PACTS Funding Framework Task Force

Thursday, August 11, 2022
10:00 am–12:00 pm
Meeting Agenda

In-Person:
Greater Portland Council of Governments
970 Baxter Boulevard, Room 201, Portland

Remote:
Webinar link: us02web.zoom.us/j/84653222389
Phone: (646) 931-3860—Webinar ID: 846 5322 2389

As of April 26, 2022 GPCOG and PACTS are holding committee meetings in hybrid format, both in person at GPCOG's offices and via webinar. The remote portions of all meetings are conducted in accordance with the requirements of GPCOG Executive Committee policy, LD 1772, PL 2022 Ch. 666, and 1 MRSA Chapter 13, Subchapter 1.

This meeting is being recorded and will be made available at gpcog.org/AgendaCenter.

1.	**Public Comment**	**5 minutes**

Members of the public are welcome to provide up to three minutes of public comment.

2.	**Introduction**	**5 minutes**

Brief introduction by the group facilitator.

3.	**Review of Previous Meeting**	**10 minutes**

Review and summary of the decisions made on the previous meeting's discussion topics.

4.	**Discussion—Evaluation Criteria (Part 1 of 2)**	**75 minutes**

Discussion of Regional Access and Safe and Reliable Mobility evaluation criteria.

5.	**Recap**	**15 minutes**

Review and summary of the decisions made on the discussion topics.

6.	**Preview of Next Meeting**	**10 minutes**

Review of the discussion topics for the next meeting, and initial input and feedback.

TODAY'S DISCUSSION

- Review of last meeting

- Evaluation Criteria (pt. 1/2)
  - Regional Access
  - Safe and Reliable Mobility

- Review of today's meeting

- Preview of next meeting

WORKSHOP #1 DECISIONS

- Define and refer to project types:

  - Roadway/Multimodal Capital project

  - Transit Capital project

  - Transit Operating project

  - Transit Planning project

- Be consistent in how we're referring to projects (not "investments", etc.)

- Indicate project type in the application

- Include project definitions in the Glossary

WORKSHOP #1 DECISIONS

- Require the following information in an application:

  - ✏ Basic information; and description, purpose, and need

  - ✏ Identification of lead applicant and project partners

  - ☑ Regional significance and coordination, inclusion in existing regional plans and studies, compliance with GPCOG's Inclusive Transportation Planning Toolkit and PACTS' Civil Rights Plan

  - ☑ Verification of eligibility for a given funding stream

  - ✏ Verification of funding, local match, and other sources

  - ✏ Project budget including labor and material expense

  - ✏ 5-year forecasted operations and maintenance needs

  - ✏ Implementation timeline and key milestones

  - ☑ Acknowledgment that project-specific outcomes to be reported on a regular basis

- The application template will be developed by RTAC and approved by the Policy Board.

WORKSHOP #1 DECISIONS

- "The Transit Task Force will review all transit project pre-applications prior to scoring to identify opportunities for regional coordination between projects."

- Each member appointed to the scoring committee will affirm there is no conflict of interest in their scoring of projects.

- Staff are evaluating opportunities for external partners to serve on the scoring committee.
  1. Staff from other MPOs
  2. Consultant expertise
  3. Regional stakeholders

- Some expressed the need for staff to retain a level of flexibility in assembling a scoring committee.

TODAY'S DISCUSSION

- Review of last meeting
- Evaluation Criteria (pt. 1/2)
  - Regional Access
  - Safe and Reliable Mobility
- Review of today's meeting
- Preview of next meeting

ODDS AND ENDS

Provide links to resources and data for the applicants—high crash locations, Census information, online mapping tools, data
- This is a work in progress.

Frame the criteria as goals.
- *Improve* Access to Jobs, *Ensure* Consistency with Local Plans.

How are "regionally significant transit stops" defined?
- The Transit Stop Access Project, but this is not an updated and comprehensive list.
- Develop a list based on on/off activity and connections to other routes and services.

Provide guidance to the scoring committee regarding subjective criteria—minimal, moderate, significant impacts.
- How should these be defined?
- Scoring is largely "relative".

UNIVERSAL ACCESS AND SOCIAL EQUITY

A project cannot receive federal funding if is has negative impacts on Environmental Justice (EJ) or Title VI populations.

- Question 9: Remove the -5 points option.

Applicants will attest to a project's compliance with PACTS' Civil Rights Plan in the application.

However, projects can be ranked to determine relative positive impacts.

ONE SET OF SCORING CRITERIA

One process for allocating funding to projects was foundational to the development of the Funding Framework.

- Allocate funding consistently, across all modes, and in support of regional goals
- Prioritize all projects regionwide and across all modes.
- Developed with roadway and transit projects in mind, including sample projects.

It was not the goal—nor is it feasible—that all projects from all applicants score well in all categories.

- Different projects have different goals, strengths, weaknesses.

Any project funded must advance **regional goals and priorities**.

THIS GROUP

IS CHARGED WITH

IDENTIFYING SPECIFIC

RECOMMENDATIONS

FOR IMPROVEMENT

Making significant structural changes to the Framework is not within the scope of this effort.

Specific language changes that can make the Framework more applicant- and mode-agnostic, more consistent, more clear, etc. are desired.

Review Topics

Evaluation Criteria: *Criteria is vague and lacking specificity. Does not adequately consider impacts on region. Expand to include:*
- *Quantified* project outcomes and benefits
- Implementation *timeline*
- Ongoing annual *financial (O&M) requirements* and impacts on FYCOP.
- Regional impacts, *including potential negative impacts*, on equity, riders and/or other agencies
- Support of impacted agencies

Specific Recommendation:
In Application Process paragraph on page 6, insert after sixth sentence:
- *"Applications will also be scored on: quantified project outcomes; benefits; implementation timeline; ongoing annual financial requirements; impacts to FYCOP; evaluation of regional equity on riders and impact on other transit operators; and for those applications affecting more than one agency, support of impacted agencies."*

PROJECT INFO:
SCORED VS NOT SCORED

General project information is not scored, but is required to ensure sufficient context is provided:

- Description, purpose, and need
- Regional significance and coordination
- Project budget and implementation timeline

Project outcomes are scored:

- Access to jobs
- Safety improvements
- Climate impacts

What improvements could be made?

- Quantified project outcomes; benefits
- Evaluation of regional equity on riders
- Impact on other transit operators

The Policy Board has some discretion in the final funding decision, informed by the project scores and other project information.

GPCOG
GREATER PORTLAND
COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

PACTS
PORTLAND AREA COMPREHENSIVE
TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM

Development of PACTS' Transportation Funding Framework

For additional information, see gpcog.org/497/Funding-Framework.

2016, Federal Recertification—*"The MPO should refine its TIP project selection and prioritization process. ... PACTS should update its TIP policies and procedures document to include a list of selection criteria used in the TIP project selection and prioritization process. ..."*

2018, PACTS Reforms—*"Allocate Funds with Consistency. PACTS is responsible for consistently allocating funds to its members for both capital and planning projects. Fair allocation of funds across all modes in the entire region can be accomplished by reconvening the Transportation Improvement Program Process and Procedures committee and with the development of a TIP application guide."*

10/01/2019, Executive Committee Meeting Packet—*"... PACTS needs to develop update its policies and procedures for developing the Transportation Improvement Program as well as develop a framework for prioritizing investments in public transportation.*

While the Federal Highway capital funds have long been programed through a competitive process, this is not the case for public transportation, with the exception of a small amount of funding for transit expansions or enhancements.

The PACTS Priorities, adopted by the Policy Committee on 8.15.19, include transit as a top priority for the region. The PACTS Reforms, adopted in 2018, state that PACTS must program limited funds consistently across all modes in support of the regional goals of the MPO. The Reforms also stated that "The governing bodies do not provide meaningful input on public transportation issues in the region, and there is inadequate engagement between the governing committees and the Transit Committee."

To develop the TIP, PACTS needs to create a multi-modal framework for prioritizing funding. To do this with all the necessary expertise, PACTS could create an ad hoc committee composed of all TIP Committee members ... and all Transit Committee members to develop a framework for prioritizing federal highway and transit funding, under the guidance of PACTS' governing committees. To identify best practices from around the nation, staff recommend consultant support.

If the Executive Committee decides to proceed in this direction, at its December meeting, the Executive Committee will:

1. *provide direction to the ad hoc transportation funding committee based on guidance from the following five documents: Destination 2040, Moving Southern MaineForward, PACTS Priorities, PACTS Reforms, and work-to-date from Transit Tomorrow*

2. *will review a draft RFP for consultant support.*

Proposed Actions: Create an ad hoc transportation funding committee composed of the PACTS TIP Committee and the PACTS Transit Committee.