



## **ASHUELOT RIVER PARK ADVISORY BOARD MEETING AGENDA**

Tuesday, March 10, 2026 at 8:15 AM  
Room 22 Recreation Center

### Members:

Paul Bocko, Chair  
Suzy Krautmann, Vice-Chair  
Leslie Casey  
Dian Mathews  
Kelly Cook  
Arthur “Bud” Winsor  
Thomas Haynes (Alternate)

### Staff:

Carrah Fisk Hennessey, Parks & Recreation Director  
Bryan Ruoff, City Engineer

### Agenda:

1. Welcome and Call to Order
2. Approval of February 10, 2026 Meeting Minutes
3. Ashuelot River Dam – Bryan Ruoff, City Engineer
  - a. Feedback Collection
4. Friends of Ashuelot River Park Arboretum Report
5. Finance Report
  - a. Calendar Year 2026 Budget
6. Project Tracking
  - a. Permanent Sign
  - b. Bird Ecology
7. Recent/Upcoming Events
  - a. Pollinator Palooza – day change – Saturday 6/27/26 11am-2pm
8. New/Other Business
9. Adjourn – Next Meeting scheduled for Tuesday, March 10, 2026



**CY 2025 Budget Review**

Total Budget \$14,500 (Trust Funded)

Expenditures \$7727.01

Phil's Tree \$2850 – Siberian Elm Excavation

Bartlett Tree \$1507.28 – Arboretum Pruning

Bartlett Tree \$1243.38 – Arboretum Root Invigoration

Bartlett Tree \$1172.33 – Arboretum Soil Removal and Mulch Application

Balance \$6772.99

Budget Lines: Landscaping (\$4000)

Replanting Program (\$500)

Bartlett Tree (\$9000)

Invasive Treatment (\$1000)

**CY 2026 Budget Proposal**

Total Budget \$12,300 (Trust Funded)

Budget Lines: Landscaping (\$1500)

Replanting Program (\$500)

Bartlett Tree (\$5500)

Tree Removal (\$1500)

Educational Signage (\$2300)

Invasive Treatment (\$1000)

City of Keene  
New Hampshire

ASHUELOT RIVER PARK ADVISORY BOARD  
MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday, February 10, 2026

8:15 AM

Room 22,  
Recreation Center

Members Present:

Kelly Cook  
Arthur Winsor  
Leslie Casey  
Paul Bocko, Chair  
Suzy Krautmann, Vice Chair

Staff Present:

Carrah Fisk-Hennessey, Parks and Recreation  
Director  
Bryan Ruoff, City Engineer

Members Not Present:

Dian Mathews  
Thomas Haynes, Alternate

1) Welcome and Call to Order

Chair Bocko called the meeting to order at 8:15 AM. Roll call was conducted. Chair Bocko stated that they need to add an agenda item to elect a chair and vice chair.

2) Approval of January 13, 2026 Meeting Minutes

Regarding the Minute Taker’s question on Line 13 about Kate’s last name, ARPAB members stated that they do not know.

Regarding lines 271 and 272, ARPAB members questioned whether “charette” is the correct term, and others replied yes. ARBAB members asked if “the Rhode Island School of Design” is correct, and others replied yes.

Ms. Cook made a motion to approve the meeting minutes of January 13, 2026. Ms. Krautmann seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 4 to 0. Mr. Winsor abstained.

Chair Bocko stated that they need to elect a chair and vice chair.

Ms. Casey nominated Paul Bocko for Chair. Mr. Winsor seconded the nomination, which passed by unanimous vote.

32 Ms. Cook nominated Suzy Krautmann as Vice Chair. Mr. Winsor seconded the motion, which  
33 passed by unanimous vote.

34

35 **3) Ashuelot River Dam – Bryan Ruoff, City Engineer**

36

37 Chair Bocko welcomed Bryan Ruoff, City Engineer.

38

39 Mr. Ruoff stated that the reason he is here today is that the Engineering Division, as part of one  
40 of the planned CIP improvements, bid the design services, publicly requesting proposals from  
41 engineers for either the repair or the removal of the Ashuelot River Dam. He continued that  
42 through the bidding process from the engineering consultants, they discovered that the scope of  
43 doing an “and/or” added a lot of cost and a lot of permitting uncertainty that would require more  
44 studies for the design. The Engineering Division is always looking to maximize the tax dollars  
45 that go to projects. They did not award the project, based on the qualifications they received.  
46 Instead, they are now doing public outreach associated with the two options for this work.

47

48 Mr. Ruoff continued that to back up a little, in 2009, the City received a letter of deficiency from  
49 the NH Department of Environmental Services (NHDES), regarding the existing dam. Some of  
50 the problems the City could address on its own, such as vegetation, maintenance, and minor  
51 repairs. Others were problems the City could not address in house, like seepage around the  
52 gates, seepage through the existing stone masonry structure, and leakage through the gate valves  
53 for the system. The City did everything to address that NHDES letter not to incur fines, and now  
54 they are looking to move forward on finalizing the repair or removal of the dam. From an  
55 engineering standpoint, looking at the data that has been compiled to date, there are pros and  
56 cons with each decision.

57

58 From their standpoint as engineers, there is not necessarily an impact, as far as flood water  
59 downstream, which you would normally imagine in removing a dam. The whole intent of a dam  
60 is that it holds back water so it does not travel downstream too fast. As part of the investigation,  
61 NHDES performed a 100 Year Flood Spillway Analysis and identified that in the 100-year flood  
62 event, which dams are designed for, there is no increase in outflow from this structure from what  
63 comes in. Essentially, what comes in comes out. Thus, from an engineering perspective, it does  
64 not make a difference whether it is removed or not.

65

66 Mr. Ruoff continued that the stone and masonry structure was constructed in 1919. As with the  
67 bridges that were constructed in the 1920s, they are at the point where they have to do something  
68 with them. Planned into the CIP, the City has money to do the more expensive option, which is  
69 repairs and modifications to the existing structure. Either way, whether the decision is to repair  
70 or remove the structure, there will be some kind of infrastructure implemented that meets  
71 NHDES requirements. That would be some kind of aquatic habitat interconnectivity, and some  
72 kind of fish ladder would be designed either way.

73

74 Mr. Ruoff continued that in response to the NHDES’s letter of deficiency, in 2012, the City  
75 commissioned a study by an engineer consultant, DuBois & King. DuBois & King did some  
76 preliminary hydrology and hydraulic calculations to determine what the impacts would be and  
77 did some conceptual designs, which the pictures do not do justice. The pictures show a flat river

78 through the area, which would not be the case. There would still be some kind of spillway  
79 because there is a 15-foot vertical drop between where the water level is now at the higher level  
80 and the lower level.

81  
82 DuBois & King identified the pros and cons of removal, because essentially, repairing and  
83 modifying the dam would result in the same infrastructure that is there, just improved to meet  
84 NHDES's requirements. DuBois & King cited that the flood elevation at the spillway, which is  
85 at the park area, would be reduced vertically by about four feet. Continuing upwards on that tail  
86 water condition, about halfway to the overpass where Rt. 9 goes over the road, at that point, there  
87 would be no improvements to flooding. So, about halfway from the spillway to Rt. 9, there is  
88 about a two-foot vertical difference on the floodplain. To the north of the spillway, all of that is  
89 in the floodplain. The entire river corridor is in the floodplain. To the north, most of the area  
90 adjacent to the river is existing wetlands, so with the removal of the dam, there is some benefit in  
91 the floodwater elevations. There could also be unknown impacts to the wetlands. It could  
92 potentially reduce the wetlands storage and associated aquatic life; they do not know. It would  
93 have to be studied. But it is likely that that would happen – if there was less water backing up,  
94 there would be fewer amphibious creatures.

95  
96 Mr. Ruoff continued that a pro DuBois & King identified was there would be an eight-mile  
97 connectivity of the fish stream of the Ashuelot River. There would no longer be a stopping point  
98 as there is now, at the pond and the spillway. It would be continuous for eight miles to the next  
99 dam, which would be the next impoundment point. A benefit to removal would be aquatic life  
100 continuity, but the downside would be that some aquatic creatures need greater depth for  
101 spawning.

102  
103 Mr. Ruoff stated that the Engineering Division is looking for the ARPAB's feedback on what  
104 their preference would be. They do not need to come to consensus. He is looking for the  
105 ARPAB's feedback on what could be included in the scope. For example, the Engineering  
106 Division is looking at the potential scope of removing the spillway of the dam. With that, he  
107 sees no reason to remove the masonry blocks on either side of the spillway. They look good, and  
108 they are acting as a retaining wall. If replacing it, they would put in more modern retaining wall  
109 which would not work, in his opinion, with the historical look that it has now. That is an  
110 example of the type of feedback the Engineering Division is looking for, to clarify the scope, so  
111 they can ask an engineer to design this for construction and address all of NHDES's concerns.  
112 They call this existing structure a "dam," but it actually does not meet NHDES's  
113 definition/criteria for a dam, which is one of the reasons why NHDES is saying the City has to  
114 do something with it.

115  
116 Mr. Ruoff asked for questions or feedback.

117  
118 ARPAB members replied that the Ashuelot River has an endangered species, the dwarf wedge  
119 mussel, and asked if they have looked into how that species would be affected. Mr. Ruoff  
120 replied that as part of the Lower Winchester St. project, staff identified that in that area. He  
121 continued that a study would need to be done to see what would need to be done to maintain the  
122 habitat for the dwarf wedge mussel. That would be included, regardless of whether the dam was  
123 removed or repaired.

124  
125 Mr. Winsor spoke about the soothing sound of the dam and how it softens the traffic noise of  
126 West St. He continued that this waterfall is incredibly beautiful and he would hate to see it go.  
127 He prefers the City do everything it can to keep it.  
128  
129 Mr. Ruoff replied yes, he should have said, a con would be the loss of the waterfall aesthetic, its  
130 historic significance, and its sound. Others agreed that the waterfall and its soothing sounds are  
131 important, noting that it is an asset in the Ashuelot River Park Master Plan.  
132  
133 Ms. Casey stated that at the charette, one option was to have staggered boulders in the part  
134 beyond where the dam was removed, which might sound like water rushing over stones in a  
135 brook. Others agreed that they were interested in whether that would be an option. Mr. Ruoff  
136 replied that it would need to be, because there is a 15-foot drop. He continued that something  
137 will need to transition that water to the lower level. There would still be a spillway of sorts,  
138 although not as loud as a waterfall. It would not have that cascading feature, but it would have a  
139 more natural look. It is likely what the City would need to implement for NHDES to permit the  
140 changes.  
141  
142 In response to a question about what a fish ladder would look like, and whether that could  
143 replace the waterfall, Mr. Ruoff replied yes, it would be in place of the waterfall. He continued  
144 that you build up stream bed material at a certain slope where the fish are able to work their way  
145 back up that instead of trying to jump 15 feet. The incline would be gradual enough to allow fish  
146 to travel up it. Some version of a fish ladder will be installed, whether the dam is removed or  
147 not.  
148  
149 Ms. Cook asked if he is saying removal is less expensive. Mr. Ruoff replied yes, removal of the  
150 structure is identified as about 25% less expensive than repairing, rehabilitating, and modifying  
151 the structure. Ms. Casey stated that that would essentially be a permanent solution. She  
152 continued that 100 years from now, there would be no need to do repairs. Mr. Ruoff replied that  
153 that is a great point – if the decision is to repair and modify the structure, at some point in the  
154 future, it will have to be revisited.  
155  
156 Mr. Winsor restated that he would hate to see the dam go. He continued that as Mr. Ruoff  
157 mentioned, it is part of Keene’s manufacturing history. It is important to try and maintain. Chair  
158 Bocko stated that he is happy to hear Mr. Ruoff is already thinking about how they would not  
159 need to remove the stone masonry, even if the dam is removed. That historical evidence would  
160 be there, which is important for education. Others agreed.  
161  
162 In response to a question about whether bedrock is under that 15-foot drop, Mr. Ruoff replied  
163 that he does not think it is bedrock right at the splash point. He continued that there are boulders  
164 and cobbles, and there is a certain depth of stream bed material, about two or three feet, and that  
165 under that is likely more of a defined bedrock.  
166  
167 In response to a question about what effect removal of the dam would have on the water level  
168 that is generally seen at the park, Mr. Ruoff replied that the pond level would be about four feet  
169 lower, which is significant. He continued that further up, by about the hospital, the water level in

170 the river would be about two feet lower. It would decrease the footprint of flood area. Canoeing  
171 would be difficult. There would not be that deep pool anymore; it would be more a continuous  
172 flow.

173  
174 ARPAB members asked if water birds would be affected. Mr. Ruoff replied that they would  
175 likely be impacted. He continued that the Infrastructure Project Manager reminded him that fire  
176 training would be affected, too, along with paddle sports. If the dam were eliminated, it might  
177 not eliminate the possibility of paddle sports, but it would put restrictions on it, for sure, and it  
178 would not be the same as it is now.

179  
180 Ms. Krautmann asked if Mr. Ruoff will be going before the Monadnock Conservancy. Mr.  
181 Ruoff replied yes, staff wants their input. He continued that they are seeking the ARPAB's  
182 feedback first, and then staff would want to present it to Council and other committees and even  
183 have public hearings. In the public hearing, they would want to say what the ARPAB and  
184 Council recommend, to make sure everyone is fully understanding and educated about the issues.  
185 They do not want to get feedback that steers the direction of the project in a way that does not  
186 meet objectives of the committees and Council.

187  
188 Councilor Haas stated that removal would mean loss of wetlands upstream, but creation of  
189 wetlands where the pond is now. He continued that the shoreline of the pond goes away, and the  
190 stream is there, but the shoreline probably would become wetlands. Discussion continued.

191  
192 Ms. Fisk-Hennessey asked what it would look like in drought conditions. Mr. Ruoff replied that  
193 it would look rather bare, and you would probably see things you have not seen before in there.  
194 Chair Bocko replied that as climate change continues, the conditions will be variable, not  
195 necessarily just increased drought. Mr. Ruoff stated that the letter of deficiency came in 2009,  
196 and he questions the accuracy of the flow numbers in it. He continued that he did some quick  
197 calculations and found that current conditions are about a 33% increase from the 2009 flow  
198 conditions. There is variability of extreme storms, as it seems like they get no storms and then a  
199 massive storm. When he started his engineering career, they designed for the two-year storm  
200 event. Now they design for the 50-year storm event.

201  
202 Chair Bocko stated that he was thinking that regardless of whether the dam is removed or  
203 repaired, there is an opportunity here for education, maybe involving classrooms if they feel so  
204 moved. He asked if there is any opportunity for that interpretation in the funding, or if this is just  
205 straight up structural. Mr. Ruoff replied that he thinks there is an opportunity for education. He  
206 continued that they have been approached by a couple of schools, for students doing various  
207 projects and the City is open to facilitating student projects. He wishes they received more of  
208 those requests, because there is a lot more that can be uncovered by multiple people looking at  
209 the same problem. Chair Bocko replied that he is glad to hear that, and maybe the ARPAB can  
210 help promote those educational opportunities.

211  
212 Mr. Winsor asked how soon Mr. Ruoff thinks something will have to be done with the dam. Mr.  
213 Ruoff replied that money is allocated for FY 27, which starts in July. He continued that  
214 however, he does not think they will realistically be ready for construction for at least 18 months.  
215 The necessary permitting and studies will likely take at least a year, maybe two. They also need

216 strong public feedback, and they need everything to be well-documented to explain why the City  
217 makes the decision that it makes. It needs to be well understood both by the public and by the  
218 permitting agencies, because this is the type of project that is difficult to permit. It has potential  
219 environmental impacts either way, and all of those need to be accounted for. He thinks the  
220 construction could potentially be in 2028, depending on the engineering studies and  
221 environmental studies.

222  
223 Ms. Krautmann stated that back in 2009 or so, the University of Rhode Island was looking into  
224 whether the dam could generate power again. She asked if that is going anywhere. Mr. Ruoff  
225 replied no, not right now. He continued that it was determined to not be feasible for that  
226 location, given the permitting and all the aspects that would be necessary. It seemed like it was  
227 going to happen, and then they decided it was not going to make sense. Discussion continued.  
228 Ms. Krautmann stated that she wonders if it could be feasible now, since things have changed  
229 since 2009 and there have been advances with solar. Mr. Ruoff replied that he will check the file  
230 to see what information they have. He continued that if the same constraints are around today, it  
231 is unlikely to be implemented, but if changes to technology or changes to the flow have changed  
232 the feasibility of it, the selected consultant could potentially review that as part of the study.  
233 Discussion continued about the flows. Mr. Ruoff noted that there is huge variation between the  
234 high flows and low flows. He continued that due to climate change, they are getting more  
235 drought periods, along with an occasional heavy, intense storm, and designing something to  
236 utilize that, at this location, probably does not make sense.

237  
238 Mr. Ruoff stated that today's conversation was to get the ARPAB members thinking about these  
239 issues. He continued that he is happy to come back to the next meeting, if the ARPAB wants, for  
240 any follow-up. He has questionnaires for people to fill out sometime after the meeting, regarding  
241 what their preferences would be. Then, staff would be looking for a summary from the ARPAB,  
242 via the meeting minutes or a short memo, on what their recommendation is for moving forward.  
243 He thinks the next logical step would be to present at the Heritage Commission and the City  
244 Council, with a summary of input received from the ARPAB, and then a presentation to the  
245 public. NHDES will provide an updated letter of deficiency, based on the current NHDES  
246 regulations, expected by the end of March. Staff would then look to readvertise for engineering  
247 services based on the feedback they received and the revised scope, in early to mid June.

248  
249 Chair Bocko asked if it would be okay for the ARPAB to get him the memo in a month, or if Mr.  
250 Ruoff needs it sooner. Mr. Ruoff replied that a month is fine.

251

#### 252 **4) Friends of Ashuelot River Park Arboretum Report**

253  
254 Ms. Casey stated that last time the Friends met, they went over what money they have and what  
255 plants they have. She continued that they have some plants that are ready to go into the park,  
256 and money for some shrubs and possibly more seedlings, but they are also thinking about the  
257 "soft landing" concept where they put layered vegetation around the base of trees, especially  
258 ones like oaks that have a lot of invertebrate life in their canopies. That helps them overwinter  
259 and gives them a way to complete their life cycle. When they talk about their budget, they will  
260 consider money for at least a proof of concept for a soft landing. That will be good for  
261 educational purposes, too. The Friends are looking to work with the various garden clubs to get

262 everyone under one umbrella, working towards implementation of the master plan. They are  
263 looking into becoming a registered arboretum. Mr. Winsor replied that that is a difficult process,  
264 but it can happen.

265  
266 Ms. Casey continued that the snow is again piling up (where the accessible parking spaces are).  
267 Ms. Fisk-Hennessey replied that she reached out to the Mascoma Bank manager this morning.

268  
269 Ms. Casey stated that one more thing to report is that the Caterpillar Lab has a movie coming  
270 out, which should be interesting. She continued that they do not have the date yet.

271

- 272 **6) Project Tracking**  
273 **A) Permanent Sign**  
274 **B) Bird Ecology**

275  
276 Chair Bocko stated that they will address the 6<sup>th</sup> agenda item before the 5<sup>th</sup>, because he thinks  
277 these two projects – the permanent sign, and bird ecology – are relevant to the budget discussion.  
278 He continued that the ARPAB has said at least a couple of times that the permanent sign project  
279 needs a working group.

280

- 281 **7) Recent/Upcoming Events**  
282 **a. Pollinator Palooza – Day Change – Saturday 6/27/26 11 AM to 2 PM**

283  
284 Ms. Fisk-Hennessey stated that the Cheshire County Conservation District always runs the  
285 Pollinator Palooza at Ashuelot River Park. She continued that they have typically run it during  
286 the week. This time, they requested to be able to use the park on a Saturday in hopes of  
287 improving foot traffic.

288

289 Chair Bocko asked if there were any other events to talk about.

290

291 Mr. Winsor stated that the Monadnock Conservancy building is going up quickly. He continued  
292 that they hope to be in there by June. He looked at the landscape plan and saw that it is rather  
293 generic. The Monadnock Conservancy gave him permission to come up with some climate-  
294 resilient trees, to be like a showcase for what you should plant in your yard, just like the park is.  
295 At the last meeting, they discussed climate-resilient trees, and when you stop and look, you  
296 realize that not a lot of research has been done yet, but it is starting. The idea is for the  
297 Monadnock Conservancy's landscaping to complement what the park has, and to keep it a  
298 learning place.

299

300 Discussion continued. Ms. Fisk-Hennessey stated that someone anonymously donated \$35,000  
301 to develop a concept design for the other section of the green space where the Conservancy is.

302

- 303 **8) Finance Report**  
304 **a. Calendar Year 2026 Budget (Trustees in March)**

305

306 Chair Bocko stated that the finance report is in the agenda packet. Ms. Fisk-Hennessey stated  
307 that this year, the ARPAB had \$14,500 - trust funded. She continued that she is passing out

308 copies of the updated estimate from Bartlett Tree. She and Mr. Winsor can talk a little bit about  
309 the meeting they had with James Tatum. The ARPAB has spent \$7,700. They currently have a  
310 balance of \$6,772. She put in what their lines were when they entered this calendar year budget  
311 cycle, but they entered this calendar year budget cycle in June. She wants to remind everyone  
312 that she was under the impression that it was a fiscal year calendar that mirrored the City with a  
313 July 1 start, but she was informed that it was not; it is a calendar year budget with a January 1  
314 start. They are already a month into this caldenar year, and she would like to be able to present to  
315 the Trustees in March so that they can move forward with what they would like to use, and how.  
316 As a reminder, the budget is a percentage of the interest that comes in from the trust.

317  
318 Regarding a question of whether the \$5,500 from Bartlett Tree is on target, Mr. Winsor and Ms.  
319 Fisk-Hennessey both replied yes, they think so. ARPAB members noted that \$5,500 is a much  
320 lower figure than the last one. Mr. Winsor replied that apparently, they are up to speed with the  
321 inventory, which is good news.

322  
323 Chair Bocko stated that something he would like to put on the table, partly because there is less  
324 needed for Bartlett Tree this year, is the idea of the ARPAB allocating some money for the  
325 permanent sign project, and if possible, also some money to actually implement the bird ecology  
326 project. He continued that he does not think he could get an estimate ready for that, but they  
327 could reasonably allocate some money for it.

328  
329 Friends members asked whether invasive species treatment will still come out of this budget, or  
330 if that is now done through Public Works. Ms. Fisk-Hennessey replied that hopefully, it is more  
331 of a City-wide initiative now, but she thinks it would be smart for the ARPAB to keep some  
332 money for invasive species in reserve within this budget, because the park is an important facet  
333 and amenity for the city. Friends members replied that \$1,000 seems reasonable, and Ms. Fisk-  
334 Hennessey agreed.

335  
336 Regarding landscaping, Friends members stated that mulch will essentially be free now, from the  
337 City. They discussed whether they are okay with compost for this year or whether they will need  
338 more and spoke positively about the compost they got from Mr. Anderson last year. Friends  
339 members stated that budgeting \$500 for compost would probably be reasonable. The Friends  
340 continued that they think \$1,000 would be reasonable to budget for the “soft landings,” in the  
341 “replanting” or “landscaping” category.

342  
343 Mr. Winsor asked if they should budget for potential tree removal, because there might be some  
344 trees that need to be thinned out. Discussion ensued and ARPAB members agreed that \$1,500  
345 for a tree to be removed seems reasonable.

346  
347 Chair Bocko asked if landscaping is staying at \$4,000. Ms. Fisk-Hennessey and others replied  
348 no, that can be brought down to \$1,500. Chair Bocko continued that Bartlett Tree is at \$5,500.  
349 Ms. Fisk-Hennessey replied that she will double check on the inventory. She and Mr. Winsor  
350 were both surprised that Bartlett Tree shared that the inventory had been done. If it has not,  
351 ARPAB might need to add about \$2,000 for the inventory.

352

353 In response to a question about Mr. Winsor's idea for tree identification tags, Mr. Winsor replied  
354 that he has not done much with that yet, but he thinks it would cost around \$300.

355  
356 Continuing down the list, Chair Bocko asked if \$500 for replanting is correct, and \$1,000 for  
357 invasive treatment. Others replied yes. Chair Bocko continued that he proposes adding \$2,000  
358 for educational signage, and they could add \$300 to that for tags. He heard others propose a tree  
359 removal for \$1,500. He has not done the math, but all of that together gives them a budget that  
360 would be well under last year's \$14,500. Others replied that it sounds reasonable and  
361 comprehensive.

362  
363 Friends asked whether the cost of the water pump will come out of the City's budget. Ms. Fisk-  
364 Hennessey replied yes.

365  
366 Friends asked whether Chair Bocko's proposed \$2,000 for the signage includes hiring an outside  
367 person to do the sign's design. Mr. Winsor replied that contrary to last month's discussion of  
368 how Peter Poanessa would not do the design, he thinks Mr. Poanessa would, if the ARPAB gave  
369 him the right information. He continued that it is more that the ARPAB did not want Mr.  
370 Poanessa to take complete license of designing it and wanted to have a rough idea of what they,  
371 the ARPAB, wanted with the timeline and photos. Discussion ensued about the importance of  
372 the ARPAB being very clear with what they give to Mr. Poanessa so he understands what it is  
373 the ARPAB wants. Ms. Fisk-Hennessey stated that another option is to seek assistance from  
374 graphic design students at Keene State College.

375  
376 Chair Bocko stated that he thinks they have done a good job with the budget today. He  
377 continued that they do not have it written in front of them today, so the question is whether they  
378 can run with it now, or if they need to vote on it next time. Ms. Fisk-Hennessey replied that she  
379 feels like the ARPAB has given her enough information today, so it is up to the ARPAB whether  
380 they are comfortable voting for the budget today, or if they want her to email the budget and the  
381 ARPAB can give consensus that way. Chair Bocko replied that he thinks they should do it  
382 through email. Others agreed.

383

384 **9) New/Other Business**

385

386 **10) Adjourn – Next Meeting Scheduled for Tuesday, March 10, 2026**

387

388 **11) Adjournment**

389

390 There being no further business, Chair Bocko adjourned the meeting at 9:18 AM.

391

392 Respectfully submitted by,  
393 Britta Reida, Minute Taker

394

395 Reviewed and edited by,  
396 Carrah Fisk-Hennessey, Parks & Recreation Director

397