

## PACTS Regional Traffic Management System Committee Meeting Notes

Tuesday, January 18, 2022

10:30 AM -11:30 AM

Remote Meeting

### In Attendance:

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

### 1. Public Comments

There was no public comment.

### 2. Approval of the December 14<sup>th</sup>, 2021 Meeting Minutes

The December 14<sup>th</sup>, 2021 meeting minutes were approved unanimously.

### 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 28<sup>th</sup>, the PACTS Policy Board approved the allocation of \$189,500, contingent upon the development of a local match cost share.

At the December RTMS meeting, Sebago Technics presented cost share options for splitting Phase 1 RTMS upgrades. The Subcommittee expressed favor for the server pricing options that would

reflect the municipality's percentage of signals throughout the region, over the options that would divide the cost evenly across all municipalities.

Also at the December RTMS meeting, and in a follow-up email, Scarborough expressed they would be withdrawing from the RTMS server and should not be included in the funding options. To address this scenario, Sebago Technics presented four new cost share options for Phase 1 RTMS upgrades. Given Scarborough opt-out and the preference from other municipalities to wait until their signals become connected, the preferred cost-share option would be "Option 3: Pay for server once municipality's first signal goes online w/out Scarborough included."

Jeremiah Bartlett and Katherine Kelley expressed some concerns regarding future commitments and the risk inherited by municipalities tasked with paying during Phase 1, before other municipalities. Katherine asked whether there should be a point in the process when municipalities are no longer allowed to join. Jeremiah suggested that a future meeting agenda should discuss a future scenario in which municipalities are non-committal to joining the upgrade process.

Mark Arienti and Tom Milligan both made the point that their municipalities were committed to joining the network when their signals come up to be joined/upgraded with the network.

Brad Lyon added that the funding outline provided by Sebago Technics would include a "rebate" in subsequent phases for municipalities that joined in earlier phases. Tom noted the importance of accurate bookkeeping throughout this process.

Justin Gove moved to approve the funding of the PACTS RTMS Phase 1 Upgrade with the Option 3 Local Cost Share, Jeremiah Bartlett seconded. All were in favor.

#### **4. Regional Maintenance**

This agenda item was an open discussion regarding future regional maintenance responsibilities. In the past, PACTS has funded an engineering consultant for electronic components and detection issues. Elizabeth proposed the possibility of PACTS funds being used for server maintenance and fiber cables – items that are regionally significant. Cost implications could become clearer if a direction is set.

Stephen Buckley expressed that Scarborough was hesitant to join the network upgrades because the maintenance responsibility has been unclear in the past and did not appear to have direction in the near future.

Brad Lyon stated maintenance should be clearly defined – routine/reactionary maintenance versus capital improvement maintenance.

Katherine Kelley and Stephen Buckley expressed the utility and importance of having an engineering consultant available for maintenance services.

Based on feedback from RTMS members, any maintenance plan would need to include clear definitions of short- and long-term plans for routine and capital maintenance and expectations for level of service and response time.

## **5. Future Topics and Direction**

There needs to be a well-defined plan in place before advancing to Phase 2, 3, and 4. Justin Gove added that a finished maintenance plan should be agreed upon and in place prior to beginning work on Phase 1. Elizabeth also outlined the next steps before

To determine next steps, PACTS will need further information about how municipalities plan to proceed – whether they will plan to participate in upcoming phases. It was decided that holding the next meeting in March would be best for advancing the upgrades. This would provide an opportunity to discuss what direction members would like to proceed.

Tom Milligan requested an updated matrix showing cost estimates for the different phase implementations. Mark Arienti added that the scenarios should be conservative, including the scenario with Scarborough opting out.

Brad Lyon invited all members to arrange meetings to discuss their own signal plans.

## **6. Adjourn.**

The meeting adjourned at 11:35 AM.