

**DRAFT ONLY – NOT APPROVED OR FINAL**  
**Rte. 1 North Advisory Committee**  
**Meeting Notes – regular meeting**  
**Monday, August 22, 2016**  
**Washington Street Conference Room – Camden, Maine**

**WHO:**

*Members Present:* Richard Bernhard, Bob Falciani, Tony Grassi, Jane LaFleur, Sasha Laurita, Geoff Scott, Jenny Simon

*Members excused:* Nancy Caudle-Johnson,

*Select Board Liaisons:* Don White

*Select Board Liaisons excused:* Leonard Lookner

*Staff:* Patricia Finnigan

*Guests/Others:* some abutters and public

**MEETING PURPOSE:** Camden Route One Advisory Committee discuss project considerations point by point.

**COMMITTEE BUSINESS:** Motion (B. Falciani) seconded (T. Grassi) and unanimously approved minutes from August 4, 2016 meeting.

**KEY THINGS DISCUSSED:**

Recommend Town Board request speed study

Plan to meet with abutters to discuss their concerns

Surface drainage issues and pursuing drainage considerations

Utility poles

Layout each area of recommendation in Google doc.

Work to negotiate for a cooperative venture in order to serve the interests of the town rather than fight.

Look for a commonality in our recommendations (telephone pole placement, tree preservation, stone walls, etc.)

Tony and Bob want to meet with MDOT to determine if they are willing to listen to our concerns and if there is flexibility in design, particularly surface drainage, from their perspective.

Committee discusses project considerations line by line. **SEE "GOOGLE DOC" DRAFT BELOW.**

**DECISIONS MADE:** Next committee meeting scheduled for **Tuesday, September 6, 2016 at 2:00 pm** in the Washington Street Conference Room, Camden, Maine.

*Committee Purpose:*

*A committee set up for the purpose of working with the Maine DOT to insure that any reconstruction of Route 1 in the Town of Camden be designed and built to be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan of the Town and the special scenic character of the road and to minimize the environmental impact on the neighboring properties while improving the safety and maintenance of the highway, keeping in mind safe vehicular, bicycle, and pedestrian access.*

## DRAFT ONLY – NOT APPROVED OR FINAL

### GOOGLE DRAFT DOC

#### DRAFT-DRAFT-DRAFT

#### MEMO

To: The Camden Board of Selectmen

From: The Route One North Advisory Committee

Re: Route One Camden-Lincolnville Road Redesign and Reconstruction

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

The Camden Route One Advisory Committee offers the following recommendations to the Camden Board of Selectmen regarding the Route One Camden-Lincolnville Road Redesign and Reconstruction.

#### Recommended Project Goals

- To maintain consistency with Camden's Comprehensive Plan
- To preserve and protect the distinctive scenic road from Camden to Lincolnville
- To conserve in perpetuity the distinctive rural and scenic landscapes on the road from Camden to Lincolnville, including preserving old stone walls and mature trees that contribute to the rural character of the corridor.
- To enhance safety for all users of the road including people on foot, people on bicycles and people in vehicles
- To continue the existing context sensitive design of Route One from the Camden Public Library to the Camden Hills State Park (High Street)
- To reconstruct this portion of the federal highway Route One corridor so as to best meet the needs of Camden, its residents and property owners and the travelling public. *I would make this the first bullet (TG)*
- To preserve the quality of life of the residents along this stretch of Rt 1 and the value of their properties.
- To recognize and protect the economic value of this corridor as contributing to and serving as an economic engine of the State of Maine
- To preserve a smoothly functioning Route 1, economic growth, and preservation of the scenic, small town, and rural qualities that are the pride of Corridor residents and attract people from around the world. *This seems redundant (TG)*
- To slow down speeds and therefore increase the safety of this portion of the Route One Corridor.
- To enhance this portion of Route 1 so as to not disrupt the safety, serenity and enjoyment of property owners in the area. *This seems redundant (TG)*
- To accommodate all users of the corridor and provide complete streets. *This seems redundant (TG)*
- To uphold the findings and recommendations in previous planning documents of MaineDOT, the 21 midcoast communities and the Federal Highway Administration. This includes the following municipal goals: • Preserve Route 1 mobility and safety (includes multi-modal choice). • Maintain/preserve attractiveness of Route 1 Corridor. • Preserve ability to use Route 1 to generate tax base. • Develop municipal communication and cooperation. • Improve communication with and access to MaineDOT funding and planning process.

#### Project Recommendations:

*(I would be inclined to add a "next steps or further analysis" section under each category. e.g. Historical analysis, meeting with drainage expert, environmental assessment, understanding where Lincolnville is on the speed study, etc.(TG)*

*Also, I think we need to make more in this text of the impact of all this on the businesses along this stretch of road.(TG))*

## DRAFT ONLY – NOT APPROVED OR FINAL

### **Context Sensitive Solutions and Design**

Discussion: Context Sensitive Design should be the guiding principle in all aspects of this reconstruction project, as required by State and Federal law.

Recommendation: The Committee requests that each of the design elements discussed below be addressed by the MaineDOT as to how the **concept of** Context Sensitive Design was incorporated.

### **Speed:**

Discussion: Except for a 3-mile section in Camden and Lincolnville (of which this project includes 1.5 miles), a 50 mph speed limit does not occur anywhere on Route 1 between Northport and the vicinity of the Thomaston-Warren town boundary. This section is incongruous in this 18 mile long, trafficked highway corridor. Nor does the existing 50 mph speed limit do anything to measurably reduce travel time in the Lincolnville-Camden-Rockport-Rockland-Thomaston corridor.

The 50 mph speed limit causes the establishment of a wider clear zone, thus eliminating tree canopy and other natural traffic calming elements such as stone walls.

The 50 mph speed limit increases the chance of accidents at Springbrook Hill and causes the suggestion to raise the road in that area, thus destroying one of the traffic calming aspects as well as the historic character of the rolling hills between the Camden Hills and Penobscot Bay. A lower speed limit would discourage acceleration after the State Park right before Springbrook Hill.

The design and completion of the proposed roadway should be so intuitive that artificial traffic calming devices are deemed unnecessary. These include road bump-outs, excessive road striping, and arbitrarily placed traffic islands.

Recommendations: The speed limit should be 45 mph or lower. The Committee has already recommended a speed study (in cooperation with the Town of Lincolnville) be conducted to determine the design speed for the existing road. We have been assured in writing that this speed study will not result in an increase in the existing 50 mph limit. The Committee recommends a lowered speed limit from the State Park to the Lincolnville town line and beyond to Lincolnville Beach. ~~Except for this existing 3 mile section in Camden and Lincolnville, a 50 mph speed limit does not occur anywhere on Route 1 between Northport and the vicinity of the Thomaston-Warren town boundary. This section is incongruous in this 18 mile long, trafficked highway corridor. Nor does the existing 50 mph speed limit do anything to measurably reduce travel time in the Lincolnville-Camden-Rockport-Rockland-Thomaston corridor. [RB]~~

- ~~• The 50 mph speed limit causes the establishment of a wider clear zone, thus eliminating tree canopy and other natural traffic calming elements such as stone walls. (TG)~~
- ~~• The 50 mph speed limit increases the chance of accidents at Springbrook Hill and causes the suggestion to raise the road in that area, thus destroying one of the traffic calming aspects as well as the historic character of the rolling hills between the Camden Hills and Penobscot Bay. A lower speed limit would discourage acceleration after the State Park right before Springbrook Hill. (TG)~~

### Next Steps:

- Complete speed study and reflect the result in the design drawings.
- Change the speed limit downward to reflect the speed study.
- Add additional speed limit signs and enforce the limit.
- If speed limit is above **35 mph**, implement traffic calming measures including a tree canopy to maintain the rural, scenic character of this area.

### **Road Width:**

## DRAFT ONLY – NOT APPROVED OR FINAL

Discussion: The wider the road, the faster the speed, the higher the serious accident rate and the heavier the negative impact on family life at residential properties and on local businesses. The goal is to maintain and improve the quality of life for residents and businesses in the area.

Recommendations:

- Place the paved road in the middle of the right-of-way. [I am not sure this is what we want \(TG\)](#)
- The Committee does not support 5 foot wide paved shoulders. In order to preserve the scenic and economic value of this Camden neighborhood, the committee recommends 11 foot travel lanes and a 3 or 4 foot paved shoulder/bicycle lane on both sides. [If there is no separate sidewalk, then I think 3 feet is too narrow for bike safety \(TG\)](#)
- The committee recommends a sloped granite curbing to maintain the scenic character and quality of the area and the uniqueness of this stretch of Route One.
- [Perhaps](#) add a separated meandering bike/pedestrian path beyond the curb line on one side only [if supported by \(TG\)](#) additional information needed below, including tree impact, drainage impact and property impact.
- ~~Explore/understand the implications of two 11-foot travel lanes, two 3-foot wide paved shoulders, a 3-ft esplanade (including the sloped granite curb) and a 5 foot bike/pedestrian pathway (on the east side of the road). This totals 36 feet (versus 32 feet for 5/11/11/5). While wider, it may lead to less tree removal (especially where no swale is required) and would be consistent with the road leading up to the State Park. (TG)~~

~~This is an excellent vision Tony and suspect the hurdles are the extra cost of the granite curbing (but maybe not), the extra drainage issues for the esplanade and path (with curbing there will be catch basins, maybe that cost offset by no swales?), and the width of the path not meeting federal AASHTO standards for two-way bicycle traffic (typically a minimum of 8 feet). But I personally really like this idea/vision and based on the discussions in the Pathway Committee I think they would too. [Geoff]~~

~~I would add that this would worsen the project when we add drainage MDOT drainage details along the troubled properties. (PS, Cost of granite curbs is \$40-50 per foot). I like the idea of the esplanade. I think the varying issues we have may force the esplanade/path to switch sides of the road as we go toward Lincolnville? Also the question arises as to whether Lincolnville will support this on their end? Ending at the Camden line gives me pause. (Bob)~~

Next Steps:

- Research who paid for granite curbing [and sidewalk \(TG\)](#) on High Street.
- Research the tree loss and property impact of a 3-foot versus a 4-foot paved shoulder.
- Can Route One meander within the right-of-way and therefore lessen the impact of reconstruction?
- Explore/understand the implications of two 11-foot travel lanes, two 3-foot wide paved shoulders, a 3-ft esplanade (including the sloped granite curb) and a 5 foot bike/pedestrian pathway (on the east side of the road). This totals 36 feet (versus 32 feet for 5/11/11/5). While wider, it may lead to less tree removal (especially where no swale is required) and would be consistent with the road leading up to the State Park. (TG)

### **Bicycle and Pedestrian Accessibility**

Discussion: Bicycling and walking are important and significant modes of transportation and recreation in this corridor and will grow as modes if safe routes are provided. This also contributes to the economy of the cities and towns in the midcoast and the state of Maine as a whole [as well as to the health of our citizens and visitors. \(TG\)](#)

The Committee is concerned about safety and understands the positions of both the Pathways Committee and the bicycling enthusiasts for 5 foot shoulders. At the same time, the Committee is concerned a five-foot paved shoulder will become a defacto right hand passing lane for vehicles. As a compromise, the Committee recommends a 4-foot paved shoulder and recommends pursuing a paved slightly meandering off road path for pedestrians and recreational bicyclists, located just

## DRAFT ONLY – NOT APPROVED OR FINAL

outside the recommended sloped granite curb. [This last sentence belongs under recommendations \(where it in fact is as well\) below.](#)

### Recommendations:

- The Committee recommends the bike lane be 4 feet, recognizing the interest of some interest groups for a 5 foot lane. The Committee believes a 5 foot lane “reads” as a passing lane, and will encourage passing on the right, and therefore adversely affect the safety, speed and visual amenities of this corridor.
- Include an off-road but within the right-of-way, slightly meandering pedestrian and bicycle path, outside the proposed sloped granite curbing and constructed as part of this project. [Here we are presenting this as a recommendation. In the section above we are suggesting it as a possibility after further investigation. \(TG\)](#)

~~I was under the impression that the width of the shoulder (4 or 5 feet) was still being considered by this committee. (Agreed! TG) After considerable discussion within the Pathways Committee and with the Bicycle Coalition of Maine, weighing the pros and cons of a narrower shoulder (which has obvious merits), we continue to advocate for a 5 foot shoulder.~~

- ~~○ The law in Maine is that motorists must provide at least 3 feet of clearance when passing a bicycle. Normal bike handlebars are about 21-24” wide. A 5 foot bike lane creates the needed space.~~
- ~~○ With a narrower lane, to pass a bike legally, cars will have to cross the yellow line (as they do now). This creates many near misses as drivers are always anxious to get around cyclists whether they can see ahead to pass safely or not.~~
- ~~○ The issue of creating shoulder space for cars to use to to pass on the right of left turning vehicles is true, though not nearly the safety issue for cyclists that a narrower shoulder presents. [Geoff]~~
- ~~○ This goes with discussion above and from my perspective the will need to be a balance of the issues in order to finalize our recommendation on shoulder width. I don't believe any one faction will “get all that it wants” as we balance the need to narrow the total affected zone width from centerline to end of drainage. Again what happens when Lincolnville goes with 4 feet? Four feet is what I am told was the dimension for the High Street construction project. (Bob)~~

### **Next Steps:**

- [Investigate the implications of \(TG\)](#) an off-road but within the right-of-way, slightly meandering pedestrian and bicycle path, outside the proposed sloped granite curbing and constructed as part of this project.

### **Drainage**

#### Discussion:

There are 2 drainage elements: Subsurface (such as proposed at Spring Brook and the cross road culvert) and surface drainage.

Sub-surface Drainage : There is no evidence of the need for subsurface drainage changes because there has been no flooding [or washout of \(TG\)](#) Route One. The Committee asks for justification for this proposed work. There has been no ice build up near Springbrook Road. There has been some ice buildup south bound route 1 near Lincolnville line and again top of the south rise of Springbrook Hill. The committee will be hard pressed to make any recommendations regarding subgrade work without a civil engineering analysis. The Committee believes the proposed design solutions are over-engineering a problem that does not exist and the solution does not solve the problems of today.

Surface Drainage: There is evidence of surface drainage problems at specific driveways. The surface drainage must be addressed by the Committee as it is the principal cause of loss of tree canopy, property devaluation, etc.

## DRAFT ONLY – NOT APPROVED OR FINAL

### Recommendations:

- Ask MaineDOT for evidence of subsurface drainage problems and the justification for any subsurface drainage work.
- Consider alternative surface drainage solutions to affect the existing driveway surface drainage problems while minimizing the impact of the fix. Because extensive cutting and filling for drainage purposes can be deleterious to the visual landscape, the extent of drainage measures should be examined carefully and the affected area should be reduced wherever possible. Driveway repairs, [including provision to reduce water run-off over driveways](#), should be included in this project, with the approval and consultation of the homeowner or business owner.
- The Committee recognizes that rip-rap is not a natural appearing material and would like to look at other means of substituting and limiting its use. Also, seeding over any exposed rip-rap.
- Do not create new drainage that then requires long guardrails which then dramatically impact the scenic character of the road.

### Next Steps

- Speak with the homeowners where there seems to be a driveway drainage issue so we better understand these issues. After meeting with affected homeowners meet with MDOT engineering to obtain surface drainage changes. From that meeting possible next steps, [if MDOT is unresponsive, \(TG\)](#) include Federal level appeals including that Camden insists the project will not go ahead without MDOT following the guidelines of the Gateway initiative, the Camden Comprehensive Plan and the Transportation Action Package which all require “context sensitive design”

### Clear Zones:

Discussion: The proposed clear-zones appear to be the result of the non-existent subsurface drainage problem and its proposed repair. The houses are set historically very close to the road in this area, in a village or neighborhood-like setting. This also pertains to many businesses along this road that rely on an attractive setting for their revenues. An extensive “clear zone” will disrupt the life of the taxpayers and the value of their properties. A smaller or no clear zone in some areas will work to “calm” the traffic down and enhance visitors experience which translates into monetary value for the town and the whole area. Camden Hills is the most visited park on the coast of Maine after Acadia. [This previous sentence belongs elsewhere. \(TG\)](#) ~~Providing a visually pleasing and a safe place to ride bikes along that stretch of the road will only bring more visitors to our area. This sentence belongs elsewhere in this document. (TG)~~

*Recommendation:* Do not fix a problem (sub-surface drainage) that does not exist. The proposed changes at Spring Brook Hill seem more related to raising the road to reduce the incline. The clear zones relate not just to drainage but to the “deadly object” problem, which needs to be sited under Speed Limit. Restrict the clear zones to the minimal amount necessary to address driveway drainage problems in several areas only.

### Next Steps:

- Ask MaineDOT for evidence of sub-surface drainage problem.

~~The proposed changes there seem more related to raising the road to reduce the incline, The larger drainage areas are elsewhere. Also clear zones relate not just to drainage but to the “deadly object” problem, which needs to be sited under Speed Limit. (TG)~~  
~~Also where do we address specifically the phone pole issue location/height/material/design? (TG)~~  
~~To me this issue is covered under the surface drainage issue above and is not a separate issue.~~  
~~Clear zones are a function of drainage details imposed at each stretch and at each property along the affected area. (Bob)~~

## DRAFT ONLY – NOT APPROVED OR FINAL

### Landscaping

Discussion: The tree canopy must be maintained to protect the scenic character and economic quality of this area. A generous, established tree canopy and “edge” is essential to the leafy, quiet, natural, and residential ambiance of Camden and that it should be maintained as a prominent feature of this gateway and corridor. A generous tree canopy and edge is instrumental in lowering speed.

Recommendation: The Committee recommends that the Maine DOT provide a list of each (in excess of 6 inches dbh?) (TG) tree that will be removed and a landscaping plan and budget to replace each tree that is removed.

- ~~• The Committee feels that a generous, established tree canopy and “edge” is essential to the leafy, quiet, natural, and residential ambiance of Camden and that it should be maintained as a prominent feature of this gateway and corridor. [RB]~~
- ~~• A generous tree canopy and edge is instrumental in lowering speed. [RB]~~

Next Steps:

- Request a tree survey within the right-of way and final clear zone with locations, type and size for this corridor.
- Request that MDOT flag with bright yellow tape every tree of this size to be removed. (TG)
- Provide a tree cut plan and replacement plan with funding as part of the project.

### Scenic Viewsheds and Historic Features

Discussion: This stretch of US Route One contains significant scenic viewshed elements as have been outlined in the Gateway One study and have been identified for decades as one of the most scenic corridors along all of US Route One. The existing topography of the area should be recognized as a unique feature of the area and excessive leveling, raising, and manipulation of the existing road grade should be kept to a minimum. The Committee applauds the MaineDOT for its willingness to work with property owners to protect corridor amenities such as split rail fencing, stone walls, stone pillars and gateposts, State Park entrance signs, etc.

Recommendations:

- The committee recommends the project (this sentence edited by TG) be designed to protect and promote farmlands, woodlots, scenic views, rural and scenic landscapes, and protect traditional lot features noted above.
- The existing topography of the area be recognized as a unique feature of the area and that excessive leveling, raising, straightening and manipulation of the existing road grade should be kept to a minimum.
- The impact of this project on the historic character of the corridor and specific properties eligible for the National or State Register of Historic buildings should be evaluated by the Camden Historic Resources Committee. It will be evaluated by the State of Maine Historic Preservation office and this committee should engage with the SHPO in this review. Edits in the prior sentence by TG)

~~That roadway “furniture” – split rail fencing, stone walls, carved “Camden” sign, stone pillars and gateposts, State Park entrance signs, etc. – be protected. [RB]~~

Next Steps:

### **Other**

Discussion:

## DRAFT ONLY – NOT APPROVED OR FINAL

### Recommendation:

- ~~That the existing topography of the area be recognized as a unique feature of the area and that excessive leveling, raising, and manipulation of the existing road grade be kept to a minimum. [RB]~~
- ~~That the design (and execution) of the proposed roadway be so intuitive that artificial traffic calming devices are deemed unnecessary. These include road bump-outs, excessive road striping, and arbitrarily placed traffic islands. [RB]~~
- The Committee would like to investigate the use of COR-TEN weathering steel for guard rails in this construction. This material is used in other scenic highway areas such as Mt. Desert Island. [RB]
- In every way, the Committee requests that this highway sector be kept contextual Context Sensitive - ~~a good loaded word to use here [Geoff]~~ with its natural and man-made environment. [RB]

### **NEXT STEPS REQUIRED BY THE COMMITTEE: (Bob)**

1. **Complete speed study.** If we achieve the reduction in speed limit proceed to press for project redesign based on the reduction. If the study fails then recommendation that the a “design exemption” be applied using reduced speed limit criteria due to “context sensitive” design requirements.
2. **Meet with affected homeowners re: surface drainage intrusion.** This is preparation for meeting with MDOT head of engineering to press the case for better surface drainage approaches, etc. This will reduce property incursions and tree removal!!
3. **Meet with MDOT engineering.** After 2. Above meet with head of engineering to discuss civil engineering changes to drainage to reduce impact on properties. If this meeting is a failure then the “context sensitive” design adherence needs to be raised to to the Federal level.
4. **Meeting Federal Highway Administration Environmental Contact:** Environmental analysis has not been done on this project to date. This could be a significant roadblock re: project execution schedule. (BOB)