

PACTS

Portland Area Comprehensive Transportation System

PACTS Executive Committee Meeting Notice

December 2, 2008
8:00 a.m. to 10:00 a.m.

GPCOG, 68 Marginal Way, Portland

Agenda

1. Call to order
2. Public Comment
3. Approve minutes of October 7th meeting
4. Committee updates from Greg Tansley, Bob Burns and Ed Clifford (8:05)
5. Federal economic stimulus package (8:35)
6. Strategy to address our over-programming of State funds in October (9:00)
7. Staff proposal to amend our planning/administration budget (9:10)
8. Regional Collector Assessment Study (9:30)
9. Finalize agenda for Policy Committee December 18th meeting. (9:40)
10. Updates on other topics (9:45)
11. Adjourn at 10:00 a.m.

Next meeting: January 6th at 8:00 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 October 7th Meeting

Attendance: Bill Shane, Chair; Mike Bobinsky; Bob Burns; John Bubier; MaryAnn Conroy; Ed Clifford; Steve Gunty; Judy Harris; Mike Laberge; Shawn Smith; Greg Tansley
Staff: John Duncan, Carl Eppich, Rosemary Kulow, Paul Niehoff, Maddy Adams

1. **Call to Order.** Bill Shane called the meeting to order at 8:05 a.m.
2. **Public Comment.** None
3. **Approval of Minutes of September 2nd meeting.** *Mike Bobinsky made a motion to approve the September 2nd minutes, seconded by Greg Tansley. All were in favor.*
4. **Develop recommendations to the Policy Committee for the 2010/2011 biennium capital priorities.** John Duncan reviewed. The bike/ped list is pretty much done; the Planning Committee voted to recommend a small number of projects. Transit projects are also basically done; transit may be getting another \$20,000-\$30,000.

Option 1 was presented to the Policy Committee as a place to start for the meeting last month. The Policy Committee agreed that collector roads need to be taken care of. Since then, Option 2 has come about as a result of discussions among staff, Portland, OOB, Biddeford and MaineDOT. Under Option 1, the OOB roundabout would be funded over two biennia. Option 2 has the same bottom line but some of the numbers are different and the reasons are explained in the notes. The Biddeford scope hasn't changed. The cost for the OOB Roundabout has substantively increased. As such, PACTS does not have to fund the project any further. However, Option 2 is to fund it at the 2006 EPS estimate of \$860,000 plus a 50% inflation adjustment based on recent and future inflation. Note 4 deals with MaineDOT's encouragement to spend more money on NHS. Forest Avenue is the only project eligible for NHS funds.

OOB would like to get the roundabout constructed as soon as possible because construction costs continue to go up; they would like to get it built in 2010/11. Right-of-way costs are estimated at \$1.5 million; they have been reduced significantly. The potential is there to reduce the right-of-way costs even further.

Biddeford has looked at doing their project a number of ways; they are surprised by the cost increases. The cost increases are related to right-of-way, haz mat issues and a series of rules (regarding curbing, etc.) The project is ready to go; there aren't significant ROW issues if they can stay with the existing configuration. They are looking at a three lane option with two fixed lanes as another alternative. They would be prepared to kick in the 25% match. Greg said they would support the four-lane option but they are willing to explore the three-lane option. Shawn Smith further explained the scenario and how the center turn lane conflicts with the cemetery. They looked at putting in a third lane and didn't see a lot of benefit with safety and mobility with 20,000+ cars per day. The four-lane option would be four 11' lanes at a cost of \$2.79 million. The three-lane option would be two 12' travel lanes and a 14' center lane at a cost of \$2.6 million. The four-lane option would be a total of 57' wide and the three lanes would be 51' wide. There will be ROW impacts. Shawn shared some recent estimates and they fell within the range.

There was some discussion about specifications for 'warm mix' asphalt. Shawn explained that warm mix is still an asphalt product but it has more recycled material in it. They are trying to develop a specification to utilize this. The warm mix is more flexible and the paving season can go longer. It is too early to put a dollar figure on it at this time. It could be used

on any one of these projects if it fits our needs but more time needs to be spent investigating this.

Regarding the Forest Avenue project, the scope has been made smaller by dropping a sidewalk on one side. Bill thought that the Forest Avenue project was originally capped at \$1,300,000. Mike B. explained that two biennia's ago (06/07), they agreed with that cap. Since then, the cost estimate has doubled although the scope has not changed. It is related to material costs and the state of the state.

John D. recommended funding the OOB project over two biennia. MaryAnn explained that they are trying to get the utility work and relocation done in the first biennium (\$2 million) and construction in the second biennium (\$2 million). It is a top priority for OOB. They are talking about going through two or three different Councils by then. The longer it is spread out, the more variables there will be. Steve G. added that the Council has approved a bond issue for \$200,000. They feel strongly that they will be able to sell the merits of the project to the new Council. They would prefer to go with the Option 1.

Biddeford would like to take the \$3.4 million and try to bring the cost down. If it has to go to \$3.4 they will commit 25%. The hard part is that they don't have all the real numbers; there may or may not be hazardous materials issues. Mike L. pointed out that if Option 1 is chosen, NHS dollars will not be programmed and that will not be taken well. Greg pointed out that there are a lot of what if's with the OOB project. What if the OOB project failed and the other two didn't get funded, then all three would fail. Shawn stated that the Biddeford and Portland projects are the most straightforward projects. A lot of work has already been done in Biddeford.

Paul N. commented that this is a complex project scenario. It leaves us with a huge commitment in the next biennium. The scope of the OOB project has changed and the cost of the project has increased significantly. The Forest Avenue project was deferred; to put the cost on the municipality is unfair. Paul suggested funding OOB at \$1.5 million for 2010/11; then split the money between the other two projects. Bob asked Shawn which project was the highest priority. Shawn said that because of the location and volume of traffic, it is tough to prioritize; they all rank pretty high. The scope hasn't significantly changed with the OOB project. The only difference is that they are using a hybrid roundabout. The footprint changed but the scope didn't. Steve said they would be okay with Paul's suggestion. Their concern would be with what happens in the next biennium. Paul's recommendation is a hybrid of Options 1 and 2:

Biddeford	\$3.4 million
Forest Avenue	\$2.1 million
OOB	\$1.5 million

John B. recommended that if the Biddeford project comes in under budget, then those funds should be added to either the Forest Avenue or OOB projects. Mike would advocate for the money to go to the Forest Avenue project first; that would be a good faith effort to get the NHS dollars spent.

Greg Tansley made a motion to recommend to the Policy Committee to fund the projects as follows:

<i>Biddeford</i>	<i>\$3.4 million</i>
<i>Forest Avenue</i>	<i>\$2.11 million</i>
<i>OOB</i>	<i>\$1.29 million</i>

Any additional cost savings from the Biddeford project would go to the Forest Avenue project. Additionally, a good faith commitment would be needed from the Policy

Committee to commit construction funding for OOB in 2012/13 provided the scope hasn't changed. Mike Bobinsky seconded the motion. Bill disagreed with giving more money to the Forest Avenue project. Mike B. explained that it makes sense for the money to be moved to the Forest Avenue project because that project was deferred at a time when PACTS got hit with a cut in funding. The Forest Avenue project has already given up sidewalks and curbing. John B. pointed out that OOB doesn't get a significant amount of money over time. This project has been in the loop for a fair amount of time and it is a significant project. The way we are trying to put this together today is to show some deference to all of the projects. He would like to see any savings go to the OOB project because there are significant funds that do come to Portland. An amendment was made to the motion that any savings from the Biddeford project should go to the Forest Avenue project first, and OOB second. Mike L. pointed out that if the money goes to OOB it may be well be sitting but if the money goes to Forest Avenue it will be used to complete the project. *All were in favor of the motion.*

5. **Review October 2nd High Priority Projects Committee recommendations.** The Committee met last week and recommended (by a 5-4 vote) the following list of proposals (not in priority order):
- Purchase the transit vehicles per the Transit Committee's proposal at \$22,500,000 plus an inflation factor to be developed.
 - Make capital investments for "Portland North" passenger rail to Brunswick at \$70,000,000 (a rough MaineDOT estimate).
 - The Veterans Bridge rehabilitation/reconstruction project if MaineDOT is unable to fund it fully.

Mike B. noted that the 295 recommendation for an additional lane was not endorsed, but we shouldn't walk away from the I-295 improvements issue. Lighting and message boards are important. Improvements at Exit 7 and Exit 6 have been approved. When this is sent to the Policy Committee, alternative measures should be elaborated upon.

It was suggested that the wording of the Veterans Bridge bullet be changed because the balance to fund the Veterans Bridge is what the HPP is recommending. It was also recommended that the following change be made to the last paragraph: The HPP Committee recommends that PACTS not propose to the Congressional Delegation that HPP funds be sought to make I-295 corridor ~~safety and~~ mobility improvements in Portland (\$20,000,000). All were in favor of the HPP Committee's recommendations except Bob Burns because of the lack of information on the rail option. Bill requested that the Veterans Bridge bullet be listed first on the list.

6. **Prepare agenda for Policy Committee October 16th meeting.** Bill asked that the Regional Collector Road Assessment Study be the first item of business on the agenda. Tom Gorrill will present the report; Bob Burns will present the Technical Committee's thoughts on the study.

If there is additional information on the asphalt situation, that should be shared. We also need to acknowledge the HPP survey that was done. The survey findings were different than what the HPP Committee has recommended. The link to the report will be provided on the consent agenda. The consent agenda should also include the link to the PACTS-sponsored projects list that Mike Laberge put together. It was also requested that a list be prepared listing those projects that have been done over more than one biennium.

8. **Committee updates from Bob Burns, Greg Tansley and Ed Clifford.** Bob reported that the collector road study is being field reviewed. Everyone is participating.

Ed reported that at the last Transit Committee meeting they watched the Charlie Stephens DVD entitled “Preparing our Region for a Sustainable Energy Future.” The Committee is continuing to work on implementing the Regional Transit Coordination Study. They are also working on doing Automatic Vehicle Location (AVL) regionally. For the next fiscal year, they are looking into a universal pass for all buses. They are reviewing the FTA planning funds that are available. The Transit Committee will be meeting with the Planning Committee on Thursday.

Greg didn’t attend the last Planning Committee meeting but Mike Laberge did and he gave an overview. The group heard a presentation from the City of Portland on their Bike Parking Ordinance. They heard a presentation from Tex Haeuser on TOD and TIF’s for transit purposes. They also discussed access management and land use and the joint meeting with the Transit Committee.

9. **Updates on other topics.** Not addressed.
10. **Adopt agenda for next Executive Committee meeting.** Not addressed.
11. **Reschedule the November 4th meeting to another date.** A TMA meeting is scheduled for the morning of November 4th. The November Executive Committee meeting will be held on November 7th at 8:00 a.m. (It was later cancelled.)
12. **Adjourn.** The meeting adjourned at 10:00 a.m.

Agenda Item 4: Committee Updates

Member Resource: Greg Tansley, Bob Burns and Ed Clifford

Staff Resource: PACTS and GPCOG Staff

Recommendation: Discussion only. Staff offers the following notes with the understanding that Ed, Bob and Greg will lead the discussion.

- Planning Committee topics
 - Did not meet in November
 - December 11th session with the Transit Committee
 - Tex Haeuser’s TIF legislation proposal
- Technical Committee topics
 - Did not meet in November
 - Discussion of a future PACTS role in local project administration
- Transit Committee topics
 - Implementation of our Regional Transit Coordination Study
 - Discussion of other current planning tasks, and exchange of information on many other topics

Agenda Item 5: Federal Economic Stimulus Package

On November 21st MaineDOT asked for a list of projects from us by December 3rd. We will review a draft list prepared by staff with input from our members. The projects must meet the following criteria:

- Be ready to advertise within 90 days from funding made available, quite possibly January at the earliest.
- Be directly related to jobs, meaning that items such as right-of-way acquisition alone would not meet the intent.
- Be new projects or new stages of projects that are not funded in MaineDOT's current STIP.

Agenda Item 6: Over-Programming of State Funds

In May the Policy Committee committed \$312,000 in 2010/2011 PACTS State funds to complete the PACTS contribution to a Yarmouth Route 88 project. This reduced our 2010/2011 biennium allotment of State funds – but staff forgot about this when October came around and we made our final MPO Allocation list for the 2010/2011 biennium. On October 16th we had \$143,000 State funds left over, so this \$312,000 problem is only a \$169,000 problem.

There are three options for this \$169,000 problem:

1. Reduce the State match for all our 2010/2011 projects by this amount – and increase our local match for those projects by this amount. This is feasible, and staff will show you the numbers on this when we meet.
2. Cut our lowest scoring collector paving project. We are still looking into that option. It is a \$662,000 project in Freeport.
3. Withdraw funding from a PACTS project(s) that is on hold. While there are several projects on hold, our past practice is to not do that.

Perhaps the 2009 economic stimulus package will soften this blow?

Agenda Item 7: Amend Planning/Administration Budget

Recommendation: Executive Committee support for this staff recommendation to the Policy Committee

Staff proposes to amend our “UPWP” planning/administration budget. It is a 2-year budget for July 2007 to June 2009. *See table on the next page.*

Staff recommends withdrawing the \$40,000 funding for the Portland Woodford’s Corner study. We funded this originally in 2005, and Portland has not started it yet. Based on our policy adopted by the Policy Committee in 2006, we have reminded Portland many times that they risk losing the money. Mike Bobinsky wants to keep the money and is prepared to make it a high priority.

Staff is taking a strict position on this subject because we and other MPO’s have too often significantly under spent the planning funds that we have budgeted. As a result, in 2007 MaineDOT warned us that they would reduce our future budgets if we do not spend the money that we budget for regional transportation planning. Staff has focused on putting our resources to work during this biennium.

Staff recommends three new study efforts listed at the bottom of the table on the next page. The \$9,800 Windham study would be their first PACTS study.

Recommendation to revise PACTS UPWP

November 24th to Executive Committee

UPWP Task	Two Year Budget	FY 2008 Actual	Estimate Spend in FY 2009	Proposed Revised Two Year Budget	Proposed Budget Increase or Reduce
<i>Regional Staff Efforts</i>					
1 Coordination/Administration	\$640,000	\$313,210	\$346,790	\$660,000	\$20,000
2 SAFETEA and Air Quality	\$20,000	\$1,651	\$8,349	\$10,000	-\$10,000
3 TIP	\$210,000	\$140,946	\$109,054	\$250,000	\$40,000
4 Travel Demand Model	\$50,000	\$2,435	\$17,565	\$20,000	-\$30,000
5 Data Management	\$50,000	\$11,662	\$18,338	\$30,000	<u>-\$20,000</u>
The total proposed budget for Tasks 1 to 5 no net change.					\$0
6 Maine Clean Communities	\$25,000	\$21,176	\$3,824	\$25,000	\$0
6 SMRPC Planning Services	\$25,000	\$13,657	\$11,343	\$25,000	\$0
6 GPCOG Planning Services	\$40,000	\$22,948	\$17,052	\$40,000	\$0
<i>Consultant Efforts</i>					
6 PACTS Model Consultant	\$50,000	\$8,550	\$30,000	\$50,000	\$0
6 Portland Wayfinding Plan	\$25,000	\$24,118	\$882	\$25,000	\$0
6 Regional Bike/Ped Planning	\$20,000	\$0	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$0
6 Regional Collector Paving Study	\$75,000	\$22,038	\$52,962	\$75,000	\$0
6 Regional Education and Training	\$20,000	\$878	\$10,000	\$10,878	-\$9,122
6 Regional EPS	\$20,000	\$0	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$0
6 Regional Priorities Survey	\$20,000	\$0	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$0
6 Regional Funds Leverage Report	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$0	\$10,000	\$0
6 Regional PACTS Process Review	\$10,000	\$5,655	\$0	\$5,655	-\$4,345
6* Regional Signal Coordination	\$60,000	\$0	\$60,000	\$60,000	\$0
6* Saco Area Regional Transpo Plan	\$80,000	\$0	\$80,000	\$80,000	\$0
6 Transit Study Portland Peninsula	\$75,000	\$46,015	\$28,985	\$75,000	\$0
6 Transit Bus Route Study	\$30,000	\$0	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$0
6 Transit Regional Ride Guide	<u>\$15,000</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$15,000</u>	<u>\$15,000</u>	<u>\$0</u>
<i>Original Budget Subtotal</i>	<i>\$1,570,000</i>	<i>\$644,939</i>	<i>\$900,144</i>	<i>\$1,556,533</i>	<i>-\$13,467</i>
<i>Local studies funded in January 2008:</i>					
6 Portland Woodford's Corner	\$40,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	-\$40,000
6 Yarmouth Route 1 Phase II	\$35,000	\$0	\$35,000	\$35,000	\$0
6 Freeport School St Extension	\$25,000	\$0	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$0
6 Cape E. Sidewalk/Bikeway Plan	\$35,000	\$0	\$35,000	\$35,000	\$0
6* Wsbk Downtown Streetscape	\$30,000	\$0	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$0
6 Portland Libbytown Trail	\$10,000	\$0	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$0
6 Portland Eastern Waterfront	\$5,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	-\$5,000
6* Scarborough Running Hill Road	<u>\$35,000</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$35,000</u>	<u>\$35,000</u>	<u>\$0</u>
<i>"January 2008 Studies" Subtotal</i>	<i>\$215,000</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$170,000</i>	<i>\$170,000</i>	<i>-\$45,000</i>
<i>Total for Existing Budget:</i>	<i>\$1,785,000</i>	<i>\$644,939</i>	<i>\$1,070,144</i>	<i>\$1,726,533</i>	<i>-\$58,467</i>
<i>Proposed New Studies</i>					
Windham Impact Fee Analysis	\$0	\$0	\$9,800	\$9,800	\$9,800
TIF TOD outreach	\$0	\$0	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$10,000
More work with Melrose/Eyerman	\$0	\$0	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$10,000
Grand Totals	\$1,785,000	\$644,939	\$1,099,944	\$1,756,333	-\$28,667

* Started recently. Will finish in FY 2010.

Agenda Item 8: Regional Collector Assessment Study

Here is a status report:

- Tom Gorrill and his staff met with the Technical Committee numerous times this year.
- Tom gave the Policy Committee a presentation on October 16th.
- Paul Niehoff emailed a draft of the final report to members of the Policy and Technical Committees on November 20th.
- We are reviewing a study summary brochure.
- We will distribute copies of the brochure and final report to the Policy Committee on December 18th.

Agenda Item 9: Finalize Agenda for Policy Committee Meeting

Here is the draft agenda:

1. Action to address our over-programming of State funds in October
2. Amend our existing two-year planning and administration budget (called the Unified Planning Work Program)
3. Receive a report from the first meeting of the TIP Process Committee
4. Act on recommendations from MaineDOT and staff on implementing our already-adopted report called Leveraging Increased Funding Through Transportation Investment Partnerships
5. Consent Agenda

Agenda Item 10: Updates on Other Topics

1. Agenda for the December 11th TIP Process Committee meeting
 1. Introductions and Committee's purpose
 2. Overview of past TIP Committees' work
 3. Overview of our current policies and procedures
 4. Issues and topics for this Committee... The first five key topics are:
 - Our Set Aside Policy
 - Our Staff Leadership
 - Our MPO Allocation Project Cost and PACTS Contribution Control
 - Our Policy on Match Ratios and Multiple Funding Sources
 - Inefficient Development of Projects
2. Update from Paul Niehoff on the work of the PACTS/FHWA/MDOT/MPO's monthly meetings on innovations for improving MaineDOT project development
3. December 3rd meeting with managers and MaineDOT to brainstorm on ways to leverage more money for transportation (per Melrose/Eyerman report)
4. Upcoming presentations to councils and transit boards on our High Priority Project three final candidates
5. Staff is playing an active role in the fast track planning of the reconstruction of the Veterans Bridge. We are going to host a series of workshops with MaineDOT, Portland, South Portland and bicycling enthusiasts.
6. John attended the annual meeting in Seattle of the Association of MPO's (AMPO). He will give some highlights.
7. RTP/METRO collaboration
8. *Development of next UPWP this winter/spring – a topic for our January meeting.*
9. PACTS outreach/visibility work:
 - Our three recent very successful “sandwich symposia” on bicycling topics (July), traffic calming (Sept) and “complete streets” (Nov). Average attendance has been 21 people. Any suggestions for future topics?
 - Carl will soon distribute the first in our new series of “PACTS Quarterly Newsletters” to our “interested parties” people.
 - PACTS will be the lead article in the next MBTA magazine, Maine Trails.
10. Our Transportation Management Area workshop in November attracted 34 people. See summary on the next page.

PACTS in a Transportation Management Area

November 4, 2008

The USDOT will designate our Urbanized Area as a Transportation Management Area in 2012 **if** our Year 2010 Urbanized Area population reaches 200,000 and **if** the existing federal transportation planning regulations remain as they are. We will have no choice. We would prefer to avoid this designation.

The Changes

1. FTA 5307 funding for our region would increase, but our transit systems would no longer be allowed to use these funds to finance transit operations. Instead, the funds could be used only for capital purposes. All systems must sign “split agreements” each year as part of the PACTS programming process.
2. PACTS would get some federal Surface Transportation Program money to program directly from Congress – an amount likely to be less than our existing “MPO Allocation” from MaineDOT. PACTS would also have a greater role in the programming of certain other FHWA funds.
3. PACTS would develop and use a Congestion Management System Plan.
4. The PACTS process would undergo a formal certification review by FHWA, FTA, EPA, MaineDOT and others at least every 4 years.

The Constants

1. MaineDOT would continue to provide the MPO Allocation of STP and NHS funds for programming by PACTS.
2. MaineDOT would continue to design and develop all federally funded projects in the PACTS Funding Area, except for locally administered projects.
3. FHWA Planning funds and FTA 5303 Planning funds would not increase, and would continue to come to PACTS via MaineDOT.
4. The FHWA/FTA Planning Regulations require participation by elected officials in all MPO’s.
5. NNEPRA and CBITD become eligible for FTA 5309 Fixed Guideway funding after they have submitted National Transit Database statistics for 7 years. They have a few more years to go.
6. The minimum population threshold for dividing the PACTS region into multiple MPO’s is multiple 50,000 people “cores” per the Census Bureau rules.
7. PACTS continues to submit our Unified Planning Work Program, our Transportation Improvement Program and our Regional Transportation Plan to the FHWA and FTA.