

PACTS Collector Paving Working Group Meeting AGENDA

Wednesday, December 16, 2020

1:00 PM – 3:00 PM

Remote Meeting

Zoom: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/83979819493>

Call in: (301) 715-8592

Meeting ID: 838 7981 9493

As of March 31st, 2020, PACTS and GPCOG are holding all committee meetings via [Zoom conferencing technology](#). We remain committed to full public access and participation in our meetings through remote access during the COVID-19 crisis. Remote meetings will be held in accordance with the requirements of [LD 2167, Public Law Chapter 618](#).

Both the chat and Q&A features will be turned off during PACTS and GPCOG meetings to ensure full public access to telephone participants and to avoid the confusion of side conversations.

Public comment will be taken verbally during the public comment period. Members of the public who wish to speak should “raise their hands.” Participants joining by computer or mobile app can click on the “Raise Hand” button. Participants joining by telephone can dial *9.

1. Welcome – Elizabeth Roberts, GPCOG

2. Public Comments

The public will have an open comment period with a 3-minute limit per individual to comment on any issue, including items on the agenda.

3. Review of 11/18/20 Notes (Attachment A)

4. Collector Road Paving Program Recommendations (Attachment B) – 30 min.

During the November meeting of the Collector Paving Working Group several collector paving project details were discussed and summarized in the meeting notes. From that discussion, Staff has drafted a document with those recommendations.

Proposed Action: Discuss, recommend edits and/or approve staff recommendations for the PACTS Collector Road Paving Program regarding items discussed at the November meeting.

5. Selecting Collector Paving Projects (Attachment C) – 30 min.

Currently PACTS is under contract with VHB to evaluate and score collector paving roadway segments. The contract covers a five-year period with two complete evaluations of the collector roads' pavement condition (PCI rating). For the other years in the contract period, VHB is estimating the PCI rating. The PCI rating is one piece that is used to determine the Overall Rank. Roadway segments are sorted by Overall Rank and those roadways that rate as most in need of paving, but not yet with a ranking that warrants rehabilitation, are chosen. The working group is asked to consider the following:

The current scoring formula for assigning an Overall Rank is shown in the attached document. Should we change the formula?

Our current contract uses a consultant to perform a manual observation and analysis to determine a rating twice in five years. Should we use a different process such as ARAN or StreetScan? Should we evaluate annually, biannually, other? Should we be testing substructure?

Should we select projects by subregion on a rotating basis?

Currently, PACTS selects paving projects annually to be constructed two years later, which results in a 2-year plan. Should we develop a list of projects for an additional year? This would give municipalities a three year planning list.

Recommended Action: Discuss and consider how to select collector paving projects.

6. Next Steps – 15 min.

The recommendations from this working group will be presented to the Executive and Policy Committees. A final draft of those recommendations will be developed following this meeting. Does the working group need additional time to consider the recommendations or any other topics regarding collector paving?

Recommended Action: Discuss and consider project elements that should and should not be included for reimbursement next steps.

7. Other Business

8. Adjourn.

ATTACHMENT A

PACTS Collector Paving Working Group Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, November 18th, 2020

1:00 PM -3:00 PM

Remote Meeting

In Attendance:

Committee Members	Affiliation	Attendance
Adam Bliss	Technical Committee	Y
Bill Shane	Northern Subregion	Y
Chris Branch	Central Subregion	Y
Eric Dudley	Western Subregion	Y
Angela Blanchette	Southern Subregion	Y
Erin Courtney	Executive Committee (MTA)	N
Jennifer Brickett	Executive Committee (MaineDOT)	N
LaRay Hamilton	MaineDOT	Y
Darryl Belz	MaineDOT	Y
Guests		
Tim Kelley	MaineDOT	
Ken Capron		
For GPCOG		
Elizabeth Roberts, Harold Spetla, Chris Chop		

1. Welcome

Elizabeth Roberts opened the meeting shortly after 1:00 PM.

2. Public Comments

Ken Capron noted seeing potholes being patched in wet and cold conditions that would promptly undergo a freeze-thaw cycle and begin to crumble.

Ken Capron also suggested the idea of using speed humps at pedestrian crossings as opposed to the high costs associated with engineering ADA ramps.

3. Review of 10/21/20 Notes

There were no comments on the October meeting notes.

4. Collector Road Paving Program Purpose

Eric Dudley restated that the Working Group should consider all options regarding collector paving, which includes disassembling the program. Eric noted that members have complained about different aspects of the program over the course of 19 years and that the Working Group should come to an agreement on whether having a program dedicated to collector road paving is important from a funding perspective.

Adam Bliss expressed hesitation with considering an extreme proposal as the October meeting had mention of including collectors with arterials for funding.

Bill Shane asked for clarification on what would happen to the \$2.2 million currently dedicated to collector paving and subsequently what would happen to the roads funded by the collector paving allocation. LaRay Hamilton it would likely come to a PACTS policy decision, speculating that those roads would fall into a “giant pot” and would be treated less frequently. Chris Chop clarified that the money would not disappear—the funds are federally allocated to PACTS and it is PACTS policy to administer the funds through the Collector Paving Program. Darryl added that PACTS can spend the money any way they wish, for example through complex projects.

Chris Chop asked what other Maine MPO’s (metropolitan planning organizations) do for collector paving. LaRay Hamilton noted that KACTS (Kittery Area) does something similar but less formal and ATRC (Androscoggin) does more LAP and MPI.

Angela Blanchette commented that if she had to choose between the current Collector Paving Program (CPP) and nothing at all—she would choose nothing. Angela believes there is a solution that exists between the current CPP and nothing at all. Angela touted the MPI program because the funds go further and there are fewer requirements. She added that it is hard to justify the CPP when other programs are more successful and she wants to get the CPP to a point where it can be successful. Elizabeth noted we cannot move federal funds into the PACTS MPI funds, because combining state and federal funds results in the need to follow federal requirements.

Chris Branch noted his support of the CPP, in some capacity, to address the collector roads. He added that the CPP does need to be fixed, but that the program should not be eliminated. Chris also addressed the lack of necessary funding to meet the paving needs of the collector roads network— “if there was enough money, then the collector paving program problems would go away.”

Bill Shane identified “scope creep” as an issue with all projects. Bill noted that preconstruction ride-alongs with MaineDOT staff allowed municipalities to prepare ahead of time to address ADA and guardrails before federal funds went into the project. Bill also expressed concern that the CPP is dedicating money to more than just pavement. He also suggested consolidating projects by containing the program to a subregional basis.

LaRay Hamilton suggested that combining projects presents a cost saving opportunity. MaineDOT shied away from this recently due to bid complications, but if PACTS were to approve this approach it could save money.

Elizabeth proposed tabling the discussion. There was no opposition to tabling the discussion.

Angela Blanchette revisited the idea of a flat price per mile. MaineDOT’s bid prices are often inflated and she was unsure how she could cover 50% and then anything over a cap on PACTS funds. PACTS estimates sit at \$600,000-\$700,000 per mile.

Chris Branch brought up the CPR program (Cyclical Pavement Resurfacing) through MaineDOT, which has a set cost per linear foot. MaineDOT noted the total miles of treatment per year is very low. The cost of CPR treatment in urban areas goes up significantly. One possible solution for CPP would be to use CPR as a model—cover travel lanes, but not shoulders. Shoulders would be funded by the municipality if they want them. LaRay Hamilton clarified that CPR is only for Priority 3 corridors and only a ¾” overlay, so it would not be appropriate for collector roads. The idea could potentially be used as a model though.

Darryl Belz added that the CPP used to include federal, state, and local funds. When the PACTS MPI program was created, state funds were moved out of CPP and into MPI.

Elizabeth Roberts asked about potentially using MPI funds to pave collector roads. Adam Bliss noted that he was not in favor of using MPI funds for strictly paving. But Adam asked if there was a scenario in which separate WINs could be created for ADA, guardrails, etc. for funding prior to paving. LaRay Hamilton and Tim Kelley noted that match points and heights could be an issue.

Adam Bliss reiterated that he would rather not touch MPI funds and focus on improving CPP. MPI is a critical funding pool for municipalities that don't rate high enough in CPP to receive funding.

Elizabeth introduced the concept of alternative pavement maintenance strategies such as crack sealing and ultrathin overlays. Elizabeth also introduced the idea of creating suballocations to different maintenance strategies within the CPP. Tim Kelley suggested steering away from ultrathin overlays in urban environments and sticking with crack sealing and mill and fills. Tim stated that chip sealing has presented some issues, but still recommended them—cited Sanford as a recent success story. Tim would be happy to shepherd that approach for PACTS, but no promise that it will be approved by MaineDOT.

If CPP funds were used for crack sealing then they might need to adhere to federal requirements for labor rates and paperwork. Darryl advised using state funds for crack sealing. Bill thought a project needed to be a 1-inch paving project to necessitate federal requirements. MaineDOT noted several instances where ¾” projects were federalized.

Elizabeth Roberts proposed a scenario in which the Working Group might recommend increasing the funding toward preventative crack sealing in the PACTS MPI Crack Sealing Program. Bill Shane expressed his thoughts that those theoretical funds would be best allocated toward the “extras” in paving projects—ADA, guardrails, etc.

Elizabeth summarized the discussion- the Working Group recommended no changes to treatment types being funded and no additional funds toward preventative crack sealing.

5. Pavement Project Requirements

Elizabeth Roberts introduced the concept of asking municipalities to cover the ADA, guardrails, etc. separately from the paving project. Elizabeth asked for clarification on how to proceed if PACTS were to bid ADA or guardrails as a Regional PACTS package preemptively on Collector Roads and then a municipality were to back out of their match share on the paving project.

Tim Kelley clarified that MaineDOT is currently doing guardrail work *after* the pavement treatment—specifically on CPR treatment. LaRay noted there is an existing guardrail WIN at MaineDOT. Tim stated there

is a way to get the guardrails done separately, but MaineDOT would need a guarantee from the municipality that the paving would get done. Currently, MaineDOT is doing ADA work after the paving is complete. From a design standard, it is easier to do the ADA work after the paving. Darryl Belz was not sure of the specifics putting together agreements, but did note that he was not concerned. LaRay suggested it could be similar to how sewer manholes are handled in agreements.

Adam Bliss summarized what was identified for increased costs— “add-ons,” items that require subcontractors, items that require a MaineDOT “premium,” MaineDOT administrative costs, and labor supply. Elizabeth noted that major drainage work is on the municipality, minor drainage can be covered. She also identified cross slope and grading can drive up the price. Tim Kelley expressed that grading and cross slope adjustments do not drive up the construction prices, but it does add cost to the design work.

Eric Dudley expressed frustration discussing sustainable treatment strategies when the only way to make the program sustainable is to increase funding. Eric would not include ADA and guardrails as “additional costs driving up the price,” but rather as federal requirements to spend the funds.

Two scenarios were proposed: (1) ADA and guardrail would be funded with 100% local funds, or (2) ADA and guardrails would be funded 75%/25% as regional projects to get a better price.

Elizabeth summarized that the Working Group was supportive of pulling ADA and guardrails out of the collector paving projects by creating a separate regional funding pot. Drainage costs would remain as they currently exist.

There is currently not an existing PACTS Bike/Pedestrian Set Aside. Several members of the group suggested the Working Group should advocate to receive state funds to put toward bicycle/pedestrian improvements. Darryl Belz clarified that only \$2.3 million is available to the entire state at a 20% local match.

6. Other Opportunities to Improve Cost Effectiveness of Projects

LaRay Hamilton reiterated that PACTS approval to combine projects in different municipalities could save money-- the group did not object to seeking PACTS approval. MaineDOT and PACTS will continue to field verify projects and cost estimates.

The Working Group discussed the origin of segment breaks within the PACTS Collector Roads database. The database was originally developed by Gorrill Palmer via municipal feedback. VHB received the database and also sought municipal input. PACTS is making an effort to combine shorter segments to make better “project length” segments. This will be an extended effort over the course of several years. There was no objection to keeping the minimum project length at 1,200-feet.

The Working Group did not recommend a minimum project length for the PACTS Crack Sealing Program but was supportive of the PACTS Technical Committee’s recommendation to alternate subregions on an annual basis.

On the topic of paving built and unbuilt roads, MaineDOT noted that there is uncertainty at the state-level whether roads are built or unbuilt. The existing database is not guaranteed to be accurate. Angela Blanchette believes there is too much uncertainty to create a firm policy about built and unbuilt roads without a significant undertaking to identify built/unbuilt status. Eric Dudley also expressed concern with

the political implications of changing the eligibility of roads now, when similar roads have been paved in the past. Elizabeth clarified that PACTS and MaineDOT would evaluate a handful of roads that would be eligible for paving in the upcoming construction cycle. PACTS wants to ensure that funds are being allocated toward quality roads. Elizabeth refocused the conversation on the roadway substructure. Eric recalled that Gorrill Palmer produced deflectometer data that should be reviewed. Angela suggested doing the substructure review separate from the Collector Paving Program.

The Working Group did not oppose removing crack sealing roadway segment candidates, if deemed as an inappropriate candidate by MaineDOT, with consultation with the municipality. This was cautioned as a slippery slope.

The discussion was tabled until the December 16th meeting.

7. Other Business

This agenda item was not addressed as the discussion was tabled at 3:15 PM.

8. Adjourn.

The meeting adjourned shortly after 3:15 PM.

ATTACHMENT B

DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PACTS COLLECTOR PAVING

The PACTS Collector Paving Working Group was tasked with discussing and defining a path forward for the Collector Paving Program to make the best use of limited funding. The following is a summary of the recommendations from the working group.

Program Funding

The working group discussed whether some or all of PACTS MPI funds should be dedicated to collector paving. The group felt that the PACTS MPI program is a very successful program and are reluctant to change it. Therefore, the group's recommendation is no change.

The working group discussed whether some or all the collector paving set aside should be dedicated to lighter paving projects or preventive maintenance such as crack sealing. Currently, PACTS does have a crack sealing set-aside with the PACTS MPI program. The group's recommendation is to maintain the PACTS MPI crack sealing and to not dedicate any federal funding to lighter paving or preventative maintenance, as using PACTS MPI funds would be more cost efficient.

Paving Project Requirements

The working group was asked to consider which elements of collector paving projects should be covered with collector paving funds and which elements should be the responsibility of the municipality. Specifically, the following items were considered.

- Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) improvements for wheelchair ramps
- Guardrail improvements
- Drainage improvements

The group recommends that ADA improvements and guardrail improvements that are required by MaineDOT, be covered with collector paving funds. However, the working group also recommends that these improvements be pulled out of individual projects and become their own project. The reason to create a separate project for ADA and guardrail improvements is to provide a better opportunity to get a better product at a lower price. The group recommends working with MaineDOT to create these stand-alone ADA and guardrail projects.

The group recommends that only minor drainage improvements be included in PACTS funding and that major drainage improvements be the responsibility of the municipality. This is no change from the current policy.

Other Opportunities to Improve Cost Effectiveness of Paving Projects

The working group was asked to consider specific details regarding collector paving projects and PACTS MPI crack sealing, which are as follows:

- Minimum project length – currently set at 1,200 feet
- Built vs. unbuilt roads

ATTACHMENT B

- Ability to remove a paving candidate if after a review by MaineDOT it is determined that the road is an unsuitable candidate.

The recommendations from the group are as follows:

- The minimum project length for collector paving projects of 1,200 feet remain and we try to combine roadway segments to meet the minimum project length.
- No minimum project length for PACTS crack sealing. Efficiencies can be gained by crack sealing only two subregions per year as was recommended by the Technical Committee.
- Because of the difficulty in determining whether a road is built or unbuilt, a road's classification of being unbuilt will not necessarily eliminate it from collector paving projects or MPI crack sealing
- Give MaineDOT the ability to remove a candidate for MPI crack sealing if it is found to be an unsuitable candidate and the municipality and PACTS are notified.
- Do not give MaineDOT the ability to remove a candidate for a collector paving project.

ATTACHMENT C

Collector Paving Overall Ranking Methodology

The formula used to determine the overall rank for a collector paving road segment is the following:

$$R = (100 - P_p) * A * T$$

Where:

R is the overall ranking

P_p is the predicted Pavement Condition Index (PCI)

T is the Transit Factor which is 1 for a road with no transit; 1.1 for a road with a transit route

A is the Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) Factor based on the following table:

AADT range	AADT Factor	(For Reference) No. of Road Segments in each AADT Category
AADT < 1,000	1	4
1,000 <= AADT < 2,000	1.025	13
2,000 <= AADT < 4,000	1.05	71
4,000 <= AADT < 6,000	1.075	86
6,000 <= AADT < 8,000	1.1	51
8,000 <= AADT < 10,000	1.125	23
10,000 <= AADT < 12,000	1.15	15
12,000 <= AADT < 14,000	1.175	9
14,000 <= AADT < 16,000	1.2	10
AADT > = 16,000	1.225	4