



Linking our Communities . Advancing our Region

# PACTS

---

## Portland Area Comprehensive Transportation System

### Executive Committee Meeting Notice

February 1, 2011  
8:30 a.m. to 10:30 a.m.

GPCOG, 68 Marginal Way, Portland

#### Agenda

1. Call to order
2. Minutes of January 4<sup>th</sup> meeting
3. The High Cost of Federally Funded Projects (8:35)
4. Options for re-programming funds from withdrawn and other projects (9:00)
5. FTA 5307 sub-allocation formula (9:20)
6. Unified Planning Work Program for Next Biennium (9:40)
7. Draft bylaw language regarding Executive Committee authority to amend UPWP (10:00)
8. Updates from Staff and Committees (10:05)
9. Minor TIP Amendment (10:15)
10. Finalize agenda for Policy Committee's February 17<sup>th</sup> meeting (10:20)
11. Public comment on topics not on today's agenda (10:25)
12. Adjourn

Next meeting: March 1<sup>st</sup> at 8:30 a.m.

*The Metropolitan Planning Organization for the Portland Urbanized Area*

68 Marginal Way • Portland, Maine 04101

Telephone: (207) 774-9891 • Fax: (207) 774-7149 • [www.pactsplan.org](http://www.pactsplan.org)

## **Minutes of January 4<sup>th</sup> Meeting**

**Present:** Kathi Earley, Chair; Dan Bacon; John Bubier; Nathan Poore; Al Presgraves; Sara Trafton; Marty Rooney; John Duncan; Carl Eppich; Steve Linnell; Paul Niehoff; Maddy Adams

Kathi thanked John Bubier for his recent service as Chair of the Policy Committee, and for all the work he accomplished as Chair, and presented John with a plaque for his service. John B. said it was a pleasure working with this group.

- **Call to order.** Kathi opened the meeting at 8:35.
- **Minutes of December 7<sup>th</sup> meeting.** *The minutes were accepted by consensus.*
- **High Cost of Federally Funded Projects.** This issue was discussed at the last meeting and there have been other meetings on the topic since that time. Paul explained that Falmouth, South Portland and Cumberland are looking at one project in each of their towns and comparing their experience with either a DOT project that was underway, in the case of Johnson Road, or two other projects -- Route 88 and Cummings Road, and Johnson Road -- and they will get back to Paul on their comparisons. Paul has also talked with Tom Gorrill to determine what the differences are when he works as a consultant with a town versus working with DOT. We are looking for ways to reduce the costs of doing these projects; it will come down to item by item costs.

Dan mentioned that Scarborough was in line for funding for Pleasant Hill Road collector funding and then the Scarborough PWD ran some costs and found that the town could do the project for close to their 25% match. Paul said he has heard that is typical. John explained that this is a complicated, very important subject and we will definitely be in communication with MaineDOT sooner than later. Marty explained that you need to look at the scope in order to strive to compare apples to apples. Marty suggested having a workshop to go over this issue. The committee thought it would be important to have all the players in the room who understand the rules and regulations to discuss why municipalities are finding it less expensive to do the projects. We are looking at doing business that is quite different than the existing model. It is important to look at the planning and design process. A suggestion was made to have the Chairperson establish a meeting with the Governor's staff, in addition to Federal Highway and MaineDOT staff. Nathan mentioned that they had discussed having John D. go directly to the Governor's staff but thought that the first step should be a conversation with MaineDOT. Paul spoke about design exceptions and overruns. So much money is spent upfront on planning and design which leaves less money for construction costs.

Marty explained that MaineDOT does a more strategic job of assigning projects now. He suggested having a conversation with the players involved before the project begins to determine if it makes more sense (pros and cons) to do the project locally versus through MaineDOT. MaineDOT has a design exception team. He also suggested that PACTS should meet with this group regarding design exceptions maybe once a year. Environmental considerations also play a part.

- **TIP Project Topics.**

**4A. FTA 5307 sub-allocation formula and the FY 2011 allocations.** Steve explained that this has been an annual discussion with the Transit Committee. They are looking at using the 70/30 split (boardings/vehicle miles) but also using a rolling average which would take out the peaks and valleys. A three-year period will be looked at; the current formula compares only two years. Coming up with a performance measure that is fair to everyone is very challenging. Sara explained that the performance measures are difficult because RTP is demand response, the miles for fixed route service are pretty much set, and then there's the ferry. Last year we went back to the original formula because there was less money available. What we are trying to do now is implement that in a way that is as painless as possible. Nathan said that the performance measure component is like a blank check if a transit system adds vehicle miles, which can be significant. Perhaps there should be a base amount and add a little more for additional service. Sara felt that we also need clarity about the way we count trips.

**4B. Funding of Windham River Road Improvements.** John referred to a map of the region's collector roads. He explained that we will not be providing funding from our collector set aside for the areas marked in red on the map. River Road is not funded because it is a red road. It runs from North Windham to the Westbrook line. It is estimated that it will cost roughly \$15 million to improve the road. Half of the River Road (4.3 of the 8.3 miles) is in the PACTS area. MaineDOT said they would fix the River Road many years ago when it wasn't in the PACTS area. Marty explained that MaineDOT committed to funding for design and right of way. They moved forward on the assumption that they would fund it when they were funding a certain number of collectors a year, but a lot has changed since 2002-2003. MaineDOT would like to discuss what partnership opportunities exist between MaineDOT and PACTS regarding joint funding options. The most expensive part of the rebuild is outside the PACTS area. If MaineDOT committed to design the full eight-mile stretch, what sort of partnership would PACTS provide? Nathan thought it was a raw deal for PACTS and the communities regarding the timing. We've already committed all of our rebuild money. John B. pointed out that although the road needs to be fixed, there are other red roads that won't be addressed. MaineDOT needs to realize that we've gone through our process to determine the roads that will be funded. Also, if PACTS were to do the project, there would be a local match needed from Windham. Therefore, until Windham makes a request to us, there probably isn't much of a role for PACTS to play. If this road were to be considered for funding, it would have to compete with all the other PACTS projects. Marty explained that a citizen's group has been meeting and there was a public meeting a month ago. The next step is the design phase, which will probably be started this winter. John B. stated that since MaineDOT committed to do design work when River Road was not in PACTS, then maybe the relationship with PACTS should be based on a net cost. Marty said that it sounds like PACTS is not willing to make any commitments at this time; however, PACTS is willing to have a dialogue providing Windham brings it to the table. John B. explained that the procedures that are in place at PACTS do not allow this project to be funded at this time but it can be submitted in the next round of funding. Nathan added that we have already committed our rebuild roads money and do not have enough money to fund this project even if we wanted to. It appears that Windham needs to approach the PACTS Policy Committee as a first step.

**4C. Funding of Baxter Boulevard and Cumberland Mills Triangle Projects.** We haven't heard back from Eric Dudley on the Cumberland Mills project. John D. explained

that things have changed with this project and PACTS may be considering withdrawing support for this project, but we're waiting to hear back from Eric.

Kathi reported that Portland has submitted a letter withdrawing funds for the Baxter Boulevard project because some underground work needs to be done first. This puts more money back in the Holding PIN.

**4D. Local match commitments made by January 1<sup>st</sup> deadline.** Outstanding ones – New Portland Road in Gorham; Eastern Prom project in Portland; Bridge Street in Westbrook. Overall, the commitment responses have come in very well (thanks to Paul's efforts).

- **UPWP Topics.**

**5A. Schedule for Development of 2012/2013 two-year UPWP.** The draft schedule is listed on page 13 of the agenda packet. A formal study request will be sent to members on January 5<sup>th</sup>. Two thirds of the draft budget is for PACTS staff work.

**5B. First Draft Budget.** John D. reviewed. Portland has developed a list of study proposals. Nathan would like to see a little more detail about each of the items on the budget for the next review. The draft budget shows a deficit so some adjustments will be necessary in order to have a balanced budget. Carl explained that this is a dream list; adjustments will need to be made. Perhaps the Gorham East West Technical Assistance project should be proposed by the interested towns. Some studies perhaps should be moved under the studies list at the bottom rather than being singled out. It was suggested that those studies that are ongoing be put on the top and then list the others at the end.

**5C. Overview Document.** This is an overview of the UPWP process regarding how studies get funded, paid for, etc. Kathi thought it might be a good idea to mention that there is a limited amount of funding for studies. Carl mentioned that it is not PACTS policy to select the next study on the list, but it is our practice.

- **PACTS Role in Convening of Regional Forums.** Paul spoke about the group that has been meeting that was called the Preferred Alternative Modes of Transportation Group that we discussed a few meetings ago. There had been some concern about the status of the Group in the context of our planning work. Paul explained that the participants cover a broad range of interests including alternative modes, health, bike/ped issues, transit, energy and sustainability, etc. PACTS staff thought it was a good idea to continue to be the convener. By doing so, PACTS can be sure that all the players/entities are invited to sit at the table. Nathan suggested that the meetings continue but that they be called "open forums." Kathi suggested rolling out the selections that have made the TIP to this group. She also thought it would be helpful to have notes from those meetings. It's okay to have an email invitation list in addition to an open invitation to anyone who wants to participate.
- **Updates from staff and committees.** Nathan mentioned that we had talked about having another Legislators Briefing but it will be difficult because of their schedule but he suggested we should stay in contact with Bill Whitten who works with the legislators.
- **Public comment. None.**
- **Adjourn.** The meeting adjourned at 10:45. The next meeting is scheduled for February 1<sup>st</sup> at 8:30 a.m.

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

Member Resources: John Bubier, Nathan Poore, Bill Shane and Jim Gailey

Staff Resource: Paul Niehoff and John Duncan

Recommendation: Receive the report from this morning's 7:30 a.m. meeting

#### **Background**

We discussed this at our December and January meetings. John Bubier, Nathan Poore, Bill Shane, Jim Gailey, Tom Gorrill, Paul Niehoff and John Duncan were scheduled to meet this morning on this. In preparation for the meeting, staff proposed the following purpose and overall strategy:

- To recommend to MaineDOT that MaineDOT, FHWA, PACTS and others work to reduce the cost of federally funded transportation projects in our region.
- Meet with MaineDOT leadership (Ken Sweeney, Joyce Taylor and Brad Foley) to discuss suggestions on how to achieve cost reductions and improve project delivery.
- Develop a short report which includes examples and suggestions of what the issues are and recommendations for improvements.
- We realize that all solutions will require strong teamwork between MaineDOT, PACTS, our municipalities and others such as FHWA.
- We will emphasize to MaineDOT how important this is to our municipalities. We will consider the legislative route if necessary.
- One of our suggestions will be local project administration at PACTS

We have hired Tom Gorrill to help us compare the costs of projects done by MaineDOT and those done locally, and to develop suggestions to take to MaineDOT.

## **Agenda Item 4: Options for re-programming funds from withdrawn and other projects**

Staff Resource: Paul Niehoff and John Duncan

Recommendation: Discussion, and possible recommendation to the Policy Committee

### Background

Last October we reallocated roughly \$1,000,000 in federal and state funds from our Holding PIN. The available funds were from projects that had been finished under budget and projects that had been withdrawn. (Note that as we decide how to use these funds we refer often to the federal and state funds. This is because the PACTS local match percentage requirement policy varies depending on the type of project.)

We now have new available funds from projects finished under budget and projects that had been withdrawn. The federal + state funds available are approximately:

- Baxter Boulevard preservation paving (\$485,000)...Kathi Earley explained last month why this project should not be done.
- CBITD ferry replacement contribution (\$240,000 federal only)...This has been funded instead with federal stimulus funds.
- Funds from other recently closed projects (\$220,000)

So, we have approximately \$945,000 in federal + state funds to reallocate. This is consistent with our policies found on pages 14 and 15 of our TIP Policies and Procedures document.

Staff recommends retaining \$100,000 for contingencies, and is prepared to discuss the pros and cons of the options below.

- Use some or all of the funds in a 2011 PACTS Credit Program. As such, the funds would be programmed late this year after we review municipal submissions for locally funded projects done late last year or this year on state roads.
- Spread the funds around to all our Set Asides (collectors, rebuild roads, intersections, transit capital and bike/ped) based on our policy percentages.
- Use more than the 9% transit capital set aside for a transit capital project.
- Use all or a large percentage for collector preservation paving projects.
- Allocate now to existing projects that are “ready to go” but are currently on a 2012 or later construction schedule.
- Reduce the local match on existing collector paving projects.
- A combination of the above.

Paul is also working with MaineDOT to close out other completed projects, and hopes to add additional funds to the Holding PIN in the near future.

## **Agenda Item 5: FTA 5307 sub-allocation formula**

Staff Resource: Steve Linnell

Recommendation: Forward to the Policy Committee the Transit Committee's revised performance formula for use in the distribution of FY 2011 FTA 5307 funds.

### **Background**

In 2008 the Transit Committee added a small performance reward element to our formula for distributing Section 5307 funds to the region's transit systems. This was well received by all parties based on the new federal STIC\*\* funds provided by Congress, but the new element has not worked out as well as expected because the STIC funding dropped off (see table on the next page) and because it is difficult to strike a fair balance with the formula for such a diverse set of transit systems in our region. As a result, in 2009 and again this year the Transit Committee is recommending some adjustments to the formula.

At its January 13, 2011 meeting the Transit Committee voted to recommend the formula below for allocating 2011\* Section 5307 funds. As has been the practice for the past three years, the 2007 distribution of funds is used as the base amount that each provider receives, regardless of performance. This "hold harmless" approach is employed to ensure that each provider has a reasonably stable number on which to base their annual budgets.

A performance metric is applied only to the incremental difference between the 2007 5307 allotment to the region and the current year's allotment. This factor is derived by combining boardings and revenue vehicle mileage (70% and 30% respectively). Boarding and mileage statistics are then averaged for three consecutive years to create a rolling average. The example presented in the table below compares the actual 2010 allocations with what would happen when applying the new formula to the same amount of funding. In this case, boardings and miles are averaged from '06 to '08 and then subtracted from the average of '07 to '09. In 2011 the three year averages will each roll forward one year. The difference represents the growth factor. Each provider with a positive growth factor receives a proportional amount of the increment. Those with no or negative growth do not receive any of the increment.

The new element in this year's formula is the rolling average. This is being used in an effort to dampen any sharp, year-to-year changes in boardings or miles. When applied to the 2010 funding amount, the rolling average does indeed dampen the annual swings in performance. Instead of three providers having negative growth, as is the case when making a simple year-to-year comparison using 2008 and 2009 data, only one provider ends up on the negative side using the rolling average. However, because of the decrease in total funding over the past two years, due mostly to the disappearance of STIC\*\* funding, the net result is that even the lower performing services may receive less funding than they did the previous year.

## Summary of Recent Funding History

|               | 2007               | 2008               | 2009               | 2010                | 10 - 09           | 10 - 07           |
|---------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| <b>5307</b>   | \$1,954,598        | \$2,119,687        | \$2,253,660        | \$ 2,246,180        | -\$7,480          | \$291,582         |
| <b>STIC</b>   | \$723,646          | \$626,738          | \$140,553          | \$ -                | -\$140,553        | -\$723,646        |
| <b>Total.</b> | <b>\$2,678,244</b> | <b>\$2,746,425</b> | <b>\$2,394,213</b> | <b>\$ 2,246,180</b> | <b>-\$148,033</b> | <b>-\$284,031</b> |

## Summary of Proposed Change

|                                     | BSOOB            | CBITD            | METRO              | RTP              | SPBS             | YCCAC            | Total              |
|-------------------------------------|------------------|------------------|--------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|--------------------|
| Actual 2010 Distribution            | \$149,596        | \$389,488        | \$1,316,486        | \$165,094        | \$157,233        | \$68,284         | \$2,246,180        |
| Percent of Funds                    | 6.7%             | 17.3%            | 58.6%              | 7.4%             | 7.0%             | 3.0%             | 100.0%             |
| Base Amount (2007, 5307 only)       | \$130,176        | \$338,927        | \$1,145,590        | \$143,663        | \$136,822        | \$59,420         | \$1,954,598        |
| 3-Yr Rolling Avg. Performance Amnt. | \$62,808         | \$0              | \$44,174           | \$12,634         | \$58,930         | \$113,035        | \$291,582          |
| <b>Total Funds 2010*</b>            | <b>\$192,985</b> | <b>\$338,927</b> | <b>\$1,189,764</b> | <b>\$156,297</b> | <b>\$195,752</b> | <b>\$172,455</b> | <b>\$2,246,180</b> |
| <b>Total Percent of Funds</b>       | <b>8.6%</b>      | <b>15.1%</b>     | <b>53.0%</b>       | <b>7.0%</b>      | <b>8.7%</b>      | <b>7.7%</b>      | <b>100.0%</b>      |
| % of Regional Boardings 2009        | 3.6%             | 29.0%            | 51.7%              | 5.6%             | 8.4%             | 1.6%             | 100.0%             |
| % of Regional V-M 2009              | 6.0%             | 2.8%             | 37.1%              | 31.9%            | 10.6%            | 11.4%            | 100.0%             |

\*This is how the funds would be distributed using the proposed three-year rolling average to calculate the performance amount.

\*2011 funding amount as yet unknown.

\*\*Small Transit Intensive Cities – Performance based federal dollars added to 5307 in areas where minimum thresholds are exceeded compared to national averages. PACTS share of this funding has slipped to zero over four years, even though 5307 funding rose each year, except in 2010.

## **Agenda Item 6: UPWP for the Next Biennium**

Staff Resource: John Duncan

Recommendation: Briefing on the following:

1. Schedule for development of the UPWP
2. Letter to MaineDOT regarding federal and state funding
3. Public comments received
4. Balanced budget worksheet
5. Staff and consultant scopes and budgets (*final 13 pages of meeting packet*)

### **Schedule for development of Unified Planning Work Program**

GPCOG, SMRPC and PACTS staff are working with the Transit Committee to develop tasks to be funded with FTA planning funds. We will coordinate this process with the development of the FHWA-funded work as outlined here.

- December 15<sup>th</sup>: John sent an email to MaineDOT asking for advice on levels of FHWA and MaineDOT funding for the next UPWP. See January 27<sup>th</sup> letter also.
- January 14<sup>th</sup>: Press Herald legal ad asking for public input.
- January 19<sup>th</sup>: Carl sent email to our Interested Parties list. See responses below.
- February 1<sup>st</sup>: Executive Committee reviews refined cost estimates and scopes for the proposed regional study efforts and PACTS staff work task descriptions for the next UPWP.
- February 4<sup>th</sup>: Study proposals due from municipalities and transit systems.
- Policy Committee briefings in February and April.
- March 1<sup>st</sup>: Executive Committee continues work. Staff presents scores of study proposals submitted by members – and comments offered on those proposals based on a staff meeting with MaineDOT in February.
- March: Staff presents scores of proposals for FHWA-funded to the Planning, Technical and Transit Committees.
- April 5<sup>th</sup>: Executive Committee endorses a final draft UPWP (FTA \$\$ and FHWA \$\$) for review by the Policy Committee on April 21<sup>st</sup>.
- May 3<sup>rd</sup>: Executive Committee recommends final UPWP budget and tasks to Policy Committee for final action.

Letter sent on January 28, 2011

Ms. Peggy Duval  
Acting Chief Planner  
Maine Department of Transportation  
State House Station #16  
Augusta, ME 04333-0016

Subject: Funding for the Next PACTS UPWP

Dear Peggy,

As you know, we are developing our UPWP for the next biennium. I ask for your help in advising as soon as possible on federal and state funding levels. I need to brief the Policy Committee on this subject at the February 17<sup>th</sup> meeting.

I attach a worksheet that we will review at our Executive Committee meeting on the 1<sup>st</sup>. Here are two questions related to it.

- Will the Department allow us to carry over our estimated \$215,000 in consultant work? This estimate assumes that the \$100,000 for our Franklin Street Study Phase II (that we transferred to PIN 14815) is not counted.
- Is there any chance that the Department would obligate enough federal money to finance the \$2,005,000 estimate in the attached worksheet?

I know that the Department's budget is uncertain at this time and that you, Duane, and I have discussed this earlier this month, but I want to put this matter before you in letter form because it is so important to us at PACTS.

Sincerely,

John Duncan

cc: Duane Scott, Jerry Douglass, Gerry Audibert

**Note regarding worksheet on next page**

**The two “uses” scenarios are staff suggestions. None of the line items and amounts are givens. Staff proposes a 3-person budget (and COG support) on the first line, and then proposes spending the balance on the line items below.**

**January 27th Budget Worksheet**  
**For The Next 2-Year PACTS UPWP (July 2011 to June 2013)**

| <u>Revenue Budget *</u>           | <u>Current<br/>Budget</u> | <u>Dec. 22nd<br/>Scenario **</u> | <u>Balanced<br/>Budget **</u> |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| New FHWA Planning funds (80%) *** | \$1,256,367               | \$1,256,367                      | \$1,256,367                   |
| MaineDOT match (13.5%)            | \$212,012                 | \$212,012                        | \$212,012                     |
| Other match ****                  | <u>\$102,080</u>          | <u>\$102,080</u>                 | <u>\$102,080</u>              |
| Total                             | \$1,570,459               | \$1,570,459                      | \$1,570,459                   |

\* This sheet omits the \$92,000 contingency budget adopted in 2009.

\*\* This sheet also omits an estimated \$215,000 in current consultant study work to be completed after June 30, 2010. MaineDOT could require that some of the post-June 2010 work be funded from our allotment of FHWA Planning Funds for July 2011 to June 2013.

\*\*\* We could ask MaineDOT to give us more.

\*\*\*\* We could increase the local match for all UPWP work, and thereby get more done.

| Uses Budget                             | Current     | Dec. 22nd<br>Scenario | Balanced<br>Budget |
|---|-------------|-----------------------|--------------------|
| PACTS Staff and GPCOG Support           | \$989,000   | \$1,050,000           | \$1,050,000        |
| PACTS Model Update and Applications     | \$38,500    | \$50,000              | \$40,000           |
| GPCOG Planning Services                 | \$30,000    | \$35,000              | \$30,000           |
| GPCOG Maine Clean Communities           | \$30,000    | \$35,000              | \$30,000           |
| SMRPC Planning Services                 | \$30,000    | \$35,000              | \$30,000           |
| Regional Signal Study II                | \$25,000    | \$0                   | \$0                |
| Regional Collector Study                | \$17,000    | \$15,000              | \$15,000           |
| Regional Dest Tomorrow Update           | \$12,500    | \$0                   | \$0                |
| Regional EPS                            | \$9,500     | \$15,000              | \$10,000           |
| Regional Transportation Funding Policy  | \$7,000     | \$10,000              | \$10,000           |
| MaineDOT Air Quality Analysis           | \$3,000     | \$0                   | \$0                |
| Locally proposed consultant studies     | \$379,000   | \$435,000             | \$160,459          |
| Regional signals coordination           | na          | \$100,000             | \$80,000           |
| Local project administration at PACTS   | na          | \$50,000              | \$30,000 *         |
| Regional Aerial Flight                  | na          | \$50,000              | \$0 **             |
| Gorham East West Land Use Tech. Assist. |             | \$50,000              | \$40,000 ***       |
| Regional Bike/Ped Wayfinding Implement. |             | na                    | \$15,000 ****      |
| Regional Arterials Study                | <u>na</u>   | <u>\$75,000</u>       | <u>\$30,000</u>    |
| Total                                   | \$1,570,500 | \$2,005,000           | \$1,570,459        |

**Unmet Need:            \$434,541            \$0**

\* Placeholder amount. Finance mostly from capital project budgets.

\*\* Rely on municipalities to pay for the "buy ups".

\*\*\* \$60,000 in proposals are now expected (six municipalities at \$10,000 each).

\*\*\*\* A staff proposal drawn from the 2009 PACTS Regional Bicycle/Pedestrian Plan.

## Public comments received

Carl sent an email to the 150 people on our Interested Parties email distribution list on January 19<sup>th</sup>. Here is a summary of the responses from ten people so far.

1. Portland businessman – Four priorities for the region: METRO to buy some new buses, a connection west from the turnpike to the Gorham bypass, commuter bus service on I-295 to Freeport, and high speed tolling.
2. Area resident – Develop a better marketing campaign that will help expand the use of our public bus systems.
3. Portland resident – Two ideas. Reduce the speed limit on I-295 in order to make it safer and less congested. Also, consider tolls on I-295 north of Portland. Use some of the toll revenues to fund the recommendations in the Portland North Study
4. Portland resident – Three ideas. Reduce the speed limit on I-295 in order to make it safer and less congested. Create a bus service for commuters from the suburbs and Portland's neighborhoods. Run a commuter ferry service between South Portland and Portland.
5. Portland resident – Host a presentation by an MIT professor on the future mobility implications of our aging population.
6. Portland city councilor – Create a regional rail plan to determine the best future use of rail infrastructure in the region.
7. Bicycling advocate – Three ideas. Create an aerial tramway or a monorail from South Portland to Congress Street. Build shoulders on Route 77 in Scarborough. Creation of a PACTS network of designated bike routes that are required by policy for funding to include 4 foot shoulders for durability, 11 foot travel lanes, wayfinding signage.
8. UNH Special Projects Director – Create a process whereby the five MPO's between Portland and Haverhill think of rail/transit corridor improvements in a coordinated fashion.
9. Westbrook resident – Proposes monorail, maglev trains and a new highway to Connecticut. Long email.
10. Portland businessman – Fix intersection of Marginal Way and Franklin Street.

## **Agenda Item 7: Draft Bylaw Language**

Staff Resource: John Duncan

Recommendation: To submit bylaw language to the Policy Committee for approval.

### **Background**

In October – in response to a proposal from staff and the Executive Committee – the Policy Committee requested that we draft bylaw language to authorize the Executive Committee to amend the UPWP.

The language in bold reflects the October vote of the Policy Committee.

### **Section 1 of Article VI of the PACTS Bylaws**

#### **Executive Committee**

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

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

## **Agenda Item 8: Updates from Staff and Committees**

1. Carl Eppich will give us an update on the completion of the **Destination Tomorrow 2011 Update**. Carl was out sick four days last week, so he was unable to get you the final draft report for today as he had planned.
2. Please see below a draft **PACTS Milestones Calendar** for your review. Do you want something like this? If yes, what should be in it? Who should get it? The Transit Committee reviews an annual committee milestones calendar every month.
3. Update on work with the **Cumberland County Legislative Delegation**:
  - John Duncan attended their first weekly meeting in early January in Augusta.
  - He made a presentation at their meeting last week (12 legislators attended). We will do this again. John has not reached out to the York County Delegation.
  - We have sent the DVD of our December Legislative Briefing to 13 local access TV stations. We have confirmation that 7 of them are showing it repeatedly in January and February.
4. Nathan, Kathi and John are organizing a **six-month review** of John's performance. Nathan will seek input from all Executive Committee members later this month.
5. Updates from the January meetings of the **Transit, Planning and Technical Committees**.
6. New Policy members:
  - Donna Larson, Freeport.
  - Peggy Duval, MaineDOT's Acting Chief of Planning Bureau
  - Carlos Pena, FHWA Planner
  - Pat Finnigan is expected to replace Joe Gray.
7. John has communicated with Portland, South Portland and MaineDOT about MaineDOT's work in progress **to enhance public information about the openings of the Casco Bay Bridge**. We might end up not spending our \$2,500 recently budgeted to work on this topic.
8. **Dave Bernhardt** is likely to be confirmed as the new MaineDOT Commissioner later this month. John and Paul got to know him during the Simplification Study process and on the planning committee for the MaineDOT annual conference.
9. The **Gorham East West Corridor Phase I Study** recommendations are almost done. They are being postponed slightly in order to get input from the next MaineDOT Commissioner.
10. February 9<sup>th</sup> meeting here of municipal, Turnpike, MaineDOT, SMRPC and others regarding interstate highways **traffic incident management** coordination in our region.
11. Tony Plante's recent response to John Duncan: "According to Ernie Martin at last night's **River Road PAC** meeting, River Road is the department's #1 "dirt work" priority in its upcoming 2012-2013 biennial capital work plan and is currently being recommended for \$6 million in the biennium, with work to begin on the northern end at the compact line by the

Masonic Hall and rehab/rebuild approximately three miles. Construction would most likely be done in calendar 2012 and could extend over two construction seasons. **No word on what is to happen with the other six miles, including the portion which falls in the MPO.**” (JD emphasis)

## **12. March 1<sup>st</sup> Executive Committee draft agenda**

- Update from the high project costs team
- More work on development of the next UPWP
- Overview of draft revised PACTS public involvement plan.
- Consider a staff proposal to ask the Policy Committee to create a 2011 TIP Process Committee that would work from April to September in preparation for development in 2012 of our 2014/2015 biennium projects list.
- Discuss a proposal to establish rules regarding the implications of abstentions in committee votes.
- Other

## Draft 2011 PACTS Milestones Calendar

Need Exec Committee input on what to put in this calendar.  
 Include an updated version of this in Executive Committee meeting packets.  
 Send an update to all committees every six months.

|  | <u>Jan</u> | <u>Feb</u> | <u>Mar</u> | <u>Apr</u> | <u>May</u> | <u>Jun</u> | <u>Jul</u> | <u>Aug</u> | <u>Sep</u> | <u>Oct</u> | <u>Nov</u> | <u>Dec</u>                                       |
|--|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|--|
| COG presentation to Policy Committee on the 3-year regional sustainable development plan process |            | X          |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |  |
| PACTS sign consortium agreement  |            |            |            | X          |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |  |
| Join Phase II Consortium of Gorham East West Study   |            |            |            | X          |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |  |
| High Cost of Projects Team work with MaineDOT et al  |            | X          | X          | X          | X          |            |            |            |            |            |            |  |
| Members/staff work with Legislature on funding   | X          | X          | X          | X          | X          |            |            |            |            |            |            |  |
| Develop 2-Year UPWP  |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |  |
| Staff solicits member requests   | X          |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |  |
| Members submit study requests  |            | X          |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |  |
| Executive Committee role   | X          | X          | X          | X          | X          |            |            |            |            |            |            |  |
| Transit Committee proposes FTA-funded work   |            |            |            |            |            | X          |            |            |            |            |            |  |
| Planning Committee recommends FHWA-funded studies  |            |            |            |            | X          |            |            |            |            |            |            |  |
| Policy Committee adopts UPWP   |            |            |            |            |            | X          |            |            |            |            |            |  |
| New UPWP work begins   |            |            |            |            |            |            | X          |            |            |            |            |  |
| PACTS Annual Meeting   |            |            |            |            |            | X          |            |            |            |            |            |  |
| Policy Committee endorse FTA 5307 funding formula  |            | X          |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |  |
| Policy Committee programs FTA 5307 funds   |            |            |            | X          |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |  |
| Prepare for 2012 work to develop '14/'15 TIP list  |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |  |
| Technical Comm. work on collector ranking  | X          | X          | X          | X          |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |  |
| TIP Process Committee  |            |            |            |            |            | X          | X          | X          | X          | X          |            |  |
| Solicit municipal and transit proposals for 2014/2015 TIP  |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |            | X          |  |
| Destination Tomorrow   |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |  |
| Policy Committee adopts Update   |            | X          |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |  |
| Brochure development and distribution  |            | X          | X          | X          |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |  |
| Video development  |            | X          | X          | X          |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |  |
| Video completion and distribution  |            |            |            |            |            | X          |            |            |            |            |            |  |
| Revise Public Participation Plan   |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |  |
| Staff and committees work on draft   | X          | X          | X          |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |  |
| Public input   |            |            |            |            | X          |            |            |            |            |            |            |  |
| Policy Committee adopts  |            |            |            |            |            | X          |            |            |            |            |            |  |
| Submit federal annual earmark proposal   |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |            | Not this year.                                   |
| Update 2009 PACTS High Priority Project proposals  |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |            | Not this year? Wait for news on reauthorization. |

## **Agenda Item 9: Minor TIP Amendment**

Staff Resource: Carl Eppich

Recommendation: To amend our TIP to add \$128,489 in federal JARC funding for the urban portion of the WAVE trolley service to the FY 2009 allocation to the York County Community Action Corporation.

### **Background**

MaineDOT is requesting this TIP amendment. The Executive Committee has the authority to make this amendment per our bylaws (as shown in Agenda Item 7 above).

The York County Community Action Corporation is a member of our Transit Committee.

## **Agenda Item 10: Finalize Policy Committee Agenda**

Here is a draft agenda for the February 17<sup>th</sup> meeting:

1. Adoption of Update of Destination Tomorrow plan
2. *GPCOG briefing on 3-year regional sustainability planning process*
3. Reallocation of new money in the Holding PIN
4. Report on work of High Project Costs Team
5. Action on use of FTA 5307 funding formula
6. Update on the process for development of the next 2-year UPWP
7. Act on bylaw language regarding Executive Committee authority to amend the UPWP.
8. Executive Director's Report
  - Mention Executive Committee's January direction to MaineDOT regarding River Road in Windham.
  - Other items from status reports above.

## PACTS Staff and Consultant Scopes and Budgets

13 pages

The “budget proposals for next UPWP” are from our larger December 22<sup>nd</sup> budget proposal.

### Outline For PACTS Staff Work For The Coming Two Years

Budget in current UPWP – \$989,000

Budget proposal for next UPWP – \$1,050,000

Lead staff involved – John Duncan

MaineDOT match required -- \$210,000

Municipal match required -- \$ 0

Municipalities involved – 15

Work Done in Current UPWP – We can prepare a synopsis if requested.

The following page is in the same format and level of detail as used in recent years.

#### Policy Development and Regional Coordination

1. Work with the members of our **5 standing committees** and with a **TIP Process Committee** in 2011. We also foresee continued quarterly joint sessions of our Planning, Technical and Transit Committees.
2. Continue a regional education and state-level collaboration processes related to **transportation needs** and funding options.
3. Monitor and advise our members on the development of and the implications of state and federal **legislation**, including the next federal transportation **authorization act**.
4. Lead the implementation of the recently adopted **PACTS region traffic management system policy** regarding traffic signals.
5. Continued close collaboration with (and development of relationships with new staff at) the **MaineDOT, the Turnpike Authority, SMRPC and GPCOG**.
6. Maintain the PACTS website and perform other **public outreach** work.

#### Project Programming and Development

1. Facilitate the **development of funded projects** in our region. This might include a greater PACTS role in **local project administration**.
2. **Monitor** changes in the scope and cost of funded projects, and then **administer** the amendment process as appropriate.
3. Work with our municipal members, MaineDOT and FHWA on opportunities **to streamline the development of projects and to reduce project costs**.
4. Perform the priority setting for the **2014/2015 PACTS MPO Allocation** list of projects.

#### Planning and Administration

1. Participate in the land-use-transit-highway planning in **Phase II of the Gorham East-West Corridor Study** led by the Turnpike Authority and MaineDOT, in the **Regional Sustainable**

**Development Plan** led by GPCOG and SMRPC, and in the **Northern York County Corridor Study**.

2. Organize, administer and participate in PACTS-funded consultant **studies**. In early 2011 we have 12 studies in process with consultants, and we estimate that we will start 12 new ones in the next UPWP. This includes work with our PACTS model consultant team who will update the model with the new data from the 2010 U. S. Census.
3. Administer the 2012/2013 Unified **Planning** Work Program, and develop the next one in early 2013.
4. Work with our federal and state partner agencies to meet federal and state planning and programming **requirements**. This will include work related to our region's new air quality non-attainment status.

**PACTS Model Update and Applications**

Budget in current UPWP – \$38,500

Budget proposal for next UPWP – \$50,000

Lead staff involved – John Duncan

Local match required -- \$10,000 The local match for Model work done for sub-regional and local studies is provided by the municipality(s) involved. The match for Model work done for the entire region is provided through the PACTS Assessment and MaineDOT.

Municipalities involved – All 15 PACTS municipalities

Work Done in Current UPWP –

Examples of outputs of the PACTS travel demand model (for current and future conditions) are peak hour traffic volumes on existing and proposed roads, mode split percentages, simulated origins and destinations of trips made on selected sections of roads, and regional vehicle miles of travel and regional vehicle hours of travel. During the current biennium our consultant produced these outputs for the following studies:

- Update of Destination Tomorrow regional transportation plan, including the required air quality conformity analysis
- Tri-Community Transportation Plan
- Windham Comprehensive Transportation Study
- Yarmouth Route One Corridor Study Phase III
- Air quality conformity analysis for the FY 2010-2013 PACTS Transportation Improvement Program
- The “future growth” inputs to our PACTS Roadway Formula scoring of proposals for FY 2012/2013 TIP proposals
- Special requests from MaineDOT and the Turnpike Authority – such as the estimated diversion of traffic during construction of the Veterans Bridge and other construction projects in our region.
- Gorham East-West Corridor Study
- Assist PACTS staff in organizing our Spring 2011 regional traffic count program.

Note that during the past three years PACTS, the Turnpike Authority and the MaineDOT jointly paid for a series of enhancements to the Model. The latest enhancements

(completed in January 2011) are the creation of a daily version of the Model, and a truck travel simulation component in the Model. We paid for this work under a different budget. Note also that MaineDOT and the Turnpike Authority paid consultants during this biennium to use the Model for the Gorham East West Corridor Study and for the Portland North Alternative Modes Study.

#### Work Proposal for Next UPWP –

- Updates to the Model based on “journey to work” data and other data from 2010 U. S. Census (delivery expected in 2012). See Details below as prepared by our Model consultant.
- Portland Forest Avenue Land Use and Transportation Plan
- New PACTS studies that we fund this spring – such as the Regional Arterials Study and ones proposed by municipal members
- Air quality conformity analysis for the FY 2012-2015 PACTS Transportation Improvement Program
- The “future growth” inputs to our PACTS Roadway Formula scoring of proposals for FY 2014/2015 TIP proposals
- It is also likely that the GPCOG/SMRPC regional sustainable development plan development process will require use of the PACTS Model. We will collectively develop a scope and budget for that work during the coming year, and decide how the work gets paid for.

#### Details on Update PM Peak Hour Model to Base Year of 2010, and refine it

- Compile 2010 Census and American Community Survey demographic data for population, households, and household vehicle availability and update TAZ data accordingly
- Update stratification of household size by number of vehicles available used in model
- Compile the most recent American Community Survey data on work trip mode choice and journey to work and use this information to update mode choice and trip distribution parameters in PACTS travel demand model
- Compare American Community Survey information on average commute times to model data for home-based work trips
- Compile employment information for the year 2010 from the Maine Department of Labor and allocate to the model TAZ structure
- Review and update characteristics in the roadway and transit networks for the year 2010
- Assist in the development of updated forecasts for all TAZ demographics and employment data
- Review and update roadway and transit characteristics to be included in future base transportation systems
- Review and update the current and future year TAZ pedestrian environment factors
- Review the TAZ system and compare it to the 2010 census geographic areas
- Compile traffic count information and update to a year 2010 calibration and count database
- Update external-external and external-internal traffic volumes for 2010
- Compile information on current through travel patterns in Greater Portland; continue to refine how model reflects splits between I-95 and I-295

- Compile information on EZPass travel characteristics in model area and incorporate as a distinct trip table

### **GPCOG Planning Services**

Budget in current UPWP – \$30,000

Budget proposal for next UPWP – \$35,000

Lead staff involved – Steve Linnell

Local match required -- \$7,000 – to be provided by GPCOG

Municipalities involved – The twelve PACTS municipalities in the Cumberland County.

Work Done in Current UPWP – This is the GPCOG planning services requested by PACTS staff – not the administrative services provided by GPCOG. So far in this biennium GPCOG staff did the following planning work for PACTS within this budget:

- Collaborated with MaineDOT in organizing a regional meeting of traffic incident management personnel (February 9, 2011).
- Provided update of demographic data and long range forecast for Destination Tomorrow, and prepared charts for Chapter 3.
- Provided input, coordination and review for PACTS staff of population, housing, employment projections for the Gorham East West Study.
- Prepared for and participated in Destination Tomorrow regional plan update advisory committee meetings.
- Provided mapping and graphics services for 20 PACTS staff requests
- Coordination/exploration of the feasibility of a regional aerial orthophoto project
- Technical assistance for the PACTS website, 2010 PACTS video and ftp site
- Created PACTS Blog website - <http://pactsblog.org/blog/>.
- Created PACTS YouTube account
- Advised with the creation of MaineTransit.org website, and renewal of maintransit.org and .com domains, and created Analytics acct and added code to main site, blog and supplied code for Maintransit.org site.
- Posted PACTS reports on the PACTS website.
- Researched and purchased, along with Go Maine, a bicycle helmet camera to use to support bicycle infrastructure projects.
- PACTS staff training in Wordpress and discussion of best practices and management.

Work Proposal for Next UPWP – Similar to the services described above, GPCOG will provide to PACTS staff upon request the following:

- Demographic data analysis relative to the 2010 U. S. Census results due in 2011 and 2012, and American Community Survey
- Mapping and graphics services
- Technical assistance for the PACTS website, blog and other telecommunications functions.
- Other services, as requested by PACTS staff.

### **GPCOG's Maine Clean Communities**

Budget in current UPWP – \$30,000  
Budget proposal for next UPWP – \$35,000  
Lead staff involved – Steve Linnell  
Local match required -- \$7,000 – to be provided by GPCOG  
Municipalities involved – The twelve PACTS municipalities in the Cumberland County

#### Work Done in Current UPWP –

Co-Sponsored Ribbon Cutting to Inaugurate the Opening of Maine Standard Bio-Fuel –  
Attended by the Governor

[Biofuels Summit](#) - featuring:

- Dean Sgouros from [Maine Standard Biofuels](#) - closed-loop biodiesel production
- Steve Fitzpatrick from [Biofine Technology LLC](#) - levulinic acid
- Dick Arnold from [Old Town Fuel and Fiber](#) - biobutanol
- Will Brinton from [Woods End Laboratories](#) - Biomethane
- Representative Steve Butterfield - Biofuels policy

[Idle Reduction and Hybrids](#) - featuring:

- GPCOG and Clean Air - Cool Planet intern Ben Lake - regional energy and greenhouse gas inventory
- Scott Potter from Havis, Inc. - [IdleRight](#) idle reduction technology
- Greg Topjian, from [Energy Xtreme](#) - Energy Xtreme's idle reduction technology
- Representatives from Falmouth and Portland - idle reduction pilots
- David Green from [Oakhurst Dairy](#) - Oakhurst's new hybrid delivery truck.

Co-hosted [“The Compelling Case for Natural Gas Vehicles \(NGVs\)”](#)

Co-hosted National AFV Day Odyssey with SMCC – featuring twenty alternative fuel and advanced technology vehicles were on display. Booths and talks raised awareness on the Northeast Low Carbon Fuel Standard, biodiesel, carpooling and vanpooling, and idle reduction technology.

Conducted two annual Fleet Surveys

Held nine Stakeholder meetings

Increased the number of Stakeholders by 25%

#### Work Proposal for Next UPWP –

- Propane Workshop(s)
- EcoDriving Workshops
- Develop Strategic Planning/Feasibility Study for Electric Vehicle and Charging Infrastructure Implementation
- Natural Gas Vehicle Workshop(s)
- Conduct 20 targeted fleet outreach visits with technical assistance follow-up
- Conduct two annual Fleet Surveys
- Hold minimum of four Stakeholder meetings
- Launch new website that is more user-friendly and searchable

#### **SMRPC Planning Services**

Budget in current UPWP – \$30,000  
Budget proposal for next UPWP – \$35,000  
Lead staff involved – Tom Reinauer

Local match required -- \$7,000 – to be provided by SMRPC  
Municipalities involved – Old Orchard Beach, Saco and Biddeford

Work Done in Current UPWP –

- Attended all PACTS Transit Committee meetings and provided staff assistance to the Committee in cooperation with GPCOG. Related work involved:
  - Reviewed and scored STP transit set-aside applications in cooperation with GPCOG and PACTS staff.
  - Participated in several meetings to review the FTA 5307 formula and proposed revisions.
  - Developed annual report to the PACTS Policy Committee regarding Transit Committee activities/accomplishments each fiscal year.
- Researched regional transit maintenance facilities and prepared draft scope for upcoming Southern Maine Transit Coordination Study.
- Attended all meetings of the Tri-Community Transportation Study and reviewed all material from consultants. Provided extensive comments on draft study documents. Conducted several traffic counts to supplement consultant data for the Tri-Community Study
- Reviewed material from the Gorham East-West study effort and provided comments as appropriate. Attended a land-use meeting for the study, provided future growth scenarios for PACTS communities in the model area, and provided GIS data layers to consultants.
- Provided technical assistance to Biddeford, Saco, and Old Orchard Beach as needed, particularly regarding the Highway Simplification Study.
- Reviewed Destination Tomorrow update chapters.
- Reviewed Biddeford Mill District Master Plan, multimodal transportation assessment

Work Proposal for Next UPWP –

- Continue providing staff assistance to the PACTS Transit Committee and subcommittees
- Continue to provide data, GIS layers, and other information for PACTS studies and planning efforts
- Provide technical assistance to Biddeford, Saco and Old Orchard Beach as needed
- Participation in PACTS study efforts and attendance at staff and committee meetings

**Regional Collectors Study**

Budget in current UPWP – \$17,000

Budget proposal for next UPWP – \$15,000

Lead staff involved – Paul Niehoff

Local match required -- \$3,000

Municipalities involved – All 15 PACTS municipalities

Work Done in Current UPWP – In 2010 Gorrill-Palmer updated the 2008 version of this study, and also worked in 2011 with Paul and the Technical Committee on revising the ranking process for the selection of PACTS collector pavement preservation projects.

Work Proposal for Next UPWP – In 2012 the consultant will create the next biennial update of the study.

### **Regional Enhanced Project Scoping**

Budget in current UPWP – \$9,500 actual (The original budget was \$15,000.)

Budget proposal for next UPWP – \$15,000

Lead staff involved – Paul Niehoff

Local match required -- \$3,000

Municipalities involved – The ones in 2012 which have proposals short listed for further consideration for funding for the 2014/2015 TIP.

Work Done in Current UPWP – In 2010 two consulting firms did enhanced project scoping of eight proposed projects in five municipalities.

Work Proposal for Next UPWP – Enhanced project scoping of proposals short listed for further consideration for funding for the 2014/2015 TIP.

### **Regional Transportation Funding Policy**

Budget in current UPWP – \$7,000 actual (The original budget was \$10,000.)

Budget proposal for next UPWP – \$10,000

Lead staff involved – John Duncan

Local match required -- \$2,000

Municipalities involved – All 15 PACTS municipalities

Work Done in Current UPWP – John Melrose assisted in the preparation for and performance of two statewide forums of MPO's regarding transportation funding priorities. Tom Gorrill is also assisting staff and our current "high project costs team". Note that John Melrose also assisted MaineDOT, PACTS and the state's other MPO's during the performance of the Highway Simplification Study. That work was paid for through a separate contract.

Work Proposal for Next UPWP – We will hire a consultant who is very familiar with state and federal transportation funding and policy. The consultant will assist PACTS staff and membership in the consideration of local, regional, state and federal transportation funding policy options and new laws that get passed by the Maine Legislature in 2011 and 2012. We will also continue to collaborate with Maine's other MPO's on these matters. The analysis will also be based on options before Congress in 2011 and 2012 during the reauthorization of SAFETEA-LU.

### **Locally-Proposed Consultant Studies**

Budget in current UPWP – \$379,000 (plus the "carryover" studies started in 08/09)

Budget proposal for next UPWP – See two scenarios in budget worksheet

Lead staff involved – Carl, Paul and John

Local match required – 20 percent local match

Municipalities involved – TBD

Work Done in Current UPWP – Consultants completed 8 studies which had been started in the 2008/2009 biennium. We expect to complete 11 studies started during the current biennium. We expect that 5 other studies started during the current biennium will be completed during the 2012/2013 biennium.

Work Proposal for Next UPWP – To be determined. Study proposals are due on February 4<sup>th</sup>.

### **Regional Traffic Management System Implementation**

Budget in current UPWP – \$0

Budget proposal for next UPWP – \$100,000

Lead staff involved – Carl Eppich

Local match required -- \$20,000

Municipalities involved – Portland, South Portland, Westbrook, Scarborough...and others who may wish to become involved.

Work Done in Current UPWP – Consultant finished \$60,000 Regional Signal Coordination Study I in late 2009. A consultant will do a \$25,000 sequel to that study this winter/spring. In 2010 staff secured earmarks to begin implementation of Study I recommendations.

We also worked with study committee to generate a Regional Traffic Management System Policy which the Policy Committee endorsed in December 2010. The preparation included learning of similar experiences in the Bangor region, the Lewiston/Auburn region and other places.

Work Proposal for Next UPWP – The four communities will collaborate on the following goals regarding 62 traffic signals:

1. Partially fund “regional system maintenance” of traffic signals
2. Standardization of traffic signal hardware and software
3. Monitor and maintain regionally our investments in signal equipment and optimization
4. Centrally collect traffic data for intersections at established regular intervals
5. Seek other available funds through Maine DOT programs, including federal homeland security funding
6. Enabling of bus transit priority (extended green light time)

Steve Sawyer developed the following narrative at our request.

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 during the summer of 2011 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 ( $58 \times \$1100 = \$63,800$  plus  $9 \times \$250 = \$2,250$  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.

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.

Signals should be retimed every 30 to 36 months. Sixty two (62) signals could equate to 1 full time engineer. 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 in Lewiston/Auburn area has one engineer for their system that will ultimately contain 80 signals. They retained a less experienced engineer on staff and 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 \$1,100 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.

### **Local Project Administration at PACTS**

Budget in current UPWP – \$0

Budget proposal for next UPWP – \$50,000 -- We would also charge to the TIP projects.

Lead staff involved – Paul Niehoff

Local match required -- \$10,000 match for the “planning” funds, and match for the federal and state funds in the TIP projects.

Municipalities involved – The municipalities in which the projects are done.

Work Done in Current UPWP – We have not written a narrative yet. Possible topics include:

- The current “high project costs” work
- Paul’s and John’s current roles
- The staff-member discussion we had in early 2009 on new role for us
- Paul’s FHWA/MDOT working group
- The Highway Simplification Study standards

Work Proposal for Next UPWP – Staff proposes that we hire staff to perform local project administration of all PACTS MPO Allocation projects. Paul and John proposed this to the “high project cost team” on February 1<sup>st</sup> during the discussion of ways to reduce the cost of

federally-funded project construction and administration, and we discussed it under Agenda Item 3 today.

### **Regional Aerial Flight**

Budget in current UPWP – \$0

Budget proposal for next UPWP – \$50,000

Lead staff involved – Paul Niehoff

Local match required -- \$10,000 from municipalities involved

Municipalities involved – To be determined.

Work Done in Current UPWP – We originally budgeted for a \$20,000 PACTS contribution to a regional aerial flight during the current biennium. GPCOG and PACTS staff worked with our municipal members and many other agencies to organize a flight, but there was not enough interest. Therefore, we dropped this item in December 2010.

Work Proposal for Next UPWP – Based on recent work by GPCOG and PACTS staff, there appears to be enough interest and enough financial commitment from several companies and state agencies to do a regional aerial flight in 2012. The consensus at the January 11<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Planning and Technical Committees was support for a proposal for PACTS funds to contribute to higher resolution “buy ups”. *We have asked the state for a regional cost estimate for “buy ups”.*

### **Gorham East West Land Use Technical Assistance**

Budget in current UPWP – \$0

Budget proposal for next UPWP – \$50,000 Note: Six towns at \$10,000 each adds up to \$60,000, but we are keeping at \$50,000 for the time being in order to simplify comparisons of new options with my original draft budget at our February 1<sup>st</sup> Exec Committee meeting.

Lead staff involved – Carl Eppich

Local match required -- \$10,000 from the municipalities involved

Municipalities involved – Gorham, Portland, Scarborough, South Portland, Westbrook and Windham

The Phase I Study recommends that funding be made available as part of Phase II to participating communities for technical assistance in developing land use policies, identifying and defining growth areas, preparing technical materials such as guidance ordinances, and other related land use efforts. *The intent is that MaineDOT, the Turnpike Authority and PACTS help to finance these land use effort in those six-plus municipalities. Collectively we will develop the scopes, budgets and cost sharing arrangements this winter and spring.*

Work Done in Current UPWP – The Gorham Corridor Phase I Study determined that transportation solutions alone will not be sufficient to manage the traffic growth and congestion that will occur in this region. In order to support future growth and economic viability, municipalities must consider adapting a land use pattern that supports a more efficient way for residents to travel to jobs and services. Only in this way can the public investment in new transportation infrastructure be protected and maximized. This recommended land use pattern builds on recent land use changes already evolving in

Gorham, Scarborough, South Portland, Westbrook, and other communities such as Standish, Windham and Portland.

Work Proposal for Next UPWP – The following describes the technical assistance tasks that would be undertaken as part of this effort by our and each participating community.

1. Designate future growth areas and parameters where the majority of future residential and commercial growth can be directed. With streamlined permitting and appropriate amenities, these areas will be highly attractive to developers and give each municipality a competitive edge. Increasing density in these areas will also make these areas affordable and attractive to new residents, and from a transportation perspective, placing jobs and housing in closer proximity will reduce travel distance for many. This action will conversely deflect growth from other, more rural areas, and maintain communities' rural character for a longer period of time. Task will be for communities to amend and update comprehensive plans to identify these future growth areas.
2. Zone and design these growth areas to include transportation choice by including a denser combination of combined residential and commercial development. This density will support and increase opportunities for transit service between major growth areas. It will also act to keep some level of vehicles off existing commuter arterials and town connector roads, as residents will naturally avail themselves of jobs and services closer to home. Task will include preparation and amendment of local zoning and ordinances to design to support recommended land use pattern.
3. Evaluate and develop fiscal tools, such as Transit-Oriented Development TIFs, to make development in the growth areas more attractive and generate municipal revenue that will help pay for transit, including operating expenses. Task will be for communities to evaluate plausibility of Transit TIF's to support identified growth areas.
4. Evaluate and Determine Feasibility and Mechanics of Regional Transfer of Development Rights program will be developed in conjunction with the communities. The program allows landowners in areas with lower-density zoning to sell a portion or all of their land's development rights to developers who are building projects in high-density growth areas. Task will be for communities to detail the feasibility and mechanics of a proposed TDR program or an appropriate variation of, including the types of standards, agreements, fiscal considerations, and actions that would needed to put such a program in place.
5. Develop model ordinance provisions to aid communities in leveling the development playing field. This means that no municipality can develop community-specific incentives to attract development that would be destructive to the goals of the regional transportation system. Task will be to work with the participating communities to develop these model ordinance provisions.

### **Regional Bike/Ped Wayfinding Implementation**

Budget in current UPWP – \$0

Budget proposal for next UPWP – \$15,000

Lead staff involved – To be determined

Local match required -- \$3,000  
Municipalities involved – To be determined

Work Done in Current UPWP – This is a proposal to implement a recommendation in our 2009 Regional Bicycle/Pedestrian Plan.

Work Proposal for Next UPWP – Staff added this to the set of UPWP proposals in late January. ***Staff is still working on this proposal.***

### **Regional Arterials Study**

Budget in current UPWP – \$0  
Budget proposal for next UPWP – \$75,000...but we now propose only \$30,000.  
Lead staff involved – To be determined  
Local match required -- \$15,000  
Municipalities involved – To be determined

Work Done in Current UPWP – This is a concept born in 2010 in the discussions of the Subcommittee for the Destination Tomorrow Update. The consensus at the January 11<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Planning and Technical Committees was that this was less important than the regional aerial photography “buy up”.

Work Proposal for Next UPWP –

- Purpose: to generate a regional “ballpark” needs picture for our arterials. They are more regionally important than our collector roads. We did a regional collector road assessment study(s), so we ought to do a similar needs assessment of our arterials.
- Show “built” arterials and “unbuilt” arterials. (We have just asked MaineDOT if they already have data on this.)
- Show opportunities for “place making” on certain arterial sections.
- Be sure to consider MaineDOT’s new draft state priorities system that Kat showed staff a few month ago and that Bruce Van Note presented at the December annual state transportation conference.
- ***Staff is still working on this proposal.***