

# **Appendix N**

## Meeting Minutes

Southern Maine Corridor Committee  
Scarborough Town Hall  
September 8, 2004  
5:00-6:30 P.M.

### **Attendance**

Caroline Allam, GPCOG; Neal Allen, GPCOG; Betsey Buckley, TrainRiders Northeast; Wayne Davis, TrainRiders Northeast; John Duncan, PACTS; George Flaherty, Cumberland County EMA; Jennie Franceschi, Biddeford; Connie Garber, YCCAC Transportation; Carolyn Gilman, Westbrook Senate District 29; Marc Guimont, MDOT; James Gulnac, Sanford; Natalya Harkins, GPCOG; Peter Hefler, Greater Portland Transit District; Robert Kahn, TrainRiders Northeast; Stephen Klein, Mermaid Transportation; Rosemary Kulow, New Gloucester; Suzanne LePage, SMRPC; Jim Long, Old Orchard; Chris Mann, MDOT; Tom Murphy, Sen. Susan Collins Office; Ronald Owens, Scarborough; Harold Parks, Gorham; Randy Perry, TrainRiders Northeast; Bob Pettitt, Gorham Economic Development Corporation; Rob Pettitt, GPCOG; Tom Reinauer, SMRPC; Bob Rodman, TrainRiders Northeast; Mike Shaw, Scarborough; David Sherlock, MDOT; Dan Stewart, MTA; David Willauer, GPCOG; Roger Winn, Newfield; Dick Wood, Gray; Steve Workman, Eastern Trail Management District.

**Call to Order** David Willauer opened the meeting with introductions.

### **Overview of Regional Transportation Assessment Approach – MaineDOT**

Chris Mann gave an update on the Regional Transportation Assessment (RTA) process and explained that the new public participation approach was approved by Commissioner David Cole. New components in the area of transportation planning include a public survey, public focus groups, and a stakeholders' survey. Broad public participation and involvement is necessary to create a meaningful public role in the decision-making process. Some of the shortfalls of the RTAC process included lack of consensus between regions, inconsistent involvement of RTAC members, and the fact that 70% of the respondents who participated in the public opinion survey were not aware of RTAC activities at all. This led to a need for some form of grassroots planning that connects the public with local and state authorities, allows for public input in the transportation planning process, and links land use, transportation and economic development together.

MaineDOT reviewed some of the public participation plans available in the country and introduced the RTA process, which will be carried out by local Regional Planning Organizations (RPOs) including GPCOG and SMRPC. This process will include public opinion to develop priority corridors and to integrate land use, transportation planning and economic development. Some of the goals of this approach include expanded public involvement, broad regional transportation goals and assessment, and a more sound information source for MaineDOT future planning and investments. The six Economic Development Districts will be used for the Regional Transportation Assessment.

### **Proposed Steering Committee Membership**

David Willauer introduced the public participation plan that was developed for the RTA process. The plan highlights some of the opportunities for public involvement in the study. The plan identified various information dissemination techniques and channels and included both formal and informal settings for future public process. The stakeholder profile form was distributed to all participants. The purpose of this form is to determine individuals that are willing to serve on the Southern Maine Corridor Steering Committee.

### **Regional Transportation Assessment**

David Willauer summarized the Corridor Based Planning concept, which expands beyond town borders and includes multiple interests in the region. Suzanne LePage presented draft maps with six suggested transportation corridors in both Cumberland and York Counties and stressed advantages of broad public participation in community planning activities. A corridor-based approach encourages regional cooperation, regulatory

consistency across municipal borders, more effective growth management tools, promotes economic development, and accounts for regional transportation needs.

Neal Allen explained how the Portland Area MPO (PACTS) has expanded from seven to 15 municipalities. GPCOG and SMRPC have a long history of working together and now both staff PACTS committees. He also described the role and structure of the Southern Maine Economic Development District (SMEDD). He further described how GPCOG and SMRPC have been working successfully with several sub-regional corridor coalitions.

### **Corridor Identification and Next Steps**

Participants discussed suggested regional corridors and elements such as pipelines, trails, water transportation, integration of territories adjacent to Maine borders, etc. One of the questions that should be asked prior to corridors delineation is the purpose of this exercise: is it designed to look at the existing conditions or is it a future vision for the region? Are they passenger and freight corridors or just highway corridors? Suzanne explained that regional corridors outline geographic regions for the purposes of information gathering and analysis, municipal cooperation, and also public outreach. The study will look at different aspects of planning and will include various transportation modes and types.

MaineDOT will provide a framework for cooperation between different regions around the state and will compile a statewide Regional Transportation Assessment (RTA).

A question was raised about the effectiveness of public participation and its influence on local planning decisions, based on the current conditions of growth happening faster than planning. MaineDOT would like to use the RTA to help with the transportation improvements prioritization process and funding. Also, this approach develops a methodology for introducing regional planning groups instead of putting this role on EPA or MaineDOT. Participants discussed the importance of common interest areas for municipal collaboration and public interest and a focus on proactive approach in planning. It was also mentioned that strong Home Rule in the state and unwillingness of local government to give up local control often restrain regional-based planning. Regional impact fees were identified as one of the tools that could be used in growth management.

Caroline Allam gave an overview of existing economic development programs and pointed out the “disconnect” between job creation and growth management.

Participants suggested town websites for disseminating information about the Regional Transportation Assessment process. Maintaining public interest and involvement could be a difficult task. David Willauer suggested that increased awareness of current transportation projects of regional significance in the area would draw public attention to the Regional Transportation Assessment process. Visualization was identified as one of the most powerful tools in conceptualizing the future impact of various development scenarios. One member suggested the use of computer based visualization applications, such as traffic simulation models, to bring attention to area traffic congestion.

### **Next Meeting**

The next meeting of Southern Maine Corridor Committee will be in early October. Staff will poll interested committee members for best date and time.

Natalya Harkins, GPCOG 774-9891

## MEMORANDUM

**To:** Southern Maine Corridors Committee and Interested Parties

**From:** Josh Mack, Transportation Planner

**Date:** October 8, 2004

**RE:** December 7, 2004 meeting of the Southern Maine Corridors Committee

---

Committee Members present: James Gulnac, Sanford; Roger Winn, Newfield; Dan Fleishman, Arundel; Margaret Forbes, disability advocate; Jim Long, Old Orchard Beach; Sandra Guay, Saco; Connie Garber, York County Community Action Corporation; and George Flaherty, Cumberland County.

Staff Members present: Natalya Harkins, GPCOG; Tom Reinauer and Josh Mack, SMRPC; Chris Mann and Marc Guimont, MaineDOT; and Dan Stewart, Maine Turnpike Authority.

Tom Reinauer opened the meeting by describing how the MaineDOT is launching a new public outreach program and replacing the former Regional Transportation Advisory Committees (RTAC) with new regionally based committees that will focus on a Regional Transportation Assessment this year. The regions will be based on the economic development district jurisdictions. The Regional Transportation Assessment document is scheduled to be complete by the end of the fiscal year, June 2005. Tom proposed having a meeting every other month on the first Thursday from 5:30 to 7:00. At the end of the meeting, there was consensus that the meetings should take place on a monthly basis because there is a great deal of work to do. The Committee agreed to try to keep to the Thursday evening schedule. Tom asked the committee if they preferred having staff run future meetings or if the committee would like to elect a Chairperson. George Flaherty was nominated and selected to be the Chair. There was consensus that at future meetings, the agendas should denote the desired outcome of agenda items and the procedure for carrying out agenda items. **The next meeting will be held at the Scarborough Municipal Offices on November 4 from 5:30 to 7:00 p.m.**

As the Regional Transportation Assessment is an entirely new process, the ensuing discussion at the first meeting was dominated by two major themes:

- The methodology that will be used to identify and prioritize regional needs, including the Committee's role in the process;
- Regional needs that should be incorporated into Southern Maine's Regional Transportation Assessment

Staff and Committee comments were collected and grouped under these two meeting themes:

### **Regional Transportation Assessment Methodology**

Committee comments:

- The Regional Transportation Assessment process should be informed by Maine DOT updates on the status of the Department's planning and project efforts--especially those projects and planning efforts aimed at mitigating issues on corridors with major transportation issues such as the Route 111, Route 302 and the Gorham bypass;
- Groups such as existing corridor committees, private developers, manufacturers, freight carriers, and tourism groups should be included in the process;
- The Regional Transportation Assessment should have a 3-5 page summary as a final product with pictures and graphics that the general public can use to better understand how the MaineDOT outreach to the public affects the Department's decision-making processes;

- The Regional Needs Corridor planning process should consider the primary needs of corridor communities stationed at endpoints of the corridor in relation to the secondary intermediary needs of communities inside the corridor;
- The Committee should consider developing a matrix analysis as a tool to identify transportation issues for each corridor and prioritize corridors. Regional traffic generators and I-95 exits should be identified in the matrix as well as a sublist of fast growing municipalities;
- The Regional Transportation Assessment should take into consideration Southern Maine’s relationship with New Hampshire and other sources of traffic moving through the area, as well as Maine’s relationship with New Brunswick;
- The Committee should focus on the public involvement plan;
- The Committee should consider breaking down into subgroups to talk about sub-corridors or groups of corridors;
- The Regional Transportation Assessment should focus on regional policies, and not focus on smaller needs and issues.

Staff comments:

- Maine DOT may require some standardization of the corridor committee reports, but wants to give the Committee the flexibility to allow the regions to make their own conclusions about their own unique transportation needs;
- A transportation inventory, outreach methods outlined in a public involvement plan, and an inventory of state and regional planning studies are being used to guide the Regional Transportation Assessment and to identify and prioritize regional needs;
- The Regional Transportation Assessment process will be guided by two major principles: (1) the desire to create a balance between transportation, land use and economic development planning and (2) examine this relationship by corridor;
- The Corridor analysis should examine the relationship between nodes and corridors;
- The Committee should keep in mind that each corridor is unique and will need to be evaluated separately;
- The Committee may want to think of the Regional Transportation Assessment as a book, where each corridor is a chapter. A major goal of the committee would be to find commonalities between each chapter of the book.

### **Regional Needs Identified**

Committee Comments:

- The following transportation planning issues were identified as being important considerations for a Regional Transportation Assessment: hazmat routes, residential growth, truck weight limits, congestion and movement of people, highway access control, truck length standards, pavement depth standards, transportation opportunities for people with disabilities;
- The following goals were identified as being important candidates for regional needs: mobility, universal access, economic sustainability, preserving capacity and safety of highways, sea lanes, balance between transportation, land use and economic development;
- The corridor committee should be cognizant of the fact that Southern Maine gets a disproportionate amount of transportation investment when compared to the tax revenue it generates for Maine;
- The corridor committee should analyze how an East-West Highway might affect existing corridors in Southern Maine—especially Route 302 and Route 26.

**Southern Maine Corridors Committee  
Scarborough Town Hall**

**November 4, 2004**

**5:00-6:30 P.M.**

**Meeting Minutes**

**Attendance**

Pete Cavanaugh, METRO; John Cavaretta, Ogunquit; George Flaherty, Cumberland County EMA; Margaret Forbes, Portland; Marc Guimont, MDOT; James Gulnac; Sanford; Natalya Harkins, GPCOG; Stephen Klein, Mermaid Transportation; Rosemary Kulow, New Gloucester; Josh Mack, SMRPC; Chris Mann, MDOT; Harold Parks, Gorham; David Sherlock, MDOT; Dan Stewart, MTA; Conrad Welzel, MTA; David Willauer, GPCOG; Jim Wendell, Scarborough

**Call to Order**

George Flaherty opened the meeting with introductions.

Review agenda, ground rules, corridor and sub-regional corridor committee roles:

The Committee members discussed the last meeting process and agreed that there should be a timekeeper assigned. Dan Stewart volunteered for this role. David Willauer reviewed ground rules in order to keep meetings organized and allow for everyone's participation. The following rules were adopted:

1. Keep on time
2. Work with time keeper
3. Share opinions on the process at the end of each meeting

David also clarified the Steering Committee's role and reviewed the following with the committee:

1. Provide feedback to the staff on the Regional Transportation Assessment
2. Provide input to an improved public outreach process

He emphasized that the final product for this year will be a Regional Transportation Assessment. MaineDOT is still developing what goes into this report. David described existing subregions and the relation between subregional corridor committees and the RTA process. Although they have a different agenda and focus, the work that was done by these committees will be integrated in the RTA report including public outreach and inventory analysis.

**A. Corridor Delineation**

David explained the principle of corridor delineation based on vectors connecting regional nodes and providing major travel movements. The "vectors" do not necessarily follow specific roads, but rather determine the movement of people and goods between major destinations. Each regional corridor will include a number of subcorridor movements, which are smaller in scale and have less impact on the region as a whole. Major points include: connection of MPO areas and large employment centers, combination of transportation modes, high traffic volumes, and areas of regional significance. He referred to a handout describing each corridor.

**Committee Feedback**

The Committee discussed proposed corridors and suggested the following modifications:

1. Add the Corridor from Sanford to Gray to Lewiston-Auburn on 202
2. Note the Corridor from Fryeburg to Lewiston/Auburn along the existing rail line
3. Note the Corridor from Bethel to Lewiston-Auburn to Brunswick
4. Identify major choke points or congested areas
5. Note the Corridor from Lewiston/Auburn to Freeport
6. Add marine corridors such as Portsmouth/ Portland
7. Include Glossary of terms in the report
8. Identify criteria for needs assessment and prioritization of needs

9. Label Nodes on map (major cities and/or destinations)
10. Be sure to coordinate between NH, Oxford County, and RTA study area
11. Create the map on 11 x 17 sheet of paper and include municipal names

### **B. Central Cumberland County Corridor RTA**

David described the corridor, which connects Portland and Lewiston/Auburn along the Maine Turnpike, Rte. 26/100, and several railroads. The regional efforts in this corridor include the Central Corridors Coalition which meets monthly and focuses on land use, transportation planning, and shared delivery of services. The Coalition will meet on November 10<sup>th</sup> for the Open Space Workshop.

Staff distributed three samples describing regional objectives and needs:

1. Sample descriptions from MaineDOT
2. Page from Central Corridor Coalition Phase I Plan describing recommendations
3. Page from Pennsylvania Plan describing Objectives and Needs

Committee Feedback:

- Preserve existing infrastructure and mobility
- Promote Economic Development, example Pineland
- Toll reconfiguration
- Control heavy haul truck movements and remove them from the local roads
- Decrease traffic congestion
- Encourage bicycle and pedestrian movements
- Preserve rural character and village centers, etc.

### **C. Southern Coastal Corridor RTA**

Josh gave an overview of the Corridor and rationale for its delineation. This Corridor connects NH and coastal Southern Maine towns with Portland along I-95 Rte. 1 and the Boston & Maine Railroad.

Committee Feedback:

- Invest in Portsmouth Naval Shipyard and explore possibility of ferry operation and reconstruction into marine passenger transportation production
- Alleviate traffic congestion east of Turnpike
- Promote commuter options such as vanpool and passenger rail service
- Improve or develop transit connectivity options to non-walkable destinations from existing rail stops
- Improve bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure on Route 1
- Toll system reconfiguration including “easy pass” system
- Improve safety on Rte. 111
- Improve access from local roads to I-95
- Improve service center hub access to Interstate “spine” (e.g. Sanford)
- Increase highway through capacity through the implementation of express lanes and HOV

### **D. Public Participation Timeline**

David summarized the public participation timeline, which will be further discussed at the next meeting along with a draft public opinion household survey. He suggested the most appropriate time for a public meeting would be in January or February when the Committee has more information on the RTA.

### **E. Next Steps, meeting date and time**

It was agreed that SMCC meetings would be held monthly on the first Thursday of each month. The next meeting was scheduled for December 9<sup>th</sup> and the location will be determined later. Other meeting dates will be on January 6, February 3, March 3, April 7, May 5, June 2, 2005.

The meeting adjourned at 7:00 p.m.

Natalya Harkins, GPCOG 774-9891

**Southern Maine Corridors Committee  
Arundel Fire House**

**December 9, 2004**

**5:30-6:45 P.M.**

**Draft Meeting Minutes**

**Attendance**

George Flaherty, Cumberland County EMA; Dan Fleishman, Arundel; Margaret Forbes; Community Partners; Connie Garber, York County Community Action Corporation; James Gulnac, Sanford; Natalya Harkins, GPCOG; Stephen Klein, Mermaid Transportation; Josh Mack, SMRPC; Dean Lessard, MDOT, Division 1 Office; Harold Parks; Dan Stewart, MTA; David Willauer, GPCOG; Tom Reinauer, SMRPC.

**Call to Order** Chairman George Flaherty opened the meeting with introductions.

**Public Involvement Plan & Survey**

David Willauer discussed Maine DOT's recent launch of a long-term public involvement initiative of which the Regional Transportation Assessment is a part, called "Transportation: 2025: Fueling this Economic Engine." He explained that a new part of the initiative is to use the Regional Transportation Assessment process as a vehicle to host "Regional Forums" where Commissioner Cole and his staff will discuss long-term transportation policy issues with regional stakeholders. In addition to public forums, MaineDOT has directed GPCOG and SMRPC to conduct one or more public opinion surveys as part of the Regional Transportation Assessment. David presented three survey documents (1) a GPCOG-produced household survey for the Cumberland County Coastal Corridor, (2) an I-295 Corridor Study On-Line Survey from the MaineDOT website, and (3) a document containing Maine DOT questions that are required to be part of the Regional Transportation Assessment. David explained that GPCOG is considering performing surveys on a corridor level. SMRPC expects to also administer one survey in York County. David asked the committee to provide feedback on the surveys and the surveying process.

**Feedback and Discussion points:**

- The Survey should include shippers, trucking companies and transit operators in the survey process.
- The State Planning Office and planning boards should be invited into the Regional Transportation Assessment process and should be contacted to provide feedback on any survey.
- Other Regional Planning Commissions/Councils of Governments in the state are exploring the targeted survey approach, with surveys directed towards government officials/planning boards/etc. A benefit of this approach is that municipal officials may have a broader—more informed view of the transportation system and planning issues—a weakness is that the survey will present one-sided, possibly biased results. If household opinion is desired, this is not a useful tool. Officials or Planning Board members may need to be given instructions to fill out a survey as a citizen of the town—not as a government employee/volunteer.
- What is the survey purpose and what is the area to be surveyed?
- Maine Turnpike Authority has an Origin-Destination Survey that is expected to be completed later this month, which can be used as a supplement to this survey.
- If MaineDOT is requiring questions pertaining to a statewide survey, then a MDOT survey should be sent out separately from a Corridor-based survey. One will have skewed results on the statewide Maine survey if it is presented to just one corridor region.
- The Southern Maine Corridors Committee and Regional Transportation Assessment process is a cross-disciplinary effort—focusing on one corridor region may not be conducive to the purposes of the committee or RTA process.
- SMRPC has 39 communities in its region—producing a survey instrument that covers the entire area and making it a statistically significant survey would require a larger budget and more administrative time than what the current RTA budget allows.

- There is some difficulty in developing survey questions about roadways and other corridors in broad regions for households that may only have finite experience or knowledge with the larger transportation system.
- One no cost option is to use the website survey approach and free newspapers. Free newspapers are distributed all over York County. GPCOG's experience with newspaper surveys is that the response rates are not good.
- Consider using more than one survey instrument.
- There is the possibility of working with town halls and having citizens drop off surveys in the towns to avoid the exorbitant mailing costs.
- Explore other public involvement strategies such as public hearings beyond that of surveys.

Conclusion: Based on committee feedback, staff should design a short survey with the required questions from MaineDOT and distribute to a random sample in the Southern Maine region.

### **York County Central Corridor System**

Josh Mack presented a map to the Committee showing the proposed "York County Central Corridor System." The system includes Routes 236, 4, 11, 202 and 5. At the Committee's request, the Route 202 corridor now extends up into Gray/New Gloucester. Josh explained that SMRPC will be adding Route 35 to this Corridor System as well, based on a recommendation at an earlier meeting. Corridors in this region vary widely in terms of the Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) that they carry. Each road, with the exception of Route 5 is a part of Maine's Heavy Haul Truck Network. This was emphasized because a significant theme for the corridor is that heavy loads use the corridor system often because of truck weight limits on Interstate highways.

#### **Objectives and Needs Feedback:**

- Map should show east-west connections and particularly I-95 exit points because I-95 has a significant impact on the functionality of the York County Central Corridor System.
- At Route 4 and 109 there are significant crash rates and the intersection functions at a Level of Service D.
- Major issue for corridor system is "How to accommodate mobility needs of people traveling on this corridor system?"
- Major issue for system is that the housing market is shifting to the North, which has implications for changing commuter patterns and capacity issues.
- Emerging center in corridor system is Waterboro, where it is becoming a new service center with banks, grocery marts, hardware stores, restaurants, etc, and diverting some traffic that used to travel to Sanford.
- York County Central Corridor System has role of attracting significant amount of drivers avoiding the coastal corridors.
- Central Corridor transit system is spread out, with most service concentrating on Sanford into Wells in this region.
- There should be a consideration of connecting the York County Central corridor with east-west train service.
- The corridor experiences substantial freight trucking traffic avoiding weigh stations on the Turnpike.

### **Cumberland County Coastal Corridor**

David Willauer presented maps of the Cumberland County Coastal Corridor and explained the features included on the map including the major highways, rail lines, ferry lines, park and ride lots, airports, and interstate exits. The corridor extends from Portland to Brunswick, including Freeport, North Yarmouth, Cumberland, Yarmouth, and Falmouth. High crash locations are concentrated in Portland where traffic volumes are also the highest of the region. Major highways on the corridor include Routes 1 and 295. Two major problems in the area are Exits 15 and 17 in Yarmouth and the problem of traveling from 95 to southbound 295 off the Falmouth spur at Exit 10.

### Objectives and Needs Feedback:

- Corridor has peak hour highway capacity issues between Portland and Brunswick.
- Rural towns are turning into bedroom communities and land use changes are affecting road capacity.
- Committee should examine vanpool opportunities with major employers in the area as well as incentives to employers for having employees participate in carpools/vanpools. There are several vanpool services through GOMaine and RTP transports employees to Bath Iron Works during commuter hours. (Examples of transit/vanpool service destinations include Bath Iron Works, Augusta, Portland parochial schools, etc.)
- The Casco Bay ferry service fares recently went up and the boats are often at capacity. This is a burden on low-income island families.
- Corridor region should consider Atlantic City model shipping car-riders from satellite parking lots into Portland. GPCOG did something similar for a one-time Tall Ships Event in 2000.
- Consider using the Portland Jetport overflow lot for transit services.
- Tukey's Bridge is a major bottleneck point on the corridor.
- The region should consider exploring a flexible highway system that allows highway authorities to reverse the direction of a lane's customary traffic flow based on a.m. and p.m. peak hour traffic.

### **F. Next Steps, meeting date and time**

At the next meeting there will be a discussion about the York County East-West Corridor and the Lakes Region Corridor. The next meeting is scheduled for January 6<sup>th</sup> at 4:30 p.m. at the Scarborough Town Hall.

The meeting adjourned at 6:50 p.m.

Josh Mack, SMRPC 324-2952

## Transportation Open House and Public Meeting

Meeting Summary

March 3, 2005

### Participants

Marcia Bowen, Normandeau Associates; Robert Bowker, Scarborough Bicycle & Pedestrian Committee, Brian Clogston, Louis Berger; George Flaherty, Cumberland County; Peggy Killmer, Yarmouth; Steve Klein, Mermaid Transportation; Sandra Lie, Old Orchard Beach; Jim Long, Old Orchard Beach, Mathew Rines, Gorham, Bernard Rines, Gorham; Dale Spaulding, Louis Berger; Robert Wagner, ExpanTest.

### GPCOG, PACTS, SMRPC, MTA and MaineDOT Staff:

John Duncan, PACTS; Marc Guimont, MaineDOT; Natalya Harkins, Josh Mack, SMRPC; Chris Mann, MaineDOT Planning, Tom Reinauer, SMRPC; Dan Stewart, Maine Turnpike Authority, Conrad Welzel, Maine Turnpike Authority; Jim Wendel, Scarborough; David Willauer, GPCOG.

### Transportation Open House – 4:00 – 6:00 p.m.

Transportation officials and planners from GPCOG, MaineDOT, Maine Turnpike Authority, PACTS, and SMRPC hosted a 2-hour Open House for the public to find out more about transportation issues and concerns. The public was invited to participate in an informal setting and ask questions regarding transportation plans, projects and policies.

### Transportation Funding Forum – 6:00 – 8:00 p.m.

John Duncan presented information about the PACTS process and the work that defines the expanded *Destination Tomorrow* Long Range Plan. He described PACTS history, the committee structure, and how the Metropolitan Planning Area has expanded from seven to 15 municipalities in the past two years.

Chris Mann presented *Transportation 2025*, or MaineDOT's 20 Year Plan. The purpose of this plan is to educate policy makers and public on transportation needs, to discuss the sustainability of resources to meet those needs and to define opportunities and challenges over the next 20 years. He said the MaineDOT is contracting with the Regional Planning Organizations (RPO's) this year to develop a Regional Transportation Assessment, with plans to conduct public forums on *Transportation 2025* next fall.

Tom Reinauer presented a summary of creative financing techniques using examples from Maine, New England and other parts of the country. He described several options for innovative financing, including local option taxes, transportation impact fees, gasoline taxes, and public/private partnerships.

Conrad Welzel presented a comprehensive history of the Maine Turnpike Authority from its construction in 1947 to the present EZ Pass implementation. In 1982, the Maine Turnpike helped Maine with its transportation financial shortfall by providing MaineDOT with \$4.7 Million each year. He presented highlights of the MTA Five Year Plan 2005-2009, including bridge rehabilitation, a pavement program and safety improvements. Over the next 10 years, the Maine Turnpike is planning to widen the roadway between Exits 44 to 52 for \$66 Million, and construct a truck-passing lane in Cumberland for \$8 Million.

### Question and Answer Period

Steve Klein had concerns regarding the proposed speed limit increase between Exits 44 and 52. Conrad Welzel said this is only in the short section where it is 55 MPH today. There was a question regarding the status of passenger rail service from Portland North. David Willauer explained MaineDOT is completing an Environmental Assessment to evaluate the environmental impacts and working with the NNEPRA on a Rail Business Plan to evaluate how to finance the expansion.

A question was asked whether new PACTS municipalities are participating in the expanded PACTS process. John Duncan said yes, there are active participants from new cities and towns in the PACTS area. Can the

Maine Turnpike implement electronic speed enforcement? No, Conrad Welzel explained this is not the intent of EZ Pass. How many forums will MaineDOT be conducting in the fall? Chris Mann said at least six.

There was more discussion regarding the rebuilding of the Payne Road Bridge over the Maine Turnpike Exit 45 Toll area adjacent to the Maine Mall. This is currently at \$6 Million. Should we be tolling roads in rural areas? Conrad Welzel said the revenues will help but it may not finance roads.

Does the fact that there was no Transportation Bond last year have an impact on funding transportation projects? Yes, this was followed by more discussion regarding funding shortfalls. The current Transportation Bond being proposed is one of the lowest ever.

There was more discussion and several questions regarding the impact of stormwater runoff from impervious surfaces and its environmental impact. With more development occurring, more surfaces are being paved and it impacts groundwater recharge.

**Southern Maine Corridors Committee  
Scarborough Municipal Offices**

**April 7, 2005**

**5:30-7:00 P.M.**

**Draft Meeting Minutes**

**Attendance**

Charles Andreson, Town of Sanford; George Flaherty, Cumberland County EMA; Margaret Forbes; Community Partners; Natalya Harkins, Greater Portland Council of Governments (GPCOG); Robert Kahn, TrainRiders Northeast; Stephen Klein, Mermaid Transportation; Rosemary Kulow, Town of New Gloucester; Chris Mann, Maine DOT, Bureau of Planning; Josh Mack, SMRPC; Marc Guimont, Maine DOT, Region 1 Office; Harold Parks, Gorham; Dan Stewart, Maine Turnpike Authority (MTA); David Willauer, GPCOG; Roger Winn, Town of Newfield; Dick Wood, Town of Gray; Steve Workman, Eastern Trail Management District.

**Call to Order:** Chairman George Flaherty opened the meeting with introductions.

**Public Open House Recap (March 3, 2005)**

David Willauer described the open house meeting conducted by staff of the Southern Maine Regional Transportation Assessment Process in conjunction with Portland Area Comprehensive Transportation Study (PACTS), Kittery Area Comprehensive Transportation Study (KACTS), Maine DOT and the MTA. GPCOG and SMRPC staff displayed information and answered questions and concerns about the Regional Transportation Assessment (RTA) process at the open house in Scarborough. There was a good turnout at the meeting and some steering committee members were present at the open house. The second half of the meeting focused on transportation funding. There were several presenters at the open house including John Duncan, Director of the PACTS MPO, Tom Reinauer, Transportation Director at SMRPC, Chris Mann, Maine DOT Bureau of Planning, and Conrad Welzel, Government Affairs for Maine Turnpike Authority. David notified the committee that notes were drafted summarizing the open house and presentations. He highlighted Maine Turnpike Authority's presentation. The Maine Turnpike will need to invest \$66 million over the next ten years to widen the roadway from Exits 44 to 52.

**MaineDOT Update – RTA Process**

Chris first updated the committee on the meeting that Maine DOT had with the leaders from Economic Development Districts (EDD) in Maine. This included executive directors from SMRPC, GPCOG, Androscoggin Valley Council of Governments, Kennebunk Valley Council of Governments, Hancock County Planning Commission and Eastern Maine Development Corporation. The meeting focused a great deal on the Maine DOT's anticipated funding gap over the next twenty years and how Maine DOT would like to work with the EDDs next fall to hold a series of Regional Forums. These regional forums would be meetings with public officials and other members of the public to provide constructive input to Maine DOT and discuss ways to close the funding gap that is the theme of their *Transportation 2025* initiative. He expects to hold these meetings sometime in September and November later this year.

Chris then provided a statewide progress report on the RTA process. All regions are putting together a RTA that considers transportation planning issues in conjunction with economic development and land use planning. Maine DOT has combined all the vector maps submitted from each EDD into a statewide vector map showing the basic travel patterns throughout the state. Each region has also formed well-represented steering committee's that are in line with Maine DOT's mandate to follow the Sensible Transportation Policy Act. Each region is in the process of finishing a first draft of each EDD Regional Transportation Assessment, which it will submit to Maine DOT later this month. A Regional Transportation Assessment product should be completed by the end of this contract year at the end of May 2005. Each EDD RTA will be reviewed by the Maine DOT, Bureau of Planning and used for Long Range Planning.

George Flaherty noted that the RTA should take into account flood hazard mitigation issues into a statewide context. Margaret Forbes asked if the David Cole, the Maine DOT Commissioner had any comments with

regard to the Regional Transportation Assessment Process. Chris answered that the Commissioner was pleased with the results so far and has said positive things about the process.

### **Draft Regional Transportation Assessment Report & Discussion of Methodology to Prioritize Corridors**

David Willauer presented the Draft Regional Transportation Assessment Report to the Committee. The Committee was asked to review the document and provide input on the draft. This draft will be submitted to the other EDDs and Maine DOT at the end of this month. David explained that there are three corridors in Cumberland County and three corridors in York County.

Rosemary Kulow asked if the 114 Corridor Committee was being replaced with the Lakes Region Corridor. David explained that in some of the large corridor systems, there are smaller corridor committees that are dealing with more localized issues, rather than the larger policy issues in which this Committee is focusing its efforts. The Lakes Region corridor is looking at the issues of the broader patterns of travel, including but not limited to Route 114.

David asked Chris Mann what the future of the Regional Transportation Assessment process is and what the future role of the steering committee will be. Chris responded that public outreach will continue to be important in the future. He is anticipating that he will work with the RPCs in the near future to determine what has worked best and what hasn't worked in attempting to gather public input for Maine DOT. He is considering the possibility of using the household survey as an instrument for public outreach next fiscal year. Natalya explained to the Committee that we received roughly a 12% return on our RTA survey. We were hoping for 20% for statistical significance, but over 10% is still a good return. It is likely that GPCOG and SMRPC will bring results to the next steering committee meeting.

Margaret said that she would like to see a strong policy with regard to station design standards for the trains. Robert Kahn stated that some of the problem with Amtrak station designs is that there is not ideal cooperation between Guilford Rail (the company that owns the Amtrak rail), Amtrak, NNEPRA and Concord Trailways.

Marc Guimont offered some comments and suggestions for the Regional Transportation Assessment report and process. He stated that he would like to see the RTA process offer policy guidelines to all Maine Stakeholders (including but not limited to Maine DOT) to be more proactive and less reactive to planning issues. He stated that Maine DOT's role is to connect nodes and that local and regional efforts are crucial to make this process work. He urged the Regional Transportation Assessment process to take into account utility corridors including microwave towers, gas lines and fiber optic cable infrastructure with regard to movement of goods and services. He also stated that redundancy should be addressed in the transportation infrastructure in case one transportation corridor is impeded. Another suggestion raised by Marc is the need for improved intermodal connectivity and scheduling.

Steve Workman asked that there be more effective dialogue between the Maine and New Hampshire transportation contingents on bridge policies. Robert Kahn stated that Maine and New Hampshire communications could be improved on a variety of levels, not only on shared bridges, but Amtrak policy as well.

Rosemary asked for clarification on how the SMEDD RTA would prioritize corridors. Chris answered that he sent an e-mail to the RPCs that afternoon providing an example of how EMDC and HCPC had developed criteria and weighting mechanisms to prioritize. The EMDC/HCPC prioritization formula does not have to be used by all RPCs. It is merely an example. The Committee launched into a brainstorm on quantitative criteria that could be used for prioritization:

- Population
- Vehicle Miles Traveled
- Size of Bridges
- % of Heavy Haul Truck Network Route Miles

- Redundancy (where is it most needed)
- Bridge conditions
- If an area is an apex of several corridors
- Safety (high crash locations, crashes, fatalities, crashes per number of trips, number of access points, backlog)
- Accessibility (speak with Eric Dibner at the Department of Labor about indicators that could be used)
- Interaction between building permits on mobility corridors
- Width of shoulders
- Whether towns institute impact fees, have feeder roads
- Whether towns have State Planning Office “consistent” comprehensive plans
- Whether towns have Maine DOT approved highway design standards
- Whether towns have compatible access management programs or zoning

Charles Andreson questioned whether there was a need or purpose to prioritizing corridors. The Committee was somewhat split on this issue as to whether it made sense to prioritize corridors. David Willauer said that the staff would follow up on this issue with Maine DOT and the other RPCs.

**Next Meeting**

A meeting was scheduled for May 5<sup>th</sup>, 2005 from 5:30 to 7:00 PM. Location to be determined.

Submitted by Josh Mack  
 April 12, 2005  
 Southern Maine Regional Planning Commission

**Southern Maine Corridors Committee**

**Scarborough Municipal Offices**

**May 5, 2005**

**5:30-7:00 P.M.**

**Draft Meeting Minutes**

**Attendance**

Peter Cavanaugh, METRO; George Flaherty, Cumberland County EMA; Natalya Harkins, Greater Portland Council of Governments (GPCOG); Will Haynes, Southern Maine Coast Tourism Association; Stephen Klein, Mermaid Transportation; Frank Koenig, Windham; Josh Mack, SMRPC; Marc Guimont, Maine DOT, Region 1 Office; Harold Parks, Gorham; Dan Stewart, Maine Turnpike Authority (MTA); Jim Wendel, Scarborough; Roger Winn, Town of Newfield; Dick Wood, Town of Gray.

**Call to Order**

Chairman George Flaherty opened the meeting with introductions. The April 7<sup>th</sup> Meeting Minutes were reviewed and adopted.

**MaineDOT Meeting – Update on RNA Process**

Josh Mack gave an update on the last meeting with MaineDOT and other Regional Planning Organizations (RPOs) that was held in Augusta on April 26. The primary purpose of the meeting was to review draft RPO reports, discuss the prioritization process and criteria, and go over the next fiscal year contract timeline and potential work items. Some of the highlights of the meeting include:

The group decided that the report's primary purpose is not to evaluate needs, but rather to look broadly at transportation planning and priorities in relation to land use and economic development. Therefore, it was determined that the term "Regional Transportation Assessment" (RTA) was a more appropriate title for the report.

Each report will consist of two parts: (1) corridor summary descriptions, objectives and priority rank; and (2) inventory and analysis for each corridor along with the maps and tabular data.

Prioritization process will help MaineDOT to define focus and distribution of efforts in the future and will be based on the importance of the corridor within the larger region rather than needs and deficiencies for each corridor.

The reports should be completed and submitted to MaineDOT by May 20<sup>th</sup>; however, some modifications can be made later if necessary.

Fiscal year 2006 contract items should be submitted by the same date for MaineDOT review. The goal is to have contracts signed by June 1. Work items may include any remaining work on the Regional Transportation Assessment, support for fall forums on Transportation 2025, continuing public involvement activities including meetings with service centers to discuss Regional Transportation Assessment, and any RPO work items based on objectives in the RTA.

The group discussed the future of the process and the role of the Steering Committee in monitoring the activities resulting from the RTA. Mark suggested that the Committee be actively involved in MaineDOT transportation planning efforts and should define the ways and tasks for future involvement.

George asked what kind of feedback the Steering Committee could give on the process and the final report. He mentioned that the document should be bolder and have more specific implementation

strategies. Mark supported the comment and emphasized that the document should remain within policy recommendations and be broad and bold.

Rob Pettit described the connection between large industrial companies and clusters of economic activity and transportation planning. He stressed the importance of involving large industry owners into the dialog and getting their perspective on the future development and growth. On the example of Poland Spring, he evaluated the impact of the company expansion on some of the major transportation corridors. Also, the group analyzed implications of emergency situations on the traffic patterns and evacuation procedures. George referred to the Hazardous Materials Commodity Flow study developed by GPCOG and the information on the most frequently used routes and volumes of materials on the state roads.

Dan Stewart suggested that the group look at the report and finalize it by a certain day so that all comments get included into the final document. The decision was made that all feedback should be forwarded to GPCOG no later than May 10<sup>th</sup>. Project staff will then modify the document based on the group's comments. The group felt that there should be another meeting to review the document prior to submitting it to MaineDOT. The next meeting date was set for Thursday, May 12 from 5:30 to 7:00 pm at the Scarborough Town Hall.

### **Corridor Prioritization Discussion**

Natalya distributed a matrix for identifying the weighted score based on seven criteria for each regional corridor. She explained the methodology for the process including the identification of significance or weight of each criteria based on 100 points by each member, assigning a rank from 1 to 10 to each corridor based on representation of each criterion within the corridor, and summing up all ranks for each criterion multiplied by the corresponding weight in order to determine the total score for each corridor. Each member filled in an individual form that was submitted to GPCOG. The results of this prioritization process will be discussed at the next meeting.

### **Public Opinion Survey Results**

Josh distributed the public opinion survey results and highlighted the major findings. He mentioned that most of the surveys came from the Cumberland County Central Corridor and the majority of respondents were in the 54-64 age bracket. Mainly, people are employed full-time and use a car as their primary transportation mode. Other graphs represented information on roadway conditions, financing transportation improvement and maintenance, transportation needs, and transportation improvements ranking. The survey revealed that the primary reason for the place of residence remains rural character and natural environment. At the same time, the majority of respondents identified passenger transportation improvement as the first regional priority. The entire text document will be included in the report.

### **Next Meeting**

The next meeting was scheduled for May 12<sup>th</sup>, 2005 from 5:30 to 7:00 PM. Location to be determined.

Submitted by Natalya Harkins  
May 6, 2005  
Greater Portland Council of Governments