PACTS Regional Transportation Advisory Committee
Tuesday, September 7, 2021
9:00-11:00 a.m.
Meeting Agenda

Webinar link: us02web.zoom.us/j/89251271320
Phone: 646-558-8656—Webinar ID: 892 5127 1320
Participating by phone? Use *9 to raise your hand and *6 to unmute.

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

2. Public Comment 5 minutes
Members of the public are welcome to provide up to three minutes of public comment on items not on this agenda. For items on this agenda, additional opportunity for public comment will be provided after the item's staff report.

3. Limited Emergency Declaration 5 minutes
Discussion, public hearing, and a vote to adopt an order declaring a limited emergency to allow for the continuation of remote public meetings.

4. Remote Participation Policy 5 minutes
Discussion, public hearing, and a vote to adopt a remote participation policy for the PACTS Regional Transportation Advisory Committee.

5. Approval of the July 6, 2021 Meeting Minutes 5 minutes

6. Staff Report 5 minutes

7. CARES Phase II and III Project Updates 20 minutes
A report and discussion on the status of projects allocated CARES funding during Phases II and III.

8. Transit Performance Metrics 30 minutes
A discussion and guidance from RTAC on the development of regional transit performance targets.
20 minutes

A report and discussion on the calendar year (CY) 2022-2023 draft Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP).

10. **Report on Complex Projects Selection**  
15 minutes

A report and discussion on the PACTS Policy Board’s allocation of Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) funding from PACTS’ 2024 MPO Allocation.

11. **Other Business**

12. **Adjourn**

**Upcoming Meetings**

- PACTS Executive Board—Tuesday, September 28, 9:00-10:30 a.m.
- PACTS Regional Transportation Advisory Committee—Tuesday, October 5, 9:00-11:00 a.m.
- PACTS Policy Board—Thursday, October 28, 11:00 am-1:00 p.m.
- PACTS Regional Transportation Advisory Committee—Tuesday, November 2, 9:00-11:00 a.m.

*In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance to review agenda materials or participate in this meeting, please contact:*

Zoe Miller, GPCOG Director of Community Engagement  
(207) 838-8382  
 zmiller@gpcog.org

*Notification 72 hours prior to the meeting will help us to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to this meeting.*
### 3. Limited Emergency Declaration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Chris Chop, staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommended action</td>
<td>Adopt the Order Declaring a Limited Emergency for the PACTS Regional Transportation Advisory Committee (RTAC).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachments</td>
<td>3A—Order Declaring a Limited Emergency</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In response to a recent increase in the COVID-19 infection rate, the spread of the Delta variant, and concerns related to ventilation in GPCOG meeting rooms while allowing for public occupancy, the GPCOG Executive Committee held an emergency meeting on August 24 to declare a limited emergency. The limited emergency allows for the continuation of remote public meetings in accordance with Maine law and the GPCOG/PACTS Remote Participation Policy. To allow GPCOG boards and committees to meet remotely as soon as possible, the GPCOG Executive Committee’s order took effect immediately. The GPCOG Executive Committee strongly recommends that all other GPCOG and PACTS boards, commissions, and committees take similar action. The PACTS Policy Board adopted an Order Declaring a Limited Emergency at its meeting on August 24.

After a public hearing, RTAC members may take action on the proposed Order Declaring a Limited Emergency.

**Recommended action:** Adopt the Order Declaring a Limited Emergency for the PACTS Regional Transportation Advisory Committee (RTAC).

**Public Hearing:** Members of the public are welcome to provide up to three minutes of public comment on this item.
ORDER DECLARING A LIMITED EMERGENCY

WHEREAS, in the Spring of 2021 the COVID-19 Pandemic had seemed to be coming to an end with the advent of vaccines and good vaccination rates, but instead infection rates, and new variants, hospitalizations, and deaths from the COVID-19 virus have been increasing in recent months; and

WHEREAS, in the two (2) weeks between July 14 and July 28, 2021, the rate of COVID-19 infections confirmed by testing have more than doubled in the United States, and those trends continue; and

WHEREAS, on July 1, 2021, in the State of Maine, the average daily case total was 22.1;

WHEREAS, since that time the rate of COVID-19 infections confirmed by testing in the State of Maine has increased at a significant rate to an average number of 67.1 daily cases as of July 27, 2021, for an increase of 203.6 percent, and those trends continue; and

WHEREAS, a majority of the new infections in the United States and the State of Maine involve the Delta variant, a highly contagious SARS-CoV-2 virus strain, which was first identified in December 2020; and

WHEREAS, the Delta variant has increased transmission, the severity of COVID-19 infections based on hospitalization and case fatality rates, and decreased susceptibility to therapeutic agents; and

WHEREAS, the Delta variant represents 47.6 percent of all sequenced samples collected in July in the State of Maine; and

WHEREAS, as a result of the Delta variant and the increase in COVID-19 infections, the United States Centers for Disease Control and Prevention announced on July 27, 2021, that fully vaccinated individuals should wear masks in indoor public settings in parts of the country that are experiencing a substantial or high transmission of COVID-19; and

WHEREAS, the Maine Center for Disease Control and Prevention similarly announced on July 28, 2021, that masks are recommended to be worn by fully vaccinated individuals in public indoor settings in almost all Maine counties, including Cumberland County; and

WHEREAS, the risk of COVID-19 virus transmission from vaccinated individuals to unvaccinated individuals (for example children under 12) remains unknown; and

WHEREAS, as a result of the above-described situation, the Executive Director has determined that GPCOG offices will remain closed to regular business and that masks must be worn by staff in GPCOG’s offices; and
WHEREAS, GPCOG offices and conference rooms have adequate ventilation under normal circumstances, but have windows that do not open and do not provide sufficient space to socially distance the number of members on many standing committees; and

WHEREAS, the technology infrastructure and processes currently exist to continue to allow remote participation in and public access to GPCOG and PACTS meetings in accordance with Maine law; and

WHEREAS, GPCOG is committed to continuing to provide opportunities for public engagement which are accessible and safe; and

WHEREAS, all GPCOG and PACTS boards and committees have or will be adopting a Remote Participation Policy as authorized in 1 M.R.S. section 403-B;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDERED AND DECLARED by the GPCOG Executive Committee that a limited emergency continues to exist within the Greater Portland region; and

BE IT FURTHER ORDERED, that as a result of the declared limited emergency and the existence of an “emergency or urgent issue” as described above, pursuant to 1 M.R.S. section 403-B and GPCOG’s recently adopted Remote Participation Policy, being physically present for meetings in GPCOG’s offices is not practicable at this time, and therefore requires that all GPCOG committees and other groups continue to be conducted by remote technology/methods only until the limited emergency is terminated; and

BE IT FURTHER ORDERED, that as a result of this declared limited emergency, the existence of an “emergency or urgent issue,” the fact that GPCOG offices remain closed to the public, and in order to be consistent throughout the GPCOG’s activities, the GPCOG Executive Committee hereby strongly recommends that all other GPCOG and PACTS boards, commissions, and committees who have adopted a Remote Participation Policy also continue to meet by remote technology/methods only in accordance with the requirements of their adopted policy; and

BE IT FURTHER ORDERED that this Order is enacted as an Emergency so that it may take effect immediately.
4. Remote Participation Policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Chris Chop, staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommended action</strong></td>
<td>Adopt the Remote Participation Policy for the PACTS Regional Transportation Advisory Committee (RTAC).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Attachments**          | 4A—Public Law Chapter 290  
4B—Remote Participation Policy |

Governor Mills signed Public Law Chapter 290 into law on June 21, 2021. The law, included as Attachment 4A, establishes (1) requirements that meetings be held in-person, and (2) the circumstances under which members of public bodies may participate in public meetings using remote technology.

In order to take advantage of the new remote participation law, PACTS’ Regional Transportation Advisory Committee (RTAC) must hold a public hearing and then adopt a policy in conformance with the new state law. If approved, the proposed Remote Participation Policy, included as Attachment 4B, will allow committee members to attend RTAC meetings via remote technologies pursuant to the requirements of Public Law Chapter 290. The PACTS Policy Board adopted the Remote Participation Policy on July 22.

*Please note that the Order Declaring a Limited Emergency, included in the previous item, allows meetings to be held remotely until the limited emergency is terminated.*

After a public hearing, RTAC members may take action on the proposed Remote Participation Policy.

**Recommended action: Adopt the Remote Participation Policy for the PACTS Regional Transportation Advisory Committee (RTAC).**

**Public Hearing:** Members of the public are welcome to provide up to three minutes of public comment on this item.
An Act Regarding Remote Participation in Public Proceedings

Emergency preamble. Whereas, acts and resolves of the Legislature do not become effective until 90 days after adjournment unless enacted as emergencies; and

Whereas, the state of emergency declared by the Governor pursuant to the Maine Revised Statutes, Title 37-B, section 742 in response to the public health emergency caused by the spread of the novel coronavirus disease referred to as COVID-19 may terminate sooner than 90 days after the adjournment of the First Special Session of the 130th Legislature; and

Whereas, the Maine Revised Statutes, Title 1, section 403-A governs remote participation in public proceedings of certain public bodies but is automatically repealed 30 days after the termination of the state of emergency declared by the Governor; and

Whereas, there is a need to have in place a law that governs remote participation in public proceedings of certain public bodies after the termination of the state of emergency declared by the Governor; and

Whereas, in the judgment of the Legislature, these facts create an emergency within the meaning of the Constitution of Maine and require the following legislation as immediately necessary for the preservation of the public peace, health and safety; now, therefore,

Be it enacted by the People of the State of Maine as follows:

Sec. 1. 1 MRSA §403-B is enacted to read:

§403-B. Remote participation in public proceedings

1. Remote participation. This section governs remote methods of participation in public proceedings of certain public bodies. For the purposes of this section, "remote methods" means telephonic or video technology allowing simultaneous reception of information and may include other means when such means are necessary to provide reasonable accommodation to a person with a disability. Public proceedings may not be conducted by text-only means such as e-mail, text messages or chat functions.

2. Requirements. A public body subject to this subchapter may allow members of the body to participate in a public proceeding using remote methods only under the following conditions:

A. After notice and hearing the body has adopted a written policy governing the conditions upon which members of the body and the public may participate in a public proceeding of that body by remote methods;
B. The policy adopted pursuant to paragraph A must provide that members of the body are expected to be physically present for public proceedings except when being physically present is not practicable. Circumstances in which physical presence for one or more members is not practicable may include:

(1) The existence of an emergency or urgent issue that requires the public body to meet by remote methods;

(2) Illness, other physical condition or temporary absence from the jurisdiction of the body that causes a member of the body to face significant difficulties traveling to and attending in person at the location in the notice under section 406;

(3) With respect to a public body with statewide membership, significant distance a member must travel to be physically present at the location in the notice under section 406; and

(4) The area of the public body's jurisdiction includes geographic characteristics that impede or slow travel, including but not limited to islands not connected by bridges;

C. The policy adopted pursuant to paragraph A must provide members of the public a meaningful opportunity to attend by remote methods when members of the body participate by remote methods, and reasonable accommodations may be provided when necessary to provide access to individuals with disabilities;

D. If the body allows or is required to provide an opportunity for public input during the proceeding, an effective means of communication between the members of the body and the public must be provided;

E. Notice of the proceeding must be provided in accordance with section 406. When the public may attend by remote methods pursuant to paragraphs C and D, the notice must include the means by which members of the public may access the proceeding using remote methods. The notice must also identify a location for members of the public to attend in person. The body may not determine that public attendance at a proceeding will be limited solely to remote methods except under the conditions in paragraph B, subparagraph (1);

F. A member of the body who participates in a public proceeding by remote methods is present for purposes of a quorum and voting;

G. All votes taken during a public proceeding using remote methods must be taken by roll call vote that can be seen and heard if using video technology, and heard if using only audio technology, by the other members of the public body and the public; and

H. The public body must make all documents and other materials considered by the public body available, electronically or otherwise, to the public who attend by remote methods to the same
extent customarily available to members of the public who attend the proceedings of the public body in person, as long as additional costs are not incurred by the public body.

3. Remote participation not permitted. This section does not authorize town meetings held pursuant to Title 30-A, section 2524 or regional school unit budget meetings held pursuant to Title 20-A, section 1482-A to be conducted using remote methods.

4. Application. This section does not apply to:

A. The Legislature; or

B. A public body to which specific statutory provisions for remote participation apply.

Emergency clause. In view of the emergency cited in the preamble, this legislation takes effect when approved.
REMOTE PARTICIPATION POLICY

PACTS Regional Transportation Advisory Committee (RTAC)

September 7, 2021

Pursuant to 1 M.R.S. § 403-B, and after public notice and hearing, the above-named body adopts the following policy to govern the participation, via remote methods, of members of the body and the public in the public proceedings or meetings of the body.

Members of the body are expected to be physically present for meetings except when not practicable, such as in the case of an emergency or urgent issue that requires the body to meet via remote methods, or an illness or temporary absence of a member that causes significant difficulty traveling to the meeting location. The GPCOG Executive Director or the Director’s designee, in consultation with the Chair if appropriate and possible, will make a determination that remote methods of participation are necessary in as timely a manner as possible under the circumstances. A member who is unable to attend a meeting in person will notify the chair or presiding officer of the body as far in advance as possible.

Remote methods of participation may include telephonic or video technology allowing simultaneous reception of information and may include other means necessary to accommodate disabled persons. Remote participation will not be by text-only means such as e-mail, text messages, or chat functions.

The public will be provided a meaningful opportunity to attend via remote methods when any member of the body participates via remote methods. If public input is allowed or required at the meeting, an effective means of communication between the body and the public will also be provided. The public will also be provided an opportunity to attend the meeting in person unless there is an emergency or urgent issue that requires the entire body to meet using remote methods.

Notice of all meetings will be provided in accordance with 1 M.R.S. § 406 and any applicable charter, policy, or bylaw. When the public may attend via remote methods, notice will include the means by which the public may access the meeting remotely and will provide a method for disabled persons to request necessary accommodation to access the meeting. Notice will also identify a location where the public may attend the meeting in person. The body will not restrict public attendance to remote methods except in the case of an emergency or urgent issue that requires the body to meet using remote methods of attendance.

The body will make all documents and materials to be considered by the body available, electronically or otherwise, to the public who attend remotely to the same extent customarily available to the public who attend in person, provided no additional costs are incurred by the body.

All votes taken during a meeting using remote methods will be by roll call vote that can be seen and heard if using video technology, or heard if using audio technology only, by other members of the body and the public. A member of the body who participates remotely will be considered present for purposes of a quorum and voting.

This policy will remain in force indefinitely unless amended or rescinded.
5. Approval of July 6, 2021 Meeting Minutes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Harold Spetla, staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommended action</td>
<td>Approve the July 6, 2021 PACTS Regional Transportation Advisory Committee (RTAC) meeting minutes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment</td>
<td>5A—2021-07-06 PACTS Regional Transportation Advisory Committee (RTAC) Meeting Minutes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The previous meeting of the PACTS Regional Transportation Advisory Committee (RTAC) was held on July 6, 2021. Minutes from the meeting are included as Attachment 5A for review, discussion, and approval.

*Recommended action: Approve the July 6, 2021 PACTS Regional Transportation Advisory Committee (RTAC) meeting minutes.*

Members of the public are welcome to provide up to three minutes of public comment on this item.
Regional Transportation Advisory Committee
July 6, 2021
9:00 a.m.
DRAFT Meeting Minutes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Seat</th>
<th>Representative</th>
<th>Attendance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PACTS Southern – Municipal</td>
<td>Diana Asanza</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACTS Southern – Planning/ Economic Development</td>
<td>Denise Clavette</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACTS Southern – Public Works/ Engineering</td>
<td>Tom Milligan</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACTS Central – Municipal</td>
<td>Matt Sturgis</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACTS Central – Planning/ Economic Development</td>
<td>Nell Donaldson</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACTS Central – Public Works/ Engineering</td>
<td>Doug Howard</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACTS Western – Municipal</td>
<td>Bill Giroux</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACTS Western – Planning/ Economic Development</td>
<td>Amanda Lessard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACTS Western – Public Works/ Engineering</td>
<td>Bob Burns</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACTS Northern – Municipal</td>
<td>Bill Shane</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACTS Northern – Planning/ Economic Development</td>
<td>Theo Holtwijk</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACTS Northern – Public Works/ Engineering</td>
<td>Adam Bliss</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>Hank Berg</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>Patricia Quinn</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>Donna Tippett</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>Robert Currie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MaineDOT</td>
<td>Tom Reinauer</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine Turnpike Authority</td>
<td>Rebecca Grover</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Transportation Specialist</td>
<td>Jean Sideris</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Specialist</td>
<td>Christian MilNeil</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Transportation Leader</td>
<td>Leann Brionez</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Transportation Leader</td>
<td>Mireille Kabongo</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector Trade Association</td>
<td>Eamonn Dundon</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **Welcome**

Nell Donaldson opened the meeting and welcomed the attendees.

2. **Public Comment**

No public comment was received.

3. **Approval of the June 1, 2021 RTAC Meeting Minutes**

Bill Shane moved to approve the minutes from June 1, 2021. Tom Milligan seconded the motion. All were in favor.

4. **Staff Report**
In response to a request made at the June RTAC meeting and after consultation with the PACTS officers, staff will vet items before including them on the agenda and will provide specific recommendations on agenda items. The PACTS officers agreed that if GPCOG staff are unable to sufficiently vet an item, that should be reflected in the agenda. This update was also provided to the PACTS Executive Board.

Staff will provide updates on CARES project expenditures starting in August. Bill Shane asked about the bypass track, a 3-mile dual track that NNEPRA built in the Falmouth/Yarmouth/Cumberland area, and how communities should ask for assistance in completing this project and what role can GPCOG/PACTS play in this process. Chris Chop stated that he would raise the topic at a PACTS Policy Board meeting.

Jean Sideris asked how the American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) funds relate to PACTS. Chris Chop, GPCOG staff, answered that about $8 million in ARPA funds have been allocated to PACTS specifically for public transportation. The funds have not been programmed yet but GPCOG staff is currently looking at how ARPA funds can be used in conjunction with the CARES funding.

Eamonn Dundon asked if PACTS is subject to the recent legislative restriction on remote public meetings. Kristina Egan, GPCOG staff, answered that GPCOG is proposing to the Executive Committee a request to continue remote meetings, which would give all standing committees, including PACTS, the option of holding a remote meeting. Additionally, GPCOG will be gathering input from GPCOG/PACTS members on their preferences for meetings (in-person, hybrid, remote) moving forward. Tom Milligan asked for clarification on whether meetings must be in person if an item requires a vote. Kristina stated that Chris Hall, who acts as GPCOG’s general counsel, is putting together information regarding this topic, which will be shared with PACTS.

5. Allocation of FHWA Funds for Collector Paving Programs Projects

The PACTS Collector Paving Program (CPP) seeks to extend the life of the pavement on the region’s collector roads. PACTS receives an annual allocation of approximately $2.2 million in Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) funding that is used for the CPP. Last year, PACTS convened a Collector Paving Working Group, which revised the PACTS CPP policy. Under the revised policy, projects are selected from one of three CPP subregion on a three-year rotating basis. Projects are ranked according to Pavement Condition Index (PCI), transit presence, and Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT).

The proposed list of 2023 paving projects is in the agenda packet (Attachment 5B). The cost for each proposed paving project is a preliminary estimate and will be refined after a field review. If refined cost estimates come in over the allocation, projects at the bottom of the ranked list will be moved to a waiting list.

No public comment was received.

Bill Shane commented on the importance of preventative maintenance and noted that reconstruction is not funded by the PACTS CPP.

Jean Sideris asked if non-motorized users are included in average daily traffic numbers. She also mentioned that she receives comments about shoulders that are not repaved when the roads are, which creates a lip between the repaved road and the deteriorated shoulder and leads to more non-motorized users, such as bicyclists, riding in the road. Chris Chop responded that the traffic numbers do not include non-motorized users, which was followed by a discussion about if and how reliable data on pedestrian and bicycle traffic could be collected. Elizabeth Roberts, GPCOG staff, mentioned that unpaved shoulders can be a cost-saving measure but are
generally included in the repave. Tom Reinauer, MaineDOT staff, agreed, noting that bicycle traffic is sometimes a factor when making the decision on whether to pave the shoulder or not.

Christian MilNeil stated that collector roads have more problems than just pavement, such as lack of sidewalks, lack of transit service, and traffic congestion, and suggested that PACTS focus on these issues as well. Christian asked if there are other funds available and if there is a long-term plan. Chris answered that PACTS, at this time, does not have a long-term strategic plan for the collector paving program. PACTS considered combining all resources into one lump sum and allocating funds based on the funding framework, but there was not enough support for the idea. Chris also mentioned that MaineDOT can assist some municipalities with collector paving preservation; however, MaineDOT does not assist urban areas, so those municipalities are forced to fund their own collector paving preservation or look to PACTS, as the region’s metropolitan planning organization (MPO). There are federal discretionary grants available, but the shorter road segments would not likely be competitive on a national level. Christian stated the existing system is not working well and is not financially sustainable. Chris pointed out that PACTS will be starting its long-range transportation plan, Connect2045, which will provide a roadmap for how resources are used long-term.

Tom Milligan explained the approach that the collector paving program takes is meant to be cost effective. For example, the region was split into three subregions to limit mobilization costs. He added that MaineDOT comes in a year after paving to review ADA accessibility. Finally, Tom stated this program is also important because deteriorating roads can impede economic development.

Tom Milligan moved to approve the Collector Paving Program as presented. Eamonn Dundon seconded the motion. There were 14 votes in favor and 2 votes opposed (Christian MilNeil, Leeann Brionez).

6. **Allocation of FHWA Funds for Complex Projects**

PACTS receives an annual allocation of $2,472,965 in Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) funding that is used for complex projects. A complex project is a project that PACTS programs in two phases—preliminary design report (PDR), and then construction when PDR is complete. If PACTS decides to fund a project for PDR, PACTS is committing to fund that project for construction in the future.

This year PACTS received nine applications for complex projects funding, three of which were removed to undergo enhanced project scoping (EPS). The remaining six applications include five projects for PDR funding and one project for construction funding. (The municipality requesting construction funding, Windham, funded its own PDR.) In addition, two project sponsors (South Portland and Westbrook) with projects that were funded before PACTS funded projects in two phases are requesting additional funds for construction due to cost increases.

GPCOG staff put together three sample allocations to demonstrate the options available:

- **Option 1: PDR-Heavy Allocation**—Fund all five applications for PDR (Portland Libbytown, Saco Island Multimodal Bridge, Yarmouth Beth Condon Path, Yarmouth Main St., Gorham Signals), plus the South Portland and Westbrook projects for construction. This option would advance more projects closer to “shovel-ready” status. It would also commit PACTS to approximately $17 million in future construction costs.
• Option 2: Construction-Heavy Allocation—Fund Windham, South Portland, and Westbrook for construction, plus the highest-scoring project (Portland Libbytown) for PDR. This option would limit PACTS’s commitment to future construction costs to approximately $6 million.

• Option 3: Limited Allocation with Savings—Fund the three highest-scoring applications for PDR (Portland Libbytown, Saco Island Multimodal Bridge, Yarmouth Beth Condon Path), plus South Portland and Westbrook for construction. This option would commit PACTS to approximately $16 million in future construction costs.

GPCOG staff recommended Option 1 plus allocating the remaining FHWA funds (approximately $900,000) for Windham’s Route 302 North Windham Sidewalk project, pending availability of additional local match funding. Staff recommended Option 1 because it funds three of the four highest-scored projects, gets projects closer to “shovel-ready” status, and provides funding for the South Portland and Westbrook projects. It is important to note that both Yarmouth projects and the Gorham project are less resource intensive.

Chris Chop stated it is important to have projects close to “shovel-ready” status so they are more competitive for discretionary grant programs. He highlighted that it is important, under the current administration, for PACTS to anticipate additional transportation resources and be prepared for that as a region.

No public comment was received.

Bill Shane asked if it is possible to produce a timeline for when projects will actually be constructed. He questioned if it would make more sense to dedicate money to constructing projects that are already on the list rather than adding PDRs. Aubrey Miller, GPCOG staff, explained that the three projects on the PDR list are not yet ready for construction funding. Under the PDR-first policy, MaineDOT recommends PACTS fund 1-2 PDRs each year so that we have projects ready for construction.

Eamonn Dundon asked when and how the decision will be made on the cost for the Saco Island Multimodal Bridge. He also asked if the South Portland and Westbrook projects are not funded through PACTS, will there be a reduction in scope or additional local match from the municipalities. Aubrey answered that the Saco and Biddeford Town Councils will decide on which alternative they want soon. She also said that the South Portland and Westbrook projects have already reduced scope to bring down cost. Chris Chop added that South Portland has separated the project and is now doing the roadway paving separately.

Jennie Franceschi, Town of Westbrook, mentioned that the Westbrook project goes back 11 years. She stated the funding for the project will address a high crash location at the intersection of William Clarke Drive and Saco Street. Additionally, this issue is not just a municipality issue, but a regional one due to the regional traffic through Westbrook.

Christian commented that these projects need better financing plans to avoid issues of overbudgeting. He believes that PACTS should be funding projects where municipalities are providing more than the required local match, like the proposed Windham Route 302 sidewalk. Christian expressed support for fully funding the Windham project and dispersing the remaining funds to South Portland and Westbrook.

Patricia Quinn asked if the local match for the PDR has been committed. Aubrey answered that the match was committed during the application process; however, some municipalities do still need formal approval from their city/town councils. Patricia also asked if it is PACTS’ policy to fund both PDR and construction. Aubrey answered yes. This is primarily because once federal funds are committed for PDR, the project must be
constructed or the federal funds may have to be paid back. Patricia mentioned that PACTS does not have to be the primary funder for construction and asked if the application process includes municipalities coming up with plans to obtain funding for construction with the understanding the PACTS is a back-up funder. Aubrey answered that some municipalities did list additional funding sources on their applications, but it is not a requirement. Finally, Patricia asked who manages the PDR and if that individual/body must report back to RTAC. Aubrey answered that the PDR is managed by MaineDOT and the municipalities; there is currently no requirement for either of those bodies to report back to RTAC.

Tom Reinauer expressed concern about getting too far ahead on PDRs and advocated for a more balanced approach. He stated that discretionary funds are not guaranteed, while the PACTS funding is. There are three projects in design now, in addition to the two projects in South Portland and Westbrook that are requesting additional funding. Tom questioned if committing to five PDRs is the right move. He suggested Option 3 (in Attachment 6G) as a more viable option.

Christian wondered what the incentive is for municipalities to seek additional funding when PACTS has already agreed to fund construction upon PDR approval.

Theo Holtwijk noted he was hearing two separate issues. The first is the allocation recommendation. He conceded there is not a perfect option; however, he would support the staff recommendation of Option 1. The second, bigger concern is the sustainability of the program. He believes that it would be worthwhile to spend time on policy decision-making to analyze where improvements can be made.

Nell Donaldson stated that trying to find the balance on whether to save or spend is difficult. She mentioned that PACTS is being encouraged to spend, even though there is not enough construction to spend it on at this time.

Chris Chop stated that this is the first time using the funding framework and improvements can be made in the near future.

Kristina Egan said PACTS needs to balance planning ahead with funding construction to ensure there are enough projects in the pipeline. She mentioned that PACTS should consider the current administration when putting forth projects. The region just went through a prioritization process for earmarks and did not have many shovel-ready projects. Kristina agreed that having a timeline is a great suggestion but cautions there are often delays. Even though there are multiple PDR projects, they will not be due for construction at the same time. There needs to be a balance between “shovel-ready” projects and construction.

Tom Reinauer agreed the PDR process can take a while depending on the complexity of the project. He also agreed that these projects will be staggered because there are always delays in this process.

Patricia Quinn asked if there is a timeline for construction for the Windham sidewalk project. Aubrey answered that she believes they are ready for construction as soon as funds are available.

Tom Milligan agreed with Theo’s approach to focus on the recommendation today and to have a larger policy discussion later. He reminded everyone that the application process takes much effort and that it is harder for smaller municipalities to compete. Tom supported the staff recommendation of Option 1, including the Windham sidewalk project.
Eamonn Dundon asked if there is any incentive for municipalities to fund their own PDRs in the funding framework. Aubrey answered that there are currently no points given to municipalities that fund their own PDRs, but the funding framework can be revised.

Christian made a motion to approve staff recommendation Option 1 with the amendment that the Windham sidewalk project is fully funded, and the remaining funds are allocated to the Westbrook and South Portland projects.

Jean commented that going further, there should be a conversation regarding the ability of smaller towns to fund their own PDRs.

Regarding the Saco-Biddeford bridge project, Tom Milligan pointed out that the PDR is intended to help determine the final design and therefore the construction cost.

Jessa Berna, City of Saco, explained that the city’s grant-funded feasibility report provides a range of bridge options and typologies, with costs ranging from about $4.5 million to $8.5 million. She reiterated Tom Milligan’s point that the PDR will determine the best option, but added that the municipalities (Saco and Biddeford) would be open to removing the highest-cost option from consideration. She simply requested that the mid-cost alternatives remain on the table to give the municipalities some flexibility; to allow for that, the project would need about $300,000 for PDR.

Jennie Franceschi, Town of Westbrook, clarified that they have worked to try to find funding for their project and that they are coming to PACTS because the western region needs it done. She asked that RTAC reject the current motion to approve Option 1 with the amendment to fully fund the Windham project and allocate the remaining funds to the Westbrook and South Portland projects. Jennie suggested that RTAC support the original staff recommendation. Bob Burns agreed that the South Portland and Westbrook projects are important to the region and need to be funded.

Christian shared census data regarding mean travel time to work to explain his disapproval of the road widening in the Westbrook project. He said there are ways for Westbrook to obtain funds to make up the difference from the original staff recommended Option 1.

Nell Donaldson brought forth Christian’s motion to approve staff recommendation Option 1 with the amendment that the Windham sidewalk project be fully funded and the remaining funds be allocated to the Westbrook and South Portland projects. Eamon Dundon seconded the motion. There were two votes in favor and 14 opposed; the motion failed.

Bill Shane made a motion to approve the staff recommendation. Tom Milligan seconded the motion. Kristina requested to add in the motion that staff will get the exact number from Saco when they have selected an alternative. There were 14 votes in favor, 1 opposed (Christian MilNeil), and 1 abstention (Tom Reinauer); the motion carried.

7. **Other Business**

The was no other business discussed.

8. **Adjourn**

With no objection, the meeting was adjourned.
6. Staff Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Elizabeth Roberts, staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommended action</td>
<td>For information only.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachments</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

High Crash Location Reports

The engineering consulting firm, VHB, was hired in 2019 to perform desktop assessments at 24 high crash locations throughout the PACTS region and then in-depth road safety audits (RSA) for 10 of those locations. The 24 high crash locations were selected by the PACTS Technical Committee. VHB submitted 24 desktop assessments to PACTS in March 2020. Upon review of the desktop assessments, the Technical Committee then provided a recommended list of 10 high crash locations for a full road safety audit (RSA), which follows.

**Central Subregion**
South Portland – Route 9 and Broadway
South Portland – Main and Skillings
Portland – Washington and Allen

**Northern Subregion**
Yarmouth – Route 1 and Spring
Freeport – I-295 Off Ramp and 125/136/Mallett (ensure MaineDOT is notified of recommendations as bridge project is in design phase)

**Western Subregion**
Gorham – Route 237 and Route 202/4 Roundabout
Standish – Route 114 and Route 35

**Southern Subregion**
Biddeford – Alfred and May
Saco – Route 1 and Route 5
Scarborough – Route 114 and Payne

VHB met with municipalities and concluded the RSAs in July 2021. The reports will be reviewed by staff and then posted to the website and distributed to the municipalities.
Regional Traffic Management System (RTMS)

The PACTS RTMS program, started in 2008, has the stated goal to optimize the current roadway network through traffic signal management and to provide direct access for remote management and monitoring of the traffic signals in the PACTS region to improve mobility and capacity along major corridors.

PACTS adopted a RTMS Policy in December of 2010 and provided initial funding for this program including funding for a central server located in a fire station in South Portland and traffic management software, Streetwise. Streetwise is no longer supported, leaving our region’s signals vulnerable. Because Streetwise is no longer supported, new traffic signal installations cannot connect to the existing server.

In 2020, Sebago Technics, an engineering consulting firm was hired to evaluate options for replacing or upgrading the PACTS RTMS server and software. The consultant presented information for three different options to upgrade the PACTS RTMS Server and Software to the RTMS subcommittee, which follows:

- Upgrade the physical server to use the successor of Streetwise - ATMS.Now
- Use a cloud-based server and upgrade to ATMS.Now
- Use a cloud-based server and switch to an NTCIP system

At the June meeting, the RTMS subcommittee voted to pursue the option with an NTCIP Central System. The consultant is currently working on costs of a phased implementation of the PACTS server upgrade with an NTCIP system.
7. CARES Phase II and III Project Updates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Chris Chop, staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommended action</td>
<td>For information and discussion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachments</td>
<td>7A—CARES Phase II and III Project Updates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In early 2020, the PACTS region received approximately $53 million in CARES Act funding to support the transit industry during the pandemic. PACTS has been allocating this funding in six-month phases, and in support of the following four priorities:

1. **Maintaining regional transit service** in light of reduced ridership and passenger-based revenues
2. **Pandemic recovery and resiliency** to support implementation of COVID-19 operating best practices and immediate efforts to rebuild ridership
3. **Transit system innovation** to spur long-term ridership recovery as the pandemic subsides
4. **Municipal budget assistance** to provide budgetary relief to municipalities that fund transit service through local match

As part of Phases II and III—covering the periods of July–December 2020 and January–June 2021, respectively—funding was allocated to several projects and studies to be managed by GPCOG. GPCOG serves in a subcontractor role to METRO to manage these projects, and submits quarterly reports to METRO per Federal Transit Administration (FTA) contracting requirements. Funding was also allocated to two projects focused on planning and implementing transit signal priority. These projects are managed by the Cities of Portland and South Portland.

The project updates shown in Attachment 7A reflect project status as of June 30, 2021.

Future project updates will be available at gpcog.org/530/CARES-ACT-Project-Updates.

**Recommended action: For information and discussion.**

Members of the public are welcome to provide up to three minutes of public comment on this item.
CARES Phase II and III Project Updates

Improve Safety and Access for Older Adults, People with Disabilities, and People of Color

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lead Agency</th>
<th>Amount Allocated</th>
<th>Amount Expended</th>
<th>Pct. Expended</th>
<th>Amount Remaining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GPCOG</td>
<td>$135,000</td>
<td>$100,659</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>$34,341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Phase II</strong>: $60,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Phase III</strong>: $75,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- GPCOG hosted an in-person graduation celebration for the first cohort of Community Transportation Leaders (CTL) members. The event was attended by 16 members, as well one CTL member's husband and children. Most people had not seen one another in over a year which made the event a joyful reunion.

- GPCOG staff conducted monthly coaching sessions with the eight (8) CTL teams -- and convened 4 full group meetings by Zoom.

- GPCOG staff provided support to CTL members, Mireille Kabongo and Leeann Brionez, in preparing for monthly PACTS Regional Transportation Advisory Committee meetings. Both Leeann and Mireille are contributing to the meetings and report feeling included and empowered.

- As the result of CTL advocacy, the Greater Portland Metro's Training and Safety Manager and Marketing Manager took a train-the-trainer course through Community Transportation Association of America’s (CTAA's) Passenger Assistance Safety and Sensitivity (PASS) program and has begun using the training in his annual staff training.

- The Bus Ambassadors Program team moved closer to launching the program. They began recruiting volunteers and have six interested people. They also worked on developing policies and procedures, along with a program handbook. Volunteer training will take place in August.

- GPCOG staff conducted a program evaluation and worked on developing a CTL handbook. The evaluation included collecting feedback from all participants and conducting a staff workshop.

Public Education and Customer Communications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lead Agency</th>
<th>Amount Allocated</th>
<th>Amount Expended</th>
<th>Pct. Expended</th>
<th>Amount Remaining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GPCOG</td>
<td>$340,000</td>
<td>$150,874</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>$189,126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Phase II</strong>: $200,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Phase III</strong>: $140,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- PACTS/GPCOG convened a marketing/communications task force, which includes marketing personnel and leadership from the region’s seven (7) transit agencies plus Concord Coach Lines.
The first phase of the campaign, which began in March, focused on COVID safety and thanking drivers, ferry workers, and passengers. It brought visitors to TransItTogether.org, a new website that serves as a hub for transit information in the region.

The larger and more aggressive Phase 2 segment of the campaign launched on July 7 on digital, social media, radio and newspapers. We created a set of videos and a jingle. Watch the Channel 13 story about the transit jingle. Ads are running on the outside of Metro, BSOOB and Lakes Region buses. See the bus ads. A television ad campaign is being considered for September.

The campaign aims to welcome back regular riders while attracting new riders by showcasing public transit’s benefits vs. driving a car, such as a reduced carbon footprint and cost-savings.

The campaign plans to spend more than $200,000 on advertising through September.

Transit Together

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lead Agency</th>
<th>Amount Allocated</th>
<th>Amount Expended</th>
<th>Pct. Expended</th>
<th>Amount Remaining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GPCOG</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$29,743</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>$470,257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase II: $380,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase III: $120,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GPCOG staff completed consultant interviews and entered into a project contract with the preferred consultant as of June 22.

The GPCOG and consultant team project managers are developing a project management plan.

The GPCOG and consultant project teams will meet for a staff kickoff meeting on July 21.

The project management team will host a stakeholder kickoff meeting in September.

Rapid Transit Feasibility Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lead Agency</th>
<th>Amount Allocated</th>
<th>Amount Expended</th>
<th>Pct. Expended</th>
<th>Amount Remaining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GPCOG</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,129</td>
<td>101%</td>
<td>($129)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase III scoping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GPCOG staff conducted case studies and reviews of similar projects and spoke with national experts to learn best practices and lessons learned for the study.

A presentation of the study was given at the June 2021 Regional Transportation Advisory Committee (RTAC) meeting, which unanimously recommend approval of an additional $800,000.
of CARES Act funding for completion of the study. The Policy Board approved this funding at its July 2021 meeting.

- Held early outreach meetings with the Federal Transit Administration, Federal Highway Administration, MaineDOT, and the Maine Turnpike Authority.
- Staff have begun drafting a Request for Proposals (RFP) for consultant services to complete the study, which is anticipated to be advertised in October 2021 and take approximately 18 months to complete.

Planning for Automatic Passenger Counters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lead Agency</th>
<th>Amount Allocated</th>
<th>Amount Expended</th>
<th>Pct. Expended</th>
<th>Amount Remaining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GPCOG</td>
<td>Phase III: $15,000</td>
<td>$156</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>$14,844</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Staff have researched and attended webinars on transit technology best practices, including automatic passenger counters (APC).
- Staff are planning to reengage local transit providers to determine their level of need and interest in procuring APCs, which will provide for better quality of data to modernize transit and offer a better basis for decision making.

Health and Safety Investments for Volunteer Driver Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lead Agency</th>
<th>Amount Allocated</th>
<th>Amount Expended</th>
<th>Pct. Expended</th>
<th>Amount Remaining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GPCOG</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>$6,005</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>$995</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Project is complete. Remaining funds will support Public Education and Customer Communications.

Transit Signal Priority

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lead Agency</th>
<th>Amount Allocated</th>
<th>Amount Expended</th>
<th>Pct. Expended</th>
<th>Amount Remaining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>METRO</td>
<td>$32,500</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$32,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPBS</td>
<td>$151,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$151,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Neither project has begun.
8. Transit Performance Metrics

Contact
Andrew Clark, staff

Recommended action
Provide guidance to staff and the Transit Task Force.

Attachments
None.

Safety Performance Targets

Per 49 CFR Section 673.11(a)(3), a public transit agency's Agency Safety Plan must include Safety Performance Targets (SPTs) based on the Safety Performance Measures (SPMs) established in the National Public Transportation Safety Plan. Those measures are:

- Total fatalities
- Fatalities per 100,000 vehicle revenue-miles (VRM)\(^1\)
- Total injuries
- Injuries per 100,000 VRM
- Total safety events\(^2\)
- Safety events per 100,000 VRM
- System reliability\(^3\)

Per 23 CFR Section 450.306(d)(4), metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs) are responsible for integrating into their planning process performance measures and targets, including SPTs, from their state department of transportation and local transit agencies' plans. As of July 21, 2021, METRO, the Regional Transportation Program (RTP), and the South Portland Bus Service (SPBS) have each submitted an Agency Safety Plan to PACTS. MaineDOT also maintains safety performance targets, and most recently published them in their 2015 Maine Strategic Transit Plan 2025\(^4\). The agencies use the metrics as shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Safety Performance Metrics Used in the PACTS Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>METRO and RTP</th>
<th>SPBS</th>
<th>MaineDOT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Total fatalities</td>
<td>• Total occurrences</td>
<td>Bus safety:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fatalities per 100,000 VRM</td>
<td>• Occurrences per 100,000 VRM</td>
<td>• Fatalities per 100,000 VRM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Injuries per 100,000 VRM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) This rate is generally presented over 100,000 VRM, but agencies may use a different number of VRM.

\(^2\) “Safety Events” is defined as a major safety event reported to the National Transit Database using the Safety & Security S&S-40 form, excluding security events.

\(^3\) Mean VRM between major mechanical failures

\(^4\) See maine.gov/mdot/planning/docs/FinalStrategicPlan.pdf.
There is no prescribed formula for setting the value of SPTs. Agencies are permitted to set targets that continue current safety performance, improve safety performance, or represent aspirations such as zero fatalities. Various MPOs set targets in different ways, including mixed strategies aiming for improvements in some metrics and stability in others. Potential strategies for calculating the actual numeric values include:

- Setting targets based on five-year trends, including five-year averages or five-year highs or lows
- Number and rate reduction, reducing by a defined percent each year from the baseline
- Benchmarking peer agencies (for example, for new agencies or reduced reporters)

The best available data for SPMs by mode for the last five years in the region are shown in Table 2.

### Table 2: Regional Safety Outcomes by mode, 2015–2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Total Fatalities</th>
<th>Rate of Fatalities(^a)</th>
<th>Total Injuries</th>
<th>Rate of Injuries(^a)</th>
<th>Total Safety events</th>
<th>Rate of Safety Events(^a)</th>
<th>System Reliability(^b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fixed-route bus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>11,959(^c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail(^d)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>No Failures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferry</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>42,132</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Per 100,000 VRM.

\(^b\) VRM divided by the number of major mechanical failures

\(^c\) Reported by METRO only.

\(^d\) Source: Rail safety data for Amtrak service in York and Cumberland Counties from the Federal Railroad Administration.

“Total Accidents/Incidents” are shown under “Total Safety Events,” but may not match the FTA definition of “safety event.”

---

Additional Performance Targets

FTA guidelines require that MPOs take a performance-based approach to planning, but the FTA permits some leeway to local leaders as they establish specific measures. Based on previous guidance from PACTS' governing bodies, staff have generated the following potential categories for the consideration of RTAC:

- Asset management
- Financial efficiency
- Operations
- Ridership
- Equity and public outreach

Staff are seeking guidance from RTAC about the development of regional Transit Performance Targets. Based on any feedback, staff will work with the Transit Task Force to further develop targets in greater detail in September. After additional review by RTAC, proposed performance targets will be presented to the Policy Board for final adoption in October.

**Recommended action: Provide guidance to staff and the Transit Task Force.**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Chris Chop, staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommended action</td>
<td>For information and discussion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachments</td>
<td>9A—2019 PACTS Reforms and Priorities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### A. Introduction and Priorities

Metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs) are required to create a Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) that documents the metropolitan transportation planning activities to be performed in compliance with federal regulation (23 CFR Part 450.308). The transportation planning tasks identified in the UPWP are funded through a combination of federal, state, and local sources. Staff are currently developing the calendar year (CY) 2022-2023 UPWP and have received input and guidance from the Executive Board (June), the Policy Board (July), and preliminary feedback from MaineDOT (August). Today, staff will present the draft program to the RTAC for information and discussion.

Below is the estimated two-year funding level for the 2022-2023 UPWP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>$2,197,746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>$311,498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal (local match)</td>
<td>$237,938 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,747,182</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Estimate based on 2022–2023 municipal study needs.

Note: MaineDOT has informed PACTS that it will allow the state’s MPOs to carryover unutilized funds from current 2020–2021 UPWP to the 2022–2023 UPWP (with a maximum carryover of 15%).

The Policy Board affirmed that the 2022–2023 UPWP shall continue to reflect the PACTS Reforms and Priorities, included as Attachment 9A, as well as recommendations from recent plans, studies, and programs, such as *Transit Tomorrow* and the multimodal Funding Framework. In June 2021, staff reviewed draft UPWP priorities with the Executive Board. Following review and input from the Executive Board, staff developed a more detailed plan and budget for tasks and elements for the Policy Board’s review and approval. This information is summarized below.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tasks and Elements</th>
<th>Element Details</th>
<th>Proposed Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TASK 1: Coordination &amp; Administration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1a. MPO Requirements &amp; Best Practices</td>
<td>• Ensure MPO meets Federal/State requirements</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Professional development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• RFP development for general consulting services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b. Budgeting and Management</td>
<td>• Manage projects and budgets across the CY22-23 UPWP</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Develop budgets for the CY24-25 UPWP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c. Policy &amp; Executive Boards</td>
<td>• Staff the PACTS Executive and Policy Boards</td>
<td>$225,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Develop strategic funding/policy recommendations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1d. Regional Transportation Advisory Committee (RTAC)</td>
<td>• Staff the Regional Transportation Advisory Committee (RTAC)</td>
<td>$105,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1e. Regional Transit Coordination</td>
<td>• Coordinate with the Transit Task Force</td>
<td>$85,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Participate in CY22 Funding Framework discussions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1f. Provide Data Services</td>
<td>• Provide data collection support for members using Miovision traffic count technology, aerial drone footage, and management of regional transit data (e.g., APC data)</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1g. Mapping, Data Analysis/Visualizations</td>
<td>• Expand PACTS' GIS geodatabase</td>
<td>$154,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Develop interactive data dashboards (e.g., for system performance)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Procure data collection tools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-h. Communications and Engagement</td>
<td>• Communicate PACTS priorities to key stakeholders and the general public</td>
<td>$333,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Engage the media, key stakeholders, and the public</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Develop holistic public outreach strategies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Update PACTS' Public Involvement Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Support the GPCOG Annual Summits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Update the GPCOG website</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal for Task 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$1,037,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TASK 2: Program and Seek Funds</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a. Program FHWA &quot;Complex Projects&quot;</td>
<td>• Update and improve the project selection process</td>
<td>$145,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Coordinate with municipalities and MaineDOT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Evaluate the program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b. Program FHWA Collector Paving</td>
<td>• Manage project selection</td>
<td>$158,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Coordinate with municipalities and MaineDOT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Conduct regional pavement assessments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Evaluate the program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2c. Program Municipal Partnership Initiative Funds</td>
<td>• Manage project selection</td>
<td>$26,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Coordinate with municipalities and MaineDOT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Evaluate the program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasks and Elements</td>
<td>Element Details</td>
<td>Proposed Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2e. Program FTA Capital, Operating and Planning Funds (Transit) | • Manage the annual development of the FYCOP/SYCOP  
• Administer 5307, 5337, CARES Act, American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA), and other funding sources  
• Coordinate with regional transit providers and state and federal partners  
• Evaluate the program | $77,000 |
| 2f. Transportation Improvement Program | • Assemble TIP on an annual basis, including documentation of performance measures  
• Administer TIP amendments and modifications  
• Update TIP Policies and Procedures, as needed | $50,000 |
| 2g. Advance Capital Projects | • Ensure projects are completed on time and on budget  
• Publish project updates on the GPCOG website  
• Coordinate with municipalities and MaineDOT | $165,000 |
| 2h. Enhanced Project Scoping | • Support project scoping efforts to help ensure up to five (5) projects are positioned for project development  
• Suggested projects in CY22 include: Libbytown Safety & Accessibility; Forest Ave. Smart Corridor, Phase IV; and the Gorham Cross Town Trail. These were the top-three highest scoring projects from CY21 that were not selected for Preliminary Design Reports (PDR).  
• Suggested projects in CY23 (pending budget): two projects determined through the project selection process. | $75,000 |
| 2i. Seek New Funding for PACTS Priorities | • Submit discretionary grant applications, working with technical consultants as needed  
• Research innovative financial strategies  
• Lead regional efforts for any transportation earmarks  
• Support members with funding pursuits | $120,000 |
| **Subtotal for Task 2** | | **$816,000** |
| **TASK 3: Plan for the Future** | | |
| 3a. Long Range Transportation and Land Use Plan | • Complete Connect 2045, the Long-Range Transportation Plan update  
• Conduct the Congestion Management Process (Federal requirement) and incorporate in Connect 2045 | Funded through MaineDOT carryover allowance* |
| 3b. Transit Tomorrow: Make Transit Easier | • Building on Transit Tomorrow, support establishment of a mobility management program and advance user-focused improvements to paratransit  
• Support the Community Transportation Leaders program | $151,500 |
<p>| 3c. Transit Tomorrow: Create Frequent Connections | • Building on Transit Tomorrow, support the CARES-funded Transit Together project | $32,000 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tasks and Elements</th>
<th>Element Details</th>
<th>Proposed Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3d. Transit Tomorrow: Improve Rapid Transit | • Building on *Transit Tomorrow*, support the advancement of rapid transit in the region  
• *This budget will supplement any CARES-funded work*                                                                 | $50,600          |
| 3e. Transit Tomorrow: Create Transit Friendly Places | • Plan for growth and encourage infill development  
• Building on *Transit Tomorrow* and the success of prior TOD plans, develop two transit-oriented development plans | $170,000         |
| 3f. Coordination on External Projects     | • Coordinate with partners on externally-funded regional projects and initiatives (e.g., Gorham Connector, Portland Transportation Center relocation, municipal/transit agency board meetings) | $80,000          |
| **Subtotal for Task 3**                   |                                                                                                                                                    | **$484,100**     |

**TASK 4: Implement Plans and Mobility Improvements**

| 4a. Regional Traffic Management System    | • Coordinate with the RTMS working group  
• Develop strategies for coordinating and maintaining the region's traffic signal network  
• Identify opportunities for transit signal priority                                                                 | $125,000         |
| 4b. Complete Streets Regional Policy      | • Finalize the PACTS Complete Streets Policy                                                                                                | $25,000          |
| 4c. Implement Active Transportation Plan  | • Conduct Phase 1 of a Level of Traffic Stress Analysis for bicycle travel, focusing on Portland, South Portland, and Westbrook (expand as budget allows) | $130,000         |
| 4d. Maine Clean Communities              | • Support the Maine Clean Communities program, expanding the use of alternative vehicles and energy efficient vehicles  
• Building on *Maine Wont' Wait*, develop strategies to reduce emissions and vehicle miles traveled, and identify vulnerable infrastructure and resiliency projects | $130,000         |
| **Subtotal for Task 4**                   |                                                                                                                                                    | **$410,000**     |

**Total DRAFT UPWP Budget**

|                                                            |                                                            | **$2,747,182** |

*Note: the draft budgets are subject to change pending additional information from MaineDOT about carryover allowances from the 2020 – 2021 UPWP to the 2022 – 2023 UPWP. It is anticipated that the carryover will cover the anticipated costs for the long-range transportation plan and help address funding shortages on other projects, programs, and priorities.

**B. Information on Local Match**

PACTS' Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP), primarily funded by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Federal Transit Administration (FTA), requires a 20 percent local match. MaineDOT contributes 15 percent of the match for FHWA planning funds (PL funds); the remaining 5 percent comes from local sources. MaineDOT does not contribute match for FTA planning funds.
(Section 5303 Metropolitan Transportation Planning funds), requiring local sources to contribute the full 20 percent match. PACTS has historically relied on GPCOG member dues for the FTA match.

MPOs take different approaches to collecting local match from member municipalities. In many cases, the local match is a fixed dollar amount based on the total UPWP budget and is proportionately distributed to municipalities based on their respective shares of the regional population, employment, traffic volumes or other metrics. Over the last several UPWP cycles, PACTS has collected FHWA local match by tying the match to specific UPWP projects, distributing the match across only the municipalities who host those projects. This means that some, but not all, PACTS municipalities contribute local match to the UPWP.

On June 22, 2021, staff presented to the Executive Board a proposed local match methodology for 2022–2023 UPWP, with a recommendation to distribute the overall match requirement across the region’s actively engaged municipalities based on four evenly weighted data-driven metrics: population, employment, total collector and arterial lane miles, and vehicles miles traveled (VMT). This holistic approach considers how a municipality’s population and workforce contribute to transportation demand, but also how a municipality’s transportation network contributes to systemwide demand and associated costs. Additionally, this approach would eliminate the aforementioned challenges and shortcomings with administering local match at the project level. The Executive Board provided input and directed staff to provide two additional alternatives for consideration at an upcoming Executive Board meeting: 1) refine the data-driven approach to reflect the PACTS “capital management area” (rather than the PACTS “planning area”), and 2) distribute local match based on municipal tax revenues. The Executive Board’s future direction will allow staff to produce municipal match expectations in advance of the 2022–2023 UPWP.

Also, on June 22, 2021, the Executive Board directed staff to request MaineDOT provide a 15 percent local match for transit planning funds, much like it does for FHWA planning funds. Staff worked with the other Maine MPOs to develop a joint letter requesting this funding assistance. The letter was submitted to MaineDOT on August 11, 2021.

**Recommended action: For information and discussion.**

Members of the public are welcome to provide up to three minutes of public comment on this item.
PACTS REFORMS

The recent integration of PACTS and GPCOG and the hire of a new Transportation Director provided an opportunity to identify ways to improve PACTS’ performance and set new priorities that would enhance regional leadership. In 2018 and 2019, the PACTS Policy Committee and the PACTS Executive Committee (which is a subset of the Policy Committee) identified opportunities for improving PACTS operations, priority setting, and leadership. In addition to the themes that emerged from this process, the committees considered two previous organizational reviews completed by The Resource Systems Group and Federal Highway Administration to compile the following reforms:

**Operate with Excellence**

1. *Strengthen Relationships:* Developing and maintaining strong relationships with state and federal partners is critical for PACTS to succeed. A strong relationship requires PACTS to have an understanding of state and federal requirements, to meet deadlines, and to communicate with consistency and clarity.

2. *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 (TIP) Process and Procedures Committee and with the development of a TIP application guide.

3. *Manage Projects Actively:* Actively managing projects gives PACTS the opportunity to ensure important projects in our region are being delivered on time and on budget. A project development guide will be useful to track the development and schedule of projects. The Executive Committee will be engaged on PACTS projects with staff providing monthly project status reports.

4. *Reform Committees:* PACTS committees need to have clearly defined roles and responsibilities. The development of committee mission statements will reduce the overlap we experience among some of the PACTS committees. Time and location changes to the Policy Committee meetings will make it more convenient for elected officials to participate.

**Lead the Region**

1. *Lead the Region:* PACTS is a transportation leader in the region. As a leader, PACTS needs to set clear priorities and communicate those priorities to members and to the public. There are several communication outlets PACTS will use to disseminate information, including the new PACTS website, the GPCOG Facebook page, and the GPCOG Twitter account, among others.

2. *Plan for the Future:* PACTS long-range plans need to be developed with a purpose and anticipate changing trends across multiple areas. Strong long-range plans are frequently assessed and adjusted based on the need and priorities of the region. PACTS will conduct a
self-assessment of Destination 2040, the region’s long-range transportation plan, and will stay current on rapidly changing technologies and trends in transportation.

3. **Set Regional Priorities:** Setting regional priorities ensures that we are all rowing in the same direction, gives PACTS’ members common goals to achieve, and creates a stronger transportation network. To effectively set regional goals, PACTS needs to link funding to priorities, educate members on regional projects, and generate a project list that identifies the needs of the region.

4. **Engage the Public:** Broad public engagement will result in effective projects and plans. PACTS needs to develop clear messages to communicate with the public on a variety of platforms. PACTS needs to consistently update its public participation plans to engage the underrepresented population.

**PACTS PRIORITIES**

PACTS is responsible for improving the safety, mobility, productivity, environmental quality and energy conservation for the region’s transportation facilities, systems, and services. To identify priority projects and initiatives from this long list of responsibilities, PACTS gathered input from PACTS committee members, member municipalities’ elected officials, and the public.

The initial step of the process was assessing the region’s current transportation infrastructure. The PACTS Policy and Executive Committees began by ranking the priorities included in Destination 2040. PACTS then gathered input from six public sub-regional meetings. The following are the ranked PACTS priorities that were identified as a result of the process with the intent to focus in on three to five top priorities to bring focus to PACTS’ work:

1. Upgrade traffic signals and intersections
2. Maintain collector and arterial roads
3. Maintain buses, trains, and ferries
4. Target investments to places where people live and work
5. Better connect public transportation services
6. Expand public transportation
7. Encourage housing in places people live and work
8. Attract younger workforce with investments
9. Expand sidewalks and bike lanes for commuters
10. Better get commuters on/off Portland peninsula
11. Expand mobility options for older people
12. Divert traffic from 295 to Turnpike
13. Prepare infrastructure for extreme weather
14. Encourage electric vehicles
15. Reduce driving alone
16. Divert freight off roads
17. Expand roadways with new lanes and highways
Once the priorities were ranked, public input was gathered through a public survey. Staff analyzed the synergy between the information gathered through the PACTS governance ranking, the sub-regional meetings ranking and the public opinion survey ranking. The PACTS Policy Committee approved the below top priorities for PACTS to focus its work, while continuing to work on the other priorities identified in *Destination 2040*. This following list includes the top priorities and the specific actions PACTS is currently doing or will be doing as part of the next Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP).

- **Maintain, improve connections and expand public transportation**
  - Implement short-range transit plan, *Moving Southern Maine Forward*
  - *Transit Tomorrow*, the long-range transit plan, will define long-range priority investments
- **Improve the region’s intersections**
  - Improve signals
  - Address high crash locations
- **Maintain the region’s roads**
  - Collector paving program
  - Municipal Partnership Initiative (MPI)
- **Plan for growth and encourage infill**
  - Encourage housing in places where people live and work
  - Transit-oriented development
- **Expand sidewalks and bikeways for commuters**
  - Regional demonstration projects
  - Complete streets policy
10. Report on Complex Projects Selection

Contact
Aubrey Miller, staff

Recommended action
For information and discussion.

Attachments
None.

On August 24, after reviewing additional financial analysis and forecasting, the PACTS Policy Board\(^6\) allocated the $2,472,965 in Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) funding\(^7\) from PACTS’ 2024 MPO Allocation to the following projects:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>FHWA Funds</th>
<th>For</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portland - Libbytown Safety &amp; Accessibility Project</td>
<td>$195,000</td>
<td>PDR (preliminary design report)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yarmouth - Beth Condon Multi-Use Pathway Extension</td>
<td>$52,000</td>
<td>PDR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yarmouth - Main Street Sidewalk Improvement Project</td>
<td>$58,125</td>
<td>PDR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gorham - Traffic Adaptive Signals &amp; Pedestrian Lighting</td>
<td>$14,250</td>
<td>PDR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Portland - Lincoln Street Rehab &amp; Multi-Use Path</td>
<td>$569,100</td>
<td>Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westbrook - William Clarke Drive Improvements</td>
<td>$472,500</td>
<td>Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windham - Route 302 North Windham Sidewalk</td>
<td>$1,111,990</td>
<td>Construction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$2,472,965

The PACTS Transportation Improvement Program Policies and Procedures state: “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.”

\(^6\) The staff report is available as Item 8 on pp. 21-63 in the August 24 Policy Board packet.

\(^7\) The municipalities will provide a minimum 25% local match for these funds.
The future construction estimates for the PDR projects are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Future Construction Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portland - Libbytown Safety &amp; Accessibility Project</td>
<td>$6,193,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yarmouth - Beth Condon Multi-Use Pathway Extension</td>
<td>$1,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yarmouth - Main Street Sidewalk Improvement Project</td>
<td>$775,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gorham - Traffic Adaptive Signals &amp; Pedestrian Lighting</td>
<td>$390,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$8,758,400</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recognizing the significant commitment to future construction costs this allocation would create, and the significant commitment to future construction costs PACTS already has, the Board voted, with Portland’s consent, to cap future construction funding for the Portland Libbytown project at $3 million. The City of Portland will need to seek alternative funding to make up the shortfall. The City may request additional funds from PACTS, but there is no guarantee for additional funding.

GPCOG staff will notify MaineDOT of the project selections.

**Recommended action: For information and discussion.**

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

---

8 These figures are the full estimates—they will be funded with (at most) 75% federal funds and (at least) 25% local funds.