

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

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

**Wednesday, February 14, 2024**

**8:15 AM**

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

**Members Present:**

Dillon Benik  
Jan Manwaring  
Michael Davern  
Councilor Edward Haas  
Rowland Russell  
Samantha Jackson  
Autumn DelaCroix  
Diana Duffy, Alternate

**Staff Present:**

William Schoefmann, GIS Technician  
Jesse Rounds, Community Development  
Director  
Amanda Palmeira, Assistant City  
Attorney

**Members Not Present:**

Drew Bryenton, Chair  
Todd Horner, Vice Chair Member Name  
Dr. Chris Brehme, Alternate  
Charles Redfern, Alternate  
Janelle Sartorio, Alternate

**1) Roll Call and Call to Order**

Mr. William Schoefmann, who was joining virtually and staff suggested the meeting be called to order at 8:15 AM.

**2) Elections and Schedule Adjustment**

Mr. Schoefmann explained the first step for elections is to take nominations, followed by a vote. Ms. Jan Manwaring asked Dr. Rowland Russell if he had any interest in being the chair. He responded that he is currently chairing two boards, two committees, and a member of several others. He continued that it might be a possibility in six to nine months, but not at the current time. Mr. Dillon Benik asked if the vice chair was a possibility. Dr. Russell said only if the chair was committed and able to attend all meetings.

Ms. Manwaring was asked about her interest and she responded that she was not able to. Mr. Mike Davern shared that he is working again and is unable to take on the chair role.

Mr. Benik asked Ms. Sam Jackson if she was interested in the role of chair. She asked for more information on the responsibilities of the role. Mr. Benik explained that it mostly involved running the meetings and helping to delegate tasks. Mr. Schoefmann is kind enough to provide drafts for any communications to the council or mayor, but the chair would be responsible for editing and approving the document as well as speaking before the council, if necessary. Mr. Benik shared that in his experience he did not find the role to be too burdensome. Ms. Jackson said she would be willing to give it a try, to which Ms. Autumn DelaCroix quickly nominated her for chair. The nomination was seconded by Mr. Ed Haas.

Mr. Benik asked if anyone had comments, questions, or concerns about the nomination. Councilor Haas reassured Ms. Jackson that they would support her. He said he believed that he would “gum up the works” as the vice chair but offered to support her in any way possible. Mr. Benik asked for a vote from all in favor of Ms. Jackson as chair. With unanimous support, Ms. Jackson was voted in as chair.

Chair Jackson took control of the meeting and welcomed nominations for vice chair. Ms. Manwaring nominated Dr. Russell and was seconded by Mr. Davern. Mr. Schoefmann asked for any other nominations. Ms. Diana Duffy said she would be willing to but understands that she is not able to as an alternate. Chair Jackson moved for a vote. With unanimous support, Dr. Russell was voted in as vice chair.

Mr. Benik explained to Chair Jackson that the normal process is for the chair to request a motion. A second is offered and then the chair will offer a period for comment. If there are no comments or further discussion, the chair can move to vote.

Mr. Schoefmann brought up the proposed schedule changes for the group to view. Mr. Benik moved to adopt the schedule and Dr. Russell seconded the motion. Chair Jackson asked for all those in favor. With a unanimous vote, the BPPAC schedule for 2024 was adopted.

### **3) July 12, December 13, 2023 and January 10, 2024 Minutes**

Chair Jackson asked if anyone had any edits or comments on the July 12, 2023, minutes. With no edits or comments, she requested a motion to approve. A motion was made by Ms. DelaCroix and seconded by Dr. Russell. With unanimous approval, the minutes of July 12, 2023, were adopted.

Chair Jackson then asked for comments or edits on the December 13, 2023, minutes. Ms. Manwaring moved to accept the minutes of December 13, 2023. Ms. DelaCroix seconded the motion and with all in favor, the December 13, 2023, minutes were adopted.

Lastly, Chair Jackson asked for comments or edits on January 10, 2024, minutes. A motion to approve was offered by Dr. Russell and seconded by Ms. Manwaring. With all in favor, the minutes from January 10, 2023, were adopted.

### **4) Safe Streets For All Grant**

Mr. Schoefmann invited Mr. Don Lussier, the City Engineer, to introduce himself and the consultants. Mr. Lussier was in person with the consultants from VHB joining virtually to talk

about the Roadway Safety Action Plan. Mr. Lussier discussed how Safe Streets for All is the name of the federal grant that the city won to work on this project. He shared that Ms. DeLaCroix is part of the public body steering committee, which was set up as an ad hoc committee to discuss the project and serve to guide the consultants through the process of developing this plan. The committee was put together with folks from Keene State College, Keene School District, members of this committee, and essentially a cross-section of the community and road users. The task was to drill down into the roadway safety issues, problems, and concerns specifically relevant to the bicycle-pedestrian path committee work.

Mr. Lussier explained the plan serves two purposes. This first, being a big picture takeaway, is to try to significantly reduce or eliminate roadway fatalities and serious injuries. The other is that to apply for federal grants for implementation funds, it is a requirement to have a plan like this that has been adopted by the community.

The goal is to adopt this plan and then come up with sets of priorities with both specific locational priorities and others that are standards and policy-type recommendations. Mr. Lussier introduced Mr. Frank Koczalka, project manager(s) for VHB. Mr. Koczalka explained that he was joined by Mr. Eric Tang, who is a safety expert and does safety analysis of crash data, and Mr. Phil Goff. Mr. Koczalka then introduced Mr. Goff.

Mr. Goff thanked the group for having them talk. He explained that he works with PHP out of Watertown, MA as a senior active transportation planner and will be overseeing the public engagement. A big chunk of his background is in pedestrian and bike-related and/or trail-related planning and design for infrastructure and community planning. He loaded a PowerPoint presentation of eleven slides and explained they were interested in hearing from the committee. They want to better understand areas of concern about roadway safety whether that be walking, biking, or roadway crossing.

He explained that there are five core tasks of their scope of work for the City based on the United States Department of Transportation (USDOT) Safe Streets for All grant. These include stakeholder engagement, data collection and analysis, determination of priorities, develop improvement recommendations, and development of an action plan. There is now a website for this effort on the city website under road safety that was made live yesterday. There is additional information there beyond what he planned to present if people are interested. There is also a link to a fourteen-question survey that he hopes people will take, which looks at various topics related to comfort and safety for all modes of transportation, not just walking. The survey asks about barriers to walking and biking, other modes of transportation, spending priorities, and destinations in terms of where people want to get to.

During the presentation, Mr. Goff explained that he will be pulling out five or six of the questions from the survey and sending them out for a flash vote to get a quick sense from people who are already set up with the flash vote system. They hope to get a few hundred of these responses and asked members of the committee to go to the website and forward them to friends and fellow pedestrians or bike path advocates. He also noted that there is an input map that is

part of the survey that provides an opportunity for survey takers to place pins to inform them of locations where they should be focusing their safety planning work.

The consultants have met with the road safety plan committee and received good input. The consultants also met with a technical advisory committee on February 13<sup>th</sup>, 2024, which is made up of various city staff. They will be meeting with both of those groups on a monthly basis. The steering committee meetings are public meetings and they do anticipate that some members of the public will attend. Those meetings are typically late afternoon or early evening meetings to help accommodate the community attendance.

Mr. Goff explained that they are setting up a series of eight stakeholder listening sessions. The first one they hope will be a single meeting with Keene State, SAU 29, Keene Housing Authority and various social services agencies. There will also be two neighborhood group meetings in the next month or so with one taking place either downtown or in the Blastos meeting room at Keene Police Department. A second one will happen in West Keene either at the YMCA or Keene High School. They have three meetings with the MSFI (Municipal Services, Facilities and Infrastructure) committee and then a final presentation to the city council they anticipate to occur in early June. It is a concentrated effort allowing for five plus months to meet all these deadlines for the applications and to be eligible for the funding.

In discussing the data collection and analysis, Mr. Goff explained that they had collected crash data made available from NHDOT and the city. As part of that analysis, they have mapped locations where the crashes occurred with a yellow square representing a serious injury and black crosses representing minor injuries (presented in a visual map in the PowerPoint slideshow). These crashes were pedestrian bike-related crashes from the five year period from 2018-2022. The data becomes more detailed in another image and highlights percent of occupants by age and whether they were wearing a seatbelt or not. The last image on the right hand side of the slide was a heat map of all the crashes with high concentration occurring along the Route 9 corridor and focused on downtown, Winchester Street and along Main Street.

A determination of priorities and doing a prioritization methodology using evaluation criteria will be required to aid in determining the different strategies. The consultants will be setting up that evaluation criteria and may weight that criteria double or triple relative to others depending on how the city sees it and the feedback they receive from city staff, the TAC (Transportation Advisory Committee) and from the steering committee. From there, they will rank and score to have a better understanding of the priorities for the various safety improvements that they lay out.

In the following slide, Mr. Goff presented a project schedule showing that the project was started in December with the initial kick off meeting with city staff and the start of data collection. As they moved through January, they worked on the development of goals and strategies. Moving into February, they are focusing on various strategies and countermeasures, which in essence is safety improvements for walking, biking and driving. As they move into the spring, a substantial piece will be meeting with various stakeholders. In April and May, they will be drafting out the

action plan and presenting it to the TAC and steering committee and then completing the project in June.

Mr. Goff then moved to an open forum discussion and asked if there were any general questions about the scope of the work or clarification of schedule. Dr. Rowland Russell presented a suggestion of Antioch University as a stakeholder group. He stated they tend to be forgotten and suggested VHB consider either a separate session with them or invite them to the Keene State one as Antioch will be moving right across from Keene State College. He explained that arguably there may be many, if not more, Antioch students who live off campus than at Keene State so the walking, biking and commuting quotient is high. Mr. Goff thanked him for the suggestion and said they did not want to forget Antioch. Dr. Russell said he had names and email addresses to pass along in that effort.

With no further general questions or comments, Mr. Goff moved onto the two questions on the open forum discussion question slide. Chair Jackson asked the group about their key goals for the Roadway Safety Action Plan, which was the first question on the slide. Ms. Jan Manwaring asked if the study or the plan included places where the state highways intersect, specifically Winchester Street, Route 101 and Main Street. Mr. Lussier offered to take that question and responded that the grant they received requires that the plan include all of the roadways within the geographic jurisdiction. He extended kudos to the consulting team for already collecting the five years of data and putting it into a map. He noted that the grant specifically requires including state highways and explained that when upon looking at the data the consultants have already put together, it is apparent that the high injury network is on the state highways. This is not surprising given the higher volumes and higher speeds.

Ms. Manwaring explained that her concern is with people who have sight problems and the lack of accessibility feature for the visibly impaired at state highway intersections. The other area of concern she had was at the intersection of Grove Street and Marlboro Street and Wheelock School crossing. She believed that to be a terrible intersection. Mr. Lussier responded that it was getting built in summer of 2024. Ms. Manwaring shared that the other day the crossing guard almost got hit as she was out in the middle of street getting ready to help a student cross. Mr. Lussier explained that he specifically is requesting some of the crossing guards attend the meeting that includes the SAU 29. Mr. Goff thanked Ms. Manwaring and said these are exactly the kind of issues and discussion they were looking for.

Chair Jackson recognized Ms. Diana Duffy. She explained that as someone who does not have a car, she does not spend a lot of time on roadways and did not know what the roadway safety action plan was. Mr. Lussier asked if she spent any time on the sidewalks to which she responded that she did. He went on to explain one of the grant requirements is that all modes of transportation are included. Ms. Duffy was pleased to hear that but said that it not obvious to her given the title of the project and might be something to consider moving forward. Mr. Lussier said the only thing they are not looking at is the rail trails and explained that the roadway includes everything from property line to property line. It includes sidewalks, bike lanes, lighting and intersections. Mr. Goff responded to Ms. Duffy and said that they appreciated the input and that will be something they consider for future presentations. Ms. Autumn DelaCroix asked if in

residential areas if the roadway included easements. Mr. Lussier confirmed that the easements were included as part of the roadway as it is called the public right away.

Mr. Eric Tang introduced himself and explained that he has worked on a number of safety plans throughout the United States. There are a variety of flavors when it comes to these safety action plans, but they all focus on the roadway network. Sometimes there will be variation in the title. He explained that he has worked on ones where they called it a Transportation Safety Plan. Other places, particularly larger cities, called it the Vision 0 plan because they are trying to move towards zero depth. There are different ways the plan can be named, but ultimately, they are trying to focus on the right of way that the city and the state are responsible for within the city limits. For example, a parking lot in front of retail establishment off of the street would not be in their focus. Mr. Lussier explained that the terminology, Roadway Safety Action Plan, comes directly out of the grant. He stated that if the city has not already done so, they should put a one-page explanation of that. He believed that the FHWA (Federal Highway Administration already has a one page about what has to be included in a qualified roadways safety action plan.

Chair Jackson recognized Dr. Russell. He noted that the BPPAC committee has discussed and even has a safety subcommittee or work group that talks about crosswalk conflicts. West Street by Ashuelot Park is a big conflict area. Another area of concern is anywhere there is four lanes as the car in the sidewalk lane may stop but the second lane car often keeps going. His question is what tools are there in the tool box that could be used. They have discussed having raised crosswalks, traffic calming bumps or speed bumps, etc. He asked if cameras at problematic crosswalks could be an option or if that was not allowed in the state. He wondered what tools other communities use and what tools Keene could be using. He said in terms of connectivity, downtown Main Street is a big connectivity issue for bicyclists especially as is West Street.

Mr. Schoefmann wanted to add that they have a couple of years' worth of bicycle and pedestrian counts that the city could provide for that corridor. Dr. Russell added that the consultant may have already thought to do this, but it would be great if it was possible to do counts at some of those crosswalks of the cars that run the red lights to include that in their study.

Mr. Goff demonstrated that if you go to the city website under the Roadway Safety Infrastructure. There are different examples at the very bottom of types of safety infrastructure. These include safety infrastructure like separated bike lanes, bumps outs, rectangular rapid flashing beacons, raised crosswalks, etc. While there are some expense and maintenance issues associated with some of these, they are out there and available. He noted that many of the photos are from examples in Keene. Their toolkit of safety countermeasures will be a little broader than that, but they wanted to at least show a good number of the candidates on the web page.

Mr. Tang added that there is a list of nine requirements, as Mr. Lussier alluded to. One of them is having a comprehensive list of strategies and actions for the city of Keene to address in the years to come. There is a strong focus on those. He would not necessarily focus on the low hanging fruit, but those are low cost, high impact types of solutions. There will be opportunity for them to help the city prioritize the various strategies and actions. In a comprehensive list, it will run the gamut of infrastructure and non-infrastructure types of programs. He likes to classify the strategy

matrix as a toolbox of sorts. It can be used to draw from and prioritize a handful of projects for consideration with implementation grants with a longer list of items that the city can draw from in the years ahead. As the city looks at additional data trends in the years ahead, priorities may shift and there may be desire to pivot to a different item in the toolbox. That comprehensive list will be invaluable for the community as a place to look at items rather than scouring the entire web and various websites trying to search for representative images and information. The hope is to make that a centralized source of tools that can be drawn from.

Mr. Koczalka added that with regards to cars running into crosswalks or running red lights, they consider those near misses and they have never recorded those unless there is actual visual evidence. They are looking at crash data from the NHDOT for minor and serious injury fatalities along pedestrian and bike accidents. The public outreach and meetings will be beneficial in helping to capture that information. Their scope does not include pedestrian counts at this time. Down the line, there are supplemental grants if the city wishes to approach it or has time. Bikes, bicycles and pedestrians have not been documented as well in the past and have become a big emphasis point. NHDOT just completed their vulnerable user's manual. Those things will become more prevalent and Mr. Koczalka expects to see the counting more available in the future.

Dr. Russell stated that he is aware that some states have them at intersections to capture people running the lights while other states do not. He wondered where New Hampshire stood on that. Ms. DelaCroix said she understood that New Hampshire has made it illegal to create any stoplight camera. Mr. Koczalka said he believed that it was for permanent cameras. It was his understanding that it is permissible for the temporary purpose of a study.

Mr. Benik wanted to highlight West Street as an area of concern, but West Street from Park Avenue to Base Hill Road is of particular concern for him as it is where he lives. Most of the street in that area has no sidewalk. It is a straight flat road that serves as a shortcut for people coming in from points west to northern west Keene allowing them to bypass those highway intersections. Drivers fly down West Street at fifty miles per hour. There are kids waiting at the bus stop and those crossings are heavily used, especially once the weather warms up. He believed the entirety of West Street really need attention.

Ms. DelaCroix said Court Street also needs attention. There is a lot of degradation on the edge of the roadway where people's lawns get torn up into the road, especially come winter. Dr. Russell pointed out that roundabouts, especially the one by Keene State College, are another area of concern. Traffic can be very heavy through there making it tricky to get across and even more challenging if someone has a mobility challenge. Ms. Duffy said crossing Route 101 is definitely a concern. South Winchester Street south of Route 101 is also a challenge that she encounters regularly. Mr. Goff asked the group to clarify as crossing Route 101 has come up multiple times. He asked where roughly there were talking about. The group said Main Street and Winchester Street was the biggest area of concern.

With no other thoughts, Mr. Lussier asked that if any other thoughts came up if Chair Jackson could funnel them through. He and the consultants are happy to make a return visit if more

questions arise. Mr. Goff wanted to remind the group of the survey and made a request for them to fill it out. After question ten, there will be an ABCD question and map in which a pin can be placed with an opportunity to explain the issue. Option A offers up to three motor vehicle safety improvements to be highlighted. Option B asked for up to three pedestrian safety improvements. Option C is for up to three bicycle related safety improvements and option D is for miscellaneous.

Mr. Lussier wanted to remind everyone that Ms. DelaCroix was nominated by the mayor to sit on the steering committee and he wanted to thank her for her service and suggested that everyone feel free to use her as a conduit from one committee to the next. With no further comments or questions, Mr. Schoefmann and the group thanked Mr. Koczalka, Mr. Goff, and Mr. Tang.

#### **5) City Attorney's Office Update**

Chair Jackson welcomed and introduced Amanda Palmeira, Assistant City Attorney. Ms. Palmeira explained that they would be switching modes slightly to talk about procedure and law, but appreciated that the group now had the context of the consultants and their work to be able to picture what they are going to be working with while in these guardrails she is going to lay out. She explained that she tries to meet with boards and commissions whenever she has the opportunity, particularly with new people or when something is coming up that raises a question because the Right-To-Know Law applies to all of the boards and commissions. She wanted to talk quickly about how that works and then transition to how that specifically fits in with the working groups because she understands that is something that this group has utilized and there are some specifics to work through on that.

The main purpose of the Right-To-Know Law, which lives in the statutes, Chapter 91A, is for public access to what the government is doing, what the various boards and commissions are doing, public transparency and public accountability. This plays out in two main ways. One being public meetings and making sure they are accessible, which is why public are allowed to attend when the doors are open, notice is given, and minutes are taken. The other way is through public records, which the city staff deal with all the time.

Ms. Palmeira continued that while there was no public in attendance at the meeting, there is significant information that the group will be dealing with that has public interests involved. This project includes every roadway in the city, the sidewalks, the lights, and the signage. The last being one that people can be very opinionated about as the city learned with the downtown project. She asked the group to keep that in mind and explained that this is why they are trying to keep everything very kosher and follow the Right-to-Know Law as best as possible.

The statute includes explanations of what happens when the law is not followed. That can be a variety of remedies that ultimately would be determined at the court level. She found that what often comes up for public bodies that do not follow the Right-to-Know Law is either they are meeting without giving notice to the public or they are meeting in a non-public session without following the proper procedures. In that event, the court could invalidate whatever that group had done during the session such as whether they had taken a vote, made a recommendation, or

decided to question a petition. They all could be invalidated in the event that the court found the Right-to-Know Law was not followed. There are also simple penalties, either to the city or individuals, but Ms. Palmeira said she has never seen it. There is also a misdemeanor associated with intentionally violating the Right-To-Know Law. This is important because there is significant public interest and people will be watching. Having said all that, she stated she wanted to narrow down on the working groups and welcomed any questions about what she said or even the specifics before she jumped into the working groups.

Councilor Haas spoke up and reminded the group that they will be making recommendations about roadway safety and the downtown plan. He stated that the goal is to minimize the opportunity for opposition to destroy their work. Ms. Duffy said she wanted to clarify that and found that statement to be heavy in the overtones of me and them, which made her a little uncomfortable. Councilor Haas responded that it came out wrong. When she met with the city attorney, Ms. Duffy said the thing the city attorney did for her was to instill this “thou shall play by the rules because it is so much better to play by the rules than the alternative” She said she can already tell that as a group they are a group that wants to do right. Knowing that the group is getting to a set of high traffic opportunities that could get them in pickle, she thought it was great to have a reminder to them to have a solid vision of what they are doing and where they are going.

Ms. Palmeira explained that one of the things that comes up regardless of wanting to be a rule follower is the Right-To-Know Law because it is unfortunately not shaped for efficiency. Even if the group determines the best way to do something, the Right-To-Know Law still dictates that they have to follow these rules for the public benefit. She made note of a definition contained in the statute of an advisory committee and how it highlights that it is separate from a public body. She explained that the BPPAC is acting as a public body. All of the members are appointed by the mayor, doing the public’s business. The statute outlines that a subgroup of a public body is also subject to the Right-To-Know Law. An advisory committee, which she used interchangeably with working group because they are effectively the same thing, is defined as “designated by the appointing authority so as to provide such authority with advice or recommendations concerning the formulation of any public policy legislation that might be promoted, modified or opposed by such authority”. She further explained that a group acting as a public authority and creating a subgroup that might bring back recommendations is essentially creating an advisory committee that is subject to the same notice, minutes, and public access as the larger committee is. There are some workarounds and she noted how Councilor Haas was kind enough to meet with her and Tom Mullins, City Attorney, to work through this and help them understand what the committee has been working on and why it is so helpful to have the subgroups.

Ms. Palmeira and Mr. Mullins created two recommendations for the group on what they thought might work and Ms. Palmeira shared that she was happy to workshop whatever the group needs. The first recommendation was that if they are working on a project that requires outside research, it could probably be done by one person. The other options is the work could be broken up into four or five smaller pieces and individually designated to four or five people. If everyone is

working on their own and then reporting back, that would avoid the problem entirely. She explained the big issue is when a subgroup is going out collecting information and then only bringing select bits back. The curating and culling of the material is what is problematic as the public never got to see the entirety of the material. However, if the group met and brought back all material and presented all material to the larger committee, the problem would have been avoided. She continued that really what the public needs to see is how the decisions were made. She welcomed any questions.

Mr. Lussier addressed the Chair and said a third option would be to have a publicly noticed subcommittee. Ms. Palmeira responded that might be up to City Council because the council created the larger committee and she does not know that the larger committee has been designated with the authority to create these subgroups. Creating a public body is the function of the city council, but there is potential to go to council and ask. It would require meeting minutes, notices, etc.

Dr. Russell explained that the safety subgroup had done a lot of research that could not be covered in the committee meeting themselves. There was significant data collection. He also brought up the fact that Energy Climate Committee has four or five work groups that have been in place for years. Ms. Palmeira responded that she started this conversation off with public attention for a reason. The law is not made for efficiency and often they way that she and Mr. Mullins will address these things are in high risk groups. If there are going to be eyes on the group, it is important that the group is playing by the rules. While this group may not have been high attention seeking in the past and may not be in the future, the grant and the current downtown project has definitely brought attention. Ms. DelaCroix added that it is also worth noting that this cannot be bypassed by having a google doc, because that constitutes a public meeting in that kind of space. Similarly, a group e-mail could constitute a quorum.

Councilor Haas asked if the safety working group members went out and collected their information individually and gathered to share the information, but all the information came back to the BPPAC in its entirety whether that would be permissible. Ms. Palmeira said she would like to think about that and get back to them. However, she said if all the same information is being shared, it might negate the need for meeting. Councilor Haas explained that he saw the meeting as a way of stimulating each other to find more information as they do not know what is missing until it is compiled. Ms. Palmeira responded the public accountability part includes whatever sparks might be passed to each other in the smaller group.

Mr. Benik asked if this a change to the Right-To-Know Law or is this a more risk-adverse reading of Right-To-Know. He explained that in the past when they have spoken with the Attorney's office, they were drilled to not form a quorum. Ms. Palmeira explained that it was a little bit of both as the statute definition was added after, but not recently. It happened about ten years ago, but it is a more recent addition than the quorum practice. She assumed that this was added to address that loophole. There are exceptions that are expressed in the statute. If it was a chance meeting or there less than a quorum, it likely is not a problem.

Ms. DelaCroix said it sounded as though the main solution is to be more discrete and specific with tasks to make sure they get done outside and time is not being wasted in the meeting. Mr. Benik responded that it should probably be added to new business on who is going to report. Ms. Palmeira suggested scheduling report outs two meetings out. All the data would be submitted one week out, allowing for one person to compile the data and report out the following week to the committee. Mr. Benik said it looks like they may need to go to council and request a subcommittee.

Conversation ensued about other committees and Ms. Duffy asked Ms. Palmeira whether any other committees are properly adhering to Right-To-Know. Ms. Palmeira highlighted the difference between the city council, the standing committees and the fully noticed subcommittees. She explained that they are not working with as much advisory related tasks and data as the BPPAC is.

Dr. Russell mentioned that the BPPAC does volunteer activities like cleanups and questioned if multiple members attended and it was advertised (as they usually are) whether that would be acceptable. Ms. Palmeira responded that there are more parts to it. She explained that committee business cannot be done at the trail cleanup. Dr. Russell suggested to the committee that they get really intentional and thoughtful about how they delegate or assign tasks and collect it. He believed that this was going to impact how the minutes are done and the packets that get put together as he believed they were going to get much larger. Mr. Jesse Rounds stepped in and defended the way minutes are done now. He explained that his staff is not going to spend a lot of time putting information together. He wants the committee members to be able to do their jobs. Mr. Schoefmann is the GIS technician. He has a job and has too much on his plate already. Adding this is a lot and it is not to say that he cannot help because that is why he is here. Dr. Russell interjected to correct and clarify saying that he meant that all the research would get added as an attachment to the packet making the packet quite large. Mr. Schoefmann added that the size will also limit capacity to email. Mr. Benik said it sounds like it is at the point where the city will need to come up with some sort of public portal online where packets can be uploaded. Mr. Schoefmann said he would likely load it to the city website and then just email the link rather than emailing the hard copy.

Councilor Haas asked if everything collected in the working group and that is discussed in the working group will get into this drive, which the group confirmed. Ms. Palmeira said she does not know that doing that would be bulletproof and said it might take some practice, but that is ok. She suggested trying to limit conversation in the working group. No editorializing anything during the conversations.

Ms. Duffy said speaking on behalf of the group that they feel a level of engagement that is different. She is confident that they will do it and work through it. She commented that one thing that has been nice has been the availability and ease of access to the legal team. With no other thoughts or questions, Chair Jackson and the group thanked Ms. Palmeira and moved onto agenda item number seven.

**6) Safety and Outreach Working Group**

- A) **Meme and Letter to the Mayor/ City Council**
- B) **Bicycle-Friendly Community Status**
- 7) **Regular Project Updates**
  - A) **Letter of Support – Downtown Infrastructure Project – RAISE Grant**

Chair Jackson recognized Mr. Lussier. Mr. Lussier thanked the chair. He explained that he was there to ask this committee to give Chair Jackson a homework assignment in the form of a letter of recommendation. He explained that in large part because of the work of this committee, the Council has approved bike lanes as part of the downtown project. The focus of the project right now is putting in for a federal grant by the end of this month to help pay for the work downtown. The grant is called the RAISE Grant, Rebuilding American Infrastructure with Sustainability and Equity. Alternatives to motorized transportation play very well with the intention and the goals of the grant program. He believed that they were going to be able to put together a very competitive grant. These grants are very competitive as they are large grants and nationwide. The minimum application amount was five million dollars. It is not a given that the city will be awarded, but they will put their best foot forward and part of that is showing that they have broad consensus and support across the community. He would love to have a letter of support from the BPPAC and offered to share a template with some key facts of the project. The grant is due at the end of this month so he would need to have the letter if not by this week, no later than next week.

Ms. DelaCroix moved to have Chair Jackson write the letter. Dr. Russell wondered if there was a volunteer willing to do the first draft to send to Chair Jackson. Mr. Schoefmann said there is a template from the former chair that he included in the packet and was willing to share with Chair Jackson. The move was seconded by Mr. Davern. With unanimous approval, the motion was approved. They spent some time discussing Right-To-Know appropriate ways for individuals to share thoughts they would like to see included in the letter. It was determined that individually emailing the chair would be the most appropriate and acceptable method. The committee withdrew the previous motion and Ms. DelaCroix moved to have Chair Jackson write the letter and send it to either Mr. Lussier or Mr. Schoefmann. The motion was seconded by Dr. Russell and unanimously approved.

Chair Jackson asked given the limited time remaining in the meeting if there were any other items that needed to be addressed before the end of the meeting.

- 8) **Old Business**
  - A) **Membership Updates**
  - B) **Bicycle Pedestrian Master Plan**

Mr. Schoefmann shared that the city received the silver level status as a bicycle friendly community and congratulated everyone that helped to put that together. Ms. Duffy asked if that status provided any rights or privileges pertaining to other things that LAB (League of American Bicyclists) offers, including their national conference. Mr. Schoefmann did not know, but offered to look into it.

- 9) **New Business**
  - A) **Items to be Included in Next Meeting**
- 10) **More Time**
  - A) **Volunteer Opportunities**
  - B) **Public Art and The Trails Update**
  - C) **Downtown Bike Racks**
  - D) **Letter re: Route 101 Improvement Project/Transportation Heritage Trail**
  - E) **Old Stone Arch Bridge**
  - F) **Kiosk Map Updates**
  - G) **BPPAC Website**
- 11) **Adjournment**

There being no further business, Chair Jackson adjourned the meeting at 9:43 AM.

Respectfully submitted by,  
Amanda Trask, Minute Taker

Reviewed and edited by,  
Will Schoefmann, Community Development Staff