



Technical Committee Meeting Notice

September 9, 2008
8:30 a.m.

PACTS, 68 Marginal Way, Portland

Agenda

1. Call to order
2. Public Comment
3. Minutes of August 12th Meeting
4. Collector Road Paving Ranking
5. Appointments to Planning and Transit Committees
6. Information and Other Business
7. Adjourn.

Next Meeting: October 14 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
August 12th, 2008 – 8:30 a.m.

Members Present: Jennie Franceschi, Biddeford, Chair; Dana Anderson, So. Portland; Bill Bent, Maine Turnpike Authority; Mike Bolduc, Saco; Jim Carmody, Portland; Mimi Cerveney, MDOT; Mary Ann Conroy, Old Orchard Beach; Eric Dudley, Westbrook; Doug Fortier, Windham; Bob Hough, MaineDOT; Dan Jellis, Yarmouth; Mike Laberge, MaineDOT; Bob Malley, Cape Elizabeth; Al Presgraves, Freeport; Dave Redlefsen, Public Transit; Skip Varney, Falmouth; Jim Wendel, Scarborough.

Absent: Don Chaisson, No. Yarmouth; Julia Dawson, SMRPC; Sara Devlin, Maine Turnpike Authority; Dale Mitchell, Policy Committee Appointee; Anna Price, FHWA

Staff and Guests: John Duncan, PACTS; Carl Eppich, PACTS; Tom Gorrill, Gorrill-Palmer Associates; Brian Keezer, MaineDOT; LaRay Hamilton, MDOT; Sue McIntyre, GPCOG; Paul Niehoff, PACTS; Ralph Norwood, Gorrill-Palmer Associates.

1. **Call to Order** Jennie Franceschi, Chair, called the meeting to order at 8:37 a.m.

2. **Public Comment:** There were no public comments expressed.

3. **Adoption of minutes of July 8th, 2008 meeting**

Bob Burns made a motion for approval of the July 8th, 2008 minutes, seconded by Bob Malley.

It was noted that Bob Burns should have been listed as absent and that Adam Ogden is no longer with the Town of Cumberland. *Vote taken. All were in favor. Minutes were accepted as amended.*

4. **Collector Road Study Update and Findings**

Tom Gorrill provided an update on Gorrill-Palmer's general findings in the collector road study as well as an update on the list of collector roads that were prioritized according to the new CPI ranking formula.

Tom began by distributing a number of handouts that included three pie charts, as well as a copy of the Collector Priority Index (CPI); three spreadsheets entitled, "All Road Segments", "Roads Not Meeting Design Standards" and "Roads Meeting Design Standards"; as well as a map depicting each member's respective town for future reference.

Gorrill-Palmer's gathering of data is almost complete. The next step is to put this information in a report form. It will be done in such a way that it will be useful for each town. The report will begin with an introduction and overview chapter followed by the rest of the chapters which will be done by town and be town specific. This format will allow for putting together an entire document for PACTS that will include all towns. Information in the large spreadsheets will be refined for better reading.

Today's discussion is to focus on input and feedback from the Committee as well as whether the Committee feels that Gorrill-Palmer's report is headed in the right direction. Tom pointed out that Gorrill-Palmer had done some things with ranking where they had used their judgment, but it remains open to interpretation and discussion.

Key items noted and discussed:

Pie charts: It was surprising to see that 39% of the roadways were shown as not meeting design standards. (But this might change a little.) The second pie chart entitled "Percentage Anticipated to Require Design Exception" shows that 11% of the collector roads may require design exceptions. In terms of funding to take care of 200 miles of roads, the amount comes to over \$1 million per mile.

A question was asked about whether the *design exception percentages* were subjective. Tom replied that the percentages were based on their experience in having reviewed the roads in the towns and what might be needed in order to meet design standards. For instance, some might need to have trees taken down, or historic structures might be affected. These types of scenarios would not meet design standards and could cause significant impact.

Tom directed the group to the *spreadsheet handouts* and noted that each road section that is listed in the spreadsheet correlates with each of the Town's respective maps. With reference to the "road" spreadsheets, total points in the last column indicate the overall condition of a particular road section. Those with the highest amount of points are those in the worst shape. A brief overview of each column was then provided.

The following columns indicate what kind of segment treatments would be most appropriate. The column entitled "*pending or recent project*" are for road segments with pending work, such as overlays, etc. In the Falling Weight Deflectometer (*FWD*) column, the higher the amount, the worse the condition of the road. Some have been given a "placeholder" until more information becomes available. The majority of the road segments that do not show an FWD rating were road segments that included things like ramps, etc.

With regards to the *PCR column*, the higher the number in this column, the better the condition of the road.

Those that were highlighted were road sections that showed, upon a field review, that it was apparent that the PCR assigned to that section was not appropriate. This might have included roads with a recent overlay for instance. Subsequently, if the number rating did not seem to match what they saw in the field, the road was highlighted.

With regards to the Average Annual Daily Traffic (*AADT*) column, the source of this data came from the Maine Department of Transportation. Some of these seemed pretty old. MDOT is working to update this information. With respect to the column "*truck route*", there is no information available yet. There are no designated truck routes that they know of but at some point it might need to be in that column.

Dave Redlfsen pointed out that Falmouth is in the process of redesigning their bus service route (specifically, Metro bus route 7) and this bus service to Falmouth may be eliminated. A final determination should be arrived at sometime in October on what kind of route structure Falmouth wants, if any at all.

The "*2008 Preliminary Opinion of Constructions Cost*" column indicates a cost amount based on the actual on-site review along with a cost based on a linear basis using MaineDOT prices. However, these do not indicate some of the deficiencies and do not include costs for right of way. That level of information is not available at the moment. They did include 10% for PE and another 10% for CE. Tom reiterated that the cost includes for the most part everything except right of way, and also does not take into consideration items such as wetlands or pole relocation.

Tom directed the group to the handout entitled "*Collector Priority Index (CPI)*". This is the index rating that was used in determining the point ratings in the spreadsheets. He noted that Paul Niehoff and Ralph Norwood had met with MaineDOT. They agreed that PACTS would be using the Highway Adequacy Index (HAI) rating differently than MaineDOT. MaineDOT does not use the HAI for prioritization and funding whereas PACTS does. Subsequently, a new Collector Priority Index (CPI) was proposed and utilized. Tom explained that they included the HAI condition index as well as the HAI service index in the CPI. It was also felt that conditions have more weight than service. Therefore, condition index was given 55 points and roadway service was given 45 points. Safety is not addressed in the CPI because MDOT has a separate program relative to safety. If an issue pertains to safety, different funds can be applied for.

Tom explained that they began with an assumption that condition should have more weight. As a result, they gave a PCR more weight than the FWD. The FWD is more structural while the PCR is pavement itself. He further explained that if structure is not falling apart then you might do an overlay to preserve what you already have. There are many factors to consider. With respect to the FWD, the higher the number, the worse the road condition is. The opposite is true for the PCR number. The higher the number is, the better the road condition is. Subsequently, the PCR was allotted 30 points while the FWD was given 25 points. The total of these gives the condition index a total of 55 points. Other items in the CPI included the service index which was allotted a total of 45 points. This included such components as how much traffic a road services; whether a road is a truck route (none have been identified at the moment); and whether it is a transit route.

All of this information will be broken down town by town, with a chapter for each town, along with a common introduction. PACTS will have a copy that includes all the chapters (all the towns). A question was asked as to whether the point system was affected if the road in question has a pending project. Tom replied "no". It is more of an information column. Ralph explained that they tried to identify those roads that had either a project pending or had had a recent project completed. They took into consideration design standards and looked at those sections eligible for overlay.

Questions and comments

- A request was made to have the information sent out in excel format. (Ralph will follow-up.)
- Bob Burns requested that the group get a spreadsheet that shows the cost that is similar to pavement condition along with back-up data. (Tom will select a few and send that out as well).
- Is it up to the towns to bring the roads that do not meet the standards for PACTS funding up to those standards? (Mike Laberge replied that it is a discussion that the Committee will have to have).
- A request was made to have more information regarding truck volume as well as truck counts included in the data in the future.

This last comment generated a short discussion pertaining to truck volume and the impact that trucks have on roads. Tom wondered if 5 points would be enough in the CPI. Mike Laberge pointed out that the Bangor MPO had recently completed a regional truck route study to see where the trucks were going. He encouraged the group to conduct a regional study. Every town would have data to make decisions. Tom made reference to a study that was done by John Melrose and Gorrill-Palmer for Pacts with regards to I-295. One big issue was where are trucks going and whether they should be traveling on the Interstate instead. Recommendations were made. He pointed out that when looking at truck routes, there are many elements that must be taken into consideration such as road radius, pedestrian safety, collision history, etc. Tom said he had recently been invited to sit in the cab of a tractor trailer noting that it was an "eye-opener". The study they conducted was more advisory in nature. Truck routes were recommended as well as improvements for some of the recommended truck routes such as items that affect the road radius and/or turning radius. He pointed out that some roads are called "designated truck routes" internally, but that doesn't mean that a truck can't go on any other route. Paul added that if a town lets truck companies know what its preferred and/or non-preferred truck routes are, due to safety or any other reason, most truck companies will try to comply with the town's request. Mike commented that PACTS would be putting together its 2010/2011 program and that this might present a good opportunity to use some of the funding for a truck route study.

With respect to the traffic volume ranges used in the AADT, Tom spoke of collector roads with multiple lanes and said if the traffic volume was over 6000 for instance, they gave the road 35 points. However, he said that the AADT index points could be modified. For instance, roads

with multiple lanes might need to be looked at by individual lane. Bob Hough asked if it would be difficult to “pull out” truck volume information from the AADT. Tom replied that there are two ways of doing that. One way would be to get the information where some roads had the classification done, but this is not the vast majority. Another would be to look at the truck volume and/or have a truck route study done and call it a designated route. It would then get an automatic number of points for that. Tom said he would welcome input from the group on this topic.

(A request was made for a map with a legend and the use of different colors depicting roads according to their different rankings).

A discussion began about roads that do not meet standards. Jennie asked about the roads that do not meet standards and have no design exception. Tom replied that the treatment that they called out on these particular roads is because it needs to be brought back to standards. Many of these issues pertain to road width and may include utility poles. A large majority would have to be redone. Many guardrails did not meet design standards. Detailed information will be provided to towns on what is needed to bring these particular roads up to standards. It was noted however, that there may be right of way impacts if it involves moving poles, etc. Mary Ann recommended that all roads that do not meet design standards should be grouped together in a separate category. Discussion continued on this topic and where these particular roads go from here. It was noted that the PACTS Policy Committee would be discussing this also. It was felt that if any decision is made it should be done now. Paul thought that the group could look at these roads, sort them out into a short list within three categories, and then the list could be discussed at the next meeting with a decision being made on whether that list should be endorsed and sent to the Policy Committee. In simplistic terms, you could use these spreadsheets and draw a line. But the practicality is that most will have to be looked at, thought over, and then discussed. John spoke of developing a short list at the next meeting in September and then have MDOT and the towns “field-check” those roads/projects on the list. At the October meeting the group could then develop a recommendation for the Policy Committee.

In the meantime, Paul added that PACTS would look at the list and pare it down into a short list to discuss in September. His intent would be to work with MDOT and the towns as well as with Gorrill-Palmer to try to come up with the best list they can for the September meeting. Discussion continued on collector road set aside monies and roads that need reconstruction. There are currently no funds budgeted for those purposes. There may be an opportunity to discuss this with the working group, MDOT and the FHWA to see whether there are any innovative solutions for these roads but it would need to be road specific. It was noted that if federal funds are used for a road, then the road must meet federal standards. Discussion continued as to whether a town should pay for the reconstruction of a road to bring it up to design standards and then subsequently be able to use federal funding for paving it.

Among other items discussed and/or noted:

- Should monies be directed toward road reconstruction for some of the collector roads?
- The Policy Committee’s decision to protect infrastructure from overlay projects up to reconstruction.
- Funding for overlay projects
- Local match vs. total cost
- Towns will need to confirm that they can meet the local match for their road project(s).
- What top 20 projects meet design standards?
- Should we allow some level of reconstruction from the \$2 million in set aside funds?
- We could come up with a list to meet design standards and categorize those or use the total list
- Projects could be categorized according to the following: “Preservation I - Simple”; Preservation II – Comprehensive; and “Road Rehabilitation Extensive”.

Discussion began on the reconstruction of some of the roads. Some may be in a “gray area” on whether they meet the criteria for reconstruction. In reference to overlays, if a road does not meet standards it has to be brought up to standards. MainDOT has different levels of preservation. Bob Hough noted that he believed the PACTS Policy is that preservation is the first level/first tier, a simple overlay and that it meets all the standards. Mike Bolduc asked then if all those roads that do not meet federal standards right now and might never meet those standards, then should these roads be removed from the list? Mimi Cerveny explained that the feds pay to bring the bad road up to standard. You can then call it a built road up to standards. The term then used is preservation. MDOT only preserves a standard road and a built road. Mike Bolduc noted that the State has an overlay program but uses federal monies. Mike L. explained that State monies would allow you to use funds on built roads only. More discussion followed on the \$5 million. Mike L. pointed out that PACTS wanted to focus on pavement preservation. In other words, preserving the good roads. So that \$5 million are for the roads that meet the modern design standards. You would have to find other monies to do those other roads. He added that he would like to know what qualifies for the \$5 million. Paul explained the three tiers: The first tier is known as the “Preservation I” Simple Method; the second tier includes roads that meet the structural integrity but not the federal design standards. These projects could be funded as well as the items that we need to fund to meet the design standards. This might include things such as guard rails and shoulders. The third tier could potentially get close to a reconstruction. Mike L. suggested that for the sake of clarity, the group could take those three categories, break them down into separate entities unto themselves, into such things as true preservation, rehabilitation and something else. Discussion continued and it re-iterated that some projects simply do not seem to fit in any category. Tom Gorrill recommended adding a 4th category explaining that in the first category we would see shim and overlay; in the second category it might be a little more extensive such as mill and fill, chip and seal, etc.; then once the roads begin to include things such as boxing out shoulders, etc. they were put into the third category. Maybe there should be a fourth category for those that don’t quite fit in any of these.

Bob Burns referenced collector overlays and said he wondered why we would want to sub-categorize into the three tiers. We have \$5 million. He also added that he didn’t believe that \$5 million could keep our good roads up to par. John Duncan explained that the dollar figures were there just as starting points. But the three tiers provide categories on were to spend the monies on.

Jennie Franceschi made a motion to pull the projects from “The all the road segments” lists, categorize the list according to Preservation I and II and then separate these into three categories. Then the list would be brought back to this Committee at the September meeting. Seconded by Mike Laberge. Discussion followed. Tom agreed noting that a 4th category could be made. In reference to the September meeting, Dana said he would like to at least receive an email and/or information on what the commitment is going to be from the towns on their respective projects. Tom added that he could have the list, at least with the three categories done by the end of the week. There was consensus among the group to ask the towns whether they will be able to budget these projects and provide their respective local share. It was noted that between now and September, the group could get some buy-in from the towns and then between the September and October meetings, from the town councils. Further discussion continued with regards to the use of the all roads list. It was felt by some that the Committee should start with those that meet the design standards and criteria. It was noted that those roads that do not meet the criteria would be moved to the third category or maybe not on the list at all. Another opinion focused on divvying up the \$5 million on those that only meet the design standards. More discussion followed pertaining to the descriptions in the various preservation categories.

Mary Ann suggested that the Committee move forward and get the commitments from the town managers to see if the matching monies are there. She felt the Committee needed to see where the towns stand in regards to their local match. ***Vote taken. 4 in favor of the motion. 9 opposed. Motion failed.***

Bob Malley made a motion that we should divvy up the shim and overlay, mill and overlay, reclaim and pave, projects and try to get a handle on the different aspects of these. (There was no second.) He said “how can we break these projects down”? Jennie felt that it must be those that meet the design standards. Tom reiterated the meaning of the FWD point ratings. When the FWD is high you have 0 points and that means that the road is in good shape. A low FWD rating is good. If it has a high FWD number then most likely it is not in the category of an overlay. In view of the discussion, **Bob Malley withdrew his motion.**

Bob wondered if it made more sense to use the \$5 million for the roads that meet the design standards.

Mike Bolduc made a motion to include all the \$5 million into category I, seconded by Dana Anderson. Discussion followed. The \$5 million into category I would be a simple exercise. If we do that we could then come up with a list in accordance to the categories that we already have. Jennie noted that we would have three lists of \$5 million. \$5 million could be in the cap and we would have those lists for discussion purposes. Tom added that the lists could be done in the scope and would be easy to generate. Paul pointed out that the Committee had voted on the three tiers indicated in the meeting packet.

Mike Bolduc made a motion for those roads on the “All road segments” list should be broken down into three categories. Seconded by Dana Anderson. Discussion began. (Mike Bolduc amended his motion to include that those roads on the “All road segments list” be broken down into three categories AND that the roads meet design standards). **Mike amended his motion to include a second list with a further breakdown of the \$5 million into three categories that the towns have outlined and that the roads meet design standards, as well. Seconded by Dana Anderson.** Discussion. It was agreed that both lists would include only the roads that meet design standards. More discussion followed on the lists and what category should those that meet design standards fit into. Jim Carmody asked if once the list was established if the individual communities would be able to pick and choose. Jennie replied “yes”.

Vote taken on the amended motion. 12 in favor. None opposed. Motion carried.

Vote taken on the original motion. 14 in favor. None Opposed. Motion carried.

Tom noted that the list would be revisited by the middle of next week. The preliminary list will be compiled and followed by field reviews of the projects. All categories should be field reviewed by the respective towns, PACTS and DOT personnel before that next meeting. From there the Committee will develop the final list. John added that field work would need to be scheduled ASAP. MaryAnn pointed out that the Committee would also need to get feedback on each town’s capability to come up with the local match before field reviews begin. It was decided that the towns would need to get back to the Committee within one week. MDOT will want some kind of informal paper work indicating that each respective town can come up with the local match for its project(s).

5. Construction/Project Scope Innovations Working Group

The Construction/Project Scope Innovations Working Group will be meeting next week and will be talking about items discussed at this meeting. It will be an open discussion with DOT/FHWA, and how to deliver projects a little sooner in conjunction with discussions on partnering with communities as well as looking at doing projects in a different way. It is envisioned that this will be a several months’ long effort. Anyone who might have some issues and/or suggestions, stories, comments, etc., please send to Paul Niehoff by the beginning of next week.

6. Information and Other Business

Challenge Grant: PACTS submitted five and MDOT submitted 14. They then picked the ones that met the criteria. Mike said many didn’t “make the cut” based on the 20-year life span. Those listed under number 1 in agenda item 6 in the meeting packet, met the criteria.

Mike Laberge announced that MaineDOT had suspended its pavement program for the rest of the season. The Commissioner will be putting out a full statement later today. When his announcement is made public Mike will send Paul a list of projects that will be affected by this decision. Simply said, they just don't have the monies because of asphalt prices. The price of asphalt has gone from \$300 a ton in January to \$750 a ton in July. It is now close to being \$850 a ton.

A short discussion took place on what to do with old roads that are "unbuilt". It was agreed that there is a need to be doing some reconstruction work but at the same time we should be looking at overlaying those roads that meet design standards. Any comments on the list sent out by Gorrill – Palmer can be sent to Paul Niehoff.

7. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 11:10 a.m.

Agenda Item 4. Collector Road Rankings.

Under separate cover (email) is the Collector CPI Workbook which includes a number of worksheets. Of primary interest is the first worksheet which is the initial list of collectors meeting modern design standards and fitting the tier one "simple" overlay parameter. We were unable to develop the second list of roads that met modern design standards but required a more substantial pavement or road rehabilitation. In most, if not all cases, if a road requires substantial rehabilitation it most likely is lacking in other major modern standard requirements, such as clear zones and shoulder width. However there are several road which meet the "simple" overlay approach but need either minor or major standard design work. Those are also included in the workbook.

The initial list was developed using the "meets standards" list of roads. Some road segments were not included because either there were questions about the segment or the length was too short to expect cost effective treatment (yellow). Green highlighted is recent or current projects. Realizing the potential revising of this list we have indicated both an estimated five million dollar list and an additional list totaling just over six million dollars. Projects were grouped where possible to attempt consistency and connectively as well as cost effectiveness and expected economies of scale.

We will need to "short list" the roads which will require field review at this meeting. The scoping group will, as soon as possible, conduct those field reviews in order to determine a final list of recommended collector roads in our October meeting.

I have again included the three tiers of treatment for our collector set-aside for discussion purposes.

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 9th 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 14th meeting. At that October meeting we will finalize and endorse the list which will then be presented to the Policy Committee meeting October 16th.

Agenda Item 5. Appointments to Planning and Transit Committees

Both the Planning and Transit Committees have made the decision to appoint one member of their respect committee to represent them on the other PACTS committee. We need to have a similar discussion and decide to appoint someone and of course if so, who will be that person.

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

1. Our MPO Project Innovations Working Group has met twice with some positive discussions taking place. We will update you at the meeting.
2. Given recent discussions on whether or not to alter PACTS funding policies or revising our set-aside policies we expect to convene another TIP Process Committee this fall, most likely November. WE will have to decide on a Committee representative.
3. Other items