Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Committee

AGENDA
Tuesday, April 21, 2020
9:30 – 11:00 a.m.
Remote Meeting by Zoom

PC, Mac, iPad, iPhone or Android device: https://zoom.us/j/97469206074
Telephone: 646-558-8656
Webinar ID: 974 6920 6074

Note: As of March 31, 2020, PACTS and GPCOG will be holding all committee meetings via Zoom conferencing technology. We remain committed to full public access and participation in our meetings through remote access during the COVID-19 crisis. Remote meetings will be held in accordance with the requirements of LD 2167, Public Law Chapter 618.

1. Welcome – Aubrey Miller, GPCOG 9:30
2. Chair and Vice-Chair (Attachment A) 9:35

Proposed Action: Elect TIP Committee Chair and Vice-Chair.

3. Committee Charge and Committee Schedule (Attachments B, C) 9:40

The TIP Committee Charge includes background information about the TIP, TIP Committee Roles & Responsibilities, background information about the TIP Committee, and TIP Committee Membership. The TIP Committee Schedule outlines topics and decision points for each TIP Committee meeting.

Proposed Action: Approve Committee Charge and Committee Schedule.

4. TIP Project Selection Overview & Update (Attachments D1, D2, D3) 9:50

The TIP Committee is charged with recommending the allocation of 2023 FHWA resources. A TIP Project Selection Overview was shared with the committee on April 13; it is attached. Also attached is a report from a February 25 meeting of the TIP Funding Working Group. The Working Group was formed this year to discuss recommendations for dealing with the possibility of overages after construction bid prices came in 30-40% above project estimates last year. The Working Group’s recommendation for overages, which was approved by the PACTS Executive Committee, was to increase the amount a municipality could seek from PACTS for a bid overage from 10% to 20% of the project’s allocated construction funds, with the acknowledgement that it could result in delaying some projects if the funds are not available in the Holding WIN (Work Identification Number). The Working Group also
reviewed current construction bids. A current list of construction projects and bids is attached; it has been updated to include bids received since February 25.

**Proposed Action:** Decide if PACTS should accept new project applications this year; solicit applications if appropriate.

5. **Policies and Procedures Documents** (Attachments E, F, G) 10:25


The following documents and webpages, all available from [gpcog.org](http://gpcog.org), may be useful resources going forward:

- PACTS Reforms & PACTS Regional Transportation Priorities
- Destination 2040
- Moving Southern Maine Forward
- Transit Tomorrow
- PACTS Public Involvement Plan
- PACTS Title VI, Environmental Justice, Non-Discrimination Plan
- Inclusive Transportation Planning Toolkit
- Inclusive Transportation Planning Recommendations
- Report from the Inaugural Community Transportation Leaders Training Program

**Proposed Action:** Provide initial input on the policies and procedures documents.

6. **Funding Prioritization Framework** (Attachment H) 10:40

The TIP Committee is charged with developing a multimodal funding prioritization framework (to be included in the Policies and Procedures) that can be used to select projects for funding. In early April GPCOG signed a contract with AECOM to help develop the framework.

**Proposed Action:** Discuss purpose and need, background.

7. **Adjourn** 11:00
## Attachment A: Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Committee Membership

*March 12, 2020*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Alternate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hank</td>
<td>Berg</td>
<td>General Manager</td>
<td>Casco Bay Lines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>Branch</td>
<td>Director, Public Works</td>
<td>City of Portland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lori</td>
<td>Brann</td>
<td>Transit Program Coordinator</td>
<td>MaineDOT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jay</td>
<td>Chace</td>
<td>Town Planner</td>
<td>Town of Scarborough</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>Chop</td>
<td>Commuter Choice Program Manager</td>
<td>Maine Medical Center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Currie</td>
<td>Transportation Program Director</td>
<td>York County Community Action Corporation (YCCAC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>DeBeradinis</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Program (RTP)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick</td>
<td>Fox</td>
<td>Director, Public Works</td>
<td>City of Saco</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>Handman</td>
<td>Transportation Director</td>
<td>City of South Portland Bus Service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce</td>
<td>Hyman</td>
<td>Transportation Program Manager</td>
<td>City of Portland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregg</td>
<td>Isherwood</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Custom Coach &amp; Limousine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex</td>
<td>Jaegerman</td>
<td>Director of Planning and Development</td>
<td>Town of Yarmouth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg</td>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>General Manager</td>
<td>Greater Portland METRO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maureen</td>
<td>O'Meara</td>
<td>Town Planner</td>
<td>Town of Cape Elizabeth</td>
<td>Matthew Sturgis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia</td>
<td>Quinn</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Northern New England Passenger Rail Authority (NNEPRA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marty</td>
<td>Rooney</td>
<td></td>
<td>MaineDOT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony</td>
<td>Scavuzzo</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Biddeford Saco Old Orchard Beach (BSOOB) Transit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>Shane</td>
<td>Town Manager</td>
<td>Town of Cumberland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erin</td>
<td>Courtney</td>
<td></td>
<td>Maine Turnpike Authority</td>
<td>Rebecca Grover</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

People who would like to receive meeting materials by email:

| Eric       | Dudley      | Director, Engineering and Public Services | City of Westbrook |
The Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

The Portland Area Comprehensive Transportation System (PACTS), in cooperation with the Maine Department of Transportation (MaineDOT), programs all Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Federal Transit Administration (FTA) funds in the PACTS region. To accomplish this, PACTS submits to FHWA and FTA—via MaineDOT—the PACTS TIP, a list of all federally funded projects programmed by PACTS and MaineDOT in the PACTS region.

Committee Roles & Responsibilities

The TIP Committee is an ad hoc advisory committee to the PACTS Policy Committee. This year the TIP Committee is charged with recommending to the PACTS Policy Committee:

- Allocation of 2023 FHWA resources.
- Updates and changes to the TIP Policies and Procedures and the Transit Policies and Procedures.
- A funding prioritization framework (to be included in the Policies and Procedures) for programming all projects.

Committee Background

PACTS has scoring criteria for selecting FHWA capital projects for programming in the TIP. Historically a TIP subcommittee, composed of members from all PACTS committees, has made recommendations to the PACTS Policy Committee regarding FHWA funding, selection of capital projects, and the policies and procedures by which those projects are selected.

PACTS does not have an equivalent mechanism for programming FTA funding. As a step toward developing a comprehensive, consistent, multimodal framework that can be used to select all projects for funding, the PACTS Executive Committee voted, in October 2019, to create an ad hoc committee composed of the former TIP subcommittee and the PACTS Transit Committee. This committee—the TIP Committee—will, among other tasks as listed above, work with a consultant to develop and recommend to the PACTS Policy Committee a framework for programming all transportation dollars.

Committee Membership

The TIP Committee consists of members of the former TIP subcommittee and members of the PACTS Transit Committee.

Members are asked to select their own alternates and inform PACTS staff of their selections. Committee members have the authority to request that a member appoint someone else in their place if the member or alternate is not in regular attendance.
## Attachment C: Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Committee
### SCHEDULE
### 4-14-2020 Draft

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Allocation of 2023 FHWA Resources</th>
<th>Policies and Procedures</th>
<th>Funding Prioritization Framework</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 17</td>
<td></td>
<td>Meeting cancelled due to COVID-19.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 21</td>
<td>Receive project selection overview and status update. Receive PDR status updates from MaineDOT. Decide if PACTS should accept new project applications this year; solicit applications if appropriate.</td>
<td>Receive overview of the documents. Provide initial input. Plan to review the documents for the May meeting.</td>
<td>Purpose &amp; need / background</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 19</td>
<td>Finalize project selections before the June 2nd PACTS Executive Committee meeting, at which a final draft list of FHWA capital projects will be adopted for later ratification by the PACTS Policy Committee.</td>
<td>Provide additional input on what should be included in the document(s).</td>
<td>Best practices / scoring factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 16</td>
<td>Receive report on action taken at June 2nd PACTS Executive Committee meeting.</td>
<td>Provide additional input on FHWA programming and project management policies.</td>
<td>Draft scoring framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 21</td>
<td>Review project selections before July 23rd PACTS Policy Committee meeting, at which the PACTS Executive Committee’s final draft list of FHWA capital projects will be ratified.</td>
<td>Provide additional input on FTA programming policies.</td>
<td>Revised draft scoring framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 18</td>
<td></td>
<td>Provide input on initial outline of document(s).</td>
<td>Final draft scoring framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 15</td>
<td>Provide input on draft document(s).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 20</td>
<td>Provide input on revised draft document(s).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 17</td>
<td>Review final document(s).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 15</td>
<td>Approve final document(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment D1: Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Committee
TIP PROJECT SELECTION OVERVIEW

What do we need to do?
The TIP Committee is charged with recommending the allocation of 2023 FHWA resources. At the April meeting, the committee will need to decide if PACTS should accept new project applications this year and the extent of the project applications, and then solicit project applications if appropriate.

Is there any history we should be aware of?
Last year, after construction bid prices came in 30-40% above project estimates, PACTS: (1) chose to defer construction by a year for several projects and (2) decided not to select any new projects for the 2022 federal allocation. These decisions allowed PACTS to:

- Fund the deficit in the 2019 capital program
- Add 30% more funding to anticipate the costs of the 2020 collector road projects
- Provide additional funding for 2020, 2021, and 2022 projects with anticipated deficits

What's the status this year?
A TIP Funding Working Group met on February 25 to: (1) review current construction bids and (2) discuss recommendations for dealing with the possibility of overages.

1. As of February 25, five PACTS projects had received construction bids under available funding and two PACTS projects had received construction bids over available funding. MaineDOT has seen many bids come in under available funding, but that may be because the funding for those projects was increased in response to the high bid prices last year. See attached TIP Funding Working Group report and a current list of construction projects and bids for more information. The list of construction projects is up-to-date and includes additional bids received since February 25.

2. Their recommendation regarding the possibility of overages, which was approved by the PACTS Executive Committee, was to increase the amount that a municipality could seek from PACTS for a bid overage from 10% to 20% of the project’s allocated construction funds, with the acknowledgement that it could result in delaying some projects if the funds are not available in the Holding WIN (Work Identification Number).

How much money do we have?
We anticipate $3,297,287 for FHWA capital projects in calendar year 2023.

Can you provide details about that figure?
MaineDOT estimates PACTS will receive $5,761,810 in federal and state capital improvement funding for calendar year 2023:
### PACTS Capital Improvement Allocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Federal</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ 4,121,609</td>
<td>$ 1,640,201</td>
<td>$ 5,761,810</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The state allocation is used for the PACTS Municipal Partnership Initiative (MPI).

The federal allocation, plus the 25% local match, will result in $5,495,479 for calendar year 2023:

### PACTS Federal Allocation plus Match

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Federal</th>
<th>25% Local Match</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ 4,121,609</td>
<td>$ 1,373,870</td>
<td>$ 5,495,479</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The $5,495,479 in federal funds will be spent on collector paving, preservation, modernization, and expansion projects according to the following set asides and spending targets:

### PACTS Federal Allocation plus Match

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collector Paving</td>
<td>$ 2,198,191</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collector Paving Set Aside</td>
<td>$ 2,198,191</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservation, Modernization, Expansion</td>
<td>$ 3,297,287</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Preservation Work Spending Target</td>
<td>$ 1,373,870</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modernization Spending Target</td>
<td>$ 1,099,096</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expansion Spending Target</td>
<td>$ 824,322</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 5,495,479</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The $3,297,287 for preservation, modernization, and expansion capital projects is the funding the TIP Committee is charged with allocating.

**Could we change the percentages?**

Yes. The committee could choose to recommend increasing the collector paving percentage, for example, to reflect project cost increases and enable the same number of miles to be paved. Or the committee could choose to reduce the collector paving percentage to enable additional funding for larger capital projects.

**Do we have larger projects in the pipeline?**

Yes. Two projects were programmed for preliminary design report (PDR) in the 2018 TIP:

- **Yarmouth: Proposed Improvements to Beth Condon Shared Use Path Extension.** $80,000 (75% PACTS federal share + 25% municipal share) for preliminary engineering and right-of-way.
- **Portland: Proposed Improvements to Brighton Avenue (Route 25).** $195,000 (75% PACTS federal share + 25% municipal share) for preliminary engineering and right-of-way.

These projects are next in line for funding.

**What is the status of the PDRs for these projects? How much funding do they need for construction?**
MaineDOT will provide PDR status updates at the April 21 meeting.

Construction funding needs are:

- Beth Condon Shared Use Path Extension: The current construction estimate is at least $950,000
- Proposed Improvements to Brighton Avenue (Route 25): The current construction estimate (as of 2017) is at least $4.2 million.
- MaineDOT is looking into phasing for both projects.

What are our options?

The TIP Committee could do any combination of the following:

- Select projects for construction funding:
  - Select the Beth Condon Shared Use Path Extension and/or
  - Select the Proposed Improvements to Brighton Avenue (Route 25) and/or
  - Select the Washington Avenue project, which had funding removed to cover the construction bid overages on the Brighton Avenue Roundabout Project and/or
  - Select new smaller projects that could go to construction funding right away

- Select projects for PDR funding:
  - Solicit applications for new complex projects

What do we do if we want to select new projects?

We will use the existing application and scoring process described in the TIP Policies and Procedures and/or consider simplifying the application. The Funding Prioritization Framework consultant will be developing a new scoring process, but it will not be ready for project selection this year.

What should we consider as we make our decision?

- How do you want to connect planning and programming?
- How do we connect to the PACTS Reforms & PACTS Regional Transportation Priorities?
TIP Funding Working Group Recommendations for Higher than Anticipated Construction Bids

On February 25, 2020, the PACTS TIP Funding Working Group met to discuss PACTS policy and the options for addressing project construction cost overages, as well as, funding priorities. Current PACTS policy allows for an additional 10% of the construction costs as the upper limit on what PACTS will contribute, with any expenses above that limit to be covered by the municipality.

However, during the summer of 2019, PACTS worked to assess the funding deficits in the 2019 PACTS Transportation Improvement Program as a result of high construction bid prices (which were about 30-40% above project estimates). After prolonged discussions, PACTS decided to fund the deficit in the 2019 capital program and provide additional funding to cover anticipated deficits. This resulted in deferring construction by a year for several projects and not selecting new capital projects to be funded with the 2022 federal allocation. The PACTS TIP Funding Working Group met to discuss recommendations for dealing with overages moving forward.

Several concerns were brought up at the meeting. It was mentioned that one of the reasons for PACTS current policy is to deter scope creep. It was felt that the policy should continue to deter scope creep.

There was also concern that municipalities are not able to cover the overages on PACTS projects that use federal dollars (which have more requirements that bring up the cost of a project). As a result, municipalities may abandon the PACTS project and look to other funding sources for their project or not build the project.

The current construction bid environment for PACTS projects is that five projects which had funds added last year and have already received construction bids, received bids that are under available funding. Since, late November construction bids for two other PACTS projects have come in over available funds – the Portland Deering Corner Roundabout, and the Portland Neighborhood Byway. MaineDOT has seen that construction bids have generally been under available funds, but the funding for those projects was increased in response to the high bid prices of last year.

The PACTS process is not conducive to quick decisions. Currently, if a project’s construction bids come in over available funds and the municipality wants to obtain the extra 10% from PACTS, then a letter must be submitted a week in advance for the next Executive or Policy Committee Meeting, which will vote on the matter. If approved, then a letter is sent to MaineDOT to request the transfer of funds. However, construction bids need to be approved or rejected within 30 or 45 days of receipt. Depending on the schedule of when the bid was received in relation to PACTS Committee meetings, there may not be enough time to secure the additional funding to approve the bid.
The following two recommendations came from the group.

1) Create a policy that will allow for overages between 10-20% of construction costs to be covered. As this may not be feasible within the available funds in the Holding WIN, it may involve discussion of impacts to existing or future projects. It could be implemented with a sunset provision, so that it only applies to this construction season.

2) Schedule additional Executive Committee meetings, as necessary, but no more than one additional time per month, to make decisions regarding covering construction overages of up to an additional 20% of construction costs.
PACTS Sponsored Projects that are Scheduled to Advertise 11/2019 - 4/2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WIN</th>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Construction Advertise Date</th>
<th>Construction low bid</th>
<th>Available Construction &amp; CE Funding</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22168</td>
<td>Westbrook</td>
<td>Cumberland Street</td>
<td>11/6/2019</td>
<td>$840,238</td>
<td>$936,470</td>
<td>$96,232</td>
<td>Includes $356,999 added last year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20547</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>Neighborhood Byway</td>
<td>11/15/2019</td>
<td>$377,803</td>
<td>$318,782</td>
<td>($59,021)</td>
<td>No funds were added last year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18624</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>Deering Corner Roundabout</td>
<td>12/19/2019</td>
<td>$3,460,888</td>
<td>$3,132,236</td>
<td>($328,652)</td>
<td>Includes $403,427 added last year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22164</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>Cumberland Avenue</td>
<td>1/29/2020</td>
<td>$398,379</td>
<td>$515,669</td>
<td>$117,290</td>
<td>Includes $148,569 added last year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22170</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>Danforth Street</td>
<td>1/29/2020</td>
<td>$604,318</td>
<td>$839,514</td>
<td>$235,196</td>
<td>Includes $143,914 added last year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18637</td>
<td>Westbrook</td>
<td>Route 25B Intersection Improvements</td>
<td>2/26/2020</td>
<td>$2,887,720</td>
<td>$1,870,000</td>
<td>($1,017,720)</td>
<td>Includes $339,000 added last year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22132</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>Congress Street Intersection Improvements</td>
<td>2/26/2020</td>
<td>$1,402,051</td>
<td>$1,144,573</td>
<td>($257,478)</td>
<td>Includes $635,823 added last year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23977</td>
<td>Biddeford</td>
<td>Precourt Street</td>
<td>3/11/2020</td>
<td>$209,070</td>
<td>$258,645</td>
<td>$49,575</td>
<td>Includes $54,734 added last year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23985</td>
<td>Saco</td>
<td>Maple Street</td>
<td>3/11/2020</td>
<td>$289,268</td>
<td>$311,397</td>
<td>($22,129)</td>
<td>Includes $37,527 added last year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23981</td>
<td>South Portland</td>
<td>Waterman Drive</td>
<td>4/8/2020*</td>
<td>$407,653</td>
<td>$407,653</td>
<td></td>
<td>Includes $86,267 added last year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22452</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>Washington Avenue</td>
<td>4/8/2020*</td>
<td>$631,376</td>
<td>$631,376</td>
<td></td>
<td>Includes $132,613 added last year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23983</td>
<td>Scarborough</td>
<td>Payne Road</td>
<td>3/18/2020*</td>
<td>$314,788</td>
<td>$314,788</td>
<td></td>
<td>Includes $66,615 added last year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22416</td>
<td>Cape Elizabeth</td>
<td>Scott Dyer Road</td>
<td>3/25/2020*</td>
<td>$273,726</td>
<td>$273,726</td>
<td></td>
<td>Includes $57,913 added last year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Forecasted date
SUMMARY

The primary purpose of the TIP Policies and Procedures “is to describe the development and administration of PACTS “MPO Allocation” projects” (p. 1). It is organized into six main sections:

I. Introduction
II. PACTS Programming Policies
III. PACTS Project Management Policies
IV. Federal Transit Administration Funding
V. Coordination with MaineDOT and Maine Turnpike Authority
VI. Glossary of Transportation Terms

The Introduction defines who has responsibility for the programming of projects funded with Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Federal Transit Administration (FTA) funds in the PACTS Funding Area. It explains the “MPO Allocation” figures used throughout the document. It provides a brief description of important programming documents (MaineDOT Work Plan, STIP, TIP) and lists the major milestones related to the TIP Policies and Procedures.

PACTS Programming Policies defines the organizations eligible to propose projects and the types of projects eligible for MPO Allocation funds. It explains match ratios, spending targets, application scoring, the collector paving set aside, the preliminary design report process, the project contingency and project cap policy, the biennial selection schedule, enhanced project scoping, the roles of PACTS committees, the roles of municipal officers and transit system boards, the public involvement process for the TIP, and the PACTS Municipal Partnership Initiative.

PACTS Project Management Policies addresses project monitoring, project amendments, PACTS Holding WIN (work identification number), unspent project funds and project withdrawals.

Federal Transit Administration Funding describes the process for allocating FTA funds in the PACTS region, including the Six Year Capital and Operating Plan (SYCOP) and the Regionally Administered Discretionary (RAD) Program.

Coordination with MaineDOT and the Maine Turnpike Authority describes a variety of funding programs, including arterial paving, the federal Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Program (CMAQ), and MaineDOT’s Municipal Partnership Initiative and Business Partnership Initiative. It also describes the new format of TIP documents in the state as well as the STIP schedule.
CONSIDERATIONS

- Do the procedures described in this document match what happens in practice?
- Are there opportunities to simplify the procedures?
- What should PACTS committee (Planning, Technical, Transit, ad hoc committees such as the TIP Committee) involvement look like? What’s the best way to ensure adequate opportunity for input without asking too much of people’s time? Are there ways to streamline the committee review and approval process?
- Who should score projects?
- Is planning work reflected in the programming process?
- Are PACTS Reforms & PACTS Regional Transportation Priorities and other relevant documents reflected in the Policies & Procedures?
- Are there separate documents related to the PACTS MPI, collector paving, etc. that could be folded into this document?
- Is there information that doesn’t need to be in this document?
- Staff will be reviewing the document to update old information, eliminate year-specific references that need frequent updating, find opportunities where this document can reference rather than duplicate other documents, check for any inconsistencies with by-laws, ensure compliance with the PACTS Public Involvement Plan and the PACTS Title VI, Environmental Justice, Non-Discrimination Plan, move general background information to the appendices, and eliminate unnecessary information.

PACTS Transit Policies and Procedures Manual
February 2019

SUMMARY

The purpose of the Transit Policies and Procedures Manual “is to serve as a resource for Transit Committee members and all participants in the PACTS transit planning process regarding the policies and procedures of the Transit Committee” (p. 4). It is organized as follows:

Introduction
  1.1. PACTS Committees Overview
Transit Committee Role in Planning and Programming
  1.2. PACTS Long Range Transportation Plan
  1.3. Transportation Improvement Program
  1.4. PACTS Transit Six Year Capital and Operating Plan
Appendices

Section 1.1 gives an overview of the PACTS committee structure and the roles and responsibilities of the PACTS Transit Committee.

Section 1.3 explains that “In 1975, Congress gave PACTS the responsibility to program FTA and FHWA funds in cooperation with MaineDOT. Programming is the decision to fund a project for design and/or construction, or for federal transit operating assistance. This is accomplished when PACTS submits to the FTA and FHWA (via MaineDOT) the PACTS Transportation Improvement Program that lists all federally-
funded projects programmed by PACTS and MaineDOT in our region. The federal agencies may not release the federal funds for any of the projects without this support from PACTS. PACTS and MaineDOT produce the PACTS TIP annually and amend it periodically.”

Section 1.3 also describes the process by which the PACTS TIP and the Maine Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) are produced annually, as well as the process to apply for PACTS MPO Allocation funding. (“The MPO Allocation is a MaineDOT annual allocation of FHWA and state capital funds which PACTS is authorized to program with essentially a guarantee that MaineDOT will concur.”)

Section 1.4 describes the methods by which FTA funding is allocated, as well as the SYCOP update process and responsibilities.

- Since 2012, our region has received significant FTA funding on a formula basis. In federal fiscal year 2016 the “region received $10,028,308 in FTA Section 5307 Urbanized Area Formula funding which is available to all transit agencies in our region, and $7,816,835 in Section 5337 State of Good Repair fixed guideway funding which is only available to CBITD [Casco Bay Island Transit District] and NNEPRA [Northern New England Passenger Rail Authority].”

- Over the last five years, the PACTS Transit Committee has “split” up the 5307 funds with a “Split Letter” and the Six Year Capital and Operating Plan (SYCOP). The Split Letter, along with the SYCOP, “represent a snapshot in time of currently funded anticipated needs based on projected funding availability.” The SYCOP “outlines anticipated capital, operating, ADA-paratransit and planning expenses for the next six years – and is the basis for each annual FTA Split Letter. The projects listed in the first four years of the Plan then are added to the PACTS TIP and the MaineDOT STIP through the amendment process or through the annual TIP and STIP production process each January.”

- “A fundamental principle in the Six Year Capital and Operating Plan is to maintain the basic needs for all agencies to keep their services operating at current levels safely and reliably. This principle has been applied to include both capital replacement and operating expenses needed to support current levels of service.”

- “The majority of 5307 funds are allocated through an asset management plan that seeks to maintain current levels of service safely and reliably throughout the region with adequate capital replacement and operating funds. Any remaining Section 5307 balance is made available for eligible new projects and unforeseen exigencies under the PACTS “Regionally Administered Discretionary (RAD) Program.” . . . the Transit Committee adopted in September 2014 a “Regional Transit Expansion & Enhancement Procedures” for selecting RAD Program projects and determining other eligible uses as agreed upon by the Transit Committee that best serve the region. Under this policy, any new service, regardless of funding source must meet certain criteria to be eligible for funding support.”

- “Updates to the SYCOP will be considered with the overall goal of maintaining fiscal constraint and preserving an annual balance of at least $1 million in 5307 funds in order to respond to any unforeseen exigencies. All PACTS regional transit agencies eligible for discretionary funding are encouraged and expected to pursue other funding for projects to increase the overall amount of funds available to the region. If a project does not receive discretionary funds following an application, it may be submitted as a requested revision during the next SYCOP update.”
Section 1.4.2, entitled “Transportation Improvement Program Transit Funding Prioritization,” explains that, at the request of the PACTS transit agencies, GPCOG staff worked to draft a new prioritization framework for the allocation of federal transit funds. Ultimately the Transit Committee directed staff to delay full development of a new Transit Funding Prioritization System until the start of the Regional Transit Plan Phase II (now known as Transit Tomorrow) because Transit Tomorrow will identify the transit priorities of the region.

Section 1.4.3 describes public involvement regarding the TIP. It is largely a copy of what is in the TIP Policies & Procedures.

Section 1.4.5 explains that “The PACTS Policy and Executive Committees are collectively responsible for adopting the TIP and SYCOP (and subsequent updates), which specify the allocation of federal transportation funds in the PACTS region to individual projects and activities. In addition, the PACTS transit agencies have repeatedly received FTA and MaineDOT guidance indicating that the transit agencies, as designated recipients of FTA funding, are collectively responsible for determining the annual “split” of the 5307 and 5337 federal transit funds that come to the PACTS region. Responsibility for the programming of federal transit funding in the PACTS region is thus divided between the PACTS Policy and Executive Committees, and the PACTS transit agencies, with each entity responsible for fulfilling their role in this process.”

The remaining subsections of Section 1.4 explain TIP amendments, TIP administrative modifications and information-only actions, and the TIP revision process and responsibilities.

CONSIDERATIONS

- Can the relevant portions of this document be folded into the TIP Policies & Procedures? If so, is there a remaining need for a shorter version of this document?
- Are PACTS Reforms & PACTS Regional Transportation Priorities, Transit Tomorrow, and other relevant documents reflected in the Policies & Procedures?
- Staff will be reviewing the document to update old information, eliminate year-specific references that need frequent updating, find opportunities where this document can reference rather than duplicate other documents, check for any inconsistencies with by-laws, ensure compliance with the PACTS Public Involvement Plan and the PACTS Title VI, Environmental Justice, Non-Discrimination Plan, and eliminate unnecessary information.
September 6, 2016

Dear PACTS Committee Members,

The Policy and Executive Committees endorsed this document for use during our project priority setting and administration during the next two years. Here are the key changes adopted.

1. We will complete the transition to programming our MPO Allocation funds on a calendar year basis, and continue our recent experience programming our MPO Allocation funds consistent with MainDOT’s requirement that we program funding initially for Preliminary Design Report (PDR) for complicated projects. See details in Section G below. For simple projects such as curb to curb paving, we will continue simply to fund for construction.

By May 1st each year, MainDOT will determine the adequacy of PDR’s developed by our members and the completeness of PDR’s developed by MainDOT. The projects with MainDOT-approved PDR’s will be eligible for construction programming by the Policy Committee two months later in July.

This new MainDOT/PACTS approach will produce more PDR’s than PACTS can fund for construction at one time given our annual allocations. Consequently we will work closely with MainDOT to find ways to consider funding some projects with money beyond our MPO Allocation.

2. In response to a Destination 2040 recommendation, we have created Preservation, Modernization and Expansion Spending Targets for use of our MPO Allocation funding, and have retained a 40% Collector Preservation Paving set aside within the Preservation Spending Target. We eliminated our set aside policy for intersections, road rebuild, bicycle/pedestrian and transit. We will rank applications using a single scoring formula rather than the three formulas used in the past, the intent being to incentivize the integration of all modes and other attributes into single projects.

Additionally, members of each subregion will convene before applications are due to assign additional points to an application or applications from their subregion in order to indicate the importance of applications.

3. We have reduced our Collector Preservation Set Aside policy percentage of our MPO Allocation funding from 57% to 40%, while the overall spending target for preservation of our region’s transportation system is 65%. This change creates an opportunity for collectors and arterials in need of reconstruction to compete effectively for funds. We will also now ask our municipalities to submit brief collector preservation paving applications rather than rely exclusively on our regional assessment of collector roads. Staff and the Technical Committee will score the applications using a process that the Technical Committee will finalize this fall.
4. We will adopt our federally-required *Transportation Improvement Program* each winter rather than every other summer.

Please join PACTS staff in thanking the Plan Implementation Committee members who worked during 2015 and 2016 to shape this new process designed to link our capital programming to the recommendations in our *Destination 2040* regional transportation plan adopted in April. The committee members were:

- John Bubier, Biddeford, Chair
- Bob Burns, Gorham
- Marina Douglass, NNEPRA
- Tex Haeuser, South Portland
- Bob Hamblen, Saco
- Art Handman, South Portland Bus Service
- Bruce Hyman, Portland
- Chris Mann, MaineDOT
- Maureen O’Meara, Cape Elizabeth
- Ann Peoples, Planning Committee
- Ben Smith, Windham
- Kevin Sutherland, Saco
- Nat Tupper, Yarmouth
- Sara Zografos, Turnpike Authority

Please contact PACTS staff at any time with questions about the content of this document.

The preparation of this report has been financed in part through grants from the Federal Highway Administration and Federal Transit Administration, U.S. Department of Transportation, under the Metropolitan Planning Program, Section 104(f) of Title 23, U.S. Code. The contents of this report do not necessarily reflect the official views or policy of the U.S. Department of Transportation.

In accordance with the Civil Rights Act of 1964, PACTS does not discriminate on the basis of race, color or national origin. For more information about these protections or to file a complaint, please contact PACTS. Please let us know if you need a translation of this document.
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I. Introduction

The Portland Area Comprehensive Transportation System (PACTS) shares the responsibility with the Maine Department of Transportation (MaineDOT) for the programming of all projects funded with Federal Highway and Federal Transit Administration (FHWA and FTA) funds in the PACTS Funding Area. The PACTS Funding Area covers parts or all of the following eighteen municipalities: Arundel, Biddeford, Cape Elizabeth, Cumberland, Gorham, Falmouth, Freeport, North Yarmouth, Old Orchard Beach, Portland, Saco, South Portland, Scarborough, Raymond, Standish, Westbrook, Windham and Yarmouth.

The primary purpose of this document is to describe the development and administration of PACTS "MPO Allocation" projects. These projects are funded with federal Surface Transportation Program (STP) and National Highway Performance Program (NHPP) funds made available to PACTS by MaineDOT. The MPO Allocation is based primarily on a percentage of the funds that come to Maine via the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). A significant portion of these federal funds are Congressional funds designated for PACTS given our “large MPO” status: the “STP Urban Sub-allocation” and a portion of Maine’s “Transportation Alternatives” allocation.

The Allocation amounts used in this document are the sum of the federal funds plus local matching funds. In February 2016, MaineDOT’s Bureau of Transportation Systems Planning sent a letter to PACTS with estimates of the federal and state funds available to PACTS for calendar year 2019. The $5,121,609 annual federal amount in the letter generates a two-year $13,657,623 total PACTS MPO Allocation based on a PACTS program with match ratios of 75% federal and 25% local. See more on match ratios below.

Despite the expansion of the PACTS region in 2012 and increasing costs of capital projects, MaineDOT has chosen to maintain the $5,121,609 that they have given PACTS for several years and will continue that level for the foreseeable future. However, MaineDOT advised the Policy Committee in January 2016 that in addition to their flat funding policy they “may be willing to partner with PACTS and member communities on sound, deliverable projects with regional, statewide or safety benefits.” Furthermore, MaineDOT routinely spends tens of millions in additional funding within PACTS above and beyond the allocation for such areas as arterial pavement preservation, bridges, safety, etc.

This document also describes the PACTS process to allocate FTA funds to the various transit systems in our region, and highlights several MaineDOT policies that directly affect the programming and project development work at PACTS.

Participants in the allocation of federal and state funds in our area should be aware of the following three programming documents. (Note that we now adopt our federally-required Transportation Improvement Program each winter rather than every other summer. See more on this in Section V. J.)

1. MaineDOT Work Plan - This is the annual MaineDOT statewide document that presents all capital projects scheduled for construction in the first year, plus additional
projects planned to be built in the subsequent two years. This document includes the MPO Allocation projects programmed by the PACTS Policy Committee.

2. **Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)** - This is a four-year statewide programming and project scheduling document prepared for the review and approval of the FHWA and FTA. Projects funded in the most recent Work Plan are listed here, as are active projects that were funded in earlier Work Plans. The projects listed in the STIP, must also be listed in the PACTS TIP.

3. **Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)** - This is a PACTS document prepared for the review and approval of the FHWA and FTA. The projects listed in the PACTS TIP must also be listed in the STIP.

This document does not describe the regional transportation planning process at PACTS, Contact staff for more information on those subjects, or visit [www.pactsplan.org](http://www.pactsplan.org).

Here are the major milestones related to the policies and procedures in this document.

- **July and September 2016** – The Policy and Executive Committees endorsed this document.
- **September 2016** – PACTS staff will hold a capital funding workshop for committee members,
- **Before February 2017** – Our subregions meet to allocate their 10 scoring points to their applications due in February.
- **As early as possible in 2017** – MaineDOT shares a list of MaineDOT bridge, safety, enhancement and arterial pavement preservation candidates with PACTS and member municipalities in order to coordinate local, regional and state objectives and funding.
- **February 3, 2017** – Project applications for 2020 and 2021 funding will be due.
- **April 2017** – MaineDOT will advise on the completion status of Preliminary Design Reports or adequacy of design information related to schedule and budget so that we can consider funding them for construction in July.
- **July 2017** – The Executive Committee adopts a final draft projects list for the use of 2020 and 2021 MPO Allocation funding in preparation for submittal of only 2020 projects to MaineDOT for inclusion in MaineDOT’s 2018-2020 Work Plan. The list will include top-ranked projects for which Preliminary Design Reports (PDR’s) have been completed as well as projects (construction and/or PDR’s) proposed in February 2017. See more details below.
- **July 2017** – The Policy Committee ratifies the Executive Committee’s list.
- **Fall 2017** – PACTS staff participate in a meeting with Senior MaineDOT Planning, Project Development, Environment and Maintenance and Operations staff to review all projects proposed for the upcoming Work Plan in order to identify risks or synergies with project
overlaps or projects within proximity to one another. (This is an annual meeting, so would happen again in the fall of 2018.)

- July 2018 – The Executive and Policy Committees finalize a 2021 list for MaineDOT similar to the one endorsed in July 2017. See below for details.

Note that we will also be programming PACTS Municipal Partnership Initiative projects, projects funded from our Holding WIN, and FTA-funded projects during this biennium. See later in this document for details on those schedules.

II. PACTS Programming Policies

A. Organization Eligibility

The chief elected or administrative officials from the following organizations may propose projects through the PACTS process:

- Biddeford Saco Old Orchard Beach Transit Committee (Shuttlebus)
- Casco Bay Island Transit District (CBITD)
- Each of the eighteen PACTS member municipalities
- Greater Portland Transit District (METRO)
- Greater Portland Council of Governments
- Maine Department of Environmental Protection
- Maine Department of Transportation
- Maine Turnpike Authority
- Northern New England Passenger Rail Authority (NNEPRA)
- Regional Transportation Program (RTP)
- South Portland Bus Service
- Southern Maine Planning and Development Commission
- York and Cumberland Counties
- York County Community Action Corporation (YCCAC)

All others who wish to propose projects through the PACTS process must have the endorsement/sponsorship of one of the organizations listed above.
B. **Project Eligibility**

Proposals for use of the PACTS MPO Allocation must be eligible for STP or NHPP funding. The following list presents examples of eligible proposals.

- Reconstruction, rehabilitation, resurfacing and restoration of highways.
- Highway safety improvements.
- Traffic operational improvements, including installation and upgrading of traffic signals.
- Streetscape projects.
- Transit-oriented development projects.
- Capital costs for transit projects and carpool projects.
- Park ‘n ride and satellite parking facilities and programs.
- Bikeways of various configurations and programs to secure bicycles including storage facilities and other bicycle facilities.
- Related road improvements to improve pedestrian facilities and safety, including pedestrian overpasses.
- Programs for new construction and major reconstruction of paths, trails or areas solely for the use of pedestrian or other non-motorized means of transportation.
- Preservation of abandoned railway corridors, including conversion and/or combined rail-with-trail use for pedestrian or bicycle trails.
- Bridge construction, reconstruction, widening, rehabilitation, resurfacing and restoration. Please note that this is a low PACTS programming priority because MaineDOT uses a separate federal funding program for these purposes. This same principle applies to the use of our MPO Allocation for projects on interstate highways and ramps.
- All other capital uses eligible for FHWA and FTA funds.

In the event that a question arises regarding the funding eligibility of a proposal, PACTS or GPCOG staff will consult with MaineDOT, FHWA and/or FTA.

C. **Capital Proposal Requirements**

Applications for 2020 and 2021 funding are due on February 3, 2017. Final submissions that omit data or show incorrect data used in the scoring process will receive zeros in those scoring factors. Corrections and supplementary data will not be accepted after the deadline. Applications that fail to meet the requirements listed below will not be considered.

Except for simple collector preservation paving applications, proposals for funding from the PACTS MPO Allocation must meet the following eligibility, threshold and policy endorsement requirements. Please review the application forms for specific information requested pertaining to the various project categories.
1. Proposals to change an intersection or roadway cross-section must be supported by a feasibility study that includes an analysis of feasible alternatives, recommendation of the most viable alternative, a cost estimate, and at least one public forum. Similarly, proposals for the construction of new sidewalks/paths/trails intended to be used solely by bicycles and/or pedestrians must be supported by an analysis that assesses viable alternative routes, potential demand, and level of municipal, business and resident support and that recommends the most feasible alternative. Studies without a clear recommendation will be deemed incomplete.

2. Proposals must include a purpose-and-need statement that describes the conditions that warrant the proposed project and explain the intended benefits of that project.

3. Proposals for new traffic signals must be accompanied by a warrant analysis approved by MaineDOT.

4. Proposals to reconstruct a road must be submitted by a registered professional engineer, and must include a cost estimate and state the source of the estimate.

5. Right of way – There should be a narrative on the likelihood of permanent right of way acquisition.

See below regarding applications for collector preservation paving projects.

D. Match Ratios

In 2013 the Policy Committee increased the local match to 25% minimum for most PACTS MPO Allocation FHWA-funded projects, and kept our existing 20% minimum local match for FHWA-funded transit projects. We will continue with this policy which means that the maximum FHWA shares are 75% and 80% respectively. There are no State funds involved.

Our local match requirement for FHWA-funded projects that involve transit-supportive elements in a road project will be 25% for the entire project. The 20% local match policy will apply only to single-mode transit projects.

The PACTS policy for PACTS Municipal Partnership Initiative projects is 50% state share and a minimum 50% local share. There are no FHWA funds involved.

The PACTS match policy for Federal Transit Administration projects is to be consistent with FTA match policies which vary slightly between FTA programs.
E. Spending Targets and Scoring for Preservation, Modernization and Expansion

The Spending Targets

As noted above the PACTS capital budgets for 2020 and 2021 funds are 65% for Preservation (40% for Collectors pavement preservation and 25% for other preservation work), 20% for Modernization and 15% for Expansion. After the Collector Preservation Paving Set Aside, the Spending Targets amount available for the remaining 60% of the MPO Allocation will be $8,194,574 (of the $13,657,623 total).

We will apply the spending targets flexibly rather than as strict budgets as we often have done in the past with our Set Aside budgets. (Note that a flexible approach over multiple biennia was the intent in 2004 when we created the set-asides structure.)

Consistent with our Destination 2040 Plan, the PACTS policy objective is to encourage our members to submit complete street proposals and other proposals that integrate our highway, land use, transit and bicycle/pedestrian planning objectives. We envision that a set of “spending targets” framed around system preservation, modernization and expansion – coupled with complementary scoring criteria – will produce capital improvements consistent with the goals of Destination 2040. In general terms the spending targets are:

- **Preservation** of our existing street/highway system, of our existing public transportation systems and of all other components of our transportation system.
- **Modernization** of the systems by addressing safety and other deficiencies for all modes, bringing systems up to current standards/technologies and being consistent with current transportation policies.
- **Expansion** of the systems – the creation of new capacity such as new roads, new sidewalks, new bicycle infrastructure and separated shared use paths, more transit vehicles to provide new services.

Here are examples of how these eligible PACTS capital project elements would be categorized. The lists are not intended to be exhaustive.

**Preservation**

- Reconstruction, rehabilitation and paving of arterials and collectors (note that these projects may typically involve modernization elements too)
- Basic drainage.
- Replacement of existing bicycle and pedestrian facilities.
- Replacement of existing transit vehicle/vessel and stop/station infrastructure.
Modernization

- The elements of road projects targeted at mitigation of safety issues, including bringing roads up to current standards
- Construction of turning lanes
- Measures to improve stormwater management
- Enhanced transit stops and shelters and major transit hubs
- Replacement of existing traffic signals with new ones (which often have pedestrian and bicycle detection, transit priority and emergency pre-emption).
- Widening, adding esplanades, or other sidewalk improvements
- Pavement markings, such as crosswalks
- Pedestrian bump outs and refuge islands
- Road diet elements such as narrow travel lanes
- Wide shoulders
- Sidewalk improvements, or new ones where warranted.
- Streetscape elements
- Striping of bicycle lanes on existing streets
- Access management elements such as well-defined entrances/exits to/from buildings along the road
- ADA-accessible ramps, traffic signal elements and other infrastructure
- Optimization (reduction or increase in illumination) in existing lighting systems in order to improve the quality of the community environment

Expansion

- Construction of new roads, through travel lanes, sidewalks, bicycle lane systems, separated bicycle facilities, transit stop shelters, and traffic signals where none currently exist
- Shared use pathways
- Extension of existing sidewalks
- Additional transit vehicles/vessels to provide increased service frequency and/or service to new areas.

Scoring of Applications for funding from the Spending Targets

We will rank applications using a single scoring formula rather than the three Set Aside scoring formulas used in the past. PACTS staff will score all the applications and share their results with the members of the Technical, Transit and Planning Committees for their review prior to sharing the final scores with the Executive Committee.

The task of deciding how much of the cost of each “multi-spending-target” project application applies to each Spending Target will be a two-step process. The first step will be for the
applicant to give us an estimate. The second step will be for the PACTS enhanced project scoping (EPS) consultant to recommend during the spring of 2017 how much of each finalist application’s construction cost should be “allocated” to the Preservation, Modernization and Expansion Spending Targets. (Note that we will revise these amounts later to reflect the PDR-based construction amounts after completion of the PDRs.)

Here are general descriptions of the scoring criteria, and a summary table.

**Scoring Formula Criteria Descriptions**

1. **Subregion’s and Transit Committee’s top priority projects**

   This factor is intended to get the municipal members from each subregion together to discuss and decide on priority project investments in the subregion. Each of the four PACTS subregions may decide how to allocate up to 10 points to project proposals coming to PACTS from the towns in the subregion. All 10 points may go to a single proposal or be spread among projects (up to 10 points). The Transit Committee may do the same for projects submitted by, or in partnership with, any of the PACTS Transit Agencies.

2. **Destination 2040 Priority Corridor or Center**

   The Destination 2040 Plan identified Priority Corridors and 56 Priority Centers, areas that are already important regional transportation corridors or existing or emerging centers that have or could have infrastructure such as water and sewers to support additional development. They generally allow a mix of uses and proximate living near jobs and services, as well as recreation opportunities. A map shows these corridors and centers. The mapped circles are not intended to define strict limits of the center. Applicants make the case that the proposed projects are in or related to a center and staff makes a determination whether or not the proposed project qualifying for these points (up to 10).

3. **Improves region’s traffic signal system**

   Maintaining and operating the region’s 100+ signalized intersections at peak performance and coordination has been a strategy of PACTS for over a decade. Signals which have sensors that can detect not only cars but also buses, bicycles and pedestrians can provide for optimal efficiency thereby reducing the need for costly roadway widening or lane expansion. Proposals will be scored on the projected improved performance, including safety and balancing of all modes which utilize the intersection. Scoring will be weighted on the amount of traffic volumes specific to the intersection as well as its regional significance i.e. how many municipalities are affected and transit agencies using the intersection and benefiting from the proposed improvements (up to 5).
4. Leverages other non-MPO funds from the MaineDOT, Private/developers, Public Private Partnerships (PPP), Tax Increment Financing (TIFs), etc.

*Destination 2040* identified a growing gap between the infrastructure needs of the growing PACTS region, and flat or declining funding available. Proposals that include funds from non-government sources, and innovative funding mechanisms can receive points. Greater percentages of non-governmental funds will receive more points (up to 3).

5. **Multi-member applications**

Transportation transcends municipal boundaries and PACTS encourages regional coordination of transportation investment decisions. Project proposals that include planning and match funding by two or more municipalities and/or transit agencies will receive the maximum points (up to 3).

6. **Enhance existing freight industry**

The efficient movement of goods is critical to the local and regional economy. Providing better access to specialized sites that handle freight, and/or projects that propose to shift large/heavy freight shipments away from congested areas and neighborhoods are eligible for points. Projects that increase heavy haul freight through existing residential neighborhoods are discouraged. Proposed projects that demonstrate a reduction in the frequency and/or weight of trucked freight and that move more freight onto rail and/or ships will receive the most points (up to 10).

7. **Economic Development Benefits of the project**

Transportation links businesses and markets at all scales. Projects that support the economic vitality of the region, and provide better links between labor and employment are desired in the PACTS region. Projects that demonstrate the infrastructure investments proposed will enable desired economic development projects in appropriate and desired locations, such as Priority Centers are eligible for points. Project proposals that demonstrate increased accommodations for all modes in job concentrated areas, for access to child care in those areas as well as education and workforce training sites are also eligible for points in this category (up to 8).

8. **Reconstruct or Rehabilitate an Arterial or Collector Road**

Arterials connect the region to the rest of the state and country and carry the majority of the region’s traffic. PACTS has a very successful pavement preservation program for Collector Roads, but has not had a means to fully fund the reconstruction of Collectors or Arterials. Proposed projects for roads that are no longer eligible for pavement preservation and require some level of rebuilding are eligible for these points (Up to: 10 points for arterials, 7 collectors).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>New or Current</th>
<th>Max. Points</th>
<th>Points Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>Reg. Focus</td>
<td>Subregion's and Transit Committee's top priority project(s)</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>The subregions and the Transit Committee assign all the points to one project application -- or spread them among multiple applications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>Reg. Focus</td>
<td>Destination 2040 Priority Corridor or Center</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10 points if a project is in Priority Center AND on a Priority Corridor. 7 points if the project is on a Priority Corridor OR Priority Center but not both. 5 points if in a Priority Center which is not connected by a Priority Corridor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>Reg. Focus</td>
<td>Improves region's traffic signal system</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Up to 5 points depending on the regional significance and impact of the proposed project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>Reg. Focus</td>
<td>Leverages other non-MPO funds from MaineDOT, Private /developers, PPP, TIFs, etc.</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Points based on the amount of funds leveraged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>Reg. Focus</td>
<td>Multi-member applications</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Points system based on our current criterion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>Eco Devo</td>
<td>Enhance existing freight industry</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Up to 5 points based on enhancing freight access to nearby commercial or industrial property and other improvements to efficient movement of freight.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>Eco Devo</td>
<td>Economic development benefits of the project</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Up to 8 points awarded by scorers based on the applicant's narrative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>Mob. Safety Access.</td>
<td>Reconstruct or rehabilitate an arterial or collector</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10 points for an arterial. 7 points for a collector.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>Mobility Safety Accessibility</td>
<td>Reduces numbers and severity of crashes</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Up to 6 points for applications for proposals that address a traffic safety issue only, or up to 6 points for improvements that will address &quot;vulnerable user&quot; safety issues, or up to 12 points if proposal does both.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>Mob. Safety Access.</td>
<td>Transit supportive project elements</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Up to 10 points awarded by scorers based on the applicant's narrative. More points for more transit supportive elements and/or greater element costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>Mob. Safety Access.</td>
<td>Improves pedestrian network</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Up to 5 points awarded by scorers based on the applicant's narrative, compared to objectives of Destination 2040.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>Mob. Safety Access.</td>
<td>Improves bicycle network</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Up to 5 points awarded by scorers based on the applicant's narrative, compared to objectives of Destination 2040.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>Mob. Safety Access.</td>
<td>Reduces congestion and/or improves multimodal level of service</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Up to 10 points awarded by scorers based on the applicant's narrative, compared to objectives of Destination 2040.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>Encourages or enables compact development, such as transit oriented development, street connectivity, etc.</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Up to 5 points awarded by scorers based on the applicant's narrative, compared to objectives of Destination 2040.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>Links jobs and housing by trips other than by automobile</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Up to 5 points awarded by scorers based on the applicant's narrative, compared to objectives of Destination 2040.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>Enviro. Energy</td>
<td>Increases resilience to climate-related events and/or provides Green Infrastructure to reduce stormwater</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Points are given for projects that address a flooding, erosion, or other impact related to storms and/or sea level rise and/or enables the facility to function in such a condition, or if runoff is decreased or if runoff is treated organically in conjunction with other transportation improvements such as rain gardens/pervious pavement, etc. Potential for points also if stand alone water quality is addressed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**: 116
9. **Reduces the numbers or severity of crashes**

The safety of the traveling public is a priority in the multi-modal environment of the PACTS region. Making streets and roads more safe and compatible for all users is an important aspect of transforming our transportation system and can relieve existing and future congestion, which often leads to crashes. Proposals that demonstrate the project will mitigate High Crash Locations (HCLs) and/or make travel conditions safer for vulnerable users, (i.e. bicyclists, pedestrians, transit riders/passengers, and underserved persons, etc.) are eligible for points (up to 12).

10. **Transit supportive project elements**

The success of the growing PACTS region depends on easier and more convenient access to transit that provides high quality transit trips as a real choice for everyday travel. The integration of transit amenities such as pedestrian and bicycle accessible transit stops and shelters, street modifications which improve transit service, technology upgrades such as Transit Signal Priority or Real-Time Passenger Information systems, as well as other transit capital projects which improve or expand existing transit service are eligible for points in the category (up to 10).

11. **Improves Pedestrian Network**

Multimodal streets and corridors that foster calmed traffic and provide a relaxed, accessible and outdoor-oriented experience encouraging pedestrian activity are critical to livability in the PACTS region. Proposals that demonstrate the removal of barriers, closing of gaps, and other treatments improving pedestrian movement are desired. Proposals that demonstrate treatments which will improve the pedestrian network, such as traffic slowing, diversion of cut-through traffic, the construction of sidewalks of adequate width, providing shade trees, and encourage active transportation and street life, etc. are eligible for points (up to 5).

12. **Improves Bicycle Network**

The ongoing and continued emphasis on a safe, comfortable, PACTS region-wide bicycle network that provides an active transportation choice for people and enables active transportation lifestyle is an important transportation strategy. Projects that propose to expand on-road bikeways, bicycle or shared-use lanes or paths, trail connections, and other treatments that provide a network for safer and more comfortable travel by bicycle are eligible for points (up to 5).

13. **Reduces congestion and/or improves multimodal level of service (MMLOS)**

The economic and population growth of the PACTS region, like other successful regions, is potentially constrained and limited by congestion. The PACTS Congestion Management Process plan focuses on mode shift and traffic signal coordination as the primary strategies for
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reducing motor vehicle congestion. Proposals that demonstrate the project will provide reductions in motor vehicle congestion AND improve MMLOS without negatively impacting the safety of non-motorized travel mode will receive the maximum points (up to 10).

14. Encourages or enables compact development such as Transit Oriented Development (TOD), street connectivity, etc.

Acknowledging limited financial resources, the Destination 2040 Plan encourages transportation and land-use decisions to direct growth toward existing infrastructure (sewer, water, transportation, safety services) in centers and connecting corridors. Destination 2040 identified Priority Centers that are either currently serviced by transit, or that could be in the future. Existing and emerging mixed-use centers are more sustainable, and more cost sensitive for municipalities delivering services and maintaining infrastructure assets than low-density developments which are more dependent on trips by automobile. Project proposals that demonstrate the project will enable or will provide for a framework for TOD, where people of all ages and incomes have transportation and housing choices, can live, work, and play, can walk, bike and use transit are eligible for these points (up to 5).

15. Links jobs and housing by trips other than by automobile

The combined costs of balancing housing and transportation related to commuting to jobs, schools and shopping comprises the majority of most household budgets. By removing barriers to transportation options other than just automobiles, and providing transportation choices and enabling walkable, transit-connected neighborhoods, these costs can be reduced. Proposals that demonstrate that the project would facilitate more non-automobile trips between employment centers and residential areas through capital improvements are eligible for these points (up to 5).

16. Increases Resilience to Climate-related events and/or provides “Green” infrastructure to reduce storm water.

Extreme weather events and a changing climate are certain to add to the transportation infrastructure needs in the near future. Many roadways and bridges will require modernization that will allow infrastructure to withstand climate related impacts such as sea level rise, storm surge, and other storm related events – resilient infrastructure that can survive these events. Proposals that demonstrate the improvements will reduce impacts from climate related events, such as flooding, erosion, storm surge, sea level rise etc. are eligible for points. Proposals that demonstrate that the proposed infrastructure facilities will function in such conditions, or may reduce run-off or treat it organically, and/or reduce the need for engineered storm water facilities are also eligible for points (Up to 5).
F. Collector Preservation Paving Set Aside

The new PACTS Spending Targets are 65% for Preservation (40% for Collector paving and 25% for other preservation work), 20% for Modernization and 15% for Expansion. The project selection process for the minimum 40% of the MPO Allocation ($5,463,049) for 2020 and 2021 for basic collector preservation paving will happen as follows:

1. Our municipalities will propose collector preservation paving candidates for their respective municipalities. They will complete a short PACTS application form for each candidate.

2. Staff will score applications using a Technical Committee scoring system to be revised during the fall of 2016. We expect to continue to use the pavement condition ratings (PCR) in our regional Collector Road Assessment report. We will also do field reviews to verify the PCR values, to review the proposed treatment types and to assess other project needs.

3. Municipalities may propose additional elements to be part of collector preservation projects that cost up to 15% above the cost of the basic preservation paving work. The costs of the additional project elements will be funded from the Collector Preservation Paving Set Aside. Also note that:
   a. The additional elements will not be considered in the Technical Committee’s scoring formula.
   b. If the additional elements trigger the unlikely requirement of a MaineDOT preliminary design report (PDR) then the project with the additional elements must be submitted for scoring under our Preservation/Modernization/Expansion projects process (see Section E above).

4. Municipalities also may propose additional elements to be part of the collector preservation projects that cost more than 15% above the cost of the basic preservation paving work. The costs of the additional project elements will be funded from the most applicable Modernization and/or Expansion Spending Targets. Also note that:
   a. Proposals that have additional elements will be submitted for scoring under our Preservation/Modernization/Expansion projects process.
b. The Collector Preservation Paving elements of the project will be funded from the 40% Collector Paving Set Aside (rather than from the Preservation Spending Target).

c. We expect that these proposals will trigger a MaineDOT preliminary design report (PDR) requirement.

The 2016 Collector Road Assessment Map below provides a regional overview of the current condition of our collector roads. It is based in part on data provided by the municipalities who responded to our requests for input as we developed the map. We welcome more input on it from our members.

What is PACTS Preservation Paving?

“Simple” pavement preservation projects are those projects which consist of primarily paving the existing roadway without a high percentage of ancillary work. The scope would include shimming the existing travel way and shoulder surfaces and paving the entire width with one to one and one half inches of hot mix asphalt. Milling (“mill and fill”) the existing surface to restore cross slope, vertical grades and/or surface deflections is also considered pavement preservation.

Work in addition to the above which is part of the paving scope, such as butt jointing, hand placing pavement at driveways and intersecting streets as well as re-graveling the shoulders and/or minor loaming and seeding would also be included. Some ADA work (level to be determined) can be considered. ADA is the federal American with Disabilities Act.

Replacing guard rails, substantial drainage, relocating poles and substantial ADA or sidewalk work are not considered under “simple” pavement preservation.
G. Preliminary Design Reports

In 2016 MaineDOT began to require that we program our complicated projects in two phases: (1) program the preliminary design work of a project in one year, and then (2) program construction funds after the Preliminary Design Report (PDR) is done. This will require numerous changes to our project selection system.

Once a PDR – which produces a 50% to 60% design for a project – is far enough into design to address budget, schedule and public involvement concerns, MaineDOT will enable the allocation of construction funds for complex projects. Since it typically takes a year or more from a PDR to project advertising, no projects will sit idle under this new policy. In fact, this is the same policy MaineDOT utilizes and has generally exceeded a 90% goal for projects maintaining schedule.

This new MaineDOT/PACTS approach could produce more PDRs than PACTS can implement given our annual allocations. Consequently we will work closely with MaineDOT to find ways to fund some of the projects with money beyond our MPO Allocation – particularly ones with statewide, regional and data driven safety improvements.

MaineDOT staff refers to “establishing a conveyer belt” and shovel ready projects should the Holding WIN balance become large. Initially we are funding more PDRs than we have construction funding for but in two or three years we will manage our project portfolio by only adding new projects for design commensurate with the amount of projects funded for construction. MaineDOT will provide recommendations for how many new PDRs should be added in a given year based on our decisions to fund projects for construction.

A PACTS decision to program funds to develop a PDR is a commitment to fund construction of the project at some point in the future provided that the PDR:

- Does not require a substantive change in the project,
- Does not discover issues that either substantively increase the cost of the project, or
- Does not determine that the project is not feasible for technical reasons or because of strong public resistance.

Does a municipality have to pay back the FHWA funds expended during the PDR phase if the project is not constructed? While this is possible and has happened in the past, MaineDOT staff advises that this is very unlikely in the future given that FHWA has a track record of accepting reasonable explanations from MaineDOT regarding why a federally-funded project should not proceed to the construction phase. MaineDOT also notes that FHWA has been amendable to several Maine projects that have needed to be delayed and revised over a ten-year period before construction has eventually been done.
In July 2016 in response to this new PDR-programming requirement, we programmed funding for five PDRs with the understanding that we will program construction funding in July 2017 or July 2018 depending on when the PDRs are completed. For more information on this please review the following two pages:

- MaineDOT’s Preliminary Design Reports Policy (presented at our January 2016 Policy Committee meeting). Preliminary engineering, called PE, is the actual capital project design process.
- The “Best Case Schedule” table regarding PDRs funded in July 2016.
- The subsequent flow chart regarding project development schedule scenarios for PDRs funded in June 2017.

How many new PDR’s should we fund in July 2017? How will we decide? We will decide next spring based on the number and estimated construction costs of the proposed new PDR’s at that time. We also might “front load” more collector preservation paving projects again. MaineDOT has agreed to advise us based on practices that the state has used over the past decade to achieve a 90% plus deliverability rate.

What status do the PDR’s funded by PACTS in July 2016 have once they have been completed? With the condition that MaineDOT has approved the completed PDR (or says in writing that they have enough confidence in a draft PDR), the answers are:

1. If a “2016” PDR is completed by May 1, 2017 then it will have a higher priority for construction funding in July 2017 than a new application for construction funds submitted in February 2017.

2. If a “2016” PDR is not completed until after May 1, 2017 it will not be eligible for 2020 construction funding to be programmed in July 2017.

3. A “2016” PDR completed after May 1, 2017 will be eligible for 2021 construction funding to be programmed in July 2018. This is based on the assumption that in July 2017 we will reserve some 2021 funding for programming in July 2018. Note that it would also be eligible for Holding WIN funding after July 2017 in the event that there is Holding WIN funding available to re-program.

How would we fund a project that is bigger than we have ever funded, such as a $6,000,000 project? MaineDOT has agreed to work with us to creatively address these larger projects based on particularities of a given scope of work. Solutions could involve some sort of borrowing from our future MPO Allocations. MaineDOT would be willing to work with us to structure something, as they have done with other MPO’s.
MaineDOT Capital Program PDR Policy (shared at the January 2016 Policy Committee meeting)

With the exception of simple paving projects, projects won’t be eligible for construction funding until a Preliminary Design Report (PDR) is completed.

- PDR’s provide reliable information on scope, schedule and cost
- Due to time between PDR completion and project advertising, this policy should not delay projects.

There will be at least one Work Plan between when a PDR is complete and project advertising.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOT Schedule Templates</th>
<th>Work Plan to WIN Authorization</th>
<th>Kickoff to PDR</th>
<th>PDR to Advertise</th>
<th>Work Plan to Advertise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Reconstruction</td>
<td>4-12 months</td>
<td>12-15 months</td>
<td>15-20 months</td>
<td>31-47 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection w/ ROW</td>
<td>4-12 months</td>
<td>4-8 months</td>
<td>9-13 months</td>
<td>17-33 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike/Ped w/ROW</td>
<td>4-12 months</td>
<td>3-7 months</td>
<td>8-12 months</td>
<td>15-31 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3-Year Work Plan and Project Schedules
- For MPO Work Plan purposes, there is no Calendar Year 1, 2 or 3 specific money.
  - As soon as a WIN is authorized PE begins
  - MaineDOT Project Development Staff are responsible for setting a project’s schedule
- When construction funding is added to a project with a PDR, it could advertise in year 1 or year 2 of the next Work Plan

Goal is to get money into economy as soon as possible versus sitting in construction/CE or Holding WINs. MPOs should strive to have 150-200% of construction value of complicated projects under PE that an MPO would anticipate to fund in a Work Plan. For instance, if an MPO’s goal is to fund $1 million in complicated projects every year, that MPO should have $1.5-$2 million worth of projects under PE.

Benefits
1) MaineDOT utilizes this process almost exclusively
   i. 90%+ Projects on Time
   ii. No major scope changes after construction commitment
   iii. Limited significant $$$ changes after construction commitment, primarily associated with factors outside MaineDOT control (completion, asphalt prices, etc.)
2) Funding for many projects currently tied up for 2-5 years in construction/construction engineering status that could otherwise be in the economy
3) MaineDOT will consider exceptions where it makes sense
4) MaineDOT will assist in transition
5) Increased certainty will promote more efficient use of staff time
   i. Fewer TIP amendments, Holding WIN Transfers etc.
   ii. Less risk of losing federal participation.
### Best Case Schedule
For Development of PACTS Projects
Programmed in July 2016 for Preliminary Design Reports (PDRs)

See flow chart below for PDR projects to be programmed in July 2017.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Project Cost Estimate</th>
<th>PACTS Budget to do PDR</th>
<th>PACTS programs construction funds in July 2017 **</th>
<th>MaineDOT advertizes for construction in July 2018 **</th>
<th>MaineDOT advertizes for construction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>Signal improvements for Congress Street from Myrtle to State</td>
<td>$525,000</td>
<td>$83,750</td>
<td>$441,250</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$441,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So. Portland</td>
<td>Broadway at Evans St. and at Lincoln St.</td>
<td>$275,000</td>
<td>$46,250</td>
<td>$228,750</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$228,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>Washington Ave reconstruction and signal improvements at Congress St and Cumberland Ave</td>
<td>$1,104,000</td>
<td>$175,600</td>
<td>$928,400</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$928,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So. Portland</td>
<td>Main Street Multi-Use Path Extension through Cash Corner</td>
<td>$346,875</td>
<td>$57,031</td>
<td>$289,844</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$289,844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windham</td>
<td>Boody’s Corner Area Ped Facility Improvements</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*If PDR is done by May 1, 2017*

### Schedule Scenarios for Development of PACTS-Funded PDR Projects Programmed in July 2017

- **Feb 2017 Applications for 2020 and 2021**
- **July 2017 PACTS funds PDR for 2020 $**
  (for MaineDOT 2018-2020 Work Plan)
- **PDR done by May 1, 2018?**
- **July 2018 PACTS programs for construction**
- **PDR done between May 2018 and May 2019?**
- **July 2019 PACTS programs for construction**
- **2019 MaineDOT Advertises Project for construction**
- **2020 MaineDOT Advertises Project for construction**

*Will need Three-Party Agreements done ASAP so that MaineDOT can do survey work in 2017.*
H. Project Contingency and Project Cap Policy

PACTS MPO Allocation projects have a 10% contingency added to the project’s construction cost estimate at the time of construction programming by the Executive Committee. The “110%” amount is the upper limit on what PACTS will contribute to a PACTS-funded project – with any expenses above that limit to be covered by the municipality. This policy does not apply to the amount that we program for PDR.

As in the past, this policy does not apply to our FTA-funded capital projects or to our single-mode transit projects funded with FHWA funds.

In November 2014 and July 2015 (prior to the 2016 PDR programming policy) the Policy Committee confirmed the Cap Policy, removed some related stipulations, and confirmed that any requests for exceptions to the Cap Policy be acted on by the Policy Committee.

I. Biennial Selection Schedule

In 2017 we will program PDR and construction projects for both our 2020 and 2021 MPO Allocation funds. This approach is designed to:

- work with MaineDOT’s 3-year Work Plan,
- enable our members to budget for PACTS capital improvements further into the future than if we programmed just one year at a time, and
- enable PACTS to fund larger projects than we could budget for using an annual budgeting process.

The two-year process will work as follows:

- July 2017 – The Executive Committee will adopt a final draft projects list for the use of 2020 and 2021 MPO Allocation funding in preparation for submittal of only 2020 projects to MaineDOT for inclusion in MaineDOT’s 2018-2020 Work Plan. The list will include top-ranked projects for which PDR’s have been completed, as well as new candidates (for construction and/or for PDR’s) proposed in February 2017. The Policy Committee will ratify the Executive Committee’s list later in July.

- July 2018 – The Executive and Policy Committees will finalize a 2021 list for MaineDOT similar to the one submitted to MaineDOT in July 2017.

- February to July 2019 – We will select 2022 and 2023 projects and then repeat the steps shown above.

J. Enhanced Project Scoping

In 2005, PACTS initiated our Enhanced Project Scoping (EPS) process in order to refine the scopes and cost estimates of most proposals submitted by our municipalities. EPS identifies
issues within a proposal that are likely to substantially impact either the cost of, or time to
deliver, a project. In contrast, a subsequent preliminary design report (PDR) is much more
detailed. *We do not do EPS for simple collector paving projects.*

We will continue to do EPS work even though the subsequent PDR work will give us a much better cost estimate before we program construction funding. We will do so because for a relatively small effort we get a second opinion and thereby significantly reduce the risk of encountering major project cost estimate increases during PDR development. This is important because a decision to fund PDR work is a commitment to program construction funding later (as described in the Preliminary Design Report section above).

EPS reports are developed after the Executive Committee’s decision on the “short list” of project candidates and before the final decision on which projects to submit to the MaineDOT for inclusion in the MaineDOT Work Plan. EPS includes a public outreach component if necessary.

An EPS report must be completed for all “short listed” project proposals, except collector paving, that meet any of the conditions listed below:

1. Project will or might require right-of-way (ROW) acquisition.
2. Project will or might involve environmental issues beyond PBR (permit by rule).
3. Project will or might involve 4F (public parks and places) or § 106 (places of historic interest) issues.
4. Project will substantially impact existing utilities (above or below ground).
5. Project will or might involve substantial drainage issues.
6. Project will or might impact a railroad infrastructure.
7. Project has the potential to generate substantial public interest or opposition.

PACTS retains the services of an engineering consultant to perform the EPS work and to write a report. Municipalities may be asked to submit additional information or to clarify aspects of the submitted proposal. Municipalities pay the local share for the cost of the consultant’s EPS work.

MaineDOT may provide assistance in the following areas of the EPS process:

- Technical input and review of geotechnical analyses;
- Estimation of right-of-way costs;
- Respond to PACTS or community requests for MaineDOT feedback on the likelihood or even preliminary approval of a design exception.
- Respond to PACTS or community requests for MaineDOT feedback on the feasibility that a project could be locally administered.
K. Roles of PACTS Committees

This section outlines the project policy and procedure roles of the PACTS Committees.

Committee Structure

Policy Committee

Executive Committee

Technical Planning Transit

Policy Committee

- Adopt this document.
- Serve as the final authority on interpretation of these policies and procedures.
- Ratify the Executive Committee’s endorsement of the Transit Committee’s annual FTA funding allocation recommendations for the PACTS federal urbanized area.
- Act on requests for exceptions to the Project Cap Policy.
- Ratify the Executive Committee’s final draft MPO Allocation list of projects.
- Endorse the final PACTS Transportation Improvement Program document every winter for submission to the FHWA and FTA.

Executive Committee

- Develop the biennial and annual lists of MPO Allocation projects, and the annual list of PACTS Municipal Partnership Initiative projects, and submit them to the Policy Committee for ratification.
- Endorse the Transit Committee’s annual FTA funding allocation recommendations for the PACTS federal urbanized area, and submit them to the Policy Committee for ratification.
- Send the draft final PACTS Transportation Improvement Program document every winter to the Policy Committee for endorsement.
- Make project amendments for all federally funded projects in the PACTS Transportation Improvement Program.
- Respond to Policy Committee challenges to Executive Committee budget decisions.
Transit Committee

- Update and amend the PACTS Six Year Transit Capital and Operating Plan.
- Develop annual FTA funding allocation recommendations for the PACTS federal urbanized area, and submit them to the Executive Committee for endorsement.
- Develop project amendments for all FTA-funded projects in the PACTS Transportation Improvement Program as needed, and submit them to the Executive Committee for endorsement.
- Review staff’s scores for all proposals received for use of MPO Allocation funds.
- Assign ten “transit subregional points” to a MPO Allocation proposal(s) submitted by the Transit Committee.
- Work together to implement the recommendations of the Destination 2040 regional plan and the 2007 Regional Transit Coordination Study which outline a path to creating a more seamless, efficient, customer-oriented system that serves and facilitates growing ridership.
- Make other project decisions described below in Section IV: Federal Transit Administration Funding.

Plan Implementation Committee

Every two years the Policy Committee convenes a “Plan Implementation Committee” to review PACTS’ current long-range transportation plan recommendations and strategies as relates to the policies and procedures for programming capital projects as described in this document. The members represent all of the standing PACTS committees and additional participation from MaineDOT. Staff and the Committee members report regularly to those other committees during the process in order to keep all parties aware of the work underway and to seek input.
Technical and Planning Committees

- In the spring of 2017, the two committees will review staff’s scores of applications (see simple collectors process below), and will submit a “short list” recommendation to the Executive Committee of project proposals that will undergo Enhanced Project Scoping. In June 2017 they will make final recommendations to the Executive Committee on proposals that have had EPS reports completed.

- In the spring of 2017, the Technical Committee will also review the scores given to the simple collector paving candidates and recommend to the Executive Committee a list of projects to be funded for construction.

L. Roles of Municipal Officers and Transit Systems Boards

In 2014 we reduced the number of times that a Council has to act regarding PACTS projects by dropping the requirement that they endorse all TIP proposals before they are submitted to PACTS. Instead Councils must endorse all “finalist” project candidates – all enhanced project scoping candidates and all finalist collector preservation paving candidates – before approval for programming by the Executive Committee in July each year. This policy also applies to transit system boards. PACTS staff will send the lists of finalist candidates to each municipality and transit system board in late April.

M. Public Involvement

PACTS encourages the general public to identify problems, to propose possible solutions, and to be involved in municipal decision-making processes during the development of projects to be funded via PACTS and MaineDOT.

The PACTS public involvement process for
TIP project priority setting is a combination of contacts with member organizations and the general public, as outlined below.

- All feasibility studies funded by PACTS (which often produce funding proposals for specific projects from MaineDOT and/or PACTS) include a public outreach component. Together, these feasibility studies and project scoping efforts are designed to provide meaningful opportunities for public involvement in regional transportation planning and funding.
- We maintain at all times an up-to-date TIP section on our website, www.pactsplan.org. The site includes a copy of the PACTS Public Participation Plan and a copy of the current PACTS Title VI Plan.
- We advise our Interested Parties list participants via email and post a notice on our website at the beginning of the biennial process to review/revise this document.
- At the beginning of the project selection process every two years we send an email to our municipal, state, transit, other regional organizations (and to our Interested Parties email list participants) advising of the deadlines for submitting MPO Allocation proposals.
- As described above, we ask that city/town councils, municipal officers and transit system boards submit written endorsements of all finalist candidates. We advise our Interested Parties list participants via email and post a notice on our website every year in order to take public comment on the draft PACTS Transportation Improvement Program.

For our project selection process in 2017 we will also make these additional efforts:

- Fall of 2016 – Distribute a news release announcing the TIP process including the opportunity for citizens to submit transportation project requests directly to their municipality. Copies of this release will be posted on the PACTS web site. We will ask that member communities also post it on their websites.
- Fall of 2016 – Offer to hold public workshops either before or after regular council/selectman meetings advertised to the general public at all member communities. We will suggest doing this on a PACTS subregion basis.
- Winter 2017 – Offer to hold public meetings to present project candidates prior to rating and selection to gather community feedback (with one during the day and the other in the evening to accommodate peoples’ schedules). We will suggest doing this also on a PACTS subregion basis.
- January each year – In addition to posting notices of the new Draft PACTS Transportation Improvement Program on the PACTS website, we will ask member municipalities to post it on theirs as well.
- January each year – Display copies of the new Draft PACTS Transportation Improvement Program at municipal offices, libraries, community centers and other civic locations during the public comment period.
- We also work to implement our Title VI Environmental Justice Plan.
The table below is from the PACTS Public Involvement Plan. It presents the public comment periods and notification processes for each of the PACTS policy, plan and program areas for which public input is sought via public notice. In all cases, the public comment periods in the table are the \textit{minimum} that PACTS will use. In situations when additional time or another extra effort at public outreach is necessary, then PACTS staff and committees will undertake an extra effort.

For more information on the PACTS public involvement process, contact staff or visit our website at \url{www.pactsplan.org}. 
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### PACTS Public Input Periods and Notification Processes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Public Comment Periods</th>
<th>Notification Processes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Start of Long-Range Plan Update Process</td>
<td>30 days from receipt of notice</td>
<td>Email to Interested Parties, post on website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft Long-Range Plan Update</td>
<td>30 days from receipt of notice</td>
<td>Email to Interested Parties, post on website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft Update of Public Involvement Plan</td>
<td>45 days from receipt of notice</td>
<td>Email to Interested Parties, and post on website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solicit public input into development of Unified Planning Work Program early in every odd-numbered year</td>
<td>30 days from receipt of notice</td>
<td>Email to Interested Parties, and post on website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start of PACTS biennial review of PACTS process for development and administration of Transportation Improvement Program projects</td>
<td>30 days from receipt of notice</td>
<td>Email to Interested Parties, and post on website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft PACTS Transportation Improvement Program every odd-numbered year</td>
<td>30 days from receipt of notice</td>
<td>Email to Interested Parties, and post on website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed TIP amendments</td>
<td>10 days</td>
<td>Post on website</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### N. PACTS Municipal Partnership Initiative

This program is designed to fund collector or arterial roadway projects and to focus on bringing our substandard roads up to PACTS and MaineDOT’s minimum standard for meeting PACTS and MaineDOT’s pavement preservation programs, thus increasing the number of miles of preservation paving candidates. The program builds on MaineDOT’s successful Municipal Partnership Initiative (MPI).

PACTS uses our annual $640,201 in MaineDOT state money, matched with local funds for road reconstruction or rehabilitation projects – and preservation paving projects if there is enough funding available.

The minimum local match for the state funds is 50% of the project cost, so if fully utilized the PACTS initiative would be a minimum $1,280,402 program every year. We use these funding parameters:
Minimum state funding per project: $75,000  
Maximum state funding per project: $200,000  
Minimum municipal match: 50% (no maximum)

Every February, we solicit municipal proposals to be built the next calendar year. We program the selected projects at the July Policy Committee meeting.

If the total requests are less than the available state funds, then we will automatically award the funding to all the requests. In the event that the total dollars requested exceed the available state funds then we will follow these steps:

1. Staff scores the applications during the spring each year
2. Technical Committee recommends projects to the Executive Committee.
3. Executive Committee adopts a list of projects in July, and sends the list to the Policy Committee for ratification.

Under both scenarios above, MaineDOT includes the PACTS MPI projects in the next version of MaineDOT’s Work Plan. The municipality is allowed to start construction of their project as soon as the agreement with MaineDOT is signed.

If we select the projects on a competitive basis the proposals will be reviewed and considered for funding based on the following criteria:

1. Collector and/or arterial rankings, such as PCR values, transit routes, traffic volumes, etc. as indicated in the most recent applicable road assessment report and only for those roads, or road segments, that need reconstruction or rehabilitation.

2. The town’s ability to quickly scope, develop, contract and complete the project.

3. Strictly pavement preservation projects will be a lower priority.

4. Extra points will be given for municipal match higher than the minimum 50% required. However, in order to avoid using this PACTS MPI program simply as supplemental funding for “large” projects, no extra points will be given for projects whose total costs exceed $800,000.

5. Points will be awarded for corridor/project improvements that are considered over and above the minimum road standards, such as inclusion of new or improved sidewalks, granite curb vs. bituminous curb, additional shoulder width for bike lanes, intersection improvements, etc.
III. PACTS Project Management Policies

A. Project Monitoring

PACTS staff is in regular contact with MaineDOT and uses the monthly MaineDOT Project Status Updates to monitor the development of funded projects. Staff forwards the reports to Technical Committee members on a monthly basis.

B. Project Amendments

PACTS submits a Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) annually to the FHWA and FTA, and periodically amends it after consideration of proposals from our municipalities, from our transit providers and from MaineDOT for changes such as:

- The addition of a new project,
- The removal of a project,
- An increase in a project’s programmed amount within federal guidance,
- A major change in the scope of a project, including a significant change in project termini, and
- Other requests for concurrence from MaineDOT.

August 2016: PACTS and GPCOG staff are currently working with MaineDOT to develop ways to reduce the frequency of asking the PACTS Executive Committee to make TIP amendments. We are also working to clarify the distinction between amendments and administrative modifications. This is more an administrative topic than a policy one. However, there might end up being a PACTS policy level decision needed if, for instance, we end up proposing that PACTS staff have more authority than we currently have. No matter what recommendations we develop on this subject staff will work with the appropriate PACTS committees to develop agreement on changes to be made.

The table on the next page is from a 4-page memorandum signed by the MaineDOT Commissioner and the FHWA Regional Administrator. It gets more involved when we look at the FTA amendment rules.
II. STIP Revision Thresholds

The procedure for formally revising the STIP varies depending on the nature of the proposed change to the STIP document. As described in 23 CFR §450, there are two types of revisions to an approved STIP besides information only ones:

- An Amendment; or
- An Administrative Modification

The degree of state action and federal approval varies considerably based on revision type. As agreed upon by the FHWA and MaineDOT, the following thresholds distinguish whether an amendment or administrative modification is necessary when revising the STIP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amendment Thresholds:</th>
<th>Administrative Modification Thresholds:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Any change to a project in the current STIP/TIP that impacts the regional air quality conformity emissions analysis used for the current conformity determination</td>
<td>A moderate change in the total cost of a project, as defined in Table 1;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adding or removing a Regionally Significant project;</td>
<td>Combining or separating two or more projects that are part of an approved STIP/TIP;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adding or removing a Non-Exempt phase of a project;</td>
<td>Combining or separating phases within a project that are part of an approved STIP/TIP;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adding a new project;</td>
<td>Adding a new phase to an existing PIN that does not have an associated substantial cost, as defined in Table 1;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Removing a project;</td>
<td>Creating a lineage PIN that does not have an associated substantial cost, as defined in Table 1;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adding a phase to a project that has a substantial cost, as defined in Table 1;</td>
<td>Making a minor change in the scope of a project, including an insignificant change in project termini and/or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making a major change in the scope of a project; including, a significant change in project termini and/or</td>
<td>Making a change to the project termini with no change in overall project cost.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adding statewide projects not specific to a particular locale.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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C. **PACTS Holding WIN**

The sources of funds in the PACTS Holding WIN are transfers from all completed projects with unspent balances, transfers from all withdrawn projects, excess funds when bids received are significantly below funded amounts, and any amounts that might be left un-programmed when we program our new annual MPO Allocation funds each July.

MaineDOT makes all Holding WIN transactions in Augusta, and keeps minimum balances of $400,000 in federal funds and $100,000 in state funds in the Holding WIN. MaineDOT sends PACTS staff periodic reports on the balances in the Holding WIN, and PACTS staff also periodically reviews the activities in the Holding WIN via remote access to MaineDOT’s Projex database.

During the past several years we re-programmed a considerable amount of money which had been transferred into the Holding WIN. After much discussion in 2014 of alternative re-programming policies, the Policy Committee endorsed the Executive Committee’s recommendation that we approach each periodic round of Holding WIN re-programming with flexible consideration of many options. In general order of priority, these options include:

1. Accelerate the schedule of an already-PACTS-funded construction project by funding it with Holding WIN funds which by definition are available to be used sooner. This would be done only with the consent of the affected town/entity (and there would be no penalty if the town/entity does not consent to the accelerated schedule).

2. A project whose PACTS-funded PDR was completed since the most recent July annual Policy Committee programming action.

3. Other projects proposed by our members or by PACTS staff.

Per our Project Cap Policy described earlier, these options do not include adding funds to an already funded project that needs additional funding. However, members may request an exception to our Project Cap Policy from the Policy Committee for this purpose.

D. **Unspent Project Funds and Project Withdrawals**

Unspent MPO Allocation project funds are transferred into the Holding WIN for reprogramming by the Executive Committee. This includes when changes in local priorities or other factors create a need to withdraw a funded project.

Note that MaineDOT requires that the municipality reimburse all federal funds expended as of the withdrawal date, depending on the project withdrawal circumstances. However, as noted earlier, while this has happened in the past MaineDOT staff advises that this is very unlikely in the future given that FHWA has a track record of accepting reasonable explanations from MaineDOT regarding why a federally-funded project should not proceed to the construction phase. MaineDOT also notes that FHWA has been amendable to several Maine projects that
have needed to be delayed and revised over a ten-year period before construction has eventually been done.

IV. Federal Transit Administration Funding

The PACTS Transit Committee is responsible for allocating the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) funds that come to the PACTS region. Over the last four years the PACTS Transit Committee has successfully “split” up these funds in a way which meets the many FTA requirements and addresses the collective priorities of the region’s transit providers. As noted above our Policy and Executive Committees endorse the Transit Committee’s recommendations by programming the FTA funds in the PACTS Transportation Improvement Program.

During the past four years the amount of FTA funding received in our region on a formula basis has increased substantially while Congressional earmarks have disappeared. The formula funding is vital to our region’s transit providers after decades of relying on Congressional earmarks for all major capital investments. In federal fiscal year 2016 our region received $10,028,308 in FTA Section 5307 Urbanized Area Formula funding which is available to all transit providers in our region, and $7,816,835 in Section 5337 State of Good Repair fixed guideway funding which is only available to CBITD and NNEPRA.

With the assistance of GPCOG staff, the Transit Committee has developed and periodically updates a Six Year Capital and Operating Plan, which outlines their anticipated capital, operating, ADA-paratransit and planning expenses for the next six years. Each agency has included specific items under specific years, but broadly these include:

- Facility Capital Maintenance/Improvement
- Replacement Vehicle Purchasing, and Existing Vehicle Rehabilitation
- Two Replacement Ferry Boats (FFY2016 and FFY2021)
- Railroad Tie Replacement/Right of Way
- Facility and Vehicle Preventive Maintenance
- Safety & Security, and Technology Updates
- Operating Assistance
- ADA Complementary Paratransit
- Agency-specific Transit Planning Projects

A fundamental principle in the Six Year Capital and Operating Plan is to maintain the basic needs for all agencies to keep their services operating at the current “status quo”. For instance, in federal fiscal year 2016 the transit providers assigned approximately 80% of Section 5307 funds to transit service capital needs, 17% for operating assistance, 1% for ADA complementary paratransit services, and 2% for agency-specific transit planning. Any remaining Section 5307 balance is made available for eligible new projects and unforeseen exigencies under our Regionally Administered Discretionary (RAD) Program. The Transit Committee developed an
Expansion/Enhancement Policy and Application Process for selecting new RAD Program projects and determining other eligible uses as agreed upon by the Transit Committee that best serve the region. Under this policy, any new service, regardless of funding source, must meet certain criteria to be eligible for funding support.

It is an FTA requirement that all Section 5307 transit planning grants be included in the approved PACTS UPWP. For planning grants allocated as part of the Six Year Capital and Operating Plan update or RAD process, a UPWP amendment will be approved concurrently with the required TIP amendment. This applies to both regional and agency-specific planning grants.

Contact GPCOG or PACTS staff with questions about this funding allocation process.
V. Coordination with MaineDOT and the Maine Turnpike Authority

The MaineDOT and the Maine Turnpike Authority plan, build and operate major transportation facilities and services in Greater Portland, and are active partners in the regional planning and coordination of PACTS. MaineDOT and the Maine Turnpike Authority work together with us to strategically anticipate the needs of the region.

As the primary implementing agency for projects programmed via PACTS, MaineDOT plays a key role in advising PACTS committee members and staff. The next few pages outline some key MaineDOT programs and some key federal transportation programs and requirements.

There are many steps in the PACTS programming process for which MaineDOT participation and approval are needed. However, while MaineDOT welcomes this opportunity, they request that all requests for information – until when MaineDOT assigns a work identification number (WIN) – go through PACTS staff to MaineDOT Bureau of Planning staff who will coordinate with appropriate MaineDOT personnel.

As noted earlier in this document, MaineDOT will provide preliminary lists of potential state-sponsored projects to PACTS early in the project selection process for the purpose of coordinating with the PACTS region’s planning and programming work. In the fall of 2017, PACTS staff participate in a meeting with Senior MaineDOT Planning, Project Development, Environment and Maintenance and Operations staff to review all projects proposed for the upcoming Work Plan in order to identify risks or synergies with project overlaps or projects within proximity to one another (this is an annual meeting, so will happen again in the fall of 2018). We will suggest that MaineDOT do presentations to a PACTS committee each spring and fall about projects they are definitely going to do and others that they might do.

A. Maine Turnpike Authority (MTA)

In 2010 and 2011, MTA staff led Phase I of the Gorham East West Corridor Study. Since then, MaineDOT and MTA executives collaborated on both the scope of the Phase II effort as well as the funding partnership for the Phase II study. In 2015, PACTS and municipal staff from Gorham, Portland, Scarborough, South Portland, Standish and Westbrook completed an inter-municipal transit-supportive land use planning study in the Gorham east-west corridor.

The MTA has been a source of significant capital improvements in our region for decades on and off the highway itself – from Major Bridge Rehabilitation and Interchange improvements such as Exit 48 to including financial contributions to the Go Maine program, the ShuttleBus service and the Eastern Trail. The MTA will continue to invest in the Turnpike for years to come and will also continue to
play a role with MTA approved MaineDOT projects in the turnpike corridor based on the requirement by LD 1538 in 2011 that the MTA allocate funds for MaineDOT projects in an amount such that the 3-year rolling average of the allocation equals at least 5% of MTA annual operating revenues.

B. **Arterial Paving**

MaineDOT uses other FHWA funds to pay for the preservation paving of arterials in the PACTS Funding Area. (This is not “maintenance” paving.) MaineDOT advises PACTS and member municipalities as early as possible each year regarding MaineDOT’s intent to “preservation pave” arterials in our region. This enables us to coordinate related projects.

C. **Other Federal and State Funds**

MaineDOT solicits proposals annually from municipalities, public transportation providers and state agencies for the use of federal and state transportation funds in the PACTS urbanized area in addition to the MPO Allocation funds. All PACTS member organizations may apply directly to MaineDOT for funding anywhere in their jurisdictions under the following programs:

- Hazard Elimination Program
- Rail Highway Crossing Program
- Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Program (See Section E below)
- Transportation Alternatives Program (PACTS staff notes that the FHWA policy is that PACTS be more involved than we are in the selection of projects in our region under this program. We are looking into this with MaineDOT.)
- Industrial Rail Access Program
- Small Harbor Improvement Program
- Boating Infrastructure Grant Program
- Certain eligible passenger and freight transportation improvements listed in MaineDOT’s Project Solicitation Application.
- Safe Routes to School Program
- Multi-modal Transportation Fund

In July 2016 we programmed $100,000 in PACTS MPO Allocation funds to develop solutions for High Crash Locations in our region. This is the first time that we have programmed capital funds to develop solutions strictly for safety issues. We will seek federal Hazard Elimination Program funding from MaineDOT to implement the recommended solutions.

In addition, MaineDOT makes improvements to bridges throughout the state and to the interstate highway system (apart from the turnpike). Here is an artist’s rendering of the Veterans Bridge that opened in 2012 in Portland and South Portland.
As noted above, MaineDOT began in 2016 to encourage PACTS and our municipalities to approach MaineDOT with requests to supplement the funding of PACTS MPO Allocation projects. The requests should be for “sound, deliverable projects with regional, statewide or safety benefits”. MaineDOT has referenced their 2016 partnership with Falmouth on a Route 100 project as a good example. Given MaineDOT’s encouragement that we produce more PDRs than PACTS can implement given our annual allocations, we will work closely with MaineDOT to find ways to fund some of our projects with money above and beyond our MPO Allocation. *Note that MaineDOT will look first to the balance in our Holding WIN, so we need to re-program any available funds in that account as soon as we can – which we always try to do.*

Also, members may wish to know about the “Section 1821” and “703-B” partnership legislation described in the 2008 PACTS report entitled *Leveraging Increased Funding Through Transportation Investment Partnerships.* The report describes 17 federal, state and local mechanisms for funding transportation projects.

See below also for an overview of MaineDOT’s Municipal and Business Partnership Initiatives.

**D. Congestion Mitigation Air Quality Program**

For the past 20 years, the MaineDOT has used a major portion of the federal Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Program (CMAQ) funding available to Maine – an average $8,000,000 annually – for capital improvements and operating assistance for passenger rail and bus service. The PACTS Policy Committee has supported these decisions through our Transportation Improvement Program endorsements.
MaineDOT does not currently have an application process or scoring process, per se, for CMAQ funds. In a general sense, projects are scored and evaluated through the department’s various program categories (e.g., Highway, Bridge, Multimodal, by mode) based on (Highway Corridor) Priority and Customer Service Levels (CSL) – Safety, Condition and Service – Service being most closely aligned with CMAQ). Once projects are proposed for the Work Plan, they are subsequently matched with appropriate, available funding-source eligibilities (e.g., CMAQ) in order to deliver the projects efficiently.

At one time, the ‘Air Conformity Working Group,’ including PACTS and the other MPOs, was asked both to submit candidates for consideration and also to score a wider variety of project candidates eligible for CMAQ funding. After one or two Work Plan cycles, interest in this process waned because of the effort required. Interestingly, however, MaineDOT had consistently funded the majority of the group’s top projects. MaineDOT would be willing to discuss reviving an advisory panel approach, but ultimately, allocation of these funds is a department decision. MaineDOT would also be willing to discuss proposals for CMAQ funding from PACTS or any of our member organizations.

Through three administrations and three MaineDOT Commissioners, a large portion of CMAQ funding has funded operations of the Downeaster, since other federal funding sources could not be used for that need. Congress specifically extended the eligibility of Downeaster operations for CMAQ funds indefinitely. CMAQ funds have also been used to fund operations for transit start-ups, (e.g. the Mountain Explorer, Shoreline Explorer, Brunswick Explorer and others), GO Maine, park-and-rides, and intersection-improvement projects, based on VMT and VHT reduction. There is no shortage of eligible needs.

E. Project Status Updates

MaineDOT provides PACTS with monthly Project Status Updates listing both the financial and work status of all MPO Allocation projects. PACTS staff forwards it to our Technical Committee members.

F. Non-Participating Projects

A “non-participating” project is a cancelled FHWA-funded project for which the FHWA will not provide federal funding. As noted above, MaineDOT requires that the municipality reimburse all federal funds expended as of the withdrawal date, depending on the project withdrawal circumstances. However, as noted earlier, while this has happened in the past MaineDOT staff advises that this is very unlikely in the future given that FHWA has a track record of accepting reasonable explanations from MaineDOT regarding why a federally-funded project should not proceed to the construction phase. MaineDOT also notes that FHWA has been amendable to several Maine projects that have needed to be delayed and revised over a ten-year period before construction has eventually been done.
G. **Three-Party Agreement**

In 2010, the Policy Committee endorsed the addition to our process of a Three-Party Agreement designed to clarify the responsibilities of MaineDOT, PACTS and the affected municipality regarding all non-transit projects funded via our MPO Allocation. MaineDOT initiated this new agreement after several years of MaineDOT and our municipal members asking for more involvement from PACTS staff during the project development and construction phases. This project involvement shift resulted in more PACTS staff monitoring of project funding, project amending, and participation in review and revisions of project scopes. This change was precipitated by many factors within and outside of PACTS, and led to the hiring of PACTS staff to work more on project development activities.

H. **Municipal Projects on State Highways and Streets**

Also in 2010, MaineDOT’s Chief Engineer met with the Policy Committee to discuss standards that municipalities must meet when making capital improvements on collectors and arterials using strictly local funds. He said that MaineDOT appreciates very much the expenditures that municipalities have been making on these roads, and reminded the members that MaineDOT has jurisdiction and responsibility to assure that appropriate capital improvements are made to them. During the spring of 2010 MaineDOT developed a short memorandum of agreement for MaineDOT and municipalities to sign.

Contact Paul Niehoff, PACTS Senior Transportation Planner, for more on this.

I. **MaineDOT Municipal and Business Partnership Initiatives**

MaineDOT’s successful Municipal Partnership Initiative is a demand response program in which MaineDOT rapidly reacts to municipal requests, such as responding to changing local transportation needs on State and State-Aid highways, developing economic opportunities, and safety concerns on or adjacent to these highways. The annual statewide budget for this state-funds program is $6 million which will leverage $6 million in municipal match.

The program promotes partnerships between MaineDOT and municipalities, public utilities, private businesses and other entities by leveraging additional resources on a voluntary basis to match limited state resources and makes improvements to State and State-Aid highways often utilizing...
more flexible project delivery methods when the nature of the highway and project allow.

The MaineDOT’s companion Business Partnership Initiative provides state funding to match private investment in highway improvements performed to facilitate economic development. The annual budget is $2 million in state funds which leverages $4 million in matching funds.

J. Schedules for STIPs and TIPs

The flow charts below show MaineDOT new schedule for the annual development of the PACTS Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) as part of the MaineDOT State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). The three charts show:

- The change from independent TIP documents from each of Maine’s four MPO’s to their TIP documents becoming elements of a single Maine STIP. The objective here is that all federally funded projects in the PACTS region, for instance, will be shown in the MaineDOT STIP document rather than spread throughout the STIP as they currently are.
- The timing of public comment during the development of the STIP and TIP each winter.
- The timing of submittals to FHWA, FTA and EPA (Environmental Protection Agency).
STIP Schedule

1/1/2017 - 1/24/2017
Based on edits and revisions, MaineDOT provides revised TIP Lists to MPO's

1/9/2017 - 1/24/2017
MDO TIP List Review/Edit Period

1/15/2017 - 1/22/2017
MaineDOT Approves TIPs

2/8/2017
MPO TIP List Review/Edit Period

2/23/2017 - 2/13/2017
MaineDOT Drafts STIP

2/19/2017
MPO Public Comment Period

2/26/2017
30 Day Public Comment Period

2/27/2017
Post STIP for Public Comment Period

3/26/2017
FHWA/FTA STIP Approval
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Glossary of Transportation Terms

In 2016, MaineDOT published a 120-page document entitled “Speak MaineDOT” which is an easy-to-read collection of Maine transportation terms.

Here are some terms often used in the PACTS planning and programming process.

**Advance construction** – A Federal Highway Administration financing technique allowing a state to initiate a project without federal funds, while preserving the project’s future eligibility for federal-aid funds. MaineDOT uses advance construction as a cash-flow management tool.

**Air quality conformity** – This process ensures that MPO long-range plans, programs and projects are consistent with federal air quality standards. MPOs that were previously or are currently in non-attainment status with the federal Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 must demonstrate that their areas’ long-range plans, transportation improvement programs and associated projects conform to the state’s plan for meeting clean air standards.

**Air quality maintenance area** – A geographic region previously designated by the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 as non-attainment, then upgraded to probationary attainment status subject to continued compliance with national air quality standards. Two of Maine’s four MPOs – the Portland Area Comprehensive Transportation System (PACTS) and the Kittery Area Comprehensive Transportation Study (KACTS) – are maintenance areas.

**Air quality non-attainment area** – A region that the Environmental Protection Agency has designated as failing to meet national air quality standards. As of 2007, Maine is in attainment.

**Amendment** – A revision to a long-range transportation plan or transportation improvement program that is significant enough to require public review and comment, a new demonstration of fiscal constraint, and/or an air-quality conformity determination. Examples include the addition or deletion of a project; or a substantial change in the cost, design concept, or design scope of a project included in an MPO long-range plan or TIP.

**Apportionment** – The distribution of funds using a formula prescribed by law. Federal transportation funds are apportioned to Maine.

**Authorization Act** – Basic, substantive legislation that establishes or continues federal programs and establishes an upper limit on the amount of funds for the program(s). The current authorization act for surface transportation programs is the Fixing America’s Surface Transportation, or the FAST Act.

**Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990** – This law, which updates the earlier Clean Air Act, specifically ties clean air improvements to receipt of federal transportation funding and imposes requirements on the transportation sector.

**Construction engineering (CE)** – All project engineering work after the start of construction.
Congestion Mitigation Air Quality Program (CMAQ) – The program funds projects in air quality non-attainment and maintenance areas that are calculated to reduce ozone precursors.

Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) – This federal agency implements the provisions of the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 at the federal level.

Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) – The federal agency within the U.S. Department of Transportation that administers the Federal-Aid Highway Program.

Federal Transit Administration (FTA) – A branch of the U.S. Department of Transportation that administers programs and funding affecting mass transit.

Functional classification – The process by which public roads are grouped into classes according to the character of service they are intended to provide. Urban roads fall into four broad categories: principal arterials, minor arterials, urban collectors, and local roads.

Hazard Elimination Program – A federal program that is part of the larger Highway Safety Improvement Program directed to transportation safety improvements. HEP projects are 90 percent federally funded. The program applies to all public highways, including local roads.

Highway improvements – Actions taken to bring an existing highway up to modern standards applicable to the functional class for the road.

Locally administered project (LAP) – Any MaineDOT project in which a municipality administers the design, development and/or construction of the project. Cities and towns administering LAPs must be certified through the MaineDOT LAP Certification Program. The LAP program is a reimbursement program. Each LAP necessitates the execution of a Local Project Agreement detailing the project development requirements expected of the municipality and MaineDOT.

Light Capital paving – A pavement treatment used as a holding action until a more significant treatment can be applied. It consists of a 5/8-inch nominal overlay. Maintenance paving in MPO areas is not eligible for state or federal capital improvement funding.

MaineDOT Work Plan – Released every January, the Work Plan describes all the projects and activities planned by the department for the next three calendar years. The Work Plan includes capital projects and programs, maintenance and operations projects and activities, and all of the administrative functions of the department. You can access it at: http://www.maine.gov/mdot/projects/workplan/

Metropolitan Planning Area (MPA) – The geographic area in which the metropolitan transportation planning process must be carried out. The boundary is determined by agreement between each MPO and the governor. By federal law, it must encompass the existing urbanized area defined by the U.S. Census Bureau, along with the area expected to become urbanized within the 20-year forecast period of an MPO long-range plan.

Metropolitan planning organization (MPO) – A regional policy-making body that is responsible for carrying out the transportation planning process in an urban area with a population of 50,000 or
more. MPOs work with MaineDOT and other partners to develop transportation plans and programs for their regions. Maine has four MPOs:

- Androscoggin Transportation Resource Center (ATRC)
- Bangor Area Comprehensive Transportation System (BACTS)
- Kittery Area Comprehensive Transportation Study (KACTS)
- Portland Area Comprehensive Transportation System (PACTS)

**MPO capital improvement allocation** – MaineDOT every two years sets aside a portion of its Surface Transportation Program and National Highway System funding for each MPO. This allocation is based on a formula established by agreement between MaineDOT and each MPO. MPOs are responsible for identifying, selecting and prioritizing a financially balanced, multi-year program of capital improvement projects using this money. The projects must be consistent with the MPO long-range plan and be included in each MPO’s federally required transportation improvement program.

**MPO project** – A project selected by a metropolitan planning organization (MPO) for inclusion in the MaineDOT two-year work plan and the MPO four-year transportation improvement program.

**National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS)** – Federal standards that set allowable concentrations and exposure limits for various pollutants. These standards ensure that certain pollutants do not exceed specified levels more than once a year. Regions with levels of transportation-related air pollutants that violate the standards are designated as Non-attainment areas.

**National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA)** – A federal law established to ensure that federally funded projects have a minimal impact on the environment, as well as on natural, cultural and economic resources. MaineDOT is obligated to consider all environmental factors under NEPA for all of its federally funded projects. The MaineDOT Bureau of Transportation Systems Planning is responsible for this aspect of project development.

**National Highway System (NHS)** – The NHS is a network of nationally significant highways approved by Congress in the National Highway System Designation Act of 1995. The NHS includes the Interstate System and nearly 114,000 miles of arterial and other roads and connectors to major intermodal terminals.

**Obligation** – The Federal Government’s legal commitment to pay or reimburse states and/or other entities for the federal share of a transportation project’s eligible costs.

**Obligational authority** – The total amount of funds that may be obligated in a year. For the Federal-Aid Highway Program, this consists of the obligation limitation plus amounts for programs exempt from the limitation.

**Obligation limitation** – A cap on the amount of federal funding that may be promised (obligated) during a set period. This is a budgetary control, required by federal law, which does not affect the apportionment or allocation of funds. Rather, it controls the rate at which these funds may be used.

**Pavement structure** – The pavement, gravel base, and sub-base of a roadway.
Preconstruction engineering (PCE) – The term covers all aspects of project engineering before construction.

Preliminary engineering (PE) – Engineering work done prior to advertising a project.

Preliminary Design Report (PDR) – A capital project development report generally done when the project plan is 30% to 50% complete. It includes horizontal and vertical alignments, drainage layout, schedule, right of way impacts and a project budget.

Preservation – Actions taken to preserve the investment in an existing transportation facility. Highway treatments falling under preservation may include repaving and drainage repair.

Reclamation – A highway project that involves pulverizing the existing pavement in place with up to ten inches of the underlying material. The reclaimed material is then graded and compacted for based pavement.

Reconstruction – A type of highway treatment that involves constructing a new pavement structure from the subgrade up, for more than half of the project length.

Rehabilitation – A type of highway treatment that may involve significant improvements to the pavement structure, including a new pavement structure, for up to half the project length.

Subgrade – The material below the “structure” of the road. The structure includes the pavement, the gravel base, and the sub-base.

State Implementation Plan (SIP) – A federally mandated plan that contains procedures to monitor, maintain, and enforce compliance with national air quality standards. Transportation planning in air quality non-attainment and maintenance areas must consider the SIP, which is developed by the Maine Department of Environmental Protection.

Stakeholders – Individuals and organizations involved in or affected by the transportation planning process.

Statewide transportation improvement program (STIP) – A multi-year, intermodal program of federal-aid transportation projects consistent with all other required transportation plans developed within Maine. It lists all projects that MaineDOT intends to undertake with federal transportation funds within a four-year period. The STIP is updated biennially. MPO transportation improvement programs (TIPs) become part of the MaineDOT STIP.

Surface Transportation Program (STP) – A federal funding source for transportation projects associated with a public highway segment not functionally classified as rural minor collector or local road. MPOs are eligible to use these funds within their areas.

Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) – The staged, four-year, intermodal program of prioritized transportation improvement projects. The TIP is an interactive MaineDOT-MPO document that lists all federally funded transportation projects in each MPO area. MPOs include projects they intend to program with their federal allocations, and MaineDOT lists the state-selected projects in each MPO area that will receive federal money. An initiative not listed in the TIP cannot
receive federal transportation funds. MPO TIPs become part of Maine’s overall statewide transportation improvement program.

**Transportation Management Area (TMA)** – An urban area with a population of at least 200,000, as determined by the U.S. Census Bureau and officially designated by the U.S. Department of Transportation. TMA designation typically is requested by the governor and the affected MPO. The Portland Urbanized Area became a TMA in 2012.

**Unified planning work program (UPWP)** – A UPWP addresses how an MPO will spend its allocation of Metropolitan Planning (PL) funds from the FHWA and its transit planning funds from the FTA. It identifies the planning priorities and activities to be carried out within the MPO area in a two-year period.

**Unbuilt road** – A highway that MaineDOT has identified as needing reconstruction or other improvement to meet modern operational and safety standards and adequate structural capacity

**Urban collector** – Collector highways in small urban or federally designated urbanized areas.

**Urbanized area** – A statistical geographic region designated by the U.S. Census Bureau. It consists of a central core and adjacent, densely settled territory that together have a residential population of at least 50,000, generally with an overall population density of at least 1,000 people per square mile. Federal law requires that a metropolitan planning organization (MPO) be designated to carry out the transportation planning process in each official urbanized area.

**Vehicle hours traveled (VHT)** – A calculation that transportation planners use in a variety of ways. VHT is the sum of times traveled by all motor vehicles in a specified region. In MPO areas, VHT is one of several factors that determine each MPO’s share of federal planning and capital improvement funding.

**Vehicle miles traveled (VMT)** – Similar to VHT, VMT is the sum of distances traveled by all motor vehicles in a specified region. In MPO areas, VMT is one of several factors that determine each MPO’s share of federal planning and capital improvement funding.

**Work Identification Number (WIN)** – A primary means of identifying and tracking projects within programs and information systems. MaineDOT assigns a WIN to all projects.
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Introduction

The purpose of this Manual is to serve as a resource for Transit Committee members and all participants in the PACTS transit planning process regarding the policies and procedures of the Transit Committee. This document complements the rules set forth in the PACTS Bylaws.

We begin with an overview of the PACTS committee structure and the roles and responsibilities of the PACTS Transit Committee.

1.1 PACTS Committees Overview

- There are five PACTS standing committees: Policy, Technical, Planning, Transit and Executive. They were each established in 1975, 1975, 1995, 2004 and 2008 respectively.
- See the PACTS bylaws for the functions of each committee.
- The Policy Committee is the MPO according to the Federal Transit and Highway Administrations. PACTS bylaws describe the significant responsibilities that the Policy Committee has delegated to the PACTS Executive Committee.
- All recommendations sent to the Policy Committee go through the Executive Committee.
- The Transit Committee is represented on the Policy, Executive, Technical and Planning Committees.
- The Transit Committee meets periodically in joint session with the Planning Committee in order to discuss topics of mutual interest.
- The Transit Committee is represented on the “TIP Process Committee” which is convened biennially to review and recommend updates to the PACTS TIP Policies and Procedures.
- The five PACTS standing committees are governed by the PACTS bylaws. Those committees follow the current edition of Robert's Rules of Order Newly Revised in their meetings for all matters not covered in the bylaws.

1.1.1 Roles and Responsibilities of the Transit Committee

Excerpted from the PACTS bylaws, below are the Transit Committee’s roles and responsibilities:

1. Advise the Executive Committee on strategic public passenger transit issues, in support of the principles outlined in the long range transportation plan for the region.
2. Develop and recommend to the Policy Committee a set of transit planning and programming policies and procedures for incorporation into the PACTS TIP Policies and Procedures document.
3. Update the PACTS Six Year Transit Capital and Operating Plan and send it to the Executive Committee for adoption.

4. Authorize the FTA-required Split Letters regarding the sub-allocation of FTA formula funds before the transit agencies send the Split Letters to MaineDOT and FTA.

5. Recommend amendments to the PACTS Transportation Improvement Program to the Executive Committee regarding the allocation of FTA formula funds.

6. Select representatives to the Policy Committee, the Technical Committee, the Planning Committee and the Executive Committee. The representatives shall serve for two years, and may serve successive terms.

The Transit Committee is composed of the region’s seven transit agencies, a MaineDOT representative, a Maine Turnpike Authority representative, two appointees appointed by the PACTS Executive Committee, an appointee from the PACTS Planning Committee, and a private transportation seat. Executive Committee appointees are intended to provide the Transit Committee with more broad-based representation from the general public and business community. Current transit agency board members are not eligible for Executive Committee appointment to the Transit Committee.

GPCOG staffs the Transit Committee.

In 2017 the Transit Committee established a Transit Committee Workshop process in order that the work which had been done by the Transit Operations Working Group be done in the future in Transit Committee workshop format in order to satisfy public meeting requirements and to align with the PACTS Bylaws and the structure of other PACTS committees. The new process works as follows:

1. Transit Committee Workshop meetings provide an opportunity for Committee members and staff to address specific topics in greater detail than is typical at full Transit Committee meetings.

2. All members of the Transit Committee are invited (but not expected) to attend Workshop meetings, and the PACTS Transit Committee Interested Parties email list is notified. All meeting packets and background materials are posted to the Transit Committee page of the PACTS website in advance of meetings. These meetings are open to the public, and comments will be accepted during the public comment agenda item. Transit Committee Workshops are held on an as-needed basis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Transit Committee Membership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CBITD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNEPRA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shuttlebus ZOOM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPBS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YCCAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MaineDOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine Turnpike</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exec. Com. Appointee 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exec. Com. Appointee 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. The Transit Committee Workshop is not a decision-making body. Transit Committee Workshop meeting participants may make recommendations relating to specific topics to the full Transit Committee. These recommendations may be advanced by discussion, straw-poll or informal consensus. The Transit Committee Workshop is not empowered to take formal actions or make decisions on behalf of, or in addition to, the full Transit Committee. As such, quorum requirements do not apply to Workshop meetings, and formal meeting minutes are not taken at or adopted by the Workshop. Transit Committee Workshop meetings are not subject to Robert's Rules of Order.

4. The Transit Committee follows a monthly meeting schedule, but meets on an as-needed basis. If a Transit Committee meeting is not needed, a Transit Committee Workshop meeting may held in its place.
### Table 2: Key Responsibilities of the Transit Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Task Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Develop and recommend adoption of the Six Year Capital and Operations Plan by the PACTS Executive Committee. (Note that the subsequent signing of the split letter is not a Transit Committee function, but rather a function of the Designated Recipient transit agencies. Note also that the Policy Committee programs the annual FTA formula funds in the PACTS TIP, and the Executive Committee amends the PACTS TIP throughout the balance of the year.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Develop and amend the Regionally Administered Discretionary (RAD) program. Approve the addition of new RAD projects into the SYCOP as part of the SYCOP update process. (Note that a subsequent TIP amendment by the Executive Committee is needed.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Recommend transit TIP Amendments to be approved by the Executive Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Provide input to staff and the Executive Committee regarding the selection of FHWA-funded PACTS transit applications. This also includes the allocation of the ten &quot;Transit Committee&quot; points.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FTA Capital and Operations Allocations

1. **Recommend transit TIP Amendments** to be approved by the Executive Committee.

### Unified Planning Work Program

1. **Develop recommendations** for FTA-funded planning work for approval by the Executive Committee in the next UPWP.
2. **Review proposals** for transit studies and other projects to be done during the biennium.
3. **Monitor progress** of the UPWP work done by staff and consultants.
4. **Recommend UPWP amendments** to the Executive Committee.
5. **Develop the Regional Transit Development Plan** and support transit agencies to create a more seamless network.
6. **Establish planning project-specific implementation sub-committees** as needed to guide the implementation of specific projects, and empower those subcommittees to make implementation decisions in place of the Transit Committee.

### Other

1. **Provide direction** to staff during implementation of regional capital projects such as the regional bus stops and shelters improvement project.
2. **Provide input** to the development of and recommendations in the PACTS long range regional transportation plan.
3. **Appoint Transit Committee representatives** to the Policy, Executive, Planning and Technical Committees.
4. **Provide input** to the Executive Committee regarding the selection of Executive Committee appointees to the Transit Committee.
5. **Share information** at meetings about federal and state policies and regulations.
Transit Committee Role in Planning and Programming

This section describes the Transit Committee’s role in developing the region’s federally-required planning documents and in programming funds for public transportation.

1.2 PACTS Long Range Transportation Plan

The federal MPO regulations require that PACTS adopt a long range regional transportation plan and update it every four years. The 2016 update of the PACTS plan is called Destination 2040.

The Transit Committee provided input on the transit-oriented analysis and recommendations during the development of Destination 2040. While most of the recommendations are meant to be implemented during the next five to ten years, some of them are long term concepts that may take longer to implement. Also, some of the recommendations are for studies to be done during the next several years.

In 2020, GPCOG will begin to update the long range plan for adoption in 2022. The process will be led by PACTS staff and advised by a special long range plan update committee composed of members from all PACTS committees.

1.2.1 UPWP Introduction

The PACTS Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) (available here) is a two-year scope and budget for the region’s transportation planning and administration work which is done by GPCOG staff, and consultants. The work done under the auspices of the UPWP is:

- Perform studies of regional transportation needs and opportunities.
- Coordinate with the MaineDOT and Turnpike Authority on major regional studies and programs.
- Program Federal Transit and Highway Administration project funds in the region’s Transportation Improvement Program.
- Serve as a regional forum on transportation and related topics.
- Develop a regional transportation plan which forecasts needs for the region and establishes goals and strategies designed to address future and current needs.

The Policy Committee sets the overall strategic direction for the UPWP. For instance, here is the strategic direction adopted for the 2018/2019 UPWP:

To help to advance the recommendations in our Destination 2040 Plan:

- To increase the technical capacity of PACTS staff (became GPCOG staff in January 2018) regarding pavement management, traffic signal management, transportation performance measuring and development of bicycle/pedestrian plans and projects.
• To begin implementation of the adopted recommendations in our 2017 Regional Transit Development Plan Phase 1, and to develop an aspirational longer term Regional Transit Plan Phase 2.
• To continue to develop and pursue strategies to lower the cost of capital projects.
• To integrate key transportation and land-use plans to preserve the long-term capacity of the region's transportation assets.
• To develop a priority list of regional transportation projects that would inform the Policy Committee when developing recommendations to pursue funding opportunities in the event that Congress substantially increases federal transportation funding.

Similar to the Policy Committee’s direction above, in June 2017 the Transit Committee endorsed these UPWP themes.

1. To provide coordination, administration and regulatory compliance of federal transit funding for the PACTS region (developing and updating the UPWP, Transportation Improvement Program, Six Year Capital and Operating Plan, facilitating the “split” of Federal FTA funding, etc.) as well as providing Transit Committee staff support, and other related sub-tasks.

2. To advance and continually improve our region’s public transportation network so that transit customers experience a seamless, efficient, environmentally sustainable, and affordable service. Activities for 2018 and 2019 will include:
   a. implementation of the 2017 Regional Transit Development Plan (Phase 1);
   b. the development of an aspirational longer term Regional Transit Plan (Phase 2) with the focus on and involvement of all seven of the region’s public transit agencies; and
   c. further development and implementation of the Regional Transit Stop Access and Regional Sign & Shelter Projects.

3. To support transit ridership growth through land use planning. Transit-supportive land uses will be fostered along the travel corridors and centers of opportunity from the Destination 2040 plan, as well as major bus, train and ferry stations and stops, and any other priority areas identified by the Regional Transit Plan. The goal of this targeted transit-supportive land use planning with be growing the region’s jobs and homes around existing and future transit service, supporting mode shift to transit, bicycle and pedestrian-based transportation, and preserving the capacity of the road network.

4. To continue to support the reduction of transportation-related emissions and petroleum consumption (with a particular focus on PACTS municipal and transit fleets) through the Maine Clean Communities program.

5. To continue to provide basic, limited transit-related Technical Support, such as project or agency-specific Mapping and GIS assistance.
The Executive Committee develops the final draft two-year UPWP and submits a draft final version to the Policy Committee for ratification. During UPWP development the Transit, Technical and Planning Committees offer recommendations to the Executive Committee regarding the scopes of studies to be done.

1.2.2 UPWP Funding Sources

The UPWP is funded 80% with FHWA and FTA planning funds, and with match provided by MaineDOT, GPCOG, transit agencies and municipalities. The FHWA “Metropolitan Planning” funds are appropriated to each state by Congress using a formula. MaineDOT sub-allocates the FHWA funds to Maine’s four MPOs using a formula developed years ago by MaineDOT and the MPOs.

FTA funding for transit planning comes from the FTA 5303 and 5307 programs:

- FTA 5303 funding is for metropolitan transit planning. PACTS uses these funds for regional transit planning purposes rather than for transit agency-specific planning.
- FTA 5307 money can be used for capital, operations, ADA-paratransit support, or planning. PACTS uses these funds for transit agency-specific planning.

Historically GPCOG has provided the matching funds for all FTA 5303 planning projects that utilize GPCOG staff or consultants. The transit agencies provide the match for planning work paid for with FTA 5307 funds.

Beginning with the 2018/2019 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP), the PACTS Transit Agencies will be collectively responsible for providing local match for 5303-funded project consultants. GPCOG will continue to provide the local match for all GPCOG staff time associated with 5303-funded UPWP work. The proportion of total local match that each agency will be responsible for shall be determined on a project-by-project basis, and include consideration of whether that agency and the area it serves will be involved with, and/or benefit from, the project. The PACTS Transit Committee is responsible for approving the proposed local match division and responsibility among each agency for each project.

1.2.3 Roles during the Development of the UPWP

These people, organizations and committees have the following roles in the development of the UPWP.

- Municipalities
  1. Submit applications for consultant studies to be done.

- Executive Committee
  1. Recommend to the Policy Committee a “strategic direction” for the upcoming UPWP.
2. Review and comment on GPCOG staff’s draft work plan and budget for the two years.
3. Submit a final draft UPWP to the Policy Committee for ratification.

- **Policy Committee**
  1. Adopt a “strategic direction” for the upcoming UPWP.
  2. Establish a budget framework for regional and local planning efforts.
  3. Review and comment on UPWP development progress reports.
  4. Ratify the Executive Committee’s draft UPWP.

- **Transit Committee**
  1. All members may submit proposals for new FTA 5303-funded studies. When appropriate and feasible, the Transit Committee will meet with Planning and Technical Committees to collaborate.
  2. Develop and recommend to the Executive Committee a “strategic direction” for the transit-related portion of the upcoming UPWP.
  3. Review and comment on GPCOG staff’s transit portion of the draft work plan and budget for the two years.
  4. Recommend a set of FTA 5307-funded studies to be funded to the Executive Committee.

- **Planning Committee**
  1. Suggest proposals for new studies. When appropriate and feasible, the Committee will meet with Technical or Transit Committee to collaborate.
  2. Review staff’s scores of local and regional study proposals (FHWA-funded ones only), and recommend a set of studies to be funded to the Executive Committee.

- **Technical Committee**
  1. Suggest proposals for new studies. When appropriate and feasible, the Committee will meet with Planning or Transit Committee to collaborate.
  2. Review and comment on staff proposals for regional studies.

- **GPCOG Staff**
  1. Lead the overall development of the UPWP, and coordinate with all parties involved in the efforts listed below.
  2. Work with the Transit Committee to develop the FTA-funded portion of the UPWP. Please note that we also coordinate with SMPDC staff in the development of the UPWP.
  3. Recommend a set of regionally significant studies.
  4. Solicit and consider public comments.
  5. Produce the draft UPWP document, and submit it to MaineDOT for review. Respond to the comments from MaineDOT, FHWA and FTA, and then submit a final UPWP to MaineDOT.
  6. Sign a UPWP Cooperative Agreement with MaineDOT.
1.2.4 Schedule for Development of the UPWP

GPCOG staff creates the schedule for the development of the next UPWP in the beginning of the second year of the existing UPWP.

1.2.5 Monitoring UPWP Activities

MaineDOT requires that PACTS (and all MPOs) send draft UPWP planning study reports to MaineDOT for review/edit in the fall of the second year of the UPWP biennium.

1.2.6 UPWP Amendments and Revisions

UPWP amendments are modifications that:

- Change the FHWA/FTA approved total PL/Section 5303 budget, or
- Change the scope of the FHWA/FTA work task(s), or
- Add or delete a work task or tasks.

The Transit Committee recommends transit-related UPWP amendments to the Executive Committee for action. The Executive Committee has the final PACTS authority to amend the UPWP. PACTS staff sends the UPWP amendments to MaineDOT which then forwards them to FTA and FHWA for concurrence. MaineDOT is responsible for securing that concurrence and reporting back to PACTS.

UPWP revisions are modifications that:

- Change the budgets for one or more individual tasks in the approved UPWP, but
- Do not change the total FHWA PL or FTA Section 5303 budgets in the UPWP, and
- Do not change the scopes of the FHWA or FTA funded task(s).

Revisions are forwarded to MaineDOT’s MPO Coordinator, who submits them to the FHWA Division Planner and the FTA Region I Planner, as appropriate, for their information (not approval).

1.2.7 UPWP Revision Process & Responsibilities

The following outlines the actual steps that Transit Agencies, PACTS Committees, GPCOG Staff, and MaineDOT take during the transit UPWP Amendment/Revision process.

1. Staff from MaineDOT, PACTS or a transit agency identify the need for a transit UPWP revision, and notify the GPCOG Clean Transportation Manager.

2. The GPCOG Clean Transportation Manager reviews UPWP guidelines under 1.2.6 above, and determines whether the revision should be completed as a UPWP Amendment or Revision (additional steps below based on revision type).
UPWP Amendment

3. GPCOG staff prepares the draft amendment approval request, and shares the draft with MaineDOT, the Transit Committee chair and vice-chair, any affected transit agencies, and the GPCOG Transportation Director, for review and any necessary revisions.

4. GPCOG staff will bring the amendment approval request to the Transit Committee for their review, and seek a recommendation from the Transit Committee to the Executive Committee for their approval.*
   
   *Note – this step may be skipped if the amendment approval process must be expedited, and with the permission of the Transit Committee chair and vice-chair.

5. GPCOG staff will bring the amendment approval request to the Executive Committee for their review and approval.

6. Following Executive Committee approval, GPCOG staff will formally submit all necessary UPWP Amendment documentation to MaineDOT (along with the Transit Committee chair and vice-chair, and any affected transit agencies). GPCOG staff will also post all documentation to the PACTS website.

7. MaineDOT staff will submit the amendment request it to FTA staff for their approval (along with the Transit Committee chair and vice-chair, any affected transit agencies, and the GPCOG Transportation Director and Clean Transportation Manager).

8. Once approved, FTA staff will notify all affected parties, and PACTS transit agencies may submit or modify related grants with FTA (as needed).

UPWP Revision

3. GPCOG staff prepares the draft revision approval request, and shares the draft with MaineDOT, the Transit Committee chair and vice-chair, any affected transit agencies, and the GPCOG Transportation Director, for review and any necessary revisions.

4. GPCOG staff will bring the revision approval request to the Transit Committee for their review, and seek a recommendation from the Transit Committee to the Executive Committee for their approval.*
   
   *Note – this step may be skipped if the revision approval process must be expedited, and with the permission of the Transit Committee chair and vice-chair.

5. GPCOG staff will bring the revision approval request to the Executive Committee for their review and approval.

6. Following Executive Committee approval, GPCOG staff will formally submit all necessary UPWP revision documentation to MaineDOT (along with the Transit Committee chair and vice-chair, and any affected transit agencies). GPCOG staff will also post all documentation to the PACTS website.

7. MaineDOT staff will submit the amendment request it to FTA staff for their information (along with the Transit Committee chair and vice-chair, any affected transit agencies, and the GPCOG Transportation Director and Clean Transportation Manager).

   *Note - by their nature, UPWP revisions do not require federal agency approval. Therefore, once MaineDOT has submitted their UPWP revision, PACTS transit agencies may submit or modify related grants with FTA.

1.2.8 Consultant Study Selection and Administration

The administration of FTA-5303-funded consultant transit studies funded through the UPWP involves many steps. Here are the key ones:
• The Transit Committee approves a consultant selection process on a case by case basis, which includes a selection committee who decides the ranking of consultants, and then GPCOG follows the guidance and makes the final selection and negotiates a contract.
• GPCOG drafts a consultant contract (which includes a lot of language required by FTA and/or MaineDOT) and sends it to the consultant. After the consultant and GPCOG staff agree on the terms, GPCOG sends it to MaineDOT for a final sign off. After MaineDOT concurrence, the GPCOG Executive Director and the chosen consultant sign the contract.
• Consultants submitting invoices and progress reports to GPCOG. GPCOG staff advises the Transit Committee of costs to date.
• GPCOG sends invoices to MaineDOT for payment of the federal share of each invoice. GPCOG pays the consultant after payment by MaineDOT.

1.3 Transportation Improvement Program

In 1975, Congress gave PACTS the responsibility to program FTA and FHWA funds in cooperation with MaineDOT. Programming is the decision to fund a project for design and/or construction, or for federal transit operating assistance. This is accomplished when PACTS submits to the FTA and FHWA (via MaineDOT) the PACTS Transportation Improvement Program that lists all federally-funded projects programmed by PACTS and MaineDOT in our region. The federal agencies may not release the federal funds for any of the projects without this support from PACTS. PACTS and MaineDOT produce the PACTS TIP annually and amend it periodically.

All federally-funded transit-related projects (funded by FTA or FHWA) can be implemented anywhere within the service area of the region’s transit agencies. (All other FHWA projects in the TIP must be within the PACTS Capital Management Area. The current PACTS Capital Management Area map (see Appendix E) was endorsed by the Policy Committee in 2014.) Please note also that every January MaineDOT produces a statewide “Work Plan” that specifies capital projects scheduled for design or construction that year, plus additional projects planned to be designed or built in the subsequent two years. This document includes FTA-funded capital projects and MPO Allocation projects already programmed by the PACTS Policy Committee. MaineDOT’s objective with this document is to inform the Legislature, contractors and all other stakeholders of the funding and scheduling of these projects – this is not a federal document like those described below.

Every two years the Policy Committee updates the PACTS policies and procedures for selection of “MPO Allocation” and FTA-funded projects. For instance, in 2016 the Policy Committee adopted the Transportation Improvement Program Policies and Procedures for 2017 and 2018. This document details programming policies, project management policies, FTA funding, and coordination with MaineDOT and the Maine Turnpike Authority. In 2017 PACTS used this document for the selection of 2020 and 2021 projects.
PACTS will add the detailed programming elements of this Transit Planning Policies and Procedures document to the overall PACTS document later this year.

The remainder of this section focuses on transit projects, including the process to apply for PACTS MPO Allocation funding. The MPO Allocation is a MaineDOT annual allocation of FHWA and state capital funds which PACTS is authorized to program with essentially a guarantee that MaineDOT will concur. Contact GPCOG staff for more information on this.

1.3.1 **The PACTS Transportation Improvement Program and the MaineDOT Statewide Transportation Improvement Program**

FTA and FHWA may only release federal funds for projects that are listed in both the PACTS Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and the MaineDOT Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). The TIP and STIP must include four years of federally funded projects. Projects in the later years may be rough estimates of funding available to our region for which scopes will be developed at a future time. These two documents are produced annually in the following process during December and January.

1. In December, MaineDOT produces a draft list of all known FTA and FHWA projects in the PACTS region and sends it to PACTS for review and approval. GPCOG staff distributes it to the region’s transit agencies and all other PACTS members for their input. The GPCOG Transportation Director is the central point of contact for this process.

Note that in December 2017 MaineDOT’s draft list also reflected agency-specific project amounts in the most current PACTS Transit Six Year Capital and Operating Plan for the first time – though only for the four-year period relevant to the TIP and STIP.

2. In January GPCOG staff sends the list and an errata sheet to the Executive Committee which initiates a 10-day public comment period.

3. Later in January the Policy Committee reviews and adopts the draft list, the errata sheet and the public comments.

4. In February GPCOG staff prepares the required PACTS TIP narrative, attaches the approved TIP projects list, public comments and errata sheet, and then sends them to MaineDOT.

5. MaineDOT subsequently incorporates the PACTS TIP into a draft Maine STIP and initiates a statewide public comment period on the entire STIP.

6. In late March, MaineDOT submits the STIP – which includes the PACTS TIP – to the FHWA and FTA for their approval.
7. In April, the FHWA and FTA approve the STIP and PACTS TIP, thereby enabling the federal agencies to approve subsequent requests to spend the federal funds.

PACTS and MaineDOT amend the TIP and STIP periodically. See below for details on that process.

1.4 PACTS Transit Six Year Capital and Operating Plan

Since 2012, the amount of FTA funding received in our region on a formula basis has increased substantially. At the same time, Congressional earmarks have disappeared and discretionary funding opportunities have diminished significantly. The formula funding is vital to our region’s transit agencies after decades of relying on Congressional earmarks for all major capital investments. For instance, in federal fiscal year 2016, our region received $10,028,308 in FTA Section 5307 Urbanized Area Formula funding which is available to all transit agencies in our region, and $7,816,835 in Section 5337 State of Good Repair fixed guideway funding which is only available to CBITD and NNEPRA.

The largest amount of FTA formula funds that come to the PACTS region are the Urbanized Area Formula Program 5307 funds. All PACTS transit agencies are eligible for 5307 funds. Over the last five years the PACTS Transit Committee has successfully “split” up these funds in a way which meets the many FTA requirements, addresses the collective priorities of the region’s transit agencies, and has received praise from MaineDOT and FTA. The “Split Letter”, along with the Six Year Capital and Operating Plan, represent a snapshot in time of currently funded anticipated needs based on projected funding availability. It is updated annually, and revised as needed.

The Transit Committee works with GPCOG staff to develop and periodically update a draft Six Year Capital and Operating Plan which they then submit to the Executive Committee for adoption. The Plan outlines anticipated capital, operating, ADA-paratransit and planning expenses for the next six years – and is the basis for each annual FTA Split Letter. The projects listed in the first four years of the Plan then are added to the PACTS TIP and the MaineDOT STIP through the amendment process or through the annual TIP and STIP production process each January.

Each agency has included specific items in the Plan under specific years, but broadly these include:

- Facility Capital Maintenance/Improvement
- Replacement Vehicle Purchasing, and Existing Vehicle Rehabilitation
- Replacement Ferry Boats
- Railroad Tie Replacement/Right of Way
- Facility and Vehicle/Vessel Preventive Maintenance
- Safety & Security, and Technology Updates
• Operating Assistance (except CBITD)
• ADA Complementary Paratransit
• Agency-specific Transit Planning Projects

A fundamental principle in the Six Year Capital and Operating Plan is to maintain the basic needs for all agencies to keep their services operating at current levels safely and reliably. This principle has been applied to include both capital replacement and operating expenses needed to support current levels of service.

The majority of 5307 funds are allocated through an asset management plan that seeks to maintain current levels of service safely and reliably throughout the region with adequate capital replacement and operating funds. Any remaining Section 5307 balance is made available for eligible new projects and unforeseen exigencies under the PACTS “Regionally Administered Discretionary (RAD) Program”. After considerable work by the Transit Operations Working Group and GPCOG staff, the Transit Committee adopted in September 2014 a “Regional Transit Expansion & Enhancement Procedures” for selecting RAD Program projects and determining other eligible uses as agreed upon by the Transit Committee that best serve the region. Under this policy, any new service, regardless of funding source must meet certain criteria to be eligible for funding support. See Appendix G for the complete Regional Transit Expansion & Enhancement Procedures.

FTA requires that all Section 5307 transit planning grants be included in the approved PACTS UPWP. For planning grants allocated as part of the Six Year Capital and Operating Plan update or RAD process, a UPWP amendment will be approved concurrently with the required TIP amendment. This applies to both regional and agency-specific planning grants. See more information below on this.

For reference purposes, here are the Six Year Capital and Operating Plan summary tables (5307 and 5337) as approved by the Policy Committee on April 25, 2019.
### 5307 FUNDING SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capital Program</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>$11,133,517</td>
<td>$6,862,051</td>
<td>$4,611,280</td>
<td>$11,983,095</td>
<td>$4,107,219</td>
<td>$4,260,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$1,965,694</td>
<td>$1,372,409</td>
<td>$906,256</td>
<td>$1,996,619</td>
<td>$821,443</td>
<td>$852,072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operating Program</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>$7,535,648</td>
<td>$7,655,440</td>
<td>$7,808,550</td>
<td>$8,814,720</td>
<td>$8,991,014</td>
<td>$9,170,836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$3,767,824</td>
<td>$3,827,720</td>
<td>$3,904,275</td>
<td>$4,407,360</td>
<td>$4,495,507</td>
<td>$4,585,418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ADA Complementary Paratransit</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>$594,000</td>
<td>$605,880</td>
<td>$617,998</td>
<td>$630,358</td>
<td>$642,964</td>
<td>$655,824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$118,800</td>
<td>$121,176</td>
<td>$123,600</td>
<td>$126,072</td>
<td>$128,593</td>
<td>$131,165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning Projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>$143,080</td>
<td>$97,484</td>
<td>$102,008</td>
<td>$106,659</td>
<td>$111,442</td>
<td>$116,364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$28,616</td>
<td>$19,497</td>
<td>$20,402</td>
<td>$21,332</td>
<td>$22,288</td>
<td>$23,273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>$13,397,882</td>
<td>$9,880,053</td>
<td>$8,185,303</td>
<td>$14,983,449</td>
<td>$8,384,808</td>
<td>$8,611,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$5,880,934</td>
<td>$5,340,802</td>
<td>$4,954,533</td>
<td>$6,551,383</td>
<td>$5,467,831</td>
<td>$5,591,928</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SOURCES OF FUNDS

**RAD Balance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>$8,170,084</td>
<td>$5,246,940</td>
<td>$6,051,120</td>
<td>$8,550,050</td>
<td>$4,250,833</td>
<td>$6,550,258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total SOURCES OF FUNDS</strong></td>
<td>$18,644,822</td>
<td>$15,391,173</td>
<td>$16,735,353</td>
<td>$19,234,282</td>
<td>$14,935,066</td>
<td>$17,234,491</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### USES OF FUNDS

**Capital Program**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>$9,040,394</td>
<td>$5,489,642</td>
<td>$3,705,024</td>
<td>$9,986,476</td>
<td>$3,285,776</td>
<td>$3,408,288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$1,965,694</td>
<td>$1,372,409</td>
<td>$906,256</td>
<td>$1,996,619</td>
<td>$821,443</td>
<td>$852,072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$13,397,882</td>
<td>$9,880,053</td>
<td>$8,185,303</td>
<td>$14,983,449</td>
<td>$8,384,808</td>
<td>$8,611,456</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Available RAD Funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>$5,246,940</td>
<td>$6,051,120</td>
<td>$8,550,050</td>
<td>$4,250,833</td>
<td>$6,550,258</td>
<td>$8,623,035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.4.1 **Six Year Capital and Operating Plan Update Process & Responsibilities**

The SYCOP update process follows the general timeline outlined below:

- January and February - FTA appropriations are made
- February through March – the Transit Committee Workshop develops a draft SYCOP for Transit Committee consideration
- April – the Transit Committee reviews and endorses the SYCOP, and approves the corresponding Split Letter for the current Federal Fiscal Year.
• May - the PACTS Executive Committee approves the SYCOP
• June - the PACTS Transit Agencies submit grant applications to FTA before the early June submission deadline

Updates to the SYCOP will be considered with the overall goal of maintaining fiscal constraint and preserving an annual balance of at least $1 million in 5307 funds in order to respond to any unforeseen exigencies. All PACTS regional transit agencies eligible for discretionary funding are encouraged and expected to pursue other funding for projects to increase the overall amount of funds available to the region. If a project does not receive discretionary funds following an application, it may be submitted as a requested revision during the next SYCOP update.

The following outlines the steps that Transit Agencies, PACTS Committees, GPCOG Staff, and MaineDOT take during the transit SYCOP update process.

1. GPCOG staff circulate the most recently approved version of the SYCOP to all PACTS transit agencies and MaineDOT, and solicit requested revisions to agency-specific 5307, 5337, and Discretionary tabs.
   a. Note that MaineDOT coordinates with and submits on behalf of RTP and YCCAC due to YCCAC’s status as a sub-recipient.
2. PACTS transit agencies and MaineDOT make initial requested revisions to agency-specific 5307, 5337, and Discretionary tabs, and submit to GPCOG staff along with any additional documentation required for changes triggering additional review (2a and 2b below). Note that Regionally Administered Discretionary (RAD) projects are evaluated during the same timeframe as SYCOP updates, and so any current RAD application funding amounts should also be included in the proposed SYCOP updates.
   a. Requested revisions may include changes to existing items, as well as the addition of new items for the six-year period.
   b. The following types of projects are subject to additional review:
      i. New or significantly revised capital projects exceeding $100,000, for a single year or combined over multiple years;
      ii. Standard operating and/or Americans with Disabilities Act paratransit operating requests exceeding a 2% increase in funds over the previous year;
      iii. New or significantly revised planning projects exceeding $50,000, for a single year or multiple years
   c. For those projects subject to additional review, agencies submitting such requested revisions shall provide a brief summary of each requested change (2-pages or less for each), addressing the following:
      i. Why is this change being requested?
      ii. What alternatives have been considered?
      iii. What efforts have been made to reduce this cost increase?
      iv. How will this change impact passengers and service?
      v. How will this impact the agency’s Transit Asset Management (TAM), Safety, or other PACTS/MaineDOT/FTA performance measures?
vi. Is there potential to collaborate with or involve other transit agencies in this project to improve transit service in the region?

vii. Is this eligible (and likely to be competitive) for discretionary funding opportunities?

d. Any proposed new funding item or project that represents a transit expansion or enhancement as defined under the PACTS Regional Transit Expansion and Enhancement Procedures (Appendix G) shall require a formal application and will be treated and evaluated under these procedures as a RAD project.

3. GPCOG staff compile, identify, highlight, and list all requested input changes to the SYCOP, and prepare an analysis showing the financial impact of each agency’s requested changes to the SYCOP.

4. The Transit Committee Workshop reviews the requested revisions, additional documentation, and financial impacts, along with any RAD project applications, seeking additional information or modifications to requests in order to assure the financial constraint of the SYCOP.

5. Based on the guidance received from the Workshop, PACTS Transit Agencies (with MaineDOT on behalf of RTP and YCCAC) and GPCOG staff make any necessary adjustments to the SYCOP.

6. The Transit Committee reviews the adjusted requested revisions, additional documentation, and financial impacts, along with any RAD project applications, and endorses the SYCOP and any supported RAD applications for Executive Committee adoption. The Transit Committee also approves the Split Letter (corresponding to the current fiscal year of funding in the endorsed SYCOP).

   a. Once approved, the Split Letter is signed by representatives from all PACTS Transit Agency direct recipients and MaineDOT.

7. The PACTS Executive Committee reviews and adopts the final version of the SYCOP.

8. The approved SYCOP and Split Letter are shared with MaineDOT for their records. MaineDOT submits the Split Letter to FTA Region 1 staff on behalf of PACTS.

1.4.2 Transportation Improvement Program Transit Funding Prioritization

At the request of the PACTS Transit Agencies, GPCOG staff began work in late 2017 to draft a new prioritization framework for the allocation of federal transit funds. Staff facilitated two Transit Committee Workshop meetings on this topic (9/26/17 and 10/31/17), and through this process identified draft criteria that are consistent with RTDP recommendations and align with transit stakeholder goals and priorities. During this process, staff identified several challenges that affected their ability to develop a new funding prioritization system from the ground up. In response, the Transit Committee directed staff to delay full development of the new Transit Funding Prioritization System until the start of the Regional Transit Plan (Phase II). Because the Regional Transit Plan Phase II will identify the transit priorities of the region (in greater detail that Destination 2040), help generate regional buy-in for the goals from a wide range of elected
officials, business leaders, existing riders and the public, and provide a roadmap for how to achieve it, the transit funding prioritization system will benefit significantly from being developed in tandem.

1.4.3 **Public Involvement regarding the Transportation Improvement Program**

The PACTS public involvement process for TIP project priority setting is a combination of contacts with member organizations and the general public, as outlined below.

- All feasibility studies funded by PACTS (which often produce funding proposals for capital improvement projects from MaineDOT and/or PACTS) include a public outreach component. Our Enhanced Project Scoping process also includes a public input component. Together, these feasibility studies and project scoping efforts are designed to provide meaningful opportunities for public involvement in regional transportation planning and funding.

- PACTS maintains at all times an up-to-date TIP section on the website, [www.pactsplan.org](http://www.pactsplan.org). Comments may be made via the info@pactsplan.org at any time.

- At the beginning of the project selection process, GPCOG staff send an email to our municipal, state, transit, other regional organizations (and to our Interested Parties email list participants) advising of the deadlines for submitting MPO Allocation proposals.

- PACTS staff ask that city/town councils, municipal officers and transit system boards submit written endorsements of their TIP proposals submitted to PACTS. PACTS also asks for written endorsement to PACTS for the projects from their municipality that the Policy Committee votes to include in each annual MPO Allocation list.

Any substantive change in PACTS TIP project selection criteria or formula is also subject to public review and comment. Amendments to the TIP selection criteria and formula shall be accomplished before the initiation of the biennial TIP development process. PACTS shall notify the public of its intent to update the TIP selection criteria and/or formula and make said material available to the public for comment.

1.4.4 **Program of Projects**

The FTA requires that each recipient of a Section 5307 grant shall develop, publish, afford an opportunity for a public hearing on, and submit for approval a Program of Projects (POP). FTA allows a grantee to rely on the locally adopted public participation requirements for the PACTS TIP in lieu of the process required in the development of the POP if the grantee has coordinated with the MPO and ensured that the public is aware that the TIP development process is being used to satisfy the POP Public Participation requirements.
The PACTS public participation process satisfies the POP participation process requirements for all these FTA Direct Recipients in the PACTS region:

- Biddeford Saco Old Orchard Beach Transit Committee
- Casco Bay Island Transit District
- Greater Portland Transit District
- Maine Department of Transportation
- Northern New England Passenger Rail Authority
- South Portland Bus Service

PACTS’ public notices for the TIP have an explicit statement that public notice of public involvement activities and time established for public review of any comments on the TIP will satisfy the POP requirements for each specific transit agency.

1.4.5 **TIP Approval/Adoption**

The PACTS Policy and Executive Committees are collectively responsible for adopting the TIP and SYCOP (and subsequent updates), which specify the allocation of federal transportation funds in the PACTS region to individual projects and activities. In addition, the PACTS transit agencies have repeatedly received FTA and MaineDOT guidance indicating that the transit agencies, as designated recipients of FTA funding, are collectively responsible for determining the annual “split” of the 5307 and 5337 federal transit funds that come to the PACTS region. Responsibility for the programming of federal transit funding in the PACTS region is thus divided between the PACTS Policy and Executive Committees, and the PACTS transit agencies, with each entity responsible for fulfilling their role in this process.

1.4.6 **TIP Amendments**

The PACTS Executive Committee periodically needs to amend the TIP. An amendment is either the addition or deletion of a project, a major change in a funded project’s budget, or a major change in the design or scope of a project that alters the intent of a project.

Before the Executive Committee makes an amendment, GPCOG staff posts to the PACTS website the proposed amendment to the TIP for public comment. All technical analysis in support of the amendment including any air quality/conformity analysis will be made available to the public for review and comment. A comment period of 10 calendar days beginning from the date of the posting will be provided during which comments may be submitted to PACTS for consideration.

This PACTS TIP amendment process satisfies the POP participation process requirements for the FTA Direct Recipients listed in Section 1.4.3 above.
Please note that FHWA, FTA and MaineDOT agreed in May, 2017 to synchronize the STIP revision procedures for both FTA and FHWA funds by utilizing the FHWA/MaineDOT STIP procedures for future transit-related TIP and STIP revision (included in Appendix H). As noted in the document, “MaineDOT and the MPO’s coordinate under the same thresholds and public involvement periods described in this agreement such that MaineDOT will request STIP and TIP amendments commensurate with this process.” GPCOG staff is still working with MaineDOT to determine necessary staff-level documentation for this process.

1.4.7 **TIP Administrative Modification & Information-Only Actions**

PACTS and MaineDOT make administrative modifications for relatively minor changes that do not require a public comment period. Administrative modifications cover the following:

- A moderate change in the total cost of a project
- Combining or separating projects that are part of an approved TIP
- Combining or separating phases of a project that are part of an approved TIP
- Adding a new phase to an existing project that does not have a substantial cost associated with it
- Creating a lineage PIN that does not have a substantial cost associated with it
- Making a minor change in the scope of a project, including an insignificant change in the termini and/or
- Making a change to the project termini with no change in overall project cost.

Information-Only Actions are similar to administrative modifications, and may be used in place of an administrative modification when the funding amounts in question fall below the threshold outlined in the MaineDOT STIP Revision Procedures (Appendix H). Information-only actions do not require federal agency approval.

1.4.8 **TIP Revision Process & Responsibilities**

The following outlines the steps that Transit Agencies, PACTS Committees, GPCOG Staff, and MaineDOT take during the transit TIP Amendment process.

1. The process starts when staff from MaineDOT or a transit agency identify the need for a transit TIP revision, and notify GPCOG staff.
2. GPCOG staff then reviews the MaineDOT STIP Revision Procedures, and determines whether the revision should be completed as a TIP Amendment, Administrative Modification, or Information-Only Action.

*The next steps depend on the revision type as described below. Several of the steps are common to all revision types.*

**TIP Amendments**

3. GPCOG staff prepares the draft amendment approval request, public notice, and related
4. GPCOG staff will bring the amendment approval request and public notice to the Transit Committee for their review, and seek a recommendation from the Transit Committee to the Executive Committee for their approval.*
   *Note – this step may be skipped if the amendment approval process must be expedited, and with the permission of the Transit Committee chair and vice-chair.

5. Following the Transit Committee recommendation, GPCOG staff will post the public notice to the PACTS website for a period of 10 calendar days beginning from the date of the posting during which comments may be submitted to PACTS for consideration. GPCOG staff will document the posting of the public notice, as well as any comments received. The public comment period should be scheduled to conclude prior to any action by the Executive Committee.

6. GPCOG staff will bring the amendment approval request, along with any public comments received, to the Executive Committee for their review and approval.

7. Following Executive Committee approval, GPCOG staff will formally submit all necessary TIP Amendment documentation to MaineDOT (along with the Transit Committee chair and vice-chair, and any affected transit agencies). GPCOG staff will also post all documentation to the PACTS website.

8. MaineDOT staff will incorporate the PACTS TIP Amendment into their STIP amendment, and submit it to FTA staff for their approval (along with the Transit Committee chair and vice-chair, any affected transit agencies, and the GPCOG Transportation Director and Clean Transportation Manager).

9. Once approved, FTA staff will notify all affected parties, and PACTS transit agencies may submit or modify related grants with FTA.

**TIP Administrative Modifications**

3. GPCOG staff prepares the draft administrative modification approval request, and related documentation for MaineDOT, and shares the drafts with MaineDOT, the Transit Committee chair and vice-chair, any affected transit agencies, and the GPCOG Transportation Director, for review and any necessary revisions.

4. GPCOG staff will bring the administrative modification approval request and public notice to the Transit Committee for their review, and seek a recommendation from the Transit Committee to the Executive Committee for their approval.*
   *Note – this step may be skipped if the administrative modification approval process must be expedited, and with the permission of the Transit Committee chair and vice-chair.

5. GPCOG staff will bring the administrative modification approval request to the Executive Committee for their review and approval.

6. Following Executive Committee approval, GPCOG staff will formally submit all necessary administrative modification documentation to MaineDOT (along with the Transit Committee chair and vice-chair, and any affected transit agencies). GPCOG staff will also post all documentation to the PACTS website.

7. MaineDOT staff will incorporate the PACTS TIP administrative modification into their
STIP administrative modification, and submit it to FTA staff for their approval (along with the Transit Committee chair and vice-chair, any affected transit agencies, and the GPCOG Transportation Director and Clean Transportation Manager).

8. Once approved, FTA staff will notify all affected parties, and PACTS transit agencies may submit or modify related grants with FTA.

TIP Information-Only Actions

3. GPCOG staff prepares the draft information-only action approval request, and related documentation for MaineDOT, and shares the drafts with MaineDOT, the Transit Committee chair and vice-chair, any affected transit agencies, and the GPCOG Transportation Director, for review and any necessary revisions.

4. GPCOG staff will bring the information-only action approval request and public notice to the Transit Committee for their review, and seek a recommendation from the Transit Committee to the Executive Committee for their approval.*
   *Note – this step may be skipped if the information-only action approval process must be expedited, and with the permission of the Transit Committee chair and vice-chair.

5. GPCOG staff will bring the information-only action approval request to the Executive Committee for their review and approval.

6. Following Executive Committee approval, GPCOG staff will formally submit all necessary information-only action documentation to MaineDOT (along with the Transit Committee chair and vice-chair, and any affected transit agencies). GPCOG staff will also post all documentation to the PACTS website.

7. MaineDOT staff will incorporate the PACTS TIP information-only action into their STIP information-only action, and submit it to FTA staff for their information (along with the Transit Committee chair and vice-chair, any affected transit agencies, and the GPCOG Transportation Director and Clean Transportation Manager).*
   *Note - by their nature, information-only actions do not require federal agency approval. Therefore, once MaineDOT has submitted their STIP information-only action, PACTS transit agencies may submit or modify related grants with FTA.
Appendix A: Overview of PACTS and GPCOG - History, roles, responsibilities, staff, relationship to MaineDOT, FTA and FHWA

1. In 1965 the original Portland Area Comprehensive Transportation Study (PACTS) regional transportation plan was adopted.

2. In 1975 the PACTS program was designated as the federally-mandated metropolitan planning organization or MPO for the Portland region. The federal government established these entities in all urbanized areas of the country in order to improve the coordination of transportation planning and investment decisions by state, municipalities and public transportation organizations. A memorandum of agreement was signed that set out the roles of the PACTS participant organizations.

3. Today the fundamental roles of MPOs remain the same as they were in 1975:
   a. Approve a Transportation Improvement Program for submittal to FHWA and FTA.
   b. Adopt and perform the planning and administration work outlined in the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP).
   c. Adopt and work to implement a regional transportation plan.

4. The PACTS Policy Committee adopts the UPWP. The funding for the UPWP has always been based on FHWA and FTA planning funds plus matching funds from municipalities, MaineDOT, GPCOG and our transit agencies.

5. Until January 25, 2018 the PACTS Policy Committee hired the PACTS Director, and the PACTS Director hired additional PACTS staff. PACTS staff are paid with FHWA, MaineDOT and local funds. On January 25, 2018 the Policy Committee approved a 3-year contract for GPCOG to provide all staff services necessary to administer the PACTS UPWP.

6. GPCOG staff has always been responsible for the FTA-funded transit planning work outlined in the PACTS UPWP.

7. PACTS staff has always worked in the GPCOG offices. For federal income tax purposes PACTS staff are GPCOG employees. PACTS staff also work under the GPCOG Personnel Policies.

8. In 2013 PACTS and GPCOG signed an Agreement for Administration of the PACTS Unified Planning Work Program in order to clarify their roles and responsibilities for internal purposes and also to clarify for MaineDOT’s administrative understanding. For the prior almost 40 years, PACTS relied on the 1975 memorandum of agreement mentioned above.

9. Until 2002, PACTS involved seven municipalities: Portland, South Portland, Cape Elizabeth, Falmouth, Westbrook, Gorham and Scarborough. In accordance with federal MPO rules and as a result of the federal decennial census, eight more municipalities were added in 2002, and then in 2012 three more were added.
Overview of GPCOG - History, roles, responsibilities, staff, relationship to PACTS, MDOT, FTA, FHWA

1. GPCOG was established in 1969 under state charter as a regional planning organization, a voluntary association of municipalities and affiliated organizations. FMI: http://www.gpcog.org/.

2. During the 1980’s, the GPCOG Transit Planner worked with and for the METRO, South Portland Bus Service, Casco Bay Island Transit District (CBITD) and the Regional Transportation Program (RTP).

3. Starting in 2002 (per the expansion of the PACTS region into Biddeford, Saco and Old Orchard Beach), GPCOG transit staff began to work also with Shuttlebus Zoom and the transportation division of the York County Community Action Program (YCCAC).

4. Also in 2002, the Southern Maine Planning and Development Commission began to participate on PACTS committees, and to provide PACTS-funded transit planning technical assistance to Shuttlebus Zoom and YCCAC.

5. GPCOG staff began to work with the Northern New England Passenger Rail Authority when NNEPRA became a member of the Transit Committee at the start in 2004.

PACTS Transit Committee Roles and Responsibilities

The authority and responsibility of the Transit Committee increased significantly after 2012 when:

- The annual amount of FTA “formula” money for the PACTS region grew from roughly $2,000,000 to $10,000,000 and federal earmarks were eliminated.
- The PACTS region became a federally-designated Transportation Management Area – which added the “split letter” authority to the Direct Recipients.
- The number of FTA Direct Recipient public transportation organizations in our region grew to five.

These changes – particularly the increase in FTA formula funds – have increased the level and complexity of the work of the Transit Committee and staff.

History of the Operations Working Group and the Transit Committee

In the early 1990’s, the PACTS Policy Committee asked the transit agencies in Greater Portland to formalize their efforts to work together. This request followed an in-depth 1989 regional transit consolidation feasibility study. In response, the members created the “Greater Portland Transit Providers Working Group”. Staffed by GPCOG, the members met monthly during
the 1990’s. The Policy Committee also asked the group to advise on the annual distribution of the FTA Urban Formula funds. The members based their work on the annual formula developed in the late 1980’s, and reached consensus (after much debate and analysis) on a new formula. The Policy Committee used the new formula for several years during the 1990’s.

In 2002, the Greater Portland Transit Providers Working Group expanded to include Shuttlebus/ZOOM and YCCAC, and became simply the “Transit Providers Working Group”.

The Policy Committee c

The Operations Working Group advised the Transit Committee on planning, project and programming topics, and was a means for the transit agencies to coordinate and collaborate on operational and other detailed topics beyond the scope of the full Transit Committee. Occasionally the Transit Committee delegated authority to the Operations Working Group.

The Operations Working Group was not an official subcommittee of the Transit Committee, but rather a stand-alone, self-appointed informal group. The Operations Working Group developed their decisions and recommendations using a consensus model as much as possible. If they could not reach consensus then they took a vote. They did not follow Robert’s Rules of Order, and their meetings were neither open to the public nor advertised.

The Chair of the Transit Committee chaired the meetings of the Operations Working Group. GPCOG staffed the Operations Working Group.

During 2016 the Transit Committee met on a quarterly basis, and the Operations Working Group often met monthly in order to get their work done. Prior to 2016 the Transit Committee usually met on a monthly basis, but the Committee chose to switch to a quarterly basis in 2016 in response to a suggestion from the transit agencies who felt that too much of the monthly Transit Committee meetings were being spent reporting on work-in-progress items rather than taking actions. The Operations Working Group met to make recommendations which then went to the Transit Committee for official action.

In 2016, the Operations Working Group began to explore how the public should be informed of the work of the Operations Working Group.

The Policy Committee created the Transit Committee in 2004 with the primary motivation being to create a federal transit funds priority setting structure consistent with the open public policy procedures used by PACTS Committees. The members of the Transit Providers Working Group decided at that time to continue to meet separately from the PACTS Transit Committee, which continued until May 2017 as the Operations Working Group.

The Northern New England Passenger Rail Authority became a member of the Transit Committee at the start in 2004.
Appendix B: Regional Plans - List of plans

The state, regional, municipal and other organizations involved in planning for Greater Portland’s transportation system do studies that include recommendations that could directly or indirectly affect the region’s transit systems. Decision making based on those studies is a process of communication, cooperation and collaboration outside and within the PACTS process.

For reference purposes for Transit Committee members, here is a list of relevant studies completed during the past ten years. GPCOG staff are available to provide details on their recommendations and the status of their implementation.

Recently Completed Studies

2016 Regional Bus Sign and Shelter, PACTS
2016 Regional Bus Passenger Survey
2016 PACTS Destination 2040
2015 Portland Bayside Circulation Master Plan
2015 Regional Traffic signal Management Study
2015 Portland Transportation Hub Link
2015 Portland Bayside Circulation Master Plan
2014 Lakes Region Bus Study, GPCOG RTP
2014 Biddeford and Saco Downtowns
2013 Regional Route Study
2012 Moving Greater Portland toward a Transit Focused Region
2012 Congress Street Bus Priority Study, City of Portland
2012 Transforming Forest Ave
Southern Maine Area Transit Initiative (SMART)

Multi-year and Ongoing Efforts and Initiatives

Sustain Southern Maine
Automated Vehicle Location, ITS
Regional Branding and Marketing
Maine DOT Strategic Transit Plan 2025
Regional ITS Architecture

Other

2011 Gorham East West Corridor Study
2011 PACTS Draft Pedestrian Access to Transit Study

2010 NNEPRA Passenger Rail Expansion- Brunswick
2009 Portland North- Small Starts
2008 Portland Peninsula Transit Study
2007 Regional Transit Coordination Study, PACTS
Portland TDM2Go Website
Scarborough Oakhill Pedestrian Plan
Southern Maine Transit Coordination
Transit Bus Routes Study


**Appendix C – PACTS By-Laws**

Here is the Transit Committee excerpt. Click [here](#) for the complete PACTS bylaws.

**ARTICLE IX: Transit Committee**

**Section 1.** The Transit Committee shall:

1. Advise the Executive Committee on strategic public passenger transit issues, in support of the principles outlined in the long range transportation plan for the region.
2. Develop and recommend to the Policy Committee a set of transit planning and programming policies and procedures for incorporation into the PACTS TIP Policies and Procedures document.
3. Update the PACTS Six Year Transit Capital and Operating Plan and send it to the Executive Committee for adoption.
4. Authorize the FTA-required Split Letters regarding the sub-allocation of FTA formula funds before the transit agencies send the Split Letters to MaineDOT and FTA.
5. Recommend amendments to the PACTS Transportation Improvement Program to the Executive Committee regarding the allocation of FTA formula funds.
6. Select representatives to the Policy Committee, the Technical Committee, the Planning Committee and the Executive Committee. The representatives shall serve for two years, and may serve successive terms.

**Section 2.** The membership of the Transit Committee shall be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Representatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CBITD</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MaineDOT</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine Turnpike Authority</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METRO</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNEPRA</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Com. Appointees</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Trans. Operator</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ShuttleBus/ZOOM</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Portland Bus</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YCCAC</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Committee</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 3. The members appointed by the Executive Committee shall be representatives of either an organization or a member of the public concerned with public passenger transportation, and interested in promoting the goals of the long range transportation plan for the region. These members shall be from the eighteen-municipality PACTS region. In addition, the private transportation operator seat shall be filled by an organization that provides passenger transportation services in Greater Portland. The term of service shall be three years. The seat will be filled by a vote of the Executive Committee after a region wide solicitation has been done.

Section 4. Each voting representative shall have one vote. Attendance by representatives of four of the transit providers shall constitute a quorum.

Section 5. The Transit Committee shall meet monthly, or as needed.
# Appendix D – PACTS Transit Committee and Operations Working Group Calendar

## PACTS TRANSIT COMMITTEE 2018/2019 BIENNIAL CALENDAR

### TRANSIT WORK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | Jun | Jul | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | Jun | Jul | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | Jun | Jul | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|

### RAD PROCESS

| Jan  | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | Jun | Jul | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan  | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | Jun | Jul | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan  | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | Jun | Jul | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|

### PACTS MPO ALLOCATION PROCESS

| Jan  | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | Jun | Jul | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan  | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | Jun | Jul | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan  | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | Jun | Jul | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|

### SIX YEAR CAPITAL PLAN & SPLIT LETTER PREPARATION

| Jan  | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | Jun | Jul | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan  | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | Jun | Jul | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan  | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | Jun | Jul | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|

### MDOT WORK PLAN / MPO TIP / FEDERAL STIP PROCESSES

| Jan  | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | Jun | Jul | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan  | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | Jun | Jul | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan  | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | Jun | Jul | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|

### TRANSIT EVENTS

| Jan  | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | Jun | Jul | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan  | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | Jun | Jul | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan  | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | Jun | Jul | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|

### PACTS Transit Committee Meetings

| Jan  | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | Jun | Jul | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan  | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | Jun | Jul | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan  | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | Jun | Jul | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
Appendix E – PACTS Capital Management Area Map

*Adopted by the Policy Committee in May, 2014.*
Appendix F – Transit System Map
Appendix G – Expansion/Enhancement Policy and Application Process

PACTS Regional Transit Expansion & Enhancement Procedures

I. Introduction

The Portland Area Comprehensive Transportation System (PACTS) shares the responsibility with the Maine Department of Transportation (MaineDOT) for the initial programming of projects funded with Federal Highway and Federal Transit Administration (FHWA and FTA) funds in the PACTS Funding Area. The PACTS Transit Committee is composed of five designated recipients and two sub-recipients, two Executive Committee appointees, a representative of the Planning Committee and a staff member from both MaineDOT and Maine Turnpike Authority (all of whom are voting members). The Transit Committee is responsible for apportioning FTA funds to eligible projects within the PACTS region. The PACTS Funding Area covers parts or all of the following eighteen municipalities: Arundel, Biddeford, Cape Elizabeth, Cumberland, Gorham, Falmouth, Freeport, North Yarmouth, Old Orchard Beach, Portland, Raymond, Saco, South Portland, Scarborough, Standish, Westbrook, Windham and Yarmouth.

This document describes the administration of the PACTS Transit Enhancement & Expansion Procedures, and its role in the allocation of Urbanized Area Formula Program funds known as Section 5307 available for transit operations, planning and capital improvements. The majority of 5307 funds are allocated through an extensive asset management plan that seeks to maintain current levels of service throughout the region with adequate capital replacement and operating funds. These Procedures were created to govern the evaluation and selection of transit enhancement or expansion projects in the PACTS region for which Federal or State funding support has been requested and may be eligible for the Regionally Administered Discretionary Transit Program (RAD Program).

The PACTS Transit Operations Working Group oversaw the development of these Procedures, and the Procedures were adopted by the PACTS Transit Committee on September 18, 2014.

II. Programming Procedure

A. Organization Eligibility

Administrative officials from the following organizations may propose projects through the PACTS process:

- Biddeford Saco Old Orchard Beach Transit Committee (Shuttlebus)
- Casco Bay Island Transit District (CBITD)
- Greater Portland Transit District (METRO)
- Northern New England Passenger Rail Authority (NNEPRA)
- Regional Transportation Program (RTP)

1 Planning funds are for individual provider projects as well as for Regional projects that have not been included in the 5303 portion of the biennial Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP).
• South Portland Bus Service (SPBS)
• York County Community Action Corporation (YCCAC)

All others who wish to propose projects through the PACTS process must have the sponsorship of at least one of the organizations listed above.

The RAD application process occurs once each year, based on the following timeline:

• September – October – GPCOG staff solicits proposals from eligible organizations
• November – applications are due; a non-staff scoring committee scores applications based on the criteria outlined below
• December - February – the Transit Committee Workshop reviews selected applications
• March – the Transit Committee Workshop incorporates recommended applications into the draft SYCOP for Transit Committee consideration
• April – the Transit Committee reviews and endorses the SYCOP, including any incorporated RAD applications, and approves the corresponding Split Letter for the current Federal Fiscal Year.
• May - the PACTS Executive Committee adopts the SYCOP, including any incorporated RAD applications

B. Project Eligibility

Proposals for the RAD Program must be for projects that are eligible for Federal Funds under the PACTS MPO Allocation Process. Proposals must also be endorsed by the applicant’s Governing Body and/or Municipal Council(s) with formal commitment of local match.

The following list presents most of the eligible purposes.

• Improving existing core service
• Enhancing customer service
• Expanding service beyond the existing system

In the event that a question arises regarding the funding eligibility of a proposal, PACTS, Greater Portland Council of Governments (GPCOG) or Southern Maine Planning and Development Commission (SMPDC) staff will consult with MaineDOT, and/or FTA.

C. Proposal Requirements and Scoring Process

Applications will be due annually on November 1st. Final submissions that omit data or show incorrect data used in the scoring process will receive zeroes in those categories. Applications that fail to meet the requirements listed below will not be considered.

Proposals for funding must include a purpose-and-need statement that describes the conditions that warrant the proposed project and explain the intended benefits of that project.
Note: Projects that involve maintenance or replacement of existing equipment exclusively, that will be “operations neutral”, and that have necessary local match in place, will not be evaluated as part of this process. Instead, these projects may be “fast-tracked” for evaluation and approval by the PACTS Transit Committee for inclusion in the Six-Year Transit Capital Plan and recommended for approval by the PACTS Executive Committee for inclusion in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).

Scoring

Regional staff (from PACTS, GPCOG and SMPDC) carefully evaluate and score all proposals for use of transit funds. Scored proposals are brought to the PACTS Transit Committee as a non-binding input. The Transit Committee will reach consensus on a final project(s) selection recommendation for consideration and ratification by the PACTS Policy Committee. Selected projects will be added to the TIP.

The scoring and ranking processes involve policy and technical criteria that were developed and adopted by the PACTS Transit Committee.

Eligible proposals are scored according to three categories:

1. Type of Project (up to 30 points)

   Projects are divided into three main types, and only one option may be selected:
   a. Improves existing core service – e.g. Increasing frequency, extending service hours along existing transit routes, or linking two or more routes to provide faster, more direct service between major destinations (up to 30 points);
   b. Enhances customer service – e.g. Improvements to ticketing equipment, upgrades to call-in centers, automatic vehicle location (AVL) & real time passenger information (RTPI), wireless internet (WiFi), bus stop improvements and amenities, etc. (up to 24 points)
   c. Expands service beyond the existing system – e.g. Creating a new route or extending an existing route into new territory (up to 18 points)

Project types are listed and scored in order of importance to the regional transit system. Improving existing core service, for example, is a higher priority for the region than expanding service beyond the existing system. Consequently, a project that proposes improvements to existing core service can earn a greater overall number of points in this category (up to 30) than a project that would expand service beyond the existing system (up to 18 points).

2. Financial Sustainability (up to 30 points)

   a. Supported by additional level of committed local funding
      The minimum requirement for local match (including state contribution) is 15% for ADA accessible buses, 20% for all other Capital expenditures, and 50% for Operating expenditures. Proposals that have secured local funding that exceed these minimum requirements will receive additional points in this category, as they will make more efficient use of limited federal funds. (up to 11 points).

   b. Leverages other federal/state/local funds for operations or capital
Utilizing multiple funding sources to support a single project will make project funds go further, as well as help increase that project’s financial resilience. Any proposal that is able to utilize additional federal, state or local funds (beyond the standard federal 5307 and municipal local match funds) to diversify financial support for the project will receive additional points in this category. (up to 11 points).

c. Continuing financial commitment for local match
   In order for a proposed project to be successful over the long term, it will require ongoing, dedicated local match. Projects that have a commitment of continuing local match will receive higher scores than those projects that only have committed local match for the first year of operation. If a project fails to achieve its projected performance levels the provider of local match will not be held to their commitment unless all parties agree to extend the effort. (up to 8 points).

3. Demonstrated Need (up to 40 points)
   a. Projected performance of new or enhanced service after 3 years
      Projects that are anticipated to provide a greater positive impact on transit system performance will be scored higher than those with a smaller impact. Performance metrics for new or enhanced service may be compared against industry or regional standards, and/or against the provider’s existing service. Performance may be demonstrated by metrics such as (but not limited to) projected changes in: Ridership, Passenger Miles, Cost per Boarding, among others. Qualitative assessments may also be used for projects not conducive to quantitative estimates (such as customer service improvements). (up to 11 points).

   b. Supported by long-range plan, study and/or modeling
      Proposed projects that can demonstrate support from existing long-range municipal or regional plans, studies or modeling will be scored higher than those without support. If the applicant is pursuing points in this category, they must demonstrate in their application how their proposed project is supported by existing long-range municipal or regional plans, studies or modeling. (up to 11 points).

   c. Addresses regional priorities
      Proposed projects that address existing regional priorities (such as improved passenger safety & security, and those laid out in Destination Tomorrow, the Regional Transit Coordination Study, or other relevant regional policy documents), will be scored higher than those that do not address these priorities. If the applicant is pursuing points in this category, they must demonstrate in their application how their proposed project addresses existing regional priorities. (up to 11 points).

   d. Addresses local priorities
      Proposed projects that address existing local priorities (such as those laid out in one or more municipal Comprehensive Plans, or other relevant local policy documents), will be scored higher than those that do not address these priorities. If the applicant is pursuing points in this category, they must demonstrate in their application how their proposed project addresses existing local priorities. (up to 7 points)*.
*Note – Regional priorities are given greater scoring weight than local priorities, due to the regional nature of the PACTS transit system.

Regional staff will determine the score of each sub-category listed above by selecting a value from a 0 - 5 rating scale, and scaling that value up relative to the maximum number of points available for that sub-category.

For example, if a project is expected to make a considerable enhancement to customer service, it may be given a rating of “4” (out of a possible 5) for the Type of Project category. Because customer service enhancement projects are eligible for up to 24 points within the project type category, a rating of 4 (out of 5) would result in a category score of: 

\[
(4 \div 5) = 0.8 \times 24 \text{ maximum points} = 19.2 \text{ points.}
\]

Eligible proposals will receive an overall score between 0 and 100, and are expected to achieve a minimum score of 70 to be considered for funding. This minimum score is intended to ensure that the PACTS region will make the most efficient use of their limited federal transit funds by selecting only strong proposals for financial support. If no proposals submitted during a given funding period meet the minimum requirements as determined by the PACTS Transit Committee, none will be awarded financial support during that period, and those funds will be rolled over into a future funding period.

Please review the application form for specific information pertaining to the various project categories.
Appendix H – MaineDOT STIP Revision Procedures

STATEWIDE TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (STIP) PROCEDURES FOR THE STATE OF MAINE

I. Introduction
The Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) lists transportation programs and projects covering four years. Projects funded by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Federal Transit Administration (FTA) must be listed in an approved STIP before they are eligible for federal expenditures. A STIP is necessary for states to demonstrate fiscal constraint, adequate public involvement, and compliance with the Clean Air Act. Projects or programs become included in an approved STIP through a comprehensive revision process that supersedes the previous STIP or they are amended to the current STIP, and they must be developed according to the performance-based provisions of 23 CFR Part 450. This agreement between the FHWA, FTA, and MaineDOT, describes the process for adding, removing, or changing projects in the current STIP.

II. STIP Revision Guidelines
The procedure for formally revising the STIP varies depending on the nature of the proposed change to the STIP document. As described in 23 CFR §450, there are two types of revisions to an approved STIP:
- Amendment (Requires public process and federal approval)
- Administrative Modification (Information Only)

The degree of state and federal actions varies depending on revision type. As agreed upon by the FHWA, FTA, and MaineDOT, the following guidelines distinguish between an Amendment and an Administrative Modification to revise the STIP.

NOTE: For financial adjustments, federal funding would come from reserved federal funding, existing projects with excess funding based on latest estimate, bid savings from advertised projects, and/or unprogrammed federal funding associated with the fourth year of the STIP. Schedule adjustments may be required to accommodate the obligation of funding.

Amendment Guidelines
- Any change to a project in the current STIP that impacts the regional air quality conformity analysis used for the current conformity determination
- Adding or removing a significant project (Project requiring an EIS and a construction cost greater than $35M)
- Adding or removing a Non-Exempt phase of a project
- Adding or removing a project
- Adding or removing a phase(s) to a project with a financial adjustment in accordance with Table 1
- A scope change resulting in a financial adjustment in accordance with Table 1
- A change in the total cost of a project in accordance with Table 1
- Creating a line item with a total project cost in accordance with Table 1
- Project location/limits (by reference or otherwise) can be revised/updated in accordance with Table 1 and/or Table 2
- Adding a project from a prior STIP to the current STIP.

Administrative Modification Guidelines
- Statewide and Regional Capital Projects
  Capital projects identified as “Statewide” and/or “Regional” or “Region #” in the current MaineDOT STIP can be re-established as location-specific project(s) in the current STIP, given the following requirements are met.
Located in non-metropolitan and/or rural areas – any located within the metropolitan planning area (MPA) must be programmed in the MPO’s TIP

Statewide and regional capital projects are developed using MaineDOT’s documented public involvement process

Scope of location-specific work is consistent with or not materially different with the scope of the statewide or regional effort from which it is derived

Qualifies for a Categorical Exclusion per the Programmatic Agreement between FHWA and MaineDOT

In non-attainment and maintenance areas, project is exempt as defined in the EPA’s transportation conformity regulations

*NOTE: Activities that do not meet the above requirements must be added to the STIP and/or respective MPO’s TIP per the Amendment process.

- Financial adjustments in accordance with Table 1
- Combining or separating two or more projects that are part of an approved STIP/TIP
- Combining or separating phases within a project that are part of an approved STIP/TIP
- Adding or removing phase(s) to a project with a financial adjustment in accordance with Table 1
- Creating a lineage WIN with a total project cost in accordance with Table 1
- A scope change resulting in a financial adjustment in accordance with Table 1
- Project location/limits (by reference or otherwise) can be revised/updated in accordance with Table 1 and/or Table 2
- Can add a fully obligated project from a past STIP to the current STIP
- Can add “Other” funding (non-federal) to a project, which is not associated with the state and/or local match to the FHWA or FTA funding, which pertains to work not associated with FHWA and/or FTA funding such as utility work, local work, or other work regardless of Table 1
- Can change the time frame of the expenditures for projects listed in the current STIP.

### Table 1 - Financial Tables Guidelines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project's Current Approved Funding</th>
<th>Funding Change Thresholds</th>
<th>Administrative Modification</th>
<th>Amendment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than or equal to $2 Million</td>
<td>For changes up to $1,000,000</td>
<td>Required for changes greater than $1,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater than $2 Million</td>
<td>For changes up to 50% of current approved funding</td>
<td>Required for changes greater than 50% of current approved funding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contract Awards and Change Orders require no action. (Changes to MPO-sponsored projects require approval by the MPO).

### Table 2 - Linear Project-Location Limits Change Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asset</th>
<th>Administrative Modification</th>
<th>Amendment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interstate</td>
<td>Unlimited</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Interstate</td>
<td>Up to 1 Mile</td>
<td>&gt; 1 mile</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*NEPA review covers the revised limits.

III. STIP Revision Approval Process
Administrative Modifications are not significant changes to the existing STIP. Therefore, no public involvement process is required. For Administrative Modification, MaineDOT e-mails FHWA and/or FTA and updates the STIP change information on the MaineDOT website. FHWA and/or FTA shall reply in a timely manner to MaineDOT if they have concerns.

Amendments to the STIP are major changes. Therefore, a public involvement process is required. In accordance with 23 CFR § 450, the STIP Amendment process must provide a “reasonable opportunity” for public comment. The level of public involvement is scaled to the significance of the change. For any project requiring a STIP amendment, each of the following public involvement activities constitute a “reasonable opportunity” for public comment and satisfies the public review and comment requirement:

- Public meetings
- Public hearings
- Public Advisory Committee (PAC) meetings
- City/Town Council or Select Board Meetings
- Announcements on MaineDOT’s website (can be concurrent with MPO public process if applicable)
  - 10 calendar days
- Meetings with Municipal Professional Staff that have been Open to the Public; or
- A project that has been included in a published MaineDOT Work Plan that has been made available to the public via MaineDOT’s website per the parameters set in the 5th bullet above concerning “Announcements on MaineDOT’s website”.

For new projects (excluding lineage projects) or any projects that have not had adequate public involvement as defined above, MaineDOT will allow a minimum public comment period of 10 calendar days prior to requesting FHWA and/or FTA approval. STIP amendments will be posted on MaineDOT’s website. Once the public involvement period ends, MaineDOT will respond to the address of all substantive comments received. FHWA and/or FTA may assist MaineDOT in determining whether a comment is substantive.

To request a STIP Amendment, MaineDOT e-mails FHWA and/or FTA. FHWA and/or FTA shall approve or reject the Amendment and notify MaineDOT as soon as practicable, but generally within 10 business days. If an Amendment is rejected, the notification will explain the reasoning and provide guidance on the corrective action needed to obtain approval.

IV. Air Quality Conformity Analysis
As indicated above, any project that is not exempt from air quality conformity requirements must be included in a conforming TIP and STIP. Under the provisions of Section 176(c) of the Clean Air Act, as amended, in 1990, certain types of projects, primarily those that add capacity in federally designated “non-attainment” or “maintenance” areas, must be included in the regional emissions analysis for the current TIP and STIP. For purposes of this agreement, it is understood by MaineDOT, FHWA, and FTA that any project requiring an air quality conformity analysis will be included in the regional emissions and air quality conformity determination for the current TIP and STIP and provide that determination with project information during the public process.

V. National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Requirements
For projects funded by FHWA, the most current Programmatic Agreement between FHWA, Maine Division and MaineDOT will be followed for a Categorical Exclusion (CE). For anything above a CE, FHWA and MaineDOT will coordinate.

For projects funded by the FTA, the project sponsor should coordinate with the FTA Region 1 office to complete NEPA.
VI. Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs)
Maine's four MPOs approve MaineDOT-derived Transportation Improvement Programs (TIPs) project listings for their respective MPA and revise them as needed, which MaineDOT then incorporates into its STIP. MaineDOT and the MPOs coordinate under the same guidelines and public involvement periods described in this agreement such that MaineDOT will request STIP amendments from FHWA and/or FTA commensurate with this process. These are documented in each organization's respective public involvement plans.

In witness thereof, the parties hereto have approved these procedures on the day and year below.

Maine Department of Transportation
This is to certify that these procedures have been reviewed by the Department, and approved as to form and execution, and are considered adopted.

Date 8/10/18

By: [Signature]

Printed Name: David Bernhardt, P.E.
Title: Commissioner

Federal Highway Administration
This is to certify that these procedures have been reviewed by the Administration, are approved as to form and execution, and are considered adopted.

Date 8/21/18

By: [Signature]

Printed Name: Todd D. Jorgensen
Title: Division Administrator

Federal Transit Administration
This is to certify that these procedures have been reviewed by the Administration, are approved as to form and execution, and are considered adopted.

Date 8/28/18

By: [Signature]

Printed Name: Peter Butler
Title: Acting Regional Administrator
## Appendix I – Glossary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADA</td>
<td>Americans with Disabilities Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVL</td>
<td>Automatic Vehicle Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOP</td>
<td>Biennial Operations Plan (MaineDOT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSOOB</td>
<td>Biddeford, Saco, Old Orchard Beach Transit Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBITD</td>
<td>Casco Bay Island Transit District a.k.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBL</td>
<td>Casco Bay Lines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMAQ</td>
<td>Congestion Mitigation Air Quality Program (Federal Funds)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOE</td>
<td>Department of Energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAST Act</td>
<td>Fixing America’s Surface Transportation (FAST) Act (2016-2020 Reauthorization, replacing MAP-21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFY</td>
<td>Federal Fiscal Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHWA</td>
<td>Federal Highway Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA</td>
<td>Federal Transit Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPCOG</td>
<td>Greater Portland Council of Governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITS</td>
<td>Intelligent Transportation Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JARC</td>
<td>Job Access &amp; Reverse Commute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUTTA</td>
<td>Land Use and Transit-Supportive Development Implementation Technical Assistance study – Continuation of the Gorham East/West study with additional municipalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAP-21</td>
<td>Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (2-year transportation authorization enacted July, 2012, replacing SAFETEA-LU, MAP – 21 Extended to end of December)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METRO</td>
<td>Greater Portland Transit District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MaineDOT</td>
<td>Maine Department of Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOA</td>
<td>Memorandum of Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOU</td>
<td>Memorandum of Understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPO</td>
<td>Metropolitan Planning Organization (PACTS, KACTS, ATRC, BACTS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNEPRA</td>
<td>Northern New England Passenger Rail Authority (Downeaster, contracts with Amtrak)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OWG</td>
<td>PACTS Transit Operations Working Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACTS</td>
<td>Portland Area Comprehensive Transportation System (Portland Area MPO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTC</td>
<td>PACTS Transit Committee, or Portland Transportation Center (Concord Coach &amp; NNEPRA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAD</td>
<td>Regionally Administered Transit Discretionary Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFP</td>
<td>Request for Proposals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFQ</td>
<td>Request for Qualifications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTDP</td>
<td>Regional Transit Development Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTPI</td>
<td>Real Time Passenger Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAFETEA-LU</td>
<td>Safe, Affordable, Flexible, Efficient, Transportation Act – Legacy for Users, 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMART</td>
<td>Southern Maine ARea Transit initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMTT</td>
<td>Southern Maine Transit Tracker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPBS</td>
<td>South Portland Bus Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STIP</td>
<td>Statewide Transportation Improvement Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP</td>
<td>Surface Transportation Program (FHWA Funds)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S&amp;S</td>
<td>Regional Bus Sign and Shelter Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEAM</td>
<td>Transportation Electronic Award Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIP</td>
<td>Transportation Improvement Program (PACTS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TMA</td>
<td>Transportation Management Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TMA</td>
<td>Transportation Management Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TrAMS</td>
<td>FTA's Transit Award Management System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSAP</td>
<td>Transit Stop Access Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPWP</td>
<td>Unified Planning Work Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YCCAC</td>
<td>York County Community Action Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5303</td>
<td>FTA Planning Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5307</td>
<td>FTA Urbanized Area Formula Grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5309</td>
<td>Fixed Guideway Capital Investment Grants (“New Starts”) for New and Expanded Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5310</td>
<td>Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5311</td>
<td>Formula Grants for Rural Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5337</td>
<td>State of Good Repair Grants – Includes High Intensity Fixed Guideway Formula for Replacement, Rehabilitation and Maintenance of existing Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5339</td>
<td>Bus and Bus Facilities Formula Grants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Introduction

On behalf of the region’s Metropolitan Planning Organization, the Greater Portland Council of Governments is soliciting proposals for assistance researching and drafting a scoring framework for prioritizing projects—of different modes and from different municipalities and agencies—for funding.

About GPCOG and PACTS

The Portland Area Comprehensive Transportation System (PACTS) is the state’s largest Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO). Pursuant to federal statute, PACTS was established in 1964 as a collaborative effort of municipal, regional, state and federal representatives responding to the transportation-related goals and objectives of the Greater Portland region and its citizens. The purpose of PACTS is to identify travel patterns in the area, forecast future needs, and develop plans for improvements necessary to maintain a transportation system that will provide for the safe and efficient movement of people and goods in the Greater Portland area.

The PACTS area includes 18 member communities with 7 public transportation providers. The member communities are Arundel, Biddeford, Cape Elizabeth, Cumberland, Falmouth, Freeport, Gorham, North Yarmouth, Old Orchard Beach, Portland, Raymond, Saco, Scarborough, South Portland, Standish, Westbrook, Windham and Yarmouth. The public transportation providers are Biddeford Saco Old Orchard Beach Transit (Shuttlebus Zoom), Casco Bay Island Transit District, Greater Portland Transit District (METRO), Northern New England Passenger Rail Authority, Regional Transportation Program, City of South Portland Bus Service, and York County Community Action Corporation.

One of PACTS’ important functions is to program state and federal transportation funds, via the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). PACTS programs these dollars throughout the region, across all modes.

In 2018, PACTS and the Greater Portland Council of Governments (GPCOG)—a regional planning agency and economic development district—voted to combine their staffs to better serve the region. The agreement, approved by the governing boards of both organizations, set up a process for a complete merger of GPCOG and PACTS over a three-year period. PACTS will continue to program federal highway and transit funds.

Project Information

Purpose and Need

As mentioned above, PACTS programs funds across all modes. While PACTS has an adopted scoring system used to prioritize FHWA capital projects, it currently lacks a formal mechanism for prioritizing transit projects. PACTS needs to develop a comprehensive, consistent, multimodal framework that can be used to select projects for funding. This framework is necessary to ensure PACTS is making the best use of its investments in support of PACTS’ regional goals.
Background

In 2016, PACTS developed, and the PACTS Policy Committee approved, a new scoring system for FHWA capital projects. The system was designed to help PACTS invest in regionally significant capital improvements across all modes and implement the Priority Corridors and Centers recommendations in the Destination 2040 long range transportation plan. The new scoring system replaced several separate scoring formulas used previously. PACTS first used the new system in 2017 and, as a result, programmed projects that met more of PACTS regional goals and objectives. The scoring system needs to be expanded to cover all projects in all modes.

Scope of Work and Location Map

The scope of work for this project is below, followed by a map of the project location. This scope of work shall be used as a guideline; it is the proposer’s responsibility to provide all necessary services to ensure the project is completed fully and efficiently.

➢ Task 1: Convene/Attend Kickoff Meetings

Convene an initial meeting with GPCOG staff. Attend a kick-off initial meeting of the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Committee.

Deliverables

• Attendance at and active participation in 2 meetings.
• Written summaries from both meetings highlighting decisions, action items, and next steps.

➢ Task 2: Research Best Practices

Research national examples of frameworks for scoring and prioritizing projects of different modes for funding. Look at frameworks used by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (San Francisco Bay Area), Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG), San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG), Atlanta Regional Commission, Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning (CMAP), Pioneer Valley Planning Commission (Massachusetts), etc. Seek examples that are simple and applicable to PACTS. Identify portions that are not applicable to PACTS, such as state-specific restrictions on funding sources. Suggest how examples from large regions could be tailored to PACTS. Also review PACTS Bylaws and related documents to determine if any changes are required to fully execute a funding prioritization framework.

Deliverables

• Written report on best practices.

➢ Task 3: Obtain Input

Design a process for obtaining input from TIP Committee members, including developing the agendas and meeting materials to solicit input from the TIP Committee in the process of developing a framework. Attend all TIP Committee meetings and facilitate agenda items as needed. Work with staff to engage committee members. Present research to the committee.
Deliverables

- Attendance at and active participation in 5-10 meetings.
- Written summaries from all TIP Committee meetings highlighting decisions, action items, and next steps.

➢ Task 4: Draft Scoring Framework

Draft a proposed scoring framework or framework options, whichever is most applicable based on the ongoing process with the TIP Committee. Develop criteria that are applicable to all modes and all funding streams.

In developing the framework, draw from the following documents:

- Moving Southern Maine Forward
- Destination 2040
- PACTS Reforms
- PACTS Priorities
- Transit Tomorrow Vision Statement

Deliverables

- Draft scoring framework(s).

➢ Task 5: Final Scoring Framework

Work with PACTS staff and the PACTS TIP Committee to select and finalize a scoring framework. Present the framework at a PACTS governing board meeting.

Deliverables

- Scoring framework(s) prepared for approval by PACTS.
- Attendance at and active participation in the PACTS governing board meeting.
- Written summary from the PACTS governing board meeting.

We estimate this work to take 150-200 hours. A framework should be adopted by May 2020.
Instructions for Proposers

Submission Requirements

Please submit two separate proposals by email, a non-price proposal and a price proposal. The proposal titles should be:

1. “PACTS Funding Prioritization Framework Non-Price Proposal”
2. “PACTS Funding Prioritization Framework Price Proposal”

The proposals should be emailed as follows:

1. The first email shall contain the response to Scope of Work with all information required, minus the cost information, and with the following in the subject line of the email:
   
   “PACTS Funding Prioritization Framework NON-PRICE PROPOSAL”

   Please limit non-price proposal submissions to a total of 30 pages of content (not including cover and table of contents).