

PACTS

Portland Area Comprehensive Transportation System

PACTS TIP Process Committee Meeting Notice

July 10, 2009
8:00 a.m. to 11:00 a.m.
GPCOG, 68 Marginal Way, Portland

Agenda

1. Call to order
2. Public Comment
3. Minutes of June 12th meeting
4. New weights to policy and technical scoring (8:05)
5. Multi-municipality TIP proposals (8:20)
6. Public-private funding of TIP projects (8:45)
7. Collector road topics (9:00)
8. Policies on unspent funds, project withdrawal and project substitution (9:20)
9. Staff reports on other topics (9:45)
 - A. MaineDOT policy on road standards for locally funded projects
 - B. The PACTS process for allocating FTA Section 5307 funds
 - C. MaineDOT's Six Year Plan
 - D. Administration of our TIP proposal application process and our Enhanced Project Scoping process
10. TIP Policies and Procedures Document (10:15)
11. Adjourn.

The Metropolitan Planning Organization for the Portland Urbanized Area

68 Marginal Way • Portland, Maine 04101

Telephone: (207) 774-9891 • Fax: (207) 774-7149 • www.pactsplan.org

Minutes of June 12th Meeting

In Attendance: John Bubier, Chair, Biddeford; Genie Beaulieu, Freeport; Kat Fuller, MaineDOT; Jim Gailey, South Portland; Bob Hough, MaineDOT; Dan Jellis, Yarmouth; Molly Just, Westbrook; Mike Laberge, MaineDOT; Tom Meyers, Public Transportation; Tom Milligan, Biddeford; Brooks More, Windham; Greg Tansley, Biddeford.

Staff: John Duncan, Carl Eppich, Sue McIntyre, Paul Niehoff

1. **Call to Order:** John Bubier, Chair, called the meeting to order at 8:02 a.m.
2. **Public Comment:** There were no public comments expressed.
3. **Minutes of May 8th, 2009 meeting:**
Tom Meyers made a motion for approval of the May 8th, 2009 minutes, seconded by Dan Jellis. Vote taken. All were in favor. Minutes were unanimously accepted.
4. **Policy Committee's May 21st Review**
The PACTS Policy Committee reviewed the material presented to them as described in the meeting packet. John D. noted that there had been positive feedback and scattered comments but no suggestions were made for changing direction and there was no major consensus on anything in particular.

He directed the group to the Set Aside table at the bottom of page 5 in the meeting packet. The Set Aside table summarizes what the TIP Process Committee is recommending. The asterisk refers to the intersections category and the amount of money. The consensus is that we budget about \$3 million for the next biennium. However, Paul has found that a little more than \$3 million has already been committed for this category. More information will be available this summer on whether or not more money will be needed.

5. **Three-Party Agreement**
Mike L. described MaineDOT's reason for deciding to develop a three-party agreement. The role of municipalities will not change and the role of the MaineDOT has been clearly delineated. The Agreement defines the amount that each entity will approve for funding. The template Agreement was also approved by Kat Fuller, Chief Planner of the MaineDOT. It explains the role of each "party", explains the process and who does what, etc. The Agreement will become a communications tool and includes a protocol when changes need to happen. For the municipalities, it is something that they are already familiar with, but in regards to MPOs, it does add more responsibility for the MPO to stay connected. Kat F. pointed out that this is just a template and not "cast in stone". There may be adjustments made in the future in regards to guidance and/or expectations with everybody.

The Agreement talks of the facilitative role of the MPOs and where the money is coming from. It addresses changes for legitimate reasons and who pays for it. A short discussion took place pertaining to an increase in workload for PACTS staff. Frustration was also expressed with the tardiness that sometimes occurs with bills that are sent out by the MaineDOT. It was noted that everyone is trying to get the same things done and are working toward better communications. In reference to increased workload for staff, Paul felt that the concept of a three-party agreement is a great concept. It allows all parties involved in a project to "kick-off" from the same page, so to speak. Further discussion will be needed on the details of the template Agreement so that the result will

be a document and process that works without overburdening all three parties. Bob H. commented that he sees this document as clarification of what everyone is already trying to do and will make the process easier in the long run. Mike L. agreed saying that the Agreement codifies what the group is already doing through practice of the patchwork system.

Paul said he did not see staff as involved with the change level but does see an increase in staff time. Staff has seen an increase in workload in the past 18 months. Discussion continued pertaining to PACTS role and the MPOs role.

Genie B. referenced a project in Freeport that has been ongoing for at least four years and expressed a concern that adding more layers in the process could subsequently result in more time and funding that the town does not have. Mike L. replied that he felt the three-party Agreement would in fact make the process more efficient because more conversation would take place about a project. John B. agreed.

Kat Fuller explained that they are open to looking at the nuances of change orders and how that might create a burden. The template could be adjusted accordingly. The document and process also ties in with scoping. It helps to address the notion that if a project starts out well-defined, you still continue with the three-party agreement throughout the entire steps of a project. If a project is not well-defined, then within the three-party agreement, you can look to the process and it becomes another way to address that issue. Dan J. expressed support for the concept of the Agreement but asked that it be “kept simple” with regards to who is going to pay for what and that if a situation comes up, to define “situation” in general terms. What happens to a project if it doesn’t meet those general terms? He didn’t see a need for PACTS staff to get involved in the details of any particular change orders other than looking at the funding mechanism.

A question was asked if this would change any of the current relationships between the State and the towns with John B. replying that it should not. This generated a long discussion on a concern that PACTS workload seems to be increasingly having to do with the funding aspects and change orders rather than planning, and that some communities are concerned that the direction of PACTS is leaning more toward the DOT rather than communities. John B. said that he shares the notion that we need to put more effort into long range planning. Mike L. said that MaineDOT gives the MPOs capital improvement monies and with those monies come the responsibility to see that it is used efficiently and wisely. Discussion continued on whether additional PACTS staffing would eventually be needed in the event that this process resulted in additional workload. Paul pointed out that the option of hiring a locally administering project manager had been mentioned at previous meetings but the discussions did not go any further.

It was decided that the three-party Agreement would be reviewed by the PACTS Executive Committee for further feedback. John D. will keep the group up-to-date and provide some notes.

6. BACTS Urban Transportation Policy Study

John D. provided a quick overview of a meeting that he recently attended at BACTS (Bangor MPO) along with Kathi Earley and Tex Haeuser. (Details included in meeting packet).

There was much enthusiasm among the Bangor area officials with the work that John Melrose is doing for BACTS. PACTS attendance was welcomed at their discussions. The URIP money is part of the process and URIP is a complicated process. URIP will be

discussed further to see what works, what doesn't, and what could be improved upon. BACTS was interested in regional recommendations coming out of this work and are looking for ground breaking ideas. In summary, it is a matter of who pays for what and whether that system is working for an urban area standpoint. They are also considering doing a survey of the towns to see how much the towns are investing of their own monies beyond what the MaineDOT is providing. A short discussion followed pertaining to regional traffic impact and how to incorporate that into some type of regional fund.

7. Regional Emphasis in Project Selection

An overview of five recommendations (described in the meeting packet) that are based on member and staff ideas that were discussed at previous meetings was provided. Staff has not gone to the next step and would like to get more feedback from the group regarding any implications on any of the recommendations. ***Among comments made:***

1. *Create a Project Selection Committee composed of members of our Technical, Planning, Policy and Transit committees.* There was consensus among the group that there is no need for another committee.
2. *Give extra points to TIP proposals jointly submitted by two or more towns.* Following a short discussion, there seemed to be consensus that a definite regional benefit would have to be demonstrated to get the extra points. Subsequently, it was decided that staff would return with some new ideas along with examples of concepts that would work and concepts that wouldn't.
3. *Change to 50/50 from 80/20 the weights given to scores from our Roadway Formula and Destination Tomorrow formulas, respectively in the scoring of proposals for funding under our Intersection and Rebuild Arterials Set Asides.* Discussion took place with a variety of opinions and comments expressed. A demonstration of the Roadway Formula was provided and described on the white board by John Duncan. Following further discussion, ***Molly Just motioned to change to 50/50 from 80/20 the weights given to scores from our Roadway Formula and Destination Tomorrow formulas, respectively in the scoring of proposals for funding under our Intersection and Rebuild Arterials Set Asides, seconded by Greg Tansley.*** Discussion followed.

Tom Milligan motioned to amend the motion until the Committee has had time to review the revised Destination Tomorrow guidelines, seconded by Dan Jellis. Vote taken. Motion failed.

Greg Tansley motioned to move the question along, seconded by Dan Jellis. Vote taken. All were in favor of moving the question.

Vote taken on the original motion made by Molly Just (see above). Five were in favor and four were opposed. Motion carried.

A request was made for an update on the revised Destination Tomorrow guidelines. Carl will bring more information to the next meeting on the changes made.

4. *Tweak our Collector Road project selection formula factor weights to give a little more weight to the traffic, transit route and bike route factors.* Discussion began pertaining to truck routes and truck route counts. A comment was also made that there could be a penalty with towns that don't do good land use planning.

Subsequently, it was decided to send this back to staff to incorporate some of these items.

5. *Create a public-private partnership mechanism option to help finance transportation projects for regionally significant land development projects.* Staff is in the process of doing this and will bring this item back to the group.

8. Policies on Unspent Funds, Project Withdrawal and Project Substitution

John D. directed the group to agenda item 8 in the meeting packet and noted that changes to the existing three policies were shown in italics.

- ***Unspent Project Funds:*** No discussion
- ***Project Withdrawals:*** Discussion focused on the rules that govern federal monies and what happens when a project is withdrawn by towns. Most often the MaineDOT ends up having to “eat”, so to speak, those funds. The three-party agreement could be beneficial early on in the process. Staff will return with more information on project withdrawals.
- ***Project Substitution:*** A discussion took place about “languishing” projects and the definition of “languishing”. It was decided that more clarity is needed in the language. Staff will review the language and bring this item back to the Committee.

9. Next meeting time and date

The next meeting is scheduled for Friday, July 10th.

10. Adjourn: Meeting adjourned at 10:20 a.m.

Agenda Item 4: New Weights to Policy and Technical Scoring

Staff Resource: John Duncan and Carl Eppich

Recommendations: Confirm vote taken on June 12th based on the information below.

Background

The Committee voted 5 to 4 in June to change to 50/50 from 80/20 the weights given to scores from our Roadway Formula and *Destination Tomorrow* formulas, respectively, in the scoring of proposals for funding under our Intersection and Rebuild Roads Set Asides. The members asked that staff give an overview today of the changes being made to the Guiding Policies of *Destination Tomorrow* as part of the process underway to update *Destination Tomorrow*.

Genie Beaulieu also asked after the meeting that we show how the change from 80/20 to 50/50 would have affected the scoring of proposals that we scored in 2008.

Implications of Changing from 80/20 to 50/50

The table below shows a comparison of the scores for the seven intersection proposals that competed for FY 2010/2011 biennium funding based on the existing 80/20 weights with the scores based on the 50/50 approach. Here are some highlights:

- In both cases the top two projects ranked in the same order and scored relatively as close to each other.
- The 3rd, 4th, 5th and 6th place projects change their ranks. The two with strong *Destination Tomorrow* scores rise two places, and the two with low D. T. scores drop two places.

<u>Town</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Project Description</u>	<u>80/20</u>	<u>80%</u>		<u>50/50</u>		<u>50%</u>		
			<u>Total Score</u>	<u>20% DT Score</u>	<u>Roadway Score</u>	<u>80/20 Rank</u>	<u>50/50 Rank</u>	<u>Total Score</u>	<u>50% DT Score</u>	<u>Roadway Score</u>
Scarboro	Dunstan Corner	Major reconfiguration of two i	63.7	13.00	50.7	1	1	64.2	32.5	31.7
Portland	Forest at Newton	Install new traffic signal.	55.1	10.50	44.6	2	2	54.1	26.3	27.9
Scarboro	Payne at Mussey	Relocate the intersection	50.8	9.00	41.8	3	<u>5</u>	48.6	22.5	26.1
OOB	Saco at Emerson	Replace signal. Install islands.	46.0	9.00	37.0	4	<u>6</u>	45.6	22.5	23.1
Westbrook	Cumb. Mills Triangle	Install new traffic signals.	42.0	13.50	28.5	5	<u>3</u>	51.5	33.8	17.8
Westbrook	Spring at Main	Replace signal. Make other ge	34.9	14.50	20.4	6	<u>4</u>	49.0	36.3	12.7
Portland	Forest at Kennebec	Reconfigure intersection. Rem	25.0	7.00	18.0	7	7	28.8	17.5	11.3

Overview of Changing Guiding Policies

Our *Destination Tomorrow Update* Committee began work a few months ago, and decided that they should review the *Destination Tomorrow* Vision Statement and Goals prior to any serious changes to the Plan's Guiding Policies – so actual changes or even tweaks have not yet been fully vetted. They have been discussed with some consolidation and tweaks suggested and looked at twice. That work is ongoing.

Staff and the DT Update Committee feel that radical change will not be coming to the Guiding Policies, rather that the process will lead to more specific considerations in the language around (1) economics/funding, such as volatile energy prices and the eroding revenues from the gas tax, (2) increased demand and usage of the public transportation (transit) system, i.e. to relieve congestion and accommodate an aging population, (3) encouragement of land use policies that support sustainable transportation choices, and (4) global climate change issues.

So far the group feels that discrete 'tweaks' and language additions are what is needed rather than major new concepts and major editing. It is likely that this will be a very efficient and careful exercise with the current Guiding Policies, with perhaps a slight reduction in total number of guiding policies.

Background:

At its March meeting the Planning Committee suggested that the Guiding Policies be reviewed and recommendations made for streamlining and consolidation. Perhaps eight guiding policies were too many.

Staff proposed some consolidation but members began to feel that in consolidating some of the policies, meaning and intent were being lost as an unintended consequence.

The *Destination Tomorrow* Update group has agreed on areas that need to be strengthened are:

- preserving the current system
- economic development
- energy and energy efficiency
- community interests
- climate change

The DT Update Committee also agrees that the Guiding Policies need to be grouped into the following four focused areas:

1. Maintaining the current system that we have
2. Economic Development
3. The changing and expanding dynamics and demands of the multi-modal system
4. Land Use and Transportation

Here for your reference are the **current** Destination Tomorrow **Eight Guiding Policies:**

Policy 1. Maintain the Condition, Safety & Efficiency of the Existing Transportation System

– Ensuring that an adequate and safe transportation system is maintained, preserved, and appropriately improved is critical to the region’s future economic vitality and quality of life. The Planning and Policy Committees have made maintaining and improving the existing transportation systems the highest priority of PACTS. Historically, approximately 60% of the transportation investments in the PACTS region have been for maintaining and improving the existing systems. Forecasts of required future investments to maintain the systems anticipate this same level of investment. Many of the Plan’s recommendations and strategies are focused on this policy and include:

1. Roadway and bridge preservation.
2. Improvements to locations that experience crashes at a higher than average rate.
3. Improvements to congested locations including intersections and interchanges.
4. Maintaining existing and extending new transit routes and services where appropriate.
5. Replacing transit fleets in a timely manner.

Policy 2. Focus Roadway Improvements on Safety and Congestion “Hotspots” at Intersections

– Another area of major emphasis is on eliminating safety and congestion problems at major intersections. These intersection projects are a higher priority than widening roadway segments and other roadway capacity increasing projects. The Plan also calls for these projects to incorporate transit, bicycle and pedestrian accommodations where appropriate and feasible.

Policy 3. Strategically Expand the Transportation System

– Where appropriate, this policy recommends capacity expansions to the transportation system that will enhance accessibility and mobility with better-coordinated land use policies. These expansions may include increased roadway capacity, new roadways, and new passenger transportation services and PACTS REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN 2006 Chapter 5: Recommendations & Strategies 5-3 routes for buses, rail and bus rapid transit. Actions taken under this policy must also incorporate Access Management measures (Policy 6) where feasible.

Policy 4. Avoid Building New Highways

– Constructing new highways is costly and often controversial. Destination Tomorrow contains a number of complementary recommendations that can be used to reduce traffic demand and increase the efficiency of the existing system. These recommendations will help to reduce the need for building new highways and conserve the limited available funding.

Policy 5. Strengthen the Link between Transportation Investments and Land Use Policies and Decisions

– Strengthening the link between transportation and land use policies and decisions is one of the most complex and important public policy challenges facing local governments, PACTS members and the State. Destination Tomorrow includes 21 largely incentive-based recommendations designed to improve this connection and, in particular, a policy statement adopted by the Policy Committee in February 2003. Ensuring that land development occurs in locations where it is supported by an adequate transportation system and preserving existing roadway capacities are two benefits that may be realized by this policy.

Policy 6. Implement Access Management Measures

– Implementation of access management measures is one of the most effective ways to preserve the capacity, traffic flow and safety on arterial roads. Important actions include coordinating access control when roadways and intersections are widened or retrofitted and when new roads are built. Another effective access management strategy is to increase the connectivity of the street network by creating through streets when development or redevelopment occurs.

Policy 7. Enhance Passenger Transportation

– Enhance, maintain and, where appropriate, expand passenger transportation services to meet changing needs. Many people depend on public transportation to meet their daily travel needs. For passenger transportation to effectively contribute to congestion relief, transit must attract riders that have the option of using an automobile.

Policy 8. Promote Community and Neighborhood Livability and Reinvestment

-Recommendations and strategies stemming from this policy are designed to create transportation facilities that are sensitive to community and neighborhood needs and cohesiveness. Many arterial streets in the PACTS area create barriers within or between neighborhoods. Strategies for this policy include bicycle and pedestrian-facility improvements, public transportation investments, investments to increase the efficiency of the arterials to minimize cut-through traffic in neighborhoods, and redesigning arterial roads to increase their compatibility with adjacent land uses.

Agenda Item 5: Multi-Municipality TIP Proposals

Staff Resources: Carl Eppich

Recommendations: Create a policy to add from 1 to 5 points to TIP proposals submitted by two (2) or more municipalities. It will work as follows.

- The municipalities' proposal will describe how the municipalities collaborated in producing the proposal, and will describe how the proposed project would benefit them and the region.
- PACTS staff will recommend to the Planning Committee a score of 1 to 5 points based on their review of the proposal. Examples of proposals that would score well are those from more than two municipalities, and ones for which multiple municipalities would share in payment of the local match for a project located wholly within one municipality.
- The Planning Committee will review the staff's score and submit a recommendation to the Policy Committee.

Background

This recommendation comes in response to the TIP Process Committee's interest in encouraging the submission of more regionally significant TIP proposals. A score of 5 points could make a big difference in the selection of a proposal for funding.

Agenda Item 6: Public-Private Funding of TIP Projects

Staff Resource: Carl Eppich

Recommendations: Create a policy to add from 1 to 5 points to TIP proposals that will include funding from a private partner. It will work as follows.

- The municipality submitting the proposal must finance the normal local match with municipal resources.
- The private partner may propose to make a cash contribution or a non-cash one such as right of way.
- PACTS staff will recommend to the Planning Committee a score of 1 to 5 points. A higher private contribution will increase the points given.
- The Planning Committee will review the staff's score and submit a recommendation to the Policy Committee.

Background

The goal is to make more efficient the use of developer money for regionally significant transportation projects.

Agenda Item 7: Collector Road Topics

Staff Resource: Paul Niehoff

- Recommendations:
1. To remove the truck factor from our Collector Paving formula, and to keep the existing factor for transit.
 2. To review Paul's data developed in response to a request from Genie Beaulieu.

Background

Last month staff suggested that we change our Collector Road project selection formula factor weights to give a little more weight to the traffic, transit route and bike route factors. We based our suggestion on the goal to enhance funding for more regionally important roads. We now recommend the following minor changes to the formula:

- Pavement condition rating (up to 35 points) – No change.
- Falling weight deflectometer rating (up to 35 points) – No change.
- Daily traffic (up to 20 points) – No change.
- Bus route (up to 5 points) – No change. Our logic is that the road wear and tear from buses is adequately measured by the three factors above.
- Truck route (up to 5 points) – *Drop this factor* because we do not have truck route data for the region's collector roads, and because the road wear and tear from trucks is adequately measured by the three factors above. We do not have any "truck routes" in our region, and nor are there any in Maine. The cost to collect truck route data for our collector roads would not be worth it.
- Bike route factor – We do not have one, and we recommend not adding one. All of the collector miles that PACTS will preserve with our federal funds (based on the TIP Process Committee's recommendation to preserve the 83 miles in good shape) have paved shoulders that should meet the needs of bicyclists.

Genie Beaulieu wishes to have a better understanding of the impact of the TIP Process Committee's proposed policy to use federal funds to maintain the 83 miles of roads in decent shape and for towns to take care of roads that are in not so good shape.

The table on the next page shows the 83 collector road miles by town, and the balance of the collector road miles by town.

Proposed Responsibility for PACTS Collector Road Miles

<u>Municipality</u>	<u>PACTS Overlay Mileage</u>	<u>PACTS Overlay Cost</u>	<u>Local Rehab Mileage</u>	<u>Local Rehabilitation Cost</u>	<u>Total Regional Cost</u>
Biddeford	4.6	\$2,530,000	15.4	\$26,950,000	\$29,480,000
Cape Elizabe	4.3	\$2,365,000	13.9	\$24,325,000	\$26,690,000
Cumberland	3.7	\$2,035,000	10.5	\$18,375,000	\$20,410,000
Falmouth	5.1	\$2,805,000	16.8	\$29,400,000	\$32,205,000
Freeport	5.7	\$3,135,000	10.3	\$18,025,000	\$21,160,000
Gorham	6.2	\$3,410,000	9.3	\$16,275,000	\$19,685,000
N. Yarmouth	1.1	\$605,000	3.0	\$5,250,000	\$5,855,000
O O B	5.9	\$3,245,000	9.9	\$17,325,000	\$20,570,000
Portland	13.3	\$7,315,000	24.6	\$43,050,000	\$50,365,000
Saco	7.5	\$4,125,000	16.8	\$29,400,000	\$33,525,000
Scarborough	3.3	\$1,815,000	24.9	\$43,575,000	\$45,390,000
S. Portland	6.0	\$3,300,000	12.5	\$21,875,000	\$25,175,000
Westbrook	5.8	\$3,190,000	12.5	\$21,875,000	\$25,065,000
Windham	0.1	\$55,000	4.7	\$8,225,000	\$8,280,000
Yarmouth	7.5	\$4,125,000	15.6	\$27,300,000	\$31,425,000

Agenda Item 8: Policies on Unspent Funds, Project Withdrawal and Project Substitution

Staff Resources: Paul Niehoff and John Duncan

Recommendations: Change our existing policies, as shown below in *italics*. In all cases below, staff will work with the Executive Committee to develop recommendations for reprogramming by the Policy Committee.

Unspent Project Funds

Unspent MPO Allocation project funds go into the PACTS “Holding PIN” for reprogramming by the Policy Committee.

Project Withdrawals

Over the years PACTS has developed, refined and used a TIP priority setting process based in great part on a technical evaluation of TIP proposals. This technical approach has fostered a confidence in the professionalism of the PACTS process. However, while this process provides a strong basis for decision-making, there are occasions when changes in local priorities create a need to withdraw a funded project. In this case, the withdrawn funds *go into the PACTS “Holding PIN”* for reprogramming by the Policy Committee.

Project Substitution

A municipality *or transit agency* may request to withdraw a PACTS MPO Allocation project in order to transfer its funds to another PACTS MPO Allocation project that requires additional funding. This process is considered a project substitution.

- A request for substitution of a funded project may be made only after the Legislature has approved the project in the MaineDOT’s Biennial Capital Work Plan.
- A municipality *or transit system* seeking a substitution will submit a written request to the Policy Committee for consideration. The Policy Committee will consider such requests on a case-by-case basis.
- *A municipality may not request to withdraw funds from a PACTS collector project for the purpose of this Substitution Policy. (In 2009 this policy applies to all active collector projects.)*
- *If the withdrawn project retains a balance after transfer to the under funded project, the remaining balance will go into the PACTS “Holding PIN” for reprogramming by the Policy Committee.*
- *For the purpose of this Substitution Policy, a municipality or transit system may not request to withdraw funds from a project first printed in a MaineDOT Capital Work Plan four (4) or more years in the past.*
- If the substitution is approved, new funding for the withdrawn project may not be requested from PACTS during the next biennial funding cycle. There is also no future-funding guarantee ascribed to the withdrawn project.

Agenda Item 9: Staff Reports on Other Topics

A. MaineDOT new policy on road standards for locally funded projects

We will report on a new (?) policy that is developing (?) at MaineDOT that would require municipalities to meet state standards when making capital improvements on collectors and arterials. In the event that this becomes a reality, then it might undermine our proposed Collector Set Aside policy in which we intend to rely on our municipalities to maintain/improve those collector miles that are in tough shape?

B. The PACTS process for allocating FTA Section 5307 funds

Staff will give a very brief overview of the process used by the Transit Committee in developing a recommendation to the Policy Committee every year for the allocation of FTA Section 5307 funds available to our region. Our goal is to be sure that the TIP Process Committee members are all aware of this annual \$2.5 million in federal transit funding while you work to make recommendations for the programming of the annual \$5 million in federal highway funding available through our MPO Allocation. (The annual \$5 million, when doubled for biennial terms and then matched with state and local funds, produces the \$14 million amount that we have worked with.)

C. MaineDOT's Six Year Plan

For approximately ten years MaineDOT has prepared statewide Six Year Plans designed to bridge the gap between their 20-year long range plans and their 2-year capital improvement programs. While this has worked well for MaineDOT, our submissions to MaineDOT for their Six Year Plans have not been meaningful for us at PACTS. While the concept sounds good for us, it does not value to our process. Time permitting, we could discuss this today.

D. Administration of our TIP proposal application process and our Enhanced Project Scoping (EPS) process

Staff has seen over the years that many members submit incomplete and inaccurate applications for PACTS funding. For the upcoming process we are developing a process for working with our members to help them produce complete and accurate application. While this will add work for PACTS staff, we feel that this will help us all improve the project selection process and produce the best results.

Likewise, we are going to make some minor changes to our EPS process based on our four years of experience doing it with our municipal members, MaineDOT and our consultants.

Agenda Item 10: TIP Policies and Procedures Document

Time permitting, we will discuss the latest draft at our meeting.