

**City of Keene**  
**New Hampshire**

**MUNICIPAL SERVICES, FACILITIES & INFRASTRUCTURE COMMITTEE**  
**MEETING MINUTES**

**Wednesday, October 23, 2024**

**6:00 PM**

**Council Chamber,  
City Hall**

**Members Present:**

Mitchell H. Greenwald, Chair  
Randy L. Filiault, Vice Chair  
Catherine I. Workman  
Laura E. Tobin  
Jacob R. Favolise

**Staff Present:**

Elizabeth A. Dragon, City Manager  
Amanda Palmeira, Assistant City Attorney  
Richard Wood, Fire Marshall  
Andy Bohannon, Deputy City Manager  
Jason Martin, Fire Chief  
Don Lussier, Public Works Director  
Bryan Ruoff, City Engineer  
Joel Chidester, Police Lieutenant

**Members Not Present:**

*All Present*

Chair Greenwald called the meeting to order at 6:00 PM and explained the procedures of the meeting.

**1) Presentation: Code and Fire Inspections – Fire Marshall Rick Wood**

Chair Greenwald asked to hear from Fire Marshall Rick Wood.

Richard Wood, Fire Marshall and Building Official, stated that he has been with the City for about six months. He continued that the work has been busy and very rewarding. He is here with Fire Chief Jason Martin, having asked him to come, as one of the features of his position was the idea of trying to create more of a unified front.

Chief Martin stated that he wanted to express his appreciation and support of Mr. Wood's work, and the collaboration and engagement he has been doing. He continued that Mr. Wood keeps him well informed of issues that might be coming up, and good things that are happening. He thanks Mr. Wood and Lt. Manke for their work with Fire Prevention Week.

Mr. Wood stated that one of his primary reasons for joining the City was the idea of trying to evaluate where the City is at with its permitting, inspection, and enforcement systems. The goal was to create a continuously improving customer experience, through engagement, transparency, efficiency, collaboration, and communication, leading to a City approach instead of a departmental approach. Tonight he will give an update on the team's progress.

Mr. Wood continued that first is the intention of customer-centric culture. Step one is the idea that (City officials) are facilitators, not regulators, which is a difficult transition for some folks. He is proud of the team's work, regarding training, mentorship, and recognition. This week, Plans Examiner Mike Hagan is at the International Code Council's annual business meeting and Code Action Hearings, where he provides input on the next series of codes. Last night, Mr. Hagan was presented with his Master Code Professional credential, which only 1,000 people have achieved in the 25 years it has been available worldwide. Mr. Hagan does a great job with the City's team.

He continued that all staff attend monthly trainings, typically with the Building Officials Association. He commends Ryan Lawliss, Housing Inspector, who is finishing his Master's degree in Public Health and recently was accepted to take the exam for a national credential as a registered Environmental Health Specialist and registered Sanitarian. The team supports him in that effort. In November, Mr. Lawliss and Lt. Manke will attend Complaints, Warrants, and Citations, a cutting-edge training program at the NH Fire Academy. Lt. Manke and "TJ" have applied for the Plan Review for Fire and Life Safety training at the National Fire Academy, which they will attend in January if they are accepted. He himself was one of the subject matter experts who wrote the last rewrite of the program, which is about 50% Building Code and 50% Fire Code. It is a great opportunity for each discipline to see the aspects from the other side.

Mr. Wood stated that regarding community engagement, they took an opportunity with the Ward Optimization Week program initiative to do some outreach. He continued that they held a meeting in each ward, which he considers a success despite limited advertisement. Four out of five wards had at least one person participate in each meeting, about an hour and 20 minutes. They had open discussions about various items and ways they (City staff and residents) can work together as partners. The team plans to do that about every six months. They also gave presentations to the Kiwanis Club, Rotary Club, and Masiello Realty in the past month or so, regarding Code changes and housing initiatives such as the Cottage Court, the new State law that changes some flexibility for redevelopment of up to four units.

He continued that the team is also focused on the idea of a proactive development code approach through engagement. Someone with a concept can reach out to the team, who can provide early on-site visits and engage in conceptual conversations about what the challenges might be, so that people do not spin their wheels in one direction and potentially miss something that could be critical. The intention is to circumvent conflicts down the road by having the conversations early and more of a partnership approach.

Mr. Wood continued that the team recently became a preferred provider for the International Code Council's training program, so they have the ability, through some of the outreach and training they anticipate doing, to issue continuing education credits for professionals, contractors, and even residents. They anticipate offering training in Code changes, how to get a building permit, and other topics.

Mr. Wood stated that the team has simplified the permitting and inspection. He continued that they are online now, about two months in, for the gas and oil permitting. It is going well, often turning permits around in less than 24 hours. There is now a greater participation rate from the trade and more engagement. City staff typically do same-day inspections, working hard to not be a burden to the industry and to remove barriers. Along that same line, the team looked at how to adjust its processes. For example, a roofing crew typically shows up at 7:00 AM to do a roof and has it complete by sundown. The challenge is how to manage that from a compliance and inspection process. The team has developed a compatible process, meeting the trade where they are at instead of holding them up by making them meet with the City where the City wants them to be. The team has also eliminated duplication between some departmental functions. For example, the Fire Department no longer permits for smoke detectors; that is part of the regular building permit. It reduces one more step for developers. They also eliminated Fire Department review and inspection of single-family homes. In the Community Development Department, the codes are unified in that approach; there is no reason to have multiple inspectors going out to look. The team has great people who are credentialed and experienced. Often, the person asking for the inspection gets a simultaneous inspection from the Building Official and Fire Official instead of multiple ones. This has been well received.

Mr. Wood continued that proactive service delivery is the next pillar. (Examples are) voluntary review and comment on design and development concepts, and voluntary project design reviews. When people come in with a preliminary schematic design, the team looks at it with them and provides feedback, before they get too far into the process. It reduces costs for developers and prevents the need for them to re-do elements. Regarding regular and frequent presence on projects, the team does not just wait for inspection requests for larger projects; they regularly make site visits to give the contractors opportunities to connect.

Mr. Wood stated that the team is also working on enhancing the review and management of enforcements. They have had challenges for Code Enforcement and have done community outreach on that. They hold a weekly case meeting. All the inspectors, including the Fire Department, meet with him every Tuesday morning to review the complex cases and strategize together. Along that same line, they have improved the transparency and communication with the public. He would love to hear the public's feedback on this. There is an online system for complaints. You can search by address and see the status (of a complaint). To increase transparency, the team now writes the activity in a way that is for the consumer, instead of writing the activity as if it were notes for staff. Staff changed the way they view what they put into the system in those fields, to make sure it has the information the end user needs. They audit the open cases monthly to make sure they are doing what they need to do and nothing falls between the cracks.

Mr. Wood continued that he previously reported on the International Accreditation Service (IAS)'s Building Department Recognition (BDR) Program. They are still in that long process. It is about benchmarking where they are at in relation to a national body that does accreditation.

He continued that lastly, he wanted to tell the MSFI Committee what to expect in the next quarter. They can expect some legislative updates; Chapter 18 has been out there for a long time, which the team will button up. That will be a Housing and Property Standards chapter; they are separating out Building Standards. They will come to the Committee with changes to Chapter 34 on Fire Alarms, and present Chapter 42 on the Fire Prevention Code, Chapter 44 as the new Building Code chapter. Those should be coming to the Committee in the next six weeks. The intent is to unify and simplify, so they do not have, for example, things that compete/conflict with State Code. They continue to work on the IAS.

Chair Greenwald thanked Mr. Wood for the great presentation. He continued that he can say from personal experience that the City's answer seems to be closer to "yes" than to "no" when someone comes in to the Community Development office. It is a matter of what needs to be done, not being told "no." He thinks the team is making some good changes.

Chair Greenwald asked if Mr. Wood might come to the next MSFI Committee meeting with more detail about the fire alarm/master box changes. He continued that apparently the master box system is being discontinued. Mr. Wood replied that that is an ongoing project. It will entail the rewrite of Chapter 34 as well. They are two parallel pieces. The Fire Chief and leadership team are managing the master box piece, as they work collectively on the rewrite.

Councilor Tobin stated that she had the opportunity to speak with Mr. Wood at a ward meeting and from his presentation tonight, she is excited to hear of the team's customer-centric approach and how they meet people where they are and remove barriers. She continued that that is a big part of making tools and the development process more accessible. She appreciates their work.

Chair Greenwald asked for public comment.

Jared Goodell of 39 Central Sq. stated that he has had building permits for different projects over the last six years and never was a fan of dealing with the Building Department. He continued that he previously was a frequent complainer, but he felt the need to come tonight to say that Mr. Wood has been a fantastic addition to the City. He thinks he is doing a great job and he echoes Chair Greenwald's comments about how the answer is now closer to "yes" than "no." He commends Mr. Wood's work.

City Manager Elizabeth Dragon stated that she wants to recognize Rick Wood for the good work he has done in the past six months. She continued that it has been a heavy lift, and he has made a lot of progress. She is excited about the future. She also wants to recognize the Fire Chief, the City employees on the fourth floor, and the inspector at the Fire Department. These changes were not easy for them. She is proud of them for stepping up.

Mr. Wood stated that he wants to thank the City Manager, because too often, people forget that "it's the people – the people we serve, and the people who serve." It is important for people to know they are appreciated. He appreciates the people in this room letting them know that.

Councilor Favolise made the following motion, which was seconded by Councilor Filiault.

On a vote of 5-0, the Municipal Services, Facilities, and Infrastructure Committee recommends that the presentation on Code and Fire Inspections be accepted as informational.

2) **Robert C. Hamm – Request for Improvements in Sidewalks and Traffic Patterns - Intersection of Grove Street and Water Street**

Chair Greenwald asked to hear from Robert Hamm.

Robert Hamm of 59 Valley St. stated that this letter is about the intersection of Grove St. and Water St. He continued that first, he wants to thank the City for responding so quickly to a need at that intersection. Putting up the four-way stop was a superb initial response. Then, not waiting for this meeting to add the markers that say “All way stop” made a difference, too. The letter has his name on it but it is a collaborative effort by the neighborhood. Many folks are in conversation about how to make the intersection better and Water St. more livable.

Mr. Hamm continued that the neighborhood likes what has been done so far, and thinks there is more that can be done. They are mainly concerned with the left turn lane, which makes the intersection confusing at times. They believe the left turn lane needs to be eliminated and they need to make provisions for a sidewalk on the Grove St. side. The elimination of the turn lane and restriping of the road would mean the traffic squeezes appropriately and they do not have three lanes coming from Grove St. onto Community Way. It is hard to tell what is happening there. Pedestrians struggle as they come onto Community Way from Grove St. The Grove St. sidewalk is on the east side, and the Community Way sidewalk is on the west side. The neighborhood likes the pedestrian lights that were moved to the bike path. It is helpful to have them on the bike path, but sometimes drivers are busy trying to negotiate the four-way stop and forget pedestrians are trying to cross, too. Then drivers watch other drivers but not the pedestrians. Some kind of pedestrian control (would help), with a flashing light, or a crossing of a different color, or something else. The neighborhood appreciates what the City is doing.

Don Lussier, Public Works Director, thanked Mr. Hamm for bringing this forward. He continued that in many ways he agrees that the intersection is confusing in its configuration. He thought it would help to review the intersection’s history and explain how they got here. The existing conditions are an outgrowth of the 2006 Planning Board review of the Railroad land development project that was brought forth by the Monadnock Economic Development Corporation (MEDC). In 2006, the MEDC’s plan included a number of development projects on the Railroad property, including the two buildings at 51 Railroad St. and the Marriott. One development project was a large, indoor, athletic arena, which has not come to pass. Instead, there is the Co op. There have thus been changes to the original plan from 2006. As they do with any development plan, the Planning Board required a traffic study to see how the project would impact the surrounding road network. That found, based on the projected development

and the expected land uses, a total of 490 vehicle trips in the peak hour, to be generated by that project. Most likely, that number has not been realized. The traffic study recommended the turning lanes.

Mr. Lussier continued that in 2012, the City prepared to do infrastructure improvements to support the Railroad land development, including reconstruction and infrastructure on Eagle Ct., Cypress St., Grove St., and Railroad St. That was completed in 2012. As part of that, City staff presented the traffic study's recommendations to the MSFI Committee, including the traffic study's projected traffic volumes for when the project was fully built out, and a plan to prepare the street for that projected traffic volume while they were already reconstructing the street and doing infrastructure work. The Committee and Council agreed. The Engineering Division brought forward a couple of recommendations. A recommendation at Grove St. and Marlboro St. was to add a turning lane, so now you have a left and right turning lane. Two alternatives were discussed for the Grove St./Water St. intersection. One would have expanded the roadway toward the west, and the other was to expand the roadway toward the east. During that time, Kurt Blomquist discussed how expanding it towards the east would be easier, because it was a vacant parcel and would not have the dramatic impact on the property, but it would make for awkward geometry. The final decision was to not have that major impact on the residential property and instead have that greater impact on the vacant parcel. The City negotiated with the property owners, acquired the property, and did the project.

Mr. Lussier stated that that is the historical context behind the geometry seen today. He continued that Mr. Hamm mentioned that the sidewalk on the west side of Grove St. was sacrificed for lane widening, but to clarify, there never was a sidewalk on the west side of that section of Grove St. In 2012, an asphalt sidewalk on the east side was replaced with concrete and granite. Thus, the City did not sacrifice an existing sidewalk; they expanded it without adding a sidewalk.

Mr. Lussier continued that the neighborhood letter proposes eliminating the left turn lane. Although the City does not have detailed counts of turning movements per lane, gross traffic counts for that intersection show about 159 vehicles northbound on Grove St. during the peak hour. Probably a more detailed traffic analysis would show the left turn lane is not warranted. That said, the Railroad development property still has undeveloped land. Two vacant, adjacent parcels on the east side of Community Way, owned by Whitney Brothers, are ripe for development. They do not know what that land use might be or what kind of traffic impacts it might have in the future. The concerns discussed in 2012, about ensuring they are planning for future growth, stand up today. Regarding the letter's recommendation of adding the sidewalk on the west side of Grove St. from Water St. to Willow St., if the Council wants to go forward with a sidewalk on that side of the street, staff recommends it extend from Water St. to Willow St.'s existing sidewalks. They do not want just a section. It is a total of about 570 feet. That is not budgeted, nor is it in the CIP, so they would have to move forward through that process.

Mr. Lussier continued that he thinks the letter had a typo in one recommendation, which he assumes referred to the sidewalk on the east side of Community Way north of Water St. He would recommend against that. The City only owns the first 270 feet of Community Way. The rest is owned by MEDC or its parent organization. If the City were to build a sidewalk there, it would be a sidewalk to nowhere. The letter then suggested flashing beacons. The Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) was recently updated with allowances for the Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacons (RRFBs) that the City uses at intersections, such as the ones at the bike trail. However, the MUTCD's guidelines specifically prohibit using RRFBs at stop-controlled intersections. The City could not put RRFBs (where the letter requests them). If they wanted to use a signal, it would have to be a pedestrian hybrid beacon or a full traffic control signal, which is very costly. Beyond that, he can say even without a formal engineering study that it is unlikely that intersection would satisfy the warrants for a full traffic control signal. He does not think Public Works could recommend this.

Mr. Lussier continued that the letter also recommends different colored crosswalks, which people tend to love, but again, the MUTCD specifically prohibits anything that is not standard coloring or anything that distracts from a driver knowing what the meaning of that pavement marking is. Public Works could not recommend this. The last recommendation in the letter (the addition of "all-way stop" markings to the stop signs) has already been taken care of.

Mr. Lussier stated that in summary, his recommendation to the Committee is to wait a little while and see how the all-way stop controls are working. He continued that although it is too soon to know, he has personally observed that drivers are stopping. The vast majority have gotten used to the idea that it is now a four-way stop, and are driving appropriately. He recommends waiting to see if this all-way stop control resolves the majority of the problems before they do anything else. If the Committee wanted to go forward with a more intensive traffic control, like a signal, it would require a traffic study, and again, he is confident that the study would not warrant a pedestrian hybrid beacon system or full traffic signal. Finally, if the Committee wants a sidewalk added to the west side, he thinks that would be great to have, but that should come through the CIP process. He would caution them that many neighborhoods have asked for new sidewalks, and the City has consistently replied that they need to address the 21 miles of sidewalks in substandard condition before building any new ones.

Councilor Tobin asked if Mr. Lussier had a specific time period in mind for the "wait and see" approach. She asked if it would be best practice to revisit it in, for example, six months or a year. Mr. Lussier replied that the MUTCD's standards for determining when something like an all-way stop or traffic signal is needed involve looking at the number of crashes over a one-, three-, or five-year period. He continued that he recommends waiting a year to see how the intersection is working, getting a report from the Keene Police Department (KPD) about any issues that they are finding, and then considering next steps.

Councilor Workman thanked Mr. Lussier, and stated that she leans toward the solution of (eliminating the left turn lane). She continued that she does not love the idea of having the

sidewalk on two sides of the street. It makes sense to have a connecting path, not a sidewalk to nowhere. She is in favor of it going through the appropriate CIP process and agrees that not doing so would be a disservice to the other neighborhoods' sidewalk requests and needs. However, she does not want to just accept this as informational, and wants them to look at this more, so she will be making a motion to refer this to City staff.

Councilor Filiault replied that he agrees with Councilor Workman. He continued that he was on both committees in 2006 and 2012 and remembers the process of both studies. He remembers the plans for the sports complex, then the eastside bypass, but neither of those came to be. It shows how things evolve and change, despite what a study might say at the time. He thinks the (letter's) points are valid, and the Council has listened, and there is now a four-way stop sign there, so they are progressing. He would not object to eliminating the left turn lane, but he knows from experience not to just jump on something and risk having to rescind it. He agrees with sending this to staff to look at it more in depth, not expecting a report back in the next couple of months, but after Public Works has had the chance to do a traffic study on that intersection.

Councilor Favolise stated that he agrees with Councilor Workman about not wanting to just accept this as informational and be done with it. He continued that this intersection is in his ward and he appreciates the community's involvement in finding solutions. He, too, is open to further discussion about the need for the left turn lane, which he sees creates a weird misalignment at the intersection. Although he voted against installing the four-way stop sign, a constituent recently told him it is working, and he has been pleasantly surprised to see people have quickly adapted to it. He supports referring this matter to staff for additional conversation about this intersection that residents have identified as problematic in a couple of different ways.

Chair Greenwald asked for public comment.

Vickie Morton of 275 Water St. stated that she agrees that the four-way stop has worked, although she has noticed that some drivers "slide" through when it is their turn instead of actually stopping. She continued that her real concern about the intersection is pedestrian safety. Many people on Water St. use bikes and scooters. Traffic does not stop for pedestrians. Many people do not use the bike lanes to go through the intersection. She thinks more schoolchildren are using the intersection, and coming from the west side of Grove St. or Community Ave., they have to cross the street to get to the east side walkway on Grove St. to walk to school. She is glad they are considering a study, because there are still issues.

Councilor Workman made the following motion, which was seconded by Councilor Filiault.

On a vote of 5-0, the Municipal Services, Facilities, and Infrastructure Committee recommends the communication be referred to City staff.

**3) Presentation – Route 9 – Old Sullivan Road Intersection – NHDOT**



Chair Greenwald asked to hear from the Public Works Director and representatives from the NH Department of Transportation (NHDOT).

Mr. Lussier stated that he would like to introduce the new City Engineer, Bryan Ruoff, who has been doing great work since joining the team a month and a half ago. He continued that also present tonight is Lt. Chidester from the KPD. This has been a collaborative effort between the Engineering Division and the KPD. He introduced Frank Linnenbringer from NHDOT District 4, the Assistant District Engineer, also a member of the City's Roadway Safety Action Planning Committee.

Mr. Ruoff stated that he will give a slide show presentation about the Rt. 9/Old Sullivan Rd. intersection's history, crash history, constraints and ownership, and a summary of public feedback. Beginning with the question of why they are here, the Engineering Division responds to serious traffic incidents and assists the KPD in performing accident surveys, for major accidents that involve a loss of life, major injury, or known or suspected crime. The City's consultant engineer reviewed this intersection as part of the Safe Streets for All program and provided recommendations. The team has been looking at this intersection since before the most recent accident, and due to the most recent accident, they are here soliciting public feedback and presenting that for the Committee.

Mr. Ruoff continued that the KPD has compiled the crash report data. There have been four incidents that fit the criteria in the past 18 months, and nine in the last 12 years. In response, the team solicited public feedback and outreach in the form of letters to abutting in the neighboring areas of Keene. Due to the volume of feedback they received, they convened a public meeting on October 10. The presentation includes the summary of the public's stated safety concerns and recommendations. The team has also discussed with NHDOT what is feasible, and NHDOT is here to talk about that as well.

Mr. Ruoff stated that Sullivan Rd. intersects both the southerly side and northerly side of Rt. 9. He continued that the eastbound lane on Rd. 9 is a single lane at the intersection while the westbound starts the passing lane at the same location, which causes difficulties with the fact that people are looking to turn left onto Sullivan Rd. while cars are also looking to speed up to pass at the same location. He showed an overhead map and continued that even though Sullivan Rd. is a City-owned road, the State right-of-way extends roughly 60 feet on either side of the intersection. He showed photos of the views eastbound and westbound on Rt. 9, and of the line of sight on both sides of Sullivan Rd. He continued that the Keene/southerly side of Sullivan Rd. is the side the team would potentially look to close, as it would have the least impact on traffic in this area, as a potential immediate solution.

Mr. Ruoff stated that regarding the feedback they received from the public, the crash history reports give good information about what occurred as parts of accidents, but they do not give information about the "near miss" situations. (The team's questions were) what allowances

people are making to safely turn on or off this road and in this intersection, what people are observing, and what they are doing to try and stay safe at this intersection. Many people indicated that they slow down to turn onto Sullivan Rd. in either direction, for both right and left turns. People traveling on Rt. 9 often let traffic pass prior to turning onto Sullivan Rd. The limited line of sight has been observed by people on Sullivan Rd. looking to either cross or turn onto Rt. 9. Because of the passing lanes on Rt. 9, many cars speed up at the passing lane while other cars are slowing down to make a turn, which creates a unique and dangerous condition. In addition, people noted there is limited visibility on Sullivan Rd. from Rt. 9 at nighttime.

Lieutenant Joel Chidester stated that using KPD records, he has completed detailed reviews of the past five years of collisions that occurred at this intersection. He is the team commander of the KPD's Collision Analysis Team. They respond to all serious motor vehicle collisions with serious bodily injury or fatality that occur in Keene.

Lt. Chidester stated that the first serious collision in the five-year window was in 2019. He continued that it involved two vehicles. The first driver on the northern side of Sullivan Rd. attempted to cross Rt. 9 to the other side of Sullivan Rd. The other driver was westbound on Rt. 9, going up the hill. The first driver crossed the road in front of the oncoming vehicle, which struck the crossing car, and the occupant in the crossing vehicle had serious injuries. There were no more serious collisions in this intersection until 2023. Alarming, the serious collisions for this section of the roadway began increasing in frequency.

He continued that a three-vehicle collision occurred in 2023, when a driver attempted to cross Rt. 9 from the northern side of Sullivan Rd. to the southern side, and in doing so, struck a vehicle traveling westbound up the hill on Rt. 9. That vehicle was pushed into the eastbound lane where it was struck by a box truck coming down the hill. The driver of the vehicle that was struck suffered serious injury and will likely never regain full use of her arm from this crash. That driver was unable to be here tonight but has repeatedly expressed interest in seeing this intersection modified to prevent such crashes in the future.

Lt. Chidester continued that there was another three-vehicle collision in 2024. The first vehicle was stopped, waiting to turn left onto Sullivan Rd to go north. The second vehicle was traveling eastbound on Rt. 9 and failed to observe the vehicle stopped in the lane ahead as it waited to turn. The second vehicle struck the first from the rear and pushed it into the westbound lane, where it struck a third vehicle. The third vehicle was forced into the guardrail. There were serious injuries to one or more occupants in all three vehicles.

He continued that the next collision in 2024 also involved three vehicles. The first vehicle was stopped in the westbound lane of Rt. 9, waiting to turn left on Sullivan Rd. Westbound traffic on Rt. 9 would essentially perceive that lane as a passing lane. The first vehicle was struck from behind by the second vehicle, which pushed them into eastbound lane, where they were struck by a tractor trailer truck that was coming down the hill. The truck was unloaded and was able to

bring his vehicle to a decelerated stop at a remarkably short distance, and that is the only reason why this was not either a serious injury or fatality.

Lt. Chidester continued that the final collision, also from 2024, was a two-vehicle collision. A motorcycle was traveling eastbound on Rt. 9, coming down the hill. A vehicle traveling westbound was attempting to turn onto Sullivan Rd. to the south, turned in front of the oncoming motorcycle, which impacted the rear of the turning vehicle. The motorcycle rider was ejected and suffered serious injury.

Mr. Ruoff stated that the team received good feedback from the public. He continued that NHDOT can speak to many of the good recommendations they were given, because many were suggested for in NHDOT's right-of-way. They received about 20 emails, three phone calls, two or three calls to the radio station, and one person came in person to talk and drew him a map of a proposed solution. The public meeting had nearly 50 attendees.

He continued that he will summarize the public's recommendations for corrective actions for this intersection. Most common was the installation of a flashing yellow light on Rt. 9 for traffic traveling in either direction. The second most frequently submitted recommendation was reducing the posted speed on Rt. 9 approaching this intersection.

Mr. Ruoff continued that other suggestions were:

- Raise the grade of Sullivan Rd. at Rt. 9 so there is better sight distance along Rt. 9
- Install rumble strips on Rt. 9 approaching the intersection, similar to the Shaw's roundabout in Peterborough
- Restripe the westbound lane for a left turn only, so that cars are not trying to pass and turn in the same lane
- Install "no passing" or "not safe to pass" signs on Rt. 9
- Install lights on light poles on Sullivan Rd. to provide better views of the road at night
- Reconstruct and reconfigure the intersection
- Widen Rt. 9 prior to the intersection to provide a dedicated passing lane
- Replace the intersection with a roundabout
- Build an overpass for Rt. 9 to go over Sullivan Rd.
- Install "dangerous intersection ahead" signs on Rt. 9 prior to Sullivan Rd.
- Install speed cameras on Rt. 9
- Provide additional police patrols
- Clear the vegetation along Rt. 9 to provide additional sight distance for cars pulling out of Sullivan Rd.
- Prohibit left turns onto and off of Rt. 9
- Replace the guard rail on Rt. 9 with wire guardrail to improve the sight distance

Mr. Ruoff continued that these recommendations that were received can be implemented by the City of Keene because they involve the City's right-of-way of Sullivan Rd.:

- Close Sullivan Rd.
- Close Sullivan Rd. but provide gated access for emergency vehicles
- Keep Sullivan Rd. open
- Submit detailed Officer reports to traffic software indicating that there are speed checks at that location

Mr. Ruoff stated that a map shows the areas for Sullivan Rd. south of Rt. 9 that are serviced by the road. He continued that Concord Rd. intersects, but it continues along to Rt. 9, so there is still another point of access at that point. Moore Hill Farm Rd., Concord Rd., Nims Rd., and a portion of Jordan Rd. are serviced by Sullivan Rd. for access to Rt. 9. For traffic traveling eastbound on Rt. 9, a closure would add roughly a four-mile detour for Keene residents for closing Sullivan Rd. south at this intersection. From Sullivan Rd. north, there are fewer Keene properties, but there is not a dedicated route to replace Sullivan Rd. Thus, from the team's preliminary review of this, they do not think it is a viable means of closing this, especially based on the feedback they received at the public meeting.

Mr. Ruoff continued that the team has coordinated initially and discussed with NHDOT at this point, and he invites Frank Linnenbringer to speak to some of the recommendations that have been provided for Rt. 9.

Mr. Linnenbringer stated that he is here tonight with Amanda-Joe Zatecka [Senior Highway Safety Engineer with NHDOT]. He continued that while it is NHDOT's right-of-way, from NHDOT's perspective, a street road is the same as a driveway. The owner of the driveway can propose improvements through a driveway permit and NHDOT can review and issue a permit so the owner can make those modifications. The City is more than able to put forward a proposal and NHDOT will review it and see if they can approve it.

Mr. Linnenbringer stated that many of these (recommendations) are ones NHDOT will discourage, because traffic studies have proven that most of them are ineffective. He continued that flashing yellow lights tend to be ignored shortly after being installed. They looked at two options, the normal flashing beacon and an intersection warning beacon, similar to ones installed at intersections in Chesterfield and Peterborough. So far, the feedback NHDOT has is not supportive of them and they do not seem to be beneficial. It is unlikely that NHDOT will expand the use of those. Regarding the posted speed, the speed of travel tends to be what people are comfortable traveling on the road, less so what the sign says. He believes trucks are traveling at an average speed of 54.5 mph and vehicles are traveling at an average of 57 mph. That is the standard speed. Changing the speed limit is unlikely to affect the speed of traffic at the location.

Mr. Linnenbringer continued that regarding rumble strips on Rt. 9, this would be a new use that is not used anywhere else in the state. The rumble strips in Peterborough warn people to slow down while approaching the roundabout. Installing them here (at the Sullivan Rd./Rt. 9 intersection) would be a new use that would perhaps confuse drivers. NHDOT is a little

confused about the idea of “no passing” signs on Rt. 9, because it is a truck passing lane, and the point of a passing lane is to pass. The sign would be in conflict. Raising the grade is an option, but it would be more on the City’s side of things. There are definitely some vertical concerns there because Rt. 9 is significantly higher than the rest of Sullivan Rd. Any modifications to bring that up to grade would carry back and have a larger implication.

He continued that the re-striping idea is something NHDOT has evaluated, and yes, if they wanted to remove the passing lane and re-stripe it as a left turn lane, that could be done. NHDOT would not want to do that without further study and an evaluation similar to what the MSFI Committee just talked about, regarding evaluating the (Water St./Grove St. intersection) to see if a turn lane is warranted. It does not serve any purpose to install unwarranted turn lanes, and they need to make sure there are no other traffic issues in the location that would be made worse by installing turn lanes. NHDOT would consider this option with a little more study.

Mr. Linnenbringer continued that installing lights and light poles would be a City issue, because NHDOT does not illuminate intersections with town or city roads on state highways. He ended up removing everything in 2012. If the City wants lights there, that would be the City’s evaluation. He thinks most of the crashes occurred in daylight, so lights might not be the issue. Regarding the ideas of reconfiguring, widening, installing a roundabout, or installing an overpass, those are all larger building projects that would need to be submitted to NHDOT to go through the Ten Year Plan process. Keene currently has two other intersections under road safety audits that NHDOT is looking at to do improvements, so this would be a third. At some point, Keene needs to prioritize the order, because they cannot do them all. Regarding the idea of “dangerous intersection ahead” signs, NHDOT would highly discourage using that without a plan for what they are going to do. Those signs would be temporary in preparation for a solution, not as a long-term solution. Speed cameras are not allowed NH roads, but if the suggestion was for speed feedback signs, the City could apply to install those. NHDOT does maintenance agreements with towns and cities on those. Regarding the idea of removing vegetation, NHDOT has one over-the-rail mower that hits Keene once or twice a year. The City can mow it more if they want to. As he said, NHDOT treats it similar to a driveway, and the sight distance of a drive is the responsibility of the driveway owner.

Mr. Linnenbringer continued that NHDOT would possibly consider the idea of prohibiting left turns. There is concern that if they prohibit left turns, many people would turn right to get out and do a U-turn on Rt. 9 further down, which would not be a safer solution. Regarding the guardrail, he does not think NHDOT has ever gone from W-beam guardrail back to cable guardrail. NHDOT is unlikely to consider that. It has been W-beam guardrail since at least 2009, so he disagrees with those who say it was “recently switched.”

He continued that the other recommendations were ones for the City. NHDOT has no opinion on whether the City should close the road; they neither oppose nor support it.

Mr. Ruoff asked Mr. Linnenbringer to speak more to the Ten Year Plan process that he mentioned.

Mr. Lussier replied that he can speak to that. He continued that Mr. Linnenbringer mentioned the two road safety audits. NHDOT periodically asks cities and towns where they want to see a road safety audit done. The City submitted two intersections to be studied. The Rt. 12/Wyman Rd./Corporate Dr. intersection was submitted three or four years ago. More recently, they submitted the Whitcomb's Mill Rd./Rt. 9 intersection. Both are still in the queue and the City does not know when they will occur. The Ten Year Plan is the NHDOT process by which the City can request funding for some of the bigger projects. For example, the lower Winchester St. project went through the Ten Year Plan program. Route 101 improvements is a Ten Year Plan project that is moving forward. They are long-term planning projects for the bigger infrastructure. The process begins with submitting a project nomination to the Southwest Regional Planning Commission (SWRPC). The local Transportation Advisory Committee looks at and ranks those and decides which projects to move forward in the process. It is about a year to go through all the review. NHDOT then ranks and stacks the projects and develops their Ten Year Plan for infrastructure improvements.

Mr. Linnenbringer stated that for a Ten Year Plan, he would say they are probably looking at 5 to 10 years on a best case for a project to get there, because NHDOT just finished the process. It is a two-year cycle, so it would be two years before the next Ten Year Plan would be generated, and then it would be ranked in with all the other projects that area already in the plan. That is not to say it would not move up higher in the plan. There have been projects that have been in the Ten Year Plan for 30 or 40 years. It definitely could bump something else down the line, but it is ranked amongst all the other projects already sitting in the plan. Again, through that process, it is probably a 5- to 10-year best-case scenario.

Chair Greenwald stated that he does not want Mr. Linnenbringer to take this comment personally, but his reaction to Mr. Linnenbringer's presentation was that it was "twelve ways of saying 'no' to everything that came up." He continued that he cannot be that patient; he wants some solutions *now*. He hears that it is political, but he is very hopeful that Mr. Linnenbringer, along with City staff, can come up with some "Yes, we can do this before the snow flies" (action to take), before someone else gets into an accident. It is a bad intersection and everyone knows it. The crumpled guardrail on the Keene side of Sullivan Rd. shows that obviously, other, non-reported accidents have happened. Maybe they were reported but did not result in serious injuries. There have to be solutions. Over 50 people came up with great ideas, most of which were not (outlandish). Yes, a roundabout or underpass is a 10-30 year project, but there must be solutions they can do. He hopes Mr. Linnenbringer and Mr. Lussier can at least get something started, and he will encourage the City Manager to get some streetlights out there, if that is what will make it safer. They have to do *something*. This is his ward; he and his neighbors use this intersection regularly and see how horrible it is. He knows people from the neighborhood who call each other and ask how the road is and "Is it safe to go out today?" Yes, other intersections need improvement, but right now, he is focused on this one.

Councilor Filiault stated that he echoes much of what Chair Greenwald said. He continued that they do not want this to go on the Ten Year Plan, because they know that would mean in 20 years or never. Three of those accidents happened this year, so obviously, it is a serious intersection. It is not okay to just be told “no, no, no” (in response to possible solutions). They need to hear that something (can be done), or at least a “maybe.” Regarding Chair Greenwald’s comments about something needing to be done before the snow flies, he is in favor of the rumble strips, which Mr. Linnenbringer said would be a “new use.” That is fine, because at the time when they did the roundabout down near Applebees, the State said, “We don’t do roundabouts.” Now they do, but it was a new idea at one time. Roundabouts were found to work and now they are popping up everywhere. The rumble strips in Peterborough work, and yes, they startle people, but that is what they are supposed to do. Rumble strips and grooves in the center lines do the job and it is inexpensive, as far as highway projects go. He asks if Mr. Linnenbringer can go back to his supervisors and request that the rumble strips and grooves be installed before the snow flies. That could at least slow the traffic down while the State (does studies) and tries to come up with something else. They need to do something *now*. This is more than just a couple accidents over a decade. Distracted driving is only increasing, not going away. They cannot do the Ten Year Project. They cannot wait for more people to be seriously injured or killed. They can do rumble strips and grooves now, and then in the spring, look for a more permanent solution.

Chair Greenwald stated that he wants to repeat that Mr. Linnenbringer is merely the messenger, and he hopes he does not take the Committee’s frustration personally. He continued that Mr. Linnenbringer’s presentation was very good. The Committee is just venting about the whole situation.

Councilor Favolise stated that he did not just hear “no, no, no” from the NHDOT presentation; he heard “no, no, no...except if it will cost the City time and resources and money.” He continued that that is another challenge, given that this is a shared intersection. Many aspects of this intersection concern him, such as the angles and sight lines, and the sloping of Sullivan Rd. He does not think rumble strips would solve the problem, but it probably would not hurt, either, and it is a potential solution. Ideally, he would like for the City Manager to announce the hiring of 20 more police officers to patrol all these traffic areas, because many of the (problems) are due to operator challenges.

Councilor Favolise continued that he has a question for Lt. Chidester, who presented about the major accidents and said there is no way to get data on the near misses. What about the minor accidents that could have been major, had someone been a second too late in slowing down? Lt. Chidester replied that they do have data on that. He continued that surprisingly, every collision from the past five years, in the police data, that involved more than one vehicle has been a serious collision. All other collisions at this location have either been single vehicles due to bad weather or animals.

Councilor Favolise asked the Public Works Director if he knows what the traffic counts are for this intersection. Mr. Lussier replied no. Councilor Favolise asked if he has traffic counts for Sullivan Rd. generally. Mr. Lussier replied no. Councilor Favolise replied that that would be helpful, long-term, to determine what is feasible. Mr. Lussier replied that a traffic study would include that data collection phase.

Mr. Lussier stated that he wants to add that Mr. Linnenbringer is a great person who has been a great partner with the City, and he appreciates his work.

Councilor Workman stated that she shares Chair Greenwald's sentiments. She continued that seeing the photos and footage of accidents in tonight's presentation was sobering. Her heart goes out to the crash victims and the first responders. She feels that they owe it to the victims and first responders to think critically and creatively about solutions. They cannot just do nothing. She is a big proponent of reducing risk, and trying some of these solutions or others. They need to at least try to mitigate the severity of the accidents.

Mr. Lussier stated that regarding what can be done quickly, the option that is completely within the City's control is at least an interim closure of the southern side of Sullivan Rd. He continued that that can be done through the normal Council process. Lt. Chidester observed early on that all of these serious accidents involved turning vehicles. For an easy solution to implement quickly, that (closure of the southern side of Sullivan Rd.) is unfortunately it. He knows the neighborhood will not love it. However, it would have a real impact.

Vickie Morton of 275 Water St. stated that she thought two of the accidents involved vehicles crossing, not turning. Lt. Chidester replied that is correct. He continued that as Mr. Lussier said, a closure of the southern part of Sullivan Rd. might not eliminate the crashes, but it would drastically reduce the number of incidents there, based on current data.

Ms. Morton stated that she hopes the Councilor would consider the number of cars that would be displaced onto Washington St. if the southern side of Sullivan Rd. were closed. She continued that the intersection of Washington St. and Rt. 9 is not always safe, either.

Chair Greenwald replied that that understands there are many implications. He continued that he hopes there would be some interim steps before they (close the southern side).

Councilor Favolise stated that he thanks Ms. Morton for her comments, because that gets to his question about how many vehicles they are talking about. He asked Mr. Lussier if there is a way to get a rough count of the numbers, such as how many cars are at (the intersection) during the peak hour. Mr. Lussier replied yes, they have a tool – the signs you see around the city that flash the traffic – to collect traffic data. He continued that it is a crude tool that does not collect data about turning movements. The tool can say how many vehicles are traveling northbound on Sullivan Rd. and how many are traveling southbound, but it cannot say how many are turning left from Rt. 9 westbound onto Sullivan Rd. southbound or vice versa. They can get a gross



volume of traffic that would be affected by this change, but not a nuanced analysis that would say whether a turning lane on Rt. 9 is warranted. Councilor Favolise replied that that is exactly the kind of data he thinks would be helpful here, as he is thinking about the displacement question if southern Sullivan Rd. were closed.

Ed Haas of 114 Jordan Rd. stated that all of these accidents were during daytime. He asked Lt. Chidester if any impaired driving was involved. Lt. Chidester replied no. Mr. Haas stated that there are a couple of things the State could easily do, and he hopes they do it. He continued that the real problem here is that people cannot judge the speed of vehicles coming eastbound down Rt. 9 or the beginning of the passing lane just to the east side of this intersection on the westbound side of Rt. 9. They could do something to control the speed coming down and eliminate the passing lane until you have passed Sullivan Rd., and then have the truck passing lane begin. Those options only require paint.

Amanda-Joe Zatecka (Senior Highway Safety Engineer, NHDOT) stated that from an NHDOT standpoint, it would be helpful to partner with the KPD to get a snapshot of the crashes. She continued that NHDOT has crash data all the way from 2002, but the data does not include much detail beyond the fact that a crash occurred on Rt. 9. Partnering with KPD would at least give NHDOT information about dates and times. They could then request the redacted crash reports from the DMV, to get that nuanced information. NHDOT does not get to see the crash diagram or summary, and often that is where the details are, such as a driver being unable to judge the speed of oncoming vehicles. That is the information they need.

Chris Jackson of 187 South Rd., Sullivan, stated that he uses (Sullivan Rd.) all the time, and he was at the local meeting. He continued that he knows they do a lot of analysis on the accidents. Since the meeting, he has thought a lot about two things. At the meeting, they talked a lot about who was at fault for the accidents. Sometimes it was a local at fault. He is not sure this data can be collected, but he wants to point out that when you are looking up or down the line, eastbound or westbound, you are making your decisions based on the fact that Rt. 9's speed limit is 55 mph. Anyone who drives it knows well that people get comfortable driving 55 mph or more, so (drivers) are making decisions about based on a theoretical but not actual speed. Thus, when discussing who is "at fault," it is important to recognize that if you are making a decision based on someone else doing something right, and they are not doing it right, then who is "at fault" becomes blurry. On the other hand, he does not know if the traffic studies include speed, which is fundamental for decision-making. They should determine how fast people are going on that road before they just close it. They also need better enforcement, not just little warnings. If it is not going to be enforced, then many of the recommendations on the list do not matter. (Accidents) will still happen, unless there is enforcement.

Gordon Matthews of 85 Nims Rd. stated that he uses the intersection regularly as well. He continued that he thinks speed is a major factor. He was shocked to hear Mr. Linnenbringer from NHDOT dismiss out of hand speed limit signage or lights, basic traffic safety measures, (saying they) would be ignored and ineffective. He thinks those options should be considered,

and thinks posting the speed lower would help improve the safety of the intersection, especially with the trajectory coming down hill. He thinks the speed limit passing Granite Gorge is 45 mph and then it increases as you are coming into the city. It is strange that NHDOT feels speed limit signs and lights are ineffective. This should be considered by the City and State.

David Jakway, Town of Sullivan Selectmen Chair, stated that the biggest issue is the sight view and people speeding. He continued that in the two weeks since there have been accidents here, he has not seen one police car, State or City, sitting on that road. Two weeks ago, he followed a driver of a silver Chrysler convertible with a black top who went from the Rt. 10 intersection on Rt. 9 to the top of the hill on Rt. 9. He himself was going 65 or 70 mph at the top and still could not catch the driver. Speed is the biggest problem here for everyone, including his Sullivan constituents. He is disappointed with NHDOT. He has talked with the person in Concord. He is very concerned about their attitude toward this side of the state, and their inaction.

Zachary Key of 49 South Rd., Sullivan, asked how they will warn people if the southern part of Sullivan Rd. is closed, if flashing signs and painted lines on the road are not viable options to alert drivers to what is there now. He questions how many accidents will occur due to people going there (to try to turn onto Sullivan Rd.) with no warning. In addition, (closing the road) would punish people for what sounds like some people's poor choices in going across the road. He works for a landscaping company on Sullivan Center Rd., which sends trucks down that road. Rather than going up Rt. 9 into Keene, it is much easier to go across to go down Concord Hill Rd., especially with a loaded truck.

Chair Greenwald stated that everything will be considered. He continued that he personally hopes there is no closure, but there are many intermediate steps they can take.

The City Manager stated that the screen shows what the team recommends as next steps. She continued that whatever solutions they come up with will require coordination and collaboration with NHDOT and emergency services. They recommend looking at which interim corrective actions can be taken and also looking at the long-term plan for this intersection.

Chair Greenwald made the following motion, which was seconded by Councilor Filiault.

The Municipal Services, Facilities, and Infrastructure Committee recommends placing this matter on more time to allow the City Manager, through City staff, to coordinate with the NH Department of Transportation to produce an action plan for presentation at the November MSFI meeting.

Chair Greenwald stated that there is no firm date for the November meeting, due to Thanksgiving. He continued that he realizes this is a time press, but he really would like to see something done before the snow comes, so they do not hear, "No, we can't restripe the road because it is too cold," or something similar.

The City Manager stated that there have been conversations about potentially canceling the November MSFI meeting and holding it in early December instead. Chair Greenwald replied that he will change (the motion) to “the next MSFI meeting,” which could also be on the Tuesday before Thanksgiving.

The motion passed unanimously.

**4) Staff Report on the Results of the Ward Optimization Weeks (WOW!) Program - Public Works Director**

Mr. Lussier stated that he is here to report to the Committee on a pilot program staff has done over the past several weeks. He continued that he pitched this idea to the City Manager, to do a week of focused maintenance in each of the wards. There were a few different goals. They wanted to encourage people to report the things that are frustrating them in their neighborhoods so staff could respond to them, and they wanted to generally spruce up the neighborhoods. He also wanted to try being more efficient in how they are doing the work. Rather than responding to a customer request in (one part of the city) and then another customer request (in a different part of the city), staff tried to gather the requests up and address them while they were in the neighborhood. After he pitched this idea to the City Manager, she passed it along to other department heads. The Fire Department participated, with the community outreach Mr. Wood spoke of earlier. The Community Development Department did a community night in each ward, held at a City facility, where they welcomed people to come in, talked with them about ideas for their neighborhood, and solicited feedback on the Comprehensive Master Plan update. (Public Works) gave Community Development staff a tablet that people at the events could use to report problems in their neighborhood. He thinks that was well received.

Mr. Lussier continued that they started advertising this program on October 16. In the eight weeks between when they started advertising it and when the program ended, they received 184 requests for maintenance and improvements from the public, through the See Click Fix program. That is a substantial uptick in their normal sort of reporting, which was great to see. He hopes that people will continue to use See Click Fix now that they have discovered it. Not all of the things staff did were due to customer requests or reports; they did many things staff had planned to do as well, for a total of 682 individual tasks completed by the crews. That includes 101 sewer mains cleaned, 284 hydrants painted, 99 locations of roadway tree trimming, 12 streets with crack sealing, 13 locations with sidewalk repairs, and 29 streets with patching. Altogether, it was about \$109,000 worth of effort, between labor, equipment, and materials. This does not mean they just spent \$109,000 that was not in the budget. That is the value of the work, but crews were working during normal business hours, using equipment they already had, and the materials were things like pavement mix and road signs, already in the normal operating budget. This was all operating budget stuff, but it was just a very concentrated way of getting the work done. Altogether, it represented a little over 2,500 hours of labor. He thinks it was a successful endeavor. They have received good feedback from people. He would like to hear what the

Committee's perception is and what they have heard from their constituents, and whether they would like to see this program continue.

Chair Greenwald replied that he has heard positive things. He continued that he congratulates Mr. Lussier and the team for being creative.

Councilor Filiault stated that he has only heard one negative comment. He continued that some older constituents are not tech-savvy, so next time, he recommends pushing more information about how people can submit requests through other, non-computer methods, such as calling the Dan Mitchell radio show or dropping off a letter at the Public Works Department. All the other feedback he has heard about WOW has been positive.

Mr. Lussier replied that staff did try to remind folks that if they were not using the computer, they could call Public Works. That is always the fall back. They tried to push that information out, but probably could have done a better job of communicating it.

Councilor Favolise stated that it is surprising and great to hear government employees thinking of ways to do things more efficiently. He continued that he appreciates the efforts and wants to talk about the interdepartmental work here, because to him as a public official, community night in his ward was helpful. It was the ability to be in a centralized location and hear from constituents, see the engagement, and see the showcasing of green space and recreational spaces. It was a good opportunity to get input on the master plan process. He does not see any reason to not continue this program into the future. He would like them to double down on the interdepartmental programming, which was great.

Mr. Lussier replied that (Parks & Recreation Director) Carrah Fisk-Hennessey was at this meeting earlier tonight but had to leave early. He continued that the Parks & Recreation Department participated in WOW. Every Wednesday, they pushed out social media information, using social media to highlight a particular space in each ward and to talk about specific improvement projects that were completed over the past year. Thus, people not only know about the spaces, but know that the City is taking care of them and working actively to improve them. Ms. Fisk-Hennessey gave some statistics, which are in the agenda packet. The Parks & Recreation Department received over 52,000 views of those social media postings during the five-week program. The number one post that received a lot of attention was the one about the amphitheater accessibility improvements.

Councilor Tobin stated that she was excited when this program was announced, and she thinks the number of departments that jumped on is a testament to what a great idea it was. It is great to be efficient. She heard a lot of positive feedback about the program. It is a great way to focus on neighborhoods and the community around us, because it is easy to get lost in a city and just think of downtown as the center, but really, there are many communities here. She thanks Mr. Lussier and those involved. There is room for growth and getting the word out, and she is excited to see what it looks like next time.

The City Manager congratulated the Public Works Director for this innovative approach. She continued that sometimes government employees get a bad rap, maybe because of state-level and federal government, but local government is creative and innovative. The City has a great team, and she sees it across the board.

Deputy City Manager Andy Bohannon stated that he wants to thank Mr. Lussier, because what was originally a Public Works idea about trying to optimize each ward became something other departments wanted to participate in. He continued that the City has many new department heads, and it was somewhat of a challenge, but it was nice to see everyone coming together. The Library was also involved in some of the events. Staff from many departments were able to get out and meet people, and at a different time than they typically do. It was really good. Mr. Lussier said that that 682 tasks were completed, but there were other tasks that they saw (needed to be done) which they went back later to do, as a result of this. Everyone did a great job.

Councilor Filiault made the following motion, which was seconded by Councilor Workman.

On a vote of 5-0, the Municipal Services, Facilities, and Infrastructure Committee accepted the item as informational.

**5) Adjournment**

There being no further business, Chair Greenwald adjourned the meeting at 8:00 PM.

Respectfully submitted by,  
Britta Reida, Minute Taker

Edits submitted by,  
Terri M. Hood, Deputy City Clerk