

# 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 March 4<sup>th</sup>, 2026

Members Present	LRPC Staff
George Tuthill – Alexandria David Kerr – Barnstead Rod Cameron – Belmont Buz Kenney – Bristol Jeff Haines – Center Harbor David Chunn – Franklin Meghan Theriault – Gilford Isaac Morse – Gilmanton Paul Hazelton – Hebron Angela Labreque – Meredith Chuck Wise – Moultonborough Bob Pollock – New Hampton Joseph Perez – Plymouth Ralph Carter – Sanbornton Maureen Westrick – Sandwich John Gotjen – Tamworth Lloyd Wood – Tuftonboro	Glenn Trefethen – Transportation Planner Shanna Saunders – Executive Director
	<b>Non-Voting Members (in person)</b>
	<b>Virtual Attendees</b>
	Cindy Yanski – CAPBM RCC Region 3 Mobility Manager Bill Watson – NH DOT Samantha Fifield – NH DOT District 3 Stephanie Giovannucci – Northfield Town Administrator Mac Bevier- NHDES Ross Wood – NH DOT
	<b>Guests</b>

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

- i. L. Wood (Chair) calls meeting to order at 2:01pm.
- ii. Self- Introductions were conducted in the room and on Zoom
- iii. Quorum was met.

### 2. Approval of Minutes

- i. Approval of September 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2025

m/s/approved  
 Abstentions

R. Carter/G. Tuthill  
 B. Pollock, M. Westrick

### 3. Public Comment

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

### 4. Items of Information

- a. LRPC On-Call Engineer

- i. G. Trefethen goes over last year's On-Call Engineer process and how LRPC was delayed in executing that process, and that is why we are doing it again this year.
- ii. G. Trefethen goes over the role of the On-Call Engineer and explains the process that LRPC TAC goes through when allocating tasks to the On-Call Engineer.
- iii. G. Trefethen goes over this year's process, explaining the timeline that the RFQ was available, the 4 submittals from BETA Group, Dubois & King, HEB, and Weston Sampson. He also goes into the details of who was on the Scoring Committee as well as the outcomes of the scores. He also discussed how he sees the process would likely change the next time we have an RFQ out for On-Call Engineer which would include the LRPC TAC as the scoring committee in order to get a more comprehensive outcome citing everyone's expertise on the committee. He acknowledges that HEB was the highest scored Engineering Firm.
  - 1. R. Cameron asks what HEB's hourly fee is.
    - a. G. Trefethen describes the process, where once the Master Agreement is finalized, and LRPC TAC authorizes the On-Call Engineer being used, LRPC will then meet with the municipality and HEB to create a work scope of work, and that's when costs will be negotiated for each line item in the scope of work and then sent to NHDOT for approval.
  - 2. M. Theriault provides her praise regarding HEB and their qualifications. She continues to highlight that she appreciates that it was an RFQ process and not an RFP Process because many municipalities have to go with the lowest bidder, but an RFQ allows for more flexibility.
    - a. G. Trefethen agreed with the sentiment and that it translates with the work HEB does in our communities but also with other RPCs like North Country Council. And that the scores did reflect their availability and expertise.

b. GACIT/TYP Updates

- i. G. Trefethen acknowledges that it's been some time since the TAC met to discuss the GACIT and TYP process but that a lot has been going on, much of which has been communicated to everyone through email throughout the process.
- ii. G. Trefethen goes over the Solicitation process and ultimately what the GACIT Process looked like. He reviewed what NHDOT proposed in the Draft 2027-2036 TYP, which included no new projects due to the shortfall of roughly \$400 Million, which means the Plymouth Project on N. Main Street that the TAC voted on as a priority last year, did not get put in the TYP. G. Trefethen reminds TAC members how LRPC handled the projects being removed from the TYP and that was to write a joint letter with those communities of Meredith, Plymouth, Moultonborough and Center Harbor who all have projects on NH 25, which was the corridor that faced the biggest cuts during this Draft TYP and GACIT Hearing process. G. Trefethen clarified that the 6 projects staying in the TYP are Federal Highway Funded projects, and that it did not include all the State and Municipal projects, or the mandated Federal program projects like those being funded by CMAQ or TAP. 12.34
- iii. G. Trefethen continues to discuss the GACIT Hearings, bringing up the attendance and the factors behind the results. G. Trefethen highlighted the Plymouth Project at NH 25 and Smith Bridge Road and how that project was put back into Draft 2027-2036 TYP after being proposed to be removed, in large part because of how well attended the Plymouth GACIT hearing was. This goes to show Plymouth's commitment to their projects and how important it is that municipalities do the work

to inform their communities and get their input when putting forth projects in the TYP.

- iv. G. Trefethen made mention that the Governor signed off on the Draft 2027-2036 Draft TYP to be brought forth to legislature to vote on.
- v. G. Trefethen paused to allow members who showed up post meeting adjournment, those members were Meghan Theriault from Gilford, David Chunn from Franklin, Isaac Morse from Gilmanton and Chuck Wise from Moultonborough.
- vi. G. Trefethen continues the GACIT/TYP discussion by going over the 2029-2038 TYP Guidance offered by NHDOT to Regional Planning Commission. G. Trefethen that the first piece of guidance from NHDOT is not to conduct a significant solicitation process to establish new projects, meaning that we would likely not be using our On-Call Engineer to conduct new concept plans and cost estimates for new projects. Second guidance indicates there should be consideration for projects with Construction delayed from the Draft 2027-2036 TYP as regional priority projects to be presented 1<sup>st</sup>, if funding allows. He reviews the third piece of guidance which he mentioned is something that NHDOT is always offering as guidance which is to review all projects in the TYP and ensure they are appropriately prioritized, and if dynamics and needs in a community have changed, they have the opportunity to swap that project out for a similar sized project in terms of cost. The final guidance indicates developing a prioritized wish list of projects using a similar funding level from previous TYP that would end up being used to recommend projects to be added if funding were available.
- vii. G. Trefethen brings up what all of that guidance means for the region and the duties of the TAC. He Explains that upcoming TAC meetings will be focusing on project statuses, prioritization and how to best use our On-Call Engineer for scoping and cost estimates. LRPC will also be working with communities who have projects in the TYP to ensure that we understand if the scopes have changed and if there is a need to update. After those discussions with communities LRPC will propose a prioritized list for TAC to discuss and vote on which factors the NHDOT Guidance, ultimately leaving LRPC and the TAC with deliverables of tasks for the On-Call Engineer, a prioritized list that will be used as a place holder in our Regional Transportation Plan.
- viii. G. Trefethen circles back to the guidance from NHDOT regarding the consideration of projects with Construction delays to be moved forward as project priorities. He mentions this again to discuss that the timing of putting these projects forth as priorities should be when the PE and ROW work has been near complete meaning that the projects are close to NEPA Review, to ensure the project is as close to shovel ready as possible. With that caveat explained, he goes to mention that the Moultonborough projects have Engineers assigned to them and that work should be expected to get started as soon as this upcoming summer. This means that the Moultonborough projects won't necessarily be our number one priority for this upcoming TYP but rather the next one, but that is not set and stone. He continues that the point of getting projects as close to shovel ready as possible meaning through NEPA review will allow communities to be able to apply for funding for projects that may fall outside of the TYP, funding like Safe Streets for All.
  1. C. Wise Brought up that he believed Moultonborough is categorically excluded from NEPA so what would that time frame look like.
    - a. G. Trefethen guessed that the NEPA process would take 2-2.5 years.
    - b. M. Theriault clarifies whether that applies to them if they have categorical exclusions.

- c. S. Saunders mentioned she would be surprised if any project had categorical exclusions at this point.
  - d. B. Watson asks C. Wise to get clarity from the town about their interest in these projects and to prove that to the project manager to help prioritize his efforts. He continues to clarify that about 85-90% of NHDOT projects fall into categorical exclusion through NEPA. Most of those are programmatic exclusions which means that NHDOT gets to do the final classification. And that the NEPA process does take about 1.5-2 years. He goes to mention that if they are starting work this upcoming summer, you may not need to hold off on prioritizing those projects for this upcoming TYP, though you wouldn't necessarily be losing anything by holding it off for a couple years, if the region felt like there was another priority to be pushing to the top.
2. J. Perez asks B. Watson if he gets the sense that NHDOT is asking for new projects to be added with PE and ROW only and if that would also follow the guidelines for using similar funding levels.
    - a. B. Watson mentions that NHDOT's concern is that escalation and inflation costs won't drop enough for construction costs to be lowered beyond the levels they are now (in the TYP), and they fear that level funding is best case scenario. He brings up the first version of the replacement to IIJA is looking to cut funding significantly for all the states. In NH the gas tax creates the revenue for the state's federal programs, and the rest comes from the federal general fund, and that general fund is looking to be entirely cut from the new bill. So, if a community or region wants to put something forward, NHDOT would also expect to hear what would be cut from the region. He goes to mention that this did happen in Gorham and Randolph NH, where Gorham gave up a project so Randolph could keep a project in the TYP.
  3. M. Theriault mentions that she would be curious to see the timeline for projects over the next ten years, and how any of the phases of those projects roll out into the next two years because the TAC then can see what is available for funding. She also thinks that LRPC needs to use HEB to assess the estimates that we have in the TYP, so we don't waste time on finding new projects when we can barely afford what we currently have in the TYP.
    - a. G. Trefethen agrees and mentions that even the last TYP process, even though we put forth the Plymouth project as a priority, that it was not actually the 1<sup>st</sup> priority. Rather the 1<sup>st</sup> priority was the Laconia project that was under funded by ~\$1.3 million from the last TYP. And we need to factor in that, and what projects have a scope that have changed, which likely means that the scope has been increased meaning the cost estimates are not accurate and will inflate how much is needed for the projects on the current TYP which are ultimately going to eat into our assumed allocation of \$6.7 Million. He goes to mention this is why one of the tasks for LRPC is to work the communities that have projects on the TYP to ensure that we understand what their scopes are and if there needs to be adjustments made. He reiterated the need to work with communities because with the Plymouth Smith Bridge Road project that was put back in the



1. B. Kenney brings up the fact that since we are just discussing federal money, does it imply that there an increase in toll, gas tax or registration fees are not moving forward?
  - a. G. Trefethen brings up the bill by Senator Waters which is proposed to increase, Gas tax or toll, he couldn't remember, and referred to B. Watson
  - b. B. Watson clarified that it is SB627 for an increase in tolls for out-of-state ez-pass holders, not NH ez-pass holders, which includes a \$1 increase at all toll plazas, aside from Hampton which is a \$2 increase. He mentioned it is an interesting position for the State to be in as it has historically been that state legislators say that the Executive Council controls the toll rate and the legislators control the toll discounts and that this Senate Bill will challenge those beliefs if passed. Though he mentioned that the Governor has been clear on her stance on an increase in tolls which is that she does not support them.
- c. Transit Updates
  - i. G. Trefethen goes over the first transit update regarding the 5305e Funded Laconia Fixed Route Feasibility Study. G. Trefethen overviewed the RFQ process and the scoring committee who will then score the submittals. The deliverables mentioned were a Draft Service Plan, with cost estimates, public input to refine what the firms have concluded with data, as well as an implementation plan which will be used by the City of Laconia, Belknap-Merrimack CAP and RCC's.
  - ii. G. Trefethen goes over the second transit update which is define by his work through the Grafton-Coos RCC. He highlights the importance of coordination of transit providers as being the key to the success in implementing a Plymouth Fixed Route which was first identified in 2020 in the NHDOT Strategic Statewide Transit Assessment. He overviewed the unique circumstances of Tri-County CAP having a unused passenger bus, and Transport Central with the desire to start a fixed route in Plymouth. G. Trefethen continues by going over in brief the draft maps he has made for this project that will be handed over to Tri-County CAP to utilize when they start their public outreach process.
  - iii. C. Yanski provides updates on the Concord Laconia Connector which started in 2024 and linked Concord to Laconia via route 3. She mentioned that as of January 30<sup>th</sup>, the CLC was shut down due to ridership levels. She mentioned that even though as sad is it is, there were a lot of lessons learned through the CLC and that in the future there is hopes to bring this route back, though with changes like shortening the route, along with corporate sponsorships. This could work by implementing the Laconia Fixed Route. C. Yanski goes through the overview of ridership levels during the CLC's operating time. C. Yanski mentioned that one of the struggles was that once the route was up and running it was difficult to get corporate sponsorship. She also mentioned that a different bus may be needed considering that style of bus did not have comfortable seats, making it difficult to feel comfortable during the nearly 2 hours round trip. C. Yanski acknowledged the municipalities are feeling taxed with the burden of daily operations which is where corporate sponsorships would be the way to help support the route.
  - iv. C. Yanski brings up the Mid-State Transit service is doing great and that this service is available to people 60 years and older, or those younger than 60 that have a disability that prevents them from driving. 2 of those Mid-State Transit buses are located in Laconia and is the busiest area for the service. She also brought up Lakes

Region Mental Health Center who also has a bus that runs in the area, though they are currently in-between drivers and have borrowed staffing from the Belknap-Merrimack CAP in the meantime. C. Yanski echoed the theme of coordination through the RCC's with LRMHC has coordinated with CAP BM who has the technology and software to help with trip bookings and mapping of rides. This all helps with limiting the duplication of trips and ends up being more efficient. C. Yanski opens it up to questions.

1. J. Perez Questions whether if the CLC were to be brought back and thinking about the time being an issue, would they see it becoming a 93-route verse route 3?
  - a. C. Yanski did not indicate that it would be a 93 route because it would not help connect to the communities that really need it like Boscowan and Franklin. Rather utilizing other options like if the Laconia Fixed Route gets put in place that it would likely shorten the round trip by a half hour. She also mentioned that there are discussions that Mr. C's taxi service may expand into Franklin, which would be very helpful. Another alternative route could be NH 106.
2. R. Cameron asked if it would be possible to have local buses that stop at most of the town and then express buses to go to specific towns to help with shortening the route.
  - a. C. Yanski thinks that would be great, though cites funding would be the issue in implementing that. Though she brings up micro-transit services that are between a fixed route and demand response service, which may be close to the type of service that R. Cameron is reefing to.
  - b. R. Cameron follows up the question with the idea that it sounds like there is no state or federal money for transit.
  - c. C. Yanski is able to clarify that there is some funding like 5310 funding that assists the Mid-State Transit and 5311 for the CAT transit service. She also plugged the attendance at RCC which helps disperse those funds to transit services.
- d. Regional Transportation Plan/LRPC Regional Plan
  - i. G. Trefethen Overviews the update to the Lakes Region Master Plan from 2015 which currently has a Transportation Survey open and has been sent out to all LRPC Commissioners and TAC Members. He Reminds them that this survey will be used as part of the Regional Transportation Plan update as well, since the RTP will be used in the Lakes Region Master Plan as the Transportation Section.

## 5. Items of Business

- a. LRPC Bike/Ped Advisory Sub-Committee Formation
  - i. G. Trefethen overviews the intent behind forming an LRPC TAC Bike/Ped Subcommittee which stemmed from his attendance at the Rails to Trails Conservancy, TrailNation Summit in October. It was evident to him that coordination is key to implementing trails that connect communities and with the previous TAP round that had 3 different trail projects proposed a subcommittee seemed appropriate to bring various trail organizations, municipalities and those interested in the process together to discuss their resources, successes and obstacles to work through issues faced when creating regional trail systems. The focus would also be to evaluate economic outcomes, techniques to engage the public with new trail systems in order to fund new trails and implement the LRPC Bike/Ped Plan.

The format would include quarterly meetings that can be virtual to accommodate members' time.

1. M. Westrick asked if there was coordination with cycling clubs.
  - a. G. Trefethen said he would need assistance in getting connected with those clubs, but the intent would be to welcome them. He mentioned that he did attend the Meredith's Pathway Committee who work on trails in Meredith and has also got Bike Walk Alliance of NH interested in the subcommittee as well.
  - b. M. Westrick also brought up Snowmobile trails and asked whether those systems are used in off seasons for walking/biking.
  - c. R. Cameron made mention that some of the challenges with Snowmobile Club trials is that they utilize private property.
  - d. M. Westrick mentioned that Sandwich had the Bear Camp Pond Trail but several town meetings ago they decided to stop paying for the general insurance for which had left the trail abandoned. She mentioned she would get more information on that.
2. L. Wood discussed the difficulties with Snowmobile trails being used by wheeled vehicles that create ruts on the trails, increasing maintenance costs.
3. G. Tuthill mentioned the high variability between different trails as some of the snowmobile trails are on wetlands, which makes it unusable for a even someone to walk in the summer months.
4. M. Bevier mentioned she can connect Glenn with local bike shops and clubs in Holderness, she continued to mention to look into NH Sled which have trail maps online and some are paved. Additionally, the STRAVA app which has a "Metro" program that allows the collaboration with Government organizations to collect data on bike travel which may be an alternative to purchasing bike counts.
5. R. Cameron mentions he is on the Statewide Trails Advisory Committee and represents NHMA and mentioned that there will be information coming out shortly to municipalities that have state parks to find out how trail systems are impacting them. Secondly, he brings up Current Use and how some of them have recreational components, and there may be potential to work with private landowners to make improvements or defining certain areas on their property that could lend itself to pedestrian or bicycle activity.
6. S. Giovanucci brought up the Highland Mountain Bike Park in Northfield and through the Northfield Economic Development they started a recreation group Foothills Foundation who are looking to expand trails in Northfield to connect to the Winnepesaukee River Trail and Highland Mountain Bike Park and have completed a trail system in a Conservation Area called Meadows End. She mentioned it was able to be done through Current Use property, but they can't charge for people to use the property.
7. R. Cameron cites homelessness activity along the trails for the reason for some sort of oversight to make the trails work properly and safely.
8. I. Morse asked to clarify if this idea was to be recreational only, or connecting communities, or a mix.
  - a. G. Trefethen mentions that the idea will be that it would be a mix because a community may have certain needs they are looking to fulfill in their own communities.
9. J. Gotjen brings up that it's important to note the positive users of the trails, like in Tamworth, are being used by horseback riders, dog sleds, runners,

bike riders who all benefit from the work that is done on trails whether its snowmobile organizations or conservation commissions.

10. P. Hazelton will consider being a part of the committee if it includes a focus on making better road conditions for cyclists.
  11. G. Trefethen rounded out the discussion with next steps which included him putting together some sort of sign up/interest list of sorts.
  12. B. Kenney brought up that Bristol in order to obtain funding from Army Corps. Was able to cite a study from PSU regarding snowmobiles to show economic benefits of a trail. He also mentioned that Bristol has abandoned getting grants and has invested energy into fundraising and outreach to fund it privately.
  13. J. Perez plugged the UNH Cooperative Extension's Outdoor Economy Academy that will be starting in May, which will help with the questions and links of Economic Development of outdoor activities.
- ii. G. Trefethen made a motion to support the formation of an LRPC TAC Bike/ Ped Subcommittee
    1. m/s/approved R. Cameron/R. Carter

## 6. Public Comment

- a. J. Gotjen Asked if there were any updates on the NH 16 Corridor Study
  - i. B. Watson said NHDOT has hired a consultant who is working on data collection along NH 16 and 153, as well as finalizing a scope to extend the work to more north into North Conway and hopes to have more information to provide next month.
- b. L. Wood wanted to make a couple of positive statements regarding Tuftonboro's Budget committee benefiting from the work done through the Road Surface Management Program LRPC conducted 4 years back. His second positive statement was regarding the Road Safety Audit at NH 171/Ledge Hill Road/Durgin Road.
  - i. G. Trefethen gives an overview of RSAs to TAC Members and reminds them that the applications are rolling.
- c. R. Carter Asked when Posted Weight Limits will be occurring in the state since Sanbornton is getting ready to post their roads.
  - i. S. Fifield mentioned that her district is in the process of determining which roads will be posted and cautioned that they will not all be done at once, though they will be starting that work next week and that on the NHDOT website it has information on what roads will be posted.

## 7. Other Business

- a. Open Floor discussion.
  - i. M. Bevier brought up the fact that NHDES has closed the Granite State Clean Fleets funding, but they still have \$1 Million available in the NH Clean Diesel Program which helps replace engines, including boat engines. She also mentioned the RFI closed for a potential \$3 Million Level 2 EV Charger rebate program which would fall under the VW Mitigation Trust funding.

## 8. Adjourn

- a. L. Wood adjourned the meeting at 3:58 PM.

m/s/approved

M. Westrick/J. Perez