1. **Welcome - Patrick Fox, Chair**
   Patrick opened the meeting by having those in attendance introduce themselves.

2. **Public Comments**
   There was no public comment.

3. **Acceptance of 4/14/20 Minutes**
   Jay Reynolds moved to approve the 4/14/2020 minutes; the motion was seconded by Tom Milligan; all were in favor.
4. **Project Updates**

In the new agenda format, in which staff will prepare project updates that will only be addressed at the meeting if Committee members express interest.

**PACTS Crack Sealing**

Jay Reynolds asked about the status and timeline for bidding on the PACTS Crack Sealing pilot project, which was discussed at an unscheduled March Technical Committee meeting. MaineDOT received a bid from Seal Coating Inc that came in under about $13,000 under estimate. The City of Portland will also be trying to piggyback onto the PACTS bid. MaineDOT will do the administrative inspection at no cost. The Committee expressed gratitude to LaRay Hamilton for heading up the pilot project on behalf of MaineDOT.

There were no other comments on the Project Updates.

5. **2022 PACTS Collector Paving Segments**

PACTS staff met with municipalities throughout the end of 2019 and delivered feedback to VHB regarding paving segment lengths. The decision was made to keep “road segments” and create “super segments” for project selection purposes. In some instances, road segments with different Pavement Condition Index (PCI) ratings and widths were combined. In these instances, VHB recorded the change between the two segments. VHB also began assessments on super segments with anticipated PCI values with a rating between 25-45, assuming these would be the most likely segments to be selected within the program for funding in 2022.

Adam Bliss asked why PCI values increased in some cases and why changes in width were recorded. Adam also noted that the 2022 Anticipated PCI was not available on the provided spreadsheet. Harold noted that some PCI increases could be expected from spot treatment and discrepancies in data collection. Harold will revisit the spreadsheet with VHB for answers to Committee questions and receive an update for 2022 Anticipated PCI.

Patrick Fox asked Committee members to review the data within the spreadsheet and compare PCI values to municipal knowledge and assess feasibility for paving in 2022.

Adam requested that VHB take a closer look at PCI values, and Harold acknowledged that he would follow up with the consultants.

6. **PACTS Municipal Partnership Initiative Project Selection**

Scarborough notified PACTS that they would no longer be requesting $200,000 of Southern subregional (and $75,660 at-large) funding from the 2021 PACTS MPI program. The $200,000 would then become eligible for the other Southern subregional communities and $75,660 would be available for all of PACTS.

Patrick Fox noted that Saco would be requesting $100,000 to fund the Saco Maple Street project, which was previously defunded from the 2020 PACTS Collector Paving program due to cost overruns, and Biddeford would be requesting $100,000 for Alfred Street and Landry Street paving. Jay Reynolds suggested, given recent bid prices, the $75,660 should be set aside as a possible contingency.

The committee discussed future funding for projects given current circumstances surrounding COVID-19 and anticipated revenue dips. Darryl Belz noted that 2021 PACTS MPI projects have a WIN created, which means
they should be funded. Katherine Kelley asked if Westbrook would be able to start design work given they had a project on the 2021 PACTS MPI list. Harold noted that the PACTS Policy Committee would need to vote to approve funding and Darryl noted that three-party agreements would need to be signed before any work could begin. There was an inquiry about whether design costs could be included in PACTS MPI projects, which is not specified by the PACTS MPI policy. Given it is not specified, design can be included in PACTS MPI projects.

Tom Milligan made a motion to approve the reallocation of $100,000 to Saco Maple Street, $100,000 to Biddeford Alfred Street and Landry Street, and to not allocate $75,660 to any specific project at this time. Bob Malley seconded the motion, and all were in favor.

7. **Saco Maple Street Collector Paving Review**
   Patrick noted that the Saco Maple Street collector paving project was put out to bid by MaineDOT combined with the Biddeford Precourt Street project. While Biddeford’s project came in under the original estimates, Saco Maple Street came in significantly over-estimate. Contributing factors include Maple Street’s narrow width, high number of pedestrian ramps, and subsurface engineering that was added to the scope to move the crown of the road. Because the projects were bid together, the prices must be jointly accepted or rejected, meaning Biddeford’s project will not be awarded.

   LaRay mentioned that MaineDOT has combined nearby projects—even across municipal boundaries—as a cost saving tool, which has not been an issue in the past. Moving forward, LaRay feels that this practice will be discontinued to avoid similar circumstances.

   There was discussion surrounding checkpoints along the project timeline to revisit the scope and estimates. Jay Reynolds noted that it would be beneficial to include a notice to municipalities if there is an increase in the estimate greater than 30%. LaRay noted that it would be helpful for MaineDOT to ride roads with PACTS early on in the timeline, since MaineDOT already rides roads to look at conditions (including drainage and ADA accommodations). PACTS staff will resume the practice of distributing a monthly list of project updates from MaineDOT.

8. **Adjourn.**

   Bob Burns made a motion to adjourn; Bob Malley seconded; all were in favor.