

Gateway One: Regional Meeting  
Camden, Rockport, Northport and Lincolnville  
Thursday, February 7, 2008  
Camden Washington Street Conference Room, Camden

Over 25 people were in attendance. See attached list. After a presentation by Jane Lafleur, Town Response Panel Representative from Camden on the purpose and time table (see last page) of Gateway One planning study, Kat Fuller from MaineDOT and Stacy Benjamin from Maine State Planning Office (SPO) lead a discussion on the Regional Forms paper developed by Evan Richert. The following discussion took place with many of the questions and comments on the Gateway One process and Scenario Building, followed by comments and questions on Regional Forms.

Q: With the regional land use approach, if a project or development occurs in a town in a job center, do all 21 towns have to agree? Doesn't this discourage a business from coming to our area if we require regional decision making?

A: Kat indicated that this is a question that the Gateway 1 communities need to grapple with. There is no State or Federal mandate for any regional governance model. The Gateway 1 study is researching what is being done elsewhere; for example, the Saco River Commission involves a number of communities that plan together and the Cape Code Commission has detailed building permit review authority. It will be up to the towns whether they want any kind of regional governance to help with managing the effects of land use and transportation decisions.

Q: What drove the Wiscasset Bypass discussion? If the bypass decision had gone through this process, would the outcome be different?

A: The bypass project has been in planning for a long time (40+ years) and went through a different approach. It did not use a corridor approach. It was very focused on a single problem. A bypass in some form will be assumed in all scenarios envisioned in the Gateway 1 study as 1) no build; 2) yes build in 10-15 years and 3) yes build now for 25 years future. The Gateway 1 Planning process has a 25 year window into the future.

Q: If it takes 25 years to identify and implement a project such as a bypass, how can the Gateway 1 study possibly have an impact on the future?

A: The Wiscasset study was started and stopped many times because there was no agreement on what should be done. Many business owners feared that a bypass would have a negative effect on business activity. It seems that now many people are in favor of a bypass but the remaining question is which of several possible corridors to focus on. Gateway 1 is different in that it is not waiting for a problem to develop; its focus is preemptive if possible. It does acknowledge existing problems and will identify solutions for as many of those that it can but more importantly, it will identify how the land use patterns outlined in local plans/ordinances or created by individual land owners will affect the transportation system into the future. If the decisions of today will affect the future in a negative way, then Gateway 1 will incorporate recommendations on what changes to land use and transportation decisions need to be made to get the future right.

Q: Route 1 planning so far has not been based on Scenarios, why make this so complicated?

A: Route 1 to date has been on a problem by problem / site by site basis or has covered the corridor but focused on transportation solutions only. This approach attempts to identify 3 possible futures and the transportation and land use tools that will assure it remains a viable life line.

Q: Has Gateway 1 looked to what if the regions cannot agree? Those with money may want to impose order on the chaos?

A: There are carrots, not sticks. First, The legislature created STPA (Sensible Transportation Policy Act) and the 1991 rule is being amended to link the Growth management Act (The Comprehensive Plans and Land Use Regulation Act) to link transportation and land use planning. The State can reward towns that link transportation and land use planning. The rule making for this goes to the legislature for a hearing the week of 2/11/2008.

Second, in the recently approved Piotti bill, the legislature allows the MaineDOT to reward towns that (on their own or together) work to preserve the long term life of the transportation system. They channel existing programs, the Transportation Enhancement Program, Scenic Byway Program, Safe Routes to School Program, Community Gateways Program and Small Harbor Improvement Program, to towns that integrate land use and transportation decisions. These towns will get bonus points. Kat noted that while there is nothing in the works, especially in this fiscal environment, the idea for a Livable Community Bond has been tossed around at MaineDOT.

Q: Why is Gateway 1 using the approach it is using?

A: The Gateway 1 study will give towns people a chance to view the impact of transportation and land use decisions. The model will show us all visually what will happen under *perfect storm*, *full wind and riding the currents* scenarios. This will make the choices an easier sell to communities when people can see that certain patterns of development lead to transportation problems. The way those transportation solutions are solved might be by changing the land use pattern, by introducing other modes of travel and by designing more fitting/sensitive highway improvements.

Q: How are you proposing to control development and towns? The towns control land use now. If you do nothing, it is not doing nothing. What are you imposing?

A: The Gateway 1 recommendations will not be mandatory. We believe the model results will lead us to much collaboration between towns. If a town up the road is having an effect on your town, you will want a conversation. This is not mandated action between towns.

Q: In the Low Density Form, we need to be looking at Route 52 as a viable alternative. Other towns have alternative routes, such as transit and airports; we don't have an alternative. Route 1 is our life blood.

A: Route 52 was identified early on by Towns because it acts as a defacto bypass. It's current condition is evidence that it was never designed to act as such.

Comment: We are handicapped. Amtrak should be coming to Brunswick in 5 years. We have other choices in the way we grow. Transit may become more viable. We may have these options if we grow in a certain way.

Comment: There are two good examples of what could have happened if Gateway recommendations had been in place. The likely arrival of Amtrak service to Brunswick and regular year round rail service to Rockland would have been accelerated.

At one point there was talk of a large scale road, the same size as Route 90, being proposed for the Route 52 corridor. Folks living near Route 52 in Lincolnville and Hope showed great opposition to that idea. So when we were planning for the reconstruction of Route 1 through Lincolnville, we were encouraged to do what we can to ensure the capacity of Route 1 is not overly diminished, in order that it not become necessary to build an oversized road along the Route 52 corridor.

Comment: I like this big picture and the value of the whole. We must engage enough people. More scenarios help. If we know what could happen, we have a leg up on the future. The more people we engage, the more opportunities we have.

We need to see the (model results of the) scenarios.

Q: What is the time table? Do we see the draft plan before we see the scenarios?

A: No. We will see the model results of the status quo (Riding the Currents) scenario in April, May, before the draft plan.

Comment: The (Scenic Resource) Visual Assessment manual and ordinance language is coming out of SPO soon.

The Visual Assessment "how to" manual noted above will be a good complement to the Gateway 1 Scenic Resource Assessment of the Gateway 1 corridor.

Q: Does the Gateway 1 Scenic Resource assessment give a visual assessment from the water.

A: No, it is from 500 feet from either side of Route 1 and from other public places such as the state park. Due to budget limitations, it did not incorporate views from the water. However, it does identify the methodology and along with SPO's handbook are considered useful models that towns could use to expand on the work done to date.

Comment: The first (micropolitan) and last (low density) regional forms are too negative. I have a visceral reaction to both. The Low density is leaving our fate to the winds and is out of control. The micropolitan is so different than what we have today; it is similar to the area between DC and Richmond. Not for us!

Comment: The regional forms are a good idea. But there are different functions and different scenarios; we can't pick between them.

Q: There is a problem on the border between towns. We need a dialog and a conversation. Some want to grow and some want a rural town. Who has the leverage? Economic growth is in the State's interest.

A: There is a way to create an inter-municipal agreement with an enforcement structure if the towns choose that approach.

Q: Who is designing the carrots and with what purpose in mind?

A: At this point in time, MaineDOT has only a limited set of carrots. Those carrots are envisioned to create opportunities for other (non-highway) modes to succeed. MaineDOT cannot keep pace with development that is driving the need for bypasses.

Comment: Lincolnville does not want industrial parks. We want our industry in Belfast. (This is possible and interlocal agreements could establish the rules for sharing tax base in such a situation.)

Q: What about the added expense and the additional fees? In the Route 1 project in Camden, the town had to pick up the additional expense of plowing, sanding, and planting. This all became the town's cost.

A: Through the STPA rule changes, the state is promoting the idea of reducing and possibly waiving the local match of the reconstruction project if the town does integrated planning of transportation and land use and if they have a land use management system that meets the STPA objectives. Certain features incorporated into projects that MaineDOT is not set up to maintain would remain the responsibility of the town (pedestrian lighting, sidewalk maintenance etc.).

The town must look at the complementariness rather than the conflict.

Comment: With regional business parks, businesses know where they are going. The loss of MBNA was a tremendous impact on us. We support our downtowns; a regional business park does not benefit us.

Comment: I like the New England Town form, the pearls on a strand for Camden and Rockport. But Lincolnville and Northport may be more (conducive to) transit oriented because these towns don't have a center.

If we don't manage how we grow, we will lose our pearls.  
This is not inhibiting economic growth. But it is tough to keep from developing.

I like the transfer of development rights tool; it is like carbon trading. People in the outskirts benefit by selling their development rights, but they stay rural and the town develops more densely where development should occur and where services are.

The space between Brunswick and Bath has limited access because MaineDOT purchased the access rights. If we limit access to the towns on Route 1, it will maintain the capacity of Route 1. But this is also our commercial base.

Can we combine several forms? Mix and match. Tune it to our area. Micropolitan is better for Belfast, Rockland, and Bath-Brunswick. Perhaps the rest are "pearls on a strand".

Q: How does this work with the modeling?

A: The modeling will give form to the forms. If we continue with low density, what will we look like? The model will distribute the growth to the forms; the forms act as variables.

Comment: The low density rural character form is a one that presents a façade to the world. It looks like traditional rural form but it has performance standards, like buffers and curb cut restrictions. There are design controls and yet development is still spread out.

Q: How does this affect transportation?

A: A low density rural character form is one that promotes driving for everything. The more driving the more wear and tear on the roads along with opportunities for more conflict, congestion and air pollution.

Comment: Design standards should be integrated into the models.

After the first set of model runs, the Steering Committee will choose from a series of "interventions", one of which could be design standards, to see how those change the outcomes.

Meeting adjourned at 8:40 p.m.

## ATTENDANCE

LAST	FIRST	TOWN
Ball	Joanne	Camden
Dodge	Deb	Camden
Emanuel	Woody	Camden
French	John	Camden
Gagne	Randy	Camden
Grove	Karen	Camden
Hensler	Deb	Camden
Hirst	Skye	Camden
Lafleur	Jane	Camden
Self	Jane	Camden
Cassidy	Cheryl	Lincolnville
Davis	Lorraine	Lincolnville
Dunham	Cindy	Lincolnville
Foster	Jay	Lincolnville
Glock	Richard	Lincolnville
Could	Barabara	Lincolnville
Osgood	Chris	Lincolnville
Payne	Brad	Lincolnville
Ray	Mike	Lincolnville
Vogel	Kim	Lincolnville
Driscoll	Jack	Northport
Kosmo	Helen	Northport
Penniman	Brad	Northport
Remsen	Richard	Rockport

Time Table of Gateway One (subject to change)

- January, 2008: Local Meetings on Regional Form/MOEs
- February 27: SC Visual Assessment
  - *Action required:* Choose views of regional significance
- March 19: SC View Scenarios without Interventions (4 pm-8 pm meeting)
  - *Action required:* Choose Interventions to model
- April: FOUR Regional Meetings: View Scenarios without Interventions
  - *Action required:* Provide regional feedback on interventions
- May: Town Reports with Staff Support
- June: SC View revised Scenarios with Interventions:
  - *Action required:* Refine scenarios/interactions.
  - *Action required:* Make first-cut recommendation on AIAs (4-hour meeting)
- July: FOUR Regional Meetings: Regional Groups see Revised Scenarios and AIA concepts
  - *Action required:* Adjustments on Scenarios
  - *Action required:* AIA feedback
- September: SC Final Scenario refinement:
  - *Action required:* Final tweaks
  - *Action required:* Final recommendation on AIA
- October: Town Reports
- November: First draft plan in progress
- December/January, 2009: First draft of written plan to SC
- February/March: Final Plan/MOAs