

City of Keene
New Hampshire

MUNICIPAL SERVICES, FACILITIES & INFRASTRUCTURE COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES

Wednesday, April 23, 2025

6:00 PM

**Council Chambers,
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. Ferland, City Manager
Amanda Palmeira, City Attorney
Don Lussier, Public Works Director
Andy Bohannon, Deputy City Manager
Rick Wood, Fire Marshall & Building
Official
Bryan Ruoff, City Engineer

Members Not Present:

All Present

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

1) Stephen Bragdon and Cheryl Belair – Safety Issues Associated with the Driveway at 82 Court Street

Chair Greenwald asked to hear from the Petitioner.

Stephen Bragdon stated that he and Ms. Belair thank the Committee for having this hearing, although it was not his and Ms. Belair's intention when they sent their letter. He continued that they just wanted to point out to the Committee and the City that there continues to be an issue (at 82 Court St.). He thanks them for all the time they spent on this last year. The letter seems to have stirred up some interest in the neighborhood. Last time they discussed this issue, the Council decided they needed to treat all the driveways in the area the same. He did not and does not think that is the case. He thinks they could differentiate between driveways by their views and a person's ability to see the cars coming from either direction as well as by the amount of traffic. The more traffic, the higher the chance of having an accident.

Mr. Bragdon continued that the solution to his and Ms. Belair's problem would be to increase the distance where cars cannot park from the north end of their driveway, maybe another car length. When you come out, you cannot see cars coming from the north if all those parking spaces are occupied. You are too low. You can sometimes catch a glimpse through the windows of parked cars, but it is difficult. He is used to the driveway and is thus very careful coming out. He will not risk darting out into traffic, but people who are not used to the driveway do that and can

cause an accident. Regarding the woman whose accident they talked about, it was her first time using the driveway and she was not familiar with it.

Mr. Bragdon continued that he thinks the Council could differentiate the driveways based on those two things, the amount of traffic and how much visual distance a driveway has. Perhaps an easier solution would be to put parking meters on both sides, up past where it becomes more residential. People do not park further down on West St. because they would have to pay the parking meters. Thus, people start (parking) at his and Ms. Belair's driveway because that is where the meters stop.

Chair Greenwald stated that he is interested in being supportive, but what they need is to determine what makes Mr. Bragdon's and Ms. Belair's driveway different from all the other driveways. That is the challenge.

Nathan Alexander of 81 Court St. stated that he is directly across the street from Mr. Bragdon and Ms. Belair's building and is also speaking on behalf of 83 Court St., the Aloha Yoga studio owned by JC Russell. He continued that the main topic is that there have been a series of accidents coming out of the driveway, going back to 2021, for the exact same reasons. Cars parked on Court St. to the south and north encroach on the driveway. This goes back many years as it pertains to 83 Court St., which was formerly the American Red Cross. Years ago, the Red Cross's bloodmobile could not even get into the driveway. The solution then was a series of "No parking here to corner" signs, to keep cars away from that outer apron so people coming and going could see. That signage has since been removed. There are no signs on either side at 81 Court St. or 83 Court St., although there are painted lines for parking.

Mr. Alexander continued that the painted lines are often not observed. People squeeze their cars in behind a parking space, which results in the tail of a car encroaching into his driveway. This means that a driver exiting the driveway has to fish around that encroaching parked car and be looking up and down to the north and south. His building has a lot of traffic, with offices for five psychotherapists, so there are people coming and going all day. The parking lot fills up. People drive in, realize there is no room, and drive back out to find a spot on Court St.

Mr. Alexander continued that the accidents here started to ramp up about five years ago. Thus, they brought this to the City's attention through email and included photos of people's vehicles encroaching the driveway. At that point, the City's response was that once the parking spaces were plotted out on Court St., much of this problem would go away. Mr. Alexander noted the problem has not gone away. He is not aware of any accidents involving vehicles coming out of 81 Court St. in the last 12 months, but the accident in the Bragdon building at 82 Court St. is a big concern to him. The 81 Court St. side has an added hazard as well, low fruit trees that impede the view. Thus, as people are looking left and right while trying to get out of his driveway, they have to look over big SUVs and through these fruit trees.

Mr. Alexander continued that he does not have a specific solution, but if consistency and continuity in the area are the main objectives, they do not have that right now. Photos show that the Bragdon building has a sign saying, “No parking here to corner,” and one parking space has zig-zag markings to prohibit parking, and still that accident happened there. The visibility at 81 Court St. is probably 30% to 40% less than at the Bragdon building. To the north, two buildings close to Putnam’s 1911 Office are a corner with the same zig zags indicating no parking. Thus, some property owners have more clear demarcations for no parking, but 81 Court St. does not. Some have signage, some do not. They are very concerned about anyone visiting the offices. Many are senior citizens.

Mr. Alexander continued that just before this meeting, he and JC Russell emailed a memorandum for the Committee’s review with documentation of specific accidents going back to 2021. They can consider those along with the accident Mr. Bragdon and Ms. Belair referred to. Thus, this has been a documented problem. They appreciate the parking spaces and all the time the City has put into understanding the matter, but they still contend with an unsafe situation.

Public Works Director Don Lussier said he largely agrees with everything said tonight. He continued by saying that he understands that seeing around a car parked close to your driveway can be difficult. There were a couple of items in Mr. Bragdon’s letter that he cannot speak to right now. He does not have specific data about the traffic speed on Court St. He suspects that if they measured it, they would find what they find in other major arteries throughout the city, that the 85th percentile is between 30 and 34 mph. He wishes he could find something unique about Mr. Bragdon’s driveway that would pose a special hardship on that one property where the City could say, here is a circumstance that warrants treat this property differently than every other property, but he cannot find that. As Mr. Alexander pointed out, across the street, they have a hard time seeing around cars that are parked in front of their driveway. He thinks if they polled the neighborhood, they would find that the condition exists up and down Court St. and up and down Washington St.

Mr. Lussier continued that he should point out that it is completely within the Committee’s purview to direct staff to write an Ordinance to make this a “no parking” zone and staff will do it. The caution he offers is that it would be very difficult when the next applicant comes in and says they have trouble seeing around the cars parked near their driveway and request a couple of those parking spaces be eliminated on either side of the driveway. What he and the City Attorney have been talking about, and what they have talked about at previous meetings, is that consistency. Mr. Bragdon, however, had a wonderful idea. If they want to extend paid parking up Court St., he thinks that is a great idea.

Councilor Tobin asked if they have looked at the overall safety issue in this area. She continued that they have another item on their agenda that also talks about that area. Thus, she wonders if they can step back from focusing on one specific property and look at the area.

Mr. Lussier replied that the next agenda item is about crosswalks, and he has information to share with the Committee about that. He continued that he thinks there are improvements they could make to the crosswalk, but he does not know how much that relates to the driveway concern.

Councilor Tobin stated that the way she is looking at it is several businesses are concerned about safety in the area for driving reasons. Other people are concerned about pedestrian safety in that area. She wonders, looking at that and putting those things together, if there is a different approach, not just the sidewalks and not just one driveway, but looking at the overall roadway safety of the area. Mr. Lussier replied that he thinks there are two separate situations, and there are different ways of addressing them.

Councilor Filiault stated that he is intrigued by the idea of extending the parking meters up the street. He continued that he does not want the Committee to just accept this item as informational. He realizes that sometimes they run up against the concern of what the next person might say, but if the Council always had that concern, they would never get anything done. They cannot always be worried about what the next scenario might be. This Council has the authority to make the changes, and if someone else wants to come in and complain, they can. He thinks that tonight, the Committee needs to come to a consensus on what changes to make, because it is unacceptable to do nothing.

Councilor Workman stated that, to piggyback off Councilor Tobin's question, nothing prevents the Council from changing the length of parking from driveways throughout the city. She asked if that is correct. Mr. Lussier replied Yes. Councilor Workman continued that to Councilor Tobin's point, the agenda has a couple of items about nearby Court St. with similar safety concerns. In addition, HCS was here not too long ago with concerns about their driveway. As a driver of a small hatchback, she understands the difficulty of being in a vehicle low to the ground and trying to edge out in between high SUVs or trucks. She does not see why they could not review this and change the length of the (no parking area). Yes, it cuts into the parking lot, but safety should come before parking.

Mr. Lussier stated that nothing would prevent the Council from changing that. He continued that the parking code has a "general prohibition" section that lists all the areas in which you are not allowed to park, such as in front of a fire hydrant or within 30 feet of an intersection. The list includes, "*in front of or in close proximity to a private driveway.*" The code does not define a specific distance. Staff has internally interpreted that to mean five feet. The last time this was before the Council, they looked at other communities that had similar language to see what they used. For communities that specify the distance, the range is about two to five feet. Thus, staff thought five feet was reasonable, but there is nothing magic about five feet. The Council could choose 10, 20, or 30 feet. They looked at different options last time.

Cheryl Belair of 82 Court St. stated that she heard someone question how they differentiate between this and other driveways. She continued that she would say there are two points to that.

First, they are a business at 82 Court St., as is Mr. Alexander at 81 Court St., and just north of them, it is all residential. Also, they are at the bottom of the hill on Court St. Speed is a problem. She is sure there is a way to confirm what the average speed is when you get to just before 82 Court St. Speed picks-up. She drives it every day and her speed picks-up, and she is very careful because anyone could be coming out of her driveway, and there could be an accident. Speed does play a part, and the property being on the downward slope increases the difficulty of seeing cars from the north coming south.

Ms. Belair continued that this is a safety concern. For her and Mr. Bragdon, it is not about the parking. It does not matter to them that people park in front of their building. They have a parking lot and plenty of space for their staff and clients. But anyone leaving is “taking their life in their own hands” by doing so, which is a real concern. It is very dangerous.

Councilor Favolise stated that he has a question for Ms. Belair or Mr. Bragdon, and Mr. Alexander can weigh on this as well if he wants to. He continued that he wants to know if they think the extension of the parking meters would be enough of a solution, or if that is at least a good first step. He thinks the Committee members agree that that is the safest step for them.

Mr. Bragdon replied that he thinks it would help. He continued that obviously, with parking meters there, people could continue to park front to back and you still cannot see when exiting the driveway. On the other hand, they are covered with parking, and further down the street where there are parking meters, no one parks. He thinks that the people who park there and walk downtown are there more often than people who park there for an hour to go to one of the offices.

Mr. Alexander stated that specifically speaking on behalf of JC Russell of Aloha Yoga at 83 Court St., Mr. Russell told him today that he is not in support of extending parking meters. He continued that he himself echoes what Ms. Belair said about how it really is a safety issue. When any vehicle is parked, metered or not, so close to his driveway that you cannot see over it or around it, the only answer is to creep slowly into traffic. Speaking on behalf of the many senior citizens who visit the building, all that would help is a metered parking space that has nobody in it, which does not benefit the City from a revenue perspective and it is not a useful space if it is empty. He does not think it would be a great solution for 81 Court St. Instead, he thinks of Mr. Lussier’s question of whether five feet is enough, with today’s trucks and SUVs, given the nature and frequency of the accidents they have seen. And if five feet is not enough, the question is what is. Perhaps at 81 Court St. where they also have low fruit trees, five feet is not great. Maybe five feet would be appropriate on a different side. This is a hard issue. They are just here representing the accident frequency, which is the driving factor.

City Manager Elizabeth Ferland stated that Mr. Lussier mentioned that staff has not done a recent speed study on this street, so that might be a good next step. She continued that in addition, there was a lot of work done the last time this issue was discussed, regarding the distance and what that meant in terms of the parking configuration. She thinks it might be

challenging to add meters that far up, because many downtown employees are looking for long term free parking opportunities, so that might create another issue. She wonders if they can place this on more time and have staff come back and refresh the Committee on the configuration of parking with different lengths of distances between driveways.

Councilor Workman stated that they might consider the option of putting “compact cars only” for parking in certain spots. She continued that she does not know the Public Works Director’s thoughts on that. Mr. Lussier replied that there are a couple of issues with that. He continued that he does not know how that could be enforced. He thinks they could limit it to compact cars only, but it would be very difficult from a logistical, operational perspective. There would probably have to be a sign at each of those driveways, on both sides, saying “compact vehicle parking only.” Otherwise, he does not know how someone coming to the city would know that that space is for compact vehicles only.

Jay Kahn, Mayor, stated that he wants to offer some support to those on Court St. who have a commercial business and commercial driveway, whether for profit or not-for-profit. He continued that they have the evidence of the number of comings and goings that 82 Court St. has provided. He thinks the others ought to be asked to provide comparable information. He does not have a solution, and he is glad to hear the Committee is willing to entertain some solutions. He believes that safety needs to outweigh precedent, and he looks forward to what can come back from City staff. He thinks it is important to do this. He travels Court St. two to six times a day, and is cautious, but he frequently sees people inching out. Every time that happens, someone is putting themselves at risk and is saying, ‘there is an at-risk situation, I cannot visibly see and safely operate my vehicle in this particular situation.’ Thus, he thinks there is plenty of evidence for them to take this under consideration, and he appreciates the Committee asking for that from the City Manager and Public Works.

Councilor Favolise stated that he has a question for the City Manager and maybe the Public Works Director. He asked what the details of the staff update would be, if the Committee motions to place this on more time with a staff update at the May meeting.

The City Manager replied that she envisions them returning with the work that had been completed last year regarding the configuration of parking on Court St., if the distance would change between driveways and parking spaces. There was a rather thorough analysis done of that last year, so that would be a start. Then, she thinks this idea of considering commercial property versus residential property is something they could look at a little more closely.

Chair Greenwald stated that he thinks there are many creative people who could put their heads together and make this work. He supports placing this on more time. Councilor Filiault replied that he is fine with that, for one cycle. He continued that he does not think this is a speed issue. He thinks it is just too busy. He drives on Court St. frequently, too, and the Mayor is right about cars inching out and looking left and right. It happens quickly. In his opinion, the Committee could address this individual request and approve expanding the space between the driveways.

He is willing to (place this on more time) for 30 days and have it come back, but he fully expects them to do something about this in 30 days. He does not want to put this off any longer. It is not that complicated. He is not worried that the Council adding a couple of feet could cause someone in the future to get jealous; they could come in the following week with a request. At some point, the Council has to do something.

George Benik asked if speed bumps would be an option for slowing people down, not just on Court St., but throughout the city. He continued that the speed limit on Arch St. is 30 mph, but people go 50 or 60 mph.

Chair Greenwald stated that he thinks he knows what the Public Works Director will say about speed bumps and plowing, but they can put it into the conversation, because he thinks the Committee is aiming toward placing this matter on more time so staff (can work on it). He continued that he encourages staff to reach out to all the interested parties to get their input.

Councilor Tobin stated that she would support placing this on more time. She continued that she feels like there are similarities between this situation and Water St., in that with people coming and going to downtown, they might not be driving over the speed limit, but they are either escalating or have not started de-escalating. She rarely tries to cross that intersection (on foot), but when she does try, people rarely stop when she is at the crosswalk. She thinks they are driving too fast to be able to stop. She hopes they can consider that entire stretch of road and whether a stop sign in a different place could impact the speed at that intersection and help slow drivers down.

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 placed the item on more time with staff to report back at the May meeting.

2) Ian D. Matheson – Court Street Pedestrian Safety Risks

Chair Greenwald stated that he was told Mr. Matheson was unable to attend tonight's meeting. He continued that it would be appropriate to place the item on more time to allow Mr. Matheson the opportunity to address his communication.

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 placed the item on more time to allow the Petitioner to be present.

3) **Adam Toepfer – Request to Add Audio and Data Cables as Part of Downtown Infrastructure Project**

Chair Greenwald asked to hear from Adam Toepfer. An unidentified member of the public replied that Mr. Toepfer could not make it tonight.

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 placed the item on more time to allow the petitioner to be present.

4) **Proposal to Add the Necessary Infrastructure to Accommodate Banners Across Main Street**

Mr. Lussier stated that they were talking about this matter at the previous MSFI Committee meeting, and the Committee asked staff to investigate a few different questions and return with more information. He continued that first, he wants to show the Committee some renderings staff had their consultant, Stantec, prepare. Option 1 is a rendering of what a standalone banner might look like. The rendering is from the perspective of a vehicle headed north, just short of Emerald St., and is drawn to scale. This version is a 4' by 35' banner, centered on both lanes of the roadway, centered over the median. Mr. Lussier went on to display a banner over the northbound lane only. Personally, he thinks this option looks better with it just over the northbound lane. He continued that it is not shown in the displayed image, but they could also have a third pole on the west side of Main St. and have one banner for northbound traffic and one for southbound traffic. Or they could have banners both facing south, but over both sections of roadway.

Mr. Lussier stated that any overhead obstruction on a roadway typically requires 16 feet of clearance. He continued that the NH Department of Transportation (NHDOT) and Federal Highway Administration will allow exceptions to go down to approximately 14 feet. He brings this up because of the next image. The Committee asked him to look at the possibility of attaching to buildings on either side of the roadway, instead of having the large poles in the public sphere. The displayed image depicted The Works at the south end and Good Fortune at the north end. That building is just slightly under 16 feet above the sidewalk. Thus, even if they pushed the banner all the way to the top, it would be well below the elevation that it needs to be. The requestors suggested the banner go at Emerald St. but attaching it to the buildings is not a viable option. It might technically be possible to do some kind of pole or outrigger on the building to hold it, but it would make the engineering much more complicated and cumbersome, so he does not support that idea.

The next building has Edward Jones, and across the street, the former Miller Brothers building. That building has enough height on both sides of the street, where they could conceivably have a banner connected between the two. Option 3, at that location from Edward Jones to the Miller Brothers building, is about a 135-foot total span distance. It would not be a straight line; there

would be a drape in the wire. It would sag about 16-18 inches, which would be noticeable. Yes, it is technically feasible, but he does not love this option, as he foresees the agreement they would need with private property owners to allow this infrastructure to be attached to their building. If a windstorm pulls the anchor out of their building and breaks a bunch of bricks, the question would be how to fix that. He sees many operational challenges with this approach.

Mr. Lussier continued that last is looking at the same kind of situation on West St. On West St., as you approach Main St., the buildings are much taller and closer together. There is about a 55- to 60-foot span, depending on which buildings you attach to. At that span, the sag in the wire goes down to about 4 to 6 inches. If the Committee's preferred approach is to attach it to a building, he thinks they should consider West St. instead of Main St. It would be simpler to do.

Mr. Lussier continued that he thinks the last question was from Councilor Tobin, regarding the policy and how they would operate the banner. City staff discussed it and came up with these bullet point suggestions for how to implement this. First, they recommend this only be made available to community-funded events, the ten events that receive City funds through the budget process every year. In addition, of course, the banner infrastructure would be utilized for City communications and City messaging. Staff recommends it be for community-funded events because there are ten such events annually and depending on the potential for overlap and when those events are happening, that allows each event to have a display time of 30 days. There would be some overlap. Not everyone would be able to get the full 30 days, but generally, they would be able to do up to 30 days. Making the banner available only to those community-funded events allows the City to have much more control over the content and the purpose. They want the banners to advertise the City as a place to come and participate in activities, and to draw people into those activities. Councilor Filiault mentioned last month that he saw an event advertised in Concord and that is what brought him back to Concord. That is exactly what these banners are supposed to do.

Mr. Lussier continued that if they make the banners available to community-funded events, the application would be a checkbox on the community-funded event application package that goes into the City Clerk's Office. Thus, it would be easy to implement. The event organizers would simply ask for a reservation of that space as part of their license application for the event. Along with that, staff suggest there not be a fee for event organizers to use the banner. If the City is already funding the use of the City's facilities and providing funding for the event, it seems counterproductive to charge (the event organizers) a fee to put the banner up. That said, the (event organizers) would be responsible for the production of the actual banner, according to City specifications. As they talked about last month, the banners would need to be installed by someone with a bucket truck, and a traffic control detail to divert traffic around the bucket truck. Staff would want that to be a qualified, licensed, and insured installer. The banners would be installed for up to 30 days, subject to availability. Staff suggest a requirement that they be removed within three days of the event. To ensure prompt removal, they would include a cost recovery provision in the licensing agreement that says if the event organizers do not have the

banner removed in a timely manner or the banner fails and the City must remove it, the City will charge them for that work.

Mr. Lussier continued that those are the basic guidelines, the basic outline of what staff suggests. He hopes that answers the Committee's questions and he would be happy to answer others.

Councilor Filiault asked what the cost would be to do the poles, since the buildings are too low. Mr. Lussier replied that the cost of the equipment would be about \$25,000. He continued that that assumes two poles, the pulleys, and the necessary hardware to hang it. He did not get a quote on a three-pole, two-banner system, but it would probably be one and a half times that. He estimates that the installed cost would be about \$50,000.

Councilor Filiault stated that Mr. Lussier mentioned that some of the events overlap. He asked if they were to do the poles that go all the way across Main St., if they could do one banner on one side and another banner on the other side, having two smaller banners up at the same time. Mr. Lussier replied that they could have one banner that shares the 35-foot space, but the system is engineered for the wind load on a 35-foot by 4-foot sail, basically. Thus, having two 35-foot sails would be more force than the pole is designed to accommodate. However, he and the City Clerk talked about how the overlapping events could share the cost of producing the banner and each use half of it. Councilor Filiault replied that alternately, the banner could advertise a different event on each side. Mr. Lussier replied yes.

Chair Greenwald asked, for clarification, if he is saying they could have three poles with two 16-foot banners. Mr. Lussier replied yes, he thinks they could design it to have three poles and two 35-foot banners. He continued that they would be larger poles with larger bases and would have to be designed for the extra weight. Chair Greenwald replied that obviously, the poles are permanent. Mr. Lussier replied yes. Chair Greenwald asked if the cable would have to be there at all times. Mr. Lussier replied that guy wires connect the poles, top of and bottom of the banner, which stay permanently. He continued that a pulley system pulls the banner across the roadway and pulls it back to remove it. Those top and bottom cables that the banner clips on stay all the time.

Councilor Favolise stated that he has several traffic-related questions, but for now, his question is about the actual installation of the banner for an individual event, with someone up in the bucket truck doing that work. He asked what that looks like in terms of traffic disruption on Main St. during the process. Mr. Lussier replied that one lane of Main St. would be closed while the truck was parked within it, and they would want some sort of traffic control detail. Most communities require a police officer with a cruiser to make sure it is visible and to divert traffic around the bucket truck. Chair Greenwald stated that it could be done at 2:00 AM. Mr. Lussier replied that the City can control the times the installation happens. He continued that generally, any time before 8:00 AM downtown is rather quiet. Installation would not take long, maybe half an hour.

Councilor Tobin stated that she has concerns about visibility, if they are talking about a pole, in terms of cars pulling out, and pedestrians near one of the crosswalks, which she knows they put a lot of thought into. She continued that regarding what Mr. Lussier is referencing, regarding the plan she asked about last time, if it is going to be relying on these festivals to create a banner and pay for that, she would want to hear from some of them, knowing that that is what they want and that they are willing. If the (event organizers) do not want to pay for those banners, even if downtown businesses would love to have them there, if the City limits the banners to downtown events, it will just end up unused, if the event organizers are not buying banners. Chair Greenwald replied that that is a good point.

Councilor Workman stated that initially she supported this, and it sounded like a great idea. She continued that she always wants to support events in town. However, the more she has learned about it, particularly the cost, the more she thinks it is just horrible timing, given the costs associated with the Downtown Infrastructure Project. This (banner system) is not a necessity. It goes against all the reasoning and logic the Committee used to make decisions about the final design phase. The Committee was reducing its decisions based on the costs, so to now add these \$75,000 banner poles that are not necessities does not make sense. Community events have good attendance now, so the marketing seems to work. She appreciates Mr. Pipp and Mr. McGreer bringing it forward, but she is really struggling with the timing of this.

Councilor Filiault stated that he does not disagree. He continued that he would like to see some fundraising done for this and see what happens, so it would not all be based on tax dollars, but he thinks the idea is doable and he does not think they should kill it here tonight. He thinks they should be positive and say that they can do this. He understands that it will take more than tax dollars, but he thinks the request is viable, and staff and downtown merchants should get together and talk about it.

Councilor Favolise stated that the Committee has not talked about the idea of having the banner on West St. He is interested to hear Mr. Pipp's thoughts on that.

Tim Pipp from Beeze Tees stated that he likes the idea, but he thinks more people come from Main St. than from West St. He continued that regarding Councilor Workman's comments, attendance at events is not great. It is very difficult for event organizers to get the word out. There is very little money in events in town. Most people are helping organize events just to break even or to raise money for a non-profit. Communities such as Manchester, Concord, Portsmouth, and Brattleboro have great events, and he is not saying Keene does not, but those communities have the better potential to have bigger events. Last time, Councilor Filiault talked about seeing a banner for an event in Concord while driving. He himself has also gone to events based on seeing a banner for it. He thinks this is the perfect timing. That is why he wrote the letter when he did, because they are talking about the infrastructure of downtown. There will already be a hole in the ground, so (it is a good time to) put a pole in it, instead of having to dig a new hole. This is thus the perfect time to talk about it, rather than in five or ten years when they would have to dig a new hole.

Mr. Pipp continued that he thinks he suggested early on that this is a fundraising event. He does not think this is a full-on taxpayer thing; it could be a downtown group thing, or a Chamber of Commerce thing, or some other group.

Chair Greenwald stated that he thinks the idea of three poles should be explored. He continued that there is another option – this could be an add alternate to the Downtown Infrastructure Project. If the budget comes in okay, they could add it, and if the budget does not come in okay, they will be looking to cut a lot of things, and (the banner infrastructure) will not happen. That way, at least they will get real numbers on what it might cost.

Councilor Filiault stated that like Mr. Pipp just said, he thinks it would work if they could use maybe not tax dollars, but a fundraiser, a downtown event, a community event. He continued that this is something that can be explored, and he thinks they can make this work. Sometimes elected officials look at reasons why they cannot do something, and he wants to look at reasons why they *can* do something.

Councilor Workman stated that they are saying, “Let’s fundraise the money.” She continued that her question is why they are talking about this now, when there is no money fundraised. She thinks they need to bring it back when they know there are people investing in it and it is a realistic ask. As Councilor Tobin said, they have not heard festival (organizers) directly saying that they want this, and no one is coming forward saying they will pay for it.

Rick Wood, Fire Marshall & Building Official, stated that he does not know if the options attaching to buildings are off the table, but he wanted to throw out that it is not as simple as they might think. He continued that the buildings they are looking at are generally very old, unreinforced masonry buildings, with different blemishes of their own, and it would be challenging to affix (hardware) for those types of pole loads. The Committee should be aware that it might be more complicated, if they decide on that option.

Councilor Tobin stated that she would like to accept this as informational. She continued however, that if everyone else is on board with placing this on more time, they could do that.

Chair Greenwald stated that he thinks accepting it as informational would mean saying “no,” essentially. Councilor Tobin replied that for her, it would be a “no” for right now. She continued that she has not heard from anyone who wants to pay for part of it, and she expected that maybe the next time the Committee discussed this, they would hear from people tonight saying (something like), “*Yes, I have a festival, and I want to pay for one of these banners, so please put the infrastructure in so I can buy this banner and hang it up.*” However, she is not hearing that.

Chair Greenwald stated that if this is accepted as informational, and Council does the same, the issue is dead for the year. He continued that although he generally dislikes more time, doing so

would bring more information, and Councilor Tobin and Councilor Workman have raised some good questions about who will do what. He would like to see some harder numbers about the cost. If there is no interest (from event organizers) in putting up banners, the City is just paying for poles for no reason. He leans toward placing this on more time.

Councilor Filiault stated that he agrees with Chair Greenwald about placing this on more time. He continued that in all fairness to Mr. Pipp and the downtown merchants, the reason no one is here saying that they will do this or that is because the City has not yet said they will allow it. He does not know who would come in and give a presentation when the Committee has not even made up its mind yet. They could place it on more time and let staff and the Petitioners get together. In 30 days, if nothing gets created, then that is the way it goes. He suggests they give it 30 days to see if they can make it work.

Councilor Workman stated that earlier on in their agenda packet they had a communication signed by multiple people who represent multiple different events in Keene. She continued that she feels like the Committee has had this on more time, and they have reviewed it, and if those people were going to come forward, they would have done so by now. She thinks they are spinning their wheels.

Councilor Favolise stated that he is not opposed to placing this on more time. He continued that he has additional questions regarding traffic and pedestrian safety on Main St., which he would like staff to address in a future report out. This is the third time this has been on the Committee's agenda. He does not want to say no to it and kill it for the year, because he thinks there are still conversations to be had. He had not previously considered the West St. idea, which he would like more time to think about. Either way, he does not think this matter is ready to move out of the Committee yet, so the choice is to either accept it as informational or place it on more time.

Chair Greenwald stated that to follow up on what Councilor Favolise said about West St., there is also the potential for (the banner to go on) Church St., Lamson St., or any street coming in and out. He continued that the first question is whether they want to have this at all. It does not sound like there is a consensus of yes or no, which is kind of the definition of more time.

Councilor Filiault stated that in his first City Council term 30 years ago, a little company from California came and asked if the City wanted to do a movie. He continued that it kind of started off like this. A couple of Councilors said no, there was no way they could do it. But they decided to take a look. After they decided to move forward with it, the movie's site manager gave the City a 3-page list of requests. His concern is that if that request had come to this Council, the Council would have just said no way, it is too much. But the Council 30 years ago had the backbone to say, "We think we can do this," and now 30 years later, they are celebrating the movie's anniversary. Therefore, he encourages people to look for how they *can* do this, not the reasons why they cannot. Placing this on more time is fair.

Councilor Tobin made a motion for the Municipal Services, Facilities, and Infrastructure Committee to place the proposal to add the necessary infrastructure to accommodate banners across Main St. or another street on more time. Councilor Filiault seconded the motion.

Councilor Favolise stated that he understands that these images are renderings from the consultant, but something that struck him in the first slide is the image of the banner is from the viewpoint of a car, and there is a pedestrian in the crosswalk. He thinks art imitates life in this scenario. Main St. has seven or eight crosswalks across it, and he has a safety concern on Main St. about creating a potential distraction for drivers in an area where there are many pedestrians crossing frequently. He would like to hear staff address that.

Councilor Favolise continued that at this point, he is not clear whether the cost would stay the same if the banner goes across West St. (instead of Main St.). He continued that it is important for the City to know, and important for anyone wanting to do fundraisers to know. He does not know enough about structural engineering to know the answer to that question. He will vote to place this item on more time, but those are the issues he would like answers about next time.

Mr. Pipp stated that he wants to be clear on what the Committee wants for the next meeting. He continued that he was unaware that the Committee wanted him to bring event organizers. He talked with many of them, and they were all in support of the banner infrastructure idea. He did not realize they needed to bring people here, because normally, you do not begin fundraising for a pole that cannot be put up, which is why they have not started a fundraising effort. He asked if for the next meeting, assuming this is placed on more time, the Committee wants him to bring people who will say they would buy a \$1,200 or \$1,500 banner.

Chair Greenwald replied that anything Mr. Pipp could do to demonstrate there is support for this would be helpful, but he would tell Mr. Pipp that his issue has moved miles ahead in a positive way. He continued that Mr. Pipp could bring answers to questions, and work with City staff about the needs.

Chair Greenwald called for a vote.

On a vote of 4-1, the Municipal Services, Facilities, and Infrastructure Committee placed the item on more time. Councilor Workman voted in opposition.

Chair Greenwald stated that the item goes on more time, and at the Committee's May meeting, they will make a decision.

5) Verbal Update: Downtown Infrastructure Project - Public Works Director

Public Works Director Don Lussier stated that this is the Committee's monthly update on the downtown project. He continued that during the last month, he is sure many people saw the drill rigs operating on Main St. The geotechnical borings and test bits were completed. The bottom

line is that nothing surprising was found, nothing that would change design parameters for the structures. That was a good result.

Mr. Lussier continued that the other item he wanted to mention was the Project Ombudsman position they talked about, which the City has advertised. In the last two weeks, they have interviewed three candidates and are currently going through the process of checking references. They expect to recommend that the City Manager extend an offer to one of the candidates within the next couple of weeks. He hopes that candidate will start in early June, and he hopes to introduce the person to the MSFI Committee at their June meeting.

Mr. Lussier continued that regarding sidewalk cafes, at last week's Council meeting there was a withdrawal of the Ordinance that the City Clerk's Office had put forward. Having talked through it, they decided that rather than having an Ordinance that said people cannot have (sidewalk) cafes during the construction period, they will manage it through additional restrictions and conditions that will be part of the sidewalk café licenses during the construction timeframe. They invited all the current licensees to a meeting on April 7, and a few were able to attend. At that meeting, he rolled out a set of proposed conditions staff thinks they can add to the licenses. If the licensees can live with that, so can the City, in terms of managing the construction.

Mr. Lussier continued that his first condition is no sidewalk cafes or sidewalk commerce within the "active construction zone." Each year, there is a phase. For 2026, it will be Central Square and Main St. to approximately the Lamson St./Church St. area. Within that phase, the work will be divided into sub-phases. They will work on, say, the east side of Central Square for two weeks, then move to the north side of Central Square. The "active construction area" will be the area of the sub-phase, and within that active construction area, you will not be able to have your sidewalk café in operation. However, outside of that active construction area, you can operate according to your existing license footprint. With that, the City would reserve the right to modify the license footprint. As construction progresses and conditions change, there is (for example), a new landscaped island here so we have to scootch this corner or cut off this area of your sidewalk café. Those modifications will be adjusted on the fly as the construction progresses. The City will agree to notify the licensees at least seven days prior to the contractor moving from one area to another. Thus, the licensees will have at least a week to know when they will need to move their furniture out of the way. Licensees will need to remove their furnishings by 6:00 AM on the day construction starts in that area. All of the normal operating conditions that are already part of the license will remain, and they are adding one more, which is essentially that in the event of unforeseen circumstances, some sort of emergency, the City reserves the right to shut down a sidewalk use immediately because it is unsafe or the water main under the patio just blew, or something like that.

Mr. Lussier continued that they shared those suggested conditions with a few of the license holders who came, and there were not a lot of objections. Generally, people agreed with the conditions. The next step is for the staff to draft the actual license language. They will send a

draft list of license conditions to all the current license holders so they can see what staff expects it to look like for next year.

Mr. Lussier continued that during that meeting with license holders, one item came up. Someone raised concerns about one of the design features they have discussed. The sidewalk commerce zone will be up against the building face throughout the project. The goal was to create, ideally, at least a 10-foot sidewalk commerce zone for all the businesses downtown. They are not able to get that 100% of the time in all locations, but it is close, and certainly much more consistent than they are able to accommodate today. Some concerns were raised about that feature. To summarize, the concerns are loss of space compared to existing conditions; the risk of someone seated against a plate glass being able to break it, which is a safety concern; and a loss of privacy, with diners on the inside of the storefront and diners on the outside being in close proximity. To help flesh out this concern, he asked Stantec to provide example layouts of different areas of the sidewalk cafes. He stressed that what he was showing the Committee are just examples. He added that Stantec and City staff are not restaurant designers; there are many ways to arrange these patios. He just asked Stantec for some reasonable layouts that might work within the designated commerce zone.

Mr. Lussier displayed an example layout for the west side of Central Square. He indicated Fritz's location. Fritz has three picnic tables in front of their own storefront and in front of the Chamber of Commerce. He believes the Chamber allows them that space, which is not to say the Chamber will always be there or always grant that permission, but for now they assume that understanding continues. There is an area with four-person tables in front of the Chamber's ramp, and two six-person tables in front of Fritz's. The fenced area delineates the area where alcoholic beverages are served and for the Pour House. Of course, they need to keep openings for access to the different occupancies to that building, but they accommodate a two-person table, a bench or bar top that they calculated would be up to eight seats, a six-person table, a couple of four-person tables, and another bar top that would accommodate about 15 people. Comparing this to existing conditions, he does not know if Fritz's tables are six-person or eight-person picnic tables. He is not sure what their licensed number of diners is, but it is between 18 and 24 with their three tables. The proposed conditions can accommodate 20. Again, this is one potential layout, not the only one.

Mr. Lussier continued that the Pour House's existing license includes 32 seated diners and 18 patrons at the bar tops. The proposed condition is for 20 table diners and 23 patrons at the bar top. They looked at the north side of Central Square. The Life is Sweet patio, with their existing license, has 15 (people at) tables and two small benches. In the proposed condition Stantec laid out within the 10-foot sidewalk commerce zone, they can accommodate 16 seated positions plus the two benches. The Stage's license has 32 seated table positions, and the proposed is also 32. The Stage is using small four-person tables. The ones Stantec's layout uses are 48"x30", which he thinks are larger than the current tables. If the Stage uses their current tables, there might be more room than shown, but this is just an example.

Mr. Lussier continued that the point is there will be changes for some business owners, in terms of what their sidewalk commerce zone can accommodate, but generally, it is close to the existing conditions, or better, in some cases. Outside these areas they laid out, there will be many storefronts that have very limited seating now or have no capacity to have outdoor seating that will be accommodated for that outdoor commerce or outdoor dining in the future. So, on balance he thinks it is still a net benefit.

Chair Greenwald stated that his only question regarding Mr. Lussier's update is whether there are any more decisions the Committee needs to make. Mr. Lussier replied not at this time.

Councilor Favolise stated that he knows it is probably still in development as they on-board the Project Ombudsman, but there was some conversation at the last verbal update that he continued with staff after the meeting, regarding what the Ombudsman's role will look like over the summer. He continued that one reason he was comfortable with voting to delay the project by a year was to give time for the Ombudsman to really start building those relationships. He does not necessarily need an answer at this meeting, but he would like a sense of what that relationship-building will look like pre-construction.

Councilor Favolise continued that his other question is whether the "active construction area" Mr. Lussier verbally mentioned is the same as what the slides call the "active zone." If so, he would stress the importance of being as consistent as possible. This will be a confusing enough time for downtown business owners. It would help to be as consistent as possible with communications. He appreciates the monthly updates.

Chair Greenwald stated that he would like to mention something that was not in Mr. Lussier's presentation, which is that outdoor dining or outdoor sales is a privilege. It is a license, not a right. That is something to keep in perspective. It is great that staff is reaching out and providing concept plans for potential seating, but like Mr. Lussier said, it will change, and that is fine. The merchants will figure out what is most advantageous for them, and we will all get through this.

Chair Greenwald asked if there were further questions or comments from the Committee. Hearing none, he asked for public comment.

Dorrie Masten stated that she owns the stretch of real estate that includes the Pour House, Fritz's, and Cholly & Waldo's. She continued that there was a big meeting here in March. Mr. Goodell presented ways to change the cityscape for cafes. At that time, they were going to wait until the downtown project was done and then decide where things were going. A recent, surprise visit from Mr. Lussier showed her where her patio would go, as it is right now. She was very upset. She looked back at her communications with the City Manager, who had been in the meeting with the merchants. She had said, and ended her email with, "*We remain committed to reviewing concerns in good faith. Public Works will assess what the layout will look like at your location once construction is complete.*" At the meeting, Mr. Lussier also told them that if they had more concerns, they could come to this (Committee) meeting. The plan that was on the website shows

nine tables in front of the Stage and eight in front of the Pour House. That is impossible. When she asked Mr. Lussier, he said they were simply dropped in there for a visual; it was not to scale. She has a big problem with that, considering all the tax dollars they have paid. Tonight, Mr. Lussier showed new visuals. Even looking at those new visuals from tonight, she can point out that those tables cannot go there. Common sense tells you tables cannot go in front of doors.

Ms. Masten continued that she understands that outdoor dining is a privilege. But as Councilor Filiault said, they should try their best to say yes, instead of saying no right away. The only thing stopping her, George Benik of the Stage, and the Tavern from having their patios just the way they are is the bike lane. Central Square is busy, and they are thankful to have successful restaurants and businesses, but “it does not work.” The visual Mr. Lussier showed for The Stage showed tables side by side. If the tables are side by side, it gives a single server three feet to walk in. That is not handicapped accessible. She is sure George would make any changes necessary to accommodate a customer, as would she, but two servers passing each other with their trays would be very difficult. Also, sitting right next to the glass with another customer inside Fritz’s window would be an awkward dining experience for anyone. As the Committee knows, every table and chair is income for them. It is not for her and George to drive fancy cars. Their money trickles down to their employees, provides jobs, and brings people downtown. Eliminating their patios and tables does not benefit anyone. They are not asking for a lot. It is two streets. If someone cannot walk two blocks, they probably do not belong on a bicycle. And it is two streets where there is a dangerous crosswalk. On the plan, the bike path that comes off Central Square crosses a busy street, as they just heard from prior testimony about Court St. traffic going fast. You could be coming down Court St., crossing the sidewalk at the same time as the bicycles are going, where they could stop right there and walk in whichever direction they are going to go in, by one block. Again, it is doable. If you just say no, you are not benefiting anyone. If it is doable and it will benefit the community, why not? Why not make the effort? If anything, it saves money, because they do not have the bike path.

George Benik of the Stage restaurant stated that he had some concerns about the layout of the map that was given to him, but he sees that there is a new design that he was not aware of. He continued that he would like a map of the actual distances that they will be working with. For example, he wants to know whether he has 10 feet, or 10.5 feet, and where his allocated sidewalk café will be designated to. The Stage has 30-inch tables; they are not big. Mostly, they put those tables together and move them around. There is concern with the entryways and how many tables they can get between. They have two big 8-foot entryways, so they are losing all that space that they utilize now, that they pay for with their license. He wants a better evaluation from staff or a designer, with the Stage’s tables, the ones they are going to use in that area the City has allocated for them. Then maybe they could work something out. Maybe they could take a little bit more sidewalk space, which would be for Stantec or the engineers and designers to accomplish. He does well with the Stage’s outdoor café. It was the first restaurant to have an outdoor table. The City Clerk’s Office gave them a license and they put small tables out when they just had the one store. They have been doing this a long time, and they know things change,

but he just wants a little more clarity and actual dimensions so he knows where the Stage's outdoor café will be placed and how much space it will be.

Chair Greenwald asked the Public Works Director if they have the base drawings to a point that Mr. Benik can reference.

Mr. Lussier stated that he was going to suggest that staff can offer Mr. Benik the same assistance they provided to the Pour House, which is to go to the site and mark out in white spray paint where that designated area for the patio would be. He continued that he wants to point out that what they are calling the "sidewalk commerce zone" is not a different material or treatment, it is just part of the sidewalk. They are saying that when a business owner wants to have that outdoor commerce, that this is the area that is designated for it. In Mr. Benik's case with the Stage restaurant, it is the width of his property, 10 feet out from the building. Staff can go mark that out. In terms of laying it out with his specific tables, he would shy away from that. They are not restaurant designers, and different restaurant owners might use tables of different shapes or sizes. Public Works is trying to provide the Committee with a sense of what the impacts would be, but neither he nor Stantec is in any way qualified to determine the optimum layout for any particular restaurant. He could provide them with some scaled drawings, and they could cut out shapes, put them on, and play with how they want to lay out their space.

Ms. Masten stated that when they go out and mark Mr. Benik's patio, it might be helpful to have someone from the Fire Department along, because the drawings for the Pour House have tables in front of the exit doors. She continued that she wants to make sure everyone understands the amount of table space being taken away from them by doing this. It is significant. She would like someone from the Fire Department to accompany them to clarify where they are allowed to put tables and chairs.

Chair Greenwald replied that as he understands it, Public Works will provide a blank map, on which Ms. Masten and Mr. Benik can design their own spaces. He continued that then they will have to run it through Code Enforcement and the Fire Department to make sure it is safe. The City will not design the space. Ms. Masten replied that they just want everyone on the same page, regarding not having tables or chairs in front of the doors.

The City Manager stated that sometime in March or around the timeframe of when the discussion about outdoor dining happened, a letter was submitted and referred to the Planning, Licenses, and Development (PLD) Committee. She continued that it was about the licensing, not the layout. It was more about the rules for outdoor cafes. The City Clerk's Office said they would deal with it later, after the construction was done. She will pull those meeting minutes to see.

Councilor Tobin stated that she can appreciate how challenging a lot of this will be. She continued that she thinks the reason they decided to postpone the project for a year was so that there would be time to work out a lot of these details and to be able to have this back and forth.

They are working on getting the Ombudsman. Until that happens, she appreciates the work staff has put in to meet these needs.

Councilor Filiault stated that having owned a downtown business, he can appreciate what business owners go through, dealing with City Council, which is sometimes not fun. He can appreciate both sides. He hopes that when this comes back next month, they will have more answers.

Councilor Workman stated that she wants to remind the public of the reason why they are even changing and reconfiguring the sidewalk café placements. She continued that it was not just for bike lanes. She has been a Council member since 2020. Every summer, she receives complaints from pet owners, people with children, and others about not feeling welcomed downtown because it is designed for and prioritizes restaurants and bars, and they have a hard time just walking down the sidewalk. This is about trying to balance the wants and needs of an entire city. They also really debated about cutting across the sidewalk, and the safety of not only pedestrians, but also waitstaff. They have considered many different variables, and as Chair Greenwald said, they are doing their best, but again, sidewalk cafes are privileges, not a right.

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 accepted the presentation as informational.

6) Relating to the Installation of a Stop Sign on Wilber Street at Water Street - Ordinance O-2025-14 - City Engineer

Bryan Ruoff, City Engineer, stated that Public Works was in front of the Committee in March regarding a “See Click Fix” comment about unsafe conditions at this intersection. He continued that the Committee voted unanimously to direct the City Manager to draft an Ordinance. That has been done. The Ordinance is here for the Committee’s consideration today. It is straightforward and consistent with City Code, and he is happy to answer any questions.

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

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

On a vote of 5-0, the Municipal Services, Facilities, and Infrastructure Committee recommends the adoption of Ordinance O-2025-14.

7) **Relating to an Amendment to the City Code, Regarding Yield Signs - Ordinance O-2025-11A - City Engineer**

Mr. Ruoff stated this Ordinance has been changed since the first reading with City Council. The “A” version in the packet includes a redlined version, to make it clear what has changed, and then the actual Ordinance. He is happy to go through all the changes and why they have been made. Essentially, many of these yield sign locations deal with the Upper Winchester St. project and the addition of yield signs for those roundabouts that were installed. Also, as sort of a catch-all so they do not have this problem again, they are adding a descriptor at all approaches into roundabout intersections, which yield signs should be installed in regardless. For the ones being eliminated, it is based on reconfiguration of that intersection. Some have traffic lights at this point, and some are totally changed intersections. This is an update of the yield signs in the City Code to reflect current conditions. It is not a full listing of yield signs in the City, just to be clear.

Chair Greenwald asked if the City Attorney is happy and satisfied with all of this. The City Attorney replied yes.

Councilor Tobin stated that her only question is whether it is correct that for all approaches into roundabout intersections, the type of road does not matter. She continued that for example, she is thinking about Winchester St. and Route 101.

Mr. Ruoff replied that that is State-owned and maintained, so it would not fall within the City Code. He continued that all the ones listed here are within City Code. It is kind of redundant, because they listed the three yield signs that were added as part of the Upper Winchester St. project, but it is not explicitly clear where the yield sign is, so it is reinforcing that point.

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 adoption of Ordinance O-2025-11-A.

8) **Relating to an Amendment to the City Code, Regarding Traffic Signals - Ordinance O-2025-12 - City Engineer**

The City Engineer stated this Ordinance relates to traffic signals. He continued he is happy to go through all the reasons for changes, but like the last one, these are mostly due to roundabouts and some of them were errant entries. For example, the Main St. pedestrian light at St. Bernard’s Church is not listed in the right location, so this is a cleanup of the City Code to match what has been in place for about the last 30 years.

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

On a vote of 5-0, the Municipal Services, Facilities, and Infrastructure Committee recommends the adoption of Ordinance O-2025-12.

9) Relating to an Amendment to the City Code, Regarding Vehicle Turning Limitations - Ordinance O-2025-13A - City Engineer

The City Engineer stated that this Ordinance has also been revised since its first reading at City Council. He continued that a couple of median locations fall in a gray area between whether they are State right-of-way or City right-of-way, and at roundabout locations short divides. This Ordinance is an update to City Code of two things. They are calling it a “turning movement change Ordinance.” It is the elimination of some existing sign limitations that are no longer in place because roundabouts have been installed in those two locations, so there are no longer turns that those signs would apply to. Then there are turning limitations in the medians and islands, which are all listed in the existing City conditions. He has the roundabout location for each one and when it was installed, if the Committee would like that information.

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

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 the adoption of Ordinance O-2025-13-A.

10) Relating to an Amendment to the City Code, Regarding Stop Signs - Ordinance O-2025-10A - City Engineer

Mr. Ruoff stated that Ordinance O-2025-10 has been revised slightly since the first reading with the City Council. He continued that there are a couple of items staff noticed were incorrect. One of the streets where a stop sign was removed met a warrant, so they put in a request to have that stop sign reinstalled based on existing City Code. Regarding the other streets, most are roundabouts that no longer exist or were wrongly entered initially, or they are describing traffic going in the wrong direction on a one-way street. This updates the City Code to reflect current conditions. He would be happy to answer any questions.

The City Attorney stated that she has a question. In the “A” versions of the ones they just looked at there was some red text, which she assumes were the changes from the City Council to here. Mr. Ruoff replied that is correct. The City Attorney stated that she does not see any red text on this one. Mr. Ruoff replied that there should be, and if the City Attorney does not have that copy, he could make a copy for her. He continued that there should be two Ordinances, one with red text and one that is the final version for approval. The City Attorney replied that it seems like the agenda packet is fine; she will check to make sure the website is right.

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

On a vote of 5-0, the Municipal Services, Facilities, and Infrastructure Committee recommends the adoption of Ordinance O-2025-10-A.

11) Adjournment

There being no further business, Chair Greenwald adjourned the meeting at 7:45 PM.

Respectfully submitted by,
Britta Reida, Minute Taker

Edits submitted by,
Terri Hood, Deputy City Clerk