



**BICYCLE PEDESTRIAN PATH ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
**AGENDA**

**Wednesday, December 14, 2022 8:15-9:30 AM**

**2<sup>nd</sup> floor Conference Room  
3 Washington St, City Hall**

**Members:**

Drew Bryenton, Chair  
Todd Horner, Vice Chair  
Dillon Benik, Chair  
Jan Manwaring

Michael Davern  
Dr. Rowland Russell  
Dr. Chris Brehme, Alternate  
Charles Redfern, Alternate

- 1) Call to Order and Roll Call
- 2) November 9, 2022 Minutes
- 3) Approve 2023 Meeting Schedule
- 4) Downtown Infrastructure Project Update
- 5) BPPAC Website
- 6) Old Business  
Public Art and the Trails Update  
Volunteer Opportunities
- 7) Regular Project Updates
- 8) New Business  
- Items to be included for next meeting
- 9) More Time  
Wayfinding/Amenities: North and South Bridge Signage  
Bike/Pedestrian Counts  
Kiosk Map Updates
- 10) Adjournment  
Next meeting date – January 11, 2023

1 **City of Keene**  
2 **New Hampshire**

3  
4  
5 **BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN PATH ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
6 **MEETING MINUTES**  
7

Wednesday, November 9, 2022

8:15 AM

2<sup>nd</sup> Floor Conference Room,  
City Hall

**Members Present:**

Drew Bryenton, Chair  
Todd Horner, Vice Chair  
Dillon Benik  
Jan Manwaring  
Michael Davern  
Dr. Rowland Russell  
Charles Redfern, Alternate

**Staff Present:**

William Schoefmann, GIS Technician  
Kürt Blomquist, Director of Public  
Works/ACM  
Andy Bohannon, Director of Parks,  
Recreation, Cemeteries and Facilities

**Members Not Present:**

Dr. Chris Brehme, Alternate

8  
9  
10 **1) Call to Order and Roll Call**

11 Chair Drew Bryenton called the meeting to order at 8:16 AM. Minutes should reflect that Mr.  
12 Charles Redfern was sitting as a full member. Mr. Dave McNamara and Mr. Ed Roberge, both  
13 of Stantec, attended.  
14

15 **2) October 12, 2022 Minutes Approval**

16 Mr. Rowland Russell motioned to approve the minutes from October 12, 2022. Ms. Jan  
17 Manwaring seconded motion. Unanimous roll call approval was received from the committee.  
18

19 **3) Downtown Infrastructure Project- Letters of Support and Update**

20 Chair Bryenton said there were a number of questions identified on the design options during  
21 the October meeting. The Stantec team was invited and attended the meeting to try to provide  
22 answers and clarification to those questions. Chair Bryenton's goal for the meeting was  
23 identify a specific design proposal that the group supports and from that, develop a  
24 recommendation for City Council.

25 Chair Bryenton opened it up for any questions. Mr. Todd Horner said he had a question  
26 regarding designs three and four and how they extend north. He would be interested in  
27 hearing Stantec's thoughts on the differences between those scenarios.

28 Mr. Ed Roberge spoke and said they have been working closely with the technical review  
29 committee (the staff cross-sectional committee) on a whole host of scenarios. When they

30 looked at the option of closing the top of Central Square, there were three things driving the  
31 feasibility of that. One being if trucks are using that route, could trucks, school busses and  
32 firetrucks make it if that particular route was eliminated. Through studies, they confirmed that  
33 they indeed could. The second issue looked at whether there was enough space to reserve an  
34 open plaza space and would there be enough space should fire trucks or emergency personnel  
35 need to get in there. The third issue was in regards to the parking and whether elimination of  
36 that could be mitigated. They were able to show in a couple of concepts how they propose  
37 mitigating those parking spaces both on Court Street and Washington Street.

38 As it is currently, the interior finished circle is about 17,000 square feet. With elimination of  
39 that roadway section and bringing Court and Washington into West Roxbury, it will cause of  
40 gain of about 14,000 square feet and almost double the size of the interior finished circle. The  
41 roadway configurations nearly keep the whole original circle space untouched. The  
42 roundabout does have some front nose modifications, but they believe it to be minimal. The  
43 study indicated not only could it be done, but could be done in a fashion that operates similar  
44 to what the expectation is today.

45 Dr. Russell asked how these different options impact bike/pedestrian traffic. Mr. Roberge  
46 responded that if Washington Street continues to West Roxbury Street, the goal would be to  
47 maintain bike lanes right into the Main Street intersection with a one-way bike lane on both  
48 the north and southbound side. They have a number of options for those bike lanes in the  
49 design options (protected, unprotected, etc.). Currently, there are no bike lanes on Court  
50 Street, so they would introduce something similar to what is currently present on Washington  
51 Street, where the lanes would enter the West Roxbury Square. He noted that there is space to  
52 accommodate that. They are also looking at crosswalks and in particular, how people come  
53 and go and the overall safety of them. There are existing crosswalks at the top of the square  
54 and some at the bottom. They are trying to maintain those and they think they could maintain  
55 the pedestrian access with a lot less pavement.

56 Dr. Russell asked how they propose increasing the safety of the pedestrian crossing in the  
57 roundabout option especially given that they would not have the benefit of a signal, which  
58 they currently do have. Mr. Roberge responded that there are a number of challenges in that.  
59 He added that roundabouts have the cross walk positioned beyond the first car stacking at the  
60 intersection. The benefit of that particular proposed design option is that by reducing the  
61 crosswalk widths; it would provide increased visibility and less traffic. The Rapid Flashing  
62 Beacon (RFB), can be used to draw attention to pedestrian crossings and provide awareness  
63 for the driver. Another benefit is the pedestrian is only crossing one lane at a time and even if  
64 there is a splitter lane; there is refuge for the pedestrian to ensure the driver has pedestrian  
65 awareness.

66 Ms. Manwaring asked what would be the option for pedestrians that are visually impaired as  
67 they will not be able to visually see a flashing beacon. Mr. Roberge responded that for  
68 visually impaired pedestrians, there are auditory systems that can be put in place to provide  
69 additional safety mechanisms and/or things such as adding a stop condition or a red light at  
70 each of those lights to provide additional safety.

71 Chair Bryenton asked specifically regarding the mini-roundabout and whether the volume  
72 capacity in that option was comparable to what it is today. Mr. Roberge responded that it  
73 would actually an improvement to what is present today. They have modeled that and will be  
74 presenting it to the Steering Committee next Tuesday. They looked at the existing, 5-leg  
75 signal and were able to show that the roundabout outperforms as it keeps traffic moving. The  
76 northbound would be a two-lane approach and that right lane would be for right lane onto  
77 Roxbury Street or straight north onto Washington Street. The left inside lane would be for a  
78 left turn onto Court Street or a hard left onto West Street. He stated they would expect those  
79 ques to be less than the length of the blocks shown in the Central Square option 4- mini-  
80 roundabout image.

81 Chair Breyenton asked if this committee was meeting their goal and meeting their vision of  
82 more bike and pedestrian traffic, how would that impact the amount of traffic that can move  
83 through. Mr. Roberge responded that he believes they included bike facilities at all approaches  
84 to the roundabout. The task now is to refine how they process bikes through the roundabout.  
85 Often times, roundabouts use a wider shared lane outside of vehicle traffic. Stantec plans to  
86 review that to see if it would fit. The widening does interfere with parking, but alternatives  
87 would be considered to either have the bikes join the traffic or place them outside the  
88 vehicular traffic. He thinks the model can accommodate all of that plus pedestrians.

89 Mr. Horner asked regarding roundabout and bike and pedestrian safety, a key consideration is  
90 speed. One reason he liked the roundabout is the avoidance of signals and people gunning it to  
91 get through lights. He wondered what the design speed is of this roundabout. He asked how  
92 fast they anticipated vehicles moving. Mr. McNamara responded that the curbs are designed  
93 to slow people to twenty miles per hour.

94 Mr. Horner wondered how the decision about Central Square relates to street design on Main  
95 Street. He questioned whether a single lane option on Main Street might become a more  
96 feasible option from a traffic standpoint, if the decision was to proceed with a roundabout  
97 versus a signalized intersection. Mr. Roberge noted what a great question it was and how that  
98 particular question was part of the studies they completed. He noted that they had alternative  
99 1, 2a, 2b and 3. Those have splintered into about eight and they are trying to make sure they  
100 can manage and talk through all of them appropriately. The 5-leg signal does add some  
101 queuing during peak hours. They have identified that all three alternatives work fairly well.  
102 He added that from the geometry, when looking at the exit southbound on Main Street, it is  
103 presently a single lane. This has potential to be opened up and with consensus of the  
104 community, could maintain a multilane roadway. When entering the roundabout, the two  
105 lanes for northbound are still needed to process the traffic and get the vehicles started into the  
106 roundabout. The other lanes (Court, Washington, Roxbury and West Streets) would all be  
107 single lane approaches.

108 Chair Bryenton asked if there were any other questions on Central Square. With no further  
109 questions, they moved onto the four Main Street options for Central Square. Regarding the  
110 Main Street and going from two lanes to one lane, he noted that they discussed how the  
111 roundabout can accommodate, but he wondered how two lanes allow in this section of

112 roadway. Mr. Roberge said the two lanes versus one lane in the straight line corridor of Main  
113 Street would behave very much like it does today. The cars would use it much the same as  
114 present. If it were single lane, speed will likely slow down and from the pedestrian  
115 perspective, it will all balance. It really comes down to signal delays and whether that can be  
116 maintained. Today, there are three lanes that sit there for the signal. Signal delays would be a  
117 little longer and require a little more time. Drivers might have to wait a little longer for the  
118 light for Roxbury, but they would not have to go all the way around thereby reducing the total  
119 travel distance. Whether single or two, they have studied both and they are both pretty  
120 comparable and nothing was noted that would be a big disconnect or que time that would be  
121 problematic.

122 Mr. Horner stated that one feature he really liked about the single lane was that it opened  
123 potential for east/west connection on Emerald and Eagle Streets as well as Gilbo and Railroad  
124 Streets. If people can get directly across town on east/west, it removes some traffic from those  
125 central locations.

126 Mr. Charles Redfern said he was not sure where the group was in the overall discussion. One  
127 previous discussion was regarding a bike lane and a dedicated lane going opposite ways right  
128 down the middle. There was question of how to enter into the traffic flow on the south part  
129 and how to exit on the north part. Dr. Russell added that he noted the reduction makes it  
130 harder for people to get to businesses to shop. It takes away the benefit of people passing  
131 through. It works for through traffic and a few destinations downtown. Mr. Roberge  
132 responded that based on corridor width, if referring to the alternative that is shown with the  
133 multiuse path, they really only have the opportunity for that in the first block. It provides a  
134 decent connection to the Cheshire Rail Trail, but it narrows back down shortly after. It really  
135 becomes a challenge of getting them out and in safely.

136 Chair Bryenton asked if any other questions on the main street section of the design.

137 Dr. Russell mentioned that a number of the group were very positive about the raised section.  
138 He questioned whether that could be on the table regardless of one lane or two lane. He  
139 noted that it was only listed in one option, but seems highly desirable for traffic calming,  
140 pedestrian safety, events, etc. Mr. Roberge said they looked at it as a gateway treatment  
141 focusing on that arrival into the trail. It would operate very well regardless of single or multi-  
142 lane.

143 Mr. Horner asked about the single lane option and requested clarification on if the protected  
144 bike lane was at sidewalk grade. He really liked the sidewalk grade and thought the thirty-four  
145 foot grassy green space was awesome and wondered if maybe it would be possible to have  
146 protected bike lanes along with a linear park up Main Street.

147 Dr. Russell added that the green space adds options to water gardens, bios walls, and greater  
148 flexibility.

149 Mr. Roberge said they tried to maintain the existing outer limits of the current parking area  
150 and all the trees that are there today. This design maximizes that and provides a balanced  
151 flexibility.

152 Mr. Redfern said he also prefers the raised bike lane. His only concern is thinking ahead, e-  
153 bike popularity are increasing. With the increased speed of e-bikes, he suggested a speed limit  
154 on the pavement on the bike lane so the riders have time to react to the pedestrians.

155 Mr. Roberge responded that it remains a concern and there is signage he has seen used in  
156 other projects to increase awareness. Another option is to use strong pavement markings to  
157 increase awareness of pedestrian traffic.

158 Chair Bryenton asked if any other questions. With no further questions, they moved onto toe  
159 Gilbo Avenue and Railroad Street area and asked Mr. Roberge to go through the design  
160 alternatives. Mr. Roberge stated the existing condition is a two-way access. They have been  
161 looking at a one-way alternative or west bound from Gilbo Avenue and whether the  
162 circulation would work from that pattern. If that was done, there is potential for a better plaza  
163 space. It mimics what can be programmed on the other side of Railroad Street. The third  
164 option was to emphasize the importance of the rail trail and its crossing so it was proposed to  
165 raise that to sidewalk elevation. The travel way north and southbound would ramp up. The  
166 continued elevation between Railroad and Gilbo space would tie in quite well, but would still  
167 be predicated on the one-way traffic.

168 Dr. Russell asked how they proposed mitigating the one-way Gilbo Avenue heading west and  
169 the impact on public transportation. Mr. Roberge said that is being studied right now. Kurt  
170 Blomquist added that the City is completing a microgrant study and that the goal is to keep  
171 Gilbo Avenue multimodal. There are still conversations that need to be had with the  
172 Greyhound bus company around what kind of impact it will have on them.

173 Chair Bryenton asked if there were any general questions for the team. With no further  
174 questions, Chair Bryenton noted that all the options presently on the table will allow to  
175 process existing traffic acceptably with no major impacts. Some of these options have  
176 splintered off. He asked Mr. Roberge what directions those splinters are going. Mr. Roberge  
177 said most of those are around on-street parking, parking type and bike safety and passage. The  
178 next piece was Central Square and whether the north piece could be closed off. He said the  
179 key takeaway is that the street could be replaced with flexible space.

180 Chair Bryenton asked how far it extends. Mr. Roberge said the project area is south of Water  
181 Street.

182 Chair Bryenton thanked the Stantec team for coming. He then opened it up for comment from  
183 the committee.

184 Ms. Manwaring said she is very against the roundabout option. She regularly watches people  
185 struggle to cross and does not see the average individual being able to cross easily, let alone  
186 someone who has any challenges. She favored option two.

187 Mr. Dillon Benik mentioned that the business owners are very protective of their parking and  
188 he is curious to hear their input.

189 Mr. Redfern liked the idea of the extension of Central Square with the green space. He  
190 favored the roundabout. The group consensus was in favor of the sidewalk grade bike lane.

191 Dr. Russell also favored the raised bike path. He stated he supported expanding Central  
192 Square park and he is leaning more away from roundabout.

193 Mr. Horner stated he had concerns with the roundabout and pedestrian safety. While the  
194 roundabout jumps out as the one that makes sense, he always comes back to the walkability  
195 and the roundabout does not have the same degree of walkability. If it were possible to put up  
196 beacons and some signals for visually impaired, he stated it would certainly be a possibility.

197 Mr. Davern liked the roundabout from a traffic sense, but noted that when adding in the  
198 beacons, it creates a random sequence that from his perception, could bottleneck things. He  
199 favored option two and four. For Main Street, he preferred the 2b multimodal with the bike  
200 path at sidewalk grade.

201 Dr. Russell pointed out that almost everyone talked about traffic and cars. As a business, he  
202 would want opportunities for cars to stop downtown. The roundabout seems more predicated  
203 on moving traffic through downtown to the detriment of bike safety. He was curious what,  
204 honestly, do the business favor and thinks the group needs to take that into account in their  
205 decision.

206 Mr. Davern questioned whether a more steady flow of traffic makes it harder on the corridor  
207 parking wise.

208 In preparation of Ms. Manwaring leaving, Mr. Will Schoefmann questioned whether the  
209 group was able to form a consensus before Ms. Manwaring left. The most important takeaway  
210 is that we need bike facilities in downtown and a central square expansion is ideal. The group  
211 agreed.

212 Mr. Benik said the Steering Committee will be meeting on Tuesday, the 15<sup>th</sup>. He will report  
213 back to the group.

214 Chair Bryenton said the group will not have time to meet in December, but can get the  
215 feedback and update the letter. The motion will say something to the effect of the BBPAC is  
216 in support of the following four implementations to the downtown projects:

- 217 1) Expanded central square park
- 218 2) Separated and protected bike facilities in downtown
- 219 3) One lane traffic through project area
- 220 4) Raised intersection at Gilbo Street

221 The group will wait to hear from the results of the Tuesday meeting and will make appropriate  
222 adjustments in the hopes of getting the open letter to the public and then the support letter to  
223 the Council next week.

224 Chair Bryenton asked if speaking to business owners would be helpful. Mr. Davern said it  
225 might be best to wait to see the feedback from Tuesday. Mr. Redfern asked if there were any  
226 councilors the group should reach out to. Mr. Davern said there were a couple of councilors  
227 on the committee.

228 Mr. Schoefmann suggested completing the letter sooner rather than later. Mr. Davern noted  
229 that there are a number of businesses in support of bikes and that he understood they will also  
230 be writing letters in support. Dr. Russell asked if the public facing letter was different from  
231 the Council letter. It was clarified that it was separate and the open letter was approved by  
232 motion in the last meeting and had been finalized.

233 Motion is on the table for the Council Recommendation, which mirrors Mr. Horner's letter to  
234 City Council. Dr. Russell seconded the motion. The group provided unanimous approval.

235 4) **BPPAC Website**

236 No Update

237

238 5) **Old Business**

239 **A) Wayfinding/ Amenities: North and South Bridge Signage**

240 Mr. Schoefmann added that he heard from Andy Bohannon that they finally had  
241 communication on the North and South Bridge signage.

242 **B) Bike/ Pedestrian Counts**

243 No Update

244 **C) Public Art and the Trails Update**

245 No Update

246 **D) Volunteer Opportunities**

247 Dr. Russell stated that it did not appear as though the weather would be ideal for cleaning  
248 Friday 10am. He mentioned that alternatives were Saturday afternoon or Sunday morning at  
249 10. A number of members preferred Sunday morning at 10, if it is dry. The meet up location  
250 is Pearl Street where the seating location is. Dr. Russell will send out a reminder and will  
251 also create a little flyer.

252 **E) Kiosk Map Updates**

253 No Update

254

255 6) **Regular Project Updates**

256 No Update

257

258 7) **New Business**

259 No Update

260 8) **Adjournment**

261 No Update

262

263 There being no further business, Chair Bryenton adjourned the meeting at 9:32 AM.

264



265 Respectfully submitted by,  
266 Amanda Trask, Minute Taker  
267  
268 Reviewed and edited by,  
269 Will Schoefmann, GIS Mapping Technician  
270 Community Development



**Bicycle Pedestrian Path Advisory Committee**  
**(BPPAC)**

**2023 Meeting Dates**

All meetings are on the 2<sup>nd</sup> Wednesday of the month, at 8:15AM  
2<sup>nd</sup> floor conference room, City Hall, 3 Washington Street, Keene, NH

Wednesday, January 11

Wednesday, February 8

Wednesday, March 8

Wednesday, April 12

Wednesday, May 10

Wednesday, June 14

Wednesday, July 12

Wednesday, August 9

Wednesday, September 13

Wednesday, October 11

Wednesday, November 8

Wednesday, December 13

Meetings dates & times are subject to change

Project	PRIORITY	Master Plan Project #	Status	Budget *			Schedule			Updates (status changes and project notes)
				Cost	Status		Start	Finish	Status	
Master Plan	N/A	N/A	Delayed	City Staff	\$5K	N/A	Spring 2014	Fall 2021	Behind	Scope of work developed and funding available to work with Southwest Regional Planning Commission to finish work on the plan in 2022. Awaiting SWRPC draft contract and timeline. Granite State Wheelers Grant submitted for funding.
Complete Streets			Working			N/A	2018	N/A	Behind	Sharred Lane Markings (Sharrows) completed, Park Ave Bike Lanes in process, Bike Boxes need repairing.
Bike Racks	AMENITIES	P21	Working	N/A	N/A	N/A	ongoing	N/A	N/A	DPW Highway have put out some racks, Will is confirming rack locations for summer/fall 2022. Gaps in where historically placed.
Appel Way Trail Paving	MAINTANANCE	P22	Planning	\$ 104,900.00	Even		2023	N/A	On Schedule	Appel Way repaving project, CIP Budgeted in Parks and Rec Trail Maintenance Program.
Cheshire Rail Trail - Park Ave. Loop	N/A	N/A	Completed	\$411,615.51	Over		Spring 2019	Fall 2022	N/A	Engineering division of DPW is managing this project now. Repaving and striping of Park Ave completed. Trail work completed. Grand opening ceremony occurred Sept 14.
NHDOT TAP Grant 2018	N/A	BE22	Hold	\$674K	N/A		Winter 2018	Summer 2022	Behind	City of Keene has been selected as a TAP grant recipient for Complete Street improvements to Marlboro Street that tie into other planned improvements, infrastructure, economic development goals and the Cheshire Rail Trail. Project was stripped from federal earmark in the infrastructure bill.
Arts and Culture Corridor	NA	N/A	Working	N/A	N/A		Ongoing	N/A	N/A	Arts Alive, Jess Gelter, have taken on a scaled down version of the Arts and Culture Corridor concept Gilbo Avenue to School Street still part of the scope.
League of American Bicyclists Bicycle Friendly Program & other community ranking programs	N/A	N/A	Planning	-	N/A		Winter 2022	Spring 2023	N/A	City of Keene's designation as a "Bicycle Friendly City" has lapsed and needs to be renewed. The process includes data gathering for a report/application. Deadline March 1, 2023 for May 2023 announcement.
Sidewalks	N/A	N/A	Submitted	CIP	Even		Spring 2022	N/A	On Schedule	Summer 2022 expecting to replace approx. 2,000 LF of asphalt sidewalk, including Colby St. and Adams St. The CIP will request funding for about 2,000 LF / year beginning in 2023.
Downtown Infrastructure Project (MAIN STREET)	AMENITIES	P14	Planning	CIP	Even		Summer 2023	Fall 2027	N/A	<b>Open letter from Vice Chair Horner out for promotion; Need for support of bicycle inclusion in the infrastructure redesign. Planned formal letter from the committee for approval.</b>
Lower Winchester Street (Roundabout - City Line)	N/A	N/A	Planning	CIP	Even		Summer 2024	Fall 2027	N/A	<b>Potential for bike/pedestrian improvements to the Route 10/Lower Winchester Street Corridor and Gateway area via Swanzey into Keene. Listening sessions held Oct 24/25.</b>

CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE

MASTER PLAN PROJECTS									
Jonathan Daniels Trail Maintenance	TOP 7	P3	Planning	\$25K	Even	Summer 2020	2022	N/A	CIP Budgeted in Parks and Rec Trail Maintenance Program.
Wayfinding Signage Facilities and Plan	TOP 7	P11	Working	City Staff, \$42,000	N/A	Planning	N/A	On Schedule	BPPAC Considering overall wayfinding plan with Parks/Rec, DPW and Comm Dev Departments. <b>UNH Downtown Trails Initiative final report prepared and submitted for review at April meeting. Next steps signage design and placement.</b>
↓Transportation Heritage Trail ↓									
THT Phase 1 - CRT Eastern Ave to NH 101 (Transportation Heritage Trail)	TOP 7	P1	Planning	\$ 386,400.00	Even	2024	2025	N/A	Project includes from Eastern Ave - 101, Bridge to Span 101, improvements to Old Stone Arch Bridge and potential crossing at Swanzey Factor Rd. <b>Notice of Award for TAP project received 9/1. Federal Earmark funds for this project.</b>
THY Phase 2 - Prowse Bridge - CRT NH 101 Overpass to Stone Arch Bridge (Transportation Heritage Trail)	TOP 7	P4	Planning	\$ 381,685.00	N/A	2027	N/A	N/A	Installation of the Historic Prowse Bridge at NH Route 101 and connecting the Cheshire Rail Trail to the Old Stone Arch Bridge and safety improvements (railings) to Old Stone Arch Bridge. <b>Promotional website and video released with funding donation from PFK.</b>
THT Phase 3 - Old Stone Arch Bridge - (Transportation Heritage Trail)	TOP 7	P4	Planning	\$ 321,195.00	N/A	2025	N/A	N/A	Collaboration with Heritage Commission to conduct research and assist with Historic Resources LCHIP application for railing/abutment design. PFK funding conceptual visuals. LCHIP grant planned for 2022 to fund Planning Study phase. <b>Promotional website and video released with funding donation from PFK.</b>
THT Phase 4 - Island Street Bailey Bridge - Swanzey Factory Road to Town Line (Transportation Heritage Trail)	TOP 7	P4	Planning	\$ 1,862,310.00	N/A	2027	N/A	N/A	Installation of the Historic Island Street Bailey Bridge at Swanzey Factory Road to create a safe overpass for trail users and creating continuity of the Cheshire Rail Trail towards the Swanzey Town line. <b>Promotional website and video released with funding donation from PFK.</b>
West Street - Complete Street	TOP 7	P19	Planning	\$ 785,275.00	N/A	2027	N/A	N/A	Designated as a Gateway Street in the Complete Street Design Guide. BPPAC discussing interim and long range solutions for bike/ped facilities along the corridor. <b>Spring, Summer and Fall Counts completed for 2020. City submitted West Street improvement project into the DOT 10 Year Plan.</b>
AMENITIES	TOP 7	P21	Working	City Staff, Facility and Maintenance Costs	Under	Planning	N/A	On Schedule	Staff should establish a base line of existing amenities and propose types and locations of future amenities in a plan. These should include Kiosk/Trailhead facilities, Trailside Facilities such as bathrooms, potable water and tune up stations and efforts should be made to engage the artist community to create spots along the trails for public art which will enhance the unique qualities of our system. <b>Survey work incorporated into UNH Downtown Trails Initiative. TRAIL LIGHTS NOW INCLUDED HERE</b>

Project	PRIORITY	Master Plan Project #	Status	Budget *			Schedule			Updates (status changes and project notes)
				Cost	Status	Start	Finish	Status		
Master Plan	N/A	N/A	Delayed	City Staff	\$5K	N/A	Spring 2014	Fall 2021	Behind	Scope of work developed and funding available to work with Southwest Regional Planning Commission to finish work on the plan in 2022. Awaiting SWRPC draft contract and timeline. Granite State Wheelers Grant submitted for funding.
Complete Streets			Working			N/A	2018	N/A	Behind	Sharred Lane Markings (Sharrows) completed, Park Ave Bike Lanes in process, Bike Boxes need repairing.
Bike Racks	AMENITIES	P21	Working	N/A	N/A	ongoing		N/A	N/A	DPW Highway have put out some racks, Will is confirming rack locations for summer/fall 2022. Gaps in where historically placed.
Appel Way Trail Paving	MAINTANANCE	P22	Planning	\$ 104,900.00	Even	2023		N/A	On Schedule	Appel Way repaving project, CIP Budgeted in Parks and Rec Trail Maintenance Program.
Cheshire Rail Trail - Park Ave. Loop	N/A	N/A	Completed	\$411,615.51	Over	Spring 2019		Fall 2022	N/A	Engineering division of DPW is managing this project now. Repaving and striping of Park Ave completed. Trail work completed. Grand opening ceremony occurred Sept 14.
NHDOT TAP Grant 2018	N/A	BE22	Hold	\$674K	N/A	Winter 2018		Summer 2022	Behind	City of Keene has been selected as a TAP grant recipient for Complete Street improvements to Marlboro Street that tie into other planned improvements, infrastructure, economic development goals and the Cheshire Rail Trail. Project was stripped from federal earmark in the infrastructure bill.
Arts and Culture Corridor	NA	N/A	Working	N/A	N/A	Ongoing		N/A	N/A	Arts Alive, Jess Gelter, have taken on a scaled down version of the Arts and Culture Corridor concept Gilbo Avenue to School Street still part of the scope.
Bicycle Mayor	N/A	N/A	Hold	Safe Routes to School	Even	Winter 2018		Fall 2019	N/A	Project is inactive, program has material that could be incorporated in current websites of the City but outreach must occur to Tiffany Mannion for access to the safe routes to school material. <b>Not Active. Meeting upcoming with Tiffany Mannion to go over new program updates.</b>
Sidewalks	N/A	N/A	Submitted	CIP	Even	Spring 2022		N/A	On Schedule	Summer 2022 expecting to replace approx. 2,000 LF of asphalt sidewalk, including Colby St. and Adams St. The CIP will request funding for about 2,000 LF / year beginning in 2023.
Downtown Infrastructure Project (MAIN STREET)	AMENITIES	P14	Planning	CIP	Even	Summer 2023		Fall 2027	N/A	<b>Open letter from Vice Chair Horner out for promotion; Need for support of bicycle inclusion in the infrastructure redesign. Planned formal letter from the committee for approval.</b>
Lower Winchester Street (Roundabout - City Line)	N/A	N/A	Planning	CIP	Even	Summer 2024		Fall 2027	N/A	<b>Potential for bike/pedestrian improvements to the Route 10/Lower Winchester Street Corridor and Gateway area via Swanzey into Keene. Listening sessions held Oct 24/25.</b>

CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE

MASTER PLAN PROJECTS									
Jonathan Daniels Trail Maintenance	TOP 7	P3	Planning	\$25K	Even	Summer 2020	2022	N/A	CIP Budgeted in Parks and Rec Trail Maintenance Program.
Wayfinding Signage Facilities and Plan	TOP 7	P11	Working	City Staff, \$42,000	N/A	Planning	N/A	On Schedule	BPPAC Considering overall wayfinding plan with Parks/Rec, DPW and Comm Dev Departments. <b>UNH Downtown Trails Initiative final report prepared and submitted for review at April meeting. Next steps signage design and placement.</b>
↓Transportation Heritage Trail ↓									
THT Phase 1 - CRT Eastern Ave to NH 101 (Transportation Heritage Trail)	TOP 7	P1	Planning	\$ 386,400.00	Even	2024	2025	N/A	Project includes from Eastern Ave - 101, Bridge to Span 101, improvements to Old Stone Arch Bridge and potential crossing at Swanzey Factor Rd. <b>Notice of Award for TAP project received 9/1. Federal Earmark funds for this project.</b>
THY Phase 2 - Prowse Bridge - CRT NH 101 Overpass to Stone Arch Bridge (Transportation Heritage Trail)	TOP 7	P4	Planning	\$ 381,685.00	N/A	2027	N/A	N/A	Installation of the Historic Prowse Bridge at NH Route 101 and connecting the Cheshire Rail Trail to the Old Stone Arch Bridge and safety improvements (railings) to Old Stone Arch Bridge. <b>Promotional website and video released with funding donation from PFK.</b>
THT Phase 3 - Old Stone Arch Bridge - (Transportation Heritage Trail)	TOP 7	P4	Planning	\$ 321,195.00	N/A	2025	N/A	N/A	Collaboration with Heritage Commission to conduct research and assist with Historic Resources LCHIP application for railing/abutment design. PFK funding conceptual visuals. LCHIP grant planned for 2022 to fund Planning Study phase. <b>Promotional website and video released with funding donation from PFK.</b>
THT Phase 4 - Island Street Bailey Bridge - Swanzey Factory Road to Town Line (Transportation Heritage Trail)	TOP 7	P4	Planning	\$ 1,862,310.00	N/A	2027	N/A	N/A	Installation of the Historic Island Street Bailey Bridge at Swanzey Factory Road to create a safe overpass for trail users and creating continuity of the Cheshire Rail Trail towards the Swanzey Town line. <b>Promotional website and video released with funding donation from PFK.</b>
West Street - Complete Street	TOP 7	P19	Planning	\$ 785,275.00	N/A	2027	N/A	N/A	Designated as a Gateway Street in the Complete Street Design Guide. BPPAC discussing interim and long range solutions for bike/ped facilities along the corridor. <b>Spring, Summer and Fall Counts completed for 2020. City submitted West Street improvement project into the DOT 10 Year Plan.</b>
AMENITIES	TOP 7	P21	Working	City Staff, Facility and Maintenance Costs	Under	Planning	N/A	On Schedule	Staff should establish a base line of existing amenities and propose types and locations of future amenities in a plan. These should include Kiosk/Trailhead facilities, Trailside Facilities such as bathrooms, potable water and tune up stations and efforts should be made to engage the artist community to create spots along the trails for public art which will enhance the unique qualities of our system. <b>Survey work incorporated into UNH Downtown Trails Initiative. TRAIL LIGHTS NOW INCLUDED HERE</b>