



Route 100 Committee

Wednesday, January 13, 2016

Minutes

Committee/Staff Attendance:

Name	Present	Name	Present	Name	Present
Sarah Boudreau	√	Eydie Pryzant	-	Joe McDonnell	√
Andrea Ferrante	√	Rebecca Grover	√	Steve Melchiskey	-
Charlie McBrady, Council Liaison	-	Lori Legere	√	Jim Thibodeau, LPAC Liaison	-
Theo Holtwijk, Staff	√	Nathan Poore, staff	√	Mark Debowski, FST	√

Others present: -

The meeting was started at 6:00 PM.

1. Review of Draft Minutes of December 16, 2015 meeting

The draft minutes of the December 16, 2015 meeting were approved as written.

2. Review Proposed Design Revisions

Theo reported on a discussion that he had with abutter Tony Hayes and Jamie Mason and Mark Debowski. Tony was petitioning the Town to include additional stormwater drainage along Route 100 so a stream could be diverted from one end of his property to the north end. The committee concurred with staff and consultant recommendations not to include this additional work as it was outside the scope of the project. Mark will draft a memo from Tony outlining the consideration and reasons why it was not being recommended.

Jamie Mason had made some technical recommendations to Mark which had been included in the scope of work. Mark will send a response to Jamie.

Theo also mentioned that comments had been received from the Bicycle Coalition of Maine. They will be incorporated in the construction plans. Mark will send a response to BCM.

The committee then reviewed the items that had been brought up at the last meeting and which Mark had reviewed in more detail.

Mark reviewed the requests that the Committee had made:

Request #1: Investigate extending the sidewalk on east side of Route 100/26 to Sta. 102+50, across from Roberts Road.

Mark's response: I have concluded, based upon further research, that MaineDOT does not permit sidewalk to end at an location that is inaccessible to handicap persons. If the sidewalk ended at Sta. 102+50 Right it would require a tip-down, crosswalk, and

receiving sidewalk on the west side of Route 100/26. Ending the sidewalk at the Southworth entrance at Sta. 104+00 Right is acceptable because it is an accessible sidewalk terminus. Therefore, no design change has been made to the Draft PDR documents.

Requested Change #2: Investigate adding a crosswalk across Route 100/26 at a midblock crossing location near Mill Road.

Response: A crosswalk has been included at this location as seen on Plan Sheet 25 (attached). The crosswalk meets MaineDOT standards. Pedestrian warning flashers are not required by MaineDOT for this crosswalk, but a cost of \$25,000 has been added to the cost estimate in the case that they are desired by the Town in final design

Requested Change #3: Investigate a raised median on Route 100/26 adjacent to the Irving location. This raised median could provide a pedestrian refuge for the crosswalk from TD Bank to West Falmouth Crossing and also discourage left turn entry movements into the Irving entrances.

Response: A curbed, raised median that meets MaineDOT standards is feasible at this location and has been incorporated into the design. Plan Sheets 20 and 21 and Typical Section Sheet 3 (attached) have been revised to show the median design. The cost estimate (attached) has been updated to show "Section 2A – Proposed Median at West Falmouth Crossing Development" at a cost of \$213,510 plus associated construction engineering and contingency costs. Though pedestrian warning flashers are not required by the DOT at this location, this median improvement includes an upgrade to the existing pedestrian warning flasher system. A lower cost option would be to not include a median and replace the pedestrian warning light system at a cost of about \$25,000.

The median was not extended to the Leighton Road intersection because doing so would require a raised median on Route 100/26 north of Leighton Road for the distance of the auxiliary left turn lane widening so that the intersection approach lanes line up across from each other. The addition of the raised median north of Leighton Road would increase impacts by at least 4' of width of both sides of Route 100. Furthermore, this median would restrict left turns into and out of the private driveways adjacent to the left turn lane – a problematic situation because there are no good U-turn locations nearby.

The committee was OK with not pursuing request #1.

Regarding request #2, the committee wanted to make sure there was adequate sight distance. It felt that a cross walk would add to the accessibility of the river trail off Mill Road. It felt that cross walk push-activated flashers could be added at a later date.

Request #3 was subject to significant discussion. The TD Bank cross would stay in the same location and provide a refuge island. The northerly gas station driveway would not be impacted by the median. Extending it to that location would require road widening and would not result in much additional benefit. The circulation at the gas station has been problematic and the median will help with good access management. Andrea was not in favor of a median, but others argues that it improved safety, add beauty and traffic calming to the area. Sarah felt that

the safety and esthetic reasons could be obtained for not much money and it would serve as a gateway to the area. It was questioned if it would lead to congestion. Nathan suggested striping the left turn lanes at the TD Bank intersection into the shopping center. Joe was OK with the median, but Andrea felt it did not add anything and there was no evidence of danger. Rebecca like the beautification aspect and sense of place it would create. Nathan said on Route 1 potential circulation issues were field tested with a fire truck. Lori stated that the esthetics was not as important to her as the safety and that she wondered why the improvements cost as much as they did. Mark felt that the median in this location was an ideal place to do that. With Andrea dissenting, the group decided to add the median. Theo will make it clear that this was a new improvement that had not been tested for feedback in the December Forum

3. Make Preliminary Plan Recommendations for Town Council

Upon a motion by Joe, and second by Rebecca, the Committee voted 5-0 to send the recommendations for \$10,891,857 to the Council.

Some discussion followed regarding how much lighting was included and when the lighting design would be finalized. This would done during final design. Solar design may be an option. The tentative Council date is 1/25.

Nathan gave a brief explanation of the proposed TIF financing and what the fiscal benefit is of funding from TIF versus from the general fund. Due to State and County formulas, the Town gets \$3 benefit from TIF versus only \$1 benefit from same increase in assessed value if there is no TIF. The concern that some have heard from citizens is that this method is “not real” and is still increasing the tax rate. The committee stressed that the message should be that we are using taxes, but only certain dedicated taxes. The TIF amendment has three aspects: the term, the acreage, and the project list.

Andrea thanked the committee and the consultant for all their hard work.

4. Next Meeting

The next meeting will be the Council presentation on 1/25.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:45 PM.

Draft minutes prepared by Theo Holtwijk, February 24, 2016