

**Gorham East-West Corridor
Feasibility Study Workshop
January 7, 2010, 4pm – 8pm
USM Wishcamper Center, Portland, Maine**

Presenters:

Paul Godfrey, HNTB
Evan Richert, AICP

Attending:

Liz Hertz, State Planning Office; Sanda Mowery, Gorham; Mike Phinney, Gorham; David Cole, Gorham; Burleigh Loveitt, Gorham; Tom Coward, South Portland; Tex Haueser, South Portland; Wayne Newbegin, Standish; James Libby, Buxton; Dan Bacon, Scarborough; Rob Sanford, USM; Alex Jaegerman, Portland; Molly Just, Westbrook; John Duncan. PACTS; Rebecca Schaffner-Tousignant, GPCOG; Steve Linnell, GPCOG; Bruce Hyman, Growsmart/Bicycle Coalition/Portland Trails; Gerry Audibert, MaineDOT; Sara Devlin, Maine Turnpike Authority; Conrad Welzel, Maine Turnpike Authority; Kevin Hooper, Hooper Associates; Charlie Colgan, Muskie School; Essek Petrie, HNTB; Andrea D'Amato, HNTB; Ray Faucher. HNTB; Carol Morris, Morris Communications.

Slides referenced can be viewed in the PowerPoint for this meeting.

Meeting began at 4:11pm

Paul Godfrey:

I'd like to go around and have everyone introduce themselves. *Audience members briefly introduce themselves.* As we go through the presentation tonight, please don't be shy about your questions. You'll see a lot of data the first 45 minutes that you will find very relevant to the discussion that Evan will follow up with later on.

In terms of agenda, I'll start out with a brief reminder of study measures of effectiveness, or MOEs. I'll go over the results of the future low density analysis. What do things look like in 2035? Is it good, or is it bad? Evan will then assist with the discussion, continuing on from the first workshop, on which alternative pattern you'd like to test. We are looking for an open discussion on choosing this pattern.

Q: What does low density mean?

Paul: It's the future no-build, or how things evolve without major influence. It is assuming the same path as today.

Measures of Effectiveness: MOEs help us determine whether the proposed land use / transportation strategies would meet the study Purpose & Need. It contains a lot of good information about what we are trying to accomplish. The MOEs we have to date are on your handout. We want them to be quantifiable to take out the guesswork. Can we measure it? Does it make things better, worse, or the same? We think it's very important to include quality of life measures and to incorporate them into the process. If these measures need to change, if we find others that will work based on existing data, we will adopt them.

Draft MOE summary chart: This shows how we begin to assess the different strategies we're looking at. We will compare the future with this chart, which shows today. We will begin to fill this in during subsequent meetings with you and the public. As we get into the assessment and testing of the alternative land use pattern, we'll use it. Which ones give us the good, double green dots? It gives us a good sense of how the strategies compare to one another. We have reams of information and have analyzed a lot of data. This will show us the story.

Before go on, I know it would be very easy to start solving problems from looking at this. We ask you to look at the problems and not to jump to solutions. Unearth the true story. The Sensible Transportation Policy Act requires us to evaluate everything fully. We also want to make sure we understand the how a land use strategy helps address our issues before we move ahead with it.

Summary of 2035 results:

- 22 out of 47 intersections analyzed at LOS E/F (up from 7 intersections)
- 17 of 116 miles of roadway at LOS E/F (up from 4 miles)
- No relief to 61 high crash locations
- Vehicle Hours Traveled (VHT) growing twice as fast as Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)

Jumping right in, we see many undesirable levels of service, increasing crashes, and lots of congestion and/or delay in trying to avoid congestion.

Intersection level of service map: The graphic shows the level of service at the 47 intersections analyzed, today and in the future. Notice five intersections with undesirable levels of service. In downtown Gorham, the bypass provides relief but in the future, it will go back to undesirable levels of service as we see additional traffic make it impossible for vehicles to get to the bypass.

PM peak hour LOS map: We have four colors on the map indicating level of service. This shows all the state routes today, with few poor levels of service. But as we move to 2035, you see color changes. The overlap is larger. We see the effect of peak hour increase.

High crash location map: These are represented by the little fuzzy dot or the red segment. In the future these will be challenges if we do not intervene.

Summary of VHT/VMT: VMT growth will be much higher on residential roads. Residential means local or minor collectors. People are living along them. So VMT is higher here than on other roads. VHT growth, study-area-wide, is 50%. VHT is also higher on residential roads.

Comment: We're finding the state is increasing the move to shift maintenance and repair costs to the municipalities. The more we increase traffic on the local roads, the worse the funding crisis.

Paul: Well-stated. Also, people are building homes on roads and then finding it's no longer a residential road at some point. It's a byproduct of congestion – people trying to find the fastest way. To what degree can we offset this so communities don't have to fix it?

2035 results summary:

- Sizeable change in volumes on all roads
- Miles of residential roads carrying >200 vph increased from 32 to 47 (47%)
- Travel delays along key corridors increased
- Transit ridership increased 26%, but primarily due to assumed increases in service and extension of services
- Walkability/Bikeability increase similar to transit ridership

So, sizable changes on all roads. 200 VPH is a threshold. A road changes character when it reaches over 2000 cars per day. Multiply what you have in peak hour by ten to get daily volume. When we see residential roads carrying greater than that, we ask if we really want that traffic on that particular road. There are opportunities to develop good mode choice. Let's think about how to ratchet this up.

Carol: A 26% increase in transit is not a lot, given how small the initial number is.

PM peak hour volume change map: The green lines show volume increases, with the largest increases on primary routes like the Turnpike and I-95. Most state routes are in the middle on the volume scale. It is somewhat proportional.

Residential road PM peak hour volume map: The red shows those already carrying over 200 VPH. In 2035, see the changes, if you look at the upper corner in Westbrook, in Gorham, in Scarborough. It's not as dramatic as we'd thought. When we look at what they're carrying today...we see most are carrying greater than 200 already! Do we want this volume?

Summary of corridor travel delays: We have picked some origins and destinations and looked at travel times. Seeing some increasing times. Double-digit increases in travel times for 6 – 8 mile trips is a concern.

Transit and multi-modal summary: This gives ridership figures. The general trend is even though we have increases, numbers are modest. How can we make these 2035 numbers substantial? How can we add benefit to the transport network, for example with walk / bike increases? This will be more of a focus when we look at alternative land use patterns.

Walkability: Walkable means a distance of a quarter-mile or less. It's mapped by TAZ, or Traffic Analysis Zone. Generally, we see these go along with what we expect. When we get out into rural areas, TAZs are less walkable.

Q: How did you get those numbers?

Paul: We looked at all trips within a TAZ and measured those which are a quarter-mile or less.

Q: What if you double that? People are willing to walk further than a quarter-mile.

Paul: It's not set in stone. But rather than just change the metric, we want to increase the number of people walking. The charge is understanding and focusing on certain things. So, how do we get things to go to yellow, to get people to walk more.

Bikeability: When we fast forward to 2035, we get increases, generally modest. The threshold is trips of two miles or less. In 2035, we have some TAZs doing better: South Portland, Gorham, Westbrook.

Q: Why does the walkability and bikeability improve in the future if you don't change anything?

Paul: There are simply more trips in 2035. It's a function of more people, so more of every kind of trip.

2035 results summary: More data, more homes, more jobs, in absolute numbers. We also look at how many homes are in a given community. We look at job and retail access. How can we do better? Where do we want to do it? With all the new housing units in this study area, it comprises 9,200 acres, a land area of about 15 sq miles. Where do we put that? Do we want all that? On the jobs side, we have 370 additional commercial acres. With EMS access, because of the greater numbers of homes, overall in the study area, we see a slight decline. If we do certain things, to what degree can we change these percentages?

Job accessibility: Red indicates low job access, or how far it is between homes and jobs within a TAZ. It gets to be less in rural areas. Fast forward to 2035, some improvement but again, do we want to increase this?

Q: What's the criteria for job accessibility?

Paul: Kevin, can you handle that one?

Kevin: The formula that's used is: numerator is the number of jobs with denominator being the distance. So in this TAZ, we are close to a lot of jobs, here in downtown Portland. This takes into account both distance from jobs and number of jobs.

Comment: So the basic concept is, if you are near a lot of jobs, you have high accessibility. If you have to travel, it's low.

Paul: Yes. Where do you want to concentrate your growth in the alternative pattern? What is your end product? Hopefully, we can ID more areas where we can have both housing and jobs close together.

Carol: Another way to look at it is that if you move to a place that has high job accessibility, it means you have a better chance of finding a job close to where you live.

Paul: *Retail accessibility*: This is proximity of housing units and retail services. Out to 2035, it gets a little better but for the most part, if you are out to the west, you have lower access. People are driving in a long ways to get to retail. Do we want to change this? We can measure it. Is retail important to us?

Acres consumed: The residential acres consumed: 9,200. Right now, a large concentration is in Scarborough: 6,500 acres. That's a lot. Where are those going to go?

MOE summary table: We've now added dots to indicate how we believe the 2035 low density model compares to today. It reads from left to right. *Reads slide categories*.

Q: While I understand job access and retail access are important, and improve, they're offset by the increase in VHT.

Paul: Yes. That is correct. There will be good data behind all of this. This is just a quick view.

Evan: In context, it is good to understand that if you're dealing with a confined area, both growth in that area and decentralization in that area gives certain benefits. As you decentralize, modest numbers of jobs access increases. There may be a cost to that but those things do improve. Decentralization can be a strategy.

Q: It is a work in progress. Could there be more MOEs?

Paul: Yes. This is not done yet. The study team wants to look at other things that could yield additional MOEs. If you see things that should be added or subtracted, do let us know.

Q: Looking at your dots, what does "varies" vs. "varies widely" mean?

Carol: It means the results were spotty, and were better in some locations and worse in others.

Paul: Questions about what you've seen so far?

Bruce: I'd like to see a little more broad inclusiveness of safety. Right now it's auto-centric. I'd like to see walkability and bikeability changed to trip potential. Also, how strong of an indicator is accessibility in terms of livability? Back to the last workshop, the four Ds were important. I want MOEs that relate to density, with more thought to the other Ds.

Paul: We are looking to break out pedestrian and bike safety. What I hear you saying is, let's talk about safety more.

Bruce: If we had 1000 trips within a quarter-mile distance before and have more now, it doesn't mean it is more "walkable."

Carol: Are you talking about measuring pedestrian and bike improvements?

Paul: I like the density suggestion.

Bruce: It's not just residences per TAZ.

Q: How are the TAZs designated?

Kevin: Census tracts and block groups. You want the TAZs to be relatively uniform in nature so that in downtown Portland, a TAZ might be street blocks. As you get further out, TAZs are larger, bounded by natural features.

Evan: We are somewhat data-limited. In rural areas, geography is just large.

Kevin: A TAZ can be subdivided. As you get into hinterlands, numbers don't mean all that much.

Comment: The last time we looked at habitat maps. That should be an MOE.

Paul: We are working on that, trying to identify growth by TAZ and where it would go. To what degree will development make an impact?

It's a work in progress. Habitats are very relevant, speaking to the environment. I'm going to hand over to Evan now.

Evan Richert:

Alternative land use patterns, to date:

- Workshop 1: Reviewed and discussed four possible regional land use patterns
- Outcome: Four *revised* patterns
- Evan and Study Team combined to two:
 - Urban-to-Rural
 - Suburban Community-Centered Corridor
- Other two Land Use patterns considered "Best Practices" to be applied to final selected alternative Land Use Pattern

We felt that we needed a workshop with key people in the study area to help identify and choose the alternative land use pattern to test. We could have done it on our own and it would have been wrong because we don't have all the information. We wanted to convene people "in the know" in their communities – those with physical and political knowledge. Tonight's outcome will be a recommendation for the Advisory and Steering Committees.

October 29, we held the first workshop. We only vaguely defined the scenarios - patterns. We broke into groups to talk about them and got four revised patterns. We then began to allocate homes and jobs to parts of the region. The Steering Committee decided on two distinct patterns. The other two patterns got incorporated into those patterns as best practices. The job for you is to guide us into which of these two to choose. It could be a hybrid. The goal is to test just one alternative. We have to create a pretty assertive but realistic test of the land use.

Molly: How does the second to last paragraph in the handout document relate to what you said? Is the Urban to Rural scenario off the table?

Evan: No. We are building up from the Suburban Community Centered Corridor pattern. That is the baseline. We really have two factors: the test pattern must be different than low density, and it must be plausible.

Alex: In the scope of services, will we only test one alternative?

Evan: Yes.

Bruce: How is the choice of land use impacting the range of transportation options? If we do Suburban Community Centered Corridors, the Mountain Division (rail line) cannot be tested. What is the relation between land use and transportation?

Evan: We don't know without running the test.

David: It does seem to me that we can test a lot of things that would be great in utopia. If there is a zero chance of it happening, it's a waste of money.

Evan: You guys can also tweak this.

Comment: I want to know what it would take from a reorganization of land use to make it plausible? Don't constrain the test model too much at the outset.

Evan: That's why we want to get your input. One future is that the number of failing intersections will triple. 9,000 acres of rural land consumed. This is the kind of future were looking at.

Comment: The thing to remember is that the status quo is what we're comparing to. The recommendation should be different than that.

Evan: Yes. That's a good floor to start from. Make it different from the low density scenario.

Allocating jobs and housing: One way to look at is to ask what the trends in growth in the subregions are and then how can we modify the trends? Then, how do we allocate growth within a given community? We have some rules for this unless you tell us differently. We allocate regionally and within the communities. Later this month, town planners will be fine-tuning this to the town & TAZ level. That will be what Kevin Hooper will test.

Alternative pattern #1: Urban-to-Rural:

- Core urban communities retain a high share of jobs and dramatically increase their share of residential growth
- Inner suburbs stabilize at existing trend for both (slight increase in jobs) and create denser, multimodal clusters

- Outer suburbs stabilize jobs but get a much smaller share of residential growth than in Low Density

The Urban-to-Rural pattern reverses the longtime trend. The charts in your hands give you a sense of the numbers.

Urban centers have 65% of the jobs. The inner suburbs have 29%. In the low density scenario, we see decentralization. Housing-wise, urban growth dropped in 2009. The trend is for urban areas to have 29% of growth, inner suburbs 45%, outer suburbs 26%. By 2035, urban areas only capture 10% of new housing, inner suburbs over half, outer suburbs nearly 40%. We have vast decentralization. This alternative reverses that.

Q: Are we still decentralizing to some extent?

Evan: Yes.

Alternative pattern #2: Suburban CCC:

- Core urban communities cede some job shares but halt loss of residential shares
- Inner suburbs significantly increase their share of jobs vs trend, capture higher share of suburban residential growth (from outer suburbs), create denser, multi-modal clusters
- Outer suburbs stabilize jobs and reduce their share of residential growth to 1990-2000 levels

Jobwise, here we have urban areas with 50% of the new jobs, inner suburbs with 45%, outer with 5%. In some ways, this means the job-rich areas get more residential. Residential growth numbers: urban 20% of homes, inner suburbs get a 55% share, outer would get 25%. There is a chart at the end of this with these numbers.

A pattern for best practice as suggested at the previous working session in October: Sub-regional balance:

- Growth of housing and jobs will be allocated regionally in order to try to create a strong jobs / housing balance in all regions
- This needs to be part of the ultimate fine-tuning of allocations by town planners

We will do this in any scenario – work towards jobs / housing balance.

Another pattern for best practice: Greenbelt development:

- This pattern suggests placement of new development based on principle of maximizing identified green and open space
- Can be integrated into any development pattern

First, figure out what should not be developed in terms of open space, woodland, farmland, etc., and then allocate growth. That's how most of us plan now.

How to make it happen: Whenever you depart from trend, even when you look at energy prices, aging demographics, etc, it is not easy to flatten a trend. What is the public's appetite for intervention? Oil is starting to go back up and we can concoct a future where the rules of the game change.

Possible incentives/regulations to drive allocation:

- Aid for new or enhanced sewer, water infrastructure
 - Density bonuses
 - Transit investments
 - Transit-oriented developments
 - TIF districts
-
- Strong rural zoning
 - Stronger growth boundaries
 - Regional Transfer of Development Rights program
 - Regional zoning

Measures could include regulation at the local and regional level, stronger rural zoning, stronger growth boundaries, rights programs so you can compensate land owners, and regional zoning. Some of these things would have to happen.

Q: What are density bonuses?

Evan: At the community level, you allow for development of certain growth areas in the community. Orono has a serious density bonus program, with a multiple of four times of allowable density in some areas.

Q: So there are real winners and losers with land owners?

Evan: There's a lot of innovation in this area. Scarborough, South Portland, and Gorham have all enacted transfer development programs. Those do nothing to take away any existing rights from landowners. Our judgment is that they will do very little to alter the pattern. It does not penalize. If you create a system of winners and losers, you try to compensate the losers.

So, which alternative should we test?

- *The pattern tested should be reality-based, yet demonstrate sufficient change to potentially make a difference*
- *Selection of the alternative pattern is not an endorsement of this pattern; it is for testing purposes only*

Discussion Topics:

- Evaluate perceived potential public tolerance of needed incentives and land use regulations
- Balance the above against apparent need for major transportation interventions
- Balance both against perceived public desire to maintain area rural qualities
- What is the public willing to trade to maintain rural qualities? To keep city centers vital?

Paul: What if we tested the extremes in jobs and dwelling units? To what level are you comfortable? Is it better to see how far we can push?

Evan: Are you suggesting two tests?

Paul: No, but we can look at different traffic levels. Certain things I am comfortable interpreting from a transportation perspective.

Evan: Can we extrapolate without further testing?

Paul: Yes.

Evan: We've reviewed a lot of literature from the last 15 – 20 yrs. We can say if we go 20% farther, we can make things "X" much better. The 4D paradigm internally capture rates, density here and at the point of origin. If we use the test as a reference point.

Paul: I want to alleviate fears.

Evan: *Refers to suggested allocations in jobs and housing for urban areas, inner suburbs, and outer suburbs.* This chart gives you a sense.

Carol: Now we're looking for everyone's thoughts about what to test. What are your concerns and questions?

Evan: To what degree do the low density projections move the political plausibility bar?

Carol: Once we do a test and the test shows making land use changes improves things...could that improve political will?

Q: What do we do next?

Evan: Starting from the parameters given for the Suburban CCC pattern in terms of job and housing allocation, how far are you willing to move?

Continued: Are we doing this discussion as a group of 30 people?

Evan: Yes.

Q: Is the dwelling unit growth distributed within community compact growth nodes?

Evan: Well, what's the real difference between the Urban-to-Rural and the Suburban CCC? Within communities, in both cases the intent is core growth areas that are multimodal friendly, and increasing the possibility of transit. That's true under either case. Beyond that, the Suburban CCC still allows a lot of decentralized growth. The Urban-to-Rural is only 20% decentralized. We think that over the last 40 years, well over 60% of housing growth has been outside of designated growth areas.

Burleigh: Are you looking for what works politically?

Evan: Yes, with a caveat: what is the edge of plausibility?

Continued: For the areas in greater Portland with in-place water and sewer it makes a lot of sense. Too bad that Portland loses residences to the outside. With some attention Portland has nice livable residential dense areas. Politically, that's very appealing. In outlying areas like Gorham, the infrastructure or lack thereof dictates. The

Standish prototype is an example. This fits Gorham. People hate willy-nilly development. Mixed use is very palatable to the political will and the individual.

Evan: Compact growth nodes means 6-15 units per acre in urban areas, 4-12 in rural areas.

Continued: Westbrook is an emerging market with an artificially low history of housing.

Evan: I think you're right there.

Tex: In South Portland and Portland, we have denser areas, areas zoned for multifamily where we're willing to consider multifamily zones and increased density. Politically, I don't see us moving from single family to multifamily use. From 10 units per acre and up is ok. Our problem is we don't have separated sewers. We have trouble with storm water discharge. We can't put it into combined sewers.

Evan: For this test, let's not limit ourselves by the dollars are available today. We can make a funding argument.

Tex: We have tremendous support for bike- and walkability. We are excited about meshing our plan with whatever comes out. We have dropped the ball on sprawl development. We should have been doing more dense development. The result is great support for denser development. Our problem is we don't have much left to develop. We can do infills and some redevelopment. There is more political support for pulling development our way instead of spreading out further. That trend will continue.

Comment: In our case, we don't have vacant land. It's tear down and put up new.

Comment: We are trying to keep things from being developed.

Molly: Speaking for Westbrook, we are quite unique, with a self-sustaining downtown and suburbs and exurbs. There are areas not served by public water and sewer. Looking at the Urban-to-Rural for Westbrook, in terms of jobs to housing, 65/35 is ideal for us. When you go to 50/20, we are a ghost town. Not what we want to see. Westbrook is committed to density.

Evan: And here's where we work with Windham, Standish, Gorham to divert housing and fulfill your vision.

David: You have widespread agreement with the concept. The key question is what level and the next level after that.

Evan: I propose more time for impressions and initial thoughts. When you feel you've gotten that on the table, let's operationalize with the numbers, using the suggested allocations slide as a floor.

Wayne: Out of the four, the first alternative had to do with getting the public involved. You have to do this – if they buy in you can get the bonds and take care of some of the incentives. If you don't get the large landowners involved, it's bad. Three years ago, we cut down to 85 building permits per year.

Even: That's very constructive information.

Alex: I would like to go for the more robust test. Can Portland absorb this level of growth? I'd like to share: Portland has a policy of sharing regional population as housing policy. We are on the losing end of the trend line. What does Portland have in place now for planning and zoning? I did promote an infill multifamily amendment and got beat up. Single family infill was ok, multifamily was not. We have the areas for growth – areas where there are no residential limitations. Portland is well situated for elder or for single-person but multifamily? I found that we do have some vacant land. More multifamily means we don't have to change the rules, we have to change the trends. We have the policy, the plan, the zoning in place. I was pleased to realize, not just politically, that we are urging growth to come our way and we already have land use policy in effect. Capacity exists. Sewers are a factor. We don't have the best schools. A school policy is needed for growth. Bottom line, it's good for the region if my city has a healthy core. We don't want to take it away from any other community but there's only so much growth to go around. If we test a less aggressive version, I'd rather test a tipping point...get the economic benefit.

Evan: My conclusion based on what I'm hearing is that Portland, South Portland and Westbrook, with a proper upgrade of infrastructure, have the land base and will to retain and achieve a stronger share of the region's housing. It is technically possible.

Burleigh: Gorham has 200 units currently in approval stage, another 500 developing.

Evan: 500 units per year on average is the estimated growth for each of the three cities.

Alex: At that pace of growth, it does not seem radical even though it's bigger than trend. That would not overwhelm us. This is a natural growth rate.

Evan: Given the land base and political will in those three cities, we can do a strong test. How important is it to have political will in the suburbs to do things to deflect the growth from them? Dave has argued that is important. From the three cities' point-of-view, what are the kinds of things you'd think of? Either you create magnets or walls. Do you see that as necessary? Or possible?

David: Gorham has 200 units in the pipeline. Many times residential units don't pay their own way. The housing question may be more palatable. The jobs question is more delicate. Some of the communities have growth caps now.

Evan: Scarborough has a growth cap.

David: The question is what does it take to achieve it?

Evan: Would this property owner of 30 acres be willing to accept 30 homes there?

Continued: What does it take to do it? If what it takes is so disagreeable, what good is it for us? If it's on the outer edge of doable, can you talk about it? Tell me what I have to do to and then go on to the next level.

Evan: To get to the Suburban CCC pattern, inner suburbs have to do very little. The organization inside the community must be stepped up. Scarborough, Gorham, and Standish have already taken steps. You have to enhance it. Deflecting growth from rural to growth corridors. Stronger rural zoning. Transfer of development credits program. Or making those corridors so attractive that that's where developers want to go. Or growth caps.

Comment: Looking at the suggested allocation, Urban-to-Rural is an improvement to status quo while it also focuses density where there is infrastructure.

Evan: Yes. Either of these require some significant changes in the market. Energy prices, aging demographics or determination from outer suburbs to get down to a lower share. This requires reigning things in. That's not a small task. Portland could say, Standish, we'll pay you for housing: transfer of development rights program.

Alex: But that adds costs to developing in Portland.

Evan: If this becomes an important transportation mitigation action, why not spend \$5000 per unit to shift homes vs. a million per mile to upgrade road? I'm pressing this because it's what you have to do to get there. A lot has to do with the outer suburbs accepting and implementing actions that slow down the rates of growth they've experienced the last 40 years.

Q: For Standish, do you want to grow as fast as trend is taking you? Portland is strong at trend. But I wonder about communities that are moving from rural to more suburban. Maybe the carrot is letting them choose what they want.

Evan: There is one policy answer, another for rural landowners.

David: Incentives. Gorham is taking a different tact. Overlays have gotten us more dense growth. I suggest that we use a free market approach to corral growth. Gorham is trying to do that. One reason Gorham and other burbs have developed a lot is that they're the only areas where inexpensive land is available. We should incentivize in the American tradition of people doing the right thing as opposed to legislative requirements. In Gorham, it won't fly. People do have land investments. But most people are not holding onto their land to get wealthy. Most people are generous with their land. Gorham is glad to help Portland with housing units.

Rob: It's a push – pull. Every community has something that pulls and things that push away. Sometimes we cancel other communities out. Let's do regional planning. If you have a push from suburbs, using incentives or other programs can help the pull. Articulate what the push and pull is and regionally coordinate. For example, should we have regional policy on tripling density?

Evan: Some of the communities are closer with established policy than I realized. Standish and Scarborough have a building cap. That works both for regional and internal distribution. Gorham and Scarborough have incentive overlay districts. Portland is zoned for growth...the wall to climb may not be as high as I envisioned.

Dan: With Scarborough, we have a building cap. We are happy to give some residential to cities. We want to keep jobs high enough for property taxes. That's where it looks like the suburban scenario is better. If commercial was closer to housing, Scarborough would be more comfortable with our current property tax situation. My other comment – the costs of extending sewer and water out is a big component. The Urban-to-Rural is less costly to the region. Fewer locations where utilities need to be extended. I support that with a bump in jobs or holding steady for inner suburbs.

Evan: Yes, the Suburban CCC pattern holds you steady.

Jim: Looking at Urban-to-Rural, I like the push-pull analogy. When I think of Buxton and our growth, people like to build and it's easy to build out our way. From what I hear in this room, it has a lot to do with infrastructure. Tax rates – ours is less than 10 mils. That's a pull. In the next three years though, reduction impacts our schools.

Evan: Growth caps tend to be leapfroggers. Now, look at a hybrid of the Urban-to-Rural to test but with a greater job allocation than 30% to the suburbs to better match the housing. Drop the 65% urban jobs. How about some ceding of jobs to suburban nodes, at least in the inner suburbs?

Molly: I think our goal for tonight is to focus on one alternative. I feel like we've done that. This is a suggestion or request. You guys go back and study the Urban-to-Rural. We know who and what we're talking about. Look at the numbers. I feel like we've had huge progress tonight.

Evan: I want to walk out of here with a good sense of where we are for the Advisory Committee – I want to say, here's what we will test. We are getting there. David Cole has issued strong cautions.

David: I am comfortable with those hybrid allocations. The real question is, what do we do if we like the numbers. I am fine if we give a little more job growth to suburbs and then just test.

Molly: My angst is the urban areas don't gain any jobs.

Evan: These are shares of growth. You do gain job. At a 50% share, you gain over 12,000 jobs.

Molly: But our share remains the same. It feels the same but we have more housing.

Evan: You get three times the amount as you do under low density.

Tex: I understand where she's coming from. If you want to reduce traffic, keep jobs near housing. From 65% to 60% in urban areas is arbitrary. This is a great discussion tonight. Maybe a little historic, in terms of a regional discussion about potentially doable things. It's significant that the gentleman from Buxton is here. Buxton has to be part of the region, they have to be comfortable.

Evan: Endorsing this in a policy is way is down the road.

Alex: With our situation in Portland – our tax rate is the highest – we are the service center for the region – the jobs are critical for our economic base. If we are not hemorrhaging jobs – the 5% reduction – is it the right message to send? It generally operates to the detriment of the downtown. I am troubled by the 5% - I want to push back on that due to the fiscal strain. We feel it worse. Our tax rate is as high as anyone's and our stressors are higher than most.

Evan: I would say that there is something to be said for improving the job / housing balance at sub regional levels. You are job-rich – not a bad thing. Your taxpayer cost is high because your daytime population is so much higher than your nighttime population. I don't want to weaken Portland or Lewiston or Bangor. At the same time, it may help to right that jobs / housing balance.

Burleigh: I move for consensus to study the Urban-to-Rural as we have it on the slide.

Paul: My perspective is that modeling the difference between a 65/30 to 60/35 jobs / housing ratio *will* make a difference. From a transportation perspective, 60/35 will yield something better. How much, I don't know. When we try to do a jobs/ housing balance it is better from transport perspective. Part of this is a transportation study. If the region and state can save money on transport, we can use it elsewhere.

Comment: If more jobs are near housing, there are less transportation costs.

Paul: Yes. We are looking to do this in new centers. We already know this is a better benefit.

Q: For clarification, do the inner burbs have a desire for more jobs to balance housing or to have fiscal benefits?

Dan: In Scarborough it is because of property tax. Scarborough doesn't want just any jobs but jobs with higher wages, so Scarborough residents can be in Scarborough. Our growth is lower-wage jobs. One of our goals is professional office and other uses.

Molly: Let me repeat something I thought I heard. I think you said Scarborough needs a higher jobs ratio or to hold steady. 30% is holding steady.

Evan: That keeps their regional job share.

Alex: What's interesting is that the only time we do regional planning is related to transportation. It's interesting to have the conversation about regional balance. My ears are open on this. I can sell this. If each community looks out for their own self interest, it's a political impasse. We need to keep an open mind and not be defensive. Great conversation. I am not quite ready to give up 5% of Portland quite yet.

Carol: Can this be resolved at the planners' meeting?

John: No!

Charlie Colgan: We had not built into the base case a change in the distribution of jobs over time as we did with housing. The reason is that census data is not geo-located. There is no trend data to get to the TAZ level. It is possible to develop a trend at the town level, though. I could do some testing on 65/30 to see what past jobs trends have been. Trend has been movement away from central cities and to inner suburbs because most of the jobs created are land-intensive. You need parking, office buildings, etc. You'd need substantial amounts of change in the way companies invest in jobs. We can resolve this if we do a little more work on the recent trends in last decade. I hear a lot about the fiscal concerns. I do understand.

However, if today's fiscal concerns are still around 2035, forget my whole forecast!

Evan: There is a motion for consensus on the Urban-to-Rural pattern as it stands and another to look at local data on recent trends (the 60/35 jobs/housing ration). Two motions. We need permission from you to move ahead.

Burleigh: I amend the motion to allow 5% either way. Just of the growth.

Audience member seconds the motion.

Evan: Can I get a show of hands on the motion to allow 5% either way?

All audience members agree with this motion. No one opposes.

Evan: Here are the next steps:

- Advisory Committee: January 14th
- Planners Meeting: January 21st
- Public Informational Meeting: February/March
- Analysis of Land Use and Transportation
- Strategies: February – April/May
- Draft Report and Findings: June
- Final Report and Findings: September

Thank you very much.

Meeting adjourned at 7:42pm.