City of Keene
New Hampshire

BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAN PATH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Wednesday, September 9, 2026 **8:15 AM** **2nd Floor Conference Room, City Hall**

Members Present:
Dwight Fischer, Chair
Councilor Edward Haas, Vice Chair
Brian Phillips (Arrived at 8:28 AM)
Rowland Russell
Charles Redfern
Jacob Robertson
Michael Davern, Alternate (Arrived at 8:20 AM)
Diana Duffy, Alternate
Andy Holte, Alternate
David Mast, Alternate (Arrived at 8:22 AM)

Staff Present:
Jason Nadeau, Parks & Recreation Programmer

Members Not Present:
Samantha Jackson

1. Call to Order

Chair Fischer called the meeting to order at 8:16 AM.

2. Adoption of Minutes – August 12, 2026

Ms. Duffy appreciated the clarity of the minutes. A motion by Vice Chair Haas to adopt the August 12, 2026 meeting minutes was duly seconded by Dr. Russell and the motion carried unanimously.

Chair Fischer thanked Vice Chair Haas for leading the previous meeting.

3. Safety & Outreach

a. Review Upcoming Schedule of Events

Staff Liaison, Jason Nadeau, reported that A Week Without Driving was coming up at the end of September. Chair Fischer said he did not see anything in the previous minutes about truly formulating A Week Without Driving. Others agreed that the Committee would just support it. Vice Chair Haas noted that Southwest Region Planning Commission Monadnock Region Mobility Manager, Lisa Steadman, would still be arranging associated activities, one of which was buttons/stickers that Vice Chair Haas shared with the Committee as a means of promotion.

He said Ms. Steadman was shifting the message a bit from A Week Without Driving to acknowledging what one would have to do if they had no automobile.

Mr. Davern arrived at 8:20 AM.

b. Annual Report to City Council

Chair Fischer noted that the Annual Report was in the meeting packet and ready to adopt.

A motion by Vice Chair Haas was duly seconded by Mr. Redfern to adopt the Annual Report as written, with Mr. Holte's name corrected throughout, and to submit it to the City Council immediately and with a request for Chair Fischer to speak about it personally at an appropriate committee meeting. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Mast arrived at 8:22 AM.

c. E-Bike Meeting Recap with Dave from BWANH from 9/2/26

Chair Fischer reported that some Committee members and the Mayor had an online meeting with Dave Topham from Bike/Walk Alliance New Hampshire. The Chair said it was a good discussion, and Mr. Topham gave a presentation. Mr. Topham would be coordinating training and outreach in various areas. They have a training program for the City that incorporates education on what is happening with e-motos, e-bikes, and scooters (trends, legislature, etc.). They are looking to go into the high schools and middle schools with the program. Chair Fischer said what they honed in on for this meeting was training and preparation that may be appropriate for the City of Keene municipal offices. Chair Fischer turned it over to Mr. Redfern to discuss what would need to come out of this meeting, next steps, and how the Committee would be steering what aligns with what Bike/Walk Alliance is trying to do.

Mr. Redfern said Mr. Topham mentioned education, legislation, and enforcement. He sent Mr. Redfern an outline, which he passed around to the rest of the Committee. Chair Fischer asked if this would be the first time that Bike/Walk Alliance would be presenting this training. Mr. Redfern replied that Keene would not be the first community. They would be using one other community first in October 2026; he supposed they would not mind doing Keene right after if the City was so indicated. So, he said kinks in the training would be worked out prior to it coming to Keene. The presentation that Mr. Topham sent was vetted and approved by the Department of Safety and the New Hampshire State Law Enforcement Group. Now, Bike/Walk Alliance was preparing to roll the program out to communities in late October or November 2026.

Mr. Phillips arrived at 8:28 AM.

Chair Fischer asked about the target audience for the event. Mr. Redfern said the target audience is all enforcement agencies: City and state police, and Fish and Game. He added City government, including organizations like the Mayor's Youth Council. He suggested involving

the assistant principals of each school or a designee who could implement the program for the students. Mr. Redfern thought it was important for the students to be trained.

Chair Fischer tried to focus on the event itself if it were to be accomplished in the next month, which would involve inviting these organizations. Mr. Redfern agreed: a "save the date," so to speak, perhaps with a copy of the outline Mr. Topham provided. Mr. Nadeau asked whether Mr. Topham needed the Committee to organize this event. Mr. Redfern said no, Mr. Topham would have to be involved and would coordinate the meeting schedule with Chair Fischer, Mr. Nadeau, and whoever else.

Dr. Russell said this felt like a heavy lift for the Committee, given how infrequently the Committee meets and how many entities need to be involved. He felt like the capacity to get everyone involved would be better directed from the Mayor's office or that level. Dr. Russell felt like it would be hard for the Committee to organize all the entities, calling it a heavy lift. Mr. Redfern agreed that the Mayor's office would have to be heavily involved.

Vice Chair Haas said first, that the Committee was waiting for Mr. Topham to give them this program. Second, he said the Committee was waiting for Mr. Topham to say when the Committee could do this program. Third, Vice Chair Haas said that if this were involving police and City staff, it would have to come from the City; the Committee would not be putting the training to them. Fourth, he said that if this were to go into the schools, that it would be different from the law enforcement training program. Mr. Redfern said the Committee did not know those pieces yet. So, Vice Chair Haas felt there was nothing for the Committee to do. Mr. Redfern noted that the Committee was supposed to see that training program at the last meeting and due to technical glitches, it did not come to fruition, so those questions were not answered. He could ask for hard copies if the Chair would like.

Chair Fischer followed up on Vice Chair Haas' questions: for example, if inviting the police, how many would be invited from the team? Would this be mandatory training? Would this be a well-developed program and what could the Committee do to support that? Chair Fischer thought it would be the City's job to support the program if it is going through the City; the City needs to coordinate training programs, or they are being imposed on them. The Committee can facilitate the program. Mr. Redfern stated that the Mayor was tracking this: phone call by phone call and as meetings were made. Mr. Redfern suggested a meeting with himself and the Chair because the Mayor requested a report on this. This meeting would be as soon as the Mayor would be available before leaving the country, so Mr. Redfern suggested urgency. Chair Fischer said the general sense was that the direction and curriculum would need to come from the Bike/Walk Alliance: they would need to put the program together. Mr. Redfern agreed that they already had they program. Chair Fischer said they needed to identify where they were going and who they were inviting. He called that a lot of logistics between now and the October 14, 2026 date, so he wanted to make sure that would be covered without doing a disservice. Mr. Redfern thought they did not know the structure of our City government and that the Mayor would want to make sure who attends. He said it is the Mayor's burden to determine who he believes should be there. Mr. Redfern though he, Chair Fischer, and Mr. Nadeau should meet after this meeting and work on a communication to Mr. Topham shortly after. Discussion ensued about concern for whether Mr. Topham would be able to successfully attend the October 14, 2026 Committee

meeting via Teams. Vice Chair Haas said Mr. Topham should send the Committee the training program as soon as possible, noting there was nothing else the Committee could discuss without that program. Mr. Robertson wondered what the Committee's role was supposed to be in this whole thing because it felt confusing and he wondered if the Committee's role was clearly defined and where to go from there. Chair Fischer said the Committee was rolling with it, there was some initiative, and the Mayor was clearly behind it, so the Committee wanted to help out. He called it a good thing to get going, it was just moving fast.

Dr. Russell agreed with the Chair's point about this feeling like two different audiences: (1) law enforcement / police, and (2) City government / schools. He suggested that the next time Mr. Redfern spoke with the Bike/Walk Alliance or Mr. Topham to seek clarification about what their delivery model would be for those two very different feeling audiences. Dr. Russell cited enforcement vs. training and implementation. Mr. Redfern called it one program. Dr. Russell called them two very different audience members to engage.

Mr. Phillips stated that he was at the meeting with Dave Topham form BWANH and took some notes. He said the training was intended to be in Keene first but he was unsure that was still the plan. Mr. Redfern recalled that they decided to let Keene be second based on the way things were working here. Mr. Phillips said the ideas included holding a one-to-two-hour training session, for which they would have flyers and brochures. They mentioned three modules: (1) training instructors, (2) focused on fourth through 12th grade students, and (3) officer education on what can be enforced. Chair Fischer said Mr. Topham would be invited to the next Bicycle/Pedestrian Path Advisory Committee (BPPAC) meeting.

Mr. Robertson said he would like to see those materials that were discussed. He thought that if it would be the Committee's role to push those in some way, the Committee should be involved on the sidelines; they should see those materials, especially if they are going into schools. Mr. Redfern thought the whole package had been submitted and approved. So, Mr. Robertson hoped to see that package, in agreement with Vice Chair Haas. Mr. Redfern agreed if they would want to show the Committee that package then they would need to send a representative to present it on screen. Chair Fischer said another element came up the other day when thinking about the separate audience of trying to reach kids and teens: he said you have to stop thinking in terms of going into schools and presenting and instead get the message into a video that is three minutes or less. He said social media is the only way to reach the younger audience; it is replicable and shareable. He was unsure whether the Bike/Walk Alliance was creating that type of content but said they did ask them for it.

The Chair, Mr. Redfern, Mr. Phillips, and Mr. Nadeau made a plan to meet after this meeting to coordinate next steps. Mr. Topham would come to the next BPPAC meeting.

4. Regular Project Updates

a. Bicycle & Pedestrian Master Plan Updates

Chair Fischer welcomed Bicycle & Pedestrian Master Plan project consultants with Vanasse Hangen Brustlin (VHB): Phil Goff (Active Transportation Planner) and Ashley Domogala (Transportation Engineer). Mr. Goff noted the package that went out to the Committee before the

meeting and acknowledged certain mistakes within, both on the map and table of corresponding recommendations. He would be sending out a revised version right after this meeting. Some were roadways that had shown recommended bike lanes that more realistically should be shared lane markings. He appreciated that there had already been comments on the map but wanted to be clear that there would be revisions. Mr. Goff stated that within this package there were 77 recommendations on pedestrian, bicycle, and trail-related improvements. Those did not include ones which had already gone through some kind of planning process, are already funded, or are under construction. Mr. Goff showed a map of some of the high-level things they had looked at and some of the key recommendations. He pointed out some alterations made in the past few days. He would open it up for comments during the meeting and the coming week or two. He said there was about one and a half months left in the planning process and the consultants had developed in essence the draft recommendations for pedestrian, bicycle, and trail related improvements. They also had the final draft goals and evaluation criteria for each of these project recommendations in order to develop a list of prioritized projects.

Next, Mr. Goff showed, in coordination with City staff, based on higher level general comments received from the Committee and others, seven project goals that had essence morphed into evaluation criteria. The consultants suggested weighting, so there is a point total for each: each project in essence goes through a model the consultants developed that provides a score at both the quantitative (e.g., volume and speeds on particular roadways) and qualitative levels (e.g., level of community support). Each of the 77 recommendations would go through these criteria and the suggested weighting to get a point total for each particular project. Mr. Goff said that was a high-level introduction to the goals and evaluation criteria, and the process. Over the next several weeks the consultants would go through that process of taking the recommendation and in a sense phasing and prioritizing the projects. He said any process that they are in during the planning work to get to a point where the City has that prioritized list of recommendations is the ultimate deliverable in many ways of a Bike/Pedestrian Master Plan like this.

Vice Chair Haas asked how many reported bicycle and pedestrian crashes there actually are in the City. Mr. Goff said he did not have a number at this time. He said they should have an existing conditions map that shows the location of crashes involving pedestrians and bicyclists over a five-to-10-year period. So, it would not be the cumulative history of the City; they picked the most recent data. Vice Chair Haas recalled seeing that map and did not think it displayed bicycle and pedestrian crashes but auto/bicycle and auto/pedestrian crashes, which he called a little different. The Committee agreed that it would be good to have the bicycle and pedestrian crashes sent to the Committee too. Mr. Goff said as far as he knew the data they used were crashes that did involve bicycles and pedestrians, which he displayed on a map over an eight-year period. He said this is just one of the data sources that goes into evaluation; some of them are more data intensive and others are more qualitative.

Mr. Goff returned to the overall recommendations map. He said that as they developed the recommendations, they focused on what is behind the recommendations. They took input from City staff (with whom they met monthly), various stakeholder meetings that the City hosted (they marked up maps, with good feedback), and the approximately 200 surveys that were responded to. They also looked at previous planning and tried to be consistent with things like the Complete Streets Plan. All of that went into forming the network of recommendations that

the consultants displayed on the map. Some recommendations were related to pedestrians, crosswalks, bicycles, sidewalks, other improvements (e.g., beacons or bump outs). He also showed crossings of the Cheshire Rail Trail. He showed examples of bike lanes on Maple Avenue and Court Street from end-to-end, for instance. He noted that New Hampshire Department of Transportation (DOT) was already planning to improve Marlboro Street to put in wider shoulders without necessarily designating them as striped bike lanes. He showed some instances of side passes immediately adjacent to roadways on East Surrey Road, for instance, where there was a desire to connect Court Street with the trails in Goose Pond (it is a very tight roadway). Theoretically, it would be nice to have some sort of fully ADA accessible path, but some sort of path to help connect the sidewalk system on Court Street with the trails of Goose Pond, for instance. Mr. Goff said the big recommendation from the previous meeting was a shared use path either along the Ashuelot River to connect the Appel Way Trail to the Middle School and Maple Avenue or potentially a route within the DOT Rt-12 right-of-way. So, Mr. Goff displayed two of those and said the consultants were not going to make a recommendation of one over the other. He said they would both be in the report and need a lot more study to understand their full feasibility.

Mr. Goff zoomed in to recommendations in the downtown area, where there are a high concentration of projects. He showed those already in development, funded, or perhaps even under construction; many of those are related to the Main Street and West Street (DOT-funded for 2028 or 2029) improvements. He showed a number of suggested improvements including crosswalks on various roadways, bike facilities (e.g., Winchester Street), bike lanes on Winchester Street as one of the gateway streets, which should ideally have bike lanes. He cited the same opportunity for Roxbury Street for a few of the projects showing shared lanes. There could be some traffic calming elements, especially on more of the lower volume local streets, like Elm Street or Gilsum Street, which are shown as a bike route. Those are roadways that should have shared lanes simply because they are narrow roadways and the opportunity to widen them is really limited. So, there are opportunities for some of these shared routes to have traffic calming facilities as well.

Vice Chair Haas noted that in the legend under either the map/recommendations there was a # showing recommended projects and an X showing currently planned or under construction projects. Vice Chair Haas said he did not see those notes appearing anywhere: were they not used or were they for the future? Mr. Goff said no, it was a little confusing what that was implying, stating that maybe there should have been a circle or square around them. However, what Mr. Goff said those were implying was that whenever you see a number, it is a recommended project, and whenever you see a letter (which they represent as X if it is a letter) it is currently planned and under construction. He understood there was no perfect way to describe that and the consultants debated how to display them. Mr. Goff noted again that he would send the revised table, maps, and evaluation criteria to Mr. Nadeau by the end of the day to share with the Committee, so they could provide comments.

Vice Chair Haas said the cost of sidewalk in the City is known ($500 per foot came to his mind), so he requested that Mr. Nadeau verify that the recommendations at least get filled in with the cost opinion. He said others might be more difficult. Vice Chair Haas asked to receive this in a CSV or spreadsheet format in addition to the PDF to help to understand it better. Mr. Goff said

yes, they were looking at the CSV format, so they had a version in Excel that they could send out. Mr. Goff said they would be looking at the cost opinion when they finalize the projects; they did not want to jump ahead with cost estimates until they knew a finalized list. They would take a look at the unit costs of typical sidewalks, shared use paths, and striping bike lanes, etc., to come up with a sense of a project cost. He referred to the legend on the PDF: anything under $50,000 had a single $, those $50,000–$150,000 had $$, those $150,000–$500,000 had $$$, and anything higher was represented by $$$$.

The Committee and consultants discussed next steps. Mr. Goff would send out the updated map and recommendations today. He briefly reviewed again those few errors that would be corrected on the new version he would send out.

Mr. Holte asked, when Mr. Goff was talking about the space available to have a bike lane or not, is that just looking at the absolute width of the road or were they considering the width of the lanes and the possibility to narrow those at all. Mr. Goff said definitely, there are a handful of projects where if you look at them at first glance, you might think there is no possibility for bike lanes (Maple Avenue, for instance). However, he said in cases where it looks like there is an opportunity to narrow the travel lanes by one or two feet, they would definitely take that into account. He provided the example of Winchester Street, where there might only be the opportunity to narrow the roadway by six inches because the travel lanes are already relatively minimal (e.g., 11 feet), so there is not enough space within the current roadway to put in bike lanes that are at least 4 feet wide without the incredibly expensive task of widening the roadway (with impacts on adjacent properties). He talked about all the factors they have to take into account when deciding whether it would be meaningful to widen roadways (e.g., are there curbs, how close are some of the buildings?). He said the Committee could feel free to push back on that if any member felt that there were areas that could accommodate things that were not listed on these recommendations; it would not guarantee the consultants would change their recommendations. Conversely, if members felt there were recommendations listed that should be completely removed because they were outlandish, Mr. Goff said those were fine for the consultants to consider in the next round as they finalized the draft recommendations.

Chair Fischer said the Committee would meet again with the consultant on October 14, 2026. At that time, Mr. Goff said the consultants would certainly have the final list of recommendations scored and prioritized, and they would have the draft report ready for the Committee's review. If any Committee members had feedback after this meeting, they were asked to provide it by late the next week. Chair Fischer thanked Mr. Goff and Ms. Domogala for coming to the meeting. Chair Fischer was glad to see that the consultant had absorbed a lot of the feedback from the Committee.

Vice Chair Haas noted that the bike/walk audits had been happening and one more was happening the next day from Keene High School at 4:00 PM. Mr. Nadeau agreed and noted that Ms. Brunner was unable to be present to provide a full update on what she had gathered from the audits so far. All data had been going directly to the consultants, so Mr. Nadeau thought that would be a part of the final draft that the Committee would see at the next meeting. Dr. Russell noted that he was at the last walk audit with Ms. Duffy at Robin Hood Park and there were not many people in attendance. So, whenever the next walk audit is, Dr. Russell said it would be

helpful to have more detailed feedback, and he encouraged more people from the Committee to join the remaining audits to garner more input.

Dr. Russell made an observation of this process, having been on this Committee for a while and gone through the Committee's annual process of reviewing the spreadsheet and prioritizing five or 10 things. He felt like that would underlie this process going forward. He said it is not just this Plan that will come out, but what this Committee does to push on that and to best support things. He said there is their priority list but there is the Committee's priority list that sort of sits on top of that. Dr. Russell said he is excited about it all. Ms. Duffy noted that at the previous walk audit Dr. Russell was able to answer so many of the public's questions about the whole effort and to speak about the history of the Master Plan in a way that brought folks down to a more focused effort. Ms. Duffy appreciated how clear and collaborative Dr. Russell was.

Mr. Phillips noted that this is a detailed Plan, and he really appreciates all the consultants put into it. He thought it was great that they captured a lot of the Committee's ideas. However, he noted they said something that honestly concerned him and made him think they are only using the existing width of the roads for where bike lanes can be placed. Mr. Davern said they mentioned rights-of-ways as well where they had opportunities. Mr. Phillips said that could really limit the creation of bike lanes if they are only going to use the existing road sizes/surfaces, because they are probably going to have to expand the shoulders of the roads in some areas to create these bike lanes. Mr. Robertson said what he heard from Mr. Goff was that it starts getting into the expensive process of widening the road. So, they were looking at a cost prohibitive thing full of unknowns when you start extending the road, with the properties you encroach on. Mr. Holte noted that Mr. Goff said the Committee could push back if there were ones they thought should be bike lanes and not shared lanes. Mr. Phillips said he thought the Committee needed to decide which of those projects to prioritize and provide that feedback to the consultants. Chair Fischer noted that Court Street is a good example, where some areas are so narrow and there is hardly a shoulder at all. Mr. Nadeau said that when he gets the email from Mr. Goff he would send it to the whole Committee and CC the consultants so the Committee members could send them direct feedback about pushbacks or preferences.

Mr. Robertson asked that the Committee be informed of whatever comes up with the e-bike stuff and where that is going. Mr. Nadeau said he would take notes and send out a wrap-up email to the whole Committee.

Mr. Mast asked if there is a correlation between funding: he assumed that a budget for a path up to the Middle School would be completely different than one for widening Ford Street. He was curious how that worked and if there is consideration of leaning on it as a bike path that goes to the Middle School as an alternative to widening Court Street or vice versa. Vice Chair Haas thought it related to the Committee needing to cross-reference this with the City's existing Capital Expenditure Plan to see what is in there, because most of these would have to go into that plan. He said anything already in that plan now would be something better for the Committee to lean into and get done, if any. Mr. Robertson said that when talking about the trail to the Middle School, the intent was to bypass Court Street.

Mr. Redfern passed out more outlines for the Bike/Walk Alliance program.

b. Mobility Management

Ms. Steadman was not present.

c. Updates to Project Tracking Table

No updates.

5. New Business (Suggested items for next meeting)

Mr. Holte talked about the updates to the e-bike regulations in New Hampshire and putting together a response to the Mayor both about the law aspect and the community behavior aspect. He said he drafted one for the law side. He asked if the Committee was still aiming to give this letter to the Mayor or whether the Bike/Walk Alliance was taking the place of the Committee's response. Vice Chair Haas thought everyone could be educated by anything Mr. Holte had developed, stating that searching the laws in New Hampshire is always a trial. Chair Fischer added that this is always evolving, so the more there is someone staying on top of it and keeping the Committee informed, the better. Mr. Holte wondered if it made sense to have a few people review the letter before passing it along to the Mayor. Vice Chair Haas asked if Mr. Holte found the current laws and statutes that govern e-bikes. Mr. Holte replied that he did not get too deep into what New Hampshire has currently; there are current laws around the three classes. Vice Chair Haas said that is what would be needed. Mr. Holte said he could have a section of the letter defining the current state of things in New Hampshire versus recommendations. Others agreed that it would be helpful. Mr. Holte offered to share a Google Doc link to the letter so others could add comments and Chair Fischer offered to help be on the review team.

Chair Fischer asked about emerging practices for enforcement, noting that seems to be where the conversation stops. Mr. Holte said that in the draft letter he got into the fact that you can get heavily into individual behavior. [audio interference] Mr. Holte noted that California has an impact on supply chains because there is such a massive market. New Hampshire is unlikely to tell a manufacturer that they cannot sell e-motos or e-bikes. Discussion ensued briefly about telling Amazon not to ship e-motos to New Hampshire.

6. Next meeting date – October 14, 2026

7. Adjournment

There being no further business, Chair Fischer adjourned the meeting at 9:30 AM.

Respectfully submitted by,
Katryna Kibler, Minute Taker

Reviewed and edited by,
Jason Nadeau, Recreation Programmer, Staff Liaison