

# Memorandum for the Record

## Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization Meeting

### January 17, 2013 Meeting

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

Ned Codd, 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:

- submit a letter of support for MassDOT's proposal to the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) for a climate change adaptation pilot project
- approve revisions to the work program for the *Regional HOV-Lane Systems Planning Study, Phase 2*
- approve the project evaluation criteria for the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) as amended today (details are included in the body of this document)
- approve two work programs: *FFY 2012-13 I-93 North and Southeast Expressway HOV Lane Monitoring and Modeling Support for MassDOT EIS for the I-93/I-95 Interchange Improvements*
- approve the minutes of the meeting of December 20
- approve of the MPO chair signing certifications and assurances related to the MPO's compliance with Title VI and submit the Update to the MPO's Title VI report to MassDOT

### Meeting Agenda

#### 1. Public Comments

Lynn Weissman, Friends of the Community Path, advocated for the need for financing for an unfunded portion of the *Community Path* project near the Fitchburg rail tracks. Referring to maps of the proposed path, she pointed out that the path would serve densely populated areas in East Somerville, including environmental justice areas and will eventually link to the Charles River Path and other bicycle facilities in Boston and beyond.

She discussed the importance of funding and building the path in conjunction with the phasing of the *Green Line Extension* project as both projects would share a corridor and

infrastructure. Constructing the path in conjunction with the Green Line would result in significant cost savings and future construction impact reductions. She also addressed the benefits of the path. It would provide pedestrian and bicycle access to future Green Line stations that will not have parking facilities.

As one of the projects identified in the Bay State Greenway Priority 100 plan, the path would help achieve the state's mode shift goals. She asked that the MPO does not pit shared-use path projects against one another when evaluating them.

Eric Bourassa, Metropolitan Area Planning Council (MAPC), raised a question regarding the specifics of the request being made by the Friends of the Community Path. L. Weissman explained that the Friends would like the missing portion of the path to be funded however possible, and expressed the idea of funding the design and construction via the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). She emphasized that it could be prohibitive to build that section of the path after the *Green Line Extension* is constructed, and she noted that the path crossing would provide emergency access to the Green Line Viaduct.

Tom Bent, Inner Core Committee (City of Somerville), added that alternatives for this section of the path have been vetted and noted that it would be important to construct the path along with the *Green Line Extension*.

## **2. Chair's Report—Ned Codd, MassDOT**

N. Codd raised two topics during the Chair's Report: the Patrick Administration's plan for transportation financing and a funding opportunity for a climate change adaptation project.

### ***Transportation Financing***

N. Codd discussed a new report released by MassDOT that was prepared as a mandate of the state legislature. *The Way Forward: A 21<sup>st</sup> Century Transportation Plan* outlines the funding challenges facing the state's transportation system and proposes financing options to address those needs.

The report gives an overview of the reforms and money saving initiatives that have been implemented at MassDOT, and it discusses challenges of a funding shortfall that has implications for maintaining the existing system and for delivering on transportation priorities to support a 21<sup>st</sup> century economy. The report also lays out options for raising revenue for the transportation system and what those options would mean for residents and the system. Additional revenue could enable MassDOT to work on improving project delivery and design, as the agency did when implementing the Accelerated Bridge Program.

The subject matter of the report was prominent in Governor Patrick's State of the Commonwealth address on January 16. The Governor discussed the transportation system's role in terms of economic development and quality of life.

N. Codd asked members and attendees to review the report and other reform resources on MassDOT's website and convey their views to their elected officials.

Members then discussed the report and its proposals.

Ed Tarallo, North Suburban Planning Council (City of Woburn), asked the Chair to discuss potential structural reforms to MPOs that might result from the proposal, which included reference to additional study and future recommendations regarding MPOs. N. Codd replied that the legislature has mandated a review of MPO structure and potential reforms. MassDOT views this as an opportunity to review the structure of MPOs in the state relative to each other and to other MPOs in the nation, to evaluate the criteria used to prioritize transportation projects, and to consider how policy changes should be reflected in the criteria. Any proposals to change the MPO structure would be discussed in a public forum.

Dennis Crowley, South West Advisory Planning Committee (Town of Medway), remarked that the Governor's proposal, which would invest \$13 billion in the transportation system over ten years, would double the amount of Chapter 90 monies directed to municipalities. He noted that the Chapter 90 monies would represent only 8% of the proposed plan and suggested that the amount of revenues directed to municipalities should be higher. N. Codd confirmed that the proposal would direct approximately 8% of revenues for Chapter 90. The proposal would also provide revenue for the MBTA and other regional transit authorities, and for the state and federal roadway and bridge system, he said.

Dennis Giombetti, MetroWest Regional Collaborative (Town of Framingham), inquired about how the list of projects named in the proposed plan was identified. He reported that he has been hearing concerns from people who believe that there are other projects, not named in the plan, which should be prioritized as well. N. Codd replied that the projects named in the plan are the major transportation priorities of the Patrick Administration. These projects include the *Green Line Extension*, *South Coast Rail*, *South Station Expansion*, and passenger rail improvements.

Paul Regan, MBTA Advisory Board, stated that the plan also calls for investments of nearly \$8 billion over the next ten years in state-of-good-repair for the highway and transit systems and to reduce MassDOT's reliance on debt financing. N. Codd added that the additional revenue generated by measures outlined in the proposal would

enable MassDOT to address the state's decaying infrastructure in a cost-effective manner in much the same manner as the Accelerated Bridge Program enabled MassDOT to get ahead in the process of rehabilitating and reconstructing structurally deficient bridges. He emphasized that the list of projects named in the plan is not an exhaustive list of the transportation needs that would be addressed. D. Giombetti suggested that the state emphasize that message.

E. Bourassa commended MassDOT and its Office of Transportation Planning for the plan noting that the agency did a good job of identifying projects while not creating an exhaustive list. He encouraged members to bring the report back to their municipalities. MAPC has been hosting forums to start the conversation on this issue and have heard from local officials that they are supportive of the proposed increase in Chapter 90 monies. D. Crowley reiterated that more than 8% of the revenues should be directed to Chapter 90.

#### ***Climate Change Adaption Pilot Project***

N. Codd reported that MassDOT is applying for a grant offered by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) that would enable MassDOT to conduct a climate change adaptation pilot project. The proposed project would study potential storm surge impacts on the Central Artery Tunnel system in Boston. A draft of MassDOT's proposal was distributed to members. MassDOT is requesting that the MPO prepare a letter of support to accompany its application.

Steve Miller, MassDOT Environmental Services, is the project manager for the proposed pilot. He provided information on the inception of the project, which developed out of MassDOT staff's concerns (heightened in the wake of Hurricane Sandy) of the potential impact of storm surge flooding on the Central Artery Tunnel system. He drew members' attention to a map – prepared by the Boston Harbor Association – that depicts areas in downtown Boston that could potentially be flooded as a result of a five foot storm surge. There is a concern that the tunnel system could be inundated.

MassDOT views the FHWA solicitation as an opportunity to assess the tunnel's vulnerability and develop adaptation measures, as well as position Massachusetts as a leader in climate change adaptation. The project will gather scientists, engineers, and planners to assess potential impacts and develop strategies for adaptation.

Members then discussed the proposal.

John Romano, MassDOT Highway Division, expressed that the MPO should support this project.

Jim Gillooly, City of Boston, thanked MassDOT for taking on the project. He noted that the city's Environment Department was aware of the FHWA solicitation, and he offered MassDOT the services of the city's Environment Department and the Boston Redevelopment Authority as the project is conducted. He remarked that during Hurricane Sandy, there was flooding alongside the Fort Point Channel and adjacent properties.

S. Miller noted that MassDOT is required to work with stakeholders, which would include the MPO, the City of Boston, FHWA, and others. N. Codd added that the pilot project ties in with the work that the MPO has done in this area.

A motion for the MPO to submit a letter of support for MassDOT's proposal to FHWA to conduct a climate change adaptation pilot project was made by the MBTA Advisory Board (P. Regan), and seconded by the MassDOT Highway Division (J. Romano). The motion carried.

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

There were none.

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

The Advisory Council met on January 9. The meeting featured a presentation on the *South Station Expansion* project by Matt Ciborowski, MassDOT, and a presentation on the MPO's Technical Assistance studies by Seth Asante, MPO staff.

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

Members were presented with a revised work program for the *Regional HOV-Lane Systems Planning Study, Phase 2*. At the meeting of December 20, members gave approval to staff to begin work on the first task of the work program and asked staff to see if issues pertaining to travel behavior and environmental impacts could also be addressed. K. Quackenbush reported that staff had since revised the work program to include a modeling task that addresses those issues and has integrated the modeling costs into the budget.

A motion to approve the revisions to the work program for the *Regional HOV-Lane Systems Planning Study, Phase 2* was made by the Inner Core Committee (City of Somerville) (T. Bent) and seconded by the North Suburban Planning Council (City of Woburn) (E. Tarallo). The motion carried.

Also at a previous meeting, members requested a breakdown of TIP funding by project by subregion. Staff distributed tables showing funding to subregions for federal fiscal years (FFYs) 2008-16 broken down by target funding and highway funding programs, and by project category and project. K. Quackenbush suggested that staff contact Sean Pflazer, MPO staff, if they have questions.

Michael Chong, FHWA, inquired if the funding analysis showed disparities in investments across subregions. K. Quackenbush replied that some subregions received more funding than others in certain categories but declined to offer an opinion on whether actual disparities were evident.

D. Giombetti thanked staff for preparing these materials.

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

Members were provided with a memorandum, titled *Review of the TIP Project Evaluation Criteria*, and a document listing the evaluation or scoring system for TIP projects. These documents show the changes to the TIP evaluation criteria that staff proposed and presented at the meeting of December 20.

S. Pfalzer summarized the proposed changes. Staff proposes to change the size of the geographic buffer used to determine if projects are eligible to receive points under the Environmental Justice category from a quarter-mile to a half-mile, and to credit projects outside the buffer that have benefits to environmental justice areas. Members were given a map depicting traffic analysis zones (TAZs) that contain environmental justice communities.

Staff also proposed to revise the Livability criteria to credit projects that contribute to compact growth strategies as defined in MAPC's MetroFuture plan, and to credit projects identified in MassDOT's Bay State Greenway Priority 100 plan. Members were given maps depicting transit stations and development sites that would be used to determine if a project is eligible to score under the Livability criteria. These locations include designated priority development areas, and Chapter 40R, 43D, and 43E districts.

Jim Gillooly, City of Boston, inquired as to how staff would determine if a project is beneficial to an environmental justice community if the project is not in a TAZ that contains an environmental justice area. S. Pfalzer explained that staff would use data from project proponents and functional design reports to make the determination.

S. Pfalzer then reported that, at members' request, staff has included figures on page 8 of the memorandum of average project rating for projects that are not in the Inner Core subregion. The average project rating for the Inner Core subregion is 78.7 points, while the average rating for non-Inner Core projects is 61 points. The average project rating for all projects is 64.3 points.

Members discussed the proposed changes to the TIP evaluation criteria.

E. Tarallo raised concerns about adding points for projects that are in the Bay State Greenway Priority 100 plan. He noted that those points would be earned under the category of reducing auto dependency, whereas trail projects may serve recreational purpose.

S. Pfalzer responded that the additional points will help to differentiate between trail projects. He also noted that when developing the Bay State Greenway Priority 100 plan MassDOT prioritized trails that would serve as transportation facilities connecting urban areas and downtown centers. E. Bourassa also emphasized that the idea behind adding points was to be able to draw distinctions between similar trail projects.

E. Tarallo expressed concern that projects in the Bay State Greenway Priority 100 plan would then get a disproportionately large score in the Livability category compared to other projects.

Dennis Crowley, South West Advisory Planning Committee (Town of Medway), asked staff to provide documentation (if readily available) by municipality on the data behind Figure 5 in the memorandum, a chart that compares the region's employment, population, daily vehicle miles travelled, and TIP funding.

A motion to approve the staff recommended changes to the TIP evaluation criteria was made by the MassDOT Highway Division (J. Romano), and seconded by MAPC (E. Bourassa).

E. Tarallo suggested amending the motion to reduce the number of points given to a project identified in the Bay State Greenway Priority 100 plan from two points to one point. The motion makers agreed to the amendment.

A motion to amend the TIP evaluation criteria to reduce the points awarded to a project identified in the Bay State Greenway Priority 100 plan from two points to one point, was made by MAPC (E. Bourassa), and seconded by the South West Advisory Planning Committee (Town of Medway) (D. Crowley). The motion carried. The following members

voted no: City of Boston (J. Gillooly and Tom Kadzis) and the Inner Core Committee (City of Somerville) (T. Bent).

A motion to approve the TIP criteria as amended today was made by the MassDOT Highway Division (J. Romano), and seconded by MAPC (E. Bourassa). The motion carried.

## **7. Work Programs—Karl Quackenbush, Executive Director, Central Transportation Planning Staff**

K. Quackenbush presented two new work programs that are summarized below.

### ***FFY 2012-13 I-93 North and Southeast Expressway HOV Lane Monitoring***

Each year the MPO staff collects data on travel times and vehicle occupancies on the Interstate 93 North and Southeast Expressway HOV lanes and associated general purpose lanes for MassDOT, which must report these data to the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection. The work program for the *FFY 2012-13 I-93 North and Southeast Expressway HOV Lane Monitoring* represents the data collection work that will take place for the period January through September 2013.

This work program follows a work program that the MPO approved in September 2012. At that time the MPO approved staff to conduct the data collection for the first quarter of FFY 2013 (October through December 2012), while staff addressed questions regarding possible alternative means to collect data. Staff resolved to continue collecting data as it has been doing, by having field staff record travel times by driving the expressways.

A motion to approve the work program for the *FFY 2012-13 I-93 North and Southeast Expressway HOV Lane Monitoring* was made by the City of Boston (J. Gillooly), and seconded by the MBTA Advisory Board (P. Regan). The motion carried.

### ***Modeling Support for MassDOT EIS for the I-93/I-95 Interchange Improvements Project North of Boston***

The work program for *Modeling Support for MassDOT EIS for the I-93/I-95 Interchange Improvements* represents travel modeling services that CTPS will provide to MassDOT as that agency examines alternatives for the design of a new interchange at Interstates 93 and 95 in Woburn. The interchange is extremely congested and has one of the worst crash records in the state.

CTPS provided modeling services for earlier MassDOT planning efforts for this interchange, including a conceptual design study and a more detailed planning study, and will now provide modeling services as MassDOT considers refined and possibly new alternatives for the interchange design.



The tasks will involve collecting traffic data, conducting a license plate survey to help refine modeled travel patterns, developing travel forecasts, preparing land use scenarios, and conducting travel modeling for several design alternatives, as well as one that includes an HOV lane and another consisting of transit improvements. The products will include estimates of traffic volumes and transit ridership under the various scenarios, an environmental justice analysis, an air quality assessment, and a health impact assessment.

Members discussed the work program.

S. Olanoff inquired about the license plate survey. K. Quackenbush noted that CTPS has conducted license plate surveys for other studies, but not for earlier studies of this particular interchange.

S. Olanoff asked if this study would relate to the work program for the *Regional HOV-Lane Systems Planning Study, Phase 2*. K. Quackenbush replied that the two studies both involve an HOV lane on I-93 and that the two efforts will be coordinated. CTPS does not yet know what the HOV lane to be modeled in the I-93/I-95 Interchange Study will consist of.

S. Olanoff noted that design alternatives already exist for the interchange and asked if more alternatives would be developed. K. Quackenbush explained that CTPS may be asked to study variants of those designs or perhaps new designs. It will also be necessary to update land use projections and changes to the transportation system that have occurred since modeling was last done on the interchange. For this new effort, CTPS will be providing a wider array of model outputs than in previous studies.

K. Quackenbush then responded to questions from the public.

Rafael Mares, Conservation Law Foundation, asked for more details about what the air quality analysis would entail (and what emissions would not be included) and whether it would account for demand that improvements to the intersection might induce (including changes to travel behavior such as mode or route changes). K. Quackenbush replied that the multi-modal regional model is designed to account for such changes in travel behavior. The air quality analysis accounts for ozone precursors, carbon monoxide, particulates, and greenhouse gases. The software used for the analysis (MOVES) does not yet, however, account for black carbon emissions.

A motion to approve the work program for *Modeling Support for MassDOT EIS for the I-93/I-95 Interchange Improvements* was made by the MBTA Advisory Board (P. Regan),

and seconded by North Suburban Planning Council (City of Woburn) (E. Tarallo). The motion carried.

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

A motion to approve the minutes of the meeting of December 20 was made by the MetroWest Regional Collaborative (Town of Framingham) (D. Giombetti), and seconded by the Advisory Council (S. Olanoff). The motion carried. The following members abstained: North Suburban Planning Council (City of Woburn) (E. Tarallo); MBTA Advisory Board (P. Regan); and At-Large City (City of Everett) (James Errickson).

### **9. MPO Title VI Report Update—*Alicia Wilson, MPO Staff***

A. Wilson gave a PowerPoint presentation regarding the MPO's annual update to the triennial Title VI Report, which it submits to MassDOT's Office of Civil Rights.

As a recipient of federal funds, the MPO must comply with several federal mandates. These mandates include Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which prohibits discrimination based on race, color, or natural origin on federally-funded projects. Courts have interpreted the law as protecting people who do not speak, read, or understand English well or at all. A federal executive order requires that agencies take reasonable steps to accommodate people with limited English proficiency (LEP). Since the cost of providing interpreters at meetings and translating documents to other languages is high and demand for these services from the MPO is low, the MPO provides interpreters and translation services only upon request. To date, no one has requested an interpreter and few have requested translations of written documents. The new MPO website incorporates GoogleTranslate for those who wish to translate MPO documents.

All recipients of federal funds must develop a Title VI program that includes preparing a non-discrimination notice, developing complaint procedures, providing for inclusive public participation, developing demographic profiles of the region, and preparing reports on program activities. The MPO's non-discrimination notice and complaint procedures are posted on the MPO's website in English and Spanish. The non-discrimination notice is included on agendas and notices to the public.

As a sub-recipient of federal funds, the MPO reports to MassDOT on a tri-annual basis with annual updates. The MPO staff is seeking the MPO's approval to submit its annual update to MassDOT today. Members received handouts describing the requirements for submittal.

A. Wilson summarized that changes reported in the annual update, which include discussion of a self-identification survey for Advisory Council members, a new notice of protection under Title VI, the new MPO website with GoogleTranslate, and MPO funding sources. An appendix includes FFY 2013-16 TIP funding tables and a map depicting environmental justice areas and projects in the region.

A motion to have the MPO chair sign certifications and assurances related to the MPO's compliance with Title VI and submit the Update to the MPO's Title VI report to MassDOT was made by the MassDOT Highway Division (J. Romano), and seconded by MAPC (E. Bourassa). The motion carried. The North Shore Task Force (City of Beverly) (D. Deschamps) abstained.

### **10. Transportation Equity—*Alicia Wilson, MPO Staff***

A. Wilson gave a PowerPoint presentation that provided information regarding the environmental justice profiles of the Boston region and the MPO's outreach to those communities through the Transportation Equity Program.

The concept of environmental justice is based on a 2000 executive order that requires equitable treatment for minorities and people with low incomes in the provision of transportation services and projects. Federal regulations require MPOs to provide for full participation by these groups and to develop demographic profiles of these populations. The Boston Region MPO is using the 2010 Census and American Community Survey to identify minority, low income, and LEP populations, and to determine the benefits and burdens to these populations from transportation projects and programs in the TIP and Long-Range Transportation Plan.

The MPO defines minority areas as transportation analysis zones (TAZs) with a minority population greater than the region's average of 27.8%. It defines low income areas as TAZs where the median household income is less than or equal to 60% of the median household income of the region (currently \$42,497). The MPO's definition of low income is more inclusive than the federal definition and accounts for higher costs of living in the Boston area.

There are approximately 3.2 million residents in the region, 27.8% of whom are minorities according to the 2010 census. The minority population has increased since the 2000 census. Asians and Hispanics are the fastest growing minority groups. English remains the language spoken by the majority of residents (76%), while Spanish is the next most commonly spoken language (8%). Of the 1,943 TAZs in the region, 11% are low income areas, 33% are minority areas, and 10% are both.

Charts showing the demographic and language profile of the region were shown, as well as data on the environmental justice TAZs in the region. (These data are also included in the memorandum titled, *Title VI and Environmental Justice Demographic Profiles of the Region*, which was distributed to members.)

The purpose of the MPO's Transportation Equity Program is to foster awareness of environmental justice needs in the transportation planning process and to encourage participation by environmental justice populations. The program considers areas of concern to be groups of TAZs that are low income or where the minority population exceeds 50%. The objective of the program is to improve awareness of the MPO and its transportation planning functions and to increase participation by environmental justice populations. Maps were shown that depict areas of concern in the region.

Following the presentation, Wig Zamore, Somerville Transportation Equity Partnership and Mystic View Task Force, expressed concern that the MPO is not addressing all the populations protected by federal regulations – minorities, low income, and immigrants. He raised concern that the MPO might be neglecting non-minority immigrants who do not speak English and environmental justice populations that fall outside of the MPO's areas of concern. He also inquired about how one would know if the MPO had a Title VI complaint filed against it. Members asked him to submit his questions in writing.

W. Zamore then asked the MPO to produce a density map of the environmental justice areas noting that it would be useful in the consideration of public health matters. He offered suggestions for resources that the MPO could use for modeling black carbon emissions. He cited a recent study that named black carbon as the second most potent greenhouse gas and expressed concerns regarding health impacts from diesel trains. He also cited a study that linked autism to exposure from pollutants from the transportation system.

In response to a question from Joe Cosgrove, MBTA, A. Wilson reported that the next triennial report will be in 2014.

### **11. Report: Roundabout Installation Screening Tool—Karl Quackenbush, Executive Director, Central Transportation Planning Staff, and Seth Asante, MPO Staff**

K. Quackenbush introduced a report on the development of a roundabout installation screening tool, a planning tool that can be used to determine the feasibility of roundabouts as a design alternative for a particular location. It is intended to be used by MPO staff, MassDOT, other MPOs in the state, and community planners and engineers. The payoff from this work is that, now, roundabout proposals can be evaluated more

quickly, hence more cheaply. Thus, more such proposals can be encouraged and evaluated. The MPO authorized this work in the spring of 2011. S. Asante then gave a PowerPoint presentation on the subject.

First, he discussed the benefits of roundabouts. They promote safety by slowing vehicles and reducing vehicle conflicts. They also have lower maintenance costs as they are self-operating and do not require signals. As roundabouts have been growing in popularity, the MPO and MassDOT have been receiving requests from municipalities to review sites for potential roundabouts. The screening tool was developed in response to that need.

Staff has developed a primer that introduces the user to the screening tool. It describes the purpose of the tool, types of roundabouts and circular intersections, traffic rules for roundabouts, considerations for screening a location, and the data necessary for the tasks.

The screening process leads the user through the following five steps:

- defining the existing problems
- defining project objectives
- determining the type of roundabout and space requirements
- answering screening questions
- making decisions based on the previous steps

An advisory task force was formed to oversee the development of the screening tool. Members included the MassDOT Highway Division and Office of Transportation Planning, and MAPC. The task force selected 24 factors that should be considered in the screening process. These factors address the following objectives:

- safety
- traffic operations
- traffic calming
- access management
- community enhancement

The outcome of the screening would be a determination of whether or not a roundabout is an appropriate alternative for a particular location and whether further study should be devoted to the alternative. The information gathered in the screening process may also be used to inform the public of the reason for the determination.

Details are provided in a memorandum titled *Roundabout Installation Screening Tool*, which was distributed to members.

Members discussed the report.

E. Bourassa inquired about the plan to disseminate the tool to municipalities. S. Asante replied that the tool will be posted on the MPO website and MPO staff members will be available to provide assistance to users. E. Bourassa suggested that staff email Department of Public Works contacts in the region to alert them to the availability of the tool.

David Koses, At-Large City (City of Newton), asked about whether modeling software is involved in the screening to determine traffic volumes. S. Asante explained that detailed traffic modeling would not be required. The tool provides graphs based on average daily traffic (ADT) and turning movements that can help the user. The tool is intended to be used at the planning level to determine if a roundabout should be considered for a location, and to avoid wasting resources at the design stage if roundabout is not appropriate for a particular location.

At the request of Marie Rose, MassDOT Highway, S. Asante provided names of the members of the advisory task force.

S. Olanoff raised the idea of using roundabouts to discourage cut-through traffic. S. Asante noted that roundabouts can be a good tool to slow high-speed traffic. He noted that traffic circles have been used in residential areas to discourage cut-through traffic.

## **12.Members Items**

J. Gillooly complimented the Governor, Secretary of Transportation, and MassDOT staff for their comprehensive approach and framing of the transportation finance issue in the report, *The Way Forward: A 21<sup>st</sup> Century Transportation Plan*. N. Codd added that MassDOT hopes the report gives state legislators strong justification to show their constituents why more revenue is needed for the transportation system.

E. Bourassa announced that MAPC will be holding an Open House on January 29 from 4 PM to 7 PM. He invited all to attend.

## **13.Adjourn**

A motion to adjourn was made by the MBTA Advisory Board (P. Regan) and seconded by the MetroWest Regional Collaborative (Town of Framingham) (D. Giombetti). The motion carried.

## Attendance

---

### Members

### Representatives and Alternates

---

At-Large City (City of Everett)	James Errickson
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
Federal Highway Administration	Michael Chong
Inner Core Committee (City of Somerville)	Tom Bent
Massachusetts Department of Transportation	Ned Codd
	David Anderson
	Marie Rose
MassDOT Highway Division	John Romano
Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority (MBTA)	Joe Cosgrove
MBTA Advisory Board	Paul Regan
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
North Suburban Planning Council (City of Woburn)	Ed Tarallo
Regional Transportation Advisory Council	Steve Olanoff
South Shore Coalition (Town of Braintree)	Melissa Santucci
	Rozzi
South West Advisory Planning Committee (Town of Medway)	Dennis Crowley
Three Rivers Interlocal Council (Town of Norwood/NVCC)	Tom O'Rourke

---

---

<b>Other Attendees</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>
Sarah Bradbury	MassDOT Highway District 3
Calli Cenizal	MassDOT
Jim Fitzgerald	World Tech Engineering
Todd Fontanella	Merrimack Valley Planning Commission
Erin Kinahan	MassDOT District 6
Tony Komornick	Merrimack Valley Planning Commission
Rafael Mares	Conservation Law Foundation
Katherine McArthur	MassDOT
Steve Miller	MassDOT
David Montgomery	Regional Transportation Advisory Council
Alan Moore	Friends of the Community Path
Joe Onorato	MassDOT Highway District 4
Ellin Reisner	Somerville Transportation Equity Partnership
Joe Reynolds	Town of Braintree
Amanda Richard	Office of State Senator McGee
Kevin Walsh	MassDOT
Lynn Weissman	Friends of the Community Path
Wig Zamore	Somerville Transportation Equity Partnership / Mystic View Task Force

---

---

**MPO Staff/Central Transportation Planning Staff**

---

Karl Quackenbush, Executive Director  
Daniel Amstutz  
David Fargen  
Maureen Kelly  
Robin Mannion  
Anne McGahan  
Elizabeth Moore  
Scott Peterson  
Sean Pfalzer  
Michelle Scott  
Alicia Wilson  
Pam Wolfe

---