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Public Engagement

This Technical Memorandum provides a summary of the public engagement for the New Hampshire DOT Pedestrian and Bicycle Transportation Plan. The engagement began with the Project Advisory Committee kick-off meeting on November 28, 2018, and continued until mid-October, 2019. The engagement strategy included:

- six meetings with the designated Project Advisory Committee,
- one meeting with each of the nine RPC Technical Advisory Committees,
- a project web site, with online interactive map and survey, and;
- a series of public meetings and outreach events throughout September and early October.

The final engagement event is scheduled for January 2020, when a final presentation will be made in Concord with a simulcast webinar to minimize travel needs for those outside of Central New Hampshire. The January 2020 final presentation notwithstanding, response from state residents to the variety of engagement activities has been quite significant. The number of public responses and event attendees have, to-date, included:

- 859 suggestions made to the online interactive map
- 1095 individual responses to the online survey
- ~620 responses from Farmers Market visitors
- ~150 public meeting attendees
- 172 people left their name and/or comments on the project web site portal
- ~2037 individuals who commented (not including the unknown number who left the 859 suggestions on the online interactive map)

Key Takeaways

Based on the variety of engagement formats and activities initiated for this planning effort, the Alta team gathered helpful input about pedestrian and bicycling related opportunities and challenges in all corners of the state. We learned not only about the geographic areas where improved facilities are needed, but also the types of facilities desired to improve accessibility and safety. The bullets below encapsulate findings from the public engagement events:
• People throughout the state are concerned about personal safety when walking and bicycling, based primarily on the volume of traffic and speeds (for many, this discourages them from using any transportation mode other than driving); factors like weather and topography play far less of a role

• Project survey results show that New Hampshire residents would like to see more rail-trails, paths, and striped bicycle lanes in the state in order to try bicycling for recreation or transportation; there is less confidence that sharing lanes with cars and/or education programs will be enough to induce more bicycling

• There were mixed feelings expressed about the need to improve conditions for pedestrians and bicyclists on busy state highways, versus looking at nearby roadways with lower traffic volume and speed to accommodate active transportation modes

• While support for some long-distance bicycle routes exists, many people expressed interest in shorter, more-local bike loops of 10-20 miles with improved connections to destinations as a way to provide recreational opportunities for those not comfortable on multi-hour rides far from their homes

• There is a need to improve pedestrian-crossing opportunities on state highways, especially as they pass through small towns and villages that may lack a traffic signal; combined with improved bicycle connectivity and/or new trails, some see town/village center enhancements for pedestrians as a way to enhance local businesses

• While some concerns about OHRV’s were expressed in some parts of the state, many see expansion of New Hampshire’s network of rail trails and greenways as a way to encourage more tourism and economic development throughout the year: warmer-weather months for bicycling, walking and equestrians, and skiing and/or snowmobiles in winter

Residents from Harrisville (and elsewhere) are keen to have more sidewalks and crosswalks in their village center
1.1 Project Advisory Committee

To help guide the NHDOT Pedestrian and Bicycle Transportation Plan effort, a Project Advisory Committee (PAC) was organized by the Department. It includes the current members of the Complete Streets Advisory Committee (CSAC), plus a handful of additional members who were included to provide a more complete perspective on pedestrian and bicycling issues, especially how they interface with economic development. The PAC met roughly every other month and includes the following individuals:

- Sylvia von Aulock, Southern NH Planning Commission
- Greg Bakos, Bike-Walk Alliance of NH
- Alek Belensz, North Country Commission
- Tim Blagden, Rail Trail Advocacy Representative
- Scott Bogle, Rockingham Planning Commission
- Simon Corson, Town of Amherst
- Tim Dunn, NH DOT Highway Design
- Karen Goddard, M&C Clothing and Gifts (Nashua Chamber)
- Sally Gunn, NH DOT Senior Highway Safety Engineer
- JoAnne Miles Holmes, NH Department of Health and Human Services
- Tom Jameson, NH DOT Planning and Community Assistance
- Larry Kenniston, NH DOT Pedestrian / Bike Program Coordinator
- Sandt Michener, NH DOT ADA Specialist
- Kathleen Mullen, NH Department of Health and Human Services
- Valerie Rochon, President, Chamber Collaborative of Greater Portsmouth
- Will Schoefmann, City of Keene
- Derek Shooster, Bike Manchester
- Will Stewart, Manchester Alderman
- Liz Strachan, NH Department of Environmental Services
- Dave Topham, Granite State Wheelers
- Craig Tufts, Central NH Planning Commission
- Stephanie Verdile, NH Office of Strategic Initiatives – Division of Planning
- Tim White, NH Department of Environmental Services
- Mike Whitten, Manchester Transit Authority
- Steve Workman, Transport New Hampshire
The PAC provided input on the draft work products developed by the consultant team, including the early 2019 existing conditions analysis, network recommendations, and the development of project goals and objectives. Additionally, committee members helped to promote the public meetings and outreach events, both of which induced significant public input that helped to inform the Alta team’s planning efforts.

### 1.2 RPC Technical Advisory Committee meetings

In February and March 2019, the consultant team met with each of the state’s nine Regional Planning Commission (RPC) Technical Advisory Committees (TAC). At the meetings, the team presented a summary of the project schedule, scope of work and deliverables, and initiated discussion about pedestrian and bicycle network gaps throughout each respective region. The dates and locations for the nine meetings included:

- Southwest RPC TAC in Keene – February 4
- North Country Council TAC in Lincoln – February 21
- Southern NHPC TAC in Manchester – February 21
- Rockingham RPC TAC in Exeter – February 28
- Strafford RPC TAC in Rochester – March 1
- Central NHRPC TAC in Bow – March 1
- Upper Valley Lake Sunapee RPC TAC in Lebanon – March 12
- Nashua RPC TAC in Merrimack – March 13

### 1.3 Project Website

The project website ([http://nhpedbikeplan.com](http://nhpedbikeplan.com)) designed to explain the study and promote the plan went live in early February 2019 and continues to be available until the project is complete in early 2020. The website also featured solicited input via an online survey and online public input map tool that was closed to the public at midnight on October 15, 2019. Links to the survey, online input map, and other documents including PowerPoint presentations from the public meetings and notes from the PAC meetings and public flyers were made available on the website as well. The website also provided an opportunity for visitors to request being
placed on the project email list and/or to leave a comment. Through this portal, 93 people left their name and email address only and 79 people also included comments.

The project web site was supplemented by social media accounts with Facebook, Twitter and Instagram. Although the project team provided a modest stream of postings to each platform, social media activity (likes, retweets, etc.) was relatively minimal. Over 50 people left their names and email address to indicate their interest in being kept in touch during the process however.

1.3.1 Online Survey

The online survey opened in early February 2019 and included 17 questions. When the survey was closed to public comment on October 15, 1095 individual responses were received.

The survey featured a mix of questions related to barriers to walking and bicycling, the primary purposes for, and frequency of, walk and bike trips, confidence level when riding a bicycle, factors that prevent more walk and bike trips, perceived effectiveness of a variety of infrastructure and program improvements, and open-ended responses seeking info on specific roadways that need improved pedestrian and bicycle facilities. The 17-questions in the survey included:

1. What is the five-digit zip code of your current residence?
2. In what type of community do you live?
3. What is your age?
4. What is your gender?
5. If you drive a car regularly for most or all of your trips, what barriers prevent you from walking or bicycling more frequently? (top 3)
6. Which of the following initiatives would encourage you to walk or bike more frequently for transportation? (top 3)
7. What are the two primary reasons you walk?
8. What are the two primary reasons you ride a bike?
9. Have you bicycled in New Hampshire in the past year?
10. If you bicycled in the past year, how many times do you ride your bike in a typical spring/summer/fall week? (a trip is one-way, so a round trip counts as 2 bike rides)
11. If you have not bicycled in New Hampshire in the last year, which factors MOST prevented you from doing so?
12. How confident do you feel when riding a bicycle?
13. How effective do you believe each of the following improvements would be to increase the number of trips that residents of New Hampshire make by walking or bicycling?
14. Of the improvements in Question 13, which three would be the most effective?
15. What do you think would MOST improve the walking and bicycling experience for young children? (top 3)
16. Please enter your top 3 state roads in which pedestrian and bicycle facilities are needed to improve accessibility and safety for pedestrians and bicyclists.

17. Would you like to be informed of the results of this survey and be given notice of public meetings for the New Hampshire Statewide Pedestrian and Bicycle Transportation Plan? If yes, please provide your email. (126 participants submitted their name and email address.)

A summary of the 1,095 responses received are shown below;

**Question 1:** “What is the five-digit zip code of your current residence?” The survey included least one response from 209 out of the 248 Zip codes in New Hampshire. Twenty-five Zip codes had more than ten responses each, and there were 73 Zip codes with one response each.

**Question 2:** “In what type of community do you live?” Respondents indicated the following categories:
- Other: 2.4%
- Rural: 20.3%
- Small town / village: 38.2%
- Suburban: 23.3%
- Urban: 16.0%

**Question 3:** “What is your age?” The largest age category was the 50 – 69 years of age, indicating high interest among middle-aged and folks heading into retirement, where interest in pedestrian and bicycle facilities peaks for some. The respondents indicated their age within following categories:
- <18: 0.3%
- 18-29: 8.0%
- 30-49: 33.3%
- 50-69: 47.8%
- >70: 10.6%

**Question 4:** “What is your gender?” Respondents were nearly evenly split along gender lines, with 52.1 identifying as Male, 45.5% identifying as Female. 2.4% selected “Other / Prefer Not to Answer”.

The largest number of respondents reported living in Zip codes, 03766 (Lebanon), 03301 (Concord), and 03246 (Laconia) respectively.
Question 5: “If you drive a car regularly for most or all of your trips, what barriers prevent you from walking or bicycling more frequently?” (Choose top 3). See graphic at left for responses.

Question 6: “Which of the following initiatives would encourage you to walk or bike more frequently for transportation?” (Choose top 3). 70% of all respondents chose “More bike lanes and wider shoulders.” 60% of all respondents chose “More rail trails and multi-use paths.” And 39% of all respondents chose “Better connected sidewalk network with safer crossings.”

Question 7 and 8: “What are the two primary reasons you walk? What are the two primary reasons you ride a bike?” The majority of respondents indicated that they choose to walk and to bicycle because it is healthy form of exercise and because it is good for the environment. (See graphic below.)
Question 9: “Have you bicycled in New Hampshire in the past year?”
- Yes: 83%
- No: 17%

Question 10: “If you bicycled in the past year, how many times do you ride your bike in a typical spring/summer/fall week? (a trip is one-way, so a round trip counts as 2 bike rides)”
- Zero times per week: 4%
- 1 to 2 times per week: 24%
- 3 to 5 times per week: 29%
- 5 to 10 times per week: 19%
- More than 10 times per week: 24%

Question 11: “If you have not bicycled in New Hampshire in the last year, which factors MOST prevented you from doing so?” Respondents were offered 11 choices to rank. As seen in the bar chart at left, the top three choices were:
- Bicycle lanes and trails are too few and not interconnected: 55%
- I don’t feel safe riding a bicycle in traffic: 47%
- Road surfaces are poor: 31%
**Question 12:** “How confident do you feel when riding a bicycle?”

- I do not or cannot ride a bike and have no plans to start riding: 0.6%
- Modestly confident: I only feel safe on separated trails/paths with few traffic crossings: 18.3%
- Quite confident: I prefer separated paths, but will ride on roads where space is available and traffic is manageable: 46.4%
- Very confident: I am comfortable riding with traffic in most situations: 34.7%

**Question 13 & 14:**

“How effective do you believe each of the following improvements would be to increase the number of trips that residents of New Hampshire make by walking or bicycling? Of the improvements in Question 13, which three would be the most effective?”

Respondents indicated whether they felt each of the 18 individual projects or programs was “Very Effective”, “Effective”, “Neutral”, “Ineffective”, or “Very Ineffective.” (See the bar chart to the right.)
**Question 15:** “What do you think would MOST improve the walking and bicycling experience for young children?” (Choose top 3)

- New or better sidewalks near schools and parks: 60%
- Traffic calming treatments near schools such as speed humps: 30.9%
- New or better crossing treatment: 28.5%
- Walking school buses: 25.9%
- Reduced automobile congestion at school during drop off and pick up periods: 23.3%
- Additional crossing guards: 7.1%
- Better police enforcement near schools: 13.8%
- Better safety training at schools: 25.9%
- Secure bike parking at schools: 11.1%
- Route maps provided to children of their own neighborhood: 8.1%

**Question 16:** “Please enter your top 3 state roads in which pedestrian and bicycle facilities are needed to improve accessibility and safety for pedestrians and bicyclists.” Respondents were able to fill in a blank text box with their answer. There were 185 individual responses. Any roadway mentioned only once is not included in the bar chart below. Respondents indicated that the roads most in need of improvement accessibility and safety for pedestrians and bicyclists include US 3, NH 28, NH 4, NH 101, and NH 108.
1.3.2 Online Public Input Map

The interactive online public input map was developed at the same time as the online survey, both placed on the project web site. There were a variety of ways that users were able to add input to the map; users received prompts and could place lines or marker points on the map to identify:

1. Where do you currently walk or bike in New Hampshire?
2. What destinations would you like to access by walking or biking in New Hampshire?
3. Which routes work well for walking and biking vs. routes that need improvement?
4. What are barriers to walking or biking (such as a busy intersection)?

Map users also had the ability to add a comment to the point or marker that they placed to indicate additional issues. After being closed for public comment at midnight on October 15th 2019, the input map tool featured:

- 859 map suggestions based on prompts
  - 416 lines markers (per prompt #1 and #3 above)
  - 443 markers (per prompt #2 and #4 above)
- 916 comments/votes on the 859 suggestions stated above
  - 834 “Likes”
  - 82 “Dislikes”
- 289 misc. comments

Many of the comments related to general corridor-wide improvements needed, while others were more focused on specific neighborhoods, streets, or intersections throughout the state. A selection of interesting comments includes:

- **Roadway Maintenance**: “Despite being a state-designated bike route, the paved shoulder to the right of the white fog line along Route 120 north and south is frequently fewer than six inches wide. Considering the high speed of vehicles, and portions where posted limits are between 40 and 50 mph, this entire corridor puts bicycle commuters at high risk, meaning only the most experienced riders are likely to take a chance at riding on this route identified (by someone else) as suitable for biking.” *(Marker left in Plainfield, just south of Lebanon)*

- **Connectivity**: NH 120 is a tremendously important route. It connects Lebanon to Hanover via the region's two biggest employers (Dartmouth College and DHMC). Parts of it are good (Mt. Support off-road path), parts of it are lacking (route on hospital property, last 1/2 mile before downtown Hanover). It could release significant latent demand if it's improved.”

- **Difficult Bike Crossing**: “It’s a challenge here riding north on Route 108 to merge across high speed traffic to continue north on Route 108” *(Market left on Rte 33 at Route 108 in Stratham. Most “liked” comment in this category.)*

- **Difficult Walk Crossing**: “The Miracle Mile (Route 4) is a busy street with a three-lane cross section. It has bus stops, a large thrift store, the closest grocery store to downtown Lebanon, and is very difficult to cross. The city applied for funding for a TAP grant but was unsuccessful. A safe crossing and sidewalks are really needed here.” *(Most “liked” comment in this category.)*
• **Favorite Bike Destination:** “There are many Exeter students that attend Cooperative Middle School and cannot walk or bike to school due to the Guinea Road bridge over Route 101. The bridge has no sidewalk nor are there sidewalks to the school entry. Providing a sidewalk/bike lane on the existing bridge or better yet a pedestrian bridge over Route 101 would open a route to Cooperative Middle School for hundreds of Exeter students and parents.”

• **Favorite Bike Route:** “Daily cycle commute to work. Section from Hanover to West Lebanon (Meadow Brook area) has a very narrow shoulder - measured at 2-20 inches (varies a bit over the stretch). This is a common cycling route as any other option to get between these places is at least a mile longer. Additionally, it is heavily traveled by cars. Leads to unsafe cycling conditions, and also annoyed drivers who have a hard time passing cyclists on this stretch.”

• **Favorite Walk Destination:** “Please add to the WOW trail. Having this trail go from Belmont to Weirs Beach and to potentially Meredith. What a great asset to our community.” (most liked comment in this category.)

• **Favorite Walk Route:** “No sidewalk for 90% of this route. I often walk with stroller and don’t feel safe from cars that drive fast.” (Bridge Street, Manchester)

• **Needs Bikeway:** “The route from downtown Dover to Kittery/Eliot via NH-4 and NH-101 is the only practical route for cyclists heading East (or take NH-4 all the way to S. Berwick, adding a big climb and several miles). No shoulder, no traffic enforcement, high vehicle traffic and speeding, blind corners and hills, no bike signage despite proximity to ECG/Eastern Trail/US Bike Route 1. Needs paved shoulders (2 foot minimum, maintained) or Bikes May Use Full Lane - Change Lanes to Pass signage. Cooperate with Maine DOT.”

• **Needs Walkway:** “This section of Route 4 is designed like a highway and does not match with the adjacent sections. It is very intimidating for peds and bikes given the fast ramps to the highway. When it is eventually rebuilt it should be narrowed and bikes lanes and sidewalks added, and the ramp geometry changed to slow down traffic.” (Marker placed in West Lebanon)

• **Misc.:** “The Route 4/Madbury Road intersection is dangerous. A friend of mine was badly hit at the intersection while she was proceeding straight on Madbury and a car turned into her. I frequently bike or jog across the intersection, and it is scary, because (a) Madbury Road south of the intersection is narrow and lacks a sidewalk north of Hampshire Ave, (b) there is no way for a pedestrian to change the Route 4 light, and (c) cars travel through the intersection in all directions very fast.” (Marker placed in Durham)

• **Walk maintenance issue:** “This gap in the roadway network isolates the elementary and high schools from the downtown. I would love to see Hanover Street reconstructed as a two-lane roadway with nice sidewalks to connect the school and town without going onto NH-120. If done well, this could be an attractive connection to the schools for all users. Trimming vegetation and maintaining the existing ped bridge would also be welcomed.”

The series of images on the following pages present snapshots, or “screen grabs,” from the online public input map that roughly match the various RPC regions.
Online public input map users added a variety of desirable pedestrian and bicycle routes to the North Country area.
Online public map users added a handful of barriers to walking and bicycling in the region, as well as comments about particular intersections or corridors that need improvement. The Lakes Region was the region with the fewest online public input map comments.
Online public map users added dozens of comments in the Hanover area, with fewer comments and map marker points added in the surrounding towns.
Public input map users indicated many marker point locations with comments related to recreational destinations, connections between rail trails and hiking trails, and on-road improvements desired.
Public input map users added more than 100 comments in the greater Merrimack Valley Area, ranging from sidewalks on local residential and collector streets to better bicycle access to Merrimack River recreation destinations.
Public input map users in the Strafford region included many miles or desirable route lines, routes that are difficult for walking or bicycling, and more specific comments like sidewalk and intersection crossing needs.
1.4 Public Outreach Events

Throughout the month of September and the first half of October, the planning team engaged the general public in two different formats:

- Evening public meetings were held in five communities: Keene, Lebanon, Manchester, Gilford and Portsmouth. A sixth meeting was held by the UVLS RPC in Lebanon using materials created by, but without assistance from, the Alta team (aka “meeting in a box”)
- Outreach events were held at five farmers markets including Dover, Nashua, Littleton, Concord and Exeter

At all events, participants were asked to answer two key questions derived from the online survey. One related to the primary challenges to walking and bicycling in New Hampshire, and the other question related to the project and/or program improvements that would encourage participants to walk and bicycle more frequently. Participants were also asked to provide the planning team their goals for a pedestrian and bicycle plan for New Hampshire. In most cases, goals were written onto post-it notes and placed on a board for other meeting/event attendees to see. Maps of each respective New Hampshire region was also made available to collect participants’ ideas and comments related to good and bad routes for walking and bicycling, and ideas for where improvements could be made. Both project Goals and Map comments are presented in the Appendix.

Feedback received from the public was based on similar activities and questions for all events, as described above. The primary distinction between the evening public meetings and the farmer’s market events was that the former included a 25-30 minute slide presentation that summarized the planning process to-date, outlined the mapping/analysis work completed so far, and highlighted next steps in the planning process. A general Q/A period followed the slide presentation and meeting attendees then assembled into small groups of 10-15 in order to provide map comments. Before the meetings were adjourned, a brief summary of the discussion items at each breakout group was made by the facilitator from the Alta team or a member of the local RPC staff.
1.4.1 Outreach Event Dates and Locations

The table below indicates the date of each event, the regional planning commission location served, and the event location.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>RPC</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>ATTENDEES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September 8th</td>
<td>Strafford Region Planning Commission</td>
<td>Dover Farmers Market</td>
<td>~85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 15th</td>
<td>Nashua Region Planning Commission</td>
<td>Nashua Farmers Market</td>
<td>~285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 17th</td>
<td>Southwest Region Planning Commission</td>
<td>Keene Public Library</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 18th</td>
<td>Upper Valley Lake Sunapee Regional Planning Commission</td>
<td>UVLS RPC Offices</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 22nd</td>
<td>North Country Council</td>
<td>Littleton Farmers Market</td>
<td>~115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 24th</td>
<td>Southern New Hampshire Planning Commission</td>
<td>Manchester Public Library</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 25th</td>
<td>Lakes Region Planning Commission</td>
<td>Gilford Public Library</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 29th</td>
<td>Central New Hampshire Regional Planning Commission</td>
<td>Concord Farmers Market</td>
<td>~85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2nd</td>
<td>Rockingham Planning Commission</td>
<td>Portsmouth Public Library</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 9th</td>
<td>Rockingham Planning Commission</td>
<td>Exeter Farmers Market</td>
<td>~45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 9th</td>
<td>Upper Valley Lake Sunapee Regional Planning Commission, Commission meeting (“meeting in a box” event)</td>
<td>UVLS RPC Offices</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.4.2 Summary of Responses to Survey Questions

As mentioned above, participants at all events were asked a pair of questions from the online survey. The survey questions were printed on a large-format poster paper. Attendees were asked to place three small colored stickers (“dots”) in the answer column they thought was most appropriate. The first survey question (#11 from the online survey) asked: “Which top THREE factors most prevent or discourage you from bicycling more in New Hampshire or in your local community?” From the 11 events in the table above, roughly 2,200 dots were placed. The bar chart at right summarizes the answers. When comparing the public’s responses at the engagement events to the responses from the online survey, obvious trends are apparent. While the resulting percent of answers or votes for the barriers to bicycling are different between the two data sets, the same three factors—see rows 2, 4 and 6—remain the top choices among both survey participants and public engagement event attendees. The table below indicates the differences between the results from the 11 public engagement events relative to the online survey.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 11 from online survey: top responses</th>
<th>Online Survey Responses</th>
<th>Public Engagement Event Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle lanes and trails are too few and not interconnected</td>
<td>55% (1st place)</td>
<td>26% (1st place)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t feel safe riding a bicycle in traffic</td>
<td>47% (2nd place)</td>
<td>23% (2nd place)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road surfaces are poor</td>
<td>31% (3rd place)</td>
<td>15% (tied for 3rd place)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition to the 11 choices offered for survey question #11, attendees were also able to include write-in answers in the “other” column. The bar chart below highlights the answers that event attendees included to represent additional factors that discourage them from bicycling in their community. For brevity, write-in answers that were only included once were excluded from the chart below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Dots</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not enough signage/confusing</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter maintenance</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor links to bus/rail transit</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hills</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truck traffic</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Showers</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cargo</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrow -or- poorly maintained shoulders</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weather</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second question public engagement event attendees were asked was adapted from question 13 from the online survey: “Which of the THREE following improvements do you feel would most likely increase the number of trips that residents of New Hampshire make by walking or bicycling?” From the 11 events described above, approximately 2,400 dots were placed. While the online survey question asked respondents to rank each individual project or program improvement based on its relative effectiveness, attendees at the 11 outreach events were asked to place their dots in the column adjacent to the three improvement they thought would most increase walk and bicycle trips in New Hampshire.
The top scoring answers to this question were also the top scoring answers in the online survey format. This supports the development of wider shoulders and striped bike lanes on state highways and busy streets, protected bike lanes buffered from traffic, and more rail trails and greenways to increase comfort for a wide range of bicyclists across New Hampshire.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 13 from online survey: top responses</th>
<th>Online Survey Responses</th>
<th>Public Engagement Event Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More rail trails and greenways</td>
<td>74% (1st place)</td>
<td>18% (1st place)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protected bike lanes buffered from traffic</td>
<td>71% (2nd place)</td>
<td>16% (3rd place)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wider shoulders and striped bike lanes on state highways and busy local streets</td>
<td>63% (3rd place)</td>
<td>17% (2nd place)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.5 Outreach Event Appendices

1.5.1 Community input on Goals for the pedestrian and bicycle transportation plan

1.5.2 Review and comments on the connectivity maps for each individual region
What should the GOALS for the NH Statewide Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan be?

Policy

- “Include users of all ages! All abilities! Require winter maintenance- especially places like Scammel Bridge (RT 6), Rowe Bridge bike lane.”
- “Absolutely!!”

Infrastructure/Design

- “Protected bike lanes on 108!”
- “Encourage civil planning that keeps small businesses in populated areas, oppose sprawl”
- “Newington side of bridge, the path is not completely black top”
- “Complete intersections- not bike lanes that disappear when needed most”
- “Wayfinding signs for ped/bike specific destinations”
- “Require bike racks in new construction”
- “limit use of shoulder rumble strips when less than 3’ shoulders”
- “Spacing of rumble strips to allow crossing into lane to avoid debris”
- “Expand public transit that includes bike carriers”
- “Agree ^!!”
- “Connect to public transit-let these nodes drive neighborhood design/growth”
- “Traffic signals that recognize cyclists”
- “108, Back River Rd, Highway ramps. Does not seem safe for the kids getting out of school or pedestrians. In spite of there being sidewalks. So much traffic is coming and going. We need some kind of bridge or two smaller bridges for pedestrians.”

Economic

- “Require all construction projects to dedicate 5% to bike ped. It’s crazy when a $250 million bridge project has “no funds” for bike/ped!”
- “Agreed ^!”

Miscellaneous

- “Cover sharing the road with bikes in Driver’s Ed”
- “Community trail needs to better marked from one leg to another. Little progress over several years. Please just mark it! Do not worry about logos or brands.”
- “Co-ordinate w/ Southern Maine Coastal Communities BCM”
- “All municipalities should host Bicycle-Friendly Driver course as offered by league 8 bicyclists”
- “Safety!! Encourage towns to sweep earlier in season- including Dover! Thank you!”
- “Nowhere in Dover for Designated Bike Parking- no racks no corrals. More bikes=less cars=
  Bike/Ped Friendly”
- “Thank you, DOT, for the bike path over the Bay!”
- “I’m sure you are looking to other bike-friendly communities for inspiration… We moved here
  from Madison, WI and were sad about the lack of bike lanes and paths. 🙁 (Especially
  connecting the university to nearby communities.) I don’t know much about the economics or
  planning for such infrastructure- but Madison may be a useful model? NH has a lot of windy
  roads with fast traffic- that feels scary as a cyclist! Dedicated bike lanes/paths would be helpful.
    😊.”

September 15, 2019- Nashua Farmer’s Market (Nashua RPC)

What should the GOALS for the NH Statewide Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan be?

Policy

- “Better walk and bike paths on bridges”
- “Encourage LEGAL bicycling (right side of road, etc.)”
- “Increase bike and ped commuting”
- “The state and the city of Nashua should adopt Complete Streets policies”
- “Allow dense development and walkable communities (downtowns)”

Infrastructure/Design

- “Connecting the rail trails Nashua”
- “Provide more technical assistance to municipal planning and engineering staff to get ped/bike
  accommodations right for all paving and construction projects”
- “Complete streets”
- “Nashua- sidewalks Taylor St from Fifield to Country Club sidewalk on Fifield from Taylor to Allds
  St We are stuck in the state street neighborhood and feel unsafe walking to town. Kids cannot
  walk or ride bike to school safely if they want to”

Economic

- “The state of NH should have grants to clean up brownfields in the cities for more compact
  affordable residential development”
- “Fund bike and ped projects!
  o Reflect mode share?
  o Economic impact on business?
  o Attract young people”

Miscellaneous

- “Using ‘clean’ means to get everywhere!”
- “We need to get as many people as possible”
- “Circumferential Highway”
Hudson Blvd- We (HARD) would like multi-use path instead of vehicle way. Hudson Assoc. responsible development”

September 17, 2019 - Keene Public Library (Southwest RPC)

What should the GOALS for the NH Statewide Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan be?

Policy
- “Focus more on densely developed urban areas vs. connecting towns e.g. Concord & Keene.”
- “Evaluate travel lane width when resurfacing”
- “Private ownerships of old railbed impedes future use”
- “Blue highways’ focus on them vs major routes, e.g. 101, 202, etc.”
- “Better/safer connections to daily needs (shopping, health, friends, etc.)”

Infrastructure/Design
- “Crossing NH 101 near Stone Arch Bridge”
- “Better crosswalk facilities at Winchester St. Roundabout lighting”
- “Connect town centers”
- “Additional parking large enough to park horse trailers”
- “More trailhead parking + signage (off main roads)”
- “Parking for biking”
- “Audio prompts at signals/crossings for blind”
- “Sidewalks from Route 10 roundabout in Keene to Swanzey”
- “Improve shoulders smoother, wider, marked, enforced”
- “In Urban Compact roads & routes NH DOT should encourage utilities companies bury lines.”
- “Sholder improvements during new or reconstruct.”
- “Improved wayfinding historic structures, etc. within the Rail Trail “
- “Encourage use of more rural roads for road biking to connect towns”
- “Traffic calming in downtown areas”
- “Wider shoulders for horses on local Roads”
- “Signage to local services”
- “Shoulders walking + bicycling”
- “More signage on trails esp. when there is a gap”

Economic
- “Improve walkability + bikeability in business districts”
- “Promote bicycle tourism”
- “Promote bike share for bicycling”
- “Mobile internet optimization for learning about bicycling/walking opportunities”
- “Make it easy to bike from inn-to-inn for biking groups”
- “What are you (DOT) trying to connect when you identify ‘connection gaps’?”
- “REGIONAL TOURISM! “Boston to Bellows Falls, VT Hike-Bike/Train Cheshire Rail Trail/Amtrak”
  TOUR! Note: Amtrak allows bikes on trains. Connect NH with MA +VT!!! (~50 miles rail trail)”

Miscellaneous
- “Support local rail trail committees”
- “Greater separation (distance) between cars & non-vehicular users”

**September 18, 2019- UVLSRPC Offices**

**What should the GOALS for the NH Statewide Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan be?**

**Policy**
- “Evaluate ten-year plan”
- “Plan for micro mobility electric bikes/scooters”
- “Speed limits on separated paths”
- “Complete Streets”
- “Reconsider default local road speed limits”
- “Baked in funding mechanism for bike + ped w/ every resurface”
- “Hanover removes bike racks/parking from Main St for the winter. Bikes still work in the winter!”
- “Allow speed limit reduction as a countermeasure (as proven on highways + recently in Boston)”
- “Lower speed limits increase local control of speed limits”
- “Remember rural connections need support”
- “Don’t plow the snow into the bike lane from the road. Also make sure bike lanes are plowed sufficiently”
- “Eliminate “Cannot impede” traffic because is used as harassment add anti-verbal harassment”

**Infrastructure/Design**
- “Toolkit should be comprehensive for state + be also able to provide new + easy tools for towns”
- “Gender equity” “Plowing + design”
- “Paint isn’t safe infrastructure. It doesn’t keep cars from crossing into the bike lane”
- “Rail trail (gravel) are not conducive to road cyclists!”
- “NACTO guide Design across intersection”
- “Toolkit for state municipalities”
- “Bike + transit integration for improved commutes”
- “Recommendations for rural roads -- separate design criteria <1500 vehicles per day 20’ vs 18’”
- “Less barriers to infrastructure choice less is more”
- “Sharrows for narrow bridges and merges without shoulders”
- “Cars drive in the bike lane on 120 all the time. That’s why the line has to be repainted every year.”
- “Universal design”
- “Paint doesn’t make me safer”
- “Don’t widen shoulders unless have engineered for slower speeds”
- “The light at Lahaye Dr to turn left onto 120 doesn’t detect bikes, despite specifically being signed as “bike route””
- “Wide shoulders don’t help keep children safe when riding”
- “Required redesign by schools + parks + trails to lower speed limit”
“Maintain ped/bike during construction including laws”
- “Add lighting on path @ DHMC (Dartmouth-Hitchcock Medical Center)…”

**Economic**
- “Good coordination w/ projects; local DPW (funding...)”
- “Low hanging fruit. Bike detection signals striping fixes narrow lanes sharrow”
- “Bake in cost savings road maintenance in road diets ↑ bikes ↓ cars”
- “Bake in health
  - Air quality
  - Crashes

And wellness
  - Noise
  - all measurable”
- “Striping signage”

**Miscellaneous**
- “Don’t let biking dominate”
- “Peds in bike lane”
- “Bikes not following rules of the road”
- “Advisory lanes (like VALLEY)”
- “Non-vehicular interaction is often unsafe”
- “Bicyclists riding >1”
- “Better education for all on sharing road”
- “Educate drivers & law enforcement that cyclists are allowed on the road”
- “Many more informed Rail Trail access points (businesses, multi-unit housing)”
- “SHARED STREETS slow zone + neighborhood streets including mid-block crossing low volume, low volume high speed course w/ design guidelines”

**September 25 2019- Gilford Public Library (Lakes RPC)**

**What should the GOALS for the NH Statewide Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan be?**

**Policy**
- “Why is focus on municipalities to narrow lanes? Met w/ NHDOT 5 times to narrow lanes”
- “Consider reducing speed on Route 106 where stress may be high”
- “Improve attitude toward ped + bikes”
- “Match population jump (tourist season) to police by %”
- “More crosswalks + sidewalks in shopping area”
- “Missed opportunity & communication breakdown”

**Infrastructure/Design**
- “Like Maine’s connectivity”
- “Crosswalks”
- “Connect Ellacoya state park w/ Ming Brook w/ wider shoulders on Route 11”
- “Maintenance of shoulders expand”
- “Sidewalks so pedestrian does not have to go thru parking to continue walking”
- “Educate tourists as both driver + pedestrian”
- “Preserve existing shoulders on major connectors, and bicycle lanes should be marked”
- “Extend bike route on 106N from Laconia to Meredith w/ wider shoulder and marked bike lanes”
- “In tourist areas, too many 40-50 mph roads have no shoulders, so walking & biking unsafe. Must prioritize widening with shoulders when resurfacing in tourist & scenic areas”

**Economic**

- “Money to fully develop rail trails throughout state. Working w/the railroad”
- “utilize trails economic development along trails restaurants”
- “Texting, people respecting crosswalk, enforcement... Qatto presentation”
- “5K’s featuring trails”
- “Tickets across lake connection to rail trails discount rate. Shoulders”

**Miscellaneous**

**September 22 2019- Littleton Farmer’s Market (NCC)**

**What should the GOALS for the NH Statewide Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan be?**

**Policy**

- “Driver education about laws regarding cyclists (I.e. distance needed when passing cyclists”
- “Enforce driver and bike rules”
- “Encourage and enable non-motor transport for local and regional use”
- “Sidewalks going up a hill walking can break your ankle”

**Infrastructure/Design**

- “Integrate design for multi-function (drive/bike/walk) stormwater (porous pavement) rest/repair facilities”
- “Separation of motor/non-motor based on relative speed”
- “Convert existing paths, rails, abandoned trails to bike friendly routes for bikers to use OFF road away from motorized vehicles”

**Economic**

- “Full cost/benefit analysis (hidden costs) of R.O.I for bike/walk”
- “Stable, long term funding 1% on fuel to trails (v $6M/yr.) 1% “to towns “

**Miscellaneous**
What should the GOALS for the NH Statewide Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan be?

**Policy**

- “Mandatory driver education on safe driving near cyclists”
- “Signage promoting bike use “bike may use full road” “Share the road””
- “Driver education: ped. Safety, share the road, etc.”
- “How will this impact drivers?”
- “Huge need for more + better law enforcement on motorists and bicyclists (equally!) for car-bike-road sharing behavior”
- “NHDOT should consider regional bike share systems for CMAQ funding. Example: Massachusetts- Look at valley bike out of Northampton. NHDOT should flex gaps in regional program target funds on STIP to make incremental bike-ped improvements (bike racks, ADA curbs, smarter crosswalks, wayfinding signage)”
- “Equitable funding across transport. Modes”
- “Connect report to public health and economic benefits and issues”
- “Property tax subsidy/relief for bike commuters”
- “Bikers/ped education for drivers & bicyclists”
- “Bike registration $1 to go toward rail/trail network”
- “Protected bike lanes on ideal corridors in neighborhoods (census tracts) that exceed 4,000 people/mi²”

**Infrastructure/Design**

- “Place signage connecting West Manchester to Bedford. E.g. Granite + Queen City Bridges to Bedford Mall”
- “Solid colored bike lanes (e.g. green like Vermont)”
- “Encourage + recommend that municipal leaders reach out to ped-bike advocacy groups for guidance (then follow their guidance)”
- “Improve connect to airport. Bike to, bus to and consider transit/timing Can I land and get to Concord? w/o being stuck”
- “Connect East and West Manchester Bridges”
- “Livability connectivity: Home-library-grocery store-post office-school with/ w/o kids safe and pleasurable, convenient”
- “Connection from Goffstown Rail trail to trail gang to Rockingham Rail Trail.”
- “Bicycle lanes at intersections. Bicycle sensitive traffic lights”
- “Additional bike/walk access crossing the Merrimack River. Connecting more communities”
- “Need pavement marking that keeps vehicle lanes at a minimum + allows bike/ped shoulder”
- “When roads are paved, is there a plan to place marked lanes back- for example RT4”
- “Need better bike-friendly connectivity between Manchester + Concord!”
- “Bike Rocks at Fishercat Stadium/SNHU- on bike trail”
“Bike shoulders on state roads all the time but especially when the road is re-paved or upgraded”
- “What is the environmental impact of trails in green lands?”
- “Better consistency of sidewalks to connect neighborhoods and thoroughfares”
- “Better bike paths on the 4 Manchester bridges- At least Bridge St + Q.C Ave Bridge.”
- “Need better ped + bike access through the Amoskeag Rotary. Can a separated ped-bike bridge or lane be recommended”
- “Do not put bike lanes next to parked cars unless they are buffered or protected bike lanes.”
- “Improve connections between Samuel P. Hunt Bridge and Downtown Manchester, (from behind ball park.)”
- “Beech, Maple, Pine, Chestnut will have dedicated bike lane between Bridge & Webster”
- “Improve Rockingham rec trail connections to Downtown Manchester.”
- “How do cargo bike users park/protect their bikes in all weather? Covered, clearance, E-bike charging.”
- “Bike racks at state facilities. State House, DMV, DES, that are not wheel-benders. 21st century bike parking”
- “Union St from River Rd → completed. Make lanes narrower to slow speed, not bike lane/wide shoulder on both sides.”
- “East-West connection across Manchester”
- “More lanes to separate bikes & cars (safety concern)”
- “^bike safety/lanes on the exit 6 rotary!! Too many lane changes + angry drivers.”
- “Contributing causes to crashes? Distractions blind spots”
- “Signs to educate drivers- share the road!”
- “double the number of bicycle/pedestrian commuters. Reduce the occurrence of “get off the road” shoots by 50%”
- “↑ Public education to improve driver behavior & ped/cyclists’ safety ↑ Participation in ped/bike community”
- “Waive the prepared meals tax for bike patrons (registered)”
- “Will there be a tax credit to incentivize people to use the trails?”
- “(Manchester) Mill yard accessibility for all modes”
- “How do you attract citizens to bike?”
- “Broad based + sales tax: (good luck!)”
- “Invest $ into bike walkable property valve desire to live here ↑↑↑ Examples: Chicago Seattle Portland Boston Boulder Denver etc.”
- “Connect Rail Trail at Rte 28 Manchester to the Goffstown Rail Trail thru the city ECONOMIC”
- “No bike parking at Ball park. Bike connections to Manchester airport”
- “Improve conditions for families (many with young kids) for whom walking is their only transport option. Make biking safer and possible for families”

**Economic**

**Miscellaneous**

- “Will there be partnership with business and schools to incentivize biking?”
- “Improved bike-share system (like Citi bike)”
“Need ways across Manchester E-W, IDed some alternate routes, IDed some roads to leave for cars”

September 28, 2019- Concord Farmer’s Market (Central NH RPC)

What should the GOALS for the NH Statewide Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan be?

Policy
- “The state should plow sidewalks on all state roads”
- “Statewide Complete Streets policy”
- “Better enforcement of traffic laws for both autos and bicycles” × 2
- “Policy should address education and outreach to change the culture around cycling – cycling is for everyone!”
- “Enforcement of “hands free” law”
- “Better enforcement of vehicles on crosswalks. They don’t always watch what they are doing.”

Infrastructure/Design
- “Protected bike lanes” × 2
- “NH DOT should have a design policy that allocates more shoulder width whenever resurfacing or restriping”
- “NH DOT should have a protective highway maintenance policy that ensures safe passage of cyclists through construction zones”
- “Safe, reliable, and well-maintained facilities that connect neighborhoods with employment and commercial centers. The perceived lack of safety is a huge barrier.”
- “Trails along the Merrimack River”
- “A BUS SYSTEM!!! With service to commute surrounding Concord with bicycles permitted on board!!!”
- “Protected bike lanes (with a curb separating bike lane from traffic)”
- “Designated bike lanes either protected by a physical barrier when possible or a painted lane specifically for bikes when able”
- “Protected bike lanes”

Economic
- “Any new road project should be required to be a complete street design”
- “The road should be paved with good materials so that you don’t have to pave over potholes every year”
- “NH should not forfeit federal funds set aside for non-motorized transportation”
- “NHDOT should use toll credits for all bike and pedestrian projects, like it does for state projects”
- “NH should have a more proactive paved recreation/transportation trails and it should be funded by the state”

Miscellaneous
- “More respect between vehicles, bikers, and walkers”
- “I like to ride to Rollins Park” (age 4)
- “There should be aggressive penalties for drivers found responsible for bike and pedestrian crashes. Current penalties are not a deterrent.”
- “Mutual respect. When you are on a bike, respect the driver. When you are the driver, respect the cyclist.”
- “More education for policy makers to understand how cycling/safer ped routes can reduce pressure on the roads and address many traffic issues”
- “More paved trail ways/bike paths for safe riding”
- “Protected bike lanes, wider shoulders, and more education for bicycle laws”
- “Bicyclist rules should be enforced also – no riding on sidewalks or against traffic”
- Hand-drawn picture of a bike by a child

**October 2, 2019- Portsmouth Public Library (Rockingham RPC)**

**What should the GOALS for the NH Statewide Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan be?**

**Policy**

- “Every bridge project incorporates ped-bike access”
- “Local site design → ensure new development provides multimodal access”
- “Adapt NH State Complete Streets Policy”
- “Better data collection”
- “Vulnerable road user law”
- “State handles routine maintenance of pavement marking, crosswalks, beacons on state highways”
- “Dedicated state funding”
- “Funding”
- “Concrete goal: specific % increase in walk/bike specific metrics”
- “Coordinate with legislators vulnerable user law”
- “Speed enforcement”
- “State speed limit below 30”
- “Connect commuter destinations”

**Infrastructure/Design**

- Pave rail trails and greenways “The best one we have- Seacoast to Manchester- is a muddy mess half the year”
- “Parking /bike lane buffer zones”
- “Narrower travel lanes → Traffic calming”
- “Bike parking requirements in zoning code”
- “Maps of bike parking”
- “Bike trailheads”
- “Connections to trailheads”
- “Sidewalks USI → close gaps”
- “Good test: pm wife rides bike to the store- if she can do it, we’re good”
“Bike path to every park ride” “Safe routes to work!”
“Wider shoulders consistently well maintained/paved, winter maintenance”
“Bike infrastructure is cheaper than vehicle infrastructure. More for your dollar.”
“Signal at equestrian height esp. at rail trails Rock. Rec.”
“Safety edge- back fill shoulder needs to be done and more constant basis”
“Parking for horse trail 6r to access rail trail and state parks and forest”
“Wide shoulder RT 111A RT 27 clear height to 10-12ft and overgrowth”
“Bicycle signaled traffic lights- esp. Lafayette Rd at Wilson Ave and Lafayette at West Marine Plaza”

Economic
“Recognize economic benefit of shifting trips to bicycle”
“Better outreach on giant opportunities Federal, Private, Handbook on funding development”
“Quantify economic impact”
“Connections to transit”
“Promoting mountain biking and interconnected, distributed and dispersed biking recreational opportunities”
“$ saved for bike/ped” “State $”

Miscellaneous
“Motorist and cyclist education Youth→ Drivers Ed, car door opening, training on riding in traffic”
“Make connection to public health”
“Bike accommodations on Kancamagus Highway”
“Better data on non-commute bike/ped travel”
“Volume + speed are up so roads that used to be comfortable aren’t”
“Winter maintenance”
“Create Pease bike paths”
“Dirt covers Grafton bike path”
“Winter policy speed limit enforcement legislature”
“Consistent shoulders”
“More $, protector for bike/ped”
“Alt routes”
“Pease”
“Rec vs. Trans”

September 25, 2019 – NHDOT Project Advisory Committee Meeting
What should the GOALS for the NH Statewide Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan be?
Policy
“Promote land use practices that support walking/cycling”
“Connect urban centers”
“Statewide Complete Streets policy”
“Statewide Complete Streets”
“Policy: Include strategic analysis of bike/ped network in ten-year plan (with updates every 2 years)”
“Policy: Adopt complete streets”
“Policy: have a network approach to designing the planned infrastructure”
“Assistance with implementation through municipalities or Land use Boards”
“Push bikes for local transportation”
“All levels of road be designed built to be safe roads and bridges that accommodate bicycles and walkers”

**Infrastructure/Design**

“Connect rail trail networks”
“Connect/finish rail trail segment throughout NH”
“Maintenance costs need to be consistent not all on municipalities” “Winter maintenance??”
“Make bike/ped and complete streets part of every DOT projects”
“Wide shoulders on every state road”
“Provide painted lines that identify center and fog lines that ensure safe shoulder space to accommodate bikers and walkers”
“Maintain a minimum road condition”

**Economic**

“Coordinate with fellow agencies to embrace connected trail system that will showcase NH’s natural beauty”
“Trails enhance tourism”
“Economic: Have DNCR launch a group in the Bureau of Trails focused on non-motorized trail use and its economic impact”
“Advertising links to community centers + destinations”
“More dedicated money to bike/ped projects”

**Miscellaneous**

“Consider safety impacts of roadway widening/straightening”
“Promote alternate routes to state highways”
“Education on bike/ped associated with license renewal at DMV”

**October 9, 2019 - Exeter Farmer’s Market (Strafford RPC)**

**What should the GOALS for the NH Statewide Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan be?**

**Policy**

“Include education of bicycle laws to students in school, also to all drivers when renewing their licenses. We need awareness.”
“.... also, in-service training for law enforcement”
- “Statewide Complete Streets policy”
- “Better enforcement of hands-free laws for drivers”

**Infrastructure/Design**

- “Sharrows on Water Street in Exeter”
- “Extend sidewalks on Route 111 in Exeter beyond Brickyard Park to Tamarind Lane and Riverwoods”
- “Bicycle paths”
- “Dedicated pathways for walking/biking through town safely”
- “Blinking lights at Crosswalks”
- “Need sidewalks on Route 111 from Riverwoods to Downtown”
- “Free standing bike pumps”
- “Bike lanes and paths”
- “Extend sidewalk network up Railroad Avenue and Winter Street”
- “Roundabout with pedestrian crossings at Front/Linden/Pine Streets”

**Economic**

- None

**Miscellaneous**

- “We need a crosswalk at Park Street Commons to accommodate students crossing Route 27 to go to the bus stop”
- “For any bike share - there must be a way to make bikes returned to stations. Bikes left on sidewalks are very hard for wheelchair or walker users!!”

**October 9, 2019 - UVLS RPC Commission Meeting**

**What should the GOALS for the NH Statewide Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan be?**

**Policy**

- “De-emphasize the car in transportation planning. Emphasize safety over speed”
- “State barriers to putting in crosswalks”
- “Policy for e-bikes and scooter”

**Infrastructure/Design**

- “Make transportation corridors accessible for all users- evaluate streets on complete streets principles. Sidewalks, bike lanes, bus shelters”
- “Willingness to narrow or change design rules”
- “Narrow roads parking on both sides prohibits biking:”

**Economic**

- “Find more bike/ped projects”
- “Can’t access safe places no funding”
- “Connect bike paths + *economic* activity relationships”
Miscellaneous

- “Education of drivers and cyclists to pass safely”
- “Law enforcement of users of road”
- “Signage for safety”
- “Bike racks at destinations”
- “Wayfinding signs”
- “Stops along trails and routes”
- “Crash data helmets or not?”
- “Bike borrowing or bike sharing”
- “Showers at work”
- “Wayfinding signs”
- “Bike helmet safety free + education”
  -
September 8 2019- Dover Farmer’s Market (Strafford RPC)

MAP 6: Seacoast Region Connectivity Map

1. “Sidewalk needed on Dover Point Rd. to Point Place on Dover Office Park to tunnel lane”
2. Connection gap of 108 (from Rollinsford/Somersworth border north to Rochester) – Generally works well for 2 bike commuters
3. BLTS segment in Dover- NH 108/Back River Rd. needs ped. crossings improvement
4. Path parallel to NH-16/Rt 4- “Blocked view corridors from bridge”
5. Rt 4 from end of bridge/Shattuck Way to Newington border/Newington Street- Needs improvement

September 15, 2019- Nashua Farmer’s Market

There were no map comments at this event

September 17, 2019- Keene Public Library (Southwest RPC)

MAP 4: Monadnock Region Connectivity Map

1. Above NH-9 connection gap in Nelson, Stoddard- “Two sides of highway with guard rail and no shoulder BAD”
2. Above Cheshire Rail Trail in Westmoreland – “Need area for parking vehicles to access rail trail”
3. Keene- “Need safe crossing form Cheshire RT to/from summit + winery”
4. Section of connection gap at south of Westmoreland and north of Chesterfield- “Bike touring groups use”
5. Section of Winchester St from intersection in Keene at NH-101, NH-10 to near Swanzey/Keene border- “Sidewalk on Rt 10”
6. Connection gap to the right of intersection at NH-101 and Main St in Keene – “Crossing over NH 101”
7. Arrow pointing to shared-use path near Winchester/Swanzey border at the intersection of NH-10 and Westport Village Rd- “Dangerous crossing”
8. NH-78 south of NH-119 and NH-10 intersection in Winchester- “Scenic valley views on Rte 78”
9. Border of Vernon and Bernardston- “Extend rail trails north (VT) and south (MA)”
10. Left of I91 in Rockingham- Bridge over 101 at trail gap: L-chip grant
11. BLTS segment in Surry/Gilsum - Well used by Peds + Bikes
12. Section of NH-12A in Surry and section of NH-10 in Gilsum – Scenic!
13. BLTS/connection gap segment of Surry Rd in Gilsum – Triathlon Route
14. Intersection of Nh-123 and NH-12A- Good formula. K.S.C + City of Keene co-funded median islands
15. Section of connection gap on NH-123 between NH-12 in Keene and the intersection of NH-124 and NH-101 in Marlborough- Just resurfaced with no improvements (heavy demand)
16. West Street in Keene between NH-9/Park Ave and Cheshire Rail Trail- West Street- only 2.5’ sidewalk with utility poles (should be buried).
17. Section of connection gap on 119 on border of Hinsdale- Old railroad trustee bridge, new Rt. 119 bridge by NHDOT soon
18. Connect centers:
   a. Intersection of NH-119, NH-63, Cheshire Rail Trail (Hinsdale)
   b. Intersection of NH-78, NH-10, Cheshire Rail Trail (Winchester)
   c. Intersection of NH-101, NH-124 (Marlborough)
   d. Intersection of NH-123, NH-127 (Hancock)
19. Intersection of NH-123, NH-202, NH-101, Common Pathway (Peterborough) – New sidewalks in this zone
20. NH-10 and NH-12A in Alstead and Marlow- wide travel lanes, opportunities for shoulders
21. Look at for options
   a. NH-123 from Intersection at NH-12 in Walpole to intersection of NH-123 and NH-12A in Alstead
   b. NH-12A from Intersection at 12A in Alstead to Surry Border
   c. NH-123 at Intersection of 12A in Alstead to intersection of NH-10 in Marlow
   d. NH-123 from intersection at NH-10 in Marlow to intersection at NH-137 in Hancock
   e. NH-137 from intersection at NH-123 in Hancock to NH-124 in Jaffrey
   f. NH-124 from intersection at Mountain Rd in Jaffrey to intersection at NH-119 in Marlborough
22. Potential loops (between Cheshire Rail Trail and Ashuelot Rail Trail)
   a. Connection Gap section of NH-119 between intersection at NH-78 and Cheshire Rail Trail
   b. NH-32 from intersection at NH-112 to intersection at 119
23. Connection gap in Jaffrey on NH-124- “No shoulder”
24. NH-32 in Richmond- “Bikes use 32” “No shoulders”
25. Intersection of Troy, Richmond, Fitzwilliam borders- “Richmond access to railroad tracks through state park”
26. Ashuelot Rail Trail near top right corner of Winchester and Swanzey borders – “More parking”
27. Ashuelot Rail Trail along NH-119 near Reservoir Road- “119 is narrow and windy here → still popular for road riding”
28. NH-10 at NH-101 in Keene near Swanzey border- “Commercial, shopping destination… no sidewalk, shoulder?”
29. NH-63 connection gap in Hinsdale- “MA has this (63) as bike lane… No shoulder/bike lane in NH”
30. Walpole at border of Bellows Falls, VT – “Walker Bridge new park” “Amtrak Station”
31. Cheshire Rail Trail in Westmoreland near Walpole border- arrows pointed with “2 gaps”
32. Cheshire Rail Trail in Walpole- “Rail trail groups to Gardner Mass”

September 18 2019- UVLSRPC Offices

MAP 3: Upper-Valley-Lake Sunapee Connectivity Map

1. “Would prefer Greensboro/Old Etna between Hanover + Lebanon if it had infrastructure. (Not a big hill to climb)”
2. “High truck traffic in Claremont no bypass”
3. “120 is not LTS1”
4. Shared-use path along Rt4 north of Lake Mascoma in Lebanon, Enfield, Canaan
   • “US-4 is key connection”
   • “Rail trail isn’t good connection”
5. Shared-use path along Rt 4 at 4A in Lebanon to Rt 4 at NH-104 in Danbury- Rt 4 is connection gap
6. Connection gap surrounding Lake Mascoma in Enfield- “Fix Shaker Hill Road!”
7. Connection gap on northern section of NH-120 in Plainfield to Lebanon Border- “Key bike connection”
8. “Rt 120 + Etna Rd intersection Etna Rd needs facilities”
9. Section of shared-use path on NH-120 from Lebanon St/Greensboro Rd in Hanover to Mt Support Rd
   • “120 not LTS 1”
   • Change to connection gap
10. Sachem Fields to the right of NH-10 in Lebanon- “Playground & athletic fields... crossing Rte 10/Main Street is dangerous (pedestrian) to playground + to library”
11. Connection gap on Rt 10 in Lebanon- “Needed for Grad student +middle school athletics”
12. RPC border/outline at River Trail (?) in Lebanon- Should be a connection gap
13. Intersection of I89/NH-12A- “Poor shoulder bypass under I-89”
14. “More bike signage like in Newport w/ safe passing”
15. “Add CT River Byway”
16. “Route 120, Lebanon → Claremont is a stretch of road that I think would be used if there was adequate space to bike or walk”
17. “Greensboro Rd- Combine AT use + biking”
18. “Be aware of scenic byways”
19. “Lyme, NH East Thetford Rd. needs shoulders major connection to VT.”
20. “Connections to rail trail from Route 4 Lebanon +Enfield”
21. “Connect:
   • Lebanon → Hanover/Rt. 10
   • Lebanon → Hanover/Rt. 120
   • Hanover → Etna /Greensboro Rd.”
22. “Rt 4 from Canaan to Lebanon:
   • Connect to bus? Rail trail?
   • Narrow shoulders very high traffic”
23. “Bike shoulders on Rt120 South from Lebanon”
24. Circled section of BLTS segment on NH-11 from Charlestown/Claremont border to intersection of Maple Ave and NH-11 – “Charlestown Rd fatalities!” “High Speed Activity”
25. Arrows pointing to Lake Mascoma and Lake Sunapee- “Lakes may benefit from alternate paths” “Tourism/econ value”
26. Lebanon- “Terrible crossing to Centerra from Lahaye Rd”
27. Lebanon- “Mechanic Street is dangerous”
28. “Connect Mascoma River to West Lebanon”
29. BLTS segment on NH-10 in Hanover
   • “Speed + volume is scary”
   • “Nice wide shoulders 1000 people bike”
   • “high speed”
   • “Why does it stop? (Great brook)”
30. New line demarcation from BLTS segment near border of Hanover and Lyme to intersection of E Thetford Rd and River Rd – “River Rd Alt.”
31. Lebanon- “Mechanic St disparate for ped/bike to access stuff + transit”
32. New line demarcation on Rt 4 in Enfield and Lebanon- “Get to rail trail instead of along Lake or Mechanic”

September 25, 2019- Gilford Public Library (Lakes RPC)

Map 2: Lakes Region Sidewalk Map

1. Intersection of Tilman and Northfield – More Sidewalks and crosswalks needed
2. RT3 in Gilford- Needs sidewalks
3. RT3 along Paugus Bay (No sidewalk|Add sidewalk on both sides)- Add sidewalk one side only (2 not possible)

Map 2: Lakes Region Connectivity Map

1. Belmont and Canterbury- “retain shoulder width on connection gap of NH-106”
2. Connection gap of 140 in Gilmanton- “No shoulders, fast speeds, blind spots”
3. Connection gap between NH-11 and NH-28A on Lake Winnipesaukee—“should be low level of bicycle traffic stress”
4. Extend WOW trail
5. Roads (e.g. Shore Rd) along the left side of Newfound Lake—“slow speeds scenic”
6. Connection gap of NH-11 on Lake Winnipesaukee—“need wider shoulders”
7. Scenic Rd—“Laconia needs sidewalks”
8. Low BLTS section of NH-25 on Lake Winnipesaukee—“Shoulders hazardous”
   “Relook…not comfortable”
9. Connection gap on NH-109 in Moultonborough near NH-25—“Heavy traffic, no shoulders”
10. Low BLTS on NH-104 from Bristol to Meredith—“Unsafe” “Relook…not comfortable”
    “would not ride speed”
11. Road to the left of 93 in Bridgewater (River Rd)—“Great road to bike”
12. Connection Gap on NH-3A/border of Hebron and Bridgewater around Newfound lake—“50 mph, no shoulders”
13. Roads surrounding Ossipee Lake—“Good loop”
14. Union Ave/11A intersection heading from Laconia to Gilford needs improvements along shoulder
15. Bypass at Gilford cinema to CVS on Lakeshore Drive—There are no sidewalks shoulders
16. “EQUITY Seasonal help not from USA rides cycles along Paugus Way ‘very dangerous’
    also they ride in the dark”
17. Connection gap on NH-11C—“Very tight + scary!”
18. “More signs related to 3’ passing law”
19. Connection gap on NH-3A around Newfound lake—“Season 40 mph (from 50 mph) that
    was effective” “Possible place for crosswalks + median or RRFB” “I want to ride this loop
    with my grandchildren but my wife won’t let me”
20. Connection gap on West Shore Road southern Newfound Lake—“West Shore sewer
    project could be good opportunity for bike lane” “Sewer getting rebuilt”
21. Connection gap on 11D in Alton—“11D is nice route to avoid worst of 11”
22. 11A/Guilford Ave near border of Gilford and Laconia—uphill section look at wider
    shoulder opportunities
23. RT3 near intersection with NH-11 in Laconia—Peds need connections to grocery stores
    and waterfront (many seniors)
24. Area of 3A in Franklin, Hill—Ticks
25. Low BLTS segment of 3A at intersection of NH-104 in Bristol—“Should be connection gap,
    no shoulder”
26. Parallel to connection gap along NH-25 in northern Plymouth—“Fairgrounds Rd preferred”
27. Connection gap along NH-175 in Holderness—“Part of 175 is ok”
28. Low BLTS NH-25 Moultonborough—“Cars too fast to feel comfortable”
29. Gilmanton intersection at NH-140 and NH-170 – “One of the most dangerous intersections. People don’t stop. Blind spot on 107
30. NH-107 in Barnstead- “A lot of town forest to access (but steep) + Meetinghouse Rd is pretty”
31. Lake Winnipesaukee- “People like the idea of loop around lake but don’t feel safe”
32. Connection gap on Meredith Center Rd/Corliss Hill Rd- “Limited sight distance. NH-106 is slightly better”

September 22, 2019- Littleton Farmer’s Market (NCC)

MAP 1: North Country Connectivity Map

1. Fewer opportunities for comfortable cycling within a circle encompassing:
   • NH-117 at Rt 302 Shared Use Path/Rail Trail in Lisbon to NH-116/NH-18 in Littleton
   • Connection gap on Old Franconia Road from NH-117/NH-18/I93 on Sugar Hill/Franconia Border north to I93 in Littleton
2. Connection gap/BLTS segment from NH-116/NH-112 in Easton north to NH-116/NH-18 in Franconia – Side path preferred improvement
3. Connection gap Rt 302/Old Cherry Mountain Rd in Carroll- Good Routes! (Needs improvements)
4. Connection gap NH-115 on border of Carroll, Whitefield, Jefferson- Good Routes!
5. Rumney to Warren- Buffalo Rd in Rumney to Warren is preferred, can avoid connection gap on 25A because loud traffic. (short unpaved Ellsworth State Park ...)

September 24, 2019- Manchester Public Library (Southern NH PC)

MAP 5: Merrimack Valley Connectivity Map

1. Section of 393 connection gap on border of Concord and Pembroke- “Connection across river from downtown to East Concord for every day groceries, shopping, post office, to school, community center, pools” “Alternate route parallel but off Loudon Rd”
2. Big spaces
   a. Derry, Auburn: NH-28B
   b. Londonderry: NH-28
   c. Dunbarton: NH-13
3. 3A previously planned shared-use path/rail trail in Manchester- No shoulder
4. 3A previously planned shared-use path/rail trail in Bow- Insane
5. Connection gap of Route 3- unless 30k travel on RT3 otherwise safer than 3A

MAP 5A: Merrimack Valley Inset Connectivity Map
1. “How to connect between trails” – circle encompassing Somerville/Kalivas Union/Hallsville/Bakersville neighborhoods from trail on 28A toward trail on Merrimack River
2. Shared-use path/rail trail next to Merrimack River parallel to 3A in northern Manchester- “Safe connection Concord to Manchester”
3. Connection gap on Rt 3 left of Merrimack River- Improvements for ped, bike and transit on Rt. 3 (Equity is critical)
4. Section of previously planned shared-use path/rail trail in Somerville and section of previously planned shared-use path/rail trail to the left of 28A- “dotted line- light green is misleading”
5. Connection gaps/BLTS Gaps in Hudson- “Need Nashua- Hudson connection”
6. Connection gap on Hanover Street- “Hanover and Bridge connects to 93 so high traffic and parked cars better E-W roads would need side path”
7. Section of previously planned shared-use path/rail trail in Manchester from 28A to existing shared-use path/rail trail to the right of Bakersville – “No longer in plan ROW abandoned”
8. Existing shared-use path/rail trail in northern Manchester on the Merrimack River- “Not allowed to ride on it? Would be great”
9. Union Street, Manchester- “bike lanes both sides” “wide shoulders should be pretty nice. Narrow travel lanes to help”
10. Check Manchester DPW bike ped plan for downtown
11. Need ways across near Catholic Medical Center and Manchester Historic Association Mill yard

September 28, 2019- Concord Farmer’s Market (Central NH RPC)

*There were no map comments at this event*

October 2, 2019- Portsmouth Public Library (Rockingham RPC)

MAP 6: Seacoast Region Connectivity Map

1. 1A along coast of Rye, North Hampton, Seabrook- “Parking along 1A precludes the BLTS 1-2 score”
2. From NH-33 and NH-151 intersection, tough for bikes to get to Portsmouth Ave
3. 1A connection gap in Northern Rye- “Widen east shoulder to provide more space for S.B. bikes (on west side)”
4. Connection gap along NH-33 in Greenland- “Extend sidepath to Portsmouth Ave”
5. NH-16 from Dover/Rollinsford to Newington- “Look at connection from SPVR Rd.”
6. Intersection of 108/9/236 in Dover- “Side path along Spaulding”
7. NH-108 in Durham/Madbury/Dover- “Consider sidepath on 08”
8. Intersection of Rockingham Rail Trail/NH-125/NH-101 in Epping – “Tough for equestrians to activate the HAWK signal (too low)”
9. NH-155 at Furber Dr/Tuttle Rd- “Look at this as option to rt. 125”
10. RPC previously planned paths/lanes in Portsmouth- “Not sure there are plans north of Elwyn”
11. Shared use path on northern coast of Rye- “Side path needs repair”
12. NH-1B in Portsmouth- “Causeway Portsmouth to New Castle lots of use no infrastructure”
13. Along NH-1A coastline- “Want wider shoulders on ocean”
14. Line drawn on border of northern Salisbury- “286 busy but good bike lanes”
15. To the right of East Coast Greenway- “There needs signage designation for route through Pease + bike bridge. Pease is a race track”
16. Previously planned shared-use path/Rail Trail in Seabrook- “No improvements yet”
17. Drawn line connecting connection gap of rt4 in Newington to previously planned shared-use path/rail trail in Portsmouth- “Good alternative to highway”
18. Above connection gap of rt 33- “Want connection here for rail trail”
19. Connection gap loop of Rt4 and NH-9 in Barrington- “Gorgeous but crummy ride”
20. Low level of bicycle traffic stress segment at intersection of Rt 4 and NH-155 in Northern Lee – “Terrible”
21. Connection gap starting at intersection of Rt 4 and NH-155- “Not so bad”
22. NH-155 between NH-125 in Lee- “Very bad”
23. NH-156 starting at Rockingham Rail trail in Raymond to NH-152 in Nottingham- “Not that great”
24. Fremont Rail Trail from Danville border south – “Sandy can’t ride ATV use”
25. Circle highlighting NH-108- “All red [connection gap]”
27. Connection gap on Durham Point Rd in northern Durham- “High speed but good shoulders”
28. Lee Hook Rd from NH-108 in Newmarket to NH-12 in Lee- alternate route (rather than Packers Falls Rd)
29. Circle encompassing Bay Rd and Durham Point Rd with NH-108

October 9, 2019 - UVLS RPC Commission Meeting

MAP 3: UVLS

1. Arrow pointing to the left border of Hanover and Lyme. “River road is a great bike/ped alternative to 10 between Hanover and Lyme. Much safer for kids”
2. “Methodist Hill Rd as a detour for Rte 120?”
3. “Lockhaven Rd seems to have a dedicated group of cyclists, but many, Gap?”
4. “What about using snow mobile trails?”
5. “Bikes do ride on cold pond rd. Acworth and unity. No connectivity”
6. “Yellow (Low level of bicycle traffic stress) in downtown Newport is not low stress bike lane”
7. Arrows pointing to Sugar River Trail in Newport/Claremont and shared-use path/rail trail in Newbury “Need connection between rail trail”
8. “Newport- stating bike passing law is great. It made me feel safe to bike there. Cars passed with good distance between us.”
9. Connection gap in Plymouth- “No downtown bike racks”
10. Connection gap in Plymouth- “Poor road surface and students could bike otherwise”
11. Top left of map- “No bike lanes across bridge”
12. Low level of bicycle traffic stress segment to connection gap from Unity to Lempster- “Unity to Lempster is a safe route often biked”
13. Arrow pointing to connection gap segments and Sugar River Trail in Newport- “In Croydon and Newport the shoulders are a nice width”
14. Arrow pointing north to left border of Claremont “Too sandy- Sugar River Trail”
15. “Washington and Route #31 see bike traffic on roadside. Its not really safe on 31 in Washington but people still use it...”
16. “Rte 10 through Lempster has frequent bike riders and seems quite safe”
17. Arrow pointing to 12A in Plainfield “Rte 12A is not a low stress area for bikes, even though some bike lanes are present”
18. “New London main St. (Rt. 114) dangerous during day due to narrow road and frequently car doors are opened”
19. “DHMC + Centerra + Altaria should be shaded as ‘densely developed area’”
20. “There are marked bike lanes/shoulders along Rte 120 from Colburn park to south end of Messenger St.”
21. Arrow pointing to low level of traffic stress segment of NH-10- “10 Between Hanover and W. Lebanon- not good for biking from Sachem to Bridge Street.”
22. “Rt 114 from New London to Grantham has narrow to no shoulder and can be busy and low view in distance”
23. Arrow pointing to white segment in Hanover “Etna Rd and Greensboro Rd are designated bike routes, but have no shoulder or facilities”
24. Northernmost municipality in UVLS- “Few Shoulders”
25. “No shoulders or sidewalks and pedestrian traffic neon school rec field and downtown”
26. Arrow pointing to Lyme- “Ortonville Road connects Lyme center and Onfundville”
27. Arrow pointing to New London connection gaps “Georges mills to new London has wide shoulders and good visibility but would benefit better signage.
28. “Route 11 from 1-89 intersection Georges mills traveling into Sunapee is dangerous for bicycles due to lack of shoulder in several locations”
29. “Route 11 from 1-89 intersection Georges Mills traveling into Sunapee is dangerous for bicycles due to lack of shoulder in several locations”
30. Arrow pointing to low level traffic stress/connection gap left of Lake Sunapee ‘No signage or very little in Sunapee to ‘share the road’ with bicycles”
31. Arrow pointing to Appalachian Trail in Hanover “120 between Buck and Lattaye needs consistent shoulder widths on both sides”
32. Intersection of Lebanon “High Street roundabout a challenge for bicycles”
33. Intersection of Lebanon “Bikes can’t (easily) trip traffic lights at Etna Rd and Rte 120”
34. Arrow pointing north to Lake Mascoma “High level stress (no shoulder)”
35. “Route 120 has good potential, should be included in study”
36. “Claremont Main St from Opera House Sq. to Union has bike lane”
37. Arrow pointing to low level of bicycle traffic stress in Unity “Road between Lempster and Claremont: should be low stress for more of this, keeping higher stress for 1st and last mile on either end. This road is VERY STEEP however, especially between Unity and Claremont”
38. “Route 10 between West Lebanon and just south of Gould Road/Sachem Village is “high stress””
39. “Route 4 from Bank St Extension to Exit 17 is high stress (not as bad after that)”
40. “12 A south of exit 20 until past the land fill is high stress”
41. “I’d say 120 south of Lebanon is actually fine and low stress, not much infrastructure there but not much traffic either.”
42. “Crosswalks in downtown Lebanon are not well lit or marked with signs”