

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 November 6, 2024

Members Present	LRPC Staff
George Tuthill – Alexandria David Kerr – Barnstead Buz Kenney – Bristol Meghan Theriault – Gilford Travis Mitchell – Gilmanton Nate Guerette (Alternate) – Laconia Robert Pollock – New Hampton Joseph Perez – Plymouth Steve St. Pierre (Alternate) - Plymouth Maureen Westrick – Sandwich John Gotjen – Tamworth Llyod Wood – Tuftonboro	Glenn Trefethen - Transportation Planner Shanna Saunders – Executive Director
	Non-Voting Members
	Lucy St. John NH DOT Samantha Fifield – District 3 Angela Labrecque - Meredith
	Virtual Attendees
	Steve Randall – Wolfeboro Bill Watson – NH DOT
	Guests

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

- i. L. Wood calls meeting to order at 2:07pm acknowledging that there is quorum.

2. Approval of Minutes

- i. October 2, 2025, minutes were approved without any corrections

m/s/approved
 abstention

G. Tuthill/M. Westrick
 R. Pollack

3. Public Comment

- a. Items on the Agenda
 - i. None.

4. Items of Information

- a. TAP Update
 - i. G. Trefethen goes over the new TAP round 5 opportunity, highlighting the December 6th deadline for submission of Letter of Intent, mandatory meetings being held in early January, and the deadline for full application submissions being January 24th. He also clarifies that the TAC members will be scoring and ranking all TAP projects similarly to what is currently being done with the Ten-Year Plan Process.
 - ii. L. Wood asked what TAP stood for, G. Trefethen clarifies that it stands for Transportation Alternative Program which is anything that has to do with non-motorized users, like pedestrians, sidewalks, multi-use trails etc.

- iii. M. Westrick asks if there is a website that everyone can go to look at all of this. G. Trefethen confirms that there is a landing page for TAP on the NHDOT [website](#).
- iv. G. Trefethen Showed the TAC members other projects that have been awarded TAP funding with brief descriptions on each, including the 2018 Franklin TAP project and 2021 in Laconia.
 - 1. N. Guerette acknowledges the Laconia project is slated for 2028.
 - 2. G. Trefethen mentions that TAP projects end up on the states TYP list and are not funded by federal highway funding.
 - 3. D. Kerr asks what the size of the funding for those projects. N. Guerette speaks on behalf of the Laconia project and the evolution of the funding estimates and how they have increased over the years and depending on the ability to do that, scoping may need to be re looked at.
 - 4. S. Saunders mentions that TAP Funding is 80/20, 80% covered by the state, 20% covered by the community.
 - 5. D. Kerr asks if there is a time frame in which funds need to be used.
 - a. L. St. John states that once a project has been granted funding it gets added to the Ten-Year Plan and depending on how quickly the town can work through project details depends on whether the project can move up in the Ten-Year Plan. The discussion continues to mention that projects tend to need to be more concrete versus “pie in the sky” idea.
 - b. D. Kerr states that he was curious about the Franklin trestle bridge project from 2018 because he didn’t believe anything had been done yet and that the funding he presumes is much less than what will need to be needed in the end.
 - c. B. Watson provided more detail on the Franklin project to clarify that the rough costs came in at around \$500k, though there needed to be an engineering study done on the trestle bridge itself and that it was identified that there were numerous concerns, which meant that there were solutions needing to be identified to rehab or bypass the trestle bridge. B. Watson clarifies that is one of the reasons to-date why the project had not gotten far, and that with staff turnover in Franklin, the cost estimates went from half a million to \$5 million. There is currently a request for the NHDOT to fund 80% of the now \$5 million out of TAP funding and that the NHDOT is trying to find ways to get that accomplished. B. Watson mentions that locally managed projects like TAP projects can take about 6-7 years to be completed on average depending upon turnovers and existing conditions.

b. Scenic Byways Grant Update

- i. S. Saunders gives an update on the Scenic Byways Grant process. S. Saunders mentions that the LRPC submitted a letter of interest to the NHDOT to seek Scenic Byway Grant money to update the management plan for the Lakes Region Tour. The last management plan was approved back in 2015 and needs an update. In addition to updating the management plan for the scenic byway funding was also proposed to include a marketing plan (signage, brochure, social media etc.) as well as feasibility for pedestrian access which she mentions is currently lacking around the scenic byway. Shanna Saunders mentioned and thanked the Planning Board and Board of Selectmen from Meredith, Center Harbor and Moultonborough who all provided letters of support for the grant opportunity.

- ii. S. Saunders mentions the rest of the process, where the NHDOT will select applicants to then submit their plans to the Federal Government.
 - 1. L. St. John mentions that eligibility information is available at the NHDOT website and mentions that a brief written summary is required to be submitted as well by November 8th.
 - 2. M. Theriault asks whether a management plan that has been mentioned would include tree management like dead ash trees and adding in native vegetation.
 - 3. S. Saunders iterates that it does have a piece of that in the management plan like that in terms of dealing with viewsheds.
 - 4. L. St. John clarifies that this grant process is nationally competitive program
- c. TYP On-Call Engineer Update
 - i. G. Trefethen gives in update on the on-call engineer process by reminding everyone that LRPC did have to re-do the RFQ process and that the process had recently ended. G. Trefethen informs everyone that HEB had been selected and that the LRPC has been given permission by NHDOT through a notice to proceed with contract negotiations with HEB and that the LRPC is hoping to have that process wrapped up by the end of the week with hopes that they can then get started on the scope of work leading to updated cost estimates.
 - 1. S. Saunders mentions that the LRPC was hoping to have had cost estimates to provide the TAC with but that unfortunately the process had taken a little longer than expected.
 - 2. N. Guerette asked if there were any other applicants aside from HEB.
 - 3. S. Saunders clarified that there were no other applicants despite reaching out to a few firms directly and posting them on NHMA website.
 - 4. G. Trefethen also added that legal notices were published in the Laconia Daily Sun and Union Leader.

5. Items of Business

- a. Ten Year Plan Ranking.
 - i. G. Trefethen acknowledges that he received 12 scores for the Plymouth TYP project. G. Trefethen also offers to the TAC that he can go through each town that submitted and state their scores, or he could simply speak to the final score that was summed and weighted. Since there was no preference G. Trefethen informed everyone that the final average and weighted score was 81.91 and ranked #1. G. Trefethen reminded TAC members that despite having only one project the reason the TAC needs to go through this ranking process was because this project then gets prioritized with other projects being submitted through other RPC's.
 - 1. S. Saunders mentions that there had been feedback from NHDOT previously regarding the cost exceeding available funding and that it has been suggested to split the project into two phases. S. Saunders mentions that Plymouth has been briefed on this and gave their preference on how it should be phased out. Pointing to the slides for proposed phase 1, which would most likely match available funding. S. Saunders mentions that LRPC will work with NHDOT on additional funding sources available for phase 2 of the project which may be eligible for TAP funding. S. Saunders confirms that this type of scenario of phasing is not uncommon.
 - 2. D. Kerr offers his congratulations to Plymouth on a very well documented proposal and that the format for the write-up of the project was one of the best ones he has seen over the years.

3. G. Trefethen asks the members for a motion to proceed with the Plymouth project at a ranking score of 81.91

m/s/approved

G. Tuthill/ N. Guerette/ unanimous

b. Confirming Support of Current TYP Projects

- i. G. Trefethen reviews that the next step in the process is to go through projects on the Ten-Year Plan that have already gone through the process in previous rounds and confirm the support from the towns. G. Trefethen mentioned prior to the meeting he had reached out to TAC Members whose town has projects on the list, and for those who are not there he could speak to them since he received support from them via email. G. Trefethen then prefaced that the point of this process is that it allows towns to elect to have their projects removed from the TYP, and if they choose to go that route, the funding would then be reallocated to other projects in the lake's region.
 1. T. Mitchell confirmed Gilmanton's support of TYP project #42603
 2. N. Guerette confirmed Laconia's support of TYP project #44217
 3. A. Lebreque confirmed Meredith's support of TYP project #43533 and mentions that there is a scoping meeting for this project at the end of the year.
 4. G. Trefethen mentions that Dari Sassan who was not able to make the meeting did confirm Moultonborough's support of their three TYP Projects.
 5. J. Perez confirmed Plymouth's support of TYP projects #41583 & #43552. J. Perez also mentioned that project #41583 has an agreement in place with DOT and that there was a public hearing recently. In addition, bringing up a letter from Plymouth, Rumney and Hebron officials in support of project #435332 with support and desire to get that project moving quicker while also asking the NHDOT to discuss with town officials on interim solutions in the meantime.
 6. Tilton project #42600 had not received any official support from email communication and in the meeting since there was no representative. S. Fifield from District 3 did speak to the project and the conditions that resulted in this project getting on the TYP. She continues to explain that it is a safety issue due to the condition of the wall that was at risk of failing.
 - a. M. Westrick asks what happens if this wall falls in prior to the project breaking ground. S. Fifield explains that it would need to be reconstructed using emergency funds and that this would be an not ideal scenario.

6. Other Business

a. Open Floor discussion.

- i. B. Kenney mentions that he believed that there should be projects from Bristol that are on the TYP.
 1. L. St. John confirmed that there are several projects from Bristol on the TYP.
 2. G. Trefethen located the projects on the TYP and announced their brief project descriptions and B. Kenney confirmed Bristol's support of both projects.
 3. S. Randall via zoom mentioned that Wolfeboro should also have a project on the list for South Main Street. G. Trefethen located Wolfeboro's projects and

- S. Randall confirmed their support and mentioned there is surveying being done currently for that project.
4. There was discussion of many other projects being on the Ten-Year Plan, it was acknowledged that many of those projects are State Aid Bridge funded projects which don't fall within the scope of this part of the TYP process where confirmation of support is needed from the towns.
- ii. J. Perez thanks TAC Members for their support of the Plymouth project through the Ten-Year Plan process.
 - iii. S. Saunders mentions that there was a recent meeting with Andover regarding sidewalk and crossings safety concerns at Proctor Academy. The discussion was with school officials, state officials and members of LRPC to brainstorm ideas for addressing the issues with various funding paths.
 - iv. N. Guerette asks what the role of the on-call engineer is and whether they are helping with applications for projects. S. Saunders explains the agreement has limited funding through the UPWP to span two years of work and how that limits the ability of them to work on other projects despite LRPC's wishes. She goes on to mention that if there is funding still available after all the work for the Plymouth TYP project is complete, then there could be a potential of having them work on other stuff. S. Saunders reiterated that any town that needs help with putting together applications can reach out to herself or G. Trefethen.
 - v. S. Saunders thanks all the members for their efforts on getting their scores to G. Trefethen prior to the meeting, by stating that it trimmed down the amount of time needed for the days TAC meeting.
 - vi. G. Trefethen also thanks the members and mentions that the next TAC meeting will be December 4th. He also mentions that the following meeting after that would not be until March 5th when TAC Members will be working on scoring TAP projects.
 1. N. Guerette asks the idea behind the break; S. Saunders explains that there is a lot of travel during the winter months and that it's important to make sure we hit a quorum for the meetings.

7. Adjourn

- a. L. Wood adjourned the meeting at 3:55pm.