SIGNIFICANCE

	Regional Evaluation Considerations	Analysis Results & Notes	Resources & Data Source(s) Consulted
Traffic Volume		There is no vehicle traffic at this location. UVLSRPC does not have bicycle and pedestrian data for this location.	
Facility Importance	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the proposed project located on a defined or obvious evacuation route? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The Northern Rail Trail has been identified by the Town as an alternative emergency evacuation route. 	Town of Canaan Hazard Mitigation Plan

SAFETY

	Regional Evaluation Considerations	Analysis Results & Notes	Resources & Data Source(s) Consulted
Safety performance		This project does not address safety performance.	
Safety Measures		This project proposes to included safety railings to improve safety of crossings for trail users.	

STATE OF REPAIR

State of Repair

	Regional Evaluation Considerations	Analysis Results & Notes	Resources & Data Source(s) Consulted
State of Repair	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is the condition of the infrastructure that is being addressed? 2. Does the project address underlying causes of current infrastructure conditions? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The bridges in the project area have been damaged over time and throughout extreme flooding events. 2. Yes. Proposed improvements would increase the span of the bridges that would assist in mitigating flood damage of the infrastructure. 	
Maintenance Considerations		It is unclear who is responsible for future maintenance	

SUPPORT

Support

	Regional Evaluation Considerations	Analysis Results & Notes	Resources & Data Source(s) Consulted
Support	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Does the project support goals of locally-adopted plans?2. Do recent public input/discussions show support for the project?	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The Town identifies this project as a goal in the Master Plan and local CIP.2. There have been no project specific public discussions. Public support adoption on Master Plan in 2019.	<p>Canaan Master Plan Canaan Capital Improvement Plan</p>

FY 2023-2032 Ten Year Plan Project Profile

PROJECT OVERVIEW

Municipality: Canaan

Location: US Route 4, Roberts Rd, Potato Rd ([Link](#))

Scope Summary: Add middle turn lane, 2 right turn lanes (EB/WB), 2 Merge lanes (EB/WB)

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

	Regional Evaluation Considerations	Analysis Results & Notes	Resources & Data Source(s) Consulted
Local & Regional	1. Does the project area improve mobility and/or accessibility to and from a regional employment hub?	1. Project area improves rural congestion at an access point to the Mascoma Community Health Center.	
Freight Movement		Project does not address freight movement.	

EQUITY, ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE & ACCESSIBILITY

	Regional Evaluation Considerations	Analysis Results & Notes	Resources & Data Source(s) Consulted
Equity & Environmental Justice		This project does not address equity and environmental justice. Project could improve rural congestions at an access point to the Mascoma Community Health Center.	

Accessibility	<p>1. Does the project incorporate accessibility upgrades or remove barriers to access?</p>	<p>1. Project does not include upgrades or removal of barriers to access.</p>	
----------------------	---	---	--

MOBILITY

	Regional Evaluation Considerations	Analysis Results & Notes	Resources & Data Source(s) Consulted
Mobility Need & Performance	<p>1. What is the federal functional classification of the project area (i.e., is high mobility an underlying function of the facility)?</p> <p>2. Is the facility a local, regional, or statewide connection?</p> <p>3. 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?</p>	<p>1. Class II highway. Federal aid eligible</p> <p>2. US 4 is a local, regional, and state connection. UVLSRPC has identified this corridor as a key regional corridor.</p> <p>3. Project addresses vehicle mobility. Data has not been collected on wait times. Project proposal reports congestion and turning difficulties.</p>	
Mobility Interventions	<p>1. For projects addressing motor vehicle mobility, to what extent will the project provide congestion relief or mobility benefits?</p>	<p>1. Adding turning lanes and merge lanes may provide some congestion relief on impacted roadways in relation to turning movements.</p>	

NATURAL HAZARD RESILIENCY

	Regional Evaluation Considerations	Analysis Results & Notes	Resources & Data Source(s) Consulted
Hazard Risk		This project does not address natural hazards.	
Hazard Mitigation		This project does not address natural hazards.	

NETWORK SIGNIFICANCE

	Regional Evaluation Considerations	Analysis Results & Notes	Resources & Data Source(s) Consulted
Traffic Volume	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is the present-day traffic volume in or near the project area? 2. How does the traffic volume in the project area compare to other traffic volumes in the region? 3. Have traffic volumes increased, decreased, or stayed about the same over time? 4. What is the measured or estimated present-day bicycle and pedestrian volume on or near the impacted facility? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. NH DOT AADT 2019 estimates 6,898 vehicles. 2. Traffic volumes are low-moderate for the area. Traffic increases as US 4 gets closer to I-89 and Lebanon. 3. Traffic volumes have increased about 200 vehicles over 10 years. 4. There is no bicycle or pedestrian data for this location. 	

Facility Importance	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Does the facility move people or goods between major locations/destinations? 2. To what degree is the project area “central” to the local and regional transportation network? 3. Is the proposed project located on a defined or obvious evacuation route? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The US Route 4 Corridor connects key destinations and serves as a primary east/west New Hampshire Corridor. 2. This corridor connects many UVLS municipalities to Lebanon and to I-89. 3. Route 4 is the main evacuation route in and out of Canaan. 	
----------------------------	--	---	--

SAFETY

	Regional Evaluation Considerations	Analysis Results & Notes	Resources & Data Source(s) Consulted
Safety performance	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is the number of passenger vehicle crashes at the location? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Proposal reports that there are several crashes annually and many “near misses” at this location. 	
Safety Measures	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Was the location identified through local, regional, or statewide network screening? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. US 4 Corridor has been identified as an important corridor in the UVLS region 	US Route 4 Corridor Study

STATE OF REPAIR

State of Repair

Regional Evaluation Considerations	Analysis Results & Notes	Resources & Data Source(s) Consulted
---	-------------------------------------	---

State of Repair	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> How significant/ effective are the Crash Modification Factors (CMFs) for key project design elements? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The proposal does not indicate that this analysis has been completed. There have been no Road Safety Audits performed. 	
Maintenance Considerations	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> What is the condition of the infrastructure that is being addressed? Does the project propose significant new/expanded transportation assets that will add significant new/additional maintenance liabilities for NHDOT? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The roadway is in good condition. This project will increase the amount of roadway and pavement at this intersection. Increased pavement maintenance as well as increased winter maintenance is expected but most likely not significant. 	

SUPPORT

Support

	Regional Evaluation Considerations	Analysis Results & Notes	Resources & Data Source(s) Consulted
Support	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Has there been recent public discussion or input opportunities regarding this project? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Proposal reports that frequent public comments occur regarding safety issues at this location which have sparked this project proposal. 	

FY 2023-2032 Ten Year Plan Project Profile

PROJECT OVERVIEW

Municipality: Enfield

Location: Route 4 near Baltic Ave ([Link](#))

Scope Summary: Replace or refurbish approximately 100' of retaining wall along US 4 Route just east of Baltic Ave.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

	Regional Evaluation Considerations	Analysis Results & Notes	Resources & Data Source(s) Consulted
Local & Regional		Project does not improve local and regional economic development. This project could prevent short-term interruptions to existing local and regional economy.	
Freight Movement		Project does not improve freight movement. This project could prevent short-term interruptions to local and regional freight movement.	

EQUITY, ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE & ACCESSIBILITY

	Regional Evaluation Considerations	Analysis Results & Notes	Resources & Data Source(s) Consulted
Equity & Environmental Justice		Project does not address equity and environmental justice. This project could prevent short-term interruptions to services and disconnection to the downtown.	

Accessibility		Project does not address accessibility. This project could prevent short-term interruptions to services and disconnection to the downtown.	
----------------------	--	--	--

MOBILITY

	Regional Evaluation Considerations	Analysis Results & Notes	Resources & Data Source(s) Consulted
Mobility Need & Performance	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is the federal functional classification of the project area? 2. Is the facility a local, regional, or statewide connection? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Class II highway. Federal aid eligible 2. US 4 is a local, regional, and state connection. UVLSRPC has identified this corridor as a key regional corridor. <p>This project does not address mobility needs.</p>	<p>UVLSRPC Regional Plan UVLSRPC Draft Regional Corridor Transportation Plan US 4 Corridor Study</p>
Mobility Interventions		<p>This project does not address mobility improvements.</p>	

NATURAL HAZARD RESILIENCY

	Regional Evaluation Considerations	Analysis Results & Notes	Resources & Data Source(s) Consulted
Hazard Risk		This project does not address natural hazards.	
Hazard Mitigation		This project does not address natural hazards.	

NETWORK SIGNIFICANCE

	Regional Evaluation Considerations	Analysis Results & Notes	Resources & Data Source(s) Consulted
Traffic Volume	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is the present-day traffic volume in or near the project area? 2. How does the traffic volume in the project area compare to other traffic volumes in the region? 3. Have traffic volumes increased. Decreased, or stayed about the same over time? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. NH DOT estimates AADT 8,840 in 2019. 2. Moderate traffic volume for the region. Major connector road between population centers and local downtowns. 3. Traffic volumes have remained steady with a +/- 500 vehicles over the past 10 years <p>There is no data for pedestrian or bicycle traffic. There is a slight demand for pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure along this corridor due to transit connections and connections to residential areas and downtown.</p>	NHDOT Transportation Data Management System

Facility Importance	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Does the facility move people or goods between major locations/destinations? To what degree is the project area “central” to the local and regional transportation network? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The US Route 4 Corridor connects key destinations and serves as a primary east/west New Hampshire Corridor. This corridor connects many UVLS municipalities to Lebanon and to I-89. <p>This project would not impact traffic on the corridor or alternative routes.</p>	
----------------------------	--	--	--

SAFETY

	Regional Evaluation Considerations	Analysis Results & Notes	Resources & Data Source(s) Consulted
Safety performance		There is a safety concern by the Town of the nearby intersection of Baltic Ave and US 4. The project area is near this intersection.	
Safety Measures		UVLSRPC does not have current crash data for this location but will continue to look for it.	

STATE OF REPAIR

State of Repair

Regional Evaluation Considerations	Analysis Results & Notes	Resources & Data Source(s) Consulted
---	-------------------------------------	---

State of Repair	1. What is the condition of the infrastructure that is being addressed?	1. The retaining wall is in poor condition. There is concern of failure which would result in severe road damage.	
Maintenance Considerations		The project is to address a lack of maintenance or a potential increase in maintenance costs due to condition of structure. The project would not increase or expand current assets.	

SUPPORT

Support

	Regional Evaluation Considerations	Analysis Results & Notes	Resources & Data Source(s) Consulted
Support		Applicant did not address this category. As a maintenance project, this type of improvement is considered throughout local, regional, and state plans.	