

PACTS

Portland Area Comprehensive Transportation Committee



Joint Planning and Technical Committee Meeting Notice

August 11, 2009
8:30 a.m.

PACTS, 68 Marginal Way, Portland

Agenda

1. Call to order
2. Public Comment
3. Minutes of June 4th, 2009 Meeting
4. PACTS Regional Bicycle & Pedestrian Plan Update
5. TIP Process Update
6. Information and Other Business
7. Adjourn.

Next Meeting: September 8, 2009

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

PACTS Joint Planning and Technical Committee Meeting
June 4th, 2009
9:00 a.m.

Members Present: Jennie Franceschi, Biddeford, Chair; Sarah Behr, MaineDOT, Bill Bent, HNTB (MTA); Angela Blanchette, Saco; Mimi Cervaney, MaineDOT; Tex Haeuser, South Portland; Alex Jaegerman, Portland; Dan Jellis, Yarmouth; Peggy Kilmer, Yarmouth; Donna Larson, Falmouth; Steve Linnell, GPCOG; Brooks Moore, Windham; Dave Redlefsen, Public Transit; Jim Wendel, Scarborough.

Members Absent: Dana Anderson, So. Portland; Dan Bacon, Scarborough; Mike Bolduc, Saco; Bob Burns, Gorham; Julia Dawson, SMRPC; Sara Devlin, MTA; Eric Dudley, Westbrook; Doug Fortier, Windham; Deb Fossum, Gorham; Connie Garber, PACTS Transit Committee Rep.; Gary Guerette, South Portland; Bob Hough, MaineDOT; Molly Just, Westbrook; Robert Kahn, Policy Com. Appt.; Mike Laberge, MaineDOT; Gary Lamb, Old Orchard Beach; Bob Malley, Cape Elizabeth; Jeff McEwen, FHWA; Dale Mitchell, Policy Committee Appointee; Brooks More, Windham; Carla Nixon, Cumberland; Maureen O'Meara, Cape Elizabeth; Al Presgraves, Freeport; Anna Price, FHWA; Peter Morelli, Saco; Tom Reinauer, SMRPC; Amanda Stearns, Falmouth; Greg Tansley, Biddeford; Gretel Varney, Portland.

Staff and Guests: John Duncan, PACTS; Carl Eppich, PACTS; Bruce Hyman, Bruce Hyman Planning Inc., Sue McIntyre, GPCOG; Paul Niehoff, PACTS, Dave, intern, MaineDOT.

1. **Call to Order:** Jennie Franceschi, Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:04 a.m.
2. **Public Comment:** There were no public comments expressed.
3. **Technical Committee Minutes of April 14th, 2009 Meeting**
Dan Jellis made a motion for approval of the April 14th, 2009 minutes, seconded by Jim Wendel. Vote taken. All were in favor. Minutes were unanimously accepted.
4. **PACTS Regional Bicycle & Pedestrian Plan Update**
PACTS has hired Bruce Hyman Planning Inc. to update the 1995 PACTS Regional Bicycle Plan. The region now includes a total of 15 communities.

Bruce provided a summary of the draft "Scope of Services and Schedule" included in the meeting packet. Among items noted:

- The scope of the work will focus on bicycle/pedestrian plans and trail facilities.
- A critical component will be the encouragement and education aspect.

The scope of the work is organized in three central tasks:

- The first item includes the collection of information and an inventory. Bruce noted that it will be essential to meet with communities soon. Municipalities have been sent an online survey. A paper version is also available. Consultants are planning to meet both the planner and engineer of each town. They will be reviewing existing bicycle/pedestrian plans, those that might be in progress, or any plans that anticipates bicycle lanes, facilities, trails, etc.
- The second task will include looking at where those places are currently located and where it would be beneficial to connect to transit, making it easier for people to access.
- The third item includes a review of barriers to the system and/or the network in order to take a look at gaps and deficiencies and to consider probable solutions such as a paved shoulder, a bicycle lane, etc.

Consultants have also been asked to determine the top ten most cost and time efficient areas of potential improvements and to determine the top ten areas of most concern for needed improvements. While in the field, consultants will document through pictures and notes what the deficiencies are in those top 10 lists. The information will then be compiled into a report for the

plan update. Education, marketing and cost estimates will be included and given to PACTS by June 30th. The plan will be posted to the website for public comment and consultants will be meeting with advocacy groups. The 1995 plan will be reviewed to see what has changed since that time and design guidelines will be developed. For instance, bicycle boulevards were not around in 1995. That could be an item included in the design guidelines along with bicycle parking. It was noted that this may be fine for a city the size of Portland, but other things may be considered for the more rural communities. The preliminary plan is due June 30th.

Paul spoke of the PACTS Preferred Alternative Mode Transportation Group (PAMTG) meeting that was held on the previous Friday and provided an overview.

Once the plan is completed, the next component will be a web based plan whereby contributors will be able to post updates on a continuing basis. A commitment from the towns to update the information would be needed. Erik West will be coordinating the website. Erik noted that this is a starting point and could provide input/comments on items such as deficiencies, what has changed and, what has been proposed. This format would keep the information current. Erik added that the big question is whether towns would find value in doing this. That question would need to be answered before the website moves forward.

Discussion began. A question was asked as to why the sudden need for all the information in a one-month span. Paul replied that part of the reason had to do with a timeframe and the financial aspect of the fiscal year. Erik made reference to the web based component and pointed out that there was no rush. Bruce re-iterated that they are setting up meetings now in the northern region and that the more information they can get sooner, such as paper maps, the more of that information can be incorporated into the updated plan. GIS files or anything else that is missing can be sent later. This will be a continuing component and will not be GIS based. It will include discussion items, policies, etc. Donna expressed her concern about the funding aspect being tied to the plan and the hurried request for getting all the information now. Her concern stemmed from the idea that if a town is not in the plan at the onset that it would be unlikely that the town would be able to get any funding. She did not think this timeframe allowed towns enough time to provide quality and thoughtful input. Paul pointed out that if a town is not part of the plan then he did not think that it would be tied to the funding aspect. The funding aspect is a future discussion. It could be decided to change the funding formula. Jennie echoed Donna's concerns about the extreme timeframe and spoke of not having enough time to provide a meaningful end to this project and for a real thought-out process. A short discussion followed pertaining to funding and the funding source. John D. pointed out that federal funds have become tighter and that the MaineDOT had given PACTS an opportunity for funding at the last minute. Roughly ¾ of this study money had to be spent by June 30th. Following June 30th, PACTS will have two years to finish the budget that they have with the consultants and to wrap this up. Discussion continued on the time constraints. Paul pointed out that they originally wanted to do this study over a year ago but at that time the Portland Trails was doing the Active Transportation Study. Talks had taken place to do it concurrently but it did not make sense. Subsequently, much of the information gathered in that study will be incorporated into this one. Paul apologized for the aggressive schedule.

A long discussion followed. The comment was made that it might be better to look at the consultant's work not as the next 10-year bicycle/pedestrian plan but more as a first step for a regional bicycle/pedestrian plan with the website that can continue with community input. Priority items could be updated into another version of the plan. Bruce explained that paper maps would be digitalized. People could submit photographs of drainage sites, for instance, and then the public could comment. Further discussion followed about the website. *Among some of the comments:*

- The website is a good idea but will only be successful if each town designates one person to update their community's information.
- This would be a collective effort in data exchange.
- Towns will have to decide if this is a worthwhile effort for them.
- One opinion was that the Study did not rise to the level of special appropriation.

- The Eastern Trail will be included in the process.
- There was interest in having a baseline map on the web and to have a designated transportation enthusiast/activist update the map.
- There could be an “official” section on the website alongside another section that is considered “unofficial” for comments/ideas/etc. But someone would need to manage the website. Towns may have to approve any map prior to it being uploaded to the website.
- There was a concern expressed for the need to be careful of government’s role in this endeavor and to be certain as to who is doing what, especially with municipal maps/documents.
- It was re-iterated and clarified that towns would determine what is considered as an official map and/or document before it is put on the website.
- Website updates could be done on a semi-annual basis.

Discussion followed pertaining to ranking and funding as well as the timeframe constraints in conjunction with whether or not a town would be left out of the plan if all the information was not given by July 17th. John D. clarified that in two years from now, depending on how priorities are set, PACTS might want to change the percentages. Tex noted that this could be seen as a pilot project for PACTS as a whole to look at in regards to citizen participation but that he would encourage that when this group has there next discussion that the website could be further along. How would the public provide input and how would PACTS keep it as separate tabs: one official and one unofficial?

5. TIP Process Update

A quick overview was provided on the items listed under Agenda Item 5 in the meeting packet. John D. noted that the TIP Process document would be compiled into a more-user friendly 15-page document. Several options were considered with regards to the Set Aside funding policy. Some of the comments supported more funding for collector roads that serve transit routes and more funding for the Bike/Ped category. There is almost a need for a separate set aside to improve transit route roads. There is just not enough money to do everything that needs to be done. John spoke of a PACTS Executive Summary Report that he forwarded to the Legislature. Topics for the next TIP Process Committee meeting are listed in the meeting packet. The next meeting is scheduled for next Friday.

6. Information and Other Business

Carl provided an overview of items listed in the meeting packet. The Long-Range Plan Committee (*Destination Tomorrow*) has met three times. The group agreed that things have changed since 2006 especially socioeconomically and environmentally. Focus will be on what has happened in the past six years and what should be incorporated. What will the region be like in the future? Two hours at the last meeting were spent on revision and goals. This will be a year-long process.

An update on item 3 by Paul noted that the Policy Committee had requested the use of funds from withdrawn collector road projects to fund projects that may not have made the 2010/2011 TIP.

Tex Haeuser, Kathy Earley and John Duncan met with BACTS, the equivalent of PACTS, in Bangor. There is much interest in the John Melrose work that is being done and in a statewide effort. John would like to give a presentation to them on the Melrose Study. It is a work in progress and John will keep the group updated.

Bruce announced that the Transit TIF Bill had passed the House in the Legislature. They are now waiting for a final vote in the Senate.

7. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 10:40 a.m.

Agenda Item 4. PACTS Regional Bicycle & Pedestrian Plan Update

Bruce Hyman will give an overview and status of the plan update. The narrative and plans were sent under separate cover. We are looking for input toward both the plan and the design guidelines.

Agenda Item 5. TIP Process Update

Attached to either this agenda packet or under separate cover is the final draft of our new TIP Policies and Procedures document. You will be pleased that the document is now condensed into a shorter document. Also, the following is a “cheat sheet” aka check list of the procedures for your review. Rest assured you will all receive copies of the final documents to get ready for the next round of submittals this October. Yes, October 2009.

Overview of PACTS TIP Applications Development and Ranking Processes August 6th Draft

This document outlines the process for compiling applications under the PACTS Intersection, Rebuild Road and Bike/Ped “set asides” and the subsequent priority setting process at PACTS. Please note that PACTS staff will adhere strictly to the deadlines and application requirements.

If you want to learn about our other two set asides (Collector Road preservation paving and Transit Capital) or to get other details about the PACTS programming process, contact PACTS, GPCOG or SMRPC staff or refer to our TIP Policies and Procedures Document which is available at www.pactsplan.org. The page numbers in parentheses below refer to the page numbers for each topic in that document.

Application Development

1. Project Eligibility (page 3)
2. Application Forms – PACTS staff will distribute the application forms for the 2012/2013 biennium in October 2009.
3. Application Schedule – Preliminary applications are due on January 8, 2010. We will review and comment on the applications so that you can improve them. *However, it is your job to submit a complete and accurate application.*

Final applications are due on February 12, 2010. We will not accept corrections or supplementary data after that date.

Final applications that omit data or show incorrect data used in the scoring process will receive zeros in those scoring factors, and ones that fail to meet the requirements listed below will not be considered.

4. Intersection Proposal Requirements (page 4)

- A. An intersection proposal whose primary objective is to improve the accommodation of morning or afternoon peak hour traffic must be for an intersection with at least one approach experiencing a current level of service of "D" or worse. A registered professional engineer must make such a determination.
- B. An intersection proposal whose primary objective is to address a current unsafe condition must be for an intersection that MaineDOT has determined is a High Crash Location and whose "MaineDOT percent personal injury" exceeds the state average by at least 10 percent.
- C. Proposals to change the existing intersection or roadway cross-section must be supported by a feasibility study that includes an analysis of feasible alternatives, recommendation of the most viable alternative, a planning level estimate of cost, and at least one public forum specific to that project.
- D. All proposals for new traffic signals must be accompanied by a warrant analysis approved by MaineDOT.
5. Proposals to reconstruct a road must be submitted by a registered professional engineer, and must include a planning level cost estimate. Please refer to the MaineDOT website for recent bid prices. Note that proposals that get short listed for EPS may have test pits and/or test borings completed if warranted.
6. Proposals for the construction of new sidewalks/paths/trails intended to be used solely by bicycles and/or pedestrians must be supported by a feasibility study that recommends the most feasible alternative (based on an assessment of the most viable alternative routes, potential demand, and level of municipal, business and resident support) and includes a planning level estimate of cost. The feasibility study must be provided to PACTS staff by the February 12th deadline.
7. Council Endorsement (page 11)
8. Public Involvement (page 12)
9. Multi-municipality proposals (see next page)
10. Public-private proposals (see next page)

Priority Setting Tools and Milestones

1. Proposal ranking tools – Roadway Formula, Destination Tomorrow Scoring, and the Bike/Ped Scoring formula (contact PACTS staff for details)
2. Enhanced Project Scoping process (page 9 and the EPS report form)
3. 2010 Schedule
 - Preliminary applications due: January 8th
 - Final applications due: February 12th
 - Rank proposals: March

- Select proposals for EPS: April
- Perform EPS: May to July
- Final projects selection: October

Multi-Municipality TIP Proposals

This is still a draft proposal from the TIP Process Committee to the Policy Committee.

This new scoring factor adds from 1 to 5 points to TIP proposals submitted by two (2) or more municipalities and/or transit systems. It will work as follows.

- The municipalities' proposal will describe how the municipalities collaborated in producing the proposal, and will describe how the proposed project would benefit them and the region.
- PACTS staff will recommend to the Planning Committee a score of 1 to 5 points based on their review of the proposal. Examples of proposals that would score well are those from more than two municipalities, and ones for which multiple municipalities would share in payment of the local match for a project located wholly within one municipality.
- The Planning Committee will review the staff's score and submit a recommendation to the Policy Committee.

This recommendation comes in response to the TIP Process Committee's interest in encouraging the submission of more regionally significant TIP proposals.

Public-Private Funding of TIP Projects

This is still a draft proposal from the TIP Process Committee to the Policy Committee.

This new scoring factor adds up to 5 points to TIP proposals that include funding from a private partner. It will work as follows.

- The municipality submitting the proposal must finance the normal local match with municipal resources. The private partner contribution must be in addition to the normal PACTS local match.
- The private partner contribution must be cash. Cash provided from an impact fee district that encompasses the project site would be eligible. A contribution of land does not apply to this policy.
- PACTS staff will calculate the points earned from this policy based on the private contribution share percentage of the total project cost. The amounts will be 1 point for every 5 percent of cost contribution. For instance, a \$250,000 private contribution to a \$1 million project would get 5 points.
- PACTS staff will calculate the points based on the project cost estimate in the original application. If the proposal goes through EPS then PACTS staff will recalculate the points based on the new project cost estimate produced during the EPS process.
- The Planning Committee will review the staff's score and submit a recommendation to the Policy Committee.

The goals are to make more efficient the use of developer money for regionally significant transportation projects, and to increase the contribution of private sector funding to transportation

projects in our region. The 2008 Dunstan Corner intersection proposal provides a good example of how this policy could be applied. Scarborough sought from PACTS only \$2 million of the \$6 million project. It ranked 1st without “public-private” points, but if it had ranked 2nd it probably would have jumped to 1st place with the help of these points.

PACTS staff will explain the table below at the August 11th meeting of the Planning and Technical Committees.

| Town | Location | Project Description | 80/20 Score Columns | | | 50/50 Score Columns | | |
|--|--------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------|------------------|------------|---------------------|------------------|-------------|
| | | | 80/20 Score | Points behind #1 | 80/20 Rank | 50/50 Rank | Points behind #1 | 50/50 Score |
| <u>2008 Intersection Candidates</u> | | | | | | | | |
| Scarboro | Dunstan Corner | Major reconfiguration of two | 63.7 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 64.2 |
| Portland | Forest at Newton | Install new traffic signal. | 55.1 | 9 | 2 | 2 | 10 | 54.1 |
| Scarboro | Payne at Mussey | Relocate the intersection | 50.8 | 13 | 3 | 5 | 16 | 48.6 |
| OOB | Saco at Emerson | Replace signal. Install islands. | 46.0 | 18 | 4 | 6 | 19 | 45.6 |
| Westbrook | Cumb. Mills Triangle | Install new traffic signals. | 42.0 | 22 | 5 | 3 | 13 | 51.5 |
| Westbrook | Spring at Main | Replace signal. Make other geo | 34.9 | 29 | 6 | 4 | 15 | 49.0 |
| Portland | Forest at Kennebec | Reconfigure intersection. Remo | 25.0 | 39 | 7 | 7 | 35 | 28.8 |
| <u>2006 Intersection Candidates</u> | | | | | | | | |
| S. Portland | Philbrook/MaineMallR | Consolidate two intersections | 64.8 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 60.0 |
| Scarboro | Dunstan Corner | Major reconfiguration of bot | 59.5 | 5 | 2 | 1 | -2 | 61.5 |
| Scarboro | Rt 114 @ Running Hill I | New signal, add turn lanes | 57.7 | 7 | 3 | 3 | 10 | 49.9 |
| Portland | West Commercial @ Be | Install actuated signal, pedestri | 57.6 | 7 | 4 | 5 | 12 | 47.8 |
| Westbrook | Eisenhower Dr & Spring | Install new signal, convert to 4 | 57.5 | 7 | 5 | 4 | 12 | 48.4 |
| Scarboro | Pleasant Hill @ Highlan | Install signal, L&R turn lanes | 49.2 | 16 | 6 | 12 | 18 | 41.9 |
| Scarboro | Rt 22, Saco St- Beech F | Add turn lanes, signal upgra | 47.9 | 17 | 7 | 10 | 16 | 43.8 |
| Scarboro | Rt 1 @ Old Blue Point F | Install signal, L-turn lane, side | 47.8 | 17 | 8 | 7 | 15 | 45.2 |
| Saco | Rt. 112 & Industrial Parl | Significant modification; add t | 47.4 | 17 | 9 | 9 | 15 | 44.9 |
| Portland | Franklin @ Congress St. | Grade Separation, add new tra | 46.6 | 18 | 10 | 6 | 14 | 45.8 |
| Saco | Elm (Rt.1) /Scamman/T | Inc turn radii, int imp, shorten | 42.1 | 23 | 11 | 11 | 16 | 43.7 |
| OOB | Ocean Park & Smith W | Realign int, L & R turn lanes | 41.9 | 23 | 12 | 13 | 18 | 41.5 |
| S. Portland | Erskine Dr, Broadway, C | Coordinate traffic signals on B | 41.1 | 24 | 13 | 15 | 22 | 38.2 |
| Portland | Commercial @ High | Install actuated signal w/cou | 40.4 | 24 | 14 | 14 | 21 | 39.2 |
| <u>2006 Rebuild Road Candidates</u> | | | | | | | | |
| Westbrook | William Clarke/Spring | Add raised median, coordina | 62.4 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 60.5 |
| Portland | Warren Ave. | Full depth recon, sidewalks, bi | 50.4 | 12 | 2 | 2 | 17 | 44.0 |
| Biddeford | Main St | Full reconstruction | 40.7 | 22 | 3 | 5 | 25 | 35.2 |
| Saco | Rt 9: Old Orchard Rd | Full depth recon, widen road | 38.6 | 24 | 4 | 4 | 25 | 35.9 |
| Freeport | Bow St | Reconstruction, drainage, new | 38.4 | 24 | 5 | 3 | 24 | 36.5 |
| Portland | Ocean Ave. | Full depth recon, sidewalks, bi | 32.9 | 29 | 6 | 6 | 29 | 31.7 |
| Freeport | South St | Reconstruction, widen should | 32.0 | 30 | 7 | 7 | 29 | 31.1 |
| Cumberland | Tuttle Rd | Reconstruction, drainage,new | 29.4 | 33 | 8 | 8 | 34 | 26.7 |
| S. Portland | Evans | Small hill removal to improv | 28.7 | 34 | 9 | 11 | 38 | 22.8 |
| Westbrook | Brook St. | Full depth recon, widen should | 25.3 | 37 | 10 | 10 | 36 | 24.8 |

Agenda Item 6. Information, Planning and Transit Updates and Other Business

1. Long Range Plan (Destination Tomorrow) Update.
2. Planning Studies Update.
3. The Preferred Alternative Mode(s) of Transportation Group met again to review the Bike/Pedestrian Plan update. A subcommittee has been formed to expand the plan to include a safety and education component.
4. The 10/11 PACTS TIP will go to the Policy Committee this Thursday the 13th.
5. We expect to have a MaineDOT presentation for our September meeting giving an overview of the “new” policy on rehabilitating state roads with other than state and federal funds.
6. The Portland Peninsula Transit Plan was recently endorsed by the City Council.
7. Pacts now has a blog and here’s the web address: <http://pactsblog.org/blog/>
8. Other items and open discussion(s).