

8.0 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION AND OUTREACH INITIATIVES

This Chapter summarizes the public outreach process that was based on regular input from two standing committees, the public, and a series of workshops and outreach meetings with regional and local experts in planning, transit and real estate development.

The Study's public outreach process communicated the purpose of the Study and provided details regarding the analysis of the land use, transit and roadway scenarios. The outreach process provided the public and stakeholders with the opportunity to provide opinions and input as the Study progressed through the development of the various scenarios. A Study website, ongoing media coverage and multiple meetings within the Study communities allowed direct and easy input to Study decisions and processes. As a high-level feasibility study focused on identifying and testing a range of possible future solutions rather than a single specific outcome, the Study Team made a concerted effort to bring the unique aspects of this land use and transportation-oriented study to the attention of the public-at-large and the media. This provided a broader awareness of the Study and its recommendations to the general public than would occur if public meetings had been the sole method of reaching out. This outreach was successful in earning two positive editorials and three major news articles in the Portland Press Herald, as well as ongoing positive coverage of public meetings from the Gorham Times, South Portland/Cape Elizabeth Sentry, American Journal, Scarborough Currents, Portland Forecaster, WCSH and WMTW television stations.

Further, the series of specialized land use and transit workshops successfully brought together municipal and regional planners, as well as local, regional, and statewide transit experts in a way that made the benefits of regional planning clear to all, setting the scene for future regional planning efforts that would be critical to the ongoing livability of the Study Area and beyond.

8.1 Study Committees

Two committees, the Steering Committee and the Advisory Committee, provided ongoing feedback and direction for the Study. The Steering Committee generally met on a monthly basis throughout the Study, getting a first look at Study findings and recommendations. Working as a collaborative unit, the steering committee was integral to this Study's groundbreaking work by its growing support of the need for land use change in order to affect long-term transportation benefits. The Advisory Committee, which met at key points throughout the Study, was developed to reflect the diverse agendas of stakeholders throughout the Study Area. Their feedback provided the Study Team with a clear picture of the range of viewpoints to be taken into account in order to move Study recommendations forward, and was a valuable counterpoint to the four core municipality-based viewpoints of the Steering Committee. Both committees had

a significant effect on Study process and recommendations. Detailed minutes were reported from every meeting noting committee and public comments.

Steering Committee Members:

Town Manager David Cole and Councilor Burleigh Loveitt, Gorham; Town Manager Tom Hall and Town Planner Dan Bacon, Scarborough; City Planner Tex Haeuser, South Portland; Director of Public Works Eric Dudley, Westbrook; Executive Director John Duncan and Transportation Planner Carl Eppich, PACTS; Government Relations Manager Conrad Welzel and Assistant Government Relations Manager Sara Devlin, MTA, and Study Manager Gerry Audibert, MaineDOT.

Advisory Committee Members:

Phil Savignano, Maine Department of Tourism; Keith Luke, Westbrook Economic Development; Tom Ellsworth, Gorham Economic Development; Barbara Charry, Maine Audubon; Paul Weiss, Sierra Club; Ben Severance, Town of Hollis; Jim Libby, Town of Buxton; Wayne Newbegin, Town of Standish; Mike Bolduc, City of Saco; Alex Jaegerman, and Judy Harris, City of Portland; Elizabeth Hertz, Maine State Planning Office; Rick Shinay, MEREDA/Drummond Woodsum & MacMahon; Bruce Hyman, GrowSmart Maine, Portland Trails, Maine Bicycle Coalition; Julie Bassett, Scarborough Economic Development; Steve Linnell, GPCOG; Warren Knight, Smiling Hill Farms; Ed Clifford, PACTS Transit Committee; Ray Penfold, VIP Tour & Charter Bus Company; Brian Parke, Maine Motor Transport Association; Wayne Davis, TrainRiders/Northeast; Mark Hasselmann, FHWA; Rob Sanford, USM; David Knapp/Lou Stack, Route 113 Corridor Committee; Chief Robert Lefebvre, Greater Portland Area Fire Chiefs; Sue Moreau, Maine Department of Transportation Multi-modal; Richard Rudolph, Rippling Waters Farm; Ann Peoples, and Phillip Bartlett, State Legislators; Paul Niehoff, PACTS; Chris Hall, Greater Portland Chamber of Commerce; Sara Devlin, MTA, Gerry Audibert, MaineDOT, John Duncan, PACTS, committee chairman.

8.2 Summary of Steering and Advisory Committee Meetings

The following is a summary of all Steering and Advisory Committee Meetings which took place as part of the Gorham East-West Corridor Feasibility Study. This summary includes meeting date, agenda and key input items.

8.2.1 Summary of Steering Committee Meetings

03/31/09 | Steering Committee Meeting

Meeting Agenda

- Review Contact Information
- Advisory Committee Update

- Study Team Efforts to Date
- Public Involvement Update
- Next Meeting Date and Time

Summary of Committee Input: The committee provided commentary on categories and individuals for the Advisory Committee, heard an overview of first tasks in terms of Study data collection and received and provided approval for draft copy and design for the website home page.

05/26/09 | Steering Committee Meeting

Meeting Agenda

- Study Progress
- Advisory Committee Meeting
- Land Use Scenarios
- Purpose and Need Statement

Summary of Committee Input: The committee agreed to a suggestion from the Advisory Committee to find a representative from Metro Chiefs (International Association of Fire Chiefs) and South Portland economic development, and after discussion, decided to leave the Steering Committee constituents in order to keep the committee size smaller and more focused. They accepted the two propose land use scenarios: Existing Trends Scenario and the Urban and Rural Land Use Scenario. They also provided a range of comments on the first draft Purpose and Need Statement that had been developed from Advisory Committee input and agreed that several iterations between the Steering and Advisory Committee would be needed - that it is very important to get the Purpose and Need Statement right.

06/23/09 | Steering Committee Meeting

Meeting Agenda:

- Draft Purpose and Need Statement
- Study Progress
- Meeting Schedule

Summary of Committee Input: The committee reviewed the second draft of the Purpose and Need Statement, which had previously received input from the Advisory Committee. The Steering Committee emphasized that it was important for final Study recommendations to be feasible and transportation-focused. In general, they agreed with Advisory Committee input, asked for a background statement to be prepared to provide

context for the Purpose and Need Statement, and agreed that a revised draft should go to the Advisory Committee.

07/28/09 | Steering Committee Meeting

Meeting Agenda

- Draft Purpose and Need Statement
- Land Use Scenarios: Evan Richert
- Study Progress
- Next Steps

Summary of Committee Input: The committee agreed to a more streamlined format for the Purpose and Need Statement and made various minor comments to be reviewed one more time by the Advisory Committee and then on to the public. They participated in an in-depth discussion of the two land use scenarios and STPA with Evan Richert, and recommended that the term “urbanization” not be used to describe the second scenario.

08/25/09 | Steering Committee Meeting

Meeting Agenda

- Economic Development Opportunities: Charlie Colgan
- Purpose and Need Statement
- Land Use Mapping

Summary of Committee Input: The committee asked pertinent questions regarding the economic development forecast in regards to their own communities and the Study Area as a whole, asking if Transit Oriented Development would be feasible and what effect changes in energy prices could potentially have. They accepted the revised draft of the Purpose and Need Statement and took land use maps back to their towns for comment.

09/29/09 | Steering Committee Meeting

Meeting Agenda

- Advisory Committee Update
- Upcoming Meeting Report: Public Meeting/Land Use Planning
- Baseline Conditions Report

Summary of Committee Input: The committee discussed the need for the Purpose and Need Statement to include the term “affordable” or “fiscally responsible” as the committee wants a solution to be able to be implemented. There was also discussion of energy prices and should it be part of the Study purpose. In the end, the Purpose and

Need Statement was accepted and voted as final as it was presented at the meeting. In discussion of the first Land Use meeting, it was agreed to invite municipal planners and interested Advisory Committee members. Steering Committee members would also attend. The committee also asked that the baseline conditions data be available to the towns.

11/24/09 | Steering Committee Meeting

Meeting Agenda

- Population Projections by Municipality
- Proposed Range of Land Use Scenarios
- Transportation Strategies

Summary of Committee Input: The committee increased their understanding of the population projections as they relate to jobs in each community and agreed to help refine TAZs. They evaluated the four potential land use scenarios that came out of the land use workshop meeting and overall felt that the hybrid, Urban and Rural, was most doable. They commented on the particular problem locations for transportation, and discussed how a ring road might make more sense than a linear connection.

01/06/10 | Steering Committee Meeting

Meeting Agenda

- Overview of 2nd Land Use Workshop
- Results of 2035 Low Density/Trends Analysis
- Transportation Strategies Brainstorming
- 2010 Steering Committee Meeting Schedule

Summary of Committee Input: The committee expressed interest and surprise at the level of worsening conditions in the Study Area in the Low Density/Trends Analysis. They made adjustments to MOEs in terms of how they were communicated in terms of new jobs and new homes, adjusting how this was communicated to be more neutral, as many communities do not want more residential growth. They asked to add an open space MOE and discussed how final recommendations could include more than one solution and that smart growth solutions should be included. Under Transportation Strategies, they agreed on the importance of including transit, and indicated an interest in a limited access ring road. Finally, they recommended that the committee hold off on defining transportation strategies until the land use recommendations are final, as long as it does not hold up the Study in terms of completion.

03/11/10 | Steering Committee Meeting

Meeting Agenda

- Updated MOEs
- Urban and Rural Findings
- Updates/Study Schedule

Summary of Committee Input: The committee again discussed the relative benefits of including fuel price change in the MOEs, as well as the need to make sure the relationship between the MOEs and the Purpose and Need Statement is clear. The committee provided positive feedback on the Urban and Rural findings, saying that they are heading in the right direction and outcomes look good. They also provided direction on how to make the Urban and Rural Land Use Scenario clearer for the presentation to the Advisory Committee and other audiences.

04/22/10 | Steering Committee Meeting

Meeting Agenda

- Transit Workshop
- Energy Prices
- Meeting Updates

Summary of Committee Input: The committee discussed the results of the transit workshop and recommended that the two proposals developed by workshop participants be combined and sent out for review via email; they did not think another meeting was needed if the proposal were combined as discussed by this committee (most of whom attended the workshop). In the discussion on including some analysis of change in energy prices, the committee was split as to whether this would be a benefit; many people ask about it but there are no firm numbers for future prices on which to base a meaningful projection. The decision was made to ask the Study Team to look at a sensitivity analysis and come back to the committee with a recommendation. Finally, a discussion on the outer communities' level of participation determined that follow up meetings with at least some of the communities would be a good idea.

05/27/10 | Steering Committee Meeting

Meeting Agenda

- Preliminary Transit Modeling results
- Fuel price scenario discussion
- Standish meeting report/Committee membership discussion
- Road improvements: Process discussion

Summary of Committee Input: The committee discussed the transit results, including how the final recommendations might play out, whether a cost benefit analysis would be done, and the potential effectiveness of the network. They heard the decision that MTA and MaineDOT did not want to do a fuel sensitivity analysis as there are no firm numbers available on which to base an analysis, and that the recommendations would help reduce transportation prices in a rising fuel scenario. The committee accepted the decision but noted that this is a perception issue and it would continue to come up from the public.

06/08/10 | Steering Committee Meeting

Meeting Agenda

- Full Transit Modeling Results: Kevin Hooper
- Next Steps

Summary of Committee Input: The committee heard Kevin Hooper give a complete and detailed presentation on the enhanced Transit Model results. Discussion regarding the details of the results ensued, with much commentary on how land use and transit would perform separately and how the two components work together. There was discussion about the potential desirability of evaluating road improvements without land use and transit, the outcome being that this is not a scenario in which MTA and MaineDOT can invest per STPA.

06/24/10 | Steering Committee Meeting

Meeting Agenda

- Developer/Other Meeting Update
- Road Improvement Discussion

Summary of Committee Input: The committee discussed the various locations that still require some level of road improvement after land use and transit are implemented and the various types of improvements that are possible. The recommendation was to look at expanding existing capacity in these locations and also to look at a potential east-west new capacity road and a north-south ring road that would also alleviate east-west travel congestion.

09/08/10 | Steering Committee Meeting

Meeting Agenda

- Roadway Scenario Findings
- Land Use Recommendations
- Upcoming Municipal Official Meeting

Summary of Committee Input: The committee heard a detailed presentation regarding the two road improvement scenarios and provided comments on how to clarify the presentation. Since both of the scenarios provided similar traffic benefits, there was discussion as to the pros and cons of each. There was commentary that the lack of a previously approved Northern Bypass of Gorham could be an issue with the public. There was commentary about the cost factor being critical, and that the public would want to know all the details about both scenarios. The committee also talked about the best way to present Study recommendations to municipal officials.

09/30/10 | Steering Committee Meeting

Meeting Agenda

- Advisory Committee Meeting Update
- Upcoming Municipal Meeting
- Land Use Recommendations/Next Steps

Summary of Committee Input: The committee discussed the proposed process for implementing Study recommendations, including land use, transit and road improvement, and the challenges that would be faced by tying all these together. As part of this, the committee provided detailed comments and suggestions on the prepared presentation for the upcoming four core town municipal presentation with an eye towards increasing clarity and brevity.

10/28/10 | Steering Committee Meeting

Meeting Agenda

- Meeting Overview: Municipal and First Public Meeting
- Discussion of Proposed Next Steps/Timing:
 - Interim Public Outreach/Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) Development
 - Phase II Study and Participants
 - Draft Sample MOU Discussion
- Roadway Improvement/Transit Costs and Impacts

Summary of Committee Input: The committee heard an update on the first public meeting and deliberated at length on the draft MOU. They suggested language changes that would both make the document clearer and more acceptable to municipalities, as well as provided their thoughts on the timing and process of moving into Phase 2. Their thought was that the interim public outreach idea was good, but that they wanted to move into Phase 2 as quickly as possible.

12/16/10 & 12/21/10 | Steering Committee Meetings

Meeting Agenda

- Review revised version of MOU

Summary of Committee Input: Besides the four core communities, Portland would need to be an integral part on the next phase because they are the major origin and destination of most of the east west trips in this corridor. Portland would be an equal partner in the agreement rather than being construed as the major player in the next phase because they are the largest community. Portland understands that this has to be a collaborative process. Suggest moving up MOU signature implementation date from 10/1/2011 to 6/1/2011. Workshops and council meetings would need to be scheduled with each community for obtaining MOU signature approvals. MOU implementation would be dependent more on funding availability rather than local approvals. Suggest replacing “monitoring” with “assistance” in the MOU. Westbrook suggested the deletion of task 10 – Upgrading the Mountain Division Rail Line for freight rail from the Phase II tasks. There were concerns regarding the length of time to undertake and complete the NEPA process for identifying a preferred roadway alternative in the next Study phase. Land use agreements are a Phase II outcome. Agreement the MOU should be more clearly worded. The MOU should clearly articulate everyone’s roles and responsibilities. The MOU would also need to be reviewed by each party’s legal staff.

01/27/11 | Steering Committee Meeting

Meeting Agenda

- Update on new MaineDOT Commissioner and January Meeting with Bruce Van Note
- Discussion of timing change of Draft Report/MOU release from Municipalities’ perspective
- Proposed Interim Outreach Activities
- Review of Revised Phase II Tasks
- Upcoming Meetings
- Other

Summary of Committee Input: The committee heard from Gerry Audibert on the meeting with now Commissioner Dave Burnhart and Deputy Commissioner Bruce Van Note in January to review and findings and recommendations of the Gorham Study. MaineDOT, while in support of the recommendations, asked the MTA to hold off on issuing the Draft Report until the new Commissioner is confirmed and they can formally agree to the recommendations. MTA indicated that they would provide funding for the Interim Outreach if needed to keep process moving. It was determined that the Draft Final

Report would likely be issued by March 1st and that the final Public Meeting for Gorham Phase I would be mid-March. Westbrook and Gorham indicated a desire to get the executive summary of the Report prior to March 1st so as to share with their respective communities. Everyone thought that even with the delay in issuing the Report, that a target of June 1st to have the core communities sign the MOU was still achievable.

Next, the committee discussed interim outreach activities. There were potential for presentations to South Portland and Westbrook to assist in delivering the Study recommendations and findings. MTA and MaineDOT staff is also working with GPCOG on the HUD study to maintain consistency between the two processes. Other meetings would be scheduled with Portland, Standish, Hollis, and Buxton once the Draft Report is issued. Finally, the committee reviewed the revised Phase II tasks and schedule. All changes were found to be acceptable.

8.2.2 Summary of Advisory Committee Meetings

04/30/09 | Advisory Committee Meeting

Meeting Agenda

- Committee Member Introductions
- Introduction of Study Background, Purpose and Goals
- Introduction of PACTS' Destination Tomorrow Land Use Policy
- Break Out Session: Identify Largest Concerns Along the Study Corridor
- Overview of Study Process
- Next Steps

Summary of Committee Input: In breakout groups, the committee members provided their concerns for the corridor. Input included concerns about the lack of efficient transportation west of Portland, lack of transit including rail service, over reliance on roads for freight movement, traffic congestion on Routes 22, 25, 114 and sprawl due to inexpensive land to the west. There was concern as to why Portland and the communities west of Gorham were not represented on the Steering Committee, with the response that this concern would be brought to the Steering Committee for consideration. There was a request to consider qualitative data as well as quantitative data in analyzing strategies.

06/18/09 | Advisory Committee Meeting

Meeting Agenda

- Introduction of New Members of Committee
- Introduction of Primary and Secondary Study Area
- Break Out Session: Review Draft Purpose and Need Statement

- Update on Traffic Analysis
- Update on Land Use Analysis
- Next Steps

Summary of Committee Input: The committee members provided input on the Purpose and Need Statement. Input included adding “identifying economic opportunities”, adding energy and carbon emission reduction-related strategies, adding “conserve natural wildlife”, specifying the need for multi-modal connections, adding “compact, walkable, transit-supportive” communities and the need for more hubs, adding the stipulation that lack of efficient travel times affects quality of life, and adding “lack of truck routes”. There was a question as to how land use analysis would coincide with smart growth concepts.

09/22/09 | Advisory Committee Meeting

Meeting Agenda

- Welcome and Introductions
- Economic Outlook
- Land Use Approach
- Baseline Conditions and Analysis
- Purpose and Need Statement Update
- Public Informational Meeting Update
- Upcoming Meetings

Summary of Committee Input: The committee voiced the importance of including the growth of the senior citizen demographic in the projected growth analysis. There was concern about the void in mapping of Portland and that this is a major hub and destination for employment and residences. There was concern over the perceived exclusion of Portland in the land use and transportation modeling. There was concern over the issue of home and land pricing being a large variable in where people live and determining land use. There was concern that the Study is too strongly focused on the future and not on current road problems. There was mention of the importance of not measuring analysis by existing road subsidies and the need to think outside of the box when the time comes to consider strategies.

01/14/10 | Advisory Committee Meeting

Meeting Agenda:

- Study Overview: What we’ve accomplished since September
- Measures of Effectiveness
- Results of 2035 Low Density Analysis

- Recommended *Alternative* Pattern of Development
- Next Steps

Summary of Committee Input: There was a request to look into including how to measure the use of all forms of energy as an MOE for the Study and to include an MOE that measures successful use of transit, such as number of people within a half mile of transit. There was concern over how the term “walkabilty” as it seems to be generally misunderstood. There was concern over the lack of pedestrian infrastructure and funding sources. There was a request to map activity centers. There was concern as to whether the growth numbers allocated to towns would be disconcerting to the municipalities. It was mentioned that Portland would welcome residential growth.

03/16/10 | Advisory Committee Meeting

Agenda:

- Welcome and Introductions
- Urban and Rural Results
- Review of Updated MOE’s
- Study Schedule
- March 25 Public Meeting Agenda
- Next Steps

Summary of Committee Input: There was concern that Urban and Rural Land Use scenario is unrealistic for some western towns. It was mentioned that these numbers are what Portland would like to see and that capturing growth is vital to supporting development projects. There was agreement from core towns that this was realistic and skepticism from the western municipalities. There was agreement that increased gas prices would only serve to support the Urban and Rural Scenario. There was concern over how difficult it is to get people to live in multi-family homes. There was concern over the Study’s perceived lack of focus on trains as the primary transportation within the region. This point was countered by mention of the fact that most Americans prefer independent transportation and that rail takes a lot of time and effort, though there was extensive support for transit. There was agreement that the Urban and Rural plan is balanced: incremental but progressive. A comment was made about the prospect of developing North Westbrook and that sewer and water are hugely important, as is transit service to that area. There was a comment voicing the desire to make sure transit service extends to the peninsula in Portland.

05/06/10 | Advisory Committee Meeting

Agenda:

- Introduction
- Overview of Development of the Revised Transit Scenario
- Presentation of Revised Transit Scenario
- Committee Input on Revised Transit Scenario
- Next Steps

Summary of Committee Input: There was concern that the Study was not following the legislative resolution to connect the western communities of York and Cumberland Counties to U.S. Route 1. The suggestion was made to consider a robust transit system during all times of the day and to make sure that the Study includes freight rail. Discussion continued to highlight the western communities desire to have transit that serves communities west of the Study Area. Concepts such as bus rapid transit and bus rights of way were discussed. The group agreed that for modeling purposes, the Mountain Division rail line and the existing rail line from Westbrook to Gorham should be modeled in order to judge potential ridership. Additionally the group agreed that the model should test for ridership as far out as Fryeburg.

06/09/10 | Advisory Committee Meeting

Agenda:

- Purpose of Transit Scenario Evaluation
- Quick Summary
- What We Tested
- Base Assumptions and Methodology
- Key Results
- Summary and Next Steps
- Comments and Questions from Public

Summary of Committee Input: There was concern over rail headways assumed in the travel demand model and that based on current capacity, the assumptions were not realistic. There was also concern that the Study had not adequately looked at incentivizing transit service over single occupant vehicle use. A comment was made that there is a great opportunity to capture USM students traveling from Gorham to Portland campuses by transit. There was a request to see the percentage of drivers taken off of the road so there can be a greater understanding of the cost-effectiveness of transit recommendations. An emphasis on a regional cooperation and regional planning was mentioned as necessary in order to achieve some of the transit and land use goals of the Study. Some members shared a concern that improving the roadways would only de-incentivize people from using transit.

09/23/10 | Advisory Committee Meeting

Agenda:

- Welcome
- Overview of How Roadway Improvement Scenarios Were Developed
- Presentation of Roadway Scenario 1 and 2 and Results
- Overview of Land Use Recommendations
- Next Steps

Summary of Committee Input: Looking at the cost-effectiveness of each alternative was mentioned as being very important information needed to evaluate scenarios. The need to develop Freight Rail connections in order to ease the demand and maintenance costs on local roads was suggested. The group shared concern that major roadway capacity improvements would induce more sprawl. The comment that Road Improvement Scenario 2 may last longer in the long-term picture was mentioned, and an analysis to look at the scenarios beyond 25 years was suggested. It was suggested to look into whether either of the two scenarios would be more conducive to compact land use patterns than the other scenario. The suggestion to include disincentives for developing outside of growth cores was mentioned. There was a request to work more closely with the communities west of Gorham on land use recommendations, as regional planning is a major goal of the Study. There was great concern about making sure there was an entity to oversee land use regulations in the future in order to make sure that all municipalities continue to develop in a sustainable manner. There was also concern as to what entity would be legally allowed to take on this responsibility.

12/08/10 | Advisory Committee Meeting

Agenda:

- Study Update
- GPCOG HUD Sustainability Grant
- Study Recommendations
 - Balanced Approach
 - Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)
 - Interim Public Outreach
 - Phase II Tasks
- Study Schedule
- Next Steps

Summary of Committee Input: Timing on several of the Phase II Tasks needs to be reevaluated or adjusted. Comp plan adjustments for incorporating recommended land use initiatives should not be perceived as difficult. The term “growth area” could be confusing. The HUD Grant is using the term “communities of opportunity”. The public

outreach has to be strategically planned. Suggest not using the term “monitoring” in the Phase II tasks. May want to provide greater emphasis to the assistance part of the MOU. There was a concern that some of the rural communities may resist proposed changes being enacted by abutting communities. Concern that roadway work may go in advance of land use and that they need to remain connected. There is a need to get the land use piece done first. The report would include a draft land use piece that would be subject to negotiation and revision.

8.3 Summary of Public Meetings

The following is a summary of all Public Meetings which took place as part of the Gorham East-West Corridor Feasibility Study. This summary includes meeting date, agenda and key input items.

10/08/09 | Public Meeting at the Gorham Municipal Center

Meeting Agenda

- Study Purpose and Need
- Economic Outlook for Study Area
- Land Use in Transportation Planning/Potential Scenarios
- Study Data

Summary of Public Input: Public input was mixed, but in general there were comments about the traffic issues, the success of the Gorham Bypass, and the need for better transportation access. There were some comments on the loss of rural land and farms, and on the difficulties of getting towns to work together and on enforcing land use change. Most people were interested in a new road and were not expecting to hear about land use.

03/25/10 | Public Meeting at the Maine Turnpike Authority Office in Portland

Meeting Agenda

- The Problem
- What are our choices?
- Possible Solutions
- Next Steps

Summary of Public Input: Comments included the observation that current zoning in most towns encourages sprawl; that adding greenbelts would be good; that this is a great first step and is aggressive but realistic and politically plausible; that hopefully we could do more; the observation that this could help the region economically; small change is good; smaller lots and smaller houses create more affordable options; that there is need for less

expensive housing where the jobs are (Portland) so people don't have to commute from Auburn.

10/26/10 | Public Meeting at the Wyndham Hotel in South Portland

Meeting Agenda

- The Problem
- Transportation Sustainability
- Study Findings
 - Land Use
 - Transit
 - Roadway Improvements
- Study Recommendations
- Next Steps

Summary of Public Input: Westbrook Main St. needs help, can't cross William Clark Drive; can't cross in downtown Gorham; need bike paths; need more rail and less roads, no rail expertise on committee, very automobile focused, rail is more cost effective and less polluting; rail is not viable in Maine, as not enough mass, should start with bikes and buses; lower cost houses would draw people and traffic would be worse; jobs are key, more important than open space; need bus shelters if you are going to have more buses; Gorham citizens and town council want a turnpike spur, can the turnpike tolls help support transit; light rail would be better than buses; we do not need a turnpike extension, we need to go back to rail and dense downtowns; six percent transit is not impressive, how can we have more; your growth projections do not match state planning office projections; need to know more about the two roadway improvement scenarios, when would that happen and how would decision be made?; why can't the region have one comprehensive plan; we need a short term plan for road fixes; we have been talking about the bottleneck at Route 22/114 for 30 years and it needs to be fixed; we need to get private enterprise to be part of this; I moved to Gorham for the rural experience and do not want more development there.

11/03/10 | Public Meeting at the Gorham Municipal Center

Meeting Agenda

- The Problem
- Transportation Sustainability
- Study Findings
 - Land Use
 - Transit
 - Roadway Improvements

- Study Recommendations
- Next Steps

Summary of Public Input: This makes sense but I do not want to live in a dense community – but I want to preserve rural character – what to do?; this kind of denser development is already occurring in Gorham so this is good; Land Trusts are in favor of this concept; I do not understand where funding for transit would come from; I love the idea of transit but think it would be a tough sell for most unless gas prices go way up; I am from England and would use transit if it was available; you should talk to large employer about the transit concept; how would people in Portland get from the train to their work; I see empty buses all the time, how could this work; what are the costs of these proposals?; we don't want to subsidize a transit system that no one is using; have you factored access management by towns into this; you should incorporate telecommuting into this equation and provide business incentives; several questions specific to the location and outcomes of the two road improvements; won't higher density create more traffic; who decides where growth areas would be; you only notice transportation if it's failing; how do you get these ideas to happen at the same time, we need a region-wide MOA; if transportation is improved, jobs would come to Gorham and we won't need to drive to Portland to work; if there is transit we won't need so much parking space – a big cost for businesses.

8.4 Summary of Other Meetings and Workshops

The following is a summary of all Other Meetings and Workshops which took place as part of the Gorham East-West Corridor Feasibility Study. This summary includes meeting date, participants, agenda and key input items.

10/29/09 | Land Use Workshop 1 at HNTB Office in Westbrook

Participants: Scarborough: Tom Hall, Sylvia Most, Jay Chace, Mike Wood, Dan Bacon; Westbrook: Eric Dudley, Molly Just; South Portland: Tex Haeuser, Maxie Beecher; Gorham: David Cole, Burleigh Loveitt, Mike Phinney, Deb Fossett, Sandra Mowery; Advisory Committee/Communities: Alex Jaegerman, Portland; Jim Libby, Buxton; Ben Severance, Hollis; Wayne Newbegin, Standish; Alton Benson, Standish; Advisory Committee/Misc.: Bruce Hyman, GrowSmart, David Knapp, Route 113 Corridor Committee; Rob Sanford, USM; Brooks Moore, Windham; Paul Neihoff, Steve Linnell, Rebeccah Shaftner-Touissignant, GPCOG/PACTS; Study Team - Evan Richert, Charlie Colgan, Paul Godfrey, Carol Morris, Ray Faucher, Conrad Welzel, Sara Devlin, Andrea D'Amato, Essek Petrie.

Workshop Agenda:

- Introduction: Purpose and Objectives of Today's Workshop

- Orientation and Background
- Possible Alternative Patterns ("Forms") of Growth
- Introduction to Measures of Effectiveness

Summary of Workshop Comments: The group was presented with four possible alternate land use scenarios: Modified Low Density, Urban Preservation, Community-Centered Corridor and Transit Oriented Development. After much discussion, these were refined to Urban-to-Rural, Suburban Community-Centered Corridor, Sub-Regional Balance and Greenbelt Development. Modified Low Density was felt to not be sufficient change, Urban-to Rural is a minor variation of Urban Preservation, Community Centered Corridor is the same, Sub-Regional Balance made sure that housing and jobs are allocated regionally in a balanced manner to create a strong jobs-housing balance overall, and Greenbelt Development suggests placement of new development based on maximizing identified green and open space.

01/07/10 | Land Use Workshop 2 at the USM Portland Campus

Participants: Liz Hertz, State Planning Office; Sandra Mowery, Mike Phinney, David Cole, and Burleigh Loveitt, Gorham; Tom Coward, and Tex Haeuser, South Portland; Wayne Newbegin, Standish; James Libby, Buxton; Dan Bacon, Scarborough; Rob Sanford, USM; Alex Jaegerman, Portland; Molly Just, Westbrook; John Duncan. PACTS; Rebeccah Schaffner-Tousignant, and Steve Linnell, GPCOG; Bruce Hyman, GrowSmart, Bicycle Coalition, Portland Trails; Gerry Audibert, MaineDOT; Sara Devlin, and Conrad Welzel, Maine Turnpike Authority; Kevin Hooper, Hooper Associates; Charlie Colgan, Muskie School; Paul Godfrey, Essek Petrie, Andrea D'Amato, and Ray Faucher, HNTB; Evan Richert, AICP; Carol Morris, Morris Communications.

Workshop Agenda

- Travel Demand Model: 2035 Low Density
- Review/Discuss Measures of Effectiveness
- Review revised Patterns of Development
- Discussion: Testing an Alternative Pattern

Summary of Workshop Comments: The group's charge was to decide on a single alternative pattern to test against the Low Density Pattern. Discussions centered on the needs of each community, whether the decision should be based on idealism or what works politically and general support for bike/pedestrian access. Essentially, all participants agreed that the denser communities – Portland, Westbrook, and South Portland - wanted more residential growth and the suburban and outer communities want less. There was also strong support for regional planning and the possibilities it opens up. With this, the consensus was to test Urban and Rural Land Use Scenario.

1/21/2010 | Planners Meeting at HNTB in Westbrook

Participants: Tex Haeuser, South Portland; Dan Bacon, Scarborough; Alex Jaegerman, Portland; Molly Just, Westbrook; Sandra Mowery, Gorham; Brooks Moore, Windham ; Study Team: Evan Richert, Paul Godfrey, Carol Morris, Essek Petrie, Uri Avin, Andrea D'Amato, Sara Devlin

Workshop Agenda

- *Review and discussion of Estimated Population, housing and job growth by Study Area Community*
- *Identification of desired Growth Area parameters (size, density, mix)*
- *Discussion and Goal of Lego Exercise*
- *Working session by Study Area Communities to identify, locate, and determine contents of proposed Growth Areas to be evaluated under Urban and Rural Land Use Scenario*

Workshop Outcome: Municipal planners identified and located proposed growth areas within Study Area using legos and community parcel maps. Study Team validated growth area details and then allocated remaining population, housing, and job growth within Study Area communities. These allocations were then tested and evaluated to determine the impacts and benefits of this alternative land use scenario known as Urban and Rural.

04/08/10 | PACTS Lunch and Learn

Attendees: Neal Allen, Sandy Amborn, Gerry Audibert, Bill Bray, Molly Casto, Beth Della Valle, Sara Devlin, Joan Faxe, Deirdre Fulton, Tex Haeuser, LaRay Hamilton, Art Handman, Gary Higginbottom, Robert Hough, Jack Kartez, Brian Keezer, Steve Landry, Steve Linnell, Jen Logan, Matt Mackenzie, Tom Meyers, Greg Mitchell, Pat Moody, Carol Morris, Paul Niehoff, Caroline Paras, Steve Sawyer, Rebecca Schaffner-Tousignant, Lynne Seeley, Jack Sutton, Elizabeth Trice, Caroline Tukey, and James Wendel.

Meeting Agenda

- Study Overview
- The Problem
- What are our choices?
- Possible Solutions
- Next Steps

Meeting Purpose: This meeting was a repeat of the March Public Meeting presentation for the benefit of an invited “Friends of PACTS” group. Comments were generally very positive about the concepts presented, with some concern and skepticism about the general public’s willingness to accept change.

04/15/10 | Transit Workshop at HNTB Office in Westbrook

Participants: Myranda McGowen, Southern Maine Regional Planning Commission; Craig Hutchinson, University of Southern Maine; Steve Linnell, and Caroline Parras, GPCOG; Ed Clifford, Shuttlebus-ZOOM; Tom Meyers, South Portland Metro; John Duncan, Study Advisory Committee Chair, PACTS; Barbara Donovan, MaineDOT; Alton Benson, Standish; Study Steering Committee: Dan Bacon, Scarborough; Tex Haeuser, South Portland, Bruce Hyman, GrowSmart Maine, Bicycle Coalition, Portland Trails; Carl Eppich, PACTS; Study Advisory Committee: Alex Jaegerman, Portland; Rebecca Schaffner-Tousignant, GPCOG; Paul Weiss, Sierra Club; Liz Hertz, State Planning Office; Dennis Coffey, Ray Faucher and Paul Godfrey, HNTB; Kevin Hooper, Hooper Associates; Sara Devlin, MTA; Carol Morris, Morris Communications.
Observers: Hilary Frenkel, League of Young Voters; Gary Higginbottom.

Meeting Agenda

- Objectives of Workshop
- Introductions
- Land Use in 2035
- Base Transit System for 2035
- Travel Demand Forecast Results
- Break Out Groups
- Report Back
- Identification of Transit Strategies

Summary of Workshop Comments: The group’s charge was to develop an optimum transit package for the year 2035 that would support the Urban and Rural development pattern. They were asked not to consider capital funding, and provided with a “basic” transit package that had been developed and tested as part of the Urban and Rural land use model. Each of two breakout groups created an additional network. One was more rail-oriented and included new rail ROWs and the other was more bus and bike oriented. The Study Team then took both networks and combined them, eliminating redundancy.

06/29/10 | Developer Meeting 1

Participants: Joe Malone, Malone Commercial Builders; Peter Bass, Developers Collaborative; Frank O’Connor, The Dunham Group; Kevin Bunker, Developers Collaborative; Elliot Chamberlain, Chamberlain Homes; Paul Ureneck, Boulos

Company; Tom Dunham, The Dunham Group; Vin Veroneau, JB Brown & Sons; Roxanne Cole, Roxanne Cole Commercial Real Estate; Paul Porada, Woodward & Curran; Ted Chapin, Woodward & Curran; Gerry Audibert, MaineDOT; Paul Godfrey and Ray Faucher, HNTB; Paul E. Violette and Sara Devlin, MTA; Carol Morris and Benjamin Ettelman, Morris Communications.

Meeting Agenda

- Study Introduction
- Projected Growth
- Proposed Land Use Allocations
- Discussion: Is Density Marketable? What should change?

Summary of Meeting Comments: The discussion centered on the challenge of developing higher than “normal” density in Maine based on existing regulations and perceptions. The consensus was that there is a clear market for denser development and mixed-use development; however because it is different than the norm, developers have to go through extra hurdles for approvals. They highly recommend that there be a more standardized process – clear and predictable rules - for any new growth zones, as that would make these areas magnets for developers. They recommended that the projects within the zones be bigger to make the numbers work. They also expressed belief that a better transit system in Portland would be very well received. Also supported would be a more regional approach to planning and regulations and better coordination between transportation agencies and planning boards.

07/21/10 | Roadway Improvement Workshop/Joint Steering and Advisory Committee at the USM Gorham Campus

Participants: John Duncan, PACTS; Tex Hauser, South Portland; Chris Hall, Portland Regional Chamber; David Cole and Burleigh Loveitt, Gorham; Ben Severance, Hollis; Jim Gailey, South Portland; Julie Bassett, Scarborough – Scarborough Economic Development Corporation (SEDCO); Liz Hertz, State Planning Office; Lou Stack, Standish; Barbara Charry, Maine Audubon Society; Alex Jaegerman, Portland; Rob Sanford, USM; Rebecca Schaffner-Tousignant, GPCOG; Gerry Audibert, MaineDOT; Conrad Welzel and Sara Devlin, MTA; Paul Godfrey and Ray Faucher, HNTB; Kevin Hooper, Kevin Hooper Associates; Carol Morris and Benjamin Ettelman, Morris Communications.

Meeting Agenda

- Welcome
- Overview of Different Types of Roadway Improvements
- Breakout Session: Roadway Improvement Workshop

- Next Steps

Summary of Committee Input: There was a suggestion to make sure that every roadway option has a cost-benefit analysis, and long term cost analysis available for it so people can get a feeling of what is most cost effective. Discussion topics included: The concern with heavy levels of congestion at the overlap of Routes 22 and 114; Payne Road in Scarborough; Route 25 into Gorham through Westbrook and Route 22 in Buxton; where higher levels of congestion could or should be considered acceptable; what local roads are being used excessively as cut-through roads and what roads municipalities would like to have through-traffic traveling on; the viability of frontage roads within the Study Area; the effect of any increased capacity on wildlife habitat. The outcome of the workshop was to further examine new capacity on new alignment *and* new capacity on existing alignment, with both options including a number of additional local road improvements, TSM and TDM considerations.

10/21/10 | Municipal Meeting with the Four Core Communities at Scarborough Municipal Building

Participants: Jay Chase, Michael Wood, Dan Bacon, Jessica Holbrook Sylvia Most, Carol Rancourt, Judy Roy and Tom Hall, Scarborough; John Duncan, PACTS; Matt Mattingly, Burleigh Loveitt, Michael Phinney and David Cole, Gorham; Joshua Meyer, Caroline Hendry and Tex Haeuser, South Portland; Conrad Welzel and Sara Devlin, MTA; Gerry Audibert, MaineDOT; Paul Godfrey and Ray Faucher, HNTB, Carol Morris and Ben Ettelman, Morris Communications.

Meeting Agenda

- Study History and Overview
- A Changing World
- Study Findings
- Draft Recommendations
- Next Steps

Summary of Meeting Comments: Overall, the group was supportive of the concepts and felt the marketability was in tune with the aging of the population, but concern was expressed about convincing the larger public: homeowners. They also asked about “carrots,” indicating that a turnpike spur might be a useful incentive but asking and wanting more. Scarborough indicated this could be very important to their town. Questions were asked about how rail would play into the scenario, seeing it as a positive but somewhat unknown regarding the ability to fund needed infrastructure improvements. The link to the HUD Sustainability Grant was noted. But there was concern about the strain that this kind of growth would have on all infrastructure. They felt it was time to

roll this out to the general public.

11/17/10 | GPCOG Presentation

Attendees: Gordy Billington, Standish Town Manager; Cathy Breen, Falmouth Town Councilor; Roger Bondeson, People's Regional Opportunity Program (PROP); Peter Crichton, Cumberland County Manager; Barbara York, Casco Selectperson; Derik Goodine, Naples Town Manager; Dick Wood, New England Association of Resource Conservation & Development (RC&D); Colleen Hilton, Westbrook Mayor; Pat Finnigan, Portland Assistant City Manager; Mike Reynolds, Raymond Selectman; Staff: Neal Allen, John Duncan, Eben Marsh, Rebecca Schaffner-Tousignant, Ann Thompson, Maddy Adams; Guests: Sara Devlin, MTA; Paul Godfrey, HNTB, Carol Morris, Morris Communications.

Meeting Agenda

- Study History and Overview
- A Changing World
- Study Findings
- Draft Recommendations
- Next Steps

Summary of Meeting Comments: Generally positive comments about the concept, and while some concern was noted about rolling out to the public, there were more questions about how this could be expanded to this larger GPCOG region.

12/13/10 | PACTS Presentation

This meeting was held at the new Ocean Gateway Terminal on the Portland waterfront provided a briefing and discussion on the regional transportation opportunities and challenges facing the PACTS region – including the draft recommendations from this regional transportation Study.

Attendees: Sara Devlin and Conrad Welzel, MTA; Ray Faucher and Paul Godfrey, HNTB, Gerry Audibert, MaineDOT; Carol Morris, Morris Communications.

Meeting Agenda

- Continental breakfast
- Welcome
- Presentation on Transportation Policies and Challenges in the PACTS Region
- Discussion led by Representative Ann Peoples
- The Gorham East West Corridor Study's Draft Recommendations
- Discussion led by Turnpike Staff

- Adjourn.

Summary of Meeting Comments: There were no comments regarding the Gorham Study presentation.

12/09/10 | MEREDA Presentation

Attendees: Evan Richert; Sara Devlin, MTA; Paul Godfrey, HNTB; Carol Morris, Morris Communications.

Meeting Agenda

- Study History and Overview
- A Changing World
- Study Findings
- Draft Recommendations
- Potential Developer Hurdles

Summary of Meeting Comments: (The following were written comments submitted by meeting participants.) Lack of Sewer and Water is major hurdle to denser development. An anchor store (Hannaford, for example) typically moves a project along, may want to modify this model. Consider a Regional Development Authority to cut the permitting process and reduce the level of effort. This would maximize potential for development. (Currently it is taking up to three years to get a permit in some towns.) Need a slow growth model/regional mechanism. Create a supply-driven model or build and development will come. Municipal or regionally based financing to build infrastructure is needed. Need education/incentive/disclosures: entities do not pay the cost of their decisions in terms of development. Make development easy, permitting should take no more than 6 months. Remove inherent vagaries and discretionary decisions of planning boards via a regional entity.