

# 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 Minutes of April 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2025

Members Present	LRPC Staff
George Tuthill – Alexandria David Kerr – Barnstead Rod Cameron – Belmont Buz Kenney – Bristol David Chunn – Franklin Travis Mitchell – Gilmanton Paul Hazelton Nate Guerette – Laconia Angela LaBrecque – Meredith Dari Sassan – Moultonborough Bob Pollock – New Hampton Phil Villari – Ossipee Joseph Perez – Plymouth Shane Dow (Alternate) – Tilton	Glenn Trefethen – Transportation Planner Shanna Saunders – Executive Director
	<b>Non-Voting Members</b>
	Lucy St. John - NH DOT Samantha Fifield – NH DOT District 3
	<b>Virtual Attendees</b>
	Roger Weeks (alternate) – Gilford John Gotjen - Tamworth Bill Watson – NH DOT Cindy Yanski – Belknap – Merrimack CAP Steve Randall – Wolfeboro Nancy Spaulding – District 3 Ross Wood – District 2 Ken Norton – Winnepesaukee River Trail Association
	<b>Guests</b>

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

- i. D. Sassan (Vice Chair) calls meeting to order at 2:03pm acknowledging that there is quorum.
- ii. Self- Introductions were conducted and Zoom participants were acknowledged by D. Sassan and G. Trefethen
- iii. Quorum was established.

### 2. Approval of Minutes

- i. March 5, 2025, minutes were approved.

m/s/approved  
 abstention

B. Kenney/D. Kerr  
 G. Tuthill, P. Hazelton, T. Mitchell

### 3. Public Comment

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

#### 4. Items of Information

- a. UNH T2 Trainings
  - i. G. Trefethen goes over current Local Road Safety trainings administered through UNH T2 Center.
- b. CommuteSmart NH
  - i. G. Trefethen gives an overview of CommuteSmart NH Spring Challenge details.
- c. Presentation: A Guide to Develop Small Projects w/ Samantha Fifield
  - i. Samantha Fifield gave a 38-minute presentation geared to helping communities that don't have access to engineering services acquire information needed to develop a small project in their communities.
    - 1. S. Fifield fielded project specific questions and overview a few resources that were listed at the end of the presentation.

#### 5. Items of Business

- a. TAP Ranking.
  - i. G. Trefethen Presents the results from the 16 TAC Members who scored the 5 TAP projects. #1 Andover, #2 Center Harbor, #3 Laconia, #4 Tilton, #5 Ossipee.
    - 1. There was discussion regarding the process of how many projects to move forward into the next phase.
      - a. L. St. John and B. Watson gave NHDOT testimonial that there are points earned based on RPC Ranking and that there are several different funding "buckets" meaning some of the projects will not be competing against each other.
      - b. D. Sassan floats the idea of moving all 5 projects forward, which is echoed by R. Cameron who emphasized that all projects are working together for the region.
      - c. J. Perez commented that there is no real way of knowing what NHDOT will do with these projects, and he would suggest that these projects be added to a Bike/Ped Plan or Regional Transportation Plan.
    - ii. Motion to endorse all 5 projects as ranked, based on their relative closeness in score and individual merits were approved
    - iii. m/s/approved  
abstention
    - D. Sassan/N. Guerette  
None.
- b. TYP Feedback
  - i. G. Trefethen presents the feedback from NHDOT regarding TYP Projects. G. Trefethen starts the discussion with a brief history of allocation in the Lakes Region and how in past rounds of TYP projects have been under-funded and that this is the reason our region has two priority projects. Priority #1 Laconia's 2025-2034 TYP project which needed to be funded using \$1,373,252 of our federal allocation for this 2027-2036 round. Priority #2 being the Plymouth Project. G. Trefethen goes on to explain that the Plymouth Project was broken out into two phases due to concerns of exceeding allocation. G. Trefethen that if the TAC were to move forward with the full project scope the project would exceed allocation by \$165,122. If the TAC were to move forward with just phase 1 the project would come \$629,491 under its allocation. And Phase 2 would be a project that could be eligible for a future TAP round of funding.

- ii. G. Trefethen clarified that the vote that needs to occur is to accept Priority #1 as is, and vote for Priority #2 as a full project, or a phased project. G. Trefethen opened up the floor for discussion.
  - 1. R. Cameron questioned the timeline associated with the project. L. St. John commented that this TYP project would be added to the end of the TYP. G. Trefethen confirming that those years as estimated to be PE in 2032, ROW in 2034 and CON in 2036.
  - 2. J. Perez speaks on behalf of Plymouth on their preference and that though it's up to the TAC on how they want to move forward he confirms if it were to be moved forward as a phased approach, they would be willing to move ahead with Phase 1 of the project as it is perceived as a regional multi-modal priority project.
  - 3. L. St. John discusses the process of allocation to our region and state and how its reflect in the TYP. She also mentions that it is common for RPC's to have this discussion to acknowledge a project's regional significance where exceeding allocation is something that is weighed and voted on.
  - 4. D. Sassan offers up a discussion around the risk of moving forward with a full project and exceeding allocation by a small amount verse moving forward with phase 1 and losing out on more than what they are exceeding.
  - 5. The discussion moves along with L. St. John and B. Watson commenting that though the numbers that are being presented are noticeably exact and will be entered into the TYP that way, it is not uncommon for project costs to escalate based on increase of inflation and construction costs.
- iii. D. Sassan moves forward with a motion to accept Priority #1 being Laconia's TYP project remaining allocation along with Priority #2 being Plymouth's full project scope.
- iv. m/s/approved D. Sassan/R. Cameron  
 abstentions None.

## 6. Public Comment

- a. General Business
  - i. R. Cameron Brings up Belmont's TYP on NH140/Main Street and asks what happens with the funds allocated for their TYP project when the potential of the final design comes in at a lower cost.
    - 1. There was some uncertainty, and further clarification would be provided to R. Cameron by L. St. John who will contact the project manager of the project after the meeting.
    - 2. G. Trefethen believes that it was stated at the recent public hearing that the money saved with the new design could possibly be put into other improvements in the area, but nothing was determined.

## 7. Other Business

- a. Open Floor discussion.
  - i. D. Kerr asked the room whether anyone has had any experience with a level spreader for controlling stormwater associated with a development.
    - 1. There were several testimonies given to D. Kerr from D. Sassan, R. Cameron, N. Guerette, S. Fifield revolving around the various methods and scenarios and the outcomes of using a level spreader.

- ii. G. Trefethen gives an overview of Jill Edelman from NHDOT Cultural Resources upcoming presentation at the next TAC Meeting on May 7<sup>th</sup>.
- iii. N. Guerette mentions that Bids are due April 18<sup>th</sup> for Segment A of the Opechee Loop project being funded through an NBRC Grant.
- iv. N. Guerette gives an update to the group regarding information he learned about the Winnepesaukee River Basin Project which relates to maintenance of the system and the condition of the infrastructure which he mentioned is currently unknown. N. Guerette goes on to mention this should come as a concern because DES has no immediate CIP for maintenance and replacements and that if a portion of the system fails it falls to the responsibility of the municipality and due to DES's expectation of an in-kind replacement it could come at an exorbitant amount of money at the community's expense.
- v. B. Pollock brings up three concerns in New Hampton 1) the need for an updated Asset Management study from 2007 due to an increase in development. 2) Questions why 104 speed limit can't be reduced from 55mph to 45 mph from 93 to Meredith. 3) Questions why New Hampton has not received a signed MOU from the state regarding the driveway permit process.
  - 1. L. St. John and S. Fifield will follow up with B. Pollock on MOU concerns.
- vi. D. Sassan recaps CommuteSmart NH May Challenge and UNH T2 Trainings.

## 8. Adjourn

- a. D. Sassan adjourned the meeting at 3:56 PM.

m/s/approved

G. Tuthill/D. Sassan