Memorandum for the Record
Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization Meeting

December 1, 2016 Meeting

10:02 AM – 11:06 AM, State Transportation Building**,** Conference Rooms 2&3, 10 Park Plaza, Boston

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

Decisions

The Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization agreed to the following:

- Approve four work programs:
  - *MetroWest Regional Transit Authority (MWRTA) 2017 Transit Planning Assistance*
  - *Middlesex 3 Community Compact Transportation Study*
  - *Freight Planning Support (FFY 2017*)
  - *Addressing Safety, Mobility, and Access on Subregional Priority Roadways*
- Approve the minutes of the meeting of October 20

Meeting Agenda

1. Public Comments

There were none.

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

There was none.

3. Committee Chairs' Reports

Bryan Pounds (MassDOT Office of Transportation Planning) reported that the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) Committee meeting, which had been scheduled on November 17, is rescheduled for December 15 prior to the MPO meeting. Topics for that meeting include the quarterly report and ties between UPWP work and LRTP goals.

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

T. Bennett reported that there is an Advisory Council meeting on December 14 at which the council will hear various updates, including and update from David Mohler, MassDOT, regarding the Green Line Extension Project, and others related to the 3C document development process.

5. Executive Director's Report—*Robin Mannion, Deputy Executive Director, Central Transportation Planning Staff*

R. Mannion reported that a new three-month MPO meeting calendar was available in hard copy at members' tables, and she noted the intention to hold the January 5 MPO meeting at an off-site location in the region; this location has not yet been identified. She also reported that the draft minutes from the October 20 MPO meeting were posted on the afternoon of November 29 and printed copies were available. R. Mannion also introduced a new member of the MPO staff, Róisín Foley.

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

A motion to approve the minutes of the meeting of October 20 was made by MetroWest Regional Collaborative (Town of Framingham) (D. Giombetti), and seconded by the City of Boston (Jim Gillooly). The motion carried. The South Shore Coalition (Town of Braintree) (Christine Stickney) abstained. At-Large Town (Town of Lexington) (Richard Canale), Minuteman Advisory Group on Interlocal Coordination (Town of Bedford) (Richard Reed), and Massachusetts Port Authority (Laura Gilmore O'Connor) were not yet present for this vote.

7. Work Program for Metrowest Regional Transit Authority 2017 Transit Planning Assistance— *Elizabeth Moore, Director of Policy and Planning, MPO Staff*

E. Moore introduced the work program for *MetroWest Regional Transit Authority 2017 Transit Planning Assistance*. In 2013, CTPS performed a comprehensive study of the MWRTA's fixed-route system to identify possibilities for service improvements. Several of the recommendations from the 2013 study have since been implemented by the MWRTA. The proposed 2017 work program is an updated evaluation of the MWRTA's fixed-route service and a continuation of planning assistance that CTPS has provided to MWRTA since its inception.

The proposed 2017 work program consists of two primary tasks. Task 1 will summarize existing conditions and changes to MWRTA fixed-route service that have occurred since 2013. The second will analyze potential changes to service and routes.

CTPS will collect ridership data generated from the MWRTA's electronic fare boxes. CTPS will compare this ridership data to data from the 2013 study and document any increases or decreases in ridership. CTPS will also analyze on-time performance data generated by MWRTA's global positioning system and document any changes.

The second task will utilize the data from Task 1, as well as other demographic and service request data, to suggest changes to routes and respond to any changes in ridership and on-time performance observed in Task 1. Recommendations may include end-to-end combinations of connecting routes, separation of existing routes into shorter ones, and changes in route coverage to serve new trip generators.

The total cost of the project is $46,000 and the work is expected to take seven months.

Vote

A motion to approve the work program for *Metrowest Regional Transit Authority 2017 Transit Planning Assistance* was made by the Inner Core Committee (City of Somerville) (Tom Bent) and seconded by the City of Boston (J. Gillooly). The motion carried.

8. Work Program for the Middlesex 3 Community Compact Transportation Study— *Elizabeth Moore, Director of Policy and Planning, MPO Staff*

E. Moore presented the work program for the *Middlesex 3 Community Compact Transportation Study*. The proposed work program represents a piece of a larger study done on behalf of the Northern Middlesex Council of Governments (NMCOG) to explore options for expanding access to transit on the Route 3 corridor. Eight communities in the Middlesex 3 Coalition have entered into a Commonwealth Community Compact to address transportation challenges along the Route 3 corridor. Transit connections in this region are challenging because some communities in the Coalition (Tyngsborough, Lowell, Chelmsford, Tewksbury, Billerica,) are served by the Lowell Regional Transit Authority (LRTA) whereas some (Burlington, Bedford, Lexington) are served by the MBTA. Transit connections between the LRTA and MBTA service areas are limited, given that federal and state funding allocated to each regional transit authority is generally applied within (not across) service area boundaries.

The larger NMCOG study will consist of two phases. Phase 1 consists of evaluating existing conditions, setting goals and objectives, and developing evaluation criteria to measure the effectiveness of potential changes. The work in Phase 1 will provide data on existing conditions for Bedford, Burlington, and Lexington. These data will include MBTA schedules and ridership data, current demographic and journey-to-work

projections, land-use patterns, data on trip generators and attractors, origin and destination data, and congestion levels. CTPS will also conduct an inventory of bicycle and pedestrian facilities and an inventory of parking conditions at employment sites.

Phase 1 will also include public outreach to present the results of the existing conditions analysis and receive input from the public to help develop the goals and objectives for the study. CTPS will provide whatever support is necessary to NMCOG in presenting this information to the MPO.

Phase 2 will identify and evaluate service alternatives, look at barriers to implementation and develop implementation strategies. CTPS will identify potential services and estimate the cost of each, including complementary paratransit. Improvements may include extensions of existing bus routes, coordination between existing services, and new express transit services.

CTPS also will identify institutional and regulatory barriers, as well as jurisdictional and funding issues, that may impact implementation of new services; outline potential actions to address such regulatory barriers; and develop an implementation strategy.

The work of CTPS on this study is estimated to take nine months at a cost of $35,000.

Vote

A motion to approve the work program was made by the Minuteman Advisory Group on Interlocal Coordination (Town of Bedford) (Richard Reed), and seconded by the City of Boston (J. Gillooly). The motion carried.

9. Work Program: Freight Planning Support (FFY 2017)— *Mark Abbott, MPO Staff*

M. Abbott presented the work program for *Freight Planning Support: FFY 2017*. The MPO established an ongoing freight planning program that began in federal fiscal year (FFY) 2014. In the first year of the Freight Program, CTPS staff created an action plan that identified six initial studies. Among the subjects recommended for study were truck traffic and related logistic issues (such as types of cargoes) in Everett, Chelsea, and the South Boston waterfront. The plan also recommended evaluating the adequacy of rest area locations for truckers in and near the Boston Region MPO area. These studies were undertaken in FFYs 2014, 2015, and 2016. As part of this ongoing work, the proposed work program for FFY 2017 includes two substantial tasks, in addition to Task 1, which entails continuing outreach and coordination between the MPO and freight and truck stakeholders in the region.

Task 2 examines the impact restrictions—specifically cargo limitations and weight and height restrictions—have on truck travel in the region and identify what, if any, corridors or geographies have the potential to be improved by projects funded through the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) process. MPO staff will create a database for eastern Massachusetts of roadways that have restrictions based on vehicle type, size, and height that limit the routes available to the trucking industry in their daily operations. This information will be used to inform the TIP process and evaluate project ideas.

Task 3 continues MPO staff development of region-wide freight flow data for trucking for use in regional model development. Early in FFY 2017, toll booths on the western part of Interstate 90 were replaced by an all-electronic tolling system. The new tolling system will be an important source for new data. CTPS will compare data from the new and old toll plaza systems to analyze the number and type of truck trips that are occurring on Interstate 90 as a way of measuring truck travel in the region. This data may allow CTPS to create trip generation estimates for use in the regional model.

It is estimated that this project will be completed 11 months after work commences. The total cost of this program is estimated to be $51,200.

Discussion

J. Gillooly asked whether the study will look into legal restrictions on freight travel as opposed to strictly physical restrictions related to height and weight of vehicles. M. Abbott responded that the study will consider both.

T. Bennett brought up the need to have regional conversations concerning bike safety and the potential conflict with implementing effective freight movement. She posed that there needs to be coordination between conversations related to freight travel and bike safety. With regards to the administration of the MPO's freight program, M. Abbott pointed to the inclusion of outreach to regional stakeholders in Task 1 as well as internal coordination between the staff conducting freight-planning work and the MPO's bike program coordinator.

Laura Gilmore O'Connor, Massachusetts Port Authority (Massport), thanked CTPS for the ongoing work of the Freight Planning Program and the recent work by William Kuttner related to South Boston, which has been particularly helpful to Massport.

Dennis Giombetti, MetroWest Regional Collaborative (Town of Framingham), inquired whether there are any plans to look at data pre- and post-closure of Beacon Yard to see what the impact of that closure has been on freight travel. M. Abbott replied that there

may be a way to investigate the Allston/Brighton toll plaza data to gauge changes in truck travel through the area.

Vote

A motion to approve the work program was made by the City of Everett (Jay Monty) and seconded by the City of Boston (J. Gillooly). The motion carried.

10. Work Program: Addressing Safety, Mobility, and Access on Subregional Priority Roadways—*Mark Abbott, MPO Staff*

M. Abbott presented the proposed work program for *Addressing Safety, Mobility, and Access on Subregional Priority Roadways*. The work program is part of ongoing work to identify and study roadway corridor segments in the MPO region that are of concern, but that have not been identified in the LRTP regional needs assessment. The roadways selected for study are not major arterial roadways, but rather arterial or collector roadways that carry fewer vehicles daily than major arterials. These roadways are typically through town and small city centers. The study will focus on issues identified by relevant subregional municipal groups and develop recommendations for low-cost, short- and long-term improvements. In addition to safety, mobility, and access, other subjects that will be considered are transit feasibility, truck-related issues, and bicycle and pedestrian transportation.

Since this ongoing work began five years ago, MPO staff has conducted six studies. They included a study of Route 3 in Cohasset and Scituate in 2013, where there is now an active MassDOT project in the preliminary design phase. The MPO also studied Route 127 and 127a in Gloucester and Rockport (in 2013), Washington Street in Newton (in 2014), and Summer Street and George Washington Boulevard in Hingham and Hull (in 2015). The Hingham and Hull study also has resulted in a current MassDOT project in the preliminary design stage. In 2016 CTPS initiated a study of Route 20 in Marlborough from Route 85 east to the Sudbury town line. This study's report is in the final editing stages and the expectation is that an outcome of its recommendations will be an active MassDOT project.

The roadway corridor segments are selected for study based on prioritization criteria and input from agencies, municipalities and MAPC subregional groups. The proposed selection, along with the list of candidate segments, will be presented to the MPO for discussion and approval.

The total cost of this project is estimated to be $110,000. The work is slated to take 10 months.

Discussion

C. Stickney asked about the size of the initial pool of candidate roadways for study. M. Abbott responded that the initial pool of candidates for 2015 was approximately 35 locations. The selection process consists of creating a ranking system using metrics for criteria such as crash history and community interest.

C. Stickney followed up by asking whether roadways that were previously candidates would remain on the list of those up for selection. M. Abbott replied that previous candidates form the basis of the selection list.

Vote

A motion to approve the work program was made by the City of Boston (J. Gillooly) and seconded by the Advisory Council (T. Bennett). The motion carried.

11. Work Plan for Long-Range Transportation Plan (FFY 2017)—*Anne McGahan, MPO Staff*

A. McGahan presented the work plan for the *Long-Range Transportation Plan (FFY 2017)*. The work plan describes the ongoing implementation of the current LRTP, *Charting Progress to 2040*, and work leading up to the adoption of the next LRTP in 2019. The development of a LRTP consists of four steps. The work plan includes seven tasks that fit into the four steps, as described below.

Step 1: Gather information via a Needs Assessment

Task 1: Update the LRTP Needs Assessment

As part of *Charting Progress to 2040,* staff developed a web-based Needs Assessment that included information on the current state of the region's transportation system, how it is currently used and projected to be used in the future, and how it interacts with the region's current and projected land-use conditions and environment.

Staff will continue to update the Needs Assessment, perform analyses, and use the results for future studies. Staff will develop a process for projecting demographic trends for use in the MPO's regional travel demand model. Data from the Needs Assessment will support the MPO's scenario-planning activities and its performance-based planning practice. Much of the work in this task is ongoing and demographic projections are scheduled to occur in the spring of 2017.

Step 2: Implement a performance-based planning process

Task 2: Develop additional performance measures and targets

The MPO is required to develop and use performance measures in its planning process. In 2015, the MPO adopted goals, objectives, and an initial set of performance measures

as part of *Charting Progress to 2040*. These were used for scenario planning and for evaluating the LRTP, TIP, and UPWP projects and programs.

In 2016, staff initiated the development of performance targets. Performance targets are specific levels of performance staff hope to achieve within a certain time frame. In 2017, staff will formalize and expand this performance-based planning process by developing additional performance measures and associated targets. Measures will be added based on guidance from the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Federal Transit Administration (FTA), as well as by MassDOT. In fall and winter 2017, staff will establish a set of formal performance measures for each goal area. In spring 2017, staff will develop targets and timeframes for a subset of the performance measures.

Staff has established an agency-wide committee to develop an inventory of data CTPS currently has and would like to obtain to use in the development of performance measures. Staff will continue to develop formats for housing and presenting this data and staff are currently working on a Performance Dashboard—a web-based visual tool that will house and present performance measures data. Staff intends to have this ready to show the MPO over the next several months.

Task 3: Incorporate the performance-based planning practice into MPO decisions

This year, staff and the MPO will formalize and expand the performance-based planning practice for the certification documents. This work will be coordinated with the MPO's ongoing Congestion Management Process. Staff will continue to integrate performance measures into the certification documents by reviewing the criteria used for project selection and making recommendations for revisions consistent with the performance measures identified in Task 2.

Staff will use the data collected in Tasks 1 and 2 to document current conditions in our transportation system. New data will be compared to the baseline data established in *Charting Progress to 2040*. Both the LRTP and TIP will include a performance report that describes trends and progress toward targets and other non-target indicators of interest. This year we will develop a format for performance reporting for these documents. Using the targets, staff will develop recommendations for strategies to reach these targets. Once adopted, these strategies will be used to guide the MPO's investment decisions. This work will be documented by staff and discussed with the MPO in an ongoing fashion.

Recommendations for strategies for meeting the initial targets are scheduled for summer of 2017.

Step 3: Conduct analyses through a scenario planning process to explore the impacts of different investment strategies

Task 4: Develop and analyze future scenarios

Staff will continue using model-based planning tools and off-model processes to generate information and forecasts about regional conditions and future transportation needs. Over the next two years, staff and the MPO will explore the impacts of different investment strategies on transportation. Possible topics could range from air quality and climate change to mode shift or the economy. Work may explore policy-related implications, as was done in the scenario-planning process conducted during the development of *Charting Progress to 2040*.

Step 4: Adopt a recommended investment strategy; assemble and circulate the LRTP

Task 5: Prepare the groundwork for the next LRTP for adoption in 2019

Staff will explore effective ways to gather information, understand the Boston region's needs, and analyze transportation and land-use options. Staff will also research best practices in metropolitan transportation planning.

Task 6: Adopt LRTP amendments if required

This task accounts for changes to regionally significant projects that would require an amendment to the plan.

Task 7: Respond to requests for information

Next Steps

Staff will return to the MPO in January to reintroduce the Performance-Based Planning Process and outline the work that has been done. At the January meeting staff will also discuss performance measures used in the last LRTP and as part of the Congestion Management Process, as well as measures the MPO is required to develop as part of MAP-21 and FAST Act legislation, and any additional measures the MPO may want to develop based on its own goals and objectives.

At a later meeting staff will make recommendations for possible scenarios to test to help us in our decision making in the development of the next LRTP.

12. Proposed Adjustments to Draft FFYs 2017–2021 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Amendment 1—*Lourenço Dantas, MPO Staff*

L. Dantas presented proposed adjustments to *Draft FFYs 2017-2021 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Amendment 1*. The public comment period for TIP

Amendment 1 is currently ongoing. MassDOT has proposed a repurposing of five earmarks as described in the TIP table provided as a handout to the MPO entitled "Comments from MassDOT Regarding Draft Amendment 1 of FFYs 2017-2021 TIP." MassDOT staff are submitting these repurposed earmarks as comments to the amendment, which the MPO is expected to endorse on December 15.

If MassDOT's comments are endorsed, four of the earmarks originally slated for transit projects would be flexed to FTA for similar transit projects. One earmark maintains funding for improvements in the same specific intersection (I-93/Mystic Avenue and McGrath Highway Interchange at Assembly Square) but applies the funds to the engineering and design of the improvements.

These funds apply to the non-target program of the TIP and do not impact the MPO's target program.

For the vote on December 15 staff will formally present these comments in the standard modified TIP table format.

Discussion

J. Gillooly asked for background on the third proposed earmark listed in the table, which flexes funds to FTA from the Longwood Avenue/Urban Ring Tunnel Study to the project for MBTA Bus Stop Accessibility and Operational Improvements within the Longwood Medical Area. His concern was that there still may be advocates for the Urban Ring Tunnel Study. S. Woelfel responded that this study was discussed many years previously and that the Urban Ring is no longer being considered, so the money is being moved to bus improvements in that same area.

J. Gillooly asked if there are any issues concerning funds expiring if they are not used by a certain date. B. Pounds responded that the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2016 noted that any federal earmark designated on or before September 2005 could be repurposed for another project (new or existing), under certain conditions. If those funds were to be obligated in FFY 2016, MassDOT had to state their intention to do so by the end of August 2016; if the funds were to be obligated by the end of FFY 2019, MassDOT had to state their intentions by the middle of September 2016.

J. Gillooly asked for a more specific description of how the funds will now be used. B. Pounds responded that he did not have anything more specific at this time. J. Gillooly asked if there had been discussion with MASCO about the repurposing. S. Woelfel responded that he was not aware whether there had been, but that MassDOT should reach out to the organization's representatives.

T. Bennett asked whether the funds for the Lechmere Station area roadway and access improvements in Cambridge, which were repurposed to the Green Line Extension (GLX) project, help to fill an additional gap in the funding for GLX. S. Woelfel responded that the funds were originally earmarked for the roadway improvements in the Lechmere area, which ended up being done by a developer; it's his understanding that this money is being returned to the GLX's general funds. T. Bennett asked whether this money becomes "new," or whether these funds have been expected as a piece of the GLX funding. S. Woelfel responded that this question is best posed to David Mohler, who is more closely involved with the GLX project.

13. Identifying Opportunities to Alleviate Bus Delay—Nick Hart, MPO Staff

N. Hart presented *Identifying Opportunities to Alleviate Bus Delay,* a UPWP-funded study examining factors leading to increased dwell time at bus stops as well as operational and scheduling practices.

Bus delay is generally categorized into three main contributors: roadway congestion, dwell time, and scheduling and operational inefficiencies. This study did not consider roadway congestion, which was explored in the *Prioritization of Dedicated Bus Lanes* study presented to the MPO by Scott Hamwey, MassDOT, on November 3. The two factors examined in this study were dwell time and scheduling and operational inefficiencies.

Dwell Time

Based on MBTA service planning recommendations, staff focused its analysis on the bus Route 116/117. This route travels through Chelsea and Revere and has the worst on-time performance of the MBTA's key bus routes. It was anecdotally believed that this might be due to a high incidence of passengers paying with cash or travelling with baby carriages.

Staff boarded 97 Route 116/117 trips between January 12 and January 21, 2016. Staff counted baby carriages, personal shopping carts, and wheeled mobility devices and tagged them to the bus stops at which they boarded. Staff then appended data from the Automatic Fare Transaction Database to compare the CharlieCard, Charlie Ticket, Add Value, and Pay with Cash transactions at each stop. Staff also used Automatic Passenger Counter data to create an estimate for dwell time at each stop. Dwell time was defined as the time between the doors opening and closing at each stop. Staff recorded both front and back door boardings and alightings and derived the load on board from passenger counts.

From these various data, staff created a multiple regression model to estimate the amount of delay related to each item. For the typical passenger boarding with a CharlieCard or CharlieTicket, the average boarding time was 3.3 seconds. When taken as a percentage of the total dwell time, passengers paying with cash and adding value to CharlieCards accounted for 11% of the total dwell time. Passengers boarding or alighting with baby carriages accounted for 3% of the total dwell time.

Dwell time accounts for about 16% of the total run time of these bus routes. When considered as part of the overall run time, cash transactions accounted for less than 2% and baby carriage boardings and alightings less than 1%.

Thus, the delay caused passengers paying with cash or boarding with a baby carriage does not appear to add significantly to the total run times of these routes. None of the observed trips had more than two minutes of delay added by pay cash and add value transactions. Furthermore, these transactions were also more likely to occur outside of peak commute hours. The delay from cash and add-value transactions and baby carriages is likely not as great as it is perceived to be. However, this study considered one bus route and does not necessarily reflect the entire MBTA bus system. N. Hart also noted that the study was conducted in January and there may also be seasonal variance in passenger activity.

Davis Koses, At-Large City (City of Newton), asked why wheelchairs were not mentioned. N. Hart replied that there was a very small number (three) of wheelchair boardings and alightings during the observed trips. These were not significant enough to estimate a coefficient using the regression model. Those three instances averaged approximately 30 seconds of dwell time.

Operational and Scheduling Inefficiencies

N. Hart explained that the first operational and scheduling practice that staff considered as part of the bus delay study is trip interlining. A bus without an interline operates along the same route throughout the day without changing routes. An interline occurs when a particular bus changes routes. An example is when a bus operating on Route 22 from Ruggles to Ashmont becomes a Route 18 bus from Ashmont to Andrew Square. Sometimes interlining includes a “deadhead movement,” which occurs when there is a trip segment in-between the two different routes on which the bus carries no passengers. An example would be if the Route 22 arrives at Ashmont and then travels from Ashmont to Dudley without passengers to become a Route 1 to Harvard. The benefit of interlining is that it allows for more flexibility in resources. The drawback is that interlined routes may pass their delays from one route to another. The preference is then to interline buses with consistent run times.

To establish the consistency of run times, staff determined a threshold for identifying the best candidate routes for interlining. Trips that run faster than 120% of the scheduled run time at least 80% (90% if a deadhead movement is required) of the time are candidates for interlining.

In fall of 2015, staff evaluated all the interlined trips in the Charlestown Bus District. For interlines without a deadhead move, 51% of the scheduled trips did not pass the threshold; for interlines with a deadhead, 62% did not pass the threshold.

Possible solutions include removing interlines or increasing scheduled run times and/or recovery times. These solutions would likely result in a reduction in service.

The second operational and scheduling procedure that staff considered was operator swing-ons. A trip without a swing-on is when an operator drives a bus from the garage to the station to begin their trips for the day. A swing-on occurs when an operator comes directly to the station without a new bus and simply switches places with the previous operator. The benefit of swing-ons is in the resources saved by reducing trips to and from the garage, which incur gas mileage and the costs associated with paying operators for the trip from the garage. Drawbacks include the amount of time a swing-on takes (an average of 59 seconds), as well as any delay associated with a previous bus run that impacts the new bus run (24% of swing-ons occurred on trips that were already late to depart).

A possible solution is to not schedule swing-ons on trips where there is historically poor on-time performance.

N. Hart stated that the overall takeaway from the study is that there seems to be more opportunity to alleviate bus delay by focusing on efficient scheduling and operational procedures rather than by focusing on fare payment methods and passenger behavior.

Discussion

J. Gillooly asked whether swing-ons are used because the MBTA does not have enough buses to serve all the routes. N. Hart replied that there are a specific number of buses that are always located at the garage and that he does not believe the lack of buses is an issue; rather it is a matter of saving resources and money. J. Gillooly asked what percentage of trips use a swing-on. N. Hart did not have this information.

Jay Monty, At-Large City (City of Everett), asked whether AFC 2.0 (the new automated fare collection system that the MBTA is planning to implement) might impact dwell time given that passengers will use their CharlieCards on the bus rather than as a gateway

to the bus. N. Hart responded that this study did not consider the implications of AFC 2.0, but that boarding at all doors could bump the time savings as a whole.

J. Gillooly commented that some delay is accounted for by the time it takes operators to pull into a bus stop and then return to the flow of traffic. N. Hart responded that this generally falls under roadway congestion and was not evaluated in this particular study.

14. Members Items

There were none.

15. Adjourn

A motion to adjourn was made by the MetroWest Regional Collaborative (Town of Framingham) (D. Giombetti) and seconded by the City of Boston (J. Gillooly). The motion carried.

Attendance

Members	Representatives and Alternates
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 Transportation Department)	Tom Kadzis
City of Boston (Boston Transportation Department)	Jim Gillooly
Federal Highway Administration	
Federal Transit Administration	
Inner Core Committee (City of Somerville)	Tom Bent
Massachusetts Department of Transportation	Stephen Woelfel Bryan Pounds
MassDOT Highway Division	Marie Rose
Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority (MBTA)	Eric Waaramaa
Massachusetts Port Authority	Laura Gilmore O'Connor
MBTA Advisory Board	Micha Gensler
Metropolitan Area Planning Council	
MetroWest Regional Collaborative (Town of Framingham)	Dennis Giombetti
Minuteman Advisory Group on Interlocal Coordination (Town of Bedford)	Richard Reed
North Shore Task Force (City of Beverly)	
North Suburban Planning Council (City of Woburn)	
Regional Transportation Advisory Council	Tegin Bennett
South Shore Coalition (Town of Braintree)	Christine Stickney
South West Advisory Planning Committee (Town of Medway)	
Three Rivers Interlocal Council (Town of Norwood/NVCC)	Tom O'Rourke

Other Attendees	Affiliation
Steve Olanoff	TRIC

MPO Staff/Central Transportation Planning Staff

Robin Mannion, Deputy Executive Director
Mark Abbott
Jonathan Belcher
Lourenço Dantas
Róisín Foley
Anne McGahan
Elizabeth Moore
Scott Peterson
Jennifer Rowe