

PACTS

Portland Area Comprehensive Transportation System

Executive Committee Meeting Notice

March 2, 2010
8:00 a.m.

GPCOG, 68 Marginal Way, Portland

Agenda

1. Call to order
2. Public Comment
3. Minutes of January 5th meeting
4. FTA 5307 Formula (8:05)
5. PACTS Credit Program (8:30)
6. Status Report on Highway Simplification Study (8:50)
7. TIP Amendments (9:10)
8. The PACTS Video (9:20)
9. Updates from Staff and Committees (9:40)
10. Finalize agenda for Policy Committee's March meeting (9:55)
11. Adjourn at 10:00

Next meeting: April 6th 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

Minutes of January 5th Meeting

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

1. **Call to Order.** Kathi Earley called the meeting to order at 8:12 a.m.
2. **Public Comment.** None.
3. **Minutes of December 1st meeting.** *Bill Shane made a motion to approve the December 1st minutes, seconded by Bob Burns. All were in favor.*
4. **Reports on Intersection Set Aside proposals, Holding PIN funding status, Dunstan Corner project funding, and proposal to reconsider recent Policy Committee vote on Credit Program.** Paul reported that a short-form intersection request was sent out to see what the intersection needs were. Three were received from Portland totaling \$570,000 and one from Yarmouth with a cost of \$1-3 million. If no intersection projects are selected in this round, the proposals would need to be resubmitted in the next round. We need to determine how we want to use the Holding PIN money – for the credit program or for intersection projects. There is \$950,000 in the Holding PIN. Should the money be open to all categories or only to intersection projects? Also, arterials and collectors are a concern. The Dunstan Corner project had \$3,350,000 committed to it. Bill Shane spoke with Tom Hall and John Bubier to provide them with more information about the credit program and asked Tom to consider resubmitting the credit program vote since he had voted in the affirmative. Tom Hall agreed. Bill felt that having the money sit in a bank account didn't make any sense and he would like to see it put to use. The credit program rewards communities who spend their own money on state roads. The community receives 10% of what they spent, capped at \$250,000. By consensus, the Committee agreed to put an item on the Policy Committee agenda to reconsider the credit program (a description of the credit program should also be included).
5. **Report on member and staff proposals for PACTS FY 2011 Congressional Annual Appropriations earmark proposals.** Numerous proposals were received; John distributed a list. Staff recommended two projects: GO Maine program proposal for \$850,000 to purchase vans for their vanpool program (the Maine Turnpike Authority will provide the 20% match); and a Scarborough proposal for \$1,000,000 to build a bridge from the Eastern Trail over the Nonesuch River, and for the trail linkage from the bridge to Wainwright Fields in South Portland. John provided some background on the GO Maine proposal. Bill asked why we aren't buying five METRO buses with this earmark. Judy responded that we couldn't buy five buses for that amount of money. The METRO buses aren't necessarily on the green level because they are not using biodiesel. Judy explained that Portland is trying to get their TDM program up and running but there is a lack of vans available. Maine Medical is interested in TDM but we can't do anything without vans. We also need to determine where the park and ride lots will be located. This is not the appropriate program for big buses. The TDM vanpool program would work if we had more vans. She is fully supportive of the vanpool concept. There was further discussion about how the GO Maine vanpool program works and how some companies offer pre-tax dollars on the money their employees spend on vanpooling. The Committee recommended that Carey Kish, GO Maine Program Manager, be available to answer questions at the Policy Committee meeting.

Carl provided some information about the Scarborough proposal. This bridge is the missing link and would connect many communities. Bill suggested that more background be provided on the Scarborough project when it is presented to the Policy Committee.

Kathi asked about the proposal for a bus shelter and/or park 'n ride in Windham for future bus service. Carl explained that a \$60,000 technical assistance grant from CTAA was secured to look at what can be done to provide bus service to/from Windham, whether it be through an RTP van shuttle or a fixed route service, etc. There is no need for this shelter in the near future because there isn't a plan in place yet for bus service.

Regarding the criteria used to select the proposals, John B asked how the GO Maine vanpool program creates jobs and regional economic benefit. John D. explained that the criterion was developed by staff. John B. noted that the Scarborough project would generate jobs. He felt that it was important to determine what the criteria are before we submit any to the Delegation. If it's jobs, then the GO Maine project wouldn't fit well under the funding. A phone call will be made to the appropriate party to determine the criteria of the proposals.

The Committee agreed by consensus to forward the two projects on to the Policy Committee.

6. **Report on staff Recommendation for PACTS Outreach, Media and Education Work.** Carl reviewed the various efforts that PACTS is undertaking regarding this subject. PACTS is putting together a video that will go on local cable stations. Bill felt it was important to keep the web site updated. He also suggested a weekly or bi-weekly update that users can subscribe to. PACTS needs to get the name out there. The problem with a blog is that someone needs to stay on top of it. There is currently a blog on the PACTS bike/ped plan but it hasn't been getting much use.

John B. felt that PACTS has made a major effort to reach out to the public and should continue to do the things they are currently doing. He recommended being careful about the interactive piece because you could run into adversarial people. There are only so many hours available for staff. Carl mentioned perhaps bringing in a PR person to deal with the social media piece. Bill disagreed because an outside person wouldn't have the background or knowledge about PACTS, and staff would need to brief the PR person regularly.

There was discussion about other social media such as twitter but the Committee felt we needed to determine who we are trying to reach. Different audiences use different media. We should be reaching out to the Congressional delegation when we send out bulletins and newsletters. We don't need to talk to the choir, we needed to talk to the decision makers. We should refine our existing sources, such as the web site, and direct information about PACTS to decision makers. It was also mentioned that we should be sure that mobile webbing works with the web site.

The Committee agreed by consensus that PACTS staff should continue to proceed in the manner they are currently going and that an update on this subject be provided in the consent agenda to the Policy Committee.

7. **Amend UPWP for Two New Study Efforts.**
 1. **To budget \$20,000 to hire a consultant to assist MPO's and MaineDOT with Highway Simplification Study.** MaineDOT wants PACTS to administer this; it is a joint statewide effort. This will continue the work of the Policy Working Group.

MaineDOT took the initiative to have it done this way. These are additional funds that MaineDOT is giving PACTS. Bob had a concern that at the end of this process they will determine that locals have to do more. It appears there is already an end goal. Bill felt that if we didn't make inroads to making repairs, the backlog will just continue to grow. Bob thought that if the group were to look at design standards, that would be great but it doesn't appear that that is what they will be doing. ***John Bubier made a motion to send this item to the Policy Committee. Bill Shane seconded the motion and all were in favor.***

- 2. To fund a Strategic Initiative to move Greater Portland to become a Transit Focused Region.** A working group was developed who met in the summer and they talked with a consultant about what would be appropriate for our region. The intent of the study is to develop a regional vision for Greater Portland to promote economic growth and development by building on existing transit service and to create realistic and cost effective strategies to do so. Bill asked why the towns have to pay the local match. Carl responded that the project has meaning to all of the communities. The scope should include coordinating with all the other transit providers and reviewing the studies that have been done. Ed asked that the word "our" be removed from the second paragraph under background on the first page of the memo (our urban communities). This has not yet gone out for RFP. Greg thought that it had too much of a "field of dreams" kind of approach – if we build it, they will come. We need to figure out how to get people out of their vehicles and onto transit. ***Bill Shane made a motion to forward this item to the Policy Committee. The motion was seconded and all were in favor.***
- 8. Updates from staff and Committees.** ***Bill Shane moved approval of the TIP adjustments on page 17. The motion was seconded and passed.***
- 9. Finalize January agenda for Policy Committee meeting.** It was decided that Item 6 – Action on PACTS outreach, media and education work – be eliminated from the agenda.
- 10. Adjourn.** The meeting adjourned at 10:20.

Agenda Item 4:

Staff Resource: John Duncan (Steve Linnell will not be with us today.)

Member Resource: Ed Clifford

Recommendation: Forward the revised FY 2010 PACTS FTA 5307 Formula to the Policy Committee for endorsement

Background

On January 21st the Policy Committee asked that the Executive Committee review the Transit Committee's proposed formula for distributing the estimated \$2.4 million in FY 2010 FTA Section 5307 funds to the region's transit systems. The proposed formula was based on a lot of work done by staff and the Transit Committee members during several months.

On February 18th and 23rd Nat Tupper facilitated meetings of our region's transit systems. The meetings produced the revised formula in today's meeting packet.

The formula is used to allocate money to a veritable apples-oranges-pineapples array of transit organizations – a ferry, two paratransit systems and three fixed route bus systems. (NNEPRA is eligible for these federal funds, but has not requested any.)

The current version of the PACTS formula is not much different from what has been used successfully over many years, but it is complex:

- It has been based on two kinds of FTA money since 2007. The larger pot has been growing for many years. The smaller pot goes up and down from year to year. This year the region will not receive any of the smaller, performance based funding.
- The formula allocates most of the money based on a prior version of the formula that provides budget certainty to the transit systems from year to year. The remainder is allocated based on transit system performance, and sets aside a small portion of that for regional purposes.

The formula is on the next page.

23-Feb-09

Allocation Formula for Calculating FY 2010 Section 5307 Funds

2007 Base

| | A | B1 | C1 | | | D1 | D2 | D3 |
|-----------------|--------------------|--------------------|-----------------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------|--------------------|------------------|
| | 2007 | 2008 | 08 - 07 | 2009 | 09 - 08 | 09 - 07 | 2010 | 10 - 09 |
| 5307 1. | \$1,954,598 | \$2,119,887 | \$165,089 | \$2,253,660 | \$133,973 | \$299,062 | \$2,411,416 | \$157,756 |
| STIC 2. | \$723,646 | \$626,738 | -\$96,908 | \$140,553 | -\$486,185 | -\$583,093 | -\$31,551 | \$31,551 |
| Total 3. | \$2,678,244 | \$2,746,425 | \$68,181 | \$2,394,213 | -\$352,212 | -\$284,031 | \$2,379,865 | \$126,205 |

| Operator | Current % Allocation | Current 5307 \$ Allocation | Current STIC \$ Allocation | Total 5307 Allocation |
|--------------|----------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------|
| B SOOB | 6.66% | \$130,176 | \$48,195 | \$178,371 |
| CBITD* | 17.34% | \$338,927 | \$125,480 | \$464,408 |
| METRO | 58.61% | \$1,145,590 | \$424,129 | \$1,569,719 |
| RTP* | 7.35% | \$143,663 | \$53,188 | \$196,851 |
| SPBS | 7.00% | \$136,822 | \$50,655 | \$187,477 |
| YCCAC | 3.04% | \$59,420 | \$21,999 | \$81,419 |
| Total | 100.00% | \$1,954,598 | \$723,646 | \$2,678,244 |

1. 5307 D1 Based on FTA '09 + 7%
Incremental Difference D2 = D1 - C1

2. Regional Projects
D2* = D2* x 20%, not to exceed \$40,000

FY 2007, 2008 & 2009 Formulae and Amounts approved by PACTS Policy and MaineDOT

B. 2010 Draft Formula

| Operator | Rev V-M 2007 | Rev V-M 2009 | Growth | Boardings 2007 | Boardings 2009 | Growth | Composite 3. 30/70 | Boardings 2009 |
|--------------|------------------|------------------|----------------|------------------|------------------|-----------------|--------------------|----------------|
| B SOOB | 105,318 | 128,948 | 21,630 | 63,502 | 93,776 | 30,274 | 27,681 | 3.6% |
| CBITD* | 59,663 | 59,876 | 213 | 855,273 | 760,097 | (95,176) | (66,559) | 29.0% |
| METRO | 828,484 | 780,854 | (47,630) | 1,360,981 | 1,352,446 | (8,535) | (20,264) | 51.7% |
| RTP* | 633,869 | 671,142 | 37,273 | 132,904 | 147,855 | 14,951 | 21,648 | 5.6% |
| SPBS | 215,310 | 223,562 | 8,252 | 189,487 | 220,834 | 31,347 | 24,419 | 8.4% |
| YCCAC | 116,391 | 240,119 | 123,728 | 38,764 | 41,949 | 3,185 | 39,348 | 1.6% |
| Total | 1,959,035 | 2,102,501 | 143,466 | 2,640,911 | 2,616,957 | (23,954) | 113,095 | |

| Operator | 2009 Base Allocation 5307 | 2009 Performance Factor 5307 30/70 | 2010 Balance Allocation 5307 - 20% | 2010 Total Allocation 5307 | 2010 Total % Allocation | = Total 2010 - Total 2009 % Change | |
|-----------------|---------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------|
| B SOOB | \$150,094 | 24.48% | \$30,890 | \$180,983 | 7.51% | \$21,529 | 13.50% |
| CBITD* | \$390,785 | -58.85% | \$0 | \$390,785 | 16.21% | -\$24,372 | -5.87% |
| METRO | \$1,320,870 | -17.92% | \$0 | \$1,320,870 | 54.78% | -\$82,378 | -5.87% |
| RTP* | \$185,644 | 19.14% | \$24,157 | \$189,801 | 7.87% | \$13,826 | 7.86% |
| SPBS | \$157,756 | 21.59% | \$27,249 | \$185,005 | 7.87% | \$17,410 | 10.39% |
| YCCAC | \$68,511 | 34.79% | \$43,909 | \$112,420 | 4.66% | \$39,636 | 54.46% |
| Total | \$2,253,660 | | \$126,205 | \$2,379,865 | 98.69% | -\$14,348 | 5.60% |
| Regional | | | | \$31,551 | 1.31% | \$31,551 | 100% |
| | | | | \$2,411,416 | 100.00% | \$17,203 | 0.72% |

Agenda Item 5: PACTS Credit Program

Staff Resource: John Duncan and Paul Niehoff

Recommendation: To submit to the Policy Committee for adoption a revised one-time pilot Credit Program for which the Policy Committee will program funds in September 2010 from the PACTS Holding PIN.

On January 21st the Policy Committee endorsed the concept of the Credit Program, and asked that staff and the Executive Committee: (1) refine the eligible uses of the funds, and (2) address questions about the “must meet state standards” question in light of that day’s MaineDOT presentation by Ken Sweeney.

February 25th Draft Memo to the Policy Committee

This is the memo from the January Policy Committee meeting **with changes/clarifications in bold and strikethroughs.**

Context

Recently adopted PACTS policy is to program PACTS funds to preserve the region’s 83 miles of collector roads which are in good condition and meet (or almost meet) MaineDOT standards.

Our municipalities have been spending 100% local funds to rehabilitate and reconstruct some of our 121 miles of collector roads in poor condition and/or do not meet MaineDOT standards – and they are likely to continue to do so.

Program Goal

To help compensate our members for using 100% local funds spent to rehabilitate or reconstruct collector roads which are in poor condition and/or do not meet MaineDOT standards.

A 10% Credit and a Cap per Municipality

The Policy Committee will program \$10,000 in federal and/or state funds – up to a limit of no more than \$250,000 – for every \$100,000 in local funds spent by the municipality. For example, the Town of Cumberland, which might spend \$3 million on Route 88, would get a maximum of \$250,000.

Policy Committee Action in September 2010

The Policy Committee will program the credit funds in September 2010 for locally-funded projects completed in calendar 2009 and 2010. Staff recommends that the Policy Committee **also program any remaining balance in the Holding PIN in**

September 2010 to other projects in order to put all the Holding PIN funds to work. ~~additional credit funds a year later for locally-funded projects done in 2010 if there is money left in the Holding PIN.~~

PACTS staff will develop an “application form” for this Program this spring.

Eligibility Requirements

1. A municipality must spend at least \$500,000 in local funds on one or more of our collectors. ~~that must be brought up to standard or which need rehabilitation or reconstruction per the PACTS Regional Collector Road Assessment Study.~~ This minimum enables staff at PACTS and MaineDOT to avoid administering small credits on small projects.
2. The rehabilitation or reconstruction project **does not need to** be completed to State standards. ~~Consequently the~~ **However**, roadway sections **improved to State standards** will be added to the PACTS preservation list of collector roads which are built to standard. The road will then be eligible for future PACTS collector road preservation funding.
3. The local projects **must have been completed in 2009 or 2010, and the** dollars must have been spent **primarily** in calendar 2009 and 2010 ~~(and 2011...see above).~~

Eligible Uses of Credit Program Funds

1. To **increase the federal/state share (and thereby reduce the local match)** on an existing PACTS project which is still **unobligated. See example below.**

For instance, the federal funds could be used to increase the project’s share from the existing 65% federal to 80% federal (the maximum allowed). This example also applies to the next situation described below.

2. To **increase the federal/state share (and thereby reduce the local match)** on a 2012/2013 PACTS project. **(The Policy Committee will program the 2012/2013 projects in September.)**
3. To help finance any federally eligible transportation project which has been proposed and ranked – **though not necessarily funded** – through the PACTS MPO Allocation process. **See example below. (Note: MaineDOT policy prohibits less than 50% federal participation in a project.)**
4. ~~Conversely,~~ A municipality may not “bank” a credit toward a future project proposal. This will ensure that our Holding PIN funds get used soon.

PACTS Holding PIN

The Policy Committee will finance up to \$1 million **in federal and state funds** for the Credit Program from our Holding PIN. MaineDOT and PACTS staff estimate that the Holding PIN will have an approximate \$1 million balance next September. ~~If the balance next September is less than \$1 million then staff will recommend an alternative amount.~~

Staff Comments

Staff realizes that the existence of this Credit Program will be only a minor incentive in a municipality's decisionmaking about using local funds to fix collector roads. Conversely, the 10% return might seem low, but it's better than nothing when a municipality has done what it has decided it needs to do in the first place.

We could increase the budget for this Credit Program by setting aside additional funds from our 2012/2013 MPO Allocation. However, it would probably have to come from our Collector Set Aside – and thereby reduce our funding for that high priority set aside. Another alternative – to reduce the funding in our Rebuild Roads Set Aside – appears infeasible because that is one of our only two Set Asides that can help MaineDOT to utilize National Highway System funding.

If this Credit Program works then we could encourage MaineDOT and FHWA to adopt a similar statewide program, or to add funding to the PACTS MPO Allocation for this purpose.

See examples on the next two pages.

Credit Program Examples:

A. Current Funded, but Unobligated Project

Falmouth completed the rehabilitation of a section of Brook Road and the entire length of Johnson Road in 2009. The locally funded cost of the Brook Road project was \$183,000 and the Johnson Road project was \$998,200. Therefore the 10% credit would be \$118,120 which can be used to offset the local match of a current or future unobligated project. This example uses the current Allen Avenue project which is in the 10/11 TIP programmed at \$414,000. Following this example is the second table which shows the use of the \$35,320 balance remaining after programming the funds toward the Allen Avenue project. Credit Example “B” is a future proposed project example which is the RT 880 Bike/Pedestrian application which I used a revised estimated cost of \$204,500. The examples are as follows:

| Project | Cost/estimate | Fed % | Amount | State % | Amount or credit | Local % | Amount |
|----------------------------------|------------------|-------------|------------------|------------|-----------------------------|------------|------------------|
| Brook Road | \$183,000 | | | | | | \$18,300 |
| Johnson Road | \$998,200 | | | | | | \$99,820 |
| | | | | | Credit Amount: | | \$118,120 |
| Allen Avenue w/out credit | \$414,000 | 65% | \$269,100 | 10% | \$41,400 | 25% | \$103,500 |
| Allen Avenue w/ credit | \$414,000 | 80%* | \$331,200 | 15% | \$62,100 | 5% | \$20,700 |
| | | | | | Credit Balance at 5% | | \$35,320 |

***80% maximum, 50% minimum required**

In this example Falmouth’s local match drops from 25% to 5% with the associated dollar local match amounts changing from \$103,500 to \$20,700. Note: in this example we are meeting the 80% federal maximum allowed while attempting to keep the fed/state ratios balanced in the holding PIN while retaining a 5% minimum local match. By doing so the credit balance is \$35,320 which could under the credit program be used for another Falmouth project such as the RT 88 sidewalk project as follows:

| Project | Cost/estimate | Fed % | Amount | State % | Amount or credit | Local % | Amount |
|---------------------------|------------------|------------|-----------------|------------|------------------|------------|---|
| | | | | | | | Credit Balance from table above: |
| Rt 88 w/out credit | \$103,865 | 51% | \$52,660 | 8% | \$8,101 | 41% | \$43,104 |
| Rt 88 w/ credit | \$103,865 | 78% | \$80,925 | 15% | \$15,165 | 7% | \$7,775 |

Credit Example B. Pending Project Submittal

The following example is another way a municipality would be able to use a PACTS Collector Road Credit (CRC). In this situation another potential Falmouth project is used as an example. In this case, let's say Falmouth submitted a bike/pedestrian project for new sidewalks on RT 26/100 for an estimated project cost of \$204,500 but the project ranking relegated it below the funding cut-off. With the \$118,120 credit amount noted above PACTS could fund the project with the credit if Falmouth agreed to fund the remaining balance. However to do so the federal and state funding ratios must be considered as indicated in the following table:

| Project | Cost/estimate | Fed % | Amount | State % | Amount or credit | Local % | Amount |
|-----------------------------------|------------------|------------|------------------|-----------|----------------------------|------------|------------------|
| Brook Road | \$183,000 | | | | | | \$18,300 |
| Johnson Road | \$998,200 | | | | | | \$99,820 |
| | | | | | Credit Amount: | | \$118,120 |
| Rt 26/100 Sidewalk Project | \$204,500 | 52% | \$106,340 | 6% | \$12,270 | 42% | \$85,890 |
| | | | | | Credited Total: | | \$118,610 |
| | | | | | Balance (negative): | | (\$490) |

In this example the credit balance is negative which may occur periodically when balancing the funding ratios within the state policies of minimum and maximum percentages. Each credit case will require detailed assessment and most likely a report outlining the project being considered for calculating the credit and a detailed cost account of the project being considered for use of the credit. PACTS staff will make a recommendation to the Policy Committee for funding projects on a project by project basis.

Agenda Item 6: Status Report on Highway Simplification Study

Staff Resource: John Duncan and Paul Niehoff

Member Resource: Dave Cole and Mike Bobinsky

- The study will be completed by July 2010.
- Gorham's Dave Cole is on the Policy Working Group. BACTS is a member. John Duncan has attended several of their meetings.
- High level MaineDOT staff and MMA's Kate Dufour provide staff support to the Policy Working Group and the two subcommittees.
- John Melrose is a consultant to MaineDOT and the MPO's for this effort.
- John Duncan and Mike Bobinsky are on the Urban Issues Subcommittee.
- Paul Niehoff has attended two of the Urban meetings and one meeting of the Standards Subcommittee.
- The Subcommittees meet every two weeks.
- *Who on the Executive Committee is receiving any of the study materials?*

- The focus so far has been on road maintenance topics. Capital topics come later.
- A survey regarding the cost of maintaining state roads within compact areas was recently sent to municipalities – 75 have responded so far.

- The Standards Subcommittee includes several people from our region. They are comparing State and municipal road standards of many kinds. They have reached a working consensus that when a road is being transferred from a town to MaineDOT – and from MaineDOT to a town – that the same standards should apply, and that the standards should be about:
 - A 10-year expected life
 - Pavement condition
 - Culverts
 - Ditches/drainage
 - Safety issues (guardrails, sight distances, etc.)
 - Clear zones
 - Signage
 - An in-depth hydrology study might be needed.

- The Urban Issues Subcommittee has reached a working consensus that the current (1913) legislative basis for urban compacts is irrelevant, but that urban compacts remain a good concept. They should be defined as follows:
 - Where local access benefits equal or exceed state mobility benefits, the community interest in serving property owners should take priority and here the compact might have good reason to exist.
 - Where community services such as parking, sidewalks, water, sewer and storm drainage are provided to an area, the community should be

in a better position than the state to coordinate street maintenance to assure an efficient and effective public works function. In these areas, compacts might have good reason to exist.

- Where there are no clear offsetting factors, local service delivery should be preferred as a means to enhance public accountability and service delivery.
 - With the primary municipal revenue being the property tax, communities should be given the tools to preserve and enhance their tax base. Where there are geographic concentrations of a community's property tax base, there may be the strongest arguments for compacts to exist.
- The Urban Issues Subcommittee has also reached a working consensus that there should be a shared financial responsibility for State highway maintenance inside compacts. There is no apparent consensus as yet on the most appropriate rationale for calculating cost shares. Several approaches to cost sharing are worth considering as follows:
 - The competing highway functions of local access versus state mobility could determine cost shares if a methodology could be arrived at for measuring the relative value of these two functions. The ratio of resident employees (the local access factor) to total community employment might offer one approach.
 - A market based approach might entail establishing compacts as a local option with the pricing of MaineDOT reimbursement set at a level sufficient to entice communities to opt in so that they might also realize the benefits that accrue with local control. The cost survey now underway might prove very valuable in identifying the optimal reimbursement level.
 - A use based distribution might be formulated such that compact communities receive a share of MaineDOT Highway Funds proportional to the annual vehicle miles of travel logged on state miles maintained by communities inside compacts. An ability to pay factor might be added to this approach which recognizes a community's relative motor vehicle excise tax receipts and adjusts the highway fund distribution accordingly among eligible communities.
 - An urban-rural equity approach could be adopted to assure that rural and urban miles are treated the same. For example, if rural town ways receive reimbursement than urban town ways would as well or in the alternative neither would be eligible for reimbursement.
 - The Urban Issues Subcommittee has begun to discuss a MaineDOT proposal to create "Local Maintenance Cooperatives". Staff can elaborate.

Agenda Item 7: TIP Amendments

Staff Resource: Paul Niehoff and Carl Eppich

Recommendation: Amend the PACTS 2010-2013 Transportation Improvement Program for these projects.

- Somerset Street extension feasibility study and alternatives analysis (\$200,001)
- Somerset Street extension PE and right of way (\$433,000)
- Improvements to the International Marine Terminal in Portland (\$5,000,000)
- Scarborough to Freeport, I-295 Construction of Beam Guardrail (\$400,000)
- “JARC” Job Access Reverse Commute Program action to enable the York County Community Action Corporation to use an additional \$130,937 for operations purposes (5316 –federal grant # ME-37-X009).

Background

See details on the non-transit projects in the draft letters at the end of this meeting packet.

The Executive Committee has the authority to take these actions – as written in our bylaws and as seen in several precedents.

Agenda Item 8: The PACTS Video

Staff Resource: John Duncan

Recommendation: Enjoy the movie, and offer suggestions for its use.

Background

The primary purpose of the 7.5 minute video is to heighten awareness of the importance of our regional transportation systems in the eyes of the general public, and to remind them that the traditional funding sources are at risk. The second purpose is to promote the awareness of PACTS.

We will distribute this to local public access television stations, and put it on YouTube. We will also use it in future public meetings. Your suggestions?

We are very grateful for the excellent creative and technical work by Michael McDade, the director of the Falmouth public access television station, in creating this video for us.

Agenda Item 9: Updates from Staff and Committees

Topics from Staff

- Staff suggests that we consider reducing the 25% local match for PACTS MPO Allocation projects in light of the difficult times facing our municipalities. If this is of interest then we need to consider that we recently programmed the Dunstan Corner project with a 25% Scarborough match.
- The Gorham East West Corridor Study is proceeding at a fast pace.
- Amend UPWP to budget to pay MaineDOT for air quality conformity analysis for our Destination Tomorrow Update this year. See Agenda Item 10.
- Update on statewide collectors funding bond proposal
- Paul met recently with new staff in Old Orchard Beach.
- Paul and Carl are scoring the recently received TIP proposals.
- Paul has processed several Three Party Agreements. The process is going well.
- Carl is organizing the Strategic Transit Focused Region Initiative.
- Carl recently attended a livability conference in Seattle.
- Carl recently met Chellie Pingree while leading our contingent at her office for the required videos regarding the FY 2011 annual appropriations earmark proposals. Carl also recently submitted the earmark applications to our Congressional Delegation members (using each of their three application forms). Carl charged his time to our local funds account.

Topics from Members

- Bill Shane, Tony Plante and John Duncan recently presented to the Legislature's Transportation Committee regarding bad roads in our region.
- Kathi Earley on Franklin Street Corridor Study Phase II. Markos Miller has offered to give the Policy Committee a presentation.
- Mike Laberge on the progress to completion of Ken Sweeney's draft policy statement regarding state/municipal agreement on 100%-locally-funded improvements to state roads.
- Greg give us an update on the Tri-Community Transportation Plan?
- Nine (9) PACTS staff and committee members are going to attend the March 11th dinner meeting of the Maine Better Transportation Association.

Draft Executive Committee agenda for April 6th

1. Assessment of the slow progress-to-date on the use of our \$750,000 consultant studies budget, and some suggestions for changes.
2. Updates on:
 - Highway Simplification
 - Destination Tomorrow
3. Committees information exchange

Agenda Item 9: January Agenda Policy Committee

1. Action on FTA 5307 formula.
2. Action on Credit Program.
3. Report on Highway Simplification Study
4. Show PACTS video?
5. Franklin Study presentation by Markos Miller?
6. Accept Executive Director's Report
7. Accept Consent Agenda:
 - Amend UPWP to budget \$3,000 to pay MaineDOT for one half of the cost of the air quality conformity analysis for our Destination Tomorrow Update this year. The \$3,000 will come from our PACTS model consultant budget: a reduction from \$46,459 to \$43, 459.

MaineDOT has asked that we help to pay for their work (100 to 150 hours) this year to perform the federally-required "air quality conformity analysis" of the capacity-related improvements recommended in our 2010 Update of *Destination Tomorrow*. MaineDOT estimates a \$5,000 total cost for this, so we will likely spend less than the \$3,000 above.

This is a first-time request for this analysis that MaineDOT does periodically for us for no charge. The reasons for this request are that: (1) the state budget is tight, and (2) their conformity analysis is usually done for a variety of statewide purposes all at one time rather than this year when the analysis is needed only for us.

Note that our 2-year UPWP includes a \$212,000 MaineDOT contribution. This is an increase from \$120,000 in each of the several recent UPWP's

8. Gorham East West Corridor Study 1-hour presentation and discussion



PACTS

Portland Area Comprehensive Transportation Committee

March 2, 2010

Mike Laberge, MPO Coordinator
Bureau of Transportation Systems Planning
Maine Department of Transportation
16 State House Station
Augusta, Maine 04333-0016

TIP Amendment for PIN 17055.10, Scarborough to Freeport, I-295 Construction of Beam Guardrail and for Improvements to the International Marine Terminal in Portland

Dear Mike:

The Portland Area Comprehensive Transportation System (PACTS) is requesting an amendment to its 2010-2013 transportation improvement program to add the following two projects:

1. MaineDOT PIN 17055.10, Scarborough to Freeport, I-295: Construction of beam guardrail and/or improvements to existing guardrail sections along 19.71 miles of the I-295 corridor. The total project budget is \$400,000, with a federal share of \$320,000 (80%) and a state share of \$80,000 (20%).
2. Upgrade pier and improve storage capacity at the International Marine Terminal in Portland. The project is being created with an award of \$5,000,000 through the American Recover and Reinvestment Act Transportation Investment Generating Economic Recovery (TIGER) grant program.

This request was approved by the PACTS Executive Committee during the March 2, 2010 meeting and is predicated on the MaineDOT incorporating appropriate comments made by the public if warranted.

If you have any questions, please give me a call.

Sincerely,

Paul Niehoff
PACTS, Senior Transportation Planner



PACTS

Portland Area Comprehensive Transportation Committee

March 2, 2010

Mike Laberge, MPO Coordinator
Bureau of Transportation Systems Planning
Maine Department of Transportation
16 State House Station
Augusta, Maine 04333-0016

PACTS FY 2010-2011 TIP Amendment for PIN 17628, Portland, Somerset Street PE and PIN 17628.10, Portland, Somerset Feasibility Study

Dear Mike:

The Portland Area Comprehensive Transportation System (PACTS) is requesting an amendment to its 2010-2013 transportation improvement program to add the following two projects:

- 1.) MaineDOT PIN 17628.00, Portland, Somerset Street: Preliminary engineering and right-of-way acquisition for highway reconstruction, in order to establish and extend Somerset Street from Elm Street to Hanover Street. Total project funding is \$433,175, with an 80% federal share consisting of HPP funds and a 20% local share.
- 2.) MaineDOT PIN 17628.10, Portland, Somerset Street: Feasibility study and alternatives analysis for the extension of Somerset Street from Hanover Street to Forest Avenue, combining with the intersection at High Street and Forest Avenue. Total project funding is \$200,001, with an 80% federal share consisting of HPP funds and a 20% local share.

This request was approved by the PACTS Executive Committee during the March 2, 2010 meeting and is predicated on the MaineDOT incorporating appropriate comments made by the public if warranted.

If you have any questions, please give me a call.

Sincerely,

Paul Niehoff
PACTS, Senior Transportation Planner

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