

# PACTS

Portland Area Comprehensive Transportation Committee



## Technical Committee Meeting Notice

December 11, 2007  
8:30 a.m.

PACTS, 68 Marginal Way, Portland

### Agenda

1. Call to order
2. Minutes of November 13<sup>th</sup> meeting
3. Draft Motion Recommending 2010/2011 Collector Road Set-A-Side Policy
4. Staff Proposal to Hire a Consultant to Assess the Overall Condition of the PACTS Region Collector Roads
5. Municipal Collector Road Historical Data Update
6. Information Items, Status Report and Other Business

**Adjourn.**

Next Year's Meeting: January 8th at 8:30 a.m.

*The Metropolitan Planning Organization for the Portland Urbanized Area*

68 Marginal Way • Portland, Maine 04101

Telephone: (207) 774-9891 • Fax: (207) 774-7149 • [www.pactsplan.org](http://www.pactsplan.org)

**PACTS Technical Committee Meeting Minutes**  
**November 13<sup>th</sup>, 2007 – 8:30 a.m.**

**Members Present:** Mike Bolduc, Saco; Jim Carmody, Portland; Doug Fortier, Windham; Jennie Franceschi, Vice-chair, Biddeford; Bob Hough (for Dean Lessard), MaineDOT; Dan Jellis, Yarmouth; Jonathan Labonte, MTA; Al Presgraves, Freeport; Dave Redlefsen, Public Transit; Jay Reynolds, Falmouth; Jim Wendell, Scarborough; David Willauer, GPCOG.

**Absent:** Dana Anderson, So. Portland; Bob Burns, Gorham, Chair; Don Chaisson, No. Yarmouth; Mary Ann Conroy, Old Orchard Beach; Eric Dudley, Westbrook; Mike Laberge, MaineDOT; Josh Mack, SMRPC; Bob Malley, Cape Elizabeth; Dale Mitchell, Policy Committee Appointee; Adam Ogden, Cumberland; John Perry, FHWA.

**Staff and Guests:** Julia Dawson, PACTS; John Duncan, PACTS; Kyle Hall, Region One Chief Engineer, MaineDOT; Sue McIntyre, GPCOG; Paul Niehoff, PACTS.

1. **Call to Order.** Jennie Franceschi, Vice-chair, called the meeting to order at 8:35 a.m.
2. **Adoption of minutes of October 9<sup>th</sup>, 2007 meeting**  
*Dan Jellis made a motion for approval of the October 9<sup>th</sup>, 2007 minutes, seconded by Al Presgraves. Vote taken. All were in favor. Minutes were unanimously approved.*
3. **MPO Collector Paving**  
The PACTS Policy Committee has charged the TIP Process Committee, along with the assistance of the Technical Committee, to develop a more definitive collector Paving Set-Aside category. Paul Niehoff directed the group to information provided in the meeting packet that described several types of road treatments and provided a brief overview of each. A glossary of MaineDOT terms entitled “MaineDOT Speak” was also distributed for reference.  
  
Paul noted that in keeping with the Policy Committee’s request for a type of “Hybrid Program” for the selection, programming and funding of collector road projects, staff formulated the following three-tier method for consideration:
  - Preservation I – Treatments – “Simple” – 10% set-a-side proposed
    - a. Includes a basic shim and ¾” or 1-1/4” overlay on a built section of road.
  - Preservation II – Treatments – Comprehensive – 15% set-a-side proposed
    - a. Could be a simple overlay and could include modern design standards. Also could include more substantial pavement rehabilitation.
  - Road Rehabilitation – Treatments (TBD) - Extensive – 15% set-a-side proposed
    - a. Includes a more in-depth rehabilitation of the road. Could go as far as in full depth reclamation.

Paul said that his way for preserving roads that are built to modern standards would be to work in “top down” approach. First, look at roads that are in good condition and that meet all current modern design standards and then look at those which would need more emphasis, working on down to the roads that need to meet more design standards and upgrade those. More research is needed on preservation methods that would be used as a “first treatment” of a road, such as chip and seal, etc. This topic generated further discussion. It was thought that crack seal was more of a maintenance type of treatment but is actually considered a capital improvement. Maintenance paving is done on roads that are falling apart or in poor condition. Sometimes a road with ruts could be considered for milling. It depends on why a

road is “rutting”, which can determine the milling or maintenance pavement preservation process. In respect to preservation, a question was asked pertaining to the depth of the surface, and when you decide to use ¾” or 1-1/4” surface. Bob Hough replied that the basic difference relies on whether the pavement surface needs more structure and if it exhibits some rutting, etc. In curb sections a minimum of 3” curb reveal is require at the curb when completed.

Paul explained that some roads in the current 06/07 list of projects that have been programmed need more substantive work to meet the federal standards. However, the 08/09 projects should not have this problem. Some roads in the 06/07 projects list could fall into the maintenance category. Towns could decide, for a variety of reasons, to just maintenance pave a road on its own. It was noted, though, that those roads on the 06/07 list are listed to be built to modern standards. John Duncan explained that some of the funds coming in for the 2010/2011 biennium could be directed to roads in the 06/07 list and that would be an item that the Policy Committee could consider.

Discussion followed on what defines a collector road and what criteria must be met to be classified as one. Bob Hough noted that one must not confuse classification of a road with the scope of work. The road may be “built” or “unbuilt” as the scope requires. It should be maintained until it can get into the program. Municipal budgetary concerns were expressed by the group for this type of paving. The fact remains that you can pave a lot of roads with maintenance paving but it can only be done so long before it needs substantial rehabilitation. Eventually roads will have to be brought up to modern standards. If they see that there are shoulders, for instance, then they have to go to MHPC for sign-off. Different items then come into play other than scoping. Paul noted that if a road has paved shoulders on it and there is the required clear zone, then the assumption is that the road is also built structurally. Bob replied that it would stand to reason that it would be.

In regards to standards Jennie asked if we are looking at projects that have been approved. Paul explained that we are currently trying to deal with 06/07 and 08/09 projects. Further discussion on the three tiers and collector paving set-aside is expected to continue at the PACTS TIP meeting scheduled for next week.

- 4. Draft Motion: Staff Proposal to Hire a Consultant to Assess the Overall Condition of the PACTS Region Collector Roads.** It has been determined that an assessment of the overall condition of the PACTS region collector roads is needed before good decisions are made in respect to funding. The TIP Process Committee has endorsed the concept of PACTS hiring a consultant to conduct an independent assessment. Since that decision, Paul has observed the falling weight deflectometer (FWD) in “action” and has been working with MaineDOT especially with the ARAN video records. The ARAN procedure is completed on a two-year cycle for the entire road system. The FWD gives a reasonable expectation of what the road structure is. This data along with other MaineDOT records would be made accessible to the consultant. It is staff’s opinion that it would be less expensive to have the consultant review the data than to assess the roads in the field. A brief scope is detailed in the meeting packet. To hire a consultant to look at data provided by the DOT is estimated to cost between \$10,000 and \$12,000. Funding for the study would come from the PACTS budget. The RFP would contain a clear description of what is tasked to the consultant and what is tasked to staff. Paul noted that the FWD would not be available until late next summer. A study would need to be completed by September 2008 to assess the overall condition of the collector roads. This information however would not be available for the 2010/2011 projects. The consultant would be tasked with determining the condition of a road and what the estimated cost to rehabilitate it and bring it up to modern standards. It was recommended that the consultant could go to the MaineDOT office in Augusta to streamline things.

Jennie suggested that a maintenance schedule also be compiled for all roads to be programmed into this system. If we have a 20-year plan we would know which roads have the highest needs and it would also take the guess work out of project proposals. Al agreed and noted that as a result of this comprehensive list all of PACTS collector roads could be reviewed annually instead of starting from scratch every time. Paul noted and reminded the group of the importance of municipalities providing historical data to forward to the DOT. This study might not produce as solid a multi-year schedule as hoped for but it would give towns something to work with. ***Al Presgraves made a motion that the consultant's final draft report shall be submitted by October 1<sup>st</sup>, 2008, seconded by Mike Bolduc. Vote taken. All were in favor. Motion carried.***

5. **Historical Municipal Collector Road Data Update** Work is continuing in gathering the historical collector road information from member communities. Seven communities have formally submitted their information.

*The following items were noted:*

- Paul will follow up with MaineDOT on whether the route logged miles are in a GIS system that could be available to all member municipalities and will check with Matti Gurney in regards to detailed shape files.

6. **Information and Other Business:**

- Copies of Mark Eyerman's comments on regional impact fees are available upon request.
- David provided a brief overview on the upcoming I-295 Corridor Study public meetings where the final draft of the study will be presented. Dates and times of the meetings are listed in the meeting packet.
- PACTS' Second Retreat is scheduled for November 14<sup>th</sup>. Discussions will focus on the 2010 census threshold. David has studied other MPOs and has found that officials are typically elected. Other MPOs also have a Standing Freight Committee, which could be another consideration.
- Two rail alignments from Portland to Yarmouth are seriously being considered. Pan Am owns the mainline to Yarmouth and St. Lawrence and Atlantic own the other alignment. The MaineDOT is in the process of purchasing the St. Lawrence railroad line. That would involve a trestle and the total cost would be about \$80 million. NNEPRA is studying the Pan Am mainline for passenger rail upgrade estimated at \$40 million. Both are in play. No doubt there will be many more discussions on this topic.
- Portland is in the process of completing a regional route study and will begin a Portland Peninsula Transit study next month. They are looking at a May/June timeframe for public hearings.
- A Regional Bus Transit Summit is scheduled to be held at the Portland Ocean Terminal on November 27, 2007 from 8:00 a.m. to 12:00 noon.
- Paul has copies available of the agenda for the Maine Transportation Conference scheduled for December 6<sup>th</sup> at the Augusta Civic Center for anyone who is interested in attending.
- Application forms for proposals for road widening set asides, etc. will be distributed in November to each town. Applications are due back to staff by January. **NOTE: This has been subsequently revised**

- The next PACTS Technical Committee meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, December 11<sup>th</sup>, 2007 at 8:30 a.m.

7. **Adjourn:**

The meeting adjourned at 9:55 a.m.

### **Agenda Item 3–Draft Motion to TIP Process Committee on Recommendations for Collector Paving Set-Aside Policy**

The following is a condensed version of a compilation of narratives relating to Collector Road treatment definitions, clarifications and uses. As an agenda item the Tech Committee is being asked to recommend to the TIP Process Committee both a three- tiered approach and funding amounts related to the PACTS Collector set-aside policy.

Staff is recommending the following approach based level of complexity (and cost) and on MaineDOT’s definitions (for consistency).

#### **Collector Set-Asides for the 2010/2011 Biennium**

For the 2010/2011 work plan PACTS staff is recommending the following collector road paving set-asides based on an expected \$9,000,000 federal MPO allocation which results in an approximate total of \$12,000,000 MPO allocation (including state and local matches). A total amount of \$5,000,000 for this category is being recommended. Given the emphasis on collector paving we are recommending a specific minimum dollar amount set-aside for the three “tier” treatment categories voted on by the Policy Committee. As of this writing the use of state match money for “maintenance” paving has not been finalized.

**Preservation I “Simple”: \$1, 500,000 set-a-side amount proposed for the following preservation methods:**

Crack Seal  
¾-inch overlay  
1-1/4- inch overlay  
Mill and Fill

Preservation I treatments are considered “simple” and funding is based on the premise that treatments would only be utilized on roads that are “built” structurally and to modern standards.

The amount of \$1,500,000 is potentially higher than what may be needed in future biennia because past practice has not necessarily been focused on the collector roads which meet the preservation I parameters. The emphasis for the 10/11 work plan will be to preserve the collectors that are prime candidates meeting the criteria for Preservation I treatments and to “catch-up” on the excellent candidates before conditions slip into the Preservation II category.

As MaineDOT condition data is made available this spring and is collected in 2008, the prime candidates will “rise to the top” and be considered for 10/11 funding.

Collectors which are both built to modern design standards and meet condition requirements for simple treatments would be eligible for PACTS funding under the Preservation I category. To enable more projects to be completed it is highly recommended that communities consider paving collectors under this category with local funds only. The premise of “self funding” is that collectors could be cost effectively preserved less expensively by the municipality.

**Preservation II Comprehensive: \$1, 500,000 set-a-side amount proposed for the following preservation methods:**

Micro Surfacing  
Chip Seal  
1-1/4 inch Overlay Plus  
Mill and Fill Plus

Eligible Preservation II projects would be built “structurally” similar to Preservation I candidates, but either require pavement milling and/or must meet state and federal modern design standards. These standards include, but are not limited to, drainage improvements, increasing shoulder widths, clear zone dimensions, guardrail improvements and ADA requirements. Given the modern design requirement, right-of-way property acquisition may also be required.

The suggested set-aside cap of \$1,500,000 allows for some of the PACTS region collector roads to be preserved as well as being brought up to current design standards.

**Road Rehabilitation Extensive: \$2,000,000 set-a-side amount proposed for the following category (and representative methods):**

Foamed Asphalt  
Full Depth Reclaim  
Full Depth Reclaim W/Cement  
Full Depth Reclaim W/Emulsion  
Cold-In-Place Recycle  
PMRAP

Rehabilitation could include removal of the pavement, reclaiming the pavement and the underlying gravel, adding additional gravel, drainage and shoulder work. Modern design standards are required.

The suggested set-aside cap of \$2,000,000 allows for the additional cost of substantial pavement structure or road rehabilitation and moves toward the original 2003/2004 (starting in 06/07) Collector Set-Aside Program goal to achieve an overall average of 3.0 condition value.

## **Agenda Item 4 Staff Proposal to Hire a Consultant to Assess the Overall Condition of the PACTS Region Collector Roads**

The TIP Process Committee has requested the Technical Committee review and recommends a scope outline for a consultant generated condition assessment of the PACTS Funding Area region collector roads.

As we discussed at the last Technical Committee meeting, MaineDOT is currently working with PACTS to make available pavement condition ratings and video records of collector roads obtained when the ARAN van collects road condition data. In addition, the FWD assessment will begin in the PACTS region in late June 2008 with data available soon after. Given the expected type and availability of data, it appears that we do not need to utilize a consultant to conduct an independent “in-the-field study”. Staff however recommends hiring a consultant to compile and assess all data as it becomes available from MaineDOT. Here is our proposed scope for discussion today – followed by additional topics on the next page.

*PACTS is seeking a qualified firm to conduct a comprehensive review of existing data for the PACTS MPO region collector roads. The data analysis shall include existing pavement condition, structural analysis, modern design standards deficiencies and current traffic counts. The consultant will submit a final report indicating the overall condition of the collector road network and make treatment recommendations to improve and maintain the collector road network including proposed scope of work and current and future cost estimates.*

*The consultant shall compile all available MaineDOT data, including but not limited to:*

- 1. ARAN road condition data,*
- 2. Video records for determining modern design standard deficiencies,*
- 3. Falling weight deflectometer (FWD) data,*
- 4. Road maintenance history and,*
- 5. Traffic counts*
- 6. Crash data*

*The consultant may need to interview PACTS member communities and the MaineDOT Region One office to obtain maintenance histories, current road data and future scheduled maintenance, utility work and rehabilitation schedules (if any). Although it is anticipated that data will be available at the PACTS office, it may be necessary for the consultant to access the data at the MaineDOT offices in Augusta Maine. Once data is compiled, a report shall be submitted which will include, but not be limited to the following:*

- 1. Overall condition of PACTS collector roads based up an agreed ranking system to be determined.*
- 2. Cost estimates to achieve and maintain a designated condition rating.*
- 3. Prioritize rankings based on the six criteria listed above.*
- 4. Anticipated project work scope for each road meeting similar conditions and design criteria*
- 5. Cost estimates in both current and future dollars.*

*The final draft report shall be submitted by October 1, 2008.*

As we have discussed, the MaineDOT has published a Highway Adequacy 2006 Interim Report which gives a history of highway condition ratings from the 1950's to the present. They are currently working towards a full report anticipated to be published in the beginning of 2009. A copy of the Interim Report is available. Data is, and will continue to be collected throughout the summer of 2008. The full report will include the PACTS area and will be an important document for us to utilize but it will not be as detailed or all inclusive as the proposed PACTS consultant report discussed above.

In the meantime, we will continue to move forward with both the development of the 2010/2011 Collector Road program and an overall condition assessment by periodically reviewing MaineDOT data as it becomes available. Keeping in mind this is a new endeavor for the MaineDOT we will continue to assess the progress, methods and direction we may need to take to achieve the desired results.

*The TIP Process Committee recently discussed the idea of adding town ways and local roads for the entirety of PACTS member towns to the condition assessment RFP. The premise is it may be economically viable to assess all these roads, it would bring consistency to the region, and it would allow member towns the opportunity to obtain road data and analysis. It would be the intent that the communities would fund the additional work requested. We need to advise the TIP Process Committee on your perspectives on this idea.*

## **Agenda Item 5 - Historical Municipal Collector Road Data Update**

Eight communities have “formally” submitted road improvement (and maintenance) data and seven communities have not. Some communities are working on compiling the data and Falmouth has stated information will come soon after the construction season ends. PACTS region information is being obtained by PACTS Staff when changes are apparent during the normal course of business. We have yet to submit information to the MaineDOT but have kept them informed of the progress. We will be working closely with them in the next few months to determine the data required and the formats to be used. They are looking forward to receiving accurate up-to-date data. We will continue to work with our members to compile the best data we can for MaineDOT/PACTS data exchange.

## **Agenda Item 6. - Information and Other Business**

1. Kathy Fuller has been appointed as the Chief of the new MaineDOT Bureau of Transportation Systems Planning
2. Enclosed: November 27 letter to Dale Doughty related to use of State funds for maintenance paving.
3. Brian Luce will attend the next technical meeting on January 8<sup>th</sup> to discuss the proposed revisions to the paving QA/QC specifications.
4. GPCOG and PACTS are assisting the MaineDOT in the last of three public meetings regarding the final draft of their I-295 Corridor Study Report. This meeting is tonight as follows:

**Portland:** December 11, 7 to 9 p.m. at the  
State of Maine Room, Portland City Hall, 389 Congress Street

Sent on letterhead

November 27, 2007

Mr. Dale Doughty  
Acting Director  
MaineDOT Bureau of Planning  
State House Station 16  
Augusta, Maine 04333

### **State Funds for “Maintenance” Paving**

Dear Dale,

During recent PACTS Policy, Technical and TIP Process Committee meetings we have discussed the potential of utilizing a portion of the State’s 2010/2011 “non-designated” match funds for “maintenance” paving on eligible major collector roads within the PACTS funding region. During these meetings, we have been under the impression the funds in question would be available for this type of use. Currently it has not been clear if we can proceed in this direction, but it is important we resolve or clarify the use of these funds given we are working on our 10/11 project submissions.

As you know, the PACTS region is faced with the same situation as is the MaineDOT whereby the infrastructure needs far outweigh the amount of funds available. PACTS communities understand and agree with the priority to improve our infrastructure by funding capital improvement projects. However, there is not funding enough to complete many of those capital improvement projects.

Given current funding scenarios, there will always be projects that remain near the bottom of “the list” but still require various levels of maintenance to allow safe travel, control vehicle damage and maintain serviceability. Realizing the MaineDOT is utilizing state funds (federal funds are ineligible) to complete “maintenance surface treatments” on roads outside the urbanized area, we are simply requesting approval to develop a similar program using a portion (to be determined) of these state funds within the PACTS funding region.

We realize that if a portion of the state funds are used in this manner additional match funds will be necessary to fund capital projects. Our member towns understand this but still feel strongly the need is there for this maintenance work and indicate their willingness to increase both the local match on other projects as well as to approve a substantial match for the maintenance paving program.

Currently the premise is PACTS will work with our communities and utilize MaineDOT data to select the roads for this PACTS maintenance paving program, develop contract documents, bid, and contract and manage the program resulting in a cost effective method to address the issue. PACTS staff feels strongly that using funds in this manner will be a benefit to our MPO region in developing an all inclusive program resulting in more satisfied member communities and happier travelers.

Thank you very much for your help on this. Given our recent funding discussions and the need to make decisions soon, (the next TIP Process Committee meeting is scheduled for December 19<sup>th</sup>) we would like at least some indication from MaineDOT as to the viability of this proposal.

Sincerely,

Paul Niehoff  
PACTS, Senior Transportation Planner

Cc. Michael Laberge, MaineDOT MPO Coordinator  
Bill Shane, Town Manager, Cumberland  
John Duncan, Executive Director, PACTS