

MAINE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

8/04 * ME

**The 180-Degree Turnaround of a Public Advisory Committee
Route 26, Sabbathday Lake Shaker Village
Scott Duncanson, Raymond Faucher, Brother Arnold Hadd,
James Linker, Deborah Stebbins, David Willauer**

Introduction: ...a reminder, to keep the cell phones either off or on "silent." I have to remind myself. Mine's on "silent." Make sure that you do that before we get started, here.

Our next presentation is one that involves a number of people -- a number of presenters. It's about the 180-degree turnaround of a public advisory committee for Route 26 at Sabbathday Lake in Shaker Village. The presenters, as I said, are several. There are six of them -- Scott Duncanson is from Gannett Fleming, and will be the lead presenter. He's a senior environmental planner with Gannett Fleming in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania. He's a certified planner, with over 19 years of experience in the environmental and transportation, engineering, consulting practice. I'm going to keep the introductions short, because it'll use up most of the hour and a half if I do big bios.

Ray Faucher is going to be part of this presentation. He was on schedule at part of the last presentation, so I think you've already met him.

Brother Arnold, from Shaker Village is part of the presentation. He currently serves his Shaker community as elder and trustee.

Jim Linker is retired from the Federal Highway Administration, Maine Division Office. He retired in 2002 after a 31-year career in various right-of-way and environmental positions in several Federal Highway Administration offices.

Deborah Stebbins is also one of the presenters. She's a member of the committee, and is a resident living on Route 26 in New Gloucester.

David Willauer is with the Greater Portland Council of Governments. He's the transportation and land use director for the Council of Governments. With that, I'll turn it over to Scott.

Scott Duncanson: Thank you, Don. Today, we've got a 2-part program for you. The first part of the session is going to be a short PowerPoint Presentation. I guess I'm kind of the setup man for the rest of the session. After I discuss the project history and talk a little bit about the project, you're going to hear from some of the players who were involved early on with the project -- involved with the Public Advisory Committee that was formed for the project. You'll get a feel from them. Especially important, I think, is that we have several members. Brother Arnold and Debbie Stebbins will be able to give you the perspective of the community and see how the process worked and see the results.

For the presentation, I'm going to talk a little bit about the project setting. I'll give you some background about the project history. We'll talk about the results and then we have a few pictures to show on the construction activity associated with the project, and the 180-degree turnaround of the PAC, as well as the community. It wasn't just the project advisory committee. You'll see that there was a turnaround in perceptions on the project within the community, as well.

The project setting -- Route 26 is just northwest of Portland. It's a 2-lane highway facility that's on the national highway system. It connects with Portland in the south, to the western Maine mountain and lake region, to the northwest -- as well as continuing on to New Hampshire and points west.

The study area that we looked at for this project. We had a little over 5 miles of roadway along Route 26. There were two communities involved -- New Gloucester to the south, and Poland to the north. The project traversed an area down by Sabbathday Lake, which was locally known as the "Seven Deadly Curves."

Transportation deficiencies that were identified leading up to the studies. There are deficient roadway geometry. There were narrow lanes, very limited shoulders. There were obstructions very close to the existing roadway. There were various horizontal and vertical curves -- especially as you see in the wintertime. They create the potential for some dicey conditions.

Also, there was an increase in traffic volumes along that roadway, serving a mix of vehicular traffic -- whether it was commuters to Portland, skiers to the mountains, or tourists in the summertime -- a number of different people utilize that roadway. As well as various commercial and industrial operations situated to the north of town.

There was also an extensive crash history associated with the roadway. There were several high accident locations -- locations that experienced a great rate of accidents than other arterials of that type in the state. Those were located along Sabbathday Lake -- the area known as the Seven Deadly Curves, as well as the Shaker Hill and Poland. There were also a number of fatalities that had occurred -- shown with the blue flags. Several were along the Seven Deadly Curves, as well as some other fatalities that occurred in other portions of the corridor.

A couple of key features were out there in the study area. 1 -- the Sabbathday Lake. 2 -- the Shaker Village, as well as the Shaker Bog, that was located north of the village. Primarily we're going to talk about the Sabbathday Lake and the Sabbathday Lake Shaker Village. The Shaker Bog is a large wetland area that we tried to avoid as best we could.

Sabbathday Lake is a small, 331-acre lake. There were a number of existing water quality concerns associated with that lake. There is an active watershed association. The lake is listed on several Maine DEP concern lists of lakes at most risk for development. Non-point source priority watershed. As well, the lake is a source of public recreation. Recreation in terms of swimming, boating and fishing -- and not just during the summer, but during the winter as well, where there is ice-fishing activity around the lake.

The Sabbathday Lake Shaker Village was established in 1783. When the village was established, I'm sure the road was nothing more than a horse path -- a horse cartway -- that ran through the village. There's a total of 18 buildings on 1,800 acres of land. It was designated as a national historic landmark in 1974, and it's the last remaining active Shaker village in the United States. I believe that's in the world -- it's not just the United States.

I won't be able to give the history of the Shakers justice. I think when Brother Arnold speaks, he'll give us a quick history. They were founded over in England in the 1740s -- known as the United Society of Believers. They were commonly known as the Shakers or Shaking Quakers. They came to this country in the 1770s, to Maine or Sabbathday Lake in 1783, and they've been there ever since.

The village itself. This gives you a little more close-up of the village. You can see that most of the buildings are clustered on the east side of the village, closer to Sabbathday Lake. There were several buildings on the west side of the roadway. The Shaker lands -- they had extensive land holdings in the area between Sabbathday Lake and points west of Route 26.

A little more highlight on that area. There were two buildings that were on the west side of the roadway, on the opposite side, from the remainder of the community. The Shaker Library, which at one point had served as the schoolhouse, as well as the Shaker Meetinghouse -- which is their place of worship. They had two fairly important buildings that were separated from the rest of the community, that were on the other side of the roadway, and they needed to cross the road, at various times. Their orchards were also located on the west side of the roadway.

Let's go over a little bit of the project history. I'm going to put my cap on, here. The first attempt started in 1988. DOT prepared some reconstruction plans for an upgrade on the existing alignment. Back in those days, the plans were presented. They came to a public meeting. Here are the plans for improving the roadway -- some widening through the village. But what do you think happened when they showed up at that meeting? The town officials and public did not support the plans, and that was a first strike against DOT.

DOT regrouped and came back with a second attempt in 1989. This time, they studied some alternatives on different alignments. They presented the bypass alternatives at public meetings. DOT and the town of New Gloucester actually concurred on a route for a bypass alignment. DOT dispatched some survey crews to go out and stake the alignment. Lo and behold, they found a number of new home foundations along that alignment. Perhaps they didn't check with some of the local folks to see what was going on. In fact, there was some new development that was happening that popped right up in the roadway alignment.

So, strike 2. DOT's down to their last strike. Time to regroup again. This time the project took a little bit longer to regroup, as many projects that you're probably familiar with have done. DOT decided it was time to take a different approach with the project.

One of the cornerstones of the project this time was going to be a project advisory committee. It was the first use of a project advisory committee by Maine DOT. I think what's also important -- and maybe you can take a look at the date on this attempt -- it was 1996. I think that coincides with a lot of the community-impact assessment thinking and philosophy that was evolving at that time. It was probably no coincidence that someone in this room with Maine DOT was working on that CIA policy and purple book with Federal Highways.

There were 13 members of the project's public advisory committee. They included local and regional government agencies, local citizens, as well as a representative from the Shaker Village itself. The local and regional government agencies extended beyond the additional towns. We also had two counties involved, as New Gloucester was in Cumberland County, and Poland is in Androscoggin County. We also had some folks involved from further up north on Route 26, who were involved with shipping goods and services through Route 26, to get to market.

So it wasn't just the local residents who were involved. There was a larger community that was involved in the public advisory committee. They met regularly, right along Route 26, right in the project area, at the Shaker Library. I think over the course of about 2 years, there were 14 meetings -- that's about one meeting every two months that were held through the NEPA process.

The PAC assisted in the development of the project purpose statement. They identified deficiencies in support of the project need. They identified and prioritized project goals, and provided input on alternative development and evaluation and selection.

One of the first things they helped with was confirming previously-identified deficiencies. The designated high-accident areas, hazardous travel conditions due to the insufficient lane width, and non-existent or narrow

shoulders. As well as the hazardous conditions due to the increasing traffic volume and travel speed mix along Route 26.

The also provided a different perspective, and gave us additional information about deficiencies that needed to be addressed with the project. They identified the hazardous access for abutters. Sometimes, trying to get out of your driveway onto Route 26, was a hazard. This shows a truck rumbling through the Shaker Village, as someone was trying to exit their access drive. There were also hazardous conditions for pedestrians. As a part of the Shaker Village Museum, they had tours that would happen daily during the summer season. Folks would need to cross the street. You'd need to look a couple times just to make sure it was going to be safe to cross.

As well, there was a beach located down by Sabbathday Lake. There was some parking at a grange building on one side of the roadway. The beach was on the other side of the roadway, so there were folks who needed to cross that beach. It's hard to see here, but that was right on a curve, as well. So they had identified that there were some additional concerns that we needed to take a look at.

Speaker: I think these skid marks...[inaudible / crossing]

Scott Duncanson: Very good. There were also noted some adverse truck and noise and vibration impacts. Again, when the roadway or cartway was initially built to run through the village back in those 1780s, no one envisioned these 18-wheelers rumbling down the roadway through the village. The houses and buildings are set fairly close to the road, so there were adverse noise-and-vibration impacts that we were clued into during the process.

Storm water quality concerns were very big. [The roadway comes very close to the road]. A lot of concerns about water quality. This is a natural resource that's important to the community and important to their way of life -- for the residents as well as summer residents -- for the economy and for recreation. Water quality was a big concern. Overall, it was felt that there was a detrimental impact to the village with the roadway running through the middle of it.

The PAC also identified and prioritized goals, early on. These were, I think at most of the PAC meetings, still up in the background, so that folks could be reminded, "Here are the goals that we set at the beginning." I found it interesting that the first goal was to facilitate the safe movement of people and goods. They were looking out for others. The first goal didn't have to do with them or their house or their community. They wanted to make sure that the roadway could facilitate the safe movement of people and goods. Protect Sabbathday Lake water quality. Improve storm water runoff. Minimize Shaker Village building impacts. Access private driveways safely. Protect groundwater. Meet or exceed National Highway standards. Eliminate the blind curves -- that's the Seven Deadly Curves. And protect pedestrians in the vicinity of Shaker Village and the Sabbathday Lake.

They also helped in the alternatives-development evaluation and selection process. They provided input and feedback on the alternatives that were developed and presented. They voiced some concerns, early on about some alternatives that went to the east of the Shaker Village, and subsequently alternatives to the east of the village were dropped.

East of the village is shown in this brown line, here. The thinking with that was the Shaker Village had a strong connection to the Sabbathday Lake, as the Sabbathday Lake Shaker Village. Having that roadway run between the village and the lake was going to have a detrimental impact to the Shaker Village. With the concerns of the water quality -- concerns in trying to move the roadway away from the lake -- the eastern bypass was dropped. We looked at an upgrade of existing Route 26. We looked at several options for what we would call a "southern bypass" for a portion of Route 26. There was a Shaker Village bypass. We looked at several alternatives to bypass the Shaker Village. We had a double bypass, which could be a combination of a southern and northern bypass. As well, we looked at one continuous western bypass of Route 26.

One thing that was interesting during the process, or something that was interesting that may not always happen when you have a public advisory committee. Brother Arnold and the Shakers were very concerned about what was best for the community. Not the Shaker community -- but what was best for the community as a whole. They were not going to impose their thoughts on the rest of the committee. On the other hand, a lot of the residents and other members of the committee were concerned about impacts the alternatives would have on the Shakers. So they weren't out looking for their own interests, either -- they were looking out for the Shaker community. The PAC did reach a consensus on a preferred alternative, and the PAC members supported that alternative at a public hearing that was held for the project. I think that shows the success of the project when your PAC members will stand up at a public hearing and support the project.

The alternative that was selected included both a southern bypass, as well as a northern bypass of the Shaker Village. The southern bypass moves the roadway away from Sabbathday Lake. It reduces the traffic volumes around the lake and the beach. It bypasses the Seven Deadly Curves section. It improves the geometric conditions of the roadway. The northern bypass removes traffic from the Shaker Village. It improves pedestrian safety at the village. It reduces the noise and vibration at those buildings that were adjacent to existing Route 26.

There were some impacts to the orchard and the Shaker water supply. There was a spring and a water tower that needed to be relocated on the property. Another important component was that the village would still be visible from the roadway. Primarily, if you approach from the north, the village is still visible, somewhat, from the roadway. Making sure that the Shakers still had a visible presence -- because they are a tourist destination -- for some locals who may come to buy goods from the orchards or from the Shakers.

The result of the project was that there was community support. The PAC really acted as an extension of DOT and Federal Highways and the transportation project development process. Environmental clearance was obtained two years after the project was restarted, and the PAC was formed. Construction is being completed, right now. The bypasses are now open. There's still a little bit of work that needs to be finished up, but the roadway work is finishing up, and it's scheduled to be completed by, I believe, November of this year. The result was a homerun for DOT, Federal Highways and the community. It did result in a 180-degree turnaround of that PAC and the community.

I'm just going to show a few slides before I move on to the other panel members. These show a few features of the new construction activity. These were taken in early July. Within a month, by the end of July, the project did open. This shows a portion that runs through the Shaker orchard. The water tower that needed to be relocated was in the path of the roadway that was relocated within the orchard. A water line was run underneath the roadway to provide the water supply to the Shaker Village.

You can see here from the roadway itself, a portion of the Shaker Village from the roadway. So it is still somewhat visible -- not quite as visible as it was, with the road running through it. Here's a portion headed down to the south, away from the Shaker Village. In addition to community impacts, there were some natural resource impacts. Wetlands areas were created for mitigation. There was one section where the road does run on existing alignment. There are probably 5-8 houses that are still on the existing alignment, and Debbie's is one of those. Here's a rock cut, as you head further to the south. This is an area that takes the roadway away from Sabbathday Lake. Here's just another picture near the southern connection. The roadway's a lot wider, and hopefully safer than the existing condition.

With that, I think you've heard enough from me. It's time to hear from some of our panel members. First up is going to be Jim Linker, from the Federal Highway Administration. Jim is actually now retired, but was heavily involved with the project, providing some guidance to DOT and to the PAC. Let me see if I can get his presentation up here.

James Linker: Thank you, Scott. I don't know if it was a 180-degree turnaround for Maine DOT, with respect to community impact assessment and public involvement interaction. But it was a very important turning point. I think it's important to take a look at where the Federal Highway Administration was, where the DOT was at that time, and how they sort of came together in their thinking. Had that not been the case, I don't think the rest of the successes we've heard about would've happened.

Our concept at the time -- in the mid-90s -- for public involvement of the Federal Highway Administration... Public involvement deals with the interaction of people, to the extent that they influence the transportation decision-making process. This was a dramatic change from where we'd come from. I'll talk about that a little bit. The public has an extensive role in this decision-making process, including developing how they interact with the process.

The really key thing you'll see here in this program -- and particularly when we hear from the really important people like Deb and Brother Arnold... The key was to focus on interests, rather than positions. It's really difficult when someone says, "No way, no how. I just don't want that thing," as opposed to, "You know I'd like to have the safety. I'd like to have the mobility. But the noise really bothers me." You can work with that.

Public involvement requires a lot of all the participants. The willingness to work together, to interact, to be creative and to find out how people actually work and perform. Also, it requires some study, some after-action reviews and some transformation development within the group that's working with the community. One size doesn't fit all, here. It doesn't fit all in the public involvement process, itself. Solutions are not something you come upon accidentally or habitually. You've got to change your process and adapt. I'm preaching to the choir, here -- we know that.

This is the concept that the Federal Highway Administration was pushing during that time. The Federal Highway Administration, as you probably know, is a guidance organization. We can't tell people how to do things, but we're located essentially in the field because things are different from place-to-place and from time-to-time. We'd rather do the right thing than do whatever it is we've always done, and do it right -- although it may not apply.

The Federal Highway evolved its thinking on public involvement and working with communities, to a point where originally, public hearings were brought about by the town's concerns in the late 50s and the early 60s about... "Bypasses?" That was a bad thing. Can you imagine? It was a different point of view. People had the expectation at that time that the DOTs and highway commissions at that time would decide what they wanted to do, design the thing and let them know what's happening.

As we ramped up with many more projects across the country through the 60s, that didn't do it well enough. As you know, during the 70s the CQ guidelines brought about what we know as the NEPA regulations. Our own Federal Highway regulations reflected a need for scoping. It gives you a better idea of the full impacts -- the wide range of impacts of the transportation project; not just the roadway, itself. It had more-enhanced public-involvement requirements.

That led us through the 80s, which was a kind of turbulent time. It was a good time for attorneys. We fought over a lot of issues. The reaction to that, of course, was the Iced Tea and T21 responses in the 90s. It required transportation officials to work early, continuously and proactively with the public, and include the public into the data stream -- not only of what's happening, but also in trying to figure out how to get that data that they need, because they understand things. They come from things with a little different perspective than we do.

Also, when we had talked about the "traveling public," in the past, that was our key constituency, so we thought. Well, our constituency broadened out. It included the underserved, and even those who don't use

highway transportation in their daily lives. That required that we assess the effect, and it also brought us to seeing a lot of rural issues. As well, you know most community impact assessment examples come from larger metropolitan areas. That part was brought into the equation, as well. The key here is that livable communities became an integral part of transportation planning and development process.

Regulations are good enough, but you know, we've got a lot of those. To emphasize that, the Federal Highway administrator and the FTA administrator both issued a really strongly-stated policy statement that supported integration of transportation and community values. It stressed the active role for the public. They're trying to make sure that all of the transportation agencies -- everyone receiving federal aid dollars for transportation -- understood the importance of getting out and understanding the community in the ways that you've heard. Definitely by the speakers I've heard here this morning.

There was an obligation on all parties, all agencies -- transportation agencies and also the participant public -- to define their goals and objectives, and identify their projects. To evaluate alternatives in a rational way with plenty of disclosure.

The public's role, as I said, is involved in the formulation of the transportation policy and the project's execution -- not just "being informed" as to what's going on. As we've said before, this is a proactive transforming, spiraling-up process, where you're supposed to try on different techniques and do what you need to, to find out the public that you're dealing with, and deal with their needs.

You've heard some of the issues on this. It was a vast little rural project. You can take a quick glance at it. But if you start peeling it off, this was our national highway system, but it was a little 2-lane road -- windy... These pictures that you just saw certainly don't do justice to the "before" situation. The roadways were narrow. On the side was a deep sand shoulder. It was horrible. Kids were standing there, waiting for buses. Skiers were trying to get up to the mountains. This really is a major connection between a lot. If anyone out of the State of Maine drinks Poland Spring water, this is the road it comes down from. Poland Spring is just up the way from it.

There is tremendous, heavy traffic coming roaring down here. Safety issues. You heard about the Seven Deadly Curves. That was just one of the safety issues. The cultural issues -- the Shaker Village was not just an important property on the National Register. It's a National Historic Monument property, as well. And there were a lot of archaeological sites along the way.

In the natural environment, you've heard about the runoff issues. You saw the slides of the highway right beside this beautiful Sabbathday Lake. There were wetland issues. There's also the psychological issue with the folks that had an interest in this process. They had just finished a war with the turnpike -- a different agency -- over citing a new exit. That had a lot of effects, because the whole world would be streaming through their neighborhood.

They had a methodology of dealing with the public, and the public was tired of the fight, but they were experienced in reacting to transportation agencies trying to change their community. You've heard that this was a success. I'll just close by saying that in my opinion, some of the elements of success were in the diversity of players and the interaction by the players and the DOT. Did this happen overnight? Did this happen as an accident? Certainly not.

The DOT, up to this point, had for the most part, done a good and conscientious job of interacting with the public -- but generally they were in control. The public hearings were conducted by -- surprise, surprise -- the design engineers, whose point of view was strongly oriented by their work. It was pretty much a one-way communication activity. I attended a lot of these. We knew something was wrong -- you heard about the two strikeouts. We had to do something very important.

I attended probably most of the PAC meetings. But the meetings leading up to and including the PAC meetings -- I traveled with [inaudible] [Lindsey Foster]. The Federal Highway Administration is supposed to guide the state, but of course, Judy helped me understand how to do that. She's a very strong advocate for community impact assessment, and also for doing the right things, as opposed to what we've done [all this time]. The other thing was, Ray Faucher became the project director-engineer or whatever. Ray has a very open and creative mind. He was looking for success; he was looking for results. With that, we were off to a different way of doing things.

You also hear later on by others about the "facilitation." These PAC meetings were facilitated by very strong outside facilitators. No transportation connection. He held those things with a whim of iron. They were very, very structured meetings. There's lots of talks in highways, and I'm not involved as much with highways as I used to be -- but boy, I was always impressed with how poetic the concept of consensus was. You've got highway folks with a lot of money and a lot of power.

We talk about consensus, but I think what the facilitator was really able to do was to manage and enable dissent. I think it was hearing the dissent and hearing the different points of view that was the important thing. Hearing them -- really hearing them. Really having them come out in all their full force.

Then the emergence of interests over positions. Deb, I think you'll be able to talk about that very, very well. As you'll see. Then as you heard before, the PAC took an ownership in the project. I think the Department took an ownership in the process of working with the PAC. Those were the two really key feelings. DOT didn't feel that they were brought dragging and screaming into a process. They really felt that this was something good for them.

With that, I'll turn it over. Scott? I'll turn it back to Scott.

Scott Duncanson: Thank you. I think what we'll do now is just hear from the other panel members. Brother Arnold, you've got a microphone right in front of you. Why don't we start with Brother Arnold? If you can give us some of your perceptions, being a member of the PAC, maybe a little bit of your feeling leading up to the PAC, and your experience with the PAC -- as well as your experience once the PAC process ended. CIA continued during final design and construction. Maybe you can share some of that with us. As well, you can correct any of my history related to the Shakers.

Brother Arnold: Thanks, Scott. When he asked me to come here, I didn't even hesitate to say, "Yea," because I knew I was going to see some people who became friends -- that we used to see on a very regular basis, as we heard. It's good to see them all -- including our good friend [Rock] who didn't get mentioned. He produced more maps than I have ever seen in my entire life. Complete folios at each and every meeting for having to deal with the new interpretations.

I'll give you a little history of the roads, since you're all interested in roads. It was laid out as the Great Portland Road, back in the 1770s. It connected us to the City of Portland, which was very important. Up until 1816, New Gloucester was the end of organized Maine. So the great and general court used to meet half-time in Portland and half-time in New Gloucester. They had to allow all those lawyers we've already heard about and judges to travel back and forth in a regular and good manner. That's why the road was begun.

It actually stopped right at the village. If you're going south and coming up, we have a pump on the road -- that was the end of it. Then it took a sharp right and went over to cut through the fields, down over a brook into the Town of New Gloucester. We just had a little path, and that path eventually as the Shakers gained some prominence in the area -- and as Poland and the rest of Maine started to develop, Route 26 as we know it changed into its present... Well, up until two months ago... present state.

Really, that road never changed. That was the carriage path that was laid out in the 1770s and just tarred over, basically. As Al Morrison dubbed it, it was the Seven Deadly Curves.

The Shakers have been at Sabbathday Lake, as Scott already said, since 1783. If anybody doesn't know who the Shakers are, we're a religious community best described as a Protestant monastic community. During most of our history, we were more secluded from the world than we are today. Route 26 played a big part in that. There are no two ways about it. When you have thousands and thousands of vehicles going right through your dooryard every day, it opens you up more.

We did indeed become a tourist destination, which helps us support ourselves -- so we wanted to see a better road. But we were also really concerned. Not only for our buildings, but also the safety. There had been four deaths that I know of on our property over the years, caused by Route 26.

[tape turn]

...about the road itself was that the community felt something had to be done. Not specifically for us, but for our neighbors. Scott also mentioned that. An overriding concern we had during all of these meetings was, "What would be best for everyone? What would make the best road and be best for the people who had to live on that road?"

We appreciated the DOT coming and informing this PAC. Really, from the very beginning, they showed a concern that they wanted to hear what everybody in that room had to say. I distinctly remember Mr. Linker in that first meeting. Really, I have to say he gave a charge to all of us about what was going to be important. Now I know that Judy was helping him with that.

He laid it right out. Mr. Gingold did run a good meeting time and time again. He kept people focused. People were concerned to be focused. I think that they were go-getters, and as concerned about what was going to happen to their neighbors as we were. There was something else I wanted to say, but I can't remember.

Working with the DOT has been wonderful. I'll give you a further-back history than 1988, though. That was 1966. That was terrible. That's when they first wanted to change Route 26. They took by eminent domain a lot of our land, which would have very adversely affected us. It would've taken a couple of our buildings, and it would've brought the road right up to the back of our barns. It would've cut us off from our pasturelands. So we would've had our animals here with no way to get them out there.

The community fought that one tooth-and-nail. I wasn't there in 1966, but when I came in 1978, that was still something that was talked about in the community. When the 1988 proposal came on board, it was basically revisiting that 1966 one. The community was unhappy, like everybody else in town, I think -- so we were very active and very much against it. We were part of the strike one and part of the strike two, I must say, as well.

But I'm very glad that we were also part of the "homerun," as Scott called it. What we've seen has been nothing but positive. People listening, people working together, people making something better happen. All during this construction phase, we've been listened to for any concern that we had. In fact, sometimes, Mr. [Pelletier] sees a concern before we do, and he comes down to seek us out.

Sometimes it doesn't work in our favor. That's for sure, but that's all right. It doesn't work out in our favor for a reason. There had been revisions all along the way to make it better. A good example of that was the water tower. According to the design process, it was going to be right on the new road. We saw that as a very dangerous thing, and pretty unacceptable. So we talked it over with them and lo-and-behold, two weeks later,

that thing was moved 500 feet back. New water lines were installed and it looks better than it ever has in the 101 years it's been there.

All I can say is, it's been a great situation. I can't give you enough kudos for everything that happened. We're very, very pleased and we're even more pleased every day we wake up and the trucks aren't in front of our houses any more.

Audience: [applause]

Scott Duncanson: Thank you, Brother Arnold, for those insightful words. I will mention Rock LaRochelle is here from CLB. They served as engineers, as well -- and continue to serve on the project. I think it's important also to note a few things that Brother Arnold had said about construction. CIA does not stop when you get NEPA clearance. CIA needs to continue within the department on those projects. You still need to work with the community as you go through final design, as well as construction. That's, I think, an important point that should be made.

At this point, I'd like to now hear from Debbie Stebbins, who's a resident of New Gloucester. She lived on Route 26 through...

Deborah Stebbins: Since 1987.

Scott Duncanson: Since 1987. Hers is one of the few houses that still remains on the alignment.

Deborah Stebbins: When I was first asked to be on the committee, I was surprised. But actually, I was honored to be on it, and very interested to find out what this whole process was about. It did take two years. I learned a lot about water and animal trails and a lot of things that I didn't know existed in my land, moving everywhere.

I think it was important to have local involvement because of what happened before. In 1988, I was surprised by getting a letter saying, "Hey! We're going to realign this." We'd go to the meeting and there really was only a handful of the public there. Fortunately, the Shakers were involved in that. That did change that. The project looked like it was going to move ahead, and not solve some of the problems like The Seven Deadly Curves. It was going to be realigned on the Seven Deadly Curves, and there are houses on either side. I don't think that really would've straightened it out. I believe that's why the public and everyone thought that.

That was a good thing, in a way -- even though it remained very dangerous in front of my house. I did have numerous accidents, and I did have deaths in front of my home. I was glad to stop that.

It's very safe now in front of my home. I'm able to see for great distances. I was a little bit on a blind corner. You'd pretty much guess that, "You'd better step on it and get out and get moving," because there was going to be a Mac coming down that hill or someone speeding or something's going to be happening. You'd get all these dangerous situations where someone decides they're going to pass you -- even though it's a double-line no-passing situation.

I did have a lot of people come to me and ask me questions. There was a lot of fear that the words, "eminent domain," that's involved with Maine DOT -- you hear all these scary stories. A lot of my neighbors were fearful of these things that were going to be going on. I was able to speak to them about the safety concerns and things that've happened in our community, and that we want the best for it -- to please speak up if they had any ideas. To come to the meetings. The meetings were open to the public. As it got closer and closer to the end, it was pretty full, back there.

The gentleman that was running the meetings did run them very well. That was good -- because sometimes the public would get a little bit excited and want to speak up while we were working through our meetings. They were allowed to speak at the end, which was wonderful -- so we did get to hear from them. That helped, I think, with support in our community.

There were some people that had losses. That was difficult for me, with my neighbors. They are my neighbors and my friends. I know I personally was willing to sacrifice whatever I needed to, to make it safer for everyone involved, passing up and down that highway. I saw wide loads almost hit school buses. I saw just tragic things. I'm just glad it's much, much safer. If I wasn't on the committee, J Loop wouldn't be there today. Originally, they were going to keep my curve in, and then it was going to go popping back out by Shaker Village to the orchard. I kept thinking, "Well, that's going to create a curve, and then there's another curve by my house. They're going to be coming down that hill 3-lanes, full-force." I thought, "Well that's probably not going to solve my problem or my neighbors' problems with people skidding off the road."

I put a new mailbox in every year. I'll tell you, I laugh when I say, "No -- I get a new one every year because it's crashed every year." I think that was important, because I kept running out on the center line and said, "Oh, that's got to leave! It's just got to go straight! Straight!" I know it did make some people unhappy with having to go through there. My house did get egged. I did experience some incidences like that. But all-in-all, it was a positive experience, and I was glad to have done that.

Audience: [applause]

Scott Duncanson: Very good. Thanks for sharing with us, Debbie.

Now we're going to hear from Dave Willauer. Dave is a representative from the Local Council of Government. Dave was involved with the project advisory committee. We're going to hear a few words from his perspective.

David Willauer: Thank you, Scott. The Greater Portland Council of Governments is involved in a number of regional transportation initiatives. I think it's timely that the conference is being held here at the Marriott. The Marriott just signed on to participate in a regional shuttle bus that we're organizing, called the Portland Explorer. After the conference or any time while you're here, if you want to go downtown or go to the mall, the Marriott has a free shuttle that goes to all the four transportation terminals and three other hotels in Portland and South Portland. I can tell you that you won't be able to take a shuttle bus to New Gloucester. New Gloucester and [Grey] are both on the turnpike and Route 26 corridor. There are no transit options out there.

Our role in this process, and my role as a committee member, if I had to sum it up, is to help serve as a liaison between DOT and the consultant team and the public. All these PAC meetings were open to the public, and there were several public meetings in addition to this. When people come to a public meeting, the biggest question that gets asked is, "Who are all these people sitting around the table, and what are they doing?"

Our role is to help facilitate some of the discussion, in addition to the facilitator, Art Gingold, that led the process. We worked on a number of committees going on at the same time. Just to the south, there was a bypass committee looking at the Exit 11 work. The Maine Turnpike and the DOT were looking at a way to bypass the [Grey] corner to the south.

We developed a one-page summary, and I've got some copies up here, if you're interested. In a nutshell -- "What's the project all about? Who's involved?" and a sketch on the back of, "What are the current alignments in play, right now?" I've got one dated August of 1997.

Just to give you an idea, in addition to DOT and FHWA, on the study team, you had CLD -- which stands for Costello Labanowski and Denapoli -- in case you're interested. Highway Management and Design. We had

Barton & Gingold serving as facilitator for the public participation. You had construction consultants. Gannett Fleming was doing the environmental assessment. North Star Hydro and Woodlot Alternatives was doing the natural resources inventory. Eastern Topographics was doing some aerial photography. There were a lot of people sitting around the table in these meetings. When the public comes to participate in a project of this magnitude, it's pretty intimidating to see all these people, and to know when it's time to ask a question. Part of what we did was to help allay some of those concerns about who was there. We explained to people what the process was about and helped to try to guide the process.

The other thing that's significant in this process is that Maine in the early 1990s passed a Maine Sensible Transportation Policy Act. In a nutshell, that meant that before you widen any roadway or add new capacity to any roadway, you need to look at all the alternatives. It was probably no accident that this happened about the same time Iced Tea was passed, in 1991.

It changed the way in which roadways were constructed in Maine, and it changed the whole public process for Maine -- I think for the better. But to this day, we're looking at a much longer period of time for these things to take place. Here we are, looking at [Grey] Corner. I believe the work is in design right now, and we may see some groundbreaking as early as perhaps next year or the year after. These meetings took place in 1997 -- 8 or 9 years ago. the Gorham Bypass in Maine, the Gorham Village is just south here. Twenty years of studies took place before we'd see any action. We're still in that process, and we still don't have any groundbreaking in Gorham -- but we're getting close to getting the funding in place.

In Wiscasset, Maine, another bypass. I think we're seeing a much more concerted effort to bring the public to the table, and to look the environmental impacts of these major roadway projects, before they're actually built.

I'm going to stop there and open up the discussions, since there are lots of folks here that can add input. Thank you.

Audience: [applause]

Scott Duncanson: Thanks, Dave. Before we open up the discussion, we've changed the batting order a little bit. Ray is now batting, "Clean up." So Ray? A few words from Ray before we open it up for discussion.

Raymond Faucher: Thank you, Scott. As we started this process, I was involved even at the Strike 1 meeting -- going to that process. It's interesting -- where's the public going to come in and tell us what to do? We're DOT. We know what we're doing. We've been doing this a long time. We continue to struggle through that process, through the early 1990s. We finally came to figure out that the tools we had in our box -- the hammers and the saws -- those primitive tools -- really weren't going to work very well in trying to solve the problems that we had along with 26 in this area.

We started to brainstorm with, "Okay. What do we need to do here?" To try to find another tool -- another mechanism to help us better-solve this problem. To try to come up with improvements to transportation into an area that DOT and the locals have identified as a problem area. We developed this project advisory committee.

It was a learning process for DOT. As has been mentioned, we also engaged the services of a facilitator to help us manage the meetings. They were very structured meetings. The public was invited to these meetings. But yes, we told the public at the beginning of every meeting, "These are working meetings of an advisory committee. We're here to provide the study team and develop some information. We're going to provide that information to the advisory committee. We're going to look for some feedback from them in assisting us in developing an alternative," that they'd feel would be acceptable to the local community. One that DOT could support. Many of the people on the advisory committee found out that as we developed these transportation projects, we also needed to permit them. As we developed these, they also needed to be acceptable to the

natural resource community -- so ultimately, we could get the necessary permit for ultimately constructing these projects.

The process in New Gloucester went exceptionally well. Although it was a learning process, we didn't do too much tripping along the way. It progressed very well. We had a great consultant who provided us with some great plans. Again, a picture's worth a thousand words, and we spoke many thousands of words with many of the plans that had been developed. We really helped try to explain a lot of the information and a lot of the work that had been done through that area.

I also learned a great deal about acronyms. Some of the terminology that we often use. I think we were out on a field walk in order to look at some of the areas. I had mentioned, "Grade separation." I think it was Debbie Stebbins who had a perspective of "grey separation," was. I said, "No, no. That means building a bridge over a highway." We get involved in our own terminology and we present that to the public. It's amazing how we really get wrapped up in what we're doing and have a feeling that they understand all the terms that we're using.

It was very much a learning process for me in working with many of the other committees on the study. Try to be more user-friendly in the terms that we're using. To be less engineering-oriented, so the public has a better understanding of the terms that are being used in the design and development of the various aspects of these transportation projects.

Route 26 was the first advisory committee we had done. It's been used on all of the other studies that I'm currently managing. There are several besides New Gloucester. I've got some other projects that are now in the construction phases. I've got one here in Portland and one in Augusta that have gone through this process and been successfully completed and moved to construction. It's interesting in that in several of these, we've gotten some tremendous feedback from many of the individuals on the advisory committee. Dave was mentioning the story in Gorham just a little ways from here. We developed several different alternatives for that. We're in the final stages of completing that environmental assessment with Federal Highway. But the alternatives have been identified as the preferred alternative. Some of the uniqueness of that alternative was provided to us by feedback from the advisory committee. We had been looking at some of the typical ways we would develop bypasses around that community. One of the community members said, "Well did you look at this, and how this would work?" We stood back and, "No, we didn't look at that." We went back to analyze it, and it turned out that really from a transportation perspective, it performed better than the others that we had identified.

They provided us with some great feedback on that one. I've got another one that I'm doing up in the Bangor area. That's looking to provide a connection between I395 and Route 9. In that particular study, we developed over 70 different alternatives. It's interesting in the preferred alternative that we're now focusing on, it was not an alternative that was developed by the design team and DOT. It was actually developed by one of the advisory committee members. One of the advisory committee members is a city engineer for the City of Bangor.

He went out and was actually very familiar with the area and snaked an alignment through the area. He said, "Have you guys looked at this?" We said, "Well, no, we haven't. But... Okay. We'll give it a look." As we've given it a look and evaluated that alternative from a transportation perspective, it performed just as well as the other one. It has less impact to the natural resource side. It has fewer displacements. So we're getting a lot of good, positive feedback from the advisory committee.

I think a couple other things are very important to know. The commitment needs to be put forward by the people and the advisory committee. The presentation report talked about the Aroostook Study. That study and that advisory committee were initiated and put together in July of 1999. That study has been going on for over five years. Many or most of the committee members are still working with us! We've got another meeting coming up in a couple of weeks, up in Aroostook County. I still remember many of the original members of the

original PAC committee that started in 1999. So there is a long-term commitment of the advisory committee to work with us.

We look at the committee as an outreach to provide a local liaison -- to provide information back to local communities. They do that very well, in many cases. In some areas, we need to be flexible as a committee. Going back to the Gorham one, as we looked to develop alternatives, in some areas we were moving to an area of the community we thought we'd never be impacting when we started this study. We had people come up and say, "We need to be involved in this process." So we need to be flexible in changing the composition of the committee. As the study area changed to move the [inaudible] over time.

There isn't a one-size-fits-all. We need to be very open in our process. But overall, the PAC process has really worked very well in providing us with alternatives that get local buy-in. It makes it a lot easier for us on some of these major transportation projects, that once they're complete, to get local support and local buy-in from the local public. That's very important from our perspective.

Scott Duncanson: Thanks, Ray. At this point, I think we wanted to open it up for some more discussion or questions. We've got some folks up here who can answer some questions about the PAC process, and how it works. I guess we'll open it up to the members, here, if anybody has any questions out here in the audience.

Speaker: I was wondering if it's standard practice to hire a facilitator for these PACs? Also, is there a specific process that you use to identify the facilitator?

Speaker: The facilitation process was something we felt that we needed as part of doing the New Gloucester. It was an added tool that we wanted to put in our box to try to manage the process better than we'd been managing it. The facilitation process is something that's been used on virtually every other committee that we've had, to date. I've done one recently where we didn't use a facilitator -- DOT managed that, along with the community. But in the majority of the cases, we've used a facilitator as someone who is, as they say, "outside -- a neutral person," to run the process. It seems to run pretty well, at this point in time.

Then again, we're looking for ways to always improve our process. There are different things that we can do to improve the advisory committee process and the project development process. It's evolving over time. We're learning that it isn't one-size-fits-all. We need to be very fluid in the way we're doing these, and looking at what the needs are and what the problems are in the local area.

Speaker: And how are those people selected?

Speaker: The original facilitator goes back a long time. I don't know -- Judy?

Speaker: Yes. Actually the way we selected this facilitator was selected differently than how we do most of them. This facilitator had been working with them in Turnpike, on the Grey project, which Dave had mentioned. A number of the people from the New Gloucester-Poland area had also been on that PAC. Anything that happened with the Maine Turnpike exit was going to impact Route 26. Including alternatives that almost connected right in this area. It had, at times, been a very volatile project. We selected the same facilitator kind of for a continuity. They were familiar with the area, plus we knew that this individual really worked -- because the Maine Turnpike project had actually been successful.

After that, we actually put out RFPs for facilitators, and we had a full rating process. So that gave us a field of facilitators. In two months, I think we've started five or six projects. One thing we don't allow is for a facilitator to live within a study area or to travel study area every day. Then they're not allowed to be a facilitator for that project. So we did need to have a selection of facilitators.

Speaker: This question is for Raymond. What kind of a budget, both money-wise and time-wise, do you need for the operation of a PAC on a major project? It may be percentage-wise to your total project costs. And also, how do you build this into your expectation?

Raymond Faucher: We haven't really broken out the costs of doing that part of the process. The advisory committee is made up of volunteers. The only cost involved is the cost of the refreshments and the cookies. In this case here, for Brother Arnold and the Shakers, they made some wonderful cookies and wonderful goodies for all of us -- and we had the meetings at the Shaker Library.

The cost is mostly department and engineering costs. Those are some of the traditional engineering costs that you'd have in preliminary engineering. There really isn't a set cost other than for the facilitator. That's broken out in a separate part of the budget.

Although the engineering costs are slightly higher for doing these, I feel that when I took over this process of doing these studies, my goal and objective was, "We're going to do these studies with an end-product." The end product's going to be we're either going to build a project or there'll be the decision made to not build the project. I didn't want to be doing a study so that I could be doing another study afterwards. That's what we'd been doing for years and years.

As had been mentioned, some of these have been going on for decades. At Gorham there were plans -- right-of-way was in the process of being purchased for that back in the mid-70s. As Brother Arnold mentioned, there was right-of-way that was purchased for New Gloucester back in the late 1960s. Some of these go on like the Augusta study, which really got going as part of a proposal back in the mid-to-late 1960s. That bridge is going to open up in November of this year.

There's been study followed by study by another study by another study. My objective was, when I took on this task, to either do something or not do something. "Let's make a decision once and for all." I feel up to this point in time, I've been successful in achieving that. Although there may be a little bit more cost in doing some of the planning and engineering work, at least we're able to come to some type of a decision document.

Speaker: Then the next question goes to Jim. How do you reconcile this with streamlining? If you do it right, you've got to take the time it takes to do it.

James Linker: Did you say streamlining?

Speaker: Yes.

James Linker: Oh. It reconciles very easily. Going back and doing rework is the alternative, as you've seen here. Yes. There are a lot of meetings. That means a lot of travel for a lot of state employees. A lot of night work. I think the Maine DOT -- I don't know how they're doing it now, but when I retired, there were a lot of PACs going on. That meant a lot of engineers were hitting the road in the late afternoon, or were staying over to make these things. That means they're not at work doing some other things. In that sense, there is an expense, but it's hidden.

Yes, it's the problem of building half a project. Not completing a project is a terrible burden on a transportation agency. Being able to complete -- however long it takes -- being able to complete a project successfully -- is really the key.

If I may, I'd like step back to Cheryl's question, about selecting facilitators. As Judy mentioned, the facilitators of course work as State consultants. So they have to go through the normal process for consultants. But the critical thing is matching the right facilitator to the project. We have seen, in this case, where it worked out

very, very well and made a difference. We've also seen in other cases where the facilitator selected was not right for the mix.

This goes back to your public -- knowing what you're getting into. In the event that anyone is anticipating this in the future, it's a good idea to leave an escape hatch there, so you can change facilitators if things are not working out. It's a very personal interaction between the facilitator and the public.

Speaker: Actually, on streamlining, one thing we did find was that we've actually shortened a lot of our project time, in doing NEPA documents. That's because we're bringing in the public right on Day 1. We're bringing them in early, because we do NEPA planning. By doing that and by getting their support -- by involving them from Day 1 -- streamlining is actually working.

Speaker: A little different understanding, then?

Speaker: Right. It just makes it more efficient.

Speaker: David brought up the fact that this takes time. Jim has brought up the fact that this takes time and it takes money. I guess my question to Ray, then, is, "If this had been a successful project in 1988 and 1999 and it had been constructed, I would have assumed therefore in the early 1990s -- what would have been the cost-differential, in terms of that construction budget between the early 1990s and now? And when we look at overall time and money spent, I'll bet the time and money you've spent doing public involvement would've been less than your construction overrun would've been.

Speaker: Cost of constructing a 40-foot roadway back in the late 80s and early 90s is I'm going to venture probably half of what it would cost, today. Given the escalation in all of the products that are out there.

However, we look at some of the personal costs, right-of-way costs, and these are some of the things we look at when we have to do some reconstruction on existing alignment. There are some tradeoffs. In many cases, those reconstructions from a right-of-way standpoint, are going to be considerably higher than right-of-way acquisitions that we need when we're looking at highways on your location. Then we get into some other process [inaudible].

We started looking at right-of-way and new locations in Aroostook County, and you can buy right-of-way up there for dirt cheap. The right-of-way up there isn't expensive. And it's relative. We're looking at right-of-way costs near Gloucester -- land values are higher than they are in Aroostook County. But buying a bare piece of land versus having to buy a piece of land doing a relocation, given we have to conform with the relocation act -- everything that's involved in doing those activities has a high cost involved. So whatever we can do in reducing those costs is good.

The other thing that we have to factor into this are the user costs -- the user benefits in many of these. Although there may be some higher construction costs, we compare those higher construction costs with the user benefits. The savings in vehicle hours traveled and savings in vehicle miles traveled, for all the uses. Mainly, these are occurring on some of our higher-use highways. These are on our major arterials. These are the corridors that are being used by the majority of the population here in the State of Maine. If we can improve or reduce travel time or travel distance by some of those users -- it is a user benefit. The Department doesn't realize that, but the public and everybody else out there realizes those benefits, which we factor into all the work that we do.

Speaker: The other thing that actually would've cost us more in the 80s is if you look at the opposition. If they had had tar-and-feathers, they would have tarred-and-feathered DOT. There was probably a good chance we would have ended up in court -- especially because of the National Landmarks. If you all remember, you have 106 and Section 4F. We would never have gotten clearances from the Advisory Council. Whereas with the

preferred alternative, we had so much support -- not only from the community, but the representatives of the National Landmarks themselves. We had no problems obtaining Section 4F approval and 106 approval.

Speaker: The point I was trying to make was, when you don't have public support and it does delay a project for 12 years or it was attempted back in the 60s and would have delayed it 34 years, there was the time-value of money that's involved there. That little bit that you spend on public involvement really is insignificant in terms of the additional construction and implementation costs of having to wait 34 years. The time-value of money.

Speaker: Point well-taken. You're absolutely right. Again, right now we have the ability to take these very controversial and very sensitive studies that have been going on -- some of these, for decades. To bring them to a successful conclusion, it gets a lot of local community support.

Speaker: Unfortunately, one of the things that I see is when you go into a budget negotiation with a lot of DOTs, they see what your public involvement costs are, and they whittle down that budget. Not realizing that they can put themselves into a situation where they're going to delay the project for several years. The cost of doing that is far more than that public-involvement budget ever was.

Speaker: You're right.

Speaker: Judy, we have a question in the back, there. Yes. You've got it.

Speaker: I have a question about the meetings. Were they regularly scheduled? Or were they scheduled when there were decisions to be made?

Speaker: That's a good point. The biggest challenge was trying to put the first meeting together. Trying to find a time best-convenient for all of the advisory committee members in the department and the professional team. We were as accommodating as we could be to the perspective. Once we had an initial meeting, then what we'd do is try to identify when we'd hold future meetings. When is the best time and the best day of the week? Is it a Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday? Is it 1-3, 3-5, 5-7? We want to have 2-hour meetings. That's the biggest amount of time we wanted to devote to this on a meeting-by-meeting basis.

Once we got that settled, then what we'd look to do is as we'd complete a particular meeting... In many cases, we'd have an idea of... The team would sit down prior to that meeting and say, "Okay. This is what we're going to present tonight. Based on that, this is what we anticipate they need to do. When do we feel we'll need another meeting? Is it in a month? A month and a half?" Then we would bounce that. Depending on how well that meeting went. Because you go to these meetings with an agenda saying, "Okay. Tonight we're going to take care of all of these items -- A through F." You get through B and it's, "Okay. This is all we were able to discuss, tonight." But yet they were beneficial meetings. So at least it gave you a starting point for what you were doing. But we had an idea what we needed to be doing. We bounced those off the committee and said, "Okay. This is when we want to schedule our other one." Again, it was always a struggle on everyone being able to make the meetings. But again, there was consensus from the group saying, "Have your meeting. I can't be here -- I'll make the next one."

Speaker: We've got time for one more question.

Speaker: First of all, I'd like to thank the members of the public that were on the PAC. I realize that takes an awful lot of time and commitment on your part. I'm also very glad to hear that your community -- the Shaker community as well as the surrounding community members -- were willing to compromise.

I did hear Debbie say something about her house got egged. I wondered how that came about. I mean everything wasn't rosy, obviously. But it appears that both groups wanted to work toward the common good. I'm wondering how, in your day-to-day life, how did that affect you being on the PAC?

Deborah Stebbins: Day-to-day, generally not much at all. Other than people were very curious as to what was going on. I worked at the Poland doctor's office at the time, at the community health center. That was wonderful, because I had access to all the Poland people, there. I was able to post maps and things, as we came up with ideas and that kind of thing.

Then, halfway through, I went to the other doctor's office, in Grey. So I got the whole New Gloucester Grey crowd, then. That was kind of wonderful. All-in-all, it was very positive.

I got egged the night after a public meeting when I came up with [inaudible] idea. Of course, I couldn't come up with it at a PAC meeting -- I had to be standing there at a public meeting going, "Oh, God. Why don't you just go straight -- right there?" So everyone in the whole community knew it was my idea.

I don't know how it happened. It was at night and...

Speaker: So there wasn't an ongoing sort of...?

Deborah Stebbins: No, it was just that one-time deal, after that meeting. I thought, "Wow, Deb. Maybe you shouldn't speak up at those big public meetings."

Speaker: How about you, Brother Arnold?

Brother Arnold: We had some opposition, too. Most people who came to us were okay. But everyone always prefaced it by, "Well, this is being done for you." It wasn't being done for us, at all -- really." But as Mr. Linker said at the first meeting, there are certain criteria we do have to meet. They could not bring the present Route 26 up to Federal Highway standards and still have our community.

Speaker: Right.

Brother Arnold: So it would have to be bypassed, at some point. But it wasn't just us, and we worked for the benefit of all. We had problems, too. We got golf balls instead of eggs. Through the store window. We had irrigation hoses stolen and we had vandalism on some other things. We're kind of used to it. We just let those things slide, because there are always going to be negative people.

The thing I found most interested in all of those PACs -- the actual people it was going to impact were by-and-large very willing to make something better. The people who were voicing the negativity were people who didn't even have a right, frankly. Two people, in particular. The lady who said her view was going to be ruined. Not even on her land. And she's been trespassing on somebody else's land for years. And just a month ago, she was still being a pain about wanting a hole cut in the new fence so that she could still access this other land.

Speaker: Oh, my...

[tape ends]

[tape begins]

...who's been illegally hunting on our land for all of his life. And his kids won't be able to illegally hunt on our land, too. Those were the two that were the most vocal in all those meetings against this.

Speaker: As a follow-up to that, I'd like to ask Raymond if you have this common "good" feeling in all other PACs -- or is it "Not in my backyard; not in... Go somewhere else?" You know -- a very much self-interest...?

Raymond Faucher: Brenda, check your feelings at the door when you walk in the room. It's difficult for people to divorce or separate themselves from their personal feelings when they walk in the door. Whether it's the committee members or the public. In a couple of my other studies, we've gotten very controversial. I've gotten stacks of paper work that comes in. In many cases, it's opposing what we're doing. In the past couple of weeks, I've been getting stacks of paperwork in support of a preferred alternative -- and I like to see that once in a while. It is very difficult. Again, you're dealing with a variety of different people, and you want to treat them on a professional basis. Understand that they have needs and they have concerns. Face their concerns. Yes. Yes, we realize you've got concerns. Indicate to them that we're trying to work through a process. "Work with us. Partner with us. Team with us." See?

So we can come up with some things that can benefit everyone. Ultimately, hopefully you should be able to benefit from the improvements that will be an outcome of this process.

Speaker: This has obviously been a really interesting session. I'm sure we could continue questions for the rest of the morning. But we do have to move on. We've got a break scheduled, now, and we have another session that we'll be starting in about 20 minutes. Less than 25 minutes. If we could take a break... First of all, thank the panel members for a really interesting presentation.

Audience: [applause]

Speaker: I also want to make note of on fact. Even though he's from Pennsylvania, Scott did wear the right baseball cap.

Audience: [laughter]

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Tell everybody that the dinner [inaudible]

Speaker: That's true, because not everybody is set up. It's going to have to wait 'til later. We have [inaudible] not set up, yet.

Speaker: [inaudible]

Speaker: We want to wait for everybody to be set up. And there are from 5-7 tonight. There's going to be a big reception there.

[session ends]