

Wiscasset Transportation Committee

Meeting Minutes

06/17/02

06/20/02

Attendance:

Michael Blagdon

Marguerite Rafter

Don Jones

Sean Rafter

Steve Kornacki

Seaver leslie

Paul Mrozinski

Absent Steve Jerrett & Allan Kaufman

- I. **Accept minutes from 10, June 2002 Meeting**, accepted six votes in favor, none opposed.

II. Chairman's update,

- a. Statistical update from MDOT given at last Tuesdays meeting.
- b. Last Thursdays meeting with MDOT representatives from Rockland
 - We were provided with updated MDOT maps along with updated Updated Wiscasset Route 1 Corridor Study Draft.
 - Paul attended the MidCoast Traffic Coalition Meeting Monday June 17th. As a result of the meeting he approached the Select Board on Tuesday June 18th with a proposal of holding a public forum on June 26th at 7:00pm at the Wiscasset High School Gymnasium. The Proposed forum will be intended for the Wiscasset community only. There will be a brief presentation of the history of the Bypass process. How it started, How we arrived at where we are right now in the Process. The future of the process and options. At the meeting the MidCoast Coalition, Wiscasset Traffic Committee and the Wiscasset Select Board would be

on hand to field questions about the process with the community. The Select Board agreed to participate in the Proposed forum.

III. Analysis of last weeks ballot measures that relate to the bypass routes and how does this analysis from our next step.

*****Discussion about the MEMORANDUM from Steve Kornacki and Nigel Calder*****

M E M O R A N D U M

To: Wiscasset Board of Selectmen, Edgecomb Board of Selectmen, Sheepscot Valley Conservation Association Board of Directors, Wiscasset Transportation Committee

From: Steve Kornacki & Nigel Calder

Copies: Newcastle Board of Selectman, Westport Board of Selectmen, Alna Board of Selectmen, Woolwich Board of Selectmen, Midcoast Traffic Coalition, Friends of Coastal Preservation, Conservation Law Foundation, Lincoln County Historical Association, Save Our Rural Edgecomb

Date: June 17, 2002

Subject: Joint Recommendation to Revive the Route One Bypass Process

As two very active participants in the Route One Bypass debate who represent groups with opposing points of view, we met to see if there was any possible way to revive the process in light of Commissioner Melrose's recent announcement to have MDOT play a much more directive role. We found ourselves in agreement that we desperately need a structural solution to the problem that will avoid a quagmire that keeps people at odds with one another as various options are explored with no real chance of being implemented. Only N8C offers the possibility of a breakthrough and we've built our recommendation around this option to include the following critical elements:

1. **N8c** will be pursued exclusively from this point forward by the parties to this agreement as the preferred alternative and all other routes (i.e., **N6**, **N8d**, along with **N2** and any of its variants) are hereby removed from their further consideration.

***note:** By eliminating the remaining routes that have the greatest polarizing effect on opposing stakeholders (built vs. natural environment), both sides achieve their most important objectives. This decisive and timely action will contribute greatly to the resumption of civil conversation in our community once again and the rebuilding of personal relationships that have been so negatively impacted by this process.*

2. Further analysis and study of **N8c** will focus on two alternative plans for the route. While both alternatives endorse the building of a new two-lane bridge across the Sheepscot that will include pedestrian and bicycle facilities along with the ability to handle truck traffic, they differ as follows:
 - a. *The first alternative provides for the retention and maintenance of the Davey Bridge to provide bi-directional travel as it currently does.*
 - b. *The second alternative provides for the removal of the Davey Bridge. The Town of Wiscasset will engage a Planning Consultant to work closely with MDOT, Wiscasset's Waterfront Committee, and, Wiscasset's Comprehensive Planning Committee to determine the future of the Davey Bridge, including developing a vision of Wiscasset without the Davey Bridge that will be supported by appropriate economic and environmental analyses.*
3. *The people of Wiscasset through a referendum will decide whether or not to accept **N8c** as the recommended build alternative. It will appear as the one and only alternative to the "no build" option and will be placed on the ballot as a referendum question in November of 2002. All parties to this agreement will support the outcome of this referendum.*
4. *MDOT, in consultation with the Towns of Wiscasset and Edgecomb, will decide the future of the Davey Bridge.*
5. *If the Davey Bridge remains, there is agreement that at no time will it be used to establish a divided highway system across the Sheepscot that provides two lanes in one direction on one bridge with two lanes in the other direction on the second bridge.*
6. *MDOT, in consultation with The Town of Wiscasset, will determine the takeoff point for the new bridge provided that it is within the 1000' corridor currently defined for **N8c**. MDOT will consult with the Town of*

Edgecomb to make a similar determination for the precise terminus of the bridge on Davis Island.

7. *Routing of N8c through Wiscasset from Route One to the takeoff point is a matter of negotiation between the Town of Wiscasset and MDOT.*
8. If **N8C** ultimately prevails in the November referendum but financial constraints preclude the immediate construction of a new bridge over the Sheepscot, then **N8C** will be completed within Wiscasset from Route One to at least the intersection with Route 27. Moreover, **N8c** will be the defined route for completion of the bypass and bridge in the future. This "partial build" scenario will provide Wiscasset with an interim parallel local roadway to help its citizens avoid the congestion on Route One.

This proposal is consistent with Wiscasset's official position, Edgecomb's expressed desire to touch down on Davis Island, and, averts many of the environmental concerns associated with other routes as well as adverse impacts on Wiscasset's Historical District. More to the point, it is our only hope to achieve a structural solution.

The discussion was quite lengthy I have included the results of the forwarded motions vote below in section IV.

IV. Prepare a resolution relating to the MEMORANDUM to submit to the Wiscasset Selectmen.

Issues were discussed along with the Memorandum above and the motion forwarded by Sean Rafter.

- **Motion To Accept Memorandum drafted by Steve Kornackie and Nigel Kalder Listed above in Blue.**

In Favor, Steve Kornackie, Seiver Leslie, Paul Mrozinski.

Not In Favor, Michael Blagdon, Sean Rafter, Don Jones.

Abstained, Margaret Rafter.

Note, that the Committee met on both Monday the 17th and Thursday the 20th to discuss this issue. The discussion was placed at the forefront of the agenda. There was much discussion and debate on the proposal. The Committee concluded that we would need a follow up meeting on Thursday June 20th to discuss further. The result was a split within the voting Committee members present. However the Committee did vote and pass the following motion.

- **If MDOT elects N8 as its preferred route he transportation committee will fully support N8C, created and motioned by Sean Rafter.**

In Favor, Margaret Rafter, Sean Rafter, Paul Mrozinski, Seiver Leslie

Not In Favor, Michael Blagdon, Don Jones

Abstained, Steve Kornackie.

V. Questions from the public and the press.

Judy Flanagan .

Nigel Kalder.

Bill Phinney.

_____ Hammond.

Other_____

VI. Adjournment.

Below is the Letter forwarded by Committee Chair Paul Mrozinski.



Memo to: Wiscasset Board of Selectman

From: Paul Mrozinski, Chair of The Wiscasset Transportation Committee

At their emergency meeting Thursday, June the 20th, the Wiscasset Transportation Committee voted on the Memorandum from Steve Kornacki and Nigel Calder that recommended the Town endorse Bypass Route N-8c as the only route for consideration. All other routes would be removed from the discussion. The Transportation Committee debated with many valid points made and discussed.

The vote was 3 to endorse the Memorandum, 3 to not endorse, 1 abstain
Yes votes: Leslie, Kornacki and Mrozinski

no votes: Jones, Blagdon and Sean Rafter

abstain: Marguerite Rafter

Sean and Marguerite would endorse the Memorandum if only after the State and Federal interagency meeting in mid-July, route N-8 was chosen as the preferred route.

A second motion was presented by Sean Rafter to that effect. ³If the MDOT decides to endorse

N-8, we will support only N-8c.

The vote was 4 to accept this motion, 2 no, 1 abstain

Yes votes: Leslie, Marguerite Rafter, Sean Rafter and Mrozinski

no votes: Jones and Blagdon

abstain: Kornacki

On the Memorandum vote, the prevailing opinion of the yes voters was that time was running out and MDOT was moving ahead to conclude its work for submittal to the Federal Government. Unless we, as a Town, now actively engaged in this process, we would lose our opportunity to shape the location and design of this road. We should immediately engage the services of a design professional and we have the benefit of focusing on only one route. We must continue the campaign for Traffic Management. The design consultant could help with this task.

The no votes want to leave the door open to a possibility that another route is better and may be chosen by MDOT. Sean Rafter argued that he would support N-8c, but conditionally, only after all other routes were removed from consideration by MDOT. There was also agreement that a Design Professional must be engaged as soon as possible. Their hope is that this professional would be used in a broader search for the ³best route for the Town².

Attachments:

1. An opinion from Committee member Seaver Leslie who voted yes for the acceptance of the Kornacki/Calder Memorandum.
2. A note from Don Jones, Committee member
3. A note from Chris Hall, candidate for State Senate
4. Copy of article from June 20, 2002 edition of The Lincoln County News



Response to Letter

Attachments 1, and 3 were not made available to the committee, and so I think it was inappropriate to forward them without the committee first seeing them. Also the memo

from member Allen Kaufman was distributed to all members expressing his views, and yet you chose not to forward that memo. Your choice of attachments suggests bias in favor of your personal view. I would very much like to see attachments 1, and 3.

Don

Future : Committee will Meet as scheduled on Monday June 24th at the CEI building at 7:00pm.