

PACTS

Portland Area Comprehensive Transportation System



Linking our Communities • Advancing our Region

TIP Process Committee Meeting Notice

10:00 to 11:30
September 6, 2011

GPCOG, 68 Marginal Way, Portland

Agenda

1. Call to order
2. Minutes of August 2nd meeting
3. The PACTS Pace in Picking Projects
4. Revisit the Project Efficiency Team recommendation to use only the 3-Party agreement (rather than do two agreements) where feasible
5. Staff presentation of scores of past proposals using revised formulas for Intersection and Road Rebuild Proposals
6. Staff presentation on the scoring process for “STP transit capital” projects
7. Review first draft update of the TIP Policies Document
8. Review progress to date and establish next meeting’s agenda
9. Adjourn

Next meeting on October 4th at 10:00 a.m.

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 August 2nd Meeting

Present: Nathan Poore (Falmouth), Jim Gailey (South Portland), Al Presgraves (Freeport), Sara Devlin (MTA), Dan Bacon (Scarborough), Marty Rooney (MaineDOT), Judy Harris (Portland), Stephanie Clark (MaineDOT), Jerry Douglass (MaineDOT), Jim Wendel (Scarborough), Kathi Earley (Portland), Molly Just (Westbrook)

Staff/guests: Paul Godfrey (HNTB), Paul Niehoff (PACTS), Steve Linnell (GPCOG), Lynne Powers (GPCOG), Carl Eppich (PACTS), John Duncan (PACTS)

1. Call to Order

Nathan Poore called the meeting to order at 10:12 A.M.

2. Minutes of July 14th Meeting

The committee adopted by consensus the minutes of the July 14, 2011 TIP Process Committee meeting.

3. Federal Policy on Reimbursement when Approved Project Is Not Built

Marty Rooney said that there has been increased scrutiny from the Federal Highway Administration recently, amid national concern about state departments of transportation spending money on projects that never get built. NEPA cannot be completed until the Department of Transportation demonstrates that it has funds for the project going forward. These regulations are not new but the reading of them has changed. Marty cautioned the committee to be aware that when PACTS funds future projects for preliminary engineering only, it may be asked for a commitment to fund the full project sooner rather than later.

Paul Niehoff asked if this affects MaineDOT's policy of funding design and then putting them on the shelf. Marty replied that funding preliminary engineering and right of way seems to be enough for now, but funding PE without future stages puts MaineDOT at disagreement with FHWA. The new reading of policy runs counter to MaineDOT's goal of getting projects ready on the shelf.

Kathi Earley asked if PACTS' policy of paying for the design in one biennium and implementation in another would be enough to satisfy these requirements. Both Marty and John Duncan believed that that policy would fall under the "funding reasonably available" requirement and would be fine, but John will look into this to be certain.

4. The PACTS Pace in Picking Projects

This was tabled for a later meeting, as it was not tied to any of the other items on the agenda, and Nathan wanted to be certain that there was enough time to look into it.

5. Gorham East West Corridor Study and PACTS Funding Policy

Sara Devlin and Paul Godfrey gave a brief presentation on the Gorham East West Corridor Study and what the role of PACTS could be in studies like these. In Phase I, a land use scenario was identified and tested, and the study board sat down with transit providers and talked about creating a robust transit network with better headways and connections, as land use, transit, and roadway improvements all add up to transportation sustainability. The Phase I recommendations were to: work with the municipalities that are willing to implement land use changes, evaluate and prioritize financially viable transit investments and identify funding sources, and to identify and evaluate a preferred corridor for new east/west capacity and funding options/partnerships. It is paramount that municipalities, metropolitan planning organizations, transit providers, MaineDOT, MTA, and any other entities involved work cooperatively going forward.

Sara said that in order to get to Phase II, MTA, PACTS, GPCOG, MaineDOT, and the nine municipalities need to enter into an MOU. Participation is voluntary, but there is a critical mass of municipalities that is needed. The MOU clearly outlines roles and responsibilities for each entity,

with MTA as the lead on the project and the primary funding source. PACTS' role involves making a commitment, creating a framework and a structure to make certain that roadways are preserved. Sara gave an example of how the entire process might work, with proactive municipalities given bonus points or funding through PACTS' current transportation improvement and UPWP programs. The keys to success are creating a level playing field for municipalities, providing technical land use assistance to plan and implement (which is a role that GP COG will step into), and follow through. The next step is the final report in August or September, and MaineDOT and MTA finalizing the MOU. Phase II will begin in early 2012.

There are more communities involved in Phase II than there were in Phase I. Sara said that after the land use workshop and the identification of growth areas based on projections for 2035, it became evident that several more municipalities needed to be involved. The list for Phase II is South Portland, Scarborough, Westbrook, Portland, Standish, Hollis, Buxton, Windham, and Gorham.

Jim Wendel asked about the questions and issues that Gorham East West will try to answer through roadway and transit steps in Phase II. Paul G. answered that in Phase I, two possible scenarios to add capacity were identified: widening roads through Scarborough and Gorham or building a new road. Phase II will evaluate these two possibilities, while making sure that no possibilities were missed, with the intent of determining which is most appropriate; studying costs, environmental impacts, benefits, etc. If at the end of the Phase II study, the better answer is widening, the Turnpike Authority's involvement will probably end there. If the answer is a new road, then they could continue to be involved. Phase I brought about a list of expansion of existing service, better connections, new services, and long term benefits for transit in the region. Phase II will take that as a starting point and determine which ideas have immediate potential, what funding sources might work, and which ones should wait until land use evolves. Phase II is about identifying a timeline and funding.

John said that this is relevant to the committee today because PACTS has capital improvement money and TIP Process is the appropriate committee to look at how that money is distributed. This study has included PACTS staff and most of the municipalities sitting around the table, and it recommends that PACTS considers how to use some of its money to help implement study recommendations. One consideration on the table is giving extra credit for good works by member municipalities. John asked the question: does PACTS want to consider something like that, despite the fact that the Gorham East West Corridor is not entirely in the PACTS area?

The ultimate goal is to implement the study's recommendations region-wide, though there is the question of how to start it so that all municipalities are involved, even the ones not in the study. Sara added that the people behind the study are aware that it would be very difficult and probably not politically viable to give extra points for Gorham East-West participation, but that PACTS could set up some tools capable of carrying over to other municipalities, such as extra points for preserving transportation investment. Dan Bacon pointed out that PACTS has, on a small scale, laid the groundwork for something like that by allocating planning study monies for four communities from Phase I to start implementing the study's land use recommendations.

Marty said that the STPA requires the provision of incentives for good planning, and that it is not always clear what the threshold of "good planning" is. Paul G. responded that changes to comprehensive plans and zoning and ordinances don't happen overnight, and that the idea is to structure the process so that certain things happen with the understanding that municipalities will begin to talk about what land uses might change. The study board hopes to keep things moving at relatively the same pace. Otherwise, there will be a long wait for communities to catch up.

Nathan asked whether language could go into this round of TIP. He liked the idea of being globally responsible for good planning, and suggested that TIP Process or the Planning Committee work on it. He suggested that at the next meeting, the committee look at the current

procedures for what is required to be submitted when applying for projects; studying the existing language and trying to start something. Carl Eppich pointed out that PACTS has a transportation planning land use policy that the committee could study. Staff will craft some recommendations for the next meeting, with ways to incorporate this into study applications. Sara added that the MTA and HNTB would be happy to help in any way with that review and with putting together recommendations.

Nathan asked for general feelings about the first step being gentle and about awareness. Several committee members approved, saying that this is a long-term plan that would allow conversation and outreach to non-participating municipalities and give them the chance to think it over. Dan mentioned the idea of a graduated scale that works with investments; the idea that the more investment that PACTS is making, the higher the threshold is for insisting on land use practices that will preserve that investment.

6. **Scoring of Intersection and Road Rebuild Proposals**

PACTS staff looked at our formulas used to rank project proposals and brought suggestions to the TIP Process Committee. These suggestions were made in the name of simplifying the process. At this meeting, the discussion was about the intersection and road rebuild proposals formulas; Steve Linnell will brief the group on the transit formulas in September, Paul Niehoff could discuss the collector paving selection process formula in October, and staff will come back to the bicycle/pedestrian-related formula.

The roadway formula was developed in the 1980s and has been tweaked numerous times since its inception. The Destination Tomorrow formula was created in 2003, when Destination Tomorrow itself came about. There were eight guiding policies in the plan; staff took those policies in 2003 and used them for scoring. Now, they are proposing that those eight policies used in the ranking formula be whittled down to five, which can be seen in the table in the meeting packet. Roadway points and Destination Tomorrow points would add up to a total of 100 points.

Staff suggested that several of the roadway categories be removed from the scoring. John explained that staff was recommending the removal of the future traffic category because, as it currently works, future traffic accounts for a relatively small number of points and will not cause a dramatic change in how projects score. The future traffic numbers that staff currently use are inaccurate because they are based on the PACTS travel demand model. The PACTS model's purpose is to work out large projects' impact on the region; it is not a model that is meant to provide traffic analysis for small road projects.

The next category recommended for removal was pavement condition scoring. John said that this is not very important for deciding whether to put money into changing the geometry of the intersection or the traffic signal coordination. Staff also suggested removing the geometric standards category. The recommendations that PACTS receives for making changes to intersections are not typically for the purposes of bringing a currently substandard intersection up to standard, which is what this factor was designed for 20 years ago. The final category that staff recommended cutting was the delay/volume to capacity ratio, because the rebuilding of a road will have a negligible impact on traffic delay. John said that essentially, the plan is to keep the existing emphasis on the remaining factors.

Paul N. said that these recommendations have been made both to simplify the process and because priorities and focus have been changing. PACTS is no longer trying to add lanes and build new roads. Staff and committees currently pick the projects with the most regional significance that there is money to fund, and the process works fairly well. The idea behind these recommended changes is to make the numerical rankings easier to understand and to cut down on the amount of information that the municipality has to gather.

While supporting the intent behind the recommended changes, Molly Just requested that staff provide a table that shows some recently funded projects and how they would have fared under the suggested new ranking formula. Staff will provide this. Kathi asked if the Technical Committee had weighed in on the suggestions for the roadway formula changes, and would prefer that they take a look and give their approval before the TIP Process Committee passes the measure. There were a number of questions on specific terms in the formula and what they meant. Staff will provide a glossary of terms to make sure that everyone who reviews the formula is on the same page, and will bring the formula to the Planning and Technical Committees for their review.

7. Institutionalize the PACTS Credit Program

The suggestion on the table was funding it at the \$250,000 level and institutionalizing it by putting it into the permanent policy document. Jim Gailey was concerned that PACTS doesn't yet know the full impact of its new process of financially rewarding municipalities who sign three-party agreements quickly. He asked if PACTS should be formalizing the credit program before finding out the cost of the new three-party agreement policy.

Nathan pointed out that PACTS has already committed to the credit program for this fiscal year; this is a question of whether to commit to it for the future. He brought up the idea of having an extra TIP Process Committee meeting in November, as a number of complex topics are converging on the September and October meetings. He would like to see a document that collects all of the committee's decisions, and asked when that would normally be available. John replied that that is usually done roughly two-thirds of the way through the process. He also pointed out that project application forms will need to be finished and released early enough for communities to collect the necessary information to fill them out. Kathi echoed that point, concerned that if municipalities aren't informed about the changes until November or December, it will be too late. She suggested having communities start working now, saying that the budget and the credit program could wait until later. Nathan pointed out that, based on a five meeting schedule, the committee is 60% of the way through its process now, and that if the comprehensive document collecting the policy changes that have been made isn't available until September 6, then there will only be one meeting to look over the committee's actions.

Al questioned delaying the credit program decision due to cost reasons. He said that it seemed like the current problem with a budget hole that needs to be filled has happened because PACTS selected projects based on a certain local match formula and then decided to implement a lower local match in order to promote a faster implementation of the process. In the future, PACTS staff and committees will be aware of the quick-sign policy for three-party agreements and the effect that it could have on the process, and there won't be a gap to be filled.

Nathan suggested an addition at the end of the language about the credit program, in order to make sure that there is some flexibility. The addition was: "or other amount as determined appropriate during the development of the biennial budget." There was general approval from the committee, and Nathan will discuss with staff to work out whether an extra meeting is necessary,

8. Review Progress to Date and Establish Next Meeting's Agenda

Nathan said that the items left to discuss are #2 and #11, which will be discussed in October's meeting, as well as #12 in September and a follow-up on the PACTS formulas. Carl asked if the group would like to see the current applications for projects. The general answer was yes, so he will send them out to committee members.

9. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 11:45 A.M.

Agenda Item 3: The PACTS Pace in Picking Projects

Staff: John Duncan

Recommendation: Support this 2012 project selection schedule for Intersection, Road Rebuild and Bike/Ped proposals:

- August 10, 2011 – Sent email to members regarding proposals data.
- Late October 2011 – Hold a “PACTS Projects 101” workshop.
- November 15, 2011 – Distribute application forms.
- March 1, 2012 – Proposals due. (In 2010 final proposals were due on February 12th. Initial draft proposals were due January 8th.)
- April 2012 – Staff shares their scores of the proposals with committees.
- May 2012 – Policy Committee establishes “short list” of proposals for which enhanced project scoping (EPS) will be done.
- Summer 2012 – Do EPS.
- The schedule for Collector Paving projects selection will be based primarily on the completion of our 2012 Collector Study.
- October 2012 – Policy Committee adopts final list of projects for 2014/2015 biennium.
- Spring 2013 – MaineDOT submits statewide list of projects to Legislature for approval.
- Summer 2013 – MaineDOT does “early kickoff” again like this year?
- October 2013 – Federal funds become available.

Background

At the April Policy Committee meeting, the members added this topic to the TIP Process Committee’s work list. The premise is that we collectively spend too much effort picking projects and that we do it over too long a period of time. For instance, the argument can be made that the project cost estimates developed in late 2011, for instance, are to be used for PACTS projects (if funded) that are built in 2014 or 2015 – and that the cost estimates get outdated in the interim.

John spoke recently with Mike McGovern. Mike was simply asking that we consider the topic, and had no suggestions beyond issued identified above.

Minutes from our July 14th Meeting

Paul and John have discussed this and they think it is working fine. For instance, next year we will start evaluating proposals for projects in January and adopt a final list in October. October is when MaineDOT must have the list. Then a year later, the federal funds will become available (except for early kick-off). If we start reviewing proposals in June for making decisions by October, it won’t happen.

We can table this until John hears back from Mike McGovern. Marty explained that MaineDOT uses a more streamlined approach. Dan said he’d be curious about the schedules of the other MPOs. Paul said staff put themselves in a position where we assist our municipalities with their applications if there is missing data, etc. Nathan thought it was a good idea to have PACTS review the applications, and others agreed.

Agenda Item 4: Revisit the Project Efficiency Team recommendation to use only the 3-Party agreement (rather than do two agreements) where feasible

Staff: John Duncan and Paul Niehoff

Recommendation: Accept the following recommendation in the MPO Project Efficiency Team's report to MaineDOT Commissioner Bernhardt:

Maintain the MaineDOT-MPO-Municipality 3-party agreement process for all MPO Allocation projects, when feasible, and eliminate 2-party agreements for some projects.

The elimination of 2-party agreements can be a community decision based on the local process for agreement approvals. At a minimum, the Team believes that resurfacing and simple-scoped projects can use the 3-party agreement for all phases, and thereby eliminate the need for the additional 2-party agreement.

Background

The MPO Project Efficiency Team submitted its report to MaineDOT Commissioner Bernhardt on July 1st. The recommendation above is one of 21 recommendations (12 of which are directly relevant to PACTS). The Commissioner has not responded yet, but his staff supports the recommendations.

In July, the TIP Process Committee reviewed all the Efficiency Team recommendations and decided to submit their recommendations to the Policy Committee in October as part of their overall set of recommendations. At their July meeting the TIP Process Committee supported a PACTS staff recommendation (developed based on further thought after the work of the Efficiency Team had been submitted): *“that we stick with the status quo – continue to require 3-party and 2-party agreements for all projects. The benefits are that MaineDOT and the municipality communicate formally a second time on the scope and financing of the project, and we avoid the risk of confusion as to which projects need two agreements versus one.”*

In August, MaineDOT's Joyce Taylor encouraged the Policy Committee to stick with the recommendation in the Efficiency Team's report based on the logic outlined in the recommendation at the top of the page.

Agenda Item 5: Staff presentation of scores of past proposals using revised formulas for Intersection and Road Rebuild Proposals

Staff: John Duncan

Recommendation: Provide guidance to staff in response to today's proposal

Background

Last month, staff offered recommendations for changes to the Intersection and Rebuild Roads formulas. Today, we will finalize the changes to those formulas, and next month we will consider changes to our Bike/Ped scoring formula, and also review revisions to the proposal application forms.

We score Intersection and Rebuild Road proposals using two formulas – the Roadway Formula and the Destination Tomorrow Formula. Here is a brief history:

- The Roadway Formula was created in the 1980's by the Technical Committee and MaineDOT. We have tweaked it many times.
- The Destination Tomorrow Formula was created in 2003 in order to explicitly incorporate Destination Tomorrow into our ranking of proposals.
- In 2003, 2005 and 2007 the Roadway Formula had an 80 percent weight and the Destination Tomorrow Formula had a 20 percent weight. In 2009 we made the formulas of equal weight (50-50) in the scoring of Intersection and Road Rebuild proposals.
- We can provide the narrative descriptions of the two formulas if requested. The narrative was included in our TIP Policies and Procedures documents until 2009 when we decided to remove them and other items for the sake of making the document more user friendly.

Last month staff explained their proposed changes to the Roadway and Destination Tomorrow Formulas. See the first table below. The changes will simplify the scoring process by:

- Eliminating several staff calculations needed to reach the 50-50 equal weight of the two formulas. This is done by having the sum of each factor's maximum possible score be 50 for both formulas.
- Reflecting the 2010 Destination Tomorrow change to five "policies" from eight "guiding policies". The D. T. Formula currently has eight factors – we recommend reducing to five.
- Removing some Roadway Formula factors that do not work well and/or are of minimal value. Here is our reasoning.

The "future growth" factor

It is the estimated 20-year traffic growth rate for the project location. We want to remove the factor because the estimated rate (taken from the PACTS traffic model) is unreliable, and because it has such a small maximum potential score (only 2.5).

The pavement condition factor in the Intersection formula

It is irrelevant to determining the importance of an intersection proposal – so remove it.

The "geometric standards" factor

It is designed as a reward for proposing to fix a location with an existing substandard geometry. This factor routinely scores negligibly because towns fail to provide the needed data and because the proposals rarely propose to bring a substandard situation up to standard – so remove it.

The delay/V/C factor in the Road Rebuild formula

It is irrelevant to determining the importance of a Road Rebuild proposal – so remove it. The Road Rebuild proposals never add measureable capacity to a roadway.

Last month the members were generally supportive of the staff's recommendations.

The second table below gives comparisons of the scoring results with the existing Intersection proposals formula and the proposed simplified formula. ***Staff will explain.*** In this case, the top ranked proposal (Dunstan Corner) drops to 3rd place. This is in great part due to the elimination of the “future growth” factor in the proposed formula.

The third table below gives comparisons of the scoring results with the existing Road Rebuild proposals formula and the proposed simplified formula. ***Staff will explain.*** In this case, the rank order did not change.

Staff Proposal for Scoring Factor Changes and Factors' New Maximum Scores for Intersection and Road Rebuild Proposals

Total potential scores remain the same for the Roadway Formula (50 points) and the Destination Tomorrow Formula (50 points).

	Roadway Formula					Destination Tomorrow Formula									
	Current Traffic	Future Traffic	Pavement Condition	Geometric Standards	Safety	Delay or V/C Ratio	Multi-Modal	Cost Effective	Regional Focus	Maintain/ Transform	Eco Devo	Trans- Land-Use	Enviro + Energy	Total *	
<u>Intersections:</u>															
<i>Proposal</i>	10	<i>Remove</i>	<i>Remove</i>	<i>Remove</i>	15	10	10	5	10	20	5	10	5	100	
Existing **	7.5	2.5	0	2.5	10	12.5	10	5	6 **	19 **	6 **	13 **	6 **	100	
<u>Road Rebuild:</u>															
<i>Proposal</i>	15	<i>Remove</i>	10	<i>Remove</i>	10	<i>Remove</i>	10	5	10	20	5	10	5	100	
Existing **	7.5	2.5	10	2.5	10	5	7.5	5	6 **	19 **	6 **	13 **	6 **	100	

* The bonus points for public/private partnerships (up to 5 points) and for multi-municipality proposals (up to 5 points) get added to this total.

** The existing Destination Tomorrow factors maximum points shown here are rough approximations taken from the existing eight Destination Tomorrow formula factors and converted to these five factors.

Comparison of 2008 Intersection Proposal Scores with Existing and Proposed Formulas

August 31, 2011

Scores Used in 2008 (there were no 2010 proposals)

		Roadway Formula							Destination Tomorrow Formula												
2008 Proposal		Current Traffic	Future Traffic	Geo-metrics	Delay Safety or V/C	Multi-Modal	Cost Effect.	Subtotal	Maintain/Improve	Regional Signif.	Expand System	Not new Road	Land Use	Access Mt.	Pass. Trans.	Econ. Livable	?	Total 2008 D. T. totals	EXISTING SYSTEM TOTAL*	Old Rank	
		10	10	10	10	10	10	80	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	27	107		
Dunstan Corner	1	10.0	10.0	0.0	6.7	4.0	10.0	0.0	40.7	1.0	2.0	0.5	0.5	0.0	0.0	1.5	1.5	0.0	7.0	51.1	1
Forest at Newton	2	5.4	0.8	0.0	0.0	7.0	10.0	9.7	32.9	2.0	3.0	1.0	1.5	2.5	0.0	0.0	1.5	1.5	13.0	48.8	2
Payne at Mussey	4	7.6	2.2	2.5	3.1	5.0	6.0	7.9	34.2	2.0	1.5	1.0	2.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	1.0	0.5	9.0	46.1	4
Saco at Emerson	3	4.1	1.5	2.5	2.6	3.0	8.0	9.4	31.0	3.0	3.0	1.5	2.0	1.0	0.5	2.0	0.5	0.0	13.5	47.3	3
Cumb. Mills Triangle	5		9.8	0.0	3.7		10.0	3.3	26.8	2.0	2.0	0.0	1.5	0.5	1.0	1.5	2.0	0.0	10.5	39.6	5
Spring at Main	6		2.0	0.0	0.1		10.0	4.2	16.4	2.5	1.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.0	0.5	2.0	1.0	9.0	26.8	7
Forest at Kennebec	7		1.3	2.5	0.0	0.0	8.0	4.6	16.4	2.0	2.0	1.5	0.5	1.5	2.0	1.5	2.0	1.5	14.5	31.5	6

*Math converted to 50:50 from 80:20

Scores Using Proposed Scoring Changes

		Roadway Formula							Destination Tomorrow Formula								
2008 Proposal		Current Traffic		Delay Safety	Multi-Modal	Cost Effect.	Subtotal	Regional Focus	Maintain/Transforr	Eco Devo	Enviro + Energy	Land Use	Subtotal 08 score out of 50	PROPOSED SYSTEM TOTAL SCORE	New Rank		
Possible Points		10		10	10	10	50	10	10	10	10	10	50				
Dunstan Corner	3	10.0			6.7	4.0	10.0	0.0	30.7	6.7	3.3	5.0	5.0	0.0	20.0	50.7	3
Forest at Newton	1	5.4			0.0	7.0	10.0	9.7	32.1	10.0	6.7	5.0	0.0	8.3	30.0	62.1	1
Payne at Mussey	4	7.6			3.1	5.0	6.0	7.9	29.6	5.0	6.7	3.3	0.0	0.0	15.0	44.6	4
Saco at Emerson	2	4.1			2.6	3.0	8.0	9.4	27.1	10.0	10.0	1.7	6.7	3.3	31.7	58.7	2
Cumb. Mills Triangle	5				3.7		10.0	3.3	17.0	6.7	6.7	6.7	5.0	1.7	26.7	43.7	5
Spring at Main	7				0.1		10.0	4.2	14.3	3.3	8.3	6.7	1.7	3.3	23.3	37.6	7
Forest at Kennebec	6				0.0	0.0	8.0	4.6	12.6	6.7	6.7	6.7	5.0	5.0	30.0	42.6	6

Comparison of 2010 Road Rebuild Proposal Scores with Existing and Proposed Formulas

August 31, 2011

Scores Used in May 2010

Roadway Formula										Destination Tomorrow Formula										CURRENT SYSTEM TOTAL SCORE
2010 Proposal	Old Rank	Current Traffic	Future Traffic	Pave-ment	Geo-metrics	Safety	Delay or V/C	Multi-Modal	Cost Effect.	Subtotal	Maintain/Improve	Regional Signif.	Expand System	Not new Road	Land Use	Access Mgt	Pass. Trans.	Econ. Livabl	DT Total	
		10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	80	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	24	
Tuttle Road	5	1.9	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	4.4	18.4	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	3.5	21.9
South Street	3	0.5	3.1	7.0	3.5	0.0	0.0	1.0	5.3	20.4	2.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	4.5	24.9
St. John St.	1	6.3	2.1	0.0	2.5	6.4	0.0	6.0	0.0	23.3	2.0	3.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	3.0	11.0	34.3
Cummings	2	10.0	1.1	0.0	2.5	1.3	0.0	4.0	3.6	22.5	2.0	0.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	0.0	1.0	1.0	5.5	28.0
Highland Ave.	4	4.2	5.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	7.9	18.9	1.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.0	3.5	22.4

Scores Using Proposed Scoring Changes

Roadway Formula							Destination Tomorrow Formula							PROPOSED SYSTEM TOTAL SCORE
2010 Proposal	Current Traffic	Pave-ment	Safety	Multi-Modal	Cost Effective	Formula Subtotal	Regional Focus	Maintain-Transform	Eco Devo	Environ +Energy	Land Use	DT Total		
	10	10	10	10	10	50	10	10	10	10	10	(2010 score out of 50)		
Tuttle Road	5	1.9	0.0	0.0	2.0	8.4	0.0	3.33	6.67	0.00	3.33	13.3	21.7	
South Street	3	0.5	7.0	0.0	1.0	13.8	0.0	6.67	6.67	0.00	3.33	16.7	30.5	
St. John St.	1	6.3	0.0	6.4	6.0	18.7	10.0	6.67	10.00	3.33	3.33	33.3	52.0	
Cummings	2	10.0	0.0	1.3	4.0	18.9	0.0	6.67	3.33	3.33	3.33	16.7	35.6	
Highland Ave.	4	4.2	0.0	0.0	1.0	13.1	0.0	3.33	3.33	3.33	0.00	10.0	23.1	

Agenda Item 6: Staff presentation on the scoring process for “STP transit capital” projects

Staff: Steve Linnell

Recommendation: Accept Steve’s report.

Background

	Score	Criteria
A	30	Addresses one or more Coordination Study Recommendations
B	20	Regional Benefit
C	20	Improves or Replaces Capacity and/or Infrastructure
D	10	Supported by Existing Studies/Plans
E	5	Improves Air Quality, Conserves Energy
F	5	Supports Compact Land Use and Enhances Access
G	5	Project Benefits More than One Provider
H	5	Project is Multi-Modal
	100	Score

In developing scoring criteria, the Transit Committee incorporated the capital related priorities of the Regional Transit Coordination Study and the Goals of Destination Tomorrow listed below:

Regional Transit Coordination Study Priorities - Criterion A

1. Regional map and timetable
 - a. Collective advertising opportunities
2. Regional route study
 - a. Identify new transit hubs
 - b. Expand bus service to Park & Ride lots
 - c. Coordinate service between major origins and destinations
 - d. Improve intermodal connections – **Criterion H**
 - e. Expand present network
3. Incorporate transit planning in Comprehensive Planning process
4. Develop Regional Pass System

DT Goals	Criteria
Regional Focus	B & G
Maintain/Transform	C
Economic Development	A & B
Transportation Land Use	F
Environment & Energy	E

Although the Criteria are used as the primary method by the Transit Committee to select proposals, other issues such as geographic funding equity and equity between transit providers may also be discussed and/or used during the selection.

Agenda Item 7: Review draft update of the TIP Policies Document

Staff: John Duncan

Recommendation: Give feedback on this draft.

Background

Last Wednesday morning, staff distributed a first draft final report of our work for your review. It gives you a sense of all the pieces of the work that we are doing. It is based on the policy document prepared two years ago – with red print showing the key changes and additions. With luck, we will be able to finish our work at our October 4th meeting.

Agenda Item 8: Review progress to date and establish next meeting’s agenda

Topics and Dates for TIP Process Review Meetings

As revised Sept. 1

TIP Process Topics	June 7	July 14	Aug 2	Sept 6	Oct 4
1 Review scope of the committee's work to do	Done				
2 Incorporate Project Efficiencies Team proposals (such as local match policy changes)		95% done		Done	
3 MaineDOT briefings on CMAQ and NEPA policies		Done	Done		
4 Exec Committee role in tracking projects status Per suggestion at recent Exec meeting	Done				
5 New local project administration function	Done				
6 Shorten time spent picking projects				Done	
7 Review our 2-biennia project policy		Done			
8 Revisit our project cap policy		Done			
9 Consider Gorham E-W Study recommendation to reward communities with transportation funding in return for certain land use plans			X		X
10 Institutionalize Credit Program			Done		
11 Receive report from Technical Committee on changes to the Collectors ranking procedure					X
12 Briefing on transit funding processes				Done	
13 Tweak Road Formula factors and weights and Tweak Dest. Tomorrow Formula factors and weights, and Bike/Ped scoring process			X	Done	
14 Revise project application requirements and application forms				X	X
15 Review staff’s TIP Process Document				X	X