

PACTS

Portland Area Comprehensive Transportation System

Executive Committee Meeting Notice

January 4, 2011
8:30 a.m. to 10:30 a.m.

GPCOG, 68 Marginal Way, Portland

Agenda

1. Call to order
2. Minutes of December 7th meeting
3. The High Cost of Federally Funded Projects (8:35)
4. TIP Project Topics (8:50)
 - A. FTA 5307 sub-allocation formula and FY 2011 allocations
 - B. Funding of Windham River Road Improvements
 - C. Funding of Baxter Boulevard and Cumberland Mills Triangle projects
 - D. Local match commitments for 2012/2013 MPO Allocation projects
5. Unified Planning Work Program Topics (9:20)
 - A. Schedule for Development of 2012/2013 2-Year UPWP
 - B. First Draft Budget
 - C. Overview Document
6. PACTS Role in Convening of Regional Forums (9:50)
7. Updates from Staff and Committees (10:05)
8. Public comment on topics not on today's agenda (10:25)
9. Adjourn

Next meeting: February 1st 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

Minutes of December 7th Meeting

In attendance: Kathi Earley, Chair; Dana Anderson; Dan Bacon; John Bubier; Jim Gailey; Judy Harris; Nathan Poore; Al Presgraves; Sara Trafton; John Duncan; Carl Eppich; Steve Linnell; Paul Niehoff; Maddy Adams

1. **Call to Order.** Kathi called the meeting to order at 8:15 a.m.
2. **Minutes of November 2nd meeting.** *The minutes were approved by consensus.*
3. **The high cost of Federally Funded Projects.** Jim Gailey and Dana Anderson from South Portland spoke about a segment of Cummings Road recently funded for reconstruction. The road is falling apart and is unsafe. The MaineDOT cost to rebuild the road is estimated at \$2.7 million with a \$600,000-700,000 local match. The estimate for the city of South Portland to do the work would be around \$500,000-\$600,000. South Portland would like to know what's in the MaineDOT scope that brings the price up so high. They would also like to know if the Executive Committee wants to take the time to work with MaineDOT on this issue. Paul explained that the cost estimate number is based on Gorrill Palmer's estimate; wetlands mitigation plays a part in the cost. There is a 25% contingency on top of what the estimate is. The number may have been inflated due to past projects coming in way over estimates. Paul agreed that South Portland could do the project for about the same amount of money that they would pay in local match dollars to have MaineDOT do the project. Paul explained some of the MaineDOT costs that bring the price up such as having a construction trailer on site, the unit price for each item is more, etc. If South Portland did the project similar to MaineDOT, they would still have to get permits. They can probably rebuild Cummings for about \$1,000,000 because of less overhead, less project management costs, and their unit prices would be less. The bottom line is that we need to start a conversation with MaineDOT and FHWA to figure out how to do more roads and end up with a quality project, but reduce the costs by reducing the scope. The costs come in with design, engineering and permitting.

It was asked if there is a way for the MPO to administer the projects rather than MaineDOT because they could understand the projects from the beginning, and the projects could presumably be done at a lesser cost. It would probably cut the design cost in half or thirds. Paul responded that PACTS considered having a locally administered project manager on staff a while ago but the idea didn't go anywhere.

What avenues can we pursue? Judy stated that we need to get our legislators to understand what's happening with the money. Use Cummings Road as a test case with MaineDOT to show how much money is being spent versus what it would cost to do it locally. Sara T. explained that the transit providers have run into the same problem with MaineDOT with buying buses; they could purchase a bus cheaper and get a better bus if they were to do it on their own. It was suggested that a small subcommittee be formed to hammer out some proposals. We need to present the new administration with some ideas. John Bubier said he would be willing to chair the subcommittee and Jim Gailey will also participate along with Paul. Cummings Road will be used as an example. We need to figure out how to put the money back to where it needs to go to get the job done in an expeditious manner.

4. **Update on Cumberland Mills Triangle Intersection Project.** No action today. John D. displayed a map of the area. MaineDOT is planning some bridge work near Sappi and they needed to know if PACTS was going to fund the intersection because that would determine how wide the bridge would need to be. MaineDOT has now decided that it will be just a

two-lane bridge. Eric Dudley wants to meet with MaineDOT and PACTS to learn more about this because he doesn't necessarily agree. Westbrook, PACTS Staff and MaineDOT will have further dialogue on this subject and we'll get an update in January.

5. **Regional Traffic Management System.** We have an opportunity to try to coordinate our traffic management systems in our region. Representatives of Portland, South Portland, Westbrook and Scarborough have been meeting for 1.5 years to determine how to maintain the signal management system. They sought funding and have secured over \$1.4 million towards this effort outside of our biannual MPO allocation. Carl explained what the plan involves. Maintenance of the operations really requires doing it regionally. Transit priority or emergency pre-emption would also be considered. The work that has been done to date is Phase 1. The four city/town managers recently liked the proposal and asked that the Executive Committee recommend endorsement of this plan to the Policy Committee. An MOU has been drafted. As communities adopt RTMS plans, we can expand it to include more communities. Phase 1 would include the areas on the map, including the Maine Mall area and Knightville.

Carl explained that we would be accessing funds from the UPWP to provide PACTS the ability to do this work; federal safety money may also be available. Developing a policy now will set the stage for a trickling effect to Biddeford/Saco, Falmouth, Yarmouth, etc. It's a system that will provide benefits to our region and move traffic more efficiently. The Executive Committee agreed with the recommendation. *Sara made a motion to recommend that the Policy Committee endorse the Regional Traffic Management System for Traffic Signals policy, and ask staff to present a UPWP budget proposal for implementation of the policy starting in July 2011. Dan Bacon seconded the motion and it passed.*

6. **Unified Planning Work Program Topics.**

6A. Reallocation of \$42,000 for studies.

The Windham Council met last week and said they would provide the local match for the Windham Impact Fees Study. We haven't gone out to our membership to ask them for ideas on ways to spend this money but we did mention it to the Transit Committee and that generated three ideas. A two-part study entitled Southern Maine Regional Transit Coordination Study was submitted. The Transit Committee will be meeting in two days; they haven't seen the proposal yet. John reviewed the list of studies.

Regional Transit Study is very exciting because it's in line with recommendations that have been made before regarding coordination and collaboration. This study is in two phases (one of which would happen in our next biennium). There were some questions about the order of the tasks and the dollar amounts involved. Nathan asked why METRO wasn't included in the consolidation proposal. Steve responded that South Portland and ShuttleBus did the Saco Bay Study and they have been doing things together. Scarborough of course is the hole in the middle and they have been talking to both South Portland and Biddeford about becoming part of one of the services and that is how this idea came about.

A motion was made to spend the \$42,000 as follows:

- \$32,000 Phase 1 of Regional Transit Study**
- \$ 5,000 Regional Bicycle Safety Promotion**
- \$ 2,500 Collector Roads Scoping**
- \$ 2,500 Casco Bay Bridge traveler information.**

It was pointed out the Lakes Region Bus Study has been around for quite a few years. Steve explained that it will go forward. *Nathan made an amendment to the motion to*

change the amount of the Regional Transit Study to \$30,000, the Collector Road Scoping to \$2,000 and to fund the Lakes Region Bus Study at \$2,500. All were in favor of the amended motion. All were in favor of the main motion below:

Approved	Requested	Project	Match
0	\$20,000	Windham impact fees	Windham
\$30,000	\$10,000	Phase 1 of regional transit study	Saco, Scarborough, et.a.
\$5,000	\$5,000	Regional bicycling safety promotion	Dues
\$2,000	\$2,000	Collector roads scoring	Dues
\$2,500	\$2,500	Support for Lakes Region Bus Study	COG?
\$2,500	\$2,500	Casco Bay Bridge Traveler information about bridge closings	Dues

6B. Planning and Administration Overview Document. Not addressed.

6C. Bylaw Language Regarding UPWP Amendment Role. Not addressed

6D. Amend UPWP for Franklin Street Corridor Study. In our UPWP we are using \$100,000 to help finance the \$558,000 Franklin Street Corridor Study Phase II. The other \$448,000 is our 2010/2011 TIP Franklin Street design project converted into a design/corridor study. In order to combine the two amounts, we need to amend our UPWP to transfer the \$100,000 to the other project. *A motion was made and seconded to recommend that the Policy Committee approve the UPWP Amendment for the Franklin Street Corridor Study. All were in favor.*

7. **PACTS Role in convening of Regional Forums.** Postponed.
8. **Destination Tomorrow Update.** If you have any comments on the Update, please let Carl know.
9. **Updates from Staff and Committees.** John D. reported that 64 people have signed up for the Legislative Forum scheduled for Monday, December 13th. Representative Peoples will help with the Q&A session. John received a call from NNEPRA asking for some time on the agenda. John said he would allow that in order to allow NNEPRA to talk about their plans.

For the next Executive Committee agenda, add a check-in on the status of local match commitments. Remove Item 4 regarding the reallocation of planning funds.

10. **Adopt Policy Committee Meeting Schedule for 2011 and agenda for December Policy Committee Meeting.** The following dates were set for meetings of the Policy Committee – February 17, April 21, May 19, Annual Meeting in June, August 18, October 20 and December 15. The Executive Committee decided to change the Executive Committee meeting start time to 8:30 beginning with the January 4th meeting.
11. **Public comment on topics not on today’s agenda.** None
12. **Adjourn.** The meeting adjourned at 10:12.

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: Discussion only

Background

Nathan Poore, Bill Shane, Jim Gailey, Paul Niehoff and John Duncan met on December 16th for an hour. The meeting was the result of the December 7th Executive Committee meeting where Jim Gailey and Dana Anderson expressed concern over the estimated cost of the recently programmed Cummings Road reconstruction project. Their assessment is that South Portland could locally fund, design and complete the project for much less than the PACTS estimated amount. While this is the most recent conversation we have had on the cost related issue, many discussions at many levels have taken place over the last few years with some minor improvements to the process with resulting lower project costs in some cases.

The Executive Committee decided to form a team to discuss the matter in depth and to develop a method to finally address the issue and make positive changes to decrease project costs including project management and project construction costs. John Bubier, Nathan Poore and Jim Gailey volunteered to head up the initiative. Bill Shane also agreed based on his experience with the Route 88 project.

The December 16th meeting generally pertained to the continued rising costs to fund, develop, manage and complete projects. A number of projects were used as examples (note, these are not final or up to date):

<u>Project and Budget</u>	<u>Comment</u>
Freeport Sidewalk (budget: \$445,863)	\$31,929 over expended for project CE
Bayview Street and Sidewalk (budget: \$685,916)	\$197,000 to date, go to bid soon
Forest Avenue Reconstruction (budget: \$2,435,000)	\$241,000 to date, go to bid 2011
Dunstan Corner (budget: \$3,350,000)	\$95,000 to date, go to bid 2012?
Route 88 Sidewalk (budget: \$103,865)	\$3,743 to date, go to bid 2011

Construction costs are another matter with the consensus being again that the town can complete a project for considerably less or something on the order of slightly above the 25% local match. As we have determined there are many reasons for the difference in cost between a MaineDOT project and a town project. Some of the reasons are based on federal and/or state standards and requirements, some are based on how the contract is structured and others are based on the perception that contractors add a cost adjustment factor to their unit prices just because it is a DOT project.

Irrespective of the reasons behind high project costs, the group was unanimous in agreeing the time is now to open discussions with Federal Highway and the MaineDOT to elicit change in the way projects are developed, managed and completed including any and all options to lower costs. Given falling revenues, increasing construction costs and ever more stringent government controls we cannot continue without substantive change in the way we conduct business.

We collectively felt the situation was important enough to warrant serious discussions with MaineDOT management and the new incoming Administration which we felt would be receptive to the discussion. We have not yet decided who to contact or when to move forward. We will decide this in our next meeting.

Staff has proposed the following methodology to the group:

1. Research and compile a cost comparison of at least three projects, one each for each of the representative communities, and possibly Bayview Street in Biddeford. This will be facilitated by Gorrill-Palmer who is familiar with at least two of the projects, has completed the PACTS Collector Road update, and consults for towns as well as MaineDOT. They will assist in comparing not only construction scopes and construction cost estimates but also compare the differences between developing and managing projects for both towns and the DOT.
2. Concurrent with this strategy PACTS staff will review the data and information developed while engaged with the 2008/2009 PACTS/MaineDOT/FHWA Flexible Design Practices Working Group which primarily focused on the issue of state and federal standards with some review of project costs.

Proposed Schedule

December/Mid-January: Paul met with Tom Gorrill on December 23rd to review the background and purpose of what we hope to accomplish.

January 4th, Brief the Executive Committee

January 14th, Town reports due

January, 24th- 28th, Reconvene to review data and findings to date and decide on next steps, whom to meet, topics and how best to address the issues.

February 1st Brief the Executive Committee

March: Meet with DOT, FHWA (possibly) and others if appropriate.

April: Continue moving forward with the results of the March meeting.

Agenda Item 4: TIP Project Topics

A. FTA 5307 sub-allocation formula and the FY 2011 allocations

Member Resource: Nathan Poore and Sara Trafton

Staff Resource: Steve Linnell and John Duncan

Recommendation: Discussion only

Background

This is an opportunity to brief the Executive Committee on the challenging work underway to revisit – and probably to revise – our formula for sub-allocating Federal Transit Administration Section 5307 funds. The amount to be allocated by the Policy Committee has been approximately \$2,000,000 per year recently. Congress might pass a budget for “5307” funds in January or February. As such, the region’s transit providers would like to have an allocation formula ready when the federal funds become available to be programmed by PACTS.

A year ago the Transit Committee struggled with a similar formula revision process. Ultimately Nat Tupper facilitated a resolution which the Policy Committee endorsed. The Transit Committee has begun a formula review process, and is considering at least one new option. Steve Linnell is the key staff member.

B. Funding of Windham River Road Improvements

Staff Resource: John Duncan

Recommendation: Respond to MaineDOT’s request described below.

Background

MaineDOT wants us to contribute 2014/2015 money (\$2.5 million) towards a \$12 to \$15 million River Road project in Windham. Four of the eight miles are in PACTS.

- A \$2.5 million contribution from PACTS would require \$625,000 from Windham.
- Tony Plante wants MaineDOT to pay it all...therefore no Windham match (?).
- MaineDOT programmed this project 8 years ago (just before Windham became part of PACTS), but had to drop it and many other projects 4 years ago due to shrinking resources.
- The four PACTS miles do NOT qualify for our Collector Paving Set Aside which focuses on “preservable” mileage.
- We have already committed our entire \$1.5 million Set Aside for Rebuild Roads.
- John met in Augusta with Kat Beaudoin and others in November. Tony Plante did also. See Tony’s December 21st letter to Kat below.
- John invited Tony and Marty Rooney (MaineDOT) to join us today.

Town of Windham

Office of the Town Manager
8 School Road
Windham, ME 04062

Anthony T. Plante, Town Manager
atplante@town windham me us

voice 207.892.1907

fax 207.892.1910

December 21, 2010

Kat Beaudoin, Chief
Bureau of Transportation Systems Planning
Maine Department of Transportation
16 State House Station
Augusta, ME 04333-0016

Re: River Road Reconstruction, PIN 11219.00
Route 302/Anglers Road/Whites Bridge Road Intersection, Windham PIN 112.32.00

Dear Ms.. Beaudoin:

In your letter of September 1, 2010 you suggested that it would be helpful to clarify whether the improvements to the Route 302/Anglers Road/Whites Bridge Road intersection or reconstruction of River Road was the higher priority. Following consultation with the Town Council and input from the public Windham hereby unequivocally states that River Road is the higher priority.

The reconstruction of River Road, a vital regional transportation resource, has long been recognized as a priority by both the town and MDOT. Its presence in earlier MDOI biennial transportation improvement programs, having been weighed against other projects to be included, illustrates this fact. That funding was not available to complete, or even begin work on the improvements has not changed the need for this project In fact, the years that have gone by and the continued deterioration of the road have made it even more important to protect public safety.

MDOT's efforts on River Road, including the CSS public advisory committee, have created a critical mass of interest and support for the River Road project.. While we urge the state, and MDOT in particular, to plan appropriately for and find all of Maine's transportation system needs, including projects such as the Route 302/Anglers Road/Whites Bridge Road intersection, River Road is a project of the highest importance and must be done as soon as possible.

From our meeting in November I understand that you and your staff are busy working on a draft biennial capital work plan for the next Legislature and the new administration. On behalf of the Town Council, members of the River Road CSS public advisory committee, and the community I strongly urge the inclusion of River Road in the 2012-2013 plan. It is important that the community sees improvement soon, and sees a clear path from start to completion in as short a time as possible.

Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Anthony T Plante
Town Manager

cc: Senator William Diamond
Representative Mark Bryant
Representative Gary Plummer

C. Funding of Baxter Boulevard and Cumberland Mills Triangle Projects

Staff Resource: John Duncan and Paul Niehoff

Recommendation: Discussion only

Background

Kathi Earley advises that Portland is compelled to drop the 2010/2011 Program project on Baxter Boulevard. She is preparing a letter to this effect, and will explain further today. We will need to recommend where to **reprogram** these funds. Staff will develop a suggestion for today's meeting.

Regarding Westbrook's Cumberland Mills Triangle, MaineDOT several months ago asked us to consider funding the recommended improvements from our Intersection Set Aside in the 2014/2015 biennium. That was a decision that we would typically make two years from now (in 2012) after soliciting proposals a year from now. MaineDOT's request related to coordination with the MaineDOT project to rebuild two nearby bridges.

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

Since then, MaineDOT has advised that they have done further traffic analysis for the bridge projects planning. Their new analysis shows that construction of the Cumberland Mills Triangle improvements would not generate enough additional traffic to warrant a widening of the two nearby bridges. As such, there would be no

compelling reason to fund the project now rather than to consider the proposal two years from now as part of our normal process.

Westbrook's Eric Dudley has been reviewing MaineDOT's new analysis. He expects to be ready to share his perspectives with PACTS staff before we meet on the 4th. (John Duncan invited Eric to join us today.)

In the event that Eric Dudley and PACTS staff concur with MaineDOT's new analysis then we would likely need to **reprogram** the 2012/2013 biennium funds and withdraw the 2014/2015 funding commitment.

See below for a sampling of recent emails.

From: Eric Dudley
Sent: Wednesday, December 01, 2010 8:19 AM
To: 'Condon, Ben'
Cc: Hanscom, Ed
Subject: RE: Westbrook 11063.00 & 11064.00

Ben,

I was speaking to Kathi Earley, the chair of the PACTS Executive Committee yesterday regarding this project. I think the concept of 2 or 3 lanes on the bridge warrants further discussion with City staff, Sebago Technics, Steve Landry and PACTS staff. There are reasons why Alternative 1B was selected. Alternative 1 is effectively 1B without the third lane, however the third lane was deemed to be the proper solution by Sebago and Steve at the time. Since the bridge project has a much longer life span than how we forecast for traffic growth, we need to make sure that we don't hem ourselves in.

Eric Dudley, P.E.
CITY ENGINEER
CITY OF WESTBROOK

From: Condon, Ben [mailto:Ben.Condon@maine.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, November 10, 2010 7:13 AM
To: Eric Dudley
Cc: Hanscom, Ed
Subject: Westbrook 11063.00 & 11064.00

Eric,

I am writing to inform you that our Planning Department has taken alternative 1B of the study and modeled it. They ran the numbers and then tried different configurations and the end result was that the third lane on the bridge offered very little benefit to the traffic model. From Planning's perspective, the traffic project does not need the third lane on the bridge in order for it to function properly and as a result of this MaineDOT will not be putting a third lane on the

easterly bridge. You probably have questions at this point, so I have attached the memo sent to me detailing the results of modeling that was done and I will provide you with Ed Hanscom's contact information so you can direct your questions to the person responsible for the review and results of the modeling. Please don't hesitate to contact me with regards to the bridge project, but questions regarding the modeling should be directed toward Ed. Enjoy your time out and we look forward to your response.

Ben Condon
Assistant Project Manager
MaineDOT Bridge Program

D. Local match commitments made by January 1st deadline

Staff Resource: Paul Niehoff

Recommendation: Accept staff report

Background

The following is Paul's December 22nd email to members on this subject. Paul will report at our meeting regarding the commitments made.

This is a friendly reminder from PACTS staff that we must have signed project ID forms by next Friday the 31st. We've received very few to date and as noted in the excerpts below the deadline is January 1st. Note: the ID forms in essence serve the same function as the "written endorsement(s)" noted below.

I have attached our 12/13 project list which indicates the projects, the funding ratios and in the last two columns; when the ID forms were sent out and when they were returned. Please note MaineDOT had originally requested all signed copies by the end of October but after many discussions with them they revised the submittal date to match ours.

Thank you for attention to this important matter. It's imperative we receive the forms next week. Everyone have a safe and enjoyable holiday season.

A. **Roles of Municipal Officers** (in part from PACTS TIP Policies and Procedures)

The PACTS Policy Committee asks that the Municipal Officers in each municipality provide the following policy support:

- *Submit written endorsement to PACTS for all MPO Allocation proposals to PACTS from their municipality within two months of the submission of the proposals.*
- *Submit written endorsement to PACTS for the projects from their municipality that the Policy Committee has voted to include in each biennial MPO Allocation list. This endorsement is required within two months of the Policy Committee's vote and it should acknowledge the amounts programmed and the estimated local share for each project.*

*(From Oct 2010 Policy Meeting packet) **4. Require our municipalities and transit systems to confirm in writing by January 1st that they will provide the local match for these projects.***

Agenda Item 5: UPWP Topics

A. Schedule for Development of the UPWP for the 2012/2013 Biennium

Staff Resource: John Duncan

Recommendation: Discussion only

Background

GPCOG, SMRPC and PACTS staff will work from January to April with the Transit Committee to develop a work plan to be funded with **FTA planning funds**. As we have done in the past, we will coordinate this process with the development of the **FHWA-funded work** as outlined here.

- November 29th: John sent an email to all members asking folks to begin thinking of proposals for study work in the next UPWP, and advising that study proposal would be needed by early February. Steve Linnell reminded the Transit Committee that this applied to them too.
- December 15th: John sent an email to MaineDOT asking for advice on levels of FHWA and MaineDOT funding for the next UPWP.
- January 5th: Staff sends formal study request to all members. It will include a description of our scoring approach and the 5-page overview document below – and state that the deadline for proposals is February 4th.
- January 11th: Staff briefs members at joint meeting of the Technical and Planning Committees.
- February 1st: Executive Committee reviews refined cost estimates and scopes for the proposed regional study efforts (see list in next agenda item), and PACTS staff work task descriptions for the next UPWP.
- Policy Committee briefings in February and April.
- March 1st: 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 5th: Executive Committee endorses a final draft UPWP (FTA \$\$ and FHWA \$\$) for review by the Policy Committee on April 21st.
- May 3rd: Executive Committee recommends final UPWP budget and tasks to Policy Committee for final action.

B. First Draft Budget

Staff Resource: John Duncan

Recommendation: Discussion only

Background

We hope that MaineDOT will be able to advise us on available federal and state funding this month. Staff is suggesting several new efforts. We will describe them today, time permitting.

December 22nd Budget Worksheet
For The 2-Year PACTS UPWP for July 2011 to June 2013

This sheet 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.

This sheet also omits the \$177,000 in study work budgeted to be completed during the 2010/2011 biennium with funds carried over from the 2008/2009 biennium. This includes the new studies (\$42,000) funded by the Policy Committee in December 2010.

This sheet also omits the FTA-funded section of the UPWP, and our contingency account.

<u>Revenue Budget</u>	<u>Current UPWP</u>	<u>Next UPWP</u>	<u>Notes for Next UPWP</u>
New FHWA Planning funds (80%) *	\$1,256,367	\$1,256,367	MaineDOT will advise soon on these amounts.
MaineDOT match (13.5%)	\$212,012	\$212,012	
Other match needed to match FHWA \$	\$102,080	\$102,080	
Total	\$1,570,459	\$1,570,459	

* Congress authorizes more than the \$1,256,367. We could ask MaineDOT to give us more.

<u>Uses Budget</u>	<u>Current UPWP</u>	<u>Next UPWP</u>	<u>Notes</u>
PACTS Staff and GPCOG Support	\$989,000	\$1,050,000	Rough estimate
Regional signals coordination	na	\$100,000	Per Steve Sawyer memo
Local project administration	na	\$50,000	Place holder
Also fund some of the local project administration work at/via PACTS from the TIP projects' budgets.			
GPCOG Planning Services	\$30,000	\$35,000	
GPCOG Maine Clean Communities	\$30,000	\$35,000	
SMRPC Planning Services	\$30,000	\$35,000	
PACTS Model (Hooper)	\$38,500	\$50,000	Incorporate 2010 census data
Regional Aerial Flight (cut Dec 2010)	na	\$50,000	Let others fund?
Regional Signal Study II	\$25,000	\$0	Invite muni's to propose more.
Regional Collector Study II	\$15,000	\$15,000	More Gorrill-Palmer work
Regional Dest Tomorrow Update	\$15,000	\$0	Big effort in 2014/2015 UPWP
Regional EPS	\$9,500	\$15,000	
Regional Finance	\$5,500	\$10,000	More Melrose work
Gorham East West Tech. Assistance	na	\$50,000	Rough estimate
Regional Arterials Study	na	\$75,000	Per Dest. Tomorrow Update
MaineDOT Air Quality Analysis	\$3,000	\$0	Discuss with MaineDOT
Portland TDM and Oakhill Ped Plan	\$60,000	\$0	
Other new consultant studies:	\$320,000	na	
Portland's internal candidates list	na	\$185,000	
Proposals from transit systems and our 14 other municipalities	na	\$250,000	Rough estimate
Total	\$1,570,500	\$2,005,000	
Unmet Need Based On Initial Estimates:		\$434,541	

C. Overview Document

Staff Resource: John Duncan

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

Background

As discussed in November, here is a draft 5-page summary for our membership regarding the development and administration of our Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP). This was on our December agenda, but we had to postpone due to time constraints. We propose to receive your comments today, make edits, and then distribute to the entire membership.

TO: All PACTS Committees
FROM: PACTS and GPCOG Staff
SUBJECT: Synopsis of the PACTS Unified Planning Work Program

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

This report is organized as follows:

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

1. Introduction and Purpose

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

The UPWP supports the following:

- Perform studies of regional transportation needs and opportunities.

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

There are three PACTS “geographies”:

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

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

2. UPWP Development

Similar to a municipal comprehensive plan which provides a framework for municipal planning work, our *Destination Tomorrow* regional transportation plan provides the same context for PACTS members and staff in the development of the 2-year planning and programming work outlined in the UPWP.

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

- PACTS Staff
 1. Lead the process.
 2. Coordinate with all parties involved in the efforts listed below.
 3. Recommend a set of regionally significant studies.
 4. Solicit and consider public comments.

5. Produce the final UPWP in collaboration with GPCOG staff.
- GPCOG and SMRPC Staff
 1. Work with the Transit Committee in development of the FTA-funded work.
 2. Score proposals for FTA-funded studies.
 3. Produce the final UPWP in collaboration with PACTS staff.
 - MaineDOT
 1. Determines the amount of FHWA funding in the current UPWP that can be “carried over” into the next UPWP in order to complete studies still underway on July 1, 2011.
 2. Advises on the amounts of new FHWA and FTA funding available.
 3. Meet with PACTS staff to provide comments on study proposals.
 4. Comment on the draft UPWP document.
 - Executive Committee
 1. Suggest proposals for new studies.
 2. Review and comment on PACTS staff’s draft work plan and budget for the two years.
 3. Review and comment on staff’s monthly updates on other UPWP topics.
 4. Submit a final UPWP budget and scope to the Policy Committee for action.
 - Planning Committee
 1. Suggest proposals for new studies. When appropriate and feasible, the Committee will meet with Technical or Transit Committee to collaborate.
 2. Review staff’s scores of local and regional study proposals (FHWA-funded ones only), and recommend a set of studies to be funded to the Executive and Policy Committees.
 - Technical Committee
 1. Suggest proposals for new studies. When appropriate and feasible, the Committee will meet with Planning or Transit Committee to collaborate.
 2. Review and comment on staff proposals for collector road analysis during the next two years, and other regional roadway-oriented studies.
 - Transit Committee
 1. Suggest proposals for new studies. When appropriate and feasible, the Committee will meet with Planning Committee to collaborate.
 2. Review staff’s scores of transit study proposals (both FTA-funded and FHWA-funded ones?) and recommend a set of studies to be funded to the Executive and Policy Committees.
 - Policy Committee
 1. Review and comment on UPWP development progress reports.
 2. Adopt the UPWP for July 2011 to June 2013.

6. UPWP Funding

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

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

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

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

7. UPWP Amendments and the PACTS Studies Time Clock

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

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

- Study proponents will work to start each PACTS-funded study within a year of adoption of the PACTS UPWP. If a year passes without the signing of a consultant contract, then the study proponent will provide monthly progress updates to PACTS staff. If 18 months pass without the signing of a consultant contract, then the Policy Committee will withdraw the funding. (The definition of “start” is the signing of a contract with a consultant. The 18-month clock starts on the date of adoption of the PACTS planning budget.)

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

8. Consultant Study Administration

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

Consultant Selection

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

Study Administration

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

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

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

- GPCOG
 - Technical analysis services for PACTS staff
 - Transit planning work
 - Regional sustainability plan development begun in 2011
 - Maine Clean Communities
 - Go Maine
- MaineDOT
 - Corridor studies funded and led by MaineDOT

- Frequent use of the PACTS model
- The Highway Simplification Study (completed in 2010)
- The revisions to the state's traffic movement permit policy

- Southern Maine Regional Planning Commission
 - Technical analysis services for PACTS staff
 - Transit planning work
 - Regional sustainability plan development begun in 2011

- The Maine Turnpike Authority
 - Corridor studies funded and led by the Turnpike Authority
 - Frequent use of the PACTS model

- Municipalities
 - PACTS studies
 - Studies wholly funded by a municipality

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

Agenda Item 6: PACTS Role in Convening of Regional Forums

Staff Resource: Paul Niehoff

Recommendation: Discussion and consensus on staff's proposals below

Background

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

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

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

As has been mentioned previously the original intent was to improve communication, dispel misunderstandings and solicit ideas on improving the region's transportation choices. Topics expanded to include, health and safety, making transportation connections as well as group to group connections and reaching balance and consensus. Additionally the group was very beneficial in vetting the update to the PACTS Regional Bike Pedestrian Plan.

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

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

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

Agenda Item 7: Updates from Staff and Committees

1. The December 13th **Legislators** Briefing

There was interest in raising the state gas tax at that session. In contrast, John heard at a recent MBTA meeting that a bill to devote a significant percentage of transportation sales tax revenues has a better chance of success. More on that later.

2. The METRO Board and the South Portland City Council are likely to reach an agreement in the very near future on a “**regional bus pass**”. GPCOG has provided technical assistance.

3. Updates from the December meetings of the Transit, Planning and Technical **Committees**.

4. The draft **Gorham East West Corridor Phase I Study** recommendations include the following actions by the our Policy Committee during the next six months:

- Endorse the Phase I feasibility study’s recommendations
- Sign an MOU to participate in the Phase II Action Plan development phase
- Amend our TIP policies to give preferences (nature to be determined) for capital funding to municipalities which participate in the development of the Phase II Action Plan
- Sign a binding implementation agreement to participate in the implementation of the Action Plan

5. February 9th meeting here of municipal, Turnpike, MaineDOT, SMRPC and others regarding interstate highways **traffic incident management** coordination in our region.

6. **Studies** underway and about to start

- Tri-Community Transportation Plan...final report is almost done.
- Regional Collector Paving Priorities Study...almost done
- Yarmouth Route One Phase III...well under way.
- Transit Focused Region... first workshop will be in January.
- North Windham comprehensive transportation plan... Study team selected a T. Y. Lin team to assist with this study.
- Scarborough Oakhill pedestrian plan...a selection team will select a firm later this month.
- Forest Avenue transit oriented development corridor...Study team selected an IBI team to assist with this study.
- Congress Street bus priority...consultant proposals are due in December.
- Franklin Street Study Phase II...RFP almost done.

- Portland TDM ordinance implementation...Carey Kish of GoMaine is working with Judy Harris on this.
- Regional bus routes study...Consultant proposal is being reviewed.
- Traffic Signals Coordination Study Phase II...Carl is working with Biddeford and Saco, and will send out an RFP this month.
- We have begun to organize the new studies funded in December by the Policy Committee.
- The 2011 Sequel of the PACTS Video...Carl will produce this with consultant help this winter/spring. It will focus on the recommendations in the 2011 Update of Destination Tomorrow – including the need for more resources.

Executive Committee Draft Agenda for February 1st

1. Follow up on January meeting topics.
2. Want a short GPCOG staff briefing on regional sustainability planning process prior to briefing of full Policy Committee on the 17th?
3. Final status report on completion of Destination Tomorrow Update
4. Review draft bylaw language regarding Executive Committee authority to amend the UPWP. (Policy Committee endorsed concept in October.)
5. Finalize Policy agenda.

Policy Committee Draft Agenda for February 17th

We will adopt the February 17th agenda on February 1st.

1. Adoption of Update of our Destination Tomorrow plan
2. GPCOG staff briefing on regional sustainability planning process
3. Act on bylaw language regarding Executive Committee authority to amend the UPWP.
4. Possible action on revisions to our FTA 5307 funding formula and actual programming of the \$2,000,000 (approx.) if Congress has adopted a budget.
5. Update on the process for development of the next 2-year UPWP – adoption in May.
6. Executive Director's Report