

PACTS

Portland Area Comprehensive Transportation Committee



Technical Committee Meeting Notice

January 8, 2008
8:30 a.m.

PACTS, 68 Marginal Way, Portland

Agenda

1. Call to order
2. Minutes of December 11th Meeting
3. MaineDOT Presentation Related to 403 Paving Spec and Method C Testing Requirements
4. Update on the PACTS Reorganization
5. Information Items, Status Report and Other Business
6. Adjourn.

Next Meeting: February 12th 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

PACTS Technical Committee Meeting Minutes

December 11th, 2007 – 8:30 a.m.

Members Present: Bob Burns, Gorham, Chair; Jim Carmody, Portland; Mary Ann Conroy, Old Orchard Beach; Eric Dudley, Westbrook; Doug Fortier, Windham; Jennie Franceschi, Vice-chair, Biddeford; Mike Laberge, MaineDOT; Dan Jellis, Yarmouth; Ron Kiene (for Mike Bolduc), Saco; Bob Malley, Cape Elizabeth; Adam Ogden, Cumberland; Al Presgraves, Freeport; Dave Redlefsen, Public Transit; Jay Reynolds, Falmouth; Jim Wendell, Scarborough.

Absent: Dana Anderson, So. Portland; Don Chaisson, No. Yarmouth; Bob Hough (for Dean Lessard), MaineDOT; Jonathan LaBonte, MTA; Josh Mack, SMRPC; Dale Mitchell, Policy Committee Appointee; John Perry, FHWA; David Willauer, GPCOG.

Staff and Guests: Julia Dawson, PACTS; John Duncan, PACTS; Sue McIntyre, GPCOG; Paul Niehoff, PACTS.

1. **Call to Order.** Bob Burns, chair, called the meeting to order at 8:31 a.m.
2. **Adoption of minutes of November 13th, 2007 meeting**
Jennie Franceschi made a motion for approval of the November 13th, 2007 minutes, seconded by Al Presgraves. Vote taken. All were in favor. Minutes were unanimously approved.

3. **Draft Motion Recommending 2010/2011 Collector Road Set-A-Side Policy**

The PACTS TIP Process Committee has asked that a recommendation be presented to them for both a three-tier approach and for funding amounts in regards to the PACTS Collector Set-Aside Policy.

Paul provided an overview of staff's proposed approach based on the level of complexity and cost, using MaineDOT definitions. (Further described in the meeting packet under agenda item 3).

- The first set-aside, "Preservation I "Simple" is based on the premise of paving roads that are in best condition for pavement preservation and that already meet modern design standards. \$1,500,000 is proposed for this tier. These roads would basically be a "shim and overlay".
- The second tier set-aside would include roads that are in need of more elaborate pavement treatments and that would need to be upgraded to modern design standards. A total of \$1,500,000 is proposed for this set-aside.
- The third tier includes roads that would pretty much need everything, short of a full-depth reconstruction. Generally a rating below a PCR of 3 would need to be brought up to standards. Staff is proposing that \$2,000,000 be set aside for this category as it is the most expensive.

Treatments listed in the packet are described with MaineDOT definitions that have been revised due to previous misunderstandings. A question was asked if the "rebuild" category had been eliminated. Paul replied that the category had not been done away with but because of funding issues and transfers, and for this biennium, this is one of the set-a-side categories that most likely will not be funded in the next biennium.

Based on discussions with MaineDOT, micro surfacing and chip and seal are listed in the second tier, Preservation II, category, but, could be done in the first tier as well. MaineDOT feels this method is more cost effective to preserve the pavement. It is a treatment similar to overlay and theoretically it is a less expensive treatment. A discussion on its use followed. Paul explained that it could be utilized in both categories and said he had tried to keep the first category as simple as possible without getting into modern design standard issues. This

generated discussion on the subject of the use of “mill and fill” as listed in the first category and if it is a viable option for collector roads under this first tier. Discussion also continued on whether municipalities should consider paving all their simple paving projects at their own expense.

It was noted that Bob Skeeahan is recommending the MaineDOT take a harder look at those applications. Julia added that basically, Preservation I and II treatments include some of the same treatments that could be used on built or unbuilt standard roads. The question was asked as to whether “chip seal” can be used when using federal dollars for unbuilt roads. Paul said that it could be used if the travel lanes are considered “built” but the road’s modern design standards are still required.

Federal dollars could be used for crack seal. He added that PACTS could do a regional contract to crack seal all the PACTS collector roads that warrant crack seal as part of a pavement preservation program.

Paul spoke of his experience with crack sealing and said if it is done for the right reasons, under the right conditions with the right contractor it can be a cost effective method. Jennie felt that crack seal is something that should be handled at the local level and did not find it to be a good efficient use of big dollar funds. Eric Dudley added that he would only use this kind of treatment on low volume roads such as back roads. Mike Laberge noted that MaineDOT has used crack seal on the Interstate but it is only used as a “band-aid”. Paul clarified that it is not designed to hold a road together that is falling apart. It was also noted that one would still have to go through the PACTS process and MaineDOT to use this method. After further discussion, there was consensus among the group to strike crack seal out of the “Preservation I Method” and leave micro seal, chip seal and the mill and fill method in. All were in favor. No opposition.

Brian Luce will be speaking to the group at the next PACTS Technical Committee meeting about “Method C Standards”, which MaineDOT thinks will lower the cost of paving.

4. **Staff Proposal to Hire a Consultant to Assess the Overall Condition of the PACTS Region Collector Roads** Paul Niehoff directed the group to the handout entitled “Table 6 – Recommended Treatments and Costs” as an example of what a study could produce. Among some important items included in this report were suggested road treatments with estimated costs for various road segments in need of repair.

Initially discussions pertained to hiring a consultant to complete a physical assessment of the overall condition of the PACTS region collector roads. Since then, it has been determined that more data and information would ultimately become available to PACTS from the MaineDOT. That information would allow PACTS to internally do a condition assessment or hire a consultant to assess the MaineDOT data and compile a report, etc. Among information included in the proposed study report would be the overall condition of our collector roads as well as what it would take to bring them up to certain standards. This information could also be brought to the attention of our Legislative delegation. In a more detail sense, the consultant would be using the Falling Weight Deflectometer data (FWD), ARAN data and videos, etc., along with ground truthing to determine what the road deficiencies are and then coalesce the information into a final report along with cost estimates to bring the roads up to standard. PACTS could request that the consultant split the roads out into the different tiers discussed earlier and then come up with a minimum enhanced scope related to each particular road collector with costs associated with each. Original estimates from Gorrill-Palmer for hiring a consultant came to \$12,000. Since then, there has been interest in getting more information and detail from the proposed study. Depending on the level of detail and work, estimated costs are now between \$20,000 and \$25,000 for a usable report. Bob Burns noted that the TIP Process Committee had strong support for spending up to \$100,000 for hiring a consultant. Discussion followed as the group considered a list of items they would like to

see in the final report. It was decided that in the beginning of the third paragraph of the proposed scope as described under "Agenda Item 4" in the meeting packet, the words "The consultant *may need to* interview PACTS member communities..." would be changed to "The consultant **must** interview PACTS member communities..." Paul noted that MaineDOT had published a Highway Adequacy 2006 Interim Report and a full report would be ready by 2009. After further discussion, the group agreed that the consultant should physically assess the roadways and do a statistical analysis. The Committee also discussed and considered forming a subcommittee to conduct the interviews for a consultant, to develop an RFP, as well as to ask how the consultant would handle the proposed scope of work.

Julia suggested that if a consultant puts together a regional needs assessment that the Committee should try to work closely with MaineDOT or at least have it coordinate with their Highway Adequacy Index. It would benefit both PACTS and MaineDOT since the State is moving in that direction. She also suggested that the consultant generates a long term or 20-year horizon analysis, perhaps in increments of five years. Julia noted that PACTS and MaineDOT are moving in the same direction with road management and with the road adequacy index system. She felt that the State should be pleased that PACTS is taking the initiative to take over control of this program rather than rely on them, especially since they are both moving toward the Highway Adequacy Index System. Dan Jellis added that he respected MaineDOT's opinions and recommendations and hoped that MaineDOT would continue with providing their recommendations to the towns as he would like to compare their recommendations with the consultant's recommendations.

Another suggestion included that presentations be given by prospective consultants to the Committee on their proposal. It was noted that if we spend more than \$50,000 we have to submit an RFP. But, we could do an RFQ followed by an RFP and then do the presentations. After further discussion, there was a formal consensus to put together a subcommittee. Members appointed to the Subcommittee include Mary Ann Conroy, Eric Dudley, Bob Skeehan, Bob Burns, and Dan Jellis.

The timeframe for the proposal is October 1, 2008. The Legislature convenes in December 2008. If the report is done by October 2008 we could then approach our local Legislative delegation. It was noted that we could include in the RFP that a "draft report" be done by October 1st, 2008, so we could utilize the information to prioritize the 2010/2011 collector paving projects. The group expressed their support for the October 1st, timeframe but with an interim report due by mid-July. Mike noted that it was critical that, in reference to the study amendment and the UPWP, that the PACTS Planning Committee endorses the amended study before the RFP goes out.

5. Municipal Collector Road Historical Data Update

Eight communities have "formally" submitted road improvement (and maintenance) data and seven communities have not. Mike said that MaineDOT is looking for basic information such as the name/segment of the road, what the treatment was that was applied, what it included etc. If more information is needed, MaineDOT will give the town a call.

6. Information Items, Status Report and Other Business

- Brian Luce will attend the next PACTS Technical Committee meeting on January 8th, 2008.
- Paul will contact the MaineDOT on the status of the LAP Committee.
- MaineDOT is basically going away from State matching funds for maintenance paving projects. They would rather see the monies be spent for capital improvements. Mike Laberge will update the group as soon as he knows more about this new policy.

On behalf of the PACTS Technical Committee, Bob thanked Julia for all of her hard work and wished her much luck in her new position with SMRPC.

7. **Adjourn**

Meeting adjourned at 10:00 a.m.

Agenda Item 3–MaineDOT Presentation for Revised Paving and Quality Assurance Specification

MaineDOT has modified their QC/QC specifications with the intent to add consistency and hopefully lower the cost of paving while retaining a quality product. Wade McClay and Brian Luce will explain the revisions and take questions relating to the new requirements. They will also be meeting with select paving contractors to determine ways to lower the cost of paving while retaining or improving the quality.

Agenda Item 4 – PACTS Reorganization

A “Transition Team” is working on a reorganization of PACTS per the Policy Committee retreats in October and November. The group has met three times John Duncan will provide an update.

The purpose of the Transition Team is to review the issues and ideas shared at the two retreats and to develop recommendations for structural change to the Policy Committee. The members will build on the themes and elements common among the four proposed organizational structures, possibly update the PACTS mission statement, and recommend implementation actions and schedule.

The Transition Team is aiming to present two options and recommendations to the Policy Committee at the January meeting on the 17th. The members are:

Mike Bobinsky, Policy Chair
Bill Shane, Policy Vice Chair
John Bubier, Policy Member
Mike McGovern, Past Policy Chair
Rick Michaud, Past Policy Chair
Nat Tupper, Past Policy Chair
Bob Burns, Technical Chair
Donna Larson, Planning Chair

Agenda Item 5. - Information and Other Business

1. The RFP for the PACTS collector Road Assessment is expected to be distributed this week. If the selection process progresses as schedule, work may commence in the beginning of March.
2. Norm Baker will give a brief update on the LAP revision process.
3. Project transfers.