

Wiscasset Transportation Committee

Meeting Minutes

07-01-02

Attendance:

Michael Blagdon
Paul Mrozinski

Marguerite Rafter
Steve Jerrett

Don Jones
Seaver Leslie

Community Attendance

David Kinney

James Hammond

I. Chairman's Update

b. Interagency Meeting Attendance.

c. Trip to MDOT on Tuesday.

Paul discussed how he had been approached by the Waterfront Master Plan Committee to show a draft that we've been working on for the economic potential if not the development along the waterfront just to give MDOT an indication that indeed the town is working on the location of a railway station down in this area and the possibility of a water ferry that goes off to Boothbay Harbor to be located on the North side of the bridge. Paul will brief MDOT on the Waterfront Master Plan Committee's efforts.

II. Approval of Minutes from the 24th of June Meeting

Approved.

III. Brief Discussion on the Public Forum of 26 June.

Question was discussed with Steve Jerrett weather or not a referendum vote could be implemented on the upcoming election. Steve wasn't certain but he believed that it could not be done.

There was a discussion of Shawn Rafters proposed route.

There was a discussion of future development there was worries about urban sprawl. The Bypass is intended to be a non-accessible road.

IV. The Committee's Direction

b. Proposed Subcommittee Structure

Don Jones Read and explained his proposal, the proposal was not voted on as an official position of the Committee, however it was recognized as a strong start for the groups considerations in such matters as determining and weighing a proposed route.

To: Members of the Wiscasset Transportation Committee

From: Donald Jones

Re: Proposal

Date: 30 June 2002

Having listened carefully to the public input at the June 26 public hearing at the High School, and discussed the bypass situation with people whose opinion I respect, I have decided to present a proposal:

- The June 11 referendum vote does not mean a majority of Wiscasset residents do not favor a bypass,
- Planning money should not be spent to challenge the EIS prepared by MDOT. They will have hired experts to get it right. That it be correct is critically important to MDOT and FHWA. Let SVCA and them worry about it.
- If we spend planning money, let it be on crafting a preferred route that meets the needs and requirements of Wiscasset.
- Wiscasset must specify its needs and requirements.
- I propose the following Wiscasset needs and requirements:

1. **The bypass must not intrude into the Historic District.**
The Historic District is the best working definition of the village, and moreover it has legal weight.
2. **The bypass must not intrude into the educational campus.**
The educational campus includes the Primary School, the Morris Farm, the Recreational Center, and the High School.
3. **The bypass must become the principal arterial highway and be designated U.S. Route One.** The key to maximum diversion of traffic is not its relative length, but its relative speed. The bypass must be a high-speed route without stops or reduced speed zones. It must become the route of choice for all through traffic, especially truck traffic.
4. **The bypass must have access to and from both Route 27 and Route 218.** It is important that there be an interchange with Route 218 to keep truck traffic from Windsor, Whitefield, Jefferson, Newcastle and Alna out of Wiscasset village. A Route 218 interchange could be forgone only if a convenient connection via the Route 27 interchange is built to and from Route 218.

- These four requirements form the basis for evaluating the acceptability of any proposed bypass route alignment.

c. Discussion of subcommittee tasks and goals

d. Formation of Two Subcommittee tasks and goals

e. Formation of two subcommittees

- i. **Analysis of existing and possible new bypass routes
this subcommittee's work will be completed before a
planning consultant is engaged by the town.**

There was discussion of what we would be doing and the scope of our work.

There was worries that that the Northern Bypass Subcommittee may not be able

to complete its scope within the existing time line of MDOT. It was also discussed that there were reservations of weather or not MDOT would consider reviewing an additional route.

Mike Blagdon

Don Jones

Sean Rafter

M Rafter will set in for Sean until he returns.

ii. Analysis of viable non-build alterations and the recommendation of a timeline for immediate implementation.

Seaver Leslie

Steve Jerrett

???

“Paul explained to the Committee that he would like not to be on either of the two subcommittees so he can maintain, I’m going to be moving in another direction, and that is direct contact with MDOT, and right now I have contact with them three times a week”. Paul would like to monitor the realignments that there working on. “Quite frankly I would like to be involved in this realignment process”.

V. Other Business

James Hammond. James discussed with the Committee his concerns with the process and existing routes. James Forwarded and explained a route that has been presented to the MDOT.

VI. Adjournment @ 6:45pm.