

Jane and Joe Wagner of Lyman submitted this comment on 08/29/2011

Response to proposals considered by the Central York County Connections Study [CYCCS]

First, we acknowledge there is no funding available in the foreseeable future for any dramatic changes to the roadways of Central York County. Nonetheless, the proposals being considered by the CYCCS are disturbing and require comment so that if they are taken off the shelf sometime in the future, their severe impact and impracticality will be duly noted.

By invitation from John Sylvester, Alfred selectman, we attended a meeting on Monday, June 27 at the Alfred Town Hall between Ms. Carol Morris of Morris Communications, the public relations firm contracted by the CYCCS, Gerry Audibert of the Maine State Department of Transportation and various members of the Alfred Zoning and Conservation Committees. Lyman selectman Leo Ruel was also in attendance. In her opening remarks, Ms. Morris mentioned the study of the alternatives conducted for the bridges connecting Maine to New Hampshire. According to Ms. Morris, by Federal rule ALL alternatives, no matter how seemingly absurd and extreme [such as ferry service and tunnels in the case of the bridge study] must be suggested and examined. The interpretation was that many if not all of the proposals considered to date by the CYCCS may be equally outlandish [proposals B5 and B6, for example].

The instigation for CYCCS stems from a resolution passed by the 123rd Legislature [H.P.1203, LD 1720] which directed the Maine Department of Transportation and the Maine Turnpike Authority to conduct a study of possible western connector roads to municipal centers in Cumberland and York counties. This begs the question: what problem does the CYCCS seek to address?

According to Ms. Morris, proposed adjustments to Central York County transportation routes are NOT due to current traffic congestion. Neither are they driven by population growth. For example, Sanford's population has been stagnant [20,000] for the last twenty years. The overall population growth of the entire county has not been significant, either. The driver for the proposals was identified as possible, potential economic development. When I asked can this entire exercise be characterized with the expression, build it and they may come, Mr. Audibert confirmed that was an accurate summarization.

In the CYCCS available material [see [www.connectingyorkcounty.org](http://www.connectingyorkcounty.org)] one general premise stands out: a projected increase of jobs and households in York County by 30% by 2035. What is NOT provided is the source of this projection. The grounds for such a prediction are specious at best. Over the past twenty years the population growth for the entire county was not significant. Mr. Audibert mentioned that renowned Maine economist Dr. Charles Colgan has been a contributor to the CYCCS discussions but he has NOT provided any long-term projections on economic development for any specific areas within the scope of the study.

IF the driver of the proposals is the facilitation of economic growth in Sanford, examining real, recent developments there are instructive. What economic development that has occurred has come in the way of big box stores being constructed in the southern end of town. If access to I-95 is a great priority for Lowe's, Tractor Supply and WalMart, then the focus should be on routes 99 and 109, direct connections to the Maine Turnpike.

A specific CYCCS proposal with which we take particular issue is B1 - the expansion of Route 111 into four lanes and increasing the speed limit to 55 mph. Recent strong resistance to a service road requirement for commercially zoned property along Route 111 in Lyman is indicative of the sentiments of making any drastic changes to the configuration of this roadway. Expansion to four lanes would entail involuntary concessions of private property and a decrease of property zoned for commercial use which runs contrary to the professed goal of economic development. A four lane Route 111 would cut Lyman in half. As Leo Ruel mentioned, that would necessitate the creation of a substation for fire and emergency in southern half of town. Also, environmental concerns abound given the amount of wetlands that would have to be drained [DOT just the past year installed passage for aquatic life on Route 111 near the intersection with Kennebunk Pond Road. This new culvert construction would have to be completely redone with the widening of Route 111].

One factor that cannot be engineered away is the fact that Route 111 runs east to west. When traveling west at sunset the glare is right at eye level and blinding. The addition of more lanes will result in even greater danger in getting onto or off of Route 111. Advisories to keep one's headlights on will not be enough.

Of the goals listed in the CYCCS material handed out at the June 27 meeting was to: "maintain and enhance the visual, cultural, historical and environmental character of the region". NONE of these would be addressed with widening Route 111. To the contrary, this proposal would destroy the quality of life in our community set in a rural, agricultural environment.

Decreasing commuting time was also mentioned at the June 27 meeting. A review of the CYCCS material indicates that whatever proposal was adopted, the decrease travel time from any points would be but a few minutes. What is missing from this perspective [and from the entire dialogue at the June 27 meeting] was the issue of public safety. Reducing commuting time by jeopardizing safety is not an acceptable tradeoff. And IF drive time was such an essential goal, CYCCS should compute the ratio of a minute saved per millions spent in construction costs.

Route 111, which we drive every day, IS in need of some safety enhancing adjustments There should be a turning lane off of 111 to Hill Road in Arundel. There should be formal turning lanes and a blinking light at the intersection of 111 and Day and Kennebunk Pond Roads. Given the twisting and rolling terrain over which 111 covers, no passing should be permitted because there is no safe stretch on which to pass. And, if anything, the speed limit should either be reduced or enforced.

Thank you for the consideration of this input.

Mary Jane and Joe Wagner  
26 Day Road  
Lyman, ME 04002-6086

The Conservation Commission of Alfred submitted this comment on 08/29/2011

Central York County Connection Study Conservation Commission Analysis

There are two significant wildlife areas that would be impacted by building a spur through the town of Alfred. These are the Massabesic Experimental Forest and the Walnut Hill Focus area. The Conservation Commission has worked very diligently to preserve these areas and any type of highway that passes through or borders these areas would be a major impact to the wildlife habitat.

It is 7 miles from the Turnpike exit at Wells to the Sanford airport. At 40 miles per hour it takes 10.5 minutes (by calculation) to drive this distance. At 55 miles per hour it would take 7.6 minutes to drive this distance. It is inconceivable to think that it is so important to travel to Sanford that 3 minutes would make a difference and taxpayers would be willing to spend millions of dollars for 3 minutes. Of major concern to the Alfred Conservation Commission are strategies B5 and B6. The analysis shows that these two have some of the greatest impact affecting rural acres within the corridor. (4,765 for B5 and 9,223 for B6). Additionally, these two affect more regulated natural resources by orders of magnitude than any of the other strategies. (4.4 miles for B5 and 4.56 miles for B6)

Massabesic forest is one of Alfred's greatest natural resources. Any impact to this area would have adverse effects on the Alfred economy. The Walnut Hill Focus area is home to several endangered species and has been identified by Beginning with Habitat and an area worth preserving. The State has recently awarded the Three Rivers Land Trust a grant to purchase a tract of land in this region and this purchase has been executed in December of 2010.

Don Cameron from the Maine Natural Areas Program joined a group of Three Rivers Land Trust directors to visit the Walnut Hill#1 property acquired in December 2010. Among the common plants, Don found a state listed plant, *Carex bullata* and a possible rare goldenrod. To confirm it we will need to return in August when it will be in flower. Lastly he found a federally listed rare plant the small whorled pogonia-*Isotria medeoloides*. This federally listed native orchid is seen in only a few states, in moist, somewhat rich woods.

This property and the surrounding area is also known to be prime habitat for a rare turtle species, the Blandings Turtle. Studies done in this area have found this turtle to be present and breeding here. Additionally the town of Alfred has voted to put conservation easements on town acquired property within the Walnut Hill area which includes more wetland habitat. This area has been targeted for preservation because it is one of the largest still unfragmented blocks of natural habitat left. (the term unfragmented is used to reflect an area not bisected by roads or developments)

Additionally, the area around Shaker Hill Road and Shaker Pond has been designated as a critical rural residential district. Significant development in this area has been restricted.

The Alfred Conservation Commission supports wildlife areas near Alfred as well as in the town of Alfred. The Kennebunk Wildlife Management Area encompasses 2,000 acres of protected land and is bordered on the Mousam River up to Route 99. This area is also known as “Blueberry Plains” and is a popular hiking and berry picking area. Closer to Alfred and just south of the Massabesic Forest is the Alewife Woods Preserve.

Study Team Response

August 16, 2011

To Alfred Selectmen, Planning Board and Conservation Commission,

On behalf of MaineDOT, the Maine Turnpike Authority and the rest of the study team, thank you all very much for inviting us to attend the June 27th meeting in Alfred to discuss the Central York County Connections Study. Thank you also for taking the time to present to us in writing the information on environmentally sensitive resources in your community and also your thoughts and concerns regarding the potential highway strategies identified to date. Since your letters indicated similar concerns, the Study Team thought we should respond to all of you in a single letter.

First, please allow us to reiterate that our charge is to evaluate the feasibility of all possible strategies to improving transportation connections in central York County. This means a wide array of potential road improvements are initially evaluated in order to determine which ones might best support the study goals. We expect several of the current highway strategies being considered will soon be dismissed, based on an objective analysis consistent with the study’s Purpose and Need Statement.

As noted by several individuals at the meeting, the study goals are broad and diverse. We will likely find that achieving all goals equally is impossible, as some goals actually conflict. Therefore, final study recommendations will be a matter of balancing needs and finding the most effective solutions that do the least harm. This means not just finding the most effective solution(s) or just doing the least harm, but finding the best balance between the two. Your letters are very helpful in allowing us to understand more clearly the harm that potentially could result from some of the strategies currently under initial consideration.

The method in which the study team is analyzing the feasibility of all possible transportation strategies is a multi-phase process. In the initial phases, we have performed a high-level analysis in which all strategies are evaluated based on the Measures of Effectiveness (MOEs). The MOEs were developed at the start of the study based on the study’s Purpose and Need Statement, and the Purpose and Need Statement was developed with the help of the Steering and Advisory Committees. This phase is intended to develop initial information that will help participants understand the potential benefits and impacts associated with each strategy. Please understand the strategies are broadly conceptual in nature at this point and do not necessarily represent what would be recommended when the study concludes. As we noted at the June 27 meeting, it is imperative to wait until we have all the MOE data

before making conclusions on any of the strategies that have been presented to date. These initial results, along with the study team's draft recommendations as to which strategies should move forward to the next round of detailed analysis, will be presented to John Sylvester, Heidi Daly-Woolever, Leo Ruel, and the other Steering and Advisory Committee members at the next Steering and Advisory Committee meetings, scheduled for September. They will also be presented at the next public meeting, to be held in late September. We encourage all of you to attend and participate in the public meeting.

Once a decision is made as to which strategies move forward to the final phase, those that remain on the table for consideration will be analyzed in greater detail. We will also look at potential non-highway strategies, such as providing or improving public transit, land use management strategies (which are municipally controlled), improving bicycle and pedestrian access, and other potential transportation-related non-highway strategies.

The work scope clearly calls for the project's understanding of local perspectives and plans. During the initial analysis, we read and summarized all pertinent previous transportation studies and each community's comprehensive plans and ordinances, including the Town of Alfred's. A Technical Memorandum detailing this review will be published shortly, and the information is being incorporated into our first-round analysis of potential highway strategies. The next round of analysis calls for working with conservation commissions, municipalities and others to identify additional environmentally sensitive areas and other areas of concern that might be affected by the strategies remaining to be considered in the next study phase. Both the Massabesic Experimental Forest and the Walnut Hill Focus area are good examples of these areas. This inventory will be mapped and used to more closely analyze the impacts of transportation strategies to critical environmental resources. As we noted before, the alignments are conceptual in nature and their location is only an approximation. If any of the new roadway alignments were to move forward to the next phase of the study, it/they would be refined to minimize potential impacts to sensitive environmental resources. If any new alignment were to be recommended, a separate, more detailed alignment study would be required as well. Again, we thank all of you for the detailed information you provided on these areas.

In conclusion, Gerry Audibert and I thank you for inviting us to meet with you to obtain your input. We appreciate your taking the time to state the concerns you have for the future of the Town of Alfred. We pledge to continue to work with you to ensure we fully understand your concerns and account for those areas that make Alfred a special place to live and work. We invite you to visit the study website at [www.connectingyorkcounty.org](http://www.connectingyorkcounty.org) in order to see updates and data as it is developed and to remain involved with this study. Please feel free to contact me again if you have additional thoughts, questions or concerns.

Sincerely,  
Carol Morris

Study Team Public Outreach  
Morris Communications

The Planning Board of the Town of Alfred submitted this comment on 08/29/2011

MEMORANDUM

DATE: July 11, 2011

TO: Steering Committee, Gerry Audibert P.E., Maine Department of Transportation; Conrad Weizel, Maine Turnpike Authority; and Carol Morris, Morris Communications of the Central York County Connections Study Group

FROM: Alfred Planning Board

SUBJECT: Comments for consideration by the Study Group

Several years ago the residents of Alfred overwhelmingly supported a new and updated Comprehensive Plan that charted the course for the town for the next decade and beyond. Several important changes were made from the previous plan. These included new zoning districts that had, as its intent, preservation of its rural character. While the town of Alfred does not have any large industry, it prides itself with being a recreational and environmental sanctuary. One step to preserving its rural character was the establishment of a Critical Rural Residential District. This district limits the amount of development that occurs and includes a mandate that whatever development does occur, a portion is permanently maintained as open space. Along with that requirement is a minimum lot size of five acres for non-subdivision lots.

One of the most significant areas contributing to the rural landscape is the Massabesic Experimental Forest. This nearly 2,000 acre preserve, which is owned by the U.S. Federal Government, has many walking and biking trails maintained by the Alfred Conservation Commission. These trails are enjoyed by many residents from surrounding towns as well as the residents of Alfred. This entire forest, which is in a Resource Protection District, allows no construction or development to occur.

As Alfred is the Shiretown of York County, there are many historic buildings and areas in the town. One of the more significant areas is what was formerly a Shaker Village. Many of the buildings are still in existence and are currently occupied by the Brothers of Christian Instruction and the York County Shelter. A museum is under construction to maintain the Shaker legacy.

The town of Alfred will never be the business hub of York County. What it does strive to do is maintain a quality of life for the region that residents and visitors alike have come to expect. This is what attracts people to Maine.

In response to the various options for an east-west route to improve the economic prospects of inland York County, we have serious concerns for two of the considered routes. One of these, Option B-6, literally slices the town in two. It also goes through an environmentally sensitive area that the state has recognized and provided a grant in excess of \$160,000 to assure that it is kept in its natural state.

If you refer back to the intent of the proposed routes, it would seem to have no positive impact on improving Sanford's economic access to the Route 95 corridor.

Also, Option B-5 appears to slice the Massabesic Experimental Forest in half. This would, in fact, destroy the recreational and environmental attributes of this valuable resource which is located in the town's Resource Protection Zone.

Our attempt is to not become a NIMBY (Not In My Yard) community, but the town has worked hard over many decades to improve the quality of life for residents who live in the region. We would hate to see this sacrificed for a small increase in commute time for vehicle traffic traveling between Sanford and Biddeford.

Study Team Response  
August 16, 2011

To Alfred Selectmen, Planning Board and Conservation Commission,

On behalf of MaineDOT, the Maine Turnpike Authority and the rest of the study team, thank you all very much for inviting us to attend the June 27th meeting in Alfred to discuss the Central York County Connections Study. Thank you also for taking the time to present to us in writing the information on environmentally sensitive resources in your community and also your thoughts and concerns regarding

the potential highway strategies identified to date. Since your letters indicated similar concerns, the Study Team thought we should respond to all of you in a single letter.

First, please allow us to reiterate that our charge is to evaluate the feasibility of all possible strategies to improving transportation connections in central York County. This means a wide array of potential road improvements are initially evaluated in order to determine which ones might best support the study goals. We expect several of the current highway strategies being considered will soon be dismissed, based on an objective analysis consistent with the study's Purpose and Need Statement.

As noted by several individuals at the meeting, the study goals are broad and diverse. We will likely find that achieving all goals equally is impossible, as some goals actually conflict. Therefore, final study recommendations will be a matter of balancing needs and finding the most effective solutions that do the least harm. This means not just finding the most effective solution(s) or just doing the least harm, but finding the best balance between the two. Your letters are very helpful in allowing us to understand more clearly the harm that potentially could result from some of the strategies currently under initial consideration.

The method in which the study team is analyzing the feasibility of all possible transportation strategies is a multi-phase process. In the initial phases, we have performed a high-level analysis in which all strategies are evaluated based on the Measures of Effectiveness (MOEs). The MOEs were developed at the start of the study based on the study's Purpose and Need Statement, and the Purpose and Need Statement was developed with the help of the Steering and Advisory Committees. This phase is intended to develop initial information that will help participants understand the potential benefits and impacts associated with each strategy. Please understand the strategies are broadly conceptual in nature at this point and do not necessarily represent what would be recommended when the study concludes. As we noted at the June 27 meeting, it is imperative to wait until we have all the MOE data before making conclusions on any of the strategies that have been presented to date. These initial results, along with the study team's draft recommendations as to which strategies should move forward to the next round of detailed analysis, will be presented to John Sylvester, Heidi Daly-Woolever, Leo Ruel, and the other Steering and Advisory Committee members at the next Steering and Advisory Committee meetings, scheduled for September. They will also be presented at the next public meeting, to be held in late September. We encourage all of you to attend and participate in the public meeting.

Once a decision is made as to which strategies move forward to the final phase, those that remain on the table for consideration will be analyzed in greater detail. We will also look at potential non-highway strategies, such as providing or improving public transit, land use management strategies (which are municipally controlled), improving bicycle and pedestrian access, and other potential transportation-related non-highway strategies.

The work scope clearly calls for the project's understanding of local perspectives and plans. During the initial analysis, we read and summarized all pertinent previous transportation studies and each community's comprehensive plans and ordinances, including the Town of Alfred's. A Technical Memorandum detailing this review will be published shortly, and the information is being incorporated

into our first-round analysis of potential highway strategies. The next round of analysis calls for working with conservation commissions, municipalities and others to identify additional environmentally sensitive areas and other areas of concern that might be affected by the strategies remaining to be considered in the next study phase. Both the Massabesic Experimental Forest and the Walnut Hill Focus area are good examples of these areas. This inventory will be mapped and used to more closely analyze the impacts of transportation strategies to critical environmental resources. As we noted before, the alignments are conceptual in nature and their location is only an approximation. If any of the new roadway alignments were to move forward to the next phase of the study, it/they would be refined to minimize potential impacts to sensitive environmental resources. If any new alignment were to be recommended, a separate, more detailed alignment study would be required as well. Again, we thank all of you for the detailed information you provided on these areas.

In conclusion, Gerry Audibert and I thank you for inviting us to meet with you to obtain your input. We appreciate your taking the time to state the concerns you have for the future of the Town of Alfred. We pledge to continue to work with you to ensure we fully understand your concerns and account for those areas that make Alfred a special place to live and work. We invite you to visit the study website at [www.connectingyorkcounty.org](http://www.connectingyorkcounty.org) in order to see updates and data as it is developed and to remain involved with this study. Please feel free to contact me again if you have additional thoughts, questions or concerns.

Sincerely,

Carol Morris

Study Team Public Outreach  
Morris Communications

The Selectman of the Town of Alfred submitted this comment on 08/29/2011

Memorandum

To: Steering Committee, Gerry Audibert P.E., Maine Department of Transportation, Conrad Weizel  
Maine Turnpike Authority, Carol Morris, Morris Communications of the Central York County Connections  
Study Group

From: Selectmen Town of Alfred

Subject: Comments for consideration by the Study Group

Date: July 28, 2011

We have developed comments we believe should be considered as the study moves forward. Obviously, our concerns focus on the 3 options effecting Alfred directly. While we understand we do not process the sophisticated models you use to evaluate options, none the less we believe strongly that the 3 options under consideration, any of which if implemented would do great or irreparable harm to our community.

The town of Alfred is invested by the Maine Legislature with home rule authority. In fact, all 492 cities and towns in Maine have this privilege. That means to us that we have the right to decide our land use policies. We have done so since the first zoning ordinance passed in Alfred in 1973. The Planning Director at the Southern Maine Regional Planning Commission has characterized Alfred's zoning ordinances as the most comprehensive in York County.

It is beyond questions that the myriad of upgrades and refinements to this town's land use ordinances over the past 38 years have helped guarantee that growth from about 1,200 people in the mid 1970's to just over 3,000 people today has been well managed and orderly. The preservation of the communities 217 year old rural character and acknowledgement of its farming, timber management origins and its entrepreneurial spirit help sustain the town today.

The lack of interest, therefore concern, about this community's specific land use practices by the study group consultants is shocking from our perspective. The thought by consultants that a small community could stop regional infrastructure improvements simply because they could destroy that town is equally as shocking.

We call your attention to the February 14, 2011 draft purpose and need statement for the Central York County Connections study and highlight the purpose paragraph. "The purpose of the Central York County Connections study is to identify and evaluate transportation and related land use strategies that will enhance regional economic growth, increase regional transportation, inter-connectivity, improve traffic safety, direct expected travel demand through a strong mix of multimodal strategies and preserve

and improve existing infrastructure while maintaining the visual cultural and historical character of village centers and rural areas.”

We also call your attention to a few of the stated goals in the document to: “promote consistency between study goals and municipal comprehensive plans,” “to maintain and enhance the visual, cultural, historical and environmental character of the region,” and to “encourage cooperation and coordination among municipalities and agencies in developing, operating and maintaining transportation infrastructure and services”. Doing irreparable harm and/or destroying the “visual, cultural and historical character of village centers and rural areas” by splitting small towns into sections by expanding the width of an existing major route or ripping apart the comprehensive considerations of geography, history, quality of life, home rule and the will of the local people by installing a limited access highway is a strong inconsistency. The several goals of the study highlighted above are inconsistent with a limited highway installation.

The town of Alfred legislative body (town meeting) has crafted an excellent balance among the various interests and uses of land in this community. Lot size, frontage requirements, set backs, locations, evaluation of infrastructure capabilities, preservation of historical characteristics and uses are several measures used for decades to guide the town’s future.

Other Alfred officials will emphasize the details of the thoughts listed here. Our job as Selectmen is to request your careful consideration of our interests and concerns. We expect that you will “walk us through” the models used to arrive at decisions affecting our town. We are curious how the goal to “encourage cooperation and coordination among municipalities and agencies in developing and maintaining transportation infrastructure and services” will be accomplished.

Without doubt there is very strong opposition to both limited option highways as they pertain to Alfred. Some modest upgrades to Route 111 seem doable with considered input from municipal officers. There is no support for a 4 lane upgrade to Route 111 through Alfred.

The lively discussion soon to follow is of great interest to us.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

John J. Sylvester

Glenn A. Dochtermann

David R. Burns

Selectmen Town of Alfred

Study Team Response

August 16, 2011

To Alfred Selectmen, Planning Board and Conservation Commission,

On behalf of MaineDOT, the Maine Turnpike Authority and the rest of the study team, thank you all very much for inviting us to attend the June 27th meeting in Alfred to discuss the Central York County Connections Study. Thank you also for taking the time to present to us in writing the information on environmentally sensitive resources in your community and also your thoughts and concerns regarding the potential highway strategies identified to date. Since your letters indicated similar concerns, the Study Team thought we should respond to all of you in a single letter.

First, please allow us to reiterate that our charge is to evaluate the feasibility of all possible strategies to improving transportation connections in central York County. This means a wide array of potential road improvements are initially evaluated in order to determine which ones might best support the study goals. We expect several of the current highway strategies being considered will soon be dismissed, based on an objective analysis consistent with the study's Purpose and Need Statement.

As noted by several individuals at the meeting, the study goals are broad and diverse. We will likely find that achieving all goals equally is impossible, as some goals actually conflict. Therefore, final study recommendations will be a matter of balancing needs and finding the most effective solutions that do the least harm. This means not just finding the most effective solution(s) or just doing the least harm, but finding the best balance between the two. Your letters are very helpful in allowing us to understand more clearly the harm that potentially could result from some of the strategies currently under initial consideration.

The method in which the study team is analyzing the feasibility of all possible transportation strategies is a multi-phase process. In the initial phases, we have performed a high-level analysis in which all strategies are evaluated based on the Measures of Effectiveness (MOEs). The MOEs were developed at the start of the study based on the study's Purpose and Need Statement, and the Purpose and Need Statement was developed with the help of the Steering and Advisory Committees. This phase is intended to develop initial information that will help participants understand the potential benefits and impacts associated with each strategy. Please understand the strategies are broadly conceptual in nature at this point and do not necessarily represent what would be recommended when the study concludes. As we noted at the June 27 meeting, it is imperative to wait until we have all the MOE data before making conclusions on any of the strategies that have been presented to date. These initial results, along with the study team's draft recommendations as to which strategies should move forward to the next round of detailed analysis, will be presented to John Sylvester, Heidi Daly-Woolever, Leo Ruel, and the other Steering and Advisory Committee members at the next Steering and Advisory Committee meetings, scheduled for September. They will also be presented at the next public meeting, to be held in late September. We encourage all of you to attend and participate in the public meeting.

Once a decision is made as to which strategies move forward to the final phase, those that remain on the table for consideration will be analyzed in greater detail. We will also look at potential non-highway strategies, such as providing or improving public transit, land use management strategies (which are municipally controlled), improving bicycle and pedestrian access, and other potential transportation-related non-highway strategies.

The work scope clearly calls for the project's understanding of local perspectives and plans. During the initial analysis, we read and summarized all pertinent previous transportation studies and each community's comprehensive plans and ordinances, including the Town of Alfred's. A Technical Memorandum detailing this review will be published shortly, and the information is being incorporated into our first-round analysis of potential highway strategies. The next round of analysis calls for working with conservation commissions, municipalities and others to identify additional environmentally sensitive areas and other areas of concern that might be affected by the strategies remaining to be considered in the next study phase. Both the Massabesic Experimental Forest and the Walnut Hill Focus area are good examples of these areas. This inventory will be mapped and used to more closely analyze the impacts of transportation strategies to critical environmental resources. As we noted before, the alignments are conceptual in nature and their location is only an approximation. If any of the new roadway alignments were to move forward to the next phase of the study, it/they would be refined to minimize potential impacts to sensitive environmental resources. If any new alignment were to be recommended, a separate, more detailed alignment study would be required as well. Again, we thank all of you for the detailed information you provided on these areas.

In conclusion, Gerry Audibert and I thank you for inviting us to meet with you to obtain your input. We appreciate your taking the time to state the concerns you have for the future of the Town of Alfred. We pledge to continue to work with you to ensure we fully understand your concerns and account for those areas that make Alfred a special place to live and work. We invite you to visit the study website at [www.connectingyorkcounty.org](http://www.connectingyorkcounty.org) in order to see updates and data as it is developed and to remain

involved with this study. Please feel free to contact me again if you have additional thoughts, questions or concerns.

Sincerely,

Carol Morris  
Study Team Public Outreach  
Morris Communications

Laurie Beane of North Berwick, Maine submitted this comment on 07/26/2011

I am a resident of North Berwick and I would recommend careful consideration of speed limits as well as pedestrian and biking opportunities as you look at the needs for expansion. We live in smaller rural communities and would appreciate the opportunity to safely bike and walk. I do understand how many planners, managers and other fiscal agents feel regarding cost of upkeep and would like to remind those involved that we are talking about both quality of life and the long term sustainable growth of our communities. We are living in a go-green, health conscious society and we are challenged to implement promoted alternatives to driving when the walking paths and bike paths are unsafe. As school budgets wrestle with alternatives to bussing, the opportunity for walking and biking could result in a benefit to all. Thank you!

Study team Response

Thank you very much for you comment Ms. Beane. The Central York County Connections Study will be looking very closely at developing strategies to increase the safety and availability of transit and bicycle and pedestrian connectivity in the Phase III of the study, which starts this fall. Additionally, we will make sure that municipal leaders are aware of your concerns as well.

Claire Dube of Saco submitted this comment on 07/13/2011

I saw the article about your survey in the Journal Tribune in late May. One of my questions--what is the reason Saco is not included in the Survey? Is there a separate survey being done for that area? I am very interested in transportation issues, and I feel I could make some recommendations. When is your next meeting?

Thank you,

Claire Dube

Study Team Response

Claire,

The Central York County Connections Study is a regional study, with the study area including a portion of Biddeford, south to Oquonquit, west to North Berwick and Sanford, north to Waterboro, and east back to Biddeford. The study was funded based on a directive from the Maine Legislature for the purpose of evaluating any need for improvement in the transportation connections between Central York County and the Maine Turnpike and Route 1. Essentially, we are looking at the Rte. 111, Rte. 109 and Rte. 4 corridors. The section of Biddeford in the study area is that portion that includes Rte. 111. Saco is well connected to the Turnpike, and of course, to Rte. 1, so it was not part of the study.

However, that being said, all transportation is regional, and we still encourage you to take the survey. I will also add your name to our email list so you will get updates and details on upcoming meetings. We plan for a public meeting in September - the date and location will be firmed up in August.

Thanks very much for commenting.

Carol Morris

J. Gasbarro of Berwick submitted this comment on 05/26/2011

Rt 202 from Rochester, NH thru Sanford ME, is an East / West single lane highway, similar to the way the old Rt 101 from Hampton to Concord, NH was. As Rt 202 is upgraded (as it should be) to accommodate the growing commerce and population transportation needs, please work together with the State of NH to keep large vehicles on these major transportation routes, even if that means paying a toll and traveling an extra 20 miles. Too many large commercial vehicles divert from the toll roads, to minor roads not capable of handling such large tonnages.

The population growth in York County the past 20 years has forced local towns to update from dirt, to a more user friendly but less community friendly pavement. This change has negatively affected local communities and has moved the transportation routes by large commercial vehicles to smaller local roads that have become the major heavily traveled truck roads. Please make sure the study accounts for this, and removes these vehicles from local roads to a more appropriate settings. This is a tax on residents year after year to maintain roads not designed for these vehicles.

Study Team Response

Thanks for your comment. Truck traffic diverting to smaller local roads has created concerns in many communities in Maine, especially those within Central York County's Study area, and it is certainly an issue that this study will consider. We appreciate your interest in the study and will keep you updated on its progress.

Martin P. Sanborn, former Sanford/Shapleigh/W. Newfield resident of Leesville, LA / Ft. Drum-Watertown, NY submitted this comment on 01/31/2011

Traffic on 109 and 111 has been an issue since I used to be a kid living in South Sanford in the late 70's. Since joining the military in 1994, I have gotten the opportunity to experience other parts of the country, and realized our area needs help. This is my two cents: Rt. 111 needs to be a 4 lane highway from Biddeford to Sanford. Rt. 202 from Sanford to the Spaulding Turnpike could use a widening too, but not as much as 111. As for Rt. 109, it too could benefit from having 4 lanes from the Wells interchange to the Rt. 4 traffic circle. If the funds are not available, then a route-long turning lane would make sense. As for the Sanford connector, I think it is not needed. Expand and limit more of what we got, and we will be fine.

I have seen four lane highways in New York, Oklahoma, Texas, Louisiana and etc. in areas with less population and less traffic. I think we have a great case to present to the state and feds for the badly needed funds for this. Land owners around these arteries need to realize that York County constantly growing, and that long delayed changes NEED to be made. I would like to e-mail "my" proposal to this study for consideration.

#### Study Team Response

Thanks, Mr. Sanborn, for your comment. If you have an additional comment that you would like to submit in an email, please send it to [cmorris@morriscomm.net](mailto:cmorris@morriscomm.net). We are very pleased to hear suggestions.

Brian Johnson of Sanford submitted this comment on 01/24/2011

I agree with most everything that has been posted here so far. The 111 corridor has been a issue the state of Maine has ignored for far too long. Remodeling 111 into a 4-lane ltd access highway is a great cost-effective idea in theory, however with all the residential development on the road I am not really sure how that would work. As for economic development in the Sanford area, I do believe that the ME-DOT can be involved with promoting it. Just look at Biddeford, a city with only a few hundred more people than Sanford. Biddeford has so much more to offer than Sanford, mainly due to the continuous flowing heavy traffic. Creating direct access to the Maine Turnpike from Sanford would have great impact for the area. Being the only "large" population center in the state of Maine with out direct highway access has created a community unlike any other in the state. As Mr. Patterson said below, Sanford has no way of growing it self. It has lost any ability to compete with other cities in the state for jobs and growth opportunities due to the fact that it is very inaccessible. It is a lost and forgotten city in Southern Maine. Sanford has potential to become a major tourist center, being the largest, southern most "city" in the state, but it is overlooked by people coming to Maine.

A while ago I created a few alternate models my self using google earth, trying to fix east-west connection issues in Southern Maine. I wont post a link to them because I don't feel like this is the place, but I will describe them. IDEA 1: Create a spur from I-95 in Kennebunk around mile 22 directly to Sanford running parallel to 109. This spur could have 4 exits: West Kennebunk onto ME-99, South Sanford onto ME-109 Near Jagger Mill Road, Sanford onto ME-4 or ME-109 Behind The Center for Shopping, and

Sanford In-Town behind the Sanford Mills, connecting to the new road built between Emery Street and High Street. Who knows, maybe that road could have a purpose yet! IDEA 2: Create approximately 7 miles of new road and use portions of major existing roads to connect 111 to northern communities in York County including Lyman, Waterboro, North Alfred and Shapleigh. This seems like a very simple solution to reduce a large portion of the commuting traffic on 111, leaving it more available, and hopefully safer for Sanford travelers. IDEA 3: Create a highway spur from approximately mile-39 in Scarborough on I-95 to East Waterboro Village with exits in Buxton/North Saco, Hollis Center, and East Waterboro. This will reduce the need for people in the Waterboro area to use 111 as a highway access road, and also reduce the huge back-ups that form on 202 / 22 into the Portland area daily. I am very glad this study is finally happening, as this issue should be resolved before the area grows too much and nothing can be done! I look forward to hearing more news from CYCCS!

Study Team Response

Good feedback! Thanks for your thoughtful comments.

Brad Barr of Biddeford submitted this comment on 01/22/2011

The State of Maine has been averse to four-lane highways for way too long. The Route 111 corridor from Biddeford to Sanford, and Sanford to Rochester, is in dire need of an upgrade. It also should be divided in some places, due to the high speeds achieved on these routes.

If you've ever ventured out of Maine, you'll notice many states have state routes (non-interstates) which are upgraded to four-lane divided highways, mainly due to safety reasons. These roads are non-existent in Maine, and people are dying because of it. I understand that these things cost money to upgrade. But at some point the state needs to bite the bullet.

The state NEEDS to invest in this corridor, and get out of the dark ages. York County is the future of Maine, from Biddeford to Sanford and all the points in between.

Study Team Response

Thank you for your comment and your interest in the Central York County Connections Study!