

# PACTS

---

## Portland Area Comprehensive Transportation System

### Planning Committee Meeting Notice

October 2nd, 2008  
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 August 7th meeting**
4. **Final recommendations to the Policy Committee on 2010/2011 funding for bike/ped projects**
5. **The Portland bicycle parking ordinance**  
-Molly Casto from the City of Portland Planning Department
6. **Transit- Land Use Planning - Review map**  
6A Review map  
6B Transit TIFs proposal Tex Haeuser
7. **High Priority Projects Survey -- regional transportation projects attitudes, prioritization results discussion**  
  
A survey of 600 residents throughout the PACTS municipalities was completed in late August, the results of which will be presented and discussed.
8. **Status Reports**
9. **Next Meeting Date(s)**  
-October 9<sup>nd</sup> – Preparations for the joint meeting with Transit Committee October 9<sup>th</sup> at 9:00am  
-November 6<sup>th</sup>
10. **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](http://www.pactsplan.org)

### **3. Minutes of August 7th Meeting**

#### **PACTS Planning Committee Minutes**

**August 7, 2008 Meeting - 9:00 a.m.**

**Members Present:** Greg Tansley, Biddeford, Chair; Dan Bacon, Vice-Chair, Scarborough; Sarah Devlin, Maine Turnpike Authority; Alex Jaegerman, Portland; Molly Just, Westbrook; Robert Kahn, Policy Committee Appointee; Mike Laberge, MaineDOT; Donna Larson, Freeport; Amanda Stearns, Falmouth.

**Members Absent:** Maine Turnpike Authority; Dawn Emerson, Yarmouth; Deb Fossum, Gorham; Gary Guerette, Policy Committee Appointee; Tex Haeuser, South Portland; Gary Lamb, Old Orchard Beach;; Steve Linnell, GPCOG; Brooks Moore, Windham; Peter Morelli, Saco; Carla Nixon, Cumberland; Maureen O'Meara, Cape Elizabeth; Tom Reinauer, SMRPC.

**Staff and Guests:** John Duncan, PACTS; Carl Eppich, PACTS; Bruce Hyman, GrowSmart Maine; Sue McIntyre, GPCOG; Tracey Perez, MaineDOT.

1. **Call to Order.** Greg Tansley, Chair called the meeting to order at 9:10 a.m.
2. **Public Comments:**  
There were no public comments.
3. **Minutes of June 12<sup>th</sup>, 2008 meeting** – Minutes tabled until later or next meeting. No quorum present.
4. **MaineDOT's Handbook for Local and Inter-Community Transportation Planning**  
Tracey Perez provided an overview of the MaineDOT's draft report for a Handbook for Local and Inter-Community Transportation Planning.

*A little history and background on some of Maine's transportation and land use laws was given.*

- The Sensible Transportation Policy Act (STPA) was enacted in 1991 by Maine voters. It basically said that before any transportation projects could be done you had to look at alternatives.
- The Growth Management Act was adopted in 1988 and was meant to adopt the comprehensive plan and implement rules to develop those plans.
- About four years ago the STPA was amended to tie in with the Growth Management Act due to their common goals.

Towns have continued to do comprehensive plans but only eleven have done ordinances. In regards to growth management it has not been very successful. Over the years the program has been gutted even more and there are no grants to do comprehensive plans. It will most likely slow down some more and comprehensive plans will only be done on a voluntary basis.

In the meantime, sensible transportation was done to encourage towns to look at how transportation is impacted by land use and vice versa. MaineDOT's goal is to encourage growth functionality as well as road functionality. There are many areas such as Camden where U.S. Route 1 is the Main Street in that town and therefore causing conflicting uses. MaineDOT is trying to figure out what to do with towns such as these to preserve the arterials. As a result, a manual entitled "Sensible Transportation" was drafted. (A copy of the draft manual was distributed among the group.)

Mike noted that there is a program within this manual asking towns to adopt a transportation plan which could be part of a comprehensive plan or just be part of a transportation plan. It basically helps to look at land use to maintain the viability of arterials having growth areas that make sense, such as cluster development. They have a few programs that are competitive such as the enhancement programs, scenic byways, etc. but those will be given priority to towns who have adopted transportation plans that are deemed as effective. Another aspect is if there are two towns applying for monies and one has a transportation plan and another road does not, the town with the transportation plan would get the “extra points”. It is an unfunded mandate. There are no monies to do the transportation plan and there are no grants. MaineDOT would like to work with the regional councils and would like to have a grasp on how to do this by December of 2008. The manual is good land use planning but many are on a scale that is hard to apply to in Maine. Commercial development probably has more of an impact on roads here in Maine.

Mike noted that he wanted something to represent the municipalities. This draft manual provides a step by step process for towns to follow and is broken down from a sensible level. A discussion began on items such as incentives, definitions of big box stores, etc. In reply to a question, Mike confirmed that in terms of plans the manual addresses town wide plans and would also include either a separate transportation plan or would be a transportation section within a comprehensive plan. You could just put in a transportation section within a comprehensive plan. Tracey added that if you have public transit or rail it would have to be included. It was noted that the manual could additionally help guide volunteers and is also meant to help towns develop a checklist. MaineDOT has created a team internally to work with the draft manual and will be having their first weekly meeting starting on Monday.

Among other items in the manual that generated interest was Chapter 2 page 3 where basic levels of service and higher levels of service are defined as well as the section on the five policies and six strategies’ areas. A question was asked as to whether MaineDOT would have an internal group to work with the assistance program. It could provide for a meaningful discussion in October. Tracey replied that they are always receptive to comments and that they would be working with regional councils. She agreed that October would be a good time for these discussions adding that things can be changed and that the draft report is not final. Their goal for the final report/manual is the end of December.

More discussion followed pertaining to extra points and small incentives. One thought included allowing for the reduction in the local match as another incentive. Amanda had a question about context sensitive solutions and provided an example. Falmouth had two projects in the community that were pulled out of state funding. Two were collector roads but with rural characters. Some required improvements that were unacceptable to the town. She wondered if this was getting closer to context sensitivity design. Mike replied that the manual would be addressing how to do the land use and said that Paul would be gathering a group of MPOs to look at how to incorporate some flexibility in the design process.

Robert Kahn pointed out that much time had been spent on regional connections and how to get pass town lines. He felt that the drafting of the manual might provide a good opportunity to have more emphasis in the thinking of corridors. He asked if there was anything that begins to focus beyond curb cuts. Tracey replied that it encourages the towns to work together and that the nature of land use in Maine is in the local ordinances, so adopting ordinances is still done on a town by town basis. It can create conflicts. Mike made reference to the section on Regional Cooperation found on Chapter 8 page 6 and noted that MaineDOT is essentially working with the regional councils through entities such as COG. Robert said his opinion was that in order to make transportation growth management really work we also need to look

beyond sprawl. Mike explained that Maine is a strong home-rule state and that the DOT is trying to do more with education. They have spent time especially in the last couple of years in trying to educate towns and talking with planners and municipal professionals as well as volunteers about items that go beyond getting a big box store in your town because it provides a better tax base. Alex felt that this was a good effort in recognizing items listed in Destination Tomorrow. Land use was designed to maintain functionality and roadways. This is a good state effort to accomplish similar goals. The basic concepts are in the manual. He noted that they have a lot of transportation planning in Portland and wondered if they would be able to submit existing plans. Tracey replied that the manual fits every size town. Alex also suggested that the strategy outline as shown in Appendix B was looking for TDM as a strategy which is something that Portland is deeply into. Tracey explained that it is not listed as a specific. Alex added that the group was looking at TDM as a major initiative firstly in Bayside. They are actually going to create an ordinance that would make TDM a part of it. They may take that city-wide. He felt it might be worth considering adding a section on strategy that would address a TDM strategy. Portland has a number of TDM ordinances and guidelines developed in draft form.

Tracey spoke of Gateway 1 and referenced all towns from Brunswick to Stockton Spring and the looking at the development patterns along the routes. This is the first effort to bring these towns together. It has been difficult. One issue is that everyone wants commercial development to help their tax base. Robert spoke of the concept of an overlay. He noted that we are not changing the state law. Each town has its own jurisdiction but he was just wondering in these times if Maine for the greater good of all of us, what if they are holding the rest of us and the economy hostage. Could this manual point that out? Tracey replied that they could not as they cannot influence legislation. A question was asked as to whether non-profit groups could be encouraged. It was thought that perhaps groups like GrowSmart, the MMA, and the Association of Planners could provide that education. Amanda showed her appreciation for Gateway 1 and noted its intent to preserve the town's character. She spoke of educating everyone about how traveling is a part of our lifestyle and that land use is not the leading component. Greg said he agreed with Alex's comment earlier and that it was totally consistent with what the DOT had done. Greg made reference to TIFs and said there are many items that have to be tackled with regionalization noting that property taxes is one obstacle to regional cooperation.

John Duncan pointed out that staff would be talking with Biddeford/Saco and Old Orchard Beach about a tri-community transportation plan and draft a scope. The strategy and planning areas from this document could turn into a multi-town effort.

John took a moment to present Donna Larson, the out-going Chair of the PACTS Planning Committee, with a plaque as a sign of appreciation. Donna has put in a lot of time with PACTS. She has chaired the PACTS Planning Committee, served on the TIP Process Committee and has worked on transition teams. She has additionally filled in for the Town Manager on the PACTS Policy Committee and is currently still serving on the PACTS High Priority Projects Committee. Many thanks go to Donna for all her help. Thank you, Donna!

3. **Minutes of June 12<sup>th</sup>, 2008 meeting** – Taken out of order. (Quorum now present.)  
*Alex Jaegerman moved for approval of the June 12<sup>th</sup>, 2008 meeting minutes, seconded by Mike Laberge.*

Amanda noted that she was listed as present but was absent from the meeting. On the last page, in the second sentence of the last paragraph under agenda item 7, where it says "University of Maine" it should read, "University of Minnesota". ***Vote taken. All were in favor. Minutes were accepted as amended.***

**5. Review of June 12th Joint Meeting with the Transit Committee**

Greg provided an overview of the items listed on page six of the meeting packet. Those were the important items and the intent is to move forward with action steps at the next meeting in October. These items were compiled by both Steve Linnell and Carl Eppich. Greg asked the group if anyone wanted to add and/or subtract anything from the lists and which of these items they might consider more important to this Committee. The same question will be asked of the PACTS Transit Committee. It is intended that action steps will be developed as well as thoughts will be considered as to how both Committees could work together on these efforts.

***Among comments and items noted:***

- a. We should focus on the TOD and land use and integrate transit into ordinances.
- b. How can we help other communities prepare for bus service?
- c. How do we help developers provide bus stops or a park and ride area, etc. so that when transit comes, the infrastructure would already be in place.
- d. How would potential transit lines look like?
- e. What about transit within the town in conjunction with connecting parking lots, etc.?
- f. How about parking with reference to current and potential rail stops in the future?
- g. Could we include anything that looks ahead in regards to transit and commuter rail options and what kind of opportunities and benefits could exist with these kinds of growth patterns? (This might be a good way to reach out to towns before they are forced to make a decision).
- h. Up-to-date maps of current initiatives along with theoretical transit lines going out of the cities could help communities with impact fees as well as with capital planning.
- i. Bike/ped along with different modes of transportation in conjunction with TDM
- j. Bus pass subsidies should be considered.
- k. Is there a need to look at regional TDM?
- l. More time to prepare for potential transit costs at the local level.
- m. How to address the re-prioritization of funds to include more monies for transit?
- n. Should TDM be included in the CPI Index and/or what about a regional approach to TDM?
- o. There is a need to establish the regional approach and other routes that make sense. Such as what is the land use along those roads? Perhaps, that should be at the top of priorities.
- p. Could we put together an inventory in a visual sense and put that into a map that Steve has? What might that look like in the future? Could we overlay our individual roads on top of that?

It is important to get that kind of regional understanding and to provide that information to all of our member communities. Bruce reminded the group of the work that had been done as part of Destination Tomorrow in the 2003 report where rail was flushed out. They had identified 13 communities and had mapped out the highway scenario. They additionally looked at aggressive rail/transit in the long-range planning effort. That could be a strong component of that update. The Committee could look at a couple of corridors that could be significant transit routes and look at a regional perspective to get them ready. Bruce also made reference to Smart-Growth along these corridors. There is much information out there to help and update. He said he would encourage looking at a strategic level. He additionally spoke of incentives with reference to the long range plan with regards to communities showing improvement in transit and subsequently reducing the need for road repairs or road building.

John noted that there had been consensus to reconvene the PACTS Planning Committee with the PACTS Transit Committee in October. Staff could draft goals/action steps to address those items that we have just discussed. It was noted that the PACTS Transit Committee would also

be putting together a work plan. Amanda asked if staff could do a comparison of the goals as well.

Alex spoke of discussions that had taken place about mapping the future with regards to transit along with the integration of land use planning. He felt this to be an urgent issue. Greg spoke of focusing only on the regional aspect. Alex referenced transit readiness development with land use and wondered if those could be integrated. Do we adjust routes with development? It seems that it would be critical. Greg asked if the October meeting should focus on regional understanding of past, present and future TDM. Dan added that we could work through a map and provide our own local information so that we have something relatively comfortable to share with the transit community along with Destination Tomorrow. John noted that staff has many maps.

The group will review Destination Tomorrow and follow-up with Carl with any updated information that is needed with regards to their respective towns. Carl will forward everyone a list of the past six or eight studies that have been done along with a brief description.

#### **6. The Year Ahead for the Planning Committee – Brainstorming and Project Setting**

Greg Tansley provided a summary on the items that the Planning Committee had either worked on and/or were briefed on as described in the meeting packet. He then focused on discussing our priorities for the coming year in addition to the prospects listed in the meeting packet.

##### ***Among comments:***

- Staff and consultants will be working on the Unified Planning Program during the next two years.
- Destination Tomorrow will be updated in 2010, two years prior to the new census. There may be a ruling that defines the region as a TDM vs. an MPO.
- 2010 could be a strategy for updating later.
- A project could include that transit could be a solution to the wear and tear on roads.
- We have an obligation to focus on the transit piece.
- Do we fund many small projects or fund a few bigger projects. Also, do we want to have an input on that?
- Do we want to get involved in any way with the MaineDOT's permit process?
- There is a lack of attention to community impact.
- An update from MaineDOT on these issues would be beneficial in knowing where the DOT is heading.
- We could offer community studies as well.

There was consensus among the group to invite Steve Landry from the MaineDOT to the October meeting for an update. Carl will create an updated list of priorities for the coming year and will forward it by email to the group. There was also agreement that the Planning Committee should be more involved in more of the discussions.

Discussion began on the funding of local studies and the ranking process. Ranking is currently done by the PACTS Technical Committee because they have experience in ranking and capital improvement projects. Should the PACTS Planning Committee have a role in the rankings process? Amanda spoke of regional issues and the prioritization of regional studies. She wondered if there was an opportunity for the Planning Committee as a group to give incentives. It was agreed that it might be beneficial to have a discussion about whether the Planning Committee should have a role with the ranking of projects.

The discussion then focused on Adhoc Projects. Several ideas were suggested.

- Could we promote bicycle parking or bike racks in front of businesses? Maybe we could have a model ordinance to integrate bike parking. MaineDOT could buy the bike racks in bulk and sell them as a discount.
- Are we going to address parking for scooters and motorcycles, including covered parking to keep the bikes, scooters, and motorcycles out of any inclement weather?
- Tracey noted that MaineDOT has been considering bike lockers.

Discussion continued. The MaineDOT along with both GoMaine and the Bicycle Coalition of Maine have enacted a bicyclist commuter program. Donna said she would first like to see the outcome be an ordinance and then address the parking. Alex agreed to try to keep it contained and do the bike things first. The bicycle parking is relatively easy to recommend and then prospective businesses and development will have some bicycle parking as well.

***There was consensus among the group to have a limited scope project on bicycle parking.***

Other adhoc projects were discussed such as aerial photographs and the Eyerman/Melrose report. Aerial photographs were done in 2006 and John pointed out that staff would be providing a report on the results of a meeting with MaineDOT that included Kat Fuller, John Melrose and others.

#### **7. Status Reports**

Carl provided a quick update on the regional telephone survey. The survey group has been calling and receiving 600 completed surveys. It will include all the PACTS communities and will be broken down into sub-regions. A draft report should be available by the end of August.

Reference was made to the Veterans Bridge. It was pointed out that the Veterans Bridge is a major and primary evacuation route. Rebuilding the bridge is a \$40 million project. There is also a movement to make it more pedestrian and bicycle friendly road. Mike Laberge will ask why MaineDOT is “fast tracking” the design.

#### **8. Adjourn**

The meeting adjourned at 11:15 a.m.

## **Agenda Item 4. Discussion: Bike/ped projects 2010/2011 Final Recommendations to the Policy Committee**

Staff will present recommendations for the Planning Committee to endorse and forward to the Policy Committee for 2010/2011. Increased cost estimates and some input from DOT have influenced the list and we will have answers by Thursday.

SCORING CRITERIA - AVERAGE OF PAUL'S & CARL'S SCORES														
ID	Municipality	Location	Cost Est.	Users (type, number)	Regional Benefits	Cost Effectiveness	Growth Area	Network	Safety	Maintain/improve	Expanded	Land Use Connection	Livability/Redevelop	Sum
1	OOB	Saco Ave. Sidewalk and Bike Lane Enhancement	\$186,980	2.5	1.5	1.5	2.5	2.5	2.0	2.5	1.0	2.0	2.5	20.5
2	Portland	Trail Connect. I-295 Exit7 - Back Cove Trail	\$78,000	2.5	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.5	2.0	2.0	2.0	1.5	1.5	20.0
2	Portland	Tukey's Bridge: Improve Bike Ped Access	\$40,000	3.0	2.5	2.0	2.0	2.0	3.0	2.0	1.0	1.0	1.5	20.0
4	Falmouth	Falmouth Foreside Sidewalk	\$65,000	2.5	1.5	2.0	1.5	1.0	2.5	1.5	1.5	2.5	2.5	19.0
5	Portland	Improved Trail & Transit Connections: I-295 Exit 5	\$132,000	2.0	2.5	1.5	1.0	2.0	2.0	1.0	2.0	1.5	1.0	16.5
6	Freeport	Concord Gully Trail Phase 1	\$98,150	1.5	1.0	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	2.5	1.5	1.5	15.5
6	Yarmouth	Rte. 1 Bike/Ped Path" Complete Phase 1	\$572,000	2.0	1.5	0.5	1.0	1.5	2.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	2.0	15.5

You may recollect our rankings from May:

- \$385,000 available, which needs to include the 25% contingency policy and that the funding will be the maximum PACTS contribution to these projects.
- Please note that our policy is to program a 25% contingency for all PACTS projects, except design work and STP Transit projects.
- Please also note that in 2006 PACTS funded sidewalk projects for Main Street in Biddeford and for Saco Avenue in Old Orchard Beach. Unfortunately, in 2007 the Policy Committee deferred these two projects to 2010/2011, and capped the PACTS contribution to them at a total of \$329,112. As such, our total Bike/Ped program for the upcoming 2010/2011 biennium is  $\$329,112 + \$385,000 = \$714,112$ .

A brief overview of the seven proposals follows in alphabetical order.

**Falmouth- Foreside Road (Rte 88)/Underwood Park/Johnson Road/Town Landing Road:** Construct a new sidewalk from a future parking lot at Underwood Park to Johnson Road, including a crosswalk from Johnson Road across Rte 88 to a landing area at Town Landing Road. The project will improve pedestrian access and safety to the Town Landing area.

Freeport- Gully Trail, phase I: An off road multi-use trail connecting an existing trail on Casco Street to Forest Street in the vicinity of the LL Bean facility. The project will connect existing facilities and improve non-motorized access.

Old Orchard Beach- Saco Avenue new and rehabilitated sidewalks and bike lanes: Rehabilitation and construction of new sidewalks and a bike lane on Saco Avenue (Rte 5) from Staples Street to Union Avenue, including ADA ramps. The project will improve access and safety for both bicyclists and pedestrians (including transit users) along the Rte 5 corridor.

Portland- Back Cove Trail/Peninsula Connection: A multi-use trail connection between Franklin Arterial/Marginal Way and the Back Cove Trail beneath I-295. The project will be a new connection from the Portland Peninsula to the Back Bay trail for bicyclists and pedestrians.

Portland- Study to improve bicycle access across Tukey's Bridge: Feasibility and preliminary design for bicycle improvements to both the north and south approaches to Tukey's Bridge for connections to the peninsula, Eastern Prom and Back Cove Trail.

Portland- Bicycle and pedestrian connections to the Portland Transportation Center: Construct multi-use trail from facility across the Fore River Parkway to Congress Street and construct sidewalk connection from the existing sidewalk on Sewall Street to the PTC facility.

Yarmouth- Rte 1 multi-use trail construction: Construction (extension) of multi-use trail from the existing Beth Condon Memorial Pathway near Forest Falls Drive, over, along and across East Main Street to connect to existing trail at the East Main Street ramp. Project includes a retaining wall along Rte 1.

## **Agenda Item 5 – The Portland bicycle parking ordinance**

Molly Casto from the City of Portland Planning Office will be presenting information on Portland's recently approved (Feb 2008) Bicycle Parking Ordinance:

### **Section XVIII: Bicycle Parking Technical and Design Standards**

#### **I. Intention**

These standards are intended to encourage the use of bicycles for personal transportation as an alternative to motor vehicles by providing adequate and secure short-term and long-term bicycle parking for residential, employment, commercial and other transportation and travel destinations.

#### **II. Applicability**

In all zones where off-street motor vehicle parking is required and in the case of new construction, alterations and changes of use as specified in Section 14-526(a)(2) (Site Plan Standards), minimum off-street bicycle parking requirements shall be provided and maintained.

#### **III. Standards**

The provisions for bicycle parking as required under Zoning Sec. 14-332.1. *Uses requiring off-street bicycle parking* and Site Plan Sec. 14-526 (a) (2) shall meet the following location and design specifications and requirements:

##### **A. Location**

1. For commercial structures that require more than ten (10) bicycle spaces, at least ten percent (10%) of the required bicycle parking shall be provided within fifty (50) feet of the main egress point of the structure, or shall be no further from such entry than the nearest five (5) nonhandicapped parking spaces. Where there is more than one structure on a site, or where a structure has more than one main entrance, the parking shall be distributed to adequately serve all structures or main entrances.
2. Where possible, and especially for bicycle parking intended for long-term use, bicycle racks shall be provided under cover at pedestrian entry arcades or canopies where such arcades or canopies are provided.
3. To the extent feasible, placement of off-street bicycle parking racks must conform to the Bicycle Parking Rack Placement Criteria (*drawn from the Bicycle Facility Design Guide of the District Department of Transportation, 2006*) as illustrated herein (Illustration I).
4. Bicycle parking shall be separated from car parking by a physical barrier such as curbing, wheel stops, parking bollards or similar features to protect bicycles from damage by cars.
5. *Directional Signs*: If bicycle parking is not directly visible from the public right of way, directional signage shall be provided indicating the availability and location of bicycle parking facilities.

**B. Bicycle Parking Facilities:**

1. Off-street parking for bicycles shall provide a secure, durable structure to which bicycles can be affixed with customary lock and cable mechanisms, and shall maintain the bicycle in an upright position.
2. Bicycle parking facilities that are used at night shall be adequately illuminated to minimize the risk of theft and vandalism.
3. Structures that support the bicycle frame at two locations such as inverted U-racks and bike hitches are preferred over racks with single connection points, such as bike fences and wave racks. Racks shall be securely and permanently anchored according to manufacturer's specifications.

i. **Storage Lockers:** Where feasible, such as residential developments, parking garages, or other suitable locations, bicycle storage lockers are encouraged for long-term bicycle parking. Double-decker bicycle racks are appropriate for bicycle storage lockers.

ii. **Approved Bicycle Racks:** Catalogue cuts and installation specifications are provided for rack systems approved for the City right-of-way and recommended for private property. A variety of commercially available racks are acceptable on private property, including those catalogue listings identified herein (Illustrations II and III), or equivalents upon approval by the Planning Authority.

iii. **Bicycle Racks in public right-of-way:** Where site conditions cannot reasonably accommodate bicycle parking on private property, it may be located within a public sidewalk area either adjacent to or within reasonable walking distance of the site, if such areas are available that meet the Bicycle Parking Rack Placement Criteria of this chapter (*drawn from the Bicycle Facility Design Guide of the District Department of Transportation, 2006*) – see Illustration I. If no such location is available, a financial contribution commensurate with the cost for purchase and installation of the required number of bicycle racks shall be made to a City infrastructure account for racks to be installed in the public right-of-way in other, more suitable locations of the City.

The following approved brands, installed according to company specifications, shall be permitted for bicycle racks in the public right of way. Equivalent bicycle racks by other manufacturers are acceptable upon approval by the Planning Authority.

- DERO 'Downtown Rack' Inverted U-Rack (Illustration II)
- DERO 'Bike Hitch' (Illustration III)

**Old Port District, including Commercial Street:**

- DERO Bike Hitch only (Illustration III)

Bicycle racks in the public right of way shall become the property of the City of Portland.

Bicycle racks in the public right of way shall match the designated street furniture color for that location:

- a. *Bayside District*: RAL 7016 Tiger Drylac USA, Inc– Dark Gray
- b. *Bayside Commercial District (B-7 Zone)*: T357-Gr105 Cardinal Industrial Finishes.
- c. *Old Port (including Commercial Street)*: Black
- d. *Congress Street*: RAL 6012 Tiger Drylac USA, Inc – Green

Where there is no designated street furniture color, bicycle racks in the public right of way shall be black.

These standards shall be revisited by the Planning Board no later than June, 2013.

**\*\*\* SEE [www.portlandmaine.gov/planning/bicycleparkingtechnicalstds.pdf](http://www.portlandmaine.gov/planning/bicycleparkingtechnicalstds.pdf) for specifics and graphics\*\*\***

## **Agenda Item 6 – Transit- Land Use Planning - Review map**

### **6A. Review map -**

Many of you who attended the joint meeting with the Transit Committee in June will recall our discussion on developing a regional map for beginning to think about regional transit-oriented development.

Staff in met with Bruce Hyman (who had worked on the land use/transportation components of *Destination Tomorrow* to begin to develop a working map which includes:

- Geography of the PACTS Study area
- Existing urban, commuter and intercity rail
- Proposed urban, commuter and studied -or being studied- transit and land uses throughout the region (and somewhat beyond).
- Compact Land Use Areas (per Destination Tomorrow 2003)
- Economic Centers (per Destination Tomorrow 2003)
- Municipality Defined Growth Areas
- Identified potential commuter rail routes and existing ROW/track
- Identified potential Bus Rapid Transit

This will be an opportunity to view the working map, provide comment, and help explain where growth is REALLY happening in your communities, and where you think TOD opportunities REALLY exist.

Your comments/additions will be extremely helpful in preparation for the October 9<sup>th</sup> Joint Meeting with the Transit Committee.

Review purpose and summary of this mapping effort:

- What the priorities are for the region (and beyond) for transportation planning;
- In the context of increasing energy costs;
- In the context of air quality and global climate change;
- Where transit systems have capacity; where they can and should accommodate growth;
- T.O.D. -- Transit Oriented Development by community types;
- Consensus on GOALS for this effort.
- Direction for PACTS/GPCOG staff moving forward.

## **6B. Transit TIFs proposal Tex Haeuser -**

Tex's Memo to John from 9/15/2008:

**To:** John Duncan, Executive Director, PACTS  
**From:** Tex Haeuser, Planning & Development Director  
**Cc:** Tom Meyers, Transportation & Waterfront Director  
**Date:** September 15, 2008  
**Re: Legislative Proposal: Transit TIF's**

---

### **Proposal**

Amend Title 30-A, Chapter 206, Municipal Capital Improvement Districts, to add Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Districts. The intention is to enable communities to put one or more roadway corridors in TOD TIF Districts such that a portion of the property taxes on any transit- or alternative modes-related portion of a development project could be rebated to the developer or owner through a credit enhancement agreement. In addition, the incremental taxes from any qualifying TOD development in the district (mixed-use, higher density, bus/bicycle/ pedestrian accommodation) could be used in the district by the municipality for transit/alternative modes operating and capital expenditures. The TOD development criteria would include:

- meeting a minimum project size based on total project value and number of residential units provided;
- providing a mix of residential and commercial, office, or other land uses;
- incorporating a building and site design that is conducive to transit and alternative modes of transportation;
- exceeding a minimum residential density; and,
- providing fewer off-street parking spaces than industry averages per land use (thus relying to an extent on public transit and alternative modes of transportation).

Similar to Downtown TIF Districts, Transit TIF's would be exempt from the 5% caps on TIF districts' total area and taxable property value.

### **Example**

South Portland designates Broadway/Westbrook Street/Gorham Road/Running Hill Road as a TOD corridor. (This corridor would link the eastern part of the City with the Maine Mall area and, potentially, with Scarborough, Westbrook, and Gorham.) A shopping center in the corridor, hypothetically, decides to redevelop into more of a mixed-use, life-style type center. As part of the project, a facility for accommodating buses and bus riders is integrated into the design. The developer or owner of the project, therefore, would be eligible to receive back some of the new property taxes from the project to help offset the cost of the transit-related improvement. In addition, if the project met the TOD development criteria, the municipality could use incremental property taxes from the project to help pay the salaries of bus drivers serving that route or other transit operating expenses, or for various capital improvements, like bus shelters, the local match on new buses, or new bike lane construction.

## **Need for Transit TIF's and TOD**

Transit TIF's and the Transit Oriented Development they would foster are needed due to such factors as:

- Transit TIF's spur new economic activity that generate increases in state and local tax revenues as well as growth in employment. TOD development is in demand across the country; instituting Transit TIF's in Maine will enable us to share in the above average performance of this development type.
- Transit TIF's lead to mixed-use, TOD development patterns in which more trips are accomplished by bus, bicycle, or walking. This will help people keep the transportation portion of their household budgets in check.
- Increasing the ability of seniors to get around without cars is becoming a serious issue as Maine gets older demographically.
- As a state with areas that are out of attainment in terms of air quality and that could suffer major economic losses from sea level rise, promoting sustainable transportation and development is in our vital interest.
- A compact, mixed-use, higher density land use pattern in transit corridors is needed to support transit at a level of service that makes it a viable transportation choice for average citizens.
- Redevelopment of sites in the older parts of many Maine communities to their highest and best uses will need a reduction in off-street parking spaces due to the lack of room for large parking lots. Particularly for retail, this necessitates a higher volume transit system.
- Reducing paved parking areas is a key goal in the effort to reduce the negative environmental impacts of stormwater runoff.
- Redevelopment in an area's urban core will slow the rate of sprawl in the region and thus help to preserve open space and traditional community structures.
- Walking and bicycle riding associated with Transit TIF-supported TOD land use patterns can help curb obesity, a national epidemic, and bring other significant health benefits.

## **Outcome**

Passage of the proposed amendment would have the mutually reinforcing effects of encouraging transit oriented development and improving bus service and alternative modes of transportation within designated TOD corridors.

## **Agenda Item 7 -- High Priority Projects Survey -- regional transportation projects attitudes, prioritization results discussion**

A survey of 600 residents throughout the PACTS municipalities was completed in late August, the results of which will be presented and discussed.

A summary follows:

### **PACTS High Priority Projects (HPP) Transportation Investments Importance Survey Summary**

PACTS commissioned Pan Atlantic SMS Group to conduct a telephone survey of residents within the PACTS municipalities of the Greater Portland metropolitan area. The primary objective of this research was to gauge the public support for various transportation investment choices (HPP Projects) to help establish a regional investment direction in project decision making.

To achieve a regionally significant and representative survey of opinions on residents' current transportation outlook with consideration of ongoing cost escalations, a quantitative (with some qualitative input opportunities) telephone survey of 600 residents was undertaken.

The survey focused on:

- Respondents current transportation modes and mode share;
- Respondents current use of alternative (non-automotive) transportation modes;
- The impacts and changes, if any, increase in gas prices have had on transportation mode choices, and the perceived influences on those choices at further increases (\$5/gallon and \$10/gallon)
- Evaluating attitudes on future transportation mode planning alternatives and priorities for the region;
- Respondents perceived importance of the nine HPP transportation projects;
- Respondents actual first, second and third priorities of the nine HPP transportation projects;
- Demographic questions, including age, gender, income level, municipality of residence, education level and level of daily commuting to work (if any)

### Importance Level of Projects

Of the nine potential projects, three projects were clearly and consistently ranked the highest in terms of importance:

1. **Replace and Purchase New Public Transportation Vehicles** (3.96 on a 5-point scale)
2. **Add Safety Lanes on I-295 between Exits 5 and 7 in Portland** (3.94 on a 5-point scale)
3. **Rebuild Veteran's Bridge** (3.86 on a 5-point scale)

Followed closely by:

4. **Make capital improvements for 'Portland North' rail service between Portland and Brunswick** (3.62 on a 5-point scale)

### Prioritization Ranking

The top priorities were ranked in a similar pattern:

When respondents were asked to rank their first, second, and third personal transportation investment choices from the nine projects, between **16% and 22%** of respondents ranked the following four projects as their first priority:

1. **Add Safety Lanes on I-295 between Exits 5 and 7 in Portland** 21.8%
2. **Rebuild Veteran's Bridge** 19.3%

3. **Make capital improvements for 'Portland North' rail service between Portland and Brunswick 17.8%**
4. **Replace and Purchase New Public Transportation Vehicles 16.7%**

The same four projects also have the highest combined prioritization (1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> choices combined):

1. **Add Safety Lanes on I-295 between Exits 5 and 7 in Portland 56.5%**
2. **Rebuild Veteran's Bridge 48.6%**
3. **Replace and Purchase New Public Transportation Vehicles 46.2%**
4. **Make capital improvements for 'Portland North' rail service between Portland and Brunswick 44.0%**

#### The effect of Increased Gas Prices on Transportation Modes

Survey respondents indicated that the increases in gas prices over the past few years have affected approximately two-thirds (65.2%) of them. Most have indicated they drive less.

#### Important to Note

Approximately half of the survey respondents (303) provided additional suggestions and comments when asked regarding transportation planning issues that are currently affecting them

IN general a theme emerged as the leading suggestions:

- Residents of the PACTS Region would like more public transportation options, especially in the areas surrounding the City of Portland (including rural areas), with regular morning and evening hours
  - If options were already available, better marketing of the schedules and routes is recommended
  - If current public transportation services are expanded, marketing of new routes and increased hours of operation are seen as essential
  - If public transportation services are expanded, many residents would prefer that the vehicles purchased are environmentally friendly and or run on alternative fuels.
- A number of respondents suggested that current roads in the area be repaired and maintained.
- Residents of the PACTS region would like more biking options throughout the area. More bike lanes and safer biking options are very important to residents
- Many respondents would like rail service in the area expanded. However, some respondents voiced concern that if gas prices decrease, investment in expanding the current service will be for naught.

## Agenda Item 8 Status Reports

### **The Year Ahead**

**TMA training November 4<sup>th</sup>**: PACTS has set up a meeting with MaineDOT, FHWA and FTA to learn more about our future as a Transportation Management Area.

During the past year the members were briefed or worked on the following:

- Adjusting the PACTS 2-year studies budget (August)
- The Rail Planning Portland North process (August)
- Planning Committee work priorities for the year (September)
- New funding opportunities for transportation improvements – and the Eyerman/Melrose financing report (September, October, November, January, May and June)
- The PACTS High Priority Project planning process (October)
- Land use topics in the PACTS Regional Transit Coordination Study (January)
- The PACTS organizational process review (January)
- Ranking of 2010/2011 bike/ped improvement proposals (June)
- Climate change and the rising cost of fuel (June with the Transit Committee)

Priorities for the coming year.

- Review progress to implement our *Destination Tomorrow* Plan (2006). Participate in the development of our 2-year planning/studies work program next spring.
- Organize an update of *Destination Tomorrow* in 2010, as required by our federal partners. **Transit as the organizing theme?**
- Coordination of land use and transportation.
- Parking requirements (vehicle and bicycle)
- Land use and transit.
- Corridor zoning consistency.
- Pursue certain aspects of the Eyerman/Melrose report.
- Participate in a discussion of PACTS sticking with our existing policy of funding a wide variety of projects throughout the region – rather than funding a very small number of projects that are determined to be very regionally significant.
- Participate, and/or get briefed on, some of the major regional studies listed at the end of this meeting packet.
- Get briefed on the MaineDOT's current review of the Traffic Movement Permit process.
- In October the Committee will finalize a recommendation to the Policy Committee for funding of bike/ped projects in the 2010/2011 biennium.

PACTS outreach/visibility work:

- John organized and led a successful “Sandwich Symposium” last Friday September 19th on *Traffic Calming*. Eighteen people plus staff attended. The panel included Jim Carmody, Steve Landry, and Tom Errico.
- More “sandwich symposia” to come. Next up... “*Complete Streets*” Please let us know if you have any ideas for future topics
- We have sent out seven news releases in last few months. We will be releasing one this week on the on the results of the High Priority Projects Transportation Survey.
- A “quarterly newsletter” to our 100+ “interested parties” people will be sent out this week.

This past summer Paul Niehoff and Matti Gurney (GPCOG) oversaw a pair of college interns doing an exhaustive inventory of the Portland peninsula’s sidewalks. MaineDOT and a foundation are funded the work.

On Sunday, August 10, 2008, the Hydrogen Energy Center (HEC) and Maine Clean Communities (MC<sup>2</sup>) brought a fleet of twelve hydrogen cars to Portland Head Light (Fort Williams Park) in Cape Elizabeth, Maine. One park official estimated that about 1000 people attended throughout the afternoon. On Monday, the cars went to Fort Allen Park to kick off the Hydrogen Road Tour '08. The speakers were Portland Mayor Edward Suslovic, Senator Olympia Snowe, Representative Tom Allen, Department of Energy Administrator Paul Brubaker, and California Fuel Cell Partnership Executive Director Catherine Dunwoody.

GPCOG has hired Rosemary Kulow effective September 29. Over the next 9 months she will be working on a part time (32 hours/week) basis. As many of you know, after 5 years as the New Gloucester Town Manager, Rosi has resigned effective September 19 from that position. In addition to serving as TM in a number of other communities, Rosi’s background includes 2 years as a Transportation Planning Specialist with the Maine DOT . She will be working with Carol approximately one day per week getting up to speed on our Cooperative Purchasing Program and Human Resources responsibilities. As a manager who has spent most of her time in smaller communities and given her academic background, Rosi is ideally suited to assume Carol’s duties next July.

Paul and Carl recently attended the Transportation Research Board’s *Tools of the Trade* Conference\_for small metropolitan areas in Portland, Oregon.

John will attend and speak in Seattle next month at the annual MPO Executive Directors conference of the Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations.

GPCOG Executive Committee has developed three sub-committees to pursue sustainability initiatives on Community, Economy and Environment.

The Policy Committee met in on Thursday September 18<sup>th</sup> and created a new TIP Process Committee. Kat Fuller also briefed the Committee on major DOT regional studies for the first time since May, and will meet next in October to make final decisions for the 2010/2011 PACTS Capital Projects.

The Executive Committee has been meeting monthly and, and its next meeting will be held next Tuesday October 7<sup>th</sup>.

#### Technical Committee

- Paul Niehoff has initiated a Technical Committee working group to review and develop innovate and streamlined ways to develop and complete projects, including new partnerships...and maybe lobby for revising federal guidelines and/or standards. MaineDOT and the other MPO's are also interested, and have joined in the discussion.
- Regional Collector Road Study – still working on methodology to select collector paving projects to fund this fall.

#### Transit Committee

- Did not meet as a Committee in August, but Providers met to discuss and work on a plan for an understanding and “road map” for AVL - Automatic transit Vehicle Location systems (PACTS funded).
- As part of the effort, developed a Functional Requirements matrix for all providers.
- Met September 18<sup>th</sup> and viewed the Charlie Stephen's DVD “Toward a Sustainable Energy Future” which was live at USM in April
- Other work to implement Regional Transit Coordination Study.

#### Noteworthy Transportation Studies Underway, About to Start or Proposed

- Maine Turnpike Authority's Gorham East-West Corridor Study (Kickoff meeting in November)
- MaineDOT's I-295 Corridor Study
- MaineDOT's “Small Starts” passenger rail study
- MaineDOT et al review of Traffic Movement Permit process
- PACTS Portland Peninsula Transit Study
- PACTS Collector Roads Assessment Study
- PACTS Regional Signal Coordination Study
- PACTS Franklin Arterial Corridor Study
- PACTS Portland Peninsula Wayfinding Study
- PACTS Cape Elizabeth Shore Road Path Study
- PACTS Yarmouth Route 1 Phase 2 Study
- PACTS Scarborough Running Hill Road Corridor Transportation Study
- PACTS Freeport School Street Extension Study
- Turnpike Widening Alternatives Analysis – DELAYED TWO YEARS