Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Committee
MINUTES
June 16, 2020

Attendance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Attendance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Members</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hank Berg</td>
<td>Casco Bay Lines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Branch</td>
<td>City of Portland</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lori Brann</td>
<td>MaineDOT</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jay Chace</td>
<td>Town of Scarborough</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Chop</td>
<td>Maine Medical Center</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erin Courtney</td>
<td>Maine Turnpike Authority</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Currie</td>
<td>York County Community Action Corporation (YCCAC)</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack DeBeradinis</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Program (RTP)</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Fox</td>
<td>City of Saco</td>
<td>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></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>Kenneth Capron</td>
<td>MicroRail</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>For GPCOG</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Clark, Kristina Egan,Aubrey Miller, Ryan Neale, Elizabeth Roberts</td>
<td>GPCOG</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Ahillen, Price Armstrong, Jill Cahoon, Raymond Hayhurst</td>
<td>AECOM/FHI</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. **Welcome – Erin Courtney, Chair**  
   Erin Courtney opened the meeting and welcomed everyone.

2. **Public Comment**  
   There was no comment from the public.

3. **Acceptance of May 19, 2020 Meeting Minutes**  
   Jay Chace moved to accept the May 19, 2020 minutes and Bruce Hyman seconded the motion. The minutes were approved unanimously.

4. **Preliminary Design Report Set Aside Project Selection**  
   Since the new funding prioritization framework (item 5 on the agenda) is still being developed, the committee is using the existing process that was created in 2016 to select a project for the Preliminary Design Report (PDR) Set Aside funding. Recognizing the impacts of the pandemic, staff simplified the 2016 application form (Attachment B) to create the application form included as Attachment D. Aubrey Miller added that staff has heard the request to develop a list of regionally significant projects and will do so for next year. Aubrey discussed the options for schedules and scoring, noting one correction—the project application will not be distributed until after the PACTS Policy Committee ratifies the 2023 Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) allocation on June 25. Aubrey reminded the committee that whatever application form and selection process the TIP Committee selects, it will only be used this year, for this PDR Set Aside project selection. The new funding prioritization framework will be used next year.

   In response to a question from Maureen O’Meara, Aubrey said the selected project would receive PDR funding in early 2021. Maureen also asked about presenting the item to the Planning Committee. Kristina Egan confirmed the item is not being presented to any other committees because the TIP Committee was created to include representatives from the Planning, Technical, and Transit Committees.

   Alex Jaegerman noted his preference for the project selection schedule that allows more time for the applicants to prepare their applications, recognizing that it requires the TIP Committee to finalize a decision in one meeting. Other committee members concurred. Maureen added she likes having presentations before scoring takes place.

   Maureen suggested selecting members of a scoring subcommittee after applications are submitted. Alex said he would be fine with having staff score the applications and would be fine with TIP Committee members joining if they wish. Ryan Neale explained that, on the transit side, staff used to score applications for the Regionally Administered Discretionary (RAD) program, but outside scorers have been used in recent years to avoid putting staff in a difficult position. Chris Chop said he would be fine with staff scoring applications, if they have the time and resources, and would trust them to be objective. He added staff may also be more informed about the region as a whole, transportation needs, relationships to other planning documents and studies, and PACTS’ goals. Others
concurred. Erin verified with Kristina that staff is willing and able to score. Kristina supported Alex’s idea of including other people with expertise as scorers to round out the decision making. Maureen noted PACTS staff would do the initial scoring, but it would be the TIP Committee’s responsibility to ultimately recommend the project selection.

John Duncan made a motion to use the simplified application, the second schedule, and have PACTS staff score the applications. Alex seconded the motion. Jay reiterated that while staff will provide initial scoring, the TIP Committee will approve the scoring. Chris Branch concurred with the schedule and with scoring by staff but expressed concern that the application is still too complicated, particularly for a PDR project. Kristina noted that one of the reasons for developing the funding prioritization framework is to simplify the application process, but we must rely on past documents while we are still developing the process. Aubrey added that staff’s intent was to simplify the existing application without losing the integrity of what was developed through a past process. Alex pointed out that an allocation for PDR funding is also a commitment to fund construction, so the application is not just for $200,000 in PDR funding. He also noted the current discussion emphasizes the importance of the effort the committee is undertaking to develop a new funding prioritization framework.

A roll call vote was taken on John Duncan’s motion to use the simplified application, use the second proposed schedule, and have PACTS staff score applications. All were in favor, with abstentions by Lori Brann and Marty Rooney. The motion passed.

5. **Funding Prioritization Framework**

Jill Cahoon opened the presentation and noted there were 16 responses to the survey. Michael Ahillen said there was good information provided in the open-ended response section of the survey, including two different approaches to simplification: (1) a data-driven process with less narrative on behalf of the applicants, and GPCOG staff or consultant help with scoring projects using GIS and other data analytics tools, and (2) rather than scoring applications, a workshop where each sponsor presents their project and the committee makes the selection in a single day. Michael noted the two ideas need not be mutually exclusive.

Several members expressed a preference for data, noting concerns that the workshop approach may rely more on personal opinions than regional significance, and that it is unlikely a group would make a decision in a single day without a data-driven analysis. Several members also expressed interest in a hybrid process, with a data-driven application and scoring process as an input to a committee decision. Others added a presentation could also be scored and would allow applicants to answer questions and put projects into context.

Ray Hayhurst presented the six guiding principles developed by AECOM. He noted that simpler means not only easy to understand but also less of a burden for municipalities and
PACTS staff. He mentioned that leveraging existing datasets already available from local, regional, and national sources with information about traffic, environmental justice communities, priority corridors, high crash locations, etc. could ensure all applicants have the same set of tools available.

Ray also presented the ten potential criteria for a revised framework. He noted that financial viability can include leveraging other funding and resilience can be viewed through both a climate and an economic lens. Jill Cahoon asked for the TIP Committee’s input on what criteria might be missing, and if the criteria would differentiate the various projects that would go through the process.

In response to a question from Bruce Hyman, Jill said the intent is for both FTA-funded and FHWA-funded projects to go through the same scoring process. Jill took note of Bruce’s concern about reducing “mobility, safety, accessibility” to decreasing regional traffic congestion. Bruce said there are more ways to define mobility and accessibility, such as decreasing travel times on major corridors. Michael Ahillen clarified that the table simply includes examples for the various criteria.

William Gayle commented that, from a transit perspective, “financial viability” could create a misconception of what is being scored. Something like “project delivery and funding package” might be better. Erin noted that Greg Jordan commented via chat that financial viability should also include assessment of ability to sustain recurring operations and maintenance costs.

Alex asked if some of the ten criteria could be combined, for example regional significance and regional traffic and regional economy, or environmental sustainability and resilience. He noted there is no discrete measure of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and we should at least be cognizant of that under environmental sustainability.

Greg commented that “decrease regional traffic congestion” could be changed to something more general such as “improve mobility.” Decrease traffic congestion is specific and almost a metric. More general criteria might more easily apply to both transit and roadway projects. Improve mobility could include sub-criteria such as improvements in ridership for transit and reductions in traffic volume or congestion or running times for roadways.

Chris Chop added he would like to see public health included. It could potentially be included under the general mobility idea Greg mentioned. Promoting healthy lifestyles, active transportation, and access to healthcare facilities could be possible measures. Chris also suggested a cost-benefit score be included to account for scale. Smaller projects may not have as many quantitative benefits, but their costs are lower.

Maureen concurred with Alex’s idea of combining criteria. She suggested priority locations could be included in regional significance. Maureen added that the third highest
priority was land use, and local and regional economy is not the appropriate measure for land use. Matching transportation and land use must be a high priority. Maureen noted some local governments have regulations to support proposed transportation improvements. She added we should be investing in transportation improvements that are efficient and support smart growth and do not promote sprawl.

Kristina underscored Maureen’s comments, noting it would be a different way of going about this evaluation. It would be putting some responsibility on the municipality to zone appropriately to support public transit and walking and biking projects. Other regions around the country have done this and it supports the long-term viability of those projects. She asked for the group’s thoughts because this would be an interesting and significant change to how we have done things. Alex expressed his support.

Chris Branch commented that we do not have a definition for regional significance. He suggested we use the criteria listed below the “regional significance” criterion to define a regionally significant project. With limited funds, it is important to define regional significance and fund projects that are going to do the most to reach our regional goals. He also suggested looking for ways to shift money from “pot A” to “pot B” to use funds most efficiently. He sees the land use planning issue as a regionally significant factor in determining what a regionally significant project is. He said the interconnections between transit and highway are also very important. He commented that a lot of the factors are aimed at defining what a regionally significant project is.

Kristina suggested the idea of having a threshold and only funding projects that meet some baseline criteria. We may only consider projects of regional significance, once that has been defined, or projects in priority areas, for example. Jill cited the Safe Routes to School program in Massachusetts as an example of a program using such a threshold.

Jill also talked about a portal created by the Massachusetts Bureau of Geographic Information (MassGIS) and the Massachusetts Department of Transportation (MassDOT) for all projects to go through project development. An applicant defines the study area with a box on a map, and all information on wetlands, historic districts, priority corridors, etc., is already pre-populated. The applicant finds out, for example, if the project crosses a wetland, and is then asked for further explanation.

Kristina noted that staff has been considering this model because the burden is currently on the applicant to develop this data. One of the outcomes of this process could be that GPCOG creates a GIS portal with multiple layers so the data appears instantly when an applicant defines a project. This could simplify the process of applying and level the playing field between municipalities and agencies of different sizes. Erin commented it seems helpful for applicants to have such information up front, before investing a lot of time into something that might not be viable. Kristina added that defining an equitable target area for environmental justice and access and other criteria would be another goal.
to help applicants understand whether their projects would improve equity. Jill noted the portal could identify both areas to focus on and areas to avoid. Tony Scavuzzo supported the idea of taking care of the GIS component for municipalities.

Chris Branch suggested that, as part of financial viability, we consider what other funds are being brought to the table. He noted that Alex made a comment via chat that financial viability, as in secure local match, could be a threshold requirement. Alex also commented via chat that cost-benefit could be used to rank projects. Chris concurred with the importance of ensuring a viable local match and added that the additional funds an applicant is contributing to the project from other sources should be a factor. Jill noted the Massachusetts Safe Routes to School example includes criteria related to funding sources, and there are initial filters regarding local match and right-of-way.

Jill asked the group to think about the types of projects that will go through the process and identify any potential concerns. Chris Chop noted that park and ride lots might not score well because, while the intent of such lots is to transport people to jobs more sustainably, the lots themselves are not near jobs. Greg suggested making sure criteria are set up in a way to allow for operating and service expansion projects to move through the process similarly to capital projects. He said the general criteria seem fine, but some metrics and sub-criteria may need to be designed with such projects in mind. William Gayle noted rail lines should be included in priority corridors. Kristina commented that GPCOG is hoping to update the priority center/corridor map as part of the development of Transit Tomorrow. Will added that while station communities and areas around train stations are important, the mainline and branch lines are also important for projects that expand capacity similar to highway capacity expansions. Kristina said staff would check to see if rail lines were included as priority corridors in Destination 2040.

Jill said AECOM would present a draft framework at the July TIP Committee meeting.

The comments below were received from the public via chat during this item. PACTS responses follow each comment.

- **Kenneth Capron: How about including longevity of benefit from project? Paving is at best a short term fix.**
  - **PACTS Response: Comment noted.**
- **Kenneth Capron: Regional significance - is that based on populations of specific munis within the region?**
  - **PACTS Response: Regional significance is being defined as part of the development of the funding prioritization framework.**
- **Kenneth Capron: Does this process include private entities and/or transportation research projects.**
  - **PACTS Response: A list of organizations eligible to propose projects through the PACTS process can be found beginning on page 3 in the PACTS**
Transportation Improvement Program Policies and Procedures, which is available on the [GPCOG website](#).

Please note that, going forward, the chat and Q&A features will be turned off during GPCOG and PACTS meetings. Public comment will be taken verbally during the public comment period.

6. Adjourn
PACTS FUNDING PRIORITIZATION FRAMEWORK

Greater Portland Council of Governments (GPCOG) & Portland Area Comprehensive Transportation System (PACTS)

June 2020
Project Schedule

May 19
- Best Practices
- Scoring Factors

June 16
Draft Scoring Framework Options

July 21
Draft Scoring Framework

August 18
Final Scoring Framework
Survey results
Revised framework foundation
  • Guiding principles
  • Potential criteria
Discussion
Next steps
Survey Results
Feedback on Processes

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

– Use feedback to develop draft scoring framework

– Next meeting: July 21

– Post-meeting survey on draft scoring framework