

PACTS RTMS Subcommittee

Tuesday, January 18, 2022

10:30 a.m.-12:00 p.m.

Meeting Agenda

Webinar link: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/88063791706>

Phone: 301-715-8592—Webinar ID: 880 6379 1706

Participating by phone? Use *9 to raise your hand and *6 to unmute.

- | | | |
|----|---|-------------------|
| 1. | Public Comment | 5 minutes |
| 2. | Approval of the December 14, 2021, Meeting Notes | 5 minutes |
| 3. | RTMS Upgrade Phase 1 Local Cost Share Options | 40 minutes |

A discussion on options on how to split the local cost share for Phase 1 of the RTMS upgrade.

- | | | |
|----|-----------------------------|-------------------|
| 4. | Regional Maintenance | 20 minutes |
|----|-----------------------------|-------------------|

A discussion of work on a regional maintenance plan.

- | | | |
|----|------------------------------------|-------------------|
| 5. | Future Topics and Direction | 15 minutes |
|----|------------------------------------|-------------------|

A discussion regarding issues, concerns, topics for future meetings.

- | | | |
|----|----------------|--|
| 6. | Adjourn | |
|----|----------------|--|

Upcoming PACTS Meetings

- Policy Board—January 27, 11:00 am–1:00 pm
- Regional Transportation Advisory Committee—February 1, 9:00–10:30 am
- Executive Board—February 22, 9:00–10:30 am

A full list of upcoming GPCOG and PACTS meetings is available at gpcog.org/Calendar.

2. Approval of December 14, 2021, Meeting Notes

Contact	Harold Spetla, staff
Recommended action	Approve the December 14, 2021 PACTS Regional Traffic Management System Subcommittee (RTMS) meeting notes.
Attachment	2A—2021-12-14 PACTS Regional Traffic Management System Subcommittee (RTMS) Meeting Notes

The previous meeting of the PACTS Regional Traffic Management System Subcommittee (RTMS) was held on December 14, 2021. Notes from the meeting are included as Attachment 2A for review, discussion, and approval.

Recommended action: Approve the December 14, 2021 PACTS Regional Traffic Management System Subcommittee (RTMS) meeting notes.

Members of the public are welcome to provide up to three minutes of public comment on this item.

PACTS Regional Traffic Management System Committee Meeting Notes

Tuesday, December 14, 2021

10:00 AM -11:30 AM

Remote Meeting

In Attendance:

Committee Members	Affiliation	Attendance
Tom Milligan	Biddeford	Y
Tom Poirier	Gorham	Y
Steve Landry	MaineDOT	Y
Jeremiah Bartlett, Chair	Portland	Y
Travis Moore	Saco	N
Stephen Buckley	Scarborough	Y
Justin Gove	South Portland	Y
Katherine Kelley	Westbrook	Y
Mark Arienti	Windham	Y
Guests		
Brad Lyon	Sebago Technics	
Curtis Thompson	Sebago Technics	
Craig Chekan	Biddeford	
For GPCOG		
Elizabeth Roberts, Harold Spetla		

1. Public Comments

There was no public comment. Craig Chekan was admitted to the meeting as a non-voting municipal attendee.

2. Approval of the October 12th, 2021 Meeting Minutes

Katherine Kelley moved to approve the October 12th, 2021 meeting minutes, Justin Gove seconded. Six members were in favor; Jeremiah Bartlett and Tom Poirier abstained as they were not present on October 12th.

3. RTMS Upgrade Phase 1 Local Cost Share Options

At the RTMS meeting in October, the Committee voted to upgrade the server to an NTIC-based central system and recommended that it be funded for Phase 1 implementation. On October 28th, the PACTS Policy Board approved the allocation of \$189,500, contingent upon the development of a local match cost share.

The following implementation phases were proposed by Sebago Technics:

- 1) Replace Streetwise Server - \$189,500
- 2) Expand Traffic Signal Management System to High Volume Corridors - \$703,900
- 3) Expand Traffic Signal Management System to Remaining Signals - \$1,148,750
- 4) Optional Migration from Existing TMS Systems - \$88,000

The implementation timeline is dependent on funding availability. Funding is available and approved for Phase 1, but subsequent phases will need to be approved through the same process as funds become available.

The following local match cost sharing options were presented by Sebago Technics, based on a 25% local match:

- 1) Pay for server once municipality's first signal goes online, server payment function of % of signals related to region
- 2) All municipalities pay for server in Phase 1, server payment function of % of signals related to region
- 3) Pay for server once municipality's first signal goes online, server payment evenly distributed across all 8 municipalities
- 4) All municipalities pay for server in Phase 1, server payment evenly distributed across all 8 municipalities

Stephen Buckley expressed that he was not prepared to vote on this agenda item and requested additional time to review the information contained within the agenda packet.

Justin Gove noted that he is preparing his Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) for fiscal year 2022-2023 in December. Tabling the discussion until January will make it difficult to include this item in the South Portland CIP. Justin expressed support for any of the options presented, feeling comfortable paying more money upfront.

Tom Poirier expressed support for Options 1 and 2.

Katherine Kelley noted the need to move forward with Phase 1 as soon as possible, citing the obsolete server. Katherine expressed that she did not support Option 3 for Westbrook.

Tom Milligan expressed support for Option 1 as Biddeford has already completed their CIP for the 2022-2023.

Jeremiah stated an interest in delaying the vote to provide additional time for members to review data and make an informed vote. Elizabeth added that suspending the vote until another meeting in January would likely not delay the project in the long run, but delaying beyond January may create timing issues with MaineDOT.

Steve Landry added that municipalities with signals in Phase 1, if not migrated to the new server, will be responsible for connecting new developments along state/state-aid roads.

Given Scarborough's hesitancy, the other 3 communities in Phase 1 would be willing to move forward without Scarborough (Westbrook tentative) in January. To prepare, Sebago Technics will provide a scenario in which Scarborough is a non-participant in Phase 1.

Justin Gove moved to table the vote on cost sharing options until January 18th at 10:30 AM, at which time the RTMS Committee will reconvene to make an informed decision on the cost sharing options. Tom Poirier seconded. There were none opposed.

4. Regional Maintenance

This agenda item was postponed until January 18th.

5. Future Topics and Direction

This agenda item was postponed until January 18th.

6. Adjourn.

The meeting adjourned at 11:55 AM.

3. RTMS Upgrade Phase 1 Local Cost Share Options

Contact	Elizabeth Roberts, staff
Recommended action	Select one of the options to divide the local cost share of \$47,375 for the Phase 1 upgrades.
Attachments	3A – Summary of Municipal Cost Sharing Options

At the October 12th RTMS subcommittee meeting, the subcommittee recommended an NTCIP Based Central System to upgrade the PACTS RTMS server and software and to fund the Phase 1 implementation for the Policy Board’s consideration. The recommendation was made with the understanding that a plan was needed to split the local cost share.

At the October 28th Policy Board meeting, the Board approved the allocation of \$189,500 of capital funding to upgrade the RTMS server and software, contingent on the development of a local match cost sharing plan.

At the December 14th RTMS subcommittee meeting, a summary prepared by Sebago Technics that described four options for splitting the local cost share for Phase 1 implementation of the RTMS upgrades was shared and discussed. The options were as follows:

- Municipalities pay for server when municipalities first signal goes online, and the server payment share is a function of the number of signals in the municipality
- Municipalities pay for server in Phase 1, and the server payment share is a function of the number of signals in the municipality
- Municipalities pay for server when municipalities first signal goes online, and the server payment share is divided among municipalities equally
- Municipalities pay for server in Phase 1, and the server payment share is divided among municipalities equally

The subcommittee decided to table the decision on how to split the local share of the server costs to give municipalities more time to analyze the options. Sebago Technics prepared additional cost share options included in Attachment 3A, which shows the difference in cost share for Phase 1 using the first two options shared in December (and described above) with and without Scarborough’s participation, as Scarborough has expressed reservations about participating.

Recommended Action: Select one of the options to divide the local cost share of \$47,375 for the Phase 1 upgrades

Members of the public are welcome to provide up to three minutes of public comment on this item.

Municipal Cost Sharing Options for Regional TMS w/ Scarborough Options

12/30/2021

OPTION 1: PAY FOR SERVER ONCE MUNICIPALITY'S FIRST SIGNAL GOES ONLINE W/ SCARBOROUGH INCLUDED

	PACTS	Biddeford	Gorham	Portland	Saco	Scarborough	South Portland	Westbrook	Windham
Phase 1	\$ 142,125.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 20,215.42	\$ -	\$ 7,699.76	\$ 13,949.53	\$ 5,510.29	\$ -

OPTION 2: ALL MUNICIPALITIES PAY FOR SERVER W/ SCARBOROUGH INCLUDED

	PACTS	Biddeford	Gorham	Portland	Saco	Scarborough	South Portland	Westbrook	Windham
Phase 1	\$ 142,125.00	\$ 2,050.35	\$ 956.83	\$ 18,609.31	\$ 2,050.35	\$ 6,093.65	\$ 12,343.42	\$ 3,904.18	\$ 1,366.90

OPTION 3: PAY FOR SERVER ONCE MUNICIPALITY'S FIRST SIGNAL GOES ONLINE W/OUT SCARBOROUGH INCLUDED

	PACTS	Biddeford	Gorham	Portland	Saco	Scarborough	South Portland	Westbrook	Windham
Phase 1	\$ 136,556.25	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 23,255.30	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 15,557.33	\$ 6,706.11	\$ -

OPTION 4: ALL MUNICIPALITIES PAY FOR SERVER W/OUT SCARBOROUGH INCLUDED

	PACTS	Biddeford	Gorham	Portland	Saco	Scarborough	South Portland	Westbrook	Windham
Phase 1	\$ 136,556.25	\$ 2,344.62	\$ 1,094.16	\$ 20,806.48	\$ 2,344.62	\$ -	\$ 13,108.51	\$ 4,257.29	\$ 1,563.08

4. Signal Maintenance Plan

Contact	Elizabeth Roberts, staff
Recommended action	For information and discussion.
Attachments	none

Currently, municipalities are responsible for maintenance of hardware, emergency response, and all costs or fees required for maintaining signal operations continuously. PACTS has provided some funding for the services of an engineering consultant to respond to and address problem situations with the traffic signal electronic components and detection. What is the direction for future signal maintenance?

Recommended action: For information and discussion.

Members of the public are welcome to provide up to three minutes of public comment on this item.

5. Future Topics and Direction

Contact	Elizabeth Roberts, staff
Recommended action	For information and discussion.
Attachments	none

Staff has developed the calendar year (CY) 2022-2023 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) that documents the metropolitan transportation planning activities to be performed in compliance with federal regulation (23 CFR Part 450.308). The transportation planning tasks identified in the UPWP are funded through a combination of federal, state, and local sources. The plan for the upcoming UPWP includes funding to develop strategies for coordinating and maintaining the region’s traffic signal network. What topics or tasks should be included?

The deadline for the RTMS contract with Sebago Technics was extended to April 30, 2022 to help us nail down the plan for the future of RTMS.

Recommended action: For information and discussion.

Members of the public are welcome to provide up to three minutes of public comment on this item.