

**Draft Memorandum for the Record
Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) Meeting**

April 5, 2012 Meeting

10:00 AM – 1:15 PM, State Transportation Building, Conference Rooms 2 & 3, 10 Park Plaza, Boston

David Mohler, Chair, representing Richard Davey, Secretary and Chief Executive Officer, Massachusetts Department of Transportation (MassDOT)

Decisions

The Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization agreed to the following:

- approve the work program for the *Assembly Square Station Service and Fare Equity Analysis*
- approve the minutes of the meeting of March 15
- approve the administrative modification to the federal fiscal years (FFYs) 2012 – 15 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) to program the *Boston – Traffic Signal Improvements on Blue Hill Avenue and Warren Street* project

Meeting Agenda

1. Public Comments

State Representative Carl Sciortino spoke in support of the *Green Line Extension to Route 16* project and called for the MPO to program the project so that it can begin in FFY 2016. He noted that the project would produce air quality benefits for the entire region.

Michelle Consalvo, Boston University, expressed support for the *Boston – Improvements to Commonwealth Avenue from Armory Street to Alcorn Street* project. She noted that the project is a continuation of a successful project done in partnership with MassDOT, the City of Boston, and Boston University to improve the Kenmore Square and Commonwealth Avenue area.

Rafael Mares, Conservation Law Foundation, spoke in support of the *Green Line Extension to Route 16* project, which he said will have a significant positive impact on air quality and result in significant reductions in vehicle miles traveled. He asked the MPO to consider programming the project in the FFYs 2013 – 16 TIP as the project is programmed in the FFY 2016 – 2020 time band of the Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP).

Ken Krause, Medford resident, thanked the MPO for their support of the *Green Line Extension* project and for flexing money from highway to transit for it. He expressed support for extending the Green Line to Route 16 in the same phase as the extension to College Avenue. He noted that a visioning study by the Metropolitan Area Planning Council (MAPC) has quantified the benefits of the project in terms of housing, job creation, and tax revenue.

Dennis Harrington, City of Quincy, requested that the MPO program the *Quincy – Intersection and Signal Improvements at Hancock Street and East/West Squantum Streets* project in the FFYs 2013 – 16 TIP. He stated that the project's 75% design plans have been submitted to MassDOT. He also noted that the project addresses a main arterial roadway and that two bridges near the location are being rebuilt. The project would address pedestrian safety and improve air quality.

Timothy Kochan, MassDOT District 5, expressed support for the *Hanover – Reconstruction of Washington Street (Route 53)* project, which was included in the staff recommendation of the FFY 2013 – 16 TIP. He also alerted the MPO to the *Duxbury – Intersection Improvements at Kingstown Way (Route 53) and Winter Street* project, which will address safety problems at the location. The 100% design plans have been submitted to MassDOT. The project cost is approximately \$1.5 million. He asked the MPO to consider programming the project in one of the outer years of the TIP.

Beth Rudolph, Town of Winchester, advocated for the *Winchester, Stoneham, Woburn – Tri-Community Bikeway* project, which was included in scenario one of the staff recommendation for the FFY 2013 – 16 TIP. She remarked upon the project's benefits noting that the trail would be accessible to all for recreation and as a means to access commuter rail stations and schools, and could enhance economic development.

Pamela Beal, Kenmore Association, expressed support for the *Boston – Improvements to Commonwealth Avenue from Armory Street to Alcorn Street* project. She noted that the improvements already made to the Kenmore Square and Commonwealth Avenue area have had a tremendous positive impact in terms of the economic viability of the area, safety, and mobility for bicyclists, pedestrians, and motorists, as well as aesthetically.

2. Chair's Report – David Mohler, MassDOT

The MBTA Board of Directors approved a budget for FY 2013. There will be a 23% fare increase on average.

Congress has passed a 90-day extension to the federal surface transportation legislation, which provides transportation funding to states through June.

The transportation bond bill has been filed with the state legislature. The Chapter 90 portion is expected to be addressed early in April by the Senate. It is hoped that the full bill will be passed by July.

The Massachusetts Association of Regional Planning Agencies (MARPA) released fiscal targets for MPO TIP planning.

3. Committee Chairs' Reports – Lourenço Dantas, Massachusetts Port Authority

The Congestion Management Process (CMP) Committee held its first meeting. The committee discussed data needs and the committee's role. The next meeting will be held the first week of May.

4. Regional Transportation Advisory Council Report – *Steve Olanoff, Chair, Regional Transportation Advisory Council*

The Advisory Council will meet next on April 11. The MPO staff will make presentations on the TIP, the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP), and the MPO Freight Study.

5. Executive Director's Report – *Karl Quackenbush, Executive Director, Central Transportation Planning Staff*

The UPWP Committee met to discuss the staff recommendation. (This subject was discussed further during the UPWP agenda item.)

6. Assembly Square Station Service and Fare Equity Analysis – *Karl Quackenbush, Executive Director, Central Transportation Planning Staff*

Members were presented with the work program for the *Assembly Square Station Service and Fare Equity Analysis* at the meeting of March 15.

A motion to approve the work program for the *Assembly Square Station Service and Fare Equity Analysis* was made by John Romano, MassDOT Highway Division, and seconded by Eric Bourassa, MAPC. The motion carried.

7. Technical Memorandum: Maintenance Costs for Municipally-Controlled Federal Aid-Eligible Roadways – *Karl Quackenbush, Executive Director, Central Transportation Planning Staff*

At the meeting of March 15, members heard a presentation on the findings of MPO staff's research into the benefits and costs of starting a Pavement Management Program (PMS) at this MPO. The findings are documented in a technical memorandum titled, *Maintenance Costs for Municipally-Controlled Federal Aid-Eligible Roadways*.

K. Quackenbush explained that if the MPO were to adopt a PMS, then staff would begin to gather data on the condition of pavement on municipally-owned federal-aid eligible roadways in the region by video recording roadways. Data on pavement condition would then populate a database and could be used to inform MPO decision-making on the TIP. The PMS would provide the MPO with more comprehensive and complete data on pavement condition of roadways, and enable staff to project deterioration rates and estimate the cost of restoring pavement to good condition.

A graph prepared by the National Center for Pavement Preservation was shown to members. It illustrated that every \$1 spent on pavement preservation could reduce or eliminate the need to spend \$6-14 on pavement rehabilitation or reconstruction in the future.

Members discussed the proposal.

In response to questions from D. Mohler, K. Quackenbush explained that funding for the PMS was not included in the draft FFY 2013 UPWP (which was discussed later in the

meeting). The program would require \$63,700 in FFY 2013 in planning work and would continue beyond FFY 2013 as an ongoing project. The MPO would have two options if it chose to add the PMS to the UPWP. It could reduce funding for new studies (this option is not recommended by staff), or it could reduce the amount of funding for other 3C-funded activities.

Jim Gillooly, City of Boston (Boston Transportation Department), expressed concern that if the MPO started a PMS, municipalities might see MPO funding as an alternative to using Chapter 90 funds for pavement repair, and this could change the MPO's focus on project funding. K. Quackenbush responded that the data from the PMS could be used in a variety of ways, including to evaluate projects or to develop strategies that would reduce the need for reconstruction projects.

L. Dantas noted that other mechanisms – namely Chapter 90 – are in place to address pavement condition and that this would not advance the MPO current policy areas that focus on mobility and safety, particularly given the limited funding available to the MPO.

Dennis Crowley, South West Advisory Planning Committee (Town of Medway), stated that the UPWP Committee did not recommend the PMS. He noted that only 33 municipalities in the region responded to a survey staff conducted when researching the subject, which indicates that an MPO-operated PMS may not be a high priority for municipalities in the region. He expressed concern about committing 15% of UPWP funds to the project in FFY 2013 and funding the program at a similar level in future years given the limited amount of funding available for UPWP projects. K. Quackenbush suggested that funding the PMS could be accomplished by reducing funds from ongoing projects, which would not compromise funding for new UPWP projects in the future.

S. Olanoff asked about the percentage of roadways that could be evaluated. K. Quackenbush stated that data collection for all the municipally-controlled federal-aid eligible roads in the region would take four to five years. Efi Pagitsas, Manager of the Traffic Analysis Group, MPO Staff, added that staff would collect data on 20% of roadways each year on average.

E. Bourassa asked for the opinion of MassDOT Highway Division representatives. David Anderson, MassDOT Highway Division, reported that his agency has PMS for state-controlled roads which relies on an Automatic Road Analyzer vehicle that covers the road inventory in three years. This work is very important to MassDOT, not only because it identifies pavement condition, but also because it identifies other needs or issues associated with Intelligent Transportation Systems, bridges, pavement markings, drainage, and accessibility.

L. Dantas asked if MassDOT Highway Division would find data from an MPO-operated PMS system useful. D. Mohler replied no given that MassDOT is focused on roads that are not municipality-owned. He added that the MPO has traditionally had a policy of not funding resurfacing projects. Chapter 90 funds are provided to municipalities for that purpose.

Dennis Giombetti, MetroWest Regional Collaborative (Town of Framingham), noted that the Chapter 90 Program is woefully underfunded and that focus should be put on addressing that problem. He stated that the MPO should maintain its role and continue to fund the type of projects it has historically funded.

The MPO addressed the PMS later in the meeting during the UPWP agenda item.

8. Meeting Minutes – Maureen Kelly, MPO Staff

A motion to approve the minutes of the meeting of March 15 was made by E. Bourassa, and seconded by Tom Bent, Inner Core Committee (City of Somerville). The motion carried. The Massachusetts Port Authority and the Minuteman Advisory Group on Interlocal Coordination (Town of Bedford) abstained.

9. FFYs 2012 – 15 Transportation Improvement Program Administrative

Modification – Sean Pfalzer, Acting TIP Manager, MPO Staff

Staff presented an administrative modification to the FFYs 2012 – 15 TIP. TIP tables showing the changes to the document were distributed. (S. Pfalzer noted that staff has modified the format of the TIP tables to be consistent with the format MassDOT is advising all MPOs in the state to use.)

The administrative modification adds a \$321,800 High Priority Project earmark for the *Boston – Traffic Signal Improvements on Blue Hill Avenue and Warren Street* project in the FFY 2012 element. This project was originally programmed in the FFY 2011 element of the TIP but the funds were not spent in that year because a design agreement was not yet reached between the City of Boston and FHWA. A design agreement is now pending. The reprogramming of the earmark will allow for the completion of the design. The City of Boston will provide the local match. The remaining balance of the earmark will fund construction of the project in the FFY 2014 element of the TIP. The construction amount has decreased from \$2.39 million to \$2.37 million.

Members discussed the modification.

D. Mohler asked if the City of Boston expects that the project can be constructed for the reduced cost of \$2.37 million. J. Gillooly replied yes.

J. Gillooly suggested that the modification does not require that the MPO release a proposed administrative modification to the FFY 2012 – 15 TIP for public review because the project was already included in a prior TIP that was released for public review.

A motion to approve an administrative modification to the FFYs 2012 – 15 TIP to program the *Boston – Traffic Signal Improvements on Blue Hill Avenue and Warren Street* project, without a public review period, was made by J. Gillooly, and seconded by T. Bent. The motion carried.

10. Unified Planning Work Program – Karl Quackenbush, Executive Director, Central Transportation Planning Staff

Members were provided with a draft budget for the FFY 2013 UPWP and a description of seven proposed new projects that would be funded with 3C funds. The draft budget provides information on funding sources for projects; these include both discrete and on-going projects, and projects that are 3C-funded and funded by other sources.

The proposed new 3C-funded projects are as follows:

- *Priority Corridors for LRTP Needs Assessment*: This study would recommend low-cost improvements to selected corridors identified in the Needs Assessment of the LRTP.
- *Roadway Network Inventory for Emergency Needs: A Pilot Study*: This would be a continuation of the MPO's all-hazards planning work and add to the MPO's all-hazards GIS web tool. The study would assess bridge and signal condition on selected evacuation routes and provide information for the MPO's project programming decision-making.
- *Household Survey-Based Travel Profile and Trends*: This project will use data from a household travel survey funded by MassDOT and the MPO to create a profile of travel behavior by the region's households. (The primary purpose of the survey was to gather data with which to rebuild the MPO's and MassDOT's travel models.) The project will also examine the new data in comparison to data from the 1991 household travel survey.
- *Regional HOV Systems Planning Phase II*: The first phase of this study involved an assessment of where HOV lanes or HOV treatments could be considered on the express highway system. This second phase would subject the most promising locations, thought to be on I-93 to the north, to further, more detailed analysis.
- *Metrowest RTA Regional Planning Assistance*: This study will assess the Metrowest RTA's transit routes and identify improvements to the system.
- *SWAP Regional Public Transit Feasibility Study*: This study would analyze the potential for transit service in the South West Advisory Planning Committee (SWAP) subregion with work products produced by both CTPS and MAPC. Emphasis will be on integrating existing services into a better-functioning regional system.
- *Addressing Safety, Mobility, and Access on Subregional-Priority Arterial Roadways*: This study would involve a multi-modal analysis of arterial locations that have been identified by the MAPC Subregional groups as having bottlenecks or impediments to mobility.

Members discussed the proposed UPWP.

E. Bourassa asked if the UPWP budget incorporated changes that would be necessary to project budgets if the MPO were to include the PMS in the UPWP. K. Quackenbush replied no, but that he could provide that alternate budget if requested.

A motion to add a project for a PMS to the FFY 2013 UPWP was made by E. Bourassa, and seconded by David Anderson, MassDOT Highway Division. The motion failed. MassDOT and MAPC voted in favor of the motion. All others voted against it.

David Koses, At-Large City (City of Newton), raised a question about the *SWAP Regional Public Transit Feasibility Study* noting that it would seem unusual to add transit in one area of the region while reducing existing transit in the core area. E. Bourassa, D. Crowley, T. Bent, and Sarkis Sarkisian, Town of Wayland, clarified that the project would take an inventory of existing transit in the SWAP subregion and identify opportunities for better coordination among existing transit services, such as Councils on Aging operations.

The MPO is scheduled to vote on April 19 on a Draft FFY 2013 UPWP for release for public review.

11. Transportation Improvement Program – *Sean Pflazer, Acting TIP Manager, MPO Staff*

Members were presented with the staff recommendation for the FFYs 2013 – 16 TIP, the First Tier List of Projects, a memorandum describing the assumptions used in developing the recommendation, and a project evaluation matrix.

S. Pflazer described how the TIP fits into the Federal Highway Program and gave an overview of the TIP development process. A graphic was provided that showed the breakdown of federal transportation funding that comes to the state and the portion that is available for MPO discretionary funding (the Regional Targets). Another graphic illustrated the steps in the MPO project selection process.

The project selection process begins with a pool of over 135 projects (the Universe of Projects). Staff evaluates those projects that are far enough along in the design process (usually those with a functional design report) with the TIP criteria, which are based largely on MPO policies. Projects that score highest based on the evaluation criteria and that can be made ready for advertising in the TIP are considered among the First Tier projects. There are 15 projects in the First Tier for the FFY 2013 – 16 TIP with a combined cost of about \$120 million. To develop the staff recommendation, staff then draws from the First Tier projects considering the following factors: readiness and design status, whether a project is programmed in the LRTP, and geographic equity. The staff recommendation, which draws from the First Tier projects, comprises 10 or 11 projects with a combined cost of about \$75 million.

Graphics were shown depicting the geographic location of the projects included in the staff recommendation, and comparing project types between the FFY 2008 – 12 TIP and the proposed FFY 2013 – 16 TIP. Compared to the previous TIP, the staff recommendation has an increase in spending for major highway, bicycle and pedestrian projects, a decrease in spending on arterial roadway projects and the Clean Air and Mobility Program, and there is no funding flexed from highway to transit.

Also available was a handout providing project descriptions and additional information (including the project's potential eligibility for Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality funding) and Transportation Enhancements on 41 projects with the highest evaluations; all projects in the staff recommendation and First Tier List were included in this packet.

Members discussed the staff recommendation.

L. Dantas raised the issue of flexing highway funding to transit given the MPO's commitment in the LRTP to fund the *Green Line Extension* project in FFY 2016. He noted that this would be the time for the MPO to make its decision. D. Mohler agreed adding that MassDOT will bring its recommendation on the subject to the MPO within the next two weeks. Costs for the project could range from \$10-20 million in the FFY 2016 element of the TIP.

Mayor Scott Galvin, North Suburban Planning Council (City of Woburn), asked why the *Woburn – Reconstruction of Montvale Avenue* project was not included in the staff recommendation considering that the project was highly rated in the TIP evaluations. He noted that projects that rated lower than the Woburn project were included in the staff recommendation. S. Pfalzer explained that staff worked within the framework of the LRTP when programming the TIP projects. The Woburn project is included in an outer timeband of the LRTP (not in the FFY 2016 – 20 timeband from which projects may be eligible for programming in the FFY 2013 – 16 TIP). Mayor Galvin asked for a reconsideration of the decision and asked for the project to be programmed. He said that the project is a major priority for the City of Woburn.

E. Bourassa asked about the readiness of the Woburn project. According to the MassDOT Highway Division, the project could be ready by FFY 2015, replied S. Pfalzer.

S. Olanoff also questioned why the Woburn project did not make the First Tier list of projects. S. Pfalzer stated that the issue had to do with the time frame in which the MPO chose to program the project in the LRTP. D. Mohler added that staff is not authorized to make a recommendation in the TIP that is counter to the MPO's previous votes on the LRTP. He noted, however, that the MPO could amend the LRTP to accommodate the Woburn project in the TIP.

L. Dantas suggested that staff include information on which time band of the LRTP recommended TIP projects are in. S. Pfalzer pointed to the handout that provides project summaries. The summaries indicate the time band that projects are programmed the LRTP (if they are), as well as other information, such as design status, potential funding sources, and amount of carbon dioxide reduction that certain projects could achieve.

Before taking more questions, S. Pfalzer informed members that due to cost changes on *Dedham/Needham – Rehabilitation/ Replacement of 6 Bridges on I-95/Route 128 (Add-a-lane) (Contract IV)* project more money is available for programming. Approximately \$5.9 million is available in FFY 2013. He also noted that additional target funds were available in the FFY 2014 and 2015 elements of the TIP because non-target funds were

applied to the *Concord/Lincoln – Route 2 (Crosby’s Corner)* project. S. Pfalzer also noted that two projects that were in earlier iterations of the staff recommendation have not been included in the Revised Staff Recommendation: the *Acton/Maynard – Assabet River Rail Trail* and the *Wayland – Route 27/Route 30* projects.

Members returned to questions.

S. Olanoff raised questions about the Route 128 Add-a-lane project. D. Mohler provided clarification about the contracts for the project.

D. Crowley asked for clarification regarding differences in the amount currently programmed in the FFY 2013 element of the TIP and the staff recommendation for programming in that element. D. Mohler explained that the amount in the staff recommendation is higher because more target monies were made available subsequent to the programming of projects in the previous TIP.

Richard Canale, At-Large Town (Town of Lexington), asked why the *Acton/Maynard – Assabet River Rail Trail* and the *Wayland – Route 27/Route 30* projects were removed from the TIP. S. Pfalzer explained that the Wayland project was not as highly rated as other projects and that it was included in previous versions of the draft TIP because it was a relatively low-cost project that staff was able to fit into the TIP. The *Assabet River Rail Trail* was excluded because of the project cost.

S. Olanoff asked for an explanation of why the cost for the *Concord/Lincoln – Route 2 (Crosby’s Corner)* project is shown higher in the TIP than was stated at a recent MassDOT Board meeting. D. Mohler stated that the higher cost in the TIP reflects contingency costs, which are included for all projects.

S. Olanoff asked whether unspent contingency money is returned to the MPO. D. Mohler replied that those dollars are re-obligated for other MassDOT projects. If the amount programmed for contingency purposes is not enough MassDOT will not come back to the MPO to request more money.

R. Canale asked if there is an accounting of unspent contingency money. D. Mohler stated that MassDOT tracks the information on a project by project basis, but does not report that information back to the MPO.

Ed Tarrallo, North Suburban Planning Council (City of Woburn), suggested that staff evaluate projects in the LRTP that could be ready for programming in the TIP. He noted that the 25% design plans for the *Woburn – Reconstruction of Montvale Avenue* project were submitted to MassDOT in 2009.

D. Giombetti expressed that municipal officials become frustrated when projects inexplicably fall off the TIP. He suggested that staff provide justification when removing projects from the TIP.

Roland Bartl, Town of Acton, advocated for including the *Acton/Maynard – Assabet River Rail Trail* project in the FFY 2016 element. He noted that the communities have been waiting for the project since the 1980s and that the project will be ready. He distributed a letter from state representatives supporting the project. M. Chong, FHWA, stated that FHWA will not be able to sign off on permits if the construction dollars are not also programmed in the TIP.

Sarkis Sarkisian, Town of Wayland, expressed disappointment that the *Wayland – Route 27/Route 30* project was removed from the TIP in the staff recommendation and asked that the project be restored to the TIP. He noted that the town reconstructed a water main in anticipation of the project and that the project would cost \$200,000 more if delayed. He also noted that the intersection has a regional impact, particularly for the towns of Framingham and Natick.

D. Mohler asked why there are some projects in the Universe of Projects that are at a high state of design but that staff has not evaluated. S. Pfalzer replied that staff does not have the necessary information – namely functional design reports – to evaluate all the projects. Staff only considered fully evaluated projects when developing the staff recommendation. Due to the compressed schedule for TIP development this year, staff was not able to gather all of the functional design reports that might be available. (Not all proposed project have them.) Going forward, staff would like to evaluate the Universe of Projects in the non-peak season to work towards evaluating all projects possible for the next development of the next TIP.

P. Wolfe added that the set of projects evaluated also reflects municipal priorities. . D. Mohler expressed concern that some municipalities may not have prioritized certain projects because they believe that MassDOT would be advocating for those projects. Without an evaluation, MassDOT cannot advocate as well for those projects.

Anne McGahan, LRTP Manager, MPO staff, noted that as part of the implementation of MassDOT's GreenDOT environmental policy the MPO staff will be required to evaluate the Universe of Projects to determine projects' impacts in terms of reducing carbon dioxide emissions. Staff will need to gather functional design reports for that purpose, too, this year.

E. Bourassa asked why some projects in the staff evaluation have estimates for carbon dioxide reductions, but others do not. A. McGahan replied that staff evaluated 15 projects that may be eligible for Congestion Management and Air Quality Program (CMAQ) funds. Staff will be evaluating more projects this year.

D. Koses and R. Canale suggested conducting more outreach to municipalities prior to voting on the TIP to provide more opportunity for municipalities to comment on projects that have not been evaluated. P. Wolfe stated that there is some flexibility in the TIP schedule. She also noted, however, that staff has already conducted outreach to municipalities. They are invited to review the evaluations and comment or provide additional information.

M. Chong advised staff to ensure that the TIP is consistent with the LRTP. A. McGahan noted that if the MPO adds projects to the TIP that cost over \$10 million or that add capacity to the system the MPO would need to amend the LRTP, or approve an administrative adjustment, as appropriate, to maintain consistency between the two documents. Capacity adding projects, such as the *Woburn – Reconstruction of Montvale Avenue* project, would require staff to redo the air quality conformity determination for the LRTP and the TIP. D. Mohler stated that the MPO should be guided by the LRTP when making TIP programming decisions.

S. Olanoff asked why the *Green Line Extension to Route 16* project was not included in the TIP. D. Mohler stated that the project is included in the FFY 2016 – 20 timeband of the LRTP and that the MPO will have to determine what year within that timeframe the project should be programmed in the TIP. MassDOT supports flexing highway funds to fund this transit project and will make recommendations for cash flows by the April 19 meeting, he said.

Members discussed how to handle the nearly \$6 million in unassigned funds in the staff recommendation and agreed that the funds should be left unassigned for the time being to allow for flexibility during the TIP debate on April 19.

Members further discussed the *Woburn – Reconstruction of Montvale Avenue* project. E. Tarallo noted that the project was programmed in the TIP until an MPO action removed the project. T. Bent advocated for taking the decisions made during the development of the LRTP seriously. (The MPO programmed the Woburn project in an outer time band of the LRTP.) J. Romano stated that the MPO needs more information regarding the readiness of the project. D. Anderson remarked on design issues that need to be resolved having to do with bicycle accommodations on Montvale Avenue.

D. Anderson also noted that MassDOT has not received a design submittal for the *Somerville – Reconstruction of Beacon Street* project.

Beth Rudolph, Town of Winchester, asked the MPO to consider programming the *Winchester – Signal Improvements at Four Locations on Church Street and Route 3* project (given that the MPO has \$6 million unassigned). She noted that the project is at 100% design and costs \$4 million.

Members discussed having an additional MPO meeting to further discuss the TIP prior to April 19. They decided against it, however, because MassDOT's recommendation regarding the *Green Line Extension* project may not be available for discussion the week prior to the 19th.

J. Gillooly cautioned that the uncertainty surrounding future federal action on surface transportation legislation could have an impact on TIP programming in the coming months. He asked for an explanation of why the MPO has more target funds this year. D. Mohler replied that the target funds were based on federal guidance with the targets

including \$50 million in redistribution funds that the Commonwealth received this year. (Last year's targets did not include redistribution funds.) M. Chong added that FHWA aims to level fund the MPO each year.

The MPO is scheduled to vote on a Draft TIP for public review at the meeting of April 19. In advance of that meeting, staff was advised to contact proponents of projects on the staff recommendation to alert them of possible changes that could occur on April 19, and to contact all municipalities in the region to alert them of the opportunity to advocate for their projects. Proponents should also be advised to contact the MPO member for their subregion.

D. Anderson expressed interest in having staff evaluate the *Danvers/Peabody – Mainline Improvements on Route 128, Phase II* project. D. Mohler stated that MassDOT will provide information about the project for the MPO's discussion.

12. Members Items

There were none.

13. Adjourn

A motion to adjourn was made by J. Romano, and seconded by D. Giombetti. The motion carried.

**Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization Meeting Attendance
Thursday, April 5, 2012, 10:00 AM**

Members

At-Large City (City of Everett)
At-Large City (City of Newton)
At-Large Town (Town of Arlington)

At-Large Town (Town of Lexington)
City of Boston (Boston Redevelopment Agency)
City of Boston (Boston Transportation Department)

Federal Highway Administration
Inner Core Committee (City of Somerville)
Massachusetts Department of Transportation
MassDOT Highway Division

Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority (MBTA)
Massachusetts Port Authority
MBTA Advisory Board
Metropolitan Area Planning Council

MetroWest Regional Collaborative (Town of Framingham)
Minuteman Advisory Group on Interlocal Coordination
(Town of Bedford)
North Shore Task Force (City of Beverly)
North Suburban Planning Council (City of Woburn)

Regional Transportation Advisory Council
South Shore Coalition (Town of Braintree)
South West Advisory Planning Committee (Town of Medway)
Three Rivers Interlocal Council (Town of Norwood/NVCC)

Representatives and Alternates

James Errickson
David Koses
Wayne Chouinard
Laura Wiener
Richard Canale
Lara Mérida
Jim Gillooly
Tom Kadzis
Michael Chong
Tom Bent
David Mohler
David Anderson
John Romano
Joe Cosgrove
Lourenço Dantas
Paul Regan
Eric Bourassa
Eric Halvorsen
Dennis Giombetti
Richard Reed

Denise Deschamps
Mayor Scott Galvin
Ed Tarallo
Steve Olanoff
Christine Stickney
Dennis Crowley
Tom O'Rourke

MPO Staff/Central Transportation Planning Staff

Karl Quackenbush, Executive Director
Daniel Amstutz
Michael Callahan
Maureen Kelly
Robin Mannion
Anne McGahan
Efi Pagitsas
Sean Pfalzer
Pam Wolfe

Other Attendees

Roland Bartl	Town of Acton
Pam Beal	Kenmore Association
Paul Cantore	AEWM
Callida Cenizal	MassDOT Office of Transportation Planning
Michelle Consalvo	Boston University
Dennis Harrington	City of Quincy
Kristina Johnson	City of Quincy
Erin Kinahan	MassDOT District 6
David Knowlton	City of Salem
Timothy Kochan	MassDOT District 5
Ken Krause	Medford Resident
Jeff Lane	Town of Brookline
Rafael Mares	Conservation Law Foundation
Joe Onorato	MassDOT Highway
Chris Reilly	Town of Lincoln
Beth Rudolph	Town of Winchester
Sarkis Sarkisian	Town of Wayland
Rep. Carl Sciortino	State Representative
Steve Silveira	ML Strategies
Steven Smalley	Office of State Senator Thomas McGee