



Linking our Communities • Advancing our Region

PACTS

Portland Area Comprehensive Transportation System

Executive Committee Meeting Notice

May 10, 2011

8:30 a.m.

GPCOG, 68 Marginal Way, Portland

Agenda

1. Call to order
2. Minutes of April 5th meeting
3. TIP Projects and Policy Topics (8:35)
 - A. Act on a MaineDOT proposal to amend our FY 2010/2011 Transportation Improvement Program to enable commencement of 37 projects recently funded for the 2012/2013 biennium
 - B. Act on a proposal to reduce the local match for projects that start quickly, and to increase the local match for those that do not
 - C. Act on a proposal for the Executive Committee to lead the TIP Process Review work this year
 - D. Act on a proposal to expand the role of PACTS staff in the administration of capital projects
 - E. Review of our February Holding PIN funding actions in light of MaineDOT's substitution of STP funds with ARRA funds related to the CBITD vessel project
 - F. 2011 Credit Program status report
4. Unified Planning Work Program for Next Biennium (9:35)
5. Annual review of the Executive Committee (9:50)
6. Updates from Staff and Committees (10:10)
7. Finalize agenda for May 19th Policy Committee meeting (10:20)
8. Public comment on topics not on today's agenda
9. Adjourn

Next meeting: June 7th at 8:30 a.m.

The Metropolitan Planning Organization for the Portland Urbanized Area

68 Marginal Way • Portland, Maine 04101

Telephone: (207) 774-9891 • Fax: (207) 774-7149 • www.pactsplan.org

Minutes of April 5th Meeting

In attendance: Kathi Earley, Chair; Dan Bacon; John Bubier; Judy Harris; Nathan Poore; Sara Trafton; Maddy Adams; Neal Allen, Carl Eppich; John Duncan; Paul Niehoff; Ann Thompson

1. **Call to order.** Kathi Earley called the meeting to order at 8:39.
2. **Minutes of March 22nd meeting.** *The minutes were approved by consensus.*
3. **Unified Planning Work Program for Next Biennium.** This item was reviewed thoroughly at last month's meeting. On page 6, the revised hourly rate budget assumptions are 2% annual salary increases (rather than 3%). GPCOG has been working on their indirect cost plan and have been able to reduce costs by \$70,000. GPCOG will be taking away two holidays; they have reduced salary increases from 3% to 2%; they will be increasing the employee contribution to health insurance from 10% to 12.5%; and there will be more hours charged by GPCOG staff to direct projects (rather than indirect). GPCOG is also looking at the lease of this office space.

Nathan asked to have the indirect cost rate explained again. Neal Allen and Ann Thompson joined the meeting at this time. Neal explained that the billing is done similar to how a law firm works. A big contributing factor to the overhead is our office lease costs; we need to make a decision by December regarding renewal of our lease. Ann added that the indirect rate is being actively reviewed. It is prepared annually and is reviewed by MaineDOT who is our "lead agency." The rate is audited every year. Ann has been working with Greg Whitney at AVCOG regarding indirect rates. We are lucky to have received the HUD grant because that will help with Neal's billable hours and will reduce the indirect rate. The only people that bill to indirect are Neal, Ann, Stephanie, Maddy, Lynne, Jen and a GIS person. None of the planners bill to indirect.

Nathan was concerned that the indirect rate would go up again after three years when the HUD grant is done. Ann said it was her intention to keep the rate down even after the three-year period. We also have more billable hours. We are looking at all options regarding office space. The indirect rate has gone down from 68 to around 58-59. A handout was provided. All the rates have been reduced since this handout was prepared. Ann explained how the rates are arrived at. Anything in the indirect column is what makes up the indirect cost pool. The far left column is a one-year budget and that is for all of GPCOG and PACTS. The direct column includes items that can be tied to a specific project for both GPCOG/PACTS. The right-hand column is indirect costs – a blend of salaries from both organizations, etc. John Bubier (a former GPCOG Executive Director) tried to explain that this is how an indirect billing process works. The difficulty is that we as PACTS utilize differing amounts of staff, conference room space, etc.

It was asked how the indirect cost relates to revenue from GPCOG municipal dues. Ann explained that GPCOG has a dues allocation budget – matching funds, funds for member services. Member dues total \$240,000. No changes will be happening to the member dues rate this year.

Page 7 is a work in progress. The new numbers from Ann are not yet reflected on page 7 – only the 3% to 2% change is shown. Gorham East/West was increased by \$20,000. Four communities have requested \$10,000 apiece. Portland hopes to get a green light to submit so there may be 5 (that's what the \$50,000 reflects on page 7).

It was asked what the difference is between the Gorham East/West project listed on page 9 and the one listed on page 7. On page 7, we're listing the Gorham East/West study proposals and they are listed differently on page 9. On page 7, you could lump the locally proposed line and the Gorham East West line together. (It is the same \$50,000.)

Planning carryover needs – page 8. MaineDOT has been clear that there will not be carryover study money. The Forest Avenue study has to wrap up in three months and that is impossible. In Windham, the North Windham Comprehensive Transportation Plan is trying to get done by June 30th and then it will be taken over by Windham staff. It was asked if MaineDOT really has the authority to take away the carryover funds; the MPO staffs are asking FHWA. There is a Maine guidebook on the MPO process that John D. will check.

It was asked if there was a way to shift the carryover planning money to capital projects or a new bus, new boat, etc.? We have a list of unmet needs that is pretty long. John D. thought it could be done. Kathi pointed out that the communities have committed that they will spend the money given them; it's just that the product will come out much differently than if they had the proper amount of time to do the studies. If a community cannot get it done by June 30th, then the communities are going to have to pay to finish the studies. Dan asked if we should plan on reprogramming the money allocated to the Southern Maine Transit Coordination Study since we haven't received any responses to the original RFP. John D. explained that we could make it capital money and put it to another project, and then it wouldn't have to be spent by June 30th. We could try to change the planning money to capital money and have it approved by the Policy Committee.

Page 8 – Proposal for new Studies Time Clock. Staff proposes that the 18 months time be shortened to 9 months, and that all studies adopted as part of the biennial UPWP lose any remaining PACTS funds at the end of the biennium if the deadline isn't met. The idea would be to have a consultant hired within the 9-month period. John B. asked why 9 months – why not 3? There was concern that three months would be too tight but that six months might be more realistic. ***The committee agreed by consensus to change it so that a consultant would need to be hired to do the study within six months from the beginning of the fiscal year or the funds would be withdrawn.***

Local Project Administration. Judy asked if this would be optional for communities because she was concerned with the \$7,500 match. Paul explained that it hasn't been discussed. The money would be to hire a full-time person; the bulk of their time would be charged to the capital projects. Details would need to be worked out. Kathi said it was worth a placeholder in the budget but further discussion will be needed. Dan asked if an outside private consultant had been considered for this role. Paul responded that with certain projects, a consultant has to be hired anyway. We will need to look at the difference between a full-time employee versus hiring a consultant.

Dan asked to see the planning services outline for SMRPC. It had been included in a previous packet.

A quorum was no longer present (at 10:30) for the remainder of the meeting.

Nathan asked if there is a plan to do something with the FTA 5303 money not being spent by the end of this fiscal year. John D. suggested that perhaps the funds could be shifted to capital. Nathan asked for a staff recommendation on how we might be able to use that money before we lose it.

There was some discussion about the South Portland Bike/Ped Routes project (\$15,000) listed on page 9. The original intent was to hire a consultant, but instead PACTS could do it in-house.

4. **2011 TIP Process Committee.** *The remaining committee members (Dan, Nathan and Kathi) recommended that the Policy Committee convene a 2011 TIP Process Committee to review our policies and procedures in preparation for our 2012 selection of \$15,000,000 in FY 2014/2015 projects.*
5. **2011 Credit Program.** Recommend that the Policy Committee create a 2011 Credit Program which is similar to our 2010 program with the following changes:
 1. Clarify the local 100% expenditures on arterials are also eligible.
 2. Reduce the \$400,000 local 100% expenditure to \$300,000.
 3. Use the Credit Program federal and state funds for **any** federally eligible transportation project.

The FHWA requires that FHWA-funded projects have a minimum 50% FHWA contribution; this could create a stumbling block for us.

The current program requires that the credit funds can only be used for a project that already exists or for a project that has officially been proposed to PACTS. So the credit program is only a benefit to a small number of our members (is what we've heard). The Committee suggested that a little more homework be done on this subject before it goes to the Policy Committee. The concerns of the Policy Committee need to be spelled out and we'll need to provide some answers to the questions. A small subcommittee might be a good idea. John D. can prepare some information about this for the Policy Committee meeting because it is a time-sensitive issue. It will be on the April 21 Policy Committee agenda.

6. **PACTS Voting Requirements.** This question came to us as the result of a vote taken at a recent Transit Committee meeting. This will not be on the April Policy Committee agenda.
7. **Updates from staff and committees.**
 - No update from MaineDOT yet regarding reprogramming our \$240,000 (federal portion) that is no longer needed to help finance a CBITD vessel replacement.
 - #1 – Paul explained that the Policy Committee voted to use Holding PIN money for the Back Cove Connection Bike/Ped; Bike Ped on Park Avenue; Eastern Trail Connection in South Portland and one other. Jim Gailey has asked to start the Eastern Trail Connection but the money wasn't available. Paul asked if both Portland and South Portland are on board with starting the projects now. Do we want to hire a consultant to begin the design on those four projects as an LAP project? South Portland is ready to go; they want to do construction on that trail next winter. Under the current program, Portland would do it themselves but staff capacity would be an issue. There has been some dialogue about it being an LAP. Options: Portland could do it as an LAP; PACTS could hire a consultant to do all four projects; or do it as we've always done it.
8. **Finalize April Agenda.** Keep items 1 and 2; remove #4. Regarding #6, subsection 8 – Local project administration proposal, we'll just let the Policy Committee know that we're working on it. Regarding #4, Carryover money, we should put together a clearer spreadsheet of what we cannot carryover, along with possible alternatives about how we could move the money somewhere else where we could spend it.
9. **Public comment.** None.
10. **Adjourn.** The meeting adjourned at 11:15 a.m.

Agenda Item 3: TIP Projects and Policy Topics

A. MaineDOT request that we amend our FY 2010/2011 Transportation Improvement Program to enable commencement of 37 projects recently funded for the 2012/2013 biennium

Staff Resource: John Duncan and Paul Niehoff

Recommendations

1. Executive Committee* to amend our FY 2010/2011 Transportation Improvement Program to enable commencement of the 37 projects recently funded for the 2012/2013 biennium and shown on the following pages.
2. Executive Committee to support the start of design work this year for the 4 projects (also on the list of 37) *at the funding levels funded by the Policy Committee in February.*

* Note: Our bylaws state that the Executive Committee has the authority “to add, delete or change other FHWA-funded and FTA-funded projects as requested by MaineDOT”. This is the situation here. The Committee has taken this kind of action several times.

Background

MaineDOT recently sent us a list of 37 projects (the next three pages) in our region that they would like to start this summer instead of waiting for the availability of federal funding in October. By starting now MaineDOT will be able, in many cases, to bid the projects next winter or early spring, and complete the projects next year rather than in 2013.

We discussed this at our recent Project Efficiencies Team meetings. The summer work will involve survey and the start of NEPA, historic preservation and other project development work.

Most, but not all, of the projects are PACTS “MPO Allocation” projects. The \$5,000 and \$15,000 and \$30,000 amounts are estimates.

In the long run the benefits are significant:

- This will save money on individual projects.
- Therefore, more projects overall will be done.
- More projects will be done within the biennium for which they are funded.
- The general public and the Legislature will be more amenable to proposals for more transportation funding from MaineDOT, PACTS and many other transportation system stakeholders.

2012-2013 Early Kick-off Projects: STIP/TIP Amendment for Preliminary Engineering:

| PIN | PSN | Title | Description | Early KO |
|------------|------------|--|--|---------------------|
| 19004.00 | 51488 | BIDDEFORD, ROUTE 1 | Intersection Improvements: Located at the intersection of Route 1 and Route 111. | \$ 15,000.00 |
| 19391.00 | 51330 | BIDDEFORD-SACO, PEDESTRIAN BRIDGE | Engineering for Pedestrian Bridge: Located at Factory Island. Connecting downtown, businesses, transportation center, and mill development complexes. | \$ 15,000.00 |
| 19387.00 | 51241 | CAPE ELIZABETH, SHORE ROAD | Drainage and Pedestrian Safety Improvements: Located at Shore Road. Connecting neighborhoods, schools, Route 77 and the village area to improve pedestrian safety. | \$ 15,000.00 |
| 19096.00 | 51648 | FALMOUTH, ROUTE 1 | Highway Resurfacing: Beginning at Foreside Road and extending northerly on Route 1 for 1.15 miles to Bucknam Road. | \$ 15,000.00 |
| 19086.00 | 51655 | FREEPORT, ROUTE 1 | Highway Resurfacing: Beginning at Mallet Drive and extending northerly on Upper Main Street/Route 1 for 1.40 miles. | \$ 15,000.00 |
| 19381.00 | 51344 | FREEPORT, SOUTH STREET | Engineering for Drainage and Pedestrian Safety Improvements: Along South Street, between Bow and West Streets in Freeport. | \$ 5,000.00 |
| 19121.00 | 52008 | GORHAM, NEW PORTLAND ROAD | Highway Resurfacing: Beginning at Main Street and extending easterly on New Portland Road for 0.36 of a mile. | \$ 15,000.00 |
| 19385.00 | 51246 | GORHAM, BICYCLE-PEDESTRIAN SAFETY | Engineering for Bicycle and Pedestrian Facility: Connecting the downtown, neighborhoods and business areas along the historic railroad bed. | \$ 15,000.00 |
| 19327.00 | 53207 | OLD ORCHARD, OCEAN PARK ROAD | Highway Resurfacing: Beginning at Temple Avenue and extending westerly on Ocean Park Road/Route 5 for 0.28 of a mile. | \$ 15,000.00 |
| 19052.00 | 51386 | PORTLAND, CASCO BAY BRIDGE #5900, ROUTE 77 | Fender System Preservation: Casco Bay Bridge (#5900) over the Fore River on Route 77. Located at the Portland-South Portland town line. | \$ 30,000.00 |
| 19078.00 | 51419 | PORTLAND, ROUTE 22 | Highway Resurfacing: Beginning at Caleb Street and extending westerly 1.53 miles. | \$ 15,000.00 |
| 19082.00 | 51634 | PORTLAND, CAPISIC STREET | Highway Resurfacing: Beginning at Brighton Avenue and extending easterly on Capisic Street for 1.27 miles to Stevens Avenue. | \$ 15,000.00 |
| 19092.00 | 51633 | PORTLAND, BACK COVE CONNECTION | Completion of a 0.03 of a mile Franklin Street bicycle-pedestrian connection at Interstate 295, Exit 7, between Marginal Way and the Back Cove Trail; pending the results of a feasibility analysis. | \$ 15,000.00 |
| 19093.00 | 51635 | PORTLAND, VERANDA STREET | Highway Resurfacing: Beginning at Washington Avenue and extending northerly on Veranda Street for 0.50 of a mile. | \$ 15,000.00 |

| | | | |
|----------|---|---|---------------------|
| 19094.00 | 51636 PORTLAND, CONGRESS STREET | Highway Resurfacing: Beginning at Eastern Promenade and extending southwesterly on Congress Street for 0.52 of a mile to Washington Avenue. | \$ 15,000.00 |
| 19095.00 | 51647 PORTLAND, EASTERN PROMENADE | Highway Resurfacing: Beginning at Atlantic Street and extending on Eastern Promenade for 1.20 miles to Washington Street. | \$ 15,000.00 |
| 19117.00 | 52258 PORTLAND, INTERNATIONAL PARKWAY | Highway Resurfacing: Beginning at Congress Street and extending southeasterly on International Parkway for 0.32 of a mile to Al McKay Avenue. | \$ 15,000.00 |
| 19122.00 | 52011 PORTLAND, FORE STREET | Highway Resurfacing: Beginning at Franklin Street and extending northerly on Fore Street for 0.44 of a mile to Center Street. | \$ 15,000.00 |
| 19420.00 | 51392 PORTLAND, SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL | Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety Improvements: Safety flashing signals at midblock crossings on Presumpscot Street, Outer Washington Avenue and Washington Avenue, near Tukeys Bridge, to improve safety near the schools. | \$ 15,000.00 |
| 19428.00 | 51629 PORTLAND, PARK AVENUE | Safety Improvements: Beginning at Saint John Street and extending westerly on Park Avenue for 0.34 of a mile to Deering Avenue. | \$ 15,000.00 |
| 19430.00 | 51627 PORTLAND, SAINT JOHN STREET | Safety Improvements: Beginning at Congress Street and extending on Saint John Street for 0.17 of a mile to Park Avenue. | \$ 15,000.00 |
| 19083.00 | 51650 SACO, ROUTE 112 | Highway Resurfacing: Beginning at Lund Road and extending westerly on Route 112 for 0.83 of a mile. | \$ 15,000.00 |
| 19102.00 | 53639 SACO, ROUTE 112 | Highway Resurfacing: Beginning 0.51 of a mile northerly of Buxton Road and extending northerly on Route 112 for 0.89 of a mile. | \$ 15,000.00 |
| 19084.00 | 51653 SOUTH PORTLAND, RUMERY STREET | Highway Resurfacing: Beginning at Route 1 and extending northerly on Rumery Street for 0.55 of a mile to Dartmouth Street. | \$ 15,000.00 |
| 19091.00 | 51628 SOUTH PORTLAND, CUMMINGS ROAD | Preliminary Engineering for Future Highway Reconstruction: Beginning at Running Hill Road and extending northerly on Cummings Road for 0.73 of a mile to the Westbrook town line. | \$ 30,000.00 |
| 19097.00 | 51652 SOUTH PORTLAND, DARTMOUTH STREET | Highway Resurfacing: Beginning at Rumery Street and extending easterly on Dartmouth Street for 0.23 of a mile. | \$ 15,000.00 |
| 19098.00 | 51654 SOUTH PORTLAND, BROADWAY | Highway Resurfacing: Beginning at Cottage Road and extending northeasterly on Broadway for 1.12 miles to Pickett Street. | \$ 15,000.00 |
| 19105.00 | 53610 SOUTH PORTLAND, PAYNE ROAD | Highway Resurfacing: Beginning at Broadway and extending northerly 1.42 miles. | \$ 15,000.00 |
| 19426.00 | 51631 SOUTH PORTLAND-SCARBOROUGH, EASTERN TRAIL | Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements: Eastern Trail along Old Bog Road. Beginning at Gary L. Maietta Way in South Portland and extending to Pond View Drive in Scarborough. | \$ 15,000.00 |

| | | | |
|----------|-------------------------------------|---|--------------|
| 19099.00 | 51656 WESTBROOK, BRIDGE STREET | Highway Resurfacing: Beginning at Main Street and extending northerly on Bridge Street for 0.98 of a mile to Cumberland Street. | \$ 30,000.00 |
| 19100.00 | 51657 WESTBROOK, EAST BRIDGE STREET | Highway Resurfacing: Beginning at Methodist Road and extending easterly on East Bridge Street for 1.19 miles to Constitution Drive. | \$ 15,000.00 |
| 19077.00 | 51464 WINDHAM, ROUTE 302 | Highway Resurfacing: Beginning at Route 35 and extending northerly on Route 302 for 1.16 miles to Whites Bridge Road. | \$ 15,000.00 |
| 19393.00 | 51310 YARMOUTH, ROUTE 1 | Engineering for Pedestrian Safety Improvements: Located between Hannaford Plaza and the East Main Street Ramp on Route 1 in Yarmouth. | \$ 15,000.00 |

Projects of Significance for Public Comment: (may be funded with non-federal funds)

| | | | Early KO |
|----------|--|---|----------|
| 19276.00 | GORHAM, CURTIS BRIDGE #5768, ROUTE 22 | Bridge Culvert Rehabilitation: Curtis Bridge (#5768) over the East Stroudwater River. Located 1.19 miles northerly of the Scarborough town line. | n/a |
| 19051.00 | NORTH YARMOUTH, SWEETSER BRIDGE #5877, NORTH ROAD | Bridge Wearing Surface Replacement: Sweetser Bridge (#5877) which carries North Road over the Chandler River. Located 0.32 of a mile northwesterly of Route 9. | n/a |
| 19278.00 | SOUTH PORTLAND, RED BROOK BRIDGE #6282, INTERSTATE 295 | Bridge Culvert Rehabilitation: Red Brook Bridge (#6282) over Red Brook. Located 1.07 miles southerly of the Scarborough Connector. | n/a |
| 19282.00 | WESTBROOK, BRIDGE STREET BRIDGE #5661 | Preliminary Engineering for Future Bridge Improvements: Bridge Street Bridge (#5661) over the Presumpscot River. Located 0.06 of a mile northerly of Main Street. | n/a |

B. Act on a proposal to reduce the local match for PACTS projects that start quickly, and to increase the local match for those that do not

Staff Resource: John Duncan and Paul Niehoff

Recommendation to the Policy Committee

Recommend that PACTS establish a new policy designed to encourage our municipal members to collaborate more effectively with MaineDOT in the commencement of federally funded projects, and to save money in the process.

1. Recommend the creation of the following new incentive/disincentive policy for PACTS projects (except our Transit Set Aside projects) funded in the 2012/2013 biennium.
 - Allow a 10% local match for PACTS projects whose 3-Party Agreements are signed by July 31, 2011. (This is designed to be responsive to MaineDOT's proposal in Agenda Item 3B above.)
 - Allow a 20% local match for PACTS projects whose 3-Party Agreements are signed between August 1st and December 31, 2011.
 - Require a 30% local match for PACTS projects whose 3-Party Agreements are signed after December 31, 2011.
2. Apply the incentive/disincentive policy presented above in future biennia as follows:
 - Allow a 10% local match for PACTS projects whose 3-Party Agreements are signed by December 31st of the year in which the MaineDOT Capital Work Plan is adopted.
 - Require a 30% local match for PACTS projects whose 3-Party Agreements are signed after December 31st of that same year.

Background

The TIP Project Efficiencies Team is focusing on getting our projects started sooner. MaineDOT staff says that too many projects in the PACTS region have run into delays in the past, and that trend continues. (See full page of notes below from their April 28th meeting.) The Team is working to reduce the cost of future federally-funded projects by recommending ways to:

- Develop project scopes and estimates “right” from day one.
- Achieve a clear public understanding and support of the project very early on.
- Have the city/town fully support and focus on completing the project.
- Reduce the amount of design needed.
- Reduce the administrative cost and construction risks that contractors experience.
- Keep project development and construction on schedule.

The long run the benefits of getting projects done for less are significant:

- This will save money on individual projects – including the local match contributions.
- Therefore, more projects overall will be completed.
- More projects will be completed within the biennium for which they are funded.
- The general public and the Legislature will be more amenable to proposals for more transportation funding from MaineDOT, PACTS and many other transportation system stakeholders, if we can be more efficient and cost effective.

Implementation of this proposal would reduce the 25% local match for many PACTS projects programmed last fall. This would be a welcome change for many of our communities during these difficult economic times.

If we adopt the reduced local match policy recommended above then we would have to drop approximately \$1,000,000 in projects that we programmed last fall because we would be using a higher percentage of federal funds in each project. Staff recommends looking first to our list of collector projects. We also suggest that the project cutting could be mitigated by more cost effectively completing projects, and by a combination of securing more federal and state funds from these sources:

- Completed projects that have not yet been “closed out” financially.
- The \$125,000 recently reserved for potential use per the TIP Project Efficiencies Team’s recommendations.
- \$300,000 (rough estimate) reduction in the estimate to do the Cummings Road project in South Portland based on a design exception that we are seeking from MaineDOT

See Bill Shane’s email below to the Policy Committee in support of this proposal. *Staff has tweaked their proposal a little since Bill wrote his email. It is still a new concept that will take further shape as more people review it.*

Dear Policy Board Members:

May 2, 2011

As most of you are aware, Jim Gailey and I serve as your representatives on a MDOT Commissioner appointed task force. I am writing to summarize my impressions of our meetings with MDOT regarding getting projects out to bid and reducing costs for both sides – and to share two great proposals that I hope we can support on May 19th.

It is clear to me that MDOT is changing and is committed to change. They are accepting the responsibility of being held to a higher standard of accountability and transparency in process that has been absent for many years. Ms. Joyce Taylor and Commissioner Bernhardt are committed to delivering projects and working with communities. The changes that are being laid out from Ms. Taylor’s office will allow any of us to go online and look at the status and the progress of any of our projects. Their people are being held accountable, critical path scheduling is in place with milestones, and project managers are under the microscope to deliver projects. MaineDOT has recently sent

PACTS staff a list of 35 projects in our region that they want to start this summer rather than this fall when the federal funds normally become available. For many of the projects this will get them done a year faster.

Our side of the house also needs a better delivery system. Three party agreements are lingering unsigned by our communities, unnecessarily taking resources away from starting projects. Other older projects are also stalled. Projects are being designed and set on the shelf because local matches are not being raised. We need to be better at delivering on our side as well. John Duncan and Paul Niehoff have drafted a strategy to move this process ahead and spend the money that has been authorized on our regional transportation system. The idea is a big shift away from our current process, but may be the catalyst to get us all to the starting line with 3-party agreements much more quickly. The idea supported by the subcommittee and being brought to the executive committee in May will be to **reduce the match to 10% from our current 25% providing a 3-party agreement is signed within 60 days.** In the case of the current list of 35 MDOT projects (that they would like to begin this summer) that would be 60 days from our May meeting vote. If you fail to have the 3-party agreement signed within 60 days, then the 25% match would increase to 30% and your project would be moved to the end of the line of that priority group.

The reality is that while MDOT provides us with these funds to allocate to PACTS projects, they could reduce the allotments to just planning funds if we cannot be better at getting our projects started. The MDOT has been questioned by the Governor and Legislature on why they need additional monies when they haven't spent the bonds they have been authorized to currently spend. We are part of that problem and we need to change if we expect to be at the table in the future with an ability to request more monies because we are committed partners delivering projects not excuses.

I know there will be a lot of war stories and "he said she said" rhetoric around this letter. Nevertheless, we can't fix the past we can only change what is in front of us. We have a committed partner for change at MDOT and we need to decide if we can put the old ways behind us and work toward a better process defined by delivery of projects and not excuses. Jim Gailey and I both believe this process can only increase our credibility and abilities to acquire additional funding for all our Towns, but the baggage of the past needs to be left at the gate and we need to start today and commit to a new process. I think this will mean a more active role from our executive committee and staff in tracking the progress of projects and working more closely with MDOT to deliver results. Our towns and cities will need to commit local funds sooner, but projects will happen and will be easier to track.

I'd be happy to answer any questions, but I hope we can have a frank and respectful debate in on May 19th on the new policy. I would be happy to talk further with anyone asking for more details.

*Respectfully Yours,
Bill Shane
Town of Cumberland*

Draft notes from April 28, 2011 Meeting of TIP Projects Efficiency Team

Attendance: Joyce, Peggy, Bill, Jim, Cheryl, John and Paul Niehoff. The consensus was that future meeting notes will be in brief summary format. Joyce reminded us of our July 15th deadline.

The meeting purpose was to discuss planning and scoping ideas for PACTS (and all MPO's) as presented by MaineDOT and PACTS staff. The group discussed several suggestions from MaineDOT:

- Invitation to PACTS staff to attend the MaineDOT October meetings at which they begin to prepare the next year's project schedule that goes public in January. PACTS staff will then meet with municipalities to ascertain they are ready to go.
- MaineDOT to share their new-and-improved monthly project costs-to-date report with the MPO's. PACTS folks really liked this concept.
- PACTS institute more milestones and tracking of capital projects, and reduce the changing of local match on projects. The discussion included 3-party agreements.

The group discussed at length MaineDOT's recent initiative to start many projects this summer prior to availability of federal funds in October. This will involve survey and the start of NEPA, historic preservation and other project development work.

The group discussed at length – and supported – the PACTS staff idea to reduce the local match for projects that start quickly, and to increase the match for those that do not. See memo in the meeting packet. PACTS staff also recommended that MaineDOT act, or at least give significant feedback, on requests for design exceptions during our enhanced project scoping process. The other PACTS staff suggestion was that the rest of our current project selection and scoping process, as revised during the past three years, is working well and does not need to be changed much.

Next Steps

1. John and Paul to seek Executive Committee endorsement of the "\$15,000" TIP amendments on May 10th, to seek Policy Committee endorsement of the "10% local match" proposal on May 19th and to create a status report on all PACTS projects to share with this group in May.
2. Joyce will work on a prototype of the costs-to-date report for us to look at.
3. Jim Gailey to attend May 12th design exceptions meeting at MaineDOT.
4. John and Paul to meet with Portland staff to discuss project management topics on May 11th. Brad Foley is going to do the same soon?
5. Joyce will help Paul on his goal to have MaineDOT close out more completed PACTS projects.
6. Paul and John will meet with Cheryl (and Carlos Pena) to learn more about PACTS.
7. May 5th meeting at PACTS with Jim Hanley and Mark Barnes.

C. Proposal for the Executive Committee to lead the TIP Process Review work this year

Staff Resource: John Duncan

Recommendation: Recommend to the Policy Committee that the Executive Committee lead the TIP Process Review work this year

Background

Last month the Policy Committee asked Kathi Earley to convene a 2011 TIP Process Committee to review our policies and procedures in preparation for our 2012 selection of \$15,000,000 in FY 2014/2015 projects.

The following members volunteered to serve in the process:

- Judy Harris
- Bill Shane – as long as Bob Burns volunteers!
- Sara Trafton

Nathan and Kathi subsequently suggested to me that the Executive Committee lead the process, and thereby to manage the amount of time that we ask our members to participate in PACTS committee work. They asked staff to evaluate how this might work.

Staff thinks that this could work. After a review of the Executive Committee's upcoming workload, it appears that the Executive Committee – with the addition of Judy, Bill and Bob, and possibly interested others? – could handle this additional work.

See the possible topics and meeting dates on the next page.

Possible Topics and Dates for Executive Committee and TIP Process Review Meetings

Budget 3 hours for each meeting?

| | <u>June 7</u> | <u>July X</u> | <u>Aug 2</u> | <u>Sept 6</u> | <u>Oct 4</u> |
|--|---------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|
| Report on Project Efficiencies Team | X | X | | | |
| Report on Title VI Review of PACTS | X | | | | |
| Update on Gorham East West Phase II | X | | | X | |
| Update on Regional Sustainability Plan | | | | | X |
| Discuss strategic review of PACTS process | | X | | | |
| Watch Destination Tomorrow video | | X | | | |
| Monthly updates from committees and staff | X | X | X | X | X |
| Adopt draft TIP Document for public review * | | | | | |
| * Ask Policy Committee in May to authorize Executive Committee to do this. | | | | | |
| Finalize Policy Committee agenda | | | X | | X |

TIP Process Topics

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 Review scope of the committee's work to do | X | | | | |
| 2 Incorporate Project Efficiencies Team proposals (such as local match policy changes) | | | X | X | |
| 3 New local project administration function | X | | | | |
| 4 Briefing on transit funding processes | | X | | | |
| 5 Institutionalize Credit Program ** | X | | | | |
| 6 Shorten time spent picking projects ** | | X | | | |
| 7 Review our 2-biennia project policy ** | | X | | | |
| 8 Revisit our project cap policy | | X | | | |
| 9 Consider Gorham E-W Study recommendation to reward communities with transportation funding in return for certain land use plans | | X | X | | |
| 10 Tweak Road Formula factors and weights and Tweak Dest. Tomorrow Formula factors and weights. Add "health assessment review"? | | | X | X | |
| 11 Revise project application requirements and application forms | | | X | X | |
| 12 Receive report from Technical Committee on changes to the Collectors ranking procedure | | | X | | |
| 13 Review staff's TIP Process Document | | | | | X |

** Topic from April Policy Committee meeting

D. Action on a proposal to expand the role of PACTS staff in the administration of capital projects

Staff Resource: Paul Niehoff and John Duncan

Recommendation: Consider the staff proposal to have PACTS administer most of our capital projects, and give staff direction such as:

- Move ahead to hire someone (pending Policy Committee and MaineDOT support)
- Drop the idea, and remove the \$30,000 in the draft UPWP.

Background

Paul and John see an opportunity for PACTS to provide an important new service to our municipal and MaineDOT members. The service is for PACTS to locally administer the majority of PACTS funded projects.

MaineDOT staffers and public works directors have told Paul that “the system is broken” and that a new PACTS role could add significant communication and production value. However, the

Paul and John have been shaping this concept (still a work-in-progress) for over three years.

Budget in current UPWP – \$0

Budget proposal for next UPWP – \$30,000 -- *We would also charge to the TIP projects, as MaineDOT does currently.*

Lead staff involved – Paul Niehoff

Local match required -- \$6,000 match for the “planning” funds, and match for the federal and state funds in the TIP projects. *For example 5% combined of our total \$15 million allocation for CE/RW would be \$750,000 over two years as an example.*

Municipalities involved – The municipalities in which the projects are developed and completed.

The consensus at Paul’s March 30th, meeting with high-level MaineDOT staff is that the concept of PACTS administering MPO projects is valid and worth continued review and discussions.

We propose that PACTS locally administer the majority of PACTS funded projects including collector paving projects, sidewalk, bike projects, shared pathway projects and intersection projects including new signals. Some reconstruction or rehabilitation projects could also be administered under this program but if right-of-way is a major endeavor then perhaps the Department would develop and complete those projects at least initially.

The Management aspect of this proposal is proposed as follows with details to be worked through as we proceed:

- The MPO LAP Manager would be involved with PACTS and COG staff during the project selection process.
- Manager would verify scope, estimates, potential design exceptions etc.
- Either prior to (as DOT's new policy) or in October of the first funding year, the Manager will work with the community to "fine tune" the scope; develop a timeline/schedule including neighborhood or public meeting schedules.
- The Manager would develop a modified three party/MPO LAP agreement combining appropriate aspects of both current agreements and coordinate/facilitate the signing by all three parties.
- Concurrently the project would be "kicked-off" with all three parties agreeing to scope, schedule, estimates, funding amounts, meeting dates, check-ins dates with DOT etc.
- The Manager would then work closely and in concert with local officials to "do what it takes" to efficiently work through fully developing the project based on the type and complexity of project portfolios.
- The Manager and the town, when appropriate, would periodically schedule "check-ins" with DOT staff to assure project delivery and federal participation.
- A final review by all parties would take place just prior to bidding and would include a QA/QC plan outlining responsibilities.
- The project is advertised.
- Project awarded after the three party's review and concurrence.
- Construction phase starts with appropriate QA/QC and when appropriate project meetings would be conducted.
- Manager acts as resident inspector and also would oversee QA/QC consultant which also would supply resident services for select projects
- Construction ends
- All documentation assembled for project close outs.
- Project PIN is closed and reimbursements finalized.
- Project data including cost(s) compiled, entered into data base and GIS for all three parties.

The following are some of the benefits of this proposal:

- Involvement and intimate knowledge of the project from the time the project is submitted to PACTS for inclusion in the work program including, EPS (involvement), cost estimates, municipal concerns and funding, etc.
- Will facilitate work program development, resolve conflicts and track funding both proposed and obligated.
- Develop three party agreements.
- Improvement in communication between DOT and the municipalities including, but not limited to, consistency, improved knowledge of projects at the local level, ability to combine projects and coordinate and facilitate the project development process including communication during construction.
- Lessen the DOT time commitment associated with their project management thus allowing MaineDOT resources to be utilized elsewhere.
- Allows more MaineDOT projects to be designed and constructed earlier in the work plan schedule.

- Frees up and leverages more resources with personnel and/or funding especially with current workloads experienced by MaineDOT and local LAP management.
- Improved data collection and storage including construction methods and associated costs and will improve archiving MPO project data and transferring that data to the communities and to DOT.
- Ability to coordinate a MaineDOT transportation project with local initiatives (sewer and water projects, downtown revitalization, etc.).
- Fully ensure that all local needs are addressed.

E. Review of our February Holding PIN funding actions in light of MaineDOT's substitution of STP funds with ARRA funds related to the CBITD vessel project

Staff Resource: John Duncan

Recommendation: Consider the information below, and then make a recommendation to the Policy Committee. Staff suggests two options:

1. Take no action. This would mean that none of the \$705,000 re-programmed in February goes to transit purposes.
2. Take some of the \$705,000 from a project(s) and allocate it to transit purposes.

Background

In February the Policy Committee re-programmed \$945,000 in federal and state funds from our Holding PIN as follows:

- \$240,000 to transit capital projects (one in South Portland and three at the CBITD)
- \$95,000 to design four bike/ped projects
- \$260,000 to our 2011 Credit Program
- \$125,000 for consideration by the TIP Projects Efficiencies Team as a means to implement one of their recommendations due in July
- \$180,000 for a collector project (we used \$225,000 by mistake that day)

The \$240,000 amount for transit was based on a suggestion by the Executive Committee based on the fact that \$240,000 of the \$945,000 available was from a transit capital project that had been funded with ARRA stimulus funds. (Note that this was a one-time suggestion. There is no policy that funds put into our Holding PIN will go out to projects of the same kind. Our TIP Policies and Procedures document simply states that: “unspent MPO Allocation project funds are transferred into the PACTS “Holding PIN” for reprogramming by the Policy Committee.”)

In March the MaineDOT told us that the \$240,000 was not available for us to re-program and that our February \$240,000 allocation was void. At the April Policy Committee meeting, Carlos Pena, the FHWA’s Maine Division Planner, said he would look into this action by MaineDOT because he felt that MaineDOT might have acted improperly. Last week MaineDOT’s Peggy Duval confirmed to me that FHWA had supported the MaineDOT action.

F. 2011 Credit Program status report

Staff Resource: Paul Niehoff

Recommendation: Receive a brief report from Paul.

Background

The Policy Committee endorsed creation of a 2011 Credit Program last month.

Paul will solicit proposals from our membership under this program as soon as possible.

Staff has suggested to Portland that they use their anticipated 2011 credit to supplement the funding on an existing bicycle project. Portland is considering that proposal.

Agenda Item 4: UPWP for the Next Biennium

Staff Resource: John Duncan

Recommendation: Recommend Policy Committee adoption of the UPWP for the next biennium, as presented to the Policy Committee last month, with the following changes and updates:

1. Continue to budget \$10,000 for Portland to join with Scarborough, South Portland, Westbrook and Gorham (at \$10,000 each for these municipalities) to do the local land use planning recommended to be part of second phase of the Gorham East West Corridor Study. Portland has not submitted a proposal for these funds. We encourage Portland to do so, and we further recommend that in the event that Portland does not submit a proposal by June 30th that we move that \$10,000 to a new PACTS traffic/bike/pedestrian counts task.
2. Merge the \$15,000 South Portland “bicycle routes-truthing” consultant task into the Implementation of the 2009 PACTS Bike/Ped Plan (currently at \$25,000) and give the merged task a \$40,000 budget. South Portland supports this PACTS staff proposal.
3. MaineDOT is now going to provide some “carryover” funding for PACTS consultant studies which we expect to be nearly complete by June 30th. See email below.
4. Adopt a \$100,000 PACTS Assessment Budget for the biennium. See next page for details.

Background

On April 21st staff was able to answer the Policy Committee members’ few questions in response to our detailed presentation of the budget and scope of the draft UPWP.

We propose to send the Policy Committee only the budget materials in this meeting packet for their final action on May 19th. They are included in this packet.

1. PACTS assessment worksheet
2. Budget worksheet for FHWA-funded work
3. PACTS local consultant studies
4. Budget worksheet for PACTS staff and GPCOG support
5. Carryover funding email regarding MaineDOT process to determine carryover amount
6. Carryover funding status sheet
7. Budget worksheet for FTA-funded work

We propose not to send again the 16 pages of staff and consultant studies scopes of work. By the way, we sent on May 5th a draft 40-page draft Unified Planning Work Statement to MaineDOT, FHWA and FTA for their review.

PACTS Assessment History and Proposal for \$100,000 Budget for Next Two Years

The PACTS Assessment is the contributions which the member municipalities pay to support the federally-eligible *regional* work of PACTS staff and 15-municipality consultant work, plus the work that is not eligible for federal funding. See right-most column on next page.

The PACTS Assessment supplements the significant MaineDOT contributions every two years. *Thank you, MaineDOT.*

In a March email to municipal managers I estimated a \$75,000 two-year need for match for the UPWP, plus a \$25,000 contingency. ***See the proposed \$100,000 Assessment Budget below.*** *On the next page we show a \$69,092 amount.*

PACTS Assessment Budgets and Invoices History

| <u>Biennium</u> | <u>FY 2008+2009</u> | | <u>FY 2010+2011</u> | | <u>FY 2012+2013</u> | |
|--------------------|---------------------|--------------------|---------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|---------|
| MDOT \$\$ in UPWP | \$110,000 | | \$212,000 | | \$157,000 | |
| Assessment Budgets | \$92,087 | | \$92,000 * | | \$100,000 (proposed) | |
| | FY 2008 Invoice | FY 2009 Invoice | FY 2010 Invoice | FY 2011 Invoice | FY 2012 Estimate** | FY 2013 |
| Biddeford | \$2,957 | \$2,658 | \$2,150 | \$0 | \$2,806 | TBD |
| Cape Elizabeth | \$2,344 | \$1,998 | \$1,616 | \$0 | \$1,991 | TBD |
| Cumberland | \$1,599 | \$1,165 | \$942 | \$0 | \$1,263 | TBD |
| Falmouth | \$3,055 | \$2,259 | \$1,827 | \$0 | \$2,423 | TBD |
| Freeport | \$2,684 | \$1,559 | \$1,261 | \$0 | \$1,735 | TBD |
| Gorham | \$1,651 | \$1,531 | \$1,239 | \$0 | \$1,611 | TBD |
| North Yarmouth | \$805 | \$461 | \$373 | \$0 | \$508 | TBD |
| Old Orchard Beach | \$2,375 | \$1,610 | \$1,303 | \$0 | \$1,712 | TBD |
| Portland | \$13,155 | \$8,530 | \$6,900 | \$0 | \$9,148 | TBD |
| Saco | \$3,489 | \$2,233 | \$1,806 | \$0 | \$2,375 | TBD |
| Scarborough | \$5,999 | \$3,633 | \$2,939 | \$0 | \$4,040 | TBD |
| South Portland | \$7,125 | \$3,955 | \$3,200 | \$0 | \$4,325 | TBD |
| Westbrook | \$2,230 | \$1,926 | \$1,558 | \$0 | \$2,098 | TBD |
| Windham | \$3,205 | \$1,898 | \$1,536 | \$0 | \$2,140 | TBD |
| Yarmouth | <u>\$2,329</u> | <u>\$1,670</u> | <u>\$1,351</u> | <u>\$0</u> | <u>\$1,824</u> | TBD |
| Regional Total | \$55,000 | \$37,087 | \$30,000 | \$0 | \$40,000 | TBD |

* Note that actual invoices were for only \$30,000.

** See March 7, 2011 email to city and town managers from John Duncan.

Note in the table above that we will spend only \$30,000 of the \$92,000 assessment budget in this biennium. I described this to the municipal managers in another email in March:

| | |
|--|----------------|
| PACTS Assessment contribution to UPWP work | \$14,743 |
| Creation of PACTS Daily and Truck Models in 2010 | \$6,400 |
| PACTS Video preparation during the spring of 2010 | \$3,700 |
| PACTS staff work on federal earmark applications in 2010 | <u>\$4,900</u> |
| Total | \$29,743 |

April 15 Budget Worksheet For The Next 2-Year UPWP

This sheet omits current and future carryover budgets. See table later in meeting packet.
 This sheet also does not show our current and proposed assessment/contingency budgets. See assessment table later in meeting packet.

| Revenue Budget | Current Biennium | Draft 2012/2013 Budget | 12/13 %'s |
|---------------------------|------------------|------------------------|------------|
| New FHWA Planning funds * | \$1,256,367 | \$1,256,367 | 80% |
| MaineDOT match | \$212,012 | \$157,046 | 10% |
| Other match | <u>\$102,080</u> | <u>\$157,046</u> | <u>10%</u> |
| Total | \$1,570,459 | \$1,570,459 | 100% |

* We could ask MaineDOT for more.

| Uses Budget | Current Biennium | Draft 2012/2013 Budget | Sources of match for federal funds | | | |
|--|------------------|------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------|---------------|------------------|
| | | | MaineDOT | GPCOG SMRPC | Single Muni's | PACTS Assessment |
| PACTS Staff and GPCOG Support | \$989,000 1 | \$1,000,459 | \$157,000 | | | \$43,092 |
| PACTS Model Update and Applications | \$38,500 | \$40,000 | | | | \$8,000 |
| GPCOG Planning Services | \$32,500 1 | \$30,000 | | \$6,000 | | |
| GPCOG Maine Clean Communities | \$30,000 1 | \$30,000 | | \$6,000 | | |
| SMRPC Planning Services | \$30,000 | \$30,000 | | \$6,000 | | |
| Regional Signal Study II | \$25,000 1 | \$0 | na | na | na | na |
| Regional Collector Study | \$17,000 1 | \$25,000 2 | | | | \$5,000 |
| Regional Dest Tomorrow Update | \$12,500 1 | \$0 | na | na | na | na |
| Regional EPS | \$9,500 1 | \$10,000 | | | \$2,000 | |
| Regional Transportation Funding Policy | \$7,000 1 | \$10,000 | | | | \$2,000 |
| MaineDOT Air Quality Analysis | \$3,000 1 | \$0 | na | na | na | na |
| Locally proposed consultant studies | \$376,000 | \$230,000 3 | | | \$46,000 | |
| Regional traffic signals management | na | \$80,000 | | | \$16,000 | |
| Local project administration at PACTS | na | \$30,000 4 | | | \$6,000 | |
| Regional Aerial Flight | na | \$30,000 5 | | | | \$6,000 |
| PACTS Bike/Ped Plan Implementation | <u>na</u> | <u>\$25,000 6</u> | | | | <u>\$5,000</u> |
| Total | \$1,570,000 | \$1,570,459 | \$157,000 | \$18,000 | \$70,000 | \$69,092 |

Notes

1. These items will be completely spent by June 30th.
2. The \$25,000 is for a regional arterials study and an update of our 2010 collectors study.
3. The \$230,000 fully funds the top five ranked study proposals from our members.
4. Placeholder amount. Finance mostly from capital project budgets.
5. A contribution to the cost of the basic regional flight cost.
6. A staff proposal drawn from the 2009 PACTS Regional Bicycle/Pedestrian Plan.

PACTS Local Consultant Studies

| Line Items | Total Budget | FHWA PL \$\$ | Match | Sources Of Match |
|-------------------------------------|--------------|--------------|----------|---------------------|
| Biddeford/Saco Wayfinding | \$30,000 | \$24,000 | \$6,000 | Biddeford and Saco |
| Gorham East West Land Use Planning | \$50,000 | \$40,000 | \$10,000 | Five municipalities |
| Portland Brighton/Deering/Falmouth | \$35,000 | \$28,000 | \$7,000 | Portland |
| Portland Libbytown | \$100,000 | \$80,000 | \$20,000 | Portland |
| South Portland Bike/Ped routes * | \$15,000 | \$12,000 | \$3,000 | South Portland |
| * merge into PACTS regional effort. | | | | |
| New Studies Subtotal | \$230,000 | \$184,000 | \$46,000 | |

April 15, 2011 Forecast for next biennium for PACTS staff plus GPCOG support

| Staff | FY 09 Actual Hours | FY 10 Actual Hours | FY 11 Est. Hours | FY 12 * Est. Hours | FY 12 Budget Cost ** | FY 13 Budget Cost ** | Two-Year 12+13 Budget Total |
|-------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| PACTS | 5,491 | 5,306 | 5,304 | 5,305 | \$451,576 | \$460,422 | \$911,998 |
| GPCOG Support | 486 | 496 | 528 | 512 | \$27,696 | \$28,208 | \$55,904 |
| GPCOG Planning*** | <u>219</u> | <u>28</u> | <u>95</u> | <u>0</u> | <u>\$0</u> | <u>\$0</u> | <u>\$0</u> |
| Subtotals | 6,196 | 5,830 | 5,927 | 5,817 | \$479,272 | \$488,630 | \$967,902 |
| Direct Costs | | \$17,500 | \$17,500 | | <u>\$16,278</u> | <u>\$16,279</u> | <u>\$32,557</u> |
| | | | | Total Costs | \$495,550 | \$504,909 | \$1,000,459 |

* Based on average of FY 10 actual hours and FY 11 estimated hours. Assume same hours in FY 2012 and FY 2013. 10+11 budget: \$989,000
Difference: \$11,459
12+13 % increase: 1.2%

** Hourly rate budget assumptions include 2% annual salary increases, and an additional increase for the PACTS Transportation Planner position.

*** These technical support services will be billed in 12/13 to GPCOG Planning Services, but the budget for GPCOG Planning Services will be same as 10/11 biennium. This is a reduction in the budget for this function in the next biennium.

Carryover needs estimate....see email on next page

PACTS Estimate for Carryover into 12/13 UPWP

May 5, 2011

| Originally funded by PACTS Activity | Budget | Invoices Received | Estimate Spend by June 30th | Needs after June 30th | Study Status |
|---|-----------|----------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|
| May 2007 Transit Bus Route Study | \$30,000 | \$3,100 | \$20,000 | \$10,000 | Study began in February |
| May 2009 Regional Signal Study II | \$25,000 | \$7,500 | \$25,000 | \$0 | Study started in March |
| May 2009 Portland Forest Avenue * | \$100,000 | \$0 | \$60,000 | \$40,000 | Study started in March |
| May 2009 Windham Comp. Transpo. Study | \$40,000 | \$450 | \$30,000 | \$10,000 | Study began in February |
| May 2009 Yarmouth Route One Phase 3 | \$35,000 | \$27,600 | \$30,000 | \$5,000 | Study began in April 2010 |
| Dec. 2010 Scarborough Oakhill Pedestrian Plan | \$40,000 | \$2,020 | \$36,500 | \$3,500 | Study started in March |
| Dec. 2010 Southern Maine Transit Coordination | \$30,000 | \$0 | \$20,000 | \$10,000 | Study started in May. |
| Total | \$270,000 | | Total | \$78,500 | |
| | | | 80% Federal Share: | \$62,800 | |

* Have reduced the scope and budget? Details soon.

Carryover May 2nd Email

Hi Alex, Dan, Dan, Brooks, Jennifer, Angela and Steve,

I spoke with Peggy Duval on Friday about carrying over planning money after June 30th. Peggy, the Acting Director of Planning at MaineDOT, had met on this subject with Commissioner Bernhardt. They will consider providing federal funds to complete your/our planning studies which are well along toward completion. They have asked for a progress report from me on June 1st. Any funds that they allow to be in the new PACTS UPWP for this purpose must be spent by September 30th.

Peggy asked me to continue pushing you to make significant progress. I know that you all are doing all that you can in that regard. In fact, we expect that some of the studies will be done by June 30th.

In my April 14th submission to Peggy I estimated that the funds for the Forest Avenue and Transit Coordination efforts would be less than 50% spent by June 30th. As such, Peggy told me Friday that they would not provide any carryover for those two. However, when I asked her to consider them on June 1st based on actual progress she agreed to consider them. (I also had found that my April 14th request was wrong and understated the progress by June 30th that Alex had estimated.)

So, please have your study consultant get me invoices by May 31st which reflect the latest possible actual expenses of the studies. I will also need a timetable for completion of the work. (I also need from you this week an update on your study schedule. I will send you a separate email on that shortly.) Thanks, Brooks, for yours.

Feel free to contact me on this. Thanks.

John

John W. Duncan
PACTS Director
207-774-9891
www.pactsplan.org

Budget Worksheet for FTA-funded Work

| GPCOG FTA 5303 Transit Planning Budget FY 2012-2013 | | | | 14-Apr-11 | | DRAFT | | Estimated Carry Forward | Total |
|---|-------------------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| Task | | Total | Federal | Local | FY 12 | FY 13 | | | |
| 6 | Program Support - XX01 | | | | | | | | |
| | Administration | \$50,000 | \$40,000 | \$10,000 | | | | | \$50,000 |
| | PACTS Committee Support | \$60,000 | \$48,000 | \$12,000 | | | | | \$60,000 |
| | Total Administration | \$110,000 | \$88,000 | \$22,000 | \$63,000 | \$47,000 | | \$0 | \$110,000 |
| | | | | | \$50,400 | \$37,600 | | | |
| 7 | Short Range Support - XX02 | | | | \$12,600 | \$9,400 | | | |
| | Traveler Information | \$43,730 | \$34,984 | \$8,746 | | | \$20,000 | | \$63,730 |
| | Optimize Funding Opportunities | \$12,500 | \$10,000 | \$2,500 | | | \$22,000 | | \$34,500 |
| | Regional Sign & Shelter | \$48,642 | \$38,914 | \$9,728 | | | \$40,000 | | \$88,642 |
| | Total Short Range Support | \$104,872 | \$83,898 | \$20,974 | \$60,000 | \$44,872 | \$82,000 | | \$186,872 |
| | | | | | \$48,000 | \$35,898 | | | |
| 8 | Long Range - System - XX03 | | | | \$12,000 | \$8,974 | | | |
| | Transit Coordination Implementation | \$25,000 | \$20,000 | \$5,000 | | | | | \$25,000 |
| | Regional Pass Phase II | \$25,000 | \$20,000 | \$5,000 | | | | | \$25,000 |
| | Regional Transit & Land Use | \$40,000 | \$32,000 | \$8,000 | | | | | \$40,000 |
| | Regional Branding & Marketing | \$45,000 | \$36,000 | \$9,000 | | | | | \$45,000 |
| | Maine Clean Communities | \$60,000 | \$48,000 | \$12,000 | | | | | \$60,000 |
| | State & federal assistance | \$10,000 | \$8,000 | \$2,000 | | | | | \$10,000 |
| | Trans/Human Service Planning | \$20,000 | \$16,000 | \$4,000 | | | | | \$20,000 |
| | Total Long Range System | \$225,000 | \$180,000 | \$45,000 | \$100,000 | \$125,000 | \$0 | | \$225,000 |
| | | | | | \$80,000 | \$100,000 | | | |
| 9 | Long Range - Project - XX04 | | | | \$20,000 | \$25,000 | | | |
| | Update Regional ITS Architecture | \$50,000 | \$40,000 | \$10,000 | | | | | \$50,000 |
| | Regional Transit Authority | \$60,000 | \$48,000 | \$12,000 | | | | | \$60,000 |
| | Maintenance/Admin Implementation | \$24,000 | \$19,200 | \$4,800 | | | | | \$24,000 |
| | Total Long Range Project | \$134,000 | \$107,200 | \$26,800 | \$94,000 | \$40,000 | \$20,000 | | \$154,000 |
| | | | | | \$75,200 | \$32,000 | | | |
| 10 | Technical Support - XX05 | | | | \$18,800 | \$8,000 | | | |
| | Databases, Training | \$12,500 | \$10,000 | \$2,500 | | | \$12,500 | | \$25,000 |
| | Mapping & GIS Support | \$12,500 | \$10,000 | \$2,500 | | | \$12,500 | | \$25,000 |
| | ITS Planning/AVL Support | \$25,000 | \$20,000 | \$5,000 | | | | | \$25,000 |
| | Total Technical Support | \$50,000 | \$40,000 | \$10,000 | \$40,000 | \$10,000 | \$25,000 | | \$75,000 |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | Total Planning Budget | \$623,872 | \$499,098 | \$124,774 | \$357,000 | \$266,872 | \$127,000 | | \$750,872 |
| PROPOSED FY 2012-2013 ACTIVITIES for Transit Providers (5307 Funds): | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | Providers, proposed projects | Total | Federal | Local | | | | | |
| | CBITD | | | | | | | | |
| | METRO: On/Off Survey - Task 7 | \$25,000 | \$20,000 | \$5,000 | | | | | |
| | NNEPRA | | | | | | | | |
| | RTP Shopper Shuttle - Task 7 | | \$0 | \$0 | | | | \$5,000 | |
| | SPBS | | | | | | | | |
| | ShuttleBus | | | | | | | | |
| | YCCAC | | | | | | | | |
| | 5307 Totals | \$25,000 | \$20,000 | \$5,000 | \$16,000 | \$9,000 | \$5,000 | | \$30,000 |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | 5303 plus 5307 | \$648,872 | \$519,098 | \$129,774 | \$373,000 | \$275,872 | \$132,000 | | \$780,872 |

Agenda Item 5: Annual review of the Executive Committee

Staff Resource: John Duncan

Recommendation: Submit an assessment of the Executive Committee process to the Policy Committee, and ask the Policy Committee members to discuss their perspectives on the value and effectiveness of the Executive Committee.

Background

The Policy Committee has done two annual reviews of the Executive Committee process, and the consensus has always been quite positive. Key comments have been:

- The Executive Committee has reduced the time that Policy Committee members have had to spend at PACTS meetings, and has enabled the Policy Committee to focus on policy issues more than in the past.
- Policy Committee members concluded the Executive Committee has not reduced the authority of the Policy Committee and has not reduced the level of Policy Committee member participation as had been feared.
- Staff is very pleased with the Executive Committee process.
 - The participation has been excellent.
 - The guidance to staff has been very helpful.
 - The Executive Committee's vetting of topics, and their recommendations, have often made it easier to get the support of the Policy Committee.

The first annual review of the Executive Committee involved a detailed review of the actions taken and subjects considered by the Committee. The subsequent reviews have been less involved.

Our bylaws article for the Executive Committee is provided below for your reference.

Executive Committee

Section 1. The Executive Committee shall have the following functions and powers:

1. To meet with staff to organize Policy Committee meetings and to coordinate the work of the PACTS committees.
2. To offer recommendations for action to the Policy Committee.
3. To make the following TIP project changes:
 - a. To revise the scope of work of funded MPO Allocation and FTA-funded projects as long as the amendments do not increase the PACTS contribution to those projects,
 - b. To endorse project substitution proposals per the PACTS Project Substitution policy,

- c. To revise the PACTS TIP in order to fix administrative errors,
- d. To add, delete or change other FHWA-funded and FTA-funded projects as requested by MaineDOT
4. To perform the annual evaluation of the Executive Director and report to the Policy Committee.
5. To appoint “appointees” to the Planning, Transit and Technical Committees (per Article III, Section 3).
6. To make the following Unified Planning Work Program changes:
 - a. To adjust the budgets for the FTA-funded planning tasks based on a Transit Committee recommendation, and
 - b. To use newly available study funds to fund a ranked study proposal not funded in the biennial UPWP adopted by the Policy Committee.
7. To take on other responsibilities as requested by the Policy Committee.

Section 2. The membership of the Executive Committee shall be as follows:

1. The Chairperson of the Policy Committee,
2. The Vice Chairperson of the Policy Committee,
3. The Immediate Past Chairperson of the Policy Committee,
4. The Chairperson, or a designated member, of the Transit Committee,
5. The Chairperson, or a designated member, of the Planning Committee, and
6. The Chairperson, or a designated member, of the Technical Committee

Section 3. Attendance by four members shall constitute a quorum. Members may not send substitutes to meetings.

Section 4. Each member shall have one vote. However, the members shall strive to make decisions through consensus rather than by voting.

Section 5. The Executive Committee shall meet monthly, or as needed.

Agenda Item 6: Updates from Staff and Committees

1. Reschedule July 5th meeting.
2. Updates from members and staff.

Agenda Item 7: Finalize agenda for May 19th Policy Committee Meeting

1. Act on a MaineDOT proposal to amend our FY 2010/2011 Transportation Improvement Program to enable commencement of 35 projects recently funded for the 2012/2013 biennium
2. Act on a proposal to reduce the local match for projects that start quickly, and to increase the local match for those that do not
3. Briefing on a proposal to expand the role of PACTS staff in the administration of capital projects
4. Executive Committee to serve as the 2011 TIP Process Committee.
5. Ask Policy Committee to authorize the Executive Committee to adopt draft PACTS TIP for FY 2012 to FY 2015 (for submission to FHWA and FTA) for public comment in July. This needs to be done in July, and there is no other item for the Policy Committee in July.
6. Adopt the Unified Planning Work Program
7. Do annual review of the Executive Committee
8. Elect Policy Committee officers for the coming year
9. Update on \$240,000 voiding action by MaineDOT
10. Executive Director's Report
 - A. 2011 Credit Program status report
 - B. Gorham East West Memorandum of Understanding, and MOU for PACTS role in regional sustainable development plan
 - C. Annual report on June 23rd