Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Committee
AGENDA
Tuesday, June 16, 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 are 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

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 May 19, 2020 Meeting Minutes (Attachments A, A1)

   Last month the TIP Committee voted to recommend the allocation of the $3,297,287 in FHWA funds PACTS is expected to receive in 2023 as follows:
   - $950,000 to the Beth Condon Shared Use Path Extension in Yarmouth. This will fully fund the project.
   - $2,147,287 to the Proposed Improvements to Brighton Avenue (Route 25) in Portland. The City of Portland will seek funds for the remaining construction costs next year, from the 2024 allocation.
   - $200,000 for a PDR (Preliminary Design Report) Set Aside to fund approximately one new “complex” project for PDR.

   The PACTS Executive Committee adopted this recommended allocation on June 2. The PACTS Policy Committee will be asked to ratify the allocation on June 25. PACTS staff will submit the allocation to MaineDOT in July.


1 Please note this amount includes the federal allocation and the 25% local match.
The next task for the TIP Committee is to select a project for the PDR Set Aside funds.

**Project Selection Schedule**

Two potential schedules for project selection are below. The first schedule enables the committee to review the project scores in August before making a final decision in September. The second schedule gives applicants and scorers more time but requires the committee to review the project scores and make a decision at the September meeting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday, June 16</td>
<td>TIP Committee approves application form. GPCOG staff distributes application form.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday, August 7</td>
<td>Project applications due.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 8-17</td>
<td>Applications are scored.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday, August 18</td>
<td>[Project applicants give brief presentations to TIP Committee.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TIP Committee receives scores.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[TIP Committee makes project selection.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 15</td>
<td>TIP Committee finalizes project selection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 6</td>
<td>Executive Committee adopts project selection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 22</td>
<td>Policy Committee ratifies project selection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>GPCOG staff submits PDR Set Aside project selection to MaineDOT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early 2021</td>
<td>Selected project included in TIP and STIP (Statewide Transportation Improvement Program).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday, June 16</td>
<td>TIP Committee approves application form. GPCOG staff distributes application form.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday, August 17</td>
<td>Project applications due.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday, August 18</td>
<td>TIP Committee receives brief report on applications received.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[Project applicants give brief presentations to TIP Committee.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 18-31</td>
<td>Applications are scored.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 15</td>
<td>[Project applicants give brief presentations to TIP Committee.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TIP Committee receives scores.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TIP Committee makes project selection.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 6</td>
<td>Executive Committee adopts project selection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 22</td>
<td>Policy Committee ratifies project selection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>GPCOG staff submits PDR Set Aside project selection to MaineDOT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early 2021</td>
<td>Selected project included in TIP and STIP (Statewide Transportation Improvement Program).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Application Form**

The 2016 application form is included as Attachment B and the 2016 application instructions are included as Attachment C. These are attached for reference. A draft 2020 application form is included as Attachment D. The draft 2020 application form is intended to be somewhat simplified, considering the pandemic’s impact on budgets and staff time. The scoring criteria that were developed along with the PACTS Transportation Improvement Program Policies and Procedures for 2017 and 2018 remain in the application.

**Application Scoring**

The PACTS Transportation Improvement Program Policies and Procedures for 2017 and 2018 indicate PACTS staff will score the applications. Alternatively, PACTS Regionally Administered Discretionary (RAD) Transit Fund applications, for example, are scored independently by volunteers representing agencies such as MaineDOT, MTA, BACTS, and SMPDC. The TIP Committee can discuss who should score the PDR Set Aside applications. If the TIP Committee prefers volunteer scorers, the TIP Committee could approve a list of organizations and staff could identify willing individuals after the meeting.

**Applicant Presentations**

The TIP Committee may ask applicants to give brief presentations at the August or September meeting. Such presentations may help the committee decide on the project selection.

**Proposed Actions:**
- Review, revise as needed, and approve project application form.
- Approve scoring approach.
- Decide whether to request applicant presentations.

5. **Funding Prioritization Framework** (Attachment E) 10:00

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 AECOM’s research on national best practices. After the meeting, committee members were asked to complete an online survey to provide additional feedback. AECOM used the information gained from the research and the input from the survey to develop draft scoring framework options.

*Proposed Action: Review and discuss draft scoring framework options.*

6.  Adjourn 11:00
## 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, Vice Chair</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, Chair</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>Y</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>Y</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>Y</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>William Gayle</td>
<td>Northern New England Passenger Rail Authority (NNEPRA)</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca Grover</td>
<td>Maine Turnpike Authority</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Capron</td>
<td>MicroRail</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</td>
<td>GPCOG</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Ahillen, Price Armstrong, Jill Cahoon, Jason Weiss</td>
<td>AECOM/FHI</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. **Welcome – Erin Courtney, Chair**

   Erin Courtney opened the meeting. In response to a suggestion heard at last month’s meeting to divide the TIP Committee into a roadways group and a transit group, Erin explained that the PACTS Executive Committee intentionally created this combined TIP Committee with the goal of creating holistic, uniform policies.

2. **Public Comment**

   Ken Capron encouraged the committee to consider MicroRail as one of the options for transportation improvements.

3. **Acceptance of April 21, 2020 Meeting Minutes**

   Bill Shane moved to accept the April 21, 2020 minutes and Bruce Hyman seconded the motion. The minutes were approved unanimously.

4. **Allocation of 2023 FHWA Resources**

   Erin introduced the item. Aubrey Miller explained the PDR (Preliminary Design Report) Set Aside option for allocating funds. Alex Jaegerman gave a brief presentation on the Beth Condon Shared Use Path Extension.

   Alex expressed a preference for option A or C (of the options shown in *Attachment B: Options for Allocation of 2023 FHWA Resources*), both of which fund the Beth Condon Path Extension. He also supported allocating some funds for PDR.

   Bill Shane said he is fine with option A or C; his primary concern is ensuring the Brighton Avenue project gets fully funded. He also recommended asking staff to identify significant regional projects so the next TIP Committee can see what is on the horizon.

   Chris Branch clarified that his intent is not to take funding away from the Beth Condon Path Extension. He noted his preference for taking care of existing facilities before adding new facilities and supported the idea of putting money aside for PDRs.

   In response to a question, Aubrey confirmed the only difference between option A and option C is the inclusion of a PDR Set Aside in option C.

   Erin noted her understanding that the committee’s primary reason for voting not to fund new projects last month was the application turnaround time. Without the deadline, it seems appropriate to set aside funds for new PDRs.

   In response to a question from Maureen about the ranking of Beth Condon versus Brighton Avenue, Bill reiterated that PACTS does not currently have a list of regionally significant projects. Focusing on such a list would be preferable to simply funding the projects that are able to get applications submitted.
Kristina agreed it is important to keep the conveyor belt of projects filled, but there is a balance because we need to have capital funding for any projects we fund for PDR. She asked Chris Branch if there was a minimum amount Portland would need to ensure the Brighton Avenue project could proceed. Chris said Portland expects each phase to cost approximately $4 million. He also clarified that the Brighton Avenue Roundabout is a separate project and is fully funded and under construction.

Maureen said she would like to see the committee support both projects. The committee then discussed the PDR Set Aside.

Bill moved to accept option C (of the options shown in Attachment B: Options for Allocation of 2023 FHWA Resources) with the commitment that Brighton Avenue will continue to be funded. Alex Jaegerman seconded the motion. Chris Branch indicated that this is acceptable to the City of Portland. Lori Brann and Marty Rooney abstained. All others were in favor.

5. **Funding Prioritization Framework**

Erin introduced AECOM. Jill Cahoon, Price Armstrong, and Michael Ahillen presented the PowerPoint attached to the minutes.

Jill asked the group for thoughts on how to balance large and small projects. The group discussed that a first step would be to define large vs. small for PACTS, noting that PDR is not a good determinant. Maureen commented that, currently, PACTS is still working to ensure all projects address bicycle and pedestrian (bike/ped) needs; if we remove that requirement we will need a set aside for small projects, and then there may be concerns about whether or not the small projects are regionally significant. She indicated she would prefer to continue to require that all projects have regional significance and all projects address bike/ped safety. She also echoed an earlier comment that meeting the state requirements is often not financially efficient for small projects.

Jill then asked the group for thoughts on how to prevent prioritization criteria from duplicating federal requirements. A comment from William Gayle led to a discussion about the separation between roadways funding and transit funding and the differences between the application processes and scoring criteria for the two funding sources. Kristina explained that PACTS programs FTA funds and FHWA funds and there are specific ways in which those funds can be spent, but the best practices research is showing that it is helpful to have a holistic multimodal approach when programming all funding, recognizing that certain funds can only go to certain types of projects. She also noted that projects like Brighton include transit and bike/ped components, so there may be ways to combine different funding sources. She emphasized that simplification, noted by AECOM as a priority, is important. Many people have commented that PACTS’ scoring for FHWA projects is too complicated and too subjective. There are no scoring criteria for FTA funding requests, apart from the Regionally Administered Discretionary (RAD) Program.
The PACTS Reforms process and the PACTS Policy and Executive Committees gave direction to take a more holistic approach to programming all funds. PACTS has historically had a transit side and a roadways side, and this committee is the first attempt at putting those sides together and trying to make the best use of all funds.

The committee then discussed the pros and cons of looking to MPOs of various sizes for guidance on best practices. Kristina noted it is helpful to be informed by MPOs that have the resources to develop good ideas, if we are careful to keep things simple and not require too much data. Maureen agreed, adding it can be helpful to think of the ideas from large regions as a buffet—we can select the ideas that look useful for our region.

Jill said she would send out a follow-up survey and the input from that survey will help inform the development of draft framework options. Erin thanked Jill, Price, and Michael. She also complimented and requested a copy of the “current process” slide.

6. Policies and Procedures Documents

Aubrey explained the additions to Attachment C: Policies & Procedures Summary and Considerations since last month. She invited committee members to email her with any input before the next meeting. She also clarified that the funding prioritization framework will be added into the Policies & Procedures document.

7. Adjourn
Project Schedule

- Best Practices
- Scoring Factors

May 19

June 16
Draft Scoring Framework

July 21
Revised Draft Scoring Framework

August 18
Final Scoring Framework
Agenda

– Purpose of best practices review
– Background on current PACTS prioritization / bylaws
– Methodology
– Relevant examples
  • Prioritization framework
  • Prioritization criteria
– Discussion / Key questions
Goals of Best Practices Review
Best Practices Review

– Research national examples of frameworks for scoring and prioritizing projects of different modes for funding
  • Identify relevant criteria used for prioritization
  • Identify portions that are not applicable to PACTS, such as state-specific restrictions on funding sources.

– Determine if PACTS bylaws and other funding rules require changes
Review of Current Practice
Current Process

PACTS Funding Prioritization Framework

Transit agencies identify new and existing needs

Preliminary Planning

UPWP Planning Projects

Review

TIP, STIP and MaineDOT Work Plan

Design/Programming

Construction

Transit agencies bid out vehicles purchases etc

SOGR

Projects are evaluated

SYCOP is developed

SYCOP and Split Letter are approved

SYCOP and Split Letter are submitted to FTA

Transit agencies submit projects for TIP

Roadway

Projects are identified by the Municipality

If project requests are less than funding available, no scoring needed

Subregions prioritize projects

Projects scored by staff

Scored projects are submitted to appropriate committee

Selected projects are submitted to Executive Committee for approval

Projects are selected by Municipalities and PACTS

Projects are designed and developed outside of a PACTS process

Projects are put out to bid
Existing Scoring System

– Roadway projects are scored based on 16 scoring factors tied to Destination 2040 goals:
  • Regional Focus
  • Economic Development
  • Mobility, Safety, Accessibility
  • Land Use
  • Environmental / Energy

– Aligns with FHWA Required Planning Factors
Review of Best Practices
Key Questions

How do other MPOs prioritize funding across modes?

What criteria do MPOs use to inform prioritization?

What is applicable to PACTS?
Lessons Learned

- Focus on elements that might differentiate projects
- Consider different process for smaller projects
- Limit overlap among criteria
- Maximize simplicity
- Develop a transparent process
- Evaluate the outcomes and refine process
Methodology

Review of Peer/Non-Peer MPOs
- Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission (CCRPC): Burlington, VT
- Whatcom Council of Governments (WCOG): Bellingham, WA
- Greater Buffalo Niagara Regional Transportation Council (GBNRTC): Buffalo, NY
- Genesee Transportation Council (GTC): Rochester, NY
- Pioneer Valley Planning Commission (PVPC): Springfield, MA
- Metropolitan Council (Met Council): Minneapolis & St. Paul, MN
- Denver Regional Council of Governments (DRCOG): Denver & Boulder, CO
- Sacramento Area Council of Government (SACOG): Sacramento, CA
- San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG): San Diego, CA
- Atlanta Regional Commission (ARC): Atlanta, GA
- North Jersey Transportation Planning Authority (NJTPA): Newark, NJ
- Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning (CMAP): Chicago, IL
- Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC): San Francisco, CA
- Broward Metropolitan Planning Organization (Broward MPO): Fort Lauderdale, FL
- Boston Regional Metropolitan Planning Organization (CTPS): Boston, MA

Review of Research
- NCHRP 08-36 (Task 112): Cross Mode Project Prioritization
- Met Council Region Solicitation Before & After Study (2019)
- Integrating Equity into MPO Project Prioritization (2019)

Peer communities identified in Transit Tomorrow
## Different Cross-Mode Prioritization Frameworks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Solicitation</th>
<th>Project Scoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Traditional Approach</strong></td>
<td><strong>Cross-Modal Approach</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Projects selected for funding are still closely linked to regional goals and specific priorities identified in their regional policy plans or long-range transportation plans</td>
<td>– Evaluates all projects across all modes, using common scoring factors for all projects combined with mode specific scoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Long-Range Transportation Approach</strong></td>
<td><strong>Multi-Step Approach</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Larger emphasis is placed on projects in the MPO’s LRTP, and smaller pot of funding is reserved for smaller projects through a separate solicitation process</td>
<td>– Evaluate all projects across all modes in multiple phases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Geographic Distribution Approach</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Funding allocated to sub-regions or priority areas. In general, the sub-regions are responsible for developing a list of priority projects for consideration. The sub-regions are encouraged to work together with the MPO to prioritize the list of projects that best serve their regional needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cross Modal Approach: Example: Genesee Transportation Council (GTC) TIP Process

Solicitation of Project Proposals

Common Criteria (100 possible points)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Safety</th>
<th>Mobility</th>
<th>Community &amp; Economic Development</th>
<th>System Continuity &amp; Optimization</th>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>Fiscal Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Mode Specific Criteria (30 possible points per mode)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highway &amp; Bridge</th>
<th>Public Transportation</th>
<th>Bicycle &amp; Pedestrian</th>
<th>System Management &amp; Operations</th>
<th>Goods Movement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Preliminary Program Development → Public Review → Finalize Program → Transportation Committee Board → Final TIP
## Multi-Step Approach

**Example: Atlanta Regional Commission (ARC) TIP Process**

1. **Universal TIP Project Call**
2. **Qualitative Policy Filters**
3. **Quantitative Project Evaluation**
4. **Qualitative Final Factors**
5. **Funding Decisions for STBG, CMAQ & TAP programs**

### General Infrastructure
- Roadway Capacity
- Transit Capacity

### Sponsor Priority
- Benefit Cost
- Regional Equity
- Deliverability

### PACTS Funding Prioritization Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Atlanta Region's Plan Vision</th>
<th>Performance Criteria</th>
<th>Project Types</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>World Class Infrastructure</td>
<td>Mobility &amp; Congestion</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Network Connectivity</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multimodalism</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asset Management &amp; Resilience</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy Livable Communities</td>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Air Quality &amp; Climate Change</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cultural &amp; Environmental Resources</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Equity</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Compatibility</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive Economy</td>
<td>Goods Movement</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Review of Prioritization Criteria
Prioritization Criteria

- Destination 2040 goals currently inform criteria
- Evaluation of all modes will require updates to criteria
- Criteria need to be linked to federal performance management requirements
- Updated criteria requires measures and metrics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Metrics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Destination 2040</td>
<td>• Desired outcomes related to goals</td>
<td>• How criteria are objectively evaluated</td>
<td>• Specific calculation or value that relates to the performance measure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Goal 1: Maintain a Regional Focus

PACTS will plan for, fund, and maintain a transportation system that reflects a regional approach to transportation and land use planning, project prioritization, and decision-making founded on effective communication, data analysis and management of regional resources.

**Potential Criteria:**
– Consistency with LRTP
– Regional Priorities
– Regionally Significant Locations
– Regional Coordination

**San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG)**
**Measure:** Proximity to regionally designated smart growth areas with high population and employment densities
**Metric:** Population and employment in all smart growth areas within ¼ mile distance of project
**Nature of Metric:** Numerical
**Sponsor Provided:** Yes
Goal 2: Enable Economic Development

PACTS will plan for, fund, and maintain a transportation system that enhances regional prosperity through support for the economic vitality of existing businesses in centers and for economic development opportunities encouraged by local and regional plans.

Potential Criteria:
- Transit Oriented Development
- Creation of New Jobs
- Access to Jobs
- Access to Jobs for EJ/Title VI Communities
- Access to Employment Centers
- Freight Congestion
- Tourism

North Jersey Transportation Authority (NJTPA)
Measure: Improves access to tourism/recreation facilities
Metric: Annual attendance to facilities in project area using 3 tiers of attendance levels (high, medium, low)
Nature of Metric: Numerical
Sponsor Provided: Yes
Goal 3: Maintain and Improve Mobility, Safety & Accessibility

PACTS will plan for, fund, and maintain a multimodal transportation system that improves the mobility, safety and accessibility of people and goods throughout the region.

Potential Criteria:  
**Maintenance**  
– Roadway Condition  
– Transit Assets  
– Climate Resilience  

**Safety**  
– Crash Severity & Crash Risk  
– Emergency Response  
– Vulnerable Road Users  

**Accessibility**  
– Transit Accessibility (via other modes)  
– Health & Human Services  
– ADA Accessibility

---

Broward Metropolitan Planning Organization (Broward MPO)  
**Measure:** Project located within sea level rise vulnerability area (Tier 1-3) and will mitigate infrastructure in this area  
**Metric:** Project would elevate existing roadway, transit or bike facility to elevation that Climate Change Compact identified as potentially inundated (+2, +1, 0)  
**Nature of Metric:** Qualitative  
**Sponsor Provided:** Yes
Goal 4: Integrate Energy Conservation

PACTS will plan for, fund, and maintain a transportation system that conserves and efficiently uses energy resources.

**Potential Criteria:**
- Mode Shift to non-SOV
- Fleet Retrofit
- Transit Asset Modernization

**Boston Regional MPO (CTPS)**

- **Measure:** Modernizes transit asset
- **Metric:** Brings transit asset into state of good repair
- **Nature of Metric:** Qualitative
- **Sponsor Provided:** No
Goal 5: Strengthen the Land Use and Transportation Connection

PACTS will plan for, fund, and maintain a transportation system that supports land use plans and development that furthers the Urban to Rural land use pattern, that promote livable places that support walkability, bikeability and transit-oriented development in Centers of Opportunity and other areas emphasizing all modes.

Potential Criteria:
– Transit Oriented Development
– Priority Growth Areas & Corridors
– Employment Centers
– Network Connectivity

Atlanta Regional Commission (ARC)
Measure: Connections to rail & high frequency transit
Metric: # of peak period high frequency (<= 15 mins) connections and rail lines served by the project
Nature of Metric: Numerical
Sponsor Provided: No
Goal 6: Protect Environmental Quality

*PACTS will plan for, fund, and maintain a transportation system that protects and improves the human and natural environments and quality of life.*

**Potential Criteria:**
- Mode Shift
- Floodplains / Wetlands
- Impervious Surface
- Climate Resilience
- Physical Activity

**San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG)**

**Measure:** Increase in time engaged in moderate transportation-related physical activity

**Metric:** Average daily walking and biking for all trips (min.)

**Nature of Metric:** Numerical

**Sponsor Provided:** Yes
Prioritization Criteria Takeaways

– Criteria varies from qualitative and quantitative

– Simpler criteria measurers allow for consistent scoring
  • Less burden on staff and applicants and more transparent for public

– Criteria for emerging priorities are used by other MPOs
  • Ex. Equity and Public Health Impacts
Discussion / Key Questions

− How should PACTS balance large and small projects in project selection?
− How does prioritization criteria avoid duplicating federal requirements?
  • Ex. Title VI, Environmental Justice, Transit Asset Management Plans, etc.
− How might PACTS consider other criteria, such as equity and public health impacts?
Next Steps
Next Steps

- Follow-up survey
- Use feedback to develop draft scoring framework options
- Next meeting: June 16
Attachment B

Application Form for
PACTS 2020 and 2021 Complex Projects

September 30, 2016

PACTS staff and members of the Planning, Transit and Technical Committees will use the information provided to score and rank the applications. Please reference our Application Instructions and our 2017-2018 TIP Policies and Procedures document for more information, or contact PACTS staff with any questions.

Applications must be received by PACTS by 4:00 p.m. on February 3, 2017. Three (3) hard copies as well as an electronic Word submittal are required. Email (or cd) to ceppich@gpcog.org and pniehoff@gpcog.org. Attach supplementary information as needed.

Submittal Requirements

1. Proposals to change the capacity of an intersection must include the results of capacity analyses of current and proposed conditions. Proposals for a new traffic signal (or removal of an existing one) must be accompanied by a MaineDOT-approved warrant analysis. MaineDOT support documents must be submitted with the application.

2. 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.

3. 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.

4. Proposals for road and/or intersection reconstruction must be submitted by a registered professional engineer.

General Information

1. Municipality:

2. Primary contact:

3. Contact phone number:

4. Project name:

5. Project location:
6. Brief project scope description:

7. Purpose-and-need statement that describes the conditions that warrant the proposed project and an explanation of the intended benefits of that project.

8. Has a preliminary design report (PDR) been completed? If yes, then please attach it.

9. Is this an application for PDR funding as a precursor to future PACTS construction funding? If no, then describe why you think this project does not need a PDR phase:

10. Federal functional classification:

11. MaineDOT Corridor Priority: (http://www.maine.gov/mdot/about/assets/search/)

12. Are there any right-of-way impacts? If yes, please identify them.

13. Has this project been reviewed for potential environmental impacts? If yes, please identify them.

14. Will the project meet clear zone requirements?

15. Will the project require design exceptions? If yes, please identify them.

16. Will the project require historical and/or environmental review?

17. Transit provider(s) support for municipal applications that involve transit-supportive elements:

18. Cost Estimate

Provide as much detail as possible and attach the worksheets used to develop your estimates.

Contact information for the cost estimate preparer:

Preliminary engineering:
Right of way:
Construction:
Construction engineering:
Total estimated cost:

PACTS Preservation Spending Target estimate:
PACTS Modernization Spending Target estimate:
PACTS Expansion Spending Target estimate:
Total estimated cost:

**Scoring Formula Criteria**

1. **Subregion’s and Transit Committee’s top priority projects (maximum 10 points)**

   Please communicate with your PACTS subregion colleagues in order to decide on priority project investments in your subregion. Each of the four PACTS subregions shall allocate up to 10 points to PACTS applications from the municipalities in the subregion. The 10 points may go to a single proposal or be spread among multiple projects.

   The Transit Committee shall do the same for applications submitted by, or in partnership with, any of the PACTS Transit Agencies.

   Please list below the points allocated for this application and for all other applications submitted from your PACTS Subregion.

   **Submittal**

2. **Destination 2040 Priority Corridor or Center (maximum 10 points)**

   The Destination 2040 Plan identifies Priority Corridors and 56 Priority Centers which are existing important regional transportation corridors 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. The map of these corridors and centers is at the end of the PACTS application instructions memo. 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 then PACTS staff makes a determination whether or not the proposed project qualifies for these points.

   **Submittal**

3. **Improves region’s traffic signal system (maximum 5 points)**

   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.
4. **Leverages other non-MPO funds from the MaineDOT, Private/developers, Public Private Partnerships (PPP), Tax Increment Financing (TIFs), etc.** (maximum 3 points)

*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.

5. **Multi-member applications (maximum 3 points)**

Transportation transcends municipal boundaries so 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.

- 1 point – Application which includes a supporting resolution adopted by a neighboring city or town council.
- 2 points – Application which includes supporting resolutions adopted by two or more neighboring city or town councils.
- 3 points – Application for which multiple municipalities would provide equal or proportional shares in payment of the local match for a project located wholly within one municipality.

6. **Enhance existing freight industry** (maximum 10 points)

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.

7. **Economic Development Benefits of the project** (maximum 8 points)
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.

### Submittal

8. **Reconstruct or Rehabilitate an Arterial or Collector Road (maximum 10 points)**

Arterials connect the region to the rest of the state and country and carry the majority of the region’s traffic. PACTS has a 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, and 7 points for collectors).

### Submittal

9. **Reduces the numbers or severity of crashes (maximum 12 points)**

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

### Submittal

10. **Transit supportive project elements (maximum 10 points)**

The success of our growing region depends on more convenient and inviting access to transit that provides high quality transit trips as a viable 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 maintain, improve or expand existing transit service are eligible for points in the category.

### Submittal

11. **Implements Pedestrian Network (maximum 5 points)**
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.

Submittal

12. Improves Bicycle Network (maximum 5 points)

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 will 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.

Submittal

13. Reduces congestion and/or improves multimodal level of service (maximum 10 points)

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 reducing motor vehicle congestion. Proposals that demonstrate the project will provide reductions in motor vehicle congestion AND improve multimodal level of service without negatively impacting the safety of non-motorized travel mode will receive the maximum points.

Submittal

14. Encourages or enables compact development such as Transit Oriented Development, street connectivity, etc. (maximum 5 points)

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. Proposals that demonstrate the project will enable or provide for a framework for transit oriented development are eligible for these points.
15. **Links jobs and housing by trips other than by automobile (maximum 5 points)**

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.

16. **Increases Resilience to Climate-related events and/or provides “Green” infrastructure to reduce storm water (maximum 5 points)**

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.
Overview and Application Instructions for 2020 and 2021 PACTS MPO Allocation Funding Complex Projects

Applications are due on February 3, 2017. Please refer to our 2017-2018 TIP Policies and Procedures document for more background information as you prepare your applications, and feel free to contact PACTS staff with any questions.

As in the past, this application process requires a lot of information. Omissions of required information will result in 0 points in the given category. You should read these instructions and the application form completely and carefully before you begin to prepare your applications.

A “complex project” is one that PACTS programs in two phases: funding for a Preliminary Design Report (PDR) work in one year, and then funding for construction a year or more later after the PDR is done. A complex project is one that requires or might require the purchase of right of way, or involves significant design work.

Preliminary Design Reports

In 2016 MaineDOT began to require that we program our complex projects in two phases. PACTS funding for PDR work is a commitment to fund the construction later as long as certain condition are met (see page 16 in our 2017-2018 TIP Policies and Procedures document for details).

In July 2016 we programmed funding for several PDR’s to be done, but we expect that none of the PDR’s will be completed by our May 1, 2017 deadline for 2020 funding consideration. Instead, any of the PDR’s completed by May 1, 2018 will be eligible for 2021 funding consideration. (This is based on the assumption that in July 2017 we will reserve some 2021 funding for programming in July 2018. Note that projects with completed PDR’s would also be eligible for Holding WIN funding after July 2017 in the event that there is Holding WIN funding available to re-program.)

Finally, we also might get some applications on February 3, 2017 for projects for which municipalities (including Scarborough, Windham and Westbrook) have completed PDR’s on their own. We will score those applications, and any other applications with completed PDR’s, along with all the other applications submitted. It is imperative that you communicate with
MaineDOT as you begin to develop a locally-funded PDR.  See at the end of this document an important MaineDOT memo presented at a meeting in Augusta yesterday.

Collector Preservation Paving Application Forms

We will distribute our Collector Preservation Paving application forms in October. Those applications will also be due on February 3, 2017. You will need to submit the appropriate application form according to whether your project proposal is a simple paving project or actually a complex project. We will explain that important distinction in that application form.

General Instructions for 2020 and 2021 Complex Projects

1. Applications must be received by PACTS by 4:00 p.m. on February 3, 2017.

2. Three (3) hard copies as well as an electronic submittal of applications are required. Please include a Word version of the narrative section of your application. Email (or cd) to ceppich@gpcog.org and pniehoff@gpcog.org. Attach supplementary information as needed.

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

4. Applications 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.

5. Intersection applications must include results of capacity analyses of current and proposed conditions. Proposals for new traffic signals (or for removal of existing signals) must be accompanied by a MaineDOT-approved warrant analysis. PACTS will only program the installation of new traffic signals whose warrants MaineDOT has approved.

6. Municipal applications that involve transit-supportive elements should include a statement that the appropriate transit provider(s) supports the application.

7. Proposals to reconstruct a road or intersection must be submitted by a registered professional engineer.

8. Please plan ahead to organize the process for allocating your subregion’s ten Subregion Scoring Factor points.

9. See below a summary table of the scoring factors to be used in scoring the complex project applications. Our Application Form describes them in detail.
10. See below also a map of the PACTS Priority Corridors and Centers. You will use this map as you respond to the Priority Corridors and Centers scoring factor.

11. Note that if your application is short listed for our Enhanced Project Scoping phase then we will ask you to secure an official endorsement of the application from your municipal council or your transit board before the July 2017 Policy Committee final programming action.

**2020 and 2021 PACTS Spending Targets**

We will allocate the PACTS MPO Allocation 2020 and 2021 funds according to three Spending Targets. They are 65% for Preservation (40% for Collectors pavement preservation and 25% for other preservation work), 20% for Modernization and 15% for Expansion. After the 40% Collector Preservation Paving Set Aside, the Spending Targets amount available for the remaining 60% of the MPO Allocation is $8,194,574 (of the $13,657,623 total).

We anticipate that many of the applications will involve multiple Spending Target elements. Our goal is to achieve the percentages listed above, so our list of funded projects could involve the funding of some applications that rank lower per our scoring factors system but enable us to achieve the target percentages or close to the targets.

Here are general descriptions of the three Spending Targets:

- **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 and infrastructure to provide new services

The application form requires that you describe the cost of your proposed project in terms of these three Spending Targets. For instance, you might propose a project that is 60% Preservation and 40% Modernization. Next spring we will create a short list of applications to undergo enhanced project scoping (EPS). One new task for the EPS consultant will be to review and possibly revise your application’s Spending Target estimates.

Here are some details on the three Spending Targets. 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 vehicles/vessels 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
• Other multimodal on road elements
• Traffic calming
• 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.
<p>| Scoring Formula for Funding from the Preservation, Modernization and Expansion Spending Targets |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dest. 2040 Goal Scoring Factors</th>
<th>New or Current Factor</th>
<th>Max. Points</th>
<th>Points Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Reg. Focus 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 Reg. Focus 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 Reg. Focus 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 Reg. Focus 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 Reg. Focus Multi-member applications</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Points system based on our current criterion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Eco Devo Enhance existing freight industry</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Up to 10 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 Eco Devo 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 Mob. Safety Access. 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 Mobility Safety Accessibility 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 “vulnerable user” safety issues, or up to 12 points if proposal does both.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Mob. Safety Access. 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 Mob. Safety Access. 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 Mob. Safety Access. 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 Mob. Safety Access. 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 Land Use 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 Land Use 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 Enviro. Energy 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>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>116</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MaineDOT Fact Sheet

Guidance - Locally Funded Design Projects

Contact: Martin Rooney (207) 624-3317
Martin.Rooney@maine.gov

Purpose: This guidance document is for Locally Funded Design Projects that may seek Federal Construction Funding. MaineDOT has been increasingly approached by municipalities interested in designing a project with local funds while maintaining flexibility for federal construction funding. MaineDOT supports this approach in that it leverages additional resources and could accelerate projects. However, whether a project is 1% or 80% federally funded, it must meet the same requirements. Based upon our experience with previous efforts, MaineDOT issued this guidance to help avoid costly delays associated with redesigning project features and activities that could jeopardize federal funding:

MaineDOT Stakeholder Meeting: Prior to hiring a consultant, beginning robust public involvement or spending significant resources, municipalities should contact MaineDOT’s Bureau of Planning to convene a stakeholder meeting to discuss the project, assess risk, outline requirements and assign appropriate MaineDOT resources. For instance, different project locations and scopes will offer more challenges associated with federal requirements than others.

Project Administration:
Shortly after MaineDOT holds a stakeholder meeting, MaineDOT will assign a Project Manager from either MaineDOT’s Bureau of Project Development or Planning based upon our collective understanding of a project’s maturity. Generally, well defined scopes of work will be assigned to Project Development and lesser defined scopes of work will be assigned to Planning. The Project Manager will work with the municipality to execute an initial roles and responsibilities agreement to be superseded by a formal LPA agreement, once federal funding is allocated to the project.

Local Project Administration (LPA): Since municipalities are initiating these projects with local oversight, MaineDOT expects that these projects will continue through final design and construction with a municipal lead. As such, the municipal project manager must be LPA certified and follow the MaineDOT’s LPA process. MaineDOT will still assign a Project Manager and other resources to assist, commiserate with all other LPA projects, per federal requirements.

National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and Section (4f) of Federal Transportation Act: MaineDOT cannot legally delegate NEPA and Section 4(f) authority and will work with municipalities to complete the NEPA process. Municipalities must recognize that certain
associated actions taken without state consent could jeopardize and even prohibit future federal funding as documented in Title 23 and MaineDOT LPA training materials. These efforts will at a minimum require a documented project purpose and need and evaluation of all reasonable alternatives.

**Right-of-Way Process:** MaineDOT assumes that most of these projects will take place in the existing right-of-way or involve minimal property acquisitions. For projects within the state highway system, the right-of-way process will be led by MaineDOT. For projects outside of the state highway system, the municipality will be responsible for property acquisitions. Regardless of who oversees the right-of-way process, all right-of-way activities are required to be in accordance with Title 23, and consistent with the MaineDOT LPA documentation. If a project is proposed to involve considerable right-of-way acquisition, MaineDOT will discuss risks at the stakeholder meeting. Municipalities must also recognize that certain actions taken without state consent could jeopardize and even prohibit future federal funding, as documented in LPA training material.

**State Design Standards:** All project design features must conform to the most recent version of MaineDOT’s Highway Design Guide. Any design exceptions must be discussed with the MaineDOT project manager and ultimately approved by MaineDOT. MaineDOT’s flexible design philosophy associated with Maine’s Highway Corridor Priorities (HCPs) will be major factors in decision-making.
The PACTS TIP Committee, in May 2020, voted to allocate $200,000 ($150,000 in FHWA\(^1\) funding and $50,000 in local match) from the PACTS 2023 MPO\(^2\) Allocation to a PDR Set Aside to fund approximately one new complex\(^3\) project for PDR. The project (or projects) selected for this funding will begin PDR work in early 2021.

See the [PACTS Transportation Improvement Program Policies and Procedures for 2017 and 2018](#) for organization eligibility, project eligibility, and other information.

**Application Requirements**

- Applicants for the PDR Set Aside funding must complete and submit this application by 4:00 p.m. on [Friday, August 7, 2020](#). Applications must be submitted by email to Aubrey Miller at [amiller@gpcog.org](mailto:amiller@gpcog.org).

- Applicants must also give a brief (no more than 15 minutes) presentation at the TIP Committee meeting on [August 18, 2020](#).

**Applicant Information**

**Municipality:**

**Contact Name:**

**Email:**

**Phone Number:**

\(^1\) Federal Highway Administration
\(^2\) Metropolitan Planning Organization
\(^3\) A “complex project” is one that PACTS programs in two phases: preliminary design report (PDR) work funding in one year, then construction funding a year or more later (after PDR is done).
**Project Information**

**Project Name:**

---

**Project Location:**
*Describe the location of this project, including start and end points and/or other information necessary to identify the location of the project.*

---

**Project Description/Scope:**
*Provide a brief description of the scope of the project.*

---

**Purpose and Need:**
*Describe the “problem” this project will solve. What are the benefits of this project?*

---

**Cost Estimate:**
*Provide a planning-level cost estimate. You may provide additional detail if it is available.*

---

**When is council/board endorsement of the project (and the 25% local match) expected?**
*Note that your council/board does not need to endorse the project before submitting this application, but the council must endorse the project before it can be approved by the PACTS Executive Committee in October 2020.*

---

**Was this project identified in a previous plan or study?**
*Indicate yes or no. If yes, please list the plan or study and relevant page numbers.*

---

**Scoring Information**
*Please provide a submittal for each of the scoring factors described below. General descriptions of the scoring criteria can be found beginning on page 8 in the PACTS Transportation Improvement Program Policies and Procedures for 2017 and 2018, including a summary table on page 10.*

1. **Subregion’s and Transit Committee’s top priority projects (maximum 10 points)**
Please communicate with your PACTS subregion colleagues in order to decide on priority project investments in your subregion. Each of the four PACTS subregions shall allocate up to 10 points to PACTS applications from the municipalities in the subregion. The 10 points may go to a single proposal or be spread among multiple projects.

The Transit Committee shall do the same for applications submitted by, or in partnership with, any of the PACTS Transit Agencies.

Please list below the points allocated for this application and for all other applications submitted from your PACTS Subregion.

**Submittal _____**

2. *Destination 2040 Priority Corridor or Center (maximum 10 points)*

The *Destination 2040* Plan identifies Priority Corridors and 56 Priority Centers which are existing important regional transportation corridors 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. The map of these corridors and centers is in Figure 1 at the end of this application. 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 then scorers make a determination whether or not the proposed project qualifies for these points.

**Submittal _____**

3. *Improves region's traffic signal system (maximum 5 points)*

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.

**Submittal _____**
4. **Leverages other non-MPO funds from the MaineDOT, Private/developers, Public Private Partnerships (PPP), Tax Increment Financing (TIFs), etc.** (maximum 3 points)

*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.

**Submittal**

5. **Multi-member applications (maximum 3 points)**

Transportation transcends municipal boundaries so 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.

- **1 point** – Application which includes, or anticipates receiving before October 6, 2020, a supporting resolution adopted by a neighboring city or town council.

- **2 points** – Application which includes, or anticipates receiving before October 6, 2020, supporting resolutions adopted by two or more neighboring city or town councils.

- **3 points** – Application for which multiple municipalities would provide equal or proportional shares in payment of the local match for a project located wholly within one municipality.

**Submittal**

6. **Enhance existing freight industry (maximum 10 points)**

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.

**Submittal**
7. Economic Development Benefits of the project (maximum 8 points)

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 childcare in those areas as well as education and workforce training sites are also eligible for points in this category.

Submittal _____

8. Reconstruct or Rehabilitate an Arterial or Collector Road (maximum 10 points)

Arterials connect the region to the rest of the state and country and carry the majority of the region’s traffic. PACTS has a 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, and 7 points for collectors).

Submittal _____

9. Reduces the numbers or severity of crashes (maximum 12 points)

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

Submittal _____

10. Transit-supportive project elements (maximum 10 points)

The success of our growing region depends on more convenient and inviting access to transit that provides high quality transit trips as a viable 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 maintain, improve or expand existing transit service are eligible for points in the category.

Municipal applications that involve transit-supportive elements should include a statement that the appropriate transit provider(s) supports the application.

**Submittal**

11. **Improves Pedestrian Network (maximum 5 points)**

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.

**Submittal**

12. **Improves Bicycle Network (maximum 5 points)**

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 will 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.

**Submittal**

13. **Reduces congestion and/or improves multimodal level of service (maximum 10 points)**

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 reducing motor vehicle congestion. Proposals that demonstrate the project will provide reductions in motor vehicle congestion AND improve multimodal level of service without negatively impacting the safety of non-motorized travel mode will receive the maximum points.
**Submittal**

14. **Encourages or enables compact development such as Transit Oriented Development, street connectivity, etc. (maximum 5 points)**

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. Proposals that demonstrate the project will enable or provide for a framework for transit-oriented development are eligible for these points.

**Submittal**

15. **Links jobs and housing by trips other than by automobile (maximum 5 points)**

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.

**Submittal**

16. **Increases Resilience to Climate-related events and/or provides “Green” infrastructure to reduce storm water (maximum 5 points)**

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.

**Submittal**
Figure 1: PACTS Priority Corridors & Centers
Project Schedule

- May 19: Best Practices
  - Scoring Factors
- June 16: Draft Scoring Framework Options
- July 21: Draft Scoring Framework
- August 18: Final Scoring Framework
Agenda

– Survey results
– Revised framework foundation
  • Guiding principles
  • Potential criteria
– Discussion
– Next steps
Survey Results
Feedback on Processes

- Difficult to understand
  - “There are too many scoring factors”
- Regional importance
  - “The primary funding prioritization framework should be oriented around regional strategic priorities and concrete goals.”
- Concerns about subjectivity
  - “The processes are a bit too subjective with too much narrative involved.”
- Reduce criteria
Preferred Approach

- Multi-step and cross-modal too complicated
- Preference for cross-modal
- Multi-step’s qualitative filter could be helpful
- Preference for scoring during planning stage
- Use same process regardless of project size (but small projects should not compete against large projects)
Which criteria should be weighted more?

- Regional Focus
- Mobility, Safety, Accessibility
- Land Use
- Economic Development
- Environment/Energy
- All goals should be weighted fairly
How important is it for PACTS to consider equity and public health?
Most Useful Criteria

- Regionally significant locations
- Access to jobs
- Roadway/pavement conditions
- Access to transit
- Mode shift to non-single occupancy vehicle (SOV)
- Energy efficiency improvements to transit fleet & infrastructure
Ideas – Two Different Approaches

1. “I would like to see the process streamlined and data driven, if possible. Less narrative on behalf of applicants… perhaps GPCOG staff or a consultant can help score the projects using GIS and other data analytics tools.”

2. “Instead of complicated applications that eventually come down to mostly qualitative data by PACTS staff, I would prefer a workshop where each sponsor presents their project and a group/Committee makes the selection in a single day.”
Revised Framework
Foundation
Guiding Principles for Revised Framework

– Simpler
– Objective
– Transparent
– Focused on regional significance
– Data-driven?
– Leverage existing available datasets
Potential Criteria for Revised Framework based on Regional Conversation and Guiding Principles

1. Regional significance
2. Decrease regional traffic congestion
3. Improve the local/regional economy
4. System preservation
5. System connectivity
6. Financial viability
7. Priority locations
8. Enhance social and economic equity
9. Environmental sustainability
10. Resilience
How do other regions use these criteria to score projects?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Scoring Factor(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1 Regional Significance          | DRCOG (Denver/Boulder, CO) | • Cross and/or benefit multiple municipalities  
                                |                            | • Cross and/or benefit another subregion                                        |
| 2 Decrease Traffic Congestion    | GTC (Rochester, NY)        | • Reduce travel times on major regional roadways                                  |
| 3 Improve the Local/Regional     | PV MPO (Springfield, MA)   | • Support land use / econ. dev. goals  
                                |                            | • Improve intermodal connections  
                                |                            | • Reduce congestion on regional freight routes                                  |
| 4 System preservation            | PV MPO (Springfield, MA)   | • Improve substandard pavement, intersection operations, substandard traffic signal equipment, transit asset(s), or substandard sidewalk |
| 5 System connectivity            | ARC (Atlanta, GA)          | • Connection to transit services  
                                |                            | • Connection to regional ped/bike/trail network                                  |
## How do other regions use these criteria to score projects?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Scoring Factor(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 Financial Viability</td>
<td>Boston Region MPO</td>
<td>• Leverage other investments (non-TIP funding)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Priority Locations</td>
<td>SANDAG (San Diego, CA)</td>
<td>• Population and employment in designated Regional Smart Growth Areas within ¼ mile of project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Enhance Social and Economic Equity</td>
<td>ARC (Atlanta, GA)</td>
<td>• Change in the # of workers that can access Regional Employment Centers within 45 min. during peak periods – broken out between Equity Target Areas (ETA) and non-ETA communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Environmental Sustainability</td>
<td>NJTPA (Newark, NJ)</td>
<td>• Improve the management of stormwater runoff in a CSO area and include BMPs in green infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Resilience</td>
<td>Broward, FL MPO</td>
<td>• Location within sea level rise vulnerability area (Tier 1-3) identified by Climate Change Compact • Mitigation measure for infrastructure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Criteria Discussion

1. Regional significance
2. Decrease regional traffic congestion
3. Improve the local/regional economy
4. System preservation
5. System connectivity
6. Financial viability
7. Priority locations
8. Enhance social and economic equity
9. Environmental sustainability
10. Resilience
Next Steps
Next Steps

- Use feedback to develop draft scoring framework
- Next meeting: July 21
- Post-meeting survey on draft scoring framework