




Request for Proposals for Landscape Architecture and Engineering Design Services for the Route One South Infrastructure Plan

July 27, 2011

The Town of Falmouth is interested to retain the services of a licensed landscape architect and a professional engineer to assist the Town with the development of a Route One South Infrastructure Enhancement Plan. This plan is intended to coordinate improvements in a 1.5 mile Route One corridor from Route 88 intersection to the Turnpike Connector ramps.

All responses to this Request for Proposals must be received by the Town of Falmouth no later than September 7, 2011, 11:00 A.M. The goal of the project is to seek construction bids in 2012.



Route One South Infrastructure Plan

TOWN VISION FOR ROUTE 1

The Town of Falmouth has worked for several decades on the Route 1 corridor. The intent of these efforts has been the transformation of the Route 1 corridor from an automobile-based suburban service center to a more pedestrian-friendly, pedestrian-scaled New England village center.

Numerous physical changes have been made, commercial uses have evolved, and master plans have been developed. In addition, the Town organized community events aimed at guiding the (re)development of privately-owned properties (such as the current Wal-Mart property, Tidewater Village, and the Falmouth Shopping Center).

In 2011 the Council endorsed some key design concepts for Route 1 (see attachment A). These concepts are currently being translated into formal zoning ordinance amendments.

The Council's vision for the Route One area is a dynamic area with diverse uses that is a destination for many people, one which strongly encourages walking for multi-purpose trips and stimulates repeat visits. To that end, the Council envisions:

- a denser pattern of development of the Route One area with activities day and night,
- a variety of uses, including residential uses,
- an emphasis on pedestrians and sidewalks,
- attractive landscaping that appeals to businesses and shoppers.

The Council's efforts have a public and a private component. The public component consists of the Infrastructure Enhancement Plan described below. The private component consists of the above-referenced zoning ordinance amendments, which include land use regulations for new construction, building renovations and additions on private properties in this area. This involves building closer to the street, having more parking to the side and rear of buildings, and creating an overall environment that is more conducive to walking. The Council would like these private improvements to be made at a pace that is reasonable and comfortable to business owners in the area.

PURPOSE OF THE ROUTE ONE SOUTH INFRASTRUCTURE ENHANCEMENT PLAN

The purpose of this plan is a coordinated investment in, and improvement of, the public right-of-way (ROW) infrastructure of Route One to make it a more attractive, cohesive, functional and pedestrian-friendly street that strengthens its economic viability and implements the Town's vision outlined above.

SCOPE OF WORK

This project consists of three phases. This RFP covers only Phase One.

Phase One is focused on clarifying the infrastructure vision for Route One. It involves inventorying and assessing the condition of all infrastructure elements in the project area, traffic data collection and analysis, and evaluation of concept improvements. The concepts will be reviewed in a public process leading to a preferred concept plan. This is an exploratory phase and the scope of work is by necessity somewhat fluid.

Phase Two entails taking the preferred concept plan and preparing a final infrastructure plan.

Phase Three entails preparing construction documents for the approved final plan.

Possible improvements of the Infrastructure Improvement Plan that need to be evaluated in Phase One include:

- completing missing sidewalk links,
- building future sidewalks of consistent materials,
- constructing striped bike lanes (as part of roadway), bike paths (as part of widened, joint use sidewalk) or other bicycle accommodations,
- placing all existing overhead power lines along Route One underground,
- making street tree planting and landscaping improvements,
- wayfinding and decorative seasonal/event banners, and
- street furniture, such as benches and/or trash receptacles.

In addition, there has been interest in:

- lowering automobile speeds,
- on-street parking,
- traffic calming measures, such as narrowing travel lanes,
- possible bus shelters,
- pedestrian-oriented street lighting, and
- enhancing pedestrian crossings.

The project area is located in the Urban Compact Zone. MDOT has jurisdiction over all geometric and engineering changes (such as lane widths) and signage along Route 1. Certain components of the Infrastructure Improvement Plan need to be approved by MDOT. MDOT and PACTS representatives will be participating in this effort.

The plan also proposes to coordinate and integrate a number of separate projects, nine of which are already tentatively scheduled for funding by the Town as part of the State-approved Tax Increment Financing Plan for Route One South. These tentative projects are:

- Underground Utilities and Street Lighting
- Route 1/Route 88 intersection
- Signage (wayfinding)
- Street Tree Planting
- Sidewalk Repair and Construction
- Clearwater Drive "Gateway" Upgrade ¹
- Bucknam Road Pedestrian Improvements ²

¹ Two concept plans, prepared by DeLuca Hoffman Associates, involve a sidewalk, street trees, lighting, and underground electric service dated back to 2006. Note: Recent improvements have been made by Gorham Savings Bank and additional improvements are forthcoming by Wal-Mart.

- PACTS-funded Resurfacing Project ³

In addition, the following items have been suggested to be added to the Scope of Work:

- Sanitary sewer improvements: Depending on the vision, the existing sewer location may conflict with the desired plan. The desired plan may foster problems with future maintenance of sewer. While there are currently no known issues, the plan may present a unique occasion to upgrade sewer. This needs to be investigated.
- Gas line installation: Unitil may wish to extend gas service to Route One in the future. Installing a “dead” line may better position the Town for that eventuality. The feasibility for this needs to be assessed.
- Signal Coordination: See footnote ⁴

Consideration should also be given to further implementation of the 2009 PACTS Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan. This may include bicycle lanes, shared use markings (SLM), Bicycle May Use Full Lane (BMUFL) signs, regional way finding sign locations, with a special concern for how bicyclists traverse the Route 1-Route 88 intersection. (Note: Route 88 and the section of Route 1 south of the project corridor are part of the East Coast Greenway.)

Coordination will be required with the following Town projects which are already in progress and for which plans are available:

- Village Pedestrian Access (sidewalk/trail at Waldo's) ⁵
- Village Pedestrian Access (Hat Trick Drive) ⁶

² MDOT performed an I-295 Corridor Study, which includes recommendations that impact Bucknam Road at the I-295 ramps/intersections. These improvements will have an impact on the timing and scope of the Bucknam Road project.

³ This project is planned for 2012-13.

⁴ Excerpt from 2007 PACTS Signal Inventory and Assessment Report (draft) by Julia Dawson:
“[Signal] coordination can be achieved in Falmouth with minimal improvements. The town currently has a mix of Multisonic 820’s and Naztec 900’s which are not compatible. These controllers can potentially operate on a TOD basis; however, without interconnection, their clocks will not stay synchronized. Interconnection can be achieved by a variety of methods. If cost is a deciding factor, one alternative is to install GPS units in the signal cabinets. GPS units are a low-cost alternative to fiber optics and can be used to synchronize controller clocks.

- Coordinating the three signals along Route 1 with a simple TOD system would improve traffic flow and safety along the corridor. Interconnecting the two signals on Bucknam Road at I-295 and Middle Road would create one system along Route 1. Upgrading the Multisonic controllers and cabinets at Route 1 at Depot Road and Route 1 at Bucknam Road to Naztec 900’s would allow these systems to be tied into a master controller.”

⁵ The scope of work includes a crosswalk, 70 feet new sidewalk and 30 feet new trail and drainage work.

⁶ The scope of this work, prepared by Sain Associates, includes paving, curbing, sidewalk, driveway crosswalks, parking, and lighting.

All items listed in this scope of work and the alternates described below need further discussion in Phase One to determine if, and to what extent, they should be included in any concept options. The consultant is encouraged, and expected, to flag any other issues that need consideration by the Town.

Coordination with all applicable entities, such as MDOT, PACTS, METRO, Portland Water District, Unutil, Fairpoint, etc. is included in the required scope of work for all phases of the work.

SCOPE OF WORK ALTERNATES

Alternate 1: On-Street Parking

The Council is interested to explore on-street parking on Route One in order to accomplish a "Main Street"-style development pattern. Options for on-street parking need to be developed, costs and benefits of those options need to be analyzed, if proven feasible, a business case needs to be prepared, and feasibility of MDOT approval needs to be further explored.

Alternate 2: At-grade intersection Turnpike Spur-Route One

The Town initiated a study to explore the desirability and feasibility of replacing the Turnpike Spur ramps on the east side of Route One with an at-grade intersection. Meeting notes of an initial meeting with MDOT and PACTS are available as well as the pre-feasibility study by Gorrill-Palmer Engineers. This effort needs to be taken to the next step. The meeting notes are included as appendix B.

TRAFFIC DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS

1. Data Collection:

- a. Turning Movements (12 Hour Counts): Route 88, Fundy Road, Clearwater Drive, Depot Road, and Bucknam Road intersections. Note: MDOT, PACTS and the Town anticipate being able to provide the required field labor towards this counting effort, which will include bicycle and pedestrian counts. This is tentatively scheduled for August 24-25, 2011.
- b. Tube Counts: 24 hour tube counts will be collected of all turning movement locations as well as at Turnpike Spur ramps.
- c. Speed Delay Study: Speed and delay data will be collected over a three day period so that there will be two AM, Noon and PM peak periods. This will be used in determining the existing Level of Service for roadway segments.
- d. Headway Study of the corridor.
- e. Historical Traffic Data: Historical traffic data will be gathered throughout the corridor study area and analyzed for trends and for future projections.
- f. Historical Crash Data: Historical crash data will be compiled and analyzed for the latest three year period.

- g. As-Built Roadway Plans: As-Built plans for the corridor will be obtained.
- h. Signal Timing: Signal phasing and timing for the signals throughout the corridor area will be collected.

2. Existing Data Analysis:

The analysis of existing conditions will provide a detailed description of the current physical and operating characteristics of the corridor. The evaluation will be a comprehensive inventory of existing conditions regarding traffic volumes and composition, travel speeds, level of service, physical conditions, roadway geometrics, and crash history. The existing conditions also serve as a benchmark for analyzing future conditions and potential improvements. An important product of the existing conditions analysis is the identification of physical and operational deficiencies in the corridor which adversely affect its ability to serve safely and efficiently.

A. Traffic Volume (i.e. all modes, where applicable)

- 1. Daily Traffic Flows
- 2. Hourly Traffic Variation
- 3. Intersection Turning Movement Volumes
- 4. Traffic Composition
- 5. Historical Traffic Growth ⁷

B. Existing Condition Inventory

- 1. Roadway Geometrics
- 2. Stopping Sight Distance
- 3. Roadway System
- 4. Safety

C. Mobility and Operating Conditions

- 1. Corridor Travel Speeds
- 2. Hourly Speed Variation
- 3. Hourly Headway Variation
- 4. Percent Time Delay
- 5. Peak Hour Speeds
- 6. Level of Service (AM and PM peak)
 - a. Roadway
 - b. Unsignalized Intersection
 - c. Signalized Intersection

⁷ The Town’s Transportation Master Plan contains 2008-2009 traffic counts for the referenced intersections. In addition, the Town may have updated counts for some of the intersections as part of the recent site plan submittals for Norway Savings Bank and Bangor Savings Bank/Ace Hardware projects, which received Traffic Movement Permits/DOT approvals. Please contact Ethan Croce, Senior Planner at ecroce@town.falmouth.me.us to review site plan submittal information.

Operating conditions along the corridor relative to existing and future traffic mobility need to be analyzed. Mobility, capacity and level of service (LOS) needs to be assessed and a single model developed for the study corridor.

Evaluations of crash data will identify areas that currently have safety problems. High Crash Locations will be identified, and collision diagrams will be drafted and examined to determine safety problems.

3. Future Data Analysis:

The future analysis should be based on historical traffic growth trends and projected to twenty years into the future. The future evaluation of operating conditions should be based on the same methodology as existing conditions.

A. Mobility and Operating Conditions

1. Roadway
2. Unsignalized Intersections
3. Signalized Intersections

4. Recommendations:

The overall purpose of recommendations will be to promote safe and efficient movement of all modes of traffic, including bicycle and pedestrian facilities. Recommendations are usually based on short-term and long-term needs. Concept plans may be drawn on aerial photography and cost estimates will be done for roadway and related infrastructure improvement recommendations.

SCHEDULE

The following steps have been undertaken:

1. Seek Community Development Committee endorsement for developing an Infrastructure Improvement Plan at this time (March 2011) – **COMPLETED**
2. Seek Council endorsement for developing an Infrastructure Improvement Plan at this time (March 2011) – **COMPLETED**
3. Assemble Project Team (May 2011) - **COMPLETED**
4. Assemble available base plans – **COMPLETED**
5. Determine Scope of Work (June 2011) – **COMPLETED**
6. Review with PACTS and MDOT (a) draft scope of the plan and approach, (b) potential for on-street parking and other improvements/changes, and (c) required approvals (July 2011) – **COMPLETED**
7. Review draft Request for Proposals with Town Council (July 2011) – **COMPLETED**
8. Finalize the Request for Proposals (July 27, 2011) – **COMPLETED**

The following steps and schedule are anticipated for the remainder of the work:

9. Distribute/Advertise the Request for Proposals (July 28, 2011)
10. Hold Pre-Bid Meeting with Consultants (August 16, 2011, 10:00 AM, Town Hall)
11. Conduct traffic turning movement counts on Route One (August 24-25, 2011)

12. Deadline for submission of proposals (September 7, 2011, 11:00 AM, Town Hall)

13. Interview shortlisted candidates, if required (September 12-15, 2011)
14. Select Project Consultant (September 27, 2011)

Phase One:

15. Conduct an inventory and condition assessment of all infrastructure in the project area (September-October 2011)
16. Conduct traffic data collection and analysis (September-October 2011)
17. Conduct future traffic conditions Analysis (September-October 2011)
18. Develop concept options and cost estimates (October 2011)
19. Review concept plans with Project Team, MDOT and PACTS, as appropriate (October 2011)
20. Review concept plans with Route One businesses and community at large (November 2011)
21. Submit preferred concept plan to Town Council (December 2011)

Phase Two (for informational purposes only, not part of this RFP):

22. Develop final plans, cost estimates and construction schedule (TBD)
23. Review final plans with Project Team, MDOT and PACTS, as appropriate (TBD)
24. Review final plans with Route One businesses and community at large (TBD)
25. Submit recommended plan to Town Council (TBD)
26. Seek MDOT approval of Council-adopted plan (TBD)

Phase Three (for informational purposes only, not part of this RFP):

27. Town to incorporate recommendations in revised CIP and TIF programs/seek Council approval (TBD)
28. Seek and obtain all required funding (TBD)
29. Prepare Construction Documents, as appropriate (TBD)
30. Start Construction (TBD)

This schedule may be proposed to be modified by the consultant to meet the goal of seeking construction bids in 2012.

REQUIRED DELIVERABLES

The consultant is expected to produce the following work products, both in hard copy form (three copies) and in electronic format (PDF, AutoCAD, and GIS-compatible):

PHASE ONE

1. Inventory and condition assessment of current infrastructure,
2. Traffic data collection and analysis, and
3. Concept options and cost estimates

PHASE TWO (for informational purposes only, not part of this RFP):

4. Final plans and cost estimates

PHASE THREE (for informational purposes only, not part of this RFP):

5. Construction plans and specifications

REQUIRED SERVICES

In addition to preparing the required work products, the Consultant is expected to attend all required meetings with the Project Team, MDOT, the public, Town Council and other applicable committees.

The Consultant staff shall be certified with the Maine Department of Transportation to perform Locally Administered Projects (“LAP”).⁸

REQUIRED PRE-BID MEETING

All prospective bidders are required to attend a pre-bid meeting to review the project requirements and be able to ask questions. This meeting is scheduled for August 16, 2011, 10:00 A.M. in the Council Chambers in Town Hall, 271 Falmouth Road.

REFERENCE DOCUMENTS

The consultant is expected to be familiar with recommendations from other studies pertaining to the project area.

These include, but are not limited to, the following studies:

- 2010 [Pavement Management and Transportation Management Plan](http://www.town.falmouth.me.us/Pages/FalmouthME_BComm/LPAC/docs/2010TransportationStudyGPI), Gorrill-Palmer
http://www.town.falmouth.me.us/Pages/FalmouthME_BComm/LPAC/docs/2010TransportationStudyGPI
- 2010 Interstate - 295 Corridor Study Portland Area Comprehensive Transportation System and Maine Department of Transportation
<http://www.maine.gov/mdot/planningstudies/i295cs/index.htm>
- [Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan](http://www.town.falmouth.me.us/Pages/FalmouthME_Planning/Documents/Bicycle_Pedestrian_Master_Plan.pdf), Falmouth Trails Advisory Committee, January 2003
http://www.town.falmouth.me.us/Pages/FalmouthME_Planning/Documents/Bicycle_Pedestrian_Master_Plan.pdf
- [Coastal Corridor Coalition Phase I Report](http://www.gpcog.org/big_documents/CoastalReportPHASE1Final.pdf), Greater Portland Council of Governments, 2004
http://www.gpcog.org/big_documents/CoastalReportPHASE1Final.pdf
- [Destination Tomorrow: Linking Our Communities, Advancing Our Region](http://www.pactspan.org/destination_tomorrow/currentdt2010.php), Portland Area Comprehensive Transportation System, 2010
http://www.pactspan.org/destination_tomorrow/currentdt2010.php

⁸ For LAP description see: <http://www.maine.gov/mdot/lpa/whatis.htm>

- [Regional Bicycle/Pedestrian Master Plan Update](http://www.pactsplan.org/documents/PACTSB-PUUpdate_Complete_Nov30-09Final.pdf), Portland Area Comprehensive Transportation Planning Committee, November 2009
http://www.pactsplan.org/documents/PACTSB-PUUpdate_Complete_Nov30-09Final.pdf
- [PACTS Area Collector Road Assessment](http://www.pactsplan.org/reallybigfiles/Final-%20Report-1-12-09.pdf), Portland Area Comprehensive Transportation Planning Committee, Gorrill-Palmer, 2009 <http://www.pactsplan.org/reallybigfiles/Final-%20Report-1-12-09.pdf>
- [Portland North Small Starts](http://www.maine.gov/mdot/portlandnorth/), Maine Department of Transportation (currently in process)
<http://www.maine.gov/mdot/portlandnorth/>
- [2010 GPI Turnpike Spur-Route One Intersection Assessment](http://www.town.falmouth.me.us/Pages/FalmouthME_BComm/LPAC/docs/GPI_PreFeasibilityReport_20101201.pdf)
http://www.town.falmouth.me.us/Pages/FalmouthME_BComm/LPAC/docs/GPI_PreFeasibilityReport_20101201.pdf

BASE PLAN AVAILABILITY

Interested consultants may contact Jonathan Earle, Town Engineer, jearle@town.falmouth.me.us to review base plans that exist for the project area:

- DuFresne-Henry 1988 (Route 1 corridor)
- TY Lin 1997 (Route 1 corridor)
- Sebago Technics 2005 (Route 1/Route 88 intersection)

The Falmouth Sewer Department has paper plans available of its infrastructure on Route One. Please contact Pete Clark, Superintendent, Wastewater Department, pclark@town.falmouth.me.us.

In addition, the Town maintains a GIS system at <http://ags2.cdm.com/fl/falmouthme/main.html>

SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS

Three (3) paper copies plus one (1) electronic copy of all submitted materials are required for a complete submission. No facsimile or e-mail submissions will be considered. Please submit the electronic copy as a disc or thumb drive in PDF format and enclose with your paper copies.

Complete submissions shall include the following:

1. Identification of the key personnel of the design team and their qualifications, including LAP certification,
2. Description of recent experience with similar projects,
3. References for projects discussed in item 2,
4. Proposed approach and schedule of work, and
5. Proposed fees for Phase One only:
 - a. Base bid
 - b. Alternate 1
 - c. Alternate 2

The Town is requesting (a) not to exceed, all-inclusive lump sum fees, and (b) a schedule of hourly rates and reimburseable expenses. The Town expects to enter into a contract based on time and materials and a not-to-exceed maximum fee.

Upon completion of Phase One, the Town may elect, but is not required, to seek subsequent proposals from the selected consultant for Phases Two and Three.

SELECTION CRITERIA

The Town will make a selection based on the following criteria:

1. Professional qualifications necessary for satisfactory performance of the required services.
2. Past performance in performing services similar in type and scope to this project in terms of cost, quality of work, complexity, and client satisfaction.
3. Capacity to complete the project in the required time.
4. Cost.

PROJECT TEAM

The Project Team consists of the following personnel:

- Pete Clark, Superintendent, Wastewater Department
- Ethan Croce, Senior Planner
- Jon Earle, Town Engineer
- Theo Holtwijk, Director of Long Range Planning (project manager)
- Stephen Landry, Assistant State Traffic Engineer, Maine DOT
- Paul Niehoff, Senior Transportation Planner, PACTS
- Nathan Poore, Town Manager
- Jay Reynolds, Parks and Public Works Director
- Amanda Stearns, Community Development Director
- Chief Tolan, Police Chief

DEADLINE FOR SUBMISSION

All responses to this Request for Proposals must be received by the Town of Falmouth no later than September 7, 2011, 11:00 A.M.

Proposals should be sent to: Nathan Poore, Town Manager, Town of Falmouth, 271 Falmouth Road, Falmouth, Maine 04105.

RIGHT TO REJECT PROPOSALS

The Town of Falmouth reserves the right to reject any or all submissions received, for any reason, and to negotiate proposal terms in order to best serve the interest of the Town.

QUESTIONS

Written questions regarding this Request for Proposals will be considered – e-mail questions preferred. No phone calls please. Questions should be directed to: Theo Holtwijk, Director of

Long-Range Planning, Town of Falmouth, 271 Falmouth Road, Falmouth, Maine 04105,
tholtwijk@town.falmouth.me.us

CONSULTANT AGREEMENT

The Town's standard consultant agreement follows as Attachment C.

Attachment A



MEMORANDUM

To: Community Development Committee, Nathan Poore, Amanda Stearns

From: Theo Holtwijk

Date: January 27, 2011

Re: **Council Policy Direction on Proposed Route One Vision and Design Concepts**

On January 24, 2011, the Town Council reviewed the recommendations from the CDC for Route One and set the policy direction for this project. A straw vote by the Council indicated support for the policy direction outlined below (with exception of Councilor Chase).

POLICY DIRECTION OVERVIEW

The Council recommends that an Infrastructure Improvement Plan be prepared for this section of Route One to help guide investments in this area. Such a plan would focus on all required improvements in the public right-of-way (ROW).

Preparation of this plan and subsequent implementation would be paid for with Tax Increment Financing (TIF) funds, developer contributions, and State/Federal funds, where applicable, and be coordinated with the Maine Department of Transportation (MDOT) and *Portland Area Comprehensive Transportation System* (PACTS). Note: The costs, cost share, and timing involved in the preparation and implementation of such a plan have not yet been determined.

Recommended improvements include:

- Completing missing sidewalk links,
- Building future sidewalks of consistent materials,
- Constructing striped bike lanes (as part of roadway) or bike paths (as part of widened, joint use sidewalk),
- Placing all existing overhead power lines along Route One underground, and
- Making street tree planting and landscaping improvements.

Council agreement with 2005 Study:

- All development must contribute to a vibrant, attractive, safe, walkable, human-scaled, mixed-use, around the clock village that is appealing to residents, businesses and consumers alike.
- Larger, higher-intensity commercial activity should be concentrated in the proposed Village Center 1 (VC-1) district (i.e. northerly portion of study area).
- High development density (2 to 4 stories) should be allowed.
- Useable 2nd stories should be strongly encouraged in VC-1 zone.
 - o All new buildings are required to be constructed to be able to accommodate a future second story, if such is not provided at the time of construction.
 - o Second story may be vacant space and building may be one story as long as it has peaked roof and architectural features to give appearance of 2 story height.
 - o Residential uses on upper floors should be encouraged.
- Front yard setbacks should be reduced (see also “deviation” paragraph below)
- The Council concurs with having a maximum footprint limit on future single-tenant buildings:
 - o 90,000 sf in VC-1 district and
 - o 75,000 sf in VC-2 district
- The proposed Village Center – Municipal (VC-M) district is proposed to remain as is, with exception of the Library property if the library relocates and the current Library building is sold. The current library property is proposed to be included in the VC-1 zone.
- The boundary between the VC-1 and VC-2 is proposed to remain as originally proposed.

Council deviation from 2005 Study:

1. Setbacks:
 - a. The Council recommends that front yard setbacks should be a min. 0 feet to max. 55 feet from property line for VC-1.
 - b. The Council recommends that front yard setbacks should be a min. 0 feet to max. 75 feet from property line for VC-2.
2. Parking
 - For the VC-1 and VC-2 districts the Council recommends to allow up to one (1) row of parking between building and Route 1.
 - Additionally, the Council is in favor of exploring on-street parallel or diagonal parking on Route 1 with MDOT.
3. Renovations and Additions:
 - The Council recommends that the proposed setback, parking, and building height standards apply only to “new construction.”
 - The Council recommends flexibility for all renovations and additions as long as they preserve useable space in the original construction.
 - The necessary definitions for this need to be clear and will be prepared as a next step by the CDC.

Below are specific physical aspects and proposed land use regulations that will guide future private development in this area.

PROPOSED LAND USE REGULATIONS

Note: The permitted uses below include all of the permitted uses recommended in 2005 study as well as most of the proposed conditional uses from the 2005 study.

Permitted Uses VC-1 and VC-2 Districts:

- Retail and service establishments
- Business and professional offices
- Commercial sales and services
- Public/municipal uses
- Restaurants, excluding drive-through
- Convenience stores with gas pumps
- Auto repair and service facilities
- Residential dwelling units only on upper floors for parcels with Route One frontage, and on all floors for parcels without Route One frontage.
- Farmers Markets
- Theatres
- Wholly enclosed places of assembly, amusement, recreation and government
- Private clubs
- Medical offices
- Veterinary clinics
- Hotels
- Outdoor recreational facilities
- Public utilities
- Outdoor eating areas
- Day care centers
- Structured parking
- Accessory buildings and uses

Permitted Uses VC-2 District Only:

- Automobile sales
- Greenhouses and plant production facilities

Conditional Uses VC-1 and VC-2 Districts:

- Drive-through restaurants
- Outdoor sales and storage of equipment and materials

Conditional Uses VC-1 District Only:

- Religious institutions

Conditional Uses Village Center 2 (VC-2) District

- Outdoor sales and storage of equipment and materials
- Drive-through restaurants

Village Center 3 (VC-3) District Boundaries

- The VC-3 district is proposed to be incorporated in the VC-1 District.

Village Center M (VC-M) District Boundaries

- The Falmouth Memorial Library property, located in the 2005 proposed VC-M district, is proposed to be placed in the VC-1 District, if the library relocates and the current Library building is sold.

Building front setback for new construction in VC-1:

- Minimum: 0 feet
- Maximum: 55 feet

Building front setback for new construction in VC-2:

- Minimum: 0 feet
- Maximum: 75 feet

Building Orientation and Pedestrian Entrances in VC-1 and VC-2:

- Buildings, and their pedestrian entrances, shall be oriented towards Route One.
- If an internal street is proposed, buildings, and their pedestrian entrances, shall be oriented to that internal street.
- Where buildings front Route One as well as an internal street, orientation to Route One shall take precedence.
- Additional pedestrian entrances (e.g. from side and/or rear parking areas) are permitted.

Building height for new construction:

Village Center 1 zone (VC-1):

- Maximum: 4 stories
- Minimum: 2 stories

- Upper story may be vacant space and building may be one story with peaked roof and architectural features to give appearance of 2 story height.
- Construction is required to have the potential to support a useable 2nd story addition in future, if such is not provided at time of original construction.
- Buildings are strongly recommended to have useable space on all stories

Village Center 2 zone (VC-2):

- Maximum: 4 stories
- Minimum: 2 stories, upper story may be vacant space and building may be one story with peaked roof and architectural features to give appearance of 2 story height.

Location of parking for new construction in VC-1:

- A maximum of one (1) single parking row is permitted between the building and the front property line.
- A maximum of one double-loaded parking aisle is allowed between the building and the side property line.
- Parking on the side of buildings shall not extend closer to the street than the front façade.
- The space between the end of the side parking lot and the roadway shall be landscaped to screen the side parking lot.

Location of parking for new construction in VC-2:

- A maximum of one (1) single parking row is permitted between the building and the front property line.
- All other parking is to be located to the side and rear of buildings.
- Exception: parking area which is used for the display of vehicles for sale.
- A maximum of one double-loaded parking aisle is allowed between the building and the side property line.
- Parking on the side of buildings shall not extend closer to the street than the front façade.
- The space between the end of the side parking lot and the roadway shall be landscaped to screen the side parking lot.

Landscaping for new construction in VC-1 and VC-2:

- Locate landscaping so as to reduce visibility of parked cars as viewed from Route One.
- Landscaping may be located partially in ROW (Note: The Planning Board currently allows, with written MDOT permission, landscaping to be located in the ROW; i.e. this is not a new concept.)

Recommended, but not required, features for specific uses for new construction in VC-1 and VC-2:

- Banks should be recommended and encouraged to install a pedestrian-friendly ATM with 24-accessibility.
- Restaurants should be encouraged to install outdoor seating between building and street.
- The sound volume of new drive-through audio systems is strongly encouraged to be minimized to the extent possible.

Utilities for new construction in VC-1 and VC-2:

- Require underground electrical service connections for new construction as well as renovations above a specific development threshold level (level TBD).

Maximum Building Footprint:

Single-tenant buildings:

VC-1: Permitted use -Max. 90,000 sf

VC-2: No limit (Note: This was eliminated because it was moot. The thinking was that no one could erect a building this large in VC-2 because there wouldn't be enough space for parking.)

Multi-tenant buildings:

VC-1: Permitted use – Max. 120,000 sf (no single tenant to exceed a maximum footprint of 60,000 sf)


VC-2: Permitted use – Max. 90,000 sf (no single tenant to exceed a maximum footprint of 50,000 sf)

Renovations and additions in VC-1 and VC-2:

- Renovations and expansions are exempt from the following standards stated above:
 - o setback,
 - o parking, and
 - o building height standards.
- Note: All other proposed standards stated above (such as maximum building footprint, permitted uses, landscaping, utilities) and other existing and applicable standards will continue to apply for renovations and expansions. This will be clarified in the detailed ordinance language that will be prepared.
- Renovations and expansions that voluntarily meet the setback, parking, as well as building height standards for new construction may be eligible for a property tax

incentive (e.g. Credit Enhancement Tax Increment Financing). The specific incentive and conditions that will govern them have not been determined.


Proposed zoning map in 2010



Proposed Zoning for Route One, Falmouth

Draft: September 8, 2010

Map of proposed zoning changes required



Proposed Zoning for Route One, Falmouth

Draft: September 8, 2010

Attachment B

Turnpike Spur – Route One At-Grade Intersection, Falmouth Meeting Notes

August 25, 2010 - Falmouth Town Hall

Attendees:

Kat Beaudoin, MDOT
Ed Hanscom, MDOT
Steve Landry, MDOT
Sara Devlin, MTA
John Duncan, PACTS
Tom Gorrill, Gorrill-Palmer Engineers (representing Falmouth)
Nathan Poore, Town of Falmouth
Theo Holtwijk, Town of Falmouth

Purpose of Meeting- to determine if there is any merit to exploring the feasibility of an at grade intersection, and, if so, to develop a consensus on how best to proceed

Potential benefits to the Town/PACTS/MeDOT/MTA:

- Elimination of bridge and associated maintenance and capital costs
- Introduction of an attractive gateway to the Town
- Additional economic development opportunities
- Elimination of the Route 1 on off ramps and associated merging, speed, and intersection proximity issues

Potential issues:

- Limited distance between I-295 overpass and Route 1 to realize grade change
- Operational assessment of an at grade intersection or roundabout
- Demolition/Construction cost

Next Steps:

- Limited feasibility study to determine if grade change over the limited distance is feasible....are record drawings available? (estimate \$2000/2 weeks)
- If item a. is "yes," then complete a more detailed evaluation of profile, traffic volumes with operational assessment, opinion of probable construction cost, recommended funding sources to pursue, approximate time line, and recommended next steps. (estimate \$20,000+/- / 2 months)

Potential Funding Sources for Limited Feasibility Study and More Detailed Evaluation:

- Local
- PACTS
- MeDOT
- MTA
- Other

Tom noted that there was about 600 feet to overcome a grade difference between the Spur bridge over I-295 and Route 1.

Ed mentioned that the drop was about 20 feet and that the available distance was about 400 feet.

The I-295 bridge has a 1% uphill grade eastbound. Two vertical curves would be needed to accomplish the grade change.

It was noted that the resultant slope could be easily 10%.

The potential is there to eliminate a ramp on the east side of Route 1, along with the other two ramps on the west side of Route 1 that connect with it.

Kat stated that any solution has to work from a traffic engineering perspective, that MDOT has a hierarchical process of disposing of any real estate that included no guarantees, that a big concern was would MDOT ever have a future need for the land it may dispose of.

Ed noted that the crash summary indicated 5 crashes over the past 3 years. He qualified that as "few" and noted on a map the approximate locations of each of them.

Ed felt that with an at-grade signalized intersection accidents may double. He felt it was safety issue.

Kat stated that MDOT did not want the situation worse from a safety perspective.

It was noted that the Spur was built prior to I-295 and served to connect Route 1 with the Turnpike.

It was recognized that there may revenue potential for MDOT. One possibility was for MDOT to lease any available land for private development, rather than selling it.

It was noted that a signal may not necessarily be necessary.

The possibility of a roundabout was discussed. This would shorten the available distance to overcome the grade difference.

It was noted that any possible solution should not preclude the plans MDOT has for the future ramp changes in this area. John had brought showing the proposed changes for I-295 in this area.

An option that may help the grade change would be to raise the elevation of Route 1 in this area. This would be limited by the proximity of the driveway to Araby Rug.

Nathan noted the Small Starts program, the possibility for enhanced bus or rail transportation here and the interest the Town has in enhancing transportation options in this area.

Steve suggested the possibility of two roundabouts to allow traffic to travel north and south on Route 1. There is an example of that near the Auburn Mall.

Sara stated that the MTA engineers like on and off ramps as opposed to at grade intersections.

The future traffic demand on such an intersection is determined in part by the development of adjacent parcels.

Traffic patterns of users of the spur were discussed. The two ramps that are used most are the ones on the west side of Route 1 connecting to Route 1.

Ed reviewed two plans he had brought. He stated that an approximate 20 foot grade difference existed in an area of about 300 feet.

Tom suggested that the distance could be lengthened by going to the abutment of the overpass over I-295.

Steve raised a concern of the possibility of big truck turnovers and too big a grade change on the ramp that connected to I-295.

It was stated by Kat that MDOT did not have study funding available, but would be happy to have a review and comment role.

Theo asked if a property lease would be a competitive bid or could be arranged with a single party. This is a new area for MDOT, Kat stated.

Kat suggested that if the MDOT property were to become available that an easily reversible use for that parcel, such as a parking lot may be most appropriate. Future needs of MDOT should not be precluded by any private development proposal. Nathan stated that a Park and Ride facility already existed at the Falmouth Shopping Center property.

There was a speculative suggestion that perhaps the ramps could be left in place and a parking garage could be built in its center.

It was agreed that the next step was for Tom to investigate the grade difference issue further and provide a recommendation if that could work or not. Tom will prepare a brief report including, along with recommended next steps, that will be distributed to the attendees, who will have chance to comment. The next step will be decided upon after that.

Nathan and Theo thanked the guests for coming to Falmouth and including this meeting in their busy work schedules.

Draft Meeting notes by Theo Holtwijk, August 27, 2010

Attachment C

AGREEMENT

I. PARTIES

This contract (hereinafter referred to as "Agreement") is made and entered into on this _____ day of _____, 20____, by and between the Inhabitants of the Town of Falmouth with a mailing address of 271 Falmouth Road, Falmouth, Maine 04105 (hereinafter referred to as "Town"); and _____, with a mailing address of _____ (hereinafter referred to as "Consultant"). In consideration of the mutual promises contained herein, Consultant agrees to perform the following services for the Town.

II. SCOPE OF WORK

In consideration of the compensation set forth herein, the Consultant shall perform the services as outlined in a Request For Proposal dated _____ and attached hereto as Exhibit A and the response attached hereto as Exhibit B.

III. COMMENCEMENT AND COMPLETION

The Consultant will commence work on or before _____, 20____ and will complete work on or before _____, 20____.

IV. PAYMENT TERMS

The Consultant shall submit an invoice on or about the first of each month reflecting services performed at the Consultant's normal professional billing rates, attached hereto as Exhibit C. The Consultant understands that the payment for completion of the services outlined in Section II shall not exceed _____ Dollars (\$____), and the Consultant agrees to perform the services on that basis. Invoices shall list separately all out of pocket expenses being billed.

V. TERMINATION

Either party may terminate this Agreement for cause after giving the other party written notice and a reasonable opportunity to cure. The Town may terminate without cause by giving the Consultant fourteen (14) days notice, and compensating the Consultant equitably to the termination date.

VI. DISPUTE RESOLUTION

Any controversy or claim arising out of or related to this Agreement, which cannot be resolved between the parties shall be submitted to the Maine Superior Court (Cumberland County). This agreement shall be governed by Maine law.

VII. QUALIFICATIONS

The Consultant represents it holds, and will continue to hold during the term hereof any and all qualifications, licenses and certifications required to perform its services in Maine. The contractor shall perform all services in accordance with professional standards.

VIII. SUBCONTRACTORS

The Consultant shall be fully responsible to the Town for the acts and omissions of any subcontractors and of persons either directly or indirectly employed by it, and shall hold subcontractors to the same terms and conditions as Consultant is held under this Agreement. No subcontractors shall be retained on this Agreement without the specific prior written approval of the Town.

IX. INSURANCE

The Consultant shall purchase and maintain Workers' Compensation Insurance, General Public Liability and Property Damage Insurance including vehicle coverage and professional liability insurance, all with limits and terms satisfactory to the Town. The Town shall be named as an additional insured on the liability policy.

X. INDEMNIFICATION

The Consultant will indemnify and hold harmless the Town, its officers, agents and employees from and against all claims, damages, losses and expenses including attorney's fees arising out of or resulting from the performance of the Agreement by the Consultant, its officials, employees, agents and subcontractors.

XI. ENTIRE AGREEMENT

This Agreement and its attachments represent and contain the entire agreement between the parties. Prior discussions or verbal representations by the parties that are not contained in this Agreement and its attachments are not a part of this Agreement. Where there is any conflict between the provisions of this Agreement and the provisions of any attachment, the provisions of this Agreement shall control.

Date: _____

By: _____

Title: _____

Date: _____

INHABITANTS OF THE
TOWN OF FALMOUTH, MAINE

By: _____

Nathan A. Poore, Town Manager