



Transportation-Land Use Innovations: Gateway 1 and the Gorham East-West Corridor

Presentations by:

Kat Fuller, AICP, Chief of Planning, MaineDOT;

Paul Godfrey, PE, HNTB;

Professor Evan Richert, AICP, USM;

Joseph A. Stevens, Esq., Perkin's Olson, PA

***Northern New England Chapter of the
American Planning Association
Annual Meeting held in
Belfast, Maine
September 24 and 25, 2009***



Innovations

- Corridor Preservation Planning in Mid-Coast Maine involving 20 towns, SPO, DOT, FHWA
 - Includes Land Use and Transportation strategies to affect a desired future
- Corridor Connections Planning between Portland and Gorham involving x towns, MTA, MaineDOT
 - Piloting PACTS land use policy
- Importance of
 - Defining Measures of Effectiveness
 - Inter-local Agreements
 - Public Private Partnerships



Gateway 1

- 5 years ago: Mounting Tension
- Decision making model disconnected
- Interlocal impacts not considered
- Need for common ground
- Establish partnership approach at ground zero
 - Agreement on problems, scope of work, public and planning process



Gateway 1

- Define problem(s) first
- Understand driving forces
 - From demographics & economics to values & attitudes
- Determine plausible futures
- Define how success will be measured
- Determine what land use pattern will work and whether it will 'sell'



Gateway 1

- Determine Capacity and Need for each town
- Define Local and State Actions
- Outline incentives for action
- Seek formation of mpo-like coalition
 - 2 stages
 - Sharing state decision-making authority if local actions are taken
- Status –
 - Interim Technical Advisor on Board
 - X towns have signed “Start Up Agreement”



Gorham East-West Corridor

- Similar approach,
 - smaller geography
 - different problems
- MaineDOT built phase I bypass under old planning model;
 - phase II need tbd
- MTA and MaineDOT partnership with 4 communities and PACTS (MPO)
- Partnership involves agreement on scope and process as in Gateway 1
- Status:
 - Baseline conditions begin assessed



Measures of Effectiveness

Why they worked for Gateway 1



Typical Corridor Study MOE's

- **Transportation focused**
 - Level of Service (LOS)
 - Delays
 - Vehicle miles traveled (VMT)
 - Vehicle hours traveled (VHT)



Gateway 1 MOE's

- Combination of “hard”
Transportation measures AND
“softer” Quality of Life
Measures
- Focused on G-1 Plan goal of
sustaining mobility, preserving
scenic views, and connecting
communities



Transportation MOE's

- Vehicle Miles Traveled (1 & 90)
- Local Road traffic change
- LOS on Routes 1 & 90
- Transit Ridership
- Walkability
- Bikeability



Land Use MOE's

- Job and Retail Accessibility
- EMS Response
- Housing and Jobs in Core Growth Areas
- Rural land consumed
- Habitat acres developed



Quality of Life MOE's

- Viewshed Impacts
- Miles of Commercial Strip Development



Transferability of MOE's:

Gorham East West Corridor Study

- Similar type MOE's anticipated
- Focus on Transportation AND Land Use/Quality of Life
- Use/modify Gateway 1 MOE's to match



Gateway 1 Corridor Coalition



Institution Building Process

- Long-Term Mechanism needed
- Models Evaluated
- Details of the Gateway 1 Corridor Coalition
- Getting There
- Function and Structure

As revised by Steering Committee Dec. 3, 2008; rev Dec. 12, 2008 AIA Subcommittee, p 1 of 3
DESIGN OF A UNIFIED CORRIDOR ENTITY FOR GATEWAY 1: FUNCTIONS

OPTIONS – SELECT ONE BOX PER ROW						
FUNCTIONS (What do we want the entity to do?)	FUNCTIONS (What do we want the entity to do?)		FUNCTIONS (What do we want the entity to do?)			
	Yes	No	Yes, aimed at local & regional levels	Yes, aimed at state level	Yes, aimed at state and local & regional levels	No, leave to existing entities (Friends of Mid-Coast Maine, land trusts, chambers of commerce, etc.)
Education and outreach to Corridor municipalities and citizens, state agencies	Begin in yrs 1-2					
Gateway 1 advocacy (for implementing funds, legislation when required, implementation of local and state actions, etc.)	Yes, aimed at local & regional levels				Begin in yrs 1-2	
Political advocacy (for causes – economic dev, growth management, transportation systems, conservation, etc.)	Yes, in Route 1 corridor only	Yes, within and outside of Route 1 corridor	No			
Technical assistance to municipalities to help implement Gateway 1 actions	Yes, primarily through model documents	Yes, with model documents and customized assistance to individual towns or groups of towns	Yes, with pass-through grants to municipalities		Yes, using a combination of these approaches Begin in yrs 1-2	No, keep primary responsibility with State and RPCs, as at present
Transportation planning functions, including capital improvement planning (excl safety, bridges, maint.)	Yes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> primarily periodic updates of long-term Gateway 1 Plan 	Yes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> periodic updates of Gateway 1 Plan, plus other regional planning studies 	Yes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> periodic updates of Gateway 1 Plan, plus other studies of transportation needs for possible inclusion in 		No, keep these functions with MainedOT and RPCs, as at present	

DESIGN OF A UNIFIED CORRIDOR ENTITY FOR GATEWAY 1: STRUCTURE

OPTIONS – SELECT <u>ONE</u> BOX PER ROW						
STRUCTURAL ELEMENTS	Single body	Federation of sub-regions (each sub-region forms its own entity, and these form an umbrella corridor federation)	Single body with sub-regional committees appointed by Board of Directors of Corridor entity	Single body with sub-regional committees concurrently appointed by municipalities		
Role of Sub-Regional Committees	None – N/A	Sub-regional committees serve as liaisons for local level planning, technical assistance, recommendations for transportation improvements	Sub-regional committees serve as liaisons for local level planning, technical assistance, recommendations for transportation improvements; provide annual evaluations to Board of progress on plan and Board performance	Sub-regional committees (1) serve as liaisons for local level planning, technical assistance, recommendations for transportation improvements; (2) assist in working out impasses between sub-regions	Sub-regional committees (1) serve as liaisons for local level planning, technical assistance, recommendations for transportation improvements; (2) assist in working out impasses between sub-regions; and (3) able to challenge Board decisions (would need to specify circumstances, threshold no. of sub-regions)	Autonomous sub-regional entities with own authority, federated at corridor level
Sub-Regional Boundaries	None	By RPC boundaries (with minor modifications as needed)	By Service Center territory (defined by common Labor Market Area)	By topographic and other natural and physical boundaries	Self-selected by contiguous municipalities based on factors they choose; at least 3 communities per sub-	



Private/Public Agreements and the Development Process



Public/Private Agreements

- Helps implement Plans
- Address/solve issues beyond scope of zoning or ordinances
- Advantages of entering into P/PA
- Types of P/PA
- Recent Cases and Articles



Websites

- www.gateway1.org
- [www.state.me.us/mdot/mlrc/
stpa-doc.php](http://www.state.me.us/mdot/mlrc/stpa-doc.php)



Q&A/Comments