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Prepared by: Tom Gorrill
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Notice to all present: If any of the following items are incorrect or fail to record discussions at the meeting, please contact the writer of these minutes immediately.

Purpose of Meeting: To kick off development of the Tri Community Transportation Plan

The following is a summary of the discussion at the meeting (Agenda attached):

1. John reminded everyone that it is important that the plan be multimodal.
2. Mike Laberge from MaineDOT and Conrad Welzel of the Maine Turnpike Authority will be invited to join the advisory committee. It was agreed that Ed Clifford should be added to the committee.
3. Public involvement in the process was discussed. John said that the State Handbook referenced in the rfp should be used as a guideline for the project. There was consensus that each community will be guided by committees within the respective communities. These committees will review progress 3 times over the course of the study and used to provide feedback to the Advisory Committee which will be the working committee for the study.
4. The consensus of the committee was that a public visioning session should be held early in the process to help define expectation and issues. It was agreed that this would be held on Saturday March 28th from 9 AM to 12 noon at the Saco train station.
5. A discussion was held regarding the regional issues and opportunities worksheet distributed in advance of the meeting by Mark (copy included). Following is a summary of that discussion:
   - East west traffic- Routes 112 and 5 corridors have a significant impact on Saco and Biddeford. What is planned for development in these areas?
   - Pedestrian connections are important particularly on Route 1.
   - Snowmobile crossings are important particularly in OOB.
   - Growth in communities to the north such as Scarborough should also be considered. Scarborough has an interest in a Turnpike access south of Scarborough to relieve traffic through their community.
• Truck traffic in the downtowns such as Poland Springs, Wood Structures, Regional Waste and others.
• Could truck traffic be reduced if heavy trucks were allowed on the interstate system?
• The relationship of the Gorham Bypass link to Sanford...will it have an impact on the study area?
• Bicycle and trail facilities are important particularly along the ocean.
• To what extent would the traffic congestion be reduced if there were no tolls?
• A trolley system should be implemented to facilitate a carless vacation during the summer tourist season.
• Transit providers such as Zoom, Shuttle Bus, etc should be reviewed to see what improvements could be made to improve efficiency.

6. The next advisory committee meeting was scheduled for 12:00 noon on March 4th at the Saco train station
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Notice to all present: If any of the following items are incorrect or fail to record discussions at the meeting, please contact the writer of these minutes immediately.

Purpose of Meeting: To discuss local feedback groups and plan visioning session for March 28th

The following is a summary of the discussion at the meeting (Agenda attached):

1. Mark reviewed the desire for and purpose of the local feedback groups. There was consensus that each community will be guided by committees within the respective communities. These committees will participate in the visioning session and then review progress 3 times over the course of the study and be used to provide feedback to the Advisory Committee which will be the working committee for the study.

2. The visioning session for March 28th was discussed. There was some concern expressed that there was not enough time to left to have adequate public notice. After discussion, it was agreed that each community will organize its local feedback group and develop a list of interests that should be represented and contact some of those individuals concerning their availability by Tuesday the 10th. Tom agreed to poll the members of the advisory group on the 11th to verify that sufficient people can attend and make a decision whether or not to hold the meeting on the 28th.

3. Mark presented a revised visioning session outline and suggested that people look it over and get back to him with any questions.

4. A draft presentation outline was presented for the visioning session.

5. The next advisory committee meeting was scheduled for 12:00 noon on Thursday April 9th at the Saco train station.
Tri-Community Transportation Visioning Session
Notes/Results from Small Group Exercises

Small Group Exercise #1 – Most Important Transportation Problems or Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
<th>Mary Ann Conroy, Facilitator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✍️ Route 112 + Industrial Park Road -- Route 5 Turnpike connector</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OOB seasonal congestion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✍️ Urban congestion – signal synchronization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Truck routes, deliveries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sustainable funding for maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School drop-off sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Route 1 congestion – emergency response when turnpike closes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Halfway -- OOB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elm &amp; North (Saco) traffic and lights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tolls – Biddeford/Saco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More transit – trolleys &amp; bus service to Portland terminals (rapid)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✍️ Main Street Saco – York Hill – RR crossing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parking in Biddeford -- capacity of Park &amp; Ride lots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marketing awareness – transportation alternatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TP connector – IP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pedestrian access/biking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 2</td>
<td>Carl Eppich, Facilitator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>😞 Public transportation: poor UNE customer service accommodation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>😞 Regional traffic signal coordination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of adequate N-S and E-W alternative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient community planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of continuous system/connect bike/pedestrian facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>😞 Poor outdated intersection designs/engineering – i.e. OOB “Halfway”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of car pooling facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of money</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cars not people / walkability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of public transportation – number of trains</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Few E/W options</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of alternative routes around congested areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Car” culture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No room/planning for bicycles/bike lanes downtown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus/transit shelters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through traffic, i.e. Sanford to Portland avoiding tolls on turnpike</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike access to train station</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited public transit to Portland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OOB congestion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of hubs/connectability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 1, congestion OOB/Portland to/from work during commuter hours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of transit info – residents and tourists</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sporadic schedules</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real-time information – bus running late</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited access to turnpike – impact on residence/neighborhoods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trucks – improve commercial access</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overburdened intersections</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No N/S alternatives to Route 1/Main Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit operations – tight streets due to “illegally” parked cars, snow, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of sidewalks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congestion outside of commuter hours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Zone safety and markings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School drop-off</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include transit with residential planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 4</td>
<td>Art Handman, Facilitator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congestion on Route 112 (Middle School) and other routes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of sidewalks/crosswalks at Saco IP and Route 1, Hill Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☺ Change of attitudes on modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congestion affecting emergency vehicles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of bike paths/road width</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☺ Commuter congestion from West</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☺ Way finding needs for both pedestrians &amp; vehicles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public education for bikes and pedestrians, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of capacity on roads</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emissions – air quality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signal synchronization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truck weight restrictions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☺ Inadequate money for all modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination issues between agencies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety at Halfway</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☺ Lack of parking downtown and at Park and Ride lots</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban sprawl</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain schedule on improvements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of bike racks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arterial speeds/lack of enforcement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremiah Bartlett, Facilitator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>📘 Transportation funding favors autos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State should pay for state roads</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public transportation -- Not frequent enough, early enough, late enough</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable funding to maintain system</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy traffic at peak times (seasonal too) – inadequate capacity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 111 congested, slow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to weave connectivity together</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saco E-W traffic – Route 112 needs more capacity for turnpike connection to Portland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>🟩 Many roads are inadequate for trucks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location in OOB for tractor trailer training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider where people want to go and how to get them there</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolls too high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtually no alternative transportation system -- bikeway/bus etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>🟩 Bus schedule not frequent enough – inconvenient in morning for workers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piggyback on bus buys for savings on maintenance/fuel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation balance needed to help downtown businesses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smarter intersection controls</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 6</td>
<td>Sarah Devlin, Facilitator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smooth Biddeford/Saco in town traffic movement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 1 – 5 Points traffic light/congestion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>🚭 Lack of MTA interchanges</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 1 congestion/lack of bypass around Route 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR stop arms were down during power outage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 111 poor traffic flow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential streets now receive too much bypass traffic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited public transportation availability now</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-W traffic congestion, Route 111, 112</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OOB summer bottleneck – Halfway also town-wide</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>🚭 Poor bike/pedestrian capabilities (separated from road)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus/train schedule (real time info/especially when problems arise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter bus movements difficult</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OOB Halfway lacks clear traffic pattern/very unsafe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of traffic control at intersections</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to plan for 3 million square feet of development/traffic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need additional inter-community public trans. connections</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park and Rides lots too small</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>🚭 Limited funding, especially from property taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Small Group Exercise #2 – Opportunities for Improving the Transportation System**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
<th>Mary Ann Conroy, Facilitator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>😊</td>
<td>Synchronize signals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One-way opportunities (thru traffic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>😊</td>
<td>Use existing rail line for regional commuter service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intermodal passenger service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tolls - barrier Biddeford/Saco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traffic lights – Emergency pre-empt for Route 1 (accident on Turnpike)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>😊</td>
<td>“Free” trolley/shuttle for downtowns (Denver, Co.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local option sales tax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>😊</td>
<td>Businesses fund dedicated transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traffic free zones on Main Streets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education (public access)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parking decks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expand I-95 WB (36)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<p>| Happy Face | Analysis/justification of problems and regionally plan/fund i.e. intersections and traffic signals |
| Happy Face | Improve travel options N &amp; S, i.e. Eliminate toll between Saco &amp; Biddeford; access to turnpike; old exit 5 (carpooling from better Park &amp; Ride lots) |
| Happy Face | Expand/incentivize public transportation, i.e. more money; standards for transit access in private development; improve customer service; effectiveness/efficient |
| Happy Face | Create dialogue with private enterprises, institutions i.e. UNE; industrial parks |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3</th>
<th>Jason Schreiber, Facilitator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New access road/bypasses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve traffic signals – lengthen, coordinate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove street parking – for transit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designate on-street biking/walking access</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit information distribution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>🎉 Adding exits to turnpike in Saco and Biddeford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local turnpike trips-fare reduction/elimination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include transit in development approval – planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase funding for public transit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>😊 Coordination between communities – planning with MTA and State – planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination with MTA and State – planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative tracking management methods (Route 1, etc.) (helps transit too)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extend coordination (eventually) regionally</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistent/coordinated signage – transit/walking/biking; color coordinate routes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incentives to use public transportation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit website</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>😊 More transit stops/shelters, more bus/train trips</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finish Eastern Trail/spur trail – to Funtown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light rail along highway</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-way couplet to reduce transit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotion</td>
<td>Suggestion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>😊</td>
<td>More money for all modes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>😊</td>
<td>Local free toll areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>😊</td>
<td>Incentive program for transit use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>😊</td>
<td>Create education program to promote multi-mode use for all ages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>😊</td>
<td>Widen narrow roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>😊</td>
<td>Biddeford By Pass Road Route 5 to Maine Turnpike</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>😊</td>
<td>Travel Demand Management solutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>😊</td>
<td>More convenient bus scheduling/stops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>😊</td>
<td>Respond to customer needs (better)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>😊</td>
<td>Need to retrofit system bike lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>😊</td>
<td>Traffic rule enforcement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>😊</td>
<td>Advertise / educate all modes include safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>😊</td>
<td>Extend and widen sidewalks out of Downtown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>😊</td>
<td>Create a regional transportation advisory board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>😊</td>
<td>Better snow removal to enhance use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>😊</td>
<td>Pre-emption for signals at intersections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>😊</td>
<td>More parking – Saco Park and Ride Lot and Downtown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>😊</td>
<td>More way finding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremiah Bartlett, Facilitator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widen 111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>😊 Funding formula for bus and bike and other alternative transportation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>😊 Abolish urban compact to level funding playing field</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further utilize existing rail. New rail?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act together – regional plan/act/fund</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional transportation committee to tie modes together</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>😊 Include users and employers in planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have communities work together on projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State should protect and plan for transportation corridors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need people to organize for trails and alternatives – change culture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signal improvements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vary employee hours – TDM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Small Group Exercise #2*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6</th>
<th>Sarah Devlin, Facilitator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More roundabouts/rotary/other non-standard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>😊 Additional MTA exit(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>😈 112, 111, 5, 22, 98 increase traffic capacity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Biddeford/Saco bridge (Industrial Park Road to South Street)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>😐 One way Beach Street/North Street to 5 Points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>😊 Expand multimodal options – bike, bus, pedestrian, trolley, within B/S/OOB and to outlying communities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>😊 Increase money and grants into York County to increase traffic capacity/development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking garages needed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 1 turning lane needed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth to West should help pay for B/S/OOB necessary transportation costs / improvements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve way finding (all types signs/information)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least two pedestrian bridges (B to S)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Street – improve RH turn lanes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel demand management – leave early so not rushed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use modern technology for immediate schedule</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Small Group Exercise #3 – Allocation of Resources for Improvement of the Transportation System

#### Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Improvements to pedestrian facilities such as sidewalks and trails</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Improvements to bicycle facilities such as providing bike lanes on roads or bike paths</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Improvements to the local bus service serving Saco, Biddeford, and OOB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Improvements to bus service to Portland and South Portland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Improvements to the Biddeford airport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Improvements to the road system to make it easier to get to and from other areas such as Portland or areas to the south</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Improvements to the road system to make it easier to get around Saco, Biddeford, and OOB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Improvements to the road system to make it easier for people who live to the west to get through this area to go to Portland or get on the Turnpike</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Other – Rail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1 Observations:** Regional road system!! Turnpike; *link together modes.
### Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Improvements to pedestrian facilities such as sidewalks and trails</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Improvements to bicycle facilities such as providing bike lanes on roads or bike paths</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Improvements to the local bus service serving Saco, Biddeford, and OOB</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Improvements to bus service to Portland and South Portland</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Improvements to the Biddeford airport</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Improvements to the road system to make it easier to get to and from other areas such as Portland or areas to the south</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Improvements to the road system to make it easier to get around Saco, Biddeford, and OOB</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Improvements to the road system to make it easier for people who live to the west to get through this area to go to Portland or get on the Turnpike</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2 Observations:** Questions were geared to roads, not public transportation. Major infrastructure is still road improvements **BUT #3** suggests dramatic increase in transit expenditure, today does not get % allocation needed. Most participants (4 or6) some funding to sidewalks/trails and bicycle facilities. Nobody allocated to airport.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1. Improvements to pedestrian facilities such as sidewalks and trails</th>
<th>2. Improvements to bicycle facilities such as providing bike lanes on roads or bike paths</th>
<th>3. Improvements to the local bus service serving Saco, Biddeford, and OOB</th>
<th>4. Improvements to bus service to Portland and South Portland</th>
<th>5. Improvements to the Biddeford airport</th>
<th>6. Improvements to the road system to make it easier to get to and from other areas such as Portland or areas to the south</th>
<th>7. Improvements to the road system to make it easier to get around Saco, Biddeford, and OOB</th>
<th>8. Improvements to the road system to make it easier for people who live to the west to get through this area to go to Portland or get on the Turnpike</th>
<th>9. Other – Providing bus. Parking</th>
<th>9. Other – Website</th>
<th>9. Other – Marketing/Promotion</th>
<th>9. Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Small Group Exercise #3
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1. Improvements to pedestrian facilities such as sidewalks and trails</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Improvements to bicycle facilities such as providing bike lanes on roads or bike paths</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Improvements to the local bus service serving Saco, Biddeford, and OOB</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Improvements to bus service to Portland and South Portland</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Improvements to the Biddeford airport</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Improvements to the road system to make it easier to get to and from other areas such as Portland or areas to the south</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Improvements to the road system to make it easier to get around Saco, Biddeford, and OOB</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Improvements to the road system to make it easier for people who live to the west to get through this area to go to Portland or get on the Turnpike</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Other—Education &amp; advertising, way finding</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other—Park and ride</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Improvements to pedestrian facilities such as sidewalks and trails</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Improvements to bicycle facilities such as providing bike lanes on roads or bike paths</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Improvements to the local bus service serving Saco, Biddeford, and OOB</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Improvements to bus service to Portland and South Portland</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Improvements to the Biddeford airport</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Improvements to the road system to make it easier to get to and from other areas such as Portland or areas to the south</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Improvements to the road system to make it easier to get around Saco, Biddeford, and OOB</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Improvements to the road system to make it easier for people who live to the west to get through this area to go to Portland or get on the Turnpike</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 5 Observations:** 1) Talk to employers/end users. 2) Recognize diverse/sharing of funds for different types of transportation. 3) Biddeford Airport provides little for region.
### Table 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>10</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Improvements to pedestrian facilities such as sidewalks and trails</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Improvements to bicycle facilities such as providing bike lanes on roads or bike paths</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Improvements to the local bus service serving Saco, Biddeford, and OOB</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Improvements to bus service to Portland and South Portland</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Improvements to the Biddeford airport</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Improvements to the road system to make it easier to get to and from other areas such as Portland or areas to the south</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Improvements to the road system to make it easier to get around Saco, Biddeford, and OOB</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Improvements to the road system to make it easier for people who live to the west to get through this area to go to Portland or get on the Turnpike</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Other—Regional multi-modal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***Missing item here =) maintain existing roads and fleets well – which takes > 90% of transportation funds.***

**Table 6 Observations:** Note all voters put some money into question #1 & #2. Q7 greatest investment #1 priority. Q8 strong #2 priority. Q1 is priority #3. Q2 is priority #4.
Summary of Results
Tri-Community Transportation Visioning Session

The Advisory Committee for the Tri-Community Transportation Study held a “Visioning Session” to get public input on the transportation issues facing Saco, Biddeford, and Old Orchard Beach and on possible opportunities for improving the transportation system. In addition, the session began to develop a vision for the transportation system by looking at the possible allocation of transportation improvement funding among the various elements of the system.

The Visioning Session was held on Saturday, March 28, 2009 at the Saco Transportation Center. Forty-one people representing the three communities and area transportation interests participated in the session together with nine members of the Advisory Committee and five staff from the consultant team.

After an introductory presentation by Tom Gorrill of Gorrill-Palmer Consulting Engineers on the evolution of the area’s transportation system and a review of the elements of the current transportation system, the participants worked on three exercises in six small groups. Each group had a facilitator who was either a member of the Advisory Committee or the consultant staff and about seven participants.

Exercise #1 asked the participants to identify and prioritize the most important transportation issues facing the three communities. They were asked to focus on concerns that involved the three community area rather than local or neighborhood problems. Each group conducted a brainstorming session to develop a master list of issues and problems. Using this list, each group then identified the 3-5 most important transportation issues/problems in the region. The appendix includes the six master lists developed by the groups and shows the items that were identified as the most important by each group. A summary of the results of Exercise #1 is provided below.

Exercise #2 asked participants to identify and prioritize the opportunities for improving the transportation system in the three communities. Again they were asked to focus on area-wide improvements. The groups used the same process as for Exercise #1. The appendix includes the lists of opportunities identified by each group and shows the items that were identified as most important. A summary of the results of Exercise #2 is provided below.
Exercise #3 asked participants to allocate the resources available for transportation improvements among eight areas to begin to understand the relative importance of the various elements. Each participant allocated 100% of the resources among the categories. The eight areas were:

1. Improvements to pedestrian facilities such as sidewalks and trails
2. Improvements to bicycle facilities such as providing bike lanes on roads or bike paths
3. Improvements to the local bus service serving Saco, Biddeford, and OOB
4. Improvements to bus service to Portland and South Portland
5. Improvements to the Biddeford airport
6. Improvements to the road system to make it easier to get to and from other areas such as Portland or areas to the south
7. Improvements to the road system to make it easier to get around Saco, Biddeford, and OOB
8. Improvements to the road system to make it easier for people who live to the west to get through this area to go to Portland or get on the Turnpike

Participants were also able to create other funding categories through an “other” item on the worksheet. After each participant completed their individual worksheet, the facilitator developed a master worksheet with the group’s results and discussed the results with the group to identify patterns in the responses. The master sheets for the small groups are included in the appendix. A summary of the results of Exercise #3 is provided below.

Summary of Exercise #1 – Transportation Problems/Issues

Each of the six small groups identified 3-5 transportation problems/issues that they felt were the most important facing the area. These are identified on the lists in the appendix. The following is an overview of the issues/problems that emerged when the priorities of the six groups were merged:

- The lack of efficiency and congestion on the existing road/street system is a significant problem. This includes issues such as a lack of synchronization of traffic signals and poor, outdated intersections. A related issue was the lack of alternative routes around congested areas.
- The limited access to the Maine Turnpike is a significant issue. This restricts its use for local travel within the area and makes it difficult for people especially
from the west to easily get on the Turnpike resulting in impacts on residential neighborhoods.

- The lack of adequate funding for improvements to all modes of the transportation system is a key issue.
- The limited availability of transit options both for travel within the area and between the area and Greater Portland was identified. There was concern about the lack of frequent service during commute to work times and the lack of a “high speed” service to Portland.
- The ability of the road system to accommodate commuter traffic from the west is a growing concern. This results in congestion during peak commuter hours. The need for a better connection from Route 112 as well as Route 5 to the Turnpike was identified.
- Parking in the downtown areas emerged as an important issue. While this applies to all three communities, it seemed to be a bigger issue in Saco.
- Providing for the efficient movement of trucks through the area while minimizing the impacts of this type of traffic is an issue.
- Concerns about walkability and the provision of pedestrian facilities emerged.
- There was some sense that there is a need for a change in attitudes about the use of various transportation modes.

In addition to these issues that were identified as “most important” by one or more of the small groups, a few other issues/problems were identified in a number of different groups. These included:

- A number of groups specifically listed problems with the Halfway intersection in Old Orchard Beach
- The need for expanded Park and Ride lots was identified in a number of groups
- There was a theme in a couple of the small groups about the need for better education and information about the available transportation options including “real-time” information about the transit system
- The issue of improved accommodations for bicycles was identified in a number of groups

Summary of Exercise #2 – Transportation Improvement Opportunities

Each of the six groups also identified their highest priorities for improvements to the area’s transportation system. These are identified on the lists in the appendix. The following is an overview of the transportation improvement opportunities that emerged when the priorities of the six groups were merged:
• Improved funding for transportation improvements emerged as a priority including a dedication of a share of the available funding for alternative transportation such as pedestrian and bicycle facilities. This included discussion of the need to eliminate the state funding concept of “urban compacts”.
• Improved use of the turnpike through the creation of additional interchanges and a “toll free zone” for local travel.
• Increase the capacity of the existing road system to efficiently move traffic including the synchronization of traffic signals, intersection improvements, and upgrading of Routes 112, 111, 5, 22, and 98 to carry traffic. This included improved access to the turnpike for traffic from the west.
• Institute Travel Demand Management (TDM) options to make better use of the existing transportation system.
• Expand the transit options available for both transportation within the area and to Greater Portland including more frequent service.
• Coordinate transportation planning within the area. This included better coordination among the three communities (there was a suggestion for a regional transportation board) as well as coordination with area employers and transportation user groups.
• Provide free trolley service serving the downtowns with funding from the business community.
• Improve facilities for bicyclists including retrofitting existing roads with bike lanes.

In addition to these high priority improvements, there were a couple of other transportation improvement concepts that were identified by a number of groups but did not rise to the level of “most important” in any one group. These included:

• Providing for the pre-emption of traffic signals by emergency vehicles to allow better movement during periods of congestion.
• Providing improved “way finding” signage for motorists as well as for pedestrians and cyclists.

Summary of Exercise #3 – Allocation of Transportation Improvement Resources

When participants were asked to allocate the available transportation improvement funding among various elements of the transportation system, there was some
consensus among the six groups. The results of this exercise are included in the appendix. Here is an overview of the themes that emerged from this exercise:

1. Improvements to the road system were consistently allocated the largest share of the resources as would be expected. The larger share of these resources was allocated to improvements to travel within the local area with a smaller share allocated to improvements to travel outside of the area.

2. Improvements to transit service received a significant share of the resource allocation in most groups although much lower than improvements to the road system. There was a sense that although transit should receive a small share of the resources overall, that share should be larger than it is currently provided. As with roads, the focus of transit improvements was more on local service than on improved service between the area and Portland.

3. In general, the groups allocated a very small share of the available resources to pedestrian and bicycle improvements. There was a sense though, that there needs to be a dedicated share of the available resources for these facilities even though it is a very small percentage of the available resources.

4. There was almost no support of allocating improvement funding to the Biddeford Airport. One group suggested that giving the airport a very small amount of funding could resolve an ongoing problem.
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The following is a summary of the discussion at the meeting (Agenda attached):

1. The scope of the study was reviewed with respect to the identification of potential interchange locations within the study area. The consultant contract states that potential connections to the Maine Turnpike should also be investigated as part of this project. Tom G. said that he envisioned identifying conceptual interchange locations, having PACTS run the TRIPS model for those that appear feasible, and if the model shows that there would be significant usage which would reduce congestion within the study area, then an outcome of the study would be a recommendation for to further investigate the alternative in the future. The ongoing Tri-Community study would not serve to satisfy the public process or permitting necessary for a new interchange which could be expected to be a ten-year plus process. The Committee agreed with this approach and that no amendment to the current contract would be necessary.

2. The traffic data collection locations and scheduling was discussed. Tom G. said that the contract sought to minimize the amount of contract resources spent on data collection but did include collecting turning movement counts at up to four intersections from 7:00 AM to 9:00 AM and again from 3:30 to 6:00 PM. The contract also included collection of automatic traffic recorded (ATR) counts at seven locations. The Committee agreed that it would be best to collect the counts in late June or early July, but that they would need to be carefully coordinated with scheduled construction projects. The counts should include speed and classification. Tom G. agreed to send around a listing and map of the suggested count locations and a schedule for review by Committee members with respect to scheduled construction which could interfere with the counts. Julia said that SMRPC may be able to help with the counts reduce the portion of the contract funds spent on data collection.
3. The Committee discussed several alternatives for communicating on the web including interactions with the each town website, and blog. It was suggested that Carl review MaineDOT’s SpotME site to see if there are relevant comments and for potential linkage. After discussion, it was concluded that a blog is not needed and that a study webpage would be sufficient. Carl agreed to follow up on this.

4. Mark reviewed the status of the receipt of the land use information requested from each of the communities. The communities which still need to submit information to him agreed to do so in a timely manner.

5. The next Advisory Committee meeting was scheduled for 12:00 noon on Wednesday June 24th at the Saco Transportation Center.
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The following is a summary of the discussion at the meeting (Agenda attached and handout materials attached):

1. Mark presented the compilation of the Comprehensive Plans. He has collected the three adopted plans, and put together a map showing the desired land use based upon the Future Land Use Plans in the three Comp Plans organized by category/intensity of use, and a short narrative that describes what is shown on the map.
2. Mark also presented the compilation of the current Zoning. He has collected the three zoning ordinances and done a similar analysis as was done with the Comprehensive Plans.
3. Mark outlined the information he needs from the communities to complete the analysis of development patterns. There were questions regarding the specifics of each map and Mark requested each community review the maps and send any comments/corrections to him.
4. Carl said the website for the project is up and running and he will be populating it soon. He agreed to send the link to each community so they can put a link to it on their local website.
5. Tom reviewed the available and proposed 48 hour automatic traffic counts and turning movement counts both existing and proposed. Tom suggested that the proposed counts should be collected during the second week in July. It was suggested the map be updated to include the following additional data:
   • Saco Island counts
   • CVS on Main Street in Saco
   • Ross Ridge in Saco
   • Thornton Academy
   • Check to be sure no counts are available on Shadagee Road in Saco
   • Gary agreed to send the New England University study completed by Bill Bray

Tom said he would update the maps and send them out to each community prior to the July counts for review.
Carl asked that we copy Paul Nichoff on the traffic count map since he is doing data collection to update the PACTS model.

6. Greg noted that there is a meeting today between the cities of Saco and Biddeford to discuss the timing of the lights on Main Street in Saco to see if the traffic backups could be reduced.

7. Sara asked that Kat Fuller of the MaineDOT be included on the project distribution list along with Dan Stewart and Gary Douglass.

8. Julia asked if oversized trucks are an issue for the communities to be addressed in the study. The consensus was that this is not a significant issue.

9. Julia requested that we include a discussion of the collision history in the study particularly as it relates to pedestrians and bicyclists.

7. The next Advisory Committee meeting was scheduled for 12:00 noon on Wednesday July 29th at the Saco Transportation Center.

Enc.
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The following is a summary of the discussion at the meeting (Agenda attached and handout materials attached):

1. Mark discussed the transit mapping, noting that the distances from transit stations and stops are based on straight line travel time, not necessarily walk time on streets.
2. Mark presented the compilation of the regional forecasting completed by Charles Lawton. The economic forecast assumed slow recovery to 2007 levels by 2014. Additional growth will resume in the future, but long-term growth is still expected to be less than pre-2007 levels.
3. Mark also presented the specific development forecasts, which, while indicating future growth in housing, commercial and institutional in the Tri-Community area, is still expected to be at a slower pace than pre-2007 levels (similar to the economic forecast). He asked the municipalities to review the documentation for the forecasts and inform the Consultants of any changes or modifications by January 1.
4. Concerns were raised at the meeting regarding potential for trip generation based on standardized (i.e.ITE) data, which Saco and Biddeford both feel does not apply to the Mill District, for example. It was then noted that MaineDOT has accepted an alternate (i.e. reduced vehicular trip generation share) method of determining roadway impacts from mill projects.
5. Julia also noted that MaineDOT is proposing a new traffic permit methodology, which would look at doing improvements on a regional level and based on planning studies – the threshold for permitting would be less, but improvements required directly by the developer would be completed (usually) at the project driveway(s), while the fees would be paid to the Department to complete other work.
6. Mark followed up on this to discuss the alternative development scenarios, which would include the potential for higher-density development in key areas within the Tri-Community. The goal of
7. Other development alternatives discussed more delineation of downtown Saco/Biddeford and potential projects there.
8. Peter asked about a potential blending of Alternative Development areas #1 & #5, as well as #3 and #4, as these areas are essentially adjacent to each other.
9. Mark mentioned the potential of working with Scarborough to increase density along Route 1 in Scarborough between Cascade Road and Dunstan Corner in order to create more travel opportunities.
7. The next Advisory Committee meeting was scheduled for 12:00 noon on Wednesday January 27th at the Saco Transportation Center.
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The following is a summary of the discussion at the meeting:

Opening:

1. Tom introduced the context of items related to the Plan — i.e. the majority of the developed area already exists, and the Plan should seek to serve that purpose

2. Growth anticipated to be less than one percent per year, and minimal growth until 2020 — will allow for strategies to be implemented for existing uses and be ready for any future development

What follows is comments on the draft strategy ideas from the Committee:

Traffic

1. Potential signal work at Pepperell Square to better coordinate with Amtrak closures should be mentioned under traffic as well as transit.

2. MTA is concerned with references to interchanges. No plans for new interchanges in ten-year period, and Central York County Connections Study will be addressing potential for interchange locations. Study will not tie MTA to any plans, but will seek to examine potential for entire transportation network. Saco and OOB are not included in any of the major studies for MaineDOT.

JN 2125 meeting
3. Halfway Rotary was not pursued because Town did not wish to provide their share for funding – future Council may or may not have a different opinion.

4. Idea of downtown loops is interesting, but likely not pursuable for a number of reasons, including businesses, access, transit, etc. GPCEI to be provided with a copy of the Mill District Master Plan, which examined the issue of loops.

5. Parking capacities at key lots (esp. park-and-ride lots) remains a concern, especially when gas prices go back up.

6. OOB should be providing approvals for new CMP substation that would remove power lines where Town wishes to construct industrial access road – Town anticipates construction in the 2011-2012 time frame.

7. A full truck study will include extensive discussions with truck companies.

8. License plate counts in key locations in Tri-Community area make determination of truck routes possible – involves extensive data collection and processing.

9. MTA has completed studies for trucks to determine potential of toll avoidance; the percentage that reroutes appears to be very small – likely due to the fact that most big companies are primarily focused

10. Can Kevin get interchange info out of forecasting? (Will check – answer is likely yes.)

11. TDM policies should be incentivized to make employers more interested in approaching such a program.

12. Lists of challenges/opportunities could be related to intersections, not just regionally.

Transit

1. In response to discussions related to the scarcity of true commuter-based rail options, it was noted that John Bubier at NNEPRA has informed some in the Committee that a commuter pass exists for the Downeaster. There are problems with the schedules to and from Portland as well as using a bicycle as transportation to and from the train (and the train station in Portland).

2. To provide actual commuter service to Portland, the potential for use of self-powered cars (i.e. Bud cars or a more contemporary version) could be explored.

3. While there is not a stand-alone train station in Old Orchard Beach, the Chamber of Commerce building has useful train info and can be used to wait, but it has limited hours at times, no ticketing, and services a seasonal stop.

4. Issues with the train gates over Main Street should certainly be examined, as it can affect this corridor.

5. While utilization of entire former Portland and Rochester right-of-way for transit service would be costly and entail lots of property acquisition, the Gorham East-West study is looking at potential reuse of this R-O-W.

Non-Motorized

1. Bicycling opportunities should include the ever-expanding Eastern Trail.

2. The 2009 PACTS Bike/Ped Plan includes discussion and recommendations for Tri-Community area, and as such is a useful reference.

Policy/Misc

1. The figures provided in the study would benefit from having urban compact information overlaid.

2. New STPA rules offer incentives for regional planning, hence the Gorham area and York County area studies.

3. Tex Hauser is working on transit corridor TIF – which would be a transit-oriented development TIF.
The next meeting will be held April 7 at noon – location TBD. At that time, the challenges and opportunities will have been explored by the Consultant Team, resulting in a draft Action Plan, which will be discussed at the April meeting.
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The following is a summary of the discussion at the meeting:  

Opening:  

1. Tom introduced the context of items related to the Plan – i.e. the majority of the developed area already exists, and the Plan should seek to serve that purpose  

2. Growth anticipated to be less than one percent per year, and minimal growth until 2020 – will allow for strategies to be implemented for existing uses and be ready for any future development  

What follows are comments on the draft strategy ideas from the Committee for the traffic portion of the strategies:  

1. Potential signal work at Pepperell Square should better coordinate with Amtrak closures, and could be mentioned under traffic as well as transit.  

2. MTA is concerned with references to interchanges in the strategies. No plans for new interchanges in ten-year period, and Central York County Connections Study will be addressing potential for interchange locations. Study will not tie MTA to any plans, but will seek to examine potential for entire transportation network. Saco and OOB are not included in any of the major studies for MaineDOT.
3. The Halfway Rotary design was not pursued because Town did not wish to provide their share for funding – a future Council may or may not have a different opinion. Committee ultimately comfortable with Plan continuing to encourage further exploration of that option.

4. The idea of downtown loops is interesting, but likely not pursuable for a number of reasons, including businesses, access, transit, etc. GPCEI will be provided with a copy of the Mill District Master Plan, which examined the issue of loops.

5. Parking capacities at key lots (esp. park-and-ride lots) remains a concern, especially when gas prices go back up – it certainly is an issue to explore in the Plan.

6. OOB should be providing approvals for new CMP substation that would remove power lines where Town wishes to construct industrial access road – Town anticipates construction in the 2011-2012 time frame. As such, the Plan can contain recommendations to this facility.

7. The Committee wondered about references to truck routing. While the Plan will contain broader truck strategies and focus on encouragement, not prohibitions, significant changes may require a separate full truck study that would include extensive discussions with truck companies, license plate (origin-destination) counts, and specific signage recommendations. The MTA has some truck routing data, as does Rob Elder at MaineDOT, and both can be used for the purposes of this Plan.

8. Parking discussion, particularly in Saco, should discuss wayfinding and exploring parking options near Main Street – any parking at Hannaford would be useful in the context of proximity to the ET facility soon to be constructed, but other options/discussions likely unrealistic or too strongly worded.

9. Parking potential exists at Transportation Center, which has several surface parking areas and potential for expansion as needed.

10. There is potential for structured parking in the Mill District.

11. Parking could be accomplished at the Ballpark in OOB with a downtown shuttle.

12. MTA agrees that more parking capacity should be provided near Exit 32 with the current Zoom configuration – Biddeford looking to get funding for more parking (deck), not advocating for MTA to be responsible for it.

13. Review of parking data would be useful to determine shortages and strengthen funding applications.

14. New lot available on North Street for Park-and-Ride, but needs better access to the Zoom facility.

15. Anecdotal evidence suggests that some Zoom users park at Wal-Mart lot near Wendy’s and cross Route 111; may be more demand than current parking accumulation data indicates.

16. Sweetser on Route 1 in Saco has excess capacity that may be an option – close to I-195 ramps.

Jason Schriever presented additional comments on transit issues and ideas for the Plan:

1. Current funding allocation and funding structures as well as present-day operating agreements make management of effective transit services difficult in Tri-Community area.

2. Some of the same problems for cars are the same for buses – may want to explore shorter cycle lengths to result in rolling, as opposed to static, queues. This could also be done by intersection narrowing (bump-outs, adjusted radii, etc.) to reduce pedestrian crossing time and thus shorten concurrent pedestrian phasing.

3. One-way loop would make transit access more complicated – users would have to walk to different streets depending upon the direction of travel.

4. Other intersection improvements would benefit bus operations, including signal pre-emption (faster to ride than drive), or transit-exclusive queue jump lanes, which would aid in travel time during congested conditions.
5. Focusing on transit related amenities is also important as a strategy. These can range from lighting, walkways, shelters, and can be supported by public/private partnerships.

6. PACTS received a grant for transit-related signage and shelter.

7. Mobile apps are becoming indispensable for transit users in many cities.

8. Transfers from one operator to another is not currently feasible – METRO and South Portland looking at an interchangeable pass, such as an eco pass.

9. The placement and updating of transit information is low in cost but effective – businesses can sponsor stops and make sure schedule is up to date.

10. Funding WAVE service prior to funding of parking deck may be a cost-effective way at reducing parking demand at Exit 32.

11. Additional Zoom service could have a separate line that serves downtown, or first and last existing runs of the day could do through downtown before and after the Exit 32 stop.

12. A swipe system could be used at the Park-and-Ride to encourage ridership and prevent non-Zoom users from using lot.

13. The Downeaster could support more intensive use if line was double-tracked. The issue of downtown access remains – can METRO better serve station?

14. Parking management in OOB may be more effective in the short-term than additional transit service.

15. Density will be key, rather than dispersal, for better making transit work.

16. Google access being looked at for region.

17. Low cost solution for bus stops – rider-activated lights that tell a bus driver someone should be picked up. Can also do customized scheduling at signs.

18. Have major employer/school more directly support transit.

19. OOB is looking at providing year-round AMTRAK service with heating additions at Chamber facility.

20. Car-sharing can be extremely effective TDM strategy in rural areas.

21. Towns can provide maximum parking standards/footprints within ½ mile of transit lines.

22. Major employers and schools can purchase bulk passes and distribute at no additional charge.

The next meeting will be held April 28th at noon – location TBD (likely Transportation Center).

The format of the next meeting will be similar to this one. Its purpose will be for the Committee to provide comments on Transit, Bike/Ped, Land Use, and TDM/Peak Hour Travel Demand Reduction Strategies, as time at this meeting did not allow for a full review of all strategies; this information will be compiled and used to update the overall strategies to allow for the creation of the Draft Plan.
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The following is a summary of the discussion at the meeting:

Opening:

1. Tom stated that the purpose of the meeting would be to get comments and feedback on the remaining items in the draft strategies list (i.e. Bike/Ped, Peak Hour Traffic Mitigation, TDM, Policies)

What follows are comments on the draft strategy ideas from the Committee for the bike/ped portion of the strategies:

1. Eastern Trail should be shown on the mapping.
2. Questions for Zoom Bus/Ed as to use of bicycles to access Zoom in some way. The potential for bicycle storage is important, as it would minimize the need to take bicycles on the bus.
3. Saco is opposed to the idea of a median along Main Street near Pepperell Square.
4. Any mention of specific streets (such as Water or Lincoln Streets) should have the municipality’s name associated with them for reference, as many streets have similar names.

John Melrose presented discussion urban and policy issues related to MPO’s and Tri-Community:

1. Urban compacts date from 1913, when utilized as a mechanism to determine where streets had been improved.
2. Saco, for example, is a net exporter of jobs – how can people stay in the community?

3. What can be done to attract people, potentially away from sprawling areas? (Comment from Committee: green spaces would be useful in urbanized areas.)

4. One major issue is getting people to look at fiscal externalities other than the tax rate on a home.

5. Urban-Rural Initiative Program (URIP) often favors transportation funding for rural communities at the expense of urban communities. Minor collectors in compact areas, for example, do not receive state assistance. Maintenance paving limited in urban areas as well.

6. Tri-community could examine a joint locally-administered traffic permitting review process.

7. Urban compacts could be redefined, for example, to go to municipal boundaries.

8. Cost sharing could be based on annual miles of travel (VMT).

**Mark Eryeman discussed ideas related to TDM policies:**

1. Real growth appears to be near Turnpike-connected areas, resulting in poor levels of service.

2. Could congestion pricing be used to shift traffic away from these areas during peak periods? If based on commuter, and not tourist patterns, may be more politically palatable.

3. Could be an alternative offered as a potential route to explore, especially as Central York County Study comes on line.

4. PACTS can work with large employers (Committee Comment: Go Maine Could use more funding)

5. Mark believes Tri-Community area already accepts shared parking calculations to reduce potential for off-street loading.

The next meeting will be held June 2nd at noon at the Transportation Center.

The draft Plan will be provided to the Committee by May 28th, so that review and comments can be discussed at the June 2nd meeting.
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The following is a summary of the discussion at the meeting:

Opening:

1. Greg opened the meeting, and Tom followed up with the suggestion that the Committee provide general comments followed up by more specific comments in emails.

What follows are comments on the draft report from the Committee:

John Duncan

1. Liked the format of the report.
2. Liked the big ideas discussed in it.
3. Asked about responsiveness to public, but noted the references and discussion to visioning meeting.
4. Consistent with Destination Tomorrow.
Peter Morelli

1. Like land use scenarios.
2. Turnpike suggestions robust.
3. Would like the tone to focus more on traditional infrastructure, less on transit.
4. Could be fewer alternatives, or some sort of ranking/recommendation for specific ones.
5. Too much focus on transit in general.

Angela Blanchette

1. Concerned with the idea of shifting traffic in downtown.

Greg Tansley

1. Lots of discussion on transit.
2. It is a challenge to move people into transit – are the goals too optimistic?
3. There are challenges to implementing TDM plans.
4. Slow growth makes TDM review and requirements a challenge.
5. Biddeford would like faster growth – how to grapple with higher rates than established for the study?
6. Would like to avoid subjective words such as “significant”
7. Does the report meet the needs of the Turnpike?
8. Would like more discussion on traditional infrastructure.
9. Less focus on transit.

Ed Clifford

1. Reference to increased funding – would like 30-minute headways – would need more money.
2. Would like increased clarification between shuttlebus/ZOOM/local bus ridership.
3. Local bus ridership up 46% in the past two years – improved interlocking of systems.
4. Would like more analysis of riders (John M: what about passenger miles for transit?)
5. What is proportionality of system?
6. Are there comparable systems for communities of less than 50k people?
7. What about transit benchmarks?

Sara Devlin

1. Good report format
2. At this time, Gorham East-West only looking at Mountain Division line.
3. MTA will examine interchanges, and is generally satisfied with discussions on collaboration.
4. Examine subjective language in report.
5. Can recommendations include more cooperation from communities outside of Tri-Community?

Myranda McGowan

1. Will examine report, and determine how it relates to the Central York County Study
Gerry Audibert

1. What are priorities in terms of timing and cost?
2. Will have more information on transit review.
3. Cost benefit analysis?
4. What is timing of projects?
5. STPA policy can use a carrot and stick approach.
6. What about priorities for locals versus people from other communities versus tourists?

Elm Versus Main Street Traffic

1. Is it good to encourage traffic flow?
2. Some studies suggest shifting traffic can improve business. (Mark Eyerman)
3. Can Elm accommodate? (Looking at signal coordination, geometry changes, signal removal).
4. Less about shifting existing traffic to Elm than shifting growth of future traffic to Elm.

Other

1. Discussion on LOS? Can be more, significant discussion already.
2. Margins on Land Use/Transit?
3. May want to tone down “foreseeable future” comments.
4. Additional discussion on safety/HCL locations.
5. Additional discussion on ramps – mainly Industrial Park Road.
6. Reference potential for Route 1 reconstruction in Saco.
7. Concerned about congestion pricing – likely leave in report, but lesser recommendation than regional tolling.
8. How to get people to live in Tri-Community? Live/work reduces traffic. Marketing campaign? Credit on excise tax?

A copy of the Word document has been sent to the Committee for their review.

The next meeting will be held July 14th at noon at the Transportation Center.

The updated draft Plan will be provided to the Committee by July 9th, so that review and comments can be discussed at the July 14th meeting.
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The following is a summary of the discussion at the meeting:

Opening:

Greg opened the meeting, proposing to discuss the 1.) Executive Summary, followed by 2.) Comments, 3.) Acceptance of the Report, and 4.) Planning of the Public Process

1.) What follows is the discussion about the Executive Summary:

John Melrose

A. Condense Executive Summary to six pages or so – highlight the essence of the major conclusions from the Plan Report.
B. Combine similar ideas/recommendations into one heading.
C. Look at discussing key messages
   ➢ How to maximize the system?
   ➢ What is the role of alternative modes?
   ➢ What is the best bang for the buck? Do we reduce VMT? Do we shoot for low-cost solutions?
Peter Morelli

A. Two points to Plan:
   ✓ Reduce growth in VMT
   ✓ Reduce peak hour traffic

B. Tweaks to system can improve capacity

C. Report should note constraints in resources

D. Report should mention compliance with STPA policies

E. Report can discuss the historic abandonment of transit modes and some of the Plan’s goals to bring back some of this

F. Ultimately, Saco would like more activity in its urban core, regardless of mode.

G. Report should strongly emphasize the need to not focus so much of Level of Service.

H. No support for congestion pricing — report can say that the Committee considered but ultimately rejected congestion pricing, citing a concern with the viability of such programs.

I. Format could be:
   ✓ Visioning Committee wanted this (look at Pages 28-29 for organization)
   ✓ Here’s how to do what Committee wanted
   ✓ Show picture of Visioning Forum

Gary Lamb

A. More density and year-round uses – more opportunity for year-round transit.

B. Would like to mention transit service should be at major subdivisions.

C. Report should mention issues with Halfway Rotary and LOS – issue likely coming back.

Tom Milligan

A. The Executive Summary should be brief and realistically and accurately reflect report.

B. Should discuss efficiencies, and mention where traffic should be.

C. Acknowledgements at beginning of Executive Summary – should mention agencies and communities, not individuals.

Carl Eppich

A. Report should emphasize short versus long-term solutions and strategies
   ✓ Traffic signal management, coordination, upgrades
   ✓ Land Uses → Transportation Needs

Ed Clifford

A. Reference to increased funding – would like 30-minute headways – would need more money (i.e. two more buses).

Sara Devlin

A. Should highlight series of grouped strategies as a package.

B. Recommendations should work together in harmony and be at one with the STPA requirements.

C. MTA does not support congestion pricing – can say that considered, but not supported at this time.
Myranda McGowan

A. Executive Summary should be shorter
B. Maps or graphics with roads would be helpful

Gerry Audibert

A. Purpose and Need Statement
B. Who was involved?
C. Reference STPA rules/policies.
D. Show recommendations by timing and priority

Mark Eyerman

A. Provide for alternative modes

2.) What follows is the discussion about Other Comments:

Carl Eppich

A. Should mention in report that “end of an era” for more car-based infrastructure – expect more multi-modal.
B. New realm of transportation solutions, with complete streets, etc.
C. Should mention that the inability funding, LOS-based improvements are not necessarily financially and/or politically acceptable.
D. Streets have more complexity – many modes are sharing them.

Sara Devlin

A. MTA does a lot of EZ Pass promotion – would like discussion in report to reflect this, additional promotion should be low priority.

Tom Milligan

A. There should be a complete streets discussion – it’s about livability.

Mark Eyerman

A. Community forum identified complete streets – use forum as basis for recommendations.

Peter Morelli

A. Treat every street like Main Street in Saco or Congress Street in Portland.

3.) What follows is the discussion about Council Acceptance/Approval:

Gary Lamb

A. Ideally, there would be one big meeting with the Councils in attendance.
Tom Milligan

A. Would want a joint Council meeting with everyone there to vote – the consultants could be present to answer more technical questions.

Sara Devlin

A. Concurs that a joint meeting is a good idea, and in the spirit of the regional nature of the Plan.

4.) What follows is the discussion about the Public Meeting:

Tom Gorrill

A. Have a community forum to follow up.
B. Hold it on a Saturday – September 25th.
C. Invite the public, visioning members, Council members, Planning Board members.
D. Have joint Council meeting following the public meeting.

Mark Eyerman

A. Present information regionally down to municipality.
B. Information can be rated as to how is responded to visioning process.

Final comments should be provided by July 28th.

The next meeting will be held on Saturday, September 25th – time and location TBD. This will be the public meeting for the finalized Plan. The revised Executive Summary will be distributed for review and comment by early August.
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The following is a summary of the discussion at the meeting:

Opening:

Tom opened the meeting to the members of the public, interspersed with portions of the presentation. During the course of the meeting, the following comments and discussion points were made:

- More provisions on the Downeaster for bicycles would be welcome
- Having a water taxi from Saco to Biddeford (Ferry Beach/Camp Ellis area) would be helpful
- UNE students appear to be making some use of the local bus system and the Downeaster, although they don’t appear to be taking transit into Saco as much
- Portland and Wells are the only stations that allow bicycles onto the stations – hinders train/bike trips to Tri-Community area – there should be provisions for bikes in Saco and OOB stations (BSOOB buses have bike racks, and those get good use)
- When bikes are allowed on trains, they can usually use the handicapped areas
- Rails with trails could save lives by making for proper facilities along tracks with fencing, etc. – Rails to Trails Conservancy coming around to this idea
- Railroad property in Maine is covered by recreational liability laws regarding personal injuries – less risk for roadways to non-motorized users within right-of-way
- Desire to see bike paths adjacent to railroad tracks
- The Maine Board of Tourism should get involved and promote rail and car-free trips in the Tri-Community area – Funtown has over a half million people per year, OOB has the Pier, and Saco has the state’s only IMAX facility
NNEPRA has not historically been an advocate of bikes on trains – could work with John Bubier on this matter

Downtown Biddeford and Saco has a Riverwalk that could attract tourists – more scenic than some other facilities already attracting them

Regulations and private ownership make riverside development and trails difficult – should work with DEP to investigate the potential for exceptions for trails in particular

Mechanics Park is a specific project with some difficulty – DEP only wants to allow a five-foot gravel trail with a significant riverfront setback

For significant changes to the Eastern Trail, water quality treatment measures would be required – a major obstacle

Interest in constructing a trail along the Nonesuch River in Scarborough – can it actually be done with all the environmental regulations?

Federal requirements for funding tend to require overbuilding of facilities – more flexibility in design would be helpful

Federal money also requires over purchasing of transit vehicles – buses are often oversized

Does the report account for a racino? Want connections from such a site to the community – don’t want closed system – adjustments to tolling would be helpful

- The report accounts for development in the area of the racino, but for a more general buildout – investigating tolling is a recommendation of the Plan

Educating employers on TDM is a good idea – perhaps best to start with employers and churches

Issues with reliable transportation for elderly – could use RTP or Mermaid – ITN was once a factor, any maybe that should be explored again. Cabs are a growing influence in personal transportation

Other areas use more robust transportation coordination methods,

Need more late-day transportation options – real problem for anyone out during the evening

**Other Items**

- A goal is to have the respective Councils accept the report – ideally these recommendations would be included in future Comp Plans, etc.
- Get recommendations accepted by PACTS, and be included in Destination Tomorrow
- Timing is good, as HUD & USDOT have awarded a $1.6 million planning grant for the PACTS region

A finalized report will follow and be made available for distribution to the communities.