

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

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

**Wednesday, June 9, 2021**

**6:00 PM**

**Hybrid Meeting –  
Council Chambers B/Zoom**

**Members Present:**

Janis O. Manwaring, Chair  
Michael Giacomo, Vice Chair  
Randy L. Filiault  
Andrew M. Madison  
Robert C. Williams

**Staff Present:**

Elizabeth A. Dragon, City Manager  
Thomas P. Mullins, City Attorney  
Rebecca Landry, IT Director/ Assistant City  
Manager

**Members Not Present:**

*All Present*

Chair Manwaring called the meeting to order at 5:30 PM and read the executive order authorizing a remote meeting: Emergency Order #12, issued by the Governor of the State of New Hampshire pursuant to Executive Order #2020-04. Pursuant to this Order, Committee members stated their locations and whether alone.

**1) Councilor Williams – Renaming of the North Bridge**

Chair Manwaring recognized Councilor Williams, who explained that former Mayor Philip (Dale) Pregent passed away in March 2021. Mr. Pregent was Mayor of Keene from 2008-2011 and served as a City Councilor both before and after his tenure as Mayor. Councilor Williams thought it was fair to say that Mr. Pregent served as Mayor during the difficult 2008 economic crisis that hurt the City's budget, in addition to the parking vigilantes, and related disruptions later during his Mayoral tenure. Despite those challenges, Councilor Williams said that Mr. Pregent also had impressive achievements, including release of the Keene Comprehensive Master Plan while he was Mayor, as well as converting the City's vehicles to biodiesel, and contributing to the Monadnock Food Co-op's opening.

During a conversation with Councilor Williams, Mr. Pregent said that he was satisfied with his time in public life, feeling as though he made a positive impact, citing particularly that he used his leadership as Mayor to promote developing Keene's bicycle and pedestrian network, and noting the planning and development of the North Bridge on the Cheshire Rail Trail as an example. At that time, Councilor Williams said that North Bridge was somewhat controversial because the economy was in a tough spot and the public was divided about building a new pedestrian bridge, with many

considering it a boondoggle, or a bridge to nowhere. Still, he said Mr. Pregent championed the North Bridge and other pedestrian projects because he saw value in building transportation infrastructure, so people do not need to own a car.

Councilor Williams said that as Mayor, Mr. Pregent used his leadership in this area, which became a legacy that continues growing in Keene, with an extraordinarily strong trail network that has undergone multiple upgrades over the past decade, including addition of the South Bridge and soon the extensions of the Transportation Heritage Trail, as well as construction of two restored historical bridges. Due to former Mayor Pregent's legacy of stewarding Keene's trail systems, Councilor Williams suggested honoring him by renaming the North Bridge in his honor as the Philip (Dale) Pregent Memorial Bridge. Councilor Williams said this would be a way for the City to demonstrate its gratitude for former Mayor Pregent's years of service and to honor his vision for the bicycle and pedestrian trail networks in Keene.

Chair Manwaring welcomed Andy Bohannon, Director of Parks, Recreation, & Facilities, to provide history of the North Bridge's naming. In May 2012, the City Council established an Ad Hoc Committee to carry-out the naming process and the Committee returned quickly with a decision in July 2012. An email was set-up on the City website for the public to submit nominations for the bridge name, which the Ad Hoc Committee reviewed and found 40 names suggested. The Committee followed specific criteria outlined in sections 80-97 in the City Code and Mr. Bohannon said that Councilor Williams' suggestion met those criteria. Mr. Bohannon thought it would be good for the public to have input again when considering changing the name of a public facility. The process for naming would be for an individual citizen, local organization, or City Department to submit a letter suggesting a different name to this MSFI Committee of the City Council. Any unanimous decision by the MSFI Committee would be sent to City Council for approval/denial. Any renaming would be memorialized by a resolution that would be presented to the individual or their family. Mr. Bohannon continued reading a portion of City Code Sections 80-97 with the criteria for naming a public facility:

*In naming a public facility after an individual, qualifying facilities must be under the ownership of and funded through the city. 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.*

Mr. Bohannon continued stating that seven of the 40 names submitted fit those criteria. Therefore, the Ad Hoc Committee voted unanimously supporting the North Bridge name, which is the direction the trail leads. Some disputed the name, stating that the bridge faces west, but Mr. Bohannon said if

following the Cheshire Rail Trail, the bridge takes a user north. Chair Manwaring thanked Mr. Bohannon for the history.

Vice Chair Giacomo asked Mr. Bohannon whether he could cite the other six names that were considered for the bridge. Mr. Bohannon did not have that reduced list with him, but said there was a lot of support for one name that did not meet the criteria. Mr. Bohannon recalled that the American Legion proposed naming the bridge in honor of all veterans as opposed to just one veteran, and in general, the 40 names varied. So, as Councilor Williams mentioned, it was a controversial time when naming the bridge and community support was divisive. Mr. Bohannon thought the City Council had remained steadfast in what an impact that project had over the years, and what it is today.

Chair Manwaring opened the hearing to public comment.

Greg Pregent of 29 Page Street, former Mayor Philip (Dale) Pregent's son, thanked Councilor Williams for his proposal and the other Councilors for listening. Mr. Greg Pregent appreciated this sentiment in honor of his dad, who believed in Keene, lived here his whole life, and tried to help people as much as he could through infrastructure for those without cars. He remembered people perishing crossing that road before the bridge project his father stewarded and therefore, he said this would be a nice and appreciated the honor for his father.

Chuck Redfern of 9 Colby Street provided further background. He recalled a former Committee chaired by Mr. Greg Pregent, who Mr. Redfern said understood the importance of submitting matters to Council and came many times to the Bicycle and Pedestrian Path Advisory Committee (BPPAC), which assists the Keene City Council in collecting data or information for input into a process. Mr. Redfern felt this would be such an issue to engage the BPPAC. He did not have a preference for the bridge name, but felt it would be a worthy community discussion via BPPAC as the conduit. Mr. Redfern recalled the North Bridge name developed from a NH Department of transportation project, stating the name was not intended to be permanent, but later during the community input, an individual advocated the North Bridge name that exists today. Mr. Redfern said he was not criticizing nor endorsing the name, and he was not proposing a new name. He said a renaming should be overseen by the BPPAC Committee to ensure community input. Chair Manwaring thanked Mr. Redfern for the idea.

Councilor Filiault stated that during his tenure as Councilor, he had been involved with many proposed naming/re-naming projects for municipal facilities, including bridges, and said it does bring out a lot of emotion. With 23,000 people you get 23,000 different opinions. He said that former Mayor Pregent's name would be an honorable one for the North Bridge, but he thought the matter should be placed on more time so the Committee could take its time hearing from the public and other Councilors. He agreed with Mr. Redfern about opportunities for the public process through BPPAC. Councilor Filiault also mentioned Pathways for Keene and said there are other organizations that could be involved. He said such a public process could lead ultimately to honoring

Mr. Pregent, but that more time should be given to hearing opinions from the various North Bridge stakeholders.

Vice Chair Giacomo agreed that honoring former Mayor Pregent was a great idea given his enthusiasm for this infrastructure. Still, from the history presented, he said it seemed there was quite an ordeal with choosing a name in 2012 and therefore, he did not think it wise to simply change the bridge name without similar public input; doing so as just the MSFI Committee would be rushed. Vice Chair Giacomo supported putting the matter on more time and seeking input from the BPPAC. He thought everyone was in consensus about the merit of honoring former Mayor Pregent in some way.

Councilor Madison also supported putting the matter on more time because there is more to changing a name than this Committee simply doing so. He was happy for this to go on more time to explore honoring former Mayor Pregent.

Councilor Williams was happy for his request to go on more time; he was grateful for more discussion on pedestrian infrastructure and finding a way to honor former Mayor Pregent. The Councilor said he also initiated this conversation because there would be a service for former Mayor Pregent in mid-September, which would be an ideal time to enact such an honor. Councilor Williams wanted to find out more about the other two bridges pending installation and consider ways to educate the public, stating that they are very interesting, with the City paying only \$1 for one that will be crossing RT-101. He said that bridge would also be a great honor for Mr. Pregent, though he was concerned it already had a name that would need to be considered. The second bridge pending installation would be the Island Street Bridge planned to cross Swanzy Factory Road because it was a temporary bridge used in World War II, when it was called the Bailey Bridge before it was constructed on Island Street in 1979. Both the coming bridges are historical and so Councilor Williams said it might be appropriate to name one of the antique bridges for former Mayor Pregent. Still the Councilor preferred the North Bridge due to the project being important to the former Mayor.

Councilor Manwaring said that the bridge planned to cross RT-101 is a historic steel bridge currently deconstructed in chunks pending transport to Keene. She said that Prowse Bridge was named after its designer, but that name had nothing to do with the Monadnock region and while the designer could be honored on plaques, Chair Manwaring did not believe the name was appropriate for Keene.

Chair Manwaring recognized City Councilor Jones, who shared more history. He chaired the North Bridge dedication committee and one Committee member advocated branding the bridge as the Jonathan Daniels bridge, which was supported by the Jonathan Daniels/ Martin Luther King Committee (now Human Rights Committee), because he was the iconic champion of inclusion and diversity. Councilor Jones said the issue did come before the MSFI Committee and former Mayor Kendall suggested appointing a formal special committee for bridge naming, which was chaired by Cynthia Georgina. At that time, Councilor Jones said that there were open public meetings, and that Committee supported the Jonathan Daniels honor. However, Tom Little advocated against the name

because he thought there was going to be a trail from Ashuelot Park going north to what was then the Jonathan Daniels School; he thought there was going to be a Jonathan Daniels trail and did not want confusion, but that trail was not on railroad property and Councilor Jones said it is off the books now. Councilor Jones stated that he supported naming something after former Mayor Pregel, who the Councilor supported, but thought the former special Committee's decision should be honored and remain the North Bridge. If the North Bridge were to be named after a former Mayor, Councilor Jones stated that Kendall Lane was Mayor when the North Bridge was dedicated, was the one who acquired the \$500,000 for the bridge through his connections with a congressman, and the one who acquired an architect for the pro bono original design. The Councilor said Kendall Lane did a lot for that bridge and so if the North Bridge were to be renamed in someone's honor, then Councilor Jones suggested former Mayor Lane and said something else could be done for other former mayors. During the North Bridge project, the tagline was Bridging the Community, which is on a plaque there along with a list of sponsors.

Vice Chair Giacomo noted that the Prowse Bridge is a colloquial name for what is actually the Ash Street Bridge, which also means nothing to Keene.

Councilor Filiault moved to place the renaming of the North Street Bridge on more time to get more staff and public input, which Vice Chair Giacomo seconded, and the motion passed unanimously on a roll call vote of 5-0.

Chair Manwaring said this should be passed to the BPPAC and Pathways for Keene for additional input.

## **2) Presentation – Sidewalk Asset Management Plan – Public Works Director**

Chair Manwaring welcomed City Engineer, Don Lussier, and Director of Public Works, Kurt Blomquist, for a presentation on the City's Sidewalk Asset Management Plan. The Director of Public Works began, stating that this presentation focused on what assets the City owns so this Committee, the City Council, and community can understand the assets and begin a discussion on sidewalk conditions. Specifically, the Director of Public Works said the goal of this discussion was to arrive at a consensus on what the sidewalk service level standards should be in the City so Staff could return with a further inventory of those sidewalks not meeting the agreed upon service level and costs to bring them to standard.

The City Engineer began stating his delight to hear the Committee discussing the new bridges coming to Keene. He continued his discussion on sidewalks, stating that this was an extension and continuation of significant asset management planning work by City Staff. The City's Fiscal Policy guides Staff to incorporate asset management planning into regular workflow. Like other infrastructure plans Staff had presented (e.g., roadways or sewer mains), this presentation was a similar attenuation for sidewalk improvements, which had been a frequent topic of conversation in the past several months. However, the City Engineer said that Staff needed more direction from the City Council to understand specifically what sidewalk improvements mean to the community and

the Council's goals adopted recently, including the need to minimize the taxpayer's burden. He said the Council had heard him preach about asset management and its ability to minimize the lifecycle costs of City assets. Further, Council goal number two talks about infrastructure meeting the needs of the community and sidewalks are probably one of the things felt and understood by the community directly; opposed to things citizens might not understand or appreciate the conditions of, like water mains. Sidewalks, however, are key to connectivity in the City and were therefore the context of this discussion, which the City Engineer hoped would lead to the Committee engaging in an open conversation about what the community expects from Keene's sidewalk system.

The City Engineer began his presentation discussing the asset management plan. He referred to the term "level of service," which he called a fancy way of saying the sidewalk conditions the community expects to be maintained. A next step in this process would be bringing experts to present to the Committee on how sidewalk levels of services are measured and prioritized (e.g., geography versus use level), leading to long-term specifics implemented through the Capital Improvement Program (CIP); identifying specific streets and neighborhoods to be improved, upgraded, or replaced. The City Engineer said Staff understood that this would be a long-term effort over the next two or three years, beginning with this sidewalk asset inventory.

The City Engineer showed a map of current sidewalks assets in the City's Geographical Information Systems (GIS) that is a well-defined and accurate inventory of the entire sidewalk system, include the material, width, etc. The extensive inventory tells us currently that the City is responsible for 52.8 miles of sidewalks, ranging in width from three to 16 feet, with the widest in downtown areas and narrowest in older historic neighborhoods. There are 23 miles of asphalt sidewalks and 30 miles of concrete sidewalks. Curbing and grass belts excluded, upgrading the asphalt to concrete would cost approximately \$2.2 million, and replacing the 30 miles of concrete sidewalks would cost \$10.3 million. (17.13) Therefore, such improvements would be a significant investment for the City in an important piece of infrastructure.

The City Engineer continued describing conditions of the current sidewalk network, stating that between 2017-2019, the Engineering Division Staff completed a detailed - on the ground walking - survey of all 53 miles of sidewalks, as time allowed. Each sidewalk was rated from 0-100, using numerous criteria from tripping hazards, to accessibility problems, or cracking, among others. The overall conditions were scored 0-100 and incorporated into the City's asset management system Cartegraph, which provides the ability to explore the data in interesting ways. The City Engineer shared a graphic of the overall network condition that he said indicated a pretty good level of service. He said that the network-wide overall average score was 67, with 66% of the inventory in good or excellent condition, but only 8% rated as very poor, which seemed a good situation. However, he said those data might not tell the whole story, so he shared photos of sidewalks scored 67, including the west side of Main Street just north of Gilbo Avenue, which he said was installed likely in the 1980s and was in pretty good shape despite the center having shifted, presenting a tripping hazard, in addition to some cracking and an area replaced with asphalt due to utility work. He showed another photo of an asphalt sidewalk scoring 67 too, that had light cracking, which allowed puddles to form, which the City Engineer said it was an unfair condition that he thought

most people would deem unacceptable, stating that it was showing its age. Geographically, he said that the worst and best sidewalks are well-spread evenly throughout the City, with an obvious bias of sidewalks toward downtown in better condition, which he thought reflected the 2008-2016 City infrastructure work.

The City Engineer continued discussing sidewalk conditions by material type, stating that many sidewalks had been replaced for utility work. He reiterated that these data also do not tell the whole story. He showed graphics comparing conditions of the concrete and asphalt sidewalks, noting that half of concrete sidewalks are in excellent condition, 83% are in good or excellent conditions, and only 2% are in very poor and needing maintenance. Conversely, nearly half of asphalt sidewalks are in unfair condition, and approximately 16% are poor or very poor. Much fewer asphalt sidewalks are in excellent condition and many need help. Unfortunately, there is poor information on when all the different sidewalks were installed if before the mid-1990s. Therefore, the City Engineer said it was hard to distinguish life expectancy of a concrete versus asphalt sidewalk, though he said the concrete were certainly lasting longer and in better condition. Almost all the sidewalks ranked poor or very poor are asphalt, making it clear that material impacts long-term sidewalk performance.

The City Engineer showed some common defects for the different types of sidewalks. The primary concern is tripping hazards, which results normally from concrete panels shifting against one another. Concrete sidewalks must have expansion and contraction joints that allow the concrete to move with heating and cooling cycles, but sometimes those panels will then shift relative to another one another, causing some problems depicted in the photos. These concrete issues occur a lot near roadways or driveways, where people cut the corner too close and drive on the sidewalk. He said these are relatively easy to fix. Another common issue is accessibility, with large bumps impeding sidewalk use. He said that there are a number of different requirements to which the City must comply, including the Americans with Disabilities Act, and the City Engineer stated that many of the older sidewalks were not built to those standards and must be corrected by either partial or complete replacement if some other repair method is inapplicable. The City Engineer continued describing common defects of asphalt sidewalks, stating that accessibility was also a concern due to very common cracking, which is unique to asphalt, causing bumps and divots. It is also common for tree roots to push through asphalt, which would be candidates for complete replacement.

The City Engineer concluded his presentation by displaying photos of sidewalks in Keene scored differently for comparison and reference. He began showing sidewalks that scored 20/100, which were all asphalt that he thought most would agree were in rough condition, with extensive cracking, tripping hazards, and edges worn away from weeds growing through it. He showed the sidewalk on Hardy Court, which is very narrow and with some obstructions that would be hard for somebody to navigate if they had any type of ability impediments or for those riding their bikes.

Moving up the scale to score 40, the City Engineer showed a sidewalk on Main Street that was in better condition, but still with puddling and other problems, in addition to other issues on Main Street, Island Street, and Greenwood Avenue, as examples. The City Engineer continued showing sidewalks that scored 60, which he said had cracking that he thought most people would tolerate and

are adequate for passing other pedestrians without having to step off the sidewalks. Sidewalks scored 80 are in very good condition such as North Street, a new section of Water Street, and next to the Roxbury Plaza parking garage as examples.

In conclusion, Staff needed input from the Committee as to what the minimum acceptable level of service should be for Keene sidewalks. For example, should the focus be on maintaining those sidewalks scored below 20, or does the community want to see everything brought up to an 80. The City Engineer hoped this would spur discussion.

Councilor Williams shared some comments, noting that he had brought sidewalk conditions up as a concern consistently. Looking at Ward Two in the map shown, he cited his constituents who said those sidewalks are worst in the winter when there is puddling of ice that make it impossible to pass safely. He said his main concern was not aesthetics, but safe pass ways, citing the tripping hazards depicted by the City Engineer as one of the main problems he would like to solve. He said they are not just tripping hazards but also barriers to those on scooters or pushing strollers, for example, stating that once enough of these impediments accumulate, people stop using sidewalks. He thinks “rollable” sidewalks are of particular importance with the kinds of wheeled technologies developing, like hoverboards, for example, that would be great ways for kids to get around town if the sidewalks were not too bumpy. Councilor Williams also cited safety issues where there is no space between sidewalks and passing cars, mentioning Eastern Avenue and a discussion last year about replacing those sidewalks, with some petitioners wanting higher sidewalks so they feel separated from traffic more safely; sidewalks on Eastern Avenue are at grade as he understood due to drainage issues. Making sidewalks a safe environment for people to walk alongside of streets was one of Councilor Williams’ priorities. He would like to see sidewalks treated on par with the level of service for City roadways. He is bothered seeing nice areas of roadway patched with tar without the sidewalks being treated the same. He asked Staff to explain more about the current levels of service for City roadways.

The City Engineer said the Councilor's question was a great one. Something the City Engineer would be working on later this summer is parsing data from a City-wide road inspection that was conducted by a company this past winter. He thought he could provide better answers to Councilor Williams’ question within the next few months. He said the roadways asset management plan found an average score of 68, which is very similar to the sidewalk results. The focus of asset management plans is level of service, which does not have to be equal in all locations or circumstances, and staff discussed the importance of arterial straits, main thoroughfares, and gateways to the City. There could be a similar discussion for sidewalks.

Councilor Filiault said similar discussions had occurred before, often initiated by newer Councilors, with the issues coming and going from the forefront of Council focus, including his own sidewalk proposal when he was a new Councilor in 1993, stating that he was still learning today. He applauded the new Councilors for bringing this issue to the forefront again. He appreciated the criteria as it cannot be a neighborhood-by-neighborhood decision. He agreed with Councilor Williams that the sidewalks are poor in Ward Two, recalling that he represented Ward Two for 16

years. He appreciated Staff looking into and addressing this and Councilor Filiault was hopeful the criteria would help identify the worst areas to address.

Vice Chair Giacomo stated that a couple of counselors at the last MSFI meeting heard him discuss how much he liked the presentation on asset management regarding roads approximately five years ago, which was really one of the most excellent presentations he had seen because it was so detailed into literally every road's score. He appreciated that Staff provided helpful numerical references for all sidewalks in this presentation. He recalled an issue with roadways in which a road scored below 40 would have significant costs to repair them to reasonable condition. He asked the difference between the base structures of roads and sidewalks and if the costs to repair lower scoring roadways would be similar.

The City Engineer said there are fewer options for sidewalks, stating there are some modest repairs the City can make if the condition is still good. Overall, though, if a concrete sidewalk has one or two cracked panels, for example, then those could be replaced relatively easily, but asphalt is a different situation in which there are few options for preventative or routine maintenance beyond crack sealing or overlaying. The current Council policy is that if a sidewalk is being repaired, it should be replaced with concrete. The City Engineer said that a sidewalk scoring 60 today, for example, would indicate the base had not yet failed and a thin overlay could even-out the bumps and continue the sidewalk's service life, but this is contrary to the Council's concrete sidewalk policy.

Vice Chair Giacomo followed-up stating that it sounded as though the particular sidewalk issue determined the type of repair, the extent, and cost to bring the sidewalk to a specified service level chosen by the Council. With that, the Vice Chair asked whether the sidewalk inventory includes the types of problems for each sidewalk. The City Engineer said that the overall scores presented are based on very detailed inspections based on six or eight different criteria, depending on the material type, including drainage, cracks, tripping hazards, and obstructions. The inventory might indicate a high score overall, but have a low cracking score that could alert Staff to seal it against water infiltration, for example.

Councilor Madison mentioned crosswalks, stating that it was a major concern he heard from constituents about either missing crosswalks in certain areas where kids cross the road for school, or the type of signage required near crosswalks, citing some locations with no signs. Some have high visibility triangular signs and others have flashing lights, but he has heard concern from constituents about high visibility in crosswalks. Councilor Madison agreed that some are hazardous to cross, particularly at night; and even at high pedestrian traffic locations, like where he was almost hit in front of City Hall. He wondered where crosswalks fall in the greater scheme of asset management plans for sidewalks.

The Director of Public Works, Kürt Blomquist, said that crosswalks sort of blend with the road system, particularly when dealing with crosswalk conditions. He said the City uses numerous standards for crosswalks, including the Uniform Manual of Traffic Control Devices that specifies where crosswalks go and more. He said many residents disagree with those requirements for

crosswalk placement and signage in different contexts, such as flashing lights in high volume areas and specific requirements for types of signage near school crossings. The Director of Public Works said that if there were specific crosswalk concerns, he could investigate them, but in general crosswalks are managed through analysis of the requirements he cited.

Chair Manwaring noted that the meeting had to end and cited her remaining questions on costs of things discussed during this meeting. As such, she requested that the City Engineer and Director of Public Works return to the next regular meeting to provide more examples and to discuss costs for asphalt versus concrete issues. As she heard tonight, everyone wanted safe sidewalks, but she said that was only one part of the issue. She also wondered about people requesting sidewalks where there are none presently. She asked whether Staff could return to the next regular meeting for this discussion and the Director of Public Works agreed.

The Director of Public Works provided concluding remarks in response to Chair Manwaring, stating that at one time the City did maintain a list of requests for new sidewalks, which was discontinued because it was at that point approximately \$4 million of identified areas. The Director of Public Works said Staff spent several occasions with the City Council via this Committee looking at criteria to determine where new sidewalks should be prioritized. He thought that separate tracking discussions about adding new sidewalks to the inventory would be valuable, but he said the focus had been on what we own and if there are additional sidewalk needs, both the capital costs to install and the operational costs to maintain the sidewalks would have to be considered. He asked if the Chair was wondering, for example, the cost per square foot to replace a concrete sidewalk. Chair Manwaring replied yes and said she also wondered if there were low-cost ways to address the safety issues.

The Director of Public Works asked Councilors to look at sidewalks and consider appropriate service levels before the next meeting's discussion because that is what Staff needs to move forward with a sidewalk program.

**The consensus of the Committee was to place this item on more time for further discussion.**

### **3) Adjournment**

There being no further business, Chair Manwaring adjourned the meeting at 6:47 PM.

Respectfully submitted by,  
Katie Kibler, Minute Taker  
June 13, 2021

Edited by the City Clerk's Office