

MUNICIPAL SERVICES, FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE COMMITTEE AGENDA Council Chambers B September 25, 2019 6:00 PM

Janis O. Manwaring Randy L. Filiault Stephen L. Hooper Gary P. Lamoureux Robert B. Sutherland

- 1. Councilors Bosley and Richards Comprehensive Review of Neighborhood Speed Limits
- 2. Periodic Report Boards and Commissions Partner City Committee
- Installation of Traffic Control Device Arlington Avenue and Dort Street in Response to Iselin Communication Requesting a 4-Way Stop at Arlington Avenue and Dort Street - Public Works Department
- 4. Engine Brake Signage in Response to Griffin Communication to Prohibit the Use of Engine Brakes - Public Works Department
- 5. Dedication of Path System Cheshire Rail Trail Section (Thom Little)
- 6. Speed Limit Change Skyline Drive Neighborhood Ordinance O-2019-16

MORE TIME ITEMS:

A. Ashuelot Court Homeowners – Request to Partner in the Installation of Water and Sewer Lines on Ashuelot Court, a Designated Private Road

Non Public Session Adjournment



September 11, 2019

TO: Mayor and Keene City Council

FROM: Councilor Bosley and Councilor Richards

THROUGH: Patricia A. Little, City Clerk

ITEM: 1.

SUBJECT: Councilors Bosley and Richards - Comprehensive Review of Neighborhood Speed Limits

COUNCIL ACTION:

In City Council September 19, 2019. Referred to the Municipal Services, Facilities and Infrastructure Committee.

ATTACHMENTS:

Description Communication_Bosley_Richards

BACKGROUND:

Councilors Bosley and Richards are suggesting a review of all speed limits in the City's residential neighborhoods, particularly in high and medium density zones.

KATE MICHELLE BOSLEY

111 Gunn Rd • Keene, NH 03431 • Phone (603) 493-4586 Email: <u>katebosley603@gmail.com</u> * www.hendersonbosley.com

September 11, 2019

Dear Mayor and City Council,

I am writing this letter to address concerns that have been brought to me about the speeds at which cars are traveling in our neighborhoods. We have heard testimony at the MSFI committee recently about the significant dangers that occur when speed limit signs are ignored.

I would suggest a review of all of our neighborhood's speeds in the City of Keene paying close attention to high and medium density zones. These zones contain children in multi-family apartment dwellings who may not have access to yards to play and have to use city streets to access parks or community centers.

It is important to me that we look at this as a holistic approach to protect all of the children of our community and not just neighborhoods on a complaint driven basis.

Thank you for your time and consideration in this matter.

Kate Bosley

Keene City Council At-Large

DaveRichards

Keene City Council Ward 3

In City Council September 19, 2019. Referred to the Municipal Services, Facilities, and Infrastructure Committee.

atrai Cat Citv Clerk



September 19, 2019

TO: Municipal Services, Facilities and Infrastructure Committee

FROM: Kürt D. Blomquist, P.E., Public Works Director/Emergency Management Director

THROUGH: Elizabeth A. Dragon, City Manager

ITEM: 3.

SUBJECT: Installation of Traffic Control Device - Arlington Avenue and Dort Street in Response to Iselin Communication Requesting a 4-Way Stop at Arlington Avenue and Dort Street - Public Works Department

RECOMMENDATION:

That the Committee determine that the Arlington Avenue and Dort Street intersection does not meet the MUTCD criteria for a four way stop condition and that the Committee recommend the request from the Iselins for a 4-way stop sign be denied.

ATTACHMENTS:

Description

MUTCD Requirements City Engineer Review Communication_Iselin

BACKGROUND:

At the Municipal, Services, Facilities and Infrastructure Committee meeting of August 28, 2019, it was requested that the request made to install a four (4) way stop condition at the intersection of Dort Street and Arlington Avenue be brought back to the committee for review.

New Hampshire State Statutes govern the installation of traffic control devices and signals on highways and streets within the State. Revised Statutes Annotated (RSA) Chapter 47, Powers of City Councils, section 47:17 - Bylaws and Ordinances, subsection VIII states the following:

VIII. Traffic Devices and Signals.

(a) To make special regulations as to the use of vehicles upon particular highways, except as to speed, and to exclude such vehicles altogether from certain ways; to regulate the use of class IV highways within the compact limits and class V highways by establishing stop intersections, by erecting stop signs, yield right of way signs, traffic signals and all other traffic control devices on those highways over which the city council has jurisdiction. The erection, removal and maintenance of all such devices shall conform to applicable state statutes and the latest edition of the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices."

State law requires that the installation of traffic control devices comply with the latest edition of the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices.

The Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices or MUTCD is a document published by the Federal Highway Administration. This manual establishes the criteria and standards for use of various traffic control devices along with standards for signage within the public way. The purpose is to provide for safe use by all users of streets and highways by using uniform and consistent regulations throughout the country.

In reviewing the Dort Street and Arlington Avenue intersection to determine if a four (4) way stop was required, the City Engineer performed a review in accordance with the criteria outline in the MUTCD. Attached is a copy of the MUTCD section on the use of Stop signs and the City Engineer's analysis recommending that the intersection does not meet the criteria/warrants for a four (4) way stop condition.

Sign or Plaque	Sign Designation	Section	Conventional Road					
			Single Lane	Multi- Lane	Expressway	Freeway	Minimum	Oversized
SUNDAY (and times) (2 lines) (plaque)	R10-20aP	2B.53	24 x 18	24 x 18	—	-	_	
Crosswalk, Stop on Red	R10-23	2B.53	24 x 30	24 x 30	-	0 D 4 1		
Push Button To Turn On Warning Lights	R10-25	2B.52	9 x 12	9 x 12	_	_	—	
Left Turn Yield on Flashing Red Arrow After Stop	R10-27	2B.53	30 x 36	30 x 36		-		-
XX Vehicles Per Green	R10-28	2B.56	24 x 30	24 x 30			—	_
XX Vehicles Per Green Each Lane	R10-29	2B.56	36 x 24	36 x 24	-	-	-	
Right Turn on Red Must Yield to U-Turn	R10-30	2B.54	30 x 36	30 x 36	-	_	_	_
At Signal (plaque)	R10-31P	2B.53	24 x 9	24 x 9	—	-	-	(
Push Button for 2 Seconds for Extra Crossing Time	R10-32P	2B.52	9 x 12	9 x 12		_	_	_
Keep Off Median	R11-1	2B.57	24 x 30	24 x 30	-	-		-
Road Closed	R11-2	2B.58	48 x 30	48 x 30	_	_	_	—
Road Closed - Local Traffic Only	R11-3a,3b,4	2B.58	60 x 30	60 x 30		-11 -1 12	-	—
Weight Limit	R12-1,2	2B.59	24 x 30	24 x 30	36 x 48			36 x 48
Weight Limit	R12-3	2B.59	24 x 36	24 x 36	-	-	—	-
Weight Limit	R12-4	2B.59	36 x 24	36 x 24		—	_	
Weight Limit	R12-5	2B.59	24 x 36	24 x 36	36 x 48	48 x 60	-	-
Weigh Station	R13-1	2B.60	72 x 54	72 x 54	96 x 72	120 x 90	_	_
Truck Route	R14-1	2B.61	24 x 18	24 x 18			-	-
Hazardous Material	R14-2,3	2B.62	24 x 24	24 x 24	30 x 30	36 x 36	_	42 x 42
National Network	R14-4,5	2B.63	30 x 30	30 x 30	36 x 36	36 x 36	-	42 x 42
Fender Bender Move Vehicles	R16-4	2B.65	36 x 24	36 x 24	48 x 36	60 x 48	—	48 x 36
Lights On When Using Wipers or Raining	R16-5,6	2B.64	24 x 30	24 x 30	36 x 48	48 x 60	1. - - 1. 1	36 x 48
Turn On Headlights Next XX Miles	R16-7	2B.64	48 x 15	48 x 15	72 x 24	96 x 30	_	72 x 24
Turn On, Check Headlights	R16-8,9	2B.64	30 x 15	30 x 15	48 x 24	60 x 30		48 x 24
Begin, End Daytime Headlight Section	R16-10,11	2B.64	48 x 15	48 x 15	72 x 24	96 x 30	_	72 x 24

* See Table 9B-1 for minimum size required for signs on bicycle facilities

Notes: 1. Larger signs may be used when appropriate

Dimensions in inches are shown as width x height

- Where side roads intersect a multi-lane street or highway that has a speed limit of 45 mph or higher, 07 the minimum size of the STOP signs facing the side road approaches, even if the side road only has one approach lane, shall be 36 x 36 inches.
- Where side roads intersect a multi-lane street or highway that has a speed limit of 40 MPH or lower, the 08 minimum size of the STOP signs facing the side road approaches shall be as shown in the Single Lane or Multi-lane columns of Table 2B-1 based on the number of approach lanes on the side street approach. Guidance:
- The minimum sizes for regulatory signs facing traffic on exit and entrance ramps should be as shown in the 09 column of Table 2B-1 that corresponds to the mainline roadway classification (Expressway or Freeway). If a minimum size is not provided in the Freeway column, the minimum size in the Expressway column should be used. If a minimum size is not provided in the Freeway or Expressway Column, the size in the Oversized column should be used.

Section 2B.04 Right-of-Way at Intersections

Support:

State or local laws written in accordance with the "Uniform Vehicle Code" (see Section 1A.11) establish 01 the right-of-way rule at intersections having no regulatory traffic control signs such that the driver of a vehicle approaching an intersection must yield the right-of-way to any vehicle or pedestrian already in the intersection. Page 50

When two vehicles approach an intersection from different streets or highways at approximately the same time, the right-of-way rule requires the driver of the vehicle on the left to yield the right-of-way to the vehicle on the right. The right-of-way can be modified at through streets or highways by placing YIELD (R1-2) signs (see Sections 2B.08 and 2B.09) or STOP (R1-1) signs (see Sections 2B.05 through 2B.07) on one or more approaches.

Guidance:

- Engineering judgment should be used to establish intersection control. The following factors should be considered:
 - A. Vehicular, bicycle, and pedestrian traffic volumes on all approaches;
 - B. Number and angle of approaches;
 - C. Approach speeds;
 - D. Sight distance available on each approach; and
 - E. Reported crash experience.
- 13 YIELD or STOP signs should be used at an intersection if one or more of the following conditions exist:
 - A. An intersection of a less important road with a main road where application of the normal right-of-way rule would not be expected to provide reasonable compliance with the law;
 - B. A street entering a designated through highway or street; and/or
 - C. An unsignalized intersection in a signalized area.
- In addition, the use of YIELD or STOP signs should be considered at the intersection of two minor streets or local roads where the intersection has more than three approaches and where one or more of the following conditions exist:
 - A. The combined vehicular, bicycle, and pedestrian volume entering the intersection from all approaches averages more than 2,000 units per day;
 - B. The ability to see conflicting traffic on an approach is not sufficient to allow a road user to stop or yield in compliance with the normal right-of-way rule if such stopping or yielding is necessary; and/or
 - C. Crash records indicate that five or more crashes that involve the failure to yield the right-of-way at the intersection under the normal right-of-way rule have been reported within a 3-year period, or that three or more such crashes have been reported within a 2-year period.

95 YIELD or STOP signs should not be used for speed control.

Support:

- ⁰⁶ Section 2B.07 contains provisions regarding the application of multi-way STOP control at an intersection. *Guidance:*
- Once the decision has been made to control an intersection, the decision regarding the appropriate roadway to control should be based on engineering judgment. In most cases, the roadway carrying the lowest volume of traffic should be controlled.
- A YIELD or STOP sign should not be installed on the higher volume roadway unless justified by an engineering study.

Support:

- ⁰⁹ The following are considerations that might influence the decision regarding the appropriate roadway upon which to install a YIELD or STOP sign where two roadways with relatively equal volumes and/or characteristics intersect:
 - A. Controlling the direction that conflicts the most with established pedestrian crossing activity or school walking routes;
 - B. Controlling the direction that has obscured vision, dips, or bumps that already require drivers to use lower operating speeds; and
 - C. Controlling the direction that has the best sight distance from a controlled position to observe conflicting traffic.

Standard:

- ¹⁰ Because the potential for conflicting commands could create driver confusion, YIELD or STOP signs shall not be used in conjunction with any traffic control signal operation, except in the following cases:
 - A. If the signal indication for an approach is a flashing red at all times;
 - B. If a minor street or driveway is located within or adjacent to the area controlled by the traffic control signal, but does not require separate traffic signal control because an extremely low potential for conflict exists; or
 - C. If a channelized turn lane is separated from the adjacent travel lanes by an island and the channelized turn lane is not controlled by a traffic control signal.

Section 2B.06 STOP Sign Applications

Guidance:

- At intersections where a full stop is not necessary at all times, consideration should first be given to using less restrictive measures such as YIELD signs (see Sections 2B.08 and 2B.09).
- ⁰² The use of STOP signs on the minor-street approaches should be considered if engineering judgment indicates that a stop is always required because of one or more of the following conditions:
 - A. The vehicular traffic volumes on the through street or highway exceed 6,000 vehicles per day;
 - B. A restricted view exists that requires road users to stop in order to adequately observe conflicting traffic on the through street or highway; and/or
 - C. Crash records indicate that three or more crashes that are susceptible to correction by the installation of a STOP sign have been reported within a 12-month period, or that five or more such crashes have been reported within a 2-year period. Such crashes include right-angle collisions involving road users on the minor-street approach failing to yield the right-of-way to traffic on the through street or highway.

Support:

⁰³ The use of STOP signs at grade crossings is described in Sections 8B.04 and 8B.05.

Section 2B.07 Multi-Way Stop Applications

Support:

- Multi-way stop control can be useful as a safety measure at intersections if certain traffic conditions exist. Safety concerns associated with multi-way stops include pedestrians, bicyclists, and all road users expecting other road users to stop. Multi-way stop control is used where the volume of traffic on the intersecting roads is approximately equal.
- ⁰² The restrictions on the use of STOP signs described in Section 2B.04 also apply to multi-way stop applications. *Guidance:*
- ⁰³ The decision to install multi-way stop control should be based on an engineering study.
- ⁰⁴ The following criteria should be considered in the engineering study for a multi-way STOP sign installation:
 - A. Where traffic control signals are justified, the multi-way stop is an interim measure that can be installed quickly to control traffic while arrangements are being made for the installation of the traffic control signal.
 - B. Five or more reported crashes in a 12-month period that are susceptible to correction by a multi-way stop installation. Such crashes include right-turn and left-turn collisions as well as right-angle collisions.
 - C. Minimum volumes:
 - 1. The vehicular volume entering the intersection from the major street approaches (total of both approaches) averages at least 300 vehicles per hour for any 8 hours of an average day; and
 - 2. The combined vehicular, pedestrian, and bicycle volume entering the intersection from the minor street approaches (total of both approaches) averages at least 200 units per hour for the same 8 hours, with an average delay to minor-street vehicular traffic of at least 30 seconds per vehicle during the highest hour; but
 - 3. If the 85th-percentile approach speed of the major-street traffic exceeds 40 mph, the minimum vehicular volume warrants are 70 percent of the values provided in Items 1 and 2.
 - D. Where no single criterion is satisfied, but where Criteria B, C.I, and C.2 are all satisfied to 80 percent of the minimum values. Criterion C.3 is excluded from this condition.

Option:

- ⁰⁵ Other criteria that may be considered in an engineering study include:
 - A. The need to control left-turn conflicts;
 - B. The need to control vehicle/pedestrian conflicts near locations that generate high pedestrian volumes;
 - C. Locations where a road user, after stopping, cannot see conflicting traffic and is not able to negotiate the intersection unless conflicting cross traffic is also required to stop; and
 - D. An intersection of two residential neighborhood collector (through) streets of similar design and operating characteristics where multi-way stop control would improve traffic operational characteristics of the intersection.

<u>City of Keene</u> New Hampshire

DATE:	August 9, 2019
TO:	Kürt Blomquist, Public Works Director
FROM:	Donald R. Lussier, P.E., City Engineer
SUBJECT:	Request for 4-way Stop at Arlington Ave & Dort St.

Recommendation:

That the request for a 4-way Stop at the intersection of Arlington Avenue and Dort Street be denied.

Background:

The City received a letter, dated April 24, 2019, from a resident on Arlington Avenue requesting that the intersection of Arlington Avenue and Dort Street be changed to a 4-way Stop control. The Engineering Division performed an engineering study to determine if this intersection satisfies the guidelines for the application of a multi-way stop control in accordance with Section 2B.07 of the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices for Streets and Highways, 2009 edition (MUTCD).

As part of our engineering study, Engineering Division staff collected traffic volume and speed date at this intersection between May 6TH and May 13TH, 2019. During this time, we recorded 6552 vehicles on Arlington Avenue in the west-bound direction (average daily volume of 936 vehicles per day). A total of 521 vehicles were recorded during the 7 day deployment in the east-bound direction. The large disparity between west and east-bound volumes caused us to question the validity of the east-bound dataset. Therefore, a second round of data collection was conducted between June 5TH and June 12TH. During this second week of measurement, we counted a total of 2647 vehicles and 788 vehicles in the west and east-bound directions, respectively. These numbers confirmed the observations of the first week, and indicate that there is a neighborhood pattern of entering via Arlington Ave, but exiting via either Pinehurst or Royal avenues. The remainder of this analysis was performed using the combined data from both collection events.

The MUTCD provides the following criteria for the consideration of a multi-way stop control:

- A. Where traffic control signals are justified, the multi-way stop is an interim measure that can be installed quickly to control traffic while arrangements are being made for the installation of the traffic control signal.
- B. Five or more reported crashes in a 12-month period that are susceptible to correction by a multi-way stop installation. Such crashes include right-turn and left-turn collisions as well as right-angle collisions.
- C. Minimum volumes:

- 1. The vehicular volume entering the intersection from the major street approaches (total of both approaches) averages at least 300 vehicles per hour for any 8 hours of an average day; and
- 2. The combined vehicular, pedestrian, and bicycle volume entering the intersection from the minor street approaches (total of both approaches) averages at least 200 units per hour for the same 8 hours, with an average delay to minor-street vehicular traffic of at least 30 seconds per vehicle during the highest hour; but
- 3. If the 85th-percentile approach speed of the major-street traffic exceeds 40 mph, the minimum vehicular volume warrants are 70 percent of the values provided in Items 1 and 2.
- D. Where no single criterion is satisfied, but where Criteria B, C.1, and C.2 are all satisfied to 80 percent of the minimum values. Criterion C.3 is excluded from this condition.

Criteria	Analysis	Warrant Satisfied
A. Interim measure for Signalization	This intersection is not being considered for a signal.	No
B. 5 or more crashes in 12 months	Zero reported crashes at this intersection between 1/1/13 and 12/31/18	No
C. 1.Major street volume of 300 vehicles/hr. for any 8-hour period	Max. 8-hour volume was 738 vehicles (92 veh./hr.).	No
2.Minor street combined volume of 200 users/hr. for same 8-hour period	Dort St. volumes were not measured but are assumed to be lower than Arlington St.	No
 D. 85% speed of Major st.>40: volume criteria reduced to 70% of stated. 	85% speed was 24.0 mph in the eastbound direction and 19.8 mph in the westbound direction.	No
E. Criteria B, C1 and $C2 \ge 80\%$ of stated values	Criteria $B = 0\%$; C1 = 31%; C2 = 60%	No

The following table summarizes the collected data in comparison to the MUTCD criteria:

As noted above, none of the warrants for a 4-way stop are satisfied at this intersection. The MUTCD also provides optional criteria that may be considered as part of the Engineering study:

- A. The need to control left-turn conflicts;
- B. The need to control vehicle/pedestrian conflicts near locations that generate high pedestrian volumes;
- C. Locations where a road user, after stopping, cannot see conflicting traffic and is not able to negotiate the intersection unless conflicting cross traffic is also required to stop; and
- D. An intersection of two residential neighborhood collector (through) streets of similar design and operating characteristics where multi-way stop control would improve traffic operational characteristics of the intersection.

None of these optional criteria apply at this intersection.

Tobias & Brenna Iselin 46 Arlington Avenue Keene, NH 03431

April 24, 2019

Keene City Council c/o Mayor Kendall W. Lane 3 Washington St. Keene, NH 03431 (603) 357-9805

Dear Honorable Mayor and City Council,

I am writing to share my strong support for the installation of a stop sign at the intersection of Arlington Avenue and Dort Street in Keene. There is already a stop sign on Dort Street at the intersection of Arlington Avenue (see enclosed photo), therefore the approval of this request would turn this into a 4-way stop.

We have lived on Arlington Avenue for 9 years and have witnessed many close calls as cars drive quickly around the corner without stopping or even pausing. Cars traveling on Arlington Avenue do not always appear to be aware of the intersection with Dort Street, and installing a stop sign would bring much needed attention for motorists to slow down, stop, and make sure that the way is clear before proceeding.

While the need to avoid car accidents is important, the lack of a stop sign is putting pedestrians in danger. We live in a residential neighborhood, and without a sidewalk, it is quite common for adults and children to be walking, cycling, or riding skateboards/scooters on the edge of the road. Our children (5 years old and 3 year old twins) have nearly been hit multiple times because cars do not stop before turning from Arlington Avenue onto Dort Street. We have also witnessed other pedestrians having close calls with fast moving vehicles.

I implore the Keene City Council to act on this matter and approve this request before an accident happens. Without action, it is our belief that the likelihood of someone getting hurt or even killed is quite high. Please do not wait for there to be an accident. Please be proactive and approve this request and keep our neighborhood and children safe.

If cost is an issue, we would be more than happy to donate the funds to the City of Keene to pay for this expense.

Sincerely, Fina pelin Brenna kili

Tobias & Brenna Iselin (603) 903-0957









RECEIVED CITY OF KEENE

APR 2 6 2019

OFFICE OF CITY CLERK

OFFICE OF CITY CLERK

CITY OF KEENE

RECEIVED

H

APR 2 6 2019



September 19, 2019

TO: Municipal Services, Facilities and Infrastructure Committee

FROM: Kürt D. Blomquist, P.E., Public Works Director/Emergency Management Director

THROUGH: Elizabeth A. Dragon, City Manager

ITEM: 4.

SUBJECT: Engine Brake Signage in Response to Griffin Communication to Prohibit the Use of Engine Brakes - Public Works Department

RECOMMENDATION:

That the Committee recommend that the request from James Griffin to prohibit the use of engine brakes be denied, and that staff be requested to install signage that would encourage trucks not to use engine/exhaust brakes within the City at locations of major entry points from the State highway system where truck traffic is most likely occurring.

ATTACHMENTS:

Description

Locations Communication Griffin

BACKGROUND:

At the Municipal, Services, Facilities and Infrastructure Committee meeting of August 28, 2019, it was requested that staff bring back potential locations for informational signs that would request truck operators to minimize the use engine/exhaust brake systems within the City.

In reviewing the potential major entry points, staff has identified six (6) possible locations. The locations that were chosen are major entry points from the State highway system where truck traffic is most likely to be occurring. The locations include:

- West Street east of the Rte. 12 northbound off ramp,
- Winchester Street north of the Rte. 101 roundabout,
- Washington Street at Concord Road
- Maple Avenue east of the Rte. 12 northbound off ramp,
- Main Street north of the Rte. 101 intersection, and
- Optical Avenue north of the Rte. 101 intersection.

There is no Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices standard for the proposed sign. This subject may fit into the General Information Sign signs. The sign will be 24" by 24" in size with white lettering with green background. Possible language.

"Trucks please do not use engine/exhaust brakes within the City"



West Street near Rt10/12 north off bound ramp



Winchester Street north of Rt 101 roundabout



Washington Street at Concord Road



Maple Avenue at Rout 12 northbound off ramp



Main Street north of Rt 101/12 intersection



Optical Avenue north of Rt 101 intersection

RECEIVED CITY OF KEENE

JUN 1 9 2019

OFFICE OF

195 Key Road, #18 Keene, NH 03431 June 17, 2019

Mayor Kendall Lane

Keene City Council

3 Washington Street

Keene, NH 03431

Dear Mayor and City Councilors,

All year round, the residents of Keene within or near the bypass system, and downtown, are subjected to the constant loud racket created by semi-truck drivers using their engine brakes, which are often louder than a racing motorcycle, to slow their trucks, rather than their conventonal brakes. This becomes far worse in the spring and summer, when people have their windows open. You can literally follow a truck's progress around Keene by the popping and backfiring of its exhaust, with the engine brake on.

I am requesting a city ordinance be passed, prohibiting the use of engine brakes on or within the bypass system. Engine brakes are meant to slow the descent of a truck down steep hills, such as Chesterfield Hill, NOT to allow a driver to avoid using his or her conventional brakes. I have many years experience in the transportation industry, so I am not speaking from lack of knowledge.Many small towns all over the country have banned the use of engine brakes, including, recently, Winchester. There is absolutely no reason for a truck driver to use his or her engine brake just to slow down when approaching a red light.

Most of the truck drivers who use the bypass system do not use their engine brakse. However, the minority that do are mostly trash and wood chip haulers, who travel around Keene several times a day, creating an almost constant racket. Some of them also use their engine brakes in the middle of the night, when people are trying to sleep. This means such an ordinance would not affect most truck drivers, but would greatly approve the quality of life in the city of Keene.

I thank you for your attention to this matter, and look forward to seeing it on a Council agenda. If you have any questions, please call me at 338-0068 or 358-0869. Also, if necessary, I woul dbe willing to record the sound of a truck using its engine brake on thr bypass.

Jug. J. Griffin



August 23, 2019

TO: Mayor and Keene City Council

FROM: Bicycle/ Pedestrian Path Advisory Committee

THROUGH: Will Schoefmann, GIS Technician

ITEM: 5.

SUBJECT: Dedication of Path System Cheshire Rail Trail Section (Thom Little)

COUNCIL ACTION:

In City Council September 19, 2019. Referred to the Municipal Services, Facilities and Infrastructure Committee.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the City Council consider dedicating the Cheshire Rail Trail section from Emerald Street to Island Street as "Little Way".

ATTACHMENTS: Description

City Code_Naming of Public Facilities

BACKGROUND:

At its regular August meeting the Bicycle Pedestrian Advisory Committee discussed the dedication of the previously mentioned section of trail to the recently deceased Thom Little. The following is an except from that meeting including the motion:

"Mr. Bryenton made the motion to recommend to city council that the trail as previously described be dedicate as "Little Way" and establish signage similar to "Apple Way." Mr. Brehme seconded the motion and passed unanimously."

Thom Little served as a member and alternate of the BPPAC on and off for over two decades. He worked as a member of Pathways for Keene's (PFK) board to help fund raise with that organization for the many projects that PFK has contributed toward for the City's trail construction efforts over the years. Notably his tireless efforts towards the "Four on the Fourth" road race, PFK's largest fundraiser and dedication to the City's Paths and Rail Trails were a passion which he committed himself to for the greater good of the City of Keene.

Sec. 82-96. - Process.

In naming a public facility after an individual, the name of the individual and designated facility must be submitted by a citizen, local organization or city department to the municipal services, facilities and infrastructure committee of the city council. Any favorable decision by the municipal services, facilities and infrastructure committee will be sent to the city council for approval. Names approved by the city council will be memorialized by a resolution, which shall be presented to the individual or family members.

(Code 1970, § 2901.1)

Sec. 82-97. - Criteria.

- (a) In naming a public facility after an individual, qualifying facilities must be under the ownership of and funded through the city.
- (b) The criteria for naming a facility after an individual will require that at least one of the following requirements is fulfilled:
 - (1) A well-known community leader, either elected, appointed or volunteer.
 - (2) A person who has positively influenced a large populace of the city through a significant contribution of money, time, material or land.
 - (3) An individual who has had a major involvement in the acquisition or development of the facility.
 - (4) An individual whose civic leadership or volunteerism clearly has contributed to the betterment of the city.
 - (5) An individual who is deceased and whose personal attributes symbolized the principles and standards of a community organization.

(Code 1970, § 2901.1)



September 9, 2019

TO: Mayor and Keene City Council

FROM: Steven Russo, Police Chief

THROUGH: Elizabeth A. Dragon, City Manager

ITEM: 6.

SUBJECT: Speed Limit Change - Skyline Drive Neighborhood

COUNCIL ACTION:

In City Council September 19, 2019. Referred to the Municipal Services, Facilities and Infrastructure Committee.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the Keene City Council send O-2019-16 to the Municipal Services, Facilities and Infrastructure Committee for consideration and recommendation.

ATTACHMENTS: Description Ordinance O-2019-16

BACKGROUND:

On August 28, 2019 the MFSI committee heard a request from residents to reduce the speed limit from 30MPH to 25MPH on Skyline Drive and Morgan Lane. The Committee recommended to the full Council that this be done and to also include Stonehouse Lane and Summit Ridge Drive. On September 5, 2019 the full Council voted 12-2 to implement this. This Ordinance change is in response to the Council's direction.



CITY OF KEENE

In the Year of Our Lord Two Thousand and Nineteen
AN ORDINANCE

Be it ordained by the City Council of the City of Keene, as follows:

That the City Code of the City of Keene, New Hampshire, as amended is hereby further amended by deleting the struck out text and adding the bolded Italic text to the following provisions of Article IV, "Specific Street Regulations", of Division 8, "Speed Limits" of Chapter 94, entitled "TRAFFIC, PARKING AND PUBLIC WAYS" as follows;

Sec. 94-372. - Twenty-five miles per hour.

It shall be unlawful for any person to operate a motor vehicle on the following public ways in the city at a speed greater than 25 miles per hour:

American Avenue.

Apollo Avenue.

Autumn Hill Road.

Butternut Drive.

Clark Circle.

Colonial Drive.

Court Street from Central Square to Union Street.

Dale Drive.

Garrison Avenue.

Gemini Drive.

Kennedy Drive.

Laura Lane.

Liberty Lane.

Main Street from Route 101 to Central Square.

Marlboro Street from Grove Street to Main Street.

Meetinghouse Road.

Morgan Lane.

North Lincoln Street from George Street to Beaver Street.

Pako Avenue.

Railroad Street from Main to Church Street.

Roxbury Street from Central Square to Harrison Street.

Sesame Street.

Skyline Drive.

Stonehouse Lane.

Summit Ridge Drive.

Timberlane Drive.

Timberlane Drive Extension.

Ward Circle.

Washington Street from Central Square to Beaver Street.

West Street from Central Square to School Street.

Winchester Street from Ralston Street to Main Street.

Mayor Kendall W. Lane

In City Council September 19, 2019. Referred to the Municipal Services, Facilities and Infrastructure Committee.

ancie Costa City Clerk