

**Town Council Meeting
Minutes
September 23, 2019**

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 pm.

Roll Call

All councilors were present and answering roll call.

Pledge of Allegiance

Chair Kuhn led those present in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Item 1 Public Forum

Chair Kuhn opened the public forum; there was no public comment.

Item 2 (Consent Agenda)

- **Order to approve the minutes of the August 12, 2019 Town Council Workshop**
- **Order to approve the minutes of the August 12, 2019 Town Council Special Meeting.**
- **Order to approve the minutes of the August 26, 2019 Town Council Meeting.**

Chair Kuhn asked for clarification regarding the August 12 Special Meeting minutes, Item 5. She remembered Councilors asking Pete McHugh, Finance Director, to come back before the Council if requests exceeded the allocated funds. The Council could then decide whether to allocate the funds in a different way or perhaps raise the amount of funding that was available.

Councilor Asherman moved the orders; Councilor De Lima seconded.

Chair Kuhn opened the public comment period; there was no public comment.

The motion carried 7-0.

Item 3 Report from staff, Council committees and Council liaisons regarding updates on assignments and projects.

Councilor Hemphill said that ecomaine's open house is Saturday, September 28 from 8 a.m. to noon. It will be an all ages events with tours, breakfast sandwiches, electronic waste disposal, and local team mascots.

Councilor De Lima said that the FEIC is attempting to launch the Falmouth Business League. The Committee is in the process of trying to create the rationale for why Falmouth needs a business league. If members of the public have thoughts on participating or are feeling the need for a business league, they should reach out to FEIC members or plan to attend a meeting. The Committee meets every other Wednesday from 4:30-6 p.m. The next meeting is the first Wednesday in October. The FEIC will be developing a questionnaire and meeting with several businesspeople in the community.

Councilor Cahan said that REAC met. They were enthusiastic to get started on their work plan assignments. They worked with Kimberly Darling, Energy and Sustainability Coordinator, on the second annual electric car event. It was well attended and a lot of fun. The next meeting is October 3.

Chief John Kilbride provided an update on the Maine Marathon on October 6. Signs are already up indicating the closures around the Route 1 and Route 88 corridors. The race starts in Portland, goes around Baxter Boulevard and then crosses Martin's Point Bridge. Around 4,000 runners will be crossing Martin's Point Bridge. The Police Department has been successful in managing the crowd in past years. The half-marathon turns around at Mill Creek which can inconvenience traffic. Residents and the public cheer on the runners; there are bands. He has not fielded any complaints from residents over the past few years. The race starts at 7:45 a.m. The runners should reach Falmouth around 8 a.m.

Nathan Poore said that Jay Reynolds, Public Works Director, will be providing an update on road construction projects later in the meeting. An update will also be included in the upcoming newsletter. There have been major accidents during the morning commute on Mountain Road over the last few weeks. When there are accidents amidst ongoing road construction projects, it creates a strain and a lot of frustration. Erin Cadigan and Theo Holtwijk will be giving a presentation tomorrow night, September 24, at 6pm on the Falmouth Map Mural. Everyone who attends will receive a book about the map.

Chair Kuhn said that the Falmouth Education Foundation's Color Run is Sunday, September 29. The first issue of the Falmouth Focus newsletter is coming out at the end of the month. It will be available via physical mail and electronically. Going forward, it will be distributed online and paper copies will be available at Town Hall and Mason-Motz Activity Center.

Item 4 Report from the Appointment Committee and order regarding various vacancies on Boards and Committees.

Councilor Hemphill said that the Appointment Committee met last Friday and conducted several interviews for vacant board and committee positions. Tonight, the Committee is making recommendations for both appointment and re-appointment. He reviewed the board and committee attendance policy. The Appointment Committee decided to reappoint members who fell below the attendance policy with the expectation of improved attendance policy compliance. He read the Appointment Committee recommendation.

Councilor Trickett asked which of the re-appointments were board and committee members who were being re-appointed due to falling below the attendance requirements? Councilor Hemphill said Rebecca Casey and Karen Jones. Paul Bergkamp termed out on LPAC, so he is being appointed to LPAC +. Councilor Trickett asked whether PACPAC and LPAC had full membership? Councilor Hemphill said there were vacancies on both committees.

Councilor Asherman moved the order; Councilor Cahan seconded.

Chair Kuhn opened the public comment period; there was no public comment.

Motion carried 7-0.

Item 5 Jay Reynolds, Public Works Director, will provide an update on ongoing road construction projects.

Jay Reynolds, Public Works Director, delivered the presentation. He showed a map indicating the geographic location of completed and ongoing projects. Completed projects included 1) improvements to Blueberry Lane, 2) Annual Paving of Foreside Road, Providence Avenue, and Avon Road, and 3) Railroad Crossings at Field Road and Woodville Road. Continuing projects include 1) Lunt Road Bridge (MaineDOT), 2)

Blackstrap Road Bridge (MaineDOT), 3) Route 100 Project, 4) Blackstrap Road Rehabilitation, 5) Middle Road Repaving, 6) Fundy Road Sidewalk Improvements, and 7) Annual Paving of Harriette Street, Johnson Road, and Bucknam Road, and 8) Natural Gas Expansion.

Councilor Asherman asked if the Libby Bridge is being changed at all or if the Route 100 work ends before the bridge. Mr. Reynolds said that the Libby Bridge was merged and combined with the Route 100 project. MaineDOT bid that work out with the Town's Route 100 project; it is all State money, but it will be completed as part of the Route 100 project; they are rehabilitating the bridge a well.

Future projects include 1) 2021-Veranda Street Bridge Replacement (MaineDOT), 2) 2021-2022-Bucknam Road, 3) Bucknam/Falmouth/Middle Road Intersection, and 4) Route 1 (North of Bucknam Road to the Cumberland town line).

Councilor Hemphill asked for clarification on the Bucknam Road start date. Mr. Reynolds said the project was originally scheduled for 2019-2020 but bridge priorities and construction costs have changed their schedule. Mr. Poore added that Veranda Street played a role in the delay as well because that became a priority project and it will require the closing of I-295 for at least a five-day period. MaineDOT is planning to complete that portion of Veranda Street before starting the Bucknam Road Bridge project. MaineDOT is also looking at Johnson Road Bridge over I-295. Town staff have received questions about the signal that is not activated near the northbound on-ramp on Bucknam Road. There is a sensor issue there; there was a sensor placed on the I-295 ramp with the intention of getting traffic off I-295 but it was backing up traffic because it stayed activated for people exiting I-295. MaineDOT is currently working on it. They may have a solution ready in the future, but it will be fixed when the permanent intersection is designed there in a few years.

Item 6 Order to authorize the Town Manager to execute a memorandum of understanding between the Town of Falmouth and Highland Lake Association that will coordinate efforts to utilize Town funds to mitigate erosion sites that impact water quality at Highland Lake.

Mr. Poore said that the prior Council approved, in the last budget cycle, to fund up to \$10,000 for initial work. If this is successful, annual requests will be made to the Council for a while to help mitigate areas that are the highest and medium priorities that if mitigated will positively impact the lake. When the budget was approved, there was not a funding mechanism in place because the money is going towards private property. The Highland Lake Association has come forward and offered to be the agent that will manage the program. All the Town will have to do is fund the projects through the Highland Lake Association. The Association will then manage all the individual projects and have separate agreements between them and the private property owners. That takes a great deal of the accounting and the management off the Town's responsibility. The MOU includes checks and balances and ability for the Town to monitor how things are going. The Town is less formal in some of the MOU requirements because it is not a lot of money for each of these properties. If very long and formal legal agreements are developed and a lot of the property owners are being convinced that this is a good thing to do, the Town may lose the edge of getting them to work with it if they are getting nervous about long legal documents. He felt having the Highland Lake Association take this on this was a big win-win for the Town. They have successfully done it in Windham. The other check and balance is reviewing on an annual basis. If the project is going well then, we continue it, if we run into some bumps in the road then we can take a second look at this. He had a lot of confidence based on what he had seen so far that this will work. One of the key things is that any of these projects must be identified on the watershed survey so there is almost a pre-qualifier to receive funding.

Chair Kuhn clarified that the annual reporting is the opportunity for Town oversight. Mr. Poore said that was correct. She clarified that the option for renewing it for another year was also a check and balance. Mr. Poore said yes and added that they are submitting lists of projects to the Town. The Town already has a list of projects up to the first \$4,000 of the allocated \$10,000. Town staff have reviewed those projects and have

reconciled them with the watershed survey map. Most of the projects are high priority. Town staff can get that initial check-in as well.

Councilor De Lima asked how much this would cost annually? Mr. Poore said it is somewhat premature; some of the larger projects that could be done down the road could involve road associations or private roads so there could be more money in that direction. The Highland Lake Leadership Team is also working on applying for federal and state grant money. They will deliver a presentation at the October 16 meeting.

Chair Kuhn clarified that currently only \$10,000 has been appropriated and if the funding need increased over \$10,000 they would have to come back in front of the Council for a supplemental appropriation.

Councilor Trickett asked for background information on how the survey was conducted. Kimberly Darling said there was a massive volunteer effort in May 2018. The watershed was broken up into different sections. Volunteers went out with technical leaders to identify these sites. 129 sites were identified between Falmouth and Windham. The volunteers were looking for sources of erosion. Councilor Trickett asked if the primary environmental concern with erosion was phosphorus? Ms. Darling said that was correct. He asked if the Town had information with respect to whether the identified erosion rankings related to phosphorous impacts or just erosion in general. Ms. Darling said that the Water District and DEP advise keeping phosphorous out of the lake for water quality. Councilor Trickett clarified that he was trying to understand whether the survey provides enough information to figure out whether the phosphorus issue is being addressed as best as possible and in order of priority. Dennis Brown, member of the Highland Lake Association, explained that almost any erosion results in phosphorus. Councilor Trickett said that it does not necessarily help to target areas where there has been previous agricultural activity. Mr. Brown said that there is not a lot of farming activity on the lake but there are some issues that have been identified through the Highland Lake Leadership team. There was a significant manure pile with phosphorus levels as high as 18 parts per billion. The source has been eliminated but it will take at least one hundred years for it all to move through. Mr. Brown thanked Mr. Poore, Ms. Darling, and Nancy Lightbody for their participation on the Highland Lake Leadership team. This will be reported on at every Highland Lake Leadership Team meeting. The Council will not need to wait on an annual report. He said that there are a lot of people who would not do any work on the roads without the financial assistance from the town. This is an invaluable step and thought the Council would be pleased with the results.

Councilor Asherman asked for clarification around grant matching. He asked if it was up to a 50% match with the landowner? Mr. Brown said yes and added that it could also be with the road association. Councilor Asherman asked if there was potential matching of the Town's contribution as well? Mr. Brown said there are 319 grants that are managed by the State DEP but come through the EPA. The first step is to complete a watershed survey. The Highland Lake Leadership Team is wrapping up a watershed management plan which is the next phase. Once there is an approved watershed management plan, then grants can be applied for. The plan is active for ten years and then the process must be repeated.

Councilor Cahan said that the HLA has been dedicated and doing great research and impressive presentations. She felt confident in supporting them in this project because of all the thorough work that they have done to get to this point.

Councilor Hemphill moved the order; Councilor Asherman seconded.

Chair Kuhn opened the public comment period; there was not public comment.

Motion carried 7-0.

Item 7 Order to approve a supplemental appropriation from unassigned fund balance for \$23,100 to perform a feasibility study for building renovation,

redevelopment, and adaptive reuse of the Tidewater Farmhouse and Barn structures located in the Tidewater Master Planned Development District.

Nathan Poore said that Tidewater Farm was an approved mixed-use development that converted an old saltwater farm into homes and commercial retail service. The remaining areas that could be developed are TV3, TV5, TF1, TF2 and TF3, where the farmhouse and the barn are located. The Town purchased TV5, TF1, TF2, and TF3 last year. TV3 was left behind for development by the developer. The idea was to buy TV5 for future wastewater treatment expansion and for wetlands mitigation. TF1 must be conserved. TF2 and 3 are developable and there are few restrictions. It was appraised at around \$1.3 million. The Town purchased the parcels for a combined \$500,000. The idea for TF2 and 3 was going to be an agreement with the Falmouth Land Trust to have them take on a capital campaign that would allow them to pay the Town a pre-determined amount for those parcels; a quarter million dollars along with the Town contributing some funding to take care of invasive plant species and for the demolition of the farmhouse and barn. The Town was ready to enter into an agreement with the Land Trust when the historical society said the Town should take another look at those buildings. Town staff took a tour and the Council heard a presentation last spring from a former Falmouth resident with historic preservation expertise. The Council decided to stall demolishing the buildings to consider whether there could be a partnership with the Town to restore the buildings but the Council made it clear that the main object remains to put a Falmouth Land Trust headquarters at the location and have the Land Trust compensate the Town for the value of the property. The Town put out an RFQ to find out who was interested. The Town did not receive any submittals from a developer partner. The Town received a couple of proposals that were intriguing including the Barrett Made's proposal. Barrett Made proposed conducting a study to see if it is feasible to reuse them as part of a Falmouth Land Trust Headquarters. The proposal is to sit down with the Land Trust and find out about their needs and then come back with two scenarios one where they would demolish the buildings and the second would be preserving aspects or all the buildings and repurposing them. The study would give the Town two costs. With the Town funding this, the Town would have to decide later whether the funds would be recouped from the Land Trust.

Councilor Trickett asked for a brief history of the farmhouse and the extent of its historic significance. Mr. Poore said that the property dates to the shipbuilding years. Theo Holtwijk, Director of Long-Range Planning and Economic Development, said that the Historical Society's president has done significant research on the property. He said that the early history is associated with shipbuilding in the area. The property stayed in the ownership of a single family for a long time. Then, later, the agricultural history of the property came into being. Councilor Asherman added that the siting of the building and barn is significant in terms of where it is. The fact that it was in the estuary and part of that shipbuilding and farming and the fact of where it is today makes it more of an iconic historical structure which he thought was why the Historical Society stepped forward.

Councilor Trickett asked if there had been any discussion with the Land Trust about sharing the cost of the feasibility study. Mr. Poore said it was never a consideration by the Land Trust to put money forward for this because their original interest was to demolish the buildings. Their main objective is to build a headquarters and it has been the Town that has generated the interest in historic preservation.

Chair Kuhn said this is a fundamental change in the deal that was brokered. She asked how acceptable of an outcome this would be?

Councilor Asherman said the notion of historical significance was not something that was brought up by the Land Trust. It was brought up by others at a late date. The Land Trust's position is sure let us see what might be involved in preserving some or all these buildings and whether it is feasible for the Land Trust to build a headquarters woven into the historical nature of rehabilitating some of the buildings. From their perspective, it must make economic sense for them. It is not something that they have chosen but they are willing to see what comes up as a result of this study. If they had a choice, they would probably not be doing this study.

Councilor De Lima said it would surprise her if, after doing this study, demolishing and rebuilding the structures would be more expensive than preserving the buildings. She felt it was worth a conversation with the Land Trust because ultimately, they will be bearing the cost of a headquarters. They should have a say in whether they want to incur that extra cost down the road. Before we decide to appropriate money for the feasibility study; maybe we put this off? Councilor Asherman said that is the nature of doing the feasibility study to give the Land Trust and the Town some idea what the delta between the two is without doing that there is no idea. That was the notion of putting out an RFQ or an RFP and the Town received no responses initially from anyone interested in the property from an economic standpoint. That was the plan right from the beginning except at the 11th hour, the Historical Society said let us take another look at this. The Land Trust's goal is to build a new facility. If somehow it makes economic sense for them to tie in pieces of the building that is what this study will tell them whether it is feasible and what the delta would be between building a new facility and incorporating in some fashion or another some elements of the buildings or rehabilitating the buildings.

Councilor Hemphill said the Town owns this property at the moment and the Town was approached by the Historical Society and some preservation groups questioning whether or not it had done due diligence on the properties. Some evaluation was conducted and there are significant historic elements to both the barn and the farmhouse. There was enough evidence that there was some reason to entertain options for historic preservation of the buildings in a future use of that property. He felt that Land Trust was not particularly keen on that but was willing to go along with it. It was really the Town's responsibility to address this question that has been brought forward by the community regarding preserving the iconic structures on this parcel. Therefore, the Council is being asked to invest in a feasibility study to assess how and if these properties could be used in a future build out by some group.

Councilor Asherman said when the Town acquired this parcel a simultaneous closing with the Land Trust had been anticipated. This purpose of this acquisition by the Town was part to acquire something for the Land Trust and part to buy some land adjacent to our waste treatment facility. The package of acquiring it was not for the Town to own it but to turn the acquisition over. In the 11th hour of that closing, this historical issue came up. The Town said to the Land Trust that it was not going to execute the closure until it dealt with the historical issue.

Councilor De Lima asked for clarification about the possible future of the project. She asked if, after the study was completed, the Land Trust would have the ability to choose whether or not it wanted to complete the historic preservation? The Town is facilitating the eventual sale of the property by providing one additional piece of information with the understanding that it might turn out to cost significantly more to preserve versus demolish and rebuild but it is helping the Land Trust figure out what they can feasibly do with this property. Chair Kuhn said that raised the question of if it was the Land Trust's decision when the study findings came back? She did not think that this was the anticipated outcome when it was agreed to press pause.

Councilor Cahan said it was the Town seeing if there was anything worth preserving and then if there was someone who would be willing to do something with it. She viewed the extra \$23,000 as being on the Town in an attempt to further the last avenue possible of preserving some historic building that then the Land Trust could say yes or no. Perhaps the Town decides with how it is evaluated that it wants to preserve it. The Council may have another decision when the results are received, or it may be that the results indicate that there are only a few pieces that can be incorporated into a new building. She felt that the Council still had some decision power that is not just up to the Land Trust. The Council wants to continue with the partnership but also wants to preserve historic buildings when it can. She did not think that that the Council should move forward with the study thinking that it can recoup the \$23,000 from the Land Trust. It is on the Council to do this. If the Council decides to vote for that then it is on the Town.

Councilor Trickett said he is very interested in the history of Falmouth. He has some awareness of the history of shipbuilding in that area. He liked the idea of preserving this house, but he did not have enough

background information at this point to understand the historical significance. He felt that if the Council were to spend this money it would be because Councilors are interested in preserving the structures and if the study came back and there were a way to use it that were reasonably feasible that the Council would be open to making it a condition that they must use it. If the Council is not willing to do that then he could not see how the Council could justify spending this money. He did not know how much people care about this property. He did not feel comfortable voting on this item tonight. He suggested tabling it to hear from the historical society and if there were any private funds that could be made available or if there was some citizen interest beyond just recognizing that it is an old building in an area that had an interesting history that is now gone.

Councilor Johnson said this is really an asset that the Town now owns. He disagreed with Councilor Trickett on the assumption that the Land Trust will have to keep this property as part of their facility. He felt that this is an investigation into the asset, whether it has any value or not; it may be deemed that there is no value at all. He did not think that to say that the Land Trust would need to incorporate it was part of the spirit of this. The spirit is to find out what those assets are and how the Town can use them. To put it on the Land Trust to have to assume incorporation of those assets is not the spirit of what this is trying to do nor should it be put on the Land Trust.

Councilor Trickett said that the Councilors might need to clarify what they are voting on. His understanding was that this is not a feasibility study solely into using the building as is on site. This is not a feasibility study into moving it or where it could go or any future for this building other than staying on site and being used by a future occupant.

Councilor Asherman disagreed that the study was solely focused on reusing the building on site. It is not necessarily using the buildings, it could be using components of the building and building a new building. It could come out as anywhere from rehabilitating the buildings to using some pieces of the structure in a brand-new building. The prior Council heard presentations by historians. The Council met several times in committee on this. Some of the historians in town have already weighed in on this and that was the result of the first RFQ. It was well circulated in the historical community. No individuals or businesses stepped forward. The Town did receive some responses which led to it looking at those and going in a different direction and doing this feasibility study. This is the Town taking its community responsibility relative to this property.

Chair Kuhn said that the scope of work involves looking at the suitability of this building for the Land Trust's specific building. It is not hypothetical. It is to see if it is suitable for this purpose. She asked, if the study findings come back and historic preservation is going to cost a significant amount of money, but one could do it, who's decision is it then? Can the Land Trust say it is not interested or at that point has the Town invested in the historic value of the property to such an extent that it now has an interest in putting it to some other purpose? Councilor Asherman said that is where we are today. The Town owns the property and it is the Town's asset and the Town can make the decision on what it wants to do with the property, ultimately.

Councilor Hemphill asked Mr. Poore to provide clarification the Town's role in evaluating the results of the feasibility study? Does the Council have a decision point to allow something to happen or not? Mr. Poore said the Council has a range of things it could do. One end of the spectrum is to let the Land Trust make the decision. On the other end of the spectrum, the Town could say that the historic significance is more than anticipated and it has an obligation to make sure it gets restored and the only way the deal would happen is if the Land Trust meets certain restrictions. All the hypotheticals are out there. The purpose of the study is to help the Town decide what road it wants to take. Town representatives have spoken with the involved organizations hypothetically about how the study results would be evaluated.

Councilor Trickett said the proposed statement of work is written as if the Land Trust is the client. The proposal is to work with the Land Trust. The Town has little involvement. To the extent that what the Town wants to value its asset and understand what it has, this does not seem like it is targeted to do that. Barrett Made is not proposing to work with the Town, they are working with the Land Trust and it is limited to what

the Land Trust may or may not want to do with the building. Councilor Asherman said it is potentially written that way. He and Councilor Hemphill are leading the project committee. The Town does not need to be involved in what the Land Trust is looking for and that is why the project committee did not want to incur the process by telling the Land Trust what the Town wants for them to build as a facility. The Town hit the pause button. The Land Trust is only doing this because the Town is requesting them to do it.

Chair Kuhn said that there are three new councilors who were not here for the presentation on the historical significance of the farmhouse and barn. It seemed that it was important information to have in order to determine whether this is a wild goose chase or worth taking the next steps on. She suggested tabling this for now and asking historians to provide more information. Mr. Poore said that he and Mr. Holtwijk can work with those parties to set up a presentation.

Councilor Trickett moved to table the order to the October 16 meeting pending more historical information; Councilor De Lima seconded.

Councilor De Lima said that if the Land Trust had taken an interest in incorporating elements of the buildings into their designs and had approached the Town about helping to fund a feasibility study, she would be looking at it differently because she would know that they would be acting in good faith to try to work a design around the existing structures and it would be in their hands. That to her makes more sense than the Town holding the turnover of the property subject to this assessment and then not having the authority to require that the Land Trust incorporate elements of the structures. She was not sure why the Town would hold up selling the property. She suggested that the Town go ahead and sell the property and then have the Land Trust do the feasibility study. Maybe they should approach the Town for funding. She felt it would be a clearer path because it puts the onus on the Land Trust and the consultants to figure out how best to put this plan together using those key historic elements.

Councilor Hemphill said it was clear that the Land Trust was willing to take the property with the buildings having been raised. It is now the Town who is interested in accessing the historic value of these properties. Nothing would happen to these buildings if it were up to the Land Trust. This is addressing the Town's interest in preserving the buildings. The Town is taking responsibility for evaluating and helping this potential buyer of the property to see whether elements of each of these buildings could be suitable for adaptive reuse or not. If we leave it up to the Land Trust, they have already told us that this is not going to happen. They are not capable of investing at this point. It is the Town who is interested and responding to input from the Historical Society, the State Historic Commission, and other historians in town who have brought this issue up to the Council. He has reviewed the minutes from that Council meeting.

Councilor Cahan agreed that it is the Town that is doing this. What she was hearing was potentially three Councilors who are new are not sure if they, as representatives of the Town, want to move forward on this. She thought that it was fair to delay so that the Council can get more information. Originally, when it came before the Council, Councilors said let us put it out there and see if anyone is interested in rebuilding it themselves because the Council was not interested in rebuilding it. The Council said if no one is, then it is a done deal. No one came forward and now the Council is still trying to see if the buildings can be preserved. There are three new Councilors. She felt it was worth having another informational meeting before making a final decision.

Councilor Johnson said he does not need more information. He has been involved with the project for seven years. He was on the Land Trust for seven years and was part of the process of the Land Trust acquiring the property from the Town.

Councilor Cahan asked if tabling the item would cause any harm. Mr. Poore said delay at this point is associated with the continued degradation of the building itself. Three more works should not be the trigger; the Town has more time. Nothing else is pushing the Council to decide on this.

The motion to table the order until the October 16 meeting carried 4-3.

Item 8 Introduction of an amendment to the Code of Ordinances, Chapter 11-3, Sections 3-1 and 3-4 that will clarify the definition of a nuisance dog and provide more options to better enforce the ordinance.

Chief Kilbride said the spirit of the revised ordinance language was fine; the vision was there. The Police Department wanted to gear the language towards being more objective, it is currently subjective, and to increase both the protection of the dog owner and the complainant. He felt the new language achieved this.

Councilor Trickett said he made proposed changes to the ordinance language. There was already language in the ordinance regarding recovery of attorney fees. He asked for clarification on the Town's power to recover fines through civil action and to unilaterally say that it can also recover attorney fees given the Town's form of government; not having a municipal court or an in-house attorney? Mr. Poore said he would need to speak with the town attorney. He suspected that it would have to be awarded by a judge or through an agreement reached between the parties. Chief Kilbride said that there is an officer who is trained to prosecute civil cases for the Town regarding police action. In this case, only a handful of summonses have been issued. This is not a big item for the Police Department. Dog owners usually comply. The officer would prosecute the case and any fines assessed by the judge would be forwarded back to the Town.

A public hearing was tentatively scheduled for October 16. If Town staff are not able to get the ads published in time to meet the Charter requirements, then it will be scheduled for the second meeting of the month.

Item 9 Report from staff regarding the Blackstrap Road project.

Theo Holtwijk, Director of Long Range Planning and Economic Development, provided handouts and delivered a brief presentation with highlights from the public forum. A key element of why the Town is looking at Blackstrap Road is to understand who is responsible for fixing the road. Most of the responsibility lies with MaineDOT. He showed a chart illustrating the work that MaineDOT, the Town, and the Maine Turnpike Authority have completed on the road. The Town started the project two years ago. He outlined the project progress to date. The Town received cost estimates and analyzed them over a 30-year life cycle. Town staff recommend completing a full depth reclamation which is estimated to cost \$8.45 million. Town staff recommend 10.5-foot travel lanes and 3.5-foot shoulders. The proposed overall width is 28 feet. Town staff sense that completing construction in segments could be more cost effective but suggest deciding the schedule later. Staff also propose a 50/50 financing partnership with MaineDOT with the Town managing the project. Feedback from the second forum held two weeks ago focused on traffic calming, speed, character of the roadway, width, and the balance between leaving enough room for safe passage of people walking, running, and cycling but not going so wide that it changes the character of the road. Next steps include continuing to talk with MaineDOT and coming back before the Council with final recommendations. The Council could decide to appropriate funding for preliminary engineering. There may be a need to do a referendum. Construction could start by 2023-2024. This is not going to happen overnight. Mr. Holtwijk described how Blackstrap Road is a project of striking a balance.

Councilor Cahan asked for clarification on the shoulder width difference between the Town's portion of the road and MaineDOT's section. Mr. Holtwijk said the Town is building 3.5-foot shoulders. They are not considered true bike lanes because a bike lane is defined as five feet. MaineDOT's section ranges from zero feet to two feet at the most. The Town wants to make it consistent. Councilor Cahan asked if the Town considered bike lanes where both lanes were on the same side of the road? Does that shorten the width requirement? Mr. Holtwijk said that the Town did not consider that option; the engineer did not suggest it. The current cross section has 3.5 feet on each side; having both bike lanes on one side would cause cyclists to ride against traffic. Town staff could investigate that but did not explore it as part of this effort. Mr. Poore thought it would be wider. Jay Reynolds, Public Works Director, said the requirement for bike lanes is 10 feet. Mr. Poore said that the Town would want at least two feet of shoulder on both sides to protect the road.

10.5-foot lanes and two-foot shoulders would be 26 feet wide vs. 28 feet wide but the double bike lane would add an additional 10 feet so it would end up widening it more than it would narrow it.

Councilor Cahan asked how wide the shoulder is on Allen Avenue in the Pleasant Hill/Stapleford neighborhood? Mr. Reynolds said that section is 30 feet in total width. It has 11-foot lanes and 3.5- or 4-foot shoulders. It is two feet wider than what is being proposed for Blackstrap. Councilor Cahan said it does not feel safe to bike or walk on Allen Avenue. There are many residents that have gravel spilling into the shoulder. She was concerned that the Town would still not be providing a safe transit way for cyclists which should be encouraged especially if the Town is trying to lower its carbon emissions. Chair Kuhn asked if the reason that the full bike lane was not being proposed was strictly cost? Mr. Poore said no, the reason is the character of the road. Increasing the width of the road increases the impact on the grade changes, handling the drainage and the water, etc. That was a balance point that staff heard at the forums. People did not want to change the character of the road. Chair Kuhn said it is a tricky situation because for drivers to be three feet from cyclists, they are required to cross the center line.

Councilor Trickett said asked about a slide on the PowerPoint, "Key Concerns We Heard You Express." He asked if that slide was a good summary of the objectives of the project. Mr. Holtwijk said that the objective of the project is described on the third slide in the scope of work for TY Lin, to analyze road and pavement condition, drainage and maintenance, intersection alignments, and bicycle/pedestrian infrastructure. The PowerPoint was structured to give the public a sense that Town staff heard what they were saying and what was feasible in moving forward with the project. There are some ongoing efforts that Town staff will also pay attention to but there are some things that could not be accomplished with the project. Speed is a big concern for many people. There are voices on both sides as to how much pedestrian and bicycle space was allocated. Town staff heard the issue of impact on rural character. It is the preliminary plan that will give Town staff a better sense of where those impacts are going to be most strongly felt. One can go with five-foot bike lanes. That would provide more space, but it would add three feet plus the additional feet that Mr. Poore discussed. Town staff are concerned about right-of-way implications. The Town likes to do road projects within the Town and State's right-of-ways. Going on private property makes the project more complicated and costly. MaineDOT typically does not do 10.5-foot travel lanes. Town staff were pleasantly surprised that they were willing to go in that direction. Narrowing the travel lanes should positively impact speed because if drivers feel that the road is narrower, they will not go as fast. Town staff are trying to find the proverbial sweet spot. Town staff have probably pushed the travel lane width as narrow as MaineDOT will allow.

Councilor Trickett asked if there would be any possibility for the Town to assume maintenance responsibility for the whole stretch of road? Mr. Holtwijk said there are advantages and disadvantages. The advantage of taking maintenance responsibility is Town control but it comes at a price. The Town is typically responsible for everything within the urban compact line. As Falmouth grows, the Town's responsibility increases. Mr. Poore did not see any advantage to the Town of taking over maintenance of the roads. Councilor Trickett said that, at the end of the day, the only real concern that the Town would be addressing is road conditions in terms of actual pavement. He also suspected that one of the main concerns people have is the potholes. The Town cannot force MaineDOT to pave when there are complaints. One of the ways he would evaluate the project in the future is what is the 30-year cost if the Town had responsibility for the whole stretch verses doing this big road reconstruction project and figuring out which is more expensive.

Mr. Holtwijk said that Town staff have received feedback that the 3.5-foot shoulder is a significant improvement over what exists. The Middle Road shoulder is 3.5 feet. Town staff receive emails from the Bicycle Coalition of Maine saying thank you, what a fantastic improvement. They know it is not an official bike lane, but they recognize the improvement that has been made.

Councilor Cahan appreciated that 3.5-foot shoulders are a better amount for professional regular cyclists but for bicycle riders that is not enough to really feel safe and that children are ok. One of the Town's goals should be to get new people to ride bikes and that is not going to get new people out of their cars and on to bikes.

Councilor Asherman asked for clarification that the cost of increasing to a 5-foot shoulder would be \$800,000. Mr. Holtwijk said that was the initial estimate by the consultant. If the Council is interested in pursuing that, Town staff can make it part of the plan. Town staff wanted to make sure that all the soft costs and anticipated right-of-way costs were included in the recommendations. Town staff did not feel that \$800,000 should be added to the cost of the project in part because \$8.5 million is a huge amount of money. The MaineDOT program allows for a half million-dollar match on an application would have to be filed each year. You might have a million at a time to do a project so it would take at least eight years to complete the project. Town staff realized that a creative solution was needed with MaineDOT to get this done. Staff were hesitant to recommend more money because the project is already so expensive.

Chair Kuhn said it could add interest from the voters. It is hard to know.

Councilor Hemphill said he appreciates that improving the accessibility for more people on all the Town's roadways is a worthy goal. This is a pretty significant connector road and arguments could be made that there are better roads to focus now on adding that extra level of accessibility. He agrees that 3.5 feet will be scary. It would be a hard sell for some people to make that sort of investment. There are a lot of factors that need to be considered before the Council can do that level of accessibility on most of its projects.

Councilor Cahan said that a million dollars is a lot of money but it is a lot less than having to re-do the road ten years later when the community demands a bike lane. If the Town is going to do the project, then it should do it to the full capacity.

Chair Kuhn said the Council will be hearing about this again and there will be opportunities for public comment.

Mr. Poore said that, as far as public process goes, town staff have finished that stage of the project. If the Council decided that it wanted to make changes to the scope of the project, then another forum could be held. The next step would be doing the preliminary engineering. If the Council wants to further explore five-foot bike lanes, it would be good for staff to know sooner rather later. Maybe staff work with MaineDOT to find out more about their financing commitment and talk with our engineer and then have a second Council discussion. Chair Kuhn said it would also be helpful to know how high of a priority this corridor is in the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan.

Councilor Trickett said if this is coming back before the Council in October, he would be interested in learning the cost of having safe bike lanes as well as the minimum cost for a good road that is a motorway. He was very interested in the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan, but he did not think of Blackstrap Road as a casual biking road. It is a motorway. Widening the road to accommodate biking for novice bikers was changing the road character. He would rather put that money somewhere else in town where the population is denser, and it is less of a throughway. If the Town can address the basic roadway concerns in a good long-term way for less money, he would be interested in knowing what that cost is. The money that would be saved could potentially go towards building out the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan in other parts of town.

Councilor Asherman agreed with Councilor Trickett's comments. He considers Blackstrap Road to be a very busy commuter road with a lot of heavy traffic. He questioned whether he would take his family out there even with the full five-foot bike lanes.

Chair Kuhn asked if there was Council support for having staff develop two alternative budgets? Councilor Cahan would like to see a budget for how much full bike lanes would cost. Councilor Hemphill said that the recommendations that Mr. Holtwijk presented were reasonable. They gave the essence of maintaining a safe traffic road and improving a lane where cyclists could feel slightly safer. Councilor De Lima agreed with Councilor Hemphill's comments. Councilor Johnson said he supported seeing multiple budget proposals. Councilor Asherman said he is comfortable with what had been proposed.

Councilor Trickett asked whether the cost reduction options chart on slide 15 of the September 11 presentation provided the budget information that he was looking for? Mr. Holtwijk said no. There are more

cost saving options than what is presented on the chart, but staff did not want to go to that extent due to right-of-way and safety concerns. Mr. Poore said that this is not necessarily the lowest number. The Council could choose the status quo of letting the State maintain its section of the road as it sees fit. Councilor Asherman asked if the chart answered Councilor Trickett's question? Councilor Trickett asked how much would it cost to maintain the State portion of the road? He would like to know if that is not a viable option. Mr. Poore said that one of the major sections that the Town maintains, which is going up the hill from the overpass about .6 miles, was an expensive project. To maintain the two State sections the way the Town has been maintaining its sections is doing the big \$8 million project. Maintaining the road, the way the State has been maintaining it would just be resurfacing the road every eight years. If the Town took on maintaining those two sections of road the cost is exactly what is being proposed here.

Councilor Asherman said if the Town is going to let the State sections stay the way they are, why would the Town have spent the money that it has in its sections? Mr. Poore said what Town staff are proposing and what the Town has been doing is closer to rebuilding than just resurfacing. The Town is going in and taking care of really bad spots and digging things out and putting better gravel in. The Town is putting in underdrains and improving drainage. The road is currently failing because it is not well drained. Once what Town staff are proposing is done, the road is going to be much better shape for many more years. It is better wearing condition than what would result with just resurfacing it every eight years as well as the proposed widening.

Chair Kuhn asked for a straw poll to determine the direction that the Council would give staff.

Councilor Cahan said that there are three budgets being requested.

Councilor Trickett said that there is probably an incremental cost to adding full bike lanes. He was not sure that the alternative that he was looking for exists. He would like to address the road issues and not leave it up to the State to only repave every eight years. If there is a cheaper way to meet those base lines than what is proposed, he would be interested in hearing about it. It may be that what is being proposed is the base line. Mr. Poore said the options have been presented. If the Council wants to consider a different baseline which is status quo, the Town will finish up a bad section this year and could take on the remaining middle section of the Town which would be around a half million dollars. After that the Town would be done and would rely on the State. If the Town took over the State portion of the road there would be two options; either doing one of the proposed options or the same resurfacing that the State would do. There is not anything in between. Jay Reynolds, Public Works Director, said a third option would be just reclaiming what is existing and reshaping and repaving the road. A new reclaimed road would be far better than just repaving it every eight years. That would not add any bike lanes or drainage improvements. That could be the bare minimum approach. Mr. Poore said that would be a cost that Town staff could investigate. Chair Kuhn said it could be interesting to explore that option.

Councilor Trickett asked about the option presented on slide 6. He asked if when Town staff present tax rate impact information are they talking about the added cost of the project on the tax rate or is it compared to existing maintenance costs? Mr. Holtwijk said the latter. Councilor Trickett said he would like to know how much it would cost for the Town to do nothing other than basic maintenance over the next twenty years.

Councilor Asherman said there is no section that the Town has done where it has just reclaimed the road. Councilor Trickett said according to the PowerPoint, there are still sections that the Town would be doing. Councilor Asherman said not very much. Mr. Reynolds said the Town is working on the 0.8 miles and rebuilt the lower portion of Blackstrap Road. The Town rebuilt the lowest portion in 2013. The Town has made investments in the last 6 years above and beyond just resurfacing. Councilor Asherman ask if the bigger section that is the Town's section will need reclamation soon? He clarified that he was referring to the State's portion that the Town has not touched. Mr. Reynolds said the State has been resurfacing its portion every eight years which is not a long-term solution to the roadway. It should be rebuilt at some point. That is what Town staff are trying to get MaineDOT on board with.

Councilor Trickett said that roughly 1/7th of the total project cost would be on the remaining Town section which is significant. He said what he was hearing was the cost of the larger project is around what the Town would need to spend anyway to maintain its portion of the road to the standards that it already intends to maintain them so the net cost over and above what the Town would be doing anyway is probably about 1/7th less.

The Council asked staff to present numbers for the lowest cost alternative and for the plan as recommended by staff as well as an identification of the incremental increase to accommodate adding full bike lanes. Mr. Poore asked Mr. Reynolds if the incremental increase would require preliminary engineering? Mr. Reynolds said the Town would need to get the engineer to look at that because 5-foot lanes have not yet been considered. The engineer maybe be able to make an estimate based on current information or they may need to take a closer look at actual conditions out there. Mr. Poore said Town staff would get the best estimate they could without going through full preliminary engineering.

Item 10 Discussion regarding the 2016 Falmouth Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan and when and how to re-engage the public to see if there is a demand for changes to this plan.

Theo Holtwijk, Director of Long Range Planning and Economic Development, delivered a presentation covering the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan's history, the process followed, recommendations, what has happened since May 2016, the implementation status, and stakeholder meetings. There were two project goals, 1) integrate the 2002 Trails Master Plan and 2003 Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan into a single plan and 2) provide a framework to review requests from citizens and projects by others and create a prioritized guide for Town's Capital Improvement Plans and road designs. The plan includes five main elements 1) reaffirm Falmouth's vision for walking and bicycling, 2) harness the community's opinions and interests, 3) prioritize recommended improvements, 4) provide for continued community involvement in implementation, and 5) develop a plan for next 20 years. A different process was followed for the plan. It was a staff-led approach with consultant and financial assistance. The Community Development Committee was used as a sounding board. There was an extensive public outreach process with two rounds. Three different public engagement formats were used 1) experts and key stakeholders, 2) in-person public forums, and 3) online surveys. Staff used public feedback to create a master list of all possible projects. A scaled down version of the list was tested at a second public forum. Staff then prioritized the actions. Page 3 of the plan provides an outline. The action plan is also a good outline of the plan. The vision outlined in the plan is aimed at safety, accessibility, and connections. There are two main goals to achieving the vision 1) implementing promotional, educational, and behavioral strategies and 2) making physical improvements. 48 actions, 19 short-term, 18 mid-term, and 10 long-term actions. A key recommendation was to create an informal stakeholder group. The Council approved a resolution on May 23, 2016 stating that it supported the vision of the plan but not necessarily every recommended action. Additionally, that the Council did not commit to spending any money. Since May 2016, the Council endorsed the 2-year work plan, there was a call for stakeholders and an initial stakeholder meeting, the plan received the Maine planning award, the plan was amended to respond to MaineDOT I-295 bridge projects, a second stakeholder meeting was held, and staff presented at the May 2017 GPCOG Summit. Staff plan to hold a third stakeholder meeting in November. Completed promotional and educational actions include the 2017 Bike Rodeo, and Healthy Kids, Happy Kids programs. Completed walking and biking improvements include Middle Road bike lanes and Woodville Road shared access. MaineDOT completed the Longwoods/Woods Road Roundabout and is in the process of completing the Lunt Road I-295 Bridge and the I-295 North/Bucknam Road traffic signal. Trail projects have included the completion of the 2017 Open Space Plan. Possible projects by others include improvements to the Village Green by Oceanview, the PACTS: Regional Active Transportation Plan, St. Lawrence and Atlantic Rail-with-

Trail, and the PACTS: Public Transit Plan. Ongoing Town work includes restriping roads to increase shoulder width and incorporating bicycle signage and detection systems at traffic signals. The proposed November 2019 stakeholder meeting will include a complete Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan implementation update. Staff suggest that the Council should wait for the outcome of the third stakeholder meeting before deciding whether to update or make significant changes to the plan.

Councilor Cahan brought up that Blackstrap Road is identified in the plan, but staff are not recommending implementing full bike lanes. Mr. Holtwijk said that Town staff are conscious of not suggesting bike lanes everywhere in Falmouth. Sometimes a shared access road can work. At the time, the idea was that staff would study it more. After further study, staff have recommended the 3.5-foot shoulders on Blackstrap Road.

Councilor De Lima asked for clarification that a 3.5-foot shoulder was not a bike lane. Councilor Cahan and Mr. Holtwijk said it is not an official bike lane. Official bike lanes are five feet. Mr. Holtwijk reminded the Council that the plan is a guide to help the Town prioritize.

Councilor Asherman asked about putting a bicycle lane on Falmouth Road? Mr. Holtwijk said some projects are easier some are harder. This is why it is a twenty-year plan.

Chair Kuhn asked if staff feel that they have an articulated work plan for 2020-2022? Mr. Holtwijk said it is a very intentional plan. Staff hope to present what progress has been made on each of the items at the forum in November.

Councilor Johnson asked how the top five priority items were determined? Mr. Holtwijk said it was a combination of what Town staff learned from the surveys and from the forum as well as from feedback provided to the Town Manager. Mr. Reynolds also looked at what kind of study opportunities the Town had. The best opportunity to look at multi-model aspects is when Town staff know there are upcoming projects because these additions can be piggybacked with ongoing construction.

Councilor Johnson asked for clarification that the responses were based on the opinions of those present at the forums. Mr. Holtwijk said the responses were based on straw polls at the forums but that the unanimousness of the vote was striking. Councilor Johnson asked if impacts of recommendations would be considered (ex. would recommendations prevent crashes) in prioritizing what actions to implement? Mr. Poore said how the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan is implemented relates to the annual approval the budget and capital improvement plan. The comprehensive plan also provides guidance by stating that infrastructure improvements should be focused in the growth areas. Mr. Holtwijk added that Town staff asked questions to stakeholders based on key destinations.

Councilor Trickett asked for clarification on the prioritization system. Mr. Holtwijk cautioned the Council not to look at the plan with that level of specificity. It is a pretty high-level plan. Mr. Reynolds added that repaving a major portion of Falmouth Road was included in the FY18 Capital Improvement Plan. That may have been a factor in how Falmouth Road ended up being a short-term versus Blackstrap Road being long-term. Mr. Poore said that most of the short-term projects were on roads that had planned paving projects.

Chair Kuhn asked if the investments are made as the road work is completed not necessarily in terms of urgency? She was concerned that a lot of sidewalks are linking Town investments to other Town investments but are in low residential density areas. The areas with high population density are prioritized as long-term projects. Does that mean those projects would not get done until they happened to coincide with the rebuilding of their associated roads? Mr. Holtwijk said it is hard to predict what the Town will do ten years from now. If this and subsequent Councils stay committed to the plan, Falmouth will have a fantastic system. Mr. Poore added that one of the things that staff are not presenting tonight is the successes. The list of completed projects from 2016-2018 is impressive. Staff will present that at the stakeholder meeting in November. This was meant to be a twenty-year plan. The Town has gotten a lot out of it in three years. Town staff may discover at the next stakeholder meeting that the Town needs to refocus attention. The fact that the Council is showing interest in the plan is good especially because this is a new Council. To date it has been

very successful. How successful it will be in the future depends on what this Council and the public in future forums really want it to be.

Councilor Trickett said that he and other Councilors are getting a lot of feedback from residents about Foreside Road and the Johnson Road intersection which relate to the plan. It struck him that, in 2016, Johnson Road was a low priority. He would be interested in another public forum to get updated feedback. The feedback he has heard might be limited to a small group of residents. As a town-wide matter it could be a low priority. He was curious if staff have some perception that things have changed with Foreside Road or if this is a flareup of concern that is finding receptive ears with some council members? He hoped to get a better sense of how to prioritize implementation of this plan and its goals town-wide and how to do it in the most impactful and efficient way possible while making sure that resident perspectives are heard.

Councilor Hemphill asked for clarification on the L, M, and S priority categories. Mr. Holtwijk said long-term, medium term and short-term.

Chair Kuhn said that investment in what has been identified in the growth areas is consistent with the comprehensive plan. That is not just hearing from a few people.

Councilor Cahan was interested in an evaluation of the existing bike routes. She said several them are not bike lanes. They are maybe 3.5 feet shoulders or smaller. There are very dense neighborhoods like Stapleford that are isolated. Residents go down to Portland because they feel safer riding into Portland than riding in Falmouth. She felt that many of the routes on the map were not bicycle friendly. She was curious, as the Council was evaluating putting in bicycle routes, what the community really wants those to be? Is the Town meeting that need or should it be trying to create a wider area for people? Mr. Poore recalled that, at the time, people were thinking in the framework of not being able to put five-foot bike lanes everywhere so, instead, improvements could be made to as many areas as possible. Mr. Holtwijk said a different plan with a different Council might have resulted in more items. Councilor Cahan said she is curious about what the community thinks about the implementation process so far? Mr. Poore said he receives mostly positive feedback. The new and emerging item is Route 88. Mr. Holtwijk added that besides the physical improvements that the Town is trying to make in a strategic fashion, his sense of the first set of stakeholder meetings was that residents appreciated by the opportunity for dialogue. The Town does not do that on many projects. This is the one project where there is growing interest.

Councilor De Lima said that she drives by Route 88 and it is one of the roads on which she most frequently sees runners, bikers, and walkers. The concerns she has been hearing are more about traffic flow and the speed at which cars are going. That is a totally different issue than feeling safe walking or biking. What she is hearing tonight is that the Town is making incremental strides towards this being a more bike and pedestrian friendly town. She did not think that the Town wants to be spending unlimited amounts of money to make every bike path as safe and as wide as possible. She loved the approach that the Town has taken so far that the plan is referred to whenever a road is being re-constructed. There is a balance of how much is the Town willing to invest to get where it wants to go? Anecdotally, what she has heard about Route 88 is more about the flow of traffic and speed at which cars are going.

Chair Kuhn agreed about considering the best allocation of resources. Maybe it does not make sense to have a little bit of bike path everywhere in town. Maybe it is placed in a couple of commuter corridors and it really becomes a highway for people who are on bikes similarly with the sidewalks; those should be in densely populated areas where people are going to use them.

Chair Kuhn asked about public outreach for the upcoming November stakeholder meeting. Mr. Poore said that outreach will include all communications channels.

Item 11 Discussion regarding a possible Public Forum to develop a vision for the Johnson Road-Route 88 intersection.

Mr. Poore said that this specific area has been a topic of conversation for ten plus years. There have been suggestions for more parking down there. There was one Council that purchased the former Marion Brown property thinking that it could be an expanded parking area at some point. It was not brought to the public's attention until several years later. There was a neighborhood meeting and the public let it be known that it had no interest in building a parking lot in that location. That led to a sidewalk extension to Underwood Park and the creation of a few on-street parking spaces. MaineDOT standards of having to have a safe landing spot on either side of the crosswalk meant that the Town had to move the sidewalk further south. There have been concerns raised about people going too fast thru the intersection. Putting a four way stop there has been debated for many years. Town staff often receive feedback about sight distance. Other people have ideas about getting speed zone reductions. There are so many moving parts going on and town staff have not been able to address it. It is time for the Council and Town staff to commit to having a conversation and engaging the public. A public conversation about this area has been a longtime coming; maybe it should be broader to including Underwood Park as well or the approaches. Maybe even discussing bicycle lanes. The thought was to schedule a neighborhood forum. Staff intend to broadcast it. A forum was held at Holy Martyrs Church in 2014. Other proposed locations are Lunt Auditorium and the Elementary School. Town staff have raised logistical questions for the Council to provide direction on. He recommended keeping the topic focused.

Councilor De Lima said that the Depot Road and Route 88 crossing is also an issue.

Chair Kuhn added that Route 1 and Route 88 is also an issue. Mr. Poore said that is a separate larger topic that is somewhat isolated to that area. Town staff are working on some solutions, but long-term solutions will be expensive.

Mr. Poore asked where should the meeting be held? Town staff would like to broadcast it. The only location that would allow a live broadcast would be the Elementary School. Should the Town hire a facilitator for this event?

Councilor Trickett was hesitant about an open-ended forum because on this particular issue where there are many things that are out of the Council's control, Councilors receive lots of suggestions and emails that are not feasible options. The options are somewhat narrow for what can be done at Route 88 and Johnson Road. The other issue with an open-ended forum is that it is challenging to get an idea of what the public wants. We have learned over the past year that holding a forum is not actually a good poll of what the public wants. It would be helpful to present options for the intersection. If this is going to be productive it needs to be narrowed down to what is feasible. Staff could describe why other options that have been suggested are not feasible. The Town could still potentially solicit new ideas, but he suspected that this issue has been thoroughly considered based on how long it has been on the table.

Chair Kuhn suggested limiting the topics to the two intersections and bicycle and pedestrian safety.

Councilor Hemphill said that the Town has had specific conversations about parking and Underwood Park. He agreed that those issues should be excluded.

Mr. Poore suggested leaving parking in the conversation because the parking next to Town Landing Market is the challenge to improving the safety and functionality of the intersection. Chair Kuhn suggested making it specific to store parking.

Councilor Asherman agreed with Councilor Trickett's approach of narrowing the topic down. Mr. Poore asked for clarification that the options being proposed are hypothetical. The Councilors said yes. Chair Kuhn added that most of the options are known.

Councilor Johnson said he disagreed regarding Underwood Park. There are kids and joggers and bikers and retirees enjoying that road and many of them congregate in Underwood Park. Getting there is half the trouble. He has heard that people will drive to the Elementary School because it is less of a hassle than going on Route 88 to get to Underwood Park. He thinks it should be considered. Chair Kuhn said to that extent it does relate to bicycle and pedestrian safety.

Town Council Minutes

September 23, 2019

Page 17 of 17

Councilor Cahan liked having the directed conversation. Staff could lead a directed conversation without a facilitator. Mr. Poore said he was imagining the clicker exercise potentially being used.

Chair Kuhn wanted to see it held somewhere where it could be broadcast. Mr. Poore asked whether she wanted it to be live or if it could be re-broadcast?

Councilor Asherman asked if it could be broadcast live if it was held at the Elementary School? Mr. Poore said yes but that the sound quality there can be difficult.

Councilor Hemphill said that there would be sufficient space at Holy Martyrs Church. Its location would serve the neighbors well.

Chair Kuhn said Holy Martyrs Church works but she would like people to be able to watch it.

Mr. Poore said that staff and the Town's consulting engineer would need some time to come up with scenarios.

Adjourn

Councilor Cahan moved the motion to adjourn; Councilor De Lima seconded. Motion carried 7-0.

The meeting adjourned at 11:07pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Marguerite Fleming
Recording Secretary