

# **Draft Memorandum for the Record Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization Unified Planning Work Program Committee Meeting**

## **June 11, 2015 Meeting**

9:05 AM to 10:05 PM, State Transportation Building, CTPS Conference Room (Room 2150), 10 Park Plaza, Boston

Sreelatha Allam, Chair, representing the Massachusetts Department of Transportation (MassDOT)

## **Decisions**

The Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) Committee agreed to the following:

- Adopt the revised MPO staff recommendation for the FFY 2016 UPWP budget and new projects as the UPWP Committee's revised recommendation to the MPO for the FFY 2016 UPWP

## **Materials**

Materials for this meeting included:

- A copy of the meeting agenda
- A revised draft CTPS budget for the FFY 2016 UPWP, documenting staff-recommended revisions
- The UPWP-Committee-recommended MAPC budget for the FFY 2016 UPWP
- A revised list of staff-recommended new projects for the FFY 2016 UPWP
- The Safety Analysis of Intersections near MAGIC Schools work scope, which was presented to the MPO on March 5, 2015, but not approved
- The Safety Analysis of Intersections near MAGIC Schools description in the FFY 2015 UPWP
- A memorandum documenting a proposed change to MAPC's FFY 2015 Corridor/Subarea Planning Studies tasks

## Meeting Agenda

### 1. Introductions

Sreelatha Allam, Chair, Unified Planning Work Program Committee (Massachusetts Department of Transportation) called the meeting to order at approximately 9:05 AM. UPWP Committee members, other MPO members, MPO staff, and other attendees introduced themselves. (For attendance list, see page 15.)

### 2. Update on Budget and Proposed New Projects for the FFY 2016 UPWP

#### *Updates on FFY 2016 FTA 5303 Funds*

M. Scott said that MassDOT Office of Transportation Planning (OTP) staff has not yet given MPO staff estimates of the FFY 2016 FTA Section 5303 planning funds for CTPS and MAPC. This morning's discussion will focus on proposed plans for updating the budget and list of new projects in the absence of final information. MPO staff expects a reduction in FTA Section 5303 funds compared to what was available in FFY 2015. This reduction is likely to be small; MPO staff expects it to be \$5,000 or less. OTP has said that this information is late because Congress has been delayed in releasing appropriations information for FFY 2016. This has, in turn, created delays for OTP.

S. Allam added that FTA provided OTP with only eight months of the apportionment of Section 5303 funds for FFY 2016 and that OTP received related guidance in the last week of May. OTP staff is inflating this 8-month FTA estimate by 50 percent to account for the remaining four months of FFY 2016. OTP expects that this estimate for FFY 2016 will be comparable to what MPOs received in FFY 2015.

#### *Proposed Revisions to CTPS and MAPC Budgets*

M. Scott explained that MPO staff recommends removing proposed project E-1, MBTA Parking Lots Price Sensitivity Analysis, from the list of recommended new projects, in order to address the anticipated reduction in FTA Section 5303 funds for FFY 2016. MPO staff selected this project for several reasons:

- It has a smaller budget than other recommended projects.
- MPO staff is concerned that there might not be sufficient data to do a cross-sectional or longitudinal study related to parking lot price elasticity.
- The findings from this study might have limited applicability in the near term, as the MPO's MBTA Advisory board representative, Paul Regan, noted at the May 21 MPO meeting.

M. Scott noted that project E-1's budget had been made up of \$15,000 in FHWA PL planning funds and \$15,000 in FTA Section 5303 funds. MPO staff proposes to reallocate the funds in the following way:

- Add the \$15,000 in PL funds from project E-1 to project B-2, Pedestrian Level-of-Service Metric Development, This project would focus on researching a pedestrian-oriented version of the level-of-service (LOS) measure for motorized vehicles, and create a methodology that would serve the MPO's performance-based planning and other analysis work. This addition would raise the total project budget to \$45,000, and may allow staff to explore future metric applications in addition to developing the methodology.
- Add the \$15,000 in FTA Section 5303 funds—minus any reductions from the finalized FFY 2016 FTA Section 5303 estimate—to the MPO's ongoing Regional Transit Service Planning Technical Support program. Through this program, MPO Transit Service Planning staff responds to technical assistance requests, such as analysis of extensions of RTA service or first-mile-and-last-mile connections. The total budget of this program would be raised to \$35,500, but any reductions in the proposed CTPS budget would be addressed by reducing the budget of this project.

Karl Quackenbush, MPO Executive Director, added that regardless of any reduction, the Regional Transit Service Planning Technical Support budget would still be more than what was originally proposed for FFY 2016. Steve Olanoff, Three Rivers Interlocal Council (Town of Norwood/NVCC), noted that the proposed FFY 2016 budget is more than twice the FFY 2015 budget, which was approximately \$12,000. M. Scott noted that MPO staff increased the budget from last year prior to proposing this adjustment. K. Quackenbush noted that this continues to be a popular program.

Laura Wiener, At-Large Towns (Town of Arlington) asked whether staff has projects in mind for the coming year that would make use of the increased Regional Transit Service Planning Technical Support program budget. K. Quackenbush said that he did not have specifics in mind, but that there has been a steady stream requests over time. S. Allam noted that the recent transit study in Hudson is an example of a project completed through this program, and added that the project generated good recommendations and was appreciated by the community. K. Quackenbush added that there is not a lot of administrative overhead associated with getting projects underway through this program.

S. Olanoff said he was concerned about the removal of proposed project E-1, MBTA Parking Lots Price Sensitivity Analysis, from the group of recommended new studies. He noted that MAPC's recent programs have highlighted the importance of pricing parking appropriately so that it works effectively. He added that this topic is something that has been put off for a long time, and is being put off again, but it is something that the MBTA needs to address. He said that the study should be brought back at the first available opportunity.

S. Allam said that MPO staff will put the project back into the Universe of Proposed New Projects for future consideration.

K. Quackenbush added that this project would not be permanently removed. He said he regrets that MPO staff had not thought through some aspects of the project more initially, but reiterated that staff reconsidered the utility of the project after hearing feedback from MPO members. He noted that there are constraints that are on the parking lots not owned by the MBTA, which are near MBTA-owned lots in many locations throughout the MBTA system.

Scott Peterson, MPO staff, said that as staff was refining the proposed project cost estimate and identifying possible data sets, they noted that some past changes in parking prices at MBTA lots have occurred at the same time as fare increases. This would make it difficult for staff to determine the price sensitivity for use of the lots. Also, private parking lots will compete with MBTA lots, so it will be difficult to understand how private lots will change their prices in response to changes in MBTA lots prices.

S. Olanoff said these issues highlight why the study is needed. He acknowledged that there are garages that need to meet bonding requirements and therefore need to earn certain amounts of revenue, but there are enough other parking lots that could benefit from this study. He added that the City of Newton has raised concerns about their parking lots and that carefully calibrating parking prices could make a difference.

David Koses, At-Large Cities (City of Newton), noted that he was most interested in proposed project E-1. K. Quackenbush reiterated that MPO staff is concerned whether there is sufficient clean data with which to develop credible results. He added that the project results may be useful in a theoretical sense, but MPO staff is having difficulty determining how those results would be applied.

Dennis Crowley, Southwest Advisory Planning Committee (Town of Medway), asked what criteria supported including the proposed project in the initial staff recommendation, and when this proposed project might have an opportunity to be

included in the UPWP in the future. He said that this issue is important for a number of suburban communities, and asked whether it would be necessary to wait until next year to do the project. K. Quackenbush explained that, unless the Committee wanted to remove the project totally, the project would re-appear in next year's UPWP Universe of Proposed New Projects. D. Crowley requested that Committee members and staff remember that the project was "bumped" from this UPWP when they consider the projects in the UPWP Universe of Proposed New Projects next year.

D. Koses described parking challenges taking place in West Newton, where there is a 150-space MBTA parking lot. When people could park for free, the lot was heavily used, but several years ago the parking price was raised to \$4, and now only a few people park there. People are parking on the surrounding streets, and the City of Newton has had to implement village-based parking plans. He said that the parking issue is creating a lot of work for cities and towns, and creates problems for residents who now have to pay for permits, while the MBTA parking lot remains largely empty. He said he was interested in a study that would identify a price—perhaps \$1 or \$2—at which more people would use the MBTA lot.

Tom Bent, Inner Core Committee (City of Somerville), expressed surprised that people wouldn't pay \$4 to park in the lot, especially if permit parking restrictions were in place in nearby neighborhoods. He asked if the City of Newton had established permit parking by area. D. Koses said that the City of Newton spent two years implementing a plan in Auburndale and is now developing a plan for West Newton. He said that people are inclined to park in the streets just beyond the area covered by the Auburndale parking plan. He added that this reality has required the City to make ongoing adjustments to existing parking plans.

T. Bent asked whether an MPO study would be needed to help the City of Newton address these types of parking issues. He said he was unsure how MPO staff would determine the best price point to get people to use the MBTA lot. D. Koses said such a study would help start a conversation with MassDOT, who, he said, has not wanted to discuss the issue.

S. Allam said that she was getting the sense that the Committee members are very interested in this study. She recommended that staff move the project concept into the Universe of Proposed New Projects and note that it is a top priority for the FFY 2017 UPWP development cycle.

In response to D. Crowley's earlier question regarding criteria, M. Scott said that MPO staff was responding to the level of interest expressed by the UPWP Committee members and the MBTA in the study topic. She said that MPO staff has had an opportunity to do more research, and they now have concerns about the way the study, as it is currently proposed, would go forward. She explained, however, that staff recognizes how interested the UPWP Committee is in this topic. In the FFY 2017 UPWP development cycle, staff can redevelop the project. She identified the Core Capacity Constraints study as an example of a project that was not included in the year it was submitted, but was refined and included in the UPWP in FFY 2015.

K. Quackenbush added that this idea had its genesis in the Congestion Management Process (CMP) program and that staff in the MPO's Traffic Analysis and Design group work with parking data. He said that MPO staff could begin exploring ways to enrich existing data sources and otherwise refine the study prior to the start of the FFY 2017 UPWP development cycle.

S. Peterson said that he feels that there is more of a policy focus to this study than a price elasticity focus. He said that there are several locations where parking lots have resident parking only, which complicates any analysis looking at price elasticities. One option could be to study how prevalent this phenomenon is, and help make the case that there is a lot of shifting of demand for parking lot spaces when pricing changes.

E. Bourassa said he supported studying parking issues when sufficient funding is available. He said he was interested in whether there may be more optimal uses for MBTA property, depending on the location, than providing low-cost parking. Other options could include selling the property, developing it, or leasing it long-term.

T. Bent added that if parking costs were \$1, the MBTA may not be able to cover the maintenance costs of providing parking facilities. He added that competition between MBTA and private lots is also an issue, though it is distinct from the problems facing the City of Newton. He said there are a number of different issues in play, and that he supported postponing this type of study until there are enough funds and until its scope is more refined.

D. Koses said that people may make parking choices in response to the combined cost of parking and their MBTA fare. People might be willing to pay more to park if their fare was lower. T. Bent added that another topic for study could be whether it is possible to have a fare system that would bundle parking costs with transit fares.

S. Olanoff said it is important to have study E-1, because the MBTA is not going to do anything until there is a plan showing them that they can or should do something.

S. Allam summarized staff's proposal for responding to the anticipated decrease in FTA Section 5303 funds. M. Scott described other updates that were made to the staff-recommended FFY 2016 UPWP budget:

- MPO staff had set aside \$500 in the proposed FFY 2016 budget for the Safety Analysis at Intersections near MAGIC School project to account for project carryover into FFY 2016. Should that project continue to move forward, MPO staff will work towards completing it before the end of FFY 2015. MPO staff proposed that the \$500 in FFY 2016 funds be transferred to the Household Survey-Based Travel Profiles and Trends: Selected Policy Topics project. This change will not impact the total budget for the Safety Analysis at Intersections near MAGIC School project, as detailed on the work scope.
- MPO staff adjusted salary and overhead estimates for agency-funded UPWP projects in order to match the revenue assumptions that support the MPO's operating budget, which was discussed at the Administration and Finance Committee meeting on June 4. These changes are scattered throughout the budget. The most significant change was made to the FFY 2016 budget for the MBTA 2015-16 Systemwide Passenger Survey. MPO anticipate that staff will spend \$700,000 on this project over the course of FFY 2016.

M. Scott said that the anticipated FTA Section 5303 funding reduction for MAPC is expected to be about \$1,000. E. Bourassa said that MAPC could reduce funds for project MAPC 5 – Land Use Development Project Reviews. This project supports MAPC reviews of development projects that will have impacts to the transportation system, including projects being reviewed under the Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act (MEPA).

### **3. Decision on Revised UPWP Committee Recommendation for FFY 2016 UPWP Budget and New Projects**

A motion to adopt the revised staff recommendation as the UPWP Committee's revised recommendation to the MPO on the budget and new projects for the FFY 2016 UPWP was made by T. Bent and seconded by E. Bourassa. The motion carried.

#### **4. FFY 2016 UPWP Development: Current and Upcoming Steps**

M. Scott said she would present the UPWP Committee's revised recommendation for the FFY 2016 UPWP at the June 11 MPO meeting. A draft FFY 2016 UPWP is scheduled to be released for public review and comment on June 22. She hopes that the finalized FTA Section 5303 amount will be made available before June 18, so that either S. Allam or K. Quackenbush could mention the updated information to MPO members at a June 18 MPO meeting.

D. Crowley asked for a summary of the status of the FFY 2016 FTA Section 5303 funds, and asked if this funding is expected to increase or decrease. M. Scott provided a summary of the status of these funds and staff's proposed plan to address the reduction. She reminded the group that the existing FFY 2016 UPWP budgets have assumed level funding with FFY 2015, but that staff expects the FFY 2016 UPWP estimate to be lower.

K. Quackenbush reminded UPWP Committee members that the UPWP funding comes from two sources: FHWA PL and the FTA Section 5303 funds. He said that the expected reduction in the FTA Section 5303 funds will be more modest than the reduction in PL funding, compared to FFY 2015 funding levels.

#### **5. Work Program for Safety Analysis of Intersections near MAGIC Schools**

M. Scott explained that the Safety Analysis of Intersections near MAGIC Schools project is included in the FFY 2015 UPWP, which was endorsed last June. This project developed out of MPO staff discussions with members of the MAGIC subregion, which focused on concerns about students traveling to and from MAGIC-area schools by various modes, particularly biking and walking, and about crash rates in the vicinity of those schools. The FFY 2015 UPWP project would map the locations of schools in the MAGIC subregion and crash rates for intersections around those schools, along with the traffic volumes of major arterials near those schools (if that data is readily available). The budget for this project is \$22,250. The work scope was discussed at the March 5, 2015 MPO meeting, but it was not approved. MPO members raised concerns, including:

- That the budget may not be sufficient to complete the mapping work described in the work scope. M. Scott added that MPO staff is confident that this budget would be enough to complete the work described.
- That the study results would have limited applicability in other communities and subregions.



Other MPO members at the March 5 meeting said that the project results would be valuable to communities and an important first step in addressing Issues related to school-related travel.

Some suggestions made by MPO members at the March 5 MPO meeting include:

- Revising the scope so that it would focus on providing a toolkit or general recommendations that could help school systems, in conjunction with municipal staff, to address safety issues and reduce traffic.
- Examining municipal policies for busing and snow removal, and the impacts of these policies for areas near schools.
- Examining data from the My School Commute survey, supported by the Massachusetts Safe Routes to School program and MAPC.

E. Bourassa said that MPO members were concerned that this project would be just a mapping exercise, without any related technical analysis, as suggested by the scope objectives. He said that some were concerned that this information would not be useful for the towns, unless there were some analysis and recommendations, such as those that might target attention on a few specific sites. K. Quackenbush said that this project would include narratives providing interpretation of the information on the maps.

S. Allam said that she recalled that one issue raised at March 5 meeting was that there wouldn't be any recommendations associated with the project outcome. K. Quackenbush said that the intention behind this project was that it would be a first step, albeit a modest one, to understanding the safety issues that exist in the vicinity of schools. Logically, staff would want to take the project further, and ultimately tell a coherent story and make policy, infrastructure, or other recommendations. He said that such recommendations would need to be made later on, because the project budget is not sufficient to do all of that work. He added that most of the suggestions made at the March 5 meeting could not be accommodated with the funding available.

M. Scott said that MPO staff hopes the Committee will deliberate several options for addressing the existing work scope:

- Revise the work scope, which would likely trigger an amendment to the FFY 2015 UPWP.
- Amend the project out of the FFY 2015 UPWP, transfer the budget to another project in the FFY 2015 UPWP, and revisit the topic as part of the FFY 2017 UPWP development process.

Michelle Ciccolo, Minuteman Advisory Group on Interlocal Coordination (Town of Lexington), explained that she has been involved with this issue for a number of years through participation in the MAGIC subregion. She said that this project developed in part from a concern that school busing fee policies are contributing to increased traffic around schools. This, in turn, creates the need to upgrade intersections around schools, such as by installing new traffic signals, but these improvements may only be needed during certain times of day.

M. Ciccolo said that the project concept morphed into a Level-of-Service (LOS)-oriented study because there was a belief that only LOS data would be available to use for the study. While this LOS information could be mapped, she said that it is as important to understand whether spending money on infrastructure treatments is valuable compared to spending it on Safe Routes to School treatments, sidewalks, bike lanes, better crossings as mid-block locations, or other options that can get children to and from school without being driven by car. She said she believes this element has been somewhat lost in this study scope. A review of high-crash locations would help smaller communities in the MAGIC subregion that may lack transportation planning resources, but this is secondary to understanding what's happening when most parents are driving and children aren't taking the bus, walking, or biking. She said she would be in favor of modifying the scope to address some of those questions.

M. Ciccolo added that many school departments have travel plans for elementary-school-age children. These include information such as whether students are allowed to walk or if they take the bus, which helps school departments understand how students are traveling to school. She noted that this information is less prevalent at the middle-school level and probably not at all at the high-school level.

K. Quackenbush said that the existence of the Safe Routes to School (SRTS) program—a program in which several MAGIC-area schools participate—complicates the formation of an MPO study. He said that he understands the objectives of the SRTS program to be focused on getting kids to take transportation healthy options to school; educating all concerned about potential safety issues; and doing analysis to provide recommendations for infrastructure upgrades. He said that, given the existence of this program, staff found it challenging to create a proposal that was not duplicative of this work. The existing project scope was an attempt to provide some objective information to the discussion from a safety perspective, without getting into policy issues, such as busing fees. The results might inform questions such as:

- What are the safety issues around schools?

- What are the impacts to pedestrians around these schools?
- What are the pedestrian and bike-involved crashes involving school children?
- What are the circumstances under which these are happening; what patterns are prevalent?

K. Quackenbush added that his children attended a school where students were prohibited from walking and biking. M. Ciccolo said that there are still schools with these policies, although their numbers are decreasing.

K. Quackenbush said that MPO staff could try to recraft the scope using the funds that are available, although there are not any additional funds that could be added to this project in FFY 2015. He said that the Committee may wish to have staff submit a re-crafted study for the next UPWP, which may better reflect the various safety, traffic, and congestion elements that have been raised, and better address the question of when it is best to make infrastructure investments. He noted that these questions become bigger issues when considered at a regional scale.

E. Bourassa said that what M. Ciccolo wants to know is whether travel behavior would change if municipalities stopped charging busing fees. M. Ciccolo said that she expected it would, because she knows of a number of parents who will pay busing fees for their first child, but find that fees quickly add up if they have several children, which may make it cheaper for them to drop their children off at school. She said that the fees cost too much these days, even in wealthy communities like Lexington.

T. Bent said that busing fees are a municipal issue, not something under the purview of the MPO. He suggested that M. Ciccolo may already know that more people would use the bus if there were lower fees, but these fees aren't something the MPO would subsidize.

M. Ciccolo said it would be useful to examine how many communities in the region charge busing fees and the percentage of students in those communities who take the bus or walk or bike, and then map that information. T. Bent and D. Koses noted that this activity would significantly change the scope of the project. M. Ciccolo agreed, but said that she was concerned that communities are bringing intersection projects to the MPO for funding, but the money might be better spent on sidewalks. Parents' anxiety about their children's safety and the busing fees causes traffic to swell and demand for intersection projects to increase. She said she does not feel that these projects are a good use of the region's money, and that this is the scope of the issues that the MAGIC subregion is interested in understanding.

M. Ciccolo acknowledged that this proposed project would be somewhat duplicative of the SRTS program, but added that a lot of the SRTS's focus is on programming, such as giving buttons to students when they walk to school. She said that this type of cheerleading is important, but rarely do communities get to go out and look at infrastructure around the schools. She suggested that if the MPO started by examining busing fees and the percentages of students who are walking and biking to school, then they could zero in on the communities where there is low use of these travel options. MPO staff could also look at the failures of the intersections within municipalities with high busing fees and where few children take buses to school. She said that these locations don't necessarily have to be in the MAGIC subregion, although she knows that MAGIC wants this type of work done.

K. Quackenbush asked if the data to do this type of study is likely to be available. M. Ciccolo said that schools would have this information because they have registration systems for busing and data on enrollment. K. Quackenbush asked if school districts would be reticent to give out this type information. M. Ciccolo said that school administrators might not know what the MPO is, which may reduce their responsiveness. Richard Reed, MAGIC (Town of Bedford) suggested that the MPO could request information through the municipalities' TIP contacts.

K. Quackenbush said this idea is one that could have justice done to it, but it couldn't be done with the funding that is available now. M. Ciccolo said that the funding would support mapping of crashes but would not fully support [analysis] for making good local policy decisions, or help support the MPO's decision making regarding whether to fund intersection projects.

D. Koses noted that he frequently deals with school-related travel issues at work and agrees with the concerns that M. Ciccolo has been raising. He said that Newton has reduced bus fees and has done a variety of things to encourage children to walk and bike to school, such as installing blinking lights, hawk signals, and islands at various locations. He said that looking at bus fees would be a great subject for a study, though there could be other things that the MPO might examine regarding infrastructure, such as whether blinking yellow lights are more effective than hawk lights. He suggested that the MPO explore doing a study on bus fees, and that getting the necessary data from municipalities should be straightforward. K. Quackenbush said this information could be combined with information on how students are getting to school.

R. Reed said that Bedford has no bus fees, but still has problems related to parents dropping their children off at school. He suggested that one element of a study could be

a sample survey of parents to determine what motivates their choices to drive their children to school. He said that while parents may identify busing fees as a reason, their primary decision factors are likely safety and convenience.

D. Koses said that the City of Newton did a survey of parents several months ago on why they are driving their kids to school and what the City could do to get students to walk or take the bus. This survey received hundreds of responses. He offered to make this material available.

E. Bourassa asked if it would be possible to use the available funding from the current scope to do a “phase 1”-type information-gathering study. As part of this staff would develop a focus for a future study, and the products of this study could be an argument for funding a second phase next year.

M. Scott noted that a lot of valuable points had been made, and that she was glad that the group had the opportunity to have this discussion. She recommended that, using this information, MPO staff look at opportunities to adjust the existing scope and otherwise document what future study activities could be, and what budgets and staff time might be needed for those activities. This information could be used to develop a plan for when and how address these different issues.

K. Quackenbush said that if the Committee supports the general idea behind this type of study, as M. Ciccolo and others have commented, MPO staff could craft a “phase 1” activity that would set the stage for future work. The product of this effort might be a policy paper. MPO staff would use the available budget to do research, explore the availability of information, and set the parameters for future activities.

Richard Canale, At-Large Towns (Town of Lexington), noted that this issue does not affect schools only, but transportation overall. He suggested that, in the future, this issue could be connected to the Commonwealth’s mode-share goals. He said the Secretary of Transportation has noted that the only way that we are going to achieve the state’s mode share goals is through short trips. These school-related trips are ones that would make a definite impact.

D. Crowley noted that when the MPO voted against approving the existing work scope, he had wondered whether this study would just benefit the MAGIC subregion. He said that after hearing this discussion, he recognizes that this is an issue that affects communities throughout the region. He said that when staff returns to the MPO regarding this project, these issues need to be presented as ones that affect the whole region, not just the MAGIC subregion.

L. Wiener agreed that this topic needs to be examine and asked whether the project's budget needs to be spent in FFY 2015. M. Scott and S. Allam responded yes. L. Wiener said that this fact adds some pressure, and noted that the project budget is a large amount of money.

S. Allam said that staff will bring a recommendation back to the Committee in the future.

#### **6. MAPC Update on FFY 2015 Corridor/Subarea Planning Studies**

This item was deferred to a future UPWP Committee meeting.

#### **7. Possible Action Item: Decision on UPWP Committee Recommendation on Proposed FFY 2015 UPWP Amendment 1**

This item was deferred to a future UPWP Committee meeting.

#### **8. Member Items**

There were none.

#### **9. Next Meeting**

This item was deferred to a future UPWP Committee meeting.

#### **10. Adjourn**

A motion to adjourn was made by E. Bourassa and seconded by D. Koses. The motion carried.

## Attendance

---

<b>Members</b>	<b>Representatives and Alternates</b>
At-Large Cities (City of Newton)	David Koses
At-Large Town (Town of Arlington)	Laura Wiener
Inner Core Committee (City of Somerville)	Tom Bent
Massachusetts Department of Transportation	Sreelatha Allam
Metropolitan Area Planning Council	Eric Bourassa
Southwest Advisory Planning Committee (Town of Medway)	Dennis Crowley
Three Rivers Interlocal Council (Town of Norwood/NVCC)	Steve Olanoff

---

---

### **Other MPO Members and Alternates Affiliation**

---

Richard Canale	At-Large Towns (Town of Lexington)
Richard Reed	Minuteman Advisory Group on Interlocal Coordination (Town of Bedford)

---

---

### **Other Attendees Affiliation**

---

Michelle Ciccolo	Town of Lexington / Minuteman Advisory Group on Interlocal Coordination
------------------	--

---

---

### **MPO Staff/Central Transportation Planning Staff**

Karl Quackenbush, Executive Director  
Robin Mannion, Deputy Executive Director  
Mark Abbott  
Elizabeth Moore  
Scott Peterson  
Michelle Scott

---