

Draft Memorandum for the Record

Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization Meeting

October 18, 2018, Meeting

10:00 AM–12:20 PM, State Transportation Building, Conference Rooms 2 and 3, 10 Park Plaza, Boston

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 August 16, 2018, meeting
- Approve a set of federally required performance targets for travel reliability and freight movement on the National Highway System (NHS)
- Approve the final Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) for the Boston, Massachusetts—New Hampshire—Rhode Island Urbanized Area (UZA)

Meeting Agenda

1. Introductions

See attendance on page 14.

2. Public Comments

Lenard Diggins (MBTA Rider Oversight Committee, member of the Disparate Impact and Disproportionate Burden [DI/DB] Policy Stakeholder Working Group) thanked Betsy Harvey and other members of the MPO staff for the public outreach process concerning the development of the DI/DB policy. B. Harvey presented the findings of the working group to the MPO board for discussion at the meeting on October 4, 2018. L. Diggins stated that while he defers to the expertise of staff, he agreed with the consensus of the working group, which concluded that setting any threshold for differences between groups perpetuates inequities. L. Diggins expressed concerns about the use of the MPO's travel demand model to conduct the DI/DB analyses. L. Diggins suggested that the MPO look at a shorter timeframe than that of the Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) in order to ascertain whether projects are creating inequities. L. Diggins stated that he attended the public meeting about the MPO's transportation planning process held on the evening of October 17, 2018. This meeting was hosted by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Federal Transit Administration (FTA) as part of

their periodic certification review of the MPO. L. Diggins stated that several members of the public in attendance felt that it was incumbent upon the MPO to create policies and pursue projects that achieve the goal of reducing existing inequities. L. Diggins asked that the MPO develop policies that utilize emerging technologies, such as autonomous vehicles, to reduce inequities.

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

There was none.

4. Committee Chairs' Reports

There were none.

5. Regional Transportation Advisory Council Report—*Tegin Teich, Chair, Regional Transportation Advisory Council*

T. Teich reported that T. Teich and AnaCristina Fragoso had been re-elected as Chair and Vice-Chair of the Advisory Council, respectively. The October Advisory Council meeting included a discussion of MassDOT's Rail Vision efforts. This meeting will include a discussion of the DI/DB process. T. Teich expressed her support for L. Diggins' earlier comments.

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

Documents posted to the MPO meeting calendar

1. [Selection of federal fiscal years \(FFYs\) 2019 LRTP Priority Corridor Study Location](#)
2. [Selection of FFY 2019 Subregional Priority Roadway Study Location](#)

K. Quackenbush reminded the board that the next meeting will be held on November 8, 2018, at Braintree Town Hall. There will be no meeting on November 1, 2018.

K. Quackenbush remarked on two posted memos that relate to the selection of locations for recurring roadway studies. The work programs for both studies were presented to the MPO for approval in September. The selected location for the LRTP Priority Corridor study is a section of Route 16 in Everett and Chelsea. The selected location for the Subregional Priority Roadway study is Route 9 in Brookline.

K. Quackenbush asked that members review both memos and reach out to himself or Mark Abbott, Manager of Traffic Analysis and Design, should they have questions or concerns.

K. Quackenbush recapped the on-site federal review meetings held by FHWA and FTA on October 16 and October 17, 2018. The meetings consisted of presentations related to the MPO's planning process and discussion of key documents and staff work regarding transit planning, active transportation, autonomous vehicles (AVs) and transportation network companies (TNCs), civil rights and non-discrimination, interagency agreements, public participation, freight, environmental mitigation and resilience, and other topics. The federal review team included Nelson Hoffman (FHWA) and Leah Sirmin (FTA) and as many as 14 other representatives of FHWA, FTA, and the US Department of Transportation (USDOT). Representatives from the MBTA, MassDOT Office of Diversity and Civil Rights, the City of Boston, and MPO board members were in attendance, as well as staff from adjoining MPOs in Massachusetts.

Major themes of the discussions included equity, connections between plans and programs in the context of performance-based planning and programming (PBPP), resiliency and climate change, and MPO oversight of MassDOT/MBTA programming. K. Quackenbush noted that the federal team seemed to assume that the MPO board is more involved in reviewing the design details of projects that come before the board from MassDOT and the MBTA than is accurate. K. Quackenbush reported that at the public meeting on the evening of October 17, 2018, members of the public asked questions about the difference between the Metropolitan Area Planning Council (MAPC) and the MPO, voiced opinions that the board should have more oversight of transit projects, expressed a desire for more easily understandable Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) tables, and asked questions about the number of seats held by MassDOT.

N. Hoffman thanked K. Quackenbush, staff, and attendees for their participation in the review. N. Hoffman stated that the access the federal team was able to have prior to the on-site review answered some questions that were then taken off the table for the on-site meeting. N. Hoffman described emerging themes that FTA and FHWA would like to focus on as resiliency, performance-based planning and programming (PBPP), and freight, and he commended MPO staff for the work on PBPP especially. N. Hoffman stated that the federal team will meet to debrief and produce a final report, which will be presented to the board. N. Hoffman reminded members that they are invited to talk with Rachel Strauss-McBrien at the Volpe Center by October 26, 2018, if they would like their anonymous comments considered for the development of the report.

Steve Olanoff (Three Rivers Interlocal Council, Town of Norwood/Neponset Valley Chamber of Commerce) stated that he was the only MPO member who attended the on-site meetings, adding that he would have liked to see more members participate.

7. Approval of August 16, 2018, MPO Meeting Minutes—*Róisín Foley, MPO Staff*

A motion to approve the minutes of the meeting of August 16, 2018, was made by the MAPC (Eric Bourassa) and seconded by the South Shore Coalition (Town of Braintree) (Christine Stickney). The motion carried.

8. National Highway System Travel Reliability and Freight Movement Performance Targets—*Michelle Scott, MPO Staff, and Bryan Pounds, MassDOT*

Documents posted to the MPO meeting calendar

1. [Massachusetts Reliability Performance Targets/Boston Region Reliability Performance Measure Values](#)

USDOT requires performance monitoring related to the reliability of passenger and freight movement on the National Highway System (NHS). Targets are required for two types of reliability performance measures:

1. For all roadway users: percent of person-miles that are reliable for the Interstate and non-Interstate NHS (desired direction: increase)
2. For freight: Truck Travel Time Index for Interstate (desired direction: decrease)

MassDOT has set two-year and four-year statewide targets that equal baseline values for these measures. The MPO must adopt the Commonwealth's targets or set MPO-level targets by November 16, 2018. The MPO will work with MassDOT and others to plan and invest in strategies to improve reliability going forward. These are the first of the last two sets of targets the MPO must set before the end of calendar year (CY) 2018. In November, the MPO will hear from MassDOT staff regarding NHS bridge and pavement condition measures.

Both sets of measures relate to the NHS, which includes the Interstate Highway System and other roads important to the nation's economy, defense, and mobility.

Massachusetts has approximately 3,326 miles of NHS roadways. About a third of those miles are within the Boston region. About 10 percent of public roads in the Boston region are part of the NHS. Of the municipalities in the MPO's planning area, 94 out of 97 contain NHS mileage. MassDOT is responsible for about half of these roadways, while municipalities are responsible for about 43 percent. The Department of Conservation and Recreation (DCR) and other entities are responsible for the remaining roadways.

Travel time reliability can be defined as the consistency or dependability of travel times from day to day or throughout the day. Factors that contribute to reliability include fluctuations in demand, inclement weather, road work, traffic incidents, and poor signal timing.

For the purposes of the first federal measure, reliability is measured using the Level of Travel Time Ratio (LOTTR) index, which compares longer travel times with typical travel times. The further this ratio gets from 1, the less reliable travel times are.

Travel time reliability is measured using the National Performance Management Research Data Set (NPMRDS), which utilizes INRIX data. The NPMRDS provides travel time data for trucks and passenger vehicles on NHS segments. FHWA uses the NPMRDS to evaluate state performance for federal reliability and congestion measures. Vehicle volumes, vehicle occupancy factors, and other necessary data come from NPMRDS or related data sets.

MassDOT worked with Cambridge Systematics to process NPMRDS and other data for reliability and freight performance measures. The challenge is that NPMRDS historic data (2016 and earlier) differ from recent data (2017) due to a change in vendors and data characteristics. These differences make it difficult to perform trend analyses using historic data.

FHWA has encouraged states and MPOs to set conservative targets based on NPMRDS data. In light of this, MassDOT and MPO staff recommend establishing the reliability targets in the table below.

Measure	Baseline Value (2017)	Two-Year Target (CY 2019)	Four-Year Target (CY 2021)
Percent of person-miles on the Interstate that are reliable	68%	68.0%	68.0%
Percent of person-miles on the non-Interstate NHS that are reliable	80%	80.0%	80.0%

Data for the Boston region shows that travel times are much less reliable in the Boston region than in the state as a whole; 47.2 percent of person-miles on interstates in the

region are reliable compared to 68 percent statewide, and 69 percent of person-miles on non-interstates in the region are reliable compared to 80 percent statewide.

Freight reliability is measured using the Truck Travel Time Reliability (TTTR) index, which compares the consistency or dependability of truck travel times from day to day or throughout the day. MassDOT and MPO staff recommend establishing the freight reliability target in the table below.

Measure	Baseline Value (2017)	Two-Year Target (CY 2019)	Four-Year Target (CY 2021)
Truck Travel Time Reliability Index	1.85	1.85	1.85

As with the reliability measure for all users, the data for the Boston region shows less reliable travel times for trucks: the travel time index value for the region is 2.55 compared to 1.85 for the state.

If the MPO decides to support the statewide targets, it does not need to set quantifiable targets specific to the MPO area. In doing this, the MPO agrees to plan and program projects to help reach the statewide target and work with MassDOT on target narratives for the LRTP and TIP. If the MPO decides to set a separate target for the Boston region, it must commit to a quantifiable target for the region, coordinate with MassDOT on target development, and report targets to MassDOT and in the LRTP and TIP. At this time, MPO staff recommends adopting the state targets.

Going forward, the MPO will keep considering reliability and freight performance when identifying TIP and LRTP programs and projects and reporting on reliability and freight targets and performance in TIPs and the LRTP. In 2020, MassDOT and the MPO will have the opportunity to revisit four-year targets and adjust as necessary. FHWA will evaluate actual performance against targets when data is available. To have made significant progress, four or more performance measures must be better than the baseline value or better than or equal to the target value. This evaluation is done at the state level. FHWA reviews how MPOs are addressing PBPP and targets as part of certification reviews.

MassDOT and MPOs can work on anticipating effects of projects on freight and reliability performance measures, prioritizing programs and projects that may improve performance, identifying data and analysis needs to address through planning activities, and balancing reliability against other needs.

B. Pounds added that the consistent message from FHWA has been to set conservative targets as a starting point.

Discussion

E. Bourassa asked about the average length of the roadway segments measured in the INRIX dataset. Ryan Hicks (MPO Staff) replied that expressway segments are generally 3 to 4 miles, and arterial segments are about 2 miles. E. Bourassa noted that the Boston region significantly lowers the statewide average for reliability because of congestion. He stated that it makes sense to adopt state targets, but that it is important to measure reliability for the region and pursue other remedies.

Rick Reed (Minuteman Advisory Group on Interlocal Coordination) (Town of Bedford) asked whether FHWA will be collecting this data for all states and making it available. N. Hoffman replied that, yes, the idea is to create a database of information for the entire country to create a picture of the state of reliability on the NHS as a whole. This information should be available next year. R. Reed stated that it would be helpful to compare the region to other east coast cities. M. Scott added that this metric tells one part of the story, but other measures consider other aspects of mobility.

S. Olanoff asked why the LOTTR and TTTR use difference percentiles to measure long travel times to typical travel times. B. Pounds responded that this measure is tied to the economic impact of freight versus personal vehicles. S. Olanoff added that weather can affect reliability and asked whether the MPO could devise its own measure that accounts for weather. M. Scott replied that the MPO can consider measures that exceed the federal requirements. S. Olanoff asked what would be the motive to set a separate target. M. Scott replied that staff does not recommend setting separate targets for the Boston region at this time. In other MPO regions, it may make more sense and could act as a statement of intent regarding future progress.

Jim Fitzgerald (City of Boston) (Boston Planning & Development Agency) asked about the time periods and intervals that are used for analyzing data to measure reliability. M. Scott replied that the time periods and intervals are specified in the federal rule, and differ for measures for freight and measures for all roadway users. The MPO could go beyond this to examine reliability performance at specific times and locations.

T. Teich stated that she shared some of the concerns voiced by others that the measures themselves do not capture the breadth of the issues the MPO should be addressing. T. Teich asked how these measures can take into account, for instance, high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) or bus lanes. M. Scott replied that at the geographic

level of aggregation required by the performance measure, it would be difficult to estimate the impact of a bus lane on reliability.

Laura Gilmore (Massachusetts Port Authority) stated that one of the issues made clear in the latest Statewide Freight Plan is that the issues with freight in the Boston region are not necessarily on the interstate system. She asked whether there is enough data to establish other freight measures given that the federal rule only considers the interstates. M. Scott replied that it might be possible to get some data on non-interstate roadways on the NHS. N. Hoffman replied that Boston is one of upwards of 300 MPO regions nationally, and the federal expectation is that MPOs and states have other measures that speak to local conditions. L. Gilmore stated that she believes truck travel reliability on non-interstate roadways is a gap in terms of the package of federal measures.

D. Mohler replied that the MPO should have a discussion about what staff should be measuring in excess of the federal rules.

Jay Monty (At-Large City) (City of Everett) asked N. Hoffman to clarify the consequences of not meeting a set target. B. Pounds replied that the only federal measures that are tied to financial obligations are the pavement and bridge condition measures and the highway safety measures. He added that states will need to report on progress and provide explanations for why targets were not met. N. Hoffman added that the information about state level performance will be public.

Daniel Amstutz (At-Large Town) (Town of Arlington) asked whether the data captures transit on roadways in terms of person-miles. M. Scott replied that the measure is designed to get as close to this information as possible. The vehicle volumes in the dataset include multiple vehicle classifications, and FHWA provides a vehicle-occupancy factor that can be used to estimate the number of people traveling on a bus. However, the NPMRDS does not provide separate travel times for cars versus buses. D. Amstutz asked whether staff has a travel time dataset for transit vehicles. M. Scott replied that this is not available from INRIX. R. Hicks added that INRIX is moving in this direction for different modes, including bikes.

Samantha Silverberg (MBTA) added that these data would be significant for measuring the relative impact of different interventions on different modes.

T. Teich asked that staff plan an organized group discussion about what the board would like to do to explore other measures in each of the performance topic areas.

Vote

A motion to adopt proposed performance targets for travel reliability and freight movement on the NHS was made by Three Rivers Interlocal Council (Town of Norwood/Neponset Valley Chamber of Commerce) (S. Olanoff) and seconded by the City of Boston (Boston Transportation Department) (Tom Kadzis). The motion carried.

9. Draft TIP Community Transportation Program Development and Administration—Sandy Johnston, MPO Staff

Documents posted to the MPO meeting calendar

1. [Community Transportation Program Development- MPO Survey Results: Important Factors in Project Evaluation](#)

Public input received during the outreach for the current LRTP, *Charting Progress to 2040*, and the new LRTP in development, *Destination 2040*, indicated a desire for community transportation projects on topics such as first- and last-mile connections to transit, community-based transportation, and employee shuttles. The MPO previously supported several similar programs, including the Suburban Mobility program (2004-09) and Clean Air and Mobility (2011—rolled into Community Transportation in *Charting Progress to 2040*). In *Charting Progress to 2040*, three categories of projects were included under those that could be funded under the Community Transportation Program. They are as follows:

1. Community Transportation: first- and last-mile connections, human services transit, other non-traditional or non-fixed route transit projects
2. Park-and-Ride: includes bicycle infrastructure
3. Clean Air and Mobility: other projects not included in the first two categories

Charting Progress to 2040 states that 4 percent of target funds should be used for the Community Transportation Program. A total of \$4 million is programmed for the Community Transportation Program; \$2 million is programmed in FFY 2021 and \$2 million in 2023.

MPO staff conducted background research to examine local and national examples of community transportation operators and funders. Local contributors include transportation management associations (TMAs), municipalities, and social service agencies. Nationally, the San Francisco Metropolitan Transportation Council's LifeLine and Safe Routes to Transit Programs fund projects that address transportation gaps or barriers identified in community-based transportation plans or other local planning efforts in low-income neighborhoods. Philadelphia's Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission also has a Safe Routes to Transit program. Safe Routes to Transit is not a

federal program like Safe Routes to School, but rather an idea that seems to have originated in San Francisco, and focuses on pedestrian and bicycle improvements to areas around transit links.

The public sector is also beginning to experiment with TNC partnerships. Examples include the MBTA's pilot, in which Uber and Lyft supplement THE RIDE service, and North Shore Community College's pilot with Uber.

MPO staff conducted a survey of MPOs that have similar programs, asking them about the kind of projects they fund, funding mechanisms, eligible grantees, and metrics for evaluating projects. Partner or municipal financial support was widely considered very important, as was the program's inclusion in a local or regional plan or needs assessment. Demand forecasting was generally considered less important. The latter was the only criterion not to receive a first-place vote. The survey results are available on the MPO's website.

Staff used this background review to frame their recommendations for the MPO's Community Transportation Program, which are below.

Recommended entities eligible to apply:

- Municipalities
- TMAs
- Regional transit authorities (RTAs)
- Community organizations or social service agencies
- Other public agencies
- Public-private partnerships

Proposed Eligible Project Types

- Transit Operations and Improvement
 - Shuttle operations
 - TNC partnerships
 - Human services transportation
 - Transit enhancements
 - Acquisition or replacement of vehicles
 - Technology updates
- Parking Management
 - Leasing or arranging for off-site parking spaces near transit stations to supplement existing parking
 - Constructing additional parking
 - Constructing bicycle parking

- Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements
 - Access to transit
 - Improving sidewalks
 - New stairs/ramps
 - New paths
 - Americans with Disabilities Act improvements
 - Bicycles on transit
- Education and Wayfinding
 - Transit options
 - New technologies
 - Signage
 - Pilot or demonstration projects

In designing the structure of the Community Transportation Program, other considerations that MPO staff discussed included restrictions on the use of Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) Program funds, the somewhat complex process for using federal money for capital projects, and the uncertainty of rapidly evolving technologies like TNCs.

MPO staff is also proposing a potential structure for Community Transportation project evaluation criteria. Staff will be circulating a survey to MPO members asking for input on more exact priorities for criteria development in the coming weeks.

Staff's current proposal is to treat the first funding round for this program, currently FFY 2021, as a preliminary learning experience. Staff has already begun identifying project concepts that are possible candidates for funding through the outreach process for *Destination 2040*, recommendations from recent staff studies and technical assistance memos, and discussions with other agencies and stakeholders.

From October to December, staff proposes to seek feedback from the MPO on criteria, incorporate that feedback into a memo, and compile a draft universe of possible projects. In the spring, staff proposes to evaluate projects and present a draft project list to the MPO for programming. After this first round, staff will evaluate the process and report back to the MPO.

Following the first round, given MPO approval and incorporating lessons learned this year, the next round would begin in the fall of 2019.

Staff believes this program can create first- and last-mile connections and provide funding in a high-demand field and outside existing pathways, creating a flexible response to emerging technologies. The program has the potential to address gaps in

service between RTA service areas, and address employer-specific needs. This program can help facilitate coordination among agencies to generate discussions about partnerships and provide safe access to transit services. To ensure that MPO money is well spent on fiscally sustainable projects, it will be important to conduct a fatal flaw analysis of sponsor capabilities and emphasize budgeting in the criteria.

Discussion

T. Teich noted that survey respondents de-emphasized demand as a criterion for project selection. S. Johnston replied that respondents felt that smaller interventions are not necessarily financially feasible to model. Some projects may never generate a huge ridership, but they may still address real needs. T. Teich asked whether staff thinks they have enough projects to choose from for the first round. S. Johnston replied that staff has a long list of potential projects and the next step is reaching out to proponents and municipalities to gauge interest. T. Teich added that she would like the Advisory Council to be a place for outreach, and S. Johnston replied that he would be happy to present to the Advisory Council. T. Teich also asked about the issue of RTA representation on the MPO board. D. Mohler replied that this discussion will be on the agenda for the next meeting.

D. Amstutz asked whether this project is meant to target smaller municipalities with fewer resources, and noted that that \$2 million is a small amount of funding. S. Johnston replied that the initial list of projects includes municipalities of varying sizes. S. Johnston added that it is up to the MPO in terms of how to prioritize the distribution of funds, but given that these are smaller projects it may be possible to do a lot with the limited funds. D. Amstutz asked if the application process for funding would be competitive. S. Johnston replied that for the initial round staff would use the list they already have, and for future rounds staff would open up the process to the public. He added that the first round is expected to include more potential candidates than the program can fund.

S. Olanoff noted that, in his recollection, the challenge with the earlier Suburban Mobility Program was not the issue of the federal process but of sustainability.

Marie Rose (MassDOT Highway Division) asked whether the survey results include responses about all projects or only projects related to community transportation. S. Johnston replied that the responses relate only to small-scale, first-and-last mile connection projects. M. Rose noted that staff could ask survey respondents whether they had used CMAQ funds for these purposes. M. Rose discouraged the MPO from using this program to fund infrastructure projects that would need to be advertised with the Highway Division because of the work involved.

David Koses (At-Large City) (City of Newton) brought up the issue of the MPO taking funds from the Community Transportation Program to use for other TIP projects experiencing overruns, and asked how the MPO can protect the funding for this program. S. Johnston replied that this is why staff is coming to the MPO now to talk about programming projects in FFY 2021.

10. Final Draft Memorandum of Understanding for the Boston, Massachusetts—New Hampshire—Rhode Island Urbanized Area (UZA)—Bryan Pounds, MassDOT

Documents posted to the MPO meeting calendar

1. [Draft Memorandum of Understanding \(MOU\) for the Boston, Massachusetts—New Hampshire—Rhode Island Urbanized Area \(UZA\)](#)

The current memorandum of understanding (MOU) between MPO member agencies was adopted in 2003. This new document updates the MOU to reflect the boundaries of the UZA, which were updated following the 2010 Census. The new document represents an understanding between the 11 planning bodies, 3 state DOTs, and public transit operators who are now in the UZA. The new MOU also includes references to PBPP and was composed in consultation with FTA and FHWA. It was shared with the Transportation Manager's Group, which includes representatives from all the regional planning agencies in the UZA, planning bodies outside of the state, public transit operators, and applicable legal departments. Throughout October, this document is being presented to all Massachusetts MPOs and adjacent DOTs for approval. Once all the MPOs have endorsed it, the chair of the MPO will sign it and the agreement will become final.

Vote

A motion to approve the updated MOU for the Boston, Massachusetts—New Hampshire—Rhode Island UZA, was made by the MBTA Advisory Board (Paul Regan) and seconded by the City of Boston (Boston Planning & Development Agency) (J. Fitzgerald). The Advisory Council (T. Teich) abstained. The motion carried.

11. Members Items

T. Kadzis asked whether MassDOT had any feedback related to the recent reopening of the South Boston Bypass Road to commuters. D. Mohler replied that he had none.

12. Adjourn

A motion to adjourn was made by the MBTA Advisory Board (P. Regan) and seconded by MAPC (E. Bourassa). 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)	Daniel Amstutz
At-Large Town (Town of Lexington)	Dave Kucharsky
City of Boston (Boston Planning & Development Agency)	Jim Fitzgerald
City of Boston (Boston Transportation Department)	Tom Kadzis
Federal Highway Administration	Nelson Hoffman
Federal Transit Administration	
Inner Core Committee (City of Somerville)	Tom Bent
Massachusetts Department of Transportation	David Mohler
MassDOT Highway Division	Marie Rose
	John Romano
Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority (MBTA)	Samantha Silverberg
Massachusetts Port Authority	Laura Gilmore
MBTA Advisory Board	Paul Regan
Metropolitan Area Planning Council	Eric Bourassa
MetroWest Regional Collaborative (City of Framingham)	
Minuteman Advisory Group on Interlocal Coordination (Town of Bedford)	Rick Reed
North Shore Task Force (City of Beverly)	Aaron Clausen
North Suburban Planning Council (City of Woburn)	
Regional Transportation Advisory Council	Tegin Teich
South Shore Coalition (Town of Braintree)	Christine Stickney
South West Advisory Planning Committee (Town of Medway)	
Three Rivers Interlocal Council (Town of Norwood/Neponset Valley Chamber of Commerce)	Steve Olanoff

Other Attendees	Affiliation
Bryan Pounds	MassDOT
Scott Zadakis	CrossTown Connect
AnaCristina Fragoso	Advisory Council
Lenard Diggins	MBTA Rider Oversight Committee
Victoria Mier	MassDOT

MPO Staff/Central Transportation Planning Staff

Karl Quackenbush, Executive Director

Mark Abbott

Seth Asante

Annette Demchur

Róisín Foley

Ryan Hicks

Sandy Johnston

Ali Kleyman

Anne McGahan

Jen Rowe

Michelle Scott

Chen-Yuan Wang
