

City of Keene
New Hampshire

MUNICIPAL SERVICES, FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES

Wednesday, June 8, 2016

6:00 PM

Council Chambers

Members Present:

Janis O. Manwaring, Chair
Randy L. Filiault, Vice-Chair
Robert J. O'Connor
Stephen L. Hooper
Gary P. Lamoureux

Staff Present:

Medard Kopczynski, Acting City Manager
Patricia A. Little, City Clerk
Andrew Bohannon, Parks & Recreation &
Facilities Director
Donna Hanscom, Assistant Public Works
Director
W. Rhett Lamb, Assistant City Manager
Mike Cox, Water Meter Technician

Members Not Present:

Chair Manwaring called the meeting to order at 6:00 PM and explained the procedures of the meeting.

Chair Manwaring indicated that there were six items on the agenda. The first three topics, however, were regarding the same topic. She indicated the Committee would hear the first three topics together and then address them separately when it was time to vote.

1) COMMUNICATION - Laura and David Andrews – Request for Water Abatement – 46 Hamden Drive

Chair Manwaring recognized David and Laura Andrews, 46 Hamden Drive, to address their request for water abatement. Ms. Andrews explained to the MSFI Committee the incident of a high water bill received for her residence on April 20. The charge to Mr. and Ms. Andrews on the bill was \$3,987. Mr. Andrews said the residence had never received a prior bill higher than \$300. Because the City did not find a cause for the high water volume, Mr. and Ms. Andrews were requesting abatement.

Chair Manwaring asked if their residence had any underground irrigation systems. Mr. Andrews replied that they did not. He also indicated that they were frugal about water usage and cited examples such as turning water off and limiting laundry use. He referenced a relative on Arch Street several year ago whose foreclosed home's basement had flooded which resulted in a \$5,000 water bill. He said there were no such events at his residence and no evidence of leaks or toilet disrepair. He indicated that three people

reside in the home - Mr. Andrews, Ms. Andrews, and their son who occupied the basement. He said they only use their lawn sprinklers once per month, and never overnight.

Chair Manwaring asked the MSFI Committee if there were any questions for Mr. and Ms. Andrews. With no questions from the Committee, Chair Manwaring recognized Ms. Donna Hanscom, Assistant Public Works Director, and Mr. Mike Cox, Water Meter Technician for the City of Keene, to address the two memoranda before the MSFI Committee.

2) MEMORANDUM – Assistant Public Works Director & Water Meter Technician – High Volume Water/Sewer Bills

Ms. Hanscom indicated it had been several years since the process for generating water bills and procedures in the case of a high bill had been presented to the MSFI Committee. As such, she began by explaining that process. She explained that in the City of Keene, there were approximately 6,600 water accounts, of which approximately one-third were billed monthly. She said these accounts were read electronically as Mr. Cox would demonstrate to the MSFI Committee later in the meeting. She explained that joint water and sewer bills were issued to customers with usage measured in one hundred cubic feet increments which is equivalent to approximately 750 gallons of water.

Ms. Hanscom explained that when there is an unusually high or low water bill, a specific procedure is followed to address it. In such a case, a meter technician returns to the location to visually inspect the meter and take an additional reading. After this, they schedule an appointment with the occupant to inspect for leaks and inquire about repair history. She explained that if there was a leak that does not result in water entering the sewer system, the account holder can receive a sewer credit. If a leak or necessary repair was found during the technicians visit, the meter technician will return for three weeks following repair to read the meter and ensure the usage returns to normal. If the water usage does not return to normal at that point, another inspection may be necessary or the customer may be referred to a plumber. Ms. Hanscom said if use returns to normal, according to City Code, the customer can request to have the meter tested. If the meter was proven to be in good working order, the customer will be charged \$102.

Ms. Hanscom explained that if the previously outlined options do not explain the cause of the bill, the customer can request bill forgiveness from the City Council. In that situation, City ordinance requires the meter to be tested. She indicated that in the situation of Mr. and Ms. Andrews, this test has taken place. She explained that the ordinance also requires the customer to have a plumber check for leaks and to report those findings the City Council.

Ms. Hanscom indicated that the most common abatement requests received are due to leaking hoses, burst pipes, or leaking toilets. She explained that Mr. Cox will demonstrate where and how leaks can occur and how much water can pass through specific leaks in a given amount of time. She recognized that the City Council had heard other abatement

requests in the past and noted their high standards in hearing these issues and the Council's recognition of the costs to deliver water to customers.

3) MEMORANDUM – Assistant Public Works Director & Water Meter Technician – High Water Usage Quarter 4 – 2015 – 46 Hamden Drive

Ms. Hanscom introduced Mr. Cox to explain water meter technology. Mr. Cox began by explaining the type of water meters used in the City of Keene, Neptune Meters, which he said are the best on the market. He indicated that these meters will not register usage unless water moves through the meter.

Mr. Cox presented the MSFI Committee with a sample meter. He explained again, based on the device design, that the meter cannot register use unless water passes through it. Mr. Cox then presented the MSFI Committee with a disk located inside the meter. He demonstrated how the disk turns and explained that the only way a meter can fail is if part of the disk breaks or if the disk becomes plugged. He said if that were to occur, the meter would return a reading of no water usage and the meter would be replaced. He demonstrated and explained that if a meter is broken, the gears inside it will skip and break, and in that case the meter will read higher than normal. The MSFI Committee members examined all three pieces of the meter presented by Mr. Cox.

Mr. Cox continued by explaining how much water can pass through leaks of various sizes. He demonstrated a specialized ruler to the MSFI Committee which allows measurement of the amount of water that can pass through a leak. He indicated that, per the ruler, a one-eighth inch drip can generate 9,500 gallons of water during one quarter.

Chair Manwaring asked Mr. Cox how many meters 9,500 gallons is equivalent to. Ms. Hanscom asked Chair Manwaring if she meant how many hundred cubic feet it was equivalent to and Chair Manwaring agreed that was what she meant. Ms. Hanscom referred to the ruler and explained that a one-sixteenth inch drip would generate 98.5 hundred cubic feet in 90 days.

Chair Manwaring asked the cost of one hundred cubic feet. Ms. Hanscom replied that according to 2015 prices, for which the bill in question was subject to, the cost of one hundred cubic feet was \$4.04. Chair Manwaring questioned if that cost was for 90 days. Ms. Hanscom explained that the cost of one hundred cubic feet, or 750 gallons, plus sewer fees were approximately \$10 for 90 days in 2015.

Ms. Hanscom continued by explaining that reading meters is electronic. As such, she asked Mr. Cox how he knows the appropriate meter was read. She asked Mr. Cox to bring examples to demonstrate how the meter reading process works.

Mr. Cox demonstrated three ways to read a water meter depending upon the style of the meter.

Chair Manwaring asked Mr. Cox if there was an account associated with the electronic read. Mr. Cox replied that when an electronic reading occurs, the device displays the associated account number and the associated meters' 10 digit serial number. He demonstrated how the serial number was read and displayed by the device. He said with that reading, there was no way to mistake two different customer's meters.

Councilor Lamoureux asked if the electronic reader can have a crossover to another customers reading. Mr. Cox said no. Councilor Lamoureux also asked if Mr. and Ms. Andrews had an electronic meter. Mr. Cox replied no, Mr. and Ms. Andrews have a touch pad meter.

Mr. Cox then explained what happens when there is a high bill. He said they take the read and then ask the customer. He said there was a leak indicator on the meter. He showed the MSFI Committee a triangle on the meter that a technician will watch for three to four minutes for movement. If it moves within that timeframe, it indicates a leak. He said that nine out of 10 times, the leak is trickle overflow from a toilet that may be undetectable. Mr. Cox demonstrated on a sample toilet tank how and where such a leak could occur. He said that during a quarter that leak could equate to 10,000 gallons of water. He also demonstrated how a faulty toilet flapper can cause an undetectable leak and use of 750 gallons of water in 45 minutes to one hour.

Councilor O'Connor asked if they looked at the triangle at Mr. and Ms. Andrews' house and if it indicated a leak in their home at that point. Mr. Cox replied that he found no leaks in their home. He said he monitored the meter at their home for three weeks and the meter was fine. He said he tested the meter at their home with permission from Ms. Hanscom. He tried to make it fail but nothing worked and he could not find the source of the problem. Mr. Cox then sent the meter to Ti-SALES to be tested and the meter came back fine. He said the worst part of his job is when he can find no explanation and feels sorry.

Mr. Andrews said he agreed with everything Mr. Cox did and thought he did a good job. He said, regarding toilet leaks, that if older toilets leak as commonly as Mr. Cox asserted, there would be abatements every day. Mr. Andrews also addressed the issue of computer errors and said they are common. He indicated they are not asking for a free ride. Mr. Andrews said all of their water bills are current. He did not know if the problem was water going out and entering the sewer. He said maybe they could compromise and eliminate the sewer portion of the bill, but he knows they did not use \$4,000 of water.

Chair Manwaring asked Mr. Andrews if he got a new toilet after this bill. Mr. Andrews replied no.

Councilor Filiault asked Mr. Andrews what his average water bill was each month and asked if Ms. Hanscom had that figure. Ms. Hanscom said it was approximately 10 hundred cubic feet or \$125-\$150 for just the water portion prior to the high bill in question. Mr. Andrews replied that they were current on their bill. Ms. Hanscom indicated that they had been paying approximately \$300 per quarter. Mr. Andrews added

that he was not there for a free ride but to have a \$4,000 bill there had to be an error, despite the water department doing their job well and professionally.

Councilor O'Connor asked Mr. Andrews how old his toilet was. Mr. Andrews said there are two toilets in the home, each approximately one year and a half old.

Councilor O'Connor asked was anyone in the neighborhood may have pulled a prank on them, by opening an outside faucet, for example. Mr. Andrews replied no, and asked Mr. Cox how many swimming pools could be filled with that amount of water. Mr. Cox replied saying that amount of water would come out of the windows if it was inside. Mr. Andrews replied that it would have saturated the house and lawn.

Councilor Hooper asked Mr. Andrews if he had heard any unusual noises or noticed the toilet running. Mr. Andrews replied no, and indicated that was the first thing Mr. Cox checked. Councilor Hooper said that was the only thing that could cause such a massive increase in water use. Councilor Hooper said he takes Mr. Andrews word that he did not hear the toilet running and thinks this was an unfortunate aberration or mistake.

Mr. Andrews said their home was a split level if there was a leak or running water he can hear it. He said there were no leaks and he does not know where the water went. He said that everyone makes errors, computers and humans.

Chair Manwaring thanked Mr. Andrews and returned to Ms. Hanscom who asked the MSFI Committee to refer back to the ruler presented. Ms. Hanscom said 364 hundred cubic feet, the amount of water in Mr. and Ms. Andrews' home is a lot of water. Based on the city's water pressure, she questioned the City Engineer if it was even possible for that much water to pass through someone's home. He said it was possible. Ms. Hanscom said when looking at the ruler, a one-quarter inch hole at 60-70 pounds of pressure, as it was in the area of Hamden Drive, can pass 1,580 hundred cubic feet in 90 days. She said that was equivalent to 18 hundred cubic feet per day. At that rate, she indicated it would take 20 days to use the 364 hundred cubic feet in question. She recognized that as theoretical and proceeded with an example of another customer with a high bill in February. Ms. Hanscom said when Mr. Cox went to inspect that home he initially found nothing wrong and soon after the meter was speeding. She said he returned and found the toilet flapper stuck open which was audibly undetectable. Ms. Hanscom said that instance used 750 gallons of water in 45 minutes. That instance showed her the theoretical was possible and that the problem cannot always be heard. She explained that she has confidence in the meter and cannot explain what happened in Mr. and Ms. Andrews' case.

Looking at the bill, Councilor Filiault commented that most cases such as this the Council has seen have had a clear reason such as vandalism or a broken toilet. Councilor Filiault said he was not questioning anyone involved and there was no explanation for a 1,300% increases in water in three months. He said he knows the equipment was good but something went wrong and that was unknown. Councilor Filiault indicated that, while he was not making a motion yet, he recommends abatement back to the average

monthly cost because he sees this as a fluke. He said that 1,300% was too much, the equipment was fairly new, and the price had returned to normal since that quarter. He explained that sometimes there was no answer and a decision has to be made. In this instance, Councilor Filiault said, he is with the petitioner.

Councilor Hooper added the petitioner has paid bills on time and responsibly. He said he believes the petitioner and agrees with Councilor Filiault that this was an aberration. Councilor Hooper indicated, knowing they paid their bills on time and something unexplainable happened, the MSFI Committee should assist them because there was no one to blame in the situation. He agreed with Councilor Filiault's recommendation to return to the monthly bill for the petitioner.

Chair Manwaring opened the discussion to the public. Ms. Hanscom asked to add a final comment. She told the MSFI Committee there were many high water bills with no explanation. Ms. Hanscom explained she were concerned with the precedent it will set for the MSFI Committee in the future and asked them to consider where they draw the line of aberrations.

Councilor Lamoureux commented he felt for the petitioners. However, he said the system in Keene appears to be a good one of checks and balances. While Councilor Lamoureux knows machinery can make mistakes, to him the system appears fool proof. He agreed with Ms. Hanscom that care must be given here because the water went somewhere in some way. Councilor Lamoureux indicated that he would prefer a compromise, as Mr. Andrews had suggested, perhaps eliminating a portion of the water or sewer bill.

Chair Manwaring asked if there were any public questions or comments, there were not.

Councilor O'Connor asked Ms. Hanscom if there were a compromise, how much the sewer bill credit would amount to. Ms. Hanscom calculated the amount assuming 10 hundred cubic feet of usage at 2015 sewer rates. The sewer charge would be \$2,096.64 for the extra 364 hundred cubic feet.

Chair Manwaring asked Mr. Cox if Mr. and Ms. Andrews have the same water meter now as they did before the high bill. Mr. Cox said the meter was the same. Ms. Hanscom disagreed and said they have a new meter. Mr. Cox agreed that the meter had been replaced. He explained that they monitored the old meter for three weeks, tested it, sent it to Ti-SALES, and it was working. They replaced that meter and the new meter was working normally. Mr. Cox said he cannot explain what happened but he knows water went through the meter. . Mr. Cox added that it was rare to not find the explanation.

Chair Manwaring said she would take communication from Mr. and Ms. Andrews first, agenda item one, and she hoped everyone would accept the memoranda, agenda items two and three as informational.

Chair Manwaring recognized Councilor Clark for comment. Councilor Clark said this was a common issue and provided an example of high bill on a constituent's property on Darling Road due to a faulty watering system. He said in that instance, the MSFI Committee did not have much compassion. He explained that he sees things passed in the City's budgets, such as the splash pad at Wheelock Park where water was not recycled. He had given thought to the amount of water spent on a splash pad for City use and resident enjoyment. Councilor Clark said he cannot imagine how much water was used on a splash pad and he hopes the new one at Robin Hood Park will recycle the water. He said when constituents come forward with an issue like this he feels compassion for the systems involved. He said, in the end, the constituents have to pay that bill. Councilor Clark hopes there was something the MSFI Committee can do other than accepting it as informational and asked them to dig deeper. He recognized there were costs at the water plant and Federal regulations constituents have to comply with. He thinks constituents have legitimate issues that need to be "broken out." Councilor Clark said they cannot just go along with the regular billing structure, sometimes chances need to be taken, and the Council must stand with those who pay the taxes.

Chair Manwaring thanked him for his comment and asked the MSFI Committee if they were ready to discuss the items at hand. Mr. Andrews asked to comment and Chair Manwaring recognized him.

Mr. Andrews asked who pays when fire hydrants are left running to be flushed out. Ms. Hanscom replied that all users pay for that. She said it was for the good of the citizens of Keene because it cleans the mains. She added they are conscious of how much water was used, which was much less than in years past.

Mr. Andrews asked Ms. Hanscom where that money comes from. Ms. Hanscom replied that part comes from the \$4.04 to manufacture customer water and that it all comes from the operating budget. Mr. Andrews asked if that was why taxes in Keene were so high. Ms. Hanscom replied no, that was just the water bill. Mr. Andrews said he sees the water being flushed and it seems like the time and water were not monitored. He wonders where it goes and thinks it seems costly and wasteful. Ms. Hanscom said she could address the flushing process, but the water was checked every 20 minutes until it is clear. She said the flushing is required by the state of NH twice per year to improve the water quality. The workers who perform the flushing do not spend more time doing it than necessary.

Councilor Filiault said he would like to make a motion. He followed up to Councilor Clark's comments and agreed that sometimes there is no explanation for these issues but a decision has to be made. He does not doubt City staff, or the equipment, or the water users.

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

Councilor O'Connor commented that in a compromise, the bill would still be \$2,000. He would only be comfortable with a compromise if they knew the source of the issue.

Councilor Lamoureux added that he understood there were two failures to a meter, a broken gear inside which would return a zero reading or a broken gear that would cause the meter to skip. He said he understood that water did go through that meter because the meter read, indicating it was not broken. He does not know if it went through the sewer process. While Councilor Lamoureux understands everyone's points, he will likely vote against an abatement for that reason, not because he does not believe the petitioners. There was a City process and from what he understands the meter was not defective. Councilor Lamoureux knows the water went through, he just does not know where it went and, therefore, he will vote against a motion to abate.

On a vote of 4-1 the Municipal Services, Facilities, and Infrastructure Committee recommend an abatement of \$3,687 to David and Laura Andrews reducing the amount owed to \$300, their average bill. Councilor Lamoureux was opposed.

Chair Manwaring returned to memoranda in agenda items two and three.

Councilor O'Connor made the following motion, which was seconded by Councilor Lamoureux.

On a vote of 5-0, the Municipal Services, Facilities, and Infrastructure Committee recommend the memorandum from the Assistant Public Works Director and Water Meter Technician in reference to high volume water and sewer bills be accepted as informational.

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

On a vote of 5-0, the Municipal Services, Facilities, and Infrastructure Committee recommends the memorandum from the Assistant Public Works Director and Water Meter Technician in reference to high water usage quarter four, 2015, at 46 Hamden Drive be accepted as informational.

4) MEMORANDUM – ACM/Planning Director – Status of the Dog Park

Chair Manwaring recognized Holly Morin, 56 Birch Street, and Daniel Prial, 67 Forest Street. Ms. Morin indicated she and her husband have met with the City Manager and Assistant City Manager about the dog park, but this was the first time she has seen this memorandum.

Chair Manwaring said the memorandum was just to provide the MSFI Committee with the background on the dog park and that the Committee was up to speed and ready to discuss the park. She asked who the Committee was and what was currently taking place with regard to the dog park planning.

Ms. Morin said the Dog Park Committee includes herself, her husband, Mr. Prial, Chris Clay, and Bonnie Champagne.

Chair Manwaring asked where the Committee stands today.

Ms. Morin said she had met with the City Manager and Assistant City Manager, Rhett Lamb. There were concerns about the current planned location for the dog park in Wheelock Park. The proposed location is between two softball fields and batting cages. Ms. Morin explained that she has been a dog instructor for 18 years and she believes that level of activity and noise near the dog park could result in accidents and liabilities. She knows a lot of effort has gone into finding a location but she does not think it is the best choice. Ms. Morin indicated that she lives nearby Wheelock Park and uses it often and does not see how the location can work. Unless the Wheelock Park Master Plan were revised, there is not sufficient space for such an addition. She said she tried to communicate this with the City Manager, but it had been one year and a half since this process began and it needs to move forward. She thanked Mr. Andrew Bohannon, Parks & Recreation & Facilities Director, for his assistance.

Mr. Prial explained that he has lived in Keene for one year and recently adopted a dog. He joined the Dog Park Committee and learned that it was not just a need for a place for dogs to run, but a good place, like a park for children. He has been learning the history of the dog park planning and just hopes they can find the right place. Mr. Prial said the Dog Park Committee was growing and there were almost 20 individuals present at the last meeting advertised on Facebook. He added that they have raised through fundraising efforts. He said there was interest in the park and they just need to do it right.

Chair Manwaring welcomed questions. With no questions, she recognized the City Manager.

City Manager said he had communicated with Ms. Morin and Mr. Lamb via email on May 11, 2016 which resulted in a meeting. The City Manager said he included Mr. Lamb because of his planning background. It became clear that the sooner they were back before the Council with the dog park history, the better. The project has become a stalemate and they are seeking direction from the Council on how to proceed.

Chair Manwaring recognized Mr. Lamb. Mr. Lamb informed the MSFI Committee that the memorandum proposes a recommendation consistent with the current dog park proceedings that could help the dog park move forward. He also said the memorandum recognizes that there are still challenges but he believes the recommendation will allow continued investigation of the proposed site at Wheelock Park.

Mr. Lamb continued that the current proposed location in Wheelock Park does not currently meet the needs of the dog park or align with the City of Keene's use of the park. The memorandum recommends that the MSFI Committee ask for a new round of evaluations from the City Council so the Dog Park Committee and City staff can investigate an alternate location in Wheelock Park.

Mr. Lamb directed the MSFI Committee to the last page of the report. He indicated that the current site proposed for the dog park was chosen through the Wheelock Park Master Plan and developed by Brickstone Land Use Consultants. A primary concern for the proposed site was that it is currently used for other purposes in the Wheelock Park Concept Plan which would be displaced for the dog park. In order for the dog park to be established there, it would require significant changes of the Wheelock Park Concept Plan as well as time to allow phases in the plan to take place. Mr. Lamb additionally mentioned the tree removal that would result from both construction of the dog park and the Concept Plan. He said that would be a significant change to the park which was not large enough to accommodate the originally planned size of the dog park.

Mr. Lamb continued that based on the aforementioned concerns, it was necessary to investigate other possible locations for the dog park. He stated the original agreement for the dog park, that the City would provide the land and long-term maintenance, and donations would cover the construction costs. Mr. Lamb explained the cost estimates for the dog park. The proposed location in Wheelock Park would cost \$30,000-\$35,000 for a one acre dog park. The Brickstone plan, however, was for a one-third acre dog park, so the cost would likely be less. There was no cost estimate provided for the Brickstone plan, but he believed it would be less than \$35,000 and he believed they could possibly get the cost closer to \$20,000. If that were the case, then half of that amount has already been fundraised. Despite that, there was still an additional fundraising phase required.

Mr. Lamb explained what needs to take place to move forward with the dog park. He said other possible locations need to be investigated, perhaps to correspond to the original plan for a one acre dog park. He said the Dog Park Committee may be interested in a more secluded location. Because it was clear the Wheelock Park location was not ideal, he said it was necessary to continue investigating other city properties, such as the airport or Carpenter Field, and simultaneously reevaluate the criteria for the park. Past opposition to those sites were based on aesthetics which was why Wheelock Park, already in a design phase, was suggested. Mr. Lamb plans to work with the Dog Park Committee and return in the MSFI Committee in one month with a new evaluation of other locations in Wheelock Park. If no other locations in Wheelock Park meet the criteria, they will suggest reevaluating the criteria and broadening the search for a new site.

Councilor Filiault commented that the intentions regarding the dog park are good, but the location was not appropriate. He agreed that activity in proximity to that location was not ideal for a dog park. He wished the parties involved luck in their evaluations.

Ms. Morin commented that when the dog park was proposed to the MSFI Committee approximately two years ago, she explained why a parcel of land less than one acre was insufficient for a dog park. Because of dogs varying personalities and activities, one acre was the minimum size she recommends. She believed it was in the best interest of the City to maintain the one acre size, similar to what surrounding cities have developed. While fundraising is still active, it was more difficult without a specific site. She added

that previously proposed sites failed because of tension with neighbors and she hopes the final site will not have that issue.

Chair Manwaring indicated that Wheelock Park was originally chosen because of its amenities. Ms. Morin responded that the amenities were not critical as many people bring their own water to dog parks.

Chair Manwaring recognized Joseph Mirzoeff, 50 Summit Road. He inquired about the long-term maintenance cost of the dog park for the city. Mr. Lamb said a consideration was that Mr. Bohannon's staff already maintains Wheelock Park and a different location could result in increased travel costs. Mr. Bohannon responded that his staff currently work and perform maintenance in Wheelock Park. If the dog park was located in Wheelock Park, the long-term maintenance will be a component of the maintenance work already performed in the park. He said these long-term maintenance activities would be a component of the operating budget already in place. He did not foresee additional costs for the City to maintain the dog park.

Councilor O'Connor asked Mr. Bohannon if he could estimate the maintenance cost for a location other than Wheelock Park. Mr. Bohannon replied that he would have to refer to previous proposals and that the cost would depend on many factors such as parking availability. He will return in one month to present spreadsheets to the MSFI Committee that will explain the possible costs for further development.

Councilor Lamoureux commented that knowing the final location was critical before discussing costs. He believes the most important step right now was to secure a location in order to finalize a cost. He believes the recommendation to reevaluate Wheelock Park and return in one month with an evaluation was the best course of action.

Mr. Prial added that they were not suggesting the City just pay for the park for patrons benefit. He said there were many people involved and perhaps volunteers could be mobilized, or in-kind donations of things such as picnic tables may be a possibility. He said it was not just a question of obtaining \$35,000.

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

On a vote of 5-0, the Municipal Services, Facilities, and Infrastructure Committee recommend the status report on the dog park be accepted as informational and further moves that the Municipal Services, Facilities, and Infrastructure Committee recommend that the location for the dog park, in Wheelock Park, shown on the concept plan prepared by Brickstone Land Use Consultants, date December 30, 2015, be placed on hold so that city staff can investigate other locations for the dog park in Wheelock Park and report back to the MSFI Committee in one month.

Chair Manwaring instructed Ms. Morin to give any checks for the dog park made out to the City of Keene to the City Clerk's office.

5) **MEMORANDUM** – City Clerk – Warrant for Unlicensed Dogs

Chair Manwaring recognized City Manager, who spoke on behalf of the City Clerk. The City Manager explained that each year, citizens were required to renew dog licenses. He indicated that this was a state statute to ensure dogs in the City of Keene have received proper vaccinations. Each year the City Clerk is required to publish a list of citizens with unregistered dogs and to request that the City Council authorize the Police Department to issue a warrant. He said in many cases, people have moved out of town or are unaware of the registration requirement.

Chair Manwaring recognized Mr. Conan Salada, 132 Kennedy Drive. Mr. Salada asked how many unlicensed dogs there typically were. Chair Manwaring responded that there are 471 dog owners with 612 dogs remaining unlicensed.

Mr. Salada asked the cost of producing one warrant. City Manager replied that he does not know the cost to produce a warrant but the fee to the dog owner is \$25.

Mr. Salada commented that most of the warrants were likely for people who have moved out of Keene or their dogs have died. He asked if it was worth the money to produce warrants and find the owners of unlicensed dogs. He said he does not see loose dogs, he more commonly sees loose cats. Mr. Salada said dogs are less likely to contract rabies than other animals. He believed the warrants were a waste of time and money and that rabies was not as serious an issue in a City like Keene as opposed to a rural area.

Chair Manwaring indicated that the requirement to license dogs was a NH state statute. Mr. Salada responded that it was also a State statute to register cats, but Keene does not require cat registration. He questioned when all animals will require registration. He believed those concerned with unlicensed dogs and vaccinations, such as the dog park owners, could monitor this.

Councilor Filiault recommended that those opposed to this Statute contact their State Representative.

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

On a vote of 5-0, the Municipal Services, Facilities, and Infrastructure Committee recommend a warrant for unlicensed dogs pursuant be issued and the animal control officer be directed to issue a civil forfeiture to those who have failed to license their dogs by April 30, 2016.

6) CONTINUED DISCUSSION – Renaming of the “North Bridge” to the “Vietnam Veterans Bridge”

Chair Manwaring, recognized Andy Bohannon, the Parks and Recreation and Facilities Director, who provided background on the bridge renaming. The last time he was before the MSFI Committee in 2012 was to name the bridge the “North Bridge.” He indicated that they had initiated an ad hoc pedestrian bridge naming committee to identify a procedure that engages and informs the community in the bridge naming process.

Mr. Bohannon said he worked with the IT department on this process and they were still willing to make the City website available for this. However, this would require City Council to appoint a small committee to organize the bride naming. He noted that he believes the name recommendation and selection process would be swift. The process could be updated and adjusted to include modern avenues of communication, such as social media.

Mr. Bohannon said the MSFI Committee can go back to accepting the bridge naming process as informational or recommend formation of a committee to City Council. He presented the MSFI Committee with the name selection process outline.

Councilor Filiault thanked Mr. Bohannon for the criteria list and asked if he would be returning for the July 27, 2016 meeting. Mr. Bohannon said if the MSFI Committee moves to initiate the process of forming a committee, he would return in six weeks.

Chair Manwaring recognized Mr. Joseph Mirzoeff, 50 Summit Road. Mr. Mirzoeff asked how the public will be included in the name selection process. Mr. Bohannon replied by reading the name selection process criteria verbatim and indicated the dates could change based on committee action.

The proposed name selection process is as follows: 1. The committee will accept letters of 250 words or less outlining the reason for the name of nomination; 2. All written communications will be posted on a City website dedicated to this process for the public to read; 3. A dedicated email address will be created for submission purposes; 4. All letters should be sent to the Parks and Recreation Department on 312 Washington Street; 5. All letters must be received before July 8, 2016 at 4:00 PM; 6. All communications will be reviewed by the committee at their next meeting; 7. The committee will report back to the MSFI Committee on July 27, 2016 with the results of the process.

Mr. Mirzoeff asked how the committee is chosen. Mr. Bohannon said the Mayor is responsible for selecting the committee.

Mr. Mirzoeff indicated that he would like to volunteer because he had a name in mind that he believes is good of the City of Keene. He asked if he had to go through this proposed process. Mr. Bohannon indicated that submission forms will be advertised on the website and in the newspaper, any written submissions should be made to the Parks and Recreation Department. The Mayor is responsible for choosing the committee. Mr.

Bohannon indicated that he was the staff liaison last time, but the new committee will be chosen by the Mayor. Mr. Bohannon shared his contact information with Mr. Mirzoeff.

The City Manager added he believes any appointments of the Mayor would need confirmation from the City Council and that he was concerned that this may not work under the timeframe that the committee is thinking about. He suggested that perhaps he could appoint a committee that would not require Council confirmation.

Councilor O'Connor indicated it was still an option to maintain the "North Bridge" name. He said Mr. Thom Little had explained why keeping that name was a good option at the last meeting and it could be beneficial for him to speak on that again for the public.

Councilor Hooper asked Mr. Bohannon if there were set marketing venues or protocols. Mr. Bohannon replied that in the past they have advertised in the Keene Sentinel, the radio, and limited social media. He said social media was more prevalent today than it was then. Possible avenues were through Public Works, email, and Twitter. There were many platforms to reach people and engage them. He said the process would appear somewhat different than the last time, but the advertising mediums would largely remain the same.

Councilor Lamoureux clarified that the City Manager would present this to the City Council next week to propose appointing a committee at staff level. The City Manager agreed and indicated that unless there was a counter motion to maintain the "North Bridge" name, he will inform the City Council of the committee selection process needed to complete this naming by July 27, 2016.

Vice Chair Filiault made the following motion, which was seconded by Councilor Lamoureux.

On a vote of 4-1, the Municipal Services, Facilities, and Infrastructure Committee recommend the informational process for renaming the North Bridge be accepted. Councilor O'Connor opposed.

7) ADJOURNMENT

Hearing no further business, Chair Manwaring adjourned the meeting at 7:31 PM.

Respectfully submitted by,
Katie Kibler, Minute Taker