

MPO Meeting Minutes

Draft Memorandum for the Record

Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization Meeting

May 14, 2020 Meeting

10:00 AM–12:15 PM, Zoom Conference Call

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

Decisions

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

- Approve the minutes of the meeting of April 16, 2020

Meeting Agenda

1. Introductions

See attendance on page 14.

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

There was none.

3. Executive Director's Report—*Tegin Teich, Executive Director, Central Transportation Planning Staff*

T. Teich reported that the Boston Region MPO received formal recertification from the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Federal Transit Administration (FTA) following the 2018 federal certification review and the completion of two corrective actions. T. Teich stated that MPO staff continues to pursue implementation of additional recommendations in the certification review report and provides quarterly progress reports to FHWA and FTA.

T. Teich highlighted a successful outreach activity conducted by MPO staff on May 12, 2020. MPO staff and the Metropolitan Area Planning Council (MAPC) co-hosted a forum titled "Essential Trips: A COVID-19 Response Discussion for Local Transit Providers." The intent of the events was to give regional transit authorities, transportation management associations, Councils on Aging, and other transportation providers a chance to discuss the challenges they are facing and adaptations they are making during the pandemic. Speakers included Monica Tibbits-Nutt from 128 Business Council, Susan Barrett from the Town of Lexington's Lexpress service, Michelle Brooks

from TransAction Associates, and Rachel Fichtenbaum from MassMobility. T. Teich stated that a [recording of the conversation](#) is posted to the MPO's YouTube channel.

T. Teich stated that this meeting would be the last MPO presentation for Andrew Clark, who would be taking a position at the Greater Portland Council of Governments. T. Teich thanked A. Clark for his work at MPO staff.

4. Public Comments

There were none.

5. Committee Chairs' Reports

Brian Kane (Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority [MBTA] Advisory Board) reported that Paul Regan, long-time Executive Director of the MPO Board and MPO member, retired at the end of March. B. Kane stated that P. Regan served on the MPO board for 21 years and that his retirement represents a loss of institutional knowledge for the MPO; he has stayed on to assist B. Kane during the transition. B. Kane stated that the MPO will likely honor P. Regan's service at a future meeting.

S. Woelfel acknowledged P. Regan's service at the MPO and stated that the MPO would work to honor P. Regan's work appropriately at a future meeting. S. Woelfel added that one of P. Regan's roles at the MPO was as Chair of the Administration and Finance (A&F) Committee. A discussion of the role of this committee appears later on this agenda. S. Woelfel encouraged any members interested in serving as Chair of the A&F Committee to notify the Chair and staff.

6. Regional Transportation Advisory Council (Advisory Council) Report—*Lenard Diggins, Chair, Regional Transportation Advisory Council*

L. Diggins acknowledged the service of P. Regan at the MPO as well as in his visits to the MBTA Rider Oversight Committee (which L. Diggins represents on the Regional Transportation Advisory Council). L. Diggins reported that the Advisory Council met on May 13, 2020, and heard from Michelle Ho, Director of Capital Planning at the MassDOT Office of Transportation Planning. M. Ho presented on the interaction between the MassDOT and MPO capital planning processes. L. Diggins stated that the Advisory Council's 3C Documents Committee also discussed its draft public comment letter to the MPO regarding the draft federal fiscal years (FFY) 2021–25 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).

7. Action Item: Approval of April 16, 2020, MPO Meeting Minutes— Kate White, MPO Staff

Vote

A motion to approve the minutes of the meeting of April 16, 2020, was made by the MAPC (Eric Bourassa) and seconded by the MBTA Advisory Board (B. Kane). The motion carried.

8. MPO Elections Survey—Eric Bourassa, MAPC

Documents posted to the MPO meeting calendar

1. [Draft for Discussion: Survey Questions to TIP Contacts Regarding the MPO Municipal Elections Process](#)

E. Bourassa stated that one of the recommendations of the 2018 federal certification review was that the MPO review its election process to ensure that it is effectively engaging all communities in the region. MAPC and the MBTA Advisory Board jointly administer MPO elections and, as such, have drafted a 10-question survey for municipal TIP contacts to gather information on their awareness of and engagement in the MPO process. E. Bourassa stated that TIP contacts were chosen because they are those most engaged in the MPO process. E. Bourassa stated that the goal of this presentation was to get feedback on the survey questions before distributing the survey.

Discussion

Tom Kadzis (City of Boston) (Boston Transportation Department) suggested that the survey not include the text of the certification report recommendation in order not to bias respondents for or against the elections process. T. Kadzis suggested adding follow up questions to Questions 1, 3, and 6 in order to investigate why respondents feel the way they do. T. Kadzis also asked whether Question 7 should include the explanation of the reasoning behind the elections process or just focus on what respondents think of the current process.

Tina Cassidy (North Suburban Planning Council) (City of Woburn) suggested that Question 7 could be restated or made more open-ended in order to solicit feedback on specific concerns respondents might have about the elections process rather than encouraging a reopening of the conversation around whether only subregional municipalities should vote for their representatives. E. Bourassa agreed, stating that he personally feels the current policy is the correct one.

L. Diggins agreed with T. Cassidy and asked what percentage of municipalities in the region vote in MPO elections and whether the same municipalities vote every time. E. Bourassa stated that approximately 40 to 50 percent of municipalities on average vote

in MPO elections. E. Bourassa stated that he did not know whether the same municipalities participate over time but could investigate this. L. Diggins stated that it would also be interesting to ask questions about why municipalities do not vote, if they don't.

Tom Bent (Inner Core Committee) (City of Somerville) agreed with T. Kadzis and T. Cassidy.

Sheila Page (At-Large Town) (Town of Lexington) agreed with L. Diggins that it would be useful to investigate the nuances of voting behavior by adding follow up questions to Question One. Regarding Question 4, S. Page stated that it might be useful to add distance or access to Boston as a challenge. S. Page also suggested adding questions about what would make participation easier, for instance continuing virtual meetings beyond the pandemic.

Daniel Amstutz (At-Large Town) (Town of Arlington) agreed with S. Page regarding distance and time commitments. D. Amstutz agreed that the response options for Question 7 seem too binary. D. Amstutz suggested trying to construct questions that investigate what value municipalities do or do not see in the MPO process, given that some municipalities do not have dedicated transportation staff.

David Koses (At-Large City) (City of Newton) stated that he agrees that it does not make sense to have only cities vote for at-large city seats, towns vote for at-large town seats, or subregional municipalities vote for their subregional representatives.

Ken Miller (FHWA) stated that surveys are not always the best instrument to gather information, particularly when looking for why people feel the way they do. K. Miller suggested asking municipalities that have run unsuccessfully for seats about their experiences and why they have chosen not to run again. K. Miller suggested focus groups or interviews in addition to the survey. K. Miller added that many of the questions presented are not necessarily yes or no questions and suggested providing additional response options and disaggregating questions that have multiple parts. K. Miller suggested focusing on communities that have never even voted. K. Miller stated that at every level of the United States government, representatives who are elected by their constituents are expected to balance the needs of the whole with the concerns of their districts. K. Miller stated that sometimes MPO representatives think regionally and sometimes MPO representatives vote in the interest of their own constituencies and neither is necessarily a bad thing.

T. O'Rourke (Three Rivers Interlocal Council) (Town of Norwood/Neponset Valley Chamber of Commerce) suggested prefacing the survey by stating it is part of a regular

review process. T. O'Rourke suggested disaggregating the response options for Question 8.

K. Miller stated that there is a middle ground regarding possible term limits, stating that the MPO could have term limits but only when races are contested.

T. Cassidy asked whether there is a need for Question 8 if the survey might reach respondents who have no experience with the MPO process. The results of the survey might be used by the MPO to address the issue of term limits.

S. Page stated that she agreed with T. Cassidy and added that it is her understanding that many municipalities view the MPO process as synonymous with the TIP, and so are not interested in the process unless they have a TIP project.

E. Bourassa stated that given that this issue was raised by the MPO's federal partners, it makes sense to include it but in a revised format. T. Cassidy suggested asking what respondents think would improve the process relative to term limits and provide multiple choice answers.

L. Diggins suggested simply asking respondents whether they think there should be term limits or not, and agreed with K. Miller that it would be helpful to have some outreach outside of the survey.

B. Kane stated that the downward trend on participation in local government processes is not unique to the MPO, and so the lack of participation may not necessarily be something the MPO is doing wrong, but that the survey is a good first step and something the MPO should move forward with.

D. Amstutz acknowledged that some municipalities have limited resources and would need additional help to participate. D. Amstutz stated that trying to address this without addressing the foundational capacity issues that some municipalities face seems to be addressing the wrong issue.

E. Bourassa thanked the board members for their feedback and stated that he and B. Kane would incorporate it into the survey and work with the MPO Chair before sending it to municipalities.

9. MPO Committees—*Jonathan Church, MPO Staff*

J. Church presented an overview of the MPO's three committees: the A&F committee, the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) committee, and the Congestion

Management Process (CMP) committee. The goal of this presentation was to make sure that all board members were aware of the committees and how to participate.

Hiral Gandhi (MPO Staff) stated that the role of the A&F committee is to ensure that the fiduciary responsibilities of the MPO are being maintained and that policies and procedures are in place. Some of the responsibilities of the committee include budgeting and financial planning, financial reporting, and the creation and monitoring of internal controls and accountability policies. Typical tasks are to oversee the annual operating budget, approve the budget within the committee, and give recommendations to the full MPO board award for approval. In the near future, the committee may work with MPO staff to determine the financial implications of the strategic plan and work with the staff to plan a multi-year organizational budget that will financially support the implementation of the recommended strategy. Historically, the committee has met once a year during the development and approval of the operating budget but could meet twice a year or once every quarter.

Ben Muller (MassDOT) stated that the UPWP committee oversees the development of the UPWP, which is a financial plan identifying the work MPO staff will perform to support the functioning and decision-making of the MPO and member municipalities. These tasks are then fleshed out as the scopes of work that the board regularly votes on. The next draft UPWP document will likely be presented at the next MPO meeting. The UPWP committee provides an opportunity for board members to help prioritize the studies and technical assistance performed by MPO staff. Meetings are usually held the hour before the MPO meeting and typically occur once a month during the spring. MPO staff develops the Universe of Studies and tasks and seeks guidance on which specific tasks should be selected from that universe for inclusion in the UPWP. Meetings are held throughout the remainder of the year for occasional amendments. B. Muller stated that the committee would likely be reevaluating the formal membership of the committee in the coming months. B. Muller encouraged any members interested in the committee to reach out to him or Sandy Johnston, MPO staff.

Mark Abbott (MPO Staff) stated that the CMP committee supports and identifies tasks for the CMP to look at. In the past couple of years the committee has done an overall collection of park-and-ride data throughout the MBTA system and is currently in the process of creating a summary of the collection effort and an online dashboard. The committee has also supported the update of the MPO's express highway dashboards. M. Abbott said that the committee is important for guiding staff efforts as part of the CMP program. Jay Monty (At-Large City) (City of Everett) stated that the kinds of data and tools the committee has developed over the past few years will be incredibly useful

for influencing decision-making, particularly in the context of the current pandemic. J. Monty encouraged interested members to participate.

K. Miller noted that the 2018 federal certification review recommended that the MPO develop the operations plan outlined in its Memo of Understanding, and the practices and policies of subcommittee operation should be included in this document.

10. Major Infrastructure Definition—Anne McGahan, MPO Staff

Documents posted to the MPO meeting calendar

1. [Boston Region MPO Investment Programs](#)
2. [Revisiting the Major Infrastructure Program Definition in the Long-Range Transportation Plan \(LRTP\)](#)

A. McGahan introduced further discussion of the MPO's definition of Major Infrastructure program projects in the LRTP. While the MPO was developing the current LRTP, *Destination 2040*, FHWA confirmed that its only requirement for listing a major infrastructure project in the LRTP is that a project be one that changes the capacity of the transportation network. There is no threshold for cost. At the MPO meeting on November 21, 2019, the MPO discussed whether to continue to include the current \$20 million cost threshold in its definition of Major Infrastructure program projects. The board decided to continue to include this threshold. The current definition for a Major Infrastructure project is one that changes capacity of the transportation network and/or costs more than \$20 million. The issue arose again in discussions of the draft FFY 2020–24 TIP Amendment Three, when three Complete Street projects reached the \$20 million threshold. This required the MPO to amend the LRTP to include these three projects (Route 126 project in Ashland, Ferry Street in Everett, and Mount Auburn Street in Watertown). The question raised at that time was whether the MPO should consider Complete Streets projects that cost more than \$20 million in the Major Infrastructure Program or in the Complete Streets Program. This would affect the MPO's funding goals for investment programs as established in the LRTP. The funding goals in *Destination 2040* established that no more than 30 percent of the MPO's Regional Target funds should be allocated to the Major Infrastructure program. The goal for the Complete Streets program is 45 percent. If the three Complete Streets projects amended into the LRTP were recategorized as Major Infrastructure, the MPO would no longer be meeting the goals established in the LRTP. Moving forward, the MPO can consider four options:

Option 1: Keep the \$20 million threshold

LRTP Amendments may be required in the future if project costs increase during the development of the TIP. Currently there are additional projects programmed in FFY

2024 and 2025 with costs nearing \$20 million. Given that revisions to the project evaluation criteria are currently underway with a unique set of criteria associated with each investment program, continuing to use the \$20 million threshold may result in a Major Infrastructure program that includes a variety of projects that span many project types. It may be more beneficial to evaluate these projects using the criteria specific to their project type than that of the Major Infrastructure program.

Option 2: Increase the threshold dollar amount

In reviewing project costs for Complete Streets projects that have recently been submitted, a threshold of \$50 million could exclude these types of projects from the Major Infrastructure Program.

Option 3: Change the definition to apply to projects on certain types of roadways

The MPO could choose, for example, only those on the National Highway System or those with a certain level of average daily traffic.

Option 4: Change the definition of the Major Infrastructure program to exclude the threshold dollar amount

This option allows all projects to remain in the investment program aligned with their project type, and the new project evaluation criteria can be properly applied. It also eliminates the requirement for LRTP amendments during TIP development as costs increase. The definition must still include all projects that change the capacity of the transportation network.

Staff conducted research on the policies held by other large MPOs. Some do not have a threshold dollar amount identified in their LRTPs. Some identify threshold dollar amounts for different kinds of projects.

Discussion

Samantha Silverberg (MBTA) asked whether there are projects currently included in the Major Infrastructure program that would no longer be included if the MPO were to discontinue the cost threshold. A. McGahan replied that there are five Complete Streets projects that are currently in the Major Infrastructure program that do not change the capacity of the transportation network and are only included because of cost. S. Silverberg stated that it seems like the MPO should have some way of accounting for projects that don't change capacity but do have an impact on a wide range of the public, whether by including some measure of the kind of roadway or vehicle miles traveled.

T. Cassidy stated that the \$20 million threshold is no longer appropriate, and the Major Infrastructure definition should capture projects with a regional impact, such as an interchange improvement or significant transit extension. T. Cassidy expressed support

for, at a minimum, increasing the threshold to at least \$50 million, perhaps \$60 or \$75 million.

D. Amstutz agreed with T. Cassidy, stating that the \$20 million seems to function like a proxy for the tipping point at which a project becomes Major Infrastructure. D. Amstutz advocated for increasing the threshold and also including some other metrics.

J. Monty agreed with T. Cassidy and D. Amstutz. J. Monty asked about Major Infrastructure projects like McGrath Boulevard in Somerville, which do not increase the capacity of the system. A. McGahan clarified that the definition is that the project changes the capacity of the system, not that it increases capacity. Any change to the capacity of the system would qualify. J. Monty noted that there are some as yet unfunded projects that have been proposed for funding in the LRTP that may not qualify under a new definition, and cautioned that a new definition not create a situation where projects fall out of consideration.

E. Bourassa supported increasing the cost threshold and looking at other criteria related to impact.

L. Diggins asked when the \$20 million threshold was established. A. McGahan briefly reviewed the history of guidance from FHWA regarding cost thresholds, which have changed over time. L. Diggins advocated for discontinuing use of the cost threshold and coming to an agreement on what Major Infrastructure really means. L. Diggins stated that if the threshold is maintained, the MPO should retain projects in their original categories and adopt a certain threshold at which projects must be recategorized.

K. Miller stated that FHWA guidance is that Major Infrastructure projects must be regionally significant, and regionally significant projects are those that change capacity in a way that must be modeled for air quality impacts using the travel demand model. K. Miller stated that it would make sense to raise the cost threshold and create a definition that includes regionally significant projects. K. Miller suggested that the MPO call Major Infrastructure projects "Regionally Significant," retaining Complete Streets in its own category.

T. Bent agreed with previous commenters that the MPO should raise the threshold and redefine the kinds of projects that would apply in ways that can be explained to the public.

Jim Fitzgerald (City of Boston) (Boston Planning & Development Agency) advocated for keeping some cost threshold in order to retain a level of scrutiny for projects that are that expensive.

S. Woelfel stated that MassDOT is fine with using the federal definition of impact on air quality, and that it seemed like members were interested in raising the cost threshold.

D. Amstutz asked whether the threshold should be a specific amount, or whether it should be tied to the amount of regional target funding available in a given year, and whether eligibility for Advanced Construction (AC) could be incorporated into the definition.

A. McGahan noted that the percentage of regional target funding might be confusing because the amount of funding changes year to year. For the AC amount, this may replicate the issues already at play because the FHWA guidance is \$25 million.

K. Miller stated that the \$25 million guidance is essentially arbitrary to prevent AC being used for every project.

S. Woelfel conducted a straw poll, asking any members opposed to raising the threshold to \$50 million to raise their hands. No members raised their hands. S. Woelfel asked members who agreed that raising the threshold to \$50 million is the correct number to raise their hands, and for members who would prefer to have no threshold at all to raise their hands. These straw polls indicated that most members were in agreement with the \$50 million threshold and some preferred no threshold.

A. McGahan stated that staff would take these results and look at what other metrics the MPO could use to define Major Infrastructure projects. S. Woelfel asked A. McGahan to provide members with the written federal definition of regionally significant projects.

11. Transit Mitigation for New Developments Federal Fiscal Year 2020 UPWP Study—*Andrew Clark, MPO Staff*

A. Clark provided an update on the “Transit Mitigation for New Developments” study originally funded in the FFY 2020 UPWP. The original intent of this project was to study potential mitigation strategies for increased transit ridership caused by new developments by reviewing national best practices and identifying needs in the Boston region. MassDOT has also been working on this topic and in the course of scoping the study, MPO staff determined that there was little opportunity for MPO staff to add value to their existing workflow. To avoid duplicating their work, MPO staff began exploring related study ideas to pursue instead. MPO staff developed an additional project idea that keeps with the theme of the original project and supports a number of additional internal and external efforts. The topic of focus is trip generation rates at new developments. Traditionally, trip generation rates come from the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual. The data for this manual was

collected at suburban single-use sites and tends to overestimate vehicular trips and underestimate trips by transit biking or walking. This means there is limited applicability to urban settings and especially to mixed-use developments. There are some efforts underway across the country to develop other ways of estimating trip generation, and these methodologies typically involve gathering site-specific data. MPO staff believe a more thorough investigation of these methodologies could be beneficial to the Boston region and would benefit future transit mitigation work. The CTPS modeling group will undertake an FFY 2021 UPWP study to examine the applicability of ITE rates to the Boston region. MPO staff believes there's an opportunity to conduct a review of national best practices with regard to innovative approaches to estimating trip generation rates prior to this effort. Staff estimates that a literature review of this nature would require \$30,000 should the board choose to proceed. The board will also need to decide what to do with the remaining \$30,000, because the original transit mitigation study was budgeted at \$60,000. MPO staff suggests a review of nationwide and international Vision Zero policies.

Discussion

D. Amstutz expressed general support for study of both trip generation and Vision Zero, but asked how this work differs from the work proposed for next FFY. A. Clark stated that the work proposed for FFY 2021 will take Boston-specific trip data and then work with ITE to recalibrate those rates to the Boston region. The work proposed here is to look at innovative ways to get trip generation rates without using the ITE manual being advanced nationally.

Note: At this point, E. Bourassa assumed the chair's seat.

D. Amstutz suggested that the additional funding could be used to study a topic germane to the current COVID-19 pandemic.

Scott Peterson (MPO Staff) added that one of the main differences between the UPWP study that's proposed for the fall and the work being proposed by A. Clark is that the FFY 2021 study will use observed data from developments that have actually happened in this region. The work proposed by A. Clark looks at inferred data based on socio-economic characteristics.

L. Diggins asked whether leaving the funding unused would mean that MPO staff would lose the funding. L. Diggins agreed with D. Amstutz that looking at ways to deal with COVID-19 recovery would also be useful.

J. Fitzgerald asked whether MassDOT would be able to provide the MPO with an update on its trip generation work. J. Fitzgerald stated that the trip generation research

would be a great use of these funds, and that work should focus on refining the internal trip capture factors of trip generation.

T. Teich agreed that there are interesting COVID-19 related questions evolving that MPO staff is starting to filter into its work, while acknowledging that this is challenging because of the ongoing nature of the crisis. T. Teich stated that staff is open to concrete study ideas on this topic.

Annette Demchur (MPO Staff) clarified that if MPO staff doesn't use the additional \$30,000 or the \$60,000 it remains on the table. If the MPO chooses to move forward with the trip generation research and the board feels that that fits within the transit mitigation scope, then the MPO would not have to amend the UPWP. However, if MPO staff used the other \$30,000 for a project that does not fit within the scope of the transit mitigation work, the MPO would have to amend the UPWP to include the new project.

B. Muller stated that MassDOT has conducted a preliminary literature review, which focused more on policy than CTPS's work would have. MassDOT's public-private development unit is now putting together a scope for additional work. Regarding COVID-19, the MassDOT Office of Transportation Planning is looking at what the pandemic means for next year's work program.

Laura Gilmore (Massport) expressed support for the trip generation research topic.

E. Bourassa stated that MAPC is in support of this topic, noting that more research-based literature review projects are the kinds of work that are more feasible for staff in the current work from home environment. E. Bourassa added that he is aware that MassDOT and the MBTA are working to understand different reopening scenarios, what transit demand will be, and suggested that there might be ways for CTPS to help with lighter weight modeling of what different reopening scenarios might look like.

T. Teich agreed with E. Bourassa regarding research projects and stated that the proposed Vision Zero work could be useful at this time.

S. Peterson stated that there are a number of ongoing projects regarding trip generation, and CTPS is working to avoid duplication of work. S. Peterson stated that CTPS is monitoring ongoing travel behavior changes during the pandemic to reassess forecasting and trip generation going forward.

A. Clark clarified that if the board is comfortable with the trip generation research, staff can write a scope and begin that project. For the additional \$30,000, whether it relates

to Vision Zero or COVID-19, staff would write an amendment to the UPWP before bringing a new scope to the board.

Sandy Johnston (MPO Staff) stated that the MPO will be preparing a UPWP amendment anyway, and this new project could be included with that amendment.

E. Bourassa encouraged staff to move forward with scoping the trip generation project and bring another idea for the remaining funds to the UPWP Committee as an amendment to forward to the MPO.

12. Members Items

B. Kane stated that there would be an MBTA Advisory Board meeting on Tuesday, May 19, 2020.

S. Woelfel stated that the next MPO Board meeting would be held Thursday, May 28, 2020.

13. Adjourn

A motion to adjourn was made by the Inner Core Committee (City of Somerville) (T. Bent) and seconded by the MBTA Advisory Board (B. Kane). 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)	Sheila Page
City of Boston (Boston Planning & Development Agency)	Jim Fitzgerald
City of Boston (Boston Transportation Department)	Tom Kadzis
Federal Highway Administration	Ken Miller
Federal Transit Administration	
Inner Core Committee (City of Somerville)	Tom Bent
Massachusetts Department of Transportation	Steve Woelfel
MassDOT Highway Division	John Bechard
	John Romano
Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority (MBTA)	Samantha Silverberg
Massachusetts Port Authority	Laura Gilmore
MBTA Advisory Board	Brian Kane
Metropolitan Area Planning Council	Eric Bourassa
MetroWest Regional Collaborative (City of Framingham)	Thatcher Kezer III
Minuteman Advisory Group on Interlocal Coordination (Town of Acton)	
North Shore Task Force (City of Beverly)	Darlene Wynne
North Suburban Planning Council (City of Woburn)	Tina Cassidy
Regional Transportation Advisory Council	Lenard Diggins
South Shore Coalition (Town of Rockland)	
South West Advisory Planning Committee (Town of Medway)	
Three Rivers Interlocal Council (Town of Norwood/Neponset Valley Chamber of Commerce)	Tom O'Rourke

Other Attendees	Affiliation
Ali Kleyman	City of Somerville
Ben Muller	MassDOT OTP
Cheryll-Ann Senior	MassDOT
Connie Raphael	MassDOT Highway District 5
Frank Tramontozzi	City of Quincy
Joe Collins	Town of Norwood
Steve Olanoff	TRIC Alternate
Timothy Paris	MassDOT Highway District 4
Tracie Lenhardt	VHB

MPO Staff/Central Transportation Planning Staff

Tegin Teich, Executive Director
Mark Abbott
Matt Archer
Jonathan Church
Andrew Clark
Annette Demchur
Róisín Foley
Hiral Gandhi
Matt Genova
Betsy Harvey
Ryan Hicks
Kathy Jacob
Sandy Johnston
Anne McGahan
Ariel Patterson
Scott Peterson
Bradley Putnam
Kate White

The Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) operates its programs, services, and activities in compliance with federal nondiscrimination laws including Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (Title VI), the Civil Rights Restoration Act of 1987, and related statutes and regulations. Title VI prohibits discrimination in federally assisted programs and requires that no person in the United States of America shall, on the grounds of race, color, or national origin (including limited English proficiency), be excluded from participation in, denied the benefits of, or be otherwise subjected to discrimination under any program or activity that receives federal assistance. Related federal nondiscrimination laws administered by the Federal Highway Administration, Federal Transit Administration, or both, prohibit discrimination on the basis of age, sex, and disability. The Boston Region MPO considers these protected populations in its Title VI Programs, consistent with federal interpretation and administration. In addition, the Boston Region MPO provides meaningful access to its programs, services, and activities to individuals with limited English proficiency, in compliance with U.S. Department of Transportation policy and guidance on federal Executive Order 13166.

The Boston Region MPO also complies with the Massachusetts Public Accommodation Law, M.G.L. c 272 sections 92a, 98, 98a, which prohibits making any distinction, discrimination, or restriction in admission to, or treatment in a place of public accommodation based on race, color, religious creed, national origin, sex, sexual orientation, disability, or ancestry. Likewise, the Boston Region MPO complies with the Governor's Executive Order 526, section 4, which requires that all programs, activities, and services provided, performed, licensed, chartered, funded, regulated, or contracted for by the state shall be conducted without unlawful discrimination based on race, color, age, gender, ethnicity, sexual orientation, gender identity or expression, religion, creed, ancestry, national origin, disability, veteran's status (including Vietnam-era veterans), or background.

A complaint form and additional information can be obtained by contacting the MPO or at http://www.bostonmpo.org/mpo_non_discrimination. To request this information in a different language or in an accessible format, please contact

Title VI Specialist
Boston Region MPO
10 Park Plaza, Suite 2150
Boston, MA 02116
civilrights@ctps.org
857.702.3700 (voice)