

# Urban Transportation Finance and Jurisdictional Responsibilities in Maine: Review and Recommendations

Presented to the  
Bangor Area Comprehensive Transportation System

By  
Maine Tomorrow  
June 2009

*This report was funded in part through a grant from the Federal Highway Administration, U.S. Department of Transportation. The views and opinions of the authors or agency expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the U.S. Department of Transportation*

# Table of Contents

	Page
Introduction	2
Current Laws, Rules and Procedures	2
Jurisdiction	2
Cost Sharing	3
State-Local Planning Process	5
State Assistance for Capital Projects	6
Urban Compacts and Ability to Pay	7
The State of Inter Local Cooperation	9
Urban Compacts by the Numbers	10
Recommendations	11
 <u>List of Appendices</u>	
A. State Urban Compact Municipalities	15
B. Urban Compact Areas – State vs. Municipal Maintenance Responsibilities	17
C. URIP Rates per Lane Mile	18
D. State-Local Transportation Capital Planning Process	19
E. State Urban Compact Calculation Sheet	20
F. URIP Funding Display	22
G. BACTS Local Share Formula Based on VMT and Population	24
H. Federal Definitions Related To Urban Areas	25
I. Fiscal Capacity Comparisons	26

## **Introduction**

Responsibility for transportation within urban compact municipalities is shared by a complex array of public, non profit and for profit entities. Legally, at least four different political entities share authority including municipalities, Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs), the State of Maine, and the federal government. In addition, freight and passenger transportation services are provided by publicly designated non profits or are delivered through the private sector. Funding is equally opaque within urban centers. Public funding is provided from a diverse array of sources, including local property taxes, auto excise taxes, state and federal motor fuel taxes and registration and licensing fees. The private sector relies on shipping fees, passenger fares and more.

Maine Tomorrow was retained by the Bangor Area Comprehensive Transportation System (BACTS) to research, summarize, and analyze current Maine law and practices common to urban transportation delivery and finance. This report identifies and reviews key features of the existing operational environment that define the distribution of responsibilities and allocation of cost sharing for urban communities. The work is principally focused on those transportation services delivered or financed in whole or in part by the public sector. Statewide data is gathered and, while the analysis and recommendations focus on the BACTS region, the report is relevant to all MPO and urban compact communities.

## **Current Urban Compact Rules, Laws and Procedures**

This section summarizes state and municipal laws, rules, and procedures relating to the urban transportation network. The topics addressed grew directly out of the scope of work for this project.

### **Jurisdiction for Summer and Winter Maintenance of State and State Aid Highways**

Maine DOT provides information on the definition of urban compact municipalities (see Appendix A) and provides a summary of urban compact maintenance responsibilities on state/state aid highways (see Appendix B). Today, there are 36 urban compact municipalities designated as such because they meet the current population threshold of 7,500 inhabitants. The 4 urban compact communities within BACTS are Bangor, Brewer, Old Town and Orono. Statewide, there are an additional 7 urban compact municipalities between 6,000 and 7,500 population that were not allowed to opt out when the population threshold was raised to 7,500 in 1999.

23 MRSA §754 subsection 1 requires “all state and state aid highways within compact areas of urban compact municipalities” to be “maintained in good repair by the town in which the highways are located at the expense of the town.” A detailed list of the specific responsibilities for municipalities and

MaineDOT is set forth in Appendix B. Essentially, municipalities do all regular, day to day maintenance and the state's responsibilities are limited to capital improvements and route, destination, and speed limit signs. Municipalities are solely responsible for culvert repair and replacement (23 MRSA §705), even though this can be extremely expensive in some extraordinary circumstances.

There are 14 municipalities which qualify as "Winter Compact" municipalities, which have a different set of responsibilities and financial support. 23 MRSA §754.2.C(2) defines a select group of municipalities that only "undertake winter maintenance responsibilities on compact areas of state highways." These municipalities are listed in Appendix A. None are in the BACTS area. For those state highways under their control, urban and winter compact municipalities are responsible for plowing, the erection, maintenance, dismantling and rental of snow fences, and the sanding/salting of roads (23 MRSA §1001).

The definition used to determine the boundaries of urban compacts is found in 23 MRSA §2 which defines compact or built-up sections of roadway. It reads: "'Compact' or 'built-up section' means a section of the highway where structures are nearer than 200 feet apart for a distance of 1/4 of a mile." The Urban Compact statute (23 MRSA §754) states "Compact areas are compact or built-up sections as defined in Section 2."

In comparison, rural municipalities are not responsible for the regular summer maintenance of state or state aid highways. All towns are required to keep state aid highways clear of snow and to sand them, at town expense (23 MRSA §1003), but state highways in these areas have winter maintenance performed by the state.

Appendix H provides federal definitions in use related to urban areas. This is provided for information only.

### **Cost Sharing for Summer and Winter Maintenance of State and State Aid Highways**

The state's financial obligation to urban compact municipalities for road maintenance is set forth in Title 23, Chapter 19, subchapter 6 (§1801-1807). The specific guidelines for the amount of state reimbursement to municipalities are set forth in 23 MRSA §1803-B, commonly referred to as the Urban Rural Initiative Program (URIP).

The statute requires reimbursement per lane mile for roadways in each municipality. The reimbursement varies based on the status of the municipality (urban compact, winter compact or rural). Reimbursement rates are summarized in Appendix C, a table produced by the MaineDOT.

While the rates are established in statute, actual payments are governed by the amount raised in the State budget for URIP. If insufficient money is

appropriated, then proportional cuts are made and if URIP is funded beyond what is needed to reimburse based on the rates set in law, then proportional increases are provided.

Urban Compact Municipalities receive \$2,500 per lane mile for summer maintenance of state highways and state aid highways. They receive an additional \$1,250 per mile for roadways with more than 2 lanes. They, along with winter compact municipalities, receive \$1,700 per lane mile for winter maintenance of state highways only, regardless of the number of lanes.

On a two lane state highway within an urban compact the rates, if fully funded, would provide \$8,400 per centerline mile. MaineDOT's costs to similarly maintain state highways approach \$23,000 per centerline mile. Urban compact communities are therefore expected to subsidize through local revenues a substantial portion of the cost for maintenance of the state highways within compacts.

Urban compact municipalities may also receive the same compensation as rural municipalities for minor collectors and town ways located outside of the urban compact zone. Specifically, municipalities receive \$600 per lane mile for year-round roads and \$300 per lane mile for seasonal roads. There is no comparable reimbursement for town ways inside compacts and there are no minor collector roads inside compacts. Municipalities may apply for assistance with capital projects for minor collectors outside the urban compact, but in recent years few projects have been undertaken due to state and local budgetary restraints.

Under the Transit Bonus Program, MaineDOT sets aside 2.5% of URIP funds to reimburse municipalities for qualifying transit expenditures (23 MRSA §1807). The available funds are distributed proportionally to eligible municipalities, up to a cap of \$600,000. MaineDOT Rule 700 establishes the rules for this program.

When the URIP statute was enacted in 1999, it included a "hold harmless" provision (23 MRSA §1803-B.1.C). Under this provision, towns are guaranteed to receive at least as much state aid for roads as they received in 1999, the last year of the Local Road Assistance Program (LRAP). In FY08-09, 225 municipalities received more in state aid than they would otherwise receive under current law due to this hold harmless provision. When state funding is reduced, as it will be in the coming biennium, the portion of funding diverted to meet the "hold harmless" obligations is increased. For example, in FY 07-08 according to MaineDOT, with more funding available only 113 municipalities were paid under the hold harmless provision. None of the hold harmless communities include compacts with over 7,500 in population nor are there any in the 6,000 to 7,500 group.

Presently, only the winter compacts of Jay and Oxford appear to be benefited by this provision.

	<u>Urban</u>	<u>Rural</u>
State aid for town ways	N	Y
State aid for minor collectors	N	Y
State does state highway summer maintenance	N	Y
State does state <u>aid</u> highway summer maintenance	N	Y
State does state highway winter maintenance	N	Y
State does state <u>aid</u> highway winter maintenance	N	N
State funds for URIP hold harmless	N	Y

### State-Local Planning Process for Capital Improvements

The planning process for capital improvements to state and state aid highways within urban compacts is set forth in a June 1, 2009 paper entitled "State-Local Transportation Capital Planning Process" prepared by the Maine DOT (see Appendix D). Every two years the DOT prepares a statewide plan that includes a two-year capital work program. At the MPO level, "MaineDOT delegates the [planning] authority to a committee represented by host municipal officials to plan and program projects."

The Bangor Area Comprehensive Transportation System (BACTS) is a Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) created pursuant to Federal law (23 USC 134 and 135) and designated by the State of Maine. It is one of 4 MPOs in Maine. The others are the Kittery Area Comprehensive Transportation System (KACTS), the Portland Area Comprehensive Transportation System (PACTS), and Androscoggin Transportation Resource Center (ATRC).

BACTS includes the municipalities of Bangor, Brewer, Veazie and major portions of Hampden, Orono, Old Town, Milford, Bradley, Eddington, Orrington, and the Penobscot Indian Nation. It provides transportation planning for its member communities and works with both state and federal authorities on issues related to transportation planning and funding.

MPOs receive state and federal funding for their planning functions. Maine DOT and the four MPOs have reached an agreement that provides \$18,750 in state matching funds for every \$100,000 in federal funds. The state divides planning funds among the MPOs based on a formula that provides 90% of the weight to population and the remaining 10% to vehicles miles traveled (VMT). For the 2008-2009 biennium, the totals were:

#### **MPO Planning Fund Allocations**

PACTS	\$1,256,367
ATRC	\$570,314
BACTS	\$539,700
KACTS	\$227,274

#### **State Assistance for Capital Projects**

There are three statutory programs to provide state assistance to municipalities for capital road projects. None of these provisions have been used by municipalities as yet. The first is found under 23 MRSA §703-B whereby municipal officers may petition the DOT to finance from the Highway Fund up to 50% of the cost of proposed road construction for certain new major collector or arterial highways, subject to available funds. In order to be eligible, the statute requires that new road projects are necessary "to spur economic development, downtown revitalization or neighborhood preservation; to create new housing stock, to promote mixed-use or densely settled village centers; or to enhance public safety." These needs are most likely to arise in compact areas. The municipality is responsible for raising the remaining funds and for project design, permitting, and construction.

The second provision is found in 23 MRSA §1821 where the State has authorized new Transportation Investment Partnerships. They allow for municipalities to set aside funds for arterial and major collector highway capital projects. Projects must be approved jointly by the DOT and the municipality. Money set aside by the municipality must be matched by equal donations from the Highway Fund and General Fund (in the case of all publicly funded improvements) or just the Highway Fund (in the case of projects also including private investment). The state funds are to be

deposited by the Treasurer at the Maine Municipal Bond Bank in a fund set aside for the municipality.

The third provision was enacted this year which amended Maine's Tax Increment Financing law to create Transit-oriented Tax Increment Financing Districts (2009 Public Law 314). The new law allows TIF financing to be used to fund the operation or development of transit facilities, including bus and train stations, bus stops, ferry landings, and transit related highway interchanges. Eligible capital costs include transit vehicles.

## **Urban Compacts and Ability to Pay**

One major goal of this study is to gauge the relative ability to pay of the State versus urban compact and MPO municipalities and to assess ability to pay among urban compact and MPO municipalities relative to each other. A number of potential measures of ability to pay are discussed below. A large spreadsheet, Appendix E, provides data on a variety of ability to pay measures for Maine's urban compact and MPO communities (see also Appendix I for fiscal capacity comparisons for six BACTS communities).

Although not directly related to transportation funding, municipalities currently receive assistance from the state through Municipal Revenue Sharing. This is established in 30-A MRSA §5681 and provides state sales and income tax revenue to municipalities through a formula which attempts to reflect one approach to ability to pay. Funds are "distributed to each municipality in proportion to the product of the population of the municipality multiplied by the property tax burden of the municipality" (30-A MRSA §5681 subsection 4-A), where property tax burden is the amount of taxes divided by valuation. Additional funds are transferred to the Disproportionate Tax Burden Fund (also known as Revenue Sharing II), which distributes funds only to those towns with tax rates over 10 mils. This effectively transfers most of Revenue Sharing II to those municipalities with the highest tax burden.

Municipal revenue sharing is an important source of revenue for towns and it could be used for transportation infrastructure. However, most towns think of URIP and their auto excise taxes as their primary sources of funds to meet transportation needs. Nevertheless, municipal revenue sharing offers the concept that ability to pay should reflect in part tax effort. The URIP formula does not consider tax effort.

The total distributed to municipalities through URIP is calculated and distributed by the MaineDOT. For the fiscal year just ended an estimated \$24.2 million was distributed of which \$7.0 million was distributed to urban compacts under the urban formula reviewed previously. A DOT spreadsheet indicating the amounts distributed to each MPO and urban compact



municipality from FY 06 through FY 09 is provided as Appendix F. If policy makers were to reconsider the URIP formula to better reflect consideration of ability to pay they might examine options that incorporate miles and tax effort rather than just miles alone as URIP is presently constituted.

In addition to state aid through URIP, municipalities receive local general fund revenues through the motor vehicle excise tax. It is common for municipalities to think of their URIP and motor vehicle excise tax receipts combined as the fiscal foundation of their road maintenance program. Municipalities collected \$211 million in auto excise taxes during FY 08, according to Maine Revenue Services. Excise tax rates are set by state statute (36 MRSA §1482). There is no legal requirement that these revenues be used for road maintenance, but that is generally how they are utilized. The Maine Municipal Association found that for FY 07 towns spent \$235 million on roads which is an amount that equals URIP and motor vehicle tax revenue combined. While these revenues and expenditures neatly line up on a statewide basis, the situation fluctuates considerably from community to community raising again ability to pay concerns.

**BACTS Member Road Maintenance Expenses**

	<u>AUTO Excise + URIP</u>	<u>3 Year Average Expenses</u>	<u>Miles Maintained</u>	<u>Cost/Mile</u>
Bangor	5,092,000	\$4,161,482	187	\$ 24,586
Brewer	1,605,000	\$833,209	63.39	\$ 13,144
Hampden	1,585,000	\$958,676	81.15	\$ 13,347
Old Town	1,390,000	\$749,500	66.90	\$12,336
Orono	737,000	\$814,202	37.09	\$ 25,766
Veazie	340,000	\$298,970	13.77	\$22,328
MaineDOT		\$137,860,712	7,505.91	\$22,981

• State aid highway rural costs allocated 60% State for summer maintenance/40% Local for winter maintenance.

To carry this point further, data on local road maintenance expenditures was collected for six of the BACTS member communities and for MaineDOT. The table above incorporates this data as well as data on road miles and total URIP and auto excise tax revenues. As you can see, there is a significant amount of variability between towns, with expenditures per mile varying from \$12,336 in Old Town to \$25,766 in Orono. When expenditures were

compared to the combination of auto excise tax revenues plus URIP disbursements, Brewer took in nearly twice what it expended on maintenance while Orono spent more than it collected from these two revenue sources. Some caution is urged in drawing too strong a conclusion from this data since it was not possible within the limits of this study to test fully the consistency in accounting employed by each community. One final observation is that three communities had maintenance expenditures per mile at or above MaineDOT's rate while three were substantially lower.

Another perspective on ability to pay is provided through the lens of vehicle miles of travel. MaineDOT provides annual vehicle miles traveled (AVMT) data for the public road network. This data for BACTS communities is contained in the aggregate in Appendix G and as a subset just for state highways and state aid highways within compacts in Appendix E. In addition to considering miles to be maintained and local property tax capacity an argument exists for using AVMT in an ability to pay formula since it reflects the extent of use of public roads within a community. BACTS takes VMT into account with its own local share formula illustrated in Appendix G. VMT has the advantage of reflecting in large degree the burdens service center's experience as a region's focal point for employment, commerce, essential services like medical care and recreation.

The Maine Department of Labor (DOL) has compiled a chart showing jobs per town, employed residents per town, and jobs relative to employed residents. Not surprisingly, service center towns have a high ratio of jobs to employed residents. Bangor's figure of 1.97 exceeding Portland's 1.91. The BACTS towns of Brewer and Orono also have more jobs than employed residents. VMT can reflect these variations and others that reveal trips to service centers from beyond their boundaries.

## **The State of Inter Local Cooperation**

The greater Bangor area has an interesting set of experiences to draw upon when considering options for unifying the delivery of transportation services across municipal boundaries. Obviously, the BACTS communities jointly oversee the transportation planning work of the MPO, but it appears that many other cooperative arrangements exist as well.

Bangor, Brewer, Hampden, Old Town, Orono, and Veazie are currently served by the BAT Community Connector. BAT features approximately 18 buses which carry passengers between Bangor and the neighboring towns. BAT is operated by the City of Bangor with the service offered to other communities through negotiated contractual arrangements.

Bangor also plays a lead role in cooperating with neighboring communities on the maintenance of traffic signals within the BACTS area. They have an employee with the expertise and experience to offer this service. Bangor

charges for labor and equipment for this work. The closest private contractor able to provide this service is downstate, so this arrangement saves time and money for municipalities in the region.

The Bangor International Airport, while a facility of regional and statewide significance, is a self-sustaining operation under the exclusive authority of the City of Bangor.

Beyond transportation the region has cooperated through the Bangor Area Storm Water Group (BASWG) formed to protect water quality in the Bangor Area. Members are the municipalities of Bangor, Brewer, Veazie, Hampden, Orono, Old Town, and Milford and the University of Maine, University College of Bangor, Maine Air National Guard, Eastern Maine Community College, and the Dorothea Dix Psychiatric Center. BASWG prepares and implements a storm water management plan for the region to comply with Maine DEP requirements. Another cooperative venture involves the Bangor Water District and Brewer Water Department who are working to develop a system that allows each district to provide water to the other in an emergency.

These several examples of cooperation, many in the transportation arena, suggest that further collaboration is likely should suitable opportunities arise. Furthermore, in meetings with BACTS member communities leading up to this report it was clear that there exists a willingness to break with tradition and be creative as municipal finances become increasingly strained.

## **Urban Compacts by the Numbers**

Urban compact and MPO communities combined have as residents 56% of the state's population, but only 47% of the registered motor vehicles. This data suggests the tendency for residents in these communities to own fewer cars than their rural counterparts. These same communities represent 61% of the taxable property statewide underscoring to some extent their role as centers for commerce and employment even as they also tend to host a considerable share of the state's tax exempt property. Motor vehicle excise tax receipts are proportionately higher at 52% than registrations likely reflecting vehicles of more value including trucking fleets. The urban compacts and MPO communities combined have 28.5% of the public roads excluding controlled access highways like the Interstate and 36.5% of the annual vehicle miles traveled.

## Urban Compact/MPO Municipalities by the Numbers

	<u>Compacts/MPO's</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Compacts/MPO's as % of State</u>
Population (2000)	712,112	1,274,923	55.86%
Property Value (2008)	\$ 1,194,404,770	\$ 1,952,111,077	61.19%
Excise Tax (2008)	\$ 110,362,600	\$ 210,971,518	52.31%
URIP (2009)	\$10,534,785	\$ 24,209,336	43.25%
Auto and Transportation Related Sales three year average	\$ 2,412,519,767	\$ 3,541,844,667	68.11%
Vehicle Registrations (2008)	721,160	1,542,691	46.75%
Public Roads*	6,408	22,469	28.52%
Annual Vehicle Miles Traveled	5,268,254,842	14,435,555,100	36.49%

\*excludes controlled access highways for Compacts/MPO's

## Recommendations

### Reimburse Compact Communities for Town Ways

To achieve greater urban–rural equity, municipalities should receive the same rate of state URIP support for town ways whether inside or outside of an urban compact. This would provide \$2 million in additional funds to urban compact communities assuming the reimbursement rate for town ways remains as is under current law.

### Reimburse Compact Communities Fully for Maintenance on State Highways

MaineDOT currently spends roughly \$23,000 per centerline mile for maintenance, but reimburses compact municipalities roughly \$7,900 per mile for the same work. Assuming full reimbursement, compact municipalities would receive an additional \$13.3 million a year.

### MaineDOT Funding for Maintenance Paving

Currently, MaineDOT is responsible for maintenance paving state aid and state highways in rural areas, but provides no assistance beyond URIP for compact communities to maintenance pave urban state roads. In lieu of the previous recommendation, the state might consider at least picking up the cost of maintenance paving on state roads within compacts and thus invest an additional \$4.2 million a year in compacts. This assumes 883 road miles

paved once every seven years (126 miles/year) at 550 tons/mile and \$33,000 per mile.

#### Eliminate the Hold Harmless Provision

The hold harmless provision has been in place for a decade and during that time has served as an obstacle to funding the urban portion of URIP consistent with the formula.

#### Expand funding for the Transit Bonus Program

The Transit Bonus Program is oversubscribed. While state finances are tight, urban compact communities might succeed in making the case that the current cost of the hold harmless provision might be reallocated in whole or in part to raise the cap under the Transit Bonus Program. In this approach there would be no additional cost to the State.

#### Utilize Statutes for Capital Cost Sharing

The state has policies in place to share in the cost of capital projects with municipalities. Compact communities should consider using the three provisions cited on pages 6 and 7 of this report.

#### Explore Local Option Taxes for Transportation

One means of providing more funds to urban compacts for transportation expenditures would be the adoption of local option taxes. This could be imposed by individual towns or done on a regional basis, such as through MPOs. This would allow compacts to collect the revenues necessary to meet the disproportionate transportation expenses they incur.

A local option motor fuel excise tax was considered, but this approach faces some practical hurdles since the existing tax is collected at the wholesale level. A local option motor fuel tax might well require the creation of a new revenue collection system.

Another option is the imposition of a local option sales tax on automotive and transportation related sales. For FY 08, taxable sales in the automotive sector were \$3.4 billion statewide. Sales in urban compacts totaled nearly \$2.5 billion. A 1% local option sales tax would collect an additional \$25 million a year if all compact communities exercised the option.

There are some significant political challenges posed by this approach. The legislature has historically opposed a local option tax, even when tied to a specific purpose such as the construction of civic centers. The relevant tax includes all sales of new and used vehicles. This guarantees strong opposition and may lead to the movement of some retailers outside of the taxed districts.

### Institute Shadow Tolling

“Shadow tolling” means the concept of sharing highway fund revenue on the basis of vehicle miles traveled. If MaineDOT proportionally shared its revenue based on vehicle miles traveled the compact communities would benefit because of the relatively higher density of travel on their State and State Aid Highways.

### Enhance Modal Choices and Connectivity

An opportunity exists for MPOs and compact communities to improve transportation offerings across all modes and inter modal connections. Through a BACTS sponsored forum on this topic held June 18, 2009, it was determined that enhancements could be provided by developing stronger hubs and links, expanding partnerships, addressing planning/funding silos, integrating mapping and web information, expanding operating subsidies, integrating land use and transportation planning, addressing taxi service quality standards, balancing the response to seasonal demands, and exploring marine highway opportunities. These topics will be taken up in more detail through BACTS long range plan. To reach these goals, MPOs should make aggressive use of the new transit district TIF created in 2009 Public Law 314.

### Realign MPO Jurisdictional Boundaries

Consideration should be given to the benefits of realigning MPO boundaries to only include complete municipalities. The current situation, where only portions of some towns are in the MPO, blurs lines of authority and makes planning more difficult. Similarly, urban compacts only extend through the built up sections of communities. It would simplify and clarify responsibility for maintenance if the boundaries of the urban compacts were extended to also be consistent with MPO boundaries. Another alternative would be to realign MPO boundaries to reflect the commuter shed, best represented by the Labor Market Area. This would align MPOs with existing traffic patterns and provide the basis for thoughtful regional planning.

### Standardize Municipal Expense Data

Through standardized data on municipal transportation expenses, municipalities can better compare their spending practices and encourage a discussion among communities of best practices. This will improve the delivery of services and may cut costs. The MPO could lead this effort.

### Taxi Licensing

The current municipal based system of licensing taxis creates inefficiencies and incentives to violate the law. For example, taxis not licensed in Bangor cannot legally pick up passengers at Bangor International Airport, but taxis from neighboring cities routinely make trips to the Airport and often pick up

new fares there. A regional licensing system would eliminate this problem and could improve service to the region. The MPO could play a leadership role in this area as well.

#### Traffic Movement Permits

MPOs could be more effective if they were given the responsibility to prepare an area traffic movement plan that identifies investments needed to ease the flow of traffic and which serves as a guide for issuing traffic movement permits that may require funding of the needed investments. A model for this approach has been tested in Augusta for the area surrounding Interstate 95 exits 112 and 113. With MaineDOT having delegated to the municipalities of Portland, Auburn and Lewiston authority to issue traffic movement permits perhaps it would be possible to delegate this authority to an MPO for its service area. Reviewing traffic movement permits on a regional basis would provide for a more comprehensive determination of the regional impact of development and should provide for consistent impact fees throughout the region. It would expand the technical expertise within an MPO and provide for the opportunity to coordinate offsite improvements in a comprehensive and cohesive way.

#### Explore Strengthening the MPO/EMDC Link

BACTS is co-located with the Eastern Maine Development Corporation (EMDC) and enjoys a cooperative relationship. This existing partnership creates an opportunity to explore further the marriage of transportation and economic development. The two entities should explore more deeply the notion of planning and investing in transportation developments that serve as catalysts for economic development. Such an initiative should provide a mechanism whereby the value of the economic development realized is recaptured to compensate for the transportation improvements.

#### Establish a Pilot Regional Transportation Authority

Previous recommendations have suggested that the MPO be coterminous with municipal boundaries and that urban compact boundaries be the same as municipal boundaries as well. A set of contiguous urban compact communities should consider proposing to the Legislature the creation of a Regional Transportation Authority that performs all maintenance and operations duties otherwise performed in the area by MaineDOT except perhaps Interstate and bridge maintenance. An analysis of this concept may well lead to a less expensive approach for taxpayers. The new Authority would need strong guarantees from the State that it will be fairly compensated for the work done on state roads. The Authority could house MPO functions, raise revenues, issue bonds for capital improvements, and perform maintenance. This concept should be designed locally and negotiated with MaineDOT before being submitted to the Legislature.

# Appendix A

## State Urban Compact Municipalities

---

Urban Compact Municipalities are those in which the population according to the last United States census;

1. Exceeds 7,500 inhabitants, or
2. Is less than 7,500 inhabitants but more than 2,499 inhabitants, and in which the ratio of people whose place of employment is in a given municipality to employed people residing in that same municipality is 1.0 or greater, and when the municipality has not exercised the opt-out provision of this section.

**"Compact"** or **"Built-up sections"** means a section of the highway where structures are nearer than 200 feet apart for a distance of 1/4 of a mile, unless otherwise defined; reference [MRSA 23 sub-section 754](#), revised July 1, 1999.

Presently there are 43 State Urban Compact Municipalities. Pursuant to state law, each of these 43 municipalities has maintenance responsibilities within their defined compact areas. Those maintenance duties can be found [\(here\)](#).

To view the latest state urban compact boundary description, click on the municipality's name.

**The State Urban Compact areas over 7,500 population are:** [Auburn](#), [Augusta](#), [Bangor](#), [Bath](#), [Biddeford](#), [Brewer](#), [Brunswick](#), [Cape Elizabeth](#), [Caribou](#), [Falmouth](#), [Freeport](#), [Gorham](#), [Kennebunk](#), [Kittery](#), [Lewiston](#), [Lisbon](#), [Old Orchard Beach](#), [Old Town](#), [Orono](#), [Portland](#), [Presque Isle](#), [Rockland](#), [Saco](#), [Sanford](#), [Scarborough](#), [Skowhegan](#), [South Portland](#), [Standish](#), [Topsham](#), [Waterville](#), [Wells](#), [Westbrook](#), [Windham](#), [Winslow](#), [Yarmouth](#) and [York](#).

**The State Urban Compact areas over 6,000 but less than 7,500 that did not have the opt-out option in 1999 are:** [Belfast](#), [Fairfield](#), [Farmington](#), [Gardiner](#), [Houlton](#), [Millinocket](#), [Rumford](#).

**"Winter Compact" State Highway municipalities:** any municipality eligible to be an urban compact municipality, that had compact area state highway winter maintenance responsibilities on January 1, 1999, and that has opted out of summer maintenance responsibilities. These municipalities have winter maintenance responsibilities on compact areas of state highways. Currently there are 14 municipalities in this category and they are: [Bar Harbor](#), [Bridgton](#), [Bucksport](#), [Calais](#), [Camden](#), [Dexter](#), [DoverFoxcroft](#), [Ellsworth](#), [Fort Kent](#), [Jay](#), [Lincoln](#), [Madawaska](#), [Oxford](#) and [Pittsfield](#).

### Urban Compact Areas vs Federal Urban Areas:

In comparing Urban Compact Areas in Maine to Federal Urban Areas, there is different criteria that defines the boundaries of each Area. All of the above-mentioned compact areas are also Federal Urban Areas except for the following towns which are NOT Federal Urban Areas: All 14



of the Winter Compact State Highway municipalities, Fairfield, Farmington, Kennebunk, Standish, Wells, and York.

Last updated: 02/26/09

(Source: Maine Department of Transportation)

## Appendix B

### Urban Compact Areas State vs. Municipal Maintenance Responsibilities on State and State Aid Highways

---

[Title 23 § 754](#)-- Town maintenance in compact areas—

1. Jurisdiction-- all state and state aid highways within compact areas of urban compact municipalities, as defined in [subsection 2](#), as determined by the department must be maintained in good repair by the town in which the highways are located at the expense of the town.

[Per 23 § 2](#), the definition of "highway" means all of the right-of-way that may have been laid out by the State, county or town.

#### **Municipal urban maintenance duties**

- Winter snow & ice control
- Pothole repair
- Pavement markings per MUTCD (centerline and possibly edge line and crosswalks)
- Traffic Signs per MUTCD (regulatory, warning, and advisory)
- Ditching
- Driveway and cross culvert cleaning, repair, and replacement
- Catch basin cleaning and repair
- Surface treatments i.e. sand seals, chip seals, crack sealing, asphalt shimming, thin overlays (typically less than 1 inch thick and do not improve strength)
- Traffic signal maintenance
- Guardrail installation or repair
- RR signs and pavement markings
- Brush cutting, erosion control, mowing, herbicide application
- Tree pruning or removal
- Retaining walls
- Sidewalk maintenance
- Dust control, street sweeping

#### **MaineDOT maintenance duties**

- Route and destination signs
- Capital pavement projects
- Bridge and minor span maintenance and capital improvements
- Speed Limit signs on state or state aid highways when first installed or when changed due to recent DOT review

(Source: Maine Department of Transportation)

## Appendix C

### Urban Rural Initiative Program

#### Rates \* per lane mile

State Highway System	Rural Highways	State Urban Compact Highways		
		Summer		Winter **
		1st two lanes	more than two lanes	All Lanes
<b>State Highway</b>	\$0.00	\$2,500.00	\$1,250.00	\$1,700.00
<b>State Aid Highway</b>	\$0.00	\$2,500.00	\$1,250.00	\$0.00
<b>State Aid Highway/ Minor Collector</b>	\$600.00	\$2,500.00	\$1,250.00	\$0.00
<b>Town way</b>	\$600.00	\$0.00		\$0.00
<b>Seasonal Town way</b>	\$300.00	\$0.00		\$0.00

\* These rates are statutory amounts that a town is credited per lane-mile. Actual amounts may vary depending on actual budgeted URIP allocation.

\*\* Currently there are [14 municipalities](#) that were eligible to be an urban compact municipality, and had compact area state highway winter maintenance responsibilities on January 1, 1999. All opted out of summer maintenance responsibilities and continue to have winter maintenance responsibilities on compact areas of state highways.

**The definition of roads greater than two lanes is :** " Roads with paint-striped pavement for more than two lanes but **not** including shoulders, break down lanes, on-street parking areas, and turning lanes less than 0.03 miles (150 + ft) in length."

(Source: Maine Department of Transportation)

# Appendix D

## **State-Local Transportation Capital Planning Process - Prepared by MaineDOT, 6/1/09**

MaineDOT's transportation planning process includes a long-range policy based transportation plan, a mid-range project based plan and a two year capital program presented to the Maine Legislature in support of MaineDOT's biennial budget request every odd year typically in March or April. MaineDOT formally contacts municipalities in the spring of every even year for transportation project priorities that are considered for both the mid-range plan and two-year capital program. MaineDOT also has several competitive programs that are announced through this process where municipalities apply for projects. MaineDOT also provides a formal comment period for comments on the mid-range plan. In addition to these formal requests for projects, MaineDOT staff or Regional Planning Commission staff under contract to MaineDOT regularly meet with or receive correspondence from municipalities regarding complaints or requests for projects.

Although MaineDOT includes all Maine municipalities in this approach, Maine has state designated urban areas and federally designated urbanized areas including four metropolitan planning organizations (mpos). These definitions affect maintenance responsibilities and eligibility for capital funds. With regards to the mpos, MaineDOT delegates the authority to a committee represented by host municipal officials to plan and program projects. This involves regular monthly meetings with the mpo municipalities and MaineDOT through an involved process. With regard to transportation planning in non-mpo state urban compact municipalities, there are some statutory issues that need to be considered. For instance, an urban compact community is responsible for maintaining highways in an acceptable condition and MaineDOT is responsible for major capital improvements. The definitions of maintenance and capital sometimes conflict and cause frustration especially during tight budgetary times.

Lastly, in addition to the two-year capital program, MaineDOT's transportation planning process also includes transportation studies that are often multi-year efforts with a study area typically defined as a corridor or to encompass an area with potential solutions to the transportation problem. These efforts include significant municipal and public opportunities for involvement throughout the study.

How does this planning process work?

From both a state and municipal perspective, there is clearly room for improvement. However, from a state by state comparison perspective, it is also clear that MaineDOT provides much more emphasis on asking and reviewing municipal requests than other states. A major key for improving the process is education. Since transportation revenue is cyclical, the planning process also needs to be which is something frequently misunderstood by municipalities. Thus, if a municipality requests a project in May of an odd year, the typical best-case scenario is that it would be over two years before funding became available. If the same project was requested six months earlier in the summer of an even year, it would at least be considered for funding in the next construction season. The next major education issue besides timing has to do with the disparity between available resources, basic demands on these resources and requested needs. For instance, over half of MaineDOT's capital highway and bridge funding goes to projects such as safety improvements, bridges or paving with project selection almost entirely based on technical engineering evaluations. These investments are necessary to protect prior investments and maintain at least a passable transportation system. The last major education issue revolves around the restrictions of federal funding. For instance almost 20% of Maine's current federal surface transportation funding is restricted to individual projects. Many other types of funding are likewise restricted to infrastructure such as bridges and the Interstate system.



**Appendix E (cont.)**

**State Urban Compact Calculation Sheet**

A	B	P/K	P/J	Q	Q/K	Q/J	R	R/K	R/J
MPO	Community	Urban Total URIP Amount/AVMT SA and SH	Urban Total URIP Amount/C-SA and SH	Auto/Trans Sales - 3 yr avg.	Auto Trans Sales 3 Yr Avg./AVMT SA and SH	Auto Trans Sales 3 Yr Avg./C-SA and SH	Vehicle Registrations	Vehicle Registrations/AVMT SA and SH	Vehicle Registrations/ C-SA and SH
ATRC	Auburn	0.0026	8,082.28	149,207,700	1.12	3,429,273.73	22,360	0.00017	513.90
	Augusta	0.0022	8,283.98	222,488,467	1.74	6,613,806.98	18,895	0.00015	561.68
BACTS	Bangor	0.0028	9,083.14	315,048,700	1.82	5,943,193.74	26,441	0.00015	498.79
	Bath	0.0036	6,012.44	5,384,567	0.26	437,769.65	7,954	0.00039	646.67
	Belfast	0.0030	9,507.26	23,639,233	0.65	2,043,148.95	6,761	0.00018	584.36
PACTS	Biddeford	0.0021	6,098.72	24,090,733	0.29	853,978.49	18,915	0.00023	670.51
BACTS	Brewer	0.0026	9,361.34	76,801,300	1.40	4,964,531.35	9,174	0.00017	593.02
	Brunswick	0.0019	6,616.52	60,826,900	0.77	2,722,779.77	17,357	0.00022	776.95
PACTS	Cape Elizabeth	0.0034	4,877.58	1,071,833	0.06	85,815.32	9,069	0.00051	726.10
	Caribou	0.0034	6,746.68	30,001,433	1.46	2,887,529.68	8,833	0.00043	850.14
	Fairfield	0.0030	8,058.81	2,675,267	0.23	612,189.17	7,501	0.00065	1,716.48
	Falmouth	0.0022	5,457.98	78,556,533	1.23	3,028,393.73	11,882	0.00019	458.06
	Farmington	0.0029	8,906.68	27,582,300	0.69	2,094,328.02	6,635	0.00017	503.80
PACTS	Freeport	0.0022	5,064.80	5,075,833	0.15	334,596.79	8,656	0.00025	570.60
	Gardiner	0.0034	6,500.32	8,108,433	0.45	869,071.10	6,094	0.00034	653.16
PACTS	Gorham	0.0024	6,482.28	24,579,300	0.38	1,003,646.39	15,851	0.00024	647.24
	Houlton	0.0036	5,783.13	28,396,200	1.46	2,314,278.73	6,196	0.00032	504.97
	Kennebunk	0.0028	5,455.11	5,787,033	0.12	246,256.74	11,519	0.00025	490.17
KACTS	Kittery	0.0033	6,558.54	4,080,333	0.09	184,881.44	9,414	0.00021	426.55
ATRC	Lewiston	0.0029	8,665.30	52,780,833	0.34	1,006,307.59	28,742	0.00018	547.99
ATRC	Lisbon	0.0021	7,162.81	8,922,267	0.27	929,402.78	10,038	0.00030	1,045.63
	Millinocket	0.0047	6,647.37	6,797,600	0.73	1,022,195.49	5,352	0.00057	804.81
PACTS	Old Orchard Beach	0.0023	5,641.29	1,472,100	0.06	150,829.92	8,866	0.00037	908.40
BACTS	Old Town	0.0027	8,038.86	4,960,900	0.15	454,711.27	7,285	0.00022	667.74
BACTS	Orono	0.0029	7,476.70	3,497,200	0.13	349,720.00	4,541	0.00017	454.10
PACTS	Portland	0.0023	9,782.12	239,061,400	0.90	3,801,867.05	54,210	0.00020	862.12
	Presque Isle	0.0040	8,216.89	44,342,900	1.31	2,693,979.34	9,926	0.00029	603.04
	Rockland	0.0025	6,979.77	37,991,267	1.13	3,124,281.80	7,045	0.00021	579.36
	Rumford	0.0045	6,621.98	3,571,367	0.24	356,779.89	5,766	0.00039	576.02
PACTS	Saco	0.0025	7,551.69	156,418,967	1.87	5,738,039.86	18,012	0.00022	660.75
	Sanford	0.0028	7,671.42	40,804,467	0.51	1,388,379.27	20,691	0.00026	704.01
PACTS	Scarborough	0.0021	7,665.70	27,412,667	0.20	731,785.02	21,176	0.00015	565.30
	Skowhegan	0.0030	7,700.21	33,923,333	0.93	2,380,584.80	9,198	0.00025	645.47
PACTS	South Portland	0.0033	14,374.57	124,362,033	1.07	4,650,786.59	23,646	0.00020	884.29
	Standish	0.0052	18,416.79	2,370,233	0.51	1,809,338.42	11,003	0.00238	8,399.24
	Topsham	0.0016	6,222.33	40,153,667	0.90	3,630,530.44	9,858	0.00022	891.32
	Waterville	0.0025	6,761.75	71,493,133	0.99	2,644,954.99	11,420	0.00016	422.49
	Wells	0.0030	9,725.33	3,613,200	0.07	235,848.56	11,811	0.00024	770.95
PACTS	Westbrook	0.0023	8,979.38	124,764,133	1.29	5,063,479.44	16,657	0.00017	676.01
PACTS	Windham	0.0023	7,344.59	25,729,667	0.28	888,762.23	18,613	0.00020	642.94
	Winslow	0.0029	5,773.29	6,590,600	0.28	571,604.51	8,413	0.00036	729.66
PACTS	Yarmouth	0.0021	5,369.66	23,510,333	0.84	2,201,342.07	8,629	0.00031	807.96
	York	0.0031	6,005.33	13,659,600	0.30	577,817.26	14,696	0.00032	621.66
	Totals	0.1230	327,732.72	2,191,605,967	29.68	87,072,798.33	575,101	0.01358	36,864.41
	State Totals	0.2434	647,383.17	3,541,844,667	1.35	4,009,423.65	1,542,691	0.00059	1,746.35
	State Avg. Compacts	0.0026	7,753.47	50,967,581	0.83	2,480,932.29	13,374	0.00022	651.02

# Appendix F

## Urban Funding Display

MPO	Community	Compact Type	2000 Population	Total \$ Amount (URIP)	RURAL \$\$\$ (URIP)	URBAN \$\$\$ (URIP)	Transit Bonus (URIP)	FY-99 Amt (URIP)
ATRC	Auburn	SW	23,203	\$457,313	\$105,653	\$351,660	\$20,341	\$258,324
	Augusta	SW	18,560	\$327,604	\$48,931	\$278,673		\$166,824
BACTS	Bangor	SW	31,473	\$509,160	\$27,663	\$481,497	\$102,056	\$203,228
	Bar Harbor	W	4,820	\$66,638	\$62,217	\$4,421	\$1,190	\$65,448
	Bath	SW	9,266	\$87,195	\$13,242	\$73,953	\$6,915	\$61,116
	Belfast	SW99	6,381	\$152,516	\$42,517	\$109,999		\$79,740
KACTS	Berwick		6,353	\$66,324	\$66,324			\$66,324
PACTS	Biddeford	SW	20,942	\$200,792	\$28,747	\$172,045	\$7,148	\$122,976
BACTS	Bradley		1,242	\$7,924	\$7,924			\$7,008
BACTS	Brewer	SW	8,987	\$160,460	\$15,640	\$144,820	\$25,888	\$70,572
	Bridgton	W	4,883	\$115,972	\$109,770	\$6,202		\$98,880
	Brunswick	SW	21,172	\$225,332	\$77,519	\$147,813		\$159,780
	Bucksport	W	4,908	\$69,640	\$61,978	\$7,662		\$67,524
	Calais	W	3,447	\$45,936	\$30,845	\$15,091		\$31,632
	Camden	W	5,254	\$61,296	\$55,260	\$6,036		\$53,256
PACTS	Cape Elizabeth	SW	9,068	\$86,944	\$26,023	\$60,921		\$67,188
	Caribou	SW	8,312	\$165,725	\$95,627	\$70,098	\$5,643	\$128,916
PACTS	Cumberland		7,159	\$81,672	\$81,672			\$81,672
	Dexter	W	3,890	\$65,504	\$57,378	\$8,126		\$61,944
	Dover-Foxcroft	W	4,211	\$100,456	\$87,256	\$13,200		\$91,224
BACTS	Eddington		2,052	\$13,224	\$13,224			\$13,224
KACTS	Eliot		5,954	\$48,120	\$48,120			\$48,120
	Ellsworth	W	6,456	\$106,180	\$86,912	\$19,268		\$92,832
	Fairfield	SW99	6,573	\$80,356	\$45,139	\$35,217		\$70,704
	Falmouth	SW	10,310	\$162,124	\$20,544	\$141,580		\$91,208
	Farmington	SW99	7,410	\$184,360	\$67,059	\$117,301		\$105,684
	Fort Kent	W	4,233	\$91,508	\$67,205	\$24,303	\$7,524	\$61,020
PACTS	Freeport	SW	7,800	\$147,340	\$70,507	\$76,833		\$91,836
	Gardiner	SW99	6,198	\$80,332	\$19,684	\$60,648		\$53,424
PACTS	Gorham	SW	14,141	\$260,684	\$101,933	\$158,751		\$145,136
BACTS	Hampden		6,327	\$82,599	\$82,599		\$10,175	\$67,444
	Houlton	SW99	6,476	\$111,722	\$40,763	\$70,959	\$3,762	\$82,052
	Jay	W	4,985	\$94,952	\$78,645	\$16,307		\$94,952
	Kennebunk	SW	10,476	\$167,060	\$38,865	\$128,195		\$108,264
KACTS	Kittery	SW	9,543	\$171,800	\$27,053	\$144,747		\$74,592
KACTS	Lebanon		5,083	\$96,492	\$96,492			\$95,364
ATRC	Lewiston	SW	35,690	\$469,568	\$15,073	\$454,495	\$20,340	\$233,924

# Appendix F (cont.)

## Urban Funding Display

MPO	Community	Compact Type	2000 Population	Total \$ Amount (URIP)	RURAL \$\$\$ (URIP)	URBAN \$\$\$ (URIP)	Transit Bonus (URIP)	FY-99 Amt (URIP)
	Lincoln	W	5,221	\$75,152	\$57,143	\$18,009		\$56,340
ATRC	Lisbon	SW	9,077	\$109,172	\$40,409	\$68,763		\$80,292
	Madawaska	W	4,534	\$104,545	\$94,069	\$10,476	\$7,901	\$83,676
BACTS	Milford		2,950	\$28,036	\$28,036	\$0		\$25,656
	Millinocket	SW99	5,203	\$51,100	\$6,895	\$44,205		\$45,020
PACTS	N. Yarmouth		3,210	\$38,736	\$38,736			\$38,736
PACTS	O. Orchard Beach	SW	8,856	\$68,776	\$13,717	\$55,059	\$7,148	\$61,344
BACTS	Old Town	SW	8,130	\$116,422	\$28,718	\$87,704	\$8,550	\$66,552
BACTS	Orono	SW	9,112	\$86,263	\$11,496	\$74,767	\$8,087	\$38,912
BACTS	Orrington		3,526	\$51,272	\$51,272			\$49,224
	Oxford	W	3,960	\$68,600	\$61,702	\$6,898		\$58,284
BACTS	Penobs Ind. Nat			\$5,700	\$5,700			\$5,700
	Pittsfield	W	4,214	\$68,868	\$56,165	\$12,703		\$57,996
PACTS	Portland	SW	64,249	\$626,381	\$11,281	\$615,100	\$74,521	\$304,872
	Presque Isle	SW	9,511	\$215,222	\$79,972	\$135,250	\$5,643	\$123,144
	Rockland	SW	7,609	\$101,204	\$16,330	\$84,874		\$67,088
	Rumford	SW99	6,472	\$105,408	\$39,122	\$66,286		\$79,004
ATRC	Sabattus		4,486	\$49,356	\$49,356			\$49,356
PACTS	Saco	SW	16,822	\$260,344	\$54,485	\$205,859	\$7,148	\$133,548
	Sanford	SW	20,806	\$293,901	\$68,438	\$225,463	\$46,253	\$173,492
PACTS	Scarborough	SW	16,970	\$340,584	\$53,427	\$287,157		\$154,740
	Skowhegan	SW	8,824	\$162,628	\$52,900	\$109,728		\$102,000
KACTS	South Berwick		6,671	\$74,436	\$74,436			\$74,436
PACTS	South Portland	SW	23,324	\$384,376	\$0	\$384,376	\$110,528	\$139,284
	Standish	SW	9,285	\$127,489	\$103,363	\$24,126		\$114,048
	Topsham	SW	9,100	\$106,852	\$38,033	\$68,819		\$69,528
BACTS	Veazie		1,744	\$17,107	\$17,107		\$3,999	\$11,952
	Waterville	SW	15,605	\$193,984	\$11,214	\$182,770		\$105,768
	Wells	SW	9,400	\$252,349	\$103,357	\$148,992	\$28,217	\$139,104
PACTS	Westbrook	SW	16,142	\$232,459	\$11,207	\$221,252	\$33,859	\$97,464
PACTS	Windham	SW	14,904	\$282,079	\$69,453	\$212,626	\$763	\$134,688
	Winslow	SW	7,743	\$116,984	\$50,418	\$66,566		\$83,448
PACTS	Yarmouth	SW	8,360	\$86,812	\$29,464	\$57,348		\$73,548
	York	SW	12,854	\$209,364	\$67,398	\$141,966		\$146,228
		Totals	712,112	\$10,534,785	\$3,516,821	\$7,017,964	\$553,599	\$6,517,828
		State Totals	1,274,923	\$24,209,336	\$17,191,372	\$7,017,964	\$597,371	\$19,561,504



# Appendix G

BACTS Local Share formula based on VMT and Population

Municipality	Annual VMT	% VMT of region	Population	% population of region	Average of ratios	Existing ratios
Bangor	189,782,155	48.0	29720	50.7	49.37266	48.7
Bradley	3,992,746	1.0	464	0.8	0.90109	
Brewer	59,871,673	15.1	7608	13.0	14.06696	17.0
Eddington	2,899,053	0.7	114	0.2	0.46402	
Hampden	34,099,614	8.6	2901	5.0	6.78949	7.3
Milford	10,647,962	2.7	1761	3.0	2.84993	
Old Town	46,425,241	11.7	6212	10.6	11.17455	12.4
Orono	31,071,552	7.9	8224	14.0	10.94957	11.8
Orrington	9,811,689	2.5	376	0.6	1.56207	
Veazie	6,663,447	1.7	1203	2.1	1.86966	2.8
TOTAL	395,265,132	100.0	58583	100.0	100.0	100

# Appendix H

## Federal Definitions related to Urban Areas - Prepared by MaineDOT

The FHWA uses the term **Federal-Aid Urban Area (FAUA)** to distinguish the adjusted urban area boundaries allowed for transportation purposes from those designated by the Census Bureau. Source information available at: <http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/planning/census/faq2cdt.htm#q25>

### **What is an Urbanized Area (UZA)?**

An Urbanized Area is a statistical geographic entity designated by the Census Bureau, consisting of a central core and adjacent densely settled territory that together contain at least 50,000 people, generally with an overall population density of at least 1,000 people per square mile. Within the transportation planning community Urbanized Areas are typically referred to as the UZAs. To learn more about Census geography, terms and criteria see <http://www.census.gov/geo/www/>

### **What is an Urban Cluster (UC)**

An Urban Cluster is a new statistical geographic entity designated by the Census Bureau for the 2000 Census, consisting of a central core and adjacent densely settled territory that together contains between 2,500 and 49,999 people. Typically, the overall population density is at least 1,000 people per square mile. Urban Clusters are based on Census block and block group density and do not coincide with official municipal boundaries.

### **What is a Metropolitan Planning Area (MPA)?**

A Metropolitan Planning Area is defined in the Code of Federal Regulations, (23 CFR 450.104) as the geographic area in which the metropolitan transportation planning process must be carried out. This term is further described in 23 CFR 450.308.

The MPA boundary shall, as a minimum, cover the UZA(s) and the contiguous geographic area(s) likely to become urbanized within the twenty year forecast period covered by the transportation plan. The boundary may encompass the entire metropolitan statistical area or consolidated metropolitan statistical area, as defined by the Census Bureau.

### **What is a Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO)?**

A Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) is defined in Federal Transportation Legislation (23 USC 134(b) and 49 USC 5303(c)) as the designated local decisionmaking body that is responsible for carrying out the metropolitan transportation planning process. An MPO must be designated for each urban area with a population of more than 50,000 people (i.e., for each Urbanized Area (UZA) defined in the most recent decennial Census).

### **What is a Transportation Management Area (TMA)?**

A Transportation Management Area (TMA) is an area designated by the Secretary of Transportation, having an urbanized area population of over 200,000, or upon special request from the Governor and the MPO designated for the area.

# Appendix I

## Fiscal Capacity to Support Urban Compact State Highway and State Aid Highway Miles

	<u>Assessed Value/C-SA and SH</u>	<u>Excise Tax/C-SA and SH</u>	<u>Urban URIP Amount/C-SA and SH</u>	<u>Auto Trans Sales 3 Yr. Avg./C-SA and SH</u>	<u>Vehicle Reg/C- SA and SH</u>
Bangor	46,696,570	87,075	9,083	5,943,194	499
Brewer	50,820,659	94,983	9,361	4,964,531	593
Old Town	45,417,553	116,691	8,039	454,711	908
Orono	41,749,927	65,126	7,477	349,720	668
Combined rate for all Urban Compacts	73,704,353	101,357	7,753	2,480,932	651

## Fiscal Capacity to Support Urban Compact State Highway and State Aid Highway Annual Vehicle Miles of Travel

	<u>Assessed Value/AVMT SA and SH</u>	<u>Excise Tax/AVMT SA and SH</u>	<u>Urban URIP Amount/AVMT SA and SH</u>	<u>Auto Trans Sales 3 Yr. Avg./AVMT SA and SH</u>	<u>Vehicle Registrations/AVMT SA and SH</u>
Bangor	14.29	.03	.0028	1.82	.00015
Brewer	14.30	.03	.0026	1.40	.00017
Old Town	15.18	.04	.0027	.15	.00022
Orono	15.89	.02	.0029	.13	.00017
Combined Rate for all Urban Compacts	24.75	.034	.0026	.84	.00022