



## Technical Committee Meeting Notice

August 12, 2008  
8:30 a.m.

PACTS, 68 Marginal Way, Portland

### Agenda

1. Call to order
2. Public Comment
3. Minutes of July 8th Meeting
4. Collector Road Study Update and Findings
5. Construction/Project Scope Innovations Working Group
6. Information and Other Business
7. Adjourn.

Next Meeting: September 14 at 8:30 a.m.

**PACTS Technical Committee Meeting Minutes**  
**July 8<sup>th</sup>, 2008 – 8:30 a.m.**

**Members Present:** Jennie Franceschi, Biddeford, Chair; Bob Burns, Gorham, Gorham; Jim Carmody, Portland; Mimi Cerveny, MDOT; Mary Ann Conroy, Old Orchard Beach; Sara Devlin, Maine Turnpike Authority; Eric Dudley, Westbrook; Doug Fortier, Windham; Mike Laberge, MaineDOT; Bob Malley, Cape Elizabeth; Dale Mitchell, Policy Committee Appointee; Al Presgraves, Freeport; Anna Price, FHWA; Dave Redlefsen, Public Transit; Jim Wendel, Scarborough.

**Absent:** Dana Anderson, So. Portland; Mike Bolduc, Saco; Don Chaisson, No. Yarmouth; Julia Dawson, SMRPC; Bob Hough, MaineDOT; Dan Jellis, Yarmouth; Adam Ogden, Cumberland; Skip Varney, Falmouth; David Willauer, GPCOG.

**Staff and Guests:** John Duncan, PACTS; Carl Eppich, PACTS; Tom Gorrill, Gorrill-Palmer Associates; Brian Keezer, MaineDOT; LaRay Hamilton, MDOT; Jeff McEwen, FHWA; Sue McIntyre, GPCOG; Paul Niehoff, PACTS; Ralph Norwood, Gorrill-Palmer Associates; Britta Stein, MaineDOT; Conrad Welzel, Maine Turnpike Authority.

1. **Call to Order** Jennie Franceschi, Chair, called the meeting to order at 8:31 a.m.
2. **Public Comment:** There were no public comments.
3. **Adoption of minutes of June 10<sup>th</sup>, 2008 meeting**  
*Bob Malley made a motion for approval of the June 10<sup>th</sup>, 2008 minutes, seconded by Mike Laberge.*  
*Vote taken. All were in favor. Minutes were unanimously approved.*
4. **MPO/Service Center Challenge Grant Project Submittals**  
Paul directed the group to the attachment in the meeting packet for agenda item 4 noting that these were the projects that were “short listed” at the first PACTS Executive Committee meeting held on the previous Tuesday. He described the process used at that meeting and said that other projects had been considered but they were determined to have complications and/or completion timing constraints.  
  
Discussion began pertaining to funding and whether more monies would be needed for the projects on the “short list”. Jennie asked if the communities on the list had been asked if they have the matching funds. Paul explained that the “challenge fund” is set up so communities can match any amount. That is why it is called a “challenge fund”. Towns will need to commit to funding amounts beyond what the project is funded at. That is the only consideration.  
  
*Jim Carmody made a motion to accept and endorse the “short list” as described in the meeting packet under agenda item 4 for submittal to the MaineDOT for consideration, seconded by Bob Burns. Vote taken. All were in favor. Motion carried.*
5. **Collector Road Study Update and Findings**  
A handout listing an inventory of all collector roads in the PACTS region was distributed for reference. Tom Gorrill from Gorrill-Palmer Associates provided an update on the collector road study and summarized their findings as follows:
  - Gorrill-Palmer reviewed the list provided to them by PACTS with each of the Public Works Directors from each of the respective communities.
  - GIS files were obtained from the MaineDOT and much data was reviewed and examined.
  - A notebook was created on the collector roads, which helped to organize the data.

- Other items studied included the MaineDOT mile log folder and the ARAN data to verify that the information obtained was accurate.
- Road widths were looked at as well as unbuilt and built roads, clear zones, guard rail ends, etc.
- All of this information was taken into the field where each of the roads was field reviewed to see what condition each road is currently in. A description of some of the various road conditions was provided.
- A diagram handout entitled “Preliminary PACTS Collector Roads” was distributed for reference.
- 39% of the collector roads are unbuilt while 61% are built.
- With reference to the built category, it may be better to go for a design exception of 2 or 3 feet.
- A description of each of the columns in the inventory list was provided.

Tom directed the group to a third handout entitled “Proposed Highway Adequacy Index” and provided the following overview on some proposed changes:

- **Condition Index:** Gorrill-Palmer proposes a slight change
- **Safety Index:** Gorrill-Palmer proposes keeping.
- **Service Index:** Gorrill-Palmer proposes discussions with the group on whether to keep this at 25 points or instead substitute it for something else. The basic thought should be introducing something other than the traffic level itself. The transit route should help prioritize the projects as well. They would welcome input on this topic. In summary, Gorrill-Palmer is proposing changing the service index to include AADT, Truck Route and Transit Route rather than the current delay ratio that refers to travel time and speed limit.

A draft HAI will be provided within the next few days. In the final report, the cost to upgrade each of the roadways will be included as well, and will be done on a linear foot basis. There may be a little more added “here and there” given their knowledge of the area now. Some roads may need design exceptions. Tom noted that if they felt that design exception was appropriate to a particular road, they would list that road in the “built” category. Most of those roads might have roads whose shoulders were short by 2 to 4 feet but are in good condition, etc. There might only be 5% to 10% in the 61% that were design exceptions. He explained that in some cases the roads looked pretty good and that in those cases the center section could be preserved. Mary Ann requested that she would like to see the costs broken down in the report.

With reference to the Service Index, Paul asked if it would be difficult to replace it with DOT data to compare with MaineDOT Highway Adequacy Index. A discussion began on the merits of using one system vs. using another system. A request was made to provide information on what the differences would be if two systems were used along with some comparisons as examples. Tom replied that they have initial suggestions on how to refine the HAI. Transit is an important element as well as truck traffic. Dale asked if this would be done before the development costs are established. Tom replied that they are working on costs now and have developed costs for different road treatments. They will provide both the HAI and the costs so there will be two separate items to look at. A short discussion followed about how the HAI is used in the road project ranking process as well as how it relates to existing condition.

Al felt that Tom’s suggestion was better than using MaineDOT’s HAI, which utilizes the current speed limit and delay ratio elements. Paul noted that MaineDOT has not decided on the formulas for the HAI. They were going to assess that data. They are also looking at rural roads and refer to the rutting index. The MaineDOT HAI is more applicable to rural roadways and not urban roadways. Paul wondered if it would be possible to be able to directly compare PACTS road rankings and how DOT ranks. Both have different conditions. He asked if this information could be included in the draft report. For instance, he would like to see a list that shows the MaineDOT roads are in “this category” and the PACTS roads are in “that category”.

Tom thought this might be adding another area of complexity, referring to the rutting issue, especially if a component is more relevant in a rural area rather than an urban area. But it may be possible that it could work for both, in order to keep it simple. Paul said that the priority for PACTS is to keep with what the needs of the PACTS region are. The bonus would be if PACTS could compare its HAI with MaineDOT's HAI, especially if used as a funding mechanism. Mimi spoke of MaineDOT formulas and the FWD factor with reference to rutting problems. The FWD data gives you a good idea as to what your structure is. Tom added that if a built section was involved, the FWD tended to be higher. Without that you don't get a complete picture. Mimi felt there could be a good discussion on the Service Index vs. the Delay Ratio and that looking at both of these would be beneficial. Tom added that MaineDOT's formula is good with reference to lanes for instance, whether you want 3 or 4 lanes. A short discussion followed on ranking. Mary Ann felt that in looking at the ranking piece, the cost is the cost, while the ranking is more difficult and complicated. She asked "what are we valuing"? Once we have a draft we could then have a solid discussion on what we value to get the ranking.

In summary, Tom invited everyone to send along their thoughts and input and said they would put together a draft report. Mary Ann said she was looking at pavement preservation along with long term durability. Conrad Welzel said he wondered if there was any logic to dealing with land use with this component and to also have this discussion with the PACTS Planning Committee. He suggested using the monies the best way we can. Tom said that they could start with a simplistic format and then discuss further. Mimi suggested adding columns to include costs and benefit costs for something to compare to. Bob agreed saying that shoulder condition could be another column. Tom reminded the group that some items might be expensive because of the curbing and development. Once you put in curbing you have to have the drainage.

Jennie asked about MaineDOT's timeframe for this. Mike replied that the PACTS Policy Committee must approve all projects at their October meeting. Paul suggested deciding at our next meeting in August on the rankings and to do a short list in September for prioritization and for submission to the PACTS Policy Committee in October. Paul added that staff would be meeting with MaineDOT to discuss the HAI and Tom said he would need input within the next two weeks. Mary Ann asked if there could be two columns. One that defines the DOT process and the other "what is being proposed". Tom replied that he would send that to Paul today. The August meeting will focus on a list to submit to the Policy Committee.

## **6. MPO Quarterly Meeting**

Mike Laberge summarized the MPO/DOT Quarterly Meeting. For every MPO project that goes forward, a four-page identification form will be required. MPO staff will complete the form in cooperation with members. In addition, a MaineDOT representative, a project manager, and an MPO representative will all sign each form that they all agree to the cost and delivery schedule, so that everyone agrees that this is the scope of the project and resultant cost. This is being done in the hopes of improving communications. Mike said he would be happy to provide a copy of the new form at our next meeting in August. The form will be called "Unified Transportation Improvement Program" (UTIP).

In response to a request for comments, Mary Ann said she felt the LAP process had not improved at all. It is still an arduous process and it doesn't take any less time. There is much redundancy. Jim Wendel agreed saying he felt the process was unrealistic. Some items noted included the following:

- Main issues are really with the small projects that cost below half a million dollars.
- There was an LAP that cost under \$10,000 that took over a year to complete.
- Maybe LAPs should be saved for expensive projects.

Jeff McEwen from the FHWA explained that the process is still in transition and that there had been some personnel turnovers as well. The first step in the LAP process was scattered among

departments but has since been consolidated. They are trying to streamline the process and discussions have been held at both the state and federal levels. He added that more follow-up is needed. Jennie suggested including this as an agenda item sometime in the fall.

Bob Malley asked about whether updates were available for ongoing projects in the MPO area. Mike replied that a quarterly report had been sent to Paul last week. Bob Burns added that an update on active projects such as overlays, reconstructions, etc. would also be good to have. Paul said he had emailed those out but noted that some information on the bid dates and funding amounts may not be accurate because of transfers. Mike added that he does work with the project managers to make sure the information is current but sometimes the information lags. Projects dates are usually the project manager's best guess but it should give an idea as to how far along the DOT is in the process.

LaRay Hamilton provided a quick overview of reconstruction projects in the PACTS region. Among projects mentioned were: U.S. Route #1 in Scarborough as well as the Payne Road in Scarborough is now up for bid; Falmouth is also out to bid; Brunswick has already been opened; and they have Westbrook's reconstruction list for their three projects.

#### **7. Construction/Project Scope Innovations Working Group**

Paul provided an update on the status of the MPO/DOT Innovative Project Working Group. A memo was sent out with three items. One was the project development process, the other was "partnerships", and the third item referred to the federal highway standards and process. Discussions have taken place to address changes to the FHWA process, etc. Paul added that some town managers from the newly formed PACTS Executive Committee spoke of bringing in some innovative ways to bring projects closer to budget. They also recently discussed how to do projects on a partnership basis, so to speak, where a certain entity does one part of a project and another does the rest. Mike added that he had circulated the memo mentioned earlier at the MaineDOT and would follow-up. Jeff suggested starting with one meeting that focuses on one aspect. It could provide for some mutual beneficial discussions. Eric Dudley thought it might be worthwhile to do a pilot project. Discussion continued about paving quality and the lack of competition in regards to paving bids. Jim Wendel spoke of LAPs, design and construction standards. He wondered about what could be done without legislative action vs. something that could be done between PACTS, MaineDOT and FHWA with reference to management, design and construction of projects. What can be done administratively with those agencies? It was decided to form a subcommittee that could meet on a continual basis and report back to the PACTS Technical Committee. It was also decided to bring this up at the MPO meeting.

Those who will be serving on the Subcommittee are: Mimi Cerveny, Mary Ann Conroy, Jennie Franceschi, LaRay Hamilton, and Jim Wendel.

#### **8. Information and Other Business**

Paul provided an overview of items listed and described in the meeting packet under "Agenda Item 7".

##### ***Other item mentioned:***

- MaineDOT planning newsletter is available if anyone would like one. There is a short article on the URIP funding reporting requirements.
- PACTS and GPCOG were on a steering committee with Portland Trails for a study in the greater Portland area regarding an active transportation initiative that asked a rhetorical question "if you received \$50 million, what would you do? Although there isn't any funding available, the study will be used to advocate for funding. Paul was impressed with letters of support from towns, the MTA, city councils, etc. Portland Trails was picked because they are renowned for having nice bike/ped facilities.
- Paul gave a quick update on bike/ped applications and intersection projects. He noted that Sebago Tech would be doing the EPS review.

- Mike Laberge updated the group on the Old Orchard Beach rotary project. Mary Ann added that different scenarios have been considered but the roundabout was the least costly, is safe for pedestrians, and slows traffic down as well.

9. **Adjourn**

The meeting adjourned at 10:21 a.m.

**Agenda Item 4. Collector Road Study Findings.**

As we should all be aware from numerous emails the Collector Road ranking criteria has been finalized utilizing input from our members and DOT. Thank you all. Based on a meeting with the MaineDOT we agreed that the ranking and utilization of the ranking(s) and the end product are different enough that DOT requested we change the HAI designation to something different so others using the report(s) are not confused. We have suggested CPI (Collector Priority Index) as the new nomenclature. If agreed we will use this as we move forward.

For today's discussion Gorrill Palmer will present their general findings and the list of collector roads prioritized using our CPI ranking formula. The three current lists are; "All Road Segments", "Roads Meeting Design Standards" and "Roads Not Meeting Design Standards" sent with this report. We now need to discuss the findings and rankings with the intent of generating a potential list of roads that fit within our collector road paving set aside as follows (excerpted from the November 2007 Technical Committee packet):

**Collector Set-Asides for the 2010/2011 Biennium**

**Preservation I "Simple":**     ***\$1, 500,000 set-a-side amount proposed for the following preservation methods:***

*Micro Surfacing  
Chip Seal  
3/4-inch overlay  
1-1/4- inch overlay  
Mill and Fill*

*Preservation I treatments are considered "simple" and funding is based on the premise that treatments would only be utilized on roads that are "built" structurally and to modern standards.*

*The amount of \$1,500,000 is potentially higher than what may be needed in future biennia because past practice has not necessarily been focused on the collector roads which meet the preservation I parameters. The emphasis for the 10/11 work plan will be to preserve the collectors that are prime candidates meeting the criteria for Preservation I treatments and to "catch-up" on the excellent candidates before conditions slip into the Preservation II category.*

*As MaineDOT condition data is made available this spring and is collected in 2008, the prime candidates will "rise to the top" and be considered for 10/11 funding.*

*Collectors which are both built to modern design standards and meet condition requirements for simple treatments would be eligible for PACTS funding under the Preservation I*

category. To enable more projects to be completed it is highly recommended that communities consider paving collectors under this category with local funds only. The premise of “self funding” is that collectors could be cost effectively preserved less expensively by the municipality.

**Preservation II Comprehensive:**     **\$1, 500,000 set-a-side amount proposed for the following preservation methods:**

*Micro Surfacing  
Chip Seal  
1-1/4 inch Overlay Plus  
Mill and Fill Plus*

*Eligible Preservation II projects would be built “structurally” similar to Preservation I candidates, but either require pavement milling and/or must meet state and federal modern design standards. These standards include, but are not limited to, drainage improvements, increasing shoulder widths, clear zone dimensions, guardrail improvements and ADA requirements. Given the modern design requirement, right-of-way property acquisition may also be required.*

*The suggested set-aside cap of \$1,500,000 allows for some of the PACTS region collector roads to be preserved as well as being brought up to current design standards.*

**Road Rehabilitation Extensive:**     **\$2,000,000 set-a-side amount proposed for the following category (and representative methods):**

*Foamed Asphalt  
Full Depth Reclaim  
Full Depth Reclaim W/Cement  
Full Depth Reclaim W/Emulsion  
Cold-In-Place Recycle  
PMRAP*

*Rehabilitation could include removal of the pavement, reclaiming the pavement and the underlying gravel, adding additional gravel, drainage and shoulder work. Modern design standards are required.*

*The suggested set-aside cap of \$2,000,000 allows for the additional cost of substantial pavement structure or road rehabilitation and moves toward the original 2003/2004 (starting in 06/07) Collector Set-Aside Program goal to achieve an overall average of 3.0 condition value.*

Once we have time to digest the list and other various parameters and issues we must plan on short listing the roads during our September 9<sup>th</sup> meeting. The collectors that have been short listed will then be scoped in the field by a scoping crew consisting of PACTS/Municipal/MaineDOT individuals. The field review (presumably using MaineDOT’s new “Project ID Form”) will result in a detailed scope of work and accurate cost estimates. This process may result in a revised collector paving list which will be distributed for review prior to our October 14<sup>th</sup> meeting. At that October meeting we will finalize and endorse the list which will then be presented to the Policy Committee meeting October 16<sup>th</sup>.

## **Agenda Item 5. Construction/Project Scope Innovations Working Group**

Over the past year we have discussed the potential of making revisions to state and federal design and construction standards and requirements. In addition we have talked about investigating ways to more cost effectively deliver projects. Recently a “working group” of PACTS members, PACTS staff, DOT personnel and the other MPO’s has been formed to tackle some of these issues. The members are; LaRay Hamilton, Jennie Franceschi, Don Craig, Jim Wendel, Mike Laberge, Mary Ann Conroy, Jeff McEwen, Mimi Cerveny, Rob Kenerson and Tom Reinauer. Our first meeting is August 20<sup>th</sup>. We will be discussing three topics; construction standards, alternatives to standard methods of construction and material types and innovative project partnerships towards the potential of more timely project deliveries’ and potential project cost savings.

At today’s meeting we should develop some specific topics and items to bring to that initial meeting. We should also determine what we realistically expect the outcome to be both short and long term.

## **Agenda Item 6. – Information, Potential Future Agenda Items and Other Business**

1. MPO/ Service Center Challenge Grant Project Update: PACTS submitted five applications on behalf of the following communities: Cape Elizabeth, Biddeford, Falmouth, Portland and Cumberland. The MaineDOT received a total of fourteen applications statewide. We are pleased to have the Riverside/Warren Avenue project in Portland chosen as one of the projects. As we know this project has been around for a number of years and although it was proceeding albeit slowly we can now be assured the project will proceed with an anticipated spring bid/construct schedule.
2. Portland Peninsula Sidewalk Study: The field data work is complete along with nearly **3,000** photos of sidewalks, and sidewalk ramps. The data is currently being compiled with the photos linked to the data field and to GIS mapping
3. As we have recently learned, DOT has put on hold projects that include large quantities of hot mix asphalt, because of the dramatic increase in the cost of liquid asphalt and the resultant per ton cost. The projects on hold are primarily paving projects with little or no “dirt work”. We may have an update and/or more information about the situation at today’s meeting.
4. Other items