

# PACTS

---

## Portland Area Comprehensive Transportation System

### Executive Committee Meeting Notice

June 8, 2010  
8:00 a.m.  
GPCOG, 68 Marginal Way, Portland

#### Agenda

1. Call to order
2. Public Comment
3. Minutes of May 4<sup>th</sup> meeting
4. Executive Committee Process (8:05)
  - A. A review of the first two years
  - B. The year ahead at PACTS
  - C. Finalize a memorandum to the Policy Committee
5. 2012/2013 TIP Priority Setting Status (8:50)
6. Status Report on our 2-Year UPWP (9:00)
7. Updates from Staff and Committees (9:20)
8. Draft Agenda for July Policy Committee meeting (9:45)
9. Reschedule July Executive Committee meeting, and consider dates/times for meetings of the Committee during the next two years (9:55)
10. Adjourn at 10:00

*Next meeting: July xx at time to be determined*

***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](http://www.pactsplan.org)

## Minutes of May 4<sup>th</sup> Meeting

**Attendance:** John Bubier, Chair; Bob Burns; Ed Clifford; Kathi Earley; Judy Harris; Mike Laberge; Bill Shane; Greg Tansley; John Duncan; Carl Eppich; Paul Niehoff; Maddy Adams

1. **Call to Order.** Kathi Earley, Vice-Chair, called the meeting to order at 8:08 a.m.
2. **Public Comment.** None.
3. **Minutes of March 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting.** *Bob Burns made a motion to approve the March 2<sup>nd</sup> minutes, seconded by Greg Tansley. It was pointed out that the Veterans Bridge is being replaced, not repaired, and it is being done with stimulus money. With that clarification, the motion passed; Bill Shane abstained.*
4. **Executive Committee Process Check-In.** John D. provided some background. Regarding considering new authority for the Executive Committee (last paragraph of memo), John explained that in some cases it would be helpful if the Executive Committee could have the authority to approve things like TIP amendments and other housekeeping issues. The concern was that the one thing that we don't bring to the Policy Committee would be the one thing that they would want to see. Additionally, the Executive Committee doesn't have representatives from all communities like the Policy Committee does. It was suggested that we take a look at the Policy Committee agendas from the past year and see if there were housekeeping issues that could've been addressed by the Executive Committee. It was mentioned that it was very valuable when Scarborough representatives presented the Dunstan Corner project to the Executive Committee. Although it was a lengthy presentation, it provided the Executive Committee with the ability to more easily explain the situation to the Policy Committee thus saving a lot of the Policy Committee's time. We will look to the Policy Committee for input on this issue.
5. **TIP Project Amendments.** Mike L. explained that it is a new MaineDOT/FHWA policy that STIP amendments are no longer required for funding requests when the amount is below \$250,000. If the STIP is amended, typically they would have to go out for public comment. They hoped to streamline the process by not having to go out for public comment for project amendments under \$250,000. PACTS staff will review this new MaineDOT/FHWA policy and advise on its implications for PACTS.

The first amendment was for the Baxter Boulevard Collector Paving Project. The project will be revised to complete the adjacent section instead. Staff has met with MaineDOT and the City of Portland about this. Forest Avenue to Preble Street (currently funded) will be combined with the new section. The section that was a mill and fill would now be a construction project because of its condition so Portland changed the section that would be done to a section that is a mill and fill project. If the contract comes in less than estimated then we can put that money somewhere else. Nothing will be done with the section of Baxter Boulevard that needs construction. Bill was concerned with the process; he didn't feel the Executive Committee had the authority to do this. We are transferring the money from one part of Baxter Boulevard that was scoped to another part that has not been scoped. Was this project ever discussed at the Policy Committee level? Was it on the collector paving list? Paul responded that it was on the collector paving list. The first section was chosen based on traffic counts. The proposed section was looked at but wasn't done because of funding constraints. We are doing a smaller piece than originally planned. Bob said he is ok with the approach but the dollar amount is too high; this project was at the top

of the list. It was asked if there were other projects on the collector paving list that were higher on the list. Paul explained that this section was in the original list that was discussed at the technical level. There was concern about the amount of funding (\$750,000 vs. \$1,500,000). Paul explained that we can leave the funding the same and look at a longer length. We did it this way because the Gorrill Palmer Study broke the Boulevard down into sections. Mike stated that all sections of the Boulevard were on the list but Portland doesn't have the match to do all the projects. ***Bill Shane made a motion to offer to support the staff's position to mill and fill a different section of the Baxter Boulevard project. John Bubier seconded the motion and all were in favor.***

I-295 Guardrail Request. ***Bill Shane made a motion to approve this amendment request, seconded by Bob Burns. The motion passed.***

Paul Niehoff reported on the following work-in-progress topics.

Read Street. Portland is considering full completion of their Read Street CSO project to include finish pavement thereby qualifying it for the credit program and freeing up the funds (\$567,755) in the current Read Street project. Paul explained. The bulk of the work was done last year and the rest will be done this year so it would qualify for the credit money. Read Street was a collector paving project in 08-09. The money could be redistributed under the PACTS substitution policy. Greg asked why this money couldn't be used to do the Baxter Boulevard project. He pointed out that we could've funded the Read Street project with the money that we just approved for the Baxter Boulevard shift. If we funded the Read Street project instead of Baxter Boulevard, that would have freed up money to go to other projects. (Staff Note: Read Street and Baxter are both funded projects. It is correct we could fund the new section of Baxter with Read Street money (if amounts are appropriate) thus freeing up funds from the current Baxter project.) It was noted that this would be shifting collector paving money to other projects in Portland. Mike L. explained that Portland has a ten-year old project – Riverside/Warren intersection project – that needs more money. They would take the Read Street money and put it to the Riverside/Warren project. John B. said that we should have had all the critical information before this subject began. Bill agreed that we need to have full disclosure. Paul explained that when the packet went out we didn't know that we were going to have this discussion. Kathi further explained that the Riverside/Warren project went up \$1.5 million because of the cost of the retaining wall. Portland hasn't made a decision about this; this information only came up yesterday. John explained that he had told Paul to keep the information short in the agenda packet because it is so complicated; he realizes background information is important. John B. stated that if an issue is complex, it is important that it be presented as complex. The trust issue is one thing that we do not want to bust.

Bow Street – Paul made a mistake when putting the funding together. He cannot explain how it got funded the way it did. The two Bow Street sections (from the report) totaled \$168,750 (including our 25% factor) but we inadvertently funded \$122,600. The project need is \$37,400 bringing the total to \$160,000 which is less than what the original correct amount should have been. The money transferred came from another Freeport project leaving an excess balance of \$17,165 which will go to the Holding PIN so there is no loss to the PACTS pot of money.

Credit Program Status. Falmouth has submitted a request to use the Johnson Road and Middle Road projects for the credit program. The credit amount totals \$135,000 of which approximately \$39,000 has been used towards the Falmouth Route 88 sidewalk program.

As mentioned above, Read Street is also being considered. Paul said that he had asked PACTS member towns for a list of projects that might be candidates for the current program but he hasn't received many responses. Bill commended Paul on the excellent job he is doing with the credit program.

Brackett and Libby Overruns. The overrun occurred when funds in the Brackett Road project, which was under contract, were used to fund multiple collector projects in 2008. The premise now is since we took the money out we should put it back into the project. So we should take money out of the Holding PIN to fund the Brackett overrun. It is not the same case for Libby. (Staff note: since the meeting we have determined that Libby was bid with Brackett and considered as one project by MaineDOT and Gorham and transfers between the two were already made, hence the suggestion to also cover the \$65,000 funding gap in Libby. Please note: the balance after transfers is around \$37,000 which will remain in the Holding PIN). We will iron out the details when the final figures are in.

10. **Finalize agenda for Policy Committee's May Meeting.** After some discussion, it was decided that the items on the May agenda would be: Select officers for Policy Committee for next year; Steve Landry to present his traffic movement policy change concepts; Accept Executive Director's Report; and Report on Highway Simplification Study. It was decided that a special meeting be held in June to do the Executive Committee check in so that current members as well as new members could attend. We want to be sure that all new members are in attendance at the meeting for the hand-off. Judy stated that we are losing a lot of institutional memory when this Executive Committee is done, so a hand-off will be a good idea. She complimented the Executive Committee for the work they've done to date. The Executive Director's review would also be moved to June so that we can get feedback from current members.

On May 26<sup>th</sup> there will be a sounding board meeting on the Highway Simplification Study.

11. **Reschedule June meeting.** Kathi will not be available on June 1<sup>st</sup> and neither will John Duncan. It was suggested that the June meeting be held on June 8<sup>th</sup>. There was concern that we may not know who the new Executive Committee representatives will be because the Planning and Technical Committees aren't meeting in May. Bob Burns expressed his concern about the lack of Technical Committee meetings. Kathi noted that we have a number of items from today's agenda that we didn't get to so we will need a June meeting. We will confirm via e-mail what the June date will be. We will also confirm a Chair for each of the Committees prior to the June meeting. The June 8<sup>th</sup> meeting will include the items that we didn't get to today: 2012/2013 TIP Priority Setting Status; Status Report on our two-year UPWP; Updates from Staff and Committees; the Executive Committee hand-off and Check-in; and the Executive Director review.
12. **Adjourn.** The meeting adjourned at 10:15 a.m.

## **Agenda Item 4: Executive Committee Process**

- A. A review of the first two years
- B. The year ahead at PACTS
- C. Finalize a memorandum to the Policy Committee

### **A. Review of the first two years by existing members and staff for incoming members**

The first two years of the Executive Committee have gone very well. The memoranda and minutes below show the following:

- Last month's staff memo and meeting minutes
- The March 2009 review of the Executive Committee
- The Executive Committee in the PACTS Bylaws
- This year's Executive Committee activities

### **Staff memo in May 2010 Executive Committee meeting packet**

Recommendation: Forward comments to the Policy Committee

We are coming to the end of the second year of the Executive Committee. Last spring the Policy Committee's first review was positive, and the members asked for an annual check-in.

Staff feels that the process is going very well. The Policy Committee is meeting less often, is able to focus on larger issues, and is relying on the good work of the Executive Committee.

One of the reasons for creating the Executive Committee was to foster more interaction between our various committees. While we see this being achieved to some extent in the Executive Committee process, we think that this is being achieved at least as much through our numerous joint committee meetings.

On July 1<sup>st</sup> we will welcome four new members – replacements for Greg, Bill, Bob and Ed. The new membership will surely bring fresh ideas to the process.

Finally, staff periodically considers suggesting new authority for the Executive Committee – but the ideas remain on the backburner. More on that later!

### **Minutes of May 2010 Executive Committee Meeting (draft)**

*Executive Committee Process Check-In.* John D. provided some background. Regarding considering new authority for the Executive Committee (last paragraph of memo), John explained that in some cases it would be helpful if the Executive Committee could have the authority to approve things like TIP amendments and other housekeeping issues. The concern was that the one thing that we don't bring to the

Policy Committee would be the one thing that they would want to see. Additionally, the Executive Committee doesn't have representatives from all communities like the Policy Committee does. It was suggested that we take a look at the Policy Committee agendas from the past year and see if there were housekeeping issues that could have been addressed by the Executive Committee. It was mentioned that it was very valuable when Scarborough representatives presented the Dunstan Corner project to the Executive Committee. Although it was a lengthy presentation, it provided the Executive Committee with the ability to more easily explain the situation to the Policy Committee thus saving a lot of the Policy Committee's time. We will look to the Policy Committee for input on this issue.

### **Minutes of March 2009 Policy Committee Meeting**

*Assessment of the Executive Committee Process:* Although there had been many initial reservations about the formation of the Executive Committee, it was the consensus of the Policy Committee that the Executive Committee format has been working out quite well. It was recommended that a check-in be done once a year.

### **March 2009 Memo to Policy Committee on first annual review of Exec. Committee**

Member Resources: Executive Committee

Staff Resources: John Duncan

Recommendation: To continue with the Executive Committee, and to direct staff and the members to recommend in May some additional responsibilities for the Committee (such as roles in amending our 2-year planning and administration budget, and developing it (like this spring)). (*June 2010 note: we did not do the latter.*)

### **Background**

The Policy Committee created the Executive Committee last April, and directed that a review of the new committee process be done in March 2009. The Executive Committee has met almost monthly since last July 1<sup>st</sup>. We are getting excellent attendance and the meetings go well. The members held a good review of the process earlier this month. See Article VI of our bylaws on the next page for the committee's functions and powers.

Our Executive Committee process is the product of the two retreats in late 2007 and the work of a "Transition Team". The consensus last spring was that:

- The primary purposes of the proposed Executive Committee are to coordinate more the work of our four standing committees, and to take care of certain details so that the Policy Committee can work on bigger issues and, perhaps, meet less often than in the past.

- The proposed Executive Committee will have little authority.
- The primary purpose of the Transit, Planning and Technical Committees having seats on the Executive Committee is as liaisons between our committees.

John Duncan's thoughts on the process are:

- It seems to be working well. Staff enjoys the inter-committee exchange.
- It is helpful that the Executive Committee can take certain TIP amendment actions.
- The Executive Committee members know more about the work of the other PACTS Committees. *Does this mean that the sixty other committee members know more?*
- It's more meetings for staff to prepare for, but it's doable. *It's more PACTS meetings for Executive Committee members to attend!*
- The Policy Committee is meeting more often than we estimated – four times so far this fiscal year, and probably three more times (March, May and the annual meeting in June).
- *Are the Policy Committee meetings more about broader policy topics than in the past? Are the members more confident in their work knowing that the Executive Committee has vetted the topics? Are Policy Committee meetings more efficient due to the "just do it" approach taken by staff this year?*
- I have not heard any comments from members on the pros or cons of the Executive Committee.

## **ARTICLE VI of the PACTS Bylaws**

### **Executive Committee**

**Section 1.** The Executive Committee shall have the following functions and powers:

1. To meet with staff to organize Policy Committee meetings and to coordinate the work of the PACTS committees.
2. To offer recommendations for action to the Policy Committee.
3. To make the following TIP project changes:
  - a. To revise the scope of work of funded MPO Allocation and FTA-funded projects as long as the amendments do not increase the PACTS contribution to those projects,
  - b. To endorse project substitution proposals per the PACTS Project Substitution policy,
  - c. To revise the PACTS TIP in order to fix administrative errors,
  - d. To add, delete or change other FHWA-funded and FTA-funded projects as requested by MaineDOT
4. To perform the annual evaluation of the Executive Director and report to the Policy Committee.
5. To appoint “appointees” to the Planning, Transit and Technical Committees (per Article III, Section 3)
6. To take on other responsibilities as requested by the Policy Committee.

**Section 2.** The membership of the Executive Committee shall be as follows:

1. The Chairperson of the Policy Committee,
2. The Vice Chairperson of the Policy Committee,
3. The Immediate Past Chairperson of the Policy Committee,
4. The Chairperson, or a designated member, of the Transit Committee,
5. The Chairperson, or a designated member, of the Planning Committee, and
6. The Chairperson, or a designated member, of the Technical Committee

**Section 3.** Attendance by four members shall constitute a quorum. Members may not send substitutes to meetings.

**Section 4.** Each member shall have one vote. However, the members shall strive to make decisions through consensus rather than by voting.

**Section 5.** The Executive Committee shall meet monthly, or as needed.

## This Year's Executive Committee Activities

Here is a snapshot of the Committee's work since July 2009.

### Executive Committee Activities July 2009 to June 2010

<u>Agenda Items</u>	<u>July</u>	<u>Aug</u>	<u>Oct</u>	<u>Nov</u>	<u>Dec</u>	<u>Jan</u>	<u>Mar</u>	<u>May</u>	<u>June</u>
Finalize Policy agenda	na	Yes	Yes	Yes	na	Yes	Yes	Yes	na
Member updates	Yes	Yes	No time	Yes	Yes	No time	Yes	No time	Yes
Staff updates*	Yes	Yes	No time	Yes	Yes	No time	Yes	No time	Yes
MDOT TIP request	Action				Action	Action	5 actions	Action	
Project substitution			2 actions						
Project scope amendment								Action	
TIP 2010-2013 process	Briefing								
3-Party Agreement	Briefing		Briefing		Briefing				
Languishing projects		Briefing							
TIP Policies/Procedures			Briefing						
PACTS Credit Program				Special mtg.		Briefing	Briefing		
Transit Committee Holding PIN				Briefing					
Dunstan Corner project					Briefing	Briefing			
Holding PIN status						Briefing			
FY '11 Congressional earmarks						Briefing			
FTA 5307 formula revision							Briefing		
2012/2013 TIP process status								No time	Briefing
BACTS finance report		Briefing							
MDOT Highway Simplification Study							Briefing	No time	
MPO's forum in Auburn			Briefing						
Explore raise fuel tax **		Discuss							
Articulate needs meeting			Briefing						
PACTS media activities					Briefing	Briefing			
PACTS video presentation							Briefing		
MDOT Commissioner meeting			Briefing						
Appointments to committees			Action						
Review Exec Committee process								Discuss	Discuss
Spend \$6,400 for model		Briefing							
Regional aerial photo flight				Briefing					
Amend the planning budget (UPWP)						Briefing			
Status report on UPWP									Briefing

\* Includes project administrative actions by staff.

\*\* Not an agenda item, but members and staff discussed at length.

## **B. The Year Ahead at PACTS**

Staff looks forward to an exciting year of planning, projects and policy work. Here is a snapshot in order to help members prepare for it.

### Planning Topics

1. Participate in developing the final recommendations, and then endorse this fall the Gorham East West Corridor feasibility study being done by the Turnpike Authority and MaineDOT.
2. Complete the internal process and public outreach process necessary to adopt an *Update of our Destination Tomorrow* regional transportation plan in December.
3. Collaborate with GPCOG and others in submitting a planning grant application (\$1 million?) under the HUD/EPA/DOT Sustainable Communities program, and then participate in the effort is awarded the planning grant.
4. Initiate our regional “Transit Focused Region” planning effort.
5. Prepare another PACTS video?
6. Various staff roles in studies led by PACTS, MaineDOT and GPCOG.

### Projects Topics

1. Program funds under our new Credit Program.
2. Complete the scoping and priority setting this summer in order to adopt in October our \$15 million list of “MPO Allocation” projects for the upcoming biennium. This will involve enhanced project scoping and many other staff activities.
3. Review/revise our High Priority Project proposals?
4. Staff monitor prospects for Congressional funding of FY '11 earmark requests.

### Policy Topics

1. Consider the recently articulated interest in more regular meetings of the Planning and Technical Committees. Perhaps this is a topic for today.
2. Continue our input to MaineDOT’s Highway Simplification Study.
3. Investigate opportunities for regional oversight/management of traffic signals (per the consensus of our traffic signals working group).
4. Adopt next spring a 2-year PACTS planning and administration budget (our “UPWP”) for July 2011 to June 2013.

### C. Finalize Memorandum to the Policy Committee

*The following is a draft memorandum for the July Policy Committee meeting.*

Member Resources: Executive Committee

Staff Resource: John Duncan

#### Recommendations:

To thank the six members and staff for making the first two years of the Executive Committee exactly what the Policy Committee envisioned, and to thank these individuals:

- The outgoing members, Bill Shane, Greg Tansley, Ed Clifford and Bob Burns, for their two years of professional work to make the new Committee a vital part of the PACTS process.
- John Bubier and Kathi Earley for their continued leadership.
- The incoming members, Dan Bacon, Albert Presgraves, Sara Trafton and Nathan Poore, for accepting the responsibility for the next two years.

#### Background

The Policy Committee created the Executive Committee in 2008 with the intent that:

- The primary purposes of the proposed Executive Committee were to coordinate more the work of our four standing committees, and to take care of certain details so that the Policy Committee can work on bigger issues and, perhaps, meet less often than in the past.
- The proposed Executive Committee would have little authority.
- The primary purpose of the Transit, Planning and Technical Committees having seats on the Executive Committee was as liaisons between our committees.

The consensus in March 2009 was that the Executive Committee format was working out quite well, and that a check-in be done once a year.

Last month the outgoing and incoming members met for a “hand off”.

- *Say something about today’s discussion (June 8<sup>th</sup>).*
- *Include the table on activities of the past year.*
- *Include the “year ahead at PACTS” from prior page.*
- *Include a copy of the bylaws regarding the Executive Committee.*

## **Agenda Item 5: Status Report on 2012/2013 TIP Priorities**

Staff Resource: John, Paul, Carl and Steve

Recommendation: Forward report to Policy Committee

### **Background**

#### 1. Budget estimates for MPO Allocation for 2012/2013 biennium

Last fall we adopted a \$15,000,000 budget – slightly more than the \$14,600,000 that we programmed two years ago for the 2010/2011 biennium. Staff wishes to advise members that MaineDOT’s current estimate for federal funding available for the 2012/2013 biennium is the same as for the 2010/2011 biennium, *so our \$15,000,000 estimate might be high.*

Staff is comfortable for now with this relatively small difference because we can make final adjustments between Set Asides as we approach October, and we might have Holding PIN funds available to fill a gap between the current budget and the actual funding available.

We cannot determine the actual total amount that we program (federal funds plus match) until October when we decide how much to program at the three different match ratios that we use for NHS, STP and STP Transit projects.

#### 2. Collector Road Projects (\$8.55 million budget)

Paul is working with Gorrill-Palmer on a recently received draft update of our Regional Collector Roads Study. He and the Technical Committee and MaineDOT will use the results this summer to develop a list of projects for programming by the Policy Committee this fall. The process will be:

- Technical Committee to present a short list of proposals (for field review this summer by MaineDOT and municipalities) for endorsement by the Policy Committee in July.
- Field review work in July and August.
- Technical Committee finalize list of proposals for programming by the Policy Committee in September or October (deadline).

3. Bike/Ped Projects (\$600,000 budget)

In March, the Policy Committee endorsed a short list of proposals to undergo further scoping (EPS). We have hired Sebago Technics to do the EPS work. Draft EPS reports are due this month. The process will be:

- On July 13<sup>th</sup> the Technical and Planning Committees jointly will recommend to the Policy Committee a set of projects to be field reviewed.
- Policy Committee final programming action in October.

4. Rebuild Roads (\$1,500,000 budget)

Paul and Carl are scored the proposals, and submitted to the Policy Committee a short list of proposals for EPS to be done this summer. On May 20<sup>th</sup> the Policy Committee chose three proposals for which EPS will be done (being done by Gorrill-Palmer).

Like Bike/Ped above, the process will be:

- On July 13<sup>th</sup> the Technical and Planning Committees jointly will recommend to the Policy Committee a set of projects to be field reviewed.
- Policy Committee final programming action in October.

5. Intersections (\$3,000,000 budget)

We are going to use the entire amount (plus) on the Dunstan Corner project per the Policy Committee vote in January.

6. STP Transit Capital Projects (\$1,350,000 budget)

Steve Linnell and the Transit Committee are working on this.

PACTS Credit Program Update

Paul and John are reviewing four proposals for funding under our Credit Program, including the Cape Elizabeth proposal which John forgot to mention in the recent Policy Committee meeting packet. Paul is going to connect with Bob Malley, the Cape Elizabeth Public Works Director, on his initial assessment of the Cape Elizabeth proposal this week.

Paul can give the Executive Committee more info on his work today if there is interest.

## **Agenda Item 6: Status Report on our 2-Year UPWP**

Staff Resource: John Duncan

Recommendation: Accept report today, and develop recommendation at our July meeting for consideration by the Policy Committee on July 15<sup>th</sup>.

### **Background**

July 1<sup>st</sup> will be the mid-point of our 2-year Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) for planning and administration of the PACTS process. See the table on page 16 for details.

We have at least \$55,000 to reallocate – and conceivably more than that based on an update on the Portland budget for the coming year. See suggestions on the next page.

During the past year the following PACTS local studies have not started due to local staff time constraints and/or local match uncertainty:

- Forest Avenue land use and transportation study
- Congress Street Bus Priority study (funded with FTA funds – not FHWA funds)
- Windham Comprehensive Transportation Study (RFP to be sent soon)
- Franklin Street Phase II (RFP to be sent soon)

In 2006 the Policy Committee adopted the following “study time clock” policy in order to ensure that funded studies get done on a timely basis:

1. Study proponents will work to start each PACTS-funded study within a year of adoption of the PACTS UPWP. If a year passes without the signing of a consultant contract, then the study proponent will provide monthly progress updates to PACTS staff. ***If 18 months passes without the signing of a consultant contract, then the Policy Committee will withdraw the funding.*** The definition of “start” is the signing of a contract with a consultant. The 18-month clock starts on the date of adoption of the PACTS planning budget.
2. This policy also applies to consultant studies added to the PACTS planning budget at other times during future biennia.
3. After the withdrawal of funds, the study proponent is eligible to submit the study proposal for funding in the next PACTS planning budget.
4. The Policy Committee may make exceptions to this policy for good cause.

Looking ahead to future funding of the PACTS process it is good to be aware that MaineDOT has some authority regarding how much federal money comes our way each biennium for planning and administration. If we find ourselves in a position in the future where we want to ask MaineDOT to provide us with additional federal planning funds we would have difficulty convincing MaineDOT if we have significantly under spent our planning funds in prior biennia.

## Options for Reallocating \$55,000 (or more?) for New Study Efforts

1. A \$14,000 proposal from the Bicycle Coalition of Maine for a Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Promotion Initiative

We have a 2-page proposal for a \$40,000 proposal to be jointly supported by PACTS, MaineDOT and Cumberland County. We will share it for your July meeting discussion.

2. A \$7,000 PACTS staff proposal to do a second PACTS video

We propose to hire a video producer (go out to bid locally this time) to prepare a video on the transportation and other benefits of a compact regional growth pattern. Our first video (February 2010) is being shown on ten local community television stations and is on the web. It is a great way to promote the work of PACTS and the content in the video.

We welcome your suggestions for topics. We also propose to do a third video next year.

3. A \$10,000 PACTS staff proposal to develop roadway safety improvement proposals

We proposed to hire an engineering firm that would develop concept proposals for submission to MaineDOT for federal safety funding. In 2007 Julia Dawson (PACTS staff) took a class on safety analysis, and then collaborated with MaineDOT staff and our municipal members to develop seven concept proposals. MaineDOT funded four of the proposals – a very good ratio!

4. Increase the PACTS contribution to a regional aerial photo flight in 2011

Our budget has \$20,000 in the budget. GPCOG staff and Paul Niehoff have been working with many municipalities and agencies to try to organize a regional flight. The interest has been generally low.

5. Fund 2009 study proposals that we did not fund in this current UPWP

These proposals were submitted in February 2009. We do not know if the proponents still want to do them. They are listed in order of Planning Committee priority:

- \$20,000: Implementation of the Portland TDM ordinance
- \$40,000: Scarborough Oak Hill pedestrian plan
- \$25,000: Windham alternative funding study
- \$53,600: Windham parallel service road III
- \$50,000: CBITD multi-modal transit hub

6. Solicit new ideas from our members – Self-explanatory.

## June 3, 2010 Status of the PACTS Planning/Administration Budget

<u>Budget Items</u>	<u>Budget</u>	<u>Current Estimate</u>	<u>Change Estimate</u>	<u>Comments</u>
PACTS Staff and GPCOG support	\$989,000	\$989,000	\$0	
Maine Clean Communities	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$0	
SMRPC Planning Services	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$0	
GPCOG Planning Services	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$0	
PACTS Model Consultant	\$43,459	\$43,459	\$0	
Portland Forest Avenue	\$100,000	Local match?		Best case is spend \$50,000 by June 2011?
Portland Franklin Street	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$0	RFP send in summer.
Portland Congress St. Bus Priority	\$55,000	\$55,000	\$0	Note 1.
Regional Aerial Photo Flight	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$0	Do by Spring 2011???
Regional Collector Study II	\$20,000	\$10,000	-\$10,000	Draft report under review.
Regional Dest. Tomorrow Update	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$0	Developing a scope.
Regional Enhanced Project Scoping	\$25,000	\$20,000	-\$5,000	
Regional Signal Study II	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$0	
Regional Transit Focused Initiative	\$40,000	\$40,000	\$0	Hired Nelson-Nygaard team.
Regional Urban Finance Study	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$0	\$4,200 spent so far.
Simplification MPO's/MaineDOT	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$0	Melrose...spent \$14k so far.
Windham Comp. Transpo. Study	\$40,000	\$40,000	\$0	RFP send soon.
Yarmouth Route One Phase III	<u>\$40,000</u>	\$40,000	\$0	Hired Gorrill-Palmer
Pre-Carryover Subtotal	\$1,642,459	\$1,527,459	<b>-\$15,000</b>	
<u>Carryover from 2008/2009 UPWP</u>	<u>Note 2</u>	<u>Note 3</u>		
Portland Libbytown Trail	\$2,000	\$1,765	-\$235	
Regional Bike/Ped Plan Update	\$5,000	\$4,669	-\$331	
Regional Planning Software	\$16,000	\$0	-\$16,000	No longer a priority.
Regional Signal Study I	\$28,500	\$26,966	-\$1,534	
Regional Traffic Counts	\$16,000	\$16,000	\$0	Scope being developed.
Scarborough Running Hill Road	\$13,000	\$4,600	-\$8,400	
TIF TOD Outreach	\$2,000	\$1,954	-\$46	
Transit Bus Route Study	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$0	RFP sent recently.
Transit Regional Ride Guide	\$3,000	\$0	-\$3,000	
Tri-Community Transportation Plan	\$53,290	\$48,702	-\$4,588	
Veterans Bridge Facilitation	\$3,000	\$750	-\$2,250	
Westbrook Downtown Streetscape	\$2,210	\$0	-\$2,210	
Windham Route 302 Study	<u>\$3,000</u>	<u>\$645</u>	<u>-\$2,355</u>	
Carryover Subtotal	\$177,000	\$136,051	<b>-\$40,949</b>	
Total	\$1,819,459	\$1,663,510	<b>-\$155,949</b>	Available to reallocate

### Notes

1. This is funded with FTA funds. All other line items on this page are FHWA-funded.
2. These budget amounts are April 2009 estimates to finish these studies after June 2009.
3. These are revised estimates based on actual expenses before July 2009 and since.

### Staff ideas for reallocation of planning funds

- \$14,000 Bicycle Coalition of Maine proposal
- \$7,000 PACTS Video 2: The transpo and other benefits of compact regional growth pattern.
- \$10,000 Hire consultant to scope proposals to MaineDOT for Safety funding in next biennium.
- Increase PACTS \$\$ for aerial photo flight in Spring 2011.
- See narrative for unfunded study proposals from Spring of 2009.
- Solicit our members for new ideas.

## **Agenda Item 7: Updates from Staff and Committees**

### Topics from Members

1. Planning, Transit and Technical Committees have elected new officers for the next two years as follows:
  - Planning Chair and Vice Chair: Dan Bacon and Brooks More
  - Technical Chair and Vice Chair: Dan Jellis and Angela Blanchette (Election to be on July 13<sup>th</sup>)
  - Transit Chair and Vice Chair: Sara Trafton and Hank Berg
2. Planning and Transit Committees met jointly last week for a MaineDOT presentation on the Portland North Bus/Rail Study and other topics. The Transit Committee will meet again two days from now.
3. Greg Tansley and study committee members met with staff and the consulting team last week to review a first draft final report for the Tri-Community Transportation Plan.
4. Kathi Earley and other members of our Regional Traffic Management System working group met recently with staff. The focus was on a proposal to regionalize traffic signals monitoring and management.
5. John Bubier, Kathi Earley and John Duncan met with Congresswoman Pingree's staff on May 4<sup>th</sup>.

### Draft Executive Committee agenda for July xx

1. Consider changes to the UPWP consultant budget
2. Updates on results of enhanced project scoping of finalist proposals for Bike/Ped Set Aside funding and Road Rebuild Set Aside funding
3. Update on Destination Tomorrow plan update.
4. Finalize agenda for Policy Committee meeting.

### Topics from Staff

- We will hold our annual meeting on June 14<sup>th</sup> at USM. We are very pleased that Kat Beaudoin and Conrad Welzel will speak on the innovative work underway in our region and around the state regarding linking the development of transportation projects and land use plans.
- We are writing the PACTS Annual Report, and will distribute it on June 14<sup>th</sup>.

- PACTS and GPCOG staff will attend nine (8) meetings this month (3 by phone) regarding the Gorham East West Corridor Study. Current study topics include:
  - Results of a Year 2035 regional transit scenario.
  - Study assumption regarding the impact of future fuel prices on Year 2035 regional travel demand.
  - Meeting with area real estate developers.
  - Develop list of Year 2035 roadway options to be evaluated.
- The PACTS video is being aired on ten (10) community television stations. Other stats include
  - 500 viewings on YouTube at the PACTS and other website
  - Linked in the recent Greater Portland Chamber newsletter
  - Article in the Forecaster
  - On websites of MBTA, MAST and PACTS.
- GPCOG and PACTS staff are still working with others to organize a \$1,000,000-plus study proposal under the HUD/EPA/DOT Sustainable Communities Planning Grant Program. Met with HUD Regional Administrator last week.
- We need to revisit our HPP proposals.
- PACTS and MaineDOT staff are working on these project administration topics:
  - Possible need to transfer funds between a Yarmouth project that has excess funds to a Yarmouth project that needs more money. Both projects are under the same contract. This “common sense” action would trump out project cap policy? It’s not a “substitution” per our policy, but it’s similar.
  - FHWA recently responded unfavorably to a MaineDOT/PACTS letter requesting that FHWA allow their funds to be used to pay for design work done on two projects dropped in 2009 by the Old Orchard Beach and Cape Elizabeth Town Councils.
- Other PACTS Staff activities:
  - Bike lane consistency presentation at multi-state ITE meeting here (Paul)
  - Reviewing draft 2010 Update of the PACTS Regional Collector Roads Study.
  - Webinar regarding the possible expansion of the PACTS region in 2012.
  - Veterans Bridge CSS meetings.
  - Coordinated meeting of Scarborough, South Portland, Saco, Eastern Trail Management District and others regarding a proposal to seek TIGER II planning funds.
  - On Martin’s Point Bridge replacement advisory committee.

- On Windham River Road CSS study advisory committee.
- MaineDOT/MBTA annual conference planning committee meeting
- MaineDOT Title VI administration meeting.
- Alternative Modes Group meeting led by Paul Niehoff.
- June 3<sup>rd</sup> forum on sustainability hosted by the Sierra Club and others
- Conference call with federal agencies inquiring about *our exceptionally good regional transportation plan*.

### **Agenda Item 8: July Policy Committee Agenda**

The Executive Committee will meet in July to finalize the Policy Committee agenda. Here is a draft.

1. Annual check-in on Executive Committee process
2. MaineDOT overview on Portland North Study process and recommendations, and the MaineDOT study regarding extension of Amtrak service to Lewiston/Auburn. By then MaineDOT may have selected a final alignment for which to request FTA design funding.
3. Status report on 2012/2013 TIP priority setting process, and endorsement of shorter short lists of Bike/Ped and Road Rebuild proposals for field review this summer with MaineDOT and municipalities, and endorsement of a short list of collector paving projects for field review also.
4. Amend our UPWP (based on further discussion at our July meeting)
5. Accept Executive Director's Report
6. Annual performance evaluation of the Executive Director

### **Agenda Item 9: Reschedule the July Meeting and consider dates/times for meetings of the Committee during the next two years**

Need to reschedule from July 6<sup>th</sup> to a new date? Kathi has a conflict? Nathan will be late?

The members could choose to meet at different times and dates during the next two years. The first Tuesday of each month has worked well for staff, but slightly later in the month would be fine. We would prefer to have at least a week between the meeting of the Executive Committee and the time to send out the Policy Committee meeting packet.

Also, do we want to reschedule the Policy Committee from July 15<sup>th</sup> to a later date such as the 22<sup>nd</sup>? The 15<sup>th</sup> is the third Thursday, but it comes quite early in the month relative to our other committee meetings.