

PACTS

Portland Area Comprehensive Transportation System

PACTS TIP Process Committee Meeting Notice

January 9, 2009
8:00 a.m.

GPCOG, 68 Marginal Way, Portland

Agenda

1. Call to order
2. Public Comment
3. Minutes of December 11th meeting
4. Update on federal economic stimulus process
5. Discussion of member questions about the 2008/2009 and 2010/2011 Policies and Procedures documents emailed on December 24th
6. Presentation and discussion of draft committee work plan (attached)
7. Presentation and discussion of staff recommendations to revise our Set Aside Policy (attached)
8. Next steps and next meeting date
9. 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 December 11, 2008 Meeting

In Attendance: John Bubier, Chair, Biddeford; Mike Bobinsky, Portland; Kevin Donoghue, Portland; Jennie Franceschi, Biddeford; Jim Gailey, South Portland; Steve Gunty, OOB; Judy Harris, Portland; Bob Hough; Dan Jellis, Yarmouth; Molly Just, Westbrook; Tom Meyers, Public Transportation; Tom Milligan, Biddeford; Brooks More, Windham; Nathan Poore, Falmouth; Duane Scott, MaineDOT

Staff: John Duncan, Carl Eppich, Paul Niehoff, Maddy Adams

- 1. Introductions, the Committee's purpose, and distribution of 3-ring notebooks.** John Bubier, Chair, called the meeting to order at 1:37 p.m. Introductions were made. The purpose of the committee is to review the TIP priority setting and administration policies and procedures in preparation for the FY 2012/2103 biennium, and to submit a final set of recommendations to the Policy Committee by September 2009.

The Table of Contents for the document was reviewed. John Duncan gave an overview of what was included in the 3-ring notebook. Items 11-17 are not yet included in the notebook. John Bubier asked if there was anything that wasn't included in the notebook that should be. It was requested that full contact information for all committee members be included.

- 2. Issues and topics for the Committee.** Staff have suggested topics to get the ball rolling. Each topic on the list will probably take at least one meeting to discuss. Then it will take another 1-2 months to put the manual together and have the committee review it. There was discussion about whether the committee should be meeting more frequently than just once a month so that momentum is enhanced. It was felt that certain topics might warrant more than one meeting. It was also mentioned that most committee members have lots of other meetings and it would be difficult to add another meeting each month. This committee is scheduled to meet on the second Friday of the month at 8:00 so it was recommended that if an additional meeting gets added, it should be on a Friday at 8:00.

The idea of tweaking the existing Policies and Procedures document was brought up. It was suggested that the committee review the existing document and highlight the areas that need to be changed. Another suggestion was made to provide the document to the committee leaving space after each topic so that each committee member could make comments on each subject. Staff will send a link of the existing TIP Policies and Procedures document to the Committee.

The increased cost of collector road projects was brought up. Jennie mentioned that the flexible design standards group is talking about this issue in particular with MaineDOT and they are looking at design standards. The design standards group has found that there is some flexibility built into those guidelines, and is looking into some case studies to look at scopes and costs for comparison purposes to determine the difference in cost if a project is done by MaineDOT versus if it were done by the municipality. Exceptions cannot be made if it only based on monetary reasons. There has to be a viable reason to get an exception. The design guidelines and exception process is in place. We need to start looking at projects with those guidelines and exceptions in mind. Perhaps we should have someone come in to talk to this group on this subject. Jeff McEwen is planning to do a presentation for the MPO's. He would probably be willing to talk to this committee also.

John Duncan reviewed the eight topic items which included:

1. Set-aside policy. This was first established in 2004.
2. Project Cost Control and PACTS Contribution Control.
 - EPS
 - 2-biennia policy
 - Funding cap policy
3. Match Ratios and Multiple Funding Sources
 - We established a 25% match ratio to stretch the money.
4. Our Inefficient Development of Projects
5. Using and Improving Existing State Transportation Policies.
 - Melrose/Eyerman report
 - Urban compact legislation
 - MaineDOT traffic movement permit
6. Working with the MaineDOT to make changes
 - MaineDOT's new three-party agreement – recognizing the three parties that are involved and refining the fact that we are in a partnership.
 - Land use/transportation connection – MaineDOT has put out a handbook on this that explains it, encourages it and addresses incentives. Old Orchard Beach, Biddeford and Saco are working on a study about integrating land use and transportation in the context of STPA; they are working with Gorrill/Palmer and Melrose/Eyerman on this study.
7. Local project administration via PACTS. Investigating the idea of hiring a person or consultant to help move LAP projects along.
8. Tweaks to several PACTS policies and procedures.
 - There is a change in the way that the state gives money to PACTS.
 - We have been requiring Council endorsement of projects. Is this still necessary since we are doing a three-party agreement?
 - Scoring formula of TIP proposals.

Other topics suggested were the stimulus package and the Transportation Management Area concept.

There was some discussion about the stimulus money and how to rank proposals. These projects need to be ready to go out the door. Those towns with engineering staff could move projects along faster than those that do not. There was further discussion about the timing and prioritization of the stimulus money; there are still many unanswered questions.

3. **Next steps – including meeting dates and times.** The next meeting was scheduled for January 9th at 8:00 a.m. Committee members were asked to review the existing TIP document and review the MaineDOT's transportation/land use document prior to the next meeting. Highlight what you think is important and determine what isn't. A second meeting was scheduled for January 23rd at 8:00 a.m.
4. **Adjourn.** The meeting adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

Agenda Item 4: Update on federal economic stimulus process

We will give an oral update on our recent communications with MaineDOT and our Executive Committee (met January 6th) on this. While it currently appears that the TIP Process Committee will have no role on this subject, we do not know how much money will come to Maine from Congress, nor the conditions attached to the funds, nor how MaineDOT will structure the process of project selection and project development. It is simply too soon to know.

Agenda Item 5: Member questions on 08/09 and 10/11 policy documents

At our December 11th meeting members asked to see a copy of our current TIP Policies and Procedures Document in order to get a good idea of what our final product will look like. John D. explained that we did not finish this 40-page document for the 2010/2011 decision making process, but that many PACTS committee members were well briefed by attending the TIP process/procedures orientation sessions last February and March.

On December 24th we emailed members a November 2007 internal first draft of our 2010/2011 Policies and Procedures, and an August 2006 version of our 2008/2009 Policies and Procedures. *Please feel free to ask questions or offer comments today or at future meetings about those documents.*

Agenda Item 6: Draft Committee Work Plan

The next page is a *rough draft* committee work plan and schedule in the format that we used with past TIP Process Committees. This outline is intended to give you and staff a means to schedule how we tackle the many topics laid out in December. Staff will offer more specifics on Friday.

Staff would like to cancel the planned January 23rd meeting because of a conflict with an all-day MaineDOT meeting in Augusta. Let's discuss.

We propose to focus our work today on our "set aside" policy. See next agenda item.

In December we heard committee members state a lot of interest in the **FHWA and MaineDOT highway design guidelines**. Members suggested that we have a FHWA representative, Jeff McEwen, come to give an overview. While we consider this a high priority, Paul and John suggest that we discuss this subject further with you before inviting Jeff to speak. We also think that his presentation might go into more detail than you need. Please see Paul's one-page report on this on page 6.

TIP Process Committee Draft Work Plan

<u>Topic</u>	<u>12/11</u>	<u>1/9</u>	<u>1/23</u>	<u>2/13</u>	<u>3/13</u>	<u>4/10</u>	<u>5/8</u>	<u>6/12</u>
			Cancel?					
1 Committee's purpose and goals	X	X						
2 Brief the Policy Committee	Dec			Feb			May	
3 Set Aside percentages for 2012/2013 biennium		X		X				
4 MaineDOT and FHWA design standards: Briefing by FHWA and MaineDOT Working group reports by Paul Niehoff								
5 PACTS role in Local Project Administration								
6 PACTS project contribution cap policy One-biennium "simple" projects Multiple-biennia "complex" projects								
7 PACTS match ratio policy Review the status quo and its history Policy on use of state "block grant" match Give preference to proposals that meet certain goals in Destination Tomorrow Give preference to proposals with multiple match sources								
8 PACTS policy on pace of project development 3-Party Agreement Projects that get delayed								
9 Overview of FTA 5307 funds priority setting								
10 Enhanced project scoping improvements								
11 Adjust factors and weights in our scoring procedures Land use and transportation connection Adjust factors weights in Roadway Formula Adjust Dest. Tomorrow factors/weights								
12 Overview of coordination with MaineDOT Six Year Plan coordination Urban Compact Legislation discussion Traffic movement permit changes								
13 Review PACTS Substitution and Withdrawal Policies								
14 Review draft 2012/2013 Policy Document							X	
15 Endorse 2012/2013 Policy Document								X

December 2008 Status Report for the

FHWA/MPO's/MaineDOT Innovative Project Work Group

In December 2007 the Technical Committee wrote to MaineDOT listing three items of concern. It turned out that MaineDOT was either in the process of, or as a result of our letter, working on all three concerns:

- developing a project “kick-off” process including the new “3-Party Agreement”
- State and Federal standards and guidelines, and design exception process, and
- the cost implications of MaineDOT’s existing QA/QC process.

Beginning in mid-summer PACTS and MaineDOT organized a 12-member working group consisting of the MPOs, MaineDOT, and FHWA. We have met five times so far at MaineDOT, ATRC and PACTS. PACTS participants include Paul Niehoff, Jennie Franceschi, Jim Wendel and Mary Ann Conroy.

We began with the MaineDOT’s Flexible Design Practices process. We discovered that although the “process” was in place for flexible design, many MaineDOT designers were either not aware there was a process or that the process appeared “broken”. The group studied the flexibility-in-design process, and developed a much better understanding of the process which utilizes the existing design guidelines for determining the best design given certain project parameters and on site project restrictions. We also reviewed the design exception process which is used when the guidelines cannot be met even with the built-in flexibility. As a result of our work, Jeff McEwen of FHWA has developed a training presentation on the process with the intent to conduct workshops with the MaineDOT Regions and main offices, the MPOs and for the MaineDOT design consultants.

Our next order of business is looking at three “case studies” to determine:

- why costs vary widely between municipal and MaineDOT projects when similar scope and designs are utilized,
- reviewing project scoping and methods of construction to determine the most economical way to construct projects and
- to delve into municipal/state project partnerships.

We anticipate that improvements to the process of project design and scoping and construction management will occur and that reports related to the various topics will be generated after the group’s work is complete.

The next meeting is scheduled for January 21st to allow time to work on the “case study” specifics. We anticipate work related to this group will be complete by April or May.

Agenda Item 7: Staff Analysis and Recommendations

In December staff introduced the following topics.

1. PACTS Set Aside Policy
2. Project Cost Control and PACTS Contribution Control
3. Match Ratios and Multiple Funding Sources
4. Inefficient Development of Projects
5. Using and Improving Existing State Transportation Policies
6. Working with MaineDOT to make changes
7. Local project administration
8. Tweaks to several PACTS policies and procedures

Please read below for staff analysis and recommendations on our Set Aside Policy. We propose to present similar analyses and recommendations on all eight topics for future meetings.

See pages 15 to 18 in our *Draft November 2007 TIP Policies/Procedures* document for existing policy language.

PACTS Set Aside Policy: History and Current Situation

Before 2004 we did not have MPO Allocation set aside categories. We ranked our STP proposal in four categories: paving, reconstruction, intersections and “non-formula” projects. The non-formula category was for bike/ped and transit capital projects (which are not highway projects but were and are eligible purposes under the federal Surface Transportation Program).

In 2004 we established a policy to program certain percentages of our MPO Allocation funds within six categories over multiple biennia. This was a key policy developed in the context of our 2002 expansion from 7 to 15 municipalities. We later reviewed and tweaked the Set Aside Policy in preparation for our 2008/2009 and 2010/2011 priority setting efforts. Here is the introduction from our March 2004 policies and procedures document:

In the 2006/2007 biennium, PACTS will work for the first time with a percentage set-asides structure. The intents of the set-asides policy are for the Policy Committee to act upon the priorities in Destination Tomorrow, and to create a structure that would help our new members to understand our TIP priority setting process during their first years in PACTS. The members intend that the set-asides will help them to focus on their regional priorities, but not to limit their flexibility and prerogative.

The set-aside framework will cover a six-year period (the 2006/2007, 2008/2009 and 2010/2011 biennia). The Policy Committee may allow some

deviation each biennium provided that the percentages return to the standard over the three biennia period.

The percentages in the table below are based on a synthesis of the Guiding Policies in Destination Tomorrow, estimates of the funding needed to preserve the region's collector roadway network through appropriate paving strategies, and historical spending patterns in the pre-2004 PACTS Metropolitan Planning Area.

See the policy and the results in the table below. For the 2006//2007, 2008/2009 and 2010/2011 biennia we programmed almost \$39,000,000 – for an average of \$13,000,000 per biennium.

Applications of the PACTS Set Aside Policy

	<u>Policy</u>	<u>Actual Six Year Average</u>		<u>Actual (1) FY 06/07 Biennium</u>	<u>Actual (2) FY 08/09 Biennium</u>	<u>Actual (3) FY 10/11 Biennium</u>
Collectors	40%	47%	(4)	58%	49%	34%
Intersections	20%	9%	(5)	7%	8%	13%
Widen Roads	20%	13%	(6)	12%	4%	23%
Rebuild Roads	10%	20%	(7)	15%	31%	14%
Transit	7%	7%		4%	8%	10%
Bike/Ped	<u>3%</u>	<u>3%</u>		<u>4%</u>	<u>0%</u>	<u>5%</u>
Total	100%	100%		100%	100%	100%

1. Per October 2006 Policy meeting packet. This does not reflect subsequent adjustments.
2. Per May 2007 Policy meeting packet.
3. Per December 2008 Policy meeting packet.
4. The 58% and 49% include: covering cost increases for several 04/05 projects, and covering the skyrocketing costs of many 06/07 projects.
5. Note that we have committed up to approx. \$2 million in 12/13 funds to the Dunstan Corner intersection project.
6. "Widen" in this case means to add travel lanes or build a new paved shoulder.
7. The Rebuild Roads 15% includes 6% used to cover costs for some pre-existing arterial paving projects.)

Here are some additional staff comments on each of the categories.

Collectors

1. This set aside is about maintaining our existing transportation system – the top priority of *Destination Tomorrow*.
2. This set aside gives our suburban members hope that they will get some PACTS funding in their towns because most of their eligible roads are collectors.

3. The 40% goal was based on historical research of actual spending in the pre-2002 PACTS region and on analysis by MaineDOT staff. *Please note that our recently completed PACTS Collector Road Assessment Study sheds much more light on this subject for the future.*

Intersections

After maintenance of the existing system, this was our second priority of the Eight Guiding Policies of *Destination Tomorrow*. As such, it is disappointing that we under-spent in this set aside.

Widen Roads

This was set at 20% because widening roads is very expensive, so even doing a few projects costs a lot.

Rebuild Roads

This was set at only 10% because it often (not always!) costs less to rebuild roads than to widen them.

Transit

This was a continuation of our “non-formula” category mentioned above. This set aside category complements the federal FTA 5307 moneys that come to our region.

Bicycle/Pedestrian

This was also a continuation of our “non-formula” category mentioned above.

Staff Analysis and Recommendation

We have had six years of experience with this and the several other key TIP policies developed and refined since 2004. Fundamental questions to ask are:

- Should we stick with a set aside policy? Could a project scoring system work better than a set aside system in order to meet our *Destination Tomorrow* goals?
- Our MPO Allocation is a relatively small amount of money for a region of 15 municipalities and 7 transit systems. How much should we try to accomplish with the funds?
- Where is the best balance between funding a small number of large regional projects and a large number of small projects? See John Duncan’s August 2008 email dialogue with Ron Owens, Kevin Donoghue, Rick Michaud and Nat Tupper (in your 3-ring notebook and at the end of this memo).

During the PACTS Process Review work a year ago one of the major conclusions was that the PACTS process overall has become too complicated and asks too much of its members. One part of addressing this is to rely more on PACTS staff. A second

component is to simplify our policies and procedures. A third possible strategy is to reduce the number of projects that we fund (per the email dialogue referenced above).

PACTS staff proposes that we continue with a set asides policy, and that we change it as follows:

- Focus more on regionally significant projects by funding more large projects and fewer small projects.
- Stop using our federal funds for “simple” collector paving projects, and use our federal funds instead to take care of the more expensive complicated collector projects. While staff believes that the Technical Committee would support this approach on technical and cost-effectiveness bases, it might be a tough sell to city and town managers.
- Spend more on transit and bike/ped projects in the context of global warming and system sustainability.

Please review the following table. We will explain it at Friday’s meeting.

Proposal To Amend PACTS Set Aside Policy

	<u>Existing Policy</u>	<u>Proposed Policy</u>	<u>12/13 Biennium Dollars *</u>	<u>Notes</u>
Collectors	40%	25%	\$3,750,000	Use only for "Tier 2 and 3" ** Municipalities would finance simple overlay: At odds with results of our Collector Study?
Intersections	20%	35%	\$5,250,000	Relieve bottlenecks...is urban oriented. ***
Widen Roads	20%	0%	\$0	A statement against adding travel lanes.
Rebuild Roads	10%	25%	\$3,750,000	For reconstruction on arterials (expensive) Is also an urban centers statement because most arterial mileage is in urban centers.
Transit	7%	10%	\$1,500,000	A statement for sustainable transpo policy.
Bike/Ped	<u>3%</u>	<u>5%</u>	<u>\$750,000</u>	A statement for sustainable transpo policy.
Total	100%	100%	\$15,000,000	

* Our 2010/2011 biennium amount was \$14,600,000.

** Staff will explain this at our meeting.

*** Note that we have committed up to approx. \$2,000,000 in 12/13 biennium funds to the Dunstan Corner intersection project.

Next steps if TIP Process Committee likes this concept

1. Write category descriptions and review with members.
2. Other.

August “regional emphasis” email dialogue with several members of the Policy Committee – and Nat Tupper’s October email on collector paving

Hi, I want to thank Kevin, Rick, Nat and Ron for responding to my email. See below. Here is my response:

1. I will share your emails with the Executive Committee at our September 2nd meeting. I note that the Executive Committee’s mission is to help me organize Policy Committee meetings rather than shape PACTS policy. That is why the members decided at their August meeting to add this topic – for discussion only – to the September 18th Policy Committee agenda.
2. I would like PACTS to give up on setting aside funding for the “simple” collector paving needs (in the 2012/2013 program rather than in the upcoming 2010/2011 program), and put that task back on the communities.
3. The list of new intersection projects that we will adopt in October will be a shorter list than we have had in recent years.
4. I think that Ron’s comment that a more regional strategy “would make it easier for us to rally beyond a few regional projects and change our focus from what can we get to how do we make the region’s transportation system function more effectively” is what many members are saying. That is great!
5. I suggest that a TIP Process Committee convene in 2009 to revamp our system. I note that Paul Niehoff and several Technical Committee members are meeting here with MDOT and three other MPO’s as I write to explore ways to simplify and control costs. This was Paul’s initiative. He’s doing a great job.
6. Kevin, our existing Set Aside policy sets asides funds to project categories rather than to communities.
7. Finally, we adopted Destination Tomorrow in 2006 based on work done in 2004 and 2005. In 2009 and 2010 we will update it. In our new world of higher gas prices we will tackle the land use and TDM topics that Kevin mentions with renewed vigor.

John

Recent email dialogue on “regional emphasis at PACTS” with Kevin Donoghue, Ron Owens, Rick Michaud and Nat Tupper (in chronological order)

John Duncan to Kevin, Nat, Ron and Rick on August 18th

I recently spoke with each of you and I think that I heard you all suggest that PACTS should program more of our MPO Allocation funds on a smaller number of larger

REGIONAL projects rather than on the larger number of projects as we do now. This came as a bit of a surprise to me from Nat and Rick who were key architects in the creation of our Set Asides policy, and particularly our Collector Roads Set Aside. I say “surprise” gently given that Nat and Rick are regional thinkers and leaders at PACTS.

I spoke with you all during the same two week period and began to sense a trend. Please let me know if I misunderstood you, or if you want to comment further.

I note that I also recently spoke with Dave Cole (Gorham), Mike Bobinsky and Joe Gray on this “trend”. Their initial reactions were to support the status quo.

Nat Tupper Response

I still like the set aside for collector paving as a significant component of the PACTS allocation. That helps us address maintenance and makes sure the funds get spread around to all the communities based on roadway conditions rather than traffic counts or political or economic clout or staff “grant writing” skills. I think some set aside for safety, pedestrian, and transit is necessary both from a practical and political standpoint.

But for the rest of the money, I think we should consider throwing in the towel on our current approach. It’s obvious that there simply is not enough money or predictability for PACTS funds to be a reasonable way for individual communities to solve intersection, capacity, rebuild, or other priorities....we might just as well focus the PACTS funds on those projects of the greatest regional significance. Unfortunately I don’t think those will be easy to define or choose, But we are only frustrating ourselves and delaying projects by trying to squeeze a lot of projects and priorities out of way too little money.

Ron Owens Response

Nat, as usual you have stated the case very well for refocusing PACTS away from this treadmill of chasing too many projects with too little funds and becoming very frustrated with the conflicts that it creates among communities and the PACTS members. I was ready to give up on setting aside funding for collector paving and putting that task back on the communities but you make a good point that a pot of maintenance monies would assist the communities overall to maintain roads and at least provide most communities with something tangible while most of the funds get allocated to a few truly regionally significant projects of high priority. I think the strategy would make it easier for us to rally beyond a few regional projects and change our focus from what can we get to how do we make the region’s transportation system function more effectively. Finally some set aside for pedestrians, bicycles and transit would be essential to help promote alternatives but also we need to recognize political reality.

Rick Michaud Response

I agree with Nat in part. We need to review how funds are allocated with no constraints. If we were starting as if this was a new program I do not believe there would be much resemblance to what we do today. I am ready to “throw the towel in.”

Kevin Donoghue Response

I confess my ignorance up front, but if "set aside" refers to every community being entitled (all carrot, no stick) to thin sliver of pie, then I'm not sure why we would even bother calling ourselves an MPO. If, however, one received a slice because of compliance with land use goals (perhaps to be better developed) from *Destination Tomorrow*, it'd be unimportant to me whether projects were small or large in scale or local or regional in significance. I believe this should be the case for all varieties of funding within each "set aside" category like bike-ped and transit and would submit, perhaps that we increase our shares allocated to alternative modes as well. I'll be well informed to listen to the perspective and experience of others in a meeting, but, generally speaking, I believe that where we target funds for regional transportation projects should be predicated in large part on municipal land use practice or, perhaps much more simply, adoption of an (as yet undeveloped) model ordinance for Travel Demand Management. I look forward to thinking about this more with open ears with an eye toward a future we are gaining ground despite diminished resources.

Nat Tupper email October 22nd to Bill Shane (Chair of Policy Committee)

Bill:

I just wanted to share my thoughts with you about the Gorrill-Palmer study for prioritization of the collector paving program. I think they did a terrific job and the approach they are suggesting is sound, reasonable, fair, and intelligent. And it is not “policy” biased in that it does not intentionally favor one area or community over another; the allocation is based on objective quantifiable engineering assessments. Within any single political jurisdiction (town, state, MDOT Region) it makes great sense.

But PACTS is not a single jurisdiction, rather it is a collaborative regional planning effort of 15 different jurisdictions plus several transit providers.

Therefore, I suggest that we re-introduce a smidge of bias into the allocations by eliminating the proposed scoring weights assigned for traffic, truck and transit utilization. (Perhaps it is more marketable to say that this would remove a smidge of unintended urban bias?) We should keep the collector paving allocation determinations based on road conditions only as represented by the PCR with the added deflectometer [FWD] scores. Of course, the determination of how much of total PACTS allocation (currently 40% of about \$11MM) to allocate to collector paving is a completely “policy driven” decision and other legitimate policy choices could be made and justified. I’m satisfied that the 40% goal is a very reasonable

and constructive policy choice- it is not entirely an objective or engineering driven decision- nor should it be.

By adding the utilization factors of traffic and truck counts and transit route, we will bias the collector paving funds toward cities of the urban center (albeit only modestly). We have already appropriately incorporated some “urban” bias in making other set-asides for Intersections, Transit, and other large projects, as well as targeting any High Priority Projects, and in our non-paving project scoring methodologies. We have also seen that due to huge project cost increases and larger local share requirements, that non-paving projects will be concentrated to urban communities that have the ability to shift funds from other local or PACTS projects to cover the overruns and budget increases. In smaller communities, the marginal cost of just the PACTS project cost increases can rival or outstrip the entire road construction or paving budget for the entire town for the year. Those communities are not going to be able to participate in PACTS projects other than collector overlays. The price and volatility is simply getting to be too great to play in this arena.

The allocation of 40% of our funds to collector paving was not and is not based on engineering estimates targeting the most cost-effective balance (although I recall that some rough assessments were made to check for policy reasonableness). Rather, the intention was to make sure that some portion of the funds were allocated across the entire region without regard to traffic count, staff or funding capacity (or funding flexibility), political pull, or “grant-writing” skills. I think it has been a successful PACTS strategy in that regard. We do have a strong regional sense that has developed from our PACTS participation, and I believe that sense was identified as a key asset or strength by the PACTS Policy Committee members during last year’s strategic planning. I believe that both the 40% total allocation of collector paving funds focusing on objective measures of road conditions and the policy decision not to include traffic count and other utilization factors have been key in this area of PACTS success.

So, I support the recommendation of the study; the consultant, staff and Technical Committee should be commended for the work. But, I suggest that the proposed weighting for traffic, transit, and truck utilization be eliminated or reduced considerably.

On the other hand, where we have allocated funds for Transit, Ped/Bike, Intersections and large projects (including HPP), I would support greater weighting for integration of systems. That is, Ped/Bike projects that lead to transit stops ought to score a bit higher than Ped/Bike that is purely “recreational”. And intersection designs that seek to promote ped/bike safety and comfort ought to score better than intersections designed for moving traffic only.

Thanks for your consideration, Nat Tupper