

**ADOPTED**

City of Keene  
New Hampshire

**BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAN PATH ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
**MEETING MINUTES**

**Wednesday, September 14, 2016**

**8:00 AM**

**2nd floor Conference Room**

**Members Present:**

Linda Rubin, Chair  
Ed Guyot  
Thom Little  
Charles (Chuck) Redfern (arrived at 9:23 AM)  
Emily Coey

**Staff Present:**

William Schoefmann, Planning

**Members Not Present:**

Christopher Brehme, Vice Chair  
Don Hayes

Chair Rubin called the meeting to order at 8:22 AM.

**1) Roll Call**

Roll call was conducted.

**2) Accept Minutes of August 10, 2016**

Mr. Little submitted the following changes to the August minutes, in writing:

- Page 2, 3) Project Updates, first paragraph, add title “Cheshire Rail Trail – Park Avenue Loop”
- Page 2, paragraph 5, add title “South Bridge”

BPPAC Project Updates page, August and September –

- South Bridge start – Spring 2016
- South Bridge finish – October 28, 2016

Mr. Little made a motion to approve the minutes of August 10, 2016 as amended, which was seconded by Mr. Guyot. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

**3) Project Updates**

**Cheshire Rail Trail Park Ave. Loop**

Mr. Schoefmann reported that the Cheshire Rail Trail Park Ave. Loop is underway. He continued that they have done scope and fee negotiations. The contract is completed. The planning phase is underway. They have to reschedule the first public meeting due to

how the schedule is falling and some delays with how the selection and contract went. There is not a date yet but it may be November. He will let them know.

Mr. Little stated that in the past, all projects were run by BPPAC before there was a public meeting, so BPPAC members could bring up questions before the public meeting. Discussion ensued. Mr. Schoefmann stated that he doubts that the BPPAC would receive a draft/mock presentation ahead of time, but depending on the timing, he could arrange for some materials to be available, if they are ready. Mr. Little stated that he is not asking for a mock presentation; he would just like the BPPAC to have the materials ahead of time so they can talk about it at a BPPAC meeting so BPPAC members do not walk into the public meeting cold.

### **South Bridge**

Mr. Little stated that he asked the New Hampshire Department of Transportation (NHDOT) if there was anything they wanted to say publicly and they did not respond. He continued that both pillars are complete. The concrete on both abutments is complete. He watched them put in the drain on the north abutment and that seems to be in place. He asked if there was a projected date for when the steel structure would be on site or installed and there was no response.

### **Signage**

Mr. Schoefmann reported that he is scheduling a date with Bill Byrnes to look at installing the smaller signs about safe bike passage. He continued that Federal Highway said the larger ones were not compliant. They have some locations in mind for the smaller ones. Those will hopefully be up before snow flies.

### **Lighting**

Mr. Schoefmann reported that an employee will look into some of the parameters they set forth, on a number of the paved trails, to get estimates of what a trail lighting plan might look like. Hopefully he will have more information about that at the next meeting. They will assess some geographic parameters, like are there power sources, is it paved, what are the uses around the area, and so on and so forth.

### **4) BPPAC Master Plan – Priorities Discussion and Exercise**

Mr. Little stated that **BE6 – Cheshire Rail Trail Victoria St. Extension** currently says “design and construct” and it should be changed to “design,” which is consistent with the lengthy discussion they had at the last meeting. Mr. Schoefmann replied that that change has been made and he uploaded a new copy to Google drive this morning.

Mr. Little stated that regarding **BE15 – South Bridge/Ashuelot Rail Trail Asphalt Gap**, last month’s meeting minutes correctly state that he ranked it “low.” He continued that he had not been following the conversation well and would now like to change his vote to “high.”

Chair Rubin stated that Mr. Little also has new projects he wants to be added, that the BPPAC would discuss at this meeting. Mr. Schoefmann replied that he listed them on the agenda for folks to consider.

Mr. Little stated that the first proposed addition is to mark on the concrete that bicycles are permitted, when trail portions are on concrete. He continued that many bicyclists have been trained to not ride bicycles on concrete when downtown. He sees bicyclists ride in the street right next to the trail. The trail used to be marked on the sidewalk but that stopped. He recommends having it always marked on the sidewalk so bicyclists know they can be there.

Mr. Schoefmann stated that it might fall under the purview of the wayfinding initiative project(s), such as BE13 and BE14. He continued that as discussed, he said he would make sure this was indicated in the wayfinding plan, so it also includes pavement markings. He asked if that is sufficient. Chair Rubin replied that it seems like part of the wayfinding plan to her. Mr. Schoefmann stated that he has no problem trying to get this implemented ahead of time, talking with the Public Works Department to see what can be done. Mr. Guyot stated that he thinks having pavement markings is important for cyclists; it is good to know where you are allowed to ride and where you are not. In some places it would be safer to get bicyclists off the road. He suggests having language added to BE13, such as “including surface markings” or “concrete markings” so it is explicit that this is important to the group. There are concrete markings telling you downtown where you are *not* allowed to go, but there are not necessarily markings showing where cyclists *should* go. He does not think this needs to be a separate project. Mr. Schoefmann replied that he added it to BE14 but it would be good to have it in both and he could add it to BE13. Mr. Little replied that that works for him.

Mr. Little stated that the first draft of **BE5 – Cheshire Rail Trail NH Rt. 101 Overpass/Stone Arch Bridge** indicated two bridges – one over Rt. 101 and one over Factory Rd. He continued that the bridge over Factory Rd. was removed after discussion. It currently only refers to a bridge over Rt. 101. He recommends a study to determine whether there should be a bridge over Factory Rd. or a pedestrian light with improved ramps. He continued that Parks & Recreation & Facilities Director Andy Bohannon said that there is a lot of support from the snowmobile community to do something about that crossing. Based on the volume his assumption is it would end up being ramps and a light. He was there during rush hour for 15 minutes and the cars go through there about 30 miles per hour and it is a little blind. Doing something there would help. A bridge might be too expensive. The study could figure it out.

Chair Rubin asked if the new project would be the development of a plan. Mr. Little replied yes. Chair Rubin replied that she thinks it is good to add. Mr. Guyot stated that he thinks these two crossings are the next big safety challenge for Keene. Discussion continued. Mr. Schoefmann stated that since it is a trail system project he can add it, rearranging the project list a bit. Mr. Little suggested making it BE6, and then re-numbering the others. Mr. Schoefmann replied that he will find a place for it in the list of

trail system projects. He continued that other members not here today can see the update and then the BPPAC can vote on it at the next meeting.

Mr. Little stated the final proposed addition is to start planning for Cheshire Rail Trail Phase IV, which would be extending the trail from Phase III to the city limit. He continued that now is the time to start planning. Others agreed. Mr. Guyot asked clarifying questions about the city limits. Brief discussion ensued.

Mr. Little stated that much of what they do uses Federal funding and they never know what Federal funding might show up and when. It helps to have projects be shovel-ready. Planning ahead of time as much as possible helps the City be prepared.

Mr. Little asked Mr. Schoefmann when the charts might be updated. Mr. Schoefmann replied that he will try and do it today.

#### **BE18 – Emerald St. Bike Route/In Street**

Mr. Schoefmann read the project description out loud. He continued that it would also include extension of sidewalks, which he forgot to include in the description. Chair Rubin asked the BPPAC members how they would rank this project. Mr. Little stated “high” and everyone else agreed.

#### **BE19 – Complete Streets Implementation**

Mr. Schoefmann stated that this is to conduct current condition assessment of all of the streets matched up to their designations and try and measure where they are at, to give some input into Public Works Department’s street schedule.

Mr. Guyot stated “high.” Mr. Little asked if this should be merged with BE12. Mr. Schoefmann replied that he thinks it would be good to keep them separate and explained why. Others agreed. Discussion ensued. Mr. Little and Mr. Guyot ranked BE19 “high.” Chair Rubin asked if there is something in the Complete Streets design guidelines about connectivity to the trail system. Mr. Schoefmann replied probably a blurb on it but nothing very specific. There is a transit overlay but it is more about the busses than the trails. Chair Rubin and Ms. Coey agreed with “high.”

#### **BE20 – Sidewalk Connectivity and Access**

Mr. Schoefmann stated that this sounds like part of the baseline data collection, and it is, but only part. He continued that it is good to have this as a separate project, for staff to look at how connected sidewalks are downtown. It may play into Complete Streets as well. He asked what the committee thinks about having this as a separate project. Chair Rubin replied that it sounds like part of Complete Streets implementation. Should they have something like Complete Streets Project I, Complete Streets Project II, and so on and so forth? Discussion ensued about whether to have this separate or combined. Mr. Little suggested “Complete Streets – Sidewalk Connectivity/Access.” Others agreed. Ms. Coey asked if crosswalks are included. Mr. Schoefmann agreed. He stated that he will update this, and put a heading at the top of that section, since most of it is Complete Streets oriented.

Ms. Coey asked if there is a priority for locations to start with. Mr. Schoefmann replied that there is a Downtown Redesign project and that is probably where Complete Streets implementation would start. Chair Rubin stated that she likes the idea of having Complete Streets as a heading with the projects falling under that heading. She continued that it looks like there would not be too much change; most of those projects are related to Complete Streets in that section. Mr. Schoefmann stated that Main Street seems like the starting place. Mr. Little stated that he recommends including it in the name of each project, so the association is always there. Chair Rubin asked if something like “Complete Streets – Main Street” would be the name of the project. Mr. Schoefmann replied that it is already a CIP project; it is kind of under another category. Chair Rubin replied that it is 100% about Complete Streets implementation. Mr. Schoefmann replied yes, but Complete Streets implementation probably has some bearing on all projects. Chair Rubin replied that she thinks it is a good idea to have a Complete Streets heading that projects go under. They could tuck Main Street under there; that is a big one that they have prioritized. Mr. Schoefmann agreed.

Everyone voted BE20 “high.”

#### **BE21- In Street Facilities**

Mr. Schoefmann stated that looking at the next two, they could keep them as individual projects, but they are definitely part of the overall Complete Streets implementation. Mr. Little asked what in-street bicycle facilities are. Mr. Schoefmann replied sharrows, bike lanes, or other forms of pavement markings. Mr. Little asked for the wording to be changed to clarify that, like “bicycle-oriented street markings” or something like that.

Chair Rubin replied that she thinks they could get rid of this, because it is part of the Main Street Redesign as a Complete Streets project. Ms. Coey agreed – this is at the core of Complete Streets. Mr. Guyot agreed that it seems redundant. Chair Rubin stated that they are deleting BE21.

#### **BE22 – Comparisons for Modeling**

Mr. Schoefmann stated that this is looking at what other places have done. They could remove this. It was a subsection of Complete Streets. Chair Rubin asked if this was specifically relating to downtown. Mr. Schoefmann replied no. He continued that they can get rid of this one. Chair Rubin agreed that they can delete it.

#### **BE23 – Marlboro Street/Rezoning Project**

Mr. Schoefmann described the project. He stated that there is a rezoning project on the east side of Marlboro St. and this is to ensure that multi-modal transportation and Complete Streets is included with that. Staff is moving forward with this project. It is in the works but he figured it would be good for this committee to list it as a priority. Marlboro St. is being redeveloped and it would be a shame for bicycle and pedestrian facilities to go by the wayside. Chair Rubin asked why it is not just about making Marlboro St. a Complete Street. Mr. Guyot asked, if the City has adopted Complete Streets, should not every street just automatically be treated as such? Mr. Schoefmann

and Chair Rubin spoke of the importance of the BPPAC continuing to remind people about Complete Streets, to keep Complete Streets in people's minds, advocate for it, and so on and so forth.

Mr. Guyot suggested keeping it here. Chair Rubin suggested that this project description use language similar to the Main St. project, instead of saying "Stay current to the Marlboro St. Rezoning project." She continued that part of the BPPAC's purview is to make sure there really is a plan for making the street complete and to advocate for it. Mr. Little agreed and suggested they take the language from the Main St. project description and use it here, too, changing it to "Marlboro St." Discussion continued. Chair Rubin spoke of how the BPPAC's job is to make sure Complete Streets plan are really happening. It will be the overall plan for making Marlboro St. a complete street. She asked how they rank that. Ms. Coey stated "high." Others agreed.

#### **BE24 – Ensure Bike/Pedestrian Considerations in Design**

Mr. Schoefmann suggested removing this, as it relates to Marlboro St. He continued that connectivity to the rail trail is what he had in mind and staff is already doing that. The committee agreed with removing it.

#### **BE25 – Beaver Brook Greenway**

Mr. Schoefmann stated that this is sort of associated with the Marlboro St. Rezoning Project and the East side Redevelopment project. He explained that the public and staff found spaces they envision as green spaces, and explained where the Beaver Brook Greenway would go. He stated that it is a high concept project at the moment. It would be like a riverwalk. Chair Rubin asked if it would be more about open space than street connectivity. Mr. Schoefmann stated that from Marlboro St. north through Kingsbury to Carpenter St./Railroad St., there is space to do stuff there. There is not a lot of north/south other than Grove St. that pedestrians and cyclists can use. Now they have to come almost all the way into the city core to do it. Having this greenway further out would help with connectivity. Chair Rubin asked why staff ranks it "high." Mr. Schoefmann replied that they have two initiatives working in tandem, between Marlboro Rezoning and the East Side Redevelopment. There is a lot going on already and the momentum is there.

Mr. Little stated that he has trouble seeing how BE25 and BE26 relate to bicyclists and pedestrians. Mr. Guyot stated that if there is a path there at the Beaver Brook Greenway for cyclists and pedestrians to use it seems reasonable to have it on the list, but the Carpenter Field improvement seems like more of a reach. Maybe it could be tagged as part of connectivity of city infrastructure. Mr. Schoefmann stated that the greenway can be imagined like the Jonathan Daniels Trail along Beaver Brook, and the Carpenter Field improvement is a CIP project. It includes creating a pedestrian track around the outside of it that would play into any Beaver Brook project. It would be a destination and a facility that might be along the greenway. They can look at the overall picture – there is a destination project along a potential bike and pedestrian corridor, in terms of what the greenway can be. Mr. Guyot asked if that would be collectively under the Beaver Brook Greenway project. Mr. Schoefmann replied maybe, but Carpenter Street would probably

happen before the greenway. It would be good to ensure that bicycle/pedestrian facilities were included in that, and it would help Beaver Brook Greenway come to fruition. Mr. Little asked if BE26 is part of another project already. Perhaps Beaver Brook Greenway and Carpenter Field could be added as comments to the other one.

Chair Rubin asked when the Carpenter Field project is in the CIP for. Mr. Schoefmann replied 2020 or 2018. Chair Rubin replied that that would help her determine the importance of it. Ms. Coey stated that this area of town lacks trails. Mr. Schoefmann replied yes, it is automobile-centric. Chair Rubin stated that Complete Streets policy does not cover an improvement to a park. She continued that it does feel like if there was not an ensured plan to connect the park to the trail system and make it safe for all users to access it, then it would get lost. Mr. Schoefmann noted that he did not list BE25 on the map. He described the location of it and how the connections could happen. It would give north-south connectivity to neighborhoods and facilities like schools, and access to downtown, potentially. Ms. Coey stated that there could potentially be students from the school needing a safe route, and she is in favor of that. Mr. Schoefmann replied yes, there are children who ride bicycles to Wheelock School.

Chair Rubin asked if there is a Beaver Brook Greenway project. Mr. Schoefmann replied that there is a conceptualization that that would be great to have. Chair Rubin stated that it still feels very amorphous. The description of this does not really, for her, put it into a project for this committee, although she sees how it is related. They can either change the description, or leave it the way it is and vote. Mr. Schoefmann asked what she needs for more specifics. He continued that it would be a directive for staff to scope the project through design and construction of the greenway. That is the intent. If they have this as a priority, when there are projects related to east side development, they could say, "There is this greenway project – is there a grant for it, or does it fall into a grant the City already has?", and so on and so forth.

Mr. Redfern arrived at 9:23 AM.

Mr. Guyot stated that he agrees and thinks that he thinks the Carpenter Field one should be connected to the greenway project. Maybe the Beaver Brook Greenway project could say "allow connectivity to city infrastructure." Ms. Coey replied yes, like how Ashuelot River Park has connectivity to trails. Mr. Schoefmann replied that it would be open to bikes and pedestrians. Mr. Guyot replied that even if it was pedestrian only, it would fall under the BPPAC's purview. Chair Rubin stated that it sounds like the Carpenter Field project might happen before the Greenway project, although it is hard to know. Mr. Guyot stated that if the Carpenter Field project only has a path around the field, he is not sure it rises to the level of a pathway that would be within this committee's purview. Mr. Schoefmann replied that when it comes time for design and construction, the BPPAC could advocate for the Carpenter Field project and suggest connecting it to the trail system instead of just making a track around the field. Mr. Guyot replied that that makes sense. Mr. Schoefmann added that these two projects revolve around each other. Chair Rubin replied that there are probably other opportunities with the Carpenter Field one, too, with Complete Streets.

Mr. Guyot stated that he thinks the Beaver Brook Greenway project should stay on the list, and Carpenter Field as it relates to any greenway project should also stay on the list with Mr. Schoefmann's explanation of why. He would not take them off. It is important to have both and he sees the strategy. Chair Rubin replied that she agrees and would like to have Mr. Schoefmann's additional little explanation for Carpenter Field added to the project's description.

Mr. Guyot voted "high" for the Beaver Brook Greenway and "medium" for Carpenter Field. Mr. Little stated that he believes this whole discussion is moot but will vote along with the majority. Ms. Coey voted "medium." Chair Rubin replied that she votes "medium" for the greenway and "high" for Carpenter Field because it is coming soon. Mr. Little replied that how soon something is happening is not part of the criteria they use for rating a project. Mr. Guyot stated that he votes "medium" for the greenway. Mr. Little said "medium" for both. Chair Rubin and Ms. Coey agreed.

**5) Old Business**

**- Additions to Master Plan Project List**

- a) Mark trail sections which are on concrete to indicate that they are part of the trail**
- b) Plan a trail crossing of Factory Road and the Rt. 101 Overpass**
- c) Cheshire Rail Trail Phase IV, to go from Phase III to the Keene city limit**

**- Public Outreach and Workshops**

**6) New Business**

**7) Adjournment**

Hearing no further business, Chair Rubin adjourned the meeting at 9:31 AM.

Respectfully submitted by,  
Britta Reida, Minute Taker