Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Committee
AGENDA
Tuesday, May 19, 2020
9:30 – 11:00 a.m.
Remote Meeting by Zoom Webinar

Please click the link to join the webinar: https://us02web.zoom.us/j/97469206074
Or join by 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 – Erin Courtney, Chair 9:30
   In the absence of nominations, PACTS Policy Committee Chair Matthew Sturgis appointed Erin Courtney as Chair and Jay Chace as Vice Chair of the TIP Committee.

2. Public Comment
   Residents of the region are welcome to share up to three minutes of comment on any topic, including items on the agenda.

3. Acceptance of April 21, 2020 Meeting Minutes (Attachments A and A1)

4. Allocation of 2023 FHWA Resources (Attachment B) 9:35
   The TIP Committee is charged with recommending the allocation of 2023 FHWA resources. PACTS’ federal allocation plus 25% local match is $5,495,479 for calendar year 2023. 40% of that amount—$2,198,191—is allocated to the collector paving program. 60% of that amount—$3,297,287—is available for preservation, modernization, and expansion projects. (PACTS’ state allocation is used for the PACTS Municipal Partnership Initiative (MPI). The PACTS MPI Policy is available on the GPCOG website.)
   The approximately $3.3 million for preservation, modernization, and expansion projects is the amount the TIP Committee is charged with allocating. Two projects—the Beth Condon Shared Use Path Extension in Yarmouth and the Proposed Improvements to Brighton Avenue in Portland—were programmed
for preliminary design report (PDR) in the 2018 TIP and are next in line for construction funding. The PDR for Beth Condon is completed; the construction estimate is $950,000. The PDR for Brighton Avenue is expected to be completed within 12 months; the construction estimate is $4.2 million. Per the existing TIP Policies and Procedures, 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.”

At its April 21, 2020 meeting, the TIP Committee voted not to accept new project applications this year. After the meeting, MaineDOT staff discussed with PACTS staff the implications of not funding any new projects for PDR this year—it would likely leave PACTS with no “complex” projects (like Beth Condon or Brighton Avenue) to fund for construction until at least 2023. MaineDOT staff explained the possibility of allocating funds to a PDR Set Aside. This possibility would allow more time to submit applications for new projects and would ensure there are projects in the pipeline for construction funding in future years. Attachment B illustrates potential options for allocation.

The TIP Committee’s recommended list of FHWA capital project selections will be submitted for adoption by the PACTS Executive Committee on June 2 and for ratification by the PACTS Policy Committee.

*Proposed Action: Finalize recommended list of FHWA capital project selections.*

5. **Funding Prioritization Framework**

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. GPCOG selected AECOM to help develop the framework. Last month the TIP Committee discussed the purpose and need for the project. This month AECOM will share the results of its research of national examples of prioritization frameworks, identifying best practices and determining applicability to PACTS.

*Proposed Action: Discuss best practices, scoring factors.*
6. **Policies and Procedures Documents** (Attachment C) 10:50


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

7. **Adjourn** 11:00
Attachment A
Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Committee
DRAFT MINUTES
April 21, 2020

Attendance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Attendance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Members</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hank Berg</td>
<td>Casco Bay Lines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Branch</td>
<td>City of Portland</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lori Brann</td>
<td>MaineDOT</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jay Chace</td>
<td>Town of Scarborough</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Chop</td>
<td>Maine Medical Center</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erin Courtney</td>
<td>Maine Turnpike Authority</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Currie</td>
<td>York County Community Action Corporation (YCCAC)</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack DeBeradinis</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Program (RTP)</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Fox</td>
<td>City of Saco</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Handman</td>
<td>City of South Portland Bus Service</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Hyman</td>
<td>City of Portland</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregg Isherwood</td>
<td>Custom Coach &amp; Limousine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex Jaegerman</td>
<td>Town of Yarmouth</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Jordan</td>
<td>Greater Portland METRO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maureen O’Meara</td>
<td>Town of Cape Elizabeth</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Quinn</td>
<td>Northern New England Passenger Rail Authority (NNEPRA)</td>
<td>Alternate: William Gayle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marty Rooney</td>
<td>MaineDOT</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony Scavuzzo</td>
<td>Biddeford Saco Old Orchard Beach (BSOOB) Transit</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Shane</td>
<td>Town of Cumberland</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Guests</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Dudley</td>
<td>City of Westbrook</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca Grover</td>
<td>Maine Turnpike Authority</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Mann</td>
<td>MaineDOT</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>For GPCOG</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristina Egan, Aubrey Miller, Ryan Neale, Elizabeth Roberts, Phaeng Southisombath</td>
<td>GPCOG</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jill Cahoon, Price Armstrong</td>
<td>AECOM</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Welcome

Aubrey Miller opened the meeting. Ryan Neale reviewed the features of a Zoom Webinar.

2. Chair and Vice Chair

Aubrey Miller called for nominations for Chair and Vice Chair. No nominations were made. Aubrey asked Committee members to consider nominations in advance of the next meeting.

3. Committee Charge and Committee Schedule

Aubrey Miller presented the item. Alex Jaegerman moved to approve the Committee Charge and Committee Schedule as written and Maureen O’Meara seconded. A roll call vote was conducted. All were in favor.

4. TIP Project Selection Overview & Update

Aubrey Miller noted, after the 40% collector paving set-aside, PACTS has just under $3.3 million to allocate for preservation, modernization, and expansion projects. Projects currently in the pipeline include the Beth Condon Trail and the Brighton Avenue Improvements, which were both programmed for preliminary design report (PDR) funding in the 2018 TIP. The Beth Condon Trail needs approximately $950,000 for construction and the Brighton Avenue Improvements project needs approximately $4.2 million for construction.

Elizabeth Roberts explained the spreadsheet in Attachment D3, “PACTS Sponsored Projects that are Scheduled to Advertise 11/2019 - 4/2020.” She noted that straightforward collector paving project bids have generally been coming in under available funds, while bids for intersection projects—especially those with traffic signals—have been coming in over available funds. The pandemic does not seem to be affecting bids at this point.

Chris Branch noted that Portland has hired Ransom Consulting to look at how to phase the Brighton Avenue project since the full length of the project—from approximately the University of Southern Maine Law School almost to Rand Road—will likely cost more than $4.2 million. Portland plans to finish the PDR, with a phasing plan, within 12 months, and then move to bid with a $4.2 million budget. He also noted Portland’s experience that smaller construction projects are currently more competitive than larger projects.

Alex Jaegerman confirmed the $950,000 estimate for the Beth Condon Trail, noting it includes a 25% contingency and some other costs. Yarmouth is ready to move forward with the project. He noted there are other projects underway, operating under the assumption that Yarmouth will be building the Beth Condon Trail. The plan is for the entire path to run from Cumberland to the Cousins River Bridge.
Chris Branch cautioned about the current decrease in gas tax money being collected. He added he had heard about a potential loss of $125 million in MaineDOT funding in the next biennium. Marty Rooney said he had also heard about the potential $125 million shortfall, but that MaineDOT planning staff has received no direction related to cutting any projects or adjusting any MPO (metropolitan planning organization) allocations.

Bill Shane commented he did not think PACTS should fund any bicycle and pedestrian (bike/ped) projects for the next 3-5 years until the region can catch up on the collector paving program, which currently has a deficit. He expressed concern that roads are not being properly maintained and said he was not comfortable doing anything other than collector paving with most of the PACTS allocation. He also suggested dividing the TIP Committee into subcommittees to deal with the specific pieces of the TIP process. He added that there are important regional projects on the horizon and PACTS should develop a better process for how the TIP is funded. He also suggested that collector paving be handled like MPI (Municipal Partnership Initiative) with greater funding and resources allocated to it, with just state and local money and no federal money.

Lori Brann agreed the TIP Committee should be split into an FTA side and an FHWA side.

Erin Courtney asked if PACTS would have to reduce collector paving funding if the region were to include any of the larger projects in the pipeline. Aubrey said no, but the larger projects would have to be funded in phases.

Marty Rooney noted that PACTS allocates money to three programs—MPI, collector paving, and “everything else.” PACTS may wish to fundamentally change those programs, but if not, then PACTS simply needs to take the money for “everything else” and allocate it between Beth Condon, Brighton Avenue, and any new projects.

Alex Jaegerman spoke to Bill’s prior comments. He appreciates the need to maintain a strong pavement management program but noted that is what the percentages do. He added that a wholesale revamp of the formula and the expectations communities have would not be a good idea. The TIP Committee only has two meetings to develop its recommendations. The Beth Condon project went through the process, developed a PDR, and deferred funding when other projects came in over budget. He said PACTS should stay with the program to the extent possible rather than fundamentally shifting resources. There are many priorities and bike/ped is one of them. It is important to emphasize other modes and the Beth Condon Trail has regional significance and can play a role in diverting trips from highways.

Chris Chop asked about the relationship between the $3.3 million for preservation, modernization, and expansion, and the list of projects in Attachment D3. Elizabeth explained that the projects in Attachment D3 have already been funded; the attachment just shows how construction bids have been coming in compared to estimates.
Bill commented that the region has not done a lot of good work in planning for funding capital priorities in the region. He expressed his view that projects at locations with high traffic volumes should be higher priority than bike/ped projects. He said bike/ped should be more in the MPI category, funded with local match and state funding, and that such projects provide more local benefit than regional benefit.

Maureen commented that projects are funded to promote public safety. People travel in cars, on bikes, and on their feet, and we have pedestrian fatalities. Abandoning everything we have learned about complete streets to focus on paving roads feels like a huge step backwards. Maureen stated she agrees we should focus on regional priorities rather than making sure everyone gets some money. She encouraged the TIP Committee to focus on regional priorities and use the TIP process to ensure funding goes to projects important to the entire region, but not to abandon bike/ped projects.

Kristina Egan reminded everyone that PACTS went through a six-month process last year to develop its priorities. The list of five priorities includes improving intersections and maintaining roads, but also expanding sidewalks and bikeways, maintaining and improvement public transportation, and planning for growth in places that make sense. It is a balancing act to advance on all five, and there are varied opinions on the committee, but it was a PACTS-wide process to determine the five priorities. Kristina added that PACTS has been looking at BUILD (Better Utilizing Investments to Leverage Development) Transportation Discretionary Grants program opportunities, but PACTS does not have projects that are ready for such funds. Kristina expressed concern that PACTS may be missing opportunities because we have been spreading out bits of money rather than looking at bigger projects. As an example, BUILD grant projects need to be about $6.25 million. Because we have been in a mentality of scarcity, we have not thought much about large discretionary opportunities. It is important to have complicated projects continue to go through PDR.

Maureen noted that during the last recession we had TIGER (Transportation Investment Generating Economic Recovery) Discretionary Grants and there is some discussion at the federal level about a new infrastructure investment. She suggested possibly reopening requests for proposals to be prepared to take advantage of major opportunities at the federal level if they become available.

Chris Chop encouraged PACTS/GPCOG to, in the next long-range plan, include a fiscally constrained plan of projects out to 2045 and perhaps have a prioritization process included in that, where projects are phased in 4-6 year increments with anticipated financial resources assigned to them. It would help showcase some of the projects that could be in the pipeline. It could also include a list of vision projects that are not necessarily funded or anticipated to be funded but could be dream projects for discretionary funding opportunities.
Marty said that discretionary funds have stipulations on timing. He said that over the last 10 years or so, PACTS has funded various plans, but the recommendations in those plans have gotten lost. He has suggested having someone look at past plans, look at unfunded build recommendations, and come up with a pool of projects that could compete for more planning or for PDR funds. He also pointed out a complication with being ready for discretionary funding—an FHWA rule that if you design a project and 10 years go by without progress, you may have to return those funds.

Chris Branch agreed with Bill that the MPI process might be a better option for the Beth Condon project. He pointed out that Brighton Avenue is a multimodal project, not just a road project, and includes looking at bus priority along the route, bike lanes, sidewalks, ADA (Americans with Disabilities Act) compliant curb ramps, etc. Portland sees all projects as multimodal projects. Chris also said that streets in Portland are falling apart and that streets are also necessary for transit and for bike lanes.

Maureen moved to not accept new projects. Chris Branch seconded the motion.

Bruce Hyman asked about the Washington Avenue project, which had funding removed to fund the Brighton Avenue Roundabout. Chris Branch explained that the City does not plan to request money from PACTS to complete Washington Avenue, but is instead considering a redesign with significant savings.

Elizabeth Roberts asked for clarification whether the motion means we are also not funding new PDRs, which are needed to move projects into the pipeline.

Chris Branch suggested using UPWP (Unified Planning Work Program) money to fund PDRs. That would save money for construction.

Alex asked if the $3.3 million includes the local share or just the federal share, and Aubrey clarified that it includes both. Alex indicated that he likes the idea of funding PDRs from the UPWP. He added that it would be good to fund PDRs to get some projects into the pipeline.

Bill said the expectation has been that projects that receive PDR funding will also receive construction funding, which he disagrees with. He said there are bigger regional priorities than the Beth Condon Trail. He said he does not want to fund more PDRs until we have a system to fund projects of regional significance, in places with the bulk of the traffic.

Kristina Egan suggested creating a short list of projects that advance PACTS Priorities to keep building a conveyor belt of projects. PACTS staff has already looked through the unfunded recommendations in various planning documents and developed a universe of projects. Kristina said she did not want to halt PDRs, except maybe for the time it would take to develop a top 5 or top 10 list. She said staff could work on the list and in the future we would already have regional agreement about priority projects. She noted that she has
also heard from Marty that we do not want to fund PDRs that we cannot back up with capital funding because that is a waste of PDR funding.

Maureen clarified that she was neither anti-PDR nor pro-PDR. She explained she made the motion to allow the committee to move forward. She asked for clarification that we currently have a certain amount of money and we have identified two projects that exceed that amount. Aubrey confirmed that is correct. Maureen asked for further clarification that Portland is fine with the amount of money that is available because they can phase their project and Bill Shane confirmed that is correct. Maureen suggested focusing on the projects we have and following up on Kristina’s idea to develop a new list of current projects we want funded. She asked to move the vote and Aubrey confirmed the motion is to not accept any new applications for projects for construction or for PDR.

Marty Rooney noted that the funding we are deciding on now, whether for PDR or for Brighton or Beth Condon, is for construction year 2023. If PACTS does not add anything to the pipeline now, in a year we will again be looking at Beth Condon and Brighton, or possibly a project for which a municipality funds design on its own. He also noted that, while it is fine if PACTS wants to fund PDRs from the UPWP, the next UPWP will not start until 2022.

Maureen asked if new applications would be due in a month and Aubrey said yes. Maureen said that would be another reason to simply work with what we already have in the pipeline but to encourage communities to start thinking about new projects.

Kristina clarified that Maureen’s motion does not preclude future PDR funding for other projects. She also said that in the meantime, PACTS staff will start working on developing a better short list of regionally significant projects.

Aubrey confirmed that the TIP Committee’s vote is simply a recommendation and the PACTS Policy Committee has the final say.

A roll call vote was taken on Maureen’s motion to not accept any new project applications this year. The second had been offered by Bill Shane. There were six abstentions; all others (9) were in favor.

5. **Policies and Procedures Documents**

Aubrey introduced the item and suggested, in the interest of time, postponing the item until the next meeting. The committee agreed to postpone this item until the next meeting.

6. **Funding Prioritization Framework**

Aubrey introduced the item and Jill Cahoon and Price Armstrong of AECOM. (AECOM’s PowerPoint presentation is attached at the end of the minutes.) Jill introduced the full project team, which includes staff from AECOM and FHI, the same two firms working on
Transit Tomorrow. The consultant team includes multimodal and other experts to get a variety of perspectives. She discussed the schedule of tasks, starting with today’s kickoff meeting to discuss the project plan and TIP Committee engagement. The second task is to research national best practices, including both peer and non-peer agencies. The third task is to obtain input, which will happen throughout the process; the consultant team will attend all TIP Committee meetings and conduct online surveys of TIP Committee members. Jill explained that the team will bring both a draft scoring framework and a final scoring framework to the TIP Committee for input.

Chris Chop expressed concern about a large committee assigning scoring criteria and weights and suggested electronic surveys to engage committee members on their own time and to allow input in a different manner. Jill said they anticipated the same concern and have scheduled electronic surveys at two points during the process.

Maureen asked everyone to try to keep this as clean as possible. She suggested including a short paragraph with any scoring criteria, explaining how to earn the total possible points.

Bruce commented that one of the positive aspects of the prior TIP funding process was the designation and tracking of the preservation, modernization, and expansion aspects of projects. For example, the flexible target of 60% for preservation echoed the priorities in the existing long-range transportation plan, which placed great importance on preserving the system, but also acknowledged the need for modernization and expansion. He said he would like a similar framework and tracking for those elements.

Chris Branch said he thought AECOM’s work was going to be on the transit side rather than the road side, since there is a process in place on the road side but not on the transit side. Aubrey clarified that, while there may be more work to be done on the transit side, the goal is to take a comprehensive look at the system as a whole.

Alex recommended incorporating the work of the Maine Climate Council and the Transportation Working Group. As we look at the decision-making process for allocation investments in transportation, we should be cognizant of the goals for greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. Alex added that he believes PACTS should step up in the region and do what it can to work toward meeting targets for GHG emissions in the transportation sector.

7. Adjourn
The AECOM Team
Proven experience working together with GPCOG and key regional partners.

- Manage project
- Attend and lead meetings
- Gather input from TIP Committee
- Develop scoring systems
- Research best practices
- Provide technical expertise
- Develop scoring systems

*MaineDOT DBE
The AECOM Team

Principal in Charge
Stephen Gazillo, AICP

QA / QC
Jay Doyle, AICP

Active Transportation
Ray Hayhurst, AICP

Project Manager
Jill Cahoon, GISP

Mobility Management
Michael Ahillen, AICP (FHI)

Economic Impacts
Jason Weiss

Decision Framework
Price Armstrong, AICP
Project Understanding

Need for integrated scoring system to cover all projects across all modes.

- Increasingly complex, multimodal projects
- Changing regional priorities
- New vision for transportation
Vision from Transit Tomorrow

Using our region’s public transportation is faster and more affordable than driving a car. Our system is funded sustainably and provides reliable and seamless transportation for our community, including commuters, mainland and island residents, and those with limited mobility options. Our communities support the long-term viability of public transportation by focusing new homes and jobs where people already live and work.
Vision from Transit Tomorrow

To accomplish this, we envision a public transportation system that:

**Stimulates Economic Development**
Public transportation connects people to opportunity and jobs, building a stronger regional workforce and economy.

**Enhances Great Places**
New public transportation investments support housing and job growth in priority centers, reinforcing walkable neighborhoods, villages and downtowns, and helping to preserve the region’s natural areas.

**Reduces Climate Pollution**
Public transportation plays a critical role in reducing the region’s greenhouse gas emissions by providing a viable alternative to driving. The public transportation network is resilient to extreme weather events and long-range climate stresses.

**Expands Mobility**
Public transportation offers a robust, inclusive system for those who use it. Access to bus stops, terminals and stations is safe for people of all abilities, and connects to the region’s sidewalks, trails, bike network, roadway improvements and new mobility options. Our region pursues mobility management innovations and partnerships that reduce costs and coordinate resources to meet people’s needs.

**Elevates the Customer Experience**
The region’s public transportation agencies collaborate to create a safe and seamless system for people. Technology is leveraged to provide unified tools that make it easy for customers to use the network.
Task 1 – Convene / Attend Kickoff Meeting

Re-confirm project plan and TIP Committee engagement strategy.
Task 2 – Research Best Practices

Identify national examples of scoring systems applicable to PACTS.

- Review peer and non-peer regions
- Select examples applicable to Greater Portland
- Determine if PACTS bylaws and other funding rules require changes

Pioneer Valley Planning Commission

Metropolitan Council

San Diego Association of Governments
Task 3 – Obtain Input
Engage TIP committee through focused discussions and online surveys.

Proposed Meetings

1. Purpose & Need / Background
2. Best Practices / Scoring Factors
3. Draft Scoring Framework
4. Revised Draft Scoring Framework
5. Finalize / Endorse Scoring Framework

Transit Tomorrow Visioning Exercise Survey

Transit Tomorrow Visioning Exercise GPCOG

Trade-off Analysis
The following three questions describe transit investment trade-offs. Move the sliding scale to indicate your preference.

**Speed vs. Access**
- Faster service to destination, even if there are fewer places to access service
- Slower service to destination, but easy access in many places

**Coverage vs. Frequency**
- Service to more locations, even if it’s less frequent
- Service to a fewer number of locations more frequently

**Span vs. Coverage**
- Longer hours of service in the early morning and late evening in a few places
- Service in more places, even if means the service doesn’t operate as long

Online Survey
Task 4 – Draft Scoring Framework
Develop integrated scoring system(s).
Task 4 – Draft Scoring Framework

Develop integrated scoring system(s).

- Destination 2040
- PACTS Reforms
- PACTS Priorities
- Moving Southern Maine Forward
- Transit Tomorrow Vision Statement
- PACTS Scoring Formula for Funding
- FHWA Capital Projects
Task 4 – Draft Scoring Framework

Develop integrated scoring system(s).

- 5 TIP Committee meetings
- 2 online surveys
Task 4 – Draft Scoring Framework
Develop integrated scoring system(s).

– Written report summarizing applicable national best practices
Task 4 – Draft Scoring Framework
Develop integrated scoring system(s).
Task 5 – Final Scoring Framework

Present scoring framework for adoption by the Board.
Attachment B
Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Committee
OPTIONS FOR ALLOCATION OF 2023 FHWA RESOURCES

Option A
- Allocate $950,000 to Beth Condon.
- Allocate the remaining ~$2.3 million to Brighton Avenue.
- Then, next year:
  - Beth Condon would be fully funded.
  - Portland may seek ~$1.9 million for Brighton Avenue from the 2024 FHWA Resources.
  - PACTS may have ~$1.4 million\(^1\) to allocate to:
    - New “complex” projects for PDR
    - New “complex” projects for construction that have received PDR funding elsewhere
    - New “simple” projects (i.e., projects small enough to go immediately to construction without PDR)

Option B
- Allocate the full ~$3.3 million to Brighton Avenue.
- Then, next year:
  - Yarmouth may seek $950,000 for Beth Condon from the 2024 FHWA Resources.
  - Portland may seek ~$900,000 for Brighton Avenue from the 2024 FHWA Resources.
  - PACTS may have ~$1.4 million to allocate as indicated in Option A.

Option C
- Allocate $950,000 to Beth Condon.
- Allocate ~$2.1 million to Brighton Avenue.
- Allocate ~$200,000 to a PDR Set Aside to fund approximately one new “complex” project for PDR.
- Then, next year:
  - Beth Condon would be fully funded.
  - Portland may seek ~$2.1 million for Brighton Avenue from the 2024 FHWA Resources.

---

\(^1\) If PACTS continues to receive the same amount of capital improvement funding it has for many years (which is uncertain given the pandemic), and PACTS maintains the current 40/60 split between collector paving and “other” (preservation, modernization, and expansion) projects, next year PACTS would again have ~$3.3 million to allocate for “other” projects. After allocating ~$1.9 million for Brighton Avenue, ~$1.4 million would be left.
• PACTS may have ~$1.2 million\(^2\) to allocate as indicated in Option A.
• Then, in 2022, the project funded for PDR in 2020 may be ready to consider for construction funding.

**Option D**
• Allocate ~$3.1 million to Brighton Avenue.
• Allocate ~$200,000 to a PDR Set Aside to fund approximately one new “complex” project for PDR.
• Then, next year:
  o Yarmouth may seek $950,000 for Beth Condon from the 2024 FHWA Resources.
  o Portland may seek ~$1.1 million for Brighton Avenue from the 2024 FHWA Resources.
  o PACTS may have ~$1.2 million to allocate as indicated in Option A.
• Then, in 2022, the project funded for PDR in 2020 may be ready to consider for construction funding.

**Option E**
• Other ideas?

\(^2\) If PACTS continues to receive the same amount of capital improvement funding it has for many years (which is uncertain given the pandemic), and PACTS maintains the current 40/60 split between collector paving and “other” (preservation, modernization, and expansion) projects, next year PACTS would again have ~$3.3 million to allocate for “other” projects. After allocating ~$2.1 million for Brighton Avenue, ~$1.2 million would be left.
PACTS Transportation Improvement Program Policies and Procedures for 2017 and 2018

September 2016

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?
- Is the timeline accurate? (See attached pages 2-3 from the TIP Policies and Procedures.)
- Who should score projects? (See attached page 7 from the TIP Policies and Procedures.)
- What should PACTS committee (Planning, Technical, Transit, ad hoc committees such as the TIP Committee) involvement look like? What is 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? (See attached pages 22-24 from the TIP Policies and Procedures.)
- Is planning work reflected in the programming process?
- Are PACTS Reforms and PACTS Regional Transportation Policies and other relevant documents reflected in the Policies & Procedures?
- Is there information that does not 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.
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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? *(See attached pages 14-16 from the Transit Policies and Procedures Manual.)*
- Are PACTS Reforms, PACTS Regional Transportation Policies, 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.
Selected Pages, TIP Policies and Procedures
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.
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. PACS 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
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 for 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
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.
FACTS will add the detailed programming elements of this Transit Planning Policies and Procedures document to the overall FACTS document later this year.

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

1.3.1 The FACTS 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 FACTS 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 FACTS region and sends it to FACTS for review and approval. GPCOG staff distributes it to the region’s transit agencies and all other FACTS 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 FACTS 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 FACTS TIP narrative, attaches the approved TIP projects list, public comments and errata sheet, and then sends them to MaineDOT.

5. MaineDOT subsequently incorporates the FACTS 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 FACTS 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 CBTID 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

16