

BACTS Technical Committee Meeting Minutes January 7, 2004

PRESENT:	Jim Ring, Bangor	Rob Kenerson, BACTS
	Frank Higgins, Brewer	Don Cooper, BACTS
	Linda Johns, Brewer	Bob Osborne, Hampden
	Sue Morse, BACTS	Charlie Heinonen, Old Town
	Jerry Waldo, MDOT	Sarah Dubay, BACTS

The BACTS Technical Committee met Wednesday, January 07, 2004 at 9:30am in the Eastern Maine Development Corporation Board Room, One Cumberland Place, Bangor, Maine.

Jim Ring called the meeting to order. Linda Johns made a motion that the minutes from the December 16, 2003 meeting be accepted as written. Charlie Heinonen seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Discussion on Projects Ratings Criteria Final Draft

The Technical Committee reviewed the document for any final changes that needed to be decided upon before presenting the final document to the Policy Committee at their January 20, 2004 meeting.

Comments on Proposal Screening Requirements

- Proposals shall have clear geographic scope limits, and a clear and reasonable scope of work as determined by the BACTS Technical Committee.
 - With help from if necessary from MDOT as done in past
 - Jim Ring encouraged the Technical Committee members to go out and look at projects in the field during the pre-screening process in order to prioritize projects to best use funding for regional needs.
- Municipalities will coordinate with any necessary utilities located within the project limits in order to coordinate utility work plans with possible projects
- Municipal officials will sign statements agreeing to the finalized scope for each project in their municipality, as determined by the Technical Committee, prior to the start of the scoring process.
 - Bob Osborne commented that he would like to see some written requirements from MDOT on what exactly is done on a resurfacing project or on a reclaim project. Jerry Waldo from MDOT said that MDOT ranks what will be done on a project during MDOT own project scoping process according to a list of their own scoping requirements. This list is available to the Technical Committee to use to properly describe projects. BACTS will acquire this list to use during the Technical Committees process of pre-screening.
 - Technical Committee agreed that the BACTS project screen requirement #6 should read: *Municipal officials will sign statements agreeing to the **proposed** scope for each project in their municipality, as determined by the Technical Committee, prior to the start of the scoring process.*

Comments on Proposal Scoring requirements:

- Change in pavement condition calculated by dividing the lowest score into the highest score.
- Frank Higgins feels that the scoring weight for traffic volume might not be enough. It might be worthwhile to consider weighting it higher as they are corridors that receive the most use.
 - Charlie Heinonen commented that if you include truck volume with traffic volume, 45% of the weighted score is based on volume (truck and vehicle). He feels traffic volume is already well represented.
 - Frank Higgins agreed with Charlie's statement and said that even though he feels traffic volume should be weighted higher, he is not sure what other factor he would take points away from.
 - Rob Kenerson said that typically a project is submitted because of its pavement condition. Pavement condition and traffic volume are ranked equally because they should be considered on an equal basis.
 - A committee member asked whether or not we should be focusing all of our resources on our high use corridors. With the focus on our high use corridors, we are allowing our arterials to fall apart.
 - Our high use corridors are part of the state's arterial preservation program. The state pays for selected projects along these corridors – there is no local share. It would make our selection process easier if we could get a list of possible arterial candidates from MDOT sooner (it is usually sent out fairly late). If a project is not listed under the state's arterial preservation list, we could include the corridor in our own BTIP list.
 - We will have to try the scoring on a set of possible BTIP projects to see what the impact is on arterials and on minor streets.
- There was a question about where safety was included in the first three sections.
 - Safety is included in geometrics. It is not usually a factor in a resurfacing project. If safety is an issue, that project is included on the state's list of safety projects.
 - Corridors with high accident locations are handled by MDOT
 - Other safety problems might be included under multi-modal scoring.

Comments on using Truck percentage versus Truck Volume in Proposal Scoring

- Mistakes in previous formulas have been corrected
- Committee was given two spreadsheets – one spreadsheet where proposal scoring was calculated using truck percentage and one spreadsheet where proposal scoring was calculated using truck volume.
 - Priority of projects does not change - Only a few projects changed, for instance, projects on Route 9 and Route 16 ranked higher using truck percentage.
 - Does not make any significant difference to scoring – rankings only swap one position. The original strategy is on base.
- Committee decided to use truck percentage instead of truck volume for proposal scoring as was originally proposed.

Motion: Charlie Heinonen made a motion to recommend the Project Ratings Criteria to the Policy Committee as written. Frank Higgins seconded the motion.

Discussion:

- Bob Osborne felt that truck volume as compared to truck percentage seemed to be a more concrete number. For instance, on Route 16, there is a truck volume of 46 or a truck percentage of 4%. He feels that using truck volume instead of truck percentage is more understandable and more concrete for the municipalities who will need to sign off on these projects.
 - Jerry Waldo commented that MDOT considers truck percentage when deciding how to construct projects.
- Jerry Waldo asked how BACTS typically selects projects. He would like to see BACTS and MDOT work together to select projects as MDOT hears many of the complaints about roadways and has their own view of corridors in certain regions. It would make sense to combine these two views and work together regionally.
 - The Technical Committee wholeheartedly supported this idea. Rob Kenerson suggested that once municipalities have submitted preliminary lists that the Technical Committee and MDOT meet to discuss the lists.
- Sue Morse feels that MDOT needs to categorize (reconstruction, rehab, etc.) projects and decide how they would scope projects before the municipalities sign off on them. She believes it is also important to get MDOT involved in the beginning stages of project selection.
 - Frank Higgins agreed and stated that he feels that projects should be categorized by the Technical Committee during the pre-screening process to get municipalities to prioritize among the different types of projects before signing off.
 - The committee concurred and amended the first sentence of the Proposal Scoring section of the Project Rating criteria to read: *Proposals will be evaluated by the weighted scoring of variables appropriate for each of four types of project: reconstruction, resurfacing, reclaim/rehabilitation, and intersection, as determined by the Technical Committee.*

Motion: Charlie Heinonen withdrew the original motion and made a motion to recommend the Project Ratings Criteria as written with amendments to the Policy Committee. The motion was seconded by Frank Higgins and it passed unanimously.

The Project Ratings Criteria will be presented to the Policy Committee at the January 20, 2004 meeting. If approved by the Policy Committee, there will be a 45-day comment period and then the document will become official.

Other Business

- Rob Kenerson will be presenting a resolution on raising the truck-weight limit on I-95 at the Policy Committee meeting on January 20, 2004. He will also be discussing this proposal at the EMDC Board meeting on January 22, 2004.

- Long Range Plan meetings will be starting on Wednesday, January 14 and will be held on subsequent Wednesdays until February 11, 2004.

The next meeting will be Tuesday, February 17, 2004, at 9:30am in the EMDC Boardroom, One Cumberland Place, Bangor, Maine.

Bob Osborne made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Frank Higgins seconded the motion. The meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Sarah Dubay
BACTS, Administrative Assistant