

# Memorandum for the Record

## Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization Meeting

### October 16, 2014 Meeting

10:10 AM – 12:55 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:

- release draft Amendment One to the federal fiscal years (FFYs) 2015-18 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for a 15-day public review period
- approve the work program for *Priority Corridors for LRTP Needs Assessment: FFY 2015*
- approve the work program for *Addressing Safety, Mobility, and Access on Subregional Priority Roadways, FFY 2015*
- approve the MPO's Public Participation Plan, with graphic revised
- approve the minutes of the meetings of September 4 and 18

### Meeting Agenda

#### 1. Public Comments

There were none.

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

C. Bench noted that MassDOT Secretary Richard Davey will be stepping down as of October 31. There will be a video on the Governor's transition website highlighting the Secretary's accomplishments, including improvements to customer service, the institution of an automatic toll payment system, his commitment to state-of-good repair, and the implementation of the GreenDOT policy. Frank DePaola, MassDOT Highway Division Administrator, will serve as the Acting Secretary in addition to his current post.

Governor Deval Patrick, Secretary Davey, and MBTA General Manager Beverly Scott made an announcement about progress on the *Fairmount Line Improvement* project. Blue Hill Avenue Station will be in service in 18 months and a public process concerning this station is underway. Weekend service will be restored on the line and there will be

more frequent weekday service. Diesel multiple units (DMUs) will operate on the line. The reduced fares instituted in a pilot fare program have been made permanent.

Eric Bourassa, Metropolitan Area Planning Council, gave an update on the MPO election, which will be held on October 29 at the Marriot Courtyard in Boston. The cities of Beverly and Everett and the towns of Lexington and Medway have been nominated and are running unopposed for their current seats.

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

There were none.

### **4. Regional Transportation Advisory Council Report—*David Montgomery, Chair, Regional Transportation Advisory Council***

D. Montgomery reported that today is his last day as Chair of the Advisory Council. The Council held its annual election this month. Mike Gowing was elected Chair and D. Montgomery was elected Vice Chair.

Also at its last meeting, the Council discussed the MPO's Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) and Public Participation Plan.

The next meeting, on November 12, will focus on transportation and public health. Presenters will include Steve Miller of the Harvard School of Public Health, and Barry Keppard of MAPC.

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

K. Quackenbush reminded members that the new federal fiscal year began on October 1<sup>st</sup>. He then discussed the MPO's accomplishments during FFY 2014. These include the following:

- a foray into "big data"
- the development of new modeling tools
- holding the first Transportation Equity Forum and a Transit Accessibility Forum
- beginning the update of the LRTP, which will use performance measures and scenario planning
- increasing public engagement
- the development of new web tools, such as highway performance dashboards and the Needs Assessment tool
- growing the Freight Program
- working climate change considerations into planning process

- enhancing the MPO's accessibility and civil rights programs

In FFY 2015, the MPO will continue to be engaged in the development of the LRTP. As part of this process, the MPO will be using a new framework for public engagement. The MPO will also be completing its Coordinated Human Services Transportation Plan and producing timely technical studies, including one on core capacity constraints and another on a station access analysis.

Also, the MPO will be engaged in the federal recertification process. Staff has received a list of questions from the Federal Highway and Transit Administrations (FHWA and FTA). Staff will submit the responses to the questions and several documents by November 7. The federal agencies will then conduct a desk review and prepare an agenda for further discussion during the recertification meetings. The meetings are scheduled for December 10 and 11 (all day), and December 12 (half day). The all day sessions will be held in the State Transportation Library at 10 Park Plaza, Boston. The half-day session will be held at the Boston Public Library.

Lastly, K. Quackenbush drew members' attention to a written public comment from Lee Auspitz. Copies of the document were provided to members and entered into the record.

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

C. Bench introduced the topic of Amendment One to the FFYs 2015-18 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). He noted that this TIP has not been formally approved by the federal agencies because of a delay in the submission of the State Transportation Improvement Program. The FFYs 2014-17 TIP, therefore, remains the active TIP. The MPO may still release a proposed amendment today, however, on the FFYs 2015-18 TIP.

S. Pfalzer then gave an overview of the proposed Amendment One. The amendment would reprogram earmarks for highway projects whose advertising dates were delayed, and address cost changes for two pavement preservation projects and one bridge project. It would also reflect a change to the funding source and cost increase for the *Green Line Extension* project, adjust the funding source and cash flows for the procurement of new MBTA Red Line and Orange Line vehicles, and document funding used for the purchase of buses for the Cape Ann Transportation Authority.

The specific changes are as follows:

- cost increase of \$708,975 to the *Dedham – Bridge Replacement, Needham Street over Great Ditch* project
- reprogramming of earmarks from FFY 2015 to FFY 2016, for the *Boston – Reconstruction of Melnea Cass Boulevard* project to better reflect the project's design schedule
- reprogramming of earmarks from FFY 2014 to FFY 2015 for the *Boston – Improvements along Gainsborough and St. Botolph Streets* project; the project was not advertised in FFY 2014 because of building construction in the project area
- reprogramming a portion of a earmark from FFY 2014 to FFY 2015 for the *Somerville – Reconstruction of Beacon Street* project; the project was not advertised in FFY 2014 because of outstanding right-of-way issues; the remainder of the project cost will be funded with state funds
- reprogramming of an earmark from FFY 2014 to FFY 2015 for the *Medford – Clippership Linear Park and Bikeway* project; the project was not far enough along in the design process for advertising in FFY 2014
- cost increase of nearly \$1 million to the *Chelsea/Revere – Resurfacing and Related Work on Route 1* project associated with work on the bridge deck
- cost increase of nearly \$2 million to the *Beverly – Resurfacing and Related Work on Route 128* project associated with the cost of a new asphalt mixture
- cash flow adjustments to the *Green Line Extension to College Avenue and Union Square* project, and a change in funding source from the Highway section of the TIP to the Transit section; \$1.4 billion of the \$1.99 billion project is programmed for the project in this TIP; the remainder would be programmed in the FFY 2019 and 2020 elements
- adjustments to the funding source and cash flows for the MBTA's procurement of Red Line and Orange Line vehicles; the project will be funded with \$302.4 million in state funds
- programming of state RTA Capital Assistance funds for the purchase of replacement buses for the Cape Ann Transportation Authority

Members were asked to consider releasing Amendment One for an abbreviated public review period so that the changes to the programming for the *Green Line Extension* project may be approved in time for the New Starts Full-Funding Grant Agreement. The proposed public review period would run from October 20 through November 3. The MPO could then take action on the amendment on November 6.

***Discussion***

Paul Regan, MBTA Advisory Board, asked about the expected time when FTA will make a decision regarding the award of New Starts funding for the *Green Line Extension* project. Victor Rivas, MBTA, replied that the MBTA and MassDOT have completed all the required paperwork in preparation of the Full-Funding Grant Agreement and that these materials are in the hands of FTA.

P. Regan asked whether this amendment would have any other effect on Section 5309 funding. V. Rivas replied no, and added that the amendment would put the TIP in line with the financing in the Full-Funding Grant Agreement and MassDOT's CIP. People viewing the various documents should be aware that the Full-Funding Grant Agreement is organized in a calendar year format, while the CIP uses the state fiscal year, and the TIP uses the federal fiscal year.

P. Regan asked if the \$1.99 billion cost for the *Green Line Extension* project includes the cost of new vehicles. V. Rivas replied yes.

P. Regan asked if there is a new total for the procurement of Red Line and Orange Line vehicles. V. Rivas explained that the project will be fully funded by the state. The MBTA plans in the future to reprogram the federal dollars originally dedicated to this project.

Richard Reed, Minuteman Advisory Group on Interlocal Coordination (Town of Bedford), asked about the source of the addition funds required for the *Beverly – Resurfacing and Related Work on Route 128* project. S. Pfalzer replied that the funds will be made available from adjustments to the Interstate Maintenance Program and Bridge Program. Marie Rose, MassDOT Highway Division, added that this project is a statewide line item that will be advertised in the first quarter of this fiscal year. Other statewide line items may be reduced or eliminated to accommodate this cost increase.

Rafael Mares, Conservation Law Foundation (CLF), inquired as to why the project for the procurement of Red Line and Orange Line vehicles needs to appear on the TIP if the project is fully funded with state dollars. S. Pfalzer explained that the project is listed because it is regionally significant and for informational purposes.

V. Rivas further explained that the MBTA is anticipating that it will request an amendment to the TIP to reprogram the federal funding that is currently programmed for the Red Line and Orange Line vehicle procurement project. Those funds would be reprogrammed for the implementation of Positive Train Control (which is mandated by the federal government) and for a major bus procurement. It is anticipated that this request will come after the MBTA Board of Directors approves funding for the Positive

Train Control and bus procurement projects (which will total about \$900 million) in the FY 2016-20 CIP.

Tom Kadzis, City of Boston, asked about the status of the mandate for Positive Train Control and whether the federal government remains open to other cost effective ways to address the safety issue this technology would address. V. Rivas replied that the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) has mandated that all transit agencies with rail operations must implement Positive Train Control by FFY 2015. This is an unfunded mandate that is expected to cost \$439 million for the MBTA system. This year the MBTA made investments in Positive Train Control and Automated Fare Collection equipment, which demonstrates progress toward the mandate. If funding for Positive Train Control is approved by the MBTA Board this year, the MBTA will be able to propose an amendment to the TIP to incorporate that funding.

T. Kadzis expressed his understanding that the FRA had scaled back the requirements of the Positive Train Control mandate and asked about the MBTA's legal obligation in this matter. C. Bench suggested that this issue could be addressed in a future meeting by members of MassDOT's safety staff. He asked staff to note this as a future topic for agenda setting.

T. Kadzis asked if there is an estimated date when the procurement document for the Red Line and Orange Line vehicles will be ready. V. Rivas replied that the document is almost ready to be released.

### ***Motion***

A motion to release draft Amendment One to the FFYs 2015-18 TIP for a 15-day public review period was made by the Advisory Council (D. Montgomery), and seconded by the Inner Core Committee (City of Somerville) (Tom Bent). The motion carried.

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

K. Quackenbush introduced two work programs: *Priority Corridors for LRTP Needs Assessment: FFY 2015*, and *Addressing Safety, Mobility, and Access on Subregional Priority Roadways, FFY 2015*. Both are work programs that have been conducted each year in recent years.

Through the work program for *Priority Corridors for LRTP Needs Assessment: FFY 2015*, the MPO staff studies selected corridors that have been identified through the LRTP Needs Assessment as having significant problems relating to congestion and safety. One or two corridors are analyzed each year. In recent years, studies have been

conducted for Route 203 in Boston, Route 114 in Danvers, Route 2 in Concord, Route 30 in Framingham, and Route 140 in Franklin. The candidate roadways for this year's study are listed in Chapter 3 of the Needs Assessment.

The work program for *Addressing Safety, Mobility, and Access on Subregional Priority Roadways, FFY 2015* is a companion to the work program described above. It differs, however, in that the locations of study are corridors identified by MAPC subregional groups. Studies over the past two years have focused on Route 3A in Cohasset and Scituate, Routes 127 and 127A on Cape Ann, and Washington Street in Newton.

Staff will return to the MPO with a recommendation for locations to study through both programs this year, based on considerations of safety, congestion, transit significance, regional significance, regional equity, and potential for implementation of recommendations.

### ***Motion***

A motion to approve the work program for *Priority Corridors for LRTP Needs Assessment: FFY 2015* was made by the MBTA (R. Morgan), and seconded by the Inner Core Committee (City of Somerville) (T. Bent). The motion carried.

A motion to approve the work program for *Addressing Safety, Mobility, and Access on Subregional Priority Roadways, FFY 2015* was made by the South Shore Coalition (Town of Braintree) (C. Stickney), and seconded by MAPC (E. Bourassa). The motion carried.

## **8. Public Participation Plan—*Pam Wolfe, Manager of Certification Activities, MPO Staff***

P. Wolfe reported on the results of the 45-day public review period for the MPO's revised Public Participation Plan. The review period closed last week.

The revised plan was made available on the MPO's website. Staff used a variety of outreach methods to inform the public of the review period, how to submit a comment, and about the four public meetings that were held. Staff posted a news flash on the MPO's website, distributed press releases, ran a notice in the TransReport newsletter, sent email notices through the MPOinfo list serve, issued tweets, and released flyers in multiple languages.

Public meetings on the plan were held around the region in communities with high populations of minority and low-income residents, and with residents of limited English proficiency. Flyers were prepared in several languages: English, Spanish, Portuguese, Chinese, and Vietnamese. One of the meetings was held at Viet Aid in Dorchester.

A matrix summarizing the public comments received was distributed to members. P. Wolfe also summarized the comments heard.

The following ideas are considered by staff to be implementable:

- Ensure that off-site meetings have a note highlighting that they are off-site in the MPO's Calendar
- Reduce or eliminate the use of acronyms in documents
- Ask municipalities to post a link to the MPO's webpage on their own webpages
- Improve the format of TransReport
- Include notices of MassDOT's Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory meetings in TransReport
- Conduct more media outreach
- Post the MPO's policy for noticing public meetings on the MPO website
- Do not schedule early evening meetings in the suburbs because people cannot make those times

Other ideas that staff is taking under advisement includes the following:

- Include hyperlinks on the TIP document to allow readers to connect to MassDOT's project webpages
- Prepare a public service announcement for television; be interviewed on local access cable television
- Produce materials that are less bureaucratic and technical
- Make people comfortable at public meetings; have fewer formal presentations

Other comments focused on systemic issues:

- The public participation process is daunting and requires members of the public to sustain a high level of effort
- It is difficult to tell if comments are being heard by the MPO
- The system is bureaucratic and frustrating
- Pay more attention to the intersection of land use and transportation; fund transit-oriented development and transit projects; and spend less on highway projects that create sprawl
- A project that creates sprawl should receive a negative score in the TIP evaluation process
- The MPO should get involved in the design and development of projects
- The widening of Route 1 in Lynn is an important safety project
- The public process around the *Green Line Extension* project has been exhausting



- Parking garages are too big
- The MBTA is a jewel that needs to be maintained
- Public involvement will not work if it is not fun

Staff made one change to a map in the Public Participation Plan document since it was released for public review to clarify that the Town of Needham is a member of the Inner Core Committee.

Comments were also received from MPO members. The plan, with the revisions, was discussed with the Advisory Council. Staff also received a comment from the City of Boston asking staff to keep in mind that not all people have access to the web.

### ***Motion and Discussion***

A motion to approve the Public Participation Plan, with a change in wording referencing the Advisory Council in Figure 5, was made by the Advisory Council (D. Montgomery), and seconded by the City of Boston (T. Kadzis). The motion carried.

D. Montgomery shared a few suggestions from the Advisory Council. Staff should consider running a blog and doing webcasts. They should also continue to provide electronic copies of documents to public libraries.

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

A motion to approve the minutes of the meeting of September 4 was made by the At-Large Town of Lexington (Richard Canale), and seconded by the Advisory Council (D. Montgomery). The motion carried. The Massachusetts Port Authority (Lourenço Dantas) abstained.

A motion to approve the minutes of the meeting of September 18 was made by the MBTA (Ron Morgan), and seconded by the Minuteman Advisory Group on Interlocal Coordination (Town of Bedford) (R. Reed). The motion carried. The Inner Core Committee (City of Somerville) (T. Bent) abstained.

### **10. Long-Range Transportation Plan Investment Strategies—Anne McGahan and Sean Pfalzer, MPO Staff**

A. McGahan provided an update on the recent activities that have been underway as part of the development of the new Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP). The MPO has released a draft vision for the LRTP and proposed goals and objectives for public review. The MPO staff held a fall forum and made presentations at MAPC subregional meetings. Staff will be preparing a summary of public comments heard at those meetings.

Staff is currently working on the Needs Assessment for the LRTP. The Needs Assessment web tool will be released shortly, and staff is writing chapters of the Needs Assessment document. The Needs Assessment will identify the high priority needs of the region's transportation system. These priorities can then be used by the MPO to identify investment strategies.

She then presented information for the MPO to consider for investment strategies and for beginning scenario planning. The scenarios will be used to compare various packages of transportation projects and programs. Several modeling tools will be used for the scenario planning: the MPO's regional transportation demand model; the land use model, Cubeland; and the economic development model, TREDIS. All the modeling will use 2040 for the projected year.

Five options for scenario planning were presented:

- Current LRTP
- Program Focus
- System Preservation
- Mode Shift
- Climate Change

### ***Current LRTP Scenario***

In the current LRTP, *Paths to a Sustainable Region*, all regionally significant transportation projects that add capacity to the system are programmed, as well as projects costing over \$10 million. The projects are programmed in five-year timebands. The revenues programmed include MPO target funds and Major Infrastructure funding; the latter are state and federal funds provided to the MPO at MassDOT's discretion for projects costing over \$50 million. This LRTP shows MPO target funding increasing by 3% each year; financial information for the new plan is not yet available, however.

A list was shown of the projects programmed in the FFYs 2014-20 timeband of *Paths to a Sustainable Region*. Six projects, amounting to \$273 million, have not yet been programmed in the TIP. The majority of the funding left in this timeband will be directed to the *Green Line Extension, Phase 2 (from College Avenue to Route 16)* project. The unfunded projects have either not yet been designed or are in the early stages of design, so these projects have the potential to increase in cost as they move forward in design. The remaining commitments, programmed from FFYs 2020-35, amount to \$1.2 billion; again the cost of these projects may increase as they go through the design process.

A graph was shown that depicts the results of an analysis of the level of the MPO's investments by category of project in the TIP over the past ten years. The majority of investment of MPO target funds has been directed to highway and arterial projects, with an increase in funding to transit in the FFY 2016-18 timeframe because of the MPO's decision to flex highway funds to transit for the *Green Line Extension, Phase 2* project. An increasing share of MPO target funding has been directed to LRTP commitments and to Major Infrastructure projects; this is limiting opportunities to fund smaller projects (under \$10 million) through the TIP.

### ***Alternate Scenarios***

Staff presented options that could be used in the next phase of the LRTP development – Scenario Planning. A Program Focus scenario would establish a set of investment programs that advance the goals and objectives of the MPO. The other three scenarios could focus on specific MPO goals and objectives. A System Preservation scenario, for example, could prioritize state-of-good repair projects. A Mode Shift scenario could emphasize transit, bicycle, and pedestrian projects to reduce single occupant vehicle use. And, a Climate Change scenario could focus on projects and programs that reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and adapt to the effects of climate change.

### ***Program Focused Scenario***

S. Pfalzer then further discussed the concept of a Program Focused scenario. This type of scenario would consist of multiple investment programs and address the needs of all modes through a more formalized process. It could establish a stronger link between the LRTP, TIP, and UPWP, and would allow flexibility to achieve progress toward MPO goals and objectives.

He discussed possible investment programs to include in the scenario, noting each program's purpose, primary objectives that the program could advance, geographic scale, cost, connection with the UPWP, and candidate projects. The programs are as follows:

An Intersection Improvements Program would focus on projects that modernize intersections or address safety and mobility issues. The objectives would be to improve safety, reduce congestion, and reduce GHG emissions. The scale would be at the local and subregional level. Projects would cost less than \$5 million. The connection to the UPWP would be through the *Safety and Operational Improvements at Selected Intersections* studies.

A Complete Streets Program would focus on projects that modernize arterial roadways to address the needs of all users. The primary objectives would be to improve safety,

increase healthy transportation options, and reduce congestion. The scale would be at the local and subregional level. Projects would cost between \$5 million and \$25 million. The connection to the UPWP would be through the *Subregional Priority Roadways* and *Priority Corridors for the LRTP Needs Assessment* studies.

A Bottlenecks Program would focus on projects that expand arterial roadways and highways to address congested corridors. The primary objectives would be to reduce congestion, improve safety, and reduce delays on the freight network. The scale would be at the subregional and regional level and across regions. Projects would cost over \$10 million. The connection to the UPWP would be through the *Low-cost Improvements to Freeway Bottleneck Locations* and *Priority Corridors for the LRTP Needs Assessment* studies.

A Bicycle Network Program would expand or close gaps in the bicycle network, especially for facilities that improve access to transit, schools, employment centers, and shopping. The primary objectives would be to increase healthy transportation options, reduce congestion, and reduce GHG emissions. The scale would be at the local and subregional level. Projects would cost less than \$10 million (averaging \$1.6 million per mile). The connection to the UPWP would be through the *Bicycle Network Evaluation* study and the Livability Program.

A Pedestrian Connections Program would expand or close gaps in the sidewalk network, especially for facilities that improve access to transit, schools, employment centers, and shopping. The primary objectives would be to increase healthy transportation options and improve safety. The scale would be at the local level. Projects would cost less than \$5 million. The connection to the UPWP would be through the Livability Community Workshop and Community Transportation Technical Assistance programs.

An Interchange Modernization Program would focus on projects that modernize outdated interchanges to improve safety and reduce congestion. The primary objectives would be to improve safety, reduce congestion, and modernize the freight network. The scale would be at the subregional and regional level. Projects would cost between \$5 million and \$25 million. The connection to the UPWP would be through the *Priority Corridors for the LRTP Needs Assessment* study.

A Major Infrastructure Program would focus on major modernization or expansion projects that affect regional travel. The primary objectives would be to improve safety, reduce congestion, modernize the freight network, and increase transportation options.

The scale would be at the subregional and regional level. Projects would cost more than \$50 million. The connection to the UPWP would be through specific project studies.

### ***Next Steps***

The next steps were discussed by A. McGahan. Staff is proposing to compare scenarios (to be selected by the MPO) to the Current LRTP and 2040 No-Build scenarios. Today staff is seeking the MPO's concurrence to begin preparing the Current LRTP and 2040 No-Build scenarios, and feedback on the concept of a Program Focused scenario. Staff has developed a set of indicators for comparing the scenarios. They include at least one indicator for each goal and objective. The scenario planning phase of the LRTP development is currently scheduled to take place from November to January.

### ***Discussion***

Lourenço Dantas, Massachusetts Port Authority, suggested including a scenario that has a focus on economic development. This scenario would help determine a set of projects that would yield a desired level of future economic growth. A. McGahan noted that the new land use model would be beneficial for use in such a scenario. E. Bourassa also expressed support for this idea noting that the land use model would be able to produce an analysis of the impact on future development patterns overall, though not at the project level. A. McGahan added that the analysis would allow for comparisons at the regional and corridor level.

Dennis Giombetti, MetroWest Regional Collaborative (Town of Framingham), suggested that the MPO review how it evaluates economic development factors and what weight it gives to them. The MPO must be fair and consistent in evaluating projects, he said.

Paul Regan, MBTA Advisory Board, noted that the economic development impact of projects will range widely based on the scale of the projects. To strengthen the economic development outcome of the set of projects, he suggested that the projects be evaluated on a case-by-case basis rather than through a program set-up. A. McGahan noted that staff will be providing a set of indicators for each topic area at the next meeting.

Steve Miller, Harvard School of Public Health, noted that many of the programs proposed for the Program Focused scenario are inter-related. He discussed the need for an overarching set of goals to help order and prioritize the themes and suggested three: quality of life, economic development, and system preservation. A. McGahan noted that staff is using a set of goals and objectives approved by the MPO.

Wig Zamore, Mystic View Task Force and Somerville Transportation Equity Partnership, raised the issue of the increase in income inequality in Massachusetts and suggested that the MPO look at the issue by municipality. He emphasized that this issue is a massive problem in Massachusetts.

Rafael Mares, CLF, pointed to staff's examples of topic-based scenarios (System Preservation, Mode Shift, and Climate Change) and noted that it would be best if the MPO had the ability to compare all the scenarios. He also noted that in the spending analysis for MPO target funds, there should be a description of where among the various categories investments projects such as the *Green Line Extension, Phase 2* project (for which the MPO flexed highway funds to transit) fit in. For the Program Focused scenario to work, those investments must be described, he said. A. McGahan then further discussed how a Program Focused scenario would allow the MPO to evaluate whether performance measures are being met and determine whether particular program categories would require more investment.

L. Dantas asked for staff's opinion of the number of scenarios that could be modelled in keeping with the schedule for the LRTP development. A. McGahan replied that staff will have time to model the Current LRTP and 2040 No-Build scenarios plus two additional scenarios. Afterwards, staff could assess whether there is time to model additional scenarios.

D. Montgomery noted that the programs suggested for the Program Focused scenario do not reference projects costing in the \$25 million to \$50 million range. He noted that projects in this cost range should be in the mix. A. McGahan explained that the presentation was intended to give examples of the types of projects in each program; projects in that cost range are not being forgotten.

A. McGahan and K. Quackenbush then talked about what staff is asking of the MPO today. Staff is seeking the MPO's concurrence to begin preparing the Current LRTP and 2040 No-Build scenarios, and for members' thoughts about taking a Program Focused approach to developing scenarios. Scott Peterson, Director of Technical Services, MPO staff, reported that staff hopes to have all of the scenarios defined in November.

W. Zamore expressed support for the idea of a Program Focused scenario. He suggested preparing a bolder and more progressive scenario that would produce a mode share more conducive to good health. Such a scenario might limit the funding of large highway and arterial projects to 50% of the project mix, and include 25% of funding for transit projects (with an emphasis on electric power), 12.5% to bicycle and

pedestrian projects, and 12.5% to smaller projects. He noted that most of the emissions the public is exposed to come from the transportation sector.

K. Quackenbush noted that criteria will be applied to every scenario to measure factors such as modes share, climate change, and economic development potential. In addition, the MPO can craft a scenario that would produce particularly strong consequences for, for example, economic development or mode share.

C. Bench suggested that the goals and objectives developed by the MPO should be driving the development of the scenarios, and he expressed concern that the proposed scenarios would not allow for prioritizing a combination of goals. A. McGahan responded that the scenario planning is intended to help the MPO prioritize how money is allocated. She also noted that a Program Focused scenario would enable the MPO to prioritize a combination of goals and set aside money for projects that would be decided at the discretion of the MPO in the TIP process. In the Current LRTP scenario, only regionally significant projects have been programmed and the remaining funds have been left unallocated, not directed to a specific purpose or program. Staff will develop a recommendation on a Program Focused scenario to present to members.

E. Bourassa noted that the discussion has been focused on MPO target funds, but that about half of the Highway Program is funded by state dollars. He asked whether funds programmed for projects in MassDOT's Capital Investment Plan would be incorporated into the financial plan for the LRTP and how funding for Major Infrastructure projects would be reconciled in the LRTP. C. Bench discussed that the MPO's programming would need to be reconciled with the CIP.

E. Bourassa noted that the public may ask about whether there is enough funding for transit. C. Bench noted that while the focus of today's discussion was on the highway element, at issue is whether the MPO will want to flex some highway funds to transit. Regarding the share of bicycle and pedestrian projects, he noted in addition to specific bicycle and pedestrian projects, all Complete Streets projects have a bicycle and pedestrian accommodation component.

L. Dantas asked about where new projects such as the Silver Line Gateway and Beacon Yards development, which will be built during the timeframe of the LRTP, fit into the base case scenarios. A. McGahan replied that they will be included in the No-Build scenario.

D. Giombetti suggested doing the two base case scenarios, and then using the MPO's evaluation criteria to develop a set of projects that meet the goals for mode share, climate change, or economic development. He suggested that the MPO review its

evaluation criteria. A. McGahan noted, however, that the scenarios will not yield results for each project individually; rather the analysis will produce results at the regional and corridor level.

P. Regan remarked that projects that come before the MPO are generated by municipalities and agencies, and that if the MPO is going to change the criteria by which those projects are evaluated, it needs to give fair notice to project proponents. He noted that the existing project evaluation system addresses many of the topic areas raised today, such as mode shift, climate change, and system preservation. Considering that over the past several years, project proponents have become familiar with the MPO's evaluation process, there would be little advantage to restructuring the LRTP evaluation process at this stage, he said.

The MPO gave its concurrence for staff to begin preparing the Current LRTP and 2040 No-Build scenarios, and expressed a willingness to continue discussion about a Program Focused scenario approach.

### **11. State Implementation Plan Update—*Sreelatha Allam, MassDOT***

S. Allam provided an update on the *Green Line Extension* project, which is included in the State Implementation Plan (SIP).

MassDOT will be submitting a Full-Funding Grant Agreement to the FTA next month. Federal approval is expected in late fall 2014 or early winter 2015. Construction activities in Phases 1, 2, 2A, and 4 are underway. The MBTA has acquired two properties for the Vehicle Storage and Maintenance Facility, and is negotiating for two more parcels.

A public meeting was held on September 18 to provide and update on construction. The GLX Working Group is expected to meet at the beginning of October. A public meeting about the design of Lechmere Station is scheduled for October 28, and a meeting about the design of Washington Street and Union Square Stations is scheduled for November 6.

(The update on the *Fairmount Line Improvement* project was discussed in the Chair's Report.)

### **12. Members Items**

C. Bench expressed the MPO's appreciation for D. Montgomery's leadership as the Chair of the Advisory Council.



### **13. Adjourn**

A motion to adjourn was made by the MBTA Advisory Board (P. Regan) and seconded by the South Shore Coalition (Town of Braintree) (C. Stickney). The motion carried.

## Attendance

<b>Members</b>	<b>Representatives and Alternates</b>
At-Large Town (Town of Arlington)	Laura Wiener
At-Large Town (Town of Lexington)	Richard Canale
City of Boston (Boston Transportation Department)	Tom Kadzis
Inner Core Committee (City of Somerville)	Tom Bent
Massachusetts Department of Transportation	Clinton Bench
	Marie Rose
Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority (MBTA)	Ron Morgan
	Victor Rivas
Massachusetts Port Authority	Lourenço Dantas
MBTA Advisory Board	Paul Regan
Metropolitan Area Planning Council	Eric Bourassa
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)	Aaron Clausen
Regional Transportation Advisory Council	David Montgomery
South Shore Coalition (Town of Braintree)	Christine Stickney
Three Rivers Interlocal Council (Town of Norwood/NVCC)	Tom O'Rourke

<b>Other Attendees</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>
Sreelatha Allam	MassDOT Office of Transportation Planning
Sarah Bradbury	MassDOT District 3
Matthew Lipka	Cambridge resident
Rafael Mares	Conservation Law Foundation
Steve Miller	Harvard School of Public Health
Steve Olanoff	Three Rivers Interlocal Council
Joe Onorato	MassDOT District 4
Peter Sutton	MassDOT Office of Transportation Planning
Wig Zamore	Mystic View Task Force / Somerville Transportation Equity Forum

---

**MPO Staff/Central Transportation Planning Staff**

---

Karl Quackenbush, Executive Director

Mark Abbott

Maureen Kelly

Robin Mannion, Deputy Executive Director

Anne McGahan

Elizabeth Moore

Scott Peterson

Sean Pfalzer

Natalie Raffol

Michelle Scott

Pam Wolfe

---