

PACTS

Portland Area Comprehensive Transportation Committee



Technical Committee Meeting Notice

November 13, 2007
8:30 a.m.

PACTS, 68 Marginal Way, Portland

Agenda

1. Call to order
2. Minutes of October 9th meeting
3. MPO Collector Paving (again)
4. Draft Motion:
5. Historical Municipal Collector Road Data Update
6. Information Items, Status Report and Other Business
7. Adjourn.

Next Meeting: December 11th 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
October 9th, 2007 – 8:30 a.m.

Members Present: Bob Burns, Gorham, Chair; Mike Bolduc, Saco; Jim Carmody, Portland; Mary Ann Conroy, Old Orchard Beach; Doug Fortier, Windham; Jennie Franceschi, Vice-chair, Biddeford; Bob Hough (for Dean Lessard), MaineDOT; Dan Jellis, Yarmouth; Mike Laberge, MaineDOT; Jonathan Labonte, MTA; Bob Malley, Cape Elizabeth; Dale Mitchell, Policy Committee Appointee; Adam Ogden, Cumberland; John Perry, FHWA; Al Presgraves, Freeport; Dave Redlefsen, Public Transit; Jim Wendell, Scarborough; David Willauer, GPCOG.

Absent: Dana Anderson, So. Portland; Don Chaisson, No. Yarmouth; Eric Dudley, Westbrook; Josh Mack, SMRPC; Jay Reynolds, Falmouth.

Staff and Guests: Julia Dawson, PACTS; John Duncan, PACTS; Kurt Jergensen, Historic Planner, Environmental Office, MaineDOT; Jeff McEwen, FHWA; Sue McIntyre, GPCOG; Paul Niehoff, PACTS; Mike Praul, P.E., FHWA.

1. **Call to Order.** Bob burns, Chair, called the meeting to order at 8:34 a.m. and welcomed those present.
2. **Adoption of minutes of September 11th, 2007 meeting**
Jennie Franceschi made a motion for approval of the September 11th, 2007 minutes, seconded by Mary Ann Conroy. Vote taken. All were in favor. Minutes were unanimously approved.
3. **Maine Historical Preservation Commission Review**
Kurt Jergensen provided an overview of the Maine Historical Preservation Committee (MHPC) review process. He distributed a “Quick Tips” handout regarding the applicability of the environmental laws/regulations/rules to the MaineDOT work and a second handout that provided information on Section 106. The foremost issue in the MHPC review process is Section 106 of the Historic Preservation Act. It applies to all MaineDOT projects that require a federal permit, licensing or uses federal monies.

Even though the MHPC is a large part of this process, the two foremost agencies involved in this matter are the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA). MHPC is charged to complete the process in their stay (FHWA and FTA) and they decide whether the process has been completed to their satisfaction or if more information is needed. Other entities involved in the tier process include Indian Tribes, via the Tribal Historic Preservation Officer, representatives of local government, and the public. Exemptions are outlined on the second page of the MaineDOT Section 106 review handout.

The MHPC affects everything and anything that would affect historical resources one way or another. MaineDOT has its own process that is outlined in the MaineDOT Projects – Process Flow Chart handout. Online quick tips are available pertaining to the MaineDOT process and gives detailed information, person by person who has to review the process and what level the information has to be gathered as well as when information is sufficient to move on to another step. MHPC must provide a decision on their review within 30 days.

If a project falls under the exemptions, the timeframe is quicker. But if it doesn't fall under exemptions, the process could take months or even years for further review. Ideally, the environmental and historic process should be considered from day one in the planning of any project and accounted for in the project budget. Architectural information is available on any

town in Maine and requests may be submitted to Christy Mitchell at MaineDOT. Bob Burns thanked Kurt for his presentation.

4. High Priority Projects Review

Julia provided an update on the September 28th Preliminary Draft List of 2009 projects as presented in the meeting packet. It is hoped that a High Priority Projects list will be presented to the PACTS Policy Committee in November so they can finalize the list by the spring of 2008. The Policy Committee would then have the summer of 2008 to work on the list and it could be sent to the Congressional delegation by February 2009.

5. MPO Collector Paving

Paul Niehoff made reference to a March 2007 memo by Eric Ortman that spoke of confusion over the terminology and definitions associated with the review and development of the collector paving program.

In lay terms, for instance, the words maintenance and preservation are interchangeable whereas in the MaineDOT definitions, these same terms are not interchangeable.

Items noted and discussed:

- The Committee needs to decide which roads need to be considered and what treatments they will need.
- What is the cost to bring those roads up to modern standards?
- Federal funds cannot be used for maintenance paving roads; federal funds can only be used for capital improvements.
- A better process is needed to define road conditions.
- A shim and ¾" overlay is the lowest of what is considered capital improvement in road paving; a road that you want to keep in "good" condition.

Questions worth consideration:

- A good question to remember is "is there something there to preserve?"
- "Is there anything outside of the travel lane that needs to be upgraded to modern standards when using federal funds?"
- Would towns want to fund their own paving if the area outside travel lanes doesn't meet modern design standards?
- What is the distinction between "unbuilt structurally" and "not built to federal standards"?
- Should PACTS hire a consultant to do an assessment of collector roads including conditions and modern standards?

MaineDOT items:

- MaineDOT's primary responsibility with preservation paving is on arterial highways.
- Could MaineDOT categories be grouped a little broader to allow more flexibility?
- Clarification is needed on the use of "state only" funds.

Actions needed:

- Correct data on current road conditions as well as historical data is needed to make correct choices.
- Projects also need to be completed in a reasonable timeframe.
- Towns need to notify the state when work has been done on a road.
- Towns will provide Paul with improvement information on their roads including any work outside travel lanes. Once information has been compiled, the group will flush out standards and levels of preservation.

Mike Praul, the Engineering Team Leader for FHWA answered some questions. You cannot negotiate with a low bidder before you award the contract. Afterwards, it all depends on what

you mean by negotiate. If you are changing the scope of the project then, that is not okay. Mr. Praul described preservation and maintenance in respect to the deterioration curve and illustrated that on the white board. The supply issue and lack of competition is what is currently driving the bids higher. FHWA is working aggressively with MaineDOT to find ways lower the cost of paving. They are looking at things such as pavement treatment and alternative treatment methods. Funding is a different issue and not something that can be solved in this room. On a project level, FHWA does have some flexibility. If revisions could still meet their standards at a lower cost then they would entertain that. The regulations that apply to engineering are very broad and leave room for engineers. The regulations side is a little less flexible. Jeff McEwen from FHWA will be working on locally administered projects. In this process FHWA does not directly oversee the LAP projects. The MaineDOT administers the LAP process but FHWA assists the MaineDOT in oversight of the projects. In respect to testing, FHWA approves what the MaineDOT requires but is now discussing options. Discussions followed on the incentive and disincentive method, flexibility, what can be done during construction, etc. Questions on these topics can be referred to Jeff McEwen. It was noted that some of the smaller contractors are now beginning to bid MaineDOT projects.

Bob thanked Jeff McEwen and Mike Praul for coming in.

Items for next meeting:

- What is the cost benefit ratio and how much do we want to spend to do in-depth assessments?
 - Do we want to hire a consultant to do the road base sampling?
 - What is the cost going to be to do the whole infrastructure?
 - Update on how much road data has been sent in to PACTS.
- 6. Information items, status report and other business** (Item tabled until next meeting.)
- 7. Adjourn:** Meeting adjourned at 11:00 a.m.

Agenda Item 3–Staff recommendations for Collector Paving Set-Aside Policy

On September 16th, the Policy Committee charged the TIP Process Committee, with the assistance of the Technical Committee, to develop a more definitive Collector Paving Set-Aside category; specifically a “Hybrid Program” of selecting, programming and funding collector road projects. The decision is based on the infrastructure asset management premise that it is more cost effective to maintain existing “built-to-modern standards” roads than to fund only “unbuilt” roads. Focusing only on the roads which require substantial and costly treatments result in the roads that are in good condition to deteriorate to a point where more substantial and costly treatments are required.

However, while the focus may be on roads which are in good condition we cannot lose sight of the roads requiring substantial structural and modern standard upgrades. Realizing that dilemma and for proposes of discussion this memo outlines categories of road preservation and rehabilitation methods, keeping in mind the current focus on pavement preservation.

While developing the policy and project parameters please keep in mind the following paraphrased MaineDOT Definitions:

“MaineDOT defines “preservation” as an action taken to preserve the investment in an existing highway, including repaving. Preservation is intended to preserve or improve our road and transportation network. In the federal sense these actions are considered a capital improvement which can both improve and extend the life of the asset.

Maintenance paving on the other hand, is considered a holding action to maintain serviceability of unbuilt roads until a more significant treatment can be applied. In most situations the treatment consists of a ¾-inch nominal overlay. Maintenance paving projects in MPO areas are ineligible for state or federal capital improvement funding.

Types of Road Treatments

As an introduction, the following are the MaineDOT’s categories of maintenance, pavement preservation and road rehabilitation methods:

Maintenance

- Maintenance Surface Treatment- ¾”
- Maintenance Surface Treatment-Sand Mix

Preservation

- ¾ inch Overlay
- 1 ¼ inch Overlay
- Microsurfacing
- Chip Seal
- Mill & Fill
- 1 ¼ inch Overlay PLUS
- Mill & Fill PLUS
- State PPM 075
- State PPM 125
- Cold-In-Place Recycle

Rehabilitation

- Highway Widening and Overlay
- Foamed Asphalt
- Full Depth Reclaim
- Full Depth Reclaim W/Cement
- Full Depth Reclaim W/Emulsion
- Cold-In-Place Recycle
- PMRAP
- Structural Overlay

Please note the definitions noted are to assist in categorizing projects for MaineDOT scoping and data base entry and use. The final definitions have not been determined as of this document date.

Brief Overview of Treatment Definitions

Maintenance

Maintenance Surface Treatment- 3/4”: A 9.5mm HMA (hot mix asphalt) pavement placed in one pass. Used as a “holding action” or treatment until more substantive rehabilitation is programmed. This treatment is utilized more often in urbanized areas and high trafficked roads.

Maintenance Surface Treatment-Sand Mix: Similar to 3/4” HMA, but utilized in rural roadways

Preservation

a. Three quarter inch and 1-1/4” Overlays: HMA placed in two lifts with the first being a “shim” to restore shape and cross slope of the road surface. A final lift of 3/4” or 1-1/4” HMA is placed. This category is for travel lanes only (verify) but sometimes includes existing shoulders which are “built” and paved prior to the overlay.

b. Microsurfacing and Chip Seals: Two treatment types utilizing an asphalt mix and asphalt and aggregate placed in thin lifts to protect and preserve the existing surface pavement.

c. Mill & Fills: The existing surface pavement is milled to remove inconsistent riding surface, restore the cross section and remove the surface layer of pavement, which has been worn and oxidized. A new surface HMA is then placed on the milled surface.

d. One and one quarter inch overlay PLUS and Mill & Fill PLUS: Similar to the treatments noted above but including work outside of the specific travel way. Such items would include drainage, shoulder construction, drainage, etc (used to be designated as level I and level II’s)

e. State PPM 075 and State PPM 125: A state program utilizing state funds and mostly state forces. Not applicable for PACTS funding region.

Rehabilitation

Rehabilitation methods are extensive and consist of substantial road structure treatments ranging from removing and recycling the existing pavement to full depth reclamation utilizing additives and stabilizers. Drainage and extensive shoulder construction or reconstruction may be included as well as modern road design standards requirements.

Treatments include:

- Highway Widening and Overlay
- Foamed Asphalt
- Full Depth Reclaim
- Full Depth Reclaim W/Cement
- Full Depth Reclaim W/Emulsion
- Cold-In-Place Recycle
- PMRAP

Note: the definitions above pertain to MaineDOT categorized treatments. As our current focus is on collector paving; this category, treatments types and definitions may be revised to fit the PACTS region as we move forward.

Staff Recommended Collector Paving Treatment Options

Preservation I – Treatments – “Simple” – 10% set-a-side proposed

Crack Seal
3/4-inch overlay (a)
1-1/4- inch overlay (a)
Mill and Fill (c)

Preservation I treatments are considered “simple” and are based on the premise that treatments would only be utilized on roads that are “built” structurally and/or to modern standards.

Collectors which are built structurally but not to modern standards could be “self funded” with local funds only because when federal and/or state funds are utilized modern design standards are required. The premise of “self funding” is that collectors which do not meet modern standards but are built in the structural sense, could be cost effectively preserved or improved less expensively by the municipality.

Collectors which are built both to modern design standards and meet condition requirements for simple treatments would be eligible for PACTS funding under the Preservation I category. If the road does not meet current modern design standards the municipality would make the determination whether to seek PACTS funding to improve the road to meet modern standards or to preserve what currently exists utilizing local funds only. If the municipality chooses to seek PACTS funding the project would be considered under the Preservation II category as outlined below.

Preservation II – Treatments – Comprehensive - 15% set-a-side proposed

Micro Surfacing (b)
Chip Seal (b)
1-1/4 inch Overlay Plus (d)
Mill and Fill Plus (d)
Cold-In-Place Recycling

Preservation II treatments are more involved methods of preserving existing collector roads because of both the treatment type and the construction requirements. The treatment types are generally outside what may be considered “simple” overlays (Preservation I). Contract documents and technical requirements are more detailed and construction methods are more involved. Drainage improvements may also be included in the scope of work.

Preservation II projects must also meet all 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.

Road Rehabilitation- Treatments (TBD) – Extensive - 15% set-a-side proposed

This category falls between the current Collector Paving and Rebuild Roads Set-Aside Policies. Rehabilitation includes substantial reworking of the existing pavement and the road

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

Road Rehabilitation could either be developed within its own category or could be added to the existing Rebuild Road Set-Aside.

Next Steps

Determine funding categories and amounts, strictly define categories and develop a ranking system.

To effectively manage roadway assets, current (and correct) data must be utilized in determining the most cost effective way to manage our collector roads. Currently we are working with our member towns and the MaineDOT to combine existing member data, MaineDOT data (to be made available spring 2008) and conduct field reviews to determine which category and treatment best meet our needs.

We are also researching the potential of contracting with an outside consultant to assess both the condition and modern standard deficiencies of our collector roads. (see agenda item 4 below)

Agenda Item 4 Staff Proposal to Hire a Consultant to Assess the Overall Condition of the PACTS Region Collector Roads

Over the past year or so various PACTS committees have discussed a multitude of issues and complications surrounding the Collector Paving projects and the set-a-side policy. The primary discussions revolved around scope changes and the resultant cost escalations caused by the expansion of scope, treatment type, modern design standards and 35% increase in construction materials cost. PACTS staff has been working to clarify treatment types, appropriate uses, definitions and the somewhat vague set-aside policy as it currently is written. The Policy Committee voted in September to initiate a set-aside policy that specifically includes pavement preservation as well as the more substantial rehabilitation methods and to better clarify the categories.

Recent focus has been on collector paving projects related to 06/07 funding shortfalls because of dramatic increases in both construction costs and scope. Recent awareness of what constitutes “modern standards” such as shoulder types and widths, guardrail conditions and clear zone requirements (among others) has resulted in broad scope changes with associated cost increases. The consensus is that the 06/07 projects were incorrectly or vaguely scoped, but the 08/09 projects appear better scoped and the general feeling is there should not be as many “issues” when those projects are re-estimated.

However, we will soon embark on selecting candidates for the 10/11 program; hence the recent discussions pertaining to selecting (and correctly scoping) appropriate projects. Integral to developing a well-defined asset management policy to manage our collector roads is the need for current and accurate road condition data, historical improvement details and assessment of deficiencies of modern design standards. MaineDOT has condition information available, which PACTS uses to rank candidates. Historical data has been difficult to obtain because many

collector roads with-in the PACTS region have been (and continue to be) rehabilitated by the communities. Lack of historical data makes it very difficult to determine which roads are “built” and eligible for funding.

Opinions have been divided between whether PACTS should utilize existing MaineDOT data to develop and rank 10/11 candidates in mid-2008 or issue an RFP for a consultant to conduct an in-depth review of the PACTS region collector roads both for 10/11 projects as well as for an overall condition assessment. The assumption has been MaineDOT data may be incomplete, difficult to manage or inaccessible. Based on those assumptions the consensus from the October Technical Committee meeting was to move in the direction of conducting an independent review.

However, recent discussions among staff and follow-up discussions with the MaineDOT have clarified some of those assumptions and PACTS staff now believes it unnecessary to complete an all inclusive in-depth consultant study. In addition it is felt a consultant study would not be complete in time to select 10/11 candidates for this spring/summer review.

As the table indicates, information such as video records and FWD information was previously either not accessible or unavailable will be made available to PACTS in the near future. Prior to these developments a consultant would need to obtain the data as shown below.

Task	MaineDOT	Consultant
<i>Condition Rating</i>	ARAN odd calendar years	Visual assessment required
<i>Structural Component</i>	Falling Weight Deflectometer	Cores and/or test borings
<i>Modern Standards</i>	ARAN video (VisyWEB)	Must be videoed
<i>Historical Data*</i>	PACTS/DOT/Members	PACTS/DOT/Members
<i>Traffic Data</i>	DOT obtains	DOT or location specific**

*data must be obtained from member communities or extensive subsurface investigation required

**Consultant would obtain from DOT/PACTS or consultant completes specific locations

Condition ratings have been the consistent thread to assess and prioritize PACTS collector roads. As we have discovered recently, many additional parameters must be considered to properly rank and prioritize the roads PACTS requests funding for.

Emphasizing this situation is the definitive direction MaineDOT is taking to revamp their assessment protocols by moving to the Highway Adequacy Index system of rating roads. By MaineDOT moving in this direction more data is being acquired that will be accessible to the PACTS region.

MaineDOT is currently working with PACTS to make available pavement condition ratings and video records of collector roads obtained when the ARAN van collects road condition data. In addition, the FWD assessment will begin in the PACTS region in late June 2008 with data available soon after. Two important issues will be addressed by this development. One, the availability of video records will allow efficient review of existing conditions of the roadway and right-of-way to better determine modern design standard deficiencies and two, data from the FWD will help indicate the structural condition of the roadway.

To reiterate, given the current situation it appears it may not be cost effective to utilize a consultant to conduct an independent study in time for the 10/11 selection process. At present it appears we must utilize MaineDOT data as it becomes available to select candidates for the collector paving set-a-side for the 10/11 program.

Staff however recommends hiring a consultant to compile and assess all data as it becomes available from MaineDOT for an overall condition study of all PACTS collector roads for future considerations. For future programs and for an overall condition assessment we have three options to choose from:

1. Hire a consultant to complete an entirely independent condition, structural and modern design standards assessment including field data acquisition.
2. Hire a consultant to compile and utilize available MaineDOT and member community data to complete a condition assessment.
3. PACTS staff with assistance from MaineDOT and with input from members, compiles data and develops an overall condition assessment.

Based on the background analysis described above. Staff recommends that we hire a consultant to complete the Option Two work outlined below:

“PACTS is seeking a qualified firm to conduct a comprehensive review of existing data for the PACTS MPO region collector roads. The data analysis shall include existing pavement condition, structural analysis, modern design standards deficiencies and current traffic counts. The consultant will submit a final report indicating the overall condition of the collector road network and make treatment recommendations to maintain and improve network including current and future cost estimates.

The consultant shall compile all available MaineDOT data, including but not limited to:

1. ARAN road condition data,
2. Video records,
3. Falling weight deflectometer (FWD) data,
4. Road maintenance history and,
5. Traffic counts

The consultant may be required to interview PACTS member communities and the MaineDOT Region One office to obtain maintenance histories, current road data and future scheduled maintenance, utility work and rehabilitation schedules (if any)

The final draft report shall be submitted by September ____, 2008.”

We will continue to move forward with both the development of the 10/11 program and an overall condition assessment by periodically reviewing MaineDOT data as it becomes available. Keeping in mind this is a new endeavor for the MaineDOT we will continue to assess the progress, methods and direction we may need to take to achieve the desired results.

Agenda Item 5. - Historical Municipal Collector Road Data Update

Seven communities have “formally” submitted road improvement (and maintenance) data and eight communities have not. Falmouth has stated information will come soon after construction season ends. Information is being obtained when changes are apparent during the normal course of business. We have yet to submit information to the MaineDOT but have kept them informed of the progress. They are however looking forward to receiving accurate up-to-date data. We will continue to work with our members to compile the best data we can for the MaineDOT/PACTS Data Exchange Program.

Agenda Item 6. - Information and Other Business

1. The Falling Weight deflectometer was observed in the field the last week of October. A brief synopsis will be given.
2. The primary focus of the October Planning Committee was on regional impact fees as an additional revenue source. Mark Eyerman of Planning Decisions discussed the pros and cons of impact fees and other considerations to make when deciding to implement a fee policy. Copies of Mark’s comments are available if you would like a copy.
3. GPCOG and PACTS are assisting the MaineDOT in three public meetings regarding the final draft of their I-295 Corridor Study Report. Meetings are as follows:

Yarmouth: November 13, 7 to 9 p.m. at the
Log Cabin 196 Main Street (next to Key Bank) Yarmouth

Brunswick: November 20, 7 to 9 p.m. at the
Old High School Library (Spring and McKeen Strs) Brunswick

Portland: December 11, 7 to 9 p.m. at the
State of Maine Room, Portland City Hall, 389 Congress Street

4. PACTS Offsite Retreat #2 is scheduled for November 14th at 8:30 a.m. at Val Halla in Cumberland. The purpose is to continue the process of reviewing and developing a new PACTS organizational structure.
5. We very highly recommend attending the Maine Transportation Conference on December 6, 2007 at the Augusta Civic Center.

The Maine Challenge: **Transportation Opportunities**

57TH MAINE TRANSPORTATION CONFERENCE

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 6, 2007 • AUGUSTA CIVIC CENTER • AUGUSTA, MAINE

TENTATIVE AGENDA

7:00 – 8:00 a.m. REGISTRATION

8:15 – 8:30 a.m. WELCOME ADDRESS

Dr. Dana N. Humphrey, Dean, College of Engineering, UMaine
David A. Cole, Commissioner, MaineDOT

8:30 – 9:15 a.m. KEYNOTE ADDRESS:

"U.S. Infrastructure - Conditions and Initiatives"
Charles V. "Casey" Dinges, Managing Director of
External Affairs ASCE

9:30 – 10:30 a.m. SESSION 1

POLICY TRACK: Our Aging

Infrastructure – The Hidden Costs

"Condition of Maine's Transportation System"

Bruce A. Van Note, MaineDOT

"The National View"

Jim Haughey, Reed Construction Data

TECHNICAL TRACK: Our Bridge Infrastructure

"Forensic Analysis of Bridge Failures"

Bill Wright, Turner-Fairbanks Highway Research Center

"Maine's Bridge Inspection Program"

John Buxton, MaineDOT

11:00 a.m. – NOON SESSION II

POLICY TRACK: Developing Transportation

Systems in Foreign Countries

"Transportation Investments in Europe"

Dr. Michael Meyer, Georgia Tech

"Transportation Investments in China"

Eva Lerner-Lam, Falisades Consulting Group, Inc.

TECHNICAL TRACK: Student Papers

"Automated Enforcement for Work Zone Speeds"

Kenneth Wicks

"Aesthetic Cross-Walk Treatments"

MacKenzie Demkowitz

"Roundabout Truck Aprons"

Charles Phipps

"Reducing Four-Lane Roads to Three Lanes"

Alex Duguay

NOON – 1:45 p.m. LUNCHEON PROGRAM:

"Connecting Maine: Maine's Long-Range

Transportation Plan"

David A. Cole, MaineDOT &

Gregory Nadeau, MaineDOT

NOON – 1:45 p.m. LUNCHEON PROGRAM, continued

David H. Stevens Award, MaineDOT

Paul L. Lariviere Award, FHWA

Francis Crowe Society Award, UMaine

Student Paper Awards, AGC Maine

1:45 – 2:45 p.m. SESSION III

POLICY TRACK: Quality Communities

*"Maine Demographics: Impact on
Communities and Transportation"*

Laurie G. Lachance, Maine Development Foundation

"Transportation Opportunities and Quality Communities"

Marty Kennedy, Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc.

TECHNICAL TRACK: Congestion/Mobility

"Highway Speed Tolling"

Paul Godfrey, HNTB Corp.

"Access Management Best Practices, Brewer"

Linda Johns, City of Brewer

Frank Higgins, City of Brewer

3:15 – 4:30 p.m. SESSION IV

POLICY TRACK: Freight Rail & CanAm Connections

"Northeast CanAm Connections"

Joe Bryan, Global Insights

"Freight Rail Connections"

Sydney Culliford, Pan Am Railways

Ray Goss, St. Lawrence & Atlantic Railroad

Robert Grindrod, Montreal Maine & Atlantic Railway, Inc.

TECHNICAL TRACK: Freight Issues

"Infrastructure Protection and ITS Technologies"

Daniel Robbins, MaineDOT

"Kittery Automated Commercial Vehicle Screening System"

Randy Knapick, IBI Group

"Hi-Tech Snowplows"

Brian Burne, MaineDOT

4:30 – 5:00 p.m. SOCIAL

5:00 – 6:00 p.m. DINNER

6:00 – 7:30 p.m. EVENING SESSION

Max L. Wilder Award, MBTA

"Brunswick Local Redevelopment Authority and

The BNAS Reuse Plan"

Steve Levesque, Brunswick Local Redevelopment Authority

Sponsored by

Maine Better Transportation Association • MaineDOT • Maine Section, American Society of Civil Engineers

In cooperation with Maine Turnpike Authority • Federal Highway Administration • American Society of Civil Engineers • AGC Maine •
University of Maine Student Chapter • American Council of Engineering Companies/Maine • American Public Works Association/Maine