

**City of Keene**  
*New Hampshire*

**MUNICIPAL SERVICES, FACILITIES, AND INFRASTRUCTURE COMMITTEE**  
**MEETING MINUTES**

Wednesday, February 11, 2015      6:00 pm      City Hall, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor, Council  
Chambers

**Members Present:**

James P. Duffy, Chair  
Janis O. Manwaring  
Sheryl A. Redfern  
Robert J. O'Connor  
Philip M. Jones

**Members Absent:**

**Staff Present:**

Assistant City Manager Med Kopczynski  
City Attorney Tom Mullins  
GIS Technician William Schoefmann  
City Engineer James Donison  
Parking Project Manager Gary Lamoureux  
Public Works Director Kürt Blomquist  
Assistant Public Works Director Donna  
Hanscom  
Industrial Pretreatment Coordinator Eric  
Swope

**Others Present:**

Councilor David Meader  
Councilor Terry Clark

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

**1. MEMORANDUM – Industrial Pretreatment Coordinator and Assistant Public Works Director/Laboratory Manager – Keene’s Industrial Wastewater Discharge Local Limits Report to the Environmental Protection Agency**

Assistant Public Works Director Donna Hanscom introduced Industrial Pretreatment Coordinator Eric Swope, and stated that it has been a while since they talked with the MSFI Committee about the local industrial wastewater discharge limits. She continued that they have a program designed to regulate wastewater discharged into the system by industries. It is designed to protect the City’s collection system from explosions or corrosion, protect employees from toxic fumes, and protect the biological treatment system at the wastewater treatment plant. The program also protects the Ashuelot River noting that some pollutants are not removed by the plant and could impact the plants or life in the river.

Ms. Hanscom continued that they have narrative and numeric limits intended to protect those four areas. The current limits were set in 1979 before the plant was even open, as part of the requirements for building the facility with Federal money. They were based on generic numbers.

Since then the EPA has described ways of coming up with more specific numbers and they have encouraged communities to do that. The City has been working on it for a number of years; they submit to EPA and then get comments back and it goes back and forth. There have been a number of times when they have had to start this all over. The most recent time she and Mr. Swope talked with the MSFI Committee about this, the EPA had gone away from a strict numeric limit for every parameter. The City no longer needs to tell each industry to have the same discharge limit. The City's system can accept a certain number of pounds of a pollutant, and Industry 1 might not discharge any of it, and Industry 2 might discharge 3 pounds of it, for example. It allows a community to come up with a way to have the same amount of pounds of pollutant but divide the "pie" up in a different way so industries can meet it better and do not need to install elaborate pretreatment equipment if not needed. This is what they talked to the MSFI Committee about in 2012. Mr. Swope has met with local industry users and found that they are in favor of this method.

Eric Swope stated that they have been working through a number of iterations of these local limits over the years. He continued that they sent a report to the EPA in 2012, which the EPA has not yet formally responded to. Since that time, some of the underlying assumptions changed. The Wastewater Treatment Plant had been under an interim limit of 20 parts per billion for copper which is a small number, considering you can have 1.3 parts per million in drinking water. EPA removed the interim limit and installed a limit of 6.2 parts per billion which required wastewater treatment plant staff to recalculate local limits. Initially, they ended up with a negative industrial loading, which means they had nothing to give to industry, which was a problem. However, in recent years improvements at the wastewater plant has resulted in increased removal efficiency for copper. They are now taking out approximately 96 or 97 percent. The EPA agreed to give the City more time to reevaluate proposed limits. The recalculated limits do allow for a positive industrial loading but the proposed copper limit is more stringent than what they had proposed in the 2012 report. . What has also changed is the NH Department of Environmental Services (NHDES) originally required them to look at sludge concentrations of various pollutants because they wanted to keep the option for land application open. But the City does not land apply, and they have been land-filling their sludge for a number of years and will continue to do so. A year or two ago the NHDES dropped that requirement. A number of their limits in the last proposal were based on sludge quality criteria, and since that requirement was dropped a number of the proposed local limits have become less stringent.

Mr. Swope continued that they have been working with Teton Environmental, a company that has a lot of experience doing this with other communities. At the end of the memorandum was the local limits they are proposing. The top part shows the limits they evaluated specifically during this last iteration. Yes, the limits are all getting more stringent. This mass allocation method means that instead of giving industries uniform concentration limits, they said, "Here's a piece of the pie, based on what your flows are and what your needs are. If you have copper in your discharge we'll give you a bigger piece of the pie, knowing that there are some industries that don't have any copper discharge." They give away percentages of the pie, not the whole pie.

It gives them a buffer for future growth – say, if a new industry comes in and has copper discharge.

Mr. Swope continued that he and Ms. Hanscom are asking the MSFI Committee to approve the report and this new allocation method. This will require a little more on the City's end, as far as tracking and increased administrative work. They think it is the best method for the City and the community.

Councilor Jones stated that about 10 years ago when they had that major mandate from the EPA regarding copper, the thought process was that as plumbing changes the copper will go down, now that plumbers are switching to polyvinyl tubing. He asked if that is still the thought process. Mr. Swope replied yes, most of their copper comes from copper pipes in domestic homes. They have done waste minimization work, trying to educate local plumbers and residents. Some industries have taken steps to reduce copper. Councilor Jones replied that maybe ten years from now the EPA will say there is too much polyvinyl in the water. Five or six years ago they had the phosphates problem with the EPA. Some states banned detergents with phosphates. He asked if the City is doing that. Ms. Hanscom replied that the State has already done that. She continued that there are very few detergents with phosphates. The biggest source is from humans - the human body excretes proteins that have phosphates in them.

Councilor Manwaring stated that they are trying to get new businesses to come to Keene. She asked if this new allocation method/the different pie is a way to attract new businesses. Mr. Swope replied that that would depend on the businesses and how much pollutants they have. There is room for growth in all pollutants and for some, quite a bit of room.

Chair Duffy stated that this is similar to their air particle quality issues. He continued that they know it is coming from the private sector but it could potentially have a negative effect on businesses. They also have issues with the air quality; the EPA has started paying attention. That is why they have the Woodstove Changeout Program, trying to get folks to get newer models. It can have a negative effect on industry even though they are not directly causing the problem. It can be similar with copper. Mr. Swope replied that they have one business that has copper in some dyes that they use, and have done a lot of minimization work over the past few years. They reduced their usage and only discharge in small, daily batches. There is one industry that will have a little bit of an issue with copper; they are in the process of doing waste minimization strategies now, to make sure they are not using up too much of the pie.

Chair Duffy asked if there were comments from the committee or the public. Hearing none, he asked for a motion.

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

On a vote of 5 to 0, the Municipal Services Facilities and Infrastructure Committee recommends that the City Council approve and update the proposed local discharge limits for pollutants of concern as identified in the City's local limits evaluation.

**2. MEMORANDUM – City Engineer – Main Street/Route 12 Bridge Over the Beaver Brook Project**

City Engineer James Donison stated that he is here to talk about the Route 12 Bridge over the Beaver Brook. He continued that there are double barrel culverts that are classified as a bridge. He introduced Theresa McAuliffe and Liviu Sfintescu from Louis Berger, the engineering firm that is under contract with the City to do the design. He continued that the City has 32 bridges, and this is one of the 14 red-listed ones. The NH Department of Transportation (NHDOT) has included it as part of present funding for about \$1.6 million dollars. The cost is more than that so they will have to ask NHDOT for more funding. NHDOT has 80/20 cost sharing with the municipality. The project is presently scheduled for design this year, and anticipated to go into construction in the spring of 2016. Ms. McAuliffe will talk about that and the challenges with Fairpoint and some of the relocation of the utilities. They had a local public concerns meeting in November. Members of the abutting properties were present along with representatives from the Swanzey water precinct and the Conservation Commission. They had questions and Louis Berger has incorporated those into the presentation.

Mr. Donison continued that this is the engineering study phase. The process is to have an engineering study phase, followed by a local public concerns meeting to gather information. Then they present the information to the MSFI Committee, then to NHDOT to ask for their approval for the recommended option. After that, Louis Berger goes into the final design phase and they will get into more details about the traffic management plan and the control plan.

Theresa McAuliffe, Project Manager with Louis Berger, showed and explained drawings on the easel. She stated that the existing structure is comprised of twin corrugated metal pipe arch culverts and it was built in 1961 when Route 101 was replaced and Martel Court was realigned. The structure has a sufficiency rating of 52.3%. The culverts are structurally deficient, in poor condition, and have been on the red list for 15 years or more. The primary reason for this project is to get this bridge off the red list and replace it with something structurally sound. The second reason is, this is on Beaver Brook. The water shed area is 9.9 square miles. It is a tier 3 stream. This bridge is in the regulated floodway and in the floodplain. Anything they do hydraulically they are modeling so they can show they are not going to change the design flood elevation. Other reasons for the project are the existing conditions - there is only a guard rail on one side of the bridge. There is a lot of traffic in this area at the intersection of lower Main Street and Route 101. She continued that there are over 18,000 vehicles per day, and 5% are trucks. NHDOT did two borings, and terminated after 120 feet because they could not find anything. Bedrock is about 100 feet down. There is a 70-foot layer of silt clay and a layer of sand. These are liquefiable, susceptible soils. There is very little load bearing capacity. If they built this upstream or downstream they would expect to see settlements of upwards of 44 inches. That is how bad the soil is. There are a lot of underground utilities in the area – city water, sewer, an abandoned gas line, and electric, and Fairpoint has about 12 conduits. There are also electric utilities overhead.

Ms. McAuliffe continued that the scope of the project is to replace this structurally deficient structure with a new one. Additional work is to remove the sediment and debris that has built up in the channel; this would be a continuation of maintenance work done in Beaver Brook a year

ago. There is a heavily armored slope repair next to Citco; that is temporary and as part of this project they will replace it with a permanent repair for slope stabilization. They want the structure to be in the existing right-of-way. They want to look at hydraulics to make sure they can accommodate the 100 year flows. What is tricky is that the bridge is only about .25 miles upstream from the Ashuelot River. When the Ashuelot River is full, any water coming in Beaver Brook has no place to go. It backs up and creates a backwater effect. Anything that the existing culverts are doing, you cannot see it. They looked at it hydraulically to see what happens if you take away the backwater effect, and found that the culverts are not handling the 100 year flows and are creating their own backwater. The new structure needs to handle the 100 year flows if you did not account for the backwater from the Ashuelot River. They need to look at the unrestricted 100 year flood, and also at the backwater effect to make sure they are not changing the regulated flood elevation, which would affect everyone's flood insurance.

Ms. McAuliffe continued that the purpose is to replace this bridge with something hydraulically compatible with Beaver Brook and structurally sound. "Do nothing" is not an option because they would still have a deficient bridge and the backwater. Rehabilitation is also not an option; it would correct the structure but not the hydraulic opening. The first real option is a single span structure. The NH Stream Crossing Guidelines look at healthy streams and rivers in the state. Adding a structure to a stream changes how it behaves – there might be changes to degradation, aggregation, etc. The first option is putting in a bridge and meeting the stream crossing rules. Since it is a tier 3 stream the span length will be a function of its bank full width, which refers to the ordinary high water – i.e. when it is not in flood stage, but maybe like a two-year storm. That structure would be a 28-foot clear span. The NHDOT Bridge Design Manual's criteria is to have a 1-foot "free-board" – meaning in a 100 year flood elevation the water should be at least a foot away from the bottom of the bridge, so debris can pass underneath. With a 1-foot free-board and a 28-foot clear span, this would necessitate raising the road way surface up two feet. That would allow the necessary room. Right now the culvert pipes are 10.5 feet wide and 7 feet high. You would need more structure depth. Because it is a single span bridge you will need a foundation to support it. The soil is bad, so you would need piles of about 100 feet in length. The cost of that structure, by itself, without looking at roadwork or right-of-way issues, is \$2.4 million.

Ms. McAuliffe continued that the NH Stream Crossing Guidelines say that if you cannot meet those guidelines, you can look at what the most is that you can do to meet them, within reason, and within what you can afford. Option 2 is to have two side-by-side box culverts, 12 feet wide by 8 feet high, with nearly the same roadway profile and no increase in elevation. It can be supported by a cast-in-place slab on grade. It will not require additional soil strengthening or modifications to get the bearing capacity required.

Ms. McAuliffe continued that the pros of option 1 are that it meets the NH Stream Crossing Guidelines and accommodates the 100 year flood with 1-foot free-board. A con is that raising the bridge up creates an island in the floodway. Currently the Ashuelot River backs up and overtops the Route 101 intersection – if they raise the bridge, it will be an island. You would have to ford through the water to get on and off the bridge. This is impractical. Also, a con of option 1 is that it creates additional road work. Route 101 traffic would have to be staged and diverted to complete that work. That 2-foot grade change will affect adjacent property owners. Vehicles would be two feet higher than the driveway into Tire Warehouse and might bottom out.

There would have to be conversations with property owners about whether their access has changed. The shortest detour, to get traffic from Route 101 to Main Street, would be 30 miles. They cannot reroute everyone 30 miles. If the roadwork is done in stages, a two foot grade change in one area means that the rest of traffic is down two feet below, so you have to figure out how to get traffic up and down two feet.

Ms. McAuliffe stated that the con for option 2 is that it does not meet the NH Stream Crossing Guidelines. She continued that by having no change in the roadway profile (which is a pro) you will still be submerged in the 100 year flood event. But while it is submerged, there is no increase in the regulatory water surface elevations, which means no one's flood insurance would have to change, which is a pro. Also, the 12-foot by 8-foot openings increase the hydraulic opening by over 80 square feet. This alleviates the backwater effect. No one will see this improvement because it will be masked by the Ashuelot River backwater. Roadway reconstruction will still need staging but there will be no tearing up of the pavement at the Route 101 intersection. It costs over a million dollars less than option 1.

Ms. McAuliffe concluded that option 2 is the preferred alternative. It makes the most sense given the poor soil conditions. It has the least impact to adjacent properties and the Route 101 intersection, is more practical, costs less, and does not create an island.

She continued that the other part of the project is the slope repair. The slope repair here is about 75 feet downstream of the bridge. The wall height is over 11 feet. The slope prior to failure was about a 1:1 to 2:1 slope. It is adjacent to Beaver Brook, so it will have erosion or scour that the brook will impose during floods. It, too, has the same poor soil conditions. There are constraints with the property - the top of the wall is right at the parking lot for Citgo. There are a lot of surcharge loads for vehicles. It needs to meet environmental constraints. NHDES is pushing for biostabilization.

Ms. McAuliffe continued that some options for slope repair are:

- Modular step gabion wall – a gabion is a wire basket filled with smaller rocks. You stack them up and they create stability.
- Concrete gravity wall - this is a traditional wall.
- Soldier pile wall – you drive piles, spaced 6 to 8 feet apart, and put in lagging. As you excavate you bring it down. It would require tie backs around anchors because of the surcharge loads and poor soils.
- Mechanically stabilized earth wall – as seen on Route 93. It kind of looks like a soccer ball pattern.

Ms. McAuliffe stated that all of those options would encroach on the adjacent property, except the gabion wall. It would be really hard to get through permitting for the other options. The preferred option is the modular step gabion wall. It could be done in segments without fully exposing the stream bank. It could be constructed to maintain the stream width without narrowing the flow of the cross section. It can be landscaped, with small shrubs on top. For scale, each gabion basket is 3 feet high, 10 feet wide, and the slope area is about 70 feet long.

Gabion baskets would satisfy overturning, sliding, stability, and bearing. It could be constructed in segments. The cost of the gabion basket wall is about \$90,000.

Councilor Jones asked if recommending option 2 includes the gabion walls. Mr. Donison replied yes. Councilor Jones asked if it is correct that choosing option 2 saves the City about \$300,000 at 20%. Mr. Donison replied that he thinks it is \$1.4 million for option 2 without the roadway improvements, which would be about \$500,000. He continued that for the bridge itself, option 1 is \$2.4 million and option 2 is \$1.4 million. Councilor Jones replied that they would still save \$300,000. Mr. Donison replied that they would probably save a million, once you add in the roadway improvements. He continued that the cost for the roadways improvements would probably be higher for option 1 than for option 2.

Mr. Kopczynski stated that not every event on the Beaver Brook is a backwater event, especially now that they are getting more micro bursts. He continued that he assumes option 1 improves a situation where the present bridge does not meet the floodplain requirements, but option 2 would not make it better or worse. Ms. McAuliffe replied that with the Ashuelot River backwater at a 100 year flood event, with option 2 you will not see a change, but at lower flood levels, like a 50 year or 10 year, you would see an improvement. Mr. Kopczynski asked if she is saying there would be an improvement with the micro events. Ms. McAuliffe replied yes. She continued that also, downstream from the structure it slows the water down, because the hydraulic opening is wider, which is also a benefit.

Councilor O'Connor asked why there would be a 30-mile detour to re-route traffic. Ms. McAuliffe replied that that would be the only suitable route for trucks, but there could be a shorter route for passenger vehicles.

Councilor Manwaring asked if the two boxes in option 2 have been used before. Mr. Donison replied yes. Councilor Manwaring asked what holds the two boxes, if what they are sitting on is so unstable. Ms. McAuliffe replied that it is on a slab on grade. There would be a concrete mat 18 inches thick and 35 feet wide, underneath the boxes. The boxes are each 14 feet, 12 feet clear with a 1-foot wall on each side. The large pad that the two boxes sit on is what helps it distribute its load to meet the bearing pressures.

Councilor Clark stated that you see gabion basket walls on the highway a lot. He asked what their longevity is. Ms. McAuliffe replied that when small shrubs are planted on top, the roots engage in a way to hold back the rocks. She continued that there are different specifications in the wires. They could be coated in something that does not rust and deteriorate, or you can do a different type. She has not gone into those specific details yet.

Councilor Clark asked what type of wires the \$90,000 model has. Ms. McAuliffe replied that the geo-technician has that information. Councilor Clark asked if the rest of the project is compromised if one of these walls fails. Ms. McAuliffe replied that if one of the wires deteriorated and some of the large rocks fell out, it would not compromise the entire structure. She continued that for the entire structure to be compromised, all of the wires would have to fail at once, followed by a flood coming through and removing all of the rocks.

Councilor Clark asked if this type of wall would last for at least 50 years, given the fact that they are metal and may start falling down and there may be erosion. Ms. McAuliffe replied that there is typically a 75-year design life guideline. That is what they would be looking at.

Chair Duffy stated that the existing bridge is 52% sufficient. He asked what the new structure will be. Ms. McAuliffe replied 100% sufficient. She continued that it will be designed for truck loading and up to date for safety features – bridge rails, guard rails approaches, transitions, etc.

Chair Duffy asked about option 2 not meeting the NH Stream Crossing Guidelines. Ms. McAuliffe replied that is correct; it would not meet the 1-foot free-board guideline and the NH Stream Crossing Guidelines. Chair Duffy asked for more information about those guidelines and about how close option 2 is. Ms. McAuliffe replied that 1.2 times the full width of the bank is 26 feet, and the NH Stream Crossing Guidelines say that for culvert-sized structures, you want a bridge that is 1.2 times the bank full width plus two feet. That is where the 28-foot figure came from in option 1. Option 2 it is pretty close – it would still meet 1.2 times bank full width.

Chair Duffy asked if there would be room in the area of the gabion wall for a riparian buffer with trees. Ms. McAuliffe replied no.

Councilor Jones asked if there is a deadline with the State, and where this is in the CIP. Mr. Donison replied that it is presently funded from previous years' allocations. He continued that money from the Spring Street Bridge project a year or two ago was reallocated and approved by NHDOT to be used for this bridge instead. Spring Street will be addressed at a later date. The total project budget from NHDOT is \$1.6 million. Option 2 would be about \$2 million – that is an estimate only. When the City submits to NHDOT they will see the difference in what they have available in funding and what the total cost is and they will have to reconcile that and fund the difference. Councilor Jones asked if the City's 20% is in the CIP. Mr. Donison replied that he has to look. He continued that there is money in the overall bridge program. They will probably come back to the FOP Committee with a request.

Chair Duffy asked what community goals they were discussing at the public concerns meeting. Mr. Donison replied that the purpose of a local concerns meeting is to invite the public and abutters and see what they think. They presented different alternatives and gave the public the opportunity to comment. It was general in nature. Chair Duffy asked if the City was referencing Comprehensive Master Plan (CMP) goals. Mr. Donison replied no.

Councilor Redfern asked if the project would still be eligible for 80% funding if option 2 does not meet NH Stream Crossing Guidelines. Ms. McAuliffe replied yes, there is an ideal that you are striving for, but there is a 'design alternative' where you demonstrate how it is impractical to meet the rules 100% and there is a more practicable alternative. They will go through that process. Mr. Donison stated that they have had meetings with NHDOT. He continued that they present the historical features to Natural Resources and Cultural Resources. They want the City to document the stone wall, and impacts the project would have on wetlands. Once they proceed in the final design they will be submitting a wetlands application and that would address the stream crossing rules.



Chair Duffy asked for comments from the public. Hearing none, he asked for a motion.

Councilor Manwaring made the following motion, which was seconded by Councilor Redfern.

On a vote of 5 to 0, the Municipal Services Facilities and Infrastructure Committee recommends accepting option 2 as the preferred design alternative for the Main Street/Route 12 Bridge over the Beaver Brook project as presented.

### **3. VERBAL REPORT – Bicycle Pedestrian Path Advisory Committee**

Greg Pregent, Chair of the Bicycle Pedestrian Path Advisory Committee (BPPAC), stated that he is here to give an update on the BPPAC's charge, membership, activities, projects, and events that they have accomplished over the past year and projects and activities they will go forward with. He continued that the purpose of the BPPAC is to coordinate, study, and recommend comprehensive bicycle pedestrian path improvements, facilities, plans, and projects to the City Council and other appropriate boards and committees for consideration and implementation.

Mr. Pregent continued that there are seven regular and two alternative members. Members are city residents, and must represent a cross section of members of bicycle clubs, organizations, and interests in the city. Pathways for Keene (PFK) members on the BPPAC are himself, James Duffy, and Charles (Chuck) Redfern. Members are appointed by the Mayor. Other BPPAC members are Andrew McCarron, Linda Rubin (Vice Chair), Christopher Brehme, and Thom Little. Currently there are no alternates. The Planning Department provides support and William Shoefmann, GIS Technician, is the primary contact.

Mr. Pregent continued that there are numerous functions and guidelines. First is to assist the Planning Department and NHDOT in the coordination of the preliminary and final design of the downtown bike path and other bicycle/pedestrian pathway projects. Some current projects include the Roundhouse T Phase II, which will complete the downtown trail from School Street to the Island Street connections. This will continue the trail to get it uninterrupted to the North Bridge and parts north and west from Eastern Avenue. Also the Cheshire Rail Trail Phase II will improve the trail in the Stonewall Farm area and is expected to be complete this summer. The Cheshire Rail Trail Phase III is in its preliminary phase, to extend the improved trail past Hurricane Road, loop around the Ami Brown Road, and go back to the area of the YMCA. It will begin in spring of 2016.

Mr. Pregent continued that the second function is to assist the Planning Department and Planning Board in planning and adopting the BPPAC Master Plan, to be an element of the Comprehensive Master Plan. They are working on it by setting goals, sub goals, and action items. The draft should be done by the end of the year. Some goals are enhancing Keene as a healthy community by preserving its natural environment; Complete Streets; Safe Routes to School, trails and paths that would complete the transportation system, including the downtown; and ensuring a vibrant, local economy for years to come.

Mr. Pregent continued that the third function is to promote communications among users of the trails, staff, and the City Council. The BPPAC has aired PSAs about events and projects, such as

the Rack It Up bike rack program and Bike/Walk to Work Week. The fourth function is to make reports and recommendations to the City Council and City staff regarding the development and management of paths, and the fifth is to serve as an advocate for the interest of the City's bicycle/pedestrian infrastructure. Mr. Pregent commented that he hosts a local radio show and routinely talks about the work the BPPAC and City is doing relating to paths, and Ms. Rubin is the Director of Healthy Monadnock and MRTMA board. The sixth function is to assist with publicity by bringing the benefits of the paths to the attention of the public through various methods, such as a map that will be coming out this summer.

Mr. Pregent continued that the BPPAC assists the Planning Department with grant applications. Keene recently was awarded \$392,000 from NHDOT's 2014 Transportation Alternatives program to improve bicycle/pedestrian infrastructure. It covers 80% of the cost and will be used for bike lanes, markings, improved crossings, and trail improvements. The project will create multiple recreation and commuter loops and be a great enhancement to the city's trail system. The final function of the BPPAC, Mr. Pregent concluded, is to perform other functions as requested by the City Manager, such as this presentation.

Chair Duffy asked if the committee or public had questions. Hearing none, he thanked Mr. Pregent for his great presentation. He added that staff from the Planning, Parks & Recreation, and Public Works Departments are often present at BPPAC meetings. Mr. Pregent replied yes, they are involved in the monthly discussions.

Chair Duffy asked if there is anything the BPPAC needs from the City Council. Mr. Pregent replied that the main thing is to maintain open communication between the two entities, if projects come along, or if there are questions related to the BPPAC. The Marlboro Street Rezoning Project will be a great example for them all to work together to come up with a great idea and make that section great for alternative transportation. There is already the bike path. Marlboro Street is the second widest in the city, so it is a great opportunity for Complete Streets. He hopes the City Council keeps an open line of communication and feels like they can contact the BPPAC for recommendations or ideas to coordinate everything together.

Councilor Jones thanked Mr. Pregent for his thorough presentation. He continued that three MSFI members are also members of PFK, so they are familiar with the BPPAC's work.

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

On a vote of 5 to 0, the Municipal Services, Facilities and Infrastructure Committee recommends accepting Greg Pregent's BPPAC report as informational.

#### **4. ORDINANCE – O-2015-01- Relating to No Parking – Specific Streets**

Gary Lamoureux, Project Manager for Parking Services, stated that this is a "housekeeping ordinance." He continued that the parking was just redone at Heberton Hall and the Keene Public Library. A few years back, people parking there overnight was problematic, because there was not enough space for others to park. Now with the removal of the Winter Street lot parking is even more valuable to Heberton Hall and the Library. Staff asked if the Parking

Municipal Services, Facilities, and Infrastructure Committee meeting minutes,  
February 11, 2015

Services group could install signage. The signage is already there; it was installed when there were issues. He continued that this ordinance would give the City the avenue to be able to enforce the signage as needed. There is nothing in the ordinance now about Heberton Hall and the Library.

Councilor Manwaring asked if this is similar to the other parking lots. Mr. Lamoureux replied that it is different from the Commercial Street, Wells Street, and Gilbo East lots. He continued that those are set up for the people who want to park overnight, and they alternate – one night certain lots are available for overnight parking, and the next night those lots are closed for snow removal and maintenance and overnight parking is available in different lots. The City Hall parking deck is set up the same way as the Heberton Hall one – overnight parking is not necessary in those areas, and if cars are parked there overnight and do not move, the City does not have the space they need to operate. That is why those lots are different and they are requesting that they be closed completely from 12:01 to 6:00 AM.

Chair Duffy asked if the public or committee had questions.

Councilor Jones made the following motion, which was seconded by Councilor Redfern.

On a vote of 5 to 0, the Municipal Services Facilities and Infrastructure Committee recommends the adoption of Ordinance O-2015-01-Relating to No Parking – Specific Streets.

#### **5. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 7:12 PM.

Respectfully submitted by  
Britta Reida, Minute-taker