

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 September 3rd, 2025

Members Present	LRPC Staff
George Tuthill – Alexandria David Kerr – Barnstead Rod Cameron – Belmont Buz Kenney – Bristol Jeff Haines – Center Harbor Meghan Theriault – Gilford Paul Hazelton – Hebron Angela LaBrecque – Meredith Joseph Perez – Plymouth Ralph Carter - Sanbornton John Gotjen – Tamworth Lloyd Wood – Tuftonboro	Glenn Trefethen – Transportation Planner Shanna Saunders – Executive Director
	Non-Voting Members
	Bruce Woodruff – Moultonborough Interim Planner
	Virtual Attendees
	Cindy Yanski – CAPBM RCC Region 3 Mobility Manager Bill Watson – NH DOT Samantha Fifield – NH DOT District 3
	Guests
	Mac Bevier – NHDES Paul Susca - BWANH

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

- i. L. Wood (Chair) calls meeting to order at 2:02pm.
- ii. Self- Introductions were conducted in the room and on Zoom
- iii. Quorum was met.

2. Approval of Minutes

- i. Approval of May 7th

m/s/approved
 Abstentions

G. Tuthill/P. Hazelton
 R. Carter, M. Theriault

3. Public Comment

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

4. Items of Information

- a. Bike Walk Alliance New Hampshire
 - i. Paul Susca President on the board for Bike-Walk Alliance New Hampshire, presents a call for legislation for safer streets, and roads through local control of speed limits. Presentation overview; Deaths and injuries to people on foot and on bikes are at

- epidemic levels, Lower speeds save lives, how to reduce speed of traffic through design, context and speed limits, statutory limits to municipal authority in NH, proposal: “safer streets” legislation allowing municipalities to control speed limits.
- ii. R. Cameron points out that in 2010 crashes were low and questioned what happened then for that to happen. The group speculated that it could be size of vehicles, enforcement, smartphones all playing a role in the increase since 2010.
 - iii. M. Theriault asks for clarification on the definition of a traffic study being referenced in NH RSA 265:63, and whether it is defined as an engineering study, or local PD study that would qualify for a petition from a municipality to lower the speed limit. P. Susca mentions that in the statute, traffic study is not defined. And that as part of the proposed legislation, BWANH had debated the removal of traffic studies, but decided that change would lend itself to being rejected faster. M. Theriault suggest that maybe the wording could instead say, “requires a town to do engineering or traffic study (including a formal study done by local Police Department)”, it would allow for further clarification that a PD study would count, without taking out the traffic study requirement entirely.
 - iv. A. Labrecque followed up on M. Theriault question, does the traffic study have to recommend the speed limit to be lowered to 25 or 20 mph, in order for the town to set the speed. P. Susca says the language in the statutes is that the “local authority may on the basis on the investigation to change the speed limit.” B. Woodruff included that generally it means that there is a traffic/speed account for a specific period of time then calculating the 85-percentile speed which suggests what the speed ought to be. P. Susca mentioned that is generally seen as old and out dated approach meant for rural highways, not heavily applicable to urban areas
 - v. M. Theriault asks Paul whether they have reached out to NHMA legal services to get an opinion based on current language on what a traffic study would entail. Because it was to be a PD Study that towns would likely make more of an effort to get it lowered to 25mph. She also wonders if that is something the RPC could assist in getting clarified.
 - vi. G. Trefethen mentions that a discussion he previously had with Bill Lambert on lowering speed limits in Holderness in reference to NH RSA 265:63, and that there is additional language within the RSA. G. Trefethen reads directly from Bill Lambert’s response regarding Holderness; *As for reducing the speed limit to 25-mph. There is a process, also cited within RSA 265:62, for the DOT to consider a local petition for reducing the speed limit in “compact parts of cities and towns”. Historically, we interpreted that to mean the handful of urban compacts but, when pressed, revisited the interpretation to understand it as a description of density. It would be difficult to define any part of US 3/NH 25 in Holderness as “compact”.... It the town is interested, the process is for them to submit the engineering and traffic investigation supporting the request. The “petition” need be nothing more than a letter from the local governing body. Again, coordinate with the Bureau of Traffic.*
 - vii. P. Susca noted that even that response is a little muddy and that the proposed legislation is going after the statute where it refers to a business district or urban residence district. Business district is defined in the statute.
 - viii. M. Theriault reiterates there may be a need for more definition in the proposed changes that may allow towns to better understand what they are allowed to do.
 - ix. P. Susca also suggests that NHMA or RPC’s approach NHDOT to get clarification on what type of traffic investigation would satisfy the requirement in the statute.
 - x. J. Perez that in the presentation it looked like some states don’t require traffic studies and some do and asks whether Paul can elaborate on that and whether it’s a-typical

for the state to require a traffic study. P. Susca, had no immediate clarification on that.

- xi. M. Theriault pulled up the language in RSA 265:63, and noticed that it says “local authorities should not be required to hire outside consultants to determine the proper prime facie, if the local community has the sufficient staff to conduct the required engineering or traffic study investigation.” She also looked up the meaning of prime facie and it goes on to say “typically includes surveys addressing 85 percentile speed, road characteristics, traffic volume and patterns and intersection and pedestrian activity.” This leads to M. Theriault requesting a simplified fact sheet for safety concerns and speed and what the towns do and don’t have control over.

b. Presentation- NH DES – Clean Diesel & Clean Fleet Funding w/ Mac Bevier NHDES Grants Program Coordinator

- i. M. Bevier gives an overview of the Granite State Clean Fleet program. The program has \$7.5 million of VW Trust Funds Available on a rolling monthly basis until March 30th 2026. There is a \$1 Million per-entity funding cap for the entire program, and all projects must be completed by December 31st, 2026.
 - 1. Examples of Projects
 - a. Diesel to Diesel
 - b. Diesel to Alternative Fuel (Propane, Compressed Natural Gas, Hybrid)
 - c. Diesel to Electric or Hydrogen.
 - i. EV Charging Infrastructure is included
 - d. Marine Shower Power Installation.
 - ii. M. Bevier gives an overview of the NH Clean Diesel Funding. The program has \$315,000 remaining from the Diesel Emissions Reduction Act. Applications are also accepted on a rolling monthly basis, due on the 20th of each month.
 - iii. J. Perez asked for clarification on the reimbursement program and if the town needs to have the delivery of the vehicle or just the order for the unit.
 - 1. M. Bevier clarifies that the units being replaced need to be operational, and that any project chosen will still need to be approved by the Governor Council. Meaning you can order it, but you cant expend the funding.

c. NH DOT Freight Plan Update

- i. G. Trefethen gives a high-level overview of the Freight Plan Update process and what he saw in the update. G. Trefethen highlights the Critical Rural Freight Corridors (CRFC) in the plan and how that relates to the Lakes Region in terms of infrastructure, and future planning for new projects and how it ties into current Lakes Region Ten-Year Plan projects.
 - 1. D. Kerr, wanted clarification that the Meredith TYP Projects along the CRFC were being eliminated from the plan. G. Trefethen clarified the project scope of the project that is being proposed to be removed from the plan, and that it included 4 intersections, though 1 of the intersections (Laker Lane) will stay in the plan through CMAQ Funding.
 - 2. B. Watson, clarifies the context of the Freight Plan and its investment plan. There is not enough revenue to address all the Critical Freight Corridors in the state, and as part of the Freight Plan update it is a requirement from the Feds to identify where they are going to spend the allotment of Freight Funding. He explains that much of that money is going towards projects on I93 through Franconia Notch.

3. R. Carter comments that seeing a full context of all the freight corridors in the state. G. Trefethen mentioned that, it is pretty well stated in the actual Freight Plan, and that he will send out a copy of the plan to everyone.
- d. GACIT & Ten-Year Plan Updates w/Bill Watson
- i. G. Trefethen first overviews the most recent TAP funding outcomes, with Center Harbor being awarded.
 - ii. B. Watson goes over the NHDOT GACIT Presentation for the draft 2027-2036 TYP that was given to the Executive Councilors. Highlighting the key points of the draft TYP which included Pavement Condition, Red Listed Bridges, Escalation and inflation, reduction of state funds for preservation and maintenance, and revenue enhancement options.
 1. R. Carter asked if NHDOT is receiving any money from recent registration increases. B. Watson clarified that they will only receive very little. They receive 3 cents of gas tax toward betterment funding; there is no state registration fee or gas tax that is used to match federal dollars.
 2. J. Perez brings forward some strategies; Including towns in discussions on project scopes and possibly reducing them to make way for more funding, is there a way to identify any projects that are no longer local priorities, is there a way to retain any projects being proposed to be removed, so that way if funding becomes available communities don't have to start from scratch and those projects can be put back into the plan. B. Watson clarifies that part of the TYP process is to identify existing projects on the TYP and whether they are still priorities, but that generally they never hear anyone stepping up to have their project removed from the TYP. B. Watson discusses that NHDOT has debated whether they keep projects on the shelf or on retainer that are being taken out, but there is the same issue of whether those projects will still be a priority. He encourages them to put those projects into their Regional Transportation Plans.
 3. M. Theriault asks whether NHDOT had considered removing the PE portion of projects and putting that on the Town's to fund, but keeping ROW and CON phases in. That way it shows the town's commitment, and it will have merit and helps the constraints of the TYP with just Construction being supported by the TYP. B. Watson mentions it has been discussed before but has been unpopular but highlights that other states like Massachusetts follow that model. In NH he mentions its difficult just to get the 20% match from municipalities for local projects and that municipalities a lot of times believe that since it's a state road it should be on the onus of the state.
 4. M. Theriault advocates that there should be consideration for projects that municipalities can absorb through saving money every year through a CRF account, you can get a project completed faster and cheaper by not waiting to go through the TYP process. B. Watson shares success stories from Keene, Laconia and Salem who do their own PE and ROW on their own dime which results in lower construction and inflation costs.
 5. M. Theriault and B. Watson highlight that NH has by far the lowest toll rate in the country. B. Watson discusses the proposed \$1 toll hike at Hooksett, Hampton and Bedford tolls would likely be able to fund Manchester Exit 6/7, Bow-Concord and allow for All Electronic Tolling at all toll booths, soundwalls and that NH would still be the 5th or 6th lowest Toll rate in the country.

6. R. Carter brings up Electric Vehicles and about bringing their dues up to match the dues of gas vehicles.

5. Items of Business

a. Officer Elections

- i. G. Trefethen overviews the current positions, and that the Vice Chair position is open.
- ii. L. Wood is nominated to stay Chair.
 1. m/s/approved P. Hazelton/J. Haines
- iii. L. Wood opens nomination for Vice Chair
 1. G. Trefethen nominates J. Perez for Vice Chair.
 2. M/s/approved P. Hazelton/ J. Gotjen

6. Public Comment

- a. None.

7. Other Business

a. Open Floor discussion.

- i. C. Yanski discussed the Statewide Transportation Needs Assessment looking to get more participation.
- ii. G. Trefethen discusses the next meeting in October, and the calendar for the rest of the year, which includes the cancellation of the November Meeting due to a Northern New England Chapter of American Planners Association Conference.

8. Adjourn

- a. L. Wood adjourned the meeting at 4:03 PM.

m/s/ approved

R. Carter/J. Haines