Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Committee
MINUTES
May 19, 2020

Attendance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Attendance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Members</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hank Berg</td>
<td>Casco Bay Lines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Branch</td>
<td>City of Portland</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lori Brann</td>
<td>MaineDOT</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jay Chace, 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

- **May 19**: Best Practices, Scoring Factors
- **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

Transit agencies identify new and existing needs

SOGR

Projects are evaluated

SFCOP is developed

SYCOP and Split Letter are approved

SYCOP and Split Letter are submitted to FTA

Transit agencies submit projects for TIP

Transit agencies bid out vehicles purchases etc

UPWP Planning Projects

TIP, STIP and MaineDOT Work Plan

Construction

Projects are identified by the Municipality

Municipal Partnership Initiative (MPI)

Capital Improvement Projects (PDR typically required)

Subregions prioritize projects

Projects scored by staff

Scored projects are submitted to appropriate committee

Selected projects are submitted to Executive Committee for approval

Selected projects are ratified by the Policy Committee

Projects are put out to bid

Projects designed and developed outside of a PACTS process
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
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)
## 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

Universal TIP Project Call

Qualitative Policy Filters

Quantitative Project Evaluation

Qualitative Final Factors

Funding Decisions for STBG, CMAQ & TAP programs

General Infrastructure
Roadway Capacity
Transit Capacity

Sponsor Priority
Benefit Cost
Regional Equity
Deliverability

PACTS Funding Prioritization Framework
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