

**BOARD OF SELECTMEN  
MINUTES OF MEETING  
JANUARY 31, 2011**

Selectmen present: Rosendel Gerry, Chairman, H. Bob Plausse, Cathy Hardy, and Jason Trundy

Excused: Stacey Parra

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Gerry at 6:00 p.m.

Facilitator Deb Burwell set forth ground rules for the meeting. Self introductions were made including Evan Richert, Project Consultant; Stacy Benjamin, The Gateway 1 Project Administrator; Chris Mann, MaineDOT Project Manager; and Don White, Gateway 1 Implementation Steering Committee

Will Brown provided an Overview of Gateway 1, see attached.

Chris Osgood questioned whether or not this is a new level of bureaucracy

Evan Richert stated that is not another layer of government, with no decision makers. The Interlocal Agreement (ILA) is to share authority, MDOT to share priority setting and authorities. The ISC is working on bylaws.

Tom Crowley questioned why or how is \$1.3 million secured?

Chris Mann: PIN assigned - 80% federal funds - 20% state funds

Tom Crowley stated that governmental change may result in program change.

Unknown: How will Corridor Coalition (CC) be structured? What kinds of decisions will it make?

Evan Richert stated that CC has only authority given to it.

Chris Mann: if towns help us costs will be minimized. For Routes 1 and 90, we will turnover authority of investments

Jay Foster asked if this was incentive based. How?

Evan R: For competitive based statewide projects such as safe routes to school and other enhancements additional points for regional cooperation are given, Sensible Transportation Policy Act - allows additional scoring point, within the region - MDOT will allot funds to each biennium, what are the top priorities in participating communities

Chris Mann: Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPO) receive priority funding

Evan Richert gave an overview of the proposed ILA

- non-profit corporation
- each town will have one vote
- MDOT agrees to share budgetary authority
- MDOT has agreements with MPO's in Portland, Lewiston-Auburn & Bangor
- CC committees ask for comments on town standards
- CC comments advisory, Planning Board sole authority

Article 4. No financial obligation without explicit town approval for MDOT biennial funding request

Article 6. Builds in patience, allows towns to wade in versus adopt, non-binding resolution provides a seat at the table, three years after endorsing to start implementation - lose the seat if plan isn't adopted

Article 5. Twelve committee, MDOT, SPO (Rockland & Brunswick, are in), Withdrawal without penalty, except the loss of incentives, withdrawal requires a Town Meeting vote

Rosey Gerry: Rockland and Brunswick are in? Why are they in so soon?

Evan Richert: Council form of government is satisfied. Decisions can be made faster with Council versus Town Meeting.

Cathy Hardy: No town meeting vote required?

Evan Richert: Not in Rockland or Brunswick

Cathy Hardy: How do we effectively communicate this plan to those that don't live and breathe it?

Chris Osgood: emphasis on patience. ISC should take time on the bylaws

Don White: The ILA provides:

- Unprecedented voting on the transportation funds
- For regional collaboration
- Building into the bylaws, individual choice
- That choices made from away will be made locally

Evan Richert: daunting to present at a Town meeting, there is no downside to try it, ILA allows ability to wade in, set forth sound practices and principles, citizenry may not know until it is a real experience.

Chris Osgood: sounds good - what is being described isn't reality anymore - town may not like the bylaws, big towns may dominate, small towns may need best person or Town Attorney to keep up, keep small towns included

Jason Trundy: Why? MDOT has the power and ability. MDOT sees potential problems. The solution is an agreement with the towns? How does an agreement manage a problem? Does MDOT get their fingers into land use? How does this accomplish MDOT long term goals?

Chris Mann: MDOT has no land use authority, community agrees to work together to preserve mobility.

Jason Trundy: Does this reduce curb cuts and traffic? Does it allow for business growth?

Evan Richert: Core growth areas are essential - Why? To avoid Wiscasset bypass, Warren, Camden type issues. The ILA decentralizes authority.

Tom Crowley: Education and understanding is essential. "Trust me, I am a consultant" isn't going to work. This is a good plan - I'd vote for it. ISC needs to explain so people can understand, not complex - ISC needs to get this out. What motivated Brunswick and Rockland? Not how but why. Don't fall down with education, remove the carrot and the "stick"

Eric Gallant: Gateway 1 Action plan is similar to Comp Plan. How was the Comp Plan presented? Gateway 1a Comp Plan for the corridor. He is working to compare Gateway 1 and existing Comp Plans

John Krumrein: Is this just Route 1 or all roads?

Evan Richert: All funding for transportation improvements

Paul Crowley stated that when comparing 1850 to today Lincolnville has seen very little growth, we have a nice school built for 300 students that is now housing 200 with school population dropping. The plan calls for 500 additional houses by 2030. Route 3 is our de facto Route 1 bypass, stop & go traffic in Camden is diminishing, as gas prices rise we will see less traffic not more, this is aimed at larger communities, Route 1 in Lincolnville is the only 5 miles viable for businesses, 25% of the town is in State Park, almost another 25% in conservation (second only to Bar Harbor in conserved land). The ILA is troubling as the triggers for CC review (5 trips per hour on Route 1 and 20 trips per hour on community roads are too low. We need services. I'd like to see Lincolnville beach a village again. We need employment. Route 1 is only state road not posted in the spring and business needs trucks. It also has 3 phase power. Route 1 is the only game in town. We need to develop Route 1 for business and tax revenue. Why should Lincolnville sign on to limit growth?

Chris Osgood: Has done 18 years of battle with "old" MDOT. MDOT now acknowledges Lincolnville's work. Lots of developable land along Route 1. He encourages growth in the Center.

Jeanne Hollingsworth: Expressed concerns that plan designated local roads to accept Route 1 traffic

Evan Richert: Nothing in the ILA regarding alternate routes, Gateway 1 plan engineers found back roads being congested as Route 1 became developed. One strategy could be to design and alternate local system but plan does not designate or require

Stacy Benjamin: Intermediate action asks towns to identify informal routes in order to manage traffic . Lincolnville only asked to do basic actions of Gateway 1 Action Plan

Cathy Hardy: Lincolnville only has four State roads - Routes 235, 52, 173 and Route 1

Paul Crowley: Given the fact that Lincolnville is a small town, why should Lincolnville take on burden?

Don White: Layered benefits in managing growth

Evan Richert: If Lincolnville doesn't manage its growth it may grow unacceptably.

Chris Osgood: Gateway 1 is a 16 town effort, from the ground up, local effort not MDOT

Don White: The action plan does not dictate, allows to community designated alternate route and methods to manage traffic

Evan Richert: Misconceptions about Route 52, this is not a prescription to improve Route 52, MDOT will not in a vacuum upgrade Route 52

Jay Foster: If something is in the Comp Plan – then into ordinances, then to CC, then to Planning Board?

Stacy Benjamin: If the town is not comfortable, substitute - looking to achieve goal, ILA allows patience, is flexible and trusting

Jay Foster: Is goal to achieve by regulations?

Eric Gallant: PB must consider each application against ordinance

Jay Foster: So comments come to the Planning Board?

Evan Richert: Yes, CC issues non-binding comments, similar to Fire Department, Road Commissioners, etc.

Tom Crowley: We don't want to miss the boat. Suggests to educate and receive constructive input, planning is essential.

Paul Crowley suggested that a lot of committees become regulatory, inevitable to become mandatory

Will Brown: Town can withdraw with notice

Stacy Benjamin: Interlocal agreement can only change with town approval

Skip Day: Townspeople tend to think with their wallets first. Is there a fiscal obligation?

Evan Richert: Article IV CC cannot oblige costs on town without approval

Jason Trundy: Can the State force this on town via legislative action?

Evan Richert: Unlikely, almost impossible

Rosey Gerry: Have the bylaws been started?

Evan Richert: The bylaws basics are in ILA, the detail work is to be started this month

John Krumrein: How is the \$1.3 million to be distributed?

Don White: MDOT and CC

Rosey Gerry suggested that by June the Town would need more detail on how \$1.3 million would be distributed.

Chris Osgood: Bill Kelly's comments on the ILA suggested that bylaws were perhaps a bigger deal; serious give and take will be necessary, inconceivable to think bylaws will be ready before June, bylaws may hoodwink small towns

Evan Richert: \$1.3 million will be for you to decide as part of Corridor Coalition

Paul Crowley suggested that timing was peculiar, \$29,500 grant work just started; June Town Meeting doesn't make sense

Chris Mann suggested that a time extension might be necessary but only until October.

Scott Crockett suggested that people read and understand before signing on.

Jason Trundy suggested that more input from the Land Use Committee and Planning Board might be necessary.

Rosey Gerry suggested: Education - education – education

Next Steps: The Board of Selectmen will need to decide first whether to put the ILA forth to voters (they can decide not to put it forth to voters). If they do decide to put it forth, they will determine whether to seek to adopt or endorse the plan. David Kinney is to seek to obtain whatever additional information the Board members need to make this decision.

**Motion by Plausse, second by Hardy, to adjourn the meeting. Vote 4-0.**

Respectfully submitted,

David Kinney  
Town Clerk

K:\David meeting January 2011.doc