

Draft Memorandum for the Record

Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization Meeting

August 20, 2015 Meeting

10:05 AM – 11:55 AM, State Transportation Building, Conference Rooms 2&3, 10 Park Plaza, Boston, MA

Steve Woelfel, Chair, representing Stephanie Pollack, Secretary and Chief Executive Officer, Massachusetts Department of Transportation (MassDOT)

Decisions

The Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) agreed to the following:

- approve the following work programs:
 - *MBTA Youth Pass Program and Title VI Equity Analysis*
 - *MBTA 2016 Title VI Program Monitoring*
 - *Program for Mass Transportation*
 - *Prioritization of Dedicated Bus Lanes*
- approve the minutes of the meeting of July 30, with a correction

Meeting Agenda

1. Public Comments

There were none.

2. Chair's Report—*Steve Woelfel, MassDOT*

There was none.

3. Committee Chairs' Reports

There were none.

4. Regional Transportation Advisory Council Report—*Mike Gowing, Chair, Advisory Council*

There was none.

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

K. Quackenbush reported that staff is working on finalizing the MPO's certification documents: the Long-Range Transportation Plan, *Charting Progress to 2040*; the federal fiscal years (FFYs) 2016-20 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP); and the

FFYs 2016 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP). Members will be notified when the final documents are posted.

6. Work Programs—Karl Quackenbush, Executive Director, Central Transportation Planning Staff (CTPS)

K. Quackenbush introduced four new work programs, which members discussed and approved.

MBTA Youth Pass Program and Title VI Equity Analysis

The work program for the *MBTA Youth Pass Program and Title VI Equity Analysis* will support the MBTA as it conducts a one-year pilot program that will provide MBTA passes to youths who do not already receive a student pass. The youth pass will cost \$26 for a monthly pass and \$7 for a seven-day pass. The MBTA is partnering with four municipalities – Boston, Chelsea, Malden, and Somerville – to implement the program.

CTPS will support the MBTA as it evaluates the pilot program by analyzing the program's impact on fare revenue and MBTA operations, and by conducting a Title VI fare equity analysis to determine if the program places a disproportionate impact on people with low-incomes or classes of persons protected under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

This work will be conducted under a contract with the MBTA.

A motion to approve the work program for the *MBTA Youth Pass Program and Title VI Equity Analysis* was made by the MBTA Advisory Board (Paul Regan), and seconded by the Metropolitan Area Planning Council (MAPC) (Eric Bourassa).

During a discussion, Dennis Crowley, South West Advisory Planning Committee (Town of Medway), asked if the results of the pilot program would be presented to the MPO, or if the MPO members would have to request a presentation. K. Quackenbush replied that staff is aware of the MPO's interest in hearing about agency-funded work that CTPS conducts and will consider a mechanism for keeping the MPO informed about such studies.

Lourenço Dantas, Massachusetts Port Authority, inquired about the difference between the youth pass and the student pass. K. Quackenbush explained that the youth pass would be provided to youths seeking access to employment or educational opportunities.

M. Gowing asked what the criteria for success would be for this program. Staff did not have that information.

P. Regan stated that the MBTA would identify candidates for the program by working with the participating municipalities and community groups since the MBTA does not have the ability to verify incomes. The cost of the program will be borne by the MBTA; the only cost to municipalities is staff time.

Aniko Laszlo, MassDOT, asked whether the MBTA has a target for the number of youths who will participate in the program. P. Regan replied that the MBTA is planning to have about a thousand participants.

Members then voted on the motion to approve the work program for the *MBTA Youth Pass Program and Title VI Equity Analysis*. The motion carried.

MBTA 2016 Title VI Program Monitoring

The work program for *MBTA 2016 Title VI Program Monitoring* represents work that CTPS will be conducting in the coming year to assist the MBTA with its reporting requirements under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. CTPS has been assisting the MBTA with its Title VI reporting for a number of years.

As a recipient of federal funds, the MBTA must ensure that it is providing a comparable level and quality of transportation services to all customers without regard to race, color, or national origin. This current scope of work includes the preparation of an internal report for the MBTA. The next triennial report will be due to the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) in 2017. The data assessment that is part of this effort will focus on a number of service indicators, including transit vehicle loads, headways, on-time performance, transit amenity distribution, and vehicle assignments.

This work will be conducted under a contract with the MBTA.

A motion to approve the work program for *MBTA 2016 Title VI Program Monitoring* was made by the Inner Core Committee (City of Somerville) (Tom Bent), and seconded by the South Shore Coalition (Town of Braintree) (Christine Stickney). The motion carried.

Program for Mass Transportation

Through the work program for the *Program for Mass Transportation*, CTPS will assist with the production of the Program for Mass Transportation (PMT), the MBTA's 25-year master plan which is updated every five years. CTPS has assisted the MBTA in various ways with past PMTs. For this update, CTPS will largely provide travel modelling services.

The travel model that was developed for the MPO's Long-Range Transportation Plan will be employed in the modelling of three build scenarios (representing various mixes of

transit improvements) and a no-build scenario, all with a horizon year of 2040. Planning assumptions used for the City of Boston's Go Boston 2030 study will be incorporated into the modeling to the extent possible. For each scenario, staff will derive projected transit ridership. MassDOT will be responsible for developing cost estimates. Fiscal constraint will be considered in the development of this PMT.

This project will be funded through a MassDOT SPR contract.

A motion to approve the work program for the *Program for Mass Transportation* was made by the MassDOT Highway Division (John Romano), and seconded by the MBTA Advisory Board (P. Regan).

During a discussion, Ken Miller, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), asked why the project is being funded with SPR monies rather than MBTA funds. S. Woelfel replied that MassDOT's Office of Transportation Planning has been conducting more work for the MBTA, except for transit service planning.

K. Miller inquired about which agency or organization would be conducting the largest part of the work on the PMT. The project manager, Scott Hamwey, MassDOT, replied that three consulting firms have been engaged. AECOM will be the lead consultant for the commuter rail and rapid transit modes, and Nelson/Nygaard will be the lead for the bus mode. The MassDOT Rail and Transit Division, which will be conducting a study of THE RIDE, will focus on the paratransit mode. CTPS will be focused on the water transportation element, in addition to its main responsibility of providing travel forecasts for all of the modes.

K. Miller inquired about the public process and Steering Committee for the PMT. S. Hamwey explained that the consultants are conducting an internal analysis of the state of the MBTA system, which will be presented to the MBTA's Fiscal Management and Control Board next month. The public process is expected to begin in late September or October. The Steering Committee will be comprised of MBTA leadership and department heads and CTPS staff. K. Miller then noted the importance of keeping the MPO informed.

Lourenço Dantas, Massachusetts Port Authority, asked how service-related changes to the transit system (i.e. schedule changes, increases in vehicle frequency, etc.) will be reflected in the modelling of the build scenarios as compared to new systems/services or transit extensions. S. Hamwey replied that this PMT will be focused on state-of-good-repair issues, while at that same time, there will be recognition of the need to meet the growing demand for transit. The development of the build scenarios will be subject to the public process. He also noted that the public process will include conversations

about trends (such as changing demographics, mode choice, and climate change) that may have an impact on the model scenarios.

L. Dantas asked whether Task 8 in the work program, which would produce a needs assessment for the ferry service, would be focused on the state of the assets or on the service. S. Hamwey replied that, as for all the other modes, a state-of-the-system report will be prepared for the water transportation modes. More resources may have to be identified in the future in order to conduct more visioning for this mode.

K. Quackenbush noted that CTPS will also be responsible for conducting air quality and transportation equity analyses through this project.

Rafael Mares, Conservation Law Foundation, asked if greenhouse gas (GHG) analyses would be included in the project. K. Quackenbush confirmed that GHG emissions are included in the air quality analyses.

Members then voted on the motion to approve the work program for the *Program for Mass Transportation*. The motion carried.

Prioritization of Dedicated Bus Lanes

The work program for the *Prioritization of Dedicated Bus Lanes* will support MassDOT as it seeks to determine where in the Greater Boston area there is the potential to modify bus operations to serve more people by installing dedicated bus lanes.

CTPS staff will work with MassDOT and MBTA staff on this project. CTPS will map daily bus ridership on roadway segments where there are at least 3,000 passengers per day, and bus travel times by route segment. Data from the MBTA will be used to compare peak-period bus travel times with free-flow bus travel times (estimated from late-night bus travel times).

Thresholds will be proposed for ridership and travel times, and those thresholds will be used to identify roadway segments that are potential candidates for dedicated bus lanes. The roadway geometry of the candidate segments will also be examined to determine if the roadways could be reconfigured to include dedicated bus lanes, and to estimate the share of all travelers on those segments that would benefit from dedicated bus lanes. Lastly, criteria will be developed for prioritizing candidate segments for dedicated bus lanes.

This project is related to an MPO-funded study in the FFY 2016 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP), *Identifying Opportunities to Alleviate Bus Delay*.

This project will be funded through a MassDOT Section 5303 contract.

A motion to approve the work program for the *Prioritization of Dedicated Bus Lanes* was made by the MBTA Advisory Board (P. Regan), and seconded by MAPC (E. Bourassa).

During a discussion, P. Regan suggested that staff reach out to the communities where candidate roadway segments are identified (in Task 5 and 6 of the work program) to inform them about the process underway. He noted that people at the local level could help to identify areas where issues associated with freight unloading and retail deliveries may arise if dedicated bus lanes are installed. S. Hamwey expressed a preference for involving the communities on these issues through dialogue in the PMT process, rather than writing a public involvement task into this work program. He noted that this project will be feeding into the PMT process.

L. Dantas expressed support for this work program. Given that the study will be focused on existing MBTA bus routes, he urged that consideration also be given to the non-MBTA uses that may benefit from dedicated bus lanes, such as services provided by private carriers and transportation management associations. He also suggested that staff look for opportunities to consider roadway segments that may not have existing bus service, but where there may be demand for service. For example, the South Boston Waterfront Sustainable Transportation Plan identified demand for service between North Station and the Seaport district and made recommendations for dedicated bus lanes between those two locations.

L. Dantas also suggested considering opportunities for extracting the full capacity of the roadway. Right-of-way could be used differently depending on the time of day; for example, a lane might be used for bus service during the day and parking at night, or a bus lane might have reversible lanes. S. Hamwey then discussed that the next steps after this study would be to determine the solutions particular to each candidate location.

Then E. Bourassa discussed the potential impact that policy decisions could have on bus travel times. He mentioned a Barr Foundation study that included an analysis conducted by the Institute for Transportation and Development Policy that showed that nearly half of bus rapid transit (BRT) time savings resulted from pre-paid boardings. He suggested comparing time savings from dedicated lanes and queue jumping to time savings that could be achieved from having a policy that allows boardings at all doors of the bus. S. Hamwey noted that such issues would be considered in the UPWP study, *Identifying Opportunities to Alleviate Bus Delay*. K. Quackenbush confirmed that that

study would aim to determine the level of delay caused by traffic and fare payment policies.

Tom O'Rourke, Three Rivers Interlocal Council (Town of Norwood/Neponset Valley Chamber of Commerce), asked if there are other cities that are studying these issues. S. Hamwey pointed to several examples, including a BRT corridor in Cleveland and dedicated bus lanes in New York City. He also remarked on the bus corridor on Washington Street and the South End of Boston and the Route 28X project that was previously considered for Blue Hill Avenue.

K. Miller asked if the impact of fare payment options will be considered in the PMT. S. Hamwey confirmed that it would be considered in the PMT. He also noted that staff is examining dwell-time data from a free fare day that could show the impact of reducing boarding times.

Patrick Hoey, City of Boston, expressed the city's enthusiasm about working with MassDOT, MBTA, and MPO staff on this topic. He also noted that the data and analyses from the Barr Foundation's study and the South Boston Waterfront Sustainable Transportation Plan provide a good foundation for this project.

Members then voted on the work program for the *Prioritization of Dedicated Bus Lanes*. The motion carried.

7. Meeting Minutes—Maureen Kelly, MPO Staff

A motion to approve the minutes of the meeting of July 30 – with a correction to a project description suggested by T. O'Rourke – was made by the MAPC (E. Bourassa), and seconded by the South Shore Coalition (Town of Braintree) (C. Stickney). The motion carried. The Massachusetts Port Authority (L. Dantas) abstained.

8. Fairmount Line Station Access Analysis, Selection of Study Locations—Casey-Marie Claude, MPO Staff

C. Claude presented the proposed study locations for the *Fairmount Line Station Access Analysis* project and discussed the location selection process. Through this project staff will be studying ways to improve bicycle and pedestrian access to select stations on the Fairmount commuter rail corridor and ways to improve safety for those users. This project will build upon work conducted by the Boston Redevelopment Agency (BRA) and other entities.

The objectives of the study are to identify and recommend low-cost measures that are easy to implement in the near term and higher-cost improvements that could be

implemented in the long term. The recommendations will be provided to the City of Boston.

To select stations for study, staff examined areas within a half-mile radius of each station on the Fairmount line using the Active-Trans Priority Tool (APT). The APT provides a methodology for prioritizing bicycle and pedestrian improvements along existing roadways.

The presentation condensed the ten steps outlined in the APT guidebook into six processes: defining factors (categories that reflect the values and priorities of the site); selecting variables (that illustrate the state of the factors within the station area); collecting data for the variables; scaling variables (to fit a common 0 to 10 scale); establishing and applying factor weights; and creating a ranked list.

Considered among the factors were: connectivity (gaps in the bicycle network as identified in a previous CTPS study); constraints (where the station area is covered by multiple jurisdictions); transportation demand on the station area (both now and projected for 2035 and 2040); equity (the percent of the station area in environmental justice areas, the percent of each population without vehicle availability, and the percent of each population within at-risk age groups); existing conditions (vehicular crash data); safety (bicycle and pedestrian crashes); and stakeholder input (from the BRA, WalkBoston, and three entities from the Fairmount/Indigo Line CDC Collaborative).

A table was shown indicating the stations that the stakeholder groups prioritized for study. Staff then weighted the various factors giving the most weight to stakeholder input and safety. The stations selected for study are Newmarket, Morton Street, Four Corners/Geneva Avenue, Talbot Avenue, and Blue Hill Avenue. The stations that were not selected are Upham's Corner, Fairmount, and Readville.

Although Upham's Corner was ranked higher than Blue Hill Avenue, staff selected Blue Hill Avenue at the recommendation of the BRA because the area around that station is projected to have the most population growth and the highest ridership on the Fairmount line in the future (2040 and 2035, respectively).

Staff requested the MPO's approval to proceed with the project using these study locations.

Discussion

P. Hoey expressed the City of Boston's support for this project. He remarked upon the good work that has come from the Fairmount/Indigo planning initiative, and he offered to

share information that the Boston Transportation Department has gathered over the years regarding the Fairmount stations.

The MPO then gave staff the approval to proceed with studying these stations.

9. Long-Range Transportation Plan Priority Corridors: Route 140 Arterial Segment Study in Franklin—Seth Asante, MPO Staff

K. Quackenbush introduced a presentation on the *Route 140 Arterial Segment Study* in Franklin. This study was conducted as part of an ongoing program – *Priority Corridors for LRTP Needs Assessment* – for studying roadway locations identified in the Needs Assessment of the Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP). S. Asante then gave a presentation about the study.

With the MPO's approval, Route 140 in Franklin was selected for study following a review and prioritization of arterial segments identified in the Needs Assessment of the LRTP. The objectives of the study were to identify ways to increase safety for pedestrians, bicyclists, and motorists; improve access to businesses; accommodate bicyclists; promote healthy transportation; and reduce congestion.

At the outset, staff assembled an Advisory Task Force comprised of representatives of the Town of Franklin and MassDOT Highway District 3. The task force identified two segments of Route 140 to focus on – West Central Street between Franklin Village Shopping Center and Beaver Street, and East Central Street between King Street/Chestnut Street and the entrance to the Municipal Center and the Big Y store. The section of Route 140 that runs through downtown Franklin was excluded because it is the subject of another project.

The problems identified on the West Central Street segment include a high number of crashes; a lack of left-turn lanes for vehicles accessing business driveways; and a lack of accommodations for bicycles due to the absence of roadway shoulders. The intersection of West Central Street and Franklin Village Drive has been identified by MassDOT as among the top five percent of the high-crash locations in the state. The problems identified on the East Central Street segment include a high number of crashes and a lack of signal coordination, which creates traffic congestion and queues. There have been crashes involving pedestrians at both locations, as well as crashes involving bicyclists on the East Central Street segment.

Staff worked with the task force members to identify ways to address the problems. For the West Central Street segment, they recommended developing and evaluating

various cross-sectional improvement alternatives. For the East Central Street segment, they recommended retiming and coordinating traffic signals to improve traffic flow.

Staff developed three alternatives for the West Central Street segment, which currently has a four-lane configuration. Alternative One, a road diet, would reconfigure the roadway to three lanes, including a two-way left-turn lane in the center, and six-foot shoulders for bicycle accommodation. Alternative Two would be a three-lane, road diet configuration similar to Alternative One, except that there would be left-turn lanes at selected locations. Alternative Three would be a four lane configuration with the option of either two-way left-turn lanes or left-turn lanes. Alternative Three would not accommodate bicyclists. All three alternatives would be expected to improve safety and access to business areas. Alternatives One and Two would also support the goals of promoting healthy transportation, improving bicycle accommodations, and calming traffic.

The recommendations for the East Central Street segment are to coordinate the three signalized intersections to improve traffic flow. Other general recommendations for improving intersections along the roadway include lengthening left-turn lanes; installing accessible pedestrian signals; installing countdown timers; and improving the visibility of signals.

S. Asante provided crash-reduction factors for each type of intersection improvement recommended. These factors give an indication of the degree to which certain types of improvements may reduce crashes. For example, adding left-turn lanes can be expected to reduce crashes by 37 to 54 percent. He also provided estimates concerning the benefits to traffic operations from particular improvements. For example, signal coordination could be expected to reduce travel time by as much as 19 percent, and road diets can be expected to calm traffic and create pedestrian- and bicyclist-friendly roadways.

The next steps following this study are for MassDOT and the Town of Franklin to coordinate on the design and engineering for the improvements, and to work with the MPO to identify funding for construction.

Discussion

P. Regan remarked that the scoring scheme used to evaluate the three alternatives gave undue weight to the alternatives that included bicycle lanes. Alternatives One and Two, which include bicycle lanes, got a score for improving bicycle accommodations, as well as scores for promoting healthy transportation and calming traffic, whereas Alternative Three, which does not have bicycle lanes, failed to score under any of those

criteria. He asked if there are bicycle counts for Route 140 and if staff has a sense of what the need is for bicycle lanes on this roadway.

S. Asante replied that staff does have bicycle counts. He said that the volume of bicyclists on West Central Street is low and that town officials believe this to be due to the high speed of vehicles (40 miles per hour) on this section of Route 140 making bicycling feel unsafe. The bicycle counts are higher in surrounding areas where vehicle speeds are slower, including near the town center and several schools. He discussed how the road diet options (Alternatives One and Two) would reduce vehicle speeds and make the roadway safer for bicycling and walking. He also noted that the pedestrian safety and traffic calming aspects were considered as promoting healthy transportation.

L. Dantas asked if staff knows what portion of traffic is destined for businesses along the corridor, and what portion is through-traffic. S. Asante replied that staff conducted driveway counts in the study area. Left-turning traffic into the commercial areas was the cause of many of the accidents.

L. Dantas suggested that 11-foot travel lanes might be more appropriate to reduce vehicle speeds than the 12-foot lanes as proposed in the study. S. Asante agreed and noted that staff is considering an alternative in which the roadway would be striped for 11-foot lanes, allowing a buffer between bicyclists and vehicles.

David Koses, At-Large City of Newton, asked whether the two-way left-turn center lane configuration in Alternative One raised any concerns about safety, considering that vehicles travelling in both directions would be using the same space for turning.

S. Asante replied that the task force did raise the concern about the potential for head-on crashes. Alternative One, however, has the advantage of providing access to every business on the roadway. Alternative Two, while avoiding the head-on crash issue, would not provide a turn lane for every business. This issue will be addressed in the design process.

K. Miller noted that FHWA is working with MassDOT on the Every Day Counts initiative, which promotes road diets as a means for improving safety and mobility on roadways. He referred to a recent road diet guidebook produced by FHWA and noted that there is some evidence that center turn lanes improve safety. For the road diet alternatives proposed in the Route 140 study, he suggested considering 11-foot lanes to incorporate bicycle lanes.

K. Miller then asked if staff is proposing additional traffic calming measures on Route 140. S. Asante explained that the traffic calming would be produced from reconfiguring the roadway to three lanes. K. Miller expressed some skepticism about whether that

would be the effect. He then suggested that there may be opportunities to improve the roadway with consideration of land use or urban design elements.

M. Gowing inquired about the ownership of the roadway. S. Asante replied that the West Central Street section of the roadway is owned by MassDOT, and the jurisdiction of the East Central Street section is shared by MassDOT and the Town of Franklin.

M. Gowing asked if the proposed improvements to the roadway were approved at the Franklin town meeting. S. Asante replied that the town is interested in either Alternative One or Two, the road diet options. D. Crowley added that the Town of Franklin would likely have to seek funding through the MPO's Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) to advance this project.

D. Crowley then expressed concern about requirements for including bicycle lanes in roadway design. He noted that in rural suburban towns there is little demand for bicycle lanes and that adding bicycle lanes on state highways in those towns creates traffic flow problems. K. Miller stated that FHWA encourages context sensitive design and consideration of bicycle lanes to the extent possible.

In response to a question from K. Quackenbush, S. Asante further discussed why in the comparison of the three alternatives, Alternatives One and Two were recognized as options that would promote healthy transportation. These two road diet alternatives would provide more safety to pedestrians because of signal retiming that would increase the pedestrian walk time, and the lane reduction which would shorten the crossing distance for pedestrians.

10.Members Items

T. Bent announced that the Community Path from Cedar Street to Lowell Street in Somerville has opened. Congressman Michael Capuano, Somerville Mayor Joseph Curatone, Transportation Secretary Stephanie Pollack, and Somerville's legislative delegation were among the officials at the opening ceremony. Mayor Curtatone thanked MassDOT and the MPO for supporting this trail project. The next section of the Path will go from Lowell Street to Lechmere Station.

K. Miller stated that the FHWA and FTA have released their final report and recommendations from their 2014 review of the MPO's transportation planning process. The agencies are requesting that this item be included on an upcoming MPO agenda.

M. Gowing reported that the Town of Acton has been ranked 11th among the best places to live in the country, up from 16th place five years ago. He credited the MPO's

investment in rail trail and complete streets improvements in the town as among the reasons for its rise in the rankings.

D. Crowley asked MassDOT staff to provide an update on the status of two projects included in the FFY 2015 element of the TIP that may be at risk of not being ready for advertisement in this fiscal year, which ends in September. Marie Rose, MassDOT, stated that one project, the *Improvements to Commonwealth Avenue (Boston)*, will be ready for advertising in time. She offered to check to see if any other projects in the Boston Region will not be ready for advertisement.

11. Adjourn

A motion to adjourn was made by the MassDOT Highway Division (J. Romano), and seconded by the MBTA Advisory Board (P. Regan). The motion carried.

Attendance

Members

Representatives and Alternates

At-Large City (City of Newton)	David Koses
City of Boston (Boston Redevelopment Agency)	Lara Mérida
City of Boston (Boston Transportation Department)	Patrick Hoey
Federal Highway Administration	Ken Miller
Inner Core Committee (City of Somerville)	Tom Bent
Massachusetts Department of Transportation	Steve Woelfel
	David Anderson
	Marie Rose
MassDOT Highway Division	John Romano
Massachusetts Port Authority	Lourenço Dantas
MBTA	Janice Ramsay
MBTA Advisory Board	Paul Regan
Metropolitan Area Planning Council	Eric Bourassa
Minuteman Advisory Group on Interlocal Coordination (Town of Bedford)	Richard Reed
North Suburban Planning Council (City of Woburn)	Tina Cassidy
Regional Transportation Advisory Council	Mike Gowing
South Shore Coalition (Town of Braintree)	Christine Stickney
South West Advisory Planning Committee (Town of Medway)	Dennis Crowley
Three Rivers Interlocal Council (Town of Norwood/Neponset Valley Chamber of Commerce)	Tom O'Rourke

Other Attendees	Affiliation
Sreelatha Allam	MassDOT Office of Transportation Planning
Scott Hamwey	MassDOT
Aniko Laszlo	MassDOT
Rafael Mares	Conservation Law Foundation
Steve Olanoff	Three Rivers Interlocal Council
Constance Raphael	MassDOT District 4
Ellen Spring	Office of State Representative Denise Garlick

MPO Staff/Central Transportation Planning Staff

Karl Quackenbush, Executive Director
Robin Mannion, Deputy Executive Director

Mark Abbott
Seth Asante
Casey-Marie Claude
David Fargen
Maureen Kelly
Anne McGahan
Elizabeth Moore
Sean Pfalzer
Michelle Scott
