

City of Keene
New Hampshire

MUNICIPAL SERVICES, FACILITIES & INFRASTRUCTURE COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES

Wednesday, June 25, 2025

6:00 PM

**Council Chambers,
City Hall**

Members Present:

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

Members Not Present:

Mitchell H. Greenwald, Chair

Staff Present:

Elizabeth A. Ferland, City Manager
Amanda Palmeira, City Attorney
Andy Bohannon, Deputy City Manager
Bryan Ruoff, City Engineer
Carrah Fisk-Hennessey, Parks & Recreation
Director
Don Lussier, Public Works Director

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

1) Joe Schapiro – Safety Issues Associated with On-Street Parking – Church Street

Councilor Filiault asked to hear from Joe Schapiro.

Joe Schapiro of 288 Church St. stated that he and his wife live kitty-corner to the Gathering Waters Charter School. He continued that for the 25 years they have lived there, it has been a place where most staff park and most parents park when they are picking up or dropping off their children. For the longest time, starting in 2001 when the then-private Monadnock Waldorf School built an addition, there were meetings about the anticipated traffic problems. There was an informal understanding that people from the school, parents, faculty, and staff would only park on the south side of the street. For the most part, for the next 20 years, that agreement was mostly honored. It was not perfect; sometimes people would park on the other side of the street and sometimes there would be conversations about it. In 2021, the Monadnock Waldorf School was losing students, and he was concerned that if the school closed, there would be a very large empty building in the neighborhood. He and his wife were glad when it became the Gathering Waters Charter School and was renewed. The issue is that enrollment skyrocketed. Now it was a free school, and students could come from almost anywhere in New Hampshire, and it was not a neighborhood school. Almost everyone drives to the school. With as much as three times enrollment, traffic and parking became a real concern. People park on both sides of the school, even though the school discourages it and has a written policy requesting parents to only park on the south side of the street. People park on both sides, park going in the wrong direction, idle for long periods of time, park close to driveways, and park across from driveways. People do not

respect the “no parking here to corner” signs. Two times a day, it feels “like being in the middle of a Walmart parking lot.”

Mr. Schapiro continued that right away, he and his wife noticed that it was a concern and arranged a meeting with the person who was then the chair of the board and one or two of the administrators. That was almost four years ago. The administrators and board were sympathetic and said they understood the concerns and said they would try to make a plan to improve things. That has not really happened. He does not know what the situation would have been if they had had the time or wherewithal to send an administrator once a week or a couple times a month to be there during those periods of time to remind people not to park, but that never happened. The problem has persisted. He and his wife think it is a dangerous situation, should emergency vehicles need to turn from South Lincoln St. or Valley St. onto Church St. They think it is an incredible inconvenience, and dangerous when people have to back out of their driveways and there are cars parked across the street. Of course, everything is exacerbated when snow narrows the street.

Mr. Schapiro continued that the school officials first suggested they (Mr. Schapiro and his wife) ask the City to put up “no parking” signs. They did not do that, because it was an inconvenience for him and his wife, and because not all of their neighbors agreed that they wanted that. Over time, the problem has persisted, and now the neighbors are in agreement. They have talked with neighbors affected by this from South Lincoln St. all the way down to Probate St. on Church St., and many have signed this letter.

Mr. Schapiro continued that they request, as a solution, that there be no parking 8:00 AM to 4:00 PM on school days on the north side of the street, the same as it is across the street from Wheelock School. Secondly, to deal with the problems of people parking right next to driveways, (they request) clearly delineated parking spaces that are removed from the driveways. He saw that the City maybe has a new Ordinance about the distance that parking from driveways is prohibited. He does not know how that applies here, but those are their requests. He does not know that the MSFI Committee has any control over it. It would also go a long way if the Police drove by occasionally, at that period of time, to enforce whatever rules there are that are not being followed. They (he and his wife and neighbors) are not interested in harassing the people from the school. If a couple of (people were issued) tickets, people would talk to each other, and they would follow the rules.

Mr. Schapiro stated that he invited people from the area who have concerns about traffic and parking related to the school. He continued that some of their concerns might be different, but he thought that since the Committee was taking this up, this would be a good time and place for people to come and talk. Many of his neighbors are here and might want to talk about concerns other than this one on this street and Church St.

Councilor Filiault thanked Mr. Schapiro and stated that how the process works is, whatever motion the MSFI Committee makes goes to the full City Council. He continued that then, at the

next City Council meeting, the 15 Councilors will vote yes or no on whatever recommendation the MSFI Committee makes tonight.

Councilor Filiault continued that next they will hear from City staff. Regarding Mr. Schapiro's question about the parking distance from driveways, he (Councilor Filiault) met with the City Attorney the other day to discuss this, because he figured it was going to come up. He asked if the parking from driveways on this street is included in the Ordinance that they just passed. He thinks not, because this is not in the same type of district that the Ordinance they just passed was. He asked if that is correct.

City Manager Elizabeth Ferland replied that the Ordinance coming forward will apply to Washington St. and Court St. She continued that it does not apply to residential neighborhood areas. Councilor Filiault replied that that is what he thought.

Councilor Tobin stated that Mr. Schapiro mentioned the idling. She continued that she wonders if that is parents picking up and dropping off children. She asked if the "twice a day" Mr. Schapiro referred to is school starting and school getting out. Mr. Schapiro replied yes. He continued that he cannot speak for everyone, and if he and his wife were younger and working, they probably would not even notice this, because they would be at work. However, they are not working anymore and thus are sometimes at home, and (seeing this). Regarding the idling, he does not know, but maybe people get there early and are idling while they talk on the phone or do something else. He does not know why, but especially in the cold weather, sometimes people are sitting out there idling. There have been times when he or his wife have suggested to people they not sit in their car with it running, or move a little bit away from the driveway. He assumes there is an Ordinance about idling. Sometimes people are polite and cooperative, but a fair amount of the time, people are not, which is disturbing.

Councilor Favolise stated that he has a follow-up to Councilor Tobin's question, wanting to get a clearer picture of what the issue actually is, knowing that the Committee has a couple different options for how to move forward. He asked if the issue is that there is a challenge in the morning and then in the late afternoon/early evening, or if the challenge is that faculty and staff members are parking there during the day as overflow from the parking lot, and the street is taken up with that parking.

Mr. Schapiro replied that they are talking about the two sides of the street. He continued that the agreement for a long time has been that it is okay for people to park on the south side of the street. Generally speaking, people are parked all day on the south side, because that is (where) the faculty (park). He thinks there is very little or no parking at the school, and South Lincoln St. does not lend itself to parking. Sometimes when people are not honoring the agreement, people park on the north side of (Church) Street as well, but the big problem happens during drop-off and pick-up.

Councilor Workman stated that her question is for staff, probably the City Manager. She continued that she might have missed it, but she wants to know if the City has been involved in conversations between the neighbors and the school. The City Manager replied not that she is aware of. Councilor Workman asked if it would be appropriate, as a starting point, to involve the City in that discussion. The City Manager replied that they did have another charter school that was creating some issues with the drop-off and pick-up times, and the City worked with that school, and they changed their flow and did make accommodations. She continued that that was because the individual reached out to the City directly, whereas this came in as a letter to City Council.

Councilor Filiault stated that he is familiar with the area, and he (Mr. Schapiro) is correct that it is quite the bottleneck, especially in the mornings with heavy traffic and traffic trying to go down the middle. He asked if the Public Works Director or other staff wanted to add anything before he takes comment from the audience. Hearing none, he continued that the Committee is interested to hear what others in the neighborhood have to say.

Craig Stockwell of 53 Wilber St. stated that his family have been here 37 years, and they were very involved with the (Waldorf) school. He continued that he was on the board of the Waldorf school, and he was chair of the building campaign when they put the addition on. When they were working on the addition in 2001, in order to get the Zoning acceptance to move forward with construction, and given how little parking there is in the school lot, they had to reach out to the neighbors. The school sent a letter to the neighbors, saying the school would do its best to arrange, organize, and monitor the parking and the flow of traffic, if given their agreement to put on that addition. That was a long time ago and he realizes there is a different circumstance, because it is now a public school, not a private school.

Mr. Stockwell continued that with the morning and evening flow, the (traffic) goes up and around Wilber St. Wilber St. is a narrow, two-lane road. Many people park on the uphill curve, and children come in and out of the cars, and it is a very dangerous situation. He would like to add to the Church St. concern (a request) that the City also look at that hill. There are some “no parking” signs at the worst of the curve, but perhaps they could extend that all the way down to the school so people are not parking there.

Councilor Filiault stated that a while back, before school let out, he walked on Wilber St. and saw that the school had put up their own homemade “no parking” signs, which is in violation of City Ordinance. He continued that you cannot make your own “no parking” zones. However, he was going to bring up tonight that Wilber St. all the way up and around adds to what they are talking about tonight, and that this is a neighborhood issue that goes beyond one street.

Vicky Morton of 75 Water St. stated that she is here tonight to support Mr. Schapiro’s letter, and while he and the other authors are speaking directly to the eastern end of Church St., she would like to broaden the topic and express concerns about on-street parking that includes most of eastside Keene. A while ago, the neighborhood parking project was created, and it had several

intentions to facilitate housing growth, where allowed, to explore additional on-street parking, to add parking supply, and update ordinances where applicable. All of this was to be outside of downtown. As shown on the map on the website related to this project, it is primarily on the east side of town. There are some other spots in north central, but primarily this happens on the east side of town.

Ms. Morton stated that possible solutions include potential one-way streets to accommodate on-street parking, as well as proposing ordinances or solutions to the issues that have been raised around on-street parking and the neighborhood concerns. In her opinion, there is little to no opportunity for additional housing on the east side, from Main St. out to North and South Lincoln streets. She thinks they do not have the same need to have on-street parking. With the allowance of on-street parking, they now have residents parking against the flow of traffic, and parking directly opposite parked vehicles. These situations sometimes make it difficult to travel the streets and she is concerned that emergency service vehicles might not pass through a street that has parking on both sides. Her concern is primarily the streets in between Beaver St. and Roxbury St., Roxbury St. and Church St., and Church St. and Water St. Many of those streets are narrow, and with parking on both sides, it is difficult for one car to get through, never mind a massive fire truck.

Ms. Morton continued that the line-of-sight issue Mr. Schapiro raises is not limited to the area at the end of Church St. Currently, cars are parked too close to the ends of streets and intersections throughout the east side, and at one intersection, new fencing has been installed, impairing the line of sight. Some residents have placed objects in front of their homes to prevent on-site or on-street parking. She attended five listening sessions hosted by Fire Marshall Wood to hear about the issues of other neighborhoods. Four out of five neighborhoods identified line-of-sight as a concern. Regarding the school on South Lincoln St., she thinks the issues of parking impedes traffic and creates dangerous situations when parents are waiting to pick up children and someone attempts to drive around them headed north on South Lincoln St. when the oncoming traffic is headed south, and sometimes they block you and sometimes they let you go. She has been in line to go past that school when there have been 14 cars parked on the east side of South Lincoln St., waiting to pick up students, right in front of the school.

Ms. Morton continued that she thinks there are a couple of options. She would have said three, but Craig (Stockwell) just dissuaded her not to include Wilber St. One could be enforcing the “no parking” signs that are clearly there, right in front of the school where people park. Or they could remove the signs and remove the turf and grass between the street and the sidewalk, to allow the cars to get off the street and not impede traffic. She would appreciate an update on what is happening with the neighborhood parking project in regard to creating appropriate ordinances and guidance for on-street parking as well as addressing the line-of-sight issue which was identified in four of the five listening sessions. She understands the Committee has recommendations from staff about what to forward to City Council, and she wants to hear what those are. If those can be shared, it would be nice to hear.

Councilor Filiault stated that everything is always on the table. He continued that there are a couple of recommendations to consider. One is an Ordinance on the north side of Church St. between South Lincoln St. and Probate St. Another is the same thing but limited between 8:00 AM and 4:00 PM on school days. The Committee is not obligated to accept either of those, but they are on the table. Wilber St. has kind of been tossed in. Ms. Morton is correct that the entire east side has an issue with parking, but he wants to try to compartmentalize the school part of it and deal with that part first. He has been here long enough to know that if they take on too big a project, it will not get completed quickly. He would like to see something done fairly rapidly with the school situation, and then address the larger problem as a whole for the east side. Wilber St. was brought up, and he did see that. He saw the “no parking” signs that were not supposed to be there, which would get moved at the end of the day. Those were not City “no parking” signs. That is another enforcement issue for the City.

Councilor Favolise stated that he agrees with the comments about Wilber St. He continued that when he goes there for the holiday craft fair, it is “a nightmare” to try to creep up around that corner to find parking, especially since it is not a one-way street. He is seeking clarification on the existing conditions. He heard there are “no parking here to corner” signs, and it sounds like Ms. Morton was saying there are signs saying “no parking” altogether. Mr. Schapiro’s letter does not indicate there is a parking ban.

Ms. Morton replied that, headed north on South Lincoln St., in front of the school, there are two “no parking” signs right there. Councilor Filiault stated that to clarify, that is for South Lincoln St. He continued that he would have to go look at that. Ms. Morton replied that the signs are there, and the question has always been why an officer driving through when there are up to 14 cars sitting there does not move them along.

John Thornton of 287 Church St. stated that he is right across from Joe (Schapiro) and supports what he is saying. He continued that he is a signatory on the letter. He has lived there for quite a while, and his wife has been there since the 1990s when she purchased the house. She remembers giving approval for the old private school, to the agreement that they would only park on the south side of Church St. Unfortunately, they never found actual documentation of that agreement. Parking there is a problem. It is not just during the drop-off and pick-up times, as the school is very active and has many events happening. Even when the school is not in session, many people are parked on the street. Frequently, cars are parked very close to the end of his and his wife’s driveway. In one case, someone accidentally parked right in front of it, without noticing. Fortunately, he did not have to go to work that day, so he left it alone. Backing out when there are also cars parked directly across the street and you have a very narrow window is difficult, even in the summer. In the winter, the road narrows by 3 to 5 feet and it is almost impossible. If he and his wife did not back into their driveway to begin with, they probably would not be able to back out and could not see.

Mr. Thornton continued that he is in favor of an offset from the end of the driveway. He does not know how the City could do that, but maybe it could be a simple line. There is another problem.

It is not just on upper Church St. The parking extends around to Valley St., too. The traffic is much heavier now with the charter school than it was with the old private school, so they frequently see people parked on Valley St. and further down Church St. People want to pull as much off the road as they can, so they pull a little bit onto the grass, which kills the grass, and that space becomes dirt, and then people pull a little bit further onto the grass, and this continues. The area between the edge of the road and the sidewalk has narrowed by about 50%, by people continuing to just push over. He realizes this is beyond the scope of what they are talking about here but given the high traffic and the fact that this is a charter school, curbs are probably warranted in these areas, to prevent that type of damage to people's property or the (right-of-way).

Mr. Thornton continued that in addition, the sidewalk from Valley St. up to South Lincoln St. on the south side is a bit of a mess. It is a blacktop sidewalk with a lot of dips and cracks. They recently patched a couple of the deeper dips, but many students are going back and forth, and that is a liability, especially in the winter. Near South Lincoln St., the sidewalk slopes quite a bit. It is dangerous when icy. Again, he knows that is beyond the scope of the discussion tonight about fixing the parking, but that is a safety issue and liability the City should look at.

Councilor Filiault stated that like many things, this becomes more complicated when you think you have a simple (issue) and then hear from other neighbors that it expands out. It does tend to expand farther and farther as the school's population increases. He asked the City Manager if it is correct that the MSFI Committee has a meeting in July. (Yes). He asked if the City Council meets the first week of August. If not, whatever the MSFI Committee decides in July will not be voted on by the City Council until late August. School comes back right around that same time. He is trying to figure out the timeline. As much as he hates (placing an issue on more time), he thinks they now have more questions than answers, and he wants to try to encompass the other streets that neighbors brought up tonight. He thinks this will require conversation between the neighbors and City staff. He does not see an answer coming from the Committee tonight, because they are getting questions they have not had a chance to research. The two (recommended) motions do not take care of the Wilber St. or Valley St. problems. He wants to try for one motion.

Councilor Favolise stated that before the Committee makes any motion, he wants to hear from the representatives of the school. He continued that those are voices he has not yet heard. Councilor Filiault agreed and asked if anyone from the school wished to speak.

Fiona Lourie, Business Manager of Gathering Waters Charter School, stated that she lives at 74 South Lincoln St. She continued that she is a graduate of the private Waldorf school, so she has known about this issue and the history of the issue for a long time. She was not aware of the agreement that Mr. Stockwell was talking about, related to the building of the addition, the auditorium. However, she was a child at that time. When the charter school took over, enrollment did increase a lot. There are 125 students in grades K to 5. They (the school administrators) have done their best to explain, in newsletters and in communications with

parents, about the suggestion of parking on the one side of Church St. She believes staff (park on the south side of Church St.), because they are all very aware of that. It has been very difficult to monitor all the different family members dropping students off, the different parents, grandparents, (and so on and so forth). Unless the school had a full-time staff member standing out there every day, it is a challenge to maintain the no parking on the one side every single day.

Ms. Lourie continued that regarding what is happening with the “no parking” signs on South Lincoln St., that has to do mainly with afternoon pick-up. Parents form a pick-up line that often backs up onto South Lincoln St. right at the beginning of pick-up when the children have just come out to the parking lot and are lining up. They can only get them into cars so fast, because they are ages 7 to 12. Once that starts happening, the flow moves quickly. The school has tried hard to tell parents they cannot line up earlier, because that was an issue. Parents would try to be first in line, sitting and idling for 15 minutes before students were even lining up to get in cars. Thus, it appears that parents park on South Lincoln St., but they are in the pick-up line waiting to pull around.

Ms. Lourie continued that the school has had City officials, including people from the Police Department, come look at the flow with school staff and try to see how they could change anything. It is a very tricky conversation, to figure out what they could do differently. When it was the private school, they had the pick-up line go into the parking lot and circle around, and then go back out onto South Lincoln St. That does not work well with the number of students the charter school has. They need the parking lot in order for the students to line up and be able to be put in cars as quickly as possible. The pick-up process in the afternoon lasts about 12 minutes on a good day, and 15–20 minutes on a rough day. She has timed it. In 11 or 12 minutes, everyone is out and the (traffic) disappears. However, that brief window is definitely a traffic jam, and it is exacerbated a lot by people who use South Lincoln St. to cut through and people who get very upset about cars in their way.

Ms. Lourie continued that she was going to ask the City to consider two things. One was having a lighted sign on both sides of South Lincoln St. that comes on just for those periods of time at pick-up and drop-off and reminds people it is happening and that they could use a different cut-through street. Many (drivers) speed through South Lincoln St., and they are not residents who live there. Her other recommendation was a speedbump right where the crosswalk crosses South Lincoln St. and where the children walk across the street. A raised crosswalk like the one by Keene State College would slow people down and make it much more obvious that there is a lot of foot traffic.

Ms. Lourie continued that she is happy to answer any questions, and happy to work with the City. The school wants to have happy neighbors, because they have had good relations in the past, and they really like being a neighborhood school, even though they have a lot more students coming now.

Councilor Tobin stated that her question is probably for staff, regarding the Roadway Safety Plan that they put together. She continued that she thinks they addressed areas around schools and specifically drop-off times. She thinks lighting came up around schools.

Mr. Lussier stated that he does not recall if there is a specific recommendation in the Roadway Safety Action Plan for this location. He continued that the City is planning to replace all of the school zone speed limit signs. This location does not have one. That is something the City could do. He does not see speeding as the concern here; he thinks it is more the fact that the roadway is so narrow and that the vehicles lining up for pick-up do not allow a second car to pass in the northbound direction. He had had a conversation with the school's prior administrator. There are options to look at, like the lighted signs Ms. Lourie mentioned. They could even make that section of the roadway a one-way only during those pick-up and drop-off times. There are many options. That conversation never came to any conclusion.

Councilor Tobin stated that she noticed Church St. and South Lincoln St. came up quite a few times as she was looking through the ideas and suggested projects. In addition, lighting around school zones (came up), which might be something they could look at.

Councilor Workman stated that she does not have any suggestions, but clearly there is still a lot of discussion that can be had before an Ordinance comes about. She wants to thank the Petitioner and the representative from the school, because those suggestions add to the discussion and make it a more fruitful conversation. She is interested in where that goes. As she mentioned in a previous MSFI Committee meeting, the City Council is receiving a lot of communications about speeding. She recently typed up but did not post a long Facebook rant about speeding, because it is a problem in the City. She understands why it is a problem, but they need to address it. She prefers a "one and done" approach, and thinks they really have to look at the recommendations from the listening sessions and the data they already have, and start to implement some major changes throughout the City so they are not doing this through piecemeal.

Mr. Lussier stated that he would love to address that, and it might be a little off topic for tonight's agenda, but as part of the recent budget, the Council approved a supplemental request for an East Keene speed study. As of July 1st, the City will contract with one of those service providers, and it will give staff the ability to do nearly instantaneous speed studies. (For example), if someone calls him and reports a complaint about speed on South Lincoln St., he can immediately access the data that already exists in the cloud. It is not as specific and detailed as going out, putting a measuring device on the road, and measuring it for two weeks. It is based on a statistical analysis of people's cell phones, Tesla's data collection, and (so on and so forth). He thinks it is a very good data set that will be able to give answers to those questions much faster and with much less staff time and resources.

The City Manager stated that Mr. Lussier is preparing a grant application to bring forward, recommendations that came out of the road safety study. Mr. Lussier replied yes, that will be

submitted tomorrow. He continued that it is the implementation step for the grant they received to do the action plan. It will include many safety recommendations all throughout the City.

Matthew Burritt of 369 Roxbury St. stated that he is the Assistant Principal at Gathering Waters. He continued that the school very much wants to have a harmonious relationship with their neighbors. It is in the handbook for faculty and staff to not park on the north side of Church St. The literature defines the agreement that has been in place for many years. Second, they have two campuses. Their upper school is on Washington St., and there was also quite a challenge with drop-off and pick-up there. They (the school) did all they could and even changed their parking flow to make that work so that parents moved around the building in a different way, and he thinks that resolved the problem. He wants to make the point that the school wants to be good neighbors, and they are actively looking for solutions to this. It is not as if the school is trying to avoid this. However, there are narrow streets. Some students cross Lincoln St. on the designated paths and this also blocks traffic, and the law is that pedestrians have the right of way, and for Wilber St., Church St., and Lincoln St., there is a problem for that quarter hour or half hour of time. The school is open to coming up with solutions.

Nicole Demarest of 288 Church St. stated that she lives with her husband, Joe Schapiro. She continued that she wanted to return to the original issue, because the parking for the school has many facets, including Wilber St. and the pick-up on South Lincoln St., but the letter that came to the Committee was particularly about Church St. It is a different issue. It is not as complicated as all of the Wilber St. and South Lincoln St. issues. She hears from Ms. Lourie and Mr. Burritt that they would most likely be in favor of “no parking” signs between, say, 7:30 AM and 3:45 PM, or whatever the time would be. She asked if Councilor Filiault could ask those folks that question.

Councilor Filiault replied that as he said, the Committee had a couple recommendations here, and those can be tweaked, also.

Councilor Favolise stated that he appreciates that this came in as a specific focus on Church St. and that is the agenda item. He continued that his concern with taking a specific step right now is that it might cause the parking challenge to migrate to a different street, and then they could be having a specific item for Wilber St. come in next month, and a different street in East Keene the next month. Thus, he is inclined at this point to place this item on more time, even though they do not like to do that, with some direction around conversations that staff would be having with both sides, ideally together. There are other places in Keene that might not have quite these street dimension challenges and traffic patterns challenges, but Adams St. and Wheelock (School) are mentioned in Mr. Schapiro’s letter, and there have been ways to make those work. St. Joe’s (School) is in his ward, in a student housing residential neighborhood, and there are ways that has been made to work. When they (the Committee) are talking about parking or traffic, he hesitates to do something that solves a problem in one location and creates a problem in another location, and thus another problem for the Council to deal with later. He is inclined to place this on more time but is open to others’ opinions.

Councilor Filiault replied that to add to what Councilor Favolise said, if they eliminate the parking on the north side, he wonders if they would be pushing it to Valley St., Probate St., or Wilber St. He continued that he wants to be sure that they do not fix one problem just to create other problems on the other side streets. That could cause the neighbors from all these other streets to come back to the Committee in a month, because of what the Committee did to their neighborhood, so he agrees with what Councilor Favolise is saying. It happens a lot. A seemingly simple request turns out to be more complicated, like this one is. It is because of the school's success, getting more students and staff. Success sometimes creates problems, but they can get through this. He would be more inclined to place this item on more time to allow Mr. Schapiro's neighborhood to work with the City Manager/staff on this. This will probably take a little more than an Ordinance tonight.

Ms. Demarest asked if he is saying that the people who live where there are difficulties with school parking would be involved with City staff and perhaps staff members from the school, and that there would be some kind of meetings with possible solutions coming from those. Councilor Filiault replied absolutely. He continued that in tonight's conversation, the Committee heard things that they did not think they were going to hear, which obviously they cannot address tonight, so yes, it would be setting up time with the City Manager and staff and then getting back to Mr. Schapiro, as the author of the letter/the Petitioner. Mr. Schapiro could direct it to those who are interested, and it would go through the City Manager. The City Manager would get staff involved, and then it would come back to the MSFI Committee at their next meeting. By then, they would hopefully have some kind of resolution that works fairly for everyone, and the MSFI Committee would once again make a recommendation to the full City Council.

Ed Haas of 114 Jordan Rd. stated that there are some good-hearted people in the neighborhood. He continued that a solution is for a small group of people in the neighborhood and the school to get together within the confines of a group they already have – the East Keene Neighborhood Group. They can create a subcommittee to come up with specific solutions that will address the (neighborhood's) concerns, and it is up to the MSFI Committee to address the corresponding concerns that go beyond that neighborhood. He thinks they can work together to put together a small group to develop specific recommendations that they are all comfortable with.

Councilor Filiault thanked Councilor Haas for his recommendation. He continued that he does not think he will recommend that route. He will recommend the Committee place this on more time and have the neighbors, through Mr. Schapiro, get together with the City Manager and come up with a solution in the next 30 days.

Nancy Glasheen stated that she has lived at 287 Church St. for almost 30 years and was there when the (Waldorf) school built the auditorium in 2000 and for approving the parking on the south side of the street. She continued that the school's population has grown four or five times. Their concerns are erosion of the curb and street, and emergency vehicles access to their homes, given the congestion in the area. Many neighbors have been there longer than she has, and they

are all aging. They want to make sure proper resources can get to their homes if need be. Lastly, the relationship they (she and Mr. Schapiro) had with the Waldorf school was great. They (the Waldorf administrators) were very forthcoming, invited her and Mr. Schapiro to gatherings, and gave them free admission to the craft fair. It was a more harmonious relationship. The parents at the Gathering Waters School are, she thinks, much more privileged, to park on people's lawns and in people's driveways, and to obstruct where they need to get to in the mornings. The parents are down Hardy Ct. and Valley St., and they litter. She was not aware there was contact, so she appreciates Ms. Lourie and Mr. Burritt being here tonight. She wants there to be a school in the neighborhood; that is not the question. The (issue) is that they need to communicate more with the parents who feel it is a privilege to drop trash on people's lawns, park in people's driveways, and erode the grass people are trying to grow. She wants the school, which very much resembles her school.

Mr. Schapiro stated that he is fully in favor of the process that was suggested, with a get-together of interested parties, people from the school, Church St., and Wilber St. He continued that he would like to know if the school is in favor of putting up the signs on Church St. It is just one piece of data. It does not solve the whole problem, and will not eliminate that process, but he wonders if they think that would be a favorable solution.

Ms. Lourie stated that she thinks it is not as simple as her saying "yes." She continued that they (the school administrators) would very much like to be in favor of that, but part of the issue, as Councilor Favolise was saying, is not knowing (what the ramifications would be). Faculty and staff would be fine with there being no parking on the one side. The issue it would cause would be (not knowing) where parents would park for pick-up and drop-off instead. Mainly, people who park there in the mornings and afternoons are dropping off and picking up Kindergarten and First Grade students, which the school asked families to do, since many of those students are still in car seats. Having them go through the car line is much more difficult, getting a child in and out of the car with a car seat involved. Many times, there are also smaller siblings in the car. If they could figure out a solution that helps both of those situations, they (the school) are totally in favor. They do not need the one side of the street parking for most of the day, but during pick-up and drop-off, if parents cannot park on that other side, they will end up in the car line and it will probably wrap all the way over to Water St., and then the Committee would be hearing from Water St. residents. That is why her answer to the question is, "Yes, and..."

Mr. Bohannon stated that it was not long ago that the City received grants for Safe Routes to School, and addressed many of the elementary schools through that. He continued that they created walking buses, which was part of the Vision 2020 initiative. They focused on all the public elementary schools, but he does not know that they have focused on all the charter schools the City now has, which is different from how it was 15 years ago. He might suggest they revisit that, because there is opportunity (for having) a different drop-off location and teachers or parents would walk the students to the school. It also promotes exercise. There are opportunities out there.

Councilor Filiault stated that they could go on all night about this, but he thinks the Committee is clear about placing this on more time. He continued that Mr. Schapiro, his neighbors, and the City Manager can get together over the next 30 days before it comes back to the Committee, hopefully with some solid recommendations.

The City Manager stated that to clarify, her direct point of contact will be with Mr. Schapiro and someone from the school, and it will be up to them to invite the others. Councilor Filiault agreed.

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

On a vote of 4-0, the Municipal Services, Facilities, and Infrastructure Committee placed the item on more time to allow for conversations with all parties to continue.

2) **Withdrawal: Proposal to Add the Necessary Infrastructure to Accommodate Banners Across Main Street**

Councilor Filiault stated that the Petitioner withdrew the proposal for banners across Main St.

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

On a vote of 4-0, the Municipal Services, Facilities, and Infrastructure Committee recommends the withdrawal be accepted as informational.

3) **Goose Pond Spillway Bridge Proposal – Parks & Recreation and Engineering**

Carrah Fisk-Hennessey, Parks & Recreation Director, and Bryan Ruoff, City Engineer, introduced themselves. Ms. Fisk-Hennessey stated that they are excited to bring forward something that has been a long-time wish list item at Goose Pond, making it a reality at no cost to the City. They are here to share the plan to fundraise and build a spillway bridge at Goose Pond to complete the loop trail, which would allow all users at Goose Pond to go through the entire loop trail without getting their feet wet. This is a big deal. The traffic moving away from the concrete spillway will also help with all the pieces of wood that tend to travel down into the spillway itself and into the water runoff. People have used logs, branches, and twigs, trying to make their own types of bridges to try to cross. They hope to eliminate that. (This project) would also be improving the trail network, because this is not happening right at the mouth of the spillway, but about 84 feet past it into the woods.

Ms. Fisk-Hennessey continued that she can show pictures of what the spillway looks like right now, which were just taken this morning. You can see the stake with a pink ribbon, which is roughly 84 feet beyond the spillway, so they would be able to move across in a much shorter bridge span than the spillway itself. She encourages anyone who has not had a chance to get up to Goose Pond yet this summer to do so, as it is beautiful right now. She also has renderings for the bridge to share with the Committee tonight.

Councilor Favolise stated that he is a big fan of Goose Pond and is always happy to see continued work there. He continued that when he first moved to Keene, it was hard to get around Goose Pond, and the team has done a good job clearing up that trail and making it traversable. He knows that with putting the bridge in, the intention would be to increase the amount of foot traffic that will be going over the bridge as opposed to walking through the spillway. He asked if it will still be an option for people to walk through the spillway. Ms. Fisk-Hennessey replied yes, they will not take that option away.

Mr. Ruoff stated that the idea would be to have an alternate option, though, in the interest of public safety, because it is sometimes hard to gauge those water flows. He continued that (with the bridge), they would have a path that is always clear.

Councilor Filiault asked if Ms. Fisk-Hennessey and/or Mr. Ruoff could explain the “plan to fundraise.” Ms. Fisk-Hennessey replied that the Goose Pond Stewardship Committee is very actively engaged with community endeavors, and the fundraising plan is coming out of that subcommittee of the Conservation Commission.

Councilor Tobin stated that she knows exactly what they are talking about, because she walked through that water on Sunday. She continued that she had been looking for a way around and could not find one. She is excited (for the bridge plan).

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

On a vote of 4-0, the Municipal Services, Facilities, and Infrastructure Committee recommends the plans to fundraise and build a path bridge to cross Goose Pond spillway be accepted as informational.

The City Manager asked if that is the action Ms. Fisk-Hennessey and Mr. Ruoff were looking for. Ms. Fisk-Hennessey replied yes. The City Manager asked if it is correct that they will come back (to the MSFI Committee) later once they have raised the money to ask for it to be accepted so they can execute (the project). Ms. Fisk-Hennessey replied yes.

4) Presentation: Martell Court Force Main Evaluation - Public Works Director

Bryan Ruoff, City Engineer, stated that this agenda item is a culmination of over a year of preliminary engineering work. He continued that in 2022, the City’s knife gate (valve) in the Martell Court pump station failed. That failure shed light on the vulnerability of the existing wastewater collection system. They built into the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) in FY22 a detailed inspection and analysis of the pipe, put that out for RFQ, and selected Wright-Pierce to execute that project. Kevin (Garvey) from Wright-Pierce is here and will go into more detail of the results of the analysis and the recommendations. Essentially, all wastewater collection in the City of Keene gets directed to the Martell Court Pump Station, which then extends two miles by

a single force main with no redundancies to the City's Wastewater Treatment Plant. He has joked that it is arguably one of the largest, most important assets to the City, but it is serious – without it, it would take about 30 minutes before wastewater would start being discharged into the river.

Mr. Ruoff continued that with this assessment, they wanted to determine how much time they had with the current condition of the force main, and what corrective actions would be recommended based on that. He asked to hear from Kevin (Garvey), Project Manager with Wright-Pierce.

Kevin Garvey stated that to give a brief overview of his slideshow presentation tonight, they will discuss the services area, and to reiterate, what is important is the whole City flows to one pipeline. He continued that (next is) the emergency response plan, which was an earlier piece of the program that led to this project; the valve failure, which Mr. Ruoff mentioned; the internal inspections in 2024; and the external inspections this year. They (Wright-Pierce) did an alternative analysis, and then they have some recommendations.

Mr. Garvey continued that the services area is the whole City, about 100 miles of pipe and 2,000 manholes, including parts of the town of Marlborough. The station typically sees about 3 million gallons of flow a day, with a six million gallons design flow. The peak flow is 21 million gallons of flow. The pipeline is about two miles long. Everything flows to this one pipeline; there is no redundancy. Regarding the history of the program, back in 2022, the City hired Wright-Pierce to do an Emergency Response Plan and pump station evaluations for all the stations in the City. It also included a rough force main screening technology. That program looked at each pump station, and then specifically this force main had some high-level screening ideas to provide funding for the next phase.

Mr. Garvey continued that there are two main ways to inspect a pipeline – the inside of the pipe and the outside of the pipe. The program Wright-Pierce recommended for the City included both the internal and external inspections. Some (methods for internal inspections) are more expensive. Sonar inspections are about \$10,000. Coupons (the cutting of a little window into the pipe) cost about \$60,000 to \$70,000. Then, you pay for bypass pumping, which might be a quarter million dollars for a project this size. In this program, Wright-Pierce recommended the acoustic inspection, which is a sphere that can go in the force main. It allows the force main to stay active, and it can go down the pipeline and identify areas where gas is stuck in the pipeline, which might be a higher vulnerability area. It also identifies areas where gas might be leaking out of the pipeline, which is identification of a potential problem. The "Smart Pig" is identified as one of the recommendations for the future phases of the project.

Mr. Garvey continued that another chart shows the options for external inspections. Wright-Pierce recommended soil testing, test pitting, and ultrasonic testing. Soil testing is to try and understand if there is anything in the soil causing corrosion directly into the pipeline. Test pits give a visual inspection on the actual pipe. The ultrasonic inspection is a direct thickness measurement along the pipeline.

Mr. Garvey continued that the valve failure at the pump station was one of the drivers of this project, and that occurred on June 10, 2023. That identified how problematic it would be if this force main came offline. For the internal inspection, they used a device about the size of a lacrosse ball, which gets put inside the pump station. They did three inspections, and the data was different, not redundant to what they saw on the external inspections, because it was inside the pipeline. There were issues with the ball becoming lodged in the force main for longer than expected. It was supposed to be a three-hour test, but the tests took between three days and three weeks. They are not positive what the ball became stuck on, but in 1990 shortly after the force main was built, a tapping sleeve and valve were installed, and they believe the ball got stuck in that equipment somehow. The challenge is that these (spherical) devices use time to estimate where defects are, so once it became stuck in there, whether it was stuck in this exact location or 20 feet away, it then creates repetitive errors in the data they needed to deal with.

Mr. Garvey continued that regarding the general findings of the internal inspection, there were 16 air pockets. Most were in the first 1,000 feet or so of the force main, and then there were a few spots throughout the rest of the pipeline where they saw them. (Air pockets) are not directly an issue. It just means that the gas in the sewage is more likely to get stuck in that area and then start to corrode the pipeline. Additionally, they found five suspect leaks, which is more of a concern, especially with the errors they got from the ball being stuck in the force main. A suspect leak means they are hearing an air signature on the tool. It is an acoustic tool. It likely means there is air leaving the pipeline, and if it is a large enough hole, wastewater is potentially also leaving the pipeline. It is unknown at this time. When they shared these results with the Public Works Department, they immediately walked over the pipeline to do remedial tests to see if there were any obvious signs of discharges. Nothing was clear and present.

Mr. Garvey continued that that internal program led to the external program, which included three main items. The entire, continuous length of the pipeline had soil testing, and then there was discrete testing of soil in excavation pits. There was pipe wall thickness testing, direct and in excavation pits, both total wall thickness and pitting. Pitting refers to areas where you can see an indent on the outside of the pipe. Regarding those results, you can see in the slides that they have a one foot by one foot grid all down the pipe for the whole length of the pipe. They saw a significant amount of moderate corrosion, which would be expected for a pipeline of this age. The pipe is about 50 years old, and most wastewater pipelines last 50 to 75 years. They saw quite a few areas with 12.5% of wall thickness loss, which is moderate. The worst single one-foot by one-foot area they saw, though, was significant, with a 24% wall thickness loss. Pitting was very minor. With the visual inspection, almost all the corrosion appeared to be not on the outside. They expect it is all internal corrosion.

Mr. Garvey continued that additionally, a much cheaper investigation is the air release structures and drain structures along the force main where there is access to them. Although there is limited access – you will see there are only eight or so inspections of these pipes, versus the 70 inspections for the previous ones – they also had their consultant inspect these pipes for wall

thickness loss. Some of these numbers seem higher, but just a smaller number. Also, they would expect higher internal corrosion at the crown of an air release valve area. That is where they expect all the air to build up. The City has a robust program for maintaining their air release valves, but that is an area where it is known that if you do not maintain them, gas will build up.

Mr. Garvey stated that some of the key information from the external sewer inspection is that Test Pit #1, which is closest to the treatment plant, had the highest single level of corrosion. Test Pit #5, close to the Martell Court Pump Station, had the next highest, at the far ends of the pipe, which is unique. Test Pit #3 had the most significant pitting, but the pitting was relatively minor. As he mentioned previously, they saw corrosion on the crown of the air release valves. Soil was not anticipated to be a significant issue along the force main. They intentionally avoided areas with suspect leaks, mainly because of the bypass challenges they saw during the valve replacement project. They wanted to avoid the potential of a significant bypass on this project.

Mr. Garvey continued that the inspection results led them to three main buckets of recommendations. There are some short-term repairs, looking at those five suspect leaks, some continued force main inspections for the longevity of the pipeline, and then renewing (pipeline) and (adding) redundancy. The short-term recommendation is to line the whole stretch from where they saw the leaks, which are all in a roughly 2,000-foot area. On some past projects, the City has seen that when they repair just a 10- or 20-foot leak, a month or two later something downstream happens with a leak after that, so they are recommending a wider band here. That is typical with ductile iron pipes, where the inside of the pipe pits, and you get little dimples that look like a golf ball. What usually happens is one pops through, and right next to it is another dimple, and another, all around it.

Mr. Garvey continued that the inspection looked at five individual test pits. There is a more robust tool which was not available for this inspection program, given the way the valve and pump station are currently set up. Once that new valve program is online, it would allow them to do a robust inspection of the entire pipeline, so they could see, say, the five worst spots and the five best spots, to help understand if maybe there was another weak spot in the force main, so they are not stuck with an emergency down the road.

Mr. Garvey continued that finally, the main product is the City is likely to install a new force main site to the west of the existing force main, and then for redundancy reasons, lining the existing force main after the fact. Wright-Pierce included some rough costs for this. He believes the bypass product has already been funded. Lining of the suspect leak stretch of the force main would be about \$3.3 million. Pipe Diver Inspection will be about \$660,000 down the road, which will give them an idea of what is going on with the entirety of the force main, to make sure they did not inspect just the good spots or just the bad spots. Follow-up force main inspections would be similar to what they did in this program. One of the challenges is understanding how much time of useful life the force main has. The force main has an internal liner, and right now they only have two data points – the date it was installed, and today. Thus, it is hard to say if the corruptions have been happening consistently over the last 40 or 50 years, or if the liner took 20

years to (start to) corrode and in the last 20 years it has all been happening, which would make the corrosion much quicker. Thus, the recommendation is to do a second inspection, like this one, to understand whether the corrosion is going longer or shorter. They think the worst-case scenario would be that in 10 years, the force main (condition) would be a significant concern. They hope that inspection can happen in five years and they can push the duration further out.

Councilor Filiault stated that he encourages the newer Councilors who have never been to Martell Court to set something up with Public Works and go see it. He continued that his experience, having been on the Council for many years, is that when something breaks down and is expensive, it is at Martell Court. And it cannot wait. Typically, the City Manager does an emergency repair and reports to the Council about it at the next meeting. (Many) times over the years he has been on Council, (something has broken at) Martell Court, and obviously, because of what it is, they cannot have anything break down and allow discharge into our waters. And it is not cheap to repair. He encourages all Councilors who have not yet been to visit Martell Court, the Wastewater Treatment Plant, and the Water Treatment Plant.

Councilor Tobin stated that she heard Mr. Garvey say that corrosion was worse at both ends and that was unusual. She asked if that was just kind of random. Mr. Garvey replied that it was unusual in the sense that this was only five test beds, not a large number of data they are getting on one side of things. He continued that if they were both near each other it would indicate that something is happening in that area of the pipeline, and it is not, in this case. One is happening where the pipeline comes directly out of the pump station, and one is happening way at the very far end. Thus, it is not like they are seeing something happening immediately, like if the pump starts up and it was dragging dirt along the bottom of the force main, and they were seeing that at the beginning of the pump station cycle. (Instead), they were seeing it at the one end and the far end, which was surprising.

Councilor Tobin asked about the importance of redundancy. She asked if that means having a backup. Mr. Garvey replied yes, with the existing pump station, one of the plans of the bypass and the valve project is to put a bypass in around the other side of the river. As part of this project, they put a lot of time into a bypass plan, because if something did go wrong, they had people set up the mechanism to bypass across the river. There was quite a bit of effort put into it during the previous phase. They were trying to look at how to bypass and keep it on the other side of the river, which is an expensive process. With a force main this size, it is important to have some method of redundancy, to take that timeline off of needing something fixed in a few hours or a few minutes, to potentially days, if there is a way to bypass around it.

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

On a vote of 4-0, the Municipal Services, Facilities, and Infrastructure Committee recommends the presentation on the Martell Court Force Main Evaluation be accepted as informational.

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

Don Lussier, Public Works Director, stated that he has a brief update on the Downtown Infrastructure Project. He continued that the most interesting news this month is that the Project Ombudsman (George Downing) has officially started, working about 10 hours a week right now. He spent the first couple of weeks going through the plans, going through the project history, and reviewing all of the documentation of how it got to the point it is at, so he has the background. He participated last week when they did a three-hour walk through the downtown with the consulting team with the plans in hand, taking one final look and double checking everything, making sure they thought through everything. They did find a few things they had not thought about before, so it was a good use of time. Mr. Downing got to know the design team and met a couple of the shop owners while they were walking about.

Mr. Lussier continued that unfortunately, Mr. Downing is off this week, because before the City hired him, he had a vacation scheduled for this week. He will be here next month to meet with the Committee. Next week, when he is back, he will start walking around downtown and introducing himself to business owners and property owners, starting to create those relationships.

Mr. Lussier continued that in other news, two weeks ago they received the last of the permits they need for this project. Due to the size of the project, they needed an Alteration of Terrain permit. It is a way that the Department of Environmental Services (DES) regulates projects that disturb over 100,000 square feet of earth. They are looking to make sure the City is not creating an erosion control problem, damaging stormwater, discharging mud into local rivers, or that sort of thing. The draft final bid documents are on (his) desk right now. Bryan Ruoff met with the Water/Sewer Team to review all of the utilities today. He will spend a couple of hours going through them with the Highway team in the next week or so.

Mr. Lussier continued that he met with the Rotary Club last week, talking about the banner program. (Downtown) has banners on lampposts, a program which the Rotary Club operates for the City under an agreement. They are talking about things like whether the hardware the Rotary uses now is worth saving, or if they should replace it, how many banners they want to have in the new program, and that sort of thing.

Mr. Lussier continued that all said, he thinks they are in good shape to advertise in the fall as planned. Everything is looking good. He is happy to answer questions.

Councilor Favolise thanked Mr. Lussier for the update. He continued that he appreciates the commitment to the monthly updates, which is an important part of the process and transparency for the Council and public. They had had a conversation about the green color costing a lot of money for the bike lanes. He asked if there is additional information about that. Mr. Lussier replied that he was not quite ready to give the Committee a formal recommendation or suggestion, but he will suggest that the green bike lanes be done in a dark grey color instead. He

continued that green was selected because it is the standard, accepted color for bike facilities, like what they have in Central Square right now, but instead, they will propose that every couple hundred feet, they have a green box painted onto the bike lane with the bike symbol, to make it very clear to people that that is the bike lane. They could not find a more cost-effective alternative to making green concrete. It is outrageously expensive.

Councilor Favolise stated that he does not remember, from the position description, who (the Project Ombudsman) reports to. He continued that typically, an ombudsman position reports right to the President's office, at least in higher education, due to the potential for needing to mediate conflicts between people at lower levels of the organization. Mr. Lussier replied that formally the position reports to the Public Works Director. He continued that the construction team is managed by the City Engineer. The consultant that will have the inspectors overseeing the work, the consultant that did the design, that is Mr. Ruoff's role. His (the Public Works Director's) role will be to make the two sides play together. The Ombudsman represents the community and the tenants, and the City Engineer represents having to get this job constructed, and he (the Public Works Director) has to bridge that, with the advice and consent of the City Manager.

Councilor Favolise stated that it was around this time last year that the City heard back about their grant application. He asked if Mr. Lussier has any idea of a timeline on that. Mr. Lussier replied that he was hoping that would be announced soon, but it has not been announced as of today. He continued that the notice of funding opportunity that announced the grant gave a deadline for making that announcement as June 28. Thus, by Friday afternoon, they should know.

The City Manager stated that they did learn today that the grant application the City put in to Senator Shaheen's office for the downtown project, which is specifically for sidewalks, bike lanes, and lights, has moved forward. She continued that it is on the list for just over \$2.8 million, Congressionally directed, which is great news.

Councilor Filiault replied that that is great news. He continued that he knows the public has been asking when they will be sending it out to bid. Mr. Lussier replied that they are looking at late September to mid-October. He continued that they have not set a specific date yet.

Councilor Filiault asked if there were any further questions or comments. Hearing none, he asked for a motion.

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

On a vote of 4-0, the Municipal Services, Facilities, and Infrastructure Committee accepted the Verbal Update on the Downtown Infrastructure Project as informational.

6) Relating to Prohibited Parking in Proximity to Driveways - O-2025-22

Mr. Lussier stated that this is the follow-up to the many discussions about parking on Court St. and Washington St. He continued that when they last met, they talked about drafting an Ordinance that would restrict parking within 10 feet of a driveway in non-residential zones. His suggestion is to clarify the current Ordinance, which just says “close to” a driveway. He would like to have a definition of “close to” nailed down. The Ordinance in tonight’s agenda packet would define “close to” as “five feet” for any residential zone and “within 10 feet” of a driveway for all other zones. He has a graphic he quickly created to show the non-residential zones that this would apply to. The City Manager mentioned earlier that this is looking at Court St. and Washington St. first and foremost. Once Marlboro St. is finally reconstructed, he thinks it would apply to that area as well. It looks like a lot of the City is in that non-residential zone, but most of that is rural zones or conservation zones. Most of the areas they are looking at being applicable really do not have or use on-street parking to any real extent. He thinks it is fair to say that this is primarily focused on Court St., Washington St., and Marlboro St. The Ordinance defines “five feet” for residential zones, which are the areas shown in yellow. Earlier tonight, they talked about Church St. The area of Church St. they are talking about is one of those residential zones, so that would be a five-foot setback for that area.

Councilor Workman stated that they always talk about enforcement, and whether Ordinances can be enforced. She asked Mr. Lussier to explain, for the public, how he envisions this being enforceable. Mr. Lussier replied that the authority to enforce parking restrictions is with the Police Department. He continued that it is certainly not the case that they cannot enforce any parking prohibitions that the City has, it is more a matter of priority and staffing, he would assume, although he does not speak for the Police Chief. He does not know that this will be the Police Department’s highest priority or the best use of their time always. The City can certainly put up signs, and they are enforceable, and he thinks that in most cases, people will follow the rules if they know them.

Councilor Workman asked if it is correct that if there were a place of concern, a bystander would notify the Police, and they could take it up that way. Mr. Lussier replied yes, he thinks they would probably say that they enforce parking restrictions the same way Public Works enforces things like roadway or sidewalk obstructions. They do not have staff to patrol the streets and look for people who are blocking the roadway, but if someone calls them and reports, say, a construction vehicle parked on the roadway, the Department sends someone out and tells the vehicle to move along.

Councilor Favolise stated that if he recalls correctly from previous meetings, the five feet (from driveways in a residential zone) is just codifying the current practice. He asked if that is correct. Mr. Lussier replied yes, they have informally used that as a rule of thumb; it just had not been defined properly. Councilor Favolise stated that parking tends to generate a lot of interest in the community. He asked, for the sake of the public, if it is correct that they will not be losing parking in residential zones because of this (Ordinance change). Mr. Lussier replied no, this

would not change anything in residential zones beyond what they are doing today. He continued that it would change the setback in the non-residential zones, and really where it applies are the Court St. and Washington St. areas.

Councilor Tobin asked if the “no parking” zones would have different markings on the street. Mr. Lussier replied that where they delineate individual parking stalls, like Court St. and Washington St. up to a certain point, those markings will have to be revised. He continued that the Public Works Department had staff refrain from marking them this spring with the rest of the pavement markings, knowing this Ordinance was on its way. When they re-mark them, they will have to black out some markings and readjust. There might be a section of curb line that used to accommodate three vehicles, but because now two of them need to be a little closer, it will only accommodate two vehicles. Not everywhere in the City has marked parking stalls. On most residential streets, the City does not mark those individual parking stalls.

Councilor Tobin asked, for clarification, if a “no parking” zone would have diagonal lines. Mr. Lussier replied where it is marked, yes.

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

On a vote of 4-0, the Municipal Services, Facilities, and Infrastructure Committee recommends the adoption of Ordinance O-2025-22.

7) Adjournment

There being no further business, Councilor Filiault adjourned the meeting at 7:39 PM.

Respectfully submitted by,
Britta Reida, Minute Taker

Edits submitted by,
Kathleen Richards, Deputy City Clerk