

# PACTS

---

Portland Area Comprehensive Transportation Committee

## PACTS TIP Process Committee Meeting Notice

October 24, 2007  
2:00 p.m.

PACTS  
68 Marginal Way, Portland

### Agenda

1. Call to order and review goals for the meeting (see updated work plan)
2. Minutes of September 19<sup>th</sup> meeting
3. Results of October 19<sup>th</sup> PACTS Process Retreat, and the Freeport funding sub-allocation proposal
4. Collector paving topics
5. Estimate of 2010/2011 biennial funding, and Set Aside levels
6. 2008 priority setting schedule
7. Project cost overrun policy
8. Increased staff responsibilities
9. Next steps

Next Meetings: November 14<sup>th</sup> at 2:00 p.m. and December 19<sup>th</sup> at 2:00 p.m.

*The Metropolitan Planning Organization for the Portland Urbanized Area*  
68 Marginal Way • Portland, Maine 04101  
Telephone: (207) 774-9891 • Fax: (207) 774-7149 • [www.pactsplan.org](http://www.pactsplan.org)

## TIP Process Committee Draft Work Plan

<u>Topic</u>	<u>Sept. 19</u>	<u>Oct. 24</u>	<u>Nov. 14</u>	<u>Dec. 19</u>
1 Committee's purpose and goals	Done			
2 Former TIP Process Committees' work	Done			
3 Set meeting dates for Oct/Nov/Dec	Done			
4 Collector paving topics	X			
Policy Committee direction of Sept. 20th		X		
Norm Baker's standards proposal	X	X		
Use MDOT's "5%" for collector paving	X	X		
PACTS do a regional collectors study		X		
5 Regional suballocation formula	X	X		
6 Estimate of 2010/2011 funding and set asides		X		
7 2008 schedule for priority setting, and for our two 08/09 PCE projects		X		
8 Project cost overrun policy		X		
Cap per project and/or municipality?				
Future use of 25% contingency PIN's				
9 Increased PACTS staff responsibilities		X		
10 Overview of FTA 5307 funds priority setting			X	
11 Scoring highway projects			X	
Adjust factors weights in Roadway Formula?				
Adjust Dest. Tomorrow factors/weights?				
Simplify?				
12 Overview of draft MPO Administrative Guide			X	
Three party agreements				
Coordination with MaineDOT 6-Year Plan				
Other items to add to our Policy Document				
13 Strict application of proposal requirements			X	
When is a study complete enough?				
Missing/incomplete/wrong data				
14 Review draft 2010/2011 Policies Document			X	
15 Endorse 2010/2011 Policies Document				X
16 Brief the Policy Committee	Done	NA	15-Nov	20-Dec

### Other

Policy Committee endorses final Policies Document in January

Hold TIP process orientation session for all members on November 28th.

Improve our TIP application forms. Review with Tech and Planning in early November.

## **Minutes of September 19<sup>th</sup> Meeting**

**Present:** Bill Shane, Chair; Cumberland; Norm Baker, MaineDOT; Sarah Behr, MaineDOT; Bob Burns, Gorham; John Bubier, Biddeford; Julia Dawson, PACTS; John Duncan, PACTS; Kathi Earley, Portland; Donna Larson, Freeport; Dean Lessard, MaineDOT; Sue McIntyre, GPCOG; Tom Milligan, Biddeford; Paul Niehoff, PACTS; Nathan Poore, Falmouth; Dave Redlefsen, Public Transit; David Willauer, GPCOG.

1. **Call to Order.** Bill Shane, Chair, called the meeting to order at 2:04 p.m., welcomed those present and introductions were made.
2. **Committee's purpose**  
Bill summarized the "Draft Committee's Purpose Statement" as described in the meeting packet, making note of the aggressive schedule with an interim report due in December.
3. **Staff perspective on what's working well, and what needs attention**  
Bill referred to the "Summary and assessments of the work of the 2004 and 2006 Process Committees" document in the meeting packet and noted that today's meeting is an overview of what has gone well and what could be improved upon. The meeting packet also provides historical information, financial information as well as analysis done by staff.

John Duncan directed the group to the "TIP Process Committee Draft Work Plan" that he distributed.

### ***Key items noted and discussed:***

- Julia Dawson, Paul Niehoff, Dean Lessard and Bob Burns provided input on the former TIP Process Committee's work.
- There is consensus to move ahead with analysis and clarification of terminology as well as defining what is appropriate collector pavement treatments and their definitions.
- Federal and State design standards need to be reviewed.
- Staff has put together a proposal that the Policy Committee will act on tomorrow. They will be asking the Policy Committee for direction and guidance on collector paving items such as putting more local monies toward "simple" overlays.
- Collector overlays can sometimes turn into substantial construction improvements.
- There is a need to clearly define what can be simply an overlay and what requires shoulder widening and other road treatments.
- Why do DOT projects cost more to pave when towns could do it for less and still follow DOT specs?
- MaineDOT does not maintenance pave in urban compact areas.
- Would a summit with MaineDOT, PACTS, Public Works Depts. and private sector be worthwhile?
- Is there a need to get back to basics?
- 75% of MaineDOT funds come from federal funds.

More discussion ensued. Norm Baker is proposing to the Feds that if the municipality agrees to pick up the maintenance of a road for the next “x” year(s) then maybe lower specs and standards can be used to pave the road. However, timeframes are a concern, we need to be realistic and decide what to do in the meantime. John Bubier said that another aspect to consider would be putting more funds into the rail system to get some of the heavier trucks off the local streets. This might be a good item to bring to the Policy Committee.

Discussion continued on various ideas. The idea of a modified collector program that could stretch monies for the local collector program was discussed. Maybe an additional category should be considered. Another idea included putting together a type of formula that would allow splitting the monies up among the towns and let the towns decide how to use it as long as they meet federal and state requirements. However, instead of PACTS bearing some of the “headaches”, communities would be facing the same “headaches” instead. Also, how would this affect the regional approach in relation to Destination Tomorrow? A concern was also expressed with the fact that in working with federally administered funds, once you’ve built something, and if you make an administrative process mistake, the federal government will not reimburse you. Right now the MaineDOT bears that responsibility. More discussion followed pertaining to the upside and downside of these ideas.

#### **4. Next steps, and set meeting date(s)**

- More discussion is needed on cost overruns.
- Staff will gather information on road miles and traffic counts.
- John will research federal regulations in regards to whether monies can be divided according to a single regional formula.
- Work on the process. (Wait till after the “Retreat” to look at a new PACTS model.)
- Schedule of next meetings are:
  - Wednesday, October 24<sup>th</sup>, 2:00 to 4:00 p.m.
  - Wednesday, November 14<sup>th</sup>, 2:00 to 4:00 p.m.
  - Wednesday, December 19<sup>th</sup>, 2:00 to 4:00 p.m.

#### **5. Adjourn**

Meeting adjourned at 3:35 p.m.

### **Agenda Item 3 – Results of October 19<sup>th</sup> PACTS Process Retreat and Freeport’s funding sub-allocation proposal**

We will discuss the results of last Friday’s retreat as they relate to this Committee’s work.

We will also discuss Freeport’s funding sub-allocation proposal which Donna Larson mentioned at our September meeting. Staff and MaineDOT and FHWA have discussed it and have concluded that it is allowable under the federal MPO Regulations, but they all see some potential pitfalls for the regional priority setting process that the regulations envision.

Here is Freeport’s initial proposal.

- Establish a formula to allocate PACTS funds to member communities, using criteria such as miles of road in PACTS area.
- Once money is allocated, member communities submit how they propose to use the funds. Funds may be accumulated over more than one biennium for a specific project, up to 10 years. The funds can be for one project, or for a variety of projects.
- Projects are reviewed by PACTS staff to assure that they meet all state and federal guidelines. Sub-regions meet to discuss possible coordination of projects.
- Policy Committee meets to endorse the slate of projects if necessary,
- PACTS staff works with communities to develop project specifications and cost estimates.
- PACTS staff works with DOT and municipality to develop bid proposals
- PACTS staff, DOT staff, municipal staff get projects done
- Cost overruns are the responsibility of the municipality.

#### **Benefits**

- Each member guaranteed a share of funding
- Gets the money where the needs are, municipalities know what the highest priorities are.
- Municipalities have more control over dollars spent on transportation,
- Projects developed once funding amounts are established and not before
- Less administrative overhead spent on prioritizing projects and shuffling projects, staff time is shifted to getting projects done like enhanced scoping, project inspection, etc.
- If funding is cut, every community is cut, instead of some cut completely and others not cut at all
- **Fewer meetings, less confusion, uncertainty, and frustration.**

## **Agenda Item 4 – Collector paving topics**

### A. Policy Committee’s September 19<sup>th</sup> Vote

Last month the Policy Committee voted to request that the Technical Committee (possibly in collaboration with the TIP Process Committee) develop collector road funding policy recommendations this fall in preparation for setting priorities during 2008 for the programming of 2010/2011 capital funds. The members asked that we develop a Hybrid Program (Built and unbuilt roads) – Preservation, and highway improvements. The members understood that:

- Fewer projects would be completed than if we focused on only preserving “built” roads.
- A clear set of treatment eligibility lists will need to be defined.
- Costly state and federal requirements will have to be met.
- Further discussion may ensue as to whether we should use federal money to fund straight overlays.

Staff is drafting a proposal for next steps on this. We will send it to you before the meeting.

### B. Norm Baker’s proposal

Norm will join us, and give us more insights into his proposal that he shared at our last meeting. His proposal is to lower paving standards (and lower municipal match as a result) in exchange for municipalities agreeing to do more maintenance. *The devil is in the details and definitions! We thank Norm for his initiative and look forward to his insights.*

### C. Use MaineDOT’s “5%” for paving

We discussed this idea in September: to use the MaineDOT funding that they “budget” for PACTS as a major contributor to collector paving financing in our region. It appears that this will not work. We will discuss.

### D. PACTS do a regional collectors assessment study

Staff is drafting a proposal to do a regional collectors assessment study during the next nine months. We will explain at the meeting.

**Agenda Item 5 – Estimate of 2010/2011 biennial funding, and Set Aside levels**

This was in the September meeting packet, but we did not discuss. Julia will explain.

**Estimate of PACTS MPO Allocation Funds  
To Program for 2010/2011 Biennium  
September 14, 2007**

Estimate of Federal Funds: \$7,751,574 \*  
Estimate of Federal+State+Local Funds: \$10,976,268

Set Aside	Federal Funds	Match Ratio	Total Available	Adjustments **	Already Committed	Available Balance***
Transit 7%	\$542,610	80-0-20	\$678,263	\$538,153	\$0	\$1,216,416
Bike/ped 3%	\$232,547	70-5-25	\$332,194	\$329,112	\$0	\$661,306
Collector 40%	\$3,100,630	70-5-25	\$4,429,249	-\$538,153	\$0	\$3,891,096
Intersection 20%	\$1,550,315	70-5-25	\$2,214,625	\$0	\$860,480	\$1,354,145
Widen 20%	\$1,550,315	70-5-25	\$2,214,625	\$0	\$2,086,000	\$128,625
Rebuild 10%	<u>\$775,157</u>	70-5-25	<u>\$1,107,312</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$1,300,000</u>	<u>-\$192,688</u>
<b>total</b>	<b>\$7,751,574</b>		<b>\$10,976,268</b>	<b>\$329,112</b>	<b>\$4,246,480</b>	<b>\$7,058,900</b>

\* Estimate based on an average of 06/07 and 08/09 allocations. This is a conservative estimate.

\*\* Staff will explain at our 9/19 meeting.

\*\*\* Reminder: Need to program PCE funds for next cycle (2012/2013 biennium)

Note: The Available Balance \$7,058,900 overstates the amount available by the \$329,112 Bike/Ped adjustment. We can fix this later.

## **Agenda Item 6 – 2008 priority setting schedule**

We need to decide on some deadlines this month, and to advise all relevant parties. This is built around getting our draft 2010/2011 list to MaineDOT in September 2008, and a final list to them in November 2008. The following is not a complete schedule – just some highlights of a rough draft schedule.

### **Rebuild, Widen and Intersection Proposals**

November 16, 2007: Staff distributes application forms  
January \_\_, 2008: Applications due at PACTS  
March \_\_, 2008: Select projects for Enhanced Project Scoping (EPS)  
July, 2008: Complete EPS  
September, 2008: Technical Committee submits final list to Policy Committee

### **Collector Paving**

December, 2007: We complete the new Collector Set Aside parameters, and then advise  
MaineDOT so that they can organize to give us what we need

April, 2008: MaineDOT submits to us their data, analysis, and a list of candidates

September, 2008: Technical Committee submits final list to the Policy Committee

### **Bike/Ped Proposals**

November 16, 2007: Staff distributes application forms.  
\_\_\_\_\_, 2008 Applications due at PACTS  
Do Enhanced Project Scoping?  
September, 2008: Planning Committee submits final list to Policy Committee

### **Transit Set Aside Proposals**

December, 2007: Staff distributes application forms  
February, 2008: Applications due at PACTS  
September, 2008: Transit Committee submits final list to Policy Committee

### **MaineDOT completion of 08/09 Project PDR Cost Estimates**

We need by July 1, 2008? This is an issue only for the Halfway Rotary in Old Orchard Beach, and the Biddeford Route One widening. We are working with MaineDOT staff to accelerate their schedules for these.

**Agenda Item 7 – Project cost overrun policy**

We will get you some suggestions on this before your meeting.

**Agenda Item 8 – Increased staff responsibilities**

We will get you some suggestions on this before your meeting.