

PACTS



Linking our Communities . Advancing our Region

Portland Area Comprehensive Transportation System

TIP Process Committee Meeting Notice

10:00 to 11:30
November 1, 2011
GPCOG, 68 Marginal Way, Portland

Agenda

1. **Call to order**
2. **Minutes of October 4th meeting**
3. **Wrap Up Items**
 - A. Review MaineDOT memorandum
 - B. Comparison of our project processes with ATRC, BACTS and KACTS
 - C. Final draft revised project application forms
 - D. Federal request for four years' worth of projects in MPO Allocation
 - E. Collector project scoring update
 - F. Points for proposals with project momentum
 - G. Review MaineDOT Commissioner letter regarding Project Efficiency Team report (expected soon)
 - H. Review MaineDOT's new Municipal Partnership Initiative
 - I. Overview of recent MaineDOT letter regarding capital improvement responsibilities of MaineDOT, municipalities and MPO's
 - J. Scope of TIP Process Workshop on November 15th
4. **Draft TIP Policies and Procedures Document**
5. **Next Steps**
6. **Adjourn**

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 October 4th Meeting

In attendance: Nathan Poore, Chair; Dan Bacon; Stephanie Clark; Sara Devlin; Kathi Earley; Jim Gailey; Al Presgraves; Marty Rooney; Jim Wendel; John Duncan; Carl Eppich; Paul Niehoff; Maddy Adams

1. **Call to order.** Nathan Poore called the meeting to order at 10:07 a.m.
2. **Minutes of September 6th meeting.** The minutes were approved by consensus.
3. **Staff presentation of scores of past proposals using revised formulas for Intersection and Road Rebuild Proposals.** The changes proposed wouldn't make dramatic changes to the scores. Al asked if this same comparison reflects the recent recommendations of the Technical Committee. Nathan asked what the driving factors were. The Technical Committee made some recommendations (see table in packet) and adjustments were made to a couple of numbers. The future traffic category was removed – currently built up areas don't get penalized. Dan asked why the geometric standards category got removed. John responded that we're not getting proposals that fix substandard conditions.

Under regional focus, an example of something that would score high would be Dunstan Corner, or an intersection that is on a major commuter corridor. Nathan asked if it would make more sense for the Transportation/Land Use scores to remain the same but change the score for regional focus. Dan suggested building up transportation/land use by borrowing some points from regional focus. Jim suggested reducing the regional focus score to 8 and economic development down to 7. Jim asked if we have brief narrative language for each of the five criteria, and if it would be worth it to read those policy statements again to figure out the weighting elements.

Marty explained that having gone through this process, it all comes down to definitions. Projects have benefits in different ways. The model data is not there; it is somewhat subjective. Consider the benefits of transportation/land use, economic development, and Destination Tomorrow. The challenge of the communities is to put forth their best project and to have data to support your their figures. Nathan said he likes it to be consistent with Destination Tomorrow and likes the idea of a reduced number of categories. Carl cautioned about oversimplification; this comparison is as concise and reflective as it can be. Al said there was a lot of thoughtful discussion that went into the Technical Committee's recommendations. ***Motion: Dan made a motion to change the scoring for economic development to 7.5 and regional focus to 7.5. Kathi seconded the motion. Friendly amendment – include Technical Committee's recommendation regarding roadway formula maximum points. The motion passed by consensus.***

Marty brought up the idea of giving points for project momentum – if it's a project that looks like it will go through quickly because people have done their homework, then they get extra points. Dan and Nathan liked the idea. Bonus points are received for public/private partnership so we could add the project momentum category. ***The group agreed to add 5 bonus points for project momentum.***

4. **Staff presentation of draft revised project application forms.** The forms have been revised to incorporate the updated Destination Tomorrow goals. The big change is taking Marty's suggestion and trying to make it look similar to the MaineDOT project ID form. Kathi pointed out that each application needs to be endorsed by the Council/Selectmen, etc. In Portland it's the Transportation Committee who does the approval, so she asked for some verbiage to be added to that effect.

Kathi asked if the road rebuild cover sheet (item 4) needed to be in there. Marty responded that it's been challenging to have an MPO Coordinator to go to. As part of the schedule for the TIP development, the Technical Committee would come up with a list of recommendations. The current process is not nearly as formal as perhaps it should be. Nathan said it sounded like something MaineDOT/PACTS could work on together.

5. **Land Use Incentives Language.** Carl stated that we could develop these for the entire PACTS region. Jim G. asked if by going in this direction we would be further dividing the urban areas and the smaller towns. Is this another wedge we're putting in by defining a priority growth area? Carl thought just the opposite. It could be called a transportation investment area. Dan asked how this related to the ranking/formulas discussion that we just had. There was further discussion about TIA's, regional growth and incentives. *Nathan made a motion to keep the first paragraph and bring the subject of TIA's into that paragraph, and to strike paragraphs 2 and 3. Dan seconded the motion and it passed by consensus.*
6. **Proposal to increase the Bike/Ped set aside.** Paul explained that the idea is to take a small amount of money from the other set asides and put it to bike/ped. Marty said he would not support changing the set asides (last month we had decided not to change set asides). He said he would not be interested unless it is a comprehensive discussion. Staff asked for this consideration but the TIP Process Committee declined the idea to increase the bike/ped set aside.
7. **Other Works in Progress.**
 - A. Federal request for four years' worth of projects in MPO Allocation. This can wait until next meeting.
 - B. Collector project scoring update.
 - C. Hold a TIP Process Workshop in November
 - D. Comparison of PACTS process with ATRC, BACTS and KACTS
 - E. Meeting of MaineDOT Deputy Commissioner with the Technical Committee
8. **Review draft update of the TIP Policies Document.** Nathan requested a true red-lined document showing cross outs for old material. He requested receiving it two weeks prior to the next meeting.

Judy requested further explanation of CMAQ scoring and a listing of winners.
9. **Review progress to date and establish final meeting's agenda.**
10. **Adjourn.** The meeting adjourned at 11:40.

Agenda Item 3A: MaineDOT Comments

Marty Rooney and Stephanie Clark met with Joyce Taylor (Director of Project Development) and Peggy Duval (Deputy Director of Planning) on Tuesday the 25th to review materials that I sent them just a few days before – and sent the draft memo below that afternoon. We appreciate their coordination with others at MaineDOT regarding our work in progress, and the quick delivery of the memo below. Marty, Stephanie and I will review their comments together before our meeting on the 1st.

This memo arrived just before I sent this meeting packet. They offer some ideas worthy of discussion by the TIP Process Committee. We are already doing some of what they suggest.

MEMORANDUM

TO: John Duncan
FROM: Stephanie Clark and Martin Rooney
SUBJECT: PACTS TIP Process Report Comments
DATE: October 25, 2011

Maine Department of Transportation (MaineDOT) staff involved in the 2014-2015 PACTS TIP process reviewed a draft report with MaineDOT Planning and Project Development leadership. In general, MaineDOT appreciates the report's comprehensiveness and are pleased with the potential for process streamlining compared to prior biennia. The purpose of this memorandum is to convey some additional comments primarily for clarity.

Minor Technical Comments:

- Given the size of this report, MaineDOT recommends creating an Executive Summary highlighting major milestones of the TIP process schedule including deliverables, dates and clear expectations for PACTS members, PACTS staff and MaineDOT.
- During the project application and scoring process, references are made regarding MaineDOT participation and approval of certain items. While MaineDOT welcomes this opportunity, we request that there be a systematic process where requests for information go through PACTS staff to MaineDOT Bureau of Planning staff who will coordinate with appropriate MaineDOT personnel.
- On page 6 you reference several actions related to the FY16-17 Biennium. Perhaps a separate section could be added entitled, "Proposed TIP Actions for Next TIP Process Evaluation." During the next TIP process, MaineDOT would also encourage PACTS to reexamine its Set Aside Policy based on the current transportation funding outlook.
- MaineDOT's principal local match concern is that once a match is set, it should not change. In the report, the local match incentive policy could perhaps be simplified to simply state that for the 2014-2015 TIP the following match:
 - October 2012: Policy Committee adopts 2014/2015 biennium MPO Allocation projects list. Projects (except STP Transit) are programmed at 15% local match.
 - Spring 2013: Legislature endorses MaineDOT's Capital Work Plan for 14/15.

- Summer 2013: MaineDOT drafts 3-party and LAP agreements, and distributes to municipalities.
- January 1, 2014: Local matches goes up to 30% for projects whose 3-party or LAP agreements have not been signed.*

*In the event that MaineDOT receives federal approval to begin new projects in April versus October, PACTS Policy Committee may be asked to revise this schedule based on input from PACTS staff and MaineDOT regarding when agreements could become available.

- Two Biennia Projects, MaineDOT strongly recommends continuation of this practice. During the project application review, MaineDOT will offer project specific advice regarding which projects should be one or two biennia projects.
- Project Cap Policy: The Project Cap Policy should be explicitly referenced in all municipal agreements if not already. There should be specific language that the municipality will be responsible for reimbursing any expenditures for engineering for projects that ultimately do not go to construction. If there is significant uncertainty regarding a project's cost or viability, a feasibility study instead of formally beginning engineering could alleviate this concern.
- Role of PACTS Committees: This section could be an appropriate location to clearly explain MaineDOT's and even FHWA's roles among the various committees. Please let us know if this warrants further discussion or if it is something that could be included in an organizational analysis.
- Schedule: From a statewide perspective, MaineDOT needs a final Policy Committee endorsed project listing no later than mid-November every even year. MaineDOT recommends two official opportunities to comment on PACTS projects – an initial period for minor comments/ questions consistent with the proposed schedule in March and MaineDOT also recommends the opportunity to formally comment on projects in late summer/ early fall between enhanced project scoping and final decision making. MaineDOT staff would like a minimum of three weeks to do the second project application review. This will enable MaineDOT to identify any concerns, questions related to schedule, cost estimates, potential design exceptions, etc.
- Although this would be project application specific, perhaps the schedule should also include the opportunity to identify potential design exceptions or whether or not projects are intended to be locally administered. PACTS or a community has the opportunity to receive feedback on likelihood or even preliminary approval of a design exception before a Work Plan is finalized.
- Add a definition of languishing projects to the definition.

Policy Substantive:

- Other projects: MaineDOT funds a number of projects within PACTS above and beyond the PACTS allocation such as bridges, safety projects and arterial pavement preservation. MaineDOT recommends that PACTS TIP process systematically include a process for evaluating state sponsored projects based on a broader transportation context providing MaineDOT makes preliminary lists available to PACTS early in the TIP process. For instance, MaineDOT may be replacing a bridge anticipated to last 100 years. The size and number of lanes of this structure could be

dependent upon future PACTS actions on the bridge approaches. Likewise, MaineDOT may have a \$600,000 project to specifically meet a safety need when the community has a much broader vision at the same location. In PACTS TIP process there should be a way to systematically evaluate these opportunities.

- Public Involvement: The following suggestions for expanding the TIP Public Involvement Process were developed in coordination with MaineDOT's Civil Rights Director:
 - Develop a Press Release announcing the TIP process including the opportunity for citizens to submit transportation project requests directly to their municipality. Copies of this release should be posted on PACTS and member communities websites.
 - Between October-March hold public workshops either before or after regular council/ selectman meetings advertized to the general public at all member communities.
 - Incorporate the Title VI Environmental Justice Plan into this document – rather than just referencing it.
 - Clarify what the “public outreach component” of the feasibility studies and enhanced project scoping is. For instance, what is PACTS looking for in terms of a strong public outreach component in these programs?
 - This webpage (http://www.pactsplan.org/organization_committees/tip.php) has an out-of-date version of the Policies and Procedures document – 08/09.
 - What groups are represented on the Interested Parties list? Perhaps every year or so staff should review the list to make sure that disadvantaged populations are on the list. Also, note in this document how one could join the list.
 - Order some Title VI brochures and make available at public meetings.
 - Ensure that people are aware of their Civil Rights by incorporating this language into all Publications and Public Notices:
 - “In accordance with the Civil Rights Act of 1964, PACTS does not discriminate on the basis of race, color or national origin. For more information about these protections or to file a complaint, please contact PACTS.”
 - Hold public meetings to present project candidates prior to rating and selection to gather community feedback with one during the day and the other in the evening to accommodate peoples' schedules.
 - In addition to posting notices of the draft PACTS Transportation Improvement Program on the PACTS website, ask member municipalities to post it on theirs as well.
 - Leave a hard copy of the draft PACTS TIP at local municipal offices, libraries, community centers and other civic locations, such as the Laundromat, during the public comment period.
- 4-Yr. STIP: Although MaineDOT traditionally only funded about two years of each STIP based on the state's biennial Work Plan, the Federal Highway Administration has recently provided strong guidance that MaineDOT should populate all four years of the STIP. MaineDOT's current STIP contains programmatic language in the out years such as a \$96 million line-item for pavement preservation over FFY14-FFY15. The extent to which all four years need to be project specific will depend upon

conversations with FHWA. Nevertheless, PACTS should understand that it has the flexibility to populate all four years of the STIP and there could be a federal requirement to do so in the future. Currently, ATRC is the only MPO that intentionally utilizes all four years of the STIP.

- Congressionally Designated and Competitive Program Coordination: Should there be a role in the TIP process for discussing these requests and programs? In the past, funds have been awarded for projects that still had years in the planning or design phases and projects have been funded that did not meet Title 23 eligibility. A discussion of these items during the TIP process could be a foundation for strategically seeking projects that provide regional benefits.
- Should the status of existing projects be a factor in future project selection? For instance, if a municipality still has unsigned agreements, has one or more languishing projects due directly to factors subject to control such as funding, LAP or scope creep, should this be a consideration in future project selection.
- Drawer Concept & Holding PIN: MaineDOT encourages PACTS to identify certain projects, even uncomplicated paving projects for engineering only. These would be projects that could be expedited for future construction should additional funding become available, other projects become delayed or if the holding PIN accumulates a significant amount of funding. MaineDOT staff can assist PACTS in identifying project characteristics appropriate for this concept where very little rework would be necessary if project plans sat dormant for a couple of years.

CC: Peggy Duval, Planning
Joyce Taylor, Project Development
Herb Thomson, Planning

Agenda Item 3B: Comparison with ATRC, BACTS and KACTS

As requested, see the comparison on the next page of certain PACTS TIP project selection procedures and policies with those of Maine's three other MPO's. I hope that this material is not too late for our use. If you have any further questions or requests before our meeting, please let me know.

Comparison of Maine MPOs' TIP Policies and Procedures

October 2011

	Lewiston/Auburn ATRC	Bangor BACTS	Kittery KACTS	Portland PACTS	
Funding Area population	70,000	64,000	24,000	188,000	
Municipalities	4	11	5	15	
Standing committees	2	3	1	5	
All projects in 2011 TIP	55	60	28	140	
MPO-sponsored projects in 2011 TIP	18	29	3	73	

Federal Transit Funds

FY 2011 Section 5307 Eligible organizations	\$0.75 1	\$0.70 2	\$0.24 2	\$2.25 7	In millions
--	-------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	-------------

MPO Allocation Projects

2012 applications due	TBD	January 20	??	March 2	
Use Roadway Formula	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Regional Plan Formula	No	No	No	Yes	
Field visit finalist projects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Re-run formulas after EPS and/or field reviews	No	Yes	No	Yes	
Allocates capital \$\$ to collector preservation	No	Yes	No	Yes	
Primary focus	4 Set Asides	4 Set Asides	Reconstruction	5 Set Asides	
Biennial MPO Allocation					
Federal	\$4.6	\$4.0	\$1.0	\$10.4	In millions
State	\$0.6	\$0.5	\$0.1	\$1.0	In millions
Federal/state/local ratios	80/10/10	80/10/10	80/10/10	75/10/15	See note.
Project funding cap	No	No	No	Yes	
Credit Program	No	No	No	Yes	
Two-biennia projects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	

Items of Note

ATRC does not program any funding for collector pavement preservation.

BACTS has a system for adjusting the pavement condition score for a road project proposal for a road upon which a recent surface treatment was done.

BACTS establishes the Set Aside funding amounts after the submission of proposals from members.

This is in contrast to PACTS. We establish the Set Aside budgets beforehand.

Most Kittery and Bangor projects are done as locally administered projects. The trend in the PACTS region is for most projects to be administered by MaineDOT.

KACTS often stockpiles funds in order to fund projects whose costs exceeds one biennia's available \$\$.

Note: In May 2011 the PACTS Policy Committee's new local match policy established that two years from now (2013) the local match would be 15% for projects whose 3-party agreements are signed "quickly".

Agenda Item 3C: Final draft revised project application forms

The email for today's meeting includes the following prepared by Paul Niehoff and Carl Eppich. We would like to distribute the final forms later this week so that folks who attend the November 15th workshop can have reviewed them and ask informed questions at the workshop.

- Application form for Intersection and Rebuild Road proposals
- Cover sheet for Intersection application
- Cover sheet for Rebuild Road proposals
- Application form for Bike/Ped proposals

We are still tweaking the application form for STP Transit Capital proposals.

Agenda Item 3D: Federal request for four years' worth of projects

At a recent meeting, the FHWA Division Planner advised MaineDOT and Maine's MPO's that according to federal regulations MaineDOT and the MPO's should be programming four years' worth of projects every two years – rather than the two years' worth that we have been doing for a long time. John Duncan advised that we need to know of such a change as soon as possible given that in November we will be soliciting proposals (for only two years of projects).

FHWA and MaineDOT staff met to discuss this several weeks ago. *See MaineDOT memo above.*

Agenda Item 3E: Collector project scoring update

The Technical Committee's collector scoring subcommittee met on October 11th.

The collector ranking subcommittee revised the ranking formula and dropped the falling weight deflectometer (FWD) from the ranking calculation. The information will remain available if needed. Tom Gorrill said the FWD is an issue that most people have trouble with because it does not match up well with the PCR. The PCR becomes more than half of the ranking percentage.

The FWD is an indicator of the base and helps in deciding whether to do maintenance paving or reconstruction. The FWD can be used to determine if it is worth spending the money to pave it.

The motion was made to remove the FWD from the collector priority index as part of the collector road paving study and allow the PCR to become a full 70 points of the condition index. It was seconded and 14 were in favor and 1 opposed.

Agenda Item 3F: Points for proposals with project momentum

At our October meeting, Marty Rooney suggested that we create a bonus point system for TIP proposals that have “project momentum”. The Committee discussed the idea and supported it. This new 5-point bonus system is now our third. We also give up to 5 bonus points for proposals from public-private partnerships and from multi-municipal groups.

Marty recently offered some thoughts on how this could work. (It could both add and detract from a project’s score?)

- Local Match Authorization for the construction phase of this project has already occurred (while this isn't a requirement, it eliminates a what/ if scenario)

PACTS Staff input: There may be cases where the funds are available or already approved (USM funds set aside for Portland’s Brighton intersection)

- Documented stakeholder consensus for this project (this will vary and staff may have to assist in stakeholder identification). For instance, there is a project in Portland involving travel lane size where there is a conflict between bike/ ped and METRO interests. From a project momentum perspective, I would want Portland to reach stakeholder consensus or officially take a position so future conflict does not delay a project schedule.

PACTS Staff input: A case where there has already been an extensive public process, or obvious public support

- Letters from major stakeholders (utilities, major businesses) indicated support for the project and that the project will not impact or conforms with their plans. If a utility tries to piggy back on a highway project 2/3rds through design it will affect project momentum.

PACTS Staff input: Letters from major utilities, major businesses indicated support for a project and that the project conforms with their plans. E.g: A utility has a project coming up that can be combined with a highway project prior design. A non-transportation project presents an opportunity for a transportation project to happen sooner and save money. E.g. A sewer separation project will significantly open a road presenting an opportunity for reconstruction at a much cheaper mobilization cost.

What do you think? Do these work?

Agenda Item 3G: MaineDOT letter regarding Project Efficiency Team

We hope to receive a letter from Commissioner Bernhardt regarding his official response to our July 1st report. We have incorporated all of the Team’s recommendations into our TIP Process Document. We expect few, if any, changes from the Commissioner.

Agenda Item 3H: MaineDOT's Municipal Partnership Initiative

Several months ago the MaineDOT began a new Municipal Partnership Initiative. This looks like a great program. The 3-page guide is in the attached draft TIP Policies and Procedures document. Here are some notes.

1. The mantra on this is flexible and fast.
2. There is \$7,000,000 budgeted statewide for the biennium.
3. Roughly \$500,000 has been allocated so far.
4. This is state money – not federal.
5. Freeport, Yarmouth and Scarborough (?) have gotten some already.
6. Towns work with MaineDOT's regions rather than Augusta.
7. MaineDOT's Bruce Van Note made a presentation at the recent MMA conference.
8. Region One's Kyle Hall made a presentation at the recent meeting of the Cumberland County Public Works Directors group.
9. Paul Niehoff sent a copy of this guide to the Technical Committee two weeks ago.
10. Paul and I described it briefly at the recent Policy Committee meeting. I sent a copy to the Policy Committee last week.

We are thinking that this MaineDOT initiative may encourage more local spending on collectors and arterials – and dovetail with our PACTS Credit Program to a certain extent. *We remind members that when a collector road is brought up to state standards it becomes eligible for future federally-funded preservation paving via PACTS.*

Agenda Item 3I: MaineDOT letter on capital improvement responsibilities

Following up on a Technical Committee discussion, Paul Niehoff asked MaineDOT's Deputy Commissioner, to meet with the Technical Committee to speak on the responsibilities of MaineDOT, PACTS and our municipalities when it comes to capital improvements regarding arterials and collectors in our region.

The letter below reminds us that infrastructure maintenance on minor arterial and our collector drainage systems is a local responsibility. Likewise, PACTS has the capital improvement responsibility for these capital items.

MaineDOT does not finance preservation paving on *arterials* that are considered “unbuilt”. PACTS does not finance preservation paving on *collectors* which are unbuilt or do not meet standards.

Paul and the Technical Committee are going to work with Gorrill-Palmer this fall and winter to assess the regional situation on this. We expect the regional cost estimate to be a major one.

Consequently, this topic is for information purposes only for this Committee.



STATE OF MAINE
 DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
 16 STATE HOUSE STATION
 AUGUSTA, MAINE 04333-0016

Paul R. LePage
 GOVERNOR

October 18, 2011

David Bernhardt
 COMMISSIONER

Paul Niehoff
 Portland Area Comprehensive Transportation System
 68 Marginal Way
 Portland Maine, 04101

RE: Capital Improvement Responsibilities and Corridor Priorities within MPOs

Dear Paul:

I write regarding your letter to MaineDOT Deputy Commissioner Bruce Van Note, who has asked me to respond on his behalf. I apologize that I did not respond sooner. In your letter, you requested clarification of maintenance and capital improvement *responsibilities* within the federal urban Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) boundaries, and for information about associated *funding mechanisms*. We at MaineDOT well understand how complex this can be, and in an effort to clarify roles and responsibilities, and in cooperation with Maine's four MPOs, the department worked to summarize those responsibilities in the *Administrative Guide to Metropolitan Planning Organizations (Guide)*. The *Guide* explains the metropolitan transportation planning process, from the establishment of long-term goals to the development of projects designed to meet those goals. It sets forth the basic administrative requirements for MaineDOT and the MPOs to follow as they conduct Maine's urban transportation process. It is intended for the mutual use of MPO members and staff and MaineDOT personnel, with the purpose of clarifying roles and responsibilities, improving communication, and minimizing conflicts that could affect the funding and project delivery processes. The department also published a one-page explanation in 2007 (enclosed and recently updated) which was drafted specifically for PACTS and then distributed to the other MPOs in Maine.

In regard to *responsibilities*, Section 2, "MPO Structure", of the *Guide* explains that MPO areas have two primary classes of roads eligible for federal funds: arterial highways and urban collectors. The following is a description of the functionalities of arterial highways and urban collectors, and identifies who is responsible for capital improvements and maintenance on those highways:

Arterial Highways

Arterials provide long-distance connections between towns and regional centers, typically handling more than 10,000 vehicles per day. Types of arterials in urban areas:

Principal Arterial - Interstate: These are divided, limited-access highways that in Maine consist of I-95 (Kittery-Houlton); I-195 (Saco); I-295 (South Portland-Gardiner); I-395 (Bangor-Brewer) and I-495 (Falmouth spur of the Maine Turnpike).



PRINTED ON RECYCLED PAPER

- Capital improvement responsibility = MaineDOT
- Maintenance responsibility = MaineDOT

Principal Arterial - Other Freeway and Expressway: These are divided highways with full or partial control-of-access. Examples: Washington Street (U.S. Route 202) in Auburn, Westbrook Arterial, and U.S. Route 1 between Brunswick and Bath.

- Capital improvement responsibility = MaineDOT
- Maintenance responsibility = MaineDOT (unless other agreement)

Other Principal Arterial: These routes carry through-traffic and most of the trips to and from urban areas. Examples: Route 1 in Kittery, Brighton Avenue (Route 25) in Portland, Sabattus Street (Route 126) in Lewiston, and Wilson Street (Route 1A) in Brewer.

- Capital improvement responsibility =
 - MaineDOT - preservation
 - MPOs - reconstruction and rehabilitation
- Maintenance responsibility = Municipality (unless outside compact area)

Minor Arterial: These routes, which interconnect with principal arterial highways, distribute travel to smaller regions than those served by the principal arterials. Examples: Western Avenue in South Portland, Main Street in Lewiston, and Hogan Road in Bangor.

- Capital improvement responsibility =
 - MaineDOT - preservation
 - MPOs - reconstruction and rehabilitation
- Maintenance responsibility = Municipality (unless outside compact area)

Urban Collector Highways

Urban Collector: Urban collectors typically handle thousands of vehicles a day as they deliver traffic from local roads to the nearest arterial highway. Examples: Route 1 in Yarmouth, Route 111 in Biddeford, Hotel Road in Auburn, and Stillwater Avenue in Bangor.

- Capital improvement responsibility = MPOs
- Maintenance responsibility = Municipality (unless outside compact area)

In regard to *funding mechanisms*, I would again encourage you to refer to the *Guide to Metropolitan Planning Organizations*. Section 3, “Funding for MPOs”, explains the associated funding sources and how those funds are calculated and allocated to each MPO. Specifically, please refer to Subsection 3.2, “Federal Capital Improvement Funding”. This

section provides ample information on federal funding for MPO areas, on MaineDOT's distribution of federal funding and of federal transportation funding in general.

Deputy Commissioner Van Note appreciates your invitation to attend a PACTS Planning or Technical Committee meeting. However, he believes that the answer to your question and information about the department's corridor prioritization process are best provided by staff from the Bureau of Transportation Systems Planning. Assuming the above helps clarify *responsibilities* and *funding*, appropriate staff is available to discuss corridor prioritization at your convenience. I might suggest that the next quarterly MPO meeting could be a good forum for such a presentation.

I hope this is helpful. If you have further questions or concerns, please contact Duane Scott, at 624-3309 or duane.scott@maine.gov.

Sincerely,



Herb Thomson, Director
Bureau of Transportation Systems Planning

HJT/JD/jmf

cc: John Duncan, PACTS
Jennifer Williams, ATRC
Rob Kenerson, BACTS
Tom Reinauer, KACTS
Dan Jellis, Chair, PACTS Technical Committee
Bruce Van Note, MaineDOT Deputy Commissioner
Margaret Duval, MaineDOT
Duane Scott, MaineDOT
Martin Rooney, MaineDOT
Peter Coughlan, MaineDOT

Ref #1134048

Agenda Item 3J: Scope of TIP Process Workshop on November 15th

We will hold a 2-hour workshop for all PACTS members at 8:30 a.m. on November 15th. 30 people have signed up so far. Four MaineDOT people will attend – excellent. We will do a PowerPoint presentation and provide handouts of it. We expect a lot of Q&A time. The topics will include:

- All existing policies and procedures of PACTS and MaineDOT
- This TIP Process Committee’s recommendations for change.
- Our application forms
- MaineDOT’s new Municipal Partnership Initiative

Agenda Item 4: Review draft update of the TIP Policies Document

Last month, staff distributed a first draft final report of our work for your review. It gives you a sense of all the pieces of the work that we are doing. It is based on the policy document prepared two years ago – with red print showing the key changes and additions.

Agenda Item 5: Next Steps

<u>TIP Process Topics</u>	<u>June 7</u>	<u>July 14</u>	<u>Aug 2</u>	<u>Sept 6</u>	<u>Oct 4</u>	<u>Nov 1</u>
1 Review scope of the committee's work to do	Done					
2 Incorporate Project Efficiencies Team proposals (such as local match policy changes)				Done		
3 MaineDOT briefings on CMAQ and NEPA policies		Done	Done			
4 Exec Committee role in tracking projects status Per suggestion at recent Exec meeting	Done					
5 New local project administration function	Done					
6 Shorten time spent picking projects				Done		
7 Review our 2-biennia project policy		Done				
8 Revisit our project cap policy		Done				
9 Consider Gorham E-W Study recommendation to reward communities with transportation funding in return for certain land use plans					Done	
10 Institutionalize Credit Program			Done			
11 Receive report from Technical Committee on changes to the Collectors ranking procedure						X
12 Briefing on transit funding processes				Done		
13 Tweak Road Formula factors and weights and Tweak Dest. Tomorrow Formula factors and weights, and Bike/Ped scoring process					Done	
14 Revise project application requirements and application forms						X
15 Comparison with other MPO's						X
16 MaineDOT policy on highway drainage responsibilities						X
17 FHWA proposal to program four years of projects every two years						?
18 Review draft TIP Process Document						X