

PACTS

Portland Area Comprehensive Transportation System

Planning Committee Meeting Notice

May 7th, 2009
9:00 a.m. to 11:00 a.m.
GPCOG, 68 Marginal Way, Portland

Agenda

1. Call to order
2. Public Comments
3. Minutes of the March 5 meeting (*no April meeting*)
4. Discussion on UPWP Planning Projects Scoring
5. Update on the Long Range Plan Update effort and Sub-Committee
6. Next Meeting Date(s)
 - June 4th
 - June 18th -- JOINT with Transit Committee 9am at GPCOG
7. Adjourn

The Metropolitan Planning Organization for the Portland Urbanized Area

68 Marginal Way • Portland, Maine 04101

Telephone: (207) 774-9891 • Fax: (207) 774-7149 • www.pactsplan.org

Agenda Item 3. Minutes of March 5th Meeting

PACTS Planning Committee Minutes March 5th, 2009 9:00 a.m.

Members Present: Greg Tansley, Chair; Dan Bacon, Scarborough; Ethan Croce (Falmouth); Sara Devlin, MTA; Connie Garber, PACTS Transit Committee Rep.; Tex Haeuser, South Portland; Alex Jaegerman, Portland; Molly Just, Westbrook; Gary Lamb, Old Orchard Beach; Steve Linnell, GPCOG; Brooks More, Windham; Maureen O'Meara, Cape Elizabeth; Peter Morelli, Saco; Amanda Stearns, Falmouth; Greg Tansley, Biddeford.

Members Absent: Deb Fossum, Gorham; Gary Guerette, Policy Committee Appointee; Robert Kahn, Policy Com. Appt.; Peggy Kilmer, Yarmouth; Carla Nixon, Cumberland; Tom Reinauer, SMRPC.

Staff and Guests: John Duncan, PACTS; Carl Eppich, PACTS; Art Handman, Bruce Hyman, GrowSmart Maine; Christian McNeil, GrowSmart Maine; Sue McIntyre, GPCOG.

1. **Call to order.** Greg Tansley called the meeting to order at 9:07 a.m. Introductions were made.
2. **Public Comments.** None
3. **Minutes of February 5, 2009 meeting.** Gary Lamb *moved approval of the February 5th, 2009 minutes, seconded by Dan Bacon.* Connie Garber noted that she should have been listed among those present at the meeting. *Vote taken. All were in favor. Minutes accepted as amended.*

4. **Standish Model Town** – Bruce Hyman

Bruce noted that Standish had been selected by GrowSmart Maine as a pilot project for a “model town”. With the use of a PowerPoint presentation, Bruce showed how he assisted in directing and facilitating the project as well as how the town was able to bring into focus the implementation process of their comprehensive plan.

Besides having a comp plan ready to go, Standish was also selected because it had similar issues to other Maine towns such as dealing with growth issues and its management. Standish is located on Maine’s arterials of Routes 25 and 35 and is trying to develop a street grid. In doing their comp plan, they had set a goal depicting 70% of growth would occur in the village centers. But the opposite happened. As a result, the Town adopted a growth cap where 70% of the building permits would have to be in one of four growth areas designated in the community. They recognized the problem and took policy actions. They then needed to follow-through with zoning and an implementation plan. A cap of 85 building permits was instituted with 55 permits designated in the “growth area” and 35 permits in the “rural area”. With the assistance of GrowSmart, their goal is to try to make the village attractive in preferred locations.

The town began the process with the creation of an actionable town vision. They first reviewed excerpts from their 2003 Comprehensive Plan and made a commitment to fund their master plan. Their biggest goals include efforts at preserving a rural character and natural resources, and directing most growth to the village centers. The current Gorham Route 25 and the intersection area around Route 35 were zoned for strip highway commercial use. The village master plan wants to compress the area into mixed-use zones with transitional zones outside of that. Prior to doing the master plan, the Town wanted to add some depth so they put a line on the map to by-pass the village center. In the short term they envisioned a new street grid and had the foresight to create an internal new roadway grid which would allow traffic to disperse. The village center has two types of character: There is the historic core for the village center which provides good “historic bones”. The lower village has the most vulnerability due to its large parcels of land which could produce a highway strip.

The first workshop provided building blocks for residences/homes, businesses and civic/public spaces. An aerial map was utilized and the public was asked to show what they wanted in terms of growth. Specific areas such as parks, playgrounds, civic uses, large parcels of land, etc. were provided. Trade-offs were involved as well. There was good feedback from those in attendance. A common theme was that they wanted very little of the big box stores and that the village center should have minimum lot sizes. The lower village center would have minimum large lot subdivisions with homes and businesses being in close proximity. 70 people attended the workshop. It was a diverse group from both inside the village center and outside with all major landowners in the village center attending.

All of this information was digested and GrowSmart came back to them with three concepts. Stark choices were provided and heavy visuals were used to try to give the group a sense of what their choices were.

Concept 1:

- Maintain existing zoning. Various scenarios of streetscapes were provided along with visuals that projected future outcomes.

Concept 2:

- Provided one larger mixed-use zone that would be located off of Route 25.
- Discussions took place on this concept in terms of the relation of this scale of development with the historic bones of the area and with a large scale of traffic.

Concept 3:

- Provided two mixed-use zones.
- It would involve different uses for the village center along with smaller scale mixed use; and, would also involve mid-scale mixed use for existing development.

The citizenship gravitated to concept 3. It limited the footprints and envisioned multi-story buildings but still provided 1/3 to 1/2 acre zoning lots. This type of linkage protected the rural character and the concept provided the village the quality they wanted to see.

The process included real time public engagement with the use of a keypad polling system. Following small group discussions, the group was presented with questions and images on another board with two projectors going at the same time. Everyone used their keypad including committee members. The keypads are numbered from 0 thru 9. Evaluations were conducted on how people thought. When the group was asked if the items presented provided meaningful choices, 80% replied "yes". Other answers to questions resulted in 61% wanting to see the village center differently with 84% saying yes to a more village-like streetscape.

The next steps will include bringing the preferred growth concept to the public and town council as well as include the development of draft revised zoning ordinances and policies. The final step will be the adoption process.

A question and comment period followed Bruce's presentation. Items of interest:

- The final concept does have a sizeable budget implication.
- Some on-street parking in the lower village on both sides would be allowed within the new street grid. But, no parking would be allowed on Route 25.
- Aspects for transit oriented development were not included in a formal sense but were included in terms of density and zoning in proximity of the homes to the businesses. The principles are there.
- Discussions are on the way on how to leverage public investments and how to enhance the historic area, among other things.

***Bruce pointed out that a complete set of materials is available on the GrowSmart website.**

5. Long range plan 2010 – Updating Destination Tomorrow

Guiding Policies Review:

Carl provided an update since our last meeting. At that time the first suggestion was to revise the Destination Tomorrow's Guiding Policies; to revisit them; to decrease the number; and, how to optimize them.

A discussion of existing policies as described on page six of the meeting packet took place in conjunction with recommendations made by John and Carl as listed on page seven of the meeting packet. *Among comments:*

- Number four of the existing policies seems to be redundant of number 3. Maybe we should combine 4 with 3.
- It seems like 1, 2, and 4 are all about roads whereas 3 is much broader.
- Combining 5 and 6 with 8 might be a vision statement. But, how do we achieve that and do we prioritize?
- There seems to be three ideas in the eight items. One idea is maintaining the existing system. We could group 1, 2, 3, 4 and 6 into an efficient way of investing and then put 5 and 8 as transportation and land use. The multi-modal aspect is number 7. Number 3 talks about the transportation system, but we are talking about all modes and we would have to say that in the language. It looks like we could consolidate eight policies down to three by maintaining the current capacity of our roadway system, addressing land use and transportation, and dealing with all modes of transportation.

Support was expressed in favor of this last opinion. Discussion followed on expanding transportation investment to village/town centers and cities. It was noted that there is a need to be clear and more specific for other committees and the public. Discussion then focused on collector roads. Carl pointed out that we have 200 miles of collector roads that PACTS needs to take care of. If prices stay fixed, that would mean five miles every two years. We cannot maintain and preserve our current roadway systems with the funding we currently have and at the same token, there is a need to address safety issues on some of these roads.

Sara Trafton introduced herself as the new Executive Director of the Regional Transportation Program and President of the Maine Transit Association. She referred to language in the Sensible Transportation Policy Act (STPA) reading an excerpt from section 3B and pointed out that this was a state level policy and good language. A comment was made that there is a need to show balance. Alex felt that the three notions mentioned earlier did provide that balance.

Dan Bacon will be chairing the subcommittee that will be working on the Guiding Policies. There was consensus that some public outreach should be done. The subcommittee will provide some revisions to the Committee and then public input will be sought. It can then be brought back to the group for further review with a final release of the revisions to the public.

Transportation and Economic Development:

How might we infuse this into the guiding policies? Should we leave it in the goals section? Should we give preference to some types of investments vs. others and/or specific types of investments? Connie felt that anything that talks about promoting new concepts for funding and financing, like TIFS, transportation development rights, etc., would be beneficial. There is a need to find ways to leverage additional funding in conjunction with economic development opportunities. Should we incorporate language that recognizes that budget constraints will always be an obstacle? Alex wondered if this could be a fourth idea to include innovative methods of financing and

leverage to accomplish multiple goals and to develop new funding resources at local, state and federal levels. Maureen spoke of incentives mentioned in the Eyerman Report and said she would strongly endorse that particular study.

6. Discussion on UPWP Planning Projects Received

These items are just updates and the details can be found in the file attachment.

7. Update on the Transit-T.O.D. website effort underway

The Maine Transit Association does not have a website. This new website effort is meant to educate and promote transit statewide with information on TOD and TOD TIF proposals as well as funding. PACTS has contracted with Axon Marketing & Design for a simple website that will be modular and grown. It will be taken over by Maine Transit Association and for anything related to transit. Details are available in the meeting packet. Suggestions were made to include case studies of actual transit development projects; contents, images, leasing information, contact information to commercial brokers, and links to current news such as Saco's new Transportation Center. The website is due to become "live" by April 15th.

8. Next Meeting Dates(s)

- March 12th – Joint with Transit Committee
- April 2, 2009
- April 14th, 2009 – Joint with Technical committee

9. Adjourn

Meeting adjourned at 10:50 a.m.

Agenda Item 4. Discussion on Planning Study Proposals scoring -UPWP

PACTS and GPCOG staff have completed the scoring and ranking of the Studies we received by member communities. Some of the projects submitted for PL funding (this “pot” of funding were also considered for FTA (Federal Transit Administration) 5303 funding, specifically the Portland Bus Priority Corridor study. That study has now been able to be funded that way.

Please note that in the event that the CBITD “Casco Bay Lines” study does not get funded then staff recommends funding the Windham Comprehensive Transportation Study.

Below is the table with the results of this scoring and ranking process:

Table 4 -- May 1st

PACTS/GPCOG Staff Recommendation for
FHWA-Funded Studies at PACTS July 2009 to June 2011

<u>Proposer</u>	<u>Request</u>	<u>Function/Study</u>	<u>Staff Proposal</u>	<u>Staff Rank</u>	<u>Staff Score</u>	<u>Local Rank</u>	<u>Transit Comm.</u>	<u>MDOT</u>
Portland	\$100,000	Forest Avenue land use	\$100,000	1	29	1		Good
Portland	\$100,000	Franklin Street feasibility	\$100,000	2	27	3		Good
S. Port	\$65,000	Portland-South Portland Fixed Guideway	\$40,000	3	26		Low	Low
CBITD	\$50,000	Multi-modal transit hub*	\$35,000	4	25		Medium	Good
*We propose that the study begin in 2010 after completion of the MaineDOT's Small Starts study. *Study needs to be consistent with (1) Portland's plans for the Maine State Pier, and (2) the Peninsula Transit Study as endorsed in the future by the Portland City Council.								
Yarmouth	\$45,000	Route 1 Phase III	\$40,000	5	20			
<hr/>								
Windham	\$50,000	Comp transportation study		6	18	1		Good
Portland	\$20,000	TDM ordinance implement		6	18	2		
Scarboro	\$40,000	Oak Hill pedestrian plan		6	18			Local
Windham	\$25,000	Alternative funding study		9	16	2		
Windham	\$53,600	Parallel service road III	_____	10	13	3		Local
			Total *	\$315,000				

* There is \$316,000 available in the draft PACTS budget

We are proposing to fund the top 5 studies with of course the associated 20% match from the communities.

Agenda Item 5 – Update on the 201 Long Range Plan Update effort

The *Destination Tomorrow* Long Range Plan Update Committee has met twice, on March 27th and on May 1st. The next meeting will be on May 28th at RTP on St. John Street in Portland.

Thus far the group has:

- Developed a Scope and Work Topics document
- Discussed consolidation of Guiding Policies, Vision Statement and Sustainability
- Decided to have staff present Vision, Goals, and Guiding Policies recommendations
- Agreed to a tentative 10 month workplan

The group plans to continue to meet monthly into 2010.

Current volunteer members include include:

Dan Bacon, Scarborough -Chair	Robert Kahn
Maureen O’Meara, Cape Elizabeth	Jim Wendel, Scarborough (Tech Comm rep)
Molly Just, Westbrook	Sara Trafton, RTP (Transit Committee Rep)
Tex Haeuser, South Portland	Sara Devlin, Maine Turnpike
Alex Jaegerman, Portland	Mike Laberge, DOT
David Cole, Town Manager – Gorham (Policy Committee rep)	
Nat Tupper, Town Manager – Yarmouth (Policy Committee rep)	
Mike Bobinsky, Public Services (pub works) – Portland (Policy Committee rep)	
Kathi Earley, Public Services (pub works) – Portland (Policy Committee rep)	

If you are interested in participating, please let Carl know!

Agenda Item 6 Next Meeting Date(s)

- **June 4th**
- **June 18th** -- JOINT with Transit Committee 9am at GPCOG

Agenda Item 7 Adjourn