

PACTS

Portland Area Comprehensive Transportation System

PACTS TIP Process Committee Meeting Notice

July 29, 2009

8:00 a.m.

GPCOG, 68 Marginal Way, Portland

Agenda

1. Call to order
2. Public Comment
3. Minutes of July 10th meeting
4. Implications of the 50/50 weight and the multi-municipality policies (8:05)
5. Public-private funding of TIP projects (8:30)
6. Overview of project proposal and review processes (8:45)
7. TIP Policies and Procedures Document (9:00)
8. Next steps (9:30)
9. Adjourn.

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 July 10th Meeting

In Attendance: John Bubier, Chair, Biddeford; Genie Beaulieu, Freeport; Jim Gailey, South Portland; Dan Jellis, Yarmouth; Molly Just, Westbrook; Mike Laberge, MaineDOT; Tom Meyers, Public Transportation; Tom Milligan, Biddeford; Brooks More, Windham.

Staff: John Duncan, Carl Eppich, Sue McIntyre, Paul Niehoff

1. **Call to Order:** John Bubier, Chair, called the meeting to order at 8:05 a.m.
2. **Public Comment:** There were no public comments expressed.
3. **Minutes of June 12th, 2009 meeting:**
Tom Meyers made a motion for approval of the June 12th, 2009 minutes, seconded by Jim Gailey. Vote taken. All were in favor. Minutes were unanimously accepted.

4. **New weights to policy and technical scoring**
Recommendations: Confirm vote taken on June 12th based on the information below.

At our last meeting, the group voted in favor of changing from 80/20 to 50/50 the weights given to scores from the Roadway Formula and Destination Tomorrow Formulas. At that time a request was made for more information on how the Destination Tomorrow Guiding Policies are changing or likely to change as well as a request to see a comparison on how the 50/50 change would have affected the scoring of the 2008 proposals. (A summary of the additional information can be found on pages 6, 7, 8, and 9 of the meeting packet). Reference was made to the comparison scores for the seven intersection proposals shown in the table at the bottom of page six and a short discussion took place. Carl pointed out that the comparison table shows that a proposal must have both good roadway scoring as well as good Destination Tomorrow scoring. *Mike Laberge made a motion to confirm the vote taken at the June 12th, 2009 PACTS TIP Process Committee meeting, seconded by Molly Just. Vote taken. All were in favor. Motion carried.*

5. **Multi-municipality TIP proposals**
Recommendations: Create a policy to add from 1 to 5 points to TIP proposals submitted by two (2) or more municipalities.

Support was expressed for a policy that would require multi-municipality proposals show a legitimate reason to partner with another municipality. It was noted that the proposed policy also gives the ability to judge a proposal at what level it should get additional points. A request was made to consider language that would provide a clear vision and/or definition for proposals submitted by non-municipalities such as ferry, transit, etc.

Jim Gailey made a motion to pass agenda item 5 as recommended in the meeting packet, seconded by Mike Laberge. Vote taken. All were in favor.

6. **Public-private funding of TIP projects**
Recommendations: Create a policy to add from 1 to 5 points to TIP proposals that will include funding from a private partner.

Carl provided background information and said the proposed policy would need further refinement. The group discussed several topics, ideas and different scenarios. ***Among those mentioned:***

- There should be a distinction made between “voluntary” match vs. “required” match in the review of a project.

- Would monies for traffic movement permits be included?
- How would the new proposed policy affect local projects vs. regional significant projects?
- Could the developer make the match so it would be more of a two-party proposal and could the private monies be applicable to a municipality's local match?
- Should we be talking instead about a regional impact fee and could we use Scarborough's model?
- What about a transit component?
- Should projects with the most regional significance get more points if it exceeds minimum requirements?
- A project would need to qualify for both.
- Projects could be ranked within the set aside funding amounts. This might then allow monies for the next projects on the list.
- The land use aspect would need to be considered as well as the timing of projects.
- Could a project be scored with future projects and then "deposit" these points in some kind of a "point bank"?

The group seemed to be in agreement that more refinement to the language is needed and that the topic of impact fees needs further discussion.

7. Collector road topics

Recommendations: (1). To remove the truck factor from our Collector Paving formula and to keep the existing Factor for transit. (2). To review Paul's data developed in response to a request from Genie Beaulieu.

(1) Paul N. provided background information. PACTS does not have a regional truck route plan or truck counts. In order to use this item in the Collector Road project selection formula, PACTS would have to do accurate and consistent truck route counts on every collector road. We would need to do a truck route study. MaineDOT does not have this information either. This generated discussion on the topic of the freight and rail aspect. Mike L. pointed out that the Bangor MPO had done a truck route study with the assistance of Gorrill-Palmer Associates and found the information useful in their long-range plans. It was also noted that some trucks cannot travel on I-95 due to federal weight regulations. Following further discussion it was decided to request that a truck route study be done this year if funds are available. If there are no funds available then the request will be made for next year.

(2) The group was directed to the chart on page 12 of the meeting packet. Paul N. noted that the chart gives an overall indication of where the pluses or minuses are. There is just not enough money. This chart should reflect the same information that is provided in the Gorrill-Palmer (G-P) report. Funds are available to update the G-P Study so that at every biennium these numbers will change accordingly.

8. Policies on unspent funds, project withdrawal and project substitution

Recommendations: Change our existing policies, as shown in italics (refer to meeting packet). In all cases (as described under agenda item 8 in the meeting packet) staff will work with the Executive Committee to develop recommendations for reprogramming by the Policy Committee.

Unspent Project Funds

Tom Meyers made a motion to accept the language with no changes as shown under agenda item 8, "Unspent Project Funds" in the meeting packet, seconded by Jim Gailey. Vote taken. All were in favor. Motion carried.

Project Withdrawals

*Tom Meyers made a motion to accept the language along with the changes reflected in italics as described in the meeting packet under agenda item 8, “Project Withdrawals”, seconded by Dan Jellis. A short discussion took place over the topic of reimbursement to the MaineDOT of all monies spent to date on projects withdrawn. **Vote taken. All were in favor. Motion carried.***

Project Substitution

A quick overview of the introductory paragraph and each item took place with no objections stated. *Jim Gailey made a motion to accept the language for all items along with the noted changes reflected in italics and as described in “Project Substitution” under agenda item 8 in the meeting packet, seconded by Tom Milligan. **Vote taken. All were in favor. Motion carried.***

9. Staff reports on other topics

A. MaineDOT policy on road standards for locally funded projects

Discussions have taken place about collector road standards, set asides, etc. The discussions have revolved around the cost to local towns of doing State highway road projects and what the MaineDOT standards are. Paul N. said that it has recently come to staff’s attention that it does not matter who does the road or where the funds come from. If it is a state owned road, the road must be done according to state and federal standards. If a road is done within the flexible design guidelines, the least that the MaineDOT has to be involved with is the scope of that project. PACTS would also need to be involved. Mike L. added that before a town does anything to a State highway it must make sure that MaineDOT is “okay” with what is being done. The DOT wants to make sure that the driver’s expectations remain uniform from community to community. There is some flexibility in the standards and a municipality could apply for a design exception. Mike advised the group to have the town’s consultant check with their MaineDOT Regional Engineer before beginning any work on a state highway. Overlays can be done by the municipality as long as they are not changing the safety and/or character of the road. Curb to curb will probably not be affected. MaineDOT staff has been working on a policy to clarify this regulation. Representatives from the MaineDOT will be attending the PACTS Technical Committee meeting in September to provide an overview of the new policy and the flexibility in design along with the design exception process.

B. The PACTS process for allocating FTA Section 5307 funds

Tom Meyers provided a summary of the process used by the Transit Committee in the development of a recommendation to the Policy Committee for allocation of FTA Section 5307 funds. Trains do not take 5307 allocations. There are significant FTA monies coming into the region. The current formula for allocation builds incentives for agencies that do better such as increased ridership for fixed route providers, etc. Tom added that a group has been established to look at ways to build in more of a performance based element in the formula. They will also look to see that the allocation process is done more equitably for items that providers have more control over vs. elements that providers have no control of, such as the weather.

C. MaineDOT’s Six Year Plan

The MaineDOT has a six-year plan. Over the years, MPOs have given the MaineDOT a six-year forecast of funding needs but not a “six-year plan”, per se. John D. said that the MaineDOT has found that to be acceptable. Mike L. added that the MaineDOT’s six-year plan is a mid-range plan and they have found it to be helpful with project scoping. It also provides a better way with predictability in planning their two-year program.

D. Administration of our TIP proposal application process and our Enhanced Project Scoping process

Over the years staff has received many incomplete and inaccurate applications that have been submitted from member communities for PACTS funding. Staff is considering a new policy to address this issue. A short discussion followed. It was decided that when an incomplete and/or inaccurate application is received, the application will be returned to the municipality along with a form letter thanking them for the application but noting that the application cannot be considered until it has been completed accurately and returned to PACTS by a certain date.

10. TIP Policies and Procedures Document

A brief overview of the TIP Policies and Procedures document was provided. John D. noted that there are no substantive changes. Several comments were expressed. Brooks More commented on sections D. and F. and asked if instructions could be provided on how to make an application. John D. replied that instructions such as when to put “N/A” if something doesn’t apply could be added as well as language such as “here is a number you can call” if you should have any questions could also be included. Mike L. spoke of section C. on page 5 that referred to proposal requirements and referred to page 7, section 3E and noted that these are all good policies but that he would like to see these enforced. John D. replied that staff would be doing that. It was decided that further discussion on this item would be needed. Subsequently, another meeting was scheduled for Wednesday, July 29th, 2009 at 8:30 a.m.

11. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 10:15 a.m.

Agenda Item 4: Implications of the 50/50 weight and the multi-municipality policies

Staff Resource: John Duncan

Recommendation: Discussion only

Background

On July 10th the members confirmed the June vote to recommend the switch to 50/50 weights for the Roadway and Destination Tomorrow scoring formulas from 80/20.

The members also asked for more examples of the implications of the 50/50 proposal. See Table 1 on the next page. Staff suggests that the additional examples show that the proposed change is good and will work – the change to 50/50 will increase our attention to regional policy goals while maintaining the significant contribution of the Roadway Formula analysis.

On July 10th the members also voted to add from 1 to 5 points to TIP proposals submitted by two or more municipalities and/or transit organizations.

The members also asked for examples of the implications of these supplementary points. See Table 2. Highlights of Table 2 are:

- The “points behind #1” columns show how many points each proposal is behind the highest ranking proposal. This enables you to calculate the change in score – and the change in rank – that a proposal would enjoy if awarded 1, 2, 3, 4 or 5 multi-municipality points.
- You can also estimate the implication for proposals that might be awarded public-private points.

Table 1

Comparison of 80/20 and 50/50 Weights of Roadway and Destination Tomorrow Scores

Town	Location	Project Description	<u>80/20 Score Columns</u>			<u>50/50 Score Columns</u>				
			<u>80/20</u>	<u>20% DT</u>	<u>80%</u>	<u>50/50</u>	<u>50% DT</u>	<u>50%</u>		
			<u>Total</u>	<u>Score</u>	<u>Roadway</u>	<u>Rank</u>	<u>Rank</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Score</u>	<u>Roadway</u>
			<u>Score</u>	<u>Score</u>	<u>Score</u>	<u>Rank</u>	<u>Rank</u>	<u>Score</u>	<u>Score</u>	<u>Score</u>
<u>2008 Intersection Candidates *</u>										
Scarboro	Dunstan Corner	Major reconfiguration of two in	63.7	13.0	50.7	1	1	64.2	32.5	31.7
Portland	Forest at Newton	Install new traffic signal.	55.1	10.5	44.6	2	2	54.1	26.3	27.9
Scarboro	Payne at Mussey	Relocate the intersection	50.8	9.0	41.8	3	5	48.6	22.5	26.1
OOB	Saco at Emerson	Replace signal. Install islands.	46.0	9.0	37.0	4	6	45.6	22.5	23.1
Westbrook	Cumb. Mills Triangle	Install new traffic signals.	42.0	13.5	28.5	5	3	51.5	33.8	17.8
Westbrook	Spring at Main	Replace signal. Make other geo	34.9	14.5	20.4	6	4	49.0	36.3	12.7
Portland	Forest at Kennebec	Reconfigure intersection. Remo	25.0	7.0	18.0	7	7	28.8	17.5	11.3
<u>2006 Intersection Candidates</u>										
S. Portland	Philbrook/MaineMallRd	Consolidate two intersections i	64.8	10.4	54.5	1	2	60.0	25.9	34.0
Scarboro	Dunstan Corner	Major reconfiguration of both i	59.5	13.0	46.5	2	1	61.5	32.4	29.1
Scarboro	Rt 114 @ Running Hill	New signal, add turn lanes	57.7	7.4	50.2	3	3	49.9	18.5	31.4
Portland	West Commercial @ Be	Install actuated signal, pedestri	57.6	6.3	51.3	4	5	47.8	15.7	32.1
Westbrook	Eisenhower Dr & Spring	Install new signal, convert to 4	57.5	6.7	50.8	5	4	48.4	16.7	31.7
Scarboro	Pleasant Hill @ Highlan	Install signal, L&R turn lanes	49.2	5.9	43.3	6	12	41.9	14.8	27.0
Scarboro	Rt 22, Saco St- Beech R	Add turn lanes, signal upgrade	47.9	7.4	40.4	7	10	43.8	18.5	25.3
Scarboro	Rt 1 @ Old Blue Point H	Install signal, L-turn lane, side	47.8	8.1	39.7	8	7	45.2	20.4	24.8
Saco	Rt. 112 & Industrial Par	Significant modification; add tr	47.4	8.1	39.3	9	9	44.9	20.4	24.5
Portland	Franklin @ Congress St.	Grade Separation, add new trav	46.6	8.9	37.7	10	6	45.8	22.2	23.6
Saco	Elm (Rt.1) /Scamman/T	Inc turn radii, int imp, shorten	42.1	9.3	32.8	11	11	43.7	23.1	20.5
OOB	Ocean Park & Smith Wl	Realign int, L & R turn lanes	41.9	8.1	33.8	12	13	41.5	20.4	21.1
S. Portland	Erskine Dr, Broadway, C	Coordinate traffic signals on B	41.1	6.7	34.5	13	15	38.2	16.7	21.5
Portland	Commercial @ High	Install actuated signal w/count	40.4	7.4	33.0	14	14	39.2	18.5	20.6
<u>2006 Rebuild Road Candidates</u>										
Westbrook	William Clarke/Spring	Add raised median, coordinate	62.4	11.5	50.9	1	1	60.5	28.7	31.8
Portland	Warren Ave.	Full depth recon, sidewalks, bi	50.4	6.7	43.7	2	2	44.0	16.7	27.3
Biddeford	Main St	Full reconstruction	40.7	5.2	35.5	3	5	35.2	13.0	22.2
Saco	Rt 9: Old Orchard Rd to	Full depth recon, widen road a	38.6	6.3	32.3	4	4	35.9	15.7	20.2
Freeport	Bow St	Reconstruction, drainage, new	38.4	6.7	31.7	5	3	36.5	16.7	19.8
Portland	Ocean Ave.	Full depth recon, sidewalks, bi	32.9	5.9	27.0	6	6	31.7	14.8	16.9
Freeport	South St	Reconstruction, widen shoulde	32.0	5.9	26.1	7	7	31.1	14.8	16.3
Cumberland	Tuttle Rd	Reconstruction, drainage,new v	29.4	4.4	24.9	8	8	26.7	11.1	15.6
S. Portland	Evans	Small hill removal to improve	28.7	2.6	26.1	9	11	22.8	6.5	16.3
Westbrook	Brook St.	Full depth recon, widen should	25.3	4.8	20.5	10	10	24.8	12.0	12.8

* As seen on page 6 of the July 10th meeting packet

Table 2

More Comparison of 80/20 and 50/50 Weights

Rows in bold print are suggestions of proposals that might be proposed by multi-municipalities.

Staff will explain the intended use of this table at our meeting. See "points behind #1" columns.

Town	Location	Project Description	<u>80/20 Score Columns</u>			<u>50/50 Score Columns</u>		
			<u>80/20</u> Score	<u>Points</u> behind #1	<u>80/20</u> <u>Rank</u>	<u>50/50</u> <u>Rank</u>	<u>Points</u> behind #1	<u>50/50</u> Score
<u>2008 Intersection Candidates</u>								
Scarboro	Dunstan Corner	Major reconfiguration of two	63.7	0	1	1	0	64.2
Portland	Forest at Newton	Install new traffic signal.	55.1	9	2	2	10	54.1
Scarboro	Payne at Mussey	Relocate the intersection	50.8	13	3	<u>5</u>	16	48.6
OOB	Saco at Emerson	Replace signal. Install islands.	46.0	18	4	<u>6</u>	19	45.6
Westbrook	Cumb. Mills Triangle	Install new traffic signals.	42.0	22	5	<u>3</u>	13	51.5
Westbrook	Spring at Main	Replace signal. Make other ge	34.9	29	6	<u>4</u>	15	49.0
Portland	Forest at Kennebec	Reconfigure intersection. Rem	25.0	39	7	7	35	28.8
<u>2006 Intersection Candidates</u>								
S. Portland	Philbrook/MaineMall	Consolidate two intersection	64.8	0	1	2	0	60.0
Scarboro	Dunstan Corner	Major reconfiguration of bot	59.5	5	2	1	-2	61.5
Scarboro	Rt 114 @ Running Hill	New signal, add turn lanes	57.7	7	3	<u>3</u>	10	49.9
Portland	West Commercial @ Be	Install actuated signal, pedestri	57.6	7	4	<u>5</u>	12	47.8
Westbrook	Eisenhower Dr & Spring	Install new signal, convert to 4	57.5	7	5	<u>4</u>	12	48.4
Scarboro	Pleasant Hill @ Highlan	Install signal, L&R turn lanes	49.2	16	6	<u>12</u>	18	41.9
Scarboro	Rt 22, Saco St- Beech I	Add turn lanes, signal upgra	47.9	17	7	<u>10</u>	16	43.8
Scarboro	Rt 1 @ Old Blue Point I	Install signal, L-turn lane, side	47.8	17	8	<u>7</u>	15	45.2
Saco	Rt. 112 & Industrial Par	Significant modification; add t	47.4	17	9	9	15	44.9
Portland	Franklin @ Congress St.	Grade Separation, add new tra	46.6	18	10	<u>6</u>	14	45.8
Saco	Elm (Rt.1) /Scamman/T	Inc turn radii, int imp, shorten	42.1	23	11	11	16	43.7
OOB	Ocean Park & Smith Wl	Realign int, L & R turn lanes	41.9	23	12	<u>13</u>	18	41.5
S. Portland	Erskine Dr, Broadway, (Coordinate traffic signals on B	41.1	24	13	<u>15</u>	22	38.2
Portland	Commercial @ High	Install actuated signal w/cou	40.4	24	14	14	21	39.2
<u>2006 Rebuild Road Candidates</u>								
Westbrook	William Clarke/Spring	Add raised median, coordina	62.4	0	1	1	0	60.5
Portland	Warren Ave.	Full depth recon, sidewalks, bi	50.4	12	2	2	17	44.0
Biddeford	Main St	Full reconstruction	40.7	22	3	<u>5</u>	25	35.2
Saco	Rt 9: Old Orchard Rd	Full depth recon, widen road	38.6	24	4	<u>4</u>	25	35.9
Freeport	Bow St	Reconstruction, drainage, new	38.4	24	5	<u>3</u>	24	36.5
Portland	Ocean Ave.	Full depth recon, sidewalks, bi	32.9	29	6	6	29	31.7
Freeport	South St	Reconstruction, widen should	32.0	30	7	7	29	31.1
Cumberland	Tuttle Rd	Reconstruction, drainage,new	29.4	33	8	8	34	26.7
S. Portland	Evans	Small hill removal to improv	28.7	34	9	<u>11</u>	38	22.8
Westbrook	Brook St.	Full depth recon, widen should	25.3	37	10	10	36	24.8

Agenda Item 5: Public-Private Funding of TIP Projects

Substantive changes to the July 10th draft are shown in italics.

Staff Resource: Carl Eppich

Recommendations: Create a policy to add ~~from 1 to 5~~ points to TIP proposals that will include funding from a private partner. It will work as follows.

- The municipality submitting the proposal must finance the normal local match with municipal resources. The private partner contribution must be in addition to the normal PACTS local match.
- The private partner contribution must be cash. *Cash provided from an impact fee district that encompasses the project site would be eligible. A contribution of land does not apply to this policy.*
- *PACTS staff will calculate the points earned from this policy based on the private contribution share percentage of the total project cost. The amounts will be 1 point for every 5 percent of cost contribution. For instance, a \$250,000 private contribution to a \$1 million project would get 5 points.*
- *PACTS staff will calculate the points based on the project cost estimate produced through our Enhanced Project Scoping process.*
- The Planning Committee will review the staff's score and submit a recommendation to the Policy Committee.

Background

The goals are to make more efficient the use of developer money for regionally significant transportation projects, and to increase the contribution of private sector funding to transportation projects in our region.

Please refer to Table 2 on page 8 in order to consider how the award of points under this policy might affect the scores of proposals. Staff will explain further at the meeting.

The 2008 Dunstan Corner intersection proposal provides a good example of how this policy could be applied. Scarborough sought from PACTS only \$2 million of the \$6 million project. It ranked 1st without “public-private” points, but if it had ranked 2nd it probably would have jumped to 1st place with the help of these points.

Agenda Item 6: Overview of project proposal and review processes

On July 10th members asked for a document that summarizes for members the process of applying for PACTS MPO Allocation funds every two years. The next two pages are a draft for your review. It also includes a 2010 priority setting schedule.

Agenda Item 7: TIP Policies and Procedures Document

A copy of a revised “July 24th” policies and procedures document is attached.

Note that this document does not include the many pages that described the proposal scoring procedures included in past versions of this document. As such, we recommend that the new Multi-Municipality and Public-Private points processes also not be included in this document, but rather be explained to our committees in the upcoming presentations – and then be included in our proposal application forms, of course.

Agenda Item 8: Next Steps

Staff proposes the following next steps during the coming months.

1. Distribute the process overview (agenda item 6 above) to all members next week in order to remind them of the requirements that will need a lot of time for which to prepare.
2. Present the Committee’s recommendations to the Policy Committee on August 13th. The recommendations will include a proposal to do a regional truck route study.
3. Reconvene the TIP Process Committee if requested by the Policy Committee.
4. Policy Committee adopts policies and procedures document by November.
5. Staff holds a policies and procedures workshop for all members. *Interested?*
6. The Destination Tomorrow Update Committee recommends new regional transportation plan Guiding Policies to the Planning Committee, and eventually to the Policy Committee. After endorsement, the new Guiding Policies become part of the Intersection and Rebuild Road proposal application forms.
7. Staff distributes proposal application forms.

For Agenda Item 6

Overview of PACTS TIP Proposals Development and Ranking Processes

PACTS programs approximately \$14 million every two years based on an allocation of federal highway funds provided via MaineDOT. This document outlines the process for compiling proposals under our Intersection, Rebuild Road and Bike/Ped “set asides” and the subsequent priority setting process at PACTS.

If you want to learn about our other two set asides (Collector Road preservation paving and Transit Capital) or to get any other details about the PACTS programming process, contact PACTS, GPCOG or SMRPC staff or refer to our TIP Policies and Procedures Document which is available at www.pactsplan.org. The page numbers in parentheses below refer to the page number for each topic in that document.

Proposal Development

1. Project Eligibility (page 3)
2. Application Forms – PACTS staff will distribute the application forms for the 2012/2013 biennium in October 2009.
3. Application Schedule – Final applications are due on February xx, 2010. Final submissions that omit data or show incorrect data used in the scoring process will receive zeros in those scoring factors. We will not accept corrections or supplementary data after February xx, 2010.

We encourage you to submit draft applications well before the February xx deadline. We will review and comment on the submissions so that you can improve them. *However, it is your job to submit a complete and accurate application.*

4. Intersection Proposal Requirements (page x)
 - A. An intersection proposal whose primary objective is to improve the accommodation of morning or afternoon peak hour traffic must be for an intersection with at least one approach experiencing a current level of service of "D" or worse. A registered traffic engineer must make such a determination.
 - B. An intersection proposal whose primary objective is to address a current unsafe condition must be for an intersection that MaineDOT has determined is a High Crash Location and whose “MaineDOT percent personal injury” exceeds the state average by at least 10 percent.

- C. Proposals to change the existing intersection or roadway cross-section must be supported by a feasibility study that includes an analysis of feasible alternatives, recommendation of the most viable alternative, a planning level estimate of cost, and at least one public forum specific to that project.
- D. All proposals for new traffic signals must be accompanied by a warrant analysis approved by MaineDOT.
5. Proposals to reconstruct a road must be submitted by a registered professional engineer, and must include a planning level cost estimate. Note that proposals that get short listed for EPS will have test pits and/or test borings taken (if needed).
6. Proposals for the construction of new sidewalks/paths/trails intended to be used solely by bicycles and/or pedestrians must be supported by a feasibility study that recommends the most feasible alternative (based on an assessment of the most viable alternative routes, potential demand, and level of municipal, business and resident support) and includes a planning level estimate of cost.
7. Council Endorsement (page __)
8. Public Involvement (page __)
9. Multi-municipality proposals (page __)...describe the new element here, and include text on next page.
10. Public-private proposals (page __)...describe the new element here, and include full text on next page.

Priority Setting Tools and Milestones

1. Proposal ranking tools – Roadway Formula and Destination Tomorrow Scoring (page __)
2. Short List of proposals to undergo Enhanced Project Scoping (page __)
3. Enhanced Project Scoping process (page __)
4. 2010 Schedule
 - Rank proposals: March and April 2010
 - Select proposals for EPS: May 2010
 - Perform EPS: Summer 2010
 - Final projects selection: October 2010