Town of Vinalhaven

Downtown Committee Meeting Minutes

2016-2019
1. DOT Site Visit - Nov 15, 2016 - Gerry Audibert, John Bubier, Dan Bickford, and Andy Dorr reviewed some SLR 1-foot projection maps
   a. State-Aid roads on VH total nearly 6 miles and the state owns/maintains 4 bridges (2 on Main Street, Lane’s Island bridge, and the MSFS transfer bridge). The state’s current workplan shows $1.5 million in funding for “bridge construction” at the Lane’s Island bridge in 2017/2018. The state-aid roads, for the purpose of this group, focus primarily on the section from the ferry terminal to the intersection of Main/Water Streets. This road is a priority/category 4 which is designated for maintenance applications. Category 1 and 2 roads receive higher priority and generally are granted the capital improvement funding necessary to maintain the high level of traffic seen on those roadways. It is encouraging to see the planner here taking an interest in our project as we continue to form ideas and put pen to paper in a collective downstreet master plan. Going forward, the town should work with and include other aspects of DOT and relevant agencies that pertain to or support the master plan. A meeting with the DOT regional planner and DOT bike/pedestrian coordinator will be scheduled in the coming weeks with John and Andy, perhaps Dan if schedules allow. There will also be consideration for the Complete Streets concept and learning how that may be applied to Vinalhaven’s Downstreet.
   b. Funding - At the end of the day, there will be a need to determine how to fund our project. As a state-aid road, the state conducts the maintenance work. In order to meet our desires to improve water, sidewalks, and drainage, this is perceived to be above and beyond their workplan and therefore does not provide 100% of the funds. This leaves other funding streams. The MDOT currently has 3 initiatives that assist municipalities in these types of projects.
      i. Planning Partnership Initiative - an innovative method to study, evaluate, plan and scope transportation projects on or adjacent to the state transportation system, with MaineDOT as a partner. This program has a $25,000 state/federal cap.
      ii. Municipal Partnership Initiative - responding to changing local transportation needs on State and State-Aid highways, developing economic opportunities, and safety concerns on or adjacent to these highways. This program is a 50/50 match program capped at $500,000 state match.
      iii. Business Partnership Initiative
   c. Complete Streets - a concept that incorporates all transportation use types including walking, biking, and driving. This is a process, not a design that is implemented without community support/planning. Over the next 6 months, more needs to be understood about this concept and how it might be applicable to VH. MDOT is excited
to work with municipalities to plan for these Complete Streets and we should look to access resources that bring workshops to VH and potentially a concept plan.

2. SLR Grant - Vinalhaven received a Maine Coastal Community Planning Grant this fall and we have begun to execute the proposed project. The focus of this project is a vulnerability assessment of Carver’s Harbor. From this work, probability scenarios will be available at certain points in the future which will provide long-term planning points. While some of the capital improvements will need to be finished as part of our master plan scope now, it is still important to understand how this will play into decisions regarding drainage and design. Look for more as the project progresses.

3. Broadband - The community broadband initiative currently underway is yet another supplemental piece of the master plan. Broadband is a major economic development incubator that should continue to build energy in the community.

Timeline - tentative construction project in 2019/2020 FY. SLR grant will wrap up Dec 2017.

Community engagement - a major concern for any outcome of the project. More effort needs to work to engage the community at large. A recommendation was made to reach out to additional community members, conduct a survey, engage the school/kids, and provide information in new media forms in new locations.

The overlap and energy of various community groups is great and can build on this group’s efforts to create a master plan for downstreet. There will be an effort to bring a representative(s) from each of those groups together on a more regular basis to go over what is being done and share where any overlapping efforts are being conducted.

Next Steps

- Convene a meeting with the various committees/initiatives that overlap the downstreet master plan.
- Meet with DOT representatives and other agencies to gather more information on complete streets.
- Community outreach - word of mouth, website, Facebook, Wind. We need to exhaust more options and take boots to the ground to be sure that people are involved.

Resources:

- MDOT Capital Workplan specific for Vinalhaven  
- Planning Partnership Initiative  
- Municipal Partnership Initiative  
- MDOT Complete Streets Policy  
Downstreet Committee Meeting
June 7, 2017

Attendance: Betsy Hopkins, Kris Davidson, Gabe McPhail, Elin Elisofon, Hooper Brooks, Holly Sault, Town Representative John Bubier

Committee Goals: Preservation, Economic Development/Infrastructure Improvements

Overview: The Downstreet Committee (DST) is one of three Vinalhaven town committees established to identify and address issues facing the town and island as a whole. The other two committees are: Sea Level Rise (SLR) and Broadband. Each committee functions independently. Because of the connections among the groups, a joint committee, Main Street Master Plan, will be facilitated by John Bubier, Assistant Town Planner and Andy Dorr, Town Manager. The joint committee meetings will be open to all members of each group and a representative or “chair” will act as a liaison between the groups.

Meeting Focus: At the Joint Committee meeting held on May 24th, upcoming projects requiring action on the part of each committee that will be carried out within the next 3 months were laid out to each group. DART (Design And Resiliency Teams), a 5 member team from Northhampton, MA will be on VH in July to assist in the development of a strategic vision to promote community resiliency. Issues being discussed but not limited to are: sustainability, economic development, climate change, planning, architecture, finance, etc. Because these issues are vital components of the DST committee, DST has the opportunity to guide the DART study and vision for VH. Thus, the focus for this meeting was as follows: to choose a chair for the DST committee and to establish 3 priorities to be presented to DART as they begin their work on VH.

Chair – Holly Sault was invited and agreed to serve as chair for the DST committee and to be the liaison to the Joint Committee. (This coincides with her work with the Chamber)

Priorities – The Vinalhaven Downstreet Revitalization Committee Priority Page (See Attached) that was part of the committee’s work since 2015 will be used as the working document to establish the DART priorities.

Priorities:

1. Physical Improvements/Infrastructure
   • Sidewalks
     o Safety – ADA
     o Appealing
     o Lighting
The physical improvements would be part of the Complete Streets program that is recognized and required by the Maine DOT as a criteria for financial assistance from the State. **Complete Streets is a transportation policy and design approach** that requires streets to be planned, designed, operated, and maintained to enable safe, convenient and comfortable travel and access for users of all ages and abilities regardless of their mode of transportation. The VH Chamber and the DST are supporting the implementation of the complete streets program for future planning on VH.

2. **Economic Development – working with the Chamber of Commerce**
   - Sponsor workshops for businesses
   - Provide support/incentives for new businesses
     - Target desirable new businesses
   - Encourage/target new businesses Campaign
     - Art friendly opportunities
     - Agriculture
     - Aquaculture
   - Encourage Buy Island (education, marketing, events)
   - Housing – possible scenario could be the support of and facilitation of a remodel housing model to offer winter housing for elderly who cannot remain in owned houses in winter which would then be used as seasonal housing to support businesses on island
   - Work Force – Work to increase work force base through increased communication of needs, work with agencies (state and private) on main land and participation in job fairs
   - Flood Insurance – as the preservation of main street brick and mortar buildings is evaluated, the high cost of flood insurance for building owners is pivotal to the ability to operate
   - Tax Incentives – explore incentives that might be available to increase likelihood of new businesses and the sustainability of existing businesses

3. **Preservation and Collaborative Space**
   - Historic preservation of significant buildings (net factory, Robert Indiana, Downstreet market)
   - Repurpose significant buildings (net factory)
   - Support cooperative ventures
- Community space for arts, culinary, printmaking, glass, pottery, woodworking
- Studio space, shared equipment (possible use of net factory which would also promote economic development)
  - Provide community Center space for community events (Net Factory)

Current discussion of boundaries for the Downtown area have the beginning at the Ferry Terminal to the old net factory parking lot. The DST would recommend that the Downtown boundary continue up the hill past the net factory to the War Memorial/Library (Webster Park).

Tourism – In the priority page attached, Tourism is listed as a concern and opportunity for the DST to address. At the current time further discussion is needed to gain better understanding and communication of what exactly the definition of tourism on VH looks like. It is understood that this topic is extremely important and relevant to today’s issues on the island. Without the necessary communication of this subject, the island is open to being defined by the tourist vs the island defining what scope and type of destination tourist we would be able to safely welcome due to the following constraints: infrastructure (lack of sidewalks), safety, impact of increased automobile traffic, etc. At the current time, tourism will not be listed as a priority to DART but will be reflected in our overall statement to DART in that we are addressing the topic and request the right to add this as a bullet in our economic development going forward.
Downtown Committee Meeting Notes

February

Town Office

Attendance: Kris Davidson, Andrew Dorr, Elin Elisofon, Betsy Hopkins, Holly Sault, Kathy Warren
Via Conference Call: Hooper Brooks, John Wasielewski

Call to Order

Update of Participants – John Bubier will no longer be working directly with the Downtown Committee. We will be using data, outlines, and basic structure prepared by John as our working document. With his departure, the committee will be working together to complete the Master Plan by Memorial Day, 2018.

Review of goals for meeting – We will start working through the Vinalhaven Downstreet Master Plan Committee Working Document. Our work will not proceed through the document in chronological order but rather proceed in sections that are relevant in nature to each other.

Action Sheet

**History of VH** – With an account of VH’s history already written into the Comprehensive Plan that was written in 2013. With the information being current and relevant, the committee will use the history for the Master Plan. Hooper noted that the information regarding the downtown be reviewed to make sure it is up to date for the plan. Committee members are asked to read through the plan which can be found on line to review.

**Study Area Definition** – The study area for the plan is as follows: Ferry terminal to Union Church. The committee was asked to think of words or phrases that best describe the study area – words that define what you think of and see as you travel from the ferry to the church. These words will help to paint a picture for the plan, help in the formation of mission and vision statements, and help to gain focus on why this plan is important. The following list was compiled from the members and is a working list (in no particular order):

- Unembellished working community
- Residential
- Working waterfront
- Visually extraordinary and exceptional
- Hidden assets
- Peaked roofs
- Natural beauty
- Authentic
- Honest Vision
- Independent
● Resilient
● Practicality
● Resourceful
● Frugal
● Multi-Use
● Adaptive
● Fishing Industry
● Elements of Sustainability – community and sustainable
● Down Street Business that meet the needs of year round, seasonal, and tourism residents

**Streetscapes and Public Places** – There are 11 bullet points in the State of The Downtown draft that focus on the landscape, accessibility, and usage of the defined study area. These are:

1. Streetscapes and the use of complete and shared streets
2. Sidewalks and safety
3. Traffic calming
4. Pocket Parks
5. Accessibility to commercial and mixed use zones
6. Safe crossings
7. Handicapped Accessibility
8. Shared space for walkability while preserving
9. Commercial access
10. Bicycle lanes
11. Public spaces study and review spaces to be used in the Downstreet
12. Timeless

The committee members were asked to individually choose 5 – 7 that are deemed necessary to the future of the project and the study area. It was suggested that the focus look at what we do not currently have so that the committee can work to ensure a successful plan that allows for proper planning and growth. The relationship between the “now” and the “future” is pivotal to the proper planning for the downtown. The committee chose the following from the list: Streetscapes and the use of complete and shared streets, sidewalks and safety, traffic calming, Shared space for the walkability while preserving commercial access, and public spaces.

**Historic Buildings and Components** – VH is very lucky to have a rich history with buildings/structures that are just as relevant to the future as to the past. These buildings not only enhance the aesthetics of the island and help to define the historical success of the island, they are also important in the landscape of the future. It is easy to focus on the “business district” in the center of the study area, but the entire area contains buildings that have served multiple purposes throughout history. The committee was asked to help identify these buildings and ways to best “reconstruct” the history of each. It was decided that the VH Historical Society along with longtime residents would be the first contact points to help build a working picture for the plan. Holly is to contact members from these groups for input.
DART – The committee was asked to review proposals made the DART study in 2017. Understanding that not all of the study was relevant or attainable for VH, there were some outstanding components and ideas that could be used in the building of the Master Plan. The members offered the following (in no particular order): Footbridge, cohesion of groups vision, width of streets and sidewalks, multi-use of areas, Net Factory plans, reminder of what VH has, Clam Shell Alley picnic table and public use space, inspiring viewpoints, multi-use spaces, public parks, green space, traffic tables, vibrancy, mixed use spaces, development fund, community center, interesting development potential

For the next meeting, committee members are asked to think about the following:

VH in a regional context – how can VH’s role be defined for our importance, leadership, and possible roles from a regional context among the surrounding island communities

Public spaces – where they would best work and what they might look like

Zoning – needs and allowances

Preserving buildings – what we could and should do

Next meeting – Wednesday, March 7th – 4:00 p.m.
Downtown Committee Meeting Notes
March 7, 2018
Town Office

Attendance: Kris Davidson, Andrew Dorr, Elin Elisofon, Betsy Hopkins, Holly Sault, Kathy Warren
Via Conference Call: Hooper Brooks, John Wasielewski, David Wylie

Call to Order

**Review of goals for meeting** – To continue reviewing and discussing sections of the master plan as we move toward finalizing each area of the plan. We are currently working on the Introduction and History sections of the Master Plan. We will work toward utilizing the VH Comprehensive Plan will it is applicable for consistency. Sections for discussion include: History of VH, VH in regional context, Public Spaces, Zoning, and Preserving Buildings.

**Action Sheet**

**History of VH** – With an account of VH’s history already written into the Comprehensive Plan that was written in 2013, Hooper volunteered to review the VH history data and make suggested and necessary changes that would bring the plan into a current format. Andy will provide the working copy of the original comp plan for backup information. The committee will receive updates from Hooper for review.

**VH in regional context** – The committee’s discussion was centered on “why” this section was pertinent to the plan and how much information should be included. After discussion and understanding this part is in the introduction and not a stand-alone section, the group brought the focus of the verbiage to: VH is a place to live, work and do business year round. The downtown of VH is more than retail shops - it serves as an important gathering place to the community. VH is proud of its independent nature. Maintaining our economic vitality while sustaining the year round community is both our primary concern and goal.

**Public Spaces** – This section is not only about identifying the location of desired public spaces but also what those spaces would look like and how to implement the usage of those spaces.

Possible locations include:

- Grimes Park
- War Memorial (Sands Rd)
- Clam Shell Alley
- Behind old firehouse
- Bandstand
- Net Factory
- Town Parking Lot
- Pond and space behind businesses
- Main Street

**Accessories and Equipment** –

- Park Benches
- Picnic Tables
- Granite
- Trash Receptacles
The implementation of these spaces would be at different intervals depending on time of year, maintenance needs, and depth of project. Park benches along Main St. would be more feasible with more in-depth projects requiring more planning and time to implement.

One concern for the island is to have an age friendly Main St. Sidewalks that are designed to meet a variety of characteristics that have a direct impact on usability, such as grade, cross slope, width, surface type, etc. would be of prime importance.

The Net Factory has long been on this committee’s radar screen as a viable and necessary space for the community to use as a multi-purpose venue. A community center with green space for families, youth, aged, meeting space, open market, and seasonal use would be a catalyst for new growth and the sustaining of Main St.

Carver’s Pond behind the existing downtown businesses is another untapped and extremely viable option for growth. Many businesses have a lot of unused space in the back of their buildings that could be an opportunity for more growth through stores, studios, and services while offering a new beautiful outside venue including dock, food carts, tables, and common space for the community. The use of this space would also give more opportunities for tourists to take in the natural beauty of the island in the downtown area but lessen the congestion on Main St. street side.

Resources for the public space usage and ideas from other successful communities in Maine can be found in the Maine St. Program. Within that is a 4 point approach and network to see what other towns have tried and successfully implemented.

Due to time constraints, more discussion about the pond project, zoning, and preserving buildings will be held at the next meeting.

Next meeting – Wednesday, March 28th – 4:00 p.m.
Downtown Committee Meeting Notes

March 28, 2018
Town Office

Attendance: Kris Davidson, Andrew Dorr, Elin Elisofon, Betsy Hopkins, Holly Sault, David Wylie

Via Conference Call: Hooper Brooks,

Call to Order

**Review of goals for meeting** – To discuss goals and objectives for the Maine Preservation Visit. To discuss goals and objectives for May 1st collaborative meeting.

**Action Sheet**

**Maine Preservation Visit** – On Friday, May 4th, thanks to Elin Elisofon’s efforts, members of the Maine Preservation Society whose mission is to promote and preserve historic places, buildings, downtowns and neighborhoods, strengthening the cultural and economic vitality of Maine communities will be visiting VH. Sarah and Chris will be the representatives for MPS. Ahead of their visit, the DT committee needs to have a general plan for what they will see, ideas of how their services could best be utilized on VH, and submit to them information about VH and our community that will assist them in being better prepared once they arrive. After discussion, the committee focused on the following main concern to be expressed to the society:

- To reiterate the Value of preserving our unabridged thriving downtown. As an island, it is very unusual for a community to have the working business area that VH is proud to have. We have a working waterfront, active businesses that include retail, lodging, real estate, services, financial, restaurants, and non-profit, residences, harbor frontage, rear pond view and access, and historical buildings.

We are interested in: incentive programs for building preservation, historical classification for buildings, grants or funding sources to aid in preserving

Elin will forward to the society the following: History of VH as written for the Master Plan Introduction by Hooper Brooks, Link to our Comp Plan, Work done by the Sea Level Rise committee as an informational aid in research that has been done for the effect of water in the downtown area, information on the Net Factory and potential plans/goals for the building.

Contact with the VH Historical Society for their input on important structures that need to be discussed or considered for future preservations will be done prior to the visit.
May 1st Collaborative Meeting – The DT Committee is hosting a meeting on May 1st at 5:00 p.m. Town Office. The meeting came about from our previous committee meeting through the discussion of infrastructure concerns for the area from the Ferry Terminal to the Library/Union Church. Concerns include: Sidewalk issues (this encompasses no sidewalks in some areas to sidewalks in great need of repair for safe passage by pedestrians); Aging water mains and pipes; Broadband cabling (evaluating current cables and the need for updated and better equipment/cables to better service the residents and businesses on the island); Fox Island Electric cables and lines. The groups being asked to join the meeting are: Maine Water, Fox Island Electric, Board of Selectmen, Sidewalk Committee, Broadband Committee, Sea Level Rise Committee, and the Chamber of Commerce.

With the DT Committee being charged to be an integral leader in the writing of the Master Plan, it was decided that better understanding of each of these areas of concern, plans for future updates by entities involved, and the relationship of these updates and repairs and how they can work together and how they affect each other was crucial to a successful plan being completed. To that end, the committee opted to sponsor this meeting to bring everyone together for a connected conversation to look at concerns and plans going forward. Our goal for the meeting in addition to starting the conversation is a commitment by the utilities to present at a future meeting their plans for their respective areas regarding updates and plans for VH.

Next meeting – Thursday, April 26th 12:00 p.m. The Work Dock Conference Space

Meeting adjourned – 5:15 p.m.
### Scribed Meeting Notes
**Meeting** Downtown Committee, Town of Vinalhaven, 5pm, Tuesday, May 1, 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/H</th>
<th>CURRENT</th>
<th>GOALS</th>
<th>OPPORTUNITIES</th>
<th>CHALLENGES</th>
<th>Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Town Manager, Andrew Dorr</strong></td>
<td>Looking ahead at issues and opportunities</td>
<td>Ongoing maintenance and improvements in infrastructure: utilities,</td>
<td>Current RFP to look at engineering plan for improvements to be made for</td>
<td>Funding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lots has changed over time; change is constant</td>
<td>capital projects</td>
<td>downtown during road construction</td>
<td>SLR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SLR can’t be ignored</td>
<td>What can happen at the same time? Bury utility lines? Work on water?</td>
<td>Right of ways – ownership? use?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Aging in place</td>
<td>Put in Broadband? Rise sidewalks?</td>
<td>Minimize impact of construction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Economic development</td>
<td>RFP Design process</td>
<td>of improvements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Broadband</td>
<td></td>
<td>Realistic timeframe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RFP by early June</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Board of Select Persons (BSP), Eric Davis</strong></td>
<td>Looking at SLR, broadband, capital improvements</td>
<td>Sidewalks Bank to Library and water pipes with road improvements</td>
<td>Road improvements offer chance to make changes DT Broadband important for</td>
<td>Burying power and phone lines a problem for maintenance and SLR? Complete</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Broadband resolved– plan and brought to town for vote</td>
<td>economy</td>
<td>street– would they work? Be safe?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Board of Select Persons (BSP), Phil Crossman</strong></td>
<td>SLR, sidewalks</td>
<td>Sidewalks SLR adaptation Preserve DT, not abandon DT economic</td>
<td>Changes can bring economic development opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Broadband Task Force, Janann Sherman</strong></td>
<td>Prompted by Tilson Report 28 Main Survey Service map Events Wind</td>
<td>$ available</td>
<td>Cable in place for much of the distance required</td>
<td>Funding – cost 3.5 mil + 570 household/site cost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>articles</td>
<td>Town-wide broadband</td>
<td>1000MB service</td>
<td>Capacity / a “champion” to lead the initiative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Many learning opportunities, conferences, etc.</td>
<td>Building critical public support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Phil has identified a possible “champion”</td>
<td>NH involvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chamber of Commerce, Sue Lafricain</strong></td>
<td>Business support</td>
<td>Sidewalks and broadband</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FIEC, Chip Farrington</strong></td>
<td>5% remaining work on 2013-16 plan to improve/replace regulators and</td>
<td>Reliability 2017-2020 Workplan includes VH-NH cable to include 26</td>
<td>Suggest including burying lines in RFP</td>
<td>Burying lines expensive but not</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>transformers</td>
<td>strands fiber</td>
<td>More cable helps broadband efforts</td>
<td>impossible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sidewalk Committee</strong></td>
<td>Not currently meeting Assessment done in 2006; Continued work to</td>
<td>Safe, accessible sidewalks town-wide</td>
<td></td>
<td>Everything must be buried– phone, cable, power</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>garner support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Everything must go underground, otherwise “boxes” are on sidewalk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLR Committee, Margaret Qualey, Linnell Mather</strong></td>
<td>Learning the data Informing the public Studies– Ransom, etc. DT is</td>
<td>Involve all Adaptation Keep learning Remap Fem?</td>
<td>SLR at forefront of all planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VULNERABLE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DT Committee</strong></td>
<td>Gathering information for plan</td>
<td>Master Plan</td>
<td>Broadband Capital improvements PW building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RFP to engineering firms with SLR experience</td>
<td>Private funding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME historic preservation funding? GROW ME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In attendance: Hooper Brooks (by phone), Kris Davidson, Elin, Elisofon, Betsy Hopkins, Margaret Qualey, Holly Sault, David Wylie
Guest: Michael Imber

Update RFP (Andy will report in the future) The work of an engineer is critical to committee work.

Update on writer of Master Plan (on hold): Elin shared the report prepared in 2015 by Amanda Bunker of Community Planning Studio who met with the committee early on. We might revisit her notes and contact her about possibly working with us on the Master Plan. (Report attached)
July 12 update from Andy –“I am in discussions with a couple of people who I think might be well suited for the task, more to come.”

Maine Historic Preservation recap (notes attached):
Elin had shared notes for the meetings with Chris Closs and Sarah Hansen (attached). Highlights from their visit:
* VH should consider a Demolition Delay Ordinance – The Planning Commission will consider with endorsement from the DT Committee.
* VH might consider National Register Status for key buildings, which is an honorary designation but allows for tax credits. Local ordinances impose restrictions but Mike suggested once a building acquires tax credits, restrictions are imposed. Mike will obtain more information.
* Discussion about a building hazard and safety ordinance, but that might be controversial so proceed with caution. Hooper will research Hartford CT ordinance that allows the town to buy and fix neglected properties.
* VH should consider establishing downtown as an historic district. A building and business survey would be a starting point.
* MP is a resource for planning and recommended Patrick Wright (former Gardiner Main Street ED) who will be available in the fall.

VH ordinances under consideration by Planning Commission, endorsed by DT Cmte:
* Helicopter Ordinance – in hands of Selectmen for adoption
* Cruise Ship Ordinance – David Wylie presented a proposal. Caution that potential discriminatory practice could be challenged. (Proposed ordinance attached)

Sea Level Rise:
Margaret reported on the work of the SLR Committee as it relates to DT Cmte work. Consideration for flooding needs to be part of the master plan. SLR Cmte is

Working on a resiliency checklist with guidance from county resources and Margaret is meeting with Andy to create a timeline for committee work. Margaret felt VH is doing good work to prepare.
Elin suggested involving students to mark downtown building where potential flooding would rise.
July 12 message form Mike: “I am attaching a link to IBHS https://disastersafety.org/flood/reduce-flood-damage-to-businesses a guideline developed for, and commonly used along the Gulf Coast. Per our discussion, it currently recommends finish floors be set 3 ft. above flood plane levels.”

Community Involvement:
Discussion about importance of keeping community informed and involved. Stay in touch with downtown business owners, work with Island Institute, meet with other entities affected by the work. Use social media (perhaps post a timeline)
* Display material at Town Meeting, 7 p.m., June 20: Old photo of Downtown, 1904 map of downtown, DART material, Gabe’s Visual diagram.

Next Committee Meeting: 4:30 p.m. June 26

Attachments: Maine Preservation Meeting Motes, Cruise Ship Ordinance, Amanda Bunker Report
10-11-18
Downtown Committee Meeting Minutes

Meeting 1: Initial Planning
5-6pm
Town Office, Upstairs Meeting Room

Attending: Kris Davidson, George Kendrick, David Wylie, Betsy Hopkins, Holly Sault, Andy Dorr, Hooper Brooks, Gabe McPhail
Absent: Elin Elisofin, Margaret Qualey, Kathy Warren, John Wasielewski

5pm Start

Vision and Roles
From the committee’s documentation Gabe presented the DT Com’s role and vision, recognizing that it would like evolve/adapt with the Plan:
Assist in the process and development of generating Downtown Master Plan focused on infrastructure and capital improvements that preserve historic and cultural authenticity while meeting or exceeding the current and future needs of stakeholders and the community at large.

Noted Re: Roles:
Committee does not have to solve problems, just apply best thinking to determine what might be “in the way” of achieving desired outcomes.
Gabe = group coordinator/facilitator. Responsible for organizing process and communications.
George = TA and Plan author. Responsible for technical aspects of the plan process and for drafting the DT Master Plan.

Process & Work Plan Review
Gabe presented the proposed process for how the group would gather the information needed to write the Master Plan. Each one-hour meeting would be a conversation on a specific topic. The conversation would be based on probing questions and be focused through the lenses of Zoning, Building Code, Ordinances; IT/BB; SLR; Community, Cultural, Functional; Historical, and overall community values and vision.

The goal of meetings is to voice the committee’s short and long term recommendations for each focus area. Questions would look at What is needed? Why? and by When? What is in the way? And Who is responsible? Conversations would also aim to identify challenges and opportunities, both present and future.

Information generated will be used to inform the DT Master Plan draft, which will include short and long term recommendations for the area of Vinalhaven’s Main Street from the ferry terminal to the Library/Atlantic Avenue.

The plan will focus on Capital Improvements, Economic (Development) Stability and Retention, and Sea-Level Rise, with an emphasis on policy and ordinance recommendations.
Gabe presented the general planning process:

- Gathering/compiling info and data; reviewing prior work
- Understanding stakeholder needs, goals, and challenges
- Focusing on current and future community needs and vision for Downtown

See the process Map by clicking [HERE](#).

Gabe requested volunteer point persons for each topic area. This person would know the “most” about topic area; would guide George and Gabe; and would help guide and clarify in the group conversation.

This table shows the meeting topics, point people, and proposed meeting dates. (Dates to be confirmed via Doodle poll.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic Area</th>
<th>Point Person</th>
<th>Proposed Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Economies: Sustaining, Retaining, Resiliency</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>10/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Facilities &amp; Capital Improvements Part 1</td>
<td>Andy, Margaret</td>
<td>10/25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Facilities &amp; Capital Improvements Part 2</td>
<td>Andy, Margaret</td>
<td>11/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing, Parking, &amp; Transportation Part 1</td>
<td>Kathy, Holly</td>
<td>11/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing, Parking, &amp; Transportation Part 2</td>
<td>Kathy, Holly</td>
<td>11/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic District Development</td>
<td>Elin, Betsy</td>
<td>11/29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>Holly</td>
<td>12/13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Stakeholder Matrix Review**

Gabe presented the list of stakeholders and asked the committee to look for gaps, stakeholders they are connected to, and which should be prioritized.

See the Stakeholders List by clicking [HERE](#).
Prioritized stakeholders were identified:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Star of Hope (Jim Brannan)</th>
<th>Erin &amp; Andy</th>
<th>Chet &amp; Cheryl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grocery Store (Kim Radley)</td>
<td>VinalEnergy (Arif)</td>
<td>Coop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbor Wharf</td>
<td>All Utilities</td>
<td>Beans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flea Market Field (Wes)</td>
<td>George Harrison</td>
<td>Boat Yard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOL</td>
<td>Lafricains</td>
<td>Main St. Building/Business Owners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand Bar (Lindsey)</td>
<td>Tidewater</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Notes: Interview Student reps.

**Select Dates**
The com selected tentative dates for upcoming meetings. Refer to the Doodle [HERE](#) to confirm your participation.


**6pm Meeting Adjourned**
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Meeting 2: Sustainable Economies
5-6pm
Town Office, Upstairs Meeting Room

Attending: George Kendrick, Betsy Hopkins, Margaret Qualey, Hooper Brooks, Elin Elisofin, John Wasielewski, Gabe McPhail
Absent: Holly Sault, Kathy Warren, Kris Davidson, David Wylie

5pm Start

Housekeeping
Gabe presented the following as a means of providing structure for the group’s process.

Working Guidelines
- Start & End on Time
- Stay on Topic
- Write Down Questions

Format & Process
1. Review definitions, scope, ideas generated, and recommendations
2. Identify relevant considerations, concepts, and concerns, and the discussion topic area in which they will be investigated
3. Prioritize topics for future discussion

Sustainable Economies—Sustaining, Retaining, Resiliency
The conversation around sustainable economies began with a review of information previously generated, as well as guiding definitions and scope to help frame the discussion.
Please review this information by clicking HERE.

The remainder of the meeting was spent identifying relevant considerations, concepts, and concerns, and the discussion topic area in which they will be investigated. The outcomes of this conversation are represented in the chart below.

In Support of Sustainable VH: Fisheries/Marine, Tourism, Year-round Economies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept</th>
<th>Consideration</th>
<th>Discussion Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Support fisheries diversification| ○ Aquaculture access-kelp lines  
○ Carvers pond access-tourism, fishery  
○ Shared use on Backside-three economies share | ○ Parking  
○ Parking; Capital Improvements |
| Retain/maintain Working Waterfront| ○ Marine tourism conflicts?—harbor space  
○ Limits to harbor access? | ○ Parking: Transportation |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Limits to dock space</td>
<td>○ Parking lot use-best uses, permits ○ Cruise ship launches-limit? ○ Mooring access-more? less?</td>
<td>Capital Improvements ○ Follow-up Big Picture Discussion ○ Funding; Housing?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce flood insurance</td>
<td>○ Backside development / flood mitigation-wetland construction? ○ FEMA maps-town pay to contest? ○ Local guarantee to sub as flood insurance and satisfy mortgage requirements-Hooper’s Q</td>
<td>Capital Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage downtown office space use (non-retail business)</td>
<td>○ Downtown marine industry offices ○ diversified fisheries ○ Shared use spaces-maximize efficiency and workforce by sharing resources</td>
<td>Capital Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to Housing</td>
<td>○ Year-round housing ○ Short-term housing ○ Workforce housing ○ Air B&amp;B-limits to? Owner-occupancy limit?</td>
<td>Housing ○ Funding (Tax Incentives)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generate value across multiple economies ○ Reduce strain on resources ○ Resource limits (water, sewer)</td>
<td>○ Higher-value tourism (packages)-longer stays, greater value ○ Limits to Downtown growth-water, sewer, traffic, ferry capacity</td>
<td>Housing ○ Follow-up Big Picture Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce traffic</td>
<td>○ Large-capacity vehicle transport-van, bus?</td>
<td>Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>○ Sidewalks ○ Signage; Wayfinding</td>
<td>Capital Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walkable, accessible, age friendly downtown access</td>
<td>○ Island products development ○ Cooperatives ○ Economic development office/director</td>
<td>Follow-up Big Picture Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide entrepreneurial / business support</td>
<td>○ Eldercare services ○ Eldercare housing</td>
<td>Follow-up Big Picture Discussion ○ Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support aging in place</td>
<td>○ Community gathering space</td>
<td>Town Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support central downtown gathering space</td>
<td>○ Sustainable development fund ○ Brownfield funds ○ Tax incentives</td>
<td>Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide access to capital ○ Creatively fund next steps</td>
<td>○ Building codes ○ Tax incentives</td>
<td>Facilities ○ Historical District ○ Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preserve historic VH ○ Maximize historical value</td>
<td>○ Building codes ○ Tax incentives</td>
<td>Facilities ○ Historical District ○ Funding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This information will be referenced in upcoming discussions in the respective topic areas. More considerations will be added over the course of discussion. This is by no means all that needs to be considered by the committee.

Discussions are be based in the framework of sustainably supporting VH's Three Primary Economies:

Reoccurring considerations for each discussion are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning, Code, Ordinances</th>
<th>Broadband</th>
<th>Sea Level Rise</th>
<th>Community, Cultural, Functional</th>
<th>Historical</th>
<th>Values Alignment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What should be retained, what should be altered? Added?</td>
<td>Downtown infrastructure should include cable for future BB use</td>
<td>Improvements and changes must consider Sea Level Rise per the recs. SLR Committee</td>
<td>Current and future</td>
<td>What historical aspects are relevant/essential?</td>
<td>Do all recommendations align with Sustainable VH Values?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6pm Meeting Adjourned

View the PDF powerpoint for this meeting by clicking HERE.

---

1 VH Values
- Supports and strengthens our year–round community
- Values our heritage (lobstering and independence)
- Sustains island diversity, including young people
- Enhances our sense of community and civic engagement
- Protects the island’s natural resources and beauty
- Prioritizes small, locally owned and home businesses
- Includes a thriving Main Street
10-25-18
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Downtown Committee Meeting 3: Town Facilities & Capital Improvements
Part I
5-6pm
Town Office, Upstairs Meeting Room

Attending: Elin Elisofin, John Wasielewski, David Wylie, Betsy Hopkins, Margaret Qualey, Andy Dorr, George Kendrick, Hooper Brooks (call-in), Gabe McPhail
Absent: Holly Sault, Kathy Warren, Kris Davidson

5pm Start

HOUSEKEEPING
Gabe reviewed the following as a means of providing structure for the group’s process.

Working Guidelines
● Start & End on Time
● Stay on Topic
● Write Down Questions
● Post Additions

Framework in which we are working
Goal Statement
Maintaining our economic vitality while sustaining the year-round community is both our primary concern and goal.

Sustainability
“Meeting the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs…” Sustainability is multi-layered: Environmental, Economic, Cultural, Civic

VH Sustainability
Previously-identified VH Values that define sustainability:
• Supports and strengthens our year-round community
• Values our heritage (lobstering and independence)
• Sustains island diversity, including young people
• Enhances our sense of community and civic engagement
• Protects the island’s natural resources and beauty
• Prioritizes small, locally owned and home businesses
• Includes a thriving Main Street

3 Economies
• Fisheries/Marine
• Tourism
• Year-round

Ongoing Considerations
See 10-18-18 Minutes for details
**Geographic Scope**
Ferry Terminal to Library

**Maps**
On walls of room for reference

**Meeting Purpose**
Working within our framework, generate questions, thoughts and suggestions around specific projects and considerations involving Town Facilities and Capital Improvements that are already “on the books”. Questions will inform further research and discussion needed to generate recommendations for the MP, specifically the policies, ordinance changes, and capital improvements required to sustainably preserve, support, develop, attract, retain, and create resiliency within the three primary economies.

**Format & Process**
1. Review definitions concepts and considerations. What’s missing for “what’s on the books”?  
2. Identify what we need to know, all the questions that come up.  
3. If suggestions for addressing questions are easy to identify, get them up there!

**Discussion: Town Facilities & Capital Improvements Part I**
The conversation about Town Facilities and Capital Improvements began with a review of information previously generated in relation to the projects that are technically “on the books” – capital projects that need to happen within the next 1-5 years. Probing questions were asked and additional questions, considerations, and recommendations were generated.

The following information was presented:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concepts - What’s motivating us?</th>
<th>Considerations - What’s on the Books, etc.?</th>
<th>Questions - What do we need to know or decide?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time for critical improvements</td>
<td>Sidewalks</td>
<td>Do we want a Complete Streets approach? Do we want/need sidewalks on both sides of the central Downstreet section? Should we carve out any resting/meeting spots along the sidewalks?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety, walkability, age friendly downtown access</td>
<td>Sidewalks • SLR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time for critical improvements</td>
<td>Paving/Drainage Project</td>
<td>Do we want a Complete Streets approach? Do we need to include room for bikes along the ferry to Library section? What about pull-outs for public transportation options?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Paving/Drainage Project • SLR • Drainage improvements • Water main</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support central downtown gathering and event space</td>
<td>PW Garage (Site) Re-Use</td>
<td>What is the timetable for moving the garage? Should the re-used site be used for public parking in the near term? Long term? How could a Robert Indiana Museum affect the site? How do we feel about turning that location into a higher-traffic intersection?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing access</td>
<td>PW Garage (Site) Re-Use</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared use space access</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access to High speed internet</th>
<th><strong>Bury conduit, cable, other utilities</strong></th>
<th>Do we need broadband fiber backbone along the entire study area? Should we plan for both underground and above ground options? Should there be free wifi throughout downtown? How would that affect near-term Town construction projects?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Considering others’ CIPs</td>
<td><strong>Maine Water CIP</strong> <strong>FIEC CIP</strong></td>
<td>What is each utility’s plan for SLR? What are the current “limits to growth” in terms of public water and sewer?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td><strong>Floats Ramps Wharf Repairing</strong></td>
<td>Do we have enough public access to the harbor? Do we want more public access? If so, should town floats and ramps be modified or expanded to accommodate more use by non-working boats in the inner harbor? Do we want to allow conversion of any wharf areas to mixed-use buildings? If so, would that affect the way we repair a wharf?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The information generated during this conversation is represented below in relation to our ongoing considerations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Zoning, Code, Ordinances</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What should be retained, what should be altered? Added?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>General Comments</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We need to plan for tourism scaled to our limits to growth. It’s important but should not negatively impact the WWF. We should consider all ordinances that might affect the moving of Downtown into commercial or residential Zones What recommendations will we make to sub committees and the planning commission? Project results should lead to a wide range of future options - be flexible and adaptable Let’s plan for possible changes in WWF activity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Sidewalks</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Look at: Stop signs, traffic light?, crosswalks, pedestrian only zones, green spaces to calm traffic?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Paving Drainage Project</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Study Where do we need traffic calming? Where are the entries and exits we need to access the most?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Floats Ramps Wharf Repairing</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We need to support the current Harbor Ordinance and continue to call for enforcement - Fees, Permits, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Broadband</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Downtown infrastructure should include cable for future BB use</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Bury conduit, cable,</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BB is a must. Bury conduit while we are doing the road project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Improvements and changes must consider Sea Level Rise per the recs. SLR Committee</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sidewalks</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bury conduit, cable, other utilities</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community, Cultural, Functional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current and future</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **General Comments** | What do we have funds for? Limited funds allocated for roads, sidewalks, PW garage, wharf respiring.  
Do we plan to a specified budget and plan for what we NEED/WANT and and adjust the projects according to available funds? We will discuss Cap Improvements again later; we will prioritize projects and discuss funding options.  
Safe, accessible, age-friendly streets is a goal - how do we achieve this? |
| **Sidewalks** | Bank to Net factory - larger pedestrian ways - wider sidewalks, tables in places to raise pedestrians? |
| **Town Facilities** | Town Facilities - inventory asset to assess highest and best use  
Net Factory area has potential to be nexus  
How can we repurpose certain Town facilities and spaces to bring more activity downtown to generate VIBRANCY  
Flea Market Field, Galamander - highest and best use of space?  
Green space as gathering space? |
| **Paving Drainage Project** | Complete streets in commercial zone (Ferry to Boat Yard) |
| **PW Garage (Site) Re-Use** | Does parking at PW make the most sense in terms of Highest and Best use of space and in terms of traffic? |
| **Floats Ramps Wharf Repairing** | Let’s ensure a more equal balance of WWF access - those on outer islands need ensured access/float tie-up |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What historical aspects are relevant/essential?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Town Facilities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical Value Generation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PW Garage (Site) Re-Use</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical Value Generation?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Values Alignment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do all recommendations align with Sustainable VH Values?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Comments</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heart and Soul planning - how can we capture essence of it - engage as many people as possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Floats Ramps Wharf Repairing</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perhaps we need different floats for different purposes? Rec, Outer-islands, Commercial?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This information will be referenced in upcoming discussions and will lay the foundation for recommendations and further research.

**6pm Meeting Adjourned**

View the PDF powerpoint for this meeting by clicking HERE.
11-1-18
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Downtown Committee Meeting 3: Town Facilities & Capital Improvements Part II
5-6pm
Town Office, Upstairs Meeting Room

Attending: Betsy Hopkins, Elin Elisofin, Kris Davidson, Margaret Qualey, David Wylie, Gabe McPhail, Shelby Smith Absent: John Wasielewski, Holly Sault, Kathy Warren, Hooper Brooks

5pm Start

HOUSEKEEPING
Gabe reviewed the framework, mission, guidelines, purpose, format and process including:

Goal Statement
Maintaining our economic vitality while sustaining the year-round community is both our primary concern and goal.

Sustainability
“Meeting the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs…” Sustainability is multi-layered: Environmental, Economic, Cultural, Civic

VH Sustainability
Previously-identified VH Values that define sustainability:
• Supports and strengthens our year–round community
• Values our heritage (lobstering and independence)
• Sustains island diversity, including people of all ages
• Enhances our sense of community and civic engagement
• Protects the island’s natural resources and beauty
• Prioritizes small, locally owned and home businesses
• Includes a thriving Main Street

3 Economies
• Fisheries/Marine
• Tourism
• Year-round

Ongoing Considerations
See 10-18-18 Minutes for details

Geographic Scope
Ferry Terminal to Library

Maps
On walls of room for reference

Main Themes
• Highest and best use
• Flexibility and accessibility
• Safety
• Age friendly
• Nothing to negatively impact working waterfront
• Low impact tourism
• Year round “vibrancy”

Meeting Purpose
Working within our framework, generate questions, thoughts and suggestions around specific projects and considerations involving Town Facilities and Capital Improvements that could be future possibilities.

Format & Process
1. Review definitions concepts and considerations. What’s missing?
2. Identify what we need to know, all the questions that come up.
3. If suggestions for addressing questions are easy to identify, get them up there!

DISCUSSION:
Town Facilities & Capital Improvements Part II
Part II of the conversation about Town Facilities and Capital Improvements focused on the concepts, considerations, and questions listed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concepts - What’s motivating us?</th>
<th>Considerations - What do we want to plan for / consider?</th>
<th>Questions - What do we need to know or decide?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safe, efficient, and easy movement of people in and through downtown</td>
<td>Streets (Complete?)</td>
<td>Do we want to encourage more use of bikes in the downtown corridor? Other areas? What would that require for CIPs? Are there currently any unsafe zones for pedestrians on Main St? Can/should we address that issue? Would we want to encourage more taxi, ride share, or public transit options? If so, what would they need along Main St. for capital improvements?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Support fisheries diversification | Backside Development
• Shared use on Backside-three economies share
• Aquaculture- kelp lines
• Flood mitigation through wetland construction
• FEMA maps | How do we plan for the three main economies to have shared use of the Backside area? Public access points? Will there be more kelp lines or shellfish farms in the pond in the future? Would this type of flood mitigation work? Permissible? Is/will the town pay to contest FEMA maps? Are there examples of towns offering some sort of subsidy to flood insurance that satisfies mortgage requirements? |
| Carvers pond access-tourism, fishery | | |
| Reduce flood insurance | Signage | Should all Town facilities and wayfinding/signs look the same, with graphic standards? Should there be historic/heritage site wayfinding? |
| Wayfinding and encouraging higher-value tourism | Town Parking Lots
Flea Market area
Buildings
Public Outdoor | How much parking is actually needed within the Downtown area (for retail, services, housing, events, dock access)? Do we need outdoor gathering spaces, or should we focus on inside locations? |
| Highest and best use of facilities | | |
Spaces/Parks
Where could the Flea Market go if that field wasn’t available? Should it be at a public area? Parking lot? Park? Should the Town purchase more lots/spaces for public outdoor space/parks/access? Would we ever want Town offices shifted to a downtown Main St location?

The information generated during this conversation is represented below in relation to our ongoing considerations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Zoning, Code, Ordinances</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>What should be retained, what should be altered? Added?</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>General Comments</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(for Parking conversation: Need more parking downtown Issues with parking at flea market)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Complete Streets</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Too dangerous to ride bikes on sidewalk down Main St. – walk bikes only Need space on street though – too crowded on street Currently no bikes allowed on sidewalks, but not enforced; 1/no visible signs Cyclists are considered vehicles rather than pedestrians</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Backside Dev.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DART recommends bike/pedestrian traffic out behind Main St., but a lot of commercial activity there and would not be safe for public to be back there as it is now Must be considered by building/property owners in the area Needs to be considered by DEP Will have to be made bigger back there because there really isn’t much space now “Make bigger” meaning a wetland or actually filling in land? More earth because there isn’t enough Seems like a HUGE undertaking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Signage</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Needs to be consistent throughout town Need to be specific to the town of VH / VH brand Signage could be answer to bike parking in areas Yes– wayfinding signs Traffic Calming – speed limit signs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Town Lots, Spaces, etc.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potential with development behind the fire station? Too steep Should town acquire more land? – flea market field?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Broadband</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Downtown infrastructure should include cable for future BB use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public BB?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLR</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Backside Dev.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community, Cultural, Functional</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Complete Streets</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Backside Dev.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Signage</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Paint on the road could make a big difference for pedestrian safety

| **Town Lots, Spaces, etc.** | Need more space for people to sit along Main St.  
Look at transitions rather than destinations throughout downtown (resting space from ferry to downtown - across from Candy Co? John W’s property?)  
Potential green space by “theatre” which is part of Indiana’s estate  
Town to have any connection with Robert Indiana’s estate and plan?  
Asking to use that temporarily could be an insert into a long term more formal connection |

---

| **Historical** |  
**What historical aspects are relevant/essential?** |
| **Signage** | Historic wayfinding |

| **Values Alignment** |  
**Do all recommendations align with Sustainable VH Values?** |
| **Complete Streets** | Want to encourage and provide safe bike riding options for YR community  
Would benefit all 3 economies – safe for pedestrians, accommodate commercial zone, provide safe option for bikes |
| **Backside Dev.** | No commercial kelp activity in Carvers pond currently - launching access made available, acquire right of way |

This information will be referenced in upcoming discussions and will lay the foundation for recommendations and further research.

**6pm Meeting Adjourned**

View the PDF powerpoint for this meeting by [clicking HERE](#).
11-8-18
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Downtown Committee Meeting 4: Housing, Parking, Transportation Part I
5-6pm
Town Office, Upstairs Meeting Room

Attending: Betsy Hopkins, Kris Davidson, Margaret Qualey, David Wylie, Gabe McPhail, Andy Dorr, George Kendrick, Hooper Brooks (virtually), Shelby Smith Absent: John Wasielewski, Holly Sault, Kathy Warren, Elin Elisofin

5pm Start

HOUSEKEEPING
Gabe reviewed the framework, mission, guidelines, purpose, format and process. See 11-1-18 Minutes FMI.

DISCUSSION:
Housing, Parking, Transportation Part I
Part II of the conversation about Town Facilities and Capital Improvements focused on the concepts, considerations, and questions listed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concepts - What’s motivating us?</th>
<th>Considerations- What do we want to plan for / consider?</th>
<th>Questions- What do we need to know or decide?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balance 3 Economies Highest and Best use of current parking?</td>
<td>Parking More Downtown Net Factory Property and Parking? Bike Parking Parking for Housing Access to Carvers from Backside Flea Market area Land and Float parking restrictions and permits</td>
<td>Should parking be the primary land-use in the Downstreet area? Is the central parking lot the best use of a prime waterfront space? Would reducing/eliminating street parking make it safer for pedestrians? Should we reduce parking on Downstreet to be only for ADA/elderly? Put in a 15-minute or 30-minute street parking limit? Do we want designated taxi and “public” transport parking spaces? Should the Town provide public parking for residences, or just for retail? Should apartments on Main St continue using street parking spaces instead of having an off-street space requirement?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest and Best use of town spaces</td>
<td>PW Garage (Site) Re-Use Parking Flea market space Community center SLR and stormwater management</td>
<td>Should the re-used site be used for public parking in the near term? Long term? How can we use the area for parking but not make it a parking LOT? (ground level of new facility used for parking?) How do we feel about turning that location into a higher-traffic intersection? Can/should the Town provide a subsidized space for functions/businesses without competing with other private entities?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Safety, walkability, age friendly downtown access | Transportation | Do we want to plan/encourage large-capacity transportation / discourage bringing cars to the island? Would that help ferry congestion? 
Encourage a water Taxi? 
Encourage a Land Taxi or van service, with downtown loading spots? 
Do we want/need sidewalks on both sides of the central Downstreet section? Should we carve out any resting/meeting spots along the sidewalks, or just focus on indoor meeting places only? |
| Retain/maintain Working Waterfront | Bike access |
| Balance 3 Economies | Dock “Parking” & Float (3 uses - Commercial, outer island residency, tourism) 
Cruise ship launches-limit? 
Mooring access-more? Less? |
| Reduce traffic | | |

The information generated during this conversation is represented below in relation to our ongoing considerations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning, Code, Ordinances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>What should be retained, what should be altered? Added?</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Need more parking downtown 
Issues with parking at flea market 
Inconsistencies in width of street all along Main St. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| “Carvers” lot: Selectman have recommended that Carver’s parking lot not be used for any trap storage (to be enforced by harbor master) 
How many parking spaces are really needed downtown? 
“Park Once Management System” – isn’t a huge issue on Vinalhaven |
| Parking areas need to be clearly defined no matter where they are 
There is a seasonal need for more parking 
Time limits be put on parking spaces? Maybe in front of post office, but who would enforce it? 
Removing some parking spaces in front of businesses on Main St. could allow more functionality and safety of the sidewalks in front of those businesses 
Would make areas safer for pedestrians |
| Could town WWF parking lot be better utilized? 
Already isn’t enough room for working waterfront people in those areas 
Could definitely be marked better 
Greta’s has a lot of traffic in there during the summer 
Would be hard to regulate/permit parking spots with the constant traffic in there during the summer 
Vendors selling in town parking lots - it’s currently allowed, but should it be? |
| Parking for residents on Main St. - currently they need park “off street”, but it isn’t enforced |
| Potential - could the space behind Wes Reed’s/Fuel Company be used for parking? |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PW Garage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potential - Yellow house (behind PW Garage) - a potential parking area?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **site Reuse** | Move current entrance so that it’s no longer across from Water St.  
Would reduce some of the traffic in that area  
Makes it safer for pedestrians to cross the street |
| **Transportation** | Is there a way to work with MSFS to help discourage vehicles from travelling to the island?  
Could Zip Car (or alike) be part of the solution as a seasonal service?  
(We have Vinalhaven Car Rentals currently - local enterprise) |
| **SLR** | **Improvements and changes must consider Sea Level Rise per the recs.**  
**SLR Committee** |
| **Parking** | “Carvers” parking lot - prime waterfront area but is often very wet and is most vulnerable to sea level rise |
| **PW Garage** | Good use could be for parking |
| **site Reuse** | |
| **Community, Cultural, Functional** | **Current and future** |
| **General Comments** | What are the anchors of downtown? – Grocery store and post office  
What if they moved? How would it change the feel of downtown?  
Incorporating green space/resting spot with eliminating parking spots in certain areas could be beneficial  
Are sidewalks needed or wanted on both sides of Main St.? Not down the entire street, but possibly from Clamshell Alley to The Haven |
| **Parking** | “Carvers” lot:  
Is parking the best use for the current parking lot downtown? Serves a very important purpose: Working waterfront, parking, 4th of July central station.  
Would be really hard to sell a complete change of this area  
Important to know that this area serves more than parking in this community  
Part of it could be converted to green space/something else  
(Long range plan for Damariscotta is to eliminate parking spaces behind businesses and convert to more of a downtown function space)  
Are there conflicts with street parking and pedestrians? Is it a safety issue?  
Needs to be better defined for each – it’s a free for all right now  
Yes, it is a safety concern, especially on corner near FIEC |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PW Garage site Reuse</th>
<th>Green space / multi-functional outdoor space, including parking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation</strong></td>
<td>Would a “public transportation” system be helpful/useful? Down the road it definitely should be considered but maybe not during this first phase of discussions Is there really going to be a large influx in vehicles? It doesn't seem that there will be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bikes: Should we encourage the use of bikes? Pedestrian safety is more important than focusing on bikes. We need more accessible bike parking. Widening sidewalk could provide space for more bike racks Create a safe way for bicyclists to navigate the road. More bike use could free up more parking for cars Issue: MSFS does not encourage bike use either b/c of cost</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This information will be referenced in upcoming discussions and will lay the foundation for recommendations and further research.

**6pm Meeting Adjourned**

View the PDF powerpoint for this meeting by clicking HERE.
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Downtown Committee Meeting 5: Housing, Parking, Transportation Part II
5-6pm
Town Office, Upstairs Meeting Room

Attending: Betsy Hopkins, Elin Elisofin, Holly Sault, Kris Davidson (virtually), David Wylie (virtually), Hooper Brooks (virtually), Gabe McPhail, Andy Dorr, George Kendrick, Shelby Smith
Absent: John Wasielewski, Kathy Warren, Margaret Qualey

5pm Start

DISCUSSION:
Housing, Parking, Transportation Part II
Part II of the conversation about Housing, Parking, and Transportation focused on Housing as presented in the chart below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concepts - What’s motivating us?</th>
<th>Considerations- What do we want to plan for / consider?</th>
<th>Questions- What do we need to know or decide?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access to Housing Retain/maintain Working Waterfront Balance 3 Economies</td>
<td><strong>Downtown Housing</strong>&lt;br&gt;● Year-round housing&lt;br&gt;● Short-term housing&lt;br&gt;● Workforce housing&lt;br&gt;● Elder housing&lt;br&gt;● Air B&amp;B&lt;br&gt;● Owner-occupancy</td>
<td>Should the town play a role in access housing in the DT area? How?&lt;br&gt;Should use ordinances, zoning, and tax incentive changes be put in place beyond what’s already on the books to encourage housing?&lt;br&gt;Should housing be permitted in the commercial zone?&lt;br&gt;What type of housing do we want to encourage DT?&lt;br&gt;Should there be Air B&amp;B/short term stay limitations?&lt;br&gt;Should there be owner-occupancy limitations?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The information generated during this conversation is represented below in relation to our ongoing considerations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning, Code, Ordinances</th>
<th>What should be retained, what should be altered? Added?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Comments</td>
<td>We are communicating with the Town Housing Committee (a Stakeholder group, Jeff Aronson, chair; Elin and David are members)&lt;br&gt;Group is looking mostly at YR housing needs/solutions; doing an inventory of YR housing and potential YR housing. Also looking at education - how to be a good tenant, save for down payment, etc. Educating renters on fire safety, proper renting behaviors, is essential&lt;br&gt;There are properties and land available to be purchased so the opportunity to purchase on the island exists, year-round rentals are more of a necessity for</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
members of the community
What are our limits to growth in the DT area? We must know this (sewer, water, infrastructure)
Encouraging residents to live DT YR generates vibrancy
Freezing pipes an issue that renters/building owners
Working to winterize the properties necessary to have more year-round housing
Rockland put limit on Air B&B’s allowed, which opened more areas for longer term housing
Need to have a conversation about really short-term housing, including B&Bs, Hotels - Ok for more in the DT area? Anything to prevent that now?
Workforce housing is an issue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing</th>
<th>North Haven Affordable Housing has a covenant on who can buy/rent their units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If privately owned or non-profit then it can be controlled who purchases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What ordinances could be added/changed to encourage the use of space for YR housing?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• DT residential part of buildings - change parking requirements to 1 space rather than 2?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Resident parking in town lots OK?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Allow upstairs apartments in Commercial-Marine Zone? A slippery slope?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Need to leave the working waterfront intact, rather than converting all to residential; but what sort of commercial use do they have?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Cluster-housing/co-housing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Incentives for?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• YR 2nd floor housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Co-housing, cluster housing, apartments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Large burden to maintain and build-out Main St. structures, whatever town recommends should be of benefit/incentivize building owners - help them maintain structures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Broadband</th>
<th>Downtown infrastructure should include cable for future BB use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Comments</th>
<th>BB would likely increase the desire for office spaces, specifically on second floors, in downtown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not within the “power” of the committee to dictate what kind of businesses are going to be in downtown and where those businesses are going to be located</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community, Cultural, Functional</th>
<th>Current and future</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
### Housing

3rd floor of net factory - affordable housing? YR housing; co-housing?
Town is not going to provide housing, but is encouraging housing
Public private partnership could be option for developing housing on net factory property
More people living YR DT would add to vibrancy but would it increase traffic?

This information will be referenced in upcoming discussions and will lay the foundation for recommendations and further research.

**6pm Meeting Adjourned**

View the PDF powerpoint for this meeting by [clicking HERE](#).
Downtown Committee Meeting Minutes

Downtown Committee Meeting 7: Historic District Development
5-6pm
Town Office, Upstairs Meeting Room

Attending: Betsy Hopkins, Elin Elisofin, Kris Davidson, Holly Sault, John Wasielewski (virtually), David Wylie (virtually), Gabe McPhail, Andy Dorr, George Kendrick, Shelby Smith
Absent: Hooper Brooks, Kathy Warren, Margaret Qualey

5pm Start

DISCUSSION:
Historic District Development
A conversation round the pros and cons of historic district development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concepts - What’s motivating us?</th>
<th>Considerations - What do we want to plan for / consider?</th>
<th>Questions - What do we need to know or decide?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preserve historic VH</td>
<td>Building Codes &amp; Ordinances</td>
<td>Why would we pursue Historic District designation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximize historical value</td>
<td>Tax Incentives &amp; Grants</td>
<td>What would be our objective(s) in recommending this?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SLR</td>
<td>Is historic district designation key in preserving our island heritage (a VH value)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Is there anything prohibitive about historic place or district designation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>What would need to be changed/added in terms of ordinances to comply with the required standards of historic district or place development?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Would we want to consider a demolition delay? A blight ordinance? WHY? WHY NOT?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Should we encourage more properties along Main Street to pursue National Historic Register listing?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>What are we willing to recommend for ordinance changes in order to receive access to tax incentives and grants? Would we be willing to give up anything or accept restrictions on design/renovation standards? Or are we thinking all carrot and no stick / reward rather than restriction?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Would we want to consider becoming a certified local government?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Is significant investment in rehabilitating downtown structures worth it considering SLR?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest and Best use of town buildings Access to Affordable Housing</th>
<th>Building Repurposing / Downtown Housing</th>
<th>Regarding town structures and historic sites, if needed, are we willing to consider giving up flexibility on how we use places and structures? Would we want to see historic structures used in part for YR housing? Do we want to establish an owner-occupied requirement for short-term rental housing in</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

● Year-round housing
● Elder housing
Gabe and George presented the following as an overview for the conversation:

- Historic District development could align with VH values, could support low impact “heritage” tourism, could build partnerships with Chamber of Commerce and Historical Society, could provide economic/funding opportunities – grants, incentives, credits, could help fund sea level rise adaptations on structures.
- This committee’s role is to make suggestions and recommendations and identify what is important, and what needs to be changed and improved. So what are the benefits and drawbacks of historic district development? What might be the broader community’s perspective?
- Historic District development could have federal, state, and/or local designation
- Currently five structures downtown are on the National Historic Register: Star of Hope, Union Church, Galamander, Payne House, and the Library.

The information generated during this conversation is represented below in relation to our ongoing considerations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning, Code, Ordinances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What should be retained, what should be altered? Added?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are there benefits of having a historic district? Would the community value historic properties in downtown? Would need to view this as an honor not a restriction; would need to be presented delicately. Committee is here to support and encourage property owners rather than dictate what they should do with their properties.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WWF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Should DT be looking at the working waterfront and talking to those owners about being part of a historic district? Nervous about talking to people involved in fishing/working waterfront. Working waterfront tax program- help preserve those access points for working waterfront purposes. Shoreland and Land Use Ordinances help with preservation of working waterfront properties.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Star of Hope**

Star of Hope building: Does it need any sort of permit for being converted into a museum? If so, it will be instructive for the committee to see the process and figure how they could have some “influence” in that process.

Gabe + George will be meeting with James Brannan to educate him on what DT is doing and talking about and get his input – goal is to seek opportunities for cooperation and collaboration.

**Changes**

Survey from 2012 shows 72% of responders voting that there should be a historic building ordinance. Don’t want to start getting into any restrictive measures of creating historic district, but do we want to look into implementing:

- Type of roof ordinance to set a roof design standard – for renovations and new construction?
- Demolition delay ordinance? (gives others the opportunity to take over a building rather than it just disappearing)
- Neglect ordinance / safety hazard ordinance?
- Penalize/tax property owners who are neglecting properties? Probably not a good idea to punish people financially when likely they are neglecting their buildings because they don’t have the funds to begin with

Building codes will be smart in the future to protect owners’ investments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>What historical aspects are relevant/essential?</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preservation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One goal of Historic District Development is preservation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Propose that it would benefit people through tax credits and grants for the buildings they own to be registered as historic
Historic District Development could be used as a tool to encourage and support investment in downtown buildings + support vibrancy downtown in other ways. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community, Cultural, Functional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current and future</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interpretive signage/wayfinders from the ferry terminal to Main st. to inform and be part of the overall experience of visiting the island as well as honoring island heritage for all</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This information will be referenced in upcoming discussions and will lay the foundation for recommendations and further research.

Next Steps: Committee will need to do more research to determine what is applicable when making a recommendation for the Master Plan.

6pm Meeting Adjourned
View the PDF powerpoint for this meeting by clicking HERE.
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Downtown Committee Meeting 8: Funding (Tools)
5-6pm
Town Office, Upstairs Meeting Room

Attending: Betsy Hopkins, Elin Elisofin, Kris Davidson, Margaret Qualey, Hooper Brooks (virtually), David Wylie (virtually), Gabe McPhail, Andy Dorr, George Kendrick, Shelby Smith
Absent: John Wasielewski, Kathy Warren, Holly Sault

5pm Start

**DISCUSSION:**
Funding tools that might aid in sustaining and developing Downtown.
A conversation round the pros and cons of each tool.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tools - Name</th>
<th>Summary- What is this tool for? How is it used?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Tax Increment Financing (TIF)</td>
<td>Flexible finance tool used by municipalities, towns, plantations, and the Unorganized Territory to leverage new property taxes generated by a specific project or projects within a defined geographic district. Any portion of the new taxes may be used to finance public or private projects for a defined period of time up to 30 years. Locally-driven: the municipality, town, or city defines the district and chooses how much of the new taxes will go to what public and private projects over what period of time, with the whole package requiring local political approval. Examples: Upgrading a roads or streetscapes; building addition, Fox Islands Wind…</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion- Pros, Cons, Assumptions**

Vinalhaven has a TIF for wind turbine project
TIF for Downtown area(s) could work if there was new value expected to be added, the increased value is what would be captured to help with future funding.

Can be difficult to set up for an already established area, significant amount of work will need to be planned for that much value to be added Big capital investments would be needed in a small footprint Would take a lot of additional buildings and value to collect enough tax in a TIF to have any significant impact
EX: $200,000 in taxes paid in downtown last year on 17.5 million in value

TIF Cons: nonprofits cannot have TIFs
Can get complicated and can be confusing for building owners
Would need to be case by case basis rather than one large TIF for the entire DT
Really only worth looking at for a large project (Net Factory PPP?)
TIF Pros: for the net factory specifically, anything would be a bonus because that building does not pay taxes currently
Can do spot TIFs on specific areas/buildings, such as Indiana’s

Things to test/learn: look into example of other TIFs and the pros and cons of each that could apply to Vinalhaven

Could multiple types of funding be combined for a single project?

| Employment Tax Increment Financing (ETIF) | State program that helps new and established Maine businesses hiring 5 or more new, full-time employees by refunding from 30-80% of the state withholding taxes paid by the business for up to ten years. The reimbursement rate rises with the level of local unemployment, with those in Pine Tree Development Zones receiving the highest rate.

Eligibility criteria:
Non-retail, for-profit businesses
Hiring 5 or more new, full-time employees within two calendar year
Provide new employees access to a group health care plan and retirement plan, such as a 401-K or pension plan
Average annual income of each new employee is > $46,275 |

| Discussion - Pros, Cons, Assumptions | Beneficial to a business, rather than the whole town
Could be something is the Econ. Dev toolbox, but not really a place for it broadly in the plan |

| Maine's Working Waterfront Tax Law | Provides property tax reduction and encourages preservation of WWF by preventing conversion to more intensive uses as the result of economic pressures caused by high property taxes
Intended to support commercial fishing activities
Local assessor calculates value of property based on use as “WWF land” – parcel, or portion of a parcel, of land abutting tidal waters or located in the intertidal zone used more than 50% as WWF to “provide access to or support the conduct of commercial fishing activities.”
How much of a tax reduction?
• land used predominantly (more than 90%) as WWF = 20%
• land used primarily (more than 50%) as WWF = 10%
• land permanently protected for WWF =50% (if used predominantly) or 40% (if used primarily) |
| **Discussion**  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><em>Pros, Cons, Assumptions</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Owners can apply for fish houses and any commercial property in downtown area  
Currently 2.2 million in value for wharfs, about 22,000 in taxes  
Things to test/learn: need more education especially in order to present this to the community with the intent of getting support since land use tax credits don’t have a favorable reputation here |
| **State Tax Credits for Historic Rehabilitation** |
| Maine’s State Historic Rehabilitation Tax Credit Program:  
"Substantial Rehabilitation Credit" –25% state credit for any rehabilitation that also qualifies for the 20% federal credit. The rehabilitation must meet all of the requirements of the Federal tax incentive program.  
"Small Project Rehabilitation Credit" –25% state credit for the rehabilitation of certified historic structures with certified qualified rehabilitation expenditures of between $50,000 and $250,000. Available to entities that do not claim the federal rehabilitation credit.  
"Affordable Housing Rehabilitation Credit Increase". The State Substantial Rehabilitation Credit and the Small Project Rehabilitation Credit may be increased to 30% if the rehabilitation project results in the creation of a certain amount of affordable housing.  
Only certified historic structures will qualify for the credits. A "certified historic structure" is defined as a building that is listed in the National Register of Historic Places, either individually or as a contributing building in a National Register historic district, or as a contributing building within a local historic district that has been certified by the Secretary of the Interior  
Credits cannot be claimed against the cost of acquisition, new additions, site work, or personal property. Only costs incurred in work upon or within a historic structure will qualify. Interior work will qualify if the work meets "The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation." |
| **Discussion**  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><em>Pros, Cons, Assumptions</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Need to do further research  
Things to test/learn: how does this affect what can be done for SLR (Cannot affect SLR activities) |
| **Local Loan Funds for Sustainable Development** |
| Creation of an island-based loan funded by local investors Committee  
Revolving Loan Fund  
Grants (percentage or match)  
Eligibility requirements  
Board oversees application selection; bank administers day-to-day  
Example: Slow Money Maine Investment Groups |
**Discussion**  
*Pros, Cons, Assumptions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>There are a lot of nonprofits competing for funds and there can be political backlash surrounding fundraising</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private investors could provide funds with guidelines about how/what they want to fund and how it can be used; Could be grants or loans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pros: could infuse/supports entrepreneurial ventures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People around the community want to invest in projects that will benefit the town/community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do we need an Economic Development Director?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cons: Who gets the funds? Can be perceived as something that is meant for one group over another</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Things to test/learn: Research other examples and how it could apply to our downtown from both the investor and business owner/lendee perspective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could fundraise for capital projects for matching funds although fundraising could have “political” implications</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Next Steps: Phase One (Discussion of topics) has concluded. Gabe and George presented next steps:  
Wrap up Stakeholder Meetings *(Gabe and George)*  
Compile information gathered from committee and stakeholders *(Gabe)*  
Report committee and stakeholder findings and themes *(Gabe and George)*  
Research areas where questions still exist *(Gabe and Committee)*  
Determine and prioritize recommendations *(Committee)*  
Determine funding for recommendations and reprioritize based on ability to fund *(Gabe, George, and Committee)*  
Broader community outreach *(Gabe and Committee)*  
Drafting of plan *(George)*  

Next Meetings: 1-10-19 and 1-24-19, 5-6pm, upstairs meeting room  

**6pm Meeting Adjourned**

View the PDF powerpoint for this meeting by clicking HERE.
Downtown Committee Meeting Minutes
Phase 2, Meeting 1

5-6pm
Town Office, Upstairs Meeting Room

Attending: Betsy Hopkins, Margaret Qualey, Gabe McPhail, George Kendrick
Hooper Brooks (virtually), David Wylie (virtually) Absent: Andy Dorr, Shelby Smith, John Wasielewski, Kathy Warren, Holly Sault

Initial Conversation
Gabe and George shared themes and updated the committee on the stakeholder meeting progress.
- About ⅔ done speaking with primary stakeholders
- Themes we are hearing include: pedestrian safety, sidewalks and crosswalks, lighting, traffic calming, parking, limits to doing business, supporting the different needs of the three economies.

Phase 2 Overview & Discussion
Gabe proposed an overview of the next Phase of work. Committee members were supportive of the proposed process.

Research Areas and Questions
Gabe suggested the committee gather more information in the following areas and members suggested and offered who would take on what:

- Historic Districts (Local, State, Federal) **Gabe, Elin, Betsy**
- CDBG and other grant options **Gabe**
- Local Development Funds **Gabe, John, Hooper**
- “Local Funding for Flood Insurance” **Gabe and Hooper**
- Sustainable Tourism **David**

By February Gabe will be in touch with group members to figure out next steps for how to research, who will do what, what we need to know, etc. Research will take place February–April.

**Secondary and Community Stakeholder Meetings**

Gabe shared the list of secondary stakeholders and asked on-island committee members if they would take on interviewing a few of them with Gabe.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Owners</th>
<th>Interviewer 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CASE NANS M, Row House</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DYER, BRENNAN W</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARTIN, JILL E, Row House</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MWQ PROPERTIES, Row House</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAKE, ROBERT E. SR. &amp; CATHERINE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PETERSON, DANA M &amp; SCHCEN, MARIA A C, Dolphin St Road Access</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIXLEY, DEBORAH M, Row House</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRATT, I. TORRY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TURNER, JOSHUA T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WARREN, CHESTER &amp; CHERYL, Plant Place, Village Center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WISIELEWSKI, JOHN E &amp; KONG, BESSY M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YANNELL, LEONARD C &amp; CHRISTINE, Row House</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YORK, EDWARD A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOUNG, FLORICE, Row House</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Business Owners who are renters

- Greets Eats
- Surfside
- AeroFit, Richard Carlsson
- Pizza Pit
- Sean's Bakery
- Sherry Rega
- Knight's Insurance
- Good Things, Holly Sault
- Windhorse, Alison Thibault
- Hair Salon, Jill?
- Go Fish, Rachel Noyes
- New Era Gallery, Elaine
- Vinravven Yoga & Pilates
- Island's Closet
- Engine House Press, Chris Clark

Gabe will be in touch with committee members to schedule these meetings.

**Next Steps**

Gabe suggested it may not be necessary to meet during the next scheduled meeting time 1/24, but would let everyone know prior to that date. She requested the 2/7 scheduled meeting date be left on everyone’s calendars.

**6pm Adjourn** View the PDF powerpoint for this meeting by clicking HERE.
Downtown Committee Meeting Minutes
Phase 2, Meeting 2
5-6pm
Town Office, Upstairs Meeting Room


Initial Conversation
Gabe and George shared themes and updated the committee on stakeholder meeting progress. Themes:

- Pedestrian safety
  - High speed uncontrolled vehicle use from Sands Rd. through downtown
  - 85 full time employees between ferry to library
  - 75 seasonal employees in same area
  - SLR and flood maps and raising buildings
  - Similarities between what DC has talked about and what stakeholders are saying
  - Multi leveled sidewalks has not gotten a positive response

Parking
Balancing the three economies

Primary s/h conversations complete. Mail/email, secondary and tertiary s/h meetings yet to complete (by Gabe and committee members)

Phase 2 Overview & Discussion
Gabe proposed an overview of the next Phase of work. Committee members were supportive of the proposed process.

Research and Further S/H Conversations
Gabe reviewed topics for further research. Members signed up for secondary S/H conversations with Gabe.

- Historic Districts (Local, State, Federal) Gabe, Elin, Betsy
- CDBG and other grant options Gabe
- Local Development Funds Gabe, John, Hooper
- “Local Funding for Flood Insurance” Gabe and Hooper
Sustainable Tourism David
Gabe will be in touch with group members to figure out next steps for research and s/h conversations.

SLR
Marion (Munch) Grogan attended the meeting to share the latest from the SLR Committee. Here are some highlights:

- SLR is looking at the vulnerable areas of the entire island and working on how to help prepare for the rise in these places
- Chart from NOAA showing relative sea level change in feet from year 2000 and up
  - Based on tidal station/gauge in Bar Harbor is the closest to Vinalhaven
  - Shows ranges: Intermediate-low, intermediate, intermediate-high, considered to be the more likely scenarios
  - Important to remember that this can change and likely will change within a couple of years
- SLR committee does not yet have any suggestions about what can be done in the downtown area to help prepare for the rise

FEMA Maps
Andy shared the latest on FEMA map contesting by private landowners and the Town:

- Challenging Carvers Harbor and Sands Cove – to be converted from VE zone to AE zone
- $10,000 to $15,000 to accomplish this
- Very in depth and expensive process to challenge the zoning
- Programs available to help decrease flood insurance premiums
- 20 individuals on the island who have gone through map change process since 1999

Economic Development
Sharing of info:

- DTM Plan to provide general recommendations for further research, study, opportunities; but not an in-depth focus of the plan.
- David Milder, Downtown Revitalization Specialist
  - Has done a lot of economic development work for small communities
  - Interested in making two visits to the island
    - One in the “slow season” the other in the summer
    - Will want to talk to different groups/individuals while he’s here
  - He could help provide an educational opportunity for each of the different types of economies to recognize and understand each other

Next Steps
Gabe will continue her research, communicate with the committee, and work with committee members to conduct secondary and tertiary s/h meetings.

6pm Adjourn View the PDF powerpoint for this meeting by clicking HERE.