

needs to be made clear in the travel plan. Mike Izard suggested that the travel plan needs to discuss all trails identified in the Assessment Report and point out what was considered for that trail and what the outcome was.

Gary pointed out that things like crosswalks, police presence, and traffic calming measures can all be done *now*.

It was pointed out that we need creative measures to include more children considering that 70% of children live outside the 2-mile radius.

It was stated that a traffic cop is needed at the Blake Road/Rte 25 intersection in the a.m. and in the p.m.

The enforcement of drop-off procedures and the importance of educating parents regarding proper drop-off protocol was discussed.

Mike Izard thought that the Academy having considered the purchase of adjacent property for the purpose of another access/egress to/from the school should be included in the travel plan.

To clarify the sentence starting “The preliminary recommendations were formed...” Joanne pointed out that “which” should be changed to “and” so it reads “...from these assessments *and* were adopted...”

Mike Izard pointed out that under Evaluation, redistributing the parent surveys is a *requirement* of SRtS.

Getting back to the concept of identifying Who, How, What, Why, When for each of the recommendations under the 5 E’s, it was decided that the various committee members present would each take an “E” and expand upon it in this fashion. Joanne volunteered to have everyone send her their writing, and she would compile it and send the revised travel plan out to everyone prior to the next meeting. The committee thought it reasonable that this work be done and sent to her by Monday October 26th, so that the committee could meet again in November and the travel plan could then be presented to the school board at their December meeting.

Julia asked, in regard to identifying responsible parties, how that was to be accomplished; she did not feel that the committee could commit other people and organizations without their prior consent/ knowledge, that we should be careful not to do this.

Mike Izard had a list of items which were identified in the Assessment Report which were not discussed in the travel plan, as follows:

1. Bike Racks
 2. Trail maintenance
 3. Faded crosswalk on MA property*
 4. Parking lots need re-striping*
 5. Walkway lighting along MA driveway (Academy Drive)
 6. Site distances at intersections
 7. Drop-off at Blake Road
 8. Lack of a crosswalk at Blake Road/ Academy Drive
- *need to point out that re-painting is done every 2 to 3 years.

Mike Lancor agreed to look into the lighting situation along Academy Drive, Les took on the Evaluation piece, Carolyn the Education piece, Joanne: Engineering, Sara: Encouragement, and Gary: Enforcement.

Sara pointed out that at one time, there was discussion of recommending that any sidewalks extend all the way from MCS to the Life Safety Building.

The meeting ended at approximately 5:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Joanne K. Coppinger

Moultonborough SRtS Advisory Group Meeting Minutes
October 20, 2009 3:30 p.m.
Location: Moultonborough Academy SAU 45 conference room

Present: Les Smith, Gary Torressen, Julia Velie, Carolyn Nelson, Sara Fogarty, Mike Izard, Joanne Coppinger, Mike Lancor (arrived at 4:40) Members of the public: Al Hume

Implementation Grant Deadline November 9, 2009: Mike Izard questioned whether anyone from SRtS had been working on an application for an implementation grant for SRtS which applications are due to the state on November 9, 2009. It was determined that no one was working on such a grant. It was therefore decided that because such an application entails a significant amount of work, it was not feasible to pursue such an application at this point in time. Joanne Coppinger questioned whether it was at all feasible to expect that the Travel Plan could be complete by November 9th, which is a prerequisite for applying for such implementation grant funding. Mike Izard stated that he thought it was reasonable that the Travel Plan could be complete by that time.

Purpose of the School Board Meeting: Mike Izard said he thought that the Travel Plan simply needed to be “polished up” prior to the presentation to the school board and that it was feasible to get it sufficiently ready for presentation to the school board in the near future (possibly as early as the upcoming November 10th school board meeting.). He stated that “The idea with the presentation to the school board is to deliver your thoughts about the planning process and recommendations and garner some input from the public as well. We haven’t done a lot of public outreach at this point other than notifying all the meetings on your website and that was conceptually why the meeting with the school board was built into the plan: Put it out there in the public realm and ask the question “What do you think about what we’ve come up with?” and make some modifications as required.”

The Travel Plan: 1st Draft:

The details of the first draft of the Travel Plan were discussed.

Mike Izard pointed out that it is important to answer or address any issues identified in the Assessment Report in the Travel Plan. He said that an implementation schedule that answers the questions Who, How, What, When, and Why was an important part of the plan.

It was noted that the drop-off concept didn’t make the recommendations list, and it should have.

It was noted that sidewalks are non-existent in the village, and was generally agreed that the “sidewalk” outside the Old Country Store is really more of an entrance-way to the store as opposed to a sidewalk, as it is located only directly in front of the store.

Mike Izard suggested that we complete the Recommendations section first, and then complete the Travel Plan details to support the recommendations.

The “Five E’s” were discussed. Mike Izard explained that the purpose of the Evaluation section is dual in nature; it includes what we’ve done currently in regard to assessment *and* is forward-looking as far as what we plan to do in the future.

Joanne had a few edits which she thought should be made and the committee concurred: (1) under Assessment Summary, note the acceptable walking and biking distances (1 mile and 2 miles): “...12.5% of Moultonborough students live within *the 1 mile* walking distance and 32% live within *the 2-mile* biking distance.” (2) Add “the absence of” in reference to sidewalks: “...traffic speed, traffic volume, and *the absence of* sidewalks/pathways...” (3) Change “Addition of” to “Additional” in reference to bike racks: “*Additional* bike racks and consistent maintenance...”

Trails were discussed. The committee discussed the status of trails in regard to recommendations. It was determined that at the last meeting on October 6th the committee decided that no trails were worth promoting (with the exception of Trail B) for reasons of safety (no lighting, no supervision, lack of visibility.) Unlike the other trails in the area, Trail B, which is the trail between the Academy and Laconia Savings Bank, is highly visible and considered safe. This