

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

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

**Wednesday, December 18, 2024**

**6:00 PM**

**Council Chamber,  
City Hall**

**Members Present:**

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

**Staff Present:**

Elizabeth A. Dragon, City Manager  
Amanda Palmeira, Assistant City Attorney  
Don Lussier, Public Works Director  
Bryan Ruoff, City Engineer  
Andy Bohannon, Deputy City Manager  
Duncan Watson, Assistant Public Works  
Director

**Members Not Present:**

*All Present*

**Jay V. Kahn, Mayor**

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

**1) Relating to Keene Roadway Safety Action Plan of 2025**  
**Resolution R-2024-44**

Chair Greenwald asked to hear from staff.

Don Lussier, Public Works Director, introduced the consultants from VHB, Inc. He continued that he thanks the members of the Roadway Safety Plan Committee (RSPC): J.B. Mack, Laura Tobin, Autumn DeLaCroix, Debbie Bowie, Elizabeth Dragon, Erin Rourke, Frank Linnenbringer, Fred Roberge, Ockle Johnson, and William Lambert. The members gave a lot of time and their valuable insight and assistance to the consultants as they went through this process. He is very proud of the product they produced and pleased with their work.

Frank Koczalka and Phil Goff from VHB, Inc. introduced themselves. Mr. Koczalka stated that they were before the MSFI Committee in June to talk through the process they used for the action plan. He continued that they have submitted the Roadway Safety Action Plan to the City for approval.

Mr. Koczalka stated that he wants to begin by reiterating the Safe System Approach, which they had touched on before. The Federal Highway Administration came up with it. It recognizes

human error. Previously, (the goal was) eliminating all traffic accidents. The FHA realized that is not possible, recognizing that humans make errors, to design safety measures around that. The Safe System Approach has six safe systems principles, and five system elements. It is repetitiveness. Combining safe roadways with safe speeds should create a safer situation. Also new is the proactive approach of sharing responsibilities for roadway safety, instead of waiting for accidents. It is the responsibility of the public, city officials, state officials, and everyone.

Mr. Koczalka stated that for the plan's goal, the RSPC looked at what the NH Department of Transportation (NHDOT) had developed for its Strategic Highway Safety Plan and moved it up a little. They talked about the number of fatalities and serious injuries. The goal is a 50% reduction by 2035, and to work toward 0 in 2045. It is an ambitious goal, but with the Action Plan and the strategic projects, they can see how it will work. The objectives are preventing crashes resulting in fatalities and serious injuries. They will promote the Safe System Approach, and engage partners and the public. It is a shared responsibility.

Mr. Koczalka continued that regarding the planning process they went through, they engaged the local leadership in and outside of Keene, and looked at the statewide safety initiatives. The NHDOT has developed a Strategic Highway Safety Plan. This plan for Keene aligns with the State's objectives. The screen shows critical emphasis areas, such as intersections, older drivers, and speeding. The planning process involved the RSPC and the Technical Advisory Committee that they met with. Those two groups really helped form the plan. It was a good process with a lot of good input.

Mr. Koczalka continued that regarding data analysis, VHB gets their data from the NH Department of Motor Vehicles. They looked at ten years of data, recognizing about 4,500 crashes in Keene. About 12% resulted in fatal, serious, or minor injuries. One of the big things that came out of their analysis was that 68% of crashes happened at intersections. Vulnerable users such as pedestrians and bicyclists are at intersections, so it is important to reduce those crashes at intersections. It could be as simple as improved lighting or as much as education. Part of the data analysis was looking at Keene's top 15 roadway segments that have a higher rate of fatalities or serious injuries.

Mr. Koczalka stated that Mr. Goff spearheaded the community engagement. They did the project website, which got the information out. They had over 500 respondents to the online survey, and over 1,500 comments and pins of improvements. A lot of information came into VHB, which was great. The online survey results, and input from public meetings and stakeholder meetings gave them other ways to look at why some things were not coming up in the data analysis. For example, is there a street that is or feels dangerous, but has fewer accidents because no one travels it? They took the public input, took the crash analyses, and developed strategies and actions. Five strategies kept coming up: improve safety for non-motorized road users; enhance lighting and signage; reduce conflicts at intersections; speed management; and plans, policies, programs, education, and multijurisdictional coordination. Regarding that last one, they looked at the Complete Streets plan that Keene had developed and

other programs that Keene had established, and looked at where those could be aligned with the Safe Systems Approach. They wanted to add that to the plan, especially education, which sometimes gets missed. He thinks Keene does a great job with social media, which they should keep going with, as they have many roundabouts and many improvements going on.

Mr. Koczalka continued that next was taking all of that information and developing project recommendations. Mr. Goff helped develop the evaluation criteria. They had over 190 project recommendations, developed from all of the input they got. It is a big list to go through, but it is a diverse group of bicycle roadway improvements and more. It was not for one location or one aspect; it really included everything. They wanted to make sure they had a comprehensive list of evaluation criteria, such as crash data, equity, community support, and so on and so forth. The report has a big spreadsheet/database outlining everything they saw, to give the City a way to work on and make improvements when necessary.

Mr. Koczalka continued that projects come down to funding. Thus, they have the implementation resources. Safe Streets for All is where this all started. In addition, the NHDOT has the Congestion Mitigation Air Quality Program, the Transportation Alternatives Program, and others. Over time, there is other funding, such as grants popping up. There are other ways to go through the resources and pull that.

Finally, Mr. Koczalka continued, there is the care and maintenance. The VHB has developed the plan but it is a living document, made so the City can continue to build on it. They can look at how projects are being completed, what the benefits of the projects are, and more, like how to incorporate data collection and evaluation to keep the plan going. Public reporting and public education (is another piece. The City wants to be up front and transparent, and to get the message out to the public that things are working.

He continued that the biggest part, which they have in the report, is that it is a living document that will continue to be updated and refined as new data, new projects, and new technologies become available. That is key. This iterative process not only keeps the plan responsive to emerging trends and innovations, but also ensures that new insights and community feedback are continually integrated. There will be new residents, new plans and projects, and some other area that needs to be addressed or looked at. The plan remains dynamic, adapting and evolving to the safety challenges and opportunities to better achieve the goal of zero roadway fatalities and serious roadway injuries by 2045.

Mr. Lussier stated that he wants to speak to how Public Works will use this document going forward. He continued that they are looking at this as a reference document. Realistically, the City will still be working on some of these 190 recommendations when he retires. It will take a long time. It will be a document Public Works can reference as they are doing projects, such as looking to see if they can include any of these improvements while they are doing an infrastructure project, or if there are CIP projects coming up, how that can get included. Mr. Koczalka mentioned grant opportunities. Some of these improvements will be natural fits for

different grants. They will look for those opportunities. He will plan on coming back and reporting on this to the MSFI Committee about once a year. Lastly, he wants to highlight that the vast majority of the 190 recommendations came from the public. They did a lot of outreach, and the VHB team took all of that feedback, and combined similar recommendations, as there was a lot of overlap. The vast majority came from Keene residents, which he thinks is great.

Councilor Favolise stated that he read the whole draft plan, and it was a lot of information to take in in 48 hours. He continued that something that stuck out to him was that 42% of the crashes with injuries were directly related to driver behavior, such as impaired driving, speeding, or distracted driving. This has been a frequent conversation at MSFI Committee meetings lately. There is a significant education and awareness component to this. That is the job of City staff and the job of everyone in the community, to hold each other accountable for our behaviors in the car. It was a sobering number to see. The Public Works Director said earlier that there is no engineering solution to human behavior. These projects will help one kind of traffic problem, but the driver behavior issue remains, so he was happy to see the emphasis on education.

Councilor Favolise continued that one of the recommendations was limiting the right-turn-on-red opportunities in Keene. He looked through the plan and did not see granular data on how many crashes they could tie to a right turn on red. He asked if granular data is available for that.

Mr. Koczalka replied that when crashes are reported, either the State or the City officers fill out the crash reports. He continued that the reports are not as robust as they would hope. That was something they noted as they went through this process - how crash data can be recorded more accurately or in greater detail. VHB does not have access to information about the type of crash, such as a rear end or side swipe. That information is in the crash reports, but VHB does not get that information; they get the database. They would have to request all of the crash reports and have them redacted. He wishes they could have that data, as it would be helpful. Other states collect that data.

Mr. Lussier stated that what Mr. Koczalka is getting at is that it is a legislative concern here in the state. He continued that he understands the privacy concerns, but at the same time, the Department of Safety has this database of information that would help practitioners in the field save lives, but State law does not allow them to share that information with (those practitioners). That is problematic. Everyone in NHDOT understands the issue, but it will take a legislative action to fix.

Councilor Tobin stated she was initially really excited to be on the RSPC, because she thinks a lot about pedestrian safety on the roadway and thought she would be able to contribute a lot. She continued that as it turns out, she learned so much through this process. It stimulated so many conversations. Asking people to take the survey led to many conversations at her workplace about roadway problems, which she brought back to the RSPC. The RSPC really grappled with the issues, and there was a constant striving to find opportunities for improvement. She echoes what Mr. Koczalka said about this being a living document. That is really valuable. Guidelines

will change. For example, recently there was a change in guidelines about flashing beacons. It was exciting to see that many of the projects that came up as priorities were already in the works. She is excited about this plan.

Chair Greenwald asked if members of the public had any questions or comments. Hearing none, he thanked the consultants and the RSPC for their incredible work and the tremendous report.

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

On a vote of 5-0, the Municipal Services, Facilities, and Infrastructure Committee recommends adoption of Resolution R-2024-44, relating to the Keene Roadway Safety Action Plan of 2025.

**2) Recommendations Regarding Invasive Species Education and Management – Conservation Commission**

Chair Greenwald asked to hear from representatives from the Conservation Commission.

Sparky Von Plinsky, Conservation Commission chair, and Councilor Bobby Williams introduced themselves. Mr. Von Plinsky stated that he will begin by explaining what invasive species are. He continued that invasive species are ones that are not native to an area, which can out compete native species. The Conservation Commission is mostly focused on invasive plants. Examples are Norway Maple, which are problematic and can take over entire tracts of forest; Japanese Knotweed; or Buckthorn. Once you see these invasive species, you cannot unsee them. They are everywhere in Keene. That is the point of the Commission's letter. This has started to become a real problem. Once invasive species outcompete the native species, the native species can go extinct.

Mr. Von Plinsky stated that the letter covers the Commission's lengthy discussions. Something that kept coming up is that there needs to be a single point of contact at the City for dealing with invasive species. They hear about people calling the City to report invasive species and asking what to do about it, and because there is not a single point of contact, the message either did not get to the right person and was not handled, or was handled in an unproductive way. Any solution needs to be a public/private partnership. A huge group of wonderful gardeners and horticulturalists are ready, willing, and able to help, but they need to have that coordination to try to make that happen. This does not need to be something they hand off to the City for the City to completely take care of it; this is something that can be a solution across the board.

Councilor Williams stated that he has been hearing about the invasive species problem ever since he was elected. He continued that one of the reasons he was elected, in fact, was to do something about invasive species. He got himself nominated to the Conservation Commission then convinced Commission members that this was a real problem and got their permission to start a regular program of removing invasive species on a volunteer basis. Every year for the past four years, they have spent five or six days going out and removing invasive species like

Japanese Knotweed or Oriental Bittersweet. It is a good way to educate the public. He realized the scale of the issue is much bigger than anything he and the volunteers can handle. They need the City's institutional power, to understand where the problems are, develop long-term plans, and organize volunteers better than he can.

Councilor Williams continued that the last time he and Mr. Von Plinsky were here they talked about bringing a street tree program to Keene, and he is grateful that has been funded for next year. As they are funding street trees, they need to realize something is out there killing trees. They need a better effort of containing the bittersweet vines that choke and kill trees. Not having to replace trees would save money.

Councilor Williams concluded that invasive species are a big problem, which the Conservation Commission cannot handle, and someone in the City needs to have the responsibility of knowing about this, directing resources and volunteers.

Chair Greenwald asked how to get rid of knotweed. Councilor Williams replied pull it out, year after year. He continued that herbicide can be used, but they do not have volunteers use herbicide.

Councilor Favolise expressed appreciation for the letter and presentation. He continued that he, Councilor Tobin, and Councilor Haas spent a night pulling knotweed in the Robin Hood Park area. He was surprised there was so much of it, after three or four years. It was immediately clear to him that this problem will not go away on its own. His question is whether grant funding is available for this sort of project or program, or for the point of contact person. He wonders if there is a way to do this that minimizes the impact to taxpayers.

Mr. Von Plinsky replied that he cannot answer that question entirely, but there are definitely resources available. He continued that some aspects would be education for City staff and citizens, and UNH has those resources available. They have a class that is like "invasive species boot camp." Potential funding for a point of contact person is not something he can speak to.

Councilor Workman stated that she wants to thank Councilor Williams for his efforts on that volunteer campaign. She continued that she has unfortunately never been able to attend one of those, but they do amazing work that is very much needed in the city. Everyone is usually raving about how much fun they have doing it. She supports these recommendations. She has questions, like Councilor Favolise, about funding the point of contact person, but she does think it is necessary and she would like to hear more about that at a later date.

Chair Greenwald asked if members of the public had any questions or comments.

Bob Milliken of 30 Allen Ct. stated that he is part of the Hogback Mountain Conservation group, dealing with invasive species there. He continued that he has joined the efforts in Keene recently. In Keene, he has noticed that some of these invasive species are dangerous to people.

Wild parsnips and wild chervil, for example. Seeds that fall off can take two years to germinate, that even if you pull the plant out, it could grow back in two years. Touching the sap can result in a second-degree burn. The volunteer work to remove invasive species in Keene is great. There is hope. He supports the Conservation Commission's work and hopes the MSFI Committee does, too.

Duncan Watson, Assistant Public Works Director, stated that he agrees with everything that Councilor Williams and Mr. Von Plinsky said. He continued that this is a huge problem that will not be easily solved. The amount of resources it would take to deal with this in an effective manner would overwhelm the City's budget. What they can do is learn about the issue and develop best management practices to prevent more of these invasive species from getting a hold. He thinks that a point of contact person would logically go in the Public Works Department and the Highway Division. They will be doing work to better understand the scope of the problem. Years ago, he and then-Director Kurt Blomquist developed a capital project to deal with just the Emerald Ash Borer. When they finished putting the numbers together, it was in the hundreds of thousands of dollars over multiple years. The question is, to what effect. In 2005, his property was flooded, and his riverbanks have been covered with Japanese Knotweed. He has been personally out there summer after summer, trying to deal with it, and it is a losing battle. These plants are like apex predators. Once they get a hold of something, they are tough to get rid of. The City has done experimental removals on Beaver Brook in several locations, but even with some success in those areas, they see the plant starting to return and repopulate. This pervasive problem will require long term, overarching solutions. He is not sure how realistic some of those are.

Councilor Ed Haas asked if there are examples of cities the size of Keene that have been successful with this. Mr. Von Plinsky replied that he cannot point to any examples, but he can say for sure that everyone is grappling with this issue. He continued that it is not just a Keene issue. The invasive plants cross rivers, ride on tires into other towns,(and so on and so forth. There must be case studies for Keene-sized towns but he personally does not know of them.

Chair Greenwald replied that those would be interesting to hear. He continued that he has seen knotweed grow through asphalt, which is astounding.

Councilor Tobin stated that she has done a lot of research on this since she started joining the removal efforts. She continued that there are towns in NH that have invasive species management plans, which she assumes include a point of contact. To attest to the education piece, after she first joined the volunteers in pulling knotweed, she went home and found some in her neighbors' yard, and now periodically pulls knotweed at United Way, which comes back within a couple days. Usually, after five years of persistence, you can get rid of it. She has noticed many invasive vines hanging on the wires. She called to try and have that removed. People came and cut it and told her to call the City to have it removed.

Andy Bohannon, Deputy City Manager, stated that he concurs with Mr. Watson's comments. He continued that Carrah Fisk-Hennessey, Parks & Recreation Director, has been working with the Conservation Commission to create educational events for the spring, specifically for the Ashuelot River Park, the Patricia Russell Park, and the maintenance needed along Beaver Brook. In Ashuelot River Park just beyond the bridge, you will see an opening, which was previously all knotweed. The Friends of Ashuelot River Park have been doing a great job over the last three to four years of maintaining that specific area. It is a great example of how if you work at it year after year, they can continue to manage it. The Ashuelot River Park Advisory Board has struggled due to the amount of it, but they continue to do due diligence in their efforts. He commends the Conservation Commission for bringing this forward.

Jim Sterling, of Jordan Rd. stated that Japanese Knotweed is tremendously invasive and there will be no easy solution. He continued that it mostly will be hand labor. Nothing can stop this species. He sees it taking over the shorelines, to the point where sometimes people cannot even get to the shore to fish because there is so much knotweed. It also grows along the road and becomes a danger to the public when they cannot see around a corner. The NHDOT has limited money. They choose the corners that have the worst problems, rip up the knotweed, and put down matting to prevent it from growing. He used to ask people at NHDOT if they had someone who could help with this, and they replied that they only had one person with a pesticide license, and he is not working there anymore. Knotweed started ten years ago. It is like going through a jungle. He is not sure pesticides are the solution. It is about labor, picking and choosing the areas they feel are most important, and putting their labor there. The solutions are labor and money, not studies. Knotweed is the number one invasive species, but bittersweet is a problem, too.

Heather Atwell from Pearl St. stated that she has a summer house in upstate NY, and about ten years ago, they had a program to get rid of knotweed. She continued that she has a document about that and would be happy to share it with the City. It involves chemicals injected into the plants, and it worked.

Rick Fulton stated that he is a new resident to Keene. He continued that as of six months ago, he was the Director of Public Works for the City of Port Angeles in Washington. The only way they could deal with the invasive species there was with an effort with the state. The County led the effort. The University of Washington Extension Office provided the expertise. The City staff in Parks and Recreation and Transportation joined the efforts, and all together, they were able to tackle just the critical areas. The City of Keene needs to look at State, County, City, and universities working together. Volunteers are needed, too, which takes a lot of planning, but those are his recommendations.

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



On a vote of 5-0, the Municipal Services, Facilities, and Infrastructure Committee recommends accepting the recommendations regarding invasive species and education management as informational.

**3) Tim Pipp/Beeze Tees Screen Printing – Proposal to Add the Necessary Infrastructure to Accommodate Banners Across Main St.**

Chair Greenwald asked to hear from Tim Pipp.

Tim Pipp stated that he is the owner of the Beeze Tees Screen Printing on Main St. He continued that over the years, he has talked with numerous downtown business owners about potentially putting up a banner across Main St. His proposal tonight is for the installation of poles to hold a banner. He proposes putting them in the existing place in front of Ted's Shoe and Sport and The Works. It would span Main St. The poles are about 75 feet apart. The poles' purpose would be to hold a banner to promote events and other things happening on Main St. Most banners like this prohibit logos or business use. One reason he raises the issue now is he thinks it would be a great time to do this, with the Downtown Infrastructure Project happening. A banner could let people know Main Street is open. He thinks this is a simple ask. The City will be replacing the lights anyway, so they could replace them with these taller poles.

Chair Greenwald asked to hear from Public Works.

Mr. Lussier stated that this is a very interesting suggestion, and he did not know much about these banners systems until this suggestion came about. He continued that he reached out to some manufacturers that make these kind of systems to learn a bit about them. He was surprised to find that the systems are more affordable than he expected, about \$25,000 to \$30,000 for the materials, not including installation for a system sized for what they have, about 75 feet across. The light poles currently used downtown would not be able to support something like this, because the banner would be big, hang high up in the air, and catch a lot of wind. The poles have to be designed to carry that load. The poles themselves are fairly substantial. Another thing to keep in mind is that there would be two poles on each side with taut guy wires on the top and the bottom of the banner. The banners themselves slide in and out from the ends and a pulley system retracts and extends as they change the banners. Gem Graphics gave him an estimate of about \$1,400 per graphic. He imagines that 10 or 12 per year is something the City Council would have to budget for if they wanted to go in that direction.

Chair Greenwald stated that Mr. Pipp prints these, too. Mr. Pipp replied that was correct, but this proposal is not self-serving and he is not going to give his number. He is friends with Gem Graphics. Many cities in New England and the country do these over their Main Streets, including Concord, Portsmouth, Brattleboro, and Manchester. Municipalities are not buying and hanging the banners. The event organizers buy the banners, through sponsorships, and hang them. The City would need to have some part in the hanging process, but that expense is different.

Mr. Lussier stated that he apologizes for naming Gem Graphics. He continued that he had reached out to them for his own education.

Chair Greenwald stated that as he understands it, the cables are rather substantial, not the thin kind. Mr. Lussier replied that they would be something like quarter-inch stainless steel cables, permanently affixed. He continued that this would be permanent, rugged infrastructure in place. Chair Greenwald replied that the key word is “permanent,” as the cables would stay up whether there was a banner or not. He asked if that would be problematic for tall trucks. Mr. Lussier replied no, the cables would be high enough that they would be above the clearance heights, per NHDOT standards. The cables might not be very attractive when there is not a banner hanging.

Chair Greenwald asked if another option is attaching to the buildings. Mr. Lussier replied that he would let the City Attorney weigh in on the legality of attaching to people’s buildings, in the indemnification language they would need for that. Chair Greenwald replied that he is just posing questions for consideration, because a lot of thought has to go into this, including how it would fit in with the Downtown Project.

Councilor Favolise stated that Mr. Pipp mentioned other cities with similar systems. He continued that what comes to his mind is what the process looks like for approving banners to be hung. They are thinking about downtown events. He knows that some cities have had controversy – for example, Concord – about what can and cannot be displayed. He wants to keep Keene out of the headlines for that sort of reason. Mr. Pipp replied that he is more familiar with the system in Manchester, because Beeze Tees does their banners. He continued that (the system) lays out what you can and cannot include as text, plus the banner’s weight and size, and more.

Councilor Workman asked if Mr. Lussier could briefly explain the installation of the message board in front of the post office and how that would differ from this, in terms of the process for getting your information or event listed. Mr. Lussier replied that he is not involved with that bulletin board and defers to the City Manager. He continued that he believes the City Clerk’s Office handles those temporary signs.

Chair Greenwald stated that he imagines the question of content is clearly spelled out in those two agreements. He continued that there are free speech considerations. Mr. Pipp replied yes, the banners cannot be for specific business logos, they have to be geared around an event.

Assistant City Attorney Amanda Palmeira stated that the City Attorney’s Office is paying attention to this for First Amendment reasons. She continued that there is a lot of nuances. The Supreme Court heard a case last year related to this. She would be happy to talk about and work on this topic, but tonight they are just talking about the construction. They could talk about the process later.

Councilor Filiault stated that he has lived here his whole life, and especially during the holiday season, downtown used to have multiple cables across Main St., Washington St., and Court St. He does not remember if those were taken down after the holidays, or permanent. Regarding Concord, he and his wife drive through there frequently, and both ends of Main St. have banners going across. It is a phenomenal advertising method, as he and his wife saw an event announcement they otherwise would not have known about, and it worked – they returned to Concord for the event. He can attest to the fact that these banners work well. This definitely has viability for Keene. It would probably get tied into the Downtown Infrastructure Project.

Chair Greenwald thanked Mr. Pipp for bringing in this good, creative idea. He continued that he thinks a cable is still up across Lamson St. He asked if the Committee had further questions for Mr. Pipp. Hearing none, he asked if members of the public had any questions or comments.

Ted McGreer stated that he owns the property at 115 Main St. He continued that Roger Weinreich owns the property across the street, and the two of them have been talking about this for years. It used to be that when you entered Keene, the city welcomed guests and visitors with a beautiful banner that announced Pumpkin Fest, a pancake dinner, or whatever else. He is a fan of that. This is a great opportunity to bring some of that nostalgia back to the City they love. Keene's downtown is unique, and people come from all over to see it. He wants the Committee to weigh in on this. He does not think it needs to be a \$20,000 cable system.

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

On a vote of 5-0, the Municipal Services, Facilities, and Infrastructure Committee recommends the communication regarding banners across Main St. be accepted as informational and to have City staff report back to the MSFI Committee on their findings.

Chair Greenwald stated that they will take agenda item 6 next.

**6) Request for a Marked Crosswalk at the Intersection of West Street and Pearl Street**

Chair Greenwald asked to hear from the Public Works Director. Mr. Lussier stated that some folks in the audience requested this and they might want to speak to it first.

Heather Atwell of Pearl St. stated that she submitted this request through “See, Click, Fix.” She continued that she had been seeing those signs for about two years and finally submitted something she knows the Downtown Project might supersede this, but she sees many people who walk from the hotel that is on West St. across to Pearl St., down Pearl St. to where Walmart and Target are. With the new car wash that was just built next to the new coffee shop, they were putting in beautiful sidewalks and greenery. Meanwhile, she had been thinking for years that she wanted to submit a “See, Click, Fix” request because when she approaches the stop sign at Pearl Street for West Street, there are four lanes on West Street, and all of these pedestrians are running across to get to work or wherever they are going. When she first submitted this request,

the reply said that this is part of something that might happen in 2027. Then when she saw the sidewalks going in as part of the carwash development, she wondered if they could just put something there, because it looks dangerous and scary for all the people crossing. She does not know what the City will do with her request, but she has expressed her thoughts.

Michelle Knapp of Pearl St. stated that she is sure everyone who travels West St. has seen the sheer number of cars that go back and forth West St. all day. She continued that daily, she sees people trying to cross from West St. to Pearl St. across those four lanes of traffic, including people with children, people with baby carriages, and people on bicycles. It is terrifying, because people drive at scary speeds on West St. She realizes there are multiple crosswalks, one down by the Hannaford Plaza and one near CVS, but the West St. and Pearl St. intersection feels like an accident waiting to happen. She thinks a lighted crosswalk there could potentially slow down traffic on West St.

Mr. Lussier stated that he thanks Ms. Atwell for joining them tonight. He continued that the request she submitted via See, Click, Fix was anonymous, so staff was not able to contact her. He is glad she got wind of this meeting and came tonight. He also thanks her for plugging the See, Click, Fix system, which is a great tool the City uses. Staff is happy that folks are catching on and submitting many requests. Staff received Ms. Atwell's request toward the end of October. Generally, Public Works recommends against adding mid-block crossings, which tend to have problems. Oftentimes, drivers are not expecting people to cross in the middle of a block between intersections, which leads to drivers not yielding to pedestrians in the crosswalk. As staff typically does with a traffic calming/traffic control request, they begin with an engineering study. The team goes out to look at the circumstances, looks at the data they already have, or collects more data if needed. Then, they determine if a request is appropriate for the location. For this location, staff agrees that this makes a lot of sense.

Mr. Lussier continued that the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) is Public Works' guidebook for how to do traffic controls. It has a number of criteria to look at when considering a mid-block crossing, which the MUTCD calls a "marked crosswalk at an uncontrolled location." Criteria include the distance to the next legally marked crosswalk, traffic volume, number of lanes that need to be crossed, traffic speeds, and pedestrian volumes. All of these factors are weighed. In this instance, it is a four-lane roadway with no median. Pedestrians need to cross a long distance, which can be especially challenging for folks with limited mobility. There is no median for pedestrians to pause at. It is a long distance to the next crosswalk, 800 feet to west at the plaza entrance, and 1,100 feet to the east at the Island St. intersection. Traffic volumes, per 2023 NHDOT measurements at the Ashuelot River Bridge, averaged about 19,000 vehicles per day. Thus, it is a very high-volume roadway. The standard says that a roadway with four or more lanes of traffic without a raised median or pedestrian refuge and an Average Daily Traffic (ADT) of over 12,000 vehicles should also consider conspicuity enhancements. These are things like pedestrian-activated beacons or additional signage.

Mr. Lussier stated that staff recommends the crosswalk be installed, and that it be upgraded with RRF pedestrian beacon system. He continued that if the Committee and Council agree with that recommendation, staff will put in a request to the Finance, Organization, and Personnel (FOP) Committee to fund that flashing beacon. The price will be a little less than it normally would be, as they were able to harvest some spare parts from other installations where they did not need the signs and beacons that were installed. It will be about \$7,500 to install the beacon system for this crosswalk. They propose doing that with City forces once the weather permits.

Chair Greenwald stated that he is glad to hear this.

Councilor Filiault stated that they all drive West St. and see this regularly. He continued that on lower Main St., pedestrians have a “halfway safety point,” but this does not exist on West St. He is concerned about someone getting stuck out there. He knows putting a median down the middle is not in the budget, but he wonders if there is a way to create some sort of halfway point. Crossing West St. sometimes feels like being stuck in the middle of nowhere, if you are in the middle of the street and cars are coming from the other way. The beacons will help by drawing attention, but with four lanes of traffic zipping by, it is hard for one person to judge how long it will take to cross. His question is whether it is possible to create something in the middle to make it a little bit safer, even if it is just paint, for someone to pause when they are halfway across.

Mr. Lussier replied that he would not recommend that. He continued that currently, the curb-to-curb width would not accommodate a substantial enough median in that area without narrowing the lanes more than they would like to see. However, the timing on the beacons can be adjusted based on the crossing distance. They would be programmed so that even people with limited mobility still have time to cross in the crosswalk while the lights are flashing. As he has mentioned in the past, those beacons do not change State law. Drivers are required to stop for pedestrians in the crosswalk whether a beacon is there or not. Beacons just draw the drivers’ attention and give pedestrians a better chance of being seen. Once someone is in the crosswalk and drivers have stopped to let them cross, it is incumbent on the drivers to wait until the person makes it across.

Councilor Filiault replied that he understands what drivers are supposed to do, but they do not always do what they are supposed to do. He continued that it is more of a safety concern when the driver does not do what they are supposed to do. Mr. Lussier stated that as Ms. Atwell mentioned, this area is slated for much more significant improvements in the near future. He continued that he knows 2030 does not sound like the near future, but staff will start designing the project in just a couple years. Councilor Filiault replied that he just wants to make sure they make this as safe as possible until the major developments happen in a few years.

Chair Greenwald asked if there were any further questions from the Committee or public. Hearing none, he asked for a motion.

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

The Municipal Services, Facilities, and Infrastructure Committee recommends the City Manager be authorized to install a marked crosswalk and pedestrian beacons on West Street, at the intersection of Pearl Street.

Ian Matheson of 11 Court St. stated that he is an avid pedestrian and shares Councilor Filiault's concerns about drivers not stopping. He continued that fairly often, even with these illuminated crosswalks, drivers do not stop. It is as if drivers think they do not need to stop for a pedestrian not yet in their lane. He wonders if they can install something similar to what is on Washington St. and Vernon St., a red light that stops traffic. He is concerned about the four lanes of traffic that pedestrians have to traverse through. He is not sure if the flashing yellow lights will prevent any accidents or injuries.

Chair Greenwald stated that Mr. Matheson's concern is well taken, but he assumes that the process of getting a stop light in the middle of West St. would be much more problematic than this quick and simple solution. Mr. Lussier replied yes, a pedestrian hybrid beacon is a little different and not something they have in the city. They are signal systems that go over the roadway and have stop lights associated with them, but they are pedestrian-activated. Those systems are significantly more expensive. In this area, they might have to have that reviewed by the NHDOT, because it is close to the State highway. At a certain point on West St., the NHDOT has a review prerogative for the City's improvements, but he does not recall exactly where that is. It might be the Ashuelot River Bridge. Regardless, that would be a much more involved project and much more costly.

The motion passed with a vote of 5-0.

Chair Greenwald stated that they will take agenda item 7 next.

### **7) Proposal for a Stop Sign at Intersection of Jennison Street and Foster Street**

Bryan Ruoff, City Engineer, stated that similar to the previous agenda item, this is a request from the public. He continued that the Engineering Division looked at this intersection and determined that this request for a stop sign added on Jennison St. at the intersection with Foster St. at the northernmost end of Jennison was in fact warranted, based on the MUTCD. Specifically, it is warranted by Section 2B04-09B due to the obscured sightline at the intersection looking west towards eastbound traffic on Foster St. He showed visuals of the intersection from the overhead view and from left and right and oriented the Committee to the area. He continued that a fence on private property completely obscures the view of traffic coming eastbound on Foster St. Staff spent some time in this location and noticed some cars whip around that corner, and you cannot see anyone coming. Based on that and based on their engineering assessment in conformance with the MUTCD, staff recommends that the Committee

recommend that the City Manager be directed to draft an Ordinance adding a stop sign at this location.

Chair Greenwald stated that the big discussion would be on the Ordinance. He asked if Committee members have any questions now. He asked if the City Manager or the City Attorney drafts this Ordinance. The City Manager answered the question with her mic muted.

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

The Municipal Services, Facilities, and Infrastructure Committee recommends the City Manager be directed to draft an Ordinance adding a stop sign at the northernmost end of Jennison Street at its intersection with Foster Street.

Chair Greenwald stated that again, the big discussion would really be at the Ordinance time, but the Committee seems interested. He asked if there was any further public comment, or if the Committee had anything further to say.

Councilor Favolise stated that he previously has been on the losing side of a vote related to stop signs at intersections, but this one makes perfect sense to him, due to the engineering setup. He continued that he does not think this is necessarily just a driver behavior problem. He does not know if speeding and reckless driving is a problem in this area as much as it is with some of the other four-way intersections the Committee has discussed. This looks like a “blind drive” kind of situation to him. He will wait to see what the Ordinance says when it comes back and talk more about it then, but he is definitely interested.

The motion passed with a vote of 5-0.

#### **4) Heritage Commission – Design Details in the Downtown Infrastructure Project**

Chair Greenwald stated that now they move into talking about the Downtown Infrastructure Project. He continued that they are talking about design issues and details with this agenda item and the next. Once they get into the Stantec presentation, they will also be talking about communication, the construction timing, and the ombudsman, issues that were brought forward at the FOP Committee meeting.

Chair Greenwald stated that this is a communication from the Heritage Commission about the design details in the downtown project. He asked who is presenting this. The City Manager replied that she is not sure anyone is presenting it. She continued that it is a letter of information from the HC regarding their review of the project.

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

The Municipal Services, Facilities, and Infrastructure Committee recommends Design Details in the Downtown Infrastructure Project be accepted as informational.

Mr. Lussier stated that the consultant met with the Heritage Commission while they were discussing these things. He continued that the options and choices the presentation will be showing the Committee in a few minutes have been informed by the feedback they have received. Where there are recommendations and suggestions from the Heritage Commission that staff may or may not agree with, he will point that out.

Mayor Jay Kahn stated that he thinks the Commission's comments are significant. He continued that when he came to Keene many years ago and took up his position at Keene State College, the design concepts brought into the Main St. design were the guiding principles for the Appian Way, the quadrangle, and more. Ashuelot River Park is another example of where downtown designs were picked up. He thinks that the Commission's suggestion that the City recognize some of those principles that have been brought forward are worth preserving in the consideration of the downtown design. These are significant principles that get carried forth by others in the City as they are making their design decisions.

The motion passed by a vote of 5-0.

**5) Approval of Final Design Details for Downtown Infrastructure Project (excludes approved roadway, sidewalk, and bike lane physical layouts)**

Chair Greenwald asked the City Manager to introduce this presentation.

The City Manager stated that these are the final design decisions before bidding out the Downtown Infrastructure Project. She continued that they include decisions related to things like the type of seating they would like, the type of pavement or stamped concrete or whether they want color in certain areas, how they want the Railroad Square design to look in terms of the materials used, and the design for the Gilbo Ave. area, regarding the materials used. These are not physical designs, but rather the last pieces of aesthetic design issues. Stantec will walk the Committee through it, breaking it apart so the Committee can give a consensus on each one. There are recommendations from the Public Works Department when they make those decisions, based on the durability and maintenance issues tied to different materials that may be chosen.

Ed Roberge, Civil Engineer with Stantec, introduced himself and his colleagues Bob Corning, Design Team Lead, and Dave MacNamara, Associate Project Manager.

Mr. Roberge stated that the project has been going for a while now, and they completed the preliminary design some time ago. He continued that there are a number of design details they want to flesh out tonight. They will talk about a number of factors that encompass all phases of the project. They have been talking about the project in specific areas, like Main St., Gilbo Ave., Railroad Square, and Central Square.



## **Main Street**

Mr. Roberge stated that beginning with Main St., from where they left off at the preliminary design presentation at the last meeting, these are some of the same details the Committee has seen before. Elements they will talk about tonight include sidewalk materials, tree planters, the bike lanes, crosswalks, the ways to plant trees, seating benches, and more. Stantec is approaching the 60% completion on the design package. These selections tonight will help them finish that package set. There are decision matrixes to go through tonight, based on the character areas he mentioned before. They will talk about material types in amenities and equipment and all the different options.

## **Surface Treatments on Sidewalks**

Mr. Corning stated that the design team has always tried for the sidewalk surfaces not to have just a continuous level plane of concrete. He continued that they have always thought about the fact that the main pedestrian thoroughfares would be concrete, but that there were opportunities for accents, either along the face of the building in the furnishing zones, or in the strip between the bike lane and the curb. They reviewed the materials options with Public Works in terms of durability and maintenance. Option 1 would be standard concrete. There are opportunities to do different scoring patterns, different kinds of broom finishes, or potentially exposed aggregate. (Option 2) is stamped concrete, which can have different patterns, colors, or textures. That would probably be in combination with a standard concrete. The photos in the PowerPoint presentation show examples of how it is used as an accent.

Mr. Roberge stated that they will talk a little bit about costs as they go along. He continued that considering the costs of the options is important.

Mr. Corning stated that option 3 would be a combination of concrete again, but with the introduction of a unit paver, which could be brick or concrete. Stantec has had success with these types of paver systems in urban environments. Installation is important so they hold up and are durable, but there are potential maintenance issues and increased cost.

Mr. Roberge stated that the Public Works staff prefers option 2, the standard and stamped concrete combination. Option 3 would be most expensive, option 1 would be least expensive, and option 2 would be in the middle.

Chair Greenwald asked what the Committee thinks. He continued that members of the public can share their thoughts, too. He asks everyone to try to be succinct, as they have many decisions to make tonight.

Councilor Filiault stated that he thinks overall cost is going to be very important, because there are many decisions to make. If the Committee says, "Option B costs a little more, but that's

okay” all the way through, the costs increase a little bit more and a little bit more, and at the end, the costs have increased a lot more.

Councilor Filiault stated that regarding downtown sidewalks, he has lived here a long time and seen many variations. He recommends they keep it simple. Any time a surface is not smooth, it creates a problem for people who use wheelchairs or crutches. Thus, he thinks that at least for the main areas that are heavily traveled by pedestrians, the surface should be standard concrete. That is cost efficient and requires little maintenance.

Chair Greenwald stated that something else to think about is that they are doing this project once, or at least, it is the last time in his lifetime that a project like this will happen, so they should not be too cheap. They should come up with a high quality project. He does not recommend they go to the extreme, because as Councilor Filiault says, durability and cost are important, but so are aesthetics. They want to have a project they are proud of.

Councilor Favolise stated that aside from the cost of the unit pavers, he recalls having this conversation at the Downtown Project Workshop. He thinks about ice and snow. At first, unit pavers look great, but he worries about how they will be after a few New England winters. He thinks option 3 should be off the table. Chair Greenwald replied that he agrees.

Councilor Tobin stated that she likes option 2. She continued that she likes that it creates some kind of separation. It is a clean line and adds texture to the space, and potentially some warmth.

The Mayor stated that scoring patterns matter. He continued that it cannot be a flat concrete. It needs scoring and a brush finish. You can alternate that in 90-degree directions because panels will not go in sequentially. The grit and catch for people who are walking on an icy surface is important.

Mr. Fulton stated that there is the option of a base bid and alternate bid items, where you look at those prices for enhanced sidewalks, and then when you get all the prices in, you add things up and figure out where your budget can maybe add some of those bid alternatives for higher grades aesthetically. They could talk about what they want, and what they want but do not know if they can afford and have the contractor price those out and see what happens.

Chair Greenwald asked the Committee members to choose an option. Councilor Tobin, Councilor Workman, Councilor Favolise, and Chair Greenwald chose option 2. Councilor Filiault chose option 1. Chair Greenwald stated that the Committee recommends option 2 for the sidewalk surface and noted the Councilors’ objections.

## **Bike Lanes**

Mr. Roberge stated that there are two bike path options. He continued that option 1 is maintaining the concrete surface. It is already part of the sidewalk regime. Photos in the

PowerPoint show examples of painted/colored concrete. Option 2 is bituminous. On the concrete panel, control joints and expansion joints would be present. On the bituminous side, it can be continuous. Bituminous could be unpainted or painted. They would have bike symbols, and crosswalks that are crossing that within the walking paths, so you would see that striping with either (option). Of the two, Public Works preferred option 1, concrete.

Mr. Lussier stated that to clarify, Public Works recommends the concrete with the integral pigment, not the paint. He does not love the USDOT-approved neon green color. The integral color is a little more subdued but still gets the point across that this is a space reserved for bicyclists. In addition, having integral pigment would mean not having to re-paint it every year, which would be very expensive.

Chair Greenwald stated that he is not in favor of that green color. He continued that he does not see why it could not be a red/brick color, perhaps even with stamping, to be more cohesive with the downtown.

Councilor Workman asked if it is correct that the integral concrete color is mixed into the concrete directly. Mr. Lussier replied yes.

Councilor Favolise stated that he thought they agreed at the workshop about preferring the dyed concrete. He continued that the green color makes sense to him, as it is the City's color/logo.

Chair Greenwald stated that he agrees that the conclusion was dyed concrete, not just painted on.

Councilor Tobin stated that she supports integral concrete.

Chair Greenwald stated that it sounds like the Committee prefers option 1 for the bike path surface. He continued that he would request something more brick-like, stamped. He asked if the other Committee members agree. Councilor Filiault replied that he just wants it simple. Chair Greenwald replied that he does not care whether it is stamped, but he thinks the stamp would be a minimal cost increase and would be aesthetically stronger.

### **Raised Crosswalks**

Mr. Roberge stated that these are the crosswalk tables at Gilbo Ave. and Railroad St., one at the top of Central Square, one on the Washington St. approach, and one on the Court St. approach. Mr. Corning added crosswalks would also be on the side streets. Mr. Roberge continued that there are three ways of treating these. They want to make sure pedestrians cross along the curb plane. They are prioritizing pedestrians throughout the corridor. Option 1 is a concrete option. The concrete includes the ramp up, the table surface itself, and a ramp down. Option 2 is bituminous, very similar in configuration, just built on the bituminous roadway. Option 3 is unit pavers. Bituminous would be more cost effective than concrete, but concrete would be more cost effective than the unit pavers. He knows there is some history with the unit pavers and how

they are built, but because they are segmented block and they are pieces, they would be a little more intensive to maintain than concrete or bituminous. A photo of Main St. crosswalks now shows a resin-based epoxy infill material that is stenciled. The orange-y brick color pattern is a stencil. It would be milled out of the bituminous pavement, placed very similar to what they have today. Stantec's drawings show a standard crosswalk with a "piano key"/ladder-type of crosswalk. This is more of a solid infill, which would be this brick pattern or any pattern that the design detail might come up with. Colored is a solid color, so having that is a matter of preference. The photos for option 1 show a ladder-type crosswalk, and option 2 shows a solid, infill color. Stantec's thoughts are that the Main St. crosswalks would be built in this (option 2) fashion, and the side street crosswalks could be the ladder type. They can focus on the material type, and then if the Committee wants, they can talk about the type of crosswalk striping as well.

Mr. Roberge stated that Public Works opted for options 1 and 2 for the surfaces of the raised crosswalks. He continued that from the perspective of the main line streets, that would be concrete on the raised tables, and the side streets would be bituminous.

Mr. Lussier replied that Mr. Roberge is correct; staff recommends asphalt on the side streets because Public Works staff are able to maintain those and fix the asphalt. For the crosswalk between Gilbo Ave. and Railroad Plaza, that raised intersection, and the crosswalks at Central Square, he thinks it makes sense to have something a little more robust and more aesthetically impressive. That is where they would suggest stamped concrete or patterned concrete. He does not recommend the unit pavers. Those were problematic downtown. Regarding the pattern itself, the City has gone through many crosswalk marking methods in the downtown, such as the hexagons, the current pattern, and regular painted crosswalks. He thinks the current system is a nice compromise. It is a little more aesthetically pleasing, but it can be repaired simply. For example, they can just fix the wheel tracks that get rutted out and worn through by the snow tires, without having to redo everything, and it is more durable than the unit pavers.

Chair Greenwald asked if the Committee members are good with staff's recommended options 1 and 2 for the surfaces of the raised crosswalks. The Committee members replied yes. Councilor Tobin stated that she does feel good about that option. She continued that in terms of the markings, sometimes the wide lines get worn out, making it hard to tell that there is a crosswalk, so she would want to explore that at some point.

### **Site Furnishings**

Mr. Roberge stated that site furnishings include bike racks and trash and recycling receptacles. He continued that for the bike rack options, they looked at the U-shaped bike racks, similar to what the City has now. In the PowerPoint slide, he showed a photo of ones that could be permanently mounted on a concrete pad. He continued that a little more flexible would be the locations like the triple U-shaped bike rack that could be portable, for the City to move around to different locations. Bike racks could be with or without the City logo.

Mr. Corning stated that for trash and recycling options, (option 1) is essentially what exists today, separate bins for trash and recycling. (Option 3) is a combination. (Option 2) are more contemporary versions of separate trash and recycling bins. Another option are mini-compactors, which reduces the amount of time you need to empty them, but they are more expensive. The important thing is splitting trash and recycling and having multiple fixtures there to encourage that.

Mr. Roberge stated that for bike racks, again, option 1 is either a permanent or movable U-rack, and option 2 is a U-rack with customized signage. For trash and recycling, option 1 is the “tree top” products like what the City has today. Option 2 is to have separate trash and recycling bins that look more modern. Option 3 is the “big belly” (compactor).

Chair Greenwald stated that he likes the signage, and he wants to look into whether that could be a fundraiser, with local businesses, the Kiwanis Club, the Rotary Club, or similar groups buying a bike rack. He continued that it could have the City logo on it along with “Gift of [business or group name].” That would need to be priced out and it is not an urgent decision.

Councilor Workman stated that in the photo it looks like a bar with the stamp, which could probably be added on at a later date. Mr. Roberge replied yes, it could be added at any time. He continued that Stantec suggests that if that is the plan, the City should buy the unit with the sidebar so they can convert it some other time. It is not a large cost. He does not think the signage is a “budget buster,” but the option for donations or sponsorships is a good idea.

Chair Greenwald asked what the Committee thinks about permanently fixed or portable bike racks.

Councilor Favolise stated that he thinks movable would make the most sense. Councilor Workman agreed. Councilor Filaault stated that movable makes more sense, because if the racks are not being used in a particular location, they could easily move them. They could also be moved if maintenance needs to be done around them. Councilor Tobin stated that she prefers permanent, because sometimes portable ones end up getting tossed in a corner, twisted, or not positioned clearly, but she does not have a strong preference. Chair Greenwald stated that he prefers movable.

Mr. Lussier stated that they might be able to compromise. He continued that some bike rack locations are permanent and do not impede winter maintenance. Those could be permanently installed. Others could be movable.

The Mayor stated that the bike racks that look like a hoop have a space for a bike on either side. He continued that he is surprised there is not an option for something more continuous with more lanes, like where you slide your bike into the lane. He has seen those in other cities with heavy bike use. He sees that design more often. Chair Greenwald replied that he thinks the Mayor is referring to those bikes for rent in big cities, which are slotted.

Councilor Haas stated that the Bicycle Pedestrian Path Advisory Committee (BPPAC) did a study of bike rack types and arrangements. He asked if that reached Stantec for their review. The types of bike racks presented are good, but there is a wide variety of others. Perhaps if Stantec has not seen the BPPAC's recommendation, they should hold off on this item. Mr. Roberge replied that Stantec did not see that recommendation or report, and it would be great to look at. Chair Greenwald asked if the Committee would object to holding off on the bike rack decision until they heard from the Bicycle Pedestrian Path Advisory Committee. No objection was noted.

### **Trash and Recycling**

Chair Greenwald asked what the Committee thinks about the trash can options.

Councilor Tobin asked if compost bins are a consideration now or in the future. She continued that she notices many downtown businesses have shifted to compostable trash and materials. Chair Greenwald replied that he does not know what that would be. He continued probably a third bin next to the waste and recycling.

Mr. Lussier replied yes, if that became a thing, it would probably be a third bin. He continued that Public Works's recommendation for the "big bellies" is utilitarian. The compactors allow staff to empty the bins once a week, whereas standard bins need to be emptied two or three times a week.

Chair Greenwald asked if they would consider the standard trash bins as well as the compactors. Mr. Lussier replied that that is what they are looking for the Committee to consider. Staff suggests the Committee choose one or the other. Right now, there are compactors in two locations. Chair Greenwald asked if they want to have them all the same for consistency. Mr. Lussier replied yes.

Councilor Favolise stated that the efficiency for staff is a compelling argument. He continued that what he struggles with is that the compactors do not look very historic downtown. He leans toward option 1 and would be okay with option 2. Option 3 looks too modern.

Councilor Workman stated that she leans toward option 3, for durability, not being tipped over, better containing the trash, and reducing the likelihood of animals getting in it.

Chair Greenwald asked what the cost difference is between options 1 and 3. Mr. Roberge replied that options 1 and 2 are comparable, and he would call it "one dollar sign." He continued that option 3 would be "three and a half dollar signs."

The City Manager stated that with option 1 receptacles, the City does not get great recycling compliance. She continued that they get better compliance with option 3.

Chair Greenwald asked if option 3 requires wiring. Mr. Roberge replied that it is solar-powered. Chair Greenwald stated that obviously, option 1 would not break down, as it is not mechanical.

Councilor Filiault stated that he favors option 1, for reasons of cost and simplicity. He continued that compactors come with increased cost and the need for maintenance repairs, which basic trashcans do not have. If option 3 is three times as expensive, they could instead get three times more of option 1 trashcans for downtown. They need to be careful with costs. Option 1 works and costs less.

Chair Greenwald stated that they can take option 2 out of the discussion, as no one said anything good about it. Councilor Favolise stated that he prefers option 1. Councilor Workman stated that option 3 is her first choice, and option 1 is her second choice. Councilor Tobin stated that she is okay with option 1. The Chair noted his preference for option 1.

Chair Greenwald stated that he would request the City's logo on the side of the bins. Mr. Roberge replied that there is an option for a small logo. He continued that that is something they can look at later.

## **Hydrants**

Mr. Roberge showed the options for hydrants. He continued that this is a new, modern hydrant. It is just a replica of older hydrants. Stantec talked with the Heritage Commission about this, and they liked the old "throwback" hydrant. There are four different painting schemes, and there could be more. Option 1 is solid red. Option 2 is a red body with a white "bonnet"/cover and white valves. Option 3 is all yellow. Option 4 is essentially the existing hydrant, with a blue bonnet. Blue represents the line pressure delivering the water. Blue is an indicator to the Fire Department that it is the extra high-pressure system. If it were a low-pressure system, it would be treated differently.

Mr. Lussier stated that Public Works' recommendation is to stick with the standard hydrants. He continued that if the preference is for them to blend more, they could paint the bodies black instead of the silver/gray color that is shown. The bonnet should be color-coded to the available flow for the Fire Department to know what is available there. Chair Greenwald replied that the hydrants used to be black.

Councilor Filiault stated that he agrees with Mr. Lussier. Chair Greenwald stated that it looks like the Committee prefers option 4 for the hydrant style. He continued that it would mean standard parts for repairs. Mr. Lussier replied yes, that is why staff wants to stick with the standard hydrants, instead of having another system they would have to stock parts for.

## **Planter Curbs**

Mr. Corning stated that for north of Railroad and Gilbo on the northern end of Main St. and at the perimeter of Central Square, they propose planters for the new proposed trees. He continued that for planter materials, option 1 is a vertical granite curb, a six-inch reveal. Instead of street curb, it would be a finished granite with a thermal finish on all exposed spaces. It is a dimensional granite, more finished and with finer looking detail than the street curb or other materials. Regarding option 2, there are locations with granite benches at the end of the planters. They suggest the opportunity to include a small, short fence mounted on top of the curb. It gives it a more finished look and prevents people from cutting through, prevents pets from going into the planter areas, and gives a nice-looking detail. That could have two or three sides. Public Works prefers option 2.

Councilor Favolise stated that he does not have a strong preference. He continued that he is interested in what the railing would look like. The one in the picture looks modern and might not blend with the rest of downtown. He is more interested in the planters' contents.

Mr. Lussier stated that Public Works' recommendation is utilitarian. He continued that the beds tend to get shabby-looking if people cut through them and dogs are using them inappropriately. Public Works' recommendation for the fencing is to keep the beds looking better, a little less trafficked. They could find a wrought iron fence detail that would be appropriate for the downtown.

Chair Greenwald replied that that would be good. He asked if it is correct that the fence would be mounted into the granite. Mr. Corning replied yes.

Councilor Filiault asked about costs. Mr. Lussier replied that the fence would cost more than option 1. Councilor Filiault asked how much more. Mr. Roberge replied that to use his previous analogy, the fence would be "about 1.5 dollar signs." He continued that it depends on how ornamental they want to get. There are fences that look more historic than modern. Materials, such as wrought iron or aluminum, vary in cost.

Mr. Corning stated that he thinks that is about right. He continued that the Committee should remember that this is only for the north end of Main St. and some of the planters around the Central Square perimeter.

Vicky Morton of 275 Water Street asked what the liability is for tripping hazards. Amanda Palmeira, the Assistant City Attorney, replied that the City has immunity protections for many of these things. She continued that the City has "discretionary function immunity" for how they do designs for pedestrian traffic like this, so she does not think that needs to be a factor with this choice.

Chuck Redfern of 9 Colby St. stated that he thinks the fences could be a safety hazard, if someone brushes up against them and falls, or if a wheelchair gets stuck in them. He continued that the sidewalks get busy, especially with the addition of bike lanes. He is not worried about



whether the City has insurance to cover the injured; he is more concerned with prevention. He likes the lower profile of the others, which people are less likely to stumble over.

Chair Greenwald stated that these are raised, as opposed to the existing condition, which he thinks is semi-raised. Mr. Corning replied that the existing is raised as well. It would be about the same.

The Mayor stated that his concern would be skateboards. He continued that anything that raises up, or anything that a skateboard could jump to or use in any manner, will be used. Chair Greenwald asked if he is saying it would be better or worse to have (the fence). The Mayor replied worse, as it chips. Chair Greenwald asked if skateboarders would ride along the fence. The Mayor replied not the fence, but those concrete pieces shown at the end invites someone to try it. He continued that looking at the County steps and KSC steps, you can see it happens. He thinks what exists downtown has worked well.

Councilor Filiault stated that he prefers option 1, to keep it simple. He continued that there is no need to complicate it. Regarding tripping, that can happen at any street downtown, at any time. They cannot prevent everything. Regarding costs and efficiency, the Mayor makes a good point. He thinks the rails would get broken.

Chair Greenwald, Councilor Tobin, Councilor Favolise, and Councilor Workman all chose option 1 for the planters as well.

## **Tree Wells**

Mr. Corning stated that generally north of Railroad and Gilbo, the street trees are in planters, but due to the reduced sidewalk width as you get to Gilbo and Railroad south on Main St., the trees are flush with grade. Currently, there are some tree grates in various locations. Other locations have just a mulch or planting bed. A big issue for the health of street trees in urban environments is compaction. A tree with a mulch bed is very susceptible to compaction, which is bad for the roots and growth. Stantec recommends a treatment over that that is not just an open tree pit. (Option 1) is a tree grate like what exists now. He should also mention that where there is a flush condition, Stantec proposes the Silva Sell system, which is almost like a milk crate system that is below grade that accommodates soil growth for root volume growth and supports the pavement above it. (Option 2) would be a "paver grate," which is a tree grate below the level of the pavers, with permeable pavers on top of that. It would allow drainage to percolate through, with nicer detail than a regular tree grate. (Option 3) would be a new system they have been using a lot, called "porous resin bound paving." It is similar to poured-in-place playground surfacing but a little denser. It is a plastic bound together with resin, flexible and porous. Public Works recommends matching the existing tree grates.

Councilor Tobin asked if other things will be planted with the trees. Mr. Corning replied where the trees are flush, no. Mr. Lussier stated that they are talking about instances where trees are

planted by themselves. Councilor Tobin stated that she is good with option 1 that would match the existing tree wells. Councilor Workman, Chair Greenwald, Councilor Favolise, and Councilor Filiault agreed.

### **Ornamental Traffic Signal Bases**

Mr. Roberge stated that Stantec talked about this with the Heritage Commission. He continued that they are looking at modernized traffic signals, and mast arms are needed to cover the lanes as required. There are options for signal post bases. Option 1 is a “Washington base,” very similar to the current lighting fixtures. This traffic signal base would be larger and bulkier than the streetlights, though. (Option 2) is a different type that would fit in, but with a slightly different focus. If it did not have a base cover similar to this, the traffic signals would look like they do now, a steel post that terminates at a straight concrete base. Public Works was neutral on this, so it is up to the Committee’s preference.

Chair Greenwald asked if it is correct that what exists now is option 1, as they are not talking about the poles, just the base. Mr. Roberge replied that the picture shows the difference between a straight pole and a fluted pole, which have the little indentations. He continued that the street lighting systems now, not the traffic signals, are very similar to this Washington base, and the posts are fluted. That is what was selected already, in the previous action. The Washington base with the fluted post would be closest to what the street lighting is.

Chair Greenwald stated that he chooses that.

Councilor Filiault asked what the cost difference is between the two. Mr. Roberge replied that there is not much of a cost difference. Mr. Lussier stated that there is no maintenance or durability difference; it is purely about aesthetics.

Councilor Tobin stated that she definitely prefers option 1. Chair Greenwald, Councilor Workman, and Councilor Filiault agreed. Councilor Favolise stated that he prefers option 2 but does not feel strongly.

### **Lighting - Electrical Pedestals and Bollard Lights**

Mr. Roberge stated that additional site furnishings to consider are the electrical pedestals. He continued that they are the power posts that provide downtown power. Option 1 would be a singular receptacle. Option 2 is a dual or more. (Option 1)’s size is narrow and sleek. (Option 2) would double the size, but it has more functionality.

Mr. Roberge stated that bollard lights will add better visibility at the raised crosswalks, here and at Railroad Square and the entrance to Gilbo. He continued that they need safety bollards to prevent vehicle access. The Heritage Commission encouraged them to find something that looked more historic and that would be compatible with the lights. Stantec has not found one

that would match the lighting fixture base particularly, but they have three bollard options they ask the Committee to consider.

Chair Greenwald stated that he would rather see two receptacles than extension cords, splitters, and what goes on during the events. He is not interested in the USB option; it does not really fit with downtown festivals. He noted that the other Committee members say option "2" as well.

Chair Greenwald asked the Committee about bollard lights. Councilor Workman replied that she thinks option 3 would match with the light posts a little better. She thinks they have ridged signal lights right now, so option 3 would match better, aesthetically.

Mr. Corning stated that with option 3, the whole center section is illuminated, not the top.

Chair Greenwald stated that he likes option 2.

Councilor Filiault stated that since they are on the subject of bollard lights, the MSFI Committee has talked about having temporary bollards that could be used during downtown events, such as at Washington St. and Court St. Many communities use them, including Buffalo, NY, so he does not want to hear that Keene cannot use them because of the snow. They are portable, for events, and screw into the ground. He would prefer this method for events, because currently, the City uses multi-million dollar trucks as blockades. That is cost inefficient, and it takes manpower to get all those trucks downtown, and Public Works charges for those. Removable bollards would be more cost efficient. That is probably not something Stantec or Public Works has information about tonight, but he would like to look into that.

Mr. Lussier replied that he is right that they do not have that information tonight. He continued that they heard that request, and they are evaluating different options. He has not yet found one he loves, but they know the Committee is interested in this. Regarding downtown events, to set the record clear, Public Works charges event organizers whatever it costs to have Public Works staff come in and move the equipment. Public Works does not make any money off that. He would be fine with not having as much effort to staff those events.

Mr. Roberge asked if the Committee selected option 2 for the bollards. Chair Greenwald replied yes.

### **Gilbo Ave. and Railroad St.**

Mr. Roberge stated that the Committee has finished the Main St. list, and now they move on to Gilbo Ave. and Railroad St. They will not repeat the elements they have already gone through. Two features are unique to the Gilbo Ave. area. First is the canopy lighting. In the design, it was important to activate and light up this area between the buildings along the Cheshire Rail Trail. That catenary lighting is shown in two styles of lighting fixtures Stantec felt would be appropriate and maintainable. They are shown connected to buildings, which would be subject to conversations with the building owners. Stantec wants the Committee's opinion on the style of lighting fixtures. Options 1 and 2 are both industrial looking and would match fairly well with the theme of the old rail corridor.

Mr. Roberge continued that the other unique feature for the area is the "leaning benches," which would be in and around the larger gathering space. They allow people to do some work while standing. Sometimes they are energized with receptacles. Option 2 is an angled leaning bench, which allows people to put a bag down while they are waiting or meeting people.

Regarding the catenary lighting, Chair Greenwald stated that the example photo just has bare bulbs, which he thinks look good, too. He continued that it would be interesting to see this (catenary lighting) on Lamson St., Church St., and other alleys.

Councilor Filiation stated that he likes the bare bulbs. He continued that they have a rustic look, but more than that, many of the alleys are very dark at night. Especially in the downtown area, people feel safer with light. This is good for Gilbo Ave., and he thinks down the road, they should consider some of the other alleyways.

Mr. Lussier stated that the recommendation for option 2 is based on the degree of protection for the bulb. He continued that the bare bulb has no protection, whereas option 1 offers a little bit of bulb protection, and option 3 adds a little more with the cage underneath. That protection is his only preference. In terms of aesthetics, he thinks they all look nice.

Chair Greenwald stated that he is thinking of the cost of the fixtures, but he also has to shift his mindset, because this is not his property. This is a multi-million-dollar project; they are not talking about a string of Christmas lights here.

Councilor Workman asked if a canopy could be added later on, if they went with the bare bulb.

Mr. Roberge replied that this might be one of those areas like what Mr. Fulton mentioned before about alternate adds. He continued that this might be something they want pricing on. Regarding Councilor Workman's question of whether they could go with bare bulbs and fit the canopy onto it later, the answer is no, they would have to replace the whole system.

Chair Greenwald stated that he thinks the add alternate bid is a good idea. Mr. Roberge replied that a number of these items would work well.

Councilor Favolise stated that he does not hate the idea of bare bulbs. He continued that he understands the degree of protection piece, but he is also thinking that they should be controlling costs as best they can and keeping things simple for the “non-essential” pieces, and this falls into that category for him.

Chair Greenwald stated that they do not need to have this lighting at all. However, he thinks it is a spectacular add to the project for not too big of an expense.

Councilor Tobin stated that she likes the bare bulbs. She continued that if she were to pick one of the options presented, she would pick option 2, because there is a drinking fountain that was modeled after an old fire call tower, and this reminds her of that.

The Mayor stated that he encourages limiting the add alternates, because having too many can drive bidders crazy. He continued that that said, this is a good one for an add alternate, because you could ask for unit pricing. Given the Committee’s desire to see this lighting down multiple alleyways, unit pricing would be a good add alternate.

Mr. Fulton stated that when it is 3:00 in the morning and people are coming out of bars, “anything lit is a fair shot.” He continued that once one light goes out, another gets smashed. Public Works will not replace the light every time one goes out; it will be a while. They will get complaints about the lights being out. Thus, his recommendation is “protect, protect, protect.” In addition, the bollards are a great opportunity for someone to kick down or hit with a bat. He knows Public Works always looks at future maintenance and makes things rugged so they last, preventing what vandalism they can.

Chair Greenwald asked if it is correct that if they do the fixtures, there would be many fewer fixtures than bulbs shown. Mr. Corning replied yes, and the other big difference is that the fixtures in options 1 and 2 are cable supported. The cable is supported at the building faces or on poles, then the lights and supporting electrical hangs off that. The bare bulb lights are just on a string, with no cable support.

Chair Greenwald asked if it is three fixtures across. Mr. Roberge replied that he thinks they would see a frequency of more than three. He continued that the strand is separated by 12 or 15 inches. They might not have the 10 bulbs they have here, but there would be about seven or eight. There would be a decent span across, to get the lighting effect they want.

Councilor Favolise stated that if it is between option 1 and 2, he likes option 2, for the protection piece. He continued that the cage does feel less modern than the top one. He does not hate the idea of just the bare bulbs. He appreciates the comment about the safety of them and the

vandalism. He is not necessarily concerned about this area being vandalized, compared to some other areas. He likes option 2 better than option 1 but would be fine with bare bulbs.

Councilor Workman stated that she feels the same as Councilor Favolise.

Chair Greenwald stated that he is looking at the bare bulbs as lasting three to five years. He continued that it would not be a permanent arrangement. He is in favor of the bare bulbs. Councilor Filiault stated that he too prefers the bare bulbs, and they could buy an extra case of bulbs. Councilor Tobin stated that she likes option 2. The Chair noted the consensus is bare bulbs (with a cage as a bid alternative for the canopy lighting).

### **Leaning Rail**

Councilor Favolise stated that he wants to hear some discussion about the leaning rails, because he questions whether this needs to be part of the project.

Mr. Corning stated that Stantec proposed these leaning rails in the Gilbo Ave. area and Railroad Square. He continued that it is a newer type of feature they have been using in many urban projects, and they are very popular and well used. That is why they propose it, to activate and give some different uses for the different public spaces.

Chair Greenwald replied that he has never seen it anywhere, but clearly, Stantec has. He continued that it would probably answer the question of people hanging out on the bench all day, as this is not comfortable to sit on for that long. He would be okay with losing it.

Councilor Tobin stated that she likes option 1. She continued that she can picture herself using that, gathering around and talking to people around it. She can imagine it as a little gathering place to have a drink, coffee, or ice cream

Councilor Filiault stated that he does not support the leaning rail. He continued that constituents tell them to get the project done without wasting money. He thinks this is a waste of money.

Ian Matheson stated that this seems like a great conversation point, as Councilor Tobin mentioned. He continued that maybe this could be something the public fundraises for. He does not think it should be outright dismissed. They want people to congregate downtown, and this is a great congregation point. There has to be some way for people to stop and rest and talk.

Councilor Workman stated that she would not want to eliminate any seating on Gilbo Ave. She continued that if they are not going to have the leaning rail, she still would want some benches periodically. She would be okay with setting aside the leaning rails for now and seeing where they are in the future. She thinks they could be added at any time.

Councilor Tobin stated that she would like option 1.

Councilor Filiault and Chair Greenwald stated that they do not want any leaning rails at the present time and they could be added to the designs in the future.

### **Railroad Square**

Mr. Roberge stated that they are talking about Railroad Square now, not repeating any of the items already talked about. They are focused now on the paving areas. They have talked about sidewalks and unit pavers, and now they want to talk about archways, the shade structure, and some benches.

### **Surface Options**

Mr. Corning stated that it is the same palette of choices as with Main St. He continued that he thinks Public Works is a little more supportive of unit paving as an accent element in Railroad Square. Option 1 is standard concrete, broom finish or exposed aggregate. Option 2 would be a combination of stamped concrete and standard concrete. Option 3 would be introducing unit pavers as an accent in specific areas to designate different zones within the Square.

Mr. Corning continued that one feature they propose, which seems to have some momentum and buy-in from the community, is representing the historic railroad in the pavement. Option 1 would be to use real rails, getting surplus rails from the State or another source, and incorporating them into the paving. The pavement would come up flush with the top, representing real rails and the historic situation in that area. Option 2 would be to use a Corten steel, which rusts naturally. It would just be a steel plate. It would be the thickness of a rail, if you were looking at it from the top, but it would not be the full depth, just a half inch or three-quarter inch plate that would represent the rails. Option 3 is a more interpretative idea where the rail could be represented in the paving, and you could potentially have some interpretative elements associated with that. Option 4 is using pavers. A paving pattern would represent, conceptually, a rail going through the zone.

Mr. Corning stated that Public Works supports some combination of option 1 and option 3.

Chair Greenwald asked what the problem with option 2 was. Mr. Lussier replied that selective use of the pavers could really make the space distinctive. He continued that it would be a different feeling, a little more polished. He definitely does not want to have the unit pavers throughout the downtown, for reasons of maintainability, but using them selectively here or in the middle of Central Square can really highlight the significance of those spaces.

Councilor Filiault stated that unit pavers should not be used in high traffic areas. He continued that Railroad Square has had pavers. Especially in the winter with the frost and the water, those pavers come up and go down. In the past they have been a nightmare on Railroad Square. The

area freezes and thaws and then becomes slippery. Pavers look good, but historically, they have not held up very well.

Mr. Lussier replied that there are ways of building them with different bases to make them more durable. He continued that they do require more maintenance, no question, which is why he is not advocating for using them throughout, but they are very attractive and could make these spaces look very nice.

Councilor Tobin stated that one of the Councilors said the bricks in this area are something that would be missed, so she would like a way to incorporate something like that.

Councilor Favolise stated that he really does not like the unit pavers. He continued that he understands this would be a more limited use and there are ways to do it, but he sees them as a trip hazard and a maintenance challenge. He is happier with a more limited use in a thoughtful way, but he agrees with Councilor Filiault's points. Whatever they decide, it needs to be concrete forward, with little to no use of pavers.

Councilor Workman stated that she likes option 1 with the concrete, no unit pavers.

Chair Greenwald stated that he likes option 2. He continued that he does not want to see a vast expanse of concrete. Having a mix of stamped and standard means they could have the aesthetics of the unit pavers and still have some variety out there.

Councilor Filiault replied that he agrees with Chair Greenwald that it cannot just be barren concrete, but he disagrees with the pavers. He continued that some colored, stamped concrete for visuals would be good. He agrees with option 2.

Councilor Workman replied that she could go with option 2 as well.

Councilor Tobin stated that she could live with option 2 but she is voting for option 3. The overall consensus of the Committee was option 2 for the Railroad Square surface option.

Chair Greenwald stated that regarding the railroad tracks, he is in favor of real rail.

Councilor Favolise replied that that was his thought, too. He continued that he likes all of the options better than the painting. He continued that his question is the cost. At some point, there was conversation about trying to get the actual, historical rail. To Councilor Tobin's point about the historic nature of this, he feels the sense from the community that they want to preserve the history of Railroad Square.

Mr. Roberge replied that they could try to find used, surplus steel rail, and the cost could be very nominal. He continued that it could be donated. Their partners at DOT Railroad might have enough surplus material that they could donate to the cause. It might be cost neutral. The Corten



weathering steel, option 2, would have some cost to it. If they are embedding it in concrete and stamping concrete around that, from a square foot standpoint, it might be a nominal cost as well. Options 3 and 4 can still be accomplished with stamping, with different coloration and material type. If they are looking at option 2, which is concrete and concrete stamping, they are probably comparable, with maybe a slight upcharge on the steel side.

Councilor Filiault stated that he likes the option of real rail. He continued that it is good to have friends with surplus materials.

The Mayor stated that he would refer them to the Heritage Commission's comments. He continued that the rails were a suggestion of that group. That would be a good follow through.

Councilor Tobin stated that a concern she has is that in the picture with the ridges it looks like there would be a groove. She asked if that would be finished. She wonders if a wheelchair could get caught in there. Mr. Corning replied that the rails would have a solid top.

Mr. Lussier stated that his initial recommendation for the Corten steel was based on the concern he had about detailing the interface between brick pavers and the rail. He continued that Stantec has assured him they could make that work. If the preference will be for the use of concrete and stamped concrete, using that with steel rail would be simple.

### **Gateway Arches**

Mr. Roberge stated that there are a number of options in here. He continued that the two images on the lower right are precedent images of what is nearby in the community. KSC has large brick and granite pillars, very stately with an archway of steel frame and steel text letters. Ashuelot River Park is very similar, with large granite posts with a standing arch.

Mr. Roberge continued that option 1 is a single post with a brick base. When they had the conversation with the Heritage Commission, the notion of recycling the bricks that are in Railroad Square now for these bases was really important. This size, or something broader. What is at KSC could be an option. There are a number of options here, but pinning down one of these options would be helpful for Stantec. Option 2 is a brick base, two posts, and a steel arch with steel, raised letters. It could be cut letters in a metal panel, or the steel frame with metal letters that are independent. Option 3 (1A) is single post with granite base. Utilizing the brick to the best extent possible, this really was a good option. They focused on the gateway arch at Railroad Square, but there is also space for one at the archway into Gilbo and the Cheshire Rail Trail if the Committee is inclined to consider that.

Mr. Roberge stated that the Public Works Department was all on board with multiple options here, but what was most important was the brick base. Mr. Lussier stated that the preference here is based on the conversation with the Heritage Commission. He continued that he learned

from the Commission that the pavers at Railroad Square were originally donated. It would be really nice to recycle some of those.

Councilor Filiault stated that he likes what he is hearing about donations. He continued that he has no problem with either one. Keene started on Railroad Square when the trains started coming through. He appreciates that they are bringing back Railroad Square. He realizes it will cost some money, which he might normally say no to, but he thinks it is important to preserve the history.

Chair Greenwald stated that he likes the single post. He continued that regarding being potentially hit with a snowplow, granite holds up a little better than bricks. He should not be concerned.

Councilor Favolise stated that he likes the single posts. He continued that he does not see the need for it to be as high as the KSC or ARP ones. It is a way to maintain the aesthetic throughout the City but recognize that this is a different area. He agrees with Councilor Filiault that this is an area he is okay with investing in, due to its historical nature. He likes option 1. He likes the historical tie. The Gilbo Ave. arch feels like a nice thing to have down the road but it does not have to be included here.

Councilor Workman stated that she likes option 1 as pictured with the banner and the cutout letters.

Councilor Tobin stated that she would be okay with that.

The Mayor stated that he recalls, (with the entryway at KSC, which was then modeled at Ashuelot River Park, that it is very important to have the solid letters, for photography. He continued that the perforated letters will not show up. He would like a design that emphasizes the lettering as opposed to the banner.

The consensus of the Committee was option 2 for the gateway arches. City Manager asked if they would be opposed to the Gilbo Ave. arch as a bid alternate. Chair Greenwald replied that he is not opposed to that.

### **Shade Structure**

Mr. Corning stated that they propose a shade structure for Railroad Square. He continued that this came up in their conversations with the Heritage Commission. There has been discussion about what to contain under the structure, such as benches, bike racks, or both. All of the options for structures are premanufactured products.

Mr. Corning continued that option 1 is a trellis structure, giving dimpled shade. Option 2 is similar but the roof is louvered, potentially mechanical to close or open. Option 3 is a solid roof.

They could look at variations within the different options, such as different colors, but generally it is about the style and mostly the roof structure, whether it is open, closed, or somewhere in between.

Chair Greenwald asked what the function is. Mr. Roberge replied that this was added based on public comment about having shade opportunities in the park and a bit of covering for seating, benches, or bike racks. He continued that option 3 shows the covered pavilion that has bike racks. That could be a combination with some sort of seating block.

Chair Greenwald asked if it is correct that it is not a performance center. Mr. Roberge replied that is correct. Chair Greenwald stated that it would not have tables.

Councilor Favolise stated that he recalls conversations around constituent desire for a shaded resting spot. He continued that he is confused about option 1, which looks more decorative and like it would not meet that purpose. He is not opposed to having a shade structure, but he is opposed to option 1.

Councilor Workman stated that she would go with option 3, if she is remembering correctly about where they talked about having these.

Councilor Filiault stated that he sees these as decorative and does not see the need for them. He continued that he does not see them being efficient. He thinks they talked about shade structures in Railroad Square. A couple other businesses will be moving in there shortly. He could see the businesses there and the City coordinating together. They could have tables with big sun umbrellas, like Burlington and other cities. It creates a mood and shade and does not cost (as much). He does not see a need for any of the options presented here.

Mr. Redfern of 9 Colby St. stated that he is a member of the BPPAC. He continued that he thinks the BPPAC wanted option 3 because it provides some coverage for bikes that are getting increasingly expensive and require some degree of shelter. The heat and snow are considerations, too. Keene has many winter bicyclists. This shelter does not need to be very big.

Councilor Haas stated that Mr. Redfern is correct; the (BPPAC's) idea was to provide some coverage for bicycles to stay out of the weather.

Councilor Favolise stated that he might have been confused about the intent of this space. He continued that if the intent is coverage for bicycles, he needs more time to think about this.

Ian Matheson stated that options 1 and 2 are aesthetically pleasing, like something he might put in his backyard and string some lights on at Christmas time. He continued that option 3 is practical for everyday use. He would choose option 3 if he were to sit under one of these with a book or a laptop. It provides the most shade.

Councilor Filiault stated that if a particular group badly wants this, he suggests they donate the money for it or fundraise for it.

The City Manager stated that they have had to change to more of an option 1 or option 2 structure elsewhere in the City due to people who might camp there.

Mr. Matheson stated that he does not think that one group doing something problematic is a valid reason to outright dismiss something. He continued that he thinks option 3 is viable for the city and would provide a unique experience for visitors and those considering moving to Keene. Someone who works remotely could see the beautiful downtown and think of going downtown in the summer to work in the shade. It would be very aesthetically pleasing to folks coming into downtown.

Chair Greenwald stated that he is confused by option 3. He continued that if it is a solid roof over a bike rack, people will not be sitting there. The bike rack could be removed and it could just be a roof for people who want to be there for a long time. Options 1 and 2 are aesthetic. If there is a great desire for this after the project is built, this could be easily added. He chooses “none of the above.”

Councilor Tobin asked if there was a discussion about having a shade structure in Railroad Square and then in Gilbo. She continued that she thinks they talked about how having one was a priority and maybe not having them in both places. Chair Greenwald replied that there was talk of “the big covered food truck thing.”

The City Manager replied that the one in Gilbo Ave. is a solar structure, over parking. She continued that it provides all the power that will power the downtown. Mr. Lussier added that it is also much larger.

Chair Greenwald stated that as they are going through this, they are making choices. Once it gets to the City Council for a vote, a Councilor could amend the Committee decision however they want. This is merely the Committee’s recommendations.

Mr. Bohannon asked Mr. Roberge to point out where the shade structure would be, in case the photos misled the fact that they might have been further up into Railroad Square. He continued that this will be placed in the back area by the bike racks. Mr. Roberge replied that is correct. He continued that the Cheshire Rail Trail enters into Railroad Square. They thought they should move it as far north as possible to separate the bike path, but really, this location could be a refuge for bikes. There could be benches. The question about a covered spot became important, toward the back. The value of Railroad Square is all of this open space. That allows you to be as flexible as possible. The shade structure would be located toward the back.

Councilor Workman stated that she is sticking with option 3. She continued that they need this there. The City Manager brought up a good point that they accommodated covered parking for

vehicles, and she thinks this was a compromise to also be fair to the cyclists, offering some covering and protection. She wants to highlight that it is not just for cyclists' refuge. If you are walking on the bike path and it starts to pour rain, you can go under this shelter. Someone could make a quick phone call, out of the way and out of the rain or snow. She looks at it as a quick pit stop of sorts for people coming and going.

Councilor Favolise stated that he will go with option 3, contingent on it being some sort of mixed use that he did not see in the photo. He continued that it sounds like the community interest is a general shade spot, not just something for bike racks. He thinks they do need a shade structure but not just for bikes.

Chair Greenwald stated that he does not want this. He continued that he thinks it will become camping.

Councilor Filiault stated that he agrees.

Councilor Tobin stated that she chooses option 3. The consensus of the Committee is option 3 for shade structures.

### **Central Square**

Mr. Roberge stated that now they move onto Central Square. He asked Mr. Corning to talk through these last two items.

Mr. Corning stated that regarding the paving materials on Central Square, they propose the primary walkways would be standard concrete. He continued that for the perimeter path that they added when the green got expanded, they recommend stone dust. It is a softer material. It will not be as heavily used, and it makes it more "garden-like." They think it would be a nice character for the secondary paths. For the center area where the fountain was, and which will be replaced, they suggest unit paving as an accent area to highlight that as a prominent area in the green of Central Square.

Mr. Roberge showed on the drawing where the unit pavers would be in the central gathering area where the water feature is. He continued that the main pathways that get you in and out of the center of the square would be concrete, and the perimeter paths could be stone dust.

## **Surface Treatments**

Mr. Roberge stated that Public Works agrees with standard concrete and unit pavers for the center of the square.

Councilor Filiault stated that he agrees with Public Works on this one. He continued that regarding the stone dust, people in wheelchairs should have the same access to the space as anyone else. Stone dust looks nice but would not be efficient for anyone using a wheelchair or mobility device.

Councilor Workman stated that she is okay with the recommendations.

Councilor Favolise stated that he has repeatedly noted his opposition to unit pavers but will go with the Public Works' recommendations.

Councilor Tobin stated that that she is fine with the recommendation.

## **Seating**

Mr. Corning stated that all of these seating options would have interim arms to discourage people from sleeping. He continued that option 1 would be a metal bench. Option 2 would be similar to what exists today, a metal frame with wood slats. Option 3 would be the same but backless. There are a couple ideas for option 4, such as boulder seating, which they are incorporating in other parts of the project, or granite slab seating.

Mr. Roberge showed the current bench locations on the drawing. He continued that some of the seating would be around the water feature and along the perimeter of the central island area. Staff made a good note that the backless bench or the stone block allows you to sit facing the walkway, but if there is an event or music in the gazebo, you can turn around. You could use those seats on both sides.

Mr. Roberge stated that option 1 is a metal bench, option 2 is a wood slat bench, option 3 is a wood slat backless bench, and option 4 is stone blocks. Mr. Corning replied that the stone blocks are option 4A and option 4B, natural stone versus granite slab.

Chair Greenwald asked if the backless bench could be metal. Mr. Roberge replied yes. Chair Greenwald replied that that would be more durable.

Councilor Workman stated that she likes option 3 for Central Square. She continued that it would look nicer. She prefers wood to metal.

Councilor Favolise stated that he likes option 2, as he does not like backless benches. He continued that he does appreciate that backless benches could be used on both sides. If it is option 3 he likes wood, but his first choice is option 2.

Councilor Filiault stated that he likes option 3. He continued that he thinks those work fine for Central Square. He thinks the concrete ones would be used by skateboarders, so although concrete looks good, they should not use it. He thinks backless works the best.

Councilor Tobin stated that she likes option 4A but she could go with option 2 as a second choice.

The Mayor stated that he would worry about skateboards on the flat surface of option 3. He continued that maybe metal with slats would be okay. Chair Greenwald replied that there would be interim arms. Mr. Corning stated that if they went with option 3, it would be similar to the bottom photo on option 2, with the interim arms.

Chair Greenwald, Councilor Filiault, and Councilor Workman stated that they choose option 3 for seating. Councilor Tobin stated that she could be okay with that. Councilor Workman stated that she prefers wood. Chair Greenwald replied that he does not have a preference. Councilor Filiault replied that he is fine with either, as long as the wood is durable.

Chair Greenwald asked about the fountain in Central Square.

Mr. Roberge stated that one of the things that came out in the preliminary design was an alternative that would relocate the fountain to an edge, instead of having it centered. He continued that this would be for several reasons. One would be to maximize the ability to use the center spot for something else. They would reserve space for the peace pole, which could stand alone or with whatever else might come along. Relocation or replacement of the water feature is probably a longer design consideration with the community. Stantec knows many of the parts and pieces there, such as the granite slabs, were donated by another community. This water feature is still up in the air. They know what the dimension of the center circle will be, and that is fine, whether this project moves along with no change to the water feature, they will make sure that any electricity and water and sanitary sewer connection is made and updated. But they could also relocate that anew. He thinks it is a further design consideration for the community, maybe even outside of this project.

Chair Greenwald stated that he is glad he asked, because he did not expect that answer. He continued that he did not know they were considering moving the fountain. He does not agree with that. He thought he was just asking about the fountain itself and agrees that that is a whole design he is not aesthetically skilled enough to make.

Councilor Favolise stated that he echoes the reservations about not centering the central feature of Central Square, which is the fountain. Regarding the peace pole, a couple months ago, the

MSFI Committee voted on a motion to direct the City Manager to work with the petitioners on incorporating any proposed peace pole into a new fountain design at some point in the future. He sees it as standalone. Committee members received many communications on this feature, from people on both sides of the peace pole issue. He expects people are paying careful attention to these slides. He asked if there is an update.

The City Manager replied that Councilor Favolise is right that this plan will probably create a question. She continued that Stantec is reserving the space because it is an unknown at this time. Mr. Bohannon has been working with the group that came forward for the peace pole, and they have been working on integrating elements into the fountain instead of creating a separate peace pole. They went out to bid for a project, and after that came back, they changed their minds and are now interested in a separate peace pole. That is the latest.

Mr. Bohannon replied that is correct. He continued that he advised that group to come back to the Committee related to that option of just the peace pole. There had been thought about possibly repurposing the granite that is in the fountain today with some peace wording, but it is back in that group's court to come before the Committee related to the obelisk and the peace pole.

Councilor Workman stated that her question has not been answered yet, regarding benches. She continued that she asked, if they do not do leaning rails on Gilbo Ave., if the benches that are currently there will stay in place. Mr. Lussier asked if she is talking about the ones that Public Works built. Councilor Workman replied on the rail trail. Mr. Lussier replied that Public Works built the benches there, and the idea would be that the styles the Council) expresses preferences for would be used throughout. Benches on Gilbo Ave. would be replaced with what the (Council) shows a preference for.

Councilor Filiault stated that regarding the fountain, the Committee talked previously about how it would be something to get the community involved in. He continued that he still thinks they could put it out there. For example, the community took pride in its involvement with the Wall Dogs murals. There is time. They should give people the opportunity to submit fountain designs or ideas. The community would appreciate it.

Chair Greenwald asked if Councilor Tobin had thoughts to add. Councilor Tobin replied no.

Chair Greenwald stated that his input is: do not move the fountain.

Councilor Favolise stated that he thinks he heard Public Works say they would have the backless benches throughout the downtown. He continued that he is not sure that was the intent. Mr. Lussier replied that was the intent of the question. He asked if that is not what the Committee was thinking.



The City Manager asked if they could have flexibility to use different styles of benches in different areas. She continued that she agrees the backless benches make sense in the common so people can face either direction, but they might not make sense in other areas. Thus, they could carry the same theme with the wood and the middle frame but have some opportunity to mix it up a little. Chair Greenwald replied that sounds good. Councilor Filiault agreed.

### Construction Staging, Mitigation Strategies, and the Overall Phasing

Mr. McNamara stated that he will briefly go over some of the construction staging, mitigation strategies, and the overall phasing. He continued that the planned phases have changed a little bit as the utilities have been refined, but in general, the plan is to start at the north end, the Central Square area, and work their way south. The graphic shows the construction phases – phase 1 in red; phase 2 in blue, extending up Gilbo Ave. and down Railroad a little; and phase 3 in green, at the south end of Main St. The graphic shows what will be impacted, the surface treatments, sidewalks, and roadways. The hatched areas show where the underground utility work will be, the ditches and trenches. This is what drives the overall size of the project.

Mr. McNamara continued that the contractor will not be working in the whole area at once. There would be restrictions on the contractor. For example, if they are working on the Court St. side of Central Square, the other parts of Central Square would be left alone. Then as the work progresses around the square, the location where the work had happened would be opened up, as the work moves along to the next area.

Mr. McNamara continued that for parking, the contractor will do signage to direct people to alternative locations. The number of parking spaces allowed to be taken during any single stage of construction will be limited. They are thinking 25, because that gets the biggest individual block of parking spaces. Sidewalk work will be staged, built in sections, to maintain accessibility, maintain foot traffic, and maintain access to the buildings as work goes along. Some of that will be accomplished with temporary ramps and bridges that extend from finished concrete to finished concrete, over areas that are being prepped. There are access requirements for ADA accessibility to buildings. There will be a lot of signage during construction. The contractors will have to give detour signage for pedestrians and let people know that businesses are open. Building access will be a contractor requirement. They will work individually with buildings to give people advance notice of when the contractors will be working in front of their buildings, whether it is the sidewalk work, utility connection work, or other work, and maintain the ADA accessibility through the project area. Noise, dust, and vibrations are always a challenge on any transportation project. There will be exposed dirt. It will be monitored during construction. Many of the items are on the contractor as part of their mobilization cost. They can control it better if they have some bid items for dust control and vibration monitoring built into the contract. They can incentivize the contractor to keep up with it.

Mr. McNamara continued that the construction contract in general will have clear and enforceable guidelines and directions as to what the contractor has to maintain, and the

parameters around how he will maintain it. The contractor will have to present a schedule, work plan, and traffic management plan, which will be reviewed by the City and the City Engineer. Those will need to be approved before construction starts. The construction contract will lay out clear guidance as to how many lanes of traffic the contractor can take, the parking spaces as mentioned, what needs to be restored outside of working hours, and what can be done during working hours with police and flaggers and temporary traffic control.

Mr. McNamara continued that the intent would be April to early December, which is the typical season. Late spring or early spring could vary a little bit. The work will be Monday to Friday, 7:00 AM to 5:00 PM, Saturdays and overnights only with permission. For City holidays and activities, they would have to shut down at noon on the day prior. Mr. Lussier will speak to adjustments to community events.

Mr. Lussier stated that he will talk about some of the things the City is doing to support businesses during the project. He continued that he wishes he could say this will be easy with no disruptions, but it will be a challenging project for everyone. Just as sure as he is that there will be challenges, he is sure that they can get through it. They have been talking all along about ways to help businesses get through this and make sure concerns are addressed. The number one thing they will be doing is the Project Ombudsman role. It will be a temporary, contract employee for the City. It will be someone outside of the construction team, not someone from the Engineer's Office or Stantec. Someone apart from the project can be an honest broker between the business community and the construction team. Their job is not so much to solve the problems, as it is to identify them, make sure they are responded to, and track them until they get resolved. They will attend project update meetings with the MSFI Committee, and weekly meetings with business owners. This person will visit and talk with business owners, see what challenges they are having, and come up with ways to make it better. They have written the job description. Some business owners have graciously volunteered their time to help the team hire someone. Once that is advertised in the next few weeks, they have to find the right fit. He encourages anyone who knows of potential candidates to make sure they are aware of the position.

Mr. Lussier continued that he expects to be before the MSFI Committee monthly, talking about the project and updating everyone. Probably it would be him and/or the Project Ombudsman. Alternately, they will be hosting "Coffee and Hard Hats" meetings. The idea is to give folks an informal venue, maybe Central Square or the job site or in City Hall, where they can talk to the contractor, get updates, and voice any concerns they have.

Mr. Lussier continued that he was invited to visit with Hannah Grimes staff. A few weeks ago, they hosted a meeting for community event planners. They hold this annual event in an effort to get everyone together, coordinate schedules, and make sure people know when events are planned. They asked him to speak about how this project would affect their plans. He shared a draft alternative layout plan with them that engineering staff worked with the KPD to develop. When Central Square and that northern leg of Main St. is under construction during the first

season, they will not be able to hold the food festival in Central Square. This alternative, in the slide, shows what they think is the maximum area the City could support as an event footprint next year. Not all community events need that much space; they would tailor it for each event. With the inclusion of Gilbo east and Commercial St. parking lots, in a cordoned off footprint, they can actually provide more area than any event that is currently happening in Central Square and on Main St. Pumpkin Fest, Food Festival, and those bigger events could still occur, in a different location. That said, it would take a significant portion of the event parking out of service. There would need to be significant communication and coordination with property owners about using their parking lot during events, and possibly using parking areas further out with shuttles to the events. Not every event will need all of that space. For example, an event might need Commercial St., but not Gilbo east. The point is that the City can support and continue any event that is currently happening in the downtown during construction.

Mr. Lussier continued that the City communicates for the project many different ways. The most formal are formal notifications, letters to property owners, which they have done in the past. For example, during the preliminary design phase when Stantec needed to get into every single building downtown, they sent formal letters to property owners and asked them to respond to schedule a meeting. They will do that again as other details need to be communicated. Those letters do not always get to tenants. They will do direct notifications for things like a planned utility outage. For example, if they have to replace a water main or valve, they will need to take a neighborhood off of water for a day, so the contractors are required to hang notices on every door three days in advance. That also allows them to reach the tenants, not just the property owners.

Mr. Lussier continued that regarding social and broadcast media, Public Works does a weekly interview with Dan Mitchell on the radio. Those are used more for, say, advertising that there will be changes to traffic patterns or more urgent announcements if an unexpected event happens and they need to quickly get the word out. He has a personal goal of trying to send out a weekly email update. An email list is already going for this project. People can opt in to email, text messages, or both. He intends to send a brief update weekly. Variable Message Boards (VMBs) are used a lot throughout the downtown to advertise upcoming events. They would use those for planned changes in traffic patterns, or major events they want people to know about well in advance.

Mr. Lussier continued that the project webpage is something they have been using all along. They update it periodically with presentations such as tonight's, which will be an ongoing practice. Lastly, they are right now working with the New Hampshire Department of Safety to get access to their emergency push notification system. They have not yet gone through the training, so he does not know what the rules are around emergency versus non-emergency traffic and what they are and are not allowed to use the system for. They hope some of these announcements can be used for that. The advantage is that they can target just the people who have cell phones or landlines within the project area, for example. That is still up in the air.

Mr. Redfern stated that he has sat through the very first meeting that Stantec did, to this meeting, and he wants to say that the outreach for this project has been incredible. The avenues that have been taken, the effort from staff, the effort from Stantec, right down to talking about the types of colors of trash cans. He asks that they please not put a future Council through this. The current Council and team have done the heavy lifting. He looks forward to them moving this next year and getting it done.

Councilor Favolise thanked Stantec and the Public Works Director for the presentation. He continued that this all sounds great from a logistics standpoint, from a communications standpoint, from the actual mechanics of going through construction and notifying businesses, and he really likes the idea of the ombudsman as a neutral mediator for questions and conflicts. He does not know whose responsibility this would be or where exactly this would fall, but something that strikes him as potentially useful for businesses is if they could put together, as a City, some sort of directory or group of external resources. One that comes to mind is the Small Business Development Center (SBDC). That could help with financial planning, which he has heard is a concern, and catching some more local resources. They have the logistics piece down really well. He wonders if they could better connect businesses to or make them aware of some resources that are in the state.

Mr. Lussier stated that one of those external resources is coming up next month. He continued that the Hannah Grimes Center has teamed with Radically Rural, hosting a presentation next month. It is all about surviving projects like this. He knows staff will be interested in that. They have also talked about getting together with that group for a one-on-one discussion with them.

Councilor Haas asked about the cross hatches on the slide that showed the phases of the project. He asked if all of the areas that are cross-hatched will be opened up, and if the areas not cross-hatched will not be opened. Mr. McNamara replied that the cross-hatching is where the utilities/underground work is. He continued that the areas outside of the cross-hatching are pavement and sidewalk and will be rebuilt. They will not leave little patches of pavement in between. Councilor Haas asked if there will be holes there, and if it will be excavated. Mr. McNamara replied that most of the area will be a shallower cut, digging down to put a solid base under the pavement or sidewalks, so everything is clean and there is a matching base. Councilor Haas asked if the deep cuts will be where the cross-hatching is. Mr. McNamara replied yes.

Councilor Haas stated that Stantec mentioned that during the construction phase, they would only be doing one side of the project area at a time. He asked if it is correct that it would be the west side of Central Square into Central Square then coming from the other side, so both sides would not be shut down at once. Mr. McNamara replied that is correct. Councilor Haas stated that he is hearing that traffic might not be permitted through for construction reasons, but it will be one side at a time. Mr. McNamara replied that is correct.

Councilor Haas stated that his third question is about the three-day notice for utility shutoffs. He asked if there is any way people could be given more notice than that. Mr. Lussier replied that

that the three-day notices developed over time as the compromise. He continued that the City would prefer to give a week's notice, but generally, contractors are not able to stick to that. Unfortunately, things happen in construction. Plans change, weather changes, and so on and so forth. Three days is a good middle ground. Councilor Haas replied that that is fair enough for the contract purposes, but during the project, he hopes they press to do the projections as early as they can. Mr. Lussier replied that they can certainly let people know, for example, "We know we'll be working in your neighborhood in the next two weeks," but they will not be able to give people a specific date and time their water will be shut off, until it gets closer. Councilor Haas asked if the three-day notice means three working days, not notifying people on a Friday that their water will be off on Monday. Mr. Lussier replied that is correct.

Councilor Tobin stated that regarding the communication piece, there are the urgent day-to-day communications, but it is about establishing the expectation of communication, even starting now, as much as they can. She continued that for example, letting people know that by X date, or X month, they will have a rough timeline. It is about establishing expectations, because without that, people just keep wondering, asking questions, and feeling anxious. It would be great to make sure to communicate with Farmer's Market and other groups that are downtown but do not have a physical location all week. Regarding construction phasing, she would love to see an invasive species management plan incorporated, so that invasive species are disposed of and not transferred.

Chair Greenwald asked if there were any further questions or comments from the Committee. Hearing none, he continued that he urges the public, residents, and business owners to reach out to the MSFI Committee, the City Manager, the Public Works Director, or the City Attorney with any suggestions or ideas. They are open. He has heard some very creative thoughts. This is a partnership between the consultant, the contractors, the Public Works Department, the City Manager, and the Council. They want to hear people's creative ideas. Everyone wants to see the merchants come out of this successfully on the other side. He has no doubt the project will be great. He really would like to see all of the same businesses and restaurants be there when the project is complete. He thanks everyone and thanks the Committee.

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

The Municipal Services, Facilities, and Infrastructure Committee recommends the City Council approve the final design for the Downtown Infrastructure Project, and that the City Manager be authorized to do all things necessary to implement the project with the street furnishing, materials, and design preferences discussed.

Councilor Favolise asked how this will be presented to the City Council, in terms of a report. He continued that he asks because there have been suggestions that there are potential amendments coming forward. They went through a whole list. He wants to know if the list will be presented. Chair Greenwald replied that he imagines he will stand up and run down the list of the MSFI Committee's choices. He continued that he will not run down the list of all the alternates. He is

sure that people who have been following this presentation know or can find those alternates. Then, if there is something disturbing to a Councilor, a motion to amend can be made .

Chair Greenwald asked if there were any further questions on the motion. Hearing none, he called for a vote.

The motion passed with a vote of 5-0.

**6) Adjournment**

There being no further business, Chair Greenwald adjourned the meeting at 9:54 PM.

Respectfully submitted by,  
Britta Reida, Minute Taker

Edits submitted by,  
Kathleen Richards, Deputy City Clerk