# North Country Council Planning Region 2025-2034 Ten Year Plan Projects

| Community | Project ID | Timeline | Description | Cost | Category |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Littleton | 43809 | 2025 | Preservation of 4 Bridges in Littleton carrying I-93 over Ammonoosuc River and NHRR | $ 2,269,993 | Bridges |
| Milan | 40576 | 2023-2032 | Preservation, modernization, and/or expansion of airport facilities, planning studies | $ 10,594,015 | Airport |
| Monroe | 44345 | 2034 | Replace Smutty Hollow Rd Bridge | $ 2,126,223 | Bridges |
| Northumberland | 42510 | 2028 | Reconstruction of approx. 6300’ of sidewalk to ADA standards | $ 1,159,831 | Mandated Federal |
| Rumney | 27162 | 2025 | Bridge replacement | $ 588,109 | Bridges |
| Shelburne | 40551 | 2026 | Bridge rehabilitation | $ 4,518,980 | Bridges |
| Shelburne | 42599 | 2025-2029 | Culvert upgrades | $ 2,434,646 | Individual Projects |
| Shelburne | 44215 | 2029-2034 | Raise profile of US2 ~2,100' S of North Rd to ~2,350 N of Grumpy Old Man Rd (Reflection Pond) | $ 3,812,285 | Other Fed Aid |
| Shelburne | 42966 | 2027 | North Rd Bridge Preservation for Shelburne bridge No. 075/110 | $ 643,120 | Bridges |
| Shelburne | 40363 | 2025-2026 | Bridge Rehabilitation of Red List Bridge carrying US Route 2 over Pea Brook | $ 2,052,181 | Red List Bridges |
| Sugar Hill | 44334 | 2031 | Replace Streeter Pond Road Bridge over Indian Creek | $ 1,487,183 | Bridges |
| Thornton | 40613 | 2026 | Address red list bridge | $ 6,501,990 | Red List Bridges |
| Warren | 44325 | 2029 | Replace Fish Hatchery Rd bridge over Patch Brook | $ 1,371,532 | Bridges |
| Waterville Valley | 43734 | 2023-2031 | Reconstruction of 3,406LF of road to include bike/ped lanes | $ 1,297,881 | TA |
| Wentworth | 40648 | 2025 | Bridge replacement | $ 436,150 | Bridges |
| Whitefield | 40578 | 2023-2032 | Preservation, modernization, and/or expansion of airport facilities, planning studies | $ 7,531,632 | Airport |
| Whitefield | 41582 | 2025-2028 | Road reconstruction and safety improvements | $ 4,055,160 | Individual Projects |
| Whitefield | 43521 | 2027-2032 | Pedestrian Improvements | $ 1,595,798 | Individual Projects |
| Whitefield | 43521 | 2032 | Pedestrian Improvements | $ 1,495,934 | Individual Projects |

# North Country Council Planning Region 2025-2034 Ten Year Plan Projects

| Community | Project ID | Timeline | Description | Cost | Category |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Whitefield | 44158 | 2025 | Roadway and utilities recon/rehab on US3(Union St) in downtown Whitefield (CDS 2023) | $ 1,225,000 | Mandated Federal |
| Woodstock | 43438 | 2027-2030 | Address red list bridge | $ 997,614 | Bridges |

# NH TEN YEAR PLAN: *Regional Project Review Guidance*

## 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 *Bipartisan Infrastructure Law* (BIL), 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 |
|---|---|
| **Economic Development** | Local & Regional; Freight Movement |
| **Equity, Environmental Justice, & Accessibility** | Equity & Environmental Justice; Accessibility |
| **Mobility** | Mobility Need & Performance; Mobility Intervention |
| **Natural Hazard Resiliency** | Hazard Risk; Hazard Mitigation |
| **Network Significance** | Traffic Volume; Facility Importance |
| **Safety** | Safety Performance; Safety Measures |
| **State of Repair** | State of Repair; Maintenance |
| **Support** | 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. *Depending on data availability, some considerations may not be evaluated for all projects.* | This column includes data and established resources for best practices that can be used to justify project rankings. *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.* |

***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.***

## PROJECT SCORING PROCEDURES

The weights of each project review criteria should be set before the scoring process begins. RPC staff should discuss the criteria internally and with Transportation Advisory Committee members to provide input on the importance of the criteria and to assist with the weight-setting process.

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 NEED CRITERION | | PROJECT IMPACT CRITERION | | CRITERION RELEVANCY |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 | 10 | There is a **very high need** for the project under this criterion. | **OR** | The proposed project would deliver a **significant improvement** under this criterion. | - | - - - |
| | 5 | There is a **moderate need** for the project under this criterion. | **OR** | The proposed project would deliver a **moderate improvement** under this criterion. | - | - - - |
| | 1 | There is **minimal/no need** for the project under this criterion. | **OR** | The proposed project would deliver **minimal/no improvement** under this criterion. | **OR** | The proposed project is **not relevant** to this criterion. |
| | 0 | - - - | - | The proposed project would result in a **negative impact** under this criterion. | - | - - - |

# Economic Development



***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



***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
- Climate & Economic Justice Screening Tool: https://screeningtool.geoplatform.gov
- USDOT Equitable Transportation Community Explorer: https://experience.arcgis.com/experience/0920984aa80a4362b8778d779b090723
- EPA Environmental Justice Screening & Mapping Tool: https://www.epa.gov/ejscreen
- 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.

# Mobility



***Definition:*** 1) an historical analysis of the mobility **need** and **performance** of a location for all relevant transportation modes, and 2) a forward-looking analysis of how **interventions** proposed as part of a project would improve the mobility performance for all relevant transportation 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/hwy-functional-classification-2023.pdf

Planning

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

Motor Vehicles

- Level of Travel Time Reliability (LOTTR) 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.

# Mobility (continued)

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

## REGIONAL EVALUATION CONSIDERATIONS

***Mobility Intervention*** **IMPACT**

Motor Vehicles

- 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

- 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 (e.g. curb cut consolidation, left turn lanes, two way left turn lanes, medians, etc.)

Rail and Transit

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

Bicycle and Pedestrian

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

# Natural Hazard Resiliency | NH TEN YEAR PLAN

*Regional Project Review Guidance*

***Definition:*** 1) an analysis of historic **natural hazard risks** (e.g. flooding, washouts) 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*: https://www.nccouncil.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/03/STREAM-CROSSING_guidance_02_2023.pdf

# Network Significance



***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
- *New Hampshire Pedestrian and Bicycle Plan RPC recommended priority sidewalk, bikeway & trail network, and spot improvements*
- 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