

**Gorham East-West Corridor
Advisory Committee Meeting
January 14, 2010, 1pm – 4pm
Maine Turnpike Authority, Portland, ME**

Presenters:

Paul Godfrey, HNTB
Carol Morris, Morris Communications

Minutes: Kelly Borberg

Advisory Committee members attending: John Duncan, PACTS; Sara Devlin, MTA; Tom Ellsworth, Gorham Economic Development; Barbara Charry, Maine Audubon; Paul Weiss, Sierra Club; Jim Libby, Buxton; Wayne Newbegin, Standish; Alex Jaegerman, Portland; Rick Shinay, MEREDA; Bruce Hyman, GrowSmart, Bicycle Coalition, Maine Trails; Steve Linnell, GPCOG; Rob Sanford, USM; David Knapp, 113 Corridor Committee; Carl Eppich, PACTS; Robbie Moulton, Scarborough Police Department; Rebecca Schaffner, GPCOG, Gerry Audibert, MaineDOT.

Steering Committee members attending: David Cole, Gorham; Burleigh Loveitt, Gorham; Tex Haeuser, South Portland.

Absent: Phil Sauvignon, Dept. of Tourism; Keith Luke, Westbrook Economic Development; Ben Severance, Hollis; Mike Bolduc, Saco; Judy Harris, Portland; Liz Hertz, SPO; Maria Fuentes, MBTA; Julie Basset, Scarborough Economic Development; Warren Knight, Smiling Hill Farm; Ed Clifford, PACTS Transit Committee; Ray Penfold, VIP; Brian Parke, Maine Motor Transport; Anna Price, FHWA; Bob Lefebvre, Metro Chiefs; Sue Moreau, MaineDOT; Richard Rudolph, Rippling Waters Farm; Ann Peoples, State Legislator; Phillip Bartlett, State Legislator; Paul Niehoff; PACTS, Chris Hall, Greater Portland Chamber.

Other Study Team attending : Ray Faucher, HNTB

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

Meeting began at 1:10pm

Sara Devlin:

Thank you all for coming out to the meeting today. We had some committee members who had legislative conflicts today, so at the end

of the meeting we'll discuss a potential new meeting time. Can we go around the room and make introductions? *Committee members introduce themselves.* I'd like to mention we have a new MaineDOT Project Manager, Gerry Audibert, who is taking the place of Mimi Cerveny.

John Duncan:

Let me go over the agenda. Carol will give you an overview of what's happened since September – a lot has gone on in terms of land use planning and thinking. Today we'll talk about the Measures of Effectiveness, or MOEs: how we measure the success and potential of the strategies we'll be considering. Paul will talk to that. We'll go over the results of the low density model, see what the transportation system looks like in 2035 if we don't do anything to change trends during that time. We'll look at an alternative pattern of development – several of us were at the University of Maine meeting last week and had a very exciting regional land use discussion, led by Evan Richert. This is really a fascinating element of this study. At the end, Tex Haeuser looked around and said, "This has been a historic discussion!" It was an excellent meeting.

Carol Morris:

Study progress since September: The committee hasn't met since last September. At that meeting, you finalized the Purpose and Need statement and we presented the baseline land use and transportation data. We also reported on Charlie Colgan's jobs and housing forecast for 2035, in which 60 – 70% of the growth in Maine would be in Cumberland and York Counties. That's a lot of new houses and jobs. Where might we put those? That's in part what this study is all about. What we've done since then is very land use-focused. We have been working with the land use working group, which includes all municipalities from the study area, not just the core, - their planners and municipal officials. Also in that group is about ten members of the Advisory Committee – you may recall I sent out an email asking who wanted to be part of that working group. Since September, we also developed Measures of Effectiveness (MOEs), working with the study team and land use group. These will help us measure if a strategy will satisfy the study Purpose and Need and evaluate which ones work better. As of last week, we have also completed the analysis of the existing low density growth pattern: what happens if we do nothing? As John mentioned, you will see that today.

Review of study process: Based on the Purpose and Need, MOEs help us measure the benefits of each strategy and choose which might be the best solutions. We'll use them to analyze the existing low density pattern. Then, we choose an alternative land use pattern to test. What happens if we put new jobs and housing in different locations? Does this affect our transportation issues? If that does make a difference, then we develop transportation strategies that complement that land use pattern. We will be testing two land use patterns, the low density pattern and the alternative pattern. Once this is completed, and strategies developed for both, we expect final study recommendations by May / June.

Purpose and Need: This is a feasibility study, so we need to remember that we want to have a range of potential solutions for both land use and transportation issues.

Sensible Transportation Policy Act (STPA): Essentially, this Maine law requires us to abide by the things laid out in your handout for transportation planning, capital development, and project decisions. I'd like to point out that number three says preference is given to non-highway new capacity projects before building new highways! We will look at an entire range of solutions before adding new capacity. I want to reiterate that.

No solutions: it will be easy to jump to conclusions when you see the results of the low-density analysis, but let's hold off on that. We are still identifying problems and the STPA requires us to look at all possible options. The MOEs will help us to vet solutions.

Paul Godfrey:

Good afternoon. If you have questions, don't hesitate to ask. Don't be shy about jumping in.

MOEs: Essentially, we need to know if what we propose could make things better, worse, or the same. We look at things we can quantify. More or less traffic, more or less development, jobs to housing balance. We need to be as objective as possible. Again, different than other transportation studies, we try to have a good blend of quality of life measures and transportation measures. We're not done yet, although we have some great feedback. We'll potentially add other MOEs during the process.

Draft summary chart: You'll see this a lot. It's what we're going to use moving forward every time we develop a land use or transportation strategy to understand how it measures against baseline. To quickly understand if we are heading down the right path. You have a handout that shows the MOEs that we have currently developed:

- Level of Service (LOS)
- VMT / VHT
- HCLs
- Roadway Volume Change
- Corridor Delays
- Transit Ridership
- Walkability
- Bikeability
- EMS Distance
- Job Accessibility
- Retail Accessibility
- Acres of Land Consumed
- Housing / Job Ratio
- Viewshed
- Cost

That's our laundry list. Other MOEs could be: better ways of addressing pedestrian / bike safety, looking at density levels. For example, if we want to expand bus service, what density offers opportunities for transit or commuter rail? Habitat: identifying wildlife areas and to what degree do our strategies impact those and open spaces?

Paul Weiss: Have we discussed energy and pollution emissions?

Paul: It is generally considered that Vehicle Hours Traveled and Vehicle Miles Traveled measure pollution from vehicles.

Paul W: Also energy used, oil or otherwise.

Paul: Do you mean to what degree is energy being consumed? What type?

Carol: To decrease oil dependence? We have not factored in alternative energy use.

Paul W: All types of energy.

Paul: We may need to talk about this more.

John: I've been working with the study team on a weekly basis and have seen the evolution of the MOEs and want to say that it's been a pleasure working with the study team. Practically the whole team did the Gateway 1 Study also - so when you say evolving - other MOEs are being considered - it reminds me it is an evolving process.

Low Density: What did we learn? This is a potential snapshot based on existing trends in land use and transportation, barring major intervention. What the world could look like.

Summary of results:

- 22 out of 47 intersections analyzed at level of service E/F (up from 7 intersections)
- 17 of 116 miles of roadway at level of service 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)

These are our key findings - we want to give you a chance to respond to that. VHT and VMT have really caught our eye, because VHT - how long you sit in your car - is growing twice as fast as VMT. Why? People are driving the long way around busy areas to avoid congestion. People will also be sitting in congestion for longer periods of time.

Intersection level of service map: This map shows the 47 intersections we have analyzed. Where do we have undesirable levels of service? The overlap area, downtown Gorham, etc. By 2035, we have more intersections with a poor level of service. As congestion grows, there's more and more traffic.

PM peak hour map: This map shows what the roadway levels of service are. Today we have issues in the overlap section, on Route 114, I-295 and the turnpike. Fast forward and see we have sizable areas that are now at a lower level of service. And areas with lower levels of service have grown, including sections on Routes 1, 302, and 25. The trend continues.

High crash location map: The red dots and lines on this map represent the high crash locations. Red means that by 2035, there's more volume in these locations, meaning potentially more crashes.

Summary of VHT / VMT chart: Within the study areas, VMT grows by 25% but even it is more sizable on residential roads. In the four key communities, we have concerns that people are moving onto roads not intended to carry that kind of traffic. VHT is growing twice as fast as VMT. We don't want to see this traffic on residential roads.

2035 results:

- Sizeable change in volumes on all roads
- Miles of residential roads carrying greater than 200 vph increased from 32 to 47 miles, a 47% increase
- 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

When we get volumes above 2000 cars per day, it changes from a residential road to a different kind of road. Because our model is a peak hour model, 2000 vehicles per day equates to 200 vehicles in the peak hour. We see an increase in the number of residential roads with volumes of more than 2000 vehicles per day and it's a concern. Delays – how much longer it takes to drive from A to B? Here, transit did increase by 26% - but we did assume an extension of service in the future. We also see increases in walkability and bikeability but this is primarily because there are more people, so the numbers are higher.

PM peak hour volume change: This is per hour volume changes. It's kind of proportional: interstates and the turnpike show the greatest increase in volume.

Residential roads PM peak hour volume map: Fast forward to 2035 there's only some change - conclusion is a lot of residential roads are above that threshold already today. An example is Day Road in Gorham, carrying 4000 cars per day. If there's a back-up in the overlap, vehicles go there. Do we want that?

Summary of corridor travel delays: We looked at different origin / destination points. By 2035, we see 8-mile trips that can take 45 minutes. We're starting to see double-digit time increases.

Barbara Charry: It's interesting that 2000 cars per day is the volume where everything changes for in terms of road character; it also increases the impact for wildlife at that point.

Transit & multimodal summary: These are actual peak hour ridership numbers. They are higher, but that again is just because of more people. We're going to look at how we can make these numbers mean something. Create opportunity for mode choice. Get in the car, or take a bus?

Steve Linnell: For Gorham, it's obvious we're not counting the University of Maine bus?

Paul: Correct.

Steve: Not that I want to raise expectations, but John asked for transit data for another project, spanning the last 10 years. In that, South Portland increased by 50% and Metro Portland by 25 – 35% in this timeframe. We're talking 25 years out here. These numbers might be slightly under.

Paul: We can use these numbers as a baseline. We should be more concerned about creating opportunities. For the Gateway 1 Study, there were a tiny number of trips in the Route 1 corridor using transit – we were able to forecast growth to 4% from under 0.5%. Here we have greater opportunity because of larger population and growth.

Bruce Hyman: That raises an issue. We need the MOEs to reflect what you said. They don't currently. A good change would be to measure how many people are within a half mile of transit

Paul: Yes. We can measure improved density opportunities as they relate to transit.

Bruce: I hope the next version reflects that.

Carol: It will.

Paul: *Percentage walkable trips map:* Walkable means within a traffic analysis zone (or TAZ), the percentage of trips that are a quarter-mile or less. Rural areas are in red, those are small numbers of walkable trips. The downtowns have more walkability.

Barbara: Where are we walking to and from?

Paul: Any trip within a TAZ. Could be home to work, or home to home. This is data we have available.

Carol: This measures existing car trips that are a quarter-mile or less. We assume people are willing to walk this. It's not a measure of where people are actually walking, but where it is feasible for them to walk. It's a benchmark.

Paul: Carol's point is right on the mark. For example, in the alternative land use pattern, what if we develop a dense area? We can use this measure to see how much we can change walking opportunity. Visually it helps understand the opportunity.

Carol: By opportunity, we mean the opportunity to provide bike and walk infrastructure where you have population density. We're not factoring in potential biking and pedestrian improvements here.

David Cole: What drives the yellow splotch in North Gorham? I find it hard to see that as higher walkability.

Paul: My sense is that there's a small portion of that area with a decent number of small trips. We'll follow up. (NOTE: This area surrounds the White Rock Elementary School area, where there would be a likelihood of short trips to drop off and pick up children from school.

Dave: If it turns out it is the school - that school won't be there much longer.

Paul: That is good to know.

Burleigh Loveitt: Where it says Gorham, the square area has water and sewer and is slated for dense population growth overlay. I think that increases the potential for sidewalks. But Gorham's roads are suicide to walk or bike on. I don't see the rural roads acting as connectors. I do think that Gorham Village and the overlay district have great potential.

Paul: I agree. The challenge is with the tools we have, how to best measure. Burleigh mentioned some existing hurdles. If we consciously develop in certain areas, to what degree do we get greater

walk and bike options, taking into account bike and pedestrian safety. What level of opportunity do we have?

Paul W: I caution you on how you are using data. Rural – by definition – will be more walkable from a data standpoint. It may behoove you to just look at urban area walkability. Farmland won't have sidewalks.

Paul: Maybe we can overlay it with density maps to better look at opportunities.

Paul W: Be careful with low numbers and the large percentages that develop from increased numbers – especially where there is no service available now. Maybe it's a baseline but there's bias in the data.

Carol: There is no bias in the data.

Paul W: It is data that doesn't exist. If there's no transit today, data on three people using a bus does not make sense.

Paul: The charge here is to understand how we can make numbers mean something. Little to no transit is what that says, there. That is clear.

Carol: We have to use some measure as a starting point.

Paul W: You don't have to use the data just because you have it. Maybe put an asterisk.

Paul: Point well taken. Making sure the information is meaningful is very helpful. The data isn't wrong. The reality – are they truly walkable? We don't know at this point.

Carl Eppich: I don't understand how walkability improves from 2009 to 2035 when we assume the roads will be worse. Most places walking is still on roads. So there should be fewer opportunities to walk.

Paul: This is not a measure of walking today but of vehicle trips in the TAZ a quarter mile or less. From our perspective, increases do make sense. With more people, houses, jobs in a TAZ, we get more trips of that length. Maybe we should call it "walking opportunities."

Carol: I agree that the walkability label is a problem.

Carl: The reality is that we have better opportunity but it's not the right story. Conditions would not necessarily allow more walking.

Wayne Newbegin: Maybe insert a quality of life measure into the data set. Is a trip within a quarter-mile equal to quality of life?

Carl: It is not a good measure. It does not show anything useful.

Paul: Literature tells us that trips within a quarter-mile can be walkable.

Carl: It's not correlated with other measures.

Carol: We all want more people to be walking – how can we prove that our solutions make that happen?

Carl: This distorts it. It can go either way. It's not about walkable trips.

Barbara: Identifying places where if there was infrastructure, you could walk...but we're not saying we'll have that infrastructure in 2035.

Carol: It indicates a good place to put that infrastructure.

Paul: We can use it as an overlay to see where to invest. To target investment.

Carol: This comes back to quality of life.

Paul: Every time we show this map we learn more.

Gerry Audibert: Are we going to map activity centers? That might make it more real.

Paul: Yes, another layer. The four communities have given us those centers to overlay on this.

Bikeability map: We used a two mile trip length here. What we want is to use this data to guide decisions.

2035 results summary: Through the Fire Marshals' Association, we ascertained critical distance to EMS services. What we see in 2035 is that the number of homes within the critical distance is increasing but the overall number of homes is decreasing. Job and retail access is

increasing. We have 9,200 additional acres planned for residential development in the time period: is that what we want? And where do we put it?

Tex Haeuser: Underscore that factoid - it is most compelling in terms of public opinion.

Paul: We also have 370 additional acres of planned commercial development.

EMS access index: Percentages decline, the numbers of homes increase. To what degree can we move these numbers?

Paul W: A better index of EMS is access time. That would be harder to gather. It's more important. Is it 5 or 10 miles away - who cares? But how long does it take.

Paul: The distance data is adjusted based on rural vs. city. The distance is shorter in the city. But if you have data on that, we'd love to see it.

Paul W: EMS runs reports from the towns. You can get it off the state EMS website.

Paul: *Job accessibility maps:* Job access is the distance from where you live. Highest accessibility is near a lot of jobs - so if you're in the Maine Mall area, you have high job accessibility. In 2035, job accessibility is a little better, because there are more jobs and more people.

Retail accessibility map: There are improvements from the standpoint of getting to retail. How do we use this? If we are creating a center - how much and what do we put in?

Bruce: Does that include only jobs and residences in the four core communities?

Paul: Yes.

Committee member: Can we have a combined carpool and mass transit predictions map?

Paul: Help me understand.

Continued: Can we measure how near homes/jobs would be to something near a corridor?

Paul: How far are you from a major road? Is that what you mean?

Continued: Yes.

Alex Jaegerman: To what extent have you incorporated the GoMaine database?

Paul: We have that database. We will use to crosscheck; it's a great resource.

Residential acres consumed map: You can see how it's broken down. Scarborough gains two-thirds of the 9,200 acres. This will take up all the available land in Scarborough, based on current trend.

Barbara: What size residential units are those?

Paul: I do not recall.

Barbara: Because that will have wildlife ramifications.

Paul: I will find out what calculation was used.

(NOTE: The formula is based on a town's existing zoning allowances, which were then multiplied by the number of new housing units being allocated within that TAZ.)

Carl: Does this exclude marshland or areas you cannot develop?

Paul: Yes.

John: Have the towns given comments on those? Do those numbers bother the towns?

Paul: We had a discussion with Scarborough. They thought the initial housing was too high due to their growth cap.

John: Is the question whether this is good or bad?

Tex: This is not the preferred alternative for the study area.

Paul: We know this growth will occur. How much can we change of those 9,200 new acres? What if we modify lots size, etc?

David C: If you are a municipality, you must fund services through taxes. Residential property is a money loser - we pay more money for services than we get back in taxes. I want to consume industrial property or commercial. Residential is a no. If residential was a line of business in the town budget, I'd discontinue it. We are concerned.

Paul: I add to that point that in this example, Gorham assumes 2,200 new acres of residential growth. New homes are on new roads. Who takes care of those roads? 200 new feet of road, 2,500 new homes. Do we want that?

Tex: Take it one step further. We are going out of the business of new roads. Subdivisions are now private roads. Gated communities.

Paul: Again, this is the fun part of the exercise. How can we change this? How can the number of new residential roads be smaller? This is potentially very important.

Alex: You're showing just the core four. When will we see the same for other communities?

Paul: We have residential acres for the entire region.

Alex: When we start comparing to baseline, we'll be looking at this kind of data in community categories?

Paul: Yes.

Alex: For whatever reason, Portland is anxious to have residential. We have a policy to maintain our residential share in the region. We welcome that growth. You need to present the urban data to the other communities.

Paul: When we get into the alternative model, we will.

David C: I do think Portland is different. Our economic model is for Gorham.

Barbara: Miles of roads equal huge impact to wildlife. Let's explore this in terms of measuring habitat fragmentation. Also acres consumed. Houses of a certain lot size may have larger ramifications.

Paul: We can talk afterward about what we can likely show for all communities, not just the four. It's an ongoing discussion.

MOE summary: As we develop, analyze, and provide information for different strategies, we want to find a way to see the differences. Are we headed in the right direction? This is a work in progress and a flavor of what we are looking to do. Note that the viewshed info is being gathered. Cost will be looked at when we get into the alternative land use pattern. That is our summary for the future. There is a boatload of data behind it, so let us know if you need more. We are happy to share.

Carol: Is anything surprising here?

Paul W: It's what's expected.

Paul: From a professional perspective, the amount of VHT and VMT growth was a big indication of rural roads becoming cut-through routes. Residential acres consumed are big. Also the degree of congestion. If people are going to Saco to avoid the overlap in Scarborough, it's not a good thing.

Burleigh: Westbrook is an undervalued commodity. It's much more desirable to live in. Our population in Gorham is around 16,000 and we're begging for attention. I think that will change.

Paul: We agree.

Wayne: Will we talk about outlying communities? I do have some concerns. What those four big towns do means problems for us.

Paul: The message I am taking is we need to understand the whole study area.

Carol:

Alternative land use patterns:

- 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 (Suburban CCC)
- Other two LU patterns “Best Practices”
 - Sub-regional jobs – housing balance
 - Greenbelt-based development

I’d like to go over an abbreviated version of what the land use group looked at last week. For that meeting, we had the following folks with us:

- Jim Libby, Buxton
- Wayne Newbegin, Standish
- David Knapp, 113 Corridor
- Bob Sanford, USM
- Bruce Hyman, Portland Trails
- Ben Severance, Hollis
- Alex Jaegerman, Portland
- Liz Hertz, State Planning
- Steve Linnell, GPCOG
- Carl Eppich, PACTS
- John Duncan, PACTS

2009 housing and jobs distribution: Currently Portland has the least share of housing. The inner suburbs have the most, whereas the outer suburbs have also a high percentage.

Paul W: Is this houses or apartments?

Paul: It is all housing: single, multifamily, and so on.

Carol: Here you see that Portland has most of the jobs. Inner suburbs have a good share. The outer suburbs, not so much; it requires a lot of driving for folks to get to jobs. Projecting to 2035, you can see that things get worse because the housing moves even further out but jobs are mostly in Portland, with some in the inner suburbs. And Portland housing stays relatively low.

Alternative pattern #1: Urban-to-Rural:

- Core urban communities retain high share of jobs and dramatically increase 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 much smaller share of residential growth than in Low Density

The question is, can we do something different? Can we test this pattern to see if it makes a difference? This completely reverses the trend we're looking at now.

Alternative pattern #2: Suburban CCC:

- Core urban communities cede some job shares but halt loss of residential shares
- Inner suburbs significantly increase 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 share of residential growth to 1990-2000 levels

This is a little less aggressive and flattens the trend. We give up some jobs to the inner suburbs but stop the downward trend. In 2035, Portland is projected to drop to a 10% share of new housing on the low density pattern: a huge drain. This stops that. Essentially, it means less of a difference in terms of housing and job density between Portland and the inner suburbs.

Alex: When we looked at this with Evan, he showed the data behind this.

Carol: Yes, that's on the next slide. We are moving some jobs out of Portland into the inner suburbs, making them more job rich.

Alex: I think that's the share of growth on the suggested allocation slide?

Paul: Yes, that's correct.

Carol: One of the most interesting things about the land use meeting last week is the reaction from the inner suburbs towns. We thought they would lean towards the Suburban CCC model because it gets them more jobs. But, there was a strong regional perspective – the feeling that it was important for Portland to be healthy and keep jobs – be more in line with the urban model. For the outer suburbs, the story is less housing in either scenario.

Wayne: In Standish we are projecting we have to build 751 homes in the next ten years. What we see here is a cutback to maybe 40

homes for the next 25 years. It's kind of hard to go back to Standish and say your projection is wrong.

Carol: Remember, this is a test, not a projection. We are not saying it's surely going to happen. If it will make a difference and is feasible, then we can decide if we want it to happen, we being the region as a whole.

Land use working group recommendation – Urban to Rural Pattern:

- Promotes strong urban center by retaining jobs and increasing the housing share
- Maintains 1:1 ratio of jobs and housing in inner suburbs
- Creates denser, multimodal clusters
- Is biggest contrast to Low Density and thus provides good test
- May be adjusted slightly to increase jobs in inner suburbs

Wayne: We also did a study to find out where people work. In Standish they work in Portland and Gorham.

Carol: Exactly. At the Planners' Meeting next week, they will look at the towns individually and determine where the denser clusters of activity could be placed. The towns will make the recommendations based on zoning and activity centers. Questions?

Carl: Has the Southern Regional Planning Commission been invited?

Carol: No, good point, we need to do that.

Carl: They know which towns will have more housing – they need to be there.

Carol: *Possible incentives to drive allocation:*

- Aid for new or enhanced sewer, water infrastructure
- Density bonuses
- Transit investments
- Transit-oriented developments
- TIF districts

Any questions?

Paul W: This is getting into a lot of politics.

Carol: We're all aware of the challenges to this kind of approach, but how else do you make change?

Paul W: Historically, trending in the towns and cities can have a significant effect on what people want.

Carol: They all have been very upfront in terms of seeing barriers.

Barbara: Put it in terms of dollars. If the citizens know they have to pay huge money to support something, it may help change their minds.

Bruce: One thing that Kevin Hooper said last week – the zone structure does not support good analysis. It will underrepresent a lot of things. It really needs to be looked at closely.

Paul: We will use existing zone structure.

Carol: For the first go-through?

Paul: Yes.

Carol: We are expecting the results of this test by early March.

Alex: It does extend beyond the four communities to the larger region. There are not a lot of venues for these types of conversations. This is the first time I've seen the low-density trend graphically. To begin to even think about alternatives is an opportunity for the region to look at itself. If we go ahead with the trend, it may make a big difference for transportation and other reasons. It is interesting that we are even having the discussion. Just the point of – if we don't plan ahead – that's what happens – it's interesting. Especially when there is still opportunity to adjust the outcome. Exciting to be involved because of the dynamic opportunity for the region to look at our future.

Gerry Audibert: It appears that urban and rural communities are looking for the same thing – there was less conflict at last week's meeting than we had thought.

Carol: Before we end, John will talk about timing for meetings.

John: We have roughly 30 members on our committee, and only 17 are here today. We need to improve this.

Paul W: It'd be nice to have it in late afternoon or evening – I have to take vacation time for the meetings.

Carol: Does anyone NOT want evening? *About a half dozen members did not want an evening meeting.*

Carol: Breakfast? (General agreement). Let's try that next time.
Thanks very much.

Meeting adjourned 3:13pm.