

# Memorandum for the Record

## Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization Meeting

### December 20, 2012 Meeting

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

Clinton Bench, 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 Draft Amendment Three of the federal fiscal years (FFYs) 2013-16 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) as amended
- approve the work program for the *Regional HOV-Lane Systems Planning Study, Phase 2* with the provision that staff will begin work on Task 1 and return to the MPO with a modified work program addressing the modeling tasks
- approve the minutes of the meeting of December 6

### Meeting Agenda

#### 1. Public Comments

There were none.

#### 2. Chair's Report—*Clinton Bench, MassDOT*

The Chair made several announcements:

Beverly Scott has started as the new General Manager of the MassDOT Rail and Transit Division.

The state legislature is expected to discuss solutions to the transportation system's deficit over the coming months.

The GreenDOT Implementation Plan is posted on MassDOT's website. Secretary Richard Davey has re-affirmed his commitment to GreenDOT. The plan outlines MassDOT's approach for ensuring that environmental considerations are a part of all stages of transportation projects.

In a new initiative, MassDOT is collaborating with the Institute for Transportation and Development Policy, and the Rockefeller and Barr Foundations to explore the potential for expansion of the bus rapid transit (BRT) system in the Greater Boston area. The Rockefeller foundation will fund the development of a BRT network plan that could potentially include an extension of the Silver Line to Chelsea.

### **3. Committee Chairs' Reports**

There were none.

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

At the Advisory Council's meeting of December 12, Dr. Stephanie Pollack of the Dukakis Center for Urban and Regional Policy at Northeastern University spoke on the topic of the "Future of Transit and Development in Greater Boston." Also, MPO staff members Mary Ellen Sullivan, Michelle Scott, and Sean Pfalzer provided updates on the schedules for the development of the FFY 2014 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) and the FFYs 2014-17 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).

The Advisory Council's Membership Committee met to discuss the MPO's recommendations to change the Advisory Council's bylaws.

The Advisory Council will meet next on January 9. A presentation on the South Station Development Project will be on the agenda.

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

There was none.

[Prior to taking up the action items, members agreed to change the order in which the agenda items were discussed.]

### **6. Transportation Improvement Program Amendment Three—*Sean Pfalzer, MPO Staff***

Members were provided with tables showing Draft Amendment Three of the FFYs 2013-16 TIP. Programmed in the amendment is \$1.025 million for a federal Veterans Transportation Community Living Initiative (VTCLI) grant for the MetroWest Regional Transit Authority (RTA). The grant will fund the development of a paratransit call center, including work stations, mobile data terminals for vehicles, and software for scheduling. The RTA will match the grant with RTA Capital Assistance Program (RTACAP) funds and toll credits.

The MPO received three comments during the public review period for this amendment from the MetroWest RTA, the 495/MetroWest Partnership, and State Representative David Linsky. All three comments expressed support for programming the VTCLI grant.

The MPO received another comment that pertains to the TIP from the Town of Saugus. The Board of Selectmen requested that the MPO program a project for the reconstruction of Route 1 in the FFYs 2013-16 TIP.

Dennis Giombetti, MetroWest Regional Collaborative (Town of Framingham), noted that representatives from the MetroWest RTA attended the last MPO meeting and provided the rationale for the VTCLI grant.

A motion to approve Draft Amendment Three of the FFYs 2013-16 TIP as presented was made by the MetroWest Regional Collaborative (Town of Framingham) (D. Giombetti), and seconded by the South Shore Coalition (Town of Braintree) (Christine Stickney).

Members discussed the motion.

C. Bench raised questions about the accounting for toll credit matching funds in the TIP tables and asked staff to identify the source of state funds that will match the VTCLI grant in the tables.

Lynn Ahlgren, MetroWest RTA, explained that the federal dollars for the VTCLI grant will be matched by RTA capital funds (\$25,000) and toll credits (\$231,250). While the toll credits do not contribute to the project's cost, they can be used as a match to allow the RTA to access the federal funds, she said.

C. Bench asked if the matching dollars were presented as shown in the TIP tables during the public review period. S. Pfalzer replied that staff was instructed to not include the toll credits in the draft amendment. Callida Cenizal, MassDOT, further explained that since toll credits are not actual funds, it is not possible to show them in the TIP tables without the credit amounts being added into the total project cost.

C. Bench directed staff to add the toll credit amounts to the "State Amount" column of the TIP tables while continuing to show the total project cost as \$1.025 million. He then asked the motion makers to amend the original motion to reflect this change. They agreed.

At a member's request, L. Ahlgren provided an overview of the project that the VTCLI grant would fund. The VTCLI program is a competitive federal grant program. The

MetroWest RTA was awarded one of 64 grants to develop a paratransit call center. Currently the RTA is leasing a building where the call center would be located. The grant will fund the build-out of work stations at that location as well as scheduling software and mobile data terminals for buses (which tells the driver the location of the next pick-up and logs the trip). The RTA has limited hours of operation and this new call center will allow the RTA to provide information about alternate transportation service options for customers.

C. Bench asked for confirmation that the grant funds would be directed only to equipment that is portable, given that the RTA does not own the building where the call center would be located. L. Ahlgren confirmed that all the equipment could be relocated and added that the federal grant is contingent upon the principle of Continuing Control of Assets, which disallows federal expenditures into assets that the receiving entity does not control.

In response to a question from Dennis Crowley, South West Advisory Planning Committee (Town of Medway), L. Ahlgren explained that the grant money may only be accessed by the RTA (and does not affect MPO target funds).

C. Bench noted that the MassDOT Rail and Transit Division must help the RTA implement this project. L. Ahlgren added that the MassDOT staff have been involved with the project for over a year and have provided financing to ensure that the leased building is up to code. She expressed appreciation for MassDOT's support of the state's RTAs.

Members then voted on the amended motion – to approve Draft Amendment Three of the FFYs 2013-16 TIP with a change to the TIP tables to incorporate the amount of toll credits applied to the state match. The motion carried.

## **7. Report: Screening Regional Express Highways for Possible Preferential Lane Implementation—*Karl Quackenbush, Executive Director, Central Transportation Planning Staff, and Bill Kuttner, MPO Staff***

K. Quackenbush introduced the report on the study, *Screening Regional Express Highways for Possible Preferential Lane Implementation*. The MPO approved this scope of work in the summer of 2011. The objective of the study was to screen the region's express highways to determine where High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) treatments might be suitable.

HOV lanes are a means to increase highway capacity by encouraging people to use higher occupancy modes. The HOV lanes on the Southeast Expressway, for example, carry anywhere from 170 to 230 people to every 100 people carried on the parallel general purpose lanes at peak hours.

Building an HOV lane on an express highway would admittedly be an expensive undertaking. The MPO staff spends considerable time analyzing less expensive responses to congestion in the region; however, regardless of current fiscal conditions, it is the job of planners to spend at least a modicum of time examining the potential for longer-term, higher-cost actions to reduce congestion and enhance mobility. This is one such effort.

B. Kuttner then gave a PowerPoint presentation on the report. The study was conducted in light of the fact that freeway congestion is a problem in the region, while no new freeways are being planned and lane additions are only being added in select locations. As “preferential lanes” can relieve congestion, this study examined where these lanes might be appropriate on the freeway system.

Preferential lanes offer a higher level of service than their associated general purpose lanes. Vehicles that may be eligible to use preferential lanes in the United States include carpools, buses, or “green” vehicles. Some preferential lanes are high-occupancy and toll (HOT) lanes.

In conducting this study, staff assumed that preferential lanes will be new construction, as converting existing lanes would add to congestion problems on general purpose lanes. Staff also assumed the following: 1,500 vehicles per hour would use a preferential lane; the lanes would operate as single, reversible lanes; the lanes would be wide enough to include breakdown and enforcement areas; design criteria may require land takings; and lane eligibility criteria may change.

To conduct the analysis, staff divided the highway system into major components and identified congested segments (based on weekday traffic per lane, peak-hour traffic per lane, slowest peak-period speed, and duration that the segment is substantially full). The segments were then screened to determine if the addition of preferential lanes would result in benefits to users. Staff identified right-of-way and construction issues that might be associated with adding preferential lanes in those areas.

In closing, B. Kuttner identified promising locations for preferential lane treatments on a map of the region. The Interstate 93 corridor offers the clearest benefits. Many sections would need a wider right-of-way. In the second phase of the study (which members

voted on later in this meeting), staff proposes to conduct further study on the section of Interstate 93 from Methuen to Medford.

Members discussed the study.

Laura Wiener, At-Large Town of Arlington, inquired as to whether there is evidence to show that preferential lanes increase carpooling, and she noted that it would be useful to have this information to see if the availability of those lanes actually changes travel behavior. This study did not address that question. K. Quackenbush noted, however, that some drivers will shift to carpooling if these lanes are available, and that a good bus system operating on an HOV lane will produce a mode shift. Some travelers will make routing changes, rather than shift travel modes, to take advantage of the preferential lanes. He noted that the new Statewide Household Travel Survey data will help answer L. Wiener's question.

D. Giombetti asked if the study addressed the issue of the bottleneck that occurs at the entrance of the Central Artery Tunnel, since the HOV lane does not go through the tunnel. B. Kuttner replied that the issue was discussed when the Central/Artery Tunnel was being designed, however there is little room in the tunnel to revisit the issue now. He noted that the most important issue that needs to be studied has to do with where motorists will be entering and exiting the HOV lane system. Staff could use model-based techniques to understand that issue.

Richard Canale, At-Large Town of Lexington, noted that while the region has a good radial transit system serving Boston, there are fewer transit options for moving across municipalities in the Route 128 area. He noted that the 128 Business Council had a plan to provide shuttle service from Anderson Regional Transportation Center, but it failed because there were no preferential lanes on Route 128 for buses. He asked B. Kuttner to further discuss HOV lanes for carpoolers and buses. B. Kuttner explained that intercity buses are an important supplement to the commuter rail system and these buses would be beneficiaries of preferential lane systems. Buses offer the added benefit of removing more cars from the highways. This study did not examine the possibility of buses using roadway shoulders.

Eric Bourassa, Metropolitan Area Planning Council (MAPC), expressed the need to facilitate express bus service in the region, which is also of interest of fellow MPOs. He asked about how many access and exit points would be needed if the HOV system were expanded on Interstate 93. B. Kuttner replied that this question would be examined in the second phase of the study.

S. Olanoff noted that this study has reached an important conclusion as it has demonstrated that there is no overall benefit from replacing a general purpose lane with a preferential lane in this region. Members then discussed the use of HOV lanes in other states. K. Quackenbush noted that enforcement is an issue in the use of some kinds of these lanes. This study did not address the variety of HOV treatment types available. It did, however, show the difficulty in implementing HOV lanes.

C. Bench asked if any highway segments were excluded from the recommendations due to issues associated with traffic weaving or access. B. Kuttner noted that the study contains a list of potential segments studied. These locations were narrowed down based on right-of-way needs and other issues, and with consideration for how a preferential lane in a particular location would work with the existing preferential lane system.

C. Bench asked whether any segments were identified where there is enough excess capacity that marking an existing lane as an HOV lane would not impact congestion or air quality. B. Kuttner replied that the option of removing a general purpose lane at peak travel hours in the direction of heaviest traffic was not considered because it would increase congestion. Removal of a lane in the opposite direction would require the use of a zipper machine. Only one segment was identified where this would be possible.

D. Crowley expressed concern about spending MPO dollars on the second phase of the project given the possibility that the study may produce a recommendation to build an HOV system on the northern portion of Interstate 93, which would be too expensive to implement. He suggested that staff make a rough estimate of the potential cost of such a project. K. Quackenbush replied that the second phase of the project would include cost estimates. He noted that about only six percent of the funds programmed for studies in the UPWP were used on the first phase of the project, and if approved, only about ten percent of study funds from the FFY 2013 UPWP would be used on the second phase. He also noted the value of such studies both in the MPO's long-range planning process and as a reference that can be used by MassDOT Highway Division's designers. (The MPO study titled *Improving the Southeast Expressway: A Conceptual Plan* is currently being used by MassDOT, for instance.)

Members then heard comments from members of the public.

Wig Zamore, Somerville resident, commented on the members' discussion and noted that enforcement of HOV lanes should be possible in the region.

Rafael Mares, Conservation Law Foundation, commented that several pieces of information are missing from these types of studies: the assumptions used to determine

whether people will change their travel behavior to use carpools; air quality impacts; and greenhouse gas emissions impacts. He noted that future phases of this study would benefit from including those policy considerations.

**8. Work Program for Regional HOV-Lane Systems Planning Study, Phase 2—Karl Quackenbush, Executive Director, Central Transportation Planning Staff, and Bill Kuttner, MPO Staff**

K. Quackenbush introduced the work program for *Regional HOV-Lane Systems Planning Study, Phase 2*. This study would be the second phase of the work B. Kuttner reported on (in Agenda Item 7). It would examine the most promising highway segments identified in the first phase as potential candidates for preferential lane treatments – on Interstate 93 north to the New Hampshire border – and lay out conceptual designs for a preferential lane system. Means of ingress and egress to the lanes would be studied using model data.

Consideration would also be given to adjacent land areas that would be affected by the addition of preferential lanes, locations where the highway would have to be widened, and bridges that would need to be reconstructed. General construction costs would be assigned to these elements. The study may also examine transit interactions.

This nine-month study would be funded by the MPO.

Members discussed the work program.

C. Bench asked whether staff intends to address the items raised by R. Mares during the discussion in Agenda Item 7. K. Quackenbush replied that staff should be able to incorporate modeling into the work program to shed some light on the potential for mode shift and air quality impacts.

C. Bench asked about staff's intended timeline for the project and whether modeling could be incorporated into the project. K. Quackenbush replied that staff intends to begin work on the project as soon as it is approved by the MPO. Scott Peterson, MPO staff, added that staff could incorporate model runs into the project. The runs would focus on the peak travel period and assume that the HOV-lane would require vehicles with two passengers.

C. Bench outlined the three options available to the members: 1) delay approval of the work program; 2) approve the work program as presented; or 3) approve the work program with the provision that staff will begin work on Task 1 and return to the MPO with a modified work program addressing the modeling tasks.



A motion to approve the work program for *Regional HOV-Lane Systems Planning Study, Phase 2* with the provision that staff will begin work on Task 1 and return to the MPO with a modified work program addressing the modeling tasks was made by the MassDOT Highway Division (John Romano), and seconded by the Advisory Council (S. Olanoff).

During the discussion of this motion, D. Crowley asked if the cost of the work program would remain \$59,000 with the addition of modeling tasks. C. Bench replied that this action would only authorize staff to begin work on Task 1. D. Crowley recommended delaying action on the motion until the work program is finalized.

S. Olanoff expressed the Advisory Council's support for this work and noted that the cost of the study is relatively small. He then asked if the study would consider adding ramps to the highway or at-grade access only. B. Kuttner replied that at-grade access would be more appropriate due to sensitivity to costs and distance from the urban core. C. Bench expressed MassDOT's concurrence with this approach.

A motion to close debate and move the motion was made by the South Shore Coalition (Town of Braintree) (C. Stickney), and seconded by MAPC (E. Bourassa). The motion carried.

Members voted on the original motion: to approve the work program for *Regional HOV-Lane Systems Planning Study, Phase 2* with the provision that staff will begin work on Task 1 and return to the MPO with a modified work program addressing the modeling tasks. The motion carried. The South West Advisory Planning Committee (Town of Medway) (D. Crowley) was opposed.

### **9. Meeting Minutes—Maureen Kelly, MPO Staff**

A motion to approve the minutes of the meeting of December 6 was made by the At-Large Town of Arlington (L. Wiener), and seconded by MAPC (E. Bourassa). The motion carried. The Inner Core Committee (City of Somerville) (T. Bent) abstained.

### **10. Updates to TIP Criteria—Sean Pfalzer, MPO Staff**

Members were provided with a memorandum titled, *Review of the TIP Evaluation Criteria*, and a document showing staff's proposed changes to the MPO's TIP evaluation criteria.

S. Pfalzer gave a PowerPoint presentation and discussed the project evaluation process, which is one step in the development of the TIP document. The evaluation process serves to determine which projects will advance the MPO's vision and policies. The evaluation criteria address the following policy topics:

- System Preservation, Modernization, and Efficiency
- Livability and Economic Benefit
- Mobility
- Environment and Climate Change
- Environmental Justice
- Safety and Security

Staff generally re-examines the evaluation criteria it uses every year. Consideration is given to the following: the performance of the criteria; comments received from the public regarding the criteria; opportunities to improve the criteria; and updates necessary due to changes in legislation (MAP-21).

S. Pfalzer then discussed the outcomes of the evaluation process over the past two TIP cycles when staff evaluated 48 projects. A project has the potential to score 153 points. The highest score received by a project was 98 points and the lowest was 32 points. The average score was 64.3 points.

S. Pfalzer showed graphics depicting scores as related to policy categories. Projects tend to score the highest percentage of points under the System Preservation, Modernization, and Efficiency category. The reason for this is that many projects involved improvements to pavement condition, signals, and traffic operations.

Fewer projects tend to be eligible to score points under the Environmental Justice category, although five projects were awarded points in the past two TIP cycles. Staff is considering increasing outreach to environmental justice communities to ensure that projects that benefit those communities are being advanced. Staff is also considering expanding the geographic scope used to determine if a project is eligible to receive points under the Environmental Justice category. Currently, staff uses a buffer of one-quarter mile around a project to determine if the project impacts an environmental justice community. Staff is proposing to expand that buffer to one-half mile within the urban core and one mile outside the urban core.

Members discussed this portion of the presentation.

Tom Kadzis, City of Boston, asked whether the MBTA's service coverage standard has changed. C. Bench replied that it has not changed.

C. Bench asked if staff is proposing changes to the evaluation criteria. S. Pfalzer replied that staff is recommending changing the buffer used to determine if a project is eligible to earn points under the Environmental Justice category.

Joe Cosgrove, MBTA, suggested that the eligibility for receiving environmental justice points should be based on a determination of the populations that are benefiting from a particular project. He noted that the evaluation should be project specific as a particular project could have a broader impact than the area within the buffer. S. Pfalzer stated that staff uses the buffer as an initial threshold and then examines each project to determine if it has a benefit or negative impact to an environmental justice community.

C. Bench expressed concern that making the buffer larger would result in the entire City of Boston being considered under the Environmental Justice category, without having made the effort to understand the needs of specific environmental justice communities within the city.

E. Bourassa agreed and noted that the one-mile buffer is too large an area, and that having a larger buffer may result in rewarding projects that are not actually benefiting environmental justice areas. He suggested that a half mile buffer would be more appropriate.

S. Olanoff noted that the buffer should be the last consideration while project benefits and burdens should be considered first.

J. Cosgrove suggested that project planners should provide staff with information regarding the benefits and burdens that would affect environmental justice communities for use in the evaluations.

E. Bourassa noted that the evaluation criteria for this category are not solely based on location, but also on whether the project has a benefit to the community.

D. Crowley noted that having the environmental justice category in the evaluation criteria creates a benefit in the scoring system for projects in urban areas over those in suburban areas. S. Pfalzer confirmed that the majority of transportation analysis zones (TAZs) that are in environmental justice areas are in the Inner Core subregion. P. Wolfe added that changing the buffer to one-mile would be beneficial for projects in environmental justice areas in suburban areas. T. Bent noted that most negative impacts from transportation occur in the urban core.

R. Canale suggested keeping the buffer at one-quarter mile but adding language to the evaluation criteria to specify that a project could be eligible to receive environmental justice points if it falls within the buffer or if the project affects an environmental justice area.

Following this discussion, S. Pfalzer continued with his presentation. He discussed issues that have been raised regarding the existing evaluation criteria. One is that the criteria favors densely settled urban areas. Staff conducted an analysis that revealed that projects in the Inner Core do as a whole score higher than those in regional urban centers, maturing suburbs, and developing suburbs. Charts were shown that depicted the project ratings in relation to community type and MPO policy categories. Projects in the Inner Core scored higher, but this outcome is consistent with MPO goals for maintaining state of good repair, increasing transit ridership, reducing automobile dependency, investing in activity centers, and providing equitable access to the transportation system for low-income and minority populations.

Staff examined geographic equity as well by comparing regional employment, population, vehicle miles traveled, and TIP target funding across community types. Of the projects that have been evaluated over the past two years, the largest percentage of TIP target funding has gone to regional urban centers.

Another issue raised about the evaluation criteria is that it does not capture economic development benefits of projects. Projects may receive up to 17 points under the economic development portion of the evaluation criteria; however, the average project receives a score of 5.4. In reviewing these criteria, staff determined that one criterion, which awards points to projects that serve a targeted redevelopment site (Chapter 43D), is too narrowly defined. Staff is proposing to broaden the definition to capture other priority development areas, as determined by the Executive Office of Housing and Economic Development and MAPC (for example, 40R, 43D, Regionally Significant Priority Development Area, Growth District Initiative, or eligible MBTA transit station areas). Staff is also proposing to modify the criteria to recognize projects that are consistent with the compact growth strategies of MAPC's MetroFuture plan.

The last issue regards the criteria's ability to differentiate among shared-use path projects. A chart was shown that depicted the small variation in scores received by shared-use path projects, due to lack of data to evaluate such projects. To address this problem staff is working to gather trail usage and crash data, and to better understand the role these projects play in reducing greenhouse gas emissions. Staff is also conducting the Bicycle Network Evaluation study to identify gaps in the trail system. Also, staff is proposing to add a criterion to recognize projects identified in MassDOT's Bay State Greenway Priority 100 plan.

The evaluation criteria may also have to be adjusted to address requirements in MAP-21 to incorporate performance measures. States will be required to develop performance measures for the following categories: safety, infrastructure condition,

congestion reduction, system reliability, freight movement and economic vitality, environmental sustainability, and reduced project delivery delays.

Members then discussed this information.

D. Giombetti asked staff to provide the average project rating for projects excluding those in the Inner Core.

C. Stickney requested that staff provide the maps that were shown in the PowerPoint presentation.

Members discussed whether the MPO would have to vote to approve staff recommended changes to the evaluation criteria. C. Bench noted that the MPO will need to approve the changes. P. Wolfe added that staff would appreciate the MPO's concurrence by late January in order to incorporate the new criteria when evaluating proposed TIP projects in February.

E. Bourassa noted that, in addition to the project evaluation scores, staff also considers project cost and geographic distribution of resources when developing the staff recommendation for the TIP.

D. Crowley raised the idea of having staff hold a workshop on the topic of the evaluation criteria. Members did not make a decision to hold a workshop, however. C. Bench and K. Quackenbush noted that members are always welcome to discuss such topics with staff.

R. Canale suggested that the MPO incorporate evaluation criteria that give communities an incentive to work with neighboring communities on corridor plans and projects.

Members then heard comments from members of the public.

R. Mares asked how well the evaluation criteria work for evaluating projects for non-highway modes. S. Pfalzer replied that evaluating projects for non-motorized modes and major highway investments are challenging, and that major highway projects are generally discussed in the context of the Long-Range Transportation Plan.

W. Zamore offered comments regarding the consideration of health and environmental justice impacts of transportation projects and policies. He cautioned that implementing Complete Streets policies can pose a risk to bicyclists who may be more exposed to vehicle emissions. He also advised the MPO to consider the effect of black carbon emissions from vehicles in its planning. Black carbon is a carcinogen. Lastly, he

discussed the benefits of pedestrian and bicycle facilities for environmental justice communities as well as projects that have synergy with transit services.

### **11. State Implementation Plan Update—Steve Woelfel, MPO Staff**

S. Woelfel provided an update on the projects in the State Implementation Plan (SIP).

MassDOT has submitted its annual SIP report. Public comments are due in January.

Construction work is continuing on the *Fairmount Line Improvement* project.

MassDOT has met its requirement to create 1,000 new parking spaces at transit stations through the *Construction of 1,000 New Parking Spaces* project.

The Department of Environmental Protection is expected to take action on MassDOT's request to amend the SIP to remove the obligation to design the *Red Line – Blue Line Connector* project.

On December 11 there was a groundbreaking for the first phase of the construction of the *Green Line Extension* project. New cost estimates for the project are being developed. MassDOT has been approved to use the Construction Manager/General Contractor (CM/GC) project delivery approach.

### **12. Members Items**

There were none.

### **13. Adjourn**

A motion to adjourn was made by MAPC (E. Bourassa) and seconded by the Inner Core Committee (City of Somerville) (T. Bent). The motion carried.

## Attendance

---

### Members

### Representatives and Alternates

---

At-Large City (City of Newton)	David Koses
At-Large Town (Town of Arlington)	Laura Wiener
At-Large Town (Town of Lexington)	Richard Canale
City of Boston (Boston Redevelopment Authority)	Lara Mérida
City of Boston (Boston Transportation Department)	Jim Gillooly
	Tom Kadzis
Inner Core Committee (City of Somerville)	Tom Bent
Massachusetts Department of Transportation	Clinton Bench
	Marie Rose
MassDOT Highway Division	John Romano
Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority (MBTA)	Joe Cosgrove
Metropolitan Area Planning Council	Eric Bourassa
	Eric Halvorsen
MetroWest Regional Collaborative (Town of Framingham)	Dennis Giombetti
Minuteman Advisory Group on Interlocal Coordination (Town of Bedford)	Richard Reed
North Shore Task Force (City of Beverly)	Denise Deschamps
Regional Transportation Advisory Council	Steve Olanoff
South Shore Coalition (Town of Braintree)	Christine Stickney
South West Advisory Planning Committee (Town of Medway)	Dennis Crowley

---

---

<b>Other Attendees</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>
Lynn Ahlgren	MetroWest Regional Transit Authority
Rafael Bezerra	Insurance Agent
Sarah Bradbury	MassDOT District 3
Callida Cenizal	MassDOT Office of Transportation Planning
Todd Fontanella	Merrimack Valley Planning Commission
Tony Komornick	Merrimack Valley Planning Commission
Rafael Mares	Conservation Law Foundation
David Montgomery	Regional Transportation Advisory Council / Needham
Joe Onorato	MassDOT Highway Division
Amanda Richard	Office of State Senator McGee
Steve Woelfel	MassDOT
Wig Zamore	Mystic View Task Force / Somerville Transportation Equity Partnership

---

---

**MPO Staff/Central Transportation Planning Staff**

---

Karl Quackenbush, Executive Director  
Daniel Amstutz  
David Fargen  
Maureen Kelly  
Bill Kuttner  
Robin Mannion  
Anne McGahan  
Scott Peterson  
Sean Pfalzer  
Michelle Scott  
Pam Wolfe

---