

**PACTS Executive Board**

October 18, 2021

9:00–10:30 am

Special Meeting Minutes

Affiliation	Member	
Policy Board Chair	Matt Sturgis	✓
Policy Board Vice Chair	Hope Cahan	
Central Subregion Rep.	Keith Gray	✓
Central Subregion Rep.	Kate Lewis	✓
North Subregion Rep.	Bill Shane	
South Subregion Rep.	Jim Bennett	✓
West Subregion Rep.	Eric Dudley	✓

Affiliation	Member	
MaineDOT	Jennifer Langland and Dale Doughty	✓
Maine Turnpike Auth.	Erin Courtney	
Active Transp. Specialist	Kara Wooldrik	
RTAC	Tom Milligan	✓
Transit Rep.	Patricia Quinn and Will Gayle	✓
Transit Rep.	Tom Reinauer	✓
Transit Rep.	Donna Tippet	✓

**1. Welcome**

Matt Sturgis opened the meeting and welcomed the attendees.

**2. Public Comment**

No public comment was received.

**3. Chair's Report**

The chair had no report.

**4. Staff Report**

Staff had no report.

**5. Collector Paving Working Group Formation**

Last year, PACTS convened a Collector Paving Working Group—comprised of municipal members, MaineDOT, and MTA—to develop the Collector Paving Policy, approved by the Executive Committee at its March 18 meeting. Staff now recommend convening a larger group for the following purposes:

- To consider and recommend a new roadway condition assessment methodology
- To ensure projects selected for the Collector Paving Program are consistent with program policy

- To develop a prioritized list of nearby roadway segments eligible for crack sealing under the Municipal Partnership Initiative (MPI)

Staff recommend the working group include one member from each municipality eligible to receive PACTS funding, MaineDOT, and MTA.

Matt noted the contract with VHB, contracted to perform roadway condition assessments, is due to expire in 2022. Staff said one purpose of the group will be to recommend a new methodology, including engaging a contractor to provide the service.

Tom Milligan moved to appoint the working group subject to the purposes and membership as presented; Kate Lewis seconded. All were in favor.

**6. Concord Coach Lines CARES Funding**

At its June meeting, the Executive Board allocated approximately \$1.5 million in CARES Phase IV funding to Concord Coach Lines. Since that meeting, Concord Coach Lines received approximately \$3.7 million under the CERTS program, a federal program providing relief to the private motorcoach industry. In light of this new CERTS funding and per an agreement that any CARES funding would be returned to the region should Concord Coach Lines receive relief funding from any other sources, at its September meeting, the Executive Board reconsidered its decision and tabled the discussion to this special meeting.

MaineDOT, as designated recipient of the funds, has recommended the following methodology to determine the amount of funding to de-obligate:

Total annual allocation of CERTS funding received by Concord Coach Lines	\$3,746,148
Total allocation by month, <i>\$3,746,148 / 12 months</i>	\$312,179 per mo.
Funding received during four-month September–December 2021 period, during which CARES and CERTS funding overlap, <i>\$312,179 x 4 months</i>	\$1,248,617
Portion of funding applied to Portland to Boston corridor, <i>\$1,248,617 x 42 percent</i>	<b>\$524,460</b>

Matt thanked MaineDOT for developing a reasonable approach. The item required no formal action from the board.

**7. 2022–2023 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) Local Match**

Staff will seek approval of the 2022–2023 UPWP at the October Policy Board meeting. Federal funds in the UPWP require a 20 percent local match. MaineDOT has historically provide 15 percent match on Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) funds, leaving 5 percent to be funded by the region's municipalities—totaling approximately \$103,800 in the 2022–2023 UPWP. MaineDOT does not provide

local match on Federal Transit Administration (FTA) funds, requiring a full 20 percent match from GPCOG member dues. In coordination with the other MPOs in the state, staff have requested MaineDOT contribute 15 percent to FTA-funded projects.

Staff noted municipal contributions to the UPWP support compliance with federal regulation, regional planning efforts, data collection, and other services.

At the June meeting of the Executive Board, staff presented a proposed methodology for assessing baseline municipal local match based on population, employment, lane miles, and vehicle-miles traveled in the PACTS planning area. Based on feedback from the board, staff developed the following methodologies:

- **1A:** Assess based on population, employment, lane miles, and vehicle-miles traveled in the PACTS planning area, as proposed at the June meeting
- **1B:** Assess based on population, employment, lane miles, and vehicle-miles traveled in the PACTS capital management area
- **2A:** Assess based on municipal property valuation
- **2B:** Assess based on municipal property valuation and population

The board also suggested staff evaluate a **hybrid** approach, whereby municipal-sponsored studies would be matched by the host municipality. Staff have found relatively little variation between the methodologies.

Keith Gray asked how local match had been assessed in the past. Staff said that it had been assessed on the hosts of municipal-sponsored studies. This is problematic because the local match of the entire UPWP must be borne by only a few municipalities. It can also lead to uncertainty as projects change over the course of the UPWP.

Jim Bennett asked why Arundel and Raymond were not included. Staff said those municipalities have historically not participated in PACTS initiatives, and that it may be unrealistic to expect them to contribute funding. Jim expressed concern with that approach, saying it could lead to other municipalities opting out in the future. He also felt that linking the assessment to employment numbers could disincentivize economic development efforts. He recommended a hybrid approach, as it would result in a lower annual match unless a municipality hosts a municipal-sponsored study.

Donna Tippet asked whether transit agencies could be required to contribute to the FTA local match. Staff noted this discussion applies to municipal contributions to FHWA local match only. She asked how local match would be assessed on municipal-sponsored studies shared by multiple host municipalities. Staff said that in the past, the host municipality pays the local match. If multiple municipalities collaborate to host a study, they make an agreement among themselves as to how to cover the local match. An example is the 2019 Rock Row study, jointly hosted by Westbrook and Portland.

Staff noted the 2022–2023 UPWP budgets \$75,000 to municipal-sponsored studies, which would require only \$15,000 in local match from host municipalities, if assessed at 20 percent. This amount can fluctuate between UPWPs based on regional planning work.

Matt noted the inequity in relying on GPCOG member dues to match FTA funds, because some municipalities are GPCOG members but are not within the PACTS planning area, and vice versa.

The group generally agreed that any assessment should be based on the PACTS planning area, rather than the capital management area.

Tom Reinauer noted that KACTS' (Kittery Area) UPWPs held a separate task for municipal-sponsored studies. Local match for these projects was assessed to host municipalities separately, in addition to any baseline match.

With that guidance, staff recommended removing the \$75,000 budgeted for municipal-sponsored studies, and assessing the baseline local match on the remaining budget. This would slightly reduce the baseline local match assessment for all municipalities. For municipal-sponsored studies, local match would be assessed only on the host municipalities. This will improve the regularity in billing to municipalities. Staff will communicate the board's decision to the region's municipal managers.

Tom Reinauer moved to assess baseline local match on all municipalities based on Option 1A, and to assess municipal-sponsored projects local match on host municipalities at 5 percent; Eric Dudley seconded. All were in favor.

Staff are awaiting communication from MaineDOT regarding the request of them to provide 15 percent local match on FTA funding.

## **8. Other Business**

No other business was discussed.

## **9. Adjourn**

Kate moved to adjourn; Dale Doughty seconded. With no objection, the motion carried.