

# PACTS

---

## Portland Area Comprehensive Transportation System

### Executive Committee

#### Meeting Notice

December 7, 2010

8:00 a.m. to 10:00 a.m.

GPCOG, 68 Marginal Way, Portland

#### Agenda

1. Call to order
2. Minutes of November 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting
3. The High Cost of Federally Funded Projects (8:05)
4. Update on Cumberland Mills Triangle Intersection Project (8:35)
5. Regional Traffic Management System (8:40)
6. Unified Planning Work Program Topics (8:50)
  - A. Reallocation of \$42,000 for Studies
  - B. Planning and Administration Overview Document
  - C. Bylaw Language Regarding UPWP Amendment Role
  - D. Amend UPWP for Franklin Street Corridor Study
7. PACTS Role in Convening of Regional Forums (9:20)
8. Destination Tomorrow Update (9:30)
9. Updates from Staff and Committees (9:45)
10. Adopt Policy Committee Meeting Schedule for 2011 and agenda for December Policy Committee meeting (9:55)
11. Public comment on topics not on today's agenda (10:00)
12. Adjourn

Next meeting: January 4<sup>th</sup> at 8:00 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](http://www.pactsplan.org)

## Minutes of November 2<sup>nd</sup> Meeting

**In Attendance:** Kathi Earley, Chair; Dan Bacon; John Bubier; Judy Harris; Al Presgraves

**Staff:** Maddy Adams; John Duncan; Carl Eppich; Paul Niehoff

- **Call to order.** Kathi called the meeting to order at 8:14.
- **Minutes of October 5, 2010 meeting.** By consensus, the minutes were approved as written.
- **Destination Tomorrow Update.** Carl reported that the public hearing held on October 28<sup>th</sup> went well, although only a handful of the public attended. The hearing was videotaped; DVDs will be distributed to public access channels. The video will also be posted on the PACTS web site. The public comment period for comments on the Plan ends on November 30<sup>th</sup>. A vote on the *Destination Tomorrow* Plan Update will be taken by the Policy Committee on December 16<sup>th</sup>.

Regarding remaining work to be done, Carl is working on Chapters 3 (the data chapter) and Chapter 6 (present conditions, trends, and future projections). After these two chapters are completed, the Executive Summary will be done. Please e-mail or call Carl regarding any regional projects that should be included. Judy mentioned that the Peninsula Transit Study is well along its way; an update will be available in December. Judy will provide Carl with the priorities from that study.

- **Status of two-year Planning/Administration Budget.** A breakdown of the status of the PACTS two-year UPWP was provided in a table on page 8 of the meeting packet. John D. mentioned that interstate highway incident management work is on the back burner at this point. GPCOG is planning to do an aerial flight in the spring of 2012 so we no longer need the \$20,000 that was budgeted for that in this UPWP. We are finished with EPS and there is money left over. We are also done with the Urban Finance Analysis. That would leave us with a total of \$37,000+ that we don't anticipate using. We would need to bring suggestions to the Policy Committee regarding allocation of those funds.

There are a few studies that didn't get funded – two are from Windham. There was also one from Casco Bay Lines regarding a transit hub (\$50,000). Paul suggested another idea would be to have a contract with the Bicycle Coalition of Maine to do some education. John B. said he didn't think the Melrose work was done. Regarding the aerial flight, he asked if we are comfortable that we will be able to fund it in the next cycle if we take it out now. That's a good product that the municipalities appreciate.

Judy asked why \$15,000 was needed for a *Destination Tomorrow* video. She felt the money could be better spent elsewhere. John B. pointed out that the use of videos is something that many people might take advantage of rather than looking at the report.

Biddeford has used them on their public access cable station to showcase the work of the region. Judy asked if PACTS has contemplated doing a webinar. People can't get to all the meetings so an interactive webinar might be a good idea. It would be a good educational tool since there are a lot of issues that the public doesn't understand.

Regarding carryover of funds, John D. explained that two years ago MaineDOT said that due to the tightening of federal funds, they need to limit the amount of money to be carried over because the money could be used on capital projects. We would be carrying over \$200,000 and the state will not allow that.

Al asked if we should be using the \$37,000 to fund projects that can be done right now rather than trying to carry the money over. Paul responded that we could enter into a contract with BCM fairly quickly. Planning funds can be used for Preliminary Design Reports (PDR) on capital projects. Kathi cautioned that we don't have any guarantees about future money. Regarding the Casco Bay transit hub project, Carl met with Steve Linnell yesterday about this. In 2009, this study ranked higher than the Windham studies but the previous Casco Bay Lines director was the one pushing for this project and he's not sure how the new director feels about it.

- **Preferred Alternative Modes of Transportation Group.** Paul explained that when he first came to PACTS, he found a lot of disparity among "alternative modes" groups. After speaking with a number of different people, he met with a group that ranges from advocates to municipal officials, Portland Trails, BCM, etc. The meetings are used pretty much as a communication tool. They provide an opportunity for everyone to be up to date on various projects. They talk about health, societal and other issues. The last meeting was in June.

The Committee thought what Paul was doing was great but they were concerned that he, as PACTS staff, was serving as the host of these meetings rather than just being a participant. We need to be clear that it is an informal group that is providing input to PACTS staff. It was also suggested that the meetings could be held elsewhere. Paul has found that the group is one of the best committees that he's been involved with and they have had very good discussions. One of the reasons this came about is because of Paul's interest and his feeling that PACTS is the regional transportation entity and should be coordinating this. He doesn't feel that he's in a leadership role; he is just trying to bring all the parties together in the same room.

There was some discussion about if MAST or Portland Trails would be better suited to lead a group such as this. Paul was concerned that these groups would be more focused on Portland while PACTS needs to be cognizant of all 15 members. Kathi said she was conflicted. She appreciates the need for the public to be heard but she is concerned that expectations are being set up. She likes the idea of open forums to help inform the region and the public. We should try to have the group structured with their own leadership and PACTS just be a participant. Kathi mentioned the Regional Bike/Ped Plan and that perhaps a group could be formed to deal with implementation of that plan. Al was concerned that this group might have a life of its own and

suggested that it not be given a name -- just make it an open meeting. Dan agreed that the intent of the group (coordination and education) is really good. We just need to be concerned about how it is framed. John D. said PACTS staff would report back in December with ideas/suggestions.

Kathi suggested the idea of a Lunch & Learn on the upcoming TIP; an invitation could be sent out to interested parties.

- **November 18<sup>th</sup> Policy Committee workshop with Turnpike Board.** John will be talking with Paul Violette and Sara Devlin later this morning regarding topics for this meeting. He reviewed the possible topics for discussion. John will be sending out invitations to Policy and Executive Committee members later today. There was some discussion about air emission standards and how we will be out of compliance.
- **Briefing of Legislators in December.** John D. provided background on past forums. Early December is a bad time for legislators so we were thinking about scheduling it for mid-December. John B. suggested Ocean Gateway as a better location than Scarborough.
- **PACTS Planning and Administration Document.** John D. has been working on a document; his outline was four pages and he was thinking of a 15-20 page document. The Committee agreed that shorter is better. A summary of how we set up the UPWP is in order; it should be short and concise.
- **Updates from Staff and Committees.** Item 1 deals with the local match issue. It might need more time for discussion at another meeting. Paul spoke about the timeline for match decisions and getting projects into a municipality's CIP. Item 4, TIP match, and current UPWP should be on the December meeting agenda for the Executive Committee.
- **Other Business.** None.
- **Public comment.** None
- **Adjourn.** The meeting adjourned at 10:04 a.m.

### **Agenda Item 3: The High Cost of Federally Funded Projects**

Staff Resource: Paul Niehoff and John Duncan

Recommendation: Discussion with Jim Gailey and Dana Anderson from South Portland

#### **Background**

At various times over the past few years the cost of federally funded projects has been and continues to be a concern.

During the 2008 construction season we discovered that the combination of underfunded projects, extremely high construction costs (mostly surrounding pavement prices), and federal and state standards resulted in canceling numerous projects – and some of those ultimately being completed by the local community. Given this “Perfect Storm” PACTS convened a working group of consisting of individuals from FHWA, MaineDOT, the four MPO’s, and a few of the PACTS Technical Committee members to review and discuss the cost concerns. We found it was very difficult to directly compare projects for numerous reasons in order to develop finite recommendations. However we did find there were already in-place flexibility in design(s) and a MaineDOT Design Exception process which we have utilized to complete projects with less impact to the corridor in which the projects were located.

Of late however, concerns of project costs including construction costs and the cost to manage the projects have come to the forefront again. Examples include the following:

- Jim Gailey and Dana Anderson are concerned with the estimated \$2,700,000 cost (for which their match requirement is \$675,000) for the Cummings Road project programmed by the Policy Committee in October. They feel that for the same cost or slightly more South Portland would be able to complete the project. We will hear more about this during our meeting.
- Another situation was when Falmouth completed a DOT designed project on Johnson Road in 2008 for \$988,200 when the DOT estimate at the time was \$1,750,000.
- Most recently Scarborough informed us that at the present time they are unable to fund the local \$54,250 match for the Pleasant Hill Road paving project. This begs a similar discussion about local match funding.

These examples are only some of the scenarios and discussions which have occurred over the past few years and we suspect these types of discussions will continue to occur. Staff feels strongly there is a need to further investigate potential avenues to improve efficiencies, project time to delivery and other ways to decrease project costs in their entirety while still obtaining a high quality project and an efficient project process.

MaineDOT has taken significant steps on these fronts in recent years. The design exception process mentioned above is just one. Another is that MaineDOT has reduced

its labor force dramatically. (Some would argue that this has forced a net cost increase due to the hiring of additional consultant services.) MaineDOT staff could enumerate other examples.

So where do we go from here? Paul Niehoff initiated the work group mentioned above in 2008. All parties learned a lot during that process, and MaineDOT has drafted a summary report which has not been finished yet. Here are some ideas to consider:

- Organize a meeting with MaineDOT leadership do discuss further ways to reduce the costs of project construction and management.
- Organize a meeting of the four MPO's on this subject.
- Just accept the situation, and make the best of it.
- Organize a process in which participants would learn more about MaineDOT's standards and procedures, and then compare those with New Hampshire's and/or other states' standards and procedures – and costs.
- Investigate the pros and cons of a local project administration function funded by PACTS. We had a dialogue on this two years ago.

#### **Agenda Item 4: Cumberland Mills Triangle Update**

Staff Resource: John Duncan

Recommendation: Recommend to the Policy Committee that the members withdraw the 2012/2013 biennium and 2014/2015 biennium commitments made in October for the design and construction of the Cumberland Mills Triangle intersection project.

#### **Background**

Several months ago MaineDOT asked us to consider funding the recommended improvements for Westbrook's Cumberland Mills Triangle from our Intersection Set Aside in the 2014/2015 biennium. That was a decision that we would typically make two years from now after soliciting proposals a year from now. MaineDOT's request related to coordination with the MaineDOT project to rebuild two nearby bridges.

Based on requests from Westbrook and MaineDOT, and a review of our 2008 list of unfunded Intersection Set Aside proposals, the Policy Committee chose to fund design work in the 2012/2013 biennium and construction in the 2014/2015 biennium.

However, MaineDOT has recently advised that they have done further traffic analysis for the bridge projects planning. Their new analysis shows that construction of the Cumberland Mills Triangle improvements would not generate enough additional traffic to warrant a widening of the two nearby bridges. As such, there is no compelling reason to fund the project now rather than two years from now as part of our normal process.

## **Agenda Item 5: Regional Traffic Management System**

Staff Resource: Carl Eppich

Recommendation: Recommend that the Policy Committee endorse the Regional Traffic Management System for Traffic Signals policy, and ask staff to present a UPWP budget proposal for implementation of the policy starting in July 2011.

### **Background**

In 2009, PACTS commissioned a study of signals along the busiest corridors in the region, and secured \$1.4 million in federal grants with local matches. The improvements include Brighton Avenue, Riverside Drive, Forest Avenue, and a portion of outer Congress Street in Portland/Westbrook. The RTMS also includes the signals in the vicinity of the Maine Mall in South Portland, and some adjacent signals in Scarborough. A second phase of the RTMS study will begin this winter in Biddeford and Saco.

On November 16<sup>th</sup> PACTS convened a meeting with the city managers from Portland, Scarborough, South Portland, and Westbrook on the subject of regional management and funding of the Regional Traffic Management System (RTMS) for signals. The managers reviewed a draft PACTS Policy and a draft Memorandum of Agreement and agreed to proceed, with some additions, after formal support from the PACTS Policy Committee for a PACTS “**RTMS Policy**”.

Organized below are the pieces for consideration of a PACTS policy for the regional traffic signals management. The pieces are:

1. Background on PACTS’s RTMS Planning Process
2. The general Goals of the proposal for a PACTS Policy on a Regional Traffic Management System for Traffic Signals
3. Benefits of a regional approach
4. **A DRAFT PACTS Policy** on a Regional Traffic Management System for Traffic Signals

### **1. Background on PACTS’s Regional Approach to signals management**

Since February of 2009, a subcommittee of PACTS Technical and Policy Committees has been working to develop a Regional Traffic (signal) Management System (RTMS). This high-priority project was identified in PACTS’ long-range plan *Destination Tomorrow* as Strategy #48, the coordination of traffic signals. This strategy was developed recognizing that vehicular traffic congestion along major arterial and other corridors in the region, increase commuting times, contribute to poor air quality, and threaten economic productivity. Projections suggest that by the year 2035, the average commuter will spend **25% more time stuck in congested traffic** over today. What this means is a trip that takes 30 minutes today, will take closer to 38 minutes. In addition to

increases in fuel costs, this will be an additional burden on workers, and the efficiency of the regional economy.

Recognizing that major physical capacity increases such as roadway widening is prohibitively costly, the Policy Committee has been strongly supportive of traffic signal coordination which reduces delay by increasing “green time” and synchronizing signal lights along a corridor to facilitate vehicle movement along corridors. This is known as signal system optimization.

PACTS commissioned Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc (VHB) to develop a first phase RTMS plan for arterial corridors, most of which lead toward the center of Portland. This study was completed in December of 2009 and includes a *priority* ranking of projects along 6 corridors, primarily in Portland but connecting into Scarborough and Westbrook. The major coordinated signal system already in place in the vicinity of the Maine Mall, primarily in South Portland but also partially located in Scarborough, is also a logical extension and connection to be made to the RTMS.

The RTMS plan identified an investment need of \$7,275,000 for the complete development of an Advanced Centralized Control System with High Speed Communication and Automated System Control Decision Making capabilities, necessary to optimize the capacity of our existing roadways on these six corridors. Since May of 2009, the subcommittee with the assistance of PACTS staff has been successful in securing *over \$1.4 million towards this effort outside of our biannual MPO allocation.*

The PACTS RTMS plan identified at least a 12% order of magnitude improvement over current levels in reduced fuel consumption and vehicle emissions, associated with a decrease vehicle in stop delay resulting in improved (shortened) travel time during commutes.

## **2. Goals of this proposal:**

The goal of this proposal is for the four communities to partner:

- (1) On the standardization of traffic signal hardware and software;
- (2) To monitor and maintain regionally our investments in signal equipment and optimization;
- (3) To centrally collect traffic data for intersections at established regular intervals;
- (4) To partially fund maintenance of signals regionally through PACTS 80:20 federal:local available funds,
- (5) By doing so to be better positioned to access other available funds through Maine DOT programs.
- (6) On a more comprehensive homeland security enablement.
- (7) To enable bus transit priority (extended green light time) assisting in on-time reliability.

## **3. Benefits of a regional approach**

- a. **Current costs for each municipality versus anticipated costs through regional cost-sharing. – SAVINGS through 80%:20% Federal and local funding**

- e.g. Signal hardware/software compatibility and cooperative purchasing cost savings  
Better, coordinated, and planned capital and maintenance maintaining optimal operations
- b. **Signals will be maintained and not lose their operational capacity efficiency – support investments**
  - c. **Will improve air quality**
  - d. **Will better manage growth of system**
  - e. **Will help to avoid situations where DOT must fix signals and bill municipalities for work under new rules.**
  - f. **Will help with the regional Traffic Movement Permit being developed by MDOT.**
  - g. **Will provide a single point of contact for signal issues coordination.**
  - h. **Has proven to reduce crashes along corridors where it has been implemented in Maine. (MaineDOT has documented).**
  - i. **Improved safety may allow access to State “Safety Funds” for further implementation.**

### Draft PACTS Policy on a Regional Traffic Management System for Traffic Signals

The Portland Area Comprehensive Transportation System (PACTS), through its Policy and Technical Committees, has been tasked to manage a Regional Traffic Management System [RTMS] for traffic signals and their associated hardware and software for the four PACTS RTMS member communities of Portland, Scarborough, South Portland, and Westbrook. This is strategy (#48) of PACTS regional transportation plan *Destination Tomorrow*.

Through this partnership PACTS and the four RTMS member communities will coordinate through a subcommittee of the PACTS Technical Committee known as the *RTMS Committee*, continuity of regional traffic signal operations, maintenance, and investments. This continuity will allow PACTS and the four RTMS member communities assurance of reliable and consistent traffic patterns and that traffic movements occur in the most effective and efficient manner, minimizing congestion as much as possible with available resources. Other PACTS municipalities may join the PACTS RTMS with a developed RTMS plan and application through the PACTS *RTMS Committee*.

A computerized system (hardware and software) has been purchased and designed to monitor and interact with all intersections controlled by traffic signals as approved by the municipalities as connections to them are created. This system is located, maintained, and managed at the Western Fire Station in South Portland with oversight provided by the PACTS RTMS Committee.

Goals for PACTS and RTMS member communities is to standardize:

- the types of signal control heads,
- associated controllers and hardware,

- compatibility with the current or future software program(s) and,
- the methods to be used and that are compatible with current and future software program(s).

Goals for PACTS and the RTMS member communities is to:

- provide a portion of the needed dedicated funding for the ongoing operations and maintenance for signals,
- provide a portion of the necessary dedicated funding for associated equipment at intersections and along corridors in which PACTS has investments and,
- monitor and maintain regionally our investments in signal equipment and optimization.

It is the intent of this policy to develop consistent policies and methods to be used on a regularly established basis within the PACTS region for the regional centralized monitoring of congestion and traffic flows and to determine if the signal timings at intersections with investments through PACTS are maintaining the efficient movement of vehicular and pedestrian traffic and to make timely corrections to maintain the continuity of regional traffic signal operations.

The responsibilities for the Regional Traffic Management System (RTMS) are broken down as follows:

- **The RTMS Committee**, having been created by the PACTS Technical Committee will be responsible for:
  - (1) Continuous evaluation of signal operations, maintenance and investment needs of PACTS signal investments for the RTMS member communities.
  - (2) Advising preferred hardware improvement standards and providing direction to the PACTS Staff on improvements that can be made to the Regional Traffic Management System (RTMS).
  - (3) Prioritize intersection traffic signal upgrade recommendations for funding
  - (4) Develop a list of biannual RTMS project priorities and make a recommendation for PACTS UPWP funding to the Technical Committee.
- **The PACTS Policy Committee** will review biannual RTMS maintenance, operations, and investment recommendations and associated funding recommendations through PACTS' biannual Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP).
- **Municipalities** are responsible for maintenance of hardware, emergency response, and all costs or fees required for maintaining signal operations continuously, which may include but not be limited to electrical and network connections. In the event of a traffic signal failure, it will be the community's responsibility to respond to the outage. Traffic signal failures should be reported to the communities or emergency dispatchers as applicable. If

required, any and all physical repairs will be performed by the owner of the traffic signal; the Maine Department of Transportation or with the municipality in which the problem lies, as applicable. Municipalities are responsible for insuring that any additions or changes to the signal systems resulting from developments in their community meet the equipment hardware specifications established by the *RTMS Committee* for compatibility with traffic signal software. Municipalities are responsible for providing representation on the *RTMS Committee* to ensure that issues are communicated and decisions made with consensus network wide.

- The PACTS Staff is responsible for staffing and working with the above mentioned PACTS Committees on RTMS maintenance and operation, as well as investments. PACTS Staff will also be responsible for coordinating and administering-as necessary through the UPWP, the hiring of appropriate consultants for developing, reviewing, recommending, and implementing timing, synchronization, providing traffic counting and monitoring of traffic movement patterns for planning, problem solving and other statistical purposes, and all other tasks related to the operational input of traffic signals for PACTS in the RTMS communities. PACTS will keep historical data of such records.
- Governance of the RTMS Committee will be by consensus, or if consensus can not be reached and a vote must be taken, by a vote with each community having one (1) vote. Tie votes are resolved by a vote of the Policy Committee.

All traffic signal timing problems and concerns should be directed to PACTS and the RTMS Committee and brought forward to representatives of RTMS Committee. Changes made to signal equipment that will impact other communities or operations will be reported to the PACTS Staff and the *RTMS Committee*.

### **Initial Cost Estimate for RTMS System Management for the Coming Two Years**

We asked Steve Sawyer PE of Sebago Technics for an idea of the costs associated with the RTMS system management and operations over the coming two-year period of the UPWP. The communications below suggest that \$100,000 would be an appropriate amount to budget for the biennium:

Carl –

62 signals could equate to 1 full time engineer.

The Maine Mall and Knightville system has 34 signals in it with two coordinated corridors involving 25 coordinated signals and 9 isolated signals. We also will be putting William Clarke Drive on line next summer with 6 signals and 1 coordinated corridor. Brighton Ave is 13 with one coordinated corridor. Riverside has one coordinated

corridor and 6 signals. I assume that all 8 Congress Street signals are coordinated. This totals 67 – 9 isolated and 58 coordinated. Using my numbers I would budget (58 x \$1100 = \$63,800 plus 9 x \$250 = \$2,250 for a total of \$66,050). Year one will involve some organizational set up that won't be necessary in later years, but anything new will take some time to get in place. Therefore, I guess the number should be \$75-85K maybe as high as \$100K depending on the political will to cooperate. Is this what you were thinking?

Sincerely,

Steve Sawyer  
Vice President, Transportation Services  
Sebago Technics, Inc.

**From:** Carl Eppich [mailto:ceppich@gpcog.org]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, November 30, 2010 11:15 AM  
**To:** Steve Sawyer  
**Cc:** John Adams  
**Subject:** RE: PACTS regional Signals funding

Steve-

This is great satisfies most of our question.  
My follow up would be the following.

We have 28 (?) signal intersections at the Maine Mall, plus 5(?) in Knightville Brighton Ave will have 13 up and running coordinated theoretically next year. Theoretically, there will be another 12-13 on Forest, 6 on Riverside, and 8 on Congress Street between Spring and Cummings the Skyline Drive signals, all the way to International Parkway. (Jetport)  
We are budgeting for July 2011 through June 2013. Now most of this system will be brand new, so not sure about the intensity that will be required - should be minimal.

So that would add up to about 62 signals in the RTMS to be maintained.  
What would be an appropriate amount to budget, considering much of the system is new, and won't be online until at least 2012? I have an idea, but want to see if we are in the same ballpark.

Thanks,

-Carl

Here's the one-page summary Steve also provided from Carl's initial inquiry:

**Staffing for Traffic Signal Maintenance and Operations  
November 30, 2010**

Published research indicates that typical staffing needs for agencies that oversee traffic signal maintenance and operations depends on the size of the systems (number of signals) and the geographic distribution of the signal locations. The person responsible for traffic

system engineering (planning, system operations, equipment selection, and signal timing) should have professional engineering (PE) registration and should preferably have professional traffic operations engineer (PTOE) certification. 1 General findings are as follows:

1. One Engineer per 75-100 traffic signals, one Technician per 30-40 traffic signals<sup>2</sup>
2. One Technician per 40-50 traffic signals<sup>3</sup>

The above ratios were derived from a survey of systems where the number of signals exceeded 150.

Signals should be retimed every 30-36 months.

The current direct salary cost for an experienced PE with a PTOE is probably \$70-80K, not including benefits.

The above staffing levels represent the condition after a system is set-up and running. The initial start-up would involve more effort and expense, but likely would be covered as part of the capital cost, and not considered as an operational expense. For example, ATRC has one engineer for their system that will ultimately contain 80 signals. They retained a less experienced engineer and thus are supporting this individual with an on-call consulting services contract that this year is \$20K. However, it should be understood that this amount is likely not sufficient because the system is not fully set-up and running and therefore is demanding more effort than should be expected post-construction. In addition, the initial system does not contain the full 80 signals – only about 35.

Other local experience suggests that roughly \$1100 per intersection per year for signals in coordination is a good budgetary number for consulting services to monitor and manage system operations in lieu of in-house staffing. Isolated intersections are considerably less, say \$250 per year. These numbers can vary considerably, though, depending on the extent of the data collection that is built into the systems. For example, if you only are able to monitor system performance by visual observation and customer complaints, the effort would be one level. However, if the system has full communications with remote access and 24/7 data collection capabilities, which would provide a higher level of understanding of traffic patterns, the operational efforts would be more extensive because they would allow for greater system fine-tuning.

---

1 Traffic Signal Operations and Maintenance Staffing Guidelines, March 2008 FHWA-HOP-09-006

2 Traffic Signal Installation and Maintenance Manual, 1989, ITE

3 Traffic Signal Operations and Maintenance Staffing Guidelines, March 2008 FHWA-HOP-09-006

## **Agenda Item 6: UPWP Topics**

### A. Reallocation of \$42,000 for Studies

Staff Resource: John Duncan

Recommendation: Recommend the allocation by the Policy Committee of \$42,000 for the following new study efforts:

- \$20,000 for Windham impact fees development
- \$10,000 for a regional transit study...*see note below*.
- \$5,000 for a bicycle safety education effort by the Bicycle Coalition of Maine
- \$2,000 for Gorrill-Palmer assistance to a subcommittee of the Technical Committee
- \$2,500 for GPCOG planning support for the Lakes Region Bus Study
- \$2,500 for a feasibility analysis of ways to improve the provision of information to the driving public regarding the opening and closing of the Casco Bay Bridge

#### Background

Last month we discussed the opportunity to fund \$37,000 in new studies by reallocating study funds no longer needed. That amount is now \$42,000.

It is important that these study efforts be completed by next June 30<sup>th</sup> because MaineDOT limits the amount of our unfinished studies that we may “carry over” into the next biennial budget. Our current carryover estimate is \$165,000 in consultant studies that are underway or soon to be. ***This large amount might be a problem for us.***

Except for the transit one described below, the studies listed above can be done by June 30<sup>th</sup>.

An alternative approach would be to solicit proposals from our members.

The \$20,000 Windham study is the final remaining eligible 2009 study proposal that we did not fund in 2009. (We can discuss the other two unfunded proposals if folks want.) The Windham Town Council voted on November 30<sup>th</sup> to provide the \$4,000 local match for this effort.

***The regional transit study proposal below arrived just before we sent out this meeting packet.*** The scope is more extensive than John Duncan expected based on a conversation two weeks ago. It is a very compelling proposal – and calls for **\$32,000**. (Note that the scope is for two (2) studies – one of which would happen in our next biennium...and is estimated to cost \$20,000.)

The following several pages are the scopes of the proposed work.

## **\$20,000 for Windham impact fees development**

Submitted to PACTS in February 2009

### Problem Statement and Purpose

Route 302 from the White's Bridge Road intersection north to the Mineral Springs Road intersection has been an attractive area for development over the last several years. Recent projects in this commercial/industrial zone include the Enterprise Development District, Firestorm Business Park, and a permitted hotel project. As a result of this development activity, this section of Route 302 is starting to see the types of traffic issues typical of the existing North Windham commercial district.

Anyone who has traveled Route 302 through the North Windham commercial corridor is familiar with the traffic issues between the intersections of Route 35/115 and White's Bridge Road. For the uninitiated, they include high crash locations, a total lack of access management, little or no provisions for through traffic or freight movement, and insufficient bicycle and pedestrian facilities.

Rather than repeat and compound the existing transportation issues in North Windham, the Town is working to create a comprehensive and well thought out means to plan for development along Route 302 north of White's Bridge Road.

Phase I (which has been funded by PACTS and is underway) is the development of an engineering plan for the area. This plan will, 1) establish the existing volume of trips in the area, 2) project the increased number of vehicle trips in the area over the next ten years, and 3) establish transportation improvements that will maintain a balance between the needs of local land uses and the mobility of traffic on this major east-west corridor.

Phase II, for which the Town is seeking a PACTS planning grant, will establish a funding system to leverage public and private funds for the improvements identified in the Phase I engineering plan. In particular, the Town will be using the recommendations of the PACTS "Leveraging Increased Funding Through Transportation Investment Partnerships" report to identify and develop the most appropriate system to ensure that new, and possibly existing, development pays a proportional share based upon its impact on the transportation network.

### Methodology Outline

The engineering and public participation work completed in Phase I will serve as a foundation for the methodology used to complete the proposed alternative funding plan. With the public and elected officials well engaged in the process, Phase II will build upon the four (4) public meetings that are scheduled in the engineering phase. These include a both community meetings and public hearings before the Council.

In general, the funding study will use the following methodology:

- 1) Town Council selection of a lead consultant.
- 2) Commence the process with a public meeting to:
  - a) Review the engineering plan adopted by the Town Council, and
  - b) Discuss appropriate funding options from the Melrose/Eyerman PACTS report.
- 3) Town staff and consultant will develop funding options.
- 4) A second public meeting will be convened to present the proposed funding options.
- 5) Make revisions based on public input.
- 6) Present recommended plan to the Town Council for public hearings and adoption.

### Cost Estimate

Town staff has discussed the project with Mark Eyerman of Planning Decisions. For cost estimation purposes, an impact fee system approach was used for this proposal.

Based on preliminary discussions between Town Staff, Gorrill-Palmer Consulting Engineers (the firm conducting Phase I), and Planning Decisions, a cost estimate of \$25,000.00 was developed for the establishment of the funding system.

**\*\*\* Reduced to \$20,000 in December 2010\*\*\***

While the cost estimate figure may change if an alternative funding system is chosen, Town Staff does not anticipate that the study will cost more than the requested funds.

### **\$10,000 for a transit study related to improving service in Scarborough**

*The scope below – which just came in -- is for two (2) studies – a \$20,000 study and a \$32,000 study. PACTS staff will think more on this before our meeting today. We thought the proposed scope was going to be a service-oriented study rather than an organizational structure study. Great proposal however!!*

#### **Southern Maine Regional Transit Coordination Study (Submitted by Saco, Scarborough, Biddeford, Old Orchard Beach and South Portland)**

##### **Study Purpose:**

The purpose of the study is two-fold. The first is to develop a plan and necessary steps to have the Town of Scarborough and the City of South Portland join the Biddeford-Saco-Old Orchard Beach Transit Committee (ShuttleBus). The second is to conduct a cost/benefit analysis of consolidating transit vehicle maintenance, dispatch, and administration for the ShuttleBus, South Portland Bus Service (SPBS) and the Regional Transportation Program, and having those functions conducted at a central location within the region.

## **Background:**

The proposed effort will serve as another direct implementation task that has been included in two important and recently completed PACTS studies. In 2007, all the transit providers in the PACTS region participated in and completed the Regional Transit Coordination Study. The goal of the study was to identify opportunities to increase efficiency of transit operations within Greater Portland and to work toward the development of one regional transportation system. Several recommendations point to the need for the proposed study:

- Control expenses and improve efficiency by exploring the coordination and/or consolidation of operational systems
- Explore opportunities for common branding of service
- Explore options for shared maintenance facilities

In 2007, the ShuttleBus and SPBS hired a consultant to conduct a joint study – The Saco Bay Transit Study. This study consisted of a comprehensive examination of the local transit market, existing services, and the development and evaluation of service improvement alternatives. It also included several recommendations to coordinate the two services better in the future, including:

- Operate both services under the same name.
- Renumber/rename routes using the same conventions for both SPBS and Shuttlebus routes.
- Develop a combined system map.
- Use same format/design for schedules.

## **Proposed Tasks:**

### **Task #1 (*propose to be funded through the next PACTS UPWP via FTA 5303 planning funds*)**

#### **Possible expansion of the Biddeford-Saco-Old Orchard Beach Transit Committee to include Scarborough and South Portland:**

- Conduct a cost/benefit analysis of having South Portland and Scarborough join the Transit Committee
- Work with both transit agencies and the communities to develop timeline and specific information needed for municipal board approvals
- Form a transition working group (town/city managers, planners, transit management staff, MaineDOT) to work out details and report back to respective boards and PACTS committees.
- Develop goals/criteria for expanding the Transit Committee

- Develop summary of other cost/benefit analyses completed for similar transit agencies around the country – particularly focusing on the consolidation of maintenance facilities/operations
- Conduct a survey in Scarborough to determine origin and destination details for the establishment of possible new transit routes
- Transition group will also work with consultant(s) hired for Task #2, and provide feedback as that process moves forward

**Proposed Budget for Task 1:**

PACTS FTA 5303 planning:	\$16,000
Local Match:	\$4,000
Total Cost:	\$20,000

**Task #2 (*propose funding through current funds available through PACTS*)**

**Possible consolidation of SPBS, ShuttleBus and RTP maintenance, dispatch, and administration – located at the Scarborough public works facility**

- Conduct inventory of current facility and maintenance costs for both services, and any savings that could be realized if consolidation took place
- Working with the Town of Scarborough, gather information regarding the current public works maintenance facility including:
  - Available and future vehicle maintenance space and storage space
  - Building layout and future expansion capabilities
  - Communication equipment
  - Available current and future office space
- Work with the ShuttleBus and SPBS to analyze existing and future requirements and costs for capital maintenance needs
- Develop preliminary cost estimates for the following:
  - Inventory of current facility and maintenance costs for both services
  - Rent (including share of utilities if applicable)
  - Fixed costs (office equipment, phone system, dispatch needs, etc.)
  - Folding maintenance into existing facility (labor, parts, fuel, etc.)

- Administration/dispatch for transit services – possibly at the same facility as maintenance, but also could be a separate location
- Allocation of costs and revenues between agencies
- Employee impacts
- Current Federal obligations and/or debt for buildings or equipment

**Proposed Budget:**

PACTS funds requested: \$25,600

Local Match: \$6,400

Total Cost: \$32,000

**\$5,000 for a bicycle safety education effort by the Bicycle Coalition of Maine**

*We will send you a scope before our meeting on Tuesday. We submitted a scope to the Executive Committee several months ago, and we are revising it.*

**\$2,000 for Gorrill-Palmer assistance to a subcommittee of the Technical Committee**

The Technical Committee has formed a subcommittee which will review our scoring system for selecting projects for funding under our Collectors Set Aside. The group will meet for the first time on December 14<sup>th</sup>.

We would like Gorrill-Palmer to participate in this subcommittee’s work. We estimate a \$2,000 cost for their participation.

**\$2,500 for GPCOG planning support for the Lakes Region Bus Study**

In 2009 Sara Trafton successfully led the development of an application for free technical assistance from a national program of transit experts. The goal was the development of a Lakes Region Bus Study.

GPCOG is requesting \$2,500 to help support this effort.

## **\$2,500 for a feasibility analysis of ways to improve the provision of information to the driving public regarding the opening and closing of the Casco Bay Bridge**

### **Identify Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) Opportunities to Mitigate Traffic Delays and Reduced Air Quality due to the Casco Bay Bridge**

#### **Problem Statement and Purpose**

The Casco Bay Bridge (Route 77) is a primary access route to and through the Portland peninsula from South Portland and Cape Elizabeth. Thousands of trips per day cross the bridge in both directions for many purposes. There are notable delays in mobility when the bridge is in the "open" position for vessels or otherwise closed to pedestrians, bicyclists, or motor vehicle traffic for any reason (such as accidents, potential suicides, etc.). There are many negative effects when the bridge can not be crossed immediately: reduced air quality and pollution from idling vehicles, delays in public safety response, unanticipated tardiness in getting to work on time or other critical appointments, etc. There is also a delay in truck traffic and other vehicles engaged in commerce.

Due to the legal pre-eminence of waterborne commerce and transportation, efforts to restrict the times the draw bridge can be opened have been unsuccessful and, in light of federal pre-emption, will continue to be unlikely. Therefore, providing better warning of bridge openings is the necessary approach for mitigating the negative impact of these delays. Currently, the only "warning" is flashing yellow lights in several locations on warning signs. One does not know if the bridge is going up in 15 minutes, or just about down. With a little more timely and complete information, users would have a better idea of what to do.

This study proposal is intended to identify ITS solutions to provide better, more timely information to people who usually rely on the Casco Bay Bridge as their primary means of crossing the Fore River to and from the Portland peninsula. For example, there may be an "ITS way" to **provide advance information to anyone with a home computer or mobile device the time the bridge is expected to be opened for a vessel transit and approximate time of closing**. It could be added to the 511 system already in place! Or a scrolling message could go across the bottom of Public Access TV channels. A "discretionary travelers" could choose to either leave a bit earlier or delay their trip. A person who needed to cross the bridge for an appointment could decide to select an alternate route, or leave earlier. In addition, those without advance notification could receive a little more information to make a decision about re-routing if the flashing yellow lights were replaced with sign boards that say "Bridge going up at 8:30 a.m." or "Bridge coming down at 9:00 a.m." or "All Northbound Lanes Closed Due to Accident."

Thinking further, a bridge tender could have a simple system that pushes out information with a couple key strokes and standard function keys. MaineDOT has a 24/7 operations center that is currently handling the CARS system that feeds 511. In addition, a new system might simply replace communications the bridge tenders are already making to public safety dispatch about when the bridge is going up.

## **Methodology**

This study will identify the range of possible ITS solutions and their respective costs of implementation, including any regulatory or other impediments to implementation (such as cost of scrolling signs, hardware, software, safety and security, capacity and capability of bridge tenders to provide the information, level of training that might be required, etc.)

## **Cost Estimate**

The estimated cost for this study is \$10,000.

*PACTS staff thinks that significant work could be done for \$2,500, and is recommending that. We will talk with Tom Meyers before our meeting.*

## **B. Planning and Administration Overview Document**

Staff Resource: John Duncan

Recommendation: Discussion and then distribution, as revised, to PACTS membership

### Background

As discussed last month, here is a draft 5-page summary for our membership regarding the development and administration of our Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP). We propose to receive your comments today, make edits, and then distribute to the entire membership.

TO: All PACTS Committees

FROM: PACTS and GPCOG Staff

SUBJECT: Synopsis of the PACTS Unified Planning Work Program

During the next five months we will develop a 2-year scope and budget for the PACTS planning process. Here is a synopsis to help you understand the process. There is a lot more to this process than can be explained in five pages, so please contact staff at any time with questions and suggestions.

This report is organized as follows:

1. Introduction and Purpose
2. UPWP Development
3. UPWP Funding
4. UPWP Amendments and PACTS Studies Time Clock
5. Consultant Study Administration
6. Studies Coordination with Municipalities, Transit Systems and Regional and State Agencies

## 1. Introduction and Purpose

As a “metropolitan planning organization”, PACTS is required by the Federal Highway and Transit Administrations (FHWA and FTA) to work within a scope and budget organized in a “Unified Planning Work Program” – or UPWP. Our current 60-page UPWP for July 2009 to June 2011 is available on our website, [www.pactsplan.org](http://www.pactsplan.org).

The UPWP supports the following:

- Perform studies of regional transportation needs and opportunities.
- Coordinate with the MaineDOT and Turnpike Authority on major regional studies and programs.
- Program Federal Transit and Highway Administration project funds in our Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).
- Serve as a regional forum on transportation and related topics.
- Develop a regional transportation plan which forecasts needs for the region and establishes goals and strategies designed to address future and current needs.

There are three PACTS “geographies”:

- The PACTS “Funding Area” is the area within our 15-municipalities in which PACTS shares responsibility with MaineDOT for programming federal funds. The Funding Area covers the entirety of only four municipalities, and parts of the remaining eleven.
- The PACTS “Study Area” is the entirety of the 15 municipalities. As such, PACTS spends federal transportation planning funds on studies anywhere within the 15 municipalities.
- The PACTS “Model Area” includes the same 15 municipalities and 13 more. Our regional travel demand forecasting model – the “PACTS Model” – simulates traffic patterns, and much more, throughout this large area. We and others use this tool for a variety of analysis purposes.

The UPWP is one of several documents related to the PACTS process. Contact staff if you want to learn more about these documents: the PACTS Bylaws, the PACTS Public Participation Policy, our TIP Policies and Procedures Document, and our biennial Transportation Improvement Program.

## 2. UPWP Development

Similar to a municipal comprehensive plan which provides a framework for municipal planning work, our *Destination Tomorrow* regional transportation plan

provides the same context for PACTS members and staff in the development of the 2-year planning and programming work outlined in the UPWP.

Next May, the Policy Committee will adopt the UPWP for July 2011 to June 2013. The following people and committees will have the following roles between now and then.

- PACTS Staff
  - a. Lead the process.
  - b. Coordinate with all parties involved in the efforts listed below.
  - c. Recommend a set of regionally significant studies.
  - d. Solicit and consider public comments.
  - e. Produce the final UPWP in collaboration with GPCOG staff.
- GPCOG and SMRPC Staff
  1. Work with the Transit Committee in development of the FTA-funded work.
  2. Score proposals for FTA-funded studies.
  3. Produce the final UPWP in collaboration with PACTS staff.
- MaineDOT
  1. Determines the amount of FHWA funding in the current UPWP that can be “carried over” into the next UPWP in order to complete studies still underway on July 1, 2011.
  2. Advises on the amounts of new FHWA and FTA funding available.
  3. Meet with PACTS staff to provide comments on study proposals.
  4. Comment on the draft UPWP document.
- Executive Committee
  1. Suggest proposals for new studies.
  2. Review and comment on PACTS staff’s draft work plan and budget for the two years.
  3. Review and comment on staff’s monthly updates on other UPWP topics.
  4. Submit a final UPWP budget and scope to the Policy Committee for action.
- Planning Committee
  1. Suggest proposals for new studies. When appropriate and feasible, the Committee will meet with Technical or Transit Committee to collaborate.
  2. Review staff’s scores of local and regional study proposals (FHWA-funded ones only), and recommend a set of studies to be funded to the Executive and Policy Committees.
- Technical Committee
  1. Suggest proposals for new studies. When appropriate and feasible, the Committee will meet with Planning or Transit Committee to collaborate.
  2. Review and comment on staff proposals for collector road analysis during the next two years, and other regional roadway-oriented studies.

- Transit Committee
  1. Suggest proposals for new studies. When appropriate and feasible, the Committee will meet with Planning Committee to collaborate.
  2. Review staff's scores of transit study proposals (both FTA-funded and FHWA-funded ones?) and recommend a set of studies to be funded to the Executive and Policy Committees.
- Policy Committee
  1. Review and comment on UPWP development progress reports.
  2. Adopt the UPWP for July 2011 to June 2013.

### 3. UPWP Funding

The FHWA and FTA finance 80% of the UPWP. MaineDOT provides a 15% match for the FHWA funds, and our municipalities provide the remaining 5%. (For local and certain sub-regional studies we require a 20% local match. This is part of the 5% mentioned above.) GPCOG, the transit systems and in some cases municipalities provide the match for the FTA metropolitan planning funds.

Our biennial FHWA amount is the PACTS share of FHWA "metropolitan planning" funds that come to Maine – based on a Maine formula. MaineDOT has the authority to set limits on the amount of FHWA metropolitan planning funds that we actually get. Similarly, MaineDOT has a policy to limit the amount of FHWA funds ("carried over") in the PACTS budget for studies that were started but not completed in the prior biennium.

The MaineDOT funds provide most of the match needed to support a 3-person PACTS staff. Part of the annual PACTS "assessment" provides the balance (\$4,000 for the current UPWP). In May 2009 the Policy Committee set biennial budget for the assessment at \$92,000. While we expect to spend only a small portion of the \$92,000, it is available for contingency needs and for certain federally-ineligible activities at PACTS such as preparing applications for federal earmark funds.

Periodically other funds are added to the UPWP for special projects. The funding sources have been FTA 5307, the Maine Turnpike Authority (for upgrades to the PACTS model), and other federal and state funds available via MaineDOT.

### 4. UPWP Amendments and the PACTS Studies Time Clock

The Executive and Policy Committees share the authority to amend the UPWP. The Executive Committee may only amend the UPWP as follows: (1) for FTA-funded planning tasks based on a recommendation from the Transit Committee, and (2) to use newly available study funds to fund ranked study proposals which were not funded during the development of each biennial UPWP. The authority to make all other UPWP amendments rests with the Policy Committee.

In 2006 the Policy Committee adopted the following “Studies Time Clock” policy designed to encourage municipalities to initiate local studies in a timely manner:

- 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 pass 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.)
- This policy also applies to future consultant studies added to the PACTS planning budget at other times during future biennia.
- After the withdrawal of funds, the study proponent is eligible to submit the study proposal for funding in the next PACTS planning budget.
- The Policy Committee may make exceptions to this policy for good cause.

#### 5. Consultant Study Administration

Here are some bullets on the PACTS-funded consultant study administration process. Please contact staff with any questions.

##### Consultant Selection

- PACTS and GPCOG staff collaborate with municipal or transit staff to organize the selection process.
- We follow certain MaineDOT rules. The rules are different for studies under and over \$50,000. We can go sole source for studies with <\$10,000 budgets.

##### Study Administration

- The PACTS Director and the chosen consultant sign PACTS consultant contracts.
- PACTS staff invoices municipality for the 20% local match after the contract is signed with the consultant.
- Consultants submit invoices and progress reports to PACTS. PACTS staff periodically advises the municipality of costs to date.

#### 6. Studies Coordination with Municipalities, Transit Systems and Regional and State Agencies

The roles of PACTS, GPCOG and SMRPC staff and our members vary from study to study – including studies led by MaineDOT, the Turnpike Authority, individual municipalities, transit systems and others. For the sake of brevity, this document simply lists the variety of studies and programs with which PACTS staff and members are involved.

- GPCOG
  - Technical analysis services for PACTS staff
  - Transit planning work
  - Regional sustainability plan development begun in 2011
  - Maine Clean Communities
  - Go Maine
  
- MaineDOT
  - Corridor studies funded and led by MaineDOT
  - Frequent use of the PACTS model
  - The Highway Simplification Study (completed in 2010)
  - The revisions to the state's traffic movement permit policy
  
- Southern Maine Regional Planning Commission
  - Technical analysis services for PACTS staff
  - Transit planning work
  - Regional sustainability plan development begun in 2011
  
- The Maine Turnpike Authority
  - Corridor studies funded and led by the Turnpike Authority
  - Frequent use of the PACTS model
  
- Municipalities
  - PACTS studies
  - Studies wholly funded by a municipality

Thank you for your interest in the PACTS regional transportation planning process. Please let us know when you have questions and suggestions.

#### C. Bylaw Language Regarding UPWP Amendment Role

Staff Resource: John Duncan

Recommendation: Discussion

#### Background

*We will send you language before the meeting. Sorry. Ran out of time last Wednesday.*

D. Amend UPWP for Franklin Street Corridor Study

Staff Resource: John Duncan

Recommendation: Recommend the action below by the Policy Committee.

Background

In our UPWP we are using \$100,000 to help finance the \$558,000 Franklin Street Corridor Study Phase II. The other \$448,000 is our 2010/2011 TIP Franklin Street design project converted into a design/corridor study.

In order to combine the two amounts we need to amend our UPWP to transfer the \$100,000 to the other project. *This requires Policy Committee action.*

**Agenda Item 7: PACTS Role in Convening of Regional Forums**

Staff Resource: Paul Niehoff

Recommendation: Discussion and consensus on staff's proposals below

Background

In early 2009 Paul saw the need to improve communication between various groups which had similar interests so we convened an informal gathering of "bike/ped" and other interested parties in order to share what's going on in the region. The group has met four times. We have mentioned these meetings in our committee reports. We discussed this topic last month, and asked staff to offer the members some direction today.

Staff is now proposing that the name, Preferred Alternative Modes of Transportation Group, be replaced with *Regional Information Sharing Forum* – and we offer the suggestions and perspectives below.

Staff has discussed how to proceed with this ad hoc group based on comments and suggestions made at the November meeting. We are of the opinion that this is a diverse group of interested potential partners working on various initiatives in our region. These initiatives include the bike/pedestrian realm, transit, energy and sustainability, recreation, health, safe routes to school, and green transportation. It is the only PACTS coordinated group with this much diversity.

As has been mentioned previously the original intent was to improve communication, dispel misunderstandings and solicit ideas on improving the region's transportation

choices. Topics expanded to include, health and safety, making transportation connections as well as group to group connections and reaching balance and consensus. Additionally the group was very beneficial in vetting the update to the PACTS Regional Bike Pedestrian Plan.

The feeling from staff is the group understands it is not an official PACTS committee and has no direct policy making authority. We can and will continue to make this clear if required. The group is in essence a forum to discuss studies, projects, points of view and ways to partner and combine efforts when appropriate to initiate positive changes on numerous fronts in our region. We do understand the need to include both freight and passenger rail entities which has unfortunately been an oversight not only with this group but with other initiatives as well.

Our sense is if kept to an ad hoc group facilitated by PACTS staff we will continue to see improved communications and consensus building among all the parties involved. People attend not only to voice their views but to hear the views of others. There is a concern that if another entity were to take up the responsibility of coordinating and hosting this group it wouldn't necessarily include the range of interests or bring the same people to the table. Also, the group may not continue to meet at all. Also keep in mind there are the individual groups which meet individually, but this PACTS coordinated effort is the regions only forum including all the groups.

Therefore we think its important PACTS to continue coordinating and facilitating this regional forum. As a regional entity we can bring balance and consistency to the topics discussed, connect or lessen gaps in the system and use the group for input in implementing and continually updating our Regional Bike Pedestrian Plan.

## **Agenda Item 8: Destination Tomorrow Update**

Staff Resource: Carl Eppich

Recommendation: Discussion

### **Background**

The Destination Tomorrow Update Committee met on November 17<sup>th</sup> and reviewed the last chapter of the update, Chapter 6: Implementation. Some recommendations were made and have been incorporated. With that the update is nearly complete. Staff is currently updating and creating new charts, tables, graphs, and maps associated with Chapter 3: Present Conditions, Trends and Future Choices.

A full draft will be out for all Committees to review by December 10<sup>th</sup>.

## **Agenda Item 9: Updates from Staff and Committees**

1. The December 13<sup>th</sup> Legislators Briefing
2. Updates from the November meetings of the Transit, Planning and Technical Committees.
3. The draft Gorham East West Corridor Phase I Study recommendations include the following actions by the our Policy Committee during the next six months:
  - Endorse the Phase I feasibility study's recommendations
  - Sign an MOU to participate in the Phase II Action Plan development phase
  - Amend our TIP policies to give preferences (nature to be determined) for capital funding to municipalities which participate in the development of the Phase II Action Plan
  - Sign a binding implementation agreement to participate in the implementation of the Action Plan

### **Executive Committee Draft Agenda for January 4<sup>th</sup>**

1. Follow up on today's discussion with Jim and Dana.
2. Discussion of MaineDOT's request that we consider a \$2.5 million contribution to the estimate \$15 million improvement to River Road in Windham.
3. Discussion of reallocation of TIP funds if Cumberland Mills Triangle and Baxter Boulevard projects get dropped.
4. Pending the results on the reallocation of planning funds (agenda item 6A above) – review proposals for use of the planning funds.
5. Review a draft outline scope, budget and the detailed schedule for the development of the next UPWP (July 2011 to June 2013)
6. Discuss strategy for PACTS submission of an annual Congressional earmark application. Will there be any?

## **Agenda Item 10: Adopt Policy Committee's 2011 Schedule, and Agenda for December Policy Committee meeting**

John recently sent out a 2011 schedule for the Policy Committee which lists twelve monthly meetings. In order to enable members to keep more dates open for other purposes, the Policy Committee 2011 meeting schedule could be set now – rather than asking members to reserve twelve monthly meetings with the understanding that many of them will be cancelled eventually based on our intent that the Policy Committee generally meet bi-monthly or quarterly.

Here is a possible set of six 2011 Policy Committee meeting dates plus the annual meeting.

February 17<sup>th</sup> – Two months after the December meeting  
April 21<sup>st</sup> – Review draft UPWP  
May 19<sup>th</sup> – Adopt final UPWP  
June xx – Annual meeting (date to be set based on speaker's availability)  
August 18<sup>th</sup> – Two months after June  
October 20<sup>th</sup> – Two months after August  
December 15<sup>th</sup> – Two months after October

### **Policy Committee Draft Agenda for December 16<sup>th</sup>**

1. Endorse final draft 2010 Update of our Destination Tomorrow plan – in preparation for adoption in February after completion of the required air quality conformity public comment process.
2. Adopt Regional Traffic Management System policy statement.
3. Reallocate \$42,000 for new study efforts.
4. Act on Transit Committee proposal for new use of \$115,000 (per October 21<sup>st</sup> Policy Committee vote).
5. Act on TIP amendment actions that might be needed per specific scopes for projects funded through our Credit Program on Oct 21<sup>st</sup>.
6. Act on bylaw language regarding Executive Committee authority to amend the UPWP.
7. Amend the UPWP to enable the transfer of the Franklin Street Study \$100,000.
8. Executive Director's Report
  - Cumberland Mills Triangle project update
  - Synopsis of December 13<sup>th</sup> Legislators Briefing
  - Update on Highway Simplification Study
  - Bullets on the several other topics in today's agenda, such as the discussion with Jim Gailey and Dana Anderson