

LAKES REGION PLANNING COMMISSION

103 Main Street, Suite #3
 Meredith, NH 03253
 Tel 603.279.8171
 www.lakesrpc.org



Transportation Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Meeting Notes of October 2, 2024

Members Present	LRPC Staff
George Tuthill – Alexandria Rod Cameron – Belmont Buz Kenney – Bristol Jeff Haines – Center Harbor Meghan Theriault – Gilford Travis Mitchell – Gilmanton Tink Taylor – Holderness Nate Guerette (Alternate) – Laconia Dari Sassan – Moultonborough Joseph Perez (Alternate) – Plymouth Maureen Westrick – Sandwich John Gotjen – Tamworth Llyod Wood – Tuftonboro Steve Randall – Wolfeboro	Glenn Trefethen - Transportation Planner Shanna Saunders – Executive Director
	Non-Voting Members
	Lucy St. John NH DOT Samantha Fifield – District 3 Cindy Yanski – Belknap Mountain CAP
	Virtual Attendees
	Ross Wood – NHDOT District 2 Bill Watson – NH DOT
Guests	
Allan Beetle – WOW Trail Tyler Carmichael – Laconia Planner	

1. Welcome & Introductions/ Roll Call/ Call to Order.

- i. Lloyd Wood calls meeting to order at 2:04 pm by requesting representatives and guests go around and introduce themselves and who they are affiliated with, after introductions Lloyd Wood acknowledges that there are 14 representatives and that we have Quorum while Shanna Saunders confirms that Quorum has been met. Tink Taylor comments for a round of applause.

2. Approval of Minutes

- i. Lloyd Wood asks whether we have a couple of meetings to approve. Shanna Saunders in response its just the April meeting because may we did not have quorum, and September we also didn't have a quorum and those are meeting notes that are posted on the LRPC website for folks to look at, and that there were no official minutes to be approved. Glenn Trefethen clarified that there are April at meeting minutes that need to be approved, and asked the members if they had received those via e-mail because they were forgotten in the meeting collateral. With that

information Lloyd Wood asked what the committee members wanted to do and whether they needed more time to review the minutes or if we can vote today. **Rod Cameron makes a motion to approve the minutes from April 1st, Travis Mitchell from Gilmanton seconded the motion to approve the minutes from April 1st. Lloyd asks members if there is any discussion, no members opposed, with two abstentions from Maureen Westrick and Sean Randall who were not members yet.**

3. Public Comment

a. Items on the Agenda

- i. Lloyd notes that a lot of public bodies do this type of public comment forum if anyone has questions on whats going to be covered, and that we also have a public comment at the end of the meeting if anyone wants to respond to something that has come up during the meeting. Tink Taylor states that he has a point of information that he would like to add to the agenda when we get to article 4.

4. Items of Information

a. WOW Trail Update

- i. Lloyd introduces Allan Beetle President of WOW-Trail to present. WOW-Trail presentation slides are proved on the LRPC website to be referenced, Allen Beetle presented for 22 minutes. Glenn Trefethen offers for any virtual participants to ask any questions via the chat feature. There were no questions from the virtual crowd.
- ii. Questions asked by TAC Members:
 1. Maureen Westrick – Asks if the fencing is meant to keep users of the trail from wandering off, or abutters from wandering on? Allan Beetle responds that it is a liability when inviting the public to use it. They currently spend \$10,000 a year to insure the state and patriot rails. Continued conversation leads to Allan Beetle mentioning that abutters should have license with the state to cross the tracks to access their docks.
 2. John Gotjen – asks for Allan Beetle to discuss the pros and cons of paved verse not paved trails. Allan Beetle discusses obvious pro’s, which is wheelchairs, scooters but admits he thinks its dependent on proximity to city services and park trail heads. He continues that once you start to get away from that you can go to hard packed but tends to wash out quicker which means more regular maintenance instead of fixing pavement cracking every 10 years. Maureen Westrick brings up what she calls “stabilized engineered soil”, she saw a demonstration on Governors Island which in the year it has been used there has been no erosion. (name of company TBD).
 3. Dari Sassan – Raises question regarding how it appears on the map that beyond weirs beach it appears the proposed trail goes from the inside of the track to the outside of the track essentially on the water and whether that’s accurate. Allan Beetle admits that the scenario portrayed on the map is not what would happen.
 4. Buz Kenney – asks about the cost differential between asphalt and hard packed. Allan Beetle explains that there has been no determination of cost with hard packed since the WOW Trail has yet to use that material but claims that the cost of a mile using pavement was just less than a million dollars in the first two phases and that it has likely gone up since then.

5. Tyler Carmichael – Asks the question, has there been talks about putting the trail along Weirs Blvd instead of following the rail trail? Allan Beetle thinks they should since there used to be a Trolley along there that there should be a significant right of way (ROW) but highlights the challenges that would face when connecting it to Lakeport which would be difficult for a continuous WOW Trail which would not be favorable.
 6. Joseph Perez – Brings up the tension between non-motorized users and electric bikes and has the WOW Trail faced those issues? Allan Beetle explains that there is only a conflict when users are disrespectful, and that they have run into specific issue with speed and that they believe they handled that problem. Allan Beetle also notes that E class 1 & 2 are allowed on the trail but that there is no enforcement.
- iii. After Questions Allan Beetle continues presentation to explain the Opechee Loop. Refer to LRPC website for slides. At the end of the 2 minutes presentation on the Opechee Loop Allan Beetle plugs wowtrail.org for members to view the trail video, and his e-mail is info@wowtrail.org
1. John Gotjen – asks if there are any facilities a part of the WOW Trail or are they on their own? Allan Beetle states that yes, they are on their own but that there are facilities such as the library which would be public and commercial businesses.
- b. On-Call Engineer Update
- i. Lloyd wood introduces Shanna Saunders to speak on on-call engineer updates.
 1. Shanna Saunders starts of with reminding the TAC members that during the last meeting that we stated we closed up the on-call engineer RFQ process but explains when we sent the contract to NHDOT they reminded the LRPC that we needed to put a legal notice for the RFQ in a newspaper which LRPC neglected to do. Shanna Saunders that the LRPC had to start over but has published the legal notice in the Laconia Sun on Monday (September 30th) and that the job opening has been reposted and that the LRPC has apologized to the previous candidate and asked for them to apply again. With that Shanna Saunders states that the posting needs to be up for 3 more weeks, but the on-call engineer will be declared before the TYP vote in our November TAC meeting. Shanna Saunders reminds TAC members that the roll of the on-call engineer is to look at our TYP projects and QA cost estimates so when the plans are submitted to the DOT, the DOT knows that the costs have been reviewed in today's dollars so when they assign a value for the TYP process its as close to actual costs with no real surprises when TYP go into design and construction. Shanna Saunders affirms TAC Members that we are still somewhat in line with the recommended TYP process timeline and that we will have more information regarding the on-call engineer at the November TAC meeting.
- c. Plymouth TYP presentation
- i. Lloyd Wood introduces Plymouth presentation and asks members for suggestions for a time-frame on presentation. Shanna Saunders chimes in to mention that Joseph Perez from Plymouth has been asked to present and explain the process they have gone through to submit the project for criteria ranking and that after the presentation she will go over the scoring again, but that it's a number ranking that will be a homework assignment for TAC Members so that they don't need to do that today. Shauna hands off to Jospheh Perez to start the presentation with a 15–20-minute time cap. Shanna Saunders stressed TAC Members to make sure all their

questions are answered in terms of tools, design as best as possible and that dollar amounts from the engineer will be presented later since that may play a factor into scoring.

- ii. Joseph Perez starts his presentation and the slides are available at the LRPC website. The presentation lasted 20 minutes followed by questions from TAC Members
 1. Nate Guerette – Asks what the current lane width and is the bridge passage in the project scope? Joseph Perez comments on bridge first, and that the bridge is not a part of the project and that the bridge is proposed to be rehabilitated supposedly by NHDOT. Joseph Perez mentions he is not aware of the current width of the road. But adds that the bridge lanes are the narrowest in the project and that there is a cantilever sidewalk existing and that there wouldn't need to be added sidewalks on the bridge, but there might be a request for safety when using that narrow stretch of road since there is not much that can be done to widen the bridge and clarifies that the bridge rehabilitation right now is planned for 2031. Nate clarifies that the question regarding lane width because depending on timing and urgency that at a low cost they could mill from fog line outwards and create a path there and still have it on the list to be rebuilt but this could be done in the interim. Joseph Perez agrees that it could help but the alignment issue would need to be addressed still. Joseph Perez also clarifies the town is not considered an urban compact and that they aren't the ones doing those pavement projects today, and that DOT does that.
 2. George Tuthill – Asks to be reminded if there is a sidewalk on both sides of the bridge or only one?. Joseph Perez clarifies that its only on one side. George Tuthill adds that isn't it a problem when pedestrians are presumably wanting to walk on both sides of the road and is it a part of the scope? Joseph Perez adds that at one point that it was looked at as part of the project scope to add sidewalks on both sides of the road but that it would add quite a bit to the project. He goes on to mention that there would be a crosswalk that crosses the road just before the bridge at the Foster street intersection, and that it would be great to have sidewalks on both sides but that there will at least be a marked crosswalk just before the bridge so folks can safely get across.
 3. Samantha Fifield – Clarifies that she does not have a question but rather a statement that when getting around pavement markings and crossings that they should coordinate with the DOT Bureau of Traffic way ahead of time to get the crossings liscened through the bureau since it's a state road they have authority of where these crosswalks can be placed and whats required for those crosswalks. Shauna Saunders follows up that considering this is a TYP is this something that is not looked at by DOT engineers? Samantha Fifield says there still is licensing that needs to be done and that they are running into the issue currently in Plymouth the pavement markings and ADA compliance that it was an LPA project and having issues having those issues addressed. Shanna Saunders directs a statement to Josph Perez that this would be something to remind the DOT Engineers when they are in design phase if it's accepted in the TYP. Samantha Fifield concurs.
 4. Meghan Theriault – asks if the budget includes any type of lighting? Joseph Perez says they don't have that information but that the updated engineering will happen after this and that it could be something that is added. Joseph Perez states that if he is understanding correctly that Engineering would start

in 2031 with construction in 2036. Shanna Saunders mentions that she is unaware of the timing and that DOT will make any timing determination.

5. Lloyd Wood – asks Glenn Trefethen to get the information from Samantha Fifield regarding pavement markings and to put them in the meeting notes so everyone has it since many towns want to put crosswalks in and that they are unaware of the procedure that needs to be followed.
6. Tink Taylor – mentions that the area is laced with Native American artifacts but that under the Native American Repatriation Act using any federal money, when coming across human remains you must shut the project down and call in an archaeologist. Joseph mentions that he agrees and that they are hoping that this is work within existing ROW's that they won't run into that issue and that they did increase the amount of money allocated to NARA review if that were to happen.
7. Lucy St. John – Comments that when having the engineer looking at costs it would be good to get an estimate on those items of concern because after it submitted to the NHDOT the estimate review committee will review that and give feedback to the LRPC. Basically, saying get in as much of what you want in the project in the submission to be looked at and reviewed especially anything that has to do with environmental and cultural resources.
8. Shanna Saunders thanks chairman for allowing folks from DOT speak.

d. TYP Criteria & Scoring

- i. Shanna Saunders mentions that this Plymouth project is the only submittal for TYP that the LRPC had received and that if you're thinking of a TYP that it is a two year process and that it will open up again in two years for new submittals. Shanna refers to last meeting where we had gone over criteria scoring, but we have it in the slides and in the room to use, and we can also send out the criteria scoring sheets via email. Shanna Saunders goes over criteria sheet and that we did not go over weighting in the last TAC Meeting, but it is the same weighting that LRPC used for the last 2-3 round of TYP and mentions we can relook at this in the future for next TYP if we want. Shanna Saunders lets TAC Members that we need them to score the project and that it's a 1-10 score based in the criteria, and that again this will be sent out via email alongside with DOT Criteria. In addition, reminds TAC Members they need to bring the criteria scoring sheet back with them in November's TAC Meeting filled out so that we can discuss everyone's scoring and come up with one score that is based on all input that we send to DOT and that there will be reminder emails sent out as well.
 1. Dari Sassan – Asks if its hypothetically if you're a professor you say, “whoever has the best paper gets an A” and if that is something applicable to this? Shanna Saunders clarifies that the TAC still needs to go through the scoring process according to DOT rules even if it comes out as “an A”. Dari Sassan clarifies that its more of the sentiment that we are in full support of the project. Shanna Saunders reminds TAC members that numbers are important because the project does go up against all other projects in the state TYP process.
 2. John Gotjen – Asks the criteria Shanna Saunders has mentioned, is it the same that was sent out last time? Shanna Saunders concurs.
 3. Lucy St. John – Comments that the point is that regions have multiple projects that they are reviewing and that they use the collect RPC criteria, they can weight them based on what's most important. Because each RPC as a region allocation, but then the allocation can add a couple more projects

for consideration that can go to DOT, go through review and be given feedback, so there is a little bit of push and pull, especially when you're considering multiple projects to put forward with your specific allocation.

4. Shanna Saunders – Asks members if they have any questions on the scoring process and the criteria, because she wants to be clear but that they can reach out with any questions, but the TAC will not be meeting for 4 more weeks and we won't be meeting until those scores come back.
5. Nate Guerette – Asks if the TAC needs one or two score sheets back from Laconia (Tyler Carmichael from Laconia was also present), Shanna Saunders clarified that only one score sheet per community.

e. Tink Taylor

- i. Lloyd Wood opens the floor to Tink Taylor who asked earlier in the meeting to add him to the agenda.
- ii. Tink Taylor starts off that Holderness is often considered as a town without a village, with no common. Tink mentions the town sidewalk-built years ago at the junction of 175 & 3 through to Golden Pond County Store which is 1.3 miles, except for 97 feet to the harbor, and the town is wrestling getting the sidewalk completed. Tink Taylor says it's a safety factor and describes a few local scenarios. He goes on to mention Ward D'elia Architects offered to do an engineering study to estimate the cost and the town could go on to ask for money. The question is whether it's on the ROW or outside the ROW and who is on the hook for paying for it? Shanna Saunders states that she can follow up with him on options for that. Samantha Fifield mentions to Tink Taylor that she can follow up with the ROW question when she is back in the office but for Tink Taylor to reach out to her.

5. Items of Business

a. Elections

- i. Lloyd Wood asks if there is a quorum and Shanna Saunders confirms that we do and that during the last TAC Meeting we had informal nominations that Lloyd Wood mentioned he had interest in continuing to be chair, and that Dari Sassan mentioned he was interested in being vice chair and that we are now looking for formal nominations followed by a vote.
- ii. Lloyd Wood makes a point to order to ask since he is a candidate would it be appropriate to appoint a tempt chairmen to hold the elections while Shanna Saunders notes as long, he feels comfortable doing so. Lloyd Wood asks the members if anyone wants to volunteer with Tink Taylor being mentioned and being appointed by Lloyd Wood to conduct the elections.
- iii. Tink Taylor asks the members, do we have nominations from the floor for the chair? Meghan Theriault makes a motion to nominate Lloyd Wood as chair, with Rod Cameron seconding that motion. Tink Taylor acknowledges and questions the members, is there any discussion? No discussion, Tink Taylor says all in favor may signify by saying "I", and "No", Tink Taylor elects Lloyd Wood as chair. Tink Taylor asks for nominations from the floor for Vice Chairman, Meghan Theriault makes a motion to nominate Dari Sassan from Moultonborough as Vice Chairman, Travis Mitchell seconds the motion to nominate Dari Sassan as Vice Chairman. Tink Taylor, asks members if there is any discussion on the nomination? No Discussion, favor for the nomination signify "I", and "no" Tink Taylor declares Dari Sassan as Vice Chairman.

6. Other Business:

a. Public Comment.

- i. Lloyd Wood opens the floor to public comment or review based on anything mentioned in the meeting. Shanna Saunders mentions that LRPC Transportation Planner has a few things to discuss in the Other Business portion of the meeting.
- b. Mid State Regional Coordinating Council RCC
 - i. Glenn Trefethen states that he wanted to updated TAC members on Mid-State RCC which is the regional coordinating council, which is in the process of updating in conjunction with Central NH Planning Commission, the RCC started back in 2008 with a recent update in 2019. Glenn Trefethen states that this is a new project for him and that he was introduced to it on Monday and that the full update needs to be approved in June 2025, as of right now Phase I and Phase II are currently underway now through December, Glenn Trefethen then acknowledges Cindy Yanski who is in the room who is a part of the RCC and is welcome to step in at any time. Glenn Trefethen resumes discussing current process where CNHRPC is working on phase I which is working on service availability and mapping census information, Phase II Glenn Trefethen will be starting this coming week which is the Needs Assessment. Glenn Trefethen continues to mention that December through January is Phase III which is identifying and prioritizing implementation strategies, then in February through March is Phase IV where the first draft of the update comes along and then be brought to the TAC Members, RCC, Commissioners, Executive Board in April, and that's when there is a public review with feedback from them in regards to anything they think we are missing, and the Mid-State RCC will go back to the drawing board and get the final plan approved by the Commissioners in May to make for the deadline in June. Shanna Saunders asks Glenn Trefethen to go over the major themes of the RCC, Transportation? Public transportation? What other themes? Glenn Trefethen describes that the report is to update the evolving needs of transportation and human services are being addressed in an effective manner, and that things coming out of this would be the CAT bus ridership and goes on to mention that the Laconia Sun recently published an article highlighting how it has been perceived by the public and mentions that there are 400 trips a month currently with a goal of 1,000 trips and that we are making progress. Glenn Trefethen also mentions that the article in the Laconia Sun has testimony of how people would like to see the project evolve in the future. Glenn Trefethen goes on to mention that updating we are hoping for better numbers that will lead to more funding. Shanna Saunders mentions to the TAC that they will be seeing more from this in the future so they will have an opportunity to get a little deeper into it and have time to review it.
 - 1. Cindy Yanski – Asks if Glenn is going to replace Sean Chamberlin the previous LRPC Transportation Planner, Glenn Trefethen concurs. Cindy Yanski continues to mention to TAC Members that part of the RCC is setting up her workplan for the next several years, where she covers Region 3 and that anything we want worked on send to Glenn Trefethen so he can send it over to her. Shanna Saunders asks Cindy Yanski if there needs to be a formal nomination process for Glenn Trefethen to be apart of RCC, Cindy Yanski declared that it wasn't something that needed to be done.
 - 2. Dari Sassan – Mentions he used to be an RCC Representative and that doctor visits were a part of that and was curious to know if that has stayed the same? Glenn Trefethen concurred that he hasn't gone through all the information quite yet but that he knows that doctor visits are still something that the RCC covers. Dari Sassan then goes on to ask about grocery delivery, Glenn Trefethen asks a clarifying question on whether he means store to

door type services? Dari Sassan concurs and that maybe that is no longer needed due to delivery services now. Glenn Trefethen states that he can investigate it. Dari Sassan mentioned that he was at a meeting in Moultonborough and that there was discussion regarding a service like that because there was interest in it. Dari Sassan ask if it is something he should discuss with Glenn Trefethen and if the answer is “yes” maybe there are other towns who have similar projects in the works. Lucy St. John suggests to Glenn Trefethen that he reaches out to other RPC’s like Southern since RCC looks at transit, human services and that some of those issues are addressed in that.

3. Nate Guerette – Asks what the Regional Coordinating Council is? Cindy Yanski mentions that there are 8 RCC’s, and goes over that back in 2007 the governor decided that there was a need for a regional council to coordinate transportation needs and that the idea it is governor appointed individuals and leads or representatives of state agencies like DOT, DHHS, Department of Education and meetings are held in Concord looking at the state transportation needs but that there was a need to look at the needs on a regional basis and how 5310e funding is spent.

c. NHDOT Public Information Meeting 9/26

- i. Glenn Trefethen briefly discussed the NHDOT public information meeting he attended for TYP Belmont 43352. Glenn Trefethen gave a brief overview for the reason of the meeting which was to narrow down the list of potential projects by getting public feedback. Glenn Trefethen mentioned there was a lot of discussion from the public concerning other intersections and roads that may worsen due to the proposed project. With the NHDOT mentioning the LRPC frequently regarding other intersections, Glenn Trefethen did speak at the meeting to give the public an idea on what the organization can do in terms of studying other intersections through corridor studies while also noting that would be something that would have to go through their Board of Selectmen to be done.

d. Next Meeting

- i. Shanna Saunders reminds TAC Members meet next on November 6th and that much of the meeting will be looking at the Plymouth project, with hopeful engineering input, as well as going over the scoring. In addition, a part of the TYP process is to review all Lakes region TYP and provide DOT with any information regarding removing any projects from the TYP due to traffic patterns changing or being old and antiquated.
 1. Rod Cameron spoke regarding his most recent appointment to state-wide advisory committee for trails while representing NH Municipal Association (NHMA) and that he will be sending out a questionnaire to TAC Members for input.
 2. Cindy Yanski gives an overview of RCC’s naming October Community Transportation Month while pitching NH Volunteer Drivers program and October’s Busses, Bikes & Brooms Commuter Challenge.
 3. Lucy St. John updates TAC members on the recent update to Public Involvement Process, upcoming Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) funding, as well as the Scenic Byway Grant Program that has just launched.

7. Adjourn

- a. Lloyd Wood adjourned the meeting at 3:40pm.