

# Wiscasset Transportation Committee

## Meeting Minutes

06-10-02

### Attendance:

Michael Blagdon

Marguerite Rafter

Don Jones

Sean Rafter

Steve Kornacki

Steve Jerrett

Paul Mrozinski

Allen Kaufman

Seaver leslie

### I. Accept minutes from 3 June 2002

In the discussion of the minutes there were two revisions as follows:

The first amendment recommended by Don Jones was referring to section IV, first Bullet. The revision was forwarded as a motion to be voted on, results were seven in favor, none opposed.

*"The possibility of using MDOT funds to acquire and protect environmentally sensitive lands in North Edgcomb and South Newcastle, as a way of gaining support for a Northern Route such as some variation of N@ from environmental groups such as SVCA".*

The second amendment was referring to section III,b. The amendment was forwarded by Steve Kornacki as a motion to be voted on, results were seven in favor none opposed.

*"To make recommendations to the Board for the Route 1 and Route 27 as well as the Route 1 and Bradford Road/Lee Street intersections in cooperation with MDOT".*

## **II. Chairman's update**

- a. Tuesday and Thursday Meeting with MDOT
- b. Phone conversation w/ Earle Shettleworth

Paul asked Earle if it would be possible for him to attend one of the Transportation Committee's meetings to answer some questions that we may have related to two of the routes that are on the table, specifically N6 and N8D both of which go through the historic district? Mr. Shettleworth was very hesitant to come to one of our meetings. He would like to maintain his distance/neutrality. Since his organization is one of the organizations that passes final judgment on any route. He doesn't want to get involved in the evaluation of those routes at this point. He made it clear to Paul though that he (Shettleworth) doesn't like N6 and will do his best to make sure N6 is not the preferred route from MDOT. He did not have the same statements to make about N8D although there are sections of N6 and N8D that are exactly the same. What earl told Paul is agreeable to allow the MDOT to proceed with their analysis of N8C and N8D but he did not give an opinion one way or the other as to whether he liked or dislikes, and he certainly gave a strong opinion on how he dislikes N6.

Paul discussed how he brought up a point that had been bothering him since he along with Select Board Member Judy Flanagan had attended a meeting in Augusta approximately a week and a half ago. Where they had an hour and a half meeting with the federal representative of the Highway Department Paul Lariviere. Mr. Lariviere had not seen N8D before so he was curious about it and they had a good discussion about its viability. One of the points of discussion that came out of that conversation was Mr. Lariviere said it may be possible for MDOT the historic preservation folks in Washington and ask for an adjustment of the Historic District line in order to allow this N8D road to not be part of the historic district.

Paul took a moment in his conversation with Earle Shettleworth to ask him that question and he was very disturbed by it. Earle put one of his staff people (Kirt

Mahoney) on the phone so the three of them chatted about this. The two of them were absolutely beside themselves that Mr. Lariviere even think about this. They said that its something that cant happen. First of all the only organization that can petition for an adjustment to the historic district line is the Maine Historic Preservation folk, it's not MDOT. Then Mr. Settleworth went on to explain that even though the Town of Wiscasset was not a designated Historic district the fact that it's eligible to be a designated historical district makes it just as sensitive in the Maine historic Preservation peoples mind and the FEDS.

Paul's interpretation of the conversation was even if this road way weren't in the historic district it would have an effect on the historic district.

**III. Develop a list of criteria to be used by the Planning Consultant in the evaluation of proposed bypass routes, the no-build and the non-build alternatives.**

To question the advisability of trying to design a road for forty-five miles per hour. I would argue for a range of design speeds depending on specific route. When the Committee discussed its individual views on speeds there were conflicting positions on the subject. Some view potential Bypass as an opportunity to control traffic flow via speed management others saw it as an opportunity to move traffic at a higher rate of speed to improve overall traffic flow. There was no consensus on this topic.

**IV. Develop a list of concerns and recommendations that can be discussed with MDOT's Rockland office representative at a meeting in Wiscasset on June 13<sup>th</sup>, i.e., traffic controller, turn lands, pedestrian signs at all crosswalks, enforcement of speed and weight limits plus?**

Discussion spilt over to other topics, there were no clear list generated at the meeting. However most of the subject matter covered at the meeting in regards to the Bypass and Route One traffic and traffic management could be discussed.

#### **V. The latest Bill Phinney letter**

In the letter Bill Phinney invited the following people to attend a discussion representing their respected committees and organizations.

Judy Flanagan	Bob Zach	Deanna Gordon
Chuck Applebee	Nigel Calder	Martha Frink
Phil Wright	Bill Phinney	Paul Mronzinski

The Committee discussed the possible scope of the meeting. In the discussion opinions varied on whether to send a representative or not. In the end the Committee decided that it would be a good idea to have Paul Mrozniski go as requested and represent the Committee. The Committee discussed and via a unanimous vote eight in favor, none opposed to endorse the following;

*“The Wiscasset Transportation Committee agrees to send its chairman to clarify Wiscasset's willingness to participate in this planning endeavor to seek a truly regional bypass solution provided that this discussion focus exclusively on the proposed N-2 Route and its variants”.*

#### **VI. Evaluation of the Bypass Ballot questions**

To be discussed at next meeting.

#### **VII. Other business**

To be discussed at next meeting.

## **VIII. Questions from the Public and the press**

No Members of the public or press present at meeting

## **IX. Adjourn**

### General Discussions

- Discussion of House Keeping of the Minuets, the committee agreed that we should accurately record all motions, and give results of all motions voted on in meetings. Because were determining votes by majority rules, all arguments opposing decision will be noted in the minuets.
- There was a discussion of communication; there were several instances of committee members not receiving messages sent via Email.
- There was a discussion initiated by Paul Mrozinski referring to the topic of meeting procedures, Definition of quorum. Ultimately the discussion led to the following. Quorum for a committee of nine members is five. In order to vote on topics there would have to be five members present at the time of the vote. If for some reason a member left after the opening of the meeting for the purpose of the meeting their presents is still recognized except the number of members drops below five.
- There was a discussion on the concept of a Park Way Bypass VS. A "True" Bypass.
- Davies Bridge clarification from MDOT especially with N8C. The official position of Wiscasset was to maintain two-way traffic over the Davies Bridge. What is the future of the Davies Bridge?
- To create a Resource Inventory, items listed below are included but not limited to as follows.
  - School Districts
  - Community Control
  - Morris Complex
  - Historic District

- Denser Rural Neighborhood
- Rural Green Belt

- Maintain Waterfront
- Access In Town Traffic