

# Draft Memorandum for the Record

## Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization Meeting

### July 7, 2016 Meeting

10:00 AM – 12:35 PM, State Transportation Building, Conference Rooms 2&3, 10 Park Plaza, Boston, MA

David Mohler, 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 minutes of the meeting of May 19
- approve an amended work program for the *Systemwide Title VI/Environmental Justice Assessment of Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Projects*
- release Draft Amendment One to the Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP), *Charting Progress to 2040*, for a 30-day public review period

### Meeting Agenda

#### 1. Public Comments

Members heard public comments regarding the following projects:

##### ***Cochituate Rail Trail and Pedestrian Bridge (Framingham, Natick)***

William Chenard, Natick's Deputy Town Administrator for Operations – who was joined by Janice Henderson of the Cochituate Rail Trail Advisory Committee and Mike Balcom of the Friends of Natick Trails – asked the MPO members to reconsider their decision to delay the programming of the *Cochituate Rail Trail and Pedestrian Bridge (Framingham, Natick)* project in the TIP from FFY 2018 to FFY 2020, and to restore the programming date to FFY 2018. He provided an update on the project, as well. He noted that the Town of Natick has committed over \$800,000 for design and due diligence work and the town meeting approved \$2.5 million for land acquisition. The town expects the 25% design plans to be completed in the coming months and the 100% designs to be complete in 2017. A nonprofit organization has been formed to build public support, help finance land acquisition, and maintain the trail.

Puja Mehta, Office of State Senator Karen Spilka, also expressed the Senator's support for restoring the project to the FFY 2018 fiscal element of the TIP.

***Carlton Street Footbridge (Brookline)***

Mel Kleckner, Brookline's Town Administrator – accompanied by Bill Smith of Brookline's Engineering Department – asked the MPO members to reconsider their decision to delay the programming of the *Carlton Street Footbridge (Brookline)* project from the FFY 2016 to the FFY 2018 fiscal element of the TIP. He reported that the project is at the 75% design stage, town meeting has authorized the taking of all easements, and the project will be ready for construction in 2017. He also noted that the project is an integral part of other improvements occurring in the Muddy River area, around the entranceway to the Emerald Necklace. The project cost estimate is \$2.9 million.

MPO member Marie Rose, MassDOT Highway Division, stated that the Highway Division is recommending that the project be programmed in the FFY 2018 element because of concerns about the project's readiness for construction. There are some documents missing from the plans. M. Kleckner offered to expedite the provision of any materials that are required.

**2. Chair's Report—*David Mohler, MassDOT***

There was no report.

**3. Committee Chairs' Reports**

There were no reports.

**4. Regional Transportation Advisory Council Report—*Tegin Bennett, Advisory Council Chair***

There was no report.

**5. Executive Director's Report—*Karl Quackenbush, MPO Executive Director***

K. Quackenbush drew members' attention to an updated meeting calendar. He then discussed a recent federal rulemaking that proposes that all MPOs in an Urbanized Area (UZA) should either consolidate or develop joint certification documents. (Staff distributed a map of the Boston UZA.) The public review period for the rulemaking ends August 26. The Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations (AMPO) and AASHTO have requested an extension of the public review period.

E. Bourassa, Metropolitan Area Planning Council (MAPC), announced that the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) will run a webinar on July 15 at 1:00 PM to discuss the proposed rulemaking.

D. Mohler stated that the Massachusetts Association of Regional Planning Agencies (MARPA) intends to comment on the rulemaking. MPO members who wish to comment should coordinate with K. Quackenbush, and the issue can be discussed at a future MPO meeting.

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

A motion to approve the minutes of the meeting of May 19 was made by the MAPC (E. Bourassa), and seconded by the At-Large City of Everett (Jay Monty). The motion carried.

#### **7. Work Program for Systemwide Title VI / Environmental Justice Assessment of Transportation Improvement Program Projects—Karl Quackenbush, MPO Executive Director**

K. Quackenbush introduced the work program for the *Systemwide Title VI / Environmental Justice Assessment of Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Projects*. The objective of this pilot project is to develop and test an approach to better assess the systemwide equity implications of the TIP's roadway program. Staff proposes to use the travel demand model to assess the benefits and burdens of roadway projects on environmental justice populations (minorities and people with low-incomes) as compared to non-environmental justice populations. The method developed could be used going forward as a means to periodically assess the equity impact of the collection of TIP projects. This study is included in the MPO's Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP).

#### ***Discussion***

J. Monty inquired about how staff plans to test the validity of the model.

K. Quackenbush explained that staff would run a series of tests to validate that the model has the proper sensitivities.

Laura Gilmore O'Connor, Massachusetts Port Authority, asked if other MPOs have conducted similar analyses. K. Quackenbush reported that his contacts at the federal agencies have not indicated that other MPOs have done a study along these lines.

Jim Gillooly, City of Boston, asked how pedestrian and bicycle travel would be assessed in the modeling work for this study. K. Quackenbush replied that the complete equity analyses that staff conducts for the MPO's certification documents takes those users into account, however, this study will focus on motorized travel. Staff could potentially request another UPWP study to take those users into account.

Ken Miller, FHWA, asked if the market segments that will be studied include transit users as well as roadway users. K. Quackenbush explained that this study will focus on automobile users as well as transit users, such as bus riders, that traverse the roadways included in the study. Staff already has a means for conducting a transit equity analysis for TIP transit projects.

K. Miller and D. Mohler raised questions about the possibility of using the methodology developed in this study to conduct equity analyses for specific projects or roadway facilities. Specifically, K. Miller expressed an interest in understanding the estimated burden of traffic delay on bus riders for specific roadway projects. And, D. Mohler inquired whether the methodology might be used for an analysis of spending on projects to determine if there is underspending on projects that benefit environmental justice populations.

In response to their questions, K. Quackenbush explained that the proposal is for a system level analysis (that sums the impact of a set of TIP projects or a program of investments), rather than an analysis on individual projects. He noted that a certain degree of error can be accommodated at the systems level that cannot be accommodated at the project level. Theoretically, however, it would be possible to use the methodology for a spending analysis. Further, he noted that the findings of this study could present other avenues for incorporating equity considerations into the planning process, such as improving TIP project selection criteria.

Dennis Crowley, South West Advisory Planning Committee (Town of Medway), expressed concern about the potential for this study to lead to changes to the TIP project evaluation process that could put suburban communities at an undue disadvantage in the project evaluation process. K. Quackenbush assured him that the objective of the study is not to develop data for scoring individual projects, rather it is to find a way to assess the equity implications of the entire TIP program of projects.

D. Mohler advised staff to be sure that the model can produce the results intended because when the data results are available, some may want to use it for project-level analyses.

L. G. O'Connor pointed out the limitations of modeling for understanding equity impacts and suggested that this study should be paired with a qualitative analysis.

K. Quackenbush noted that there is a task in the work program for examining data from the Massachusetts Household Survey, which may provide other means of rounding out the understanding of equity issues.

T. Bennett asked if the model would be able to capture secondary effects on the region's transportation network. K. Quackenbush replied yes.

J. Gillooly observed that the model results focus on changes in trip times that would result from changes in the transportation network. He noted that there are some projects that may not improve trip times but that are invaluable for other reasons, such as for their ability to correct an unsafe situation. Those projects should not be discounted, he said. He also expressed concern about the results of this study being considered as the only means of making determinations about equity, given the limits of the model. K. Quackenbush agreed that safety benefits cannot be explicitly represented in the model; however, the model can be used to identify populations that travel through intersections that will accrue safety benefits from TIP projects. The intent is to attempt to calculate those safety benefits off-model.

J. Gillooly asked for more details about how staff envisions using the tool developed in this study in the TIP process. K. Quackenbush discussed how staff is being responsive to FHWA, which is calling for MPOs to assess the equity of their TIPs.

J. Gillooly asked for specifics about FHWA's proposed approach. K. Miller indicated that the MPO's current practices concerning equity considerations are consistent with FHWA's recommendations. The use of the travel demand model, however, offers the potential for a finer-grained approach to assessing equity. K. Quackenbush further discussed how the study will increase the robustness of the understanding of transportation equity in the region. Modeling could be particularly helpful in determining the equity impact of large roadway projects that may serve people who live beyond the project limits.

J. Gillooly expressed concern about the practicality of an approach that assigns equity value to projects that are not located in environmental justice neighborhoods. (The MPO's current approach is geographically based.) He noted that it may be difficult to explain to the public that the MPO considered a project outside an environmental justice community as benefiting those residents. In response, K. Quackenbush pointed out that the TIP project evaluation process has a component that uses GIS-map buffering techniques to assess the impacts of vehicle emissions on residents who are proximate to project areas. Staff is interested in developing other metrics, for example, to assess safety benefits.

D. Mohler asked for more information about what staff intends to do with the results of the pilot project. K. Quackenbush replied that staff will return to the MPO with the results

and recommendations about whether to go forward with a future equity analysis on the TIP. The MPO will determine whether to adopt the recommendations.

Dennis Giombetti, MetroWest Regional Collaborative (Town of Framingham), and D. Mohler asked for more clarification about whether the systemwide analysis of TIP projects could be broken down to see results by individual projects. While noting that the intent of the project is to focus on a systems level analysis, K. Quackenbush stated that staff could provide that detail if requested.

J. Gillooly discussed the MPO's environmental justice work as a deliberate effort to increase the amount of transportation spending directed to benefit people who have historically been deprived of such investments. While expressing support for developing good environmental justice measures, he voiced concerns about proceeding with the study unless language is added to the work program to emphasize that the study is a pilot and to indicate factors that were not fully taken into consideration in the study, such as bicycle and pedestrian access.

Richard Canale, At-Large Town of Lexington, agreed with J. Gillooly's comments. He asked if the MPO would be obligated by FHWA to take another action to address equity if the MPO does not approve this work program. K. Quackenbush replied that staff may present another approach to enhance the understanding of equity. K. Miller added that FHWA requires MPOs to conduct an analysis to determine if projects' benefits and burdens are equitably distributed. While FHWA offers guidance concerning methods for doing so, MPOs have latitude to determine the methods they will use. Also, if successful, this study could be beneficial to the MPO by providing more information for equity considerations; the MPO could decide after seeing the results whether they have confidence in the results.

D. Crowley asked if the study report will show the impact on project scoring or provide recommendations for how the MPO could use the information developed in the study. K. Quackenbush explained that the study would not focus on TIP programming. The report will make recommendations to the MPO.

D. Mohler asked for clarification about Task 5 of the work program. Scott Peterson, Director of Technical Services at CTPS, replied that this task would document the new equity methodology as tested on a set of previously approved TIP projects and applied to the current set of TIP projects.

A motion to approve the work program for the *Systemwide Title VI/Environmental Justice Assessment of Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Projects*, as

presented, was made by the MAPC (E. Bourassa), and seconded by the At-Large Town of Lexington (R. Canale).

Following additional discussion, the motion makers accepted a friendly amendment made by the City of Boston (J. Gillooly) to add language to the work program to emphasize that the study is a pilot project and that the results are not intended to be used for analyses on certification documents until the results are fully vetted by the MPO. The rationale for the amendment was a concern about the lack of clarity about how pedestrians will be taken into consideration in the study as the model results are likely to be focused on travel-time savings and reducing vehicle delay.

T. Bennett expressed interest in seeing how the study results compare to the MPO's current equity analyses and whether the new methodology could add value to the project selection process. She noted that the new methodology does not have to be seen as replacing the current methodology.

D. Mohler noted that if the MPO adopts the new methodology for use in evaluating future TIPs, a failing analysis would mean that a TIP would be considered non-compliant with Title VI.

In response to further questions, K. Quackenbush noted that the purpose of an equity analysis on the TIP is to examine the proportionate impacts (benefits and burdens) of transportation projects on populations protected under Title VI versus the non-protected populations.

Elizabeth Moore, Director of Policy and Planning at CTPS, explained that the new methodology will not negate the existing process for selecting TIP projects, rather it will be a final check to determine if the TIP is equitable. If the new analysis were to show that there is an inequity in the TIP, the problem could be mitigated. She also reported that the new methodology would be included in the MPO's forthcoming disparate impact policy. Staff will be presenting this draft policy to the MPO and will seek the MPO's input on the development of metrics.

J. Gillooly expressed concern about the new methodology trumping the MPO's existing methodology. K. Miller responded that the new methodology would not trump the existing one, rather it may provide additional information or an alternative method. D. Mohler noted, however, that if the TIP were to fail this final check, the MPO would have to identify and address the inequality.

E. Moore noted that the MPO's current equity analysis examines only the distribution of funds (not the impact of projects). There is an assumption that spending on a project is

beneficial to the community where the project is being implemented, while the project could actually present a burden to the community. Staff is trying to develop a more nuanced method of evaluating the benefits and burdens of TIP spending.

D. Mohler discussed the concern that the public may judge equity based on whether or not transportation spending has occurred in a particular community.

### **Vote**

Members voted on the motion to approve the amended work program for the *Systemwide Title VI/Environmental Justice Assessment of Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Projects*. The motion carried. The following members were opposed: MetroWest Regional Collaborative (Town of Framingham) (D. Giombetti) and South West Advisory Planning Committee (Town of Medway) (D. Crowley).

## **8. Long-Range Transportation Plan Amendment One—Anne McGahan, MPO Staff**

A. McGahan presented Draft Amendment One to the Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP), *Charting Progress to 2040*. The primary reason for Amendment One is to make the LRTP consistent with the FFYs 2016–20 TIP and its amendments, the proposed FFYs 2017–21 TIP, and the Massachusetts Capital Investment Program (CIP).

Amendment One would make the following changes to the LRTP:

- Transfer MPO target funds to Phase 1 of the *Green Line Extension* (Lechmere Station to Union Square in Somerville and College Avenue in Medford) from Phase 2 (College Avenue to Route 16 in Medford), in keeping with Amendment Four of the FFYs 2016-20 TIP and the proposed FFYs 2017-21 TIP
- Program an additional \$16.8 million of state funds for the *Ramp Construction on Interstate 95 Northbound and Improvements to Canton Street and Dedham Street (Canton, Norwood, and Westwood)* project
- Program MPO target funds and earmarks for the *Reconstruction of Melnea Cass Boulevard (Boston)* project, to align with the proposed FFYs 2017–21 TIP; the project must be included in the LRTP because it costs more than \$20 million
- Document state funding for two regionally significant projects programmed in the CIP: the *Reconstruction of the Interstate 90 and Interstate 495 Interchange (Hopkinton and Westborough)* project and a new bridge connection from Burgin Parkway over the MBTA railroad in Quincy



A. McGahan drew members' attention to items in the amendment, including project descriptions, project lists, and program funding, as well as, federally required analyses for air quality, greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, and transportation equity. She then provided an overview of the requirements for the analyses.

Regarding the air quality conformity determination, the MPO is in attainment for both ozone and carbon monoxide standards, so the MPO is not required to conduct a conformity analysis for those pollutants. The MPO must, however, provide a status update on the following projects in the State Implementation Plan: *Red Line-Blue Connector (Design)*; *Fairmount Line Improvements*; and *Green Line Extension (Lechmere Station to College Avenue and Union Square)*.

The GHG analysis is a requirement of the Commonwealth's Global Warming Solutions Act. Staff used the travel demand model to perform a Build and No-Build analysis for projects in the LRTP amendment. The amendment reports on the carbon dioxide emission reductions expected from the implementation of projects in the LRTP.

Two transportation equity analyses were conducted using the travel demand model to determine if the set of projects in the LRTP would have adverse effects on minority and low-income populations in the region. The accessibility analysis examined the ability to access destinations, such as places of employment, healthcare facilities, and higher education facilities; and the mobility, congestion, and air quality analyses examined travel times, congested vehicle miles of travel, and emissions.

### ***Discussion***

K. Miller asked staff to include information about the design status of projects in the project descriptions in the future. Specifically, he asked about the status of the *Reconstruction of Melnea Cass Boulevard (Boston)* project. Marie Rose, MassDOT Highway Division, confirmed that the project is at the pre-25% design stage. J. Gillooly reported that the Boston Transportation Department has been working closely with the Roxbury community and the Friends of Melnea Cass Boulevard to develop the design. The cross-section for the boulevard has been designed and refinements are being made to the intersection designs. The 25% design plans are expected to be developed within a year. The project has the support of legislators who represent residents of Roxbury.

K. Miller also inquired about the status of the project to build a new bridge connection from Burgin Parkway over the MBTA railroad in Quincy. M. Rose offered to get back to him with more information.

K. Miller observed that there were nine or ten other evaluated projects that scored higher than the *Reconstruction of the Interstate 90 and Interstate 495 Interchange (Hopkinton and Westborough)* project, and that the Burgin Parkway bridge project was not evaluated.

**Vote**

A motion to release Draft Amendment One to the LRTP for a 30-day public review period was made by the MassDOT Highway Division (John Romano), and seconded by the City of Boston (J. Gillooly). The motion carried.

**9. Statewide Highway Programming, FFYs 2017-21—Trey Wadsworth, MassDOT Staff**

As requested by the MPO at their meeting on June 23, T. Wadsworth provided an overview of the state-funded highway program, which is documented in the Massachusetts Capital Investment Plan (CIP). The CIP represents the Commonwealth's new approach to investment planning focused on restoring reliability to the transportation system. The CIP documents state and federal funding, and funds available to each specific agency, for MassDOT and the MBTA.

He discussed the process for selecting projects to include in the CIP which involved first setting priorities for improving reliability, maintaining the system, modernizing the system, and expansion. Then programs were developed considering factors such as reliability, performance, historical spending, guidance from the MassDOT Board of Directors, and fiscal constraint.

Statewide projects are those prioritized by MassDOT. Project locations may cross MPO boundaries or be in multiple locations across the Commonwealth. Statewide funding is the remainder of federal aid not allocated through the MARPA formula to MPOs for prioritization of projects.

He provided a breakdown of state funding by program and the percentages of that funding the state provides to the Boston Region MPO over the five-year period of the TIP for projects in the MPO region. The MPO will receive 23% of the \$2.7 billion of statewide funding over the course of the TIP. Program categories are as follows: National Highway Performance Program; Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ); Off-System Bridges; Surface Transportation Program – Transportation Enhancements; and Highway Safety Improvement Program.

He described how MassDOT prioritizes bridge projects by considering factors such as the forecasted change in bridge health, bridge condition, and other factors, such as

traffic volume, roadway functional classification, and weight restrictions. A list of bridge projects for inclusion in the Boston Region's Draft TIP was shown.

He also discussed how projects funding through other program categories are funded. Pavement maintenance projects are prioritized by MassDOT asset managers who forecast pavement condition scenarios and select a slate of projects based on greatest benefit per dollar spent. Projects that receive CMAQ funding must demonstrate a quantitative air quality benefit. Bicycle and pedestrian projects are high priorities for funding in the CMAQ category. CMAQ-funded projects are selected with input from MassDOT Highway District bicycle and pedestrian coordinators. Fiscal constraint and regional equity are also considerations when prioritizing projects in all funding categories.

### ***Discussion***

R. Canale asked how the prioritization of this bridge list coincides with the prioritization of projects funded through the Accelerated Bridge Program (ABP) and how the priorities might have changed since the ABP concluded. M. Rose explained that the prioritization of some bridge projects may have changed when the responsibility for prioritizing those projects shifted to MassDOT's Bridge Section. Also the availability of funding was a factor.

D. Giombetti inquired about the process for public review of the statewide funding items. He noted that the *Cochituate Rail Trail and Pedestrian Bridge (Framingham, Natick)* project – on the CMAQ list – was delayed from FFY 2018 to FFY 2020 despite a strong feeling in the community that FFY 2018 was an appropriate year for programming. He also inquired about the rationale for delaying that project. T. Wadsworth explained that candidates for statewide funding undergo a review at MassDOT's TIP Day where MassDOT divisions and offices make recommendations for years of programming. These decisions are internal to MassDOT because the source of funding is statewide dollars. On TIP Day, MassDOT recommended programming the *Cochituate Rail Trail* project in FFY 2020 because of concerns about readiness; however, the project could be restored to FFY 2018 if right-of-way acquisition advances quickly.

D. Giombetti requested that MassDOT restore the *Cochituate Rail Trail* project to the FFY 2018 element and allow the community time to address the outstanding issues before delaying it to FFY 2020. Delaying the project, he said, would have a negative impact on fundraising efforts for the project. D. Mohler replied that MassDOT will review the request. He noted, however, that \$3 million is still needed for right-of-way acquisition. If the project is restored to FFY 2018 and the funds for acquisition are not available by the fall, the project would then have to be delayed and the MPO would

have to amend the TIP. D. Giombetti reported that the community realizes the situation and is working diligently to close the funding gap. He requested that MassDOT give the community time to do so.

**10. MBTA Transit Programming, FFYs 2017-21—Thom Dugan, MBTA Staff**

As requested by the MPO at their meeting on June 23, T. Dugan provided an overview of the MBTA's transit program.

He explained that the MBTA is prioritizing projects that improve transit reliability (state-of-good repair) as well as modernization projects. Modernization projects include capacity improvements (such as the infrastructure necessary to support new Red and Orange Line vehicles), accessibility improvements, federally mandated programs (such as Positive Train Control), and expansion projects (such as the Green Line Extension and Silver Line to Chelsea).

MBTA projects are funded from multiple sources including the following: federal formula funds; federal grants; revenue bonds issued by the MBTA; federal loans; the state-funded Rail Enhancement Program; and the new pay-as-you-go program, which is funded from efficiencies in the MBTA's operating budget.

He noted that the MBTA has established a new Office of Capital Programs and Project Controls to track the delivery of projects. The MBTA is also building a new project reporting and development process to track adherence to project schedules and budgets. Additionally, an effort is underway to provide more project definition in the TIP to coincide with the reporting in the CIP.

He gave an overview of proposed funding and projects over the five year period of the CIP under the following MBTA funding programs: Bridge; Revenue Vehicles; Track, Signals and Power; Stations and Other Facilities; Accessibility; and Expansion. The full project list will be available on the MBTA's website soon.

***Discussion***

T. Bennett inquired about the level of detail on the project list and expressed interest in learning more about the projects in the Track, Signals and Power category. T. Dugan replied that information is provided on the project name and funding allocated over a five year period. More details are available when the MBTA staff provides updates on specific projects to the MBTA Fiscal and Management Control Board; those presentations are posted on the board's website. The MBTA staff expects to make a presentation on signal projects to the board this summer or fall.

R. Canale asked staff to post the MassDOT and MBTA presentations on the MPO's website.

D. Crowley asked if the MBTA has looked at the costs associated with complying with new storm water regulations and whether those costs would be funded through the capital or operating budgets. T. Dugan offered to find out more information.

## **11. Members Items**

K. Miller reminded members about the public review period on the proposed federal rulemaking on MPO consolidation/coordination and the upcoming webinar on July 15.

E. Bourassa reported that he and staff members from CTPS, MBTA Advisory Council, MassDOT, City of Boston, 128 Business Council, and A Better City are participating in workshops on performance measures sponsored by Transportation for America and FHWA. They attended a workshop in Indianapolis in May where they learned about how other MPOs use cost/benefit analyses in their project selection process. A second workshop – or “training academy” – will be held in Boston on October 13-14. This subject will be further discussed at a future MPO meeting.

D. Crowley suggested that members schedule a discussion about municipal contributions to transportation projects on a future MPO agenda. Members then discussed how to coordinate their discussion of this topic in context of other discussions that are likely to occur at the MassDOT Board of Directors and MARPA and as the legislature considers a “value capture” bill.

D. Mohler suggested that the MPO or MARPA could begin a conversation that could then inform a discussion at the MassDOT Board of Directors. D. Giombetti raised the idea of forming an MPO subcommittee to discuss the topic. Tom Kadzis, City of Boston, suggested that the discussion should address the related topics of project funding and cost overruns, cost/benefit of projects, and municipal contributions. Members agreed to include an item on the agenda of their August 18 meeting to discuss these topics. Staff was asked to prepare a “thought piece” to start the conversation.

## **12. Adjourn**

A motion to adjourn was made by the City of Boston (J. Gillooly), and seconded by the MassDOT Highway Division (J. Romano). The motion carried.

## Attendance

<b>Members</b>	<b>Representatives and Alternates</b>
At-Large City (City of Everett)	Jay Monty
At-Large City (City of Newton)	David Koses
At-Large Town (Town of Arlington)	Laura Wiener
At-Large Town (Town of Lexington)	Richard Canale
City of Boston (Boston Redevelopment Authority)	Lara Mérida
City of Boston (Boston Transportation Department)	Jim Gillooly
	Tom Kadzis
Federal Highway Administration	Ken Miller
Inner Core Committee (City of Somerville)	Tom Bent
Massachusetts Department of Transportation	David Mohler
	Marie Rose
MassDOT Highway Division	John Romano
Massachusetts Port Authority	Laura Gilmore
	O'Connor
MBTA	Thom Dugan
MBTA Advisory Board	Micha Gensler
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
Regional Transportation Advisory Council	Tegin Bennett
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

<b>Other Attendees</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>
Mike Balcom	Friends of Natick Trails
Sarah Bradbury	MassDOT District 3
William Chenard	Town of Natick
Rick Colony	
Janice Henderson	Cochituate Rail Trail Advisory Committee

David Hock	Office of State Senator Karen Spilka
Mel Kleckner	Town of Brookline
Puja Mehta	Office of State Senator Karen Spilka
Constance Raphael	MassDOT District 4
Bill Smith	Town of Brookline, Engineering
Trey Wadsworth	MassDOT
Katy Zazzera	MassDOT

---

---

**MPO Staff/Central Transportation Planning Staff**

---

Karl Quackenbush, Executive Director  
Robin Mannion, Deputy Executive Director  
Elizabeth Moore, Director of Policy and Planning  
Scott Peterson, Director of Technical Services

Lourenço Dantas, Manager, MPO Certification  
Activities Group

David Fargen  
Maureen Kelly  
Alexandra Kleyman  
Anne McGahan  
Jennifer Rowe

---