

## **Shore Road Path Committee May 21<sup>st</sup>**

Present:

Paul Thelin, Chair  
Maureen O'Meara, Town Planner  
Cynthia Dill, Town Councilor  
George Morse  
Howard Littlefield  
Josef Chalat  
Suzanne McGinn  
William Nickerson

Carl Eppich, Representative from Portland Area Comprehensive Transportation Committee (PACTS)

Meeting called to order by Paul Thelin.

William asked Maureen if she could gather any information on a recreational path he saw recently in Carlisle, Massachusetts. The path was located on a road very similar to Shore Rd and the path respected the natural and historic features along the road. Maureen will follow up.

Minutes from the April 30<sup>th</sup> meeting were accepted and approved.

### **Discussion of Recent Public Input**

A brief discussion about recent public comments received by the Town, both positive and negative were discussed. Again, the committee has come to a general consensus that a side for the path has not been chosen by the committee at this point, although the land side appears to have less obstacles. The committee reviewed a working document outlining the significant features of both side of the road (i.e. Stonewall and wetland footage, number of parcels and telephone poles), that will be completed over the next few months. The comparison of significant features will be one tool, along with the input the committee receives from the engineering firm ultimately chosen for the job. The plan is to have the firm give their opinion on which side of the road is best suited for a path since their professional judgment is respected. All agreed it is best to seek an

expert's advice for this project. Maureen stated that the RFP did not specify either side of the road for a path.

The committee decided that they would eventually like to post the 'Comparison of the Land/Water Side' document that it has been compiling onto the website, once all the significant features were listed. The committee doesn't feel it is complete, and more work needs to be done. The committee believes that the side chosen for the path is an important issue, and the land/water side document will aid the public in educating and understanding the tools the committee has used to choose the best side.

### **Review of memorandum dated 5/21/08, subject: summary of resources**

Maureen drafted a document to outlining the funding and principles of the Shore Road Path feasibility study that was included in the agenda packet. A review and clarification of our funding sources, \$28k from PACTS and \$7k from the Roadway Drainage Account (the town match), was stated by Maureen. Any mailings will come out general Administration expenses. She strongly recommended that the committee stay within the \$35k budget when reviewing the proposals this evening. The Town Council has a very tight budget this year, and if the committee needs additional funds for the study, the committee will have to go to the town council for additional funds in a formal manner. In fact, Maureen suggested that we may want to accept a bid that is less than \$35k, so we have extra money leftover for unforeseen situations. The committee agreed that they would choose a firm that was less than \$35k because their intent was to be very frugal.

William asked why there was such a large range in costs in the proposals (\$23,500-\$66,350). Discussion ensued about how some of the elements included in the engineering proposals were unnecessary, including construction documents and permits. Maureen reminded the committee that these are elements we do not have to worry about because the committee is charged with completing a feasibility study. Other elements in the proposals that could drive the proposal price up included topographic maps and 2ft contour maps, but the town already has those available.

Maureen reminded the committee that she works for Cape. One of the firms, Oest Assoc., also works for Cape. Since she has worked with several of the firms that submitted proposals, these firms have made assumptions that Maureen will handle some of the data collection and work with landowners. The firm would then focus on completing the full survey of both sides of the road. That is one reason why some proposals are on the low side. Maureen said that she will not be choosing the consultant; rather the committee will choose. Firms submitting proposals knew that the Committee had over \$20k for the feasibility study.

To summarize, George recommends that we don't go beyond our \$35k for the proposal. He doesn't want to have to go back to the Council for money, and Cynthia agreed. We should be able to extract elements from the proposals so it fits into our budget.

The committee wants a proposal with enough information to go to the public for a public hearing, as well as present a solid proposal to the Town Council so that they can make an educated decision. Maureen reminds the committee that the final report and recommendation is what the committee presents to Town Council, and then the Shore Rd Path Committee is done. There will then be a public hearing with the Council, then the Council will vote for or against the project. The committee can participate as the public in the public hearing.

The committee agreed that they would like to meet with landowners individually, come up with a preliminary plan on a path, then have a public forum, then finalize the plan, then submit the final plan to the Town Council.

Paul asked if \$35k is our limit, will we have other needs beyond the scope of these proposals? Probably not. Maureen suggested that we'd probably like to have our dollars used for accurate surveys versus having dollars spent on compiling data already available at town hall. Maureen and the committee members can help with collecting existing data and writing reports to save money.

The committee wants the firm chosen to:

- 1) produce a survey of both sides of the road,
- 2) design a path in keeping with the rural character of Shore Rd,

3) create a final report.

**Review engineering proposals:**

Maureen, as the committee requested, put together a matrix comparing key elements of the seven proposals. Everyone agreed that it was helpful, but needed some clarification on some of the elements.

Qualifications: 1-5: The qualification rating system for the firms experience with trails and work in Cape was subjective by Maureen, based on the proposals submitted.

Survey:

Quality: lite vs. full. Lite meant that there was no field work completed. The committee agreed that we wanted a full survey.

State Plan is taking the survey and converting it to data that the town can add to its GIS system. We already have 2 ft contours through the towns GIS system.

Landscape Architect: Is it necessary? It may not be in our budget. This may be a place that we can save dollars since we are working within the right of way. There is not a lot of room for landscape creativity and flexibility. Joe believes we need a LA for drainage and culvert issues.

Engineering: We need a preliminary layout and a final conceptual layout. We do not need a permit list or to prepare permits. A permit list will be included in the cost estimate.

Wetlands: We need a cost for this. We need current wetland information. The Town has wetland maps – some as old as 1960.

Graphics: We may be able to save money by not including aerial photographs. The committee agreed that our graphic dollars would be best spent with photographs and superimposing a path to get the best idea of what the path would look like on a property.

Public Participation: Maureen defined a Charette for our committee. It is a ½ to a full day long meeting to invite public input and have professionals available, and brainstorm. The public jointly works with developing a plan. The design workshop can be difficult. Cynthia spoke of the charette for the

proposed light at the Shore Rd/Rt 77 intersection, and is reluctant to hold a charette. It is a very technical exercise and you have an open slate. This path is very limited in scope where it can be located, since it is intended to be within the right of way. The committee decided that a charette was not suitable for this project.

### **Discussion on the firms:**

Cynthia thinks we should interview Oest because they have value, know the town (Oest has been providing engineering services in Cape since 1996), and has worked on many projects in town over the years. Both Oest and Stantec should be considered for an interview because they have an investment in our community; they live in Cape, and the local connection adds value. They have relationships. Bill agreed. He added his current experience with Tom Emery on the current Fort Williams project. Bill has had a positive experience to date, and the firm seems frugal. Suzanne asked if the Town has been satisfied with Oest and Stantec's work to date, and Maureen said yes.

Carl suggested to the committee not to use cost as an elimination factor. Instead, find a firm whose elements and approach we like the most. Carl believes that these firms, when asked, will adjust their proposals to fit within our financial parameters.

Paul asked about Sebago. Why is their estimate so low? Howard thought it was low because all of their work is in-house; graphics were limited in proposal, not intrusive. Howard is familiar with Sebago and would include them for interview.

Gates is out of the running because of price, design Charette and lite survey.

Paul is concerned that the proposals are comparing apples to oranges. Joe said we are gaining enough information with the variety within the proposals.

Joe likes John Mitchell's ease of proposal style over Pepperchrome for graphics. We don't need to spend extra money on graphics.

Howard didn't include Pepperchrome on his list of candidates.

No one had DeLuca on their list of candidates.

Woodward was eliminated by the group. They didn't stand out as 'special,' lite survey, and included elements to be done that the Town already owns.

**Conclusion:**

Now the committee is down to four firms to interview.

Let the four firms know extra information prior to the interview.

- \$35k budget
- We need full survey
- Not supporting the concept of charette

The committee decided to change the next meeting of May 28 to June 4 since Paul could not attend. He should attend since he is the chair. So the meeting will be June 4, beginning at 6:30pm, and each firm will be interviewed for 40 minutes.

Maureen will contact firms and determine availability. If all firms are not all available, then switch date back to 5/28.

The committee agreed that we need to put a list of questions together to ask the firms. Maureen agreed to put a proposed list of questions together, and she solicited the committee to send their questions to her by 5/27 to compile one list. The committee wants to ask the same questions to all firms.

More cost saving ideas discussed. Do we want an engineer at meetings with landowners? The committee decided only when necessary, such as when the land poses obstacles, or wetlands are in question. Otherwise, it would be too expensive to have an engineer meet with each landowner.

Chariman Paul Thelin adjourned the meeting at 9:20 p.m.

These minutes are respectively submitted,

Suzanne McGinn