

MPO Meeting Minutes

Draft Memorandum for the Record

Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization Meeting

October 1, 2020, Meeting

10:00 AM–12:35 PM, Zoom Video Conferencing Platform

David Mohler, 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 August 20, 2020
- Approve the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Project Selection Criteria
- Approve a definition for the types of Major Infrastructure (MI) projects that will be listed in the Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP), and the scoring and programming policies for those projects

1. Introductions

See attendance on pages 14–15.

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

There was none.

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

T. Teich provided an update on recent MPO staff outreach activities. MPO staff visited the monthly meeting of the Greater Boston Chapter of the United Spinal Association to discuss the TIP Criteria revisions, the role of the Regional Transportation Advisory Council (Advisory Council), and the Coordinated Public Transit Human Services Plan.

T. Teich noted that she would be attending the Annual Meeting of the Massachusetts Chapter of the Institute of Transportation Engineers (also known as MAITE) to speak about scenario planning through exploratory modeling.

T. Teich stated that MPO staff have scheduled four transportation-focused discussions for Inner Core Committee municipalities. Meetings are scheduled for October 7, 2020, January 13, 2021, April 7, 2021, and July 14, 2021, on Wednesdays 9:00 AM to 11:00

AM. T. Teich encouraged members to contact Róisín Foley at rfoley@ctps.org or 857-702-3704 if they would like to attend.

T. Teich stated that nominations for MPO elections are due to the Metropolitan Area Planning Council (MAPC) on October 16, 2020.

T. Teich provided an overview of future MPO meeting agendas, including both MPO and non-MPO funded work programs, the presentation of the final Disparate Impact and Disproportionate Burden policy, and the Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority's (MBTA) plans to address budget shortfalls as a result of the pandemic.

4. Public Comments

There were none.

5. Committee Chairs' Reports

There were none.

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

L. Diggins stated that the Advisory Council would meet on October 14, 2020, for a final discussion of TIP Criteria revisions.

7. Action Item: Approval of August 20, 2020, MPO Meeting Minutes—*Barbara Rutman, MPO Staff*

1. [MPO Meeting Minutes, August 20, 2020](#)

Vote

A motion to approve the minutes of the meeting of August 20, 2020, was made by the North Suburban Planning Council (City of Woburn) (Tina Cassidy) and seconded by the MetroWest Regional Collaborative (City of Framingham) (Thatcher Kezer III). At-Large City (City of Everett) (Jay Monty) and the Minuteman Advisory Group on Interlocal Coordination (Town of Acton) (Austin Cyganiewicz) abstained. The motion carried.

8. Action Item: TIP Project Selection Criteria—*Matt Genova, MPO Staff*

1. [TIP Criteria Point Summary](#)

M. Genova presented the final TIP Criteria for the board's approval. M. Genova stated that MPO staff will continue exploring new ways to measure project outcomes, and plans to return for a discussion on cost effectiveness. M. Genova added that MPO staff plan to produce outreach materials describing the new criteria, including an updated TIP Criteria Guidebook.

Vote

A motion to approve the TIP Project Selection Criteria was made by the Advisory Council (L. Diggins) and seconded by the MBTA Advisory Board (Brian Kane). The motion carried.

9. Action Item: MI Program Listing, Scoring, and Programming Policies—Anne McGahan, MPO Staff

1. [Major Infrastructure Handout](#)

A. McGahan stated that the MPO recently adopted a new definition for the MI program. The MPO must now identify what MI projects should be listed in the LRTP, and the scoring and programming policies for those projects.

A. McGahan stated that some projects must be listed in the LRTP under federal guidance. The MPO may list other projects at the board's discretion. The handout posted to the MPO meeting calendar shows the projects that are in the current LRTP that must be listed, and the projects that can be listed at the MPO's discretion. A. McGahan stated that if the MPO were only to include projects that were federally required, most of the projects in the current LRTP would continue to be listed.

Both the Sumner Tunnel Reconstruction and Route 27 in Natick projects could be listed at the MPO's discretion because of cost and roadway classification. The Route 1A project in Wrentham, which has never been included in the LRTP, would now be included due to its location on an interstate highway. A. McGahan stated that if the MPO were to only include projects that are federally required, the MPO would not discuss higher cost projects or projects that are on roadways that serve regional transportation needs as part of LRTP development, forgoing the additional scrutiny applied to these types of projects during the LRTP process. These projects would instead be considered for funding as part of TIP development, a major change from past practice.

A. McGahan described the MPO staff's recommendations for scoring and programming the MI program projects that the MPO decides to list in the LRTP. For scoring projects, MPO staff recommends that all projects be assigned an LRTP score regardless of design status; any projects with a 25 percent design should also be assigned a TIP score; and rescore all projects when they are ready for programming in the TIP. This removes the assumption that a project will automatically be programmed in the TIP due to being listed in the LRTP. For programming projects, MPO staff also recommends that the MPO adopt a policy that the status of all MI projects in the LRTP be reviewed during the development of a new LRTP to ensure design and approval progress. If there is no progress, the MPO should consider placing the project back into the Universe of

Projects for consideration in future LRTPs. This would preclude the practice of pushing projects into later time bands of the LRTP when the projects do not display progress, which crowds new projects that may be seeking funding and have demonstrated progress.

Discussion

Listing MI projects in the LRTP

D. Mohler asked A. McGahan to clarify what types of federal transportation grant funds necessitate a project being listed in the LRTP. After some discussion with Ken Miller (Federal Highway Administration), D. Mohler stated that it is his understanding that it is not federal transportation grant funds alone, but projects that are undergoing the federal National Environmental Policy Act (also known as NEPA) process and use federal transportation funding.

D. Mohler stated that he does not believe a cost threshold should determine what MI projects are listed in the plan and asked members to express their opinions on this issue.

L. Diggins stated that the Advisory Council would support a vote to list MPO-defined MI projects in the LRTP at the MPO's discretion based on a cost threshold and additional roadway classification.

Sheila Page (At-Large Town) (Town of Lexington) expressed support for a cost threshold and the scoring and programming policies. She acknowledged that due to cost increases the threshold may need to be increased again in the future depending on the cost chosen. S. Page stated that the scoring and programming policies will promote accountability for project proponents because the proponents know the projects will be reevaluated when ready for consideration for programming in the TIP.

Daniel Amstutz (At-Large Town) (Town of Arlington) agreed with L. Diggins and S. Page, and stated that the purpose of a cost threshold is to provide for advanced planning, so that the MPO is aware of large-scale projects that it plans to fund in future years and can dedicate resources to financing them.

Tom Kadzis (City of Boston) (Boston Transportation Department) stated that the relatively low previous cost threshold (\$25 million) caused problems for project programming in the past and asked for clarification on whether one is required. D. Mohler stated that the MPO's federal partners have made it clear that they do not require a cost threshold. D. Mohler added that in his opinion, a cost threshold provides less scrutiny for projects because when the LRTP is being developed, it is easier to program large projects without an actual funding commitment. Then, when it comes

time to program that project in the TIP, it becomes an issue when a commitment has been made and the project must go forward. D. Mohler stated that the TIP is the right place to have a significant discussion about the merits of funding a large-scale project in relation to other projects. D. Mohler added that in his opinion, the LRTP is not the place to program projects except when specifically required by the federal government. T. Kadzis stated that there is some logic to addressing programming decisions in the TIP instead of the LRTP.

A. McGahan clarified that the MPO has already voted on the definition of projects in the MI program. That definition is used to classify projects as part of the MPO's funding goals. The current discussion only pertains to what projects in the MI program the MPO wants to list in the LRTP.

David Koses (At-Large City) (City of Newton) expressed support for a cost threshold. D. Koses asked for clarification of why the MPO is using roadway classification to define MI projects even if the project does not change network capacity. A. McGahan stated that in the course of discussion concerning what a regionally significant project is, roadway classification emerged as a characteristic that would contribute to regional significance. The MPO approved the inclusion of roadway classification in the definition of the MI program in August. That definition is used only to classify projects into the MI program for the purposes of scoring them and evaluating the MPO's funding goals. The discussion is now about what projects in the MI program the MPO wants to list in the LRTP. The MPO must list projects that are required by federal guidance, which does not include a cost threshold, but it can list others. D. Koses acknowledged that the vote was taken but expressed that the definition may put some projects at a disadvantage in the future.

D. Mohler clarified that listing MI projects in the LRTP using the MI program definition would only, at this time, impact one currently programmed TIP project: the Construction of Interstate 495/Route 1A Ramps in Wrentham. Wrentham would need to be amended into the LRTP.

D. Koses asked whether there could be a situation in the future where a project would be at a disadvantage because it would be required to be in the LRTP, and may have more difficulty getting programmed in the LRTP, and then on the TIP. D. Mohler replied that he could foresee a situation where a project on a principal arterial would be considered MI despite not being particularly large scale.

D. Amstutz asked for clarification that the principal arterials included in the definition are those that would have partial or complete access control. A. McGahan responded that this is correct.

K. Miller stated that roadway classification is not a perfect system because there are quotas for the number of miles of roads that can be put into each category statewide, which means there are sometimes inconsistent definitions. K. Miller stated that the confusion stems from trying to equate MI to regional significance, which is not necessarily the same thing. K. Miller stated that the source of the issue is the existence of the MI program, adding that it would make more sense to define project types by the type of project, whether it is Complete Streets or otherwise. Then, the MPO could decide to have criteria related to the project types, and then decide on the projects the MPO deems regionally significant.

A. McGahan stated that the purpose for devising the MPO's investment programs was to create funding goals and limit the amount of funding being allocated to large-scale projects.

D. Mohler noted that the Western Avenue project in Lynn is currently a Complete Streets project, but may cross the \$50 million cost threshold for MI in the future, at which point it would be scored as a MI project and compete against MI projects for funding. M. Genova clarified that the new MI TIP criteria have criteria that are catered to the type of project within the MI program.

Eric Bourassa (MAPC) asked D. Mohler to clarify his position on using a cost threshold. D. Mohler stated that projects in the LRTP do not get the same level of analysis as TIP projects due to being so far out chronologically and in design progression. Once a project is listed in the LRTP, it is then harder to justify not programming the project in the TIP when it is ready. E. Bourassa agreed that the LRTP is not the right place to be making long-range detailed capital decisions, but stated that it makes sense to list some projects in the plan so that the public can see what large-scale projects are priorities.

L. Diggins expressed support for points made by K. Miller and encouraged the MPO to think about what projects do rather than what the projects are called.

B. Kane (MBTA Advisory Board) asked what the process would be if the MPO does not take a successful vote on the definition, scoring, and programming policies at this meeting. A. McGahan stated that MPO staff would await direction on what additional information the MPO needs to reach a decision. MPO staff would proceed as before until further changes are agreed upon.

Scoring

D. Mohler asked whether the recommended scoring policy would in effect result in the scoring of one project in a given TIP year. A. McGahan stated that there could be several MI projects up for possible programming, and the MPO would need to decide if it prefers to program a project that provides bicycle and pedestrian improvements versus one that reconstructs an interchange.

J. Monty (At-Large City) (City of Everett) stated that the design and project development of MI projects tends to be funded by MassDOT and not municipalities, and stated that proponents need some assurance that projects will be programmed to advance design. J. Monty suggested that MI projects be scored sooner and compared against each other, or perhaps scored as a group. J. Monty stated that the level of investment is more than that is required for projects in the TIP. J. Monty stated that if a project begins at a lower cost and attains MI status as a result of cost increases throughout the design process, it may seem unfair to proponents that it would then need to be rescored. J. Monty stated that perhaps the MI program is itself ill-defined, and the MPO should only define projects by type.

K. Miller stated that the kinds of projects that should be included in the LRTP are those that are the product of regional MPO planning process, not just those proposed by municipalities for funding with Regional Target funds. A. McGahan responded that this is correct, but the MPO's funding goals are only applied to projects funded with the Regional Target funds. D. Mohler clarified that the MPO's position is that the MI definition applies only to Regional Target-funded projects. A. McGahan replied that that is correct.

T. Kadzis supported the proposed scoring policy but asked how practical it is to expect design progress for projects in later time bands. A. McGahan responded that there are some projects in the LRTP that have design progress, and could have been scored. Further out in the later time bands of the plan, projects are more conceptual. T. Kadzis asked if the MPO can require a 25 percent design at a certain point. A. McGahan stated that she would address this in the discussion of the programming policy.

J. Monty said he struggles with the policy for listing MI projects in the LRTP because some are initiated by state agencies, not municipalities. These projects tend to be larger and the MPO should consider the differences between projects with different kinds of proponents.

Programming

D. Mohler asked how far out chronologically MI projects are currently programmed in the LRTP. A. McGahan replied that there is one MI project programmed in the 2035–40 time band in *Destination 2040*, the current LRTP.

D. Mohler asked if the proposed policy means that if there is no progress on a project programmed 15 years from now, it would be placed back into the Universe of Projects. A. McGahan stated that this could happen if there is absolutely no progress.

L. Diggins expressed support for the proposed programming policy.

T. Kezer III noted that the Framingham project currently programmed in the last time band of the LRTP faces a timing issue. T. Kezer III questioned whether the project is in the last band because it was not making design progress, or if the project is not making progress because it is in the last band. T. Kezer III stated that it is difficult to commit to preparatory design work with no guarantee the project will move forward after expending the funds. T. Kezer III stated that Framingham has made the decision to move forward with the financial commitment because the project is important and the commitment becomes greater as more money is spent as it moves closer to 2035.

E. Bourassa stated that the MPO should not program projects in the later time bands of the LRTP. Revisiting projects during the TIP process would address some of the issues presented by programming projects in later time bands. E. Bourassa stated that it should be clearer to proponents that the programming of projects in the LRTP is not a complete commitment to eventual funding in the TIP.

T. Teich suggested that the MPO could decide to list MI projects only in the earliest time band of the LRTP.

T. Kezer III expressed support for T. Teich's suggestion.

L. Diggins asked whether T. Teich's suggestion would need to be part of the programming policy for MI or simply adopt it as a practice. A. McGahan responded that only listing projects in the first two time bands could be included as part of the MPO's vote on what to list in the LRTP.

T. Kadzis indicated that he would make a motion on the cost threshold as long as the MPO would revisit the policy in future years.

Vote

A motion to adopt a \$50 million cost threshold for listing MI program projects in the LRTP was made by the City of Boston (Boston Transportation Department) (T. Kadzis) and seconded by the MetroWest Regional Collaborative (City of Framingham) (T. Kezer III). The City of Boston (Boston Transportation Department) (T. Kadzis), City of Boston (Boston Planning and Development Agency) (Jim Fitzgerald), At-Large City (City of Everett) (J. Monty), At-Large Town (Town of Arlington) (D. Amstutz), At-Large Town (Town of Lexington) (S. Page), Inner Core Committee (City of Somerville) (Tom Bent), Minuteman Advisory Group on Interlocal Coordination (Town of Acton) (A. Cyganiewicz), Three Rivers Interlocal Council (Town of Norwood/Neponset Valley Chamber of Commerce) (Tom O'Rourke), and the MetroWest Regional Collaborative (City of Framingham) (T. Kezer III) voted yes. MassDOT (D. Mohler), MassDOT Highway Division (John Romano), the MBTA (Samantha Silverberg), Massport (Laura Gilmore), MAPC (E. Bourassa), the MBTA Advisory Board (B. Kane), the Advisory Council (L. Diggins), At-Large City (City of Newton) (D. Koses), the South Shore Coalition (Town of Rockland) (Jennifer Constable) voted no. The North Shore Task Force (City of Beverly) (Darlene Wynne) abstained. The motion failed.

Discussion

D. Mohler asked for a motion regarding what projects to list in the LRTP. A. McGahan clarified that this motion would limit MI projects listed in the LRTP to those required to be listed under federal regulation. It would limit federally required projects to the first two time bands of the LRTP.

Vote

A motion was made to list only federally required projects in the LRTP, limited to the first two time bands by the MetroWest Regional Collaborative (City of Framingham) (T. Kezer III) and seconded by At-Large Town (Town of Lexington) (S. Page.) The motion carried.

Discussion

D. Mohler asked for a motion to approve the recommended scoring policy for MI projects in the LRTP.

Vote

A motion to approve the recommended scoring policy for MI projects listed in the LRTP was made by MAPC (E. Bourassa) and seconded by At-Large Town (Town of Lexington) (S. Page). The motion carried.

Discussion

D. Mohler asked for a motion to approve the recommended programming policy for MI projects listed in the LRTP. There was some discussion of what constitutes progress for projects. A. McGahan and D. Mohler stated that this may be developed over time depending on what time bands projects are programmed in.

Vote

A motion to approve the recommended programming policy for MI projects listed in the LRTP was made by At-Large Town (Town of Arlington) (D. Amstutz) and seconded by the City of Boston (Boston Transportation Department) (T. Kadzis). The motion carried.

Vote

A motion to adopt all previous approved motions was made by the MBTA Advisory Board (B. Kane) and seconded by MAPC (E. Bourassa). The motion carried.

Note: At this time, E. Bourassa assumed the Chair's seat.

**10. Discussion: Review of Community Connections Program Pilot—
Sandy Johnston, MPO**

1. [Community Connections Pilot](#)

S. Johnston began his presentation by reviewing the topic. He explained that the Community Connections (CC) Program (originally known as the Community Transportation Program) is the MPO's funding program for first- and last-mile solutions, community transportation, and other small, nontraditional transportation projects, such as those that update transit technology and improve bicycle and pedestrian facilities. CC is currently funded at \$2 million annually in the TIP with Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) funds, which require that projects must be new and must show an improvement in air quality. CC is one of several new funding programs the MPO will be developing in coming years, per *Destination 2040*.

The pilot round of the CC Program funded five projects in federal fiscal year (FFY) 2021. One of those projects, microtransit in Newton, has requested funding for three years. Additionally, there are two projects that have been scored and approved by the board for funding in future years, but have not yet been formally programmed in the TIP (none of the CC projects are formally programmed beyond FFY 2021 in the TIP). Programming in future TIPs is contingent on CMAQ compliance.

S. Johnston discussed the process that staff employed to review the pilot round and the structure of the CC program. MPO staff conducted a brief, anonymized survey of project proponents who applied for funding in the CC pilot round. All respondents stated that

the CC application was a reasonable amount of work and asked for a reasonable amount of information. Proponents also provided feedback that the MPO should consider whether the capital and operating categorization of projects is functional; consider a greater diversity of categories for applications; that there should be better communication once the project application has been submitted; and that there should be more transparency about how scoring works and how decisions are made. S. Johnston added that he also surveyed staff who were involved in scoring CC applications, and that the full results of that survey are contained in the review memorandum. Staff respondents rated the extent to which the CC pilot round fulfilled the MPO's goals as 8.5 out of 10 on average.

S. Johnston stated that one of the challenges in the pilot round was determining whether it is possible to fund the capital projects while operating at the scale of CC funding, and minimizing MassDOT's administrative burden. Staff's recommendation is to pivot to using CC funds for a variety of smaller categories of projects. MAPC's collective purchasing framework is available to MPO member municipalities and already approved for federal procurement. Three project types seem reasonable for FFY 2022: bicycle parking, automatic vehicle location systems, and parking payment systems. Possible future items include road markings, bus stop shelters, and signage. MPO staff are working with the MBTA to look into the possibility of funding bus lanes and e-ink countdown/information signs at bus stops through the CC program. These categories are feasible because a pathway to implementation already exists at the MBTA in pilot form.

MPO staff also conducted an in-depth internal review of the scoring process for the pilot round. The CC criteria have 30 points for "general" criteria that are applied to all projects and 30 points for "type-specific" criteria. "Type-specific" criteria are divided into capital or operating, with every application falling into one of those two types. Staff assess that the wide variety of projects expected to apply to the CC Program means that dividing the program into "capital" and "operating" projects is too binary and rigid. In the pilot round, transit operating projects scored much better than capital projects. The "capital-specific" criteria had been written with the assumption that it would apply to projects like sidewalk extensions, which are not likely feasible through the CC program. The "transit" criteria, meanwhile, award points for required elements, which staff recommend avoiding. MPO staff's recommendation is to score all projects on comparable criteria, eliminating differential scoring for capital and operating projects. Staff's proposal is to eliminate the "type-specific" criteria and focus scoring on the "general" criteria. Relying more fully on these criteria allows staff to score a wide variety of projects in directly comparable ways, while eliminating scoring disparities between different points. This recommendation would also normalize CC criteria to a 100-point scale, as used by the

new TIP criteria. Ten points would be reserved to score proponents' budget worksheets, ensuring rigorous budgeting and financial analysis. Points currently awarded to the "general" criteria would scale up to a 100-points (with the addition of scoring for the budget sheet). Proportions would remain the same for at least this coming round.

S. Johnston noted the staff are recommending some future modifications: fully aligning the CC criteria with the newly revised TIP criteria and using access-based scoring. Staff has explored access-based scoring through technical assistance with the Transportation4America State Smart Transportation Institute, and will be working with MassDOT to familiarize staff with an access analysis software tool called Conveyal. This type of modeling may be very useful in the future for scoring small-scale projects, such as those funded through the CC program.

S. Johnston stated that once the MPO expresses approval for the revisions to the scoring process, staff will work on releasing the CC grant application. CC projects will be scored and chosen as part of TIP development in January or February of 2021.

Discussion

D. Amstutz expressed disappointed that the program was not able to support pedestrian improvements and wondered whether staff had explored avenues for including such projects. S. Johnston replied that staff have explored that possibility, but currently there is an excessive administrative burden for small projects that involve streetscape and roadway work in the public right-of-way. S. Johnston stated that MPO staff will work with MassDOT and MAPC to see what can be done in the future.

K. Miller stated that unless funding is transferred to the Federal Transit Administration, CC grants remain Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) authorizations and must conform to all federal requirements. K. Miller stated that Massachusetts does not have a local highway program and MassDOT generally does all the construction with federal highway funds, and candidate recipients must understand this. Projects that require construction are under the Office of Transportation Planning at MassDOT. K. Miller stated that FHWA is generally disinclined to approve capital funding for transit service or to buy rolling stock. S. Johnston replied that the MPO is working with MassDOT and the MBTA to produce implementation guides for project proponents. S. Johnston stated that it is his recollection that the program application states that it does not fund vehicle procurements, as FHWA provided this advice for the pilot round.

T. Kadzis stated that it has always been a challenge to fund low-cost projects with federal funding, and that avoiding the requirements that come with construction makes sense.

L. Gilmore asked if it would make sense to have a minimum funding requirement. S. Johnston stated that staff have considered having a minimum or maximum, but agree that it is important to have a larger sample size of projects before determining whether a minimum or maximum funding requirement makes sense.

K. Miller expressed that FHWA is supportive of capital construction projects, but it is important for FHWA to know that someone is overseeing the project, and that it is completed appropriately.

L Diggins asked about the CMAQ analysis for projects of this size. S. Johnston replied that MassDOT maintains a set of CMAQ spreadsheets that cover some of the project categories. This spreadsheet analysis will need to show the CMAQ Consultation committee that the project accomplishes an air quality benefit, but since these are small-scale projects, the projects would not likely create a transformative improvement in air quality.

11. Members Items

E. Bourassa stated that nominations for MPO elections are due October 16, 2020.

12. Adjourn

A motion to adjourn was made by the Inner Core Committee (City of Somerville) (T. Bent) and seconded by the MetroWest Regional Collaborative (City of Framingham) (T. Kezer III). 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 David Mohler
Massachusetts Department of Transportation	John Bechard
MassDOT Highway Division	John Romano Samantha Silverberg
Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority (MBTA)	Laura Gilmore
Massachusetts Port Authority	Brian Kane
MBTA Advisory Board	Eric Bourassa
Metropolitan Area Planning Council	Thatcher Kezer III
MetroWest Regional Collaborative (City of Framingham)	
Minuteman Advisory Group on Interlocal Coordination (Town of Acton)	Austin Cyganiewicz
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)	Jennifer Constable
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
Colette Aufranc	
Todd Blake	Medford
Sarah Bradbury	MassDOT Highway Division
William Conroy	City of Boston
Johannes Epke	Conservation Law Foundation
Michelle Ho	MassDOT
Ben Muller	MassDOT Office of Transportation Planning
Timothy Paris	MassDOT
Constance Raphael	MassDOT Highway Division 4
Tony Rodolakis	
Cheryll-Ann Senior	MassDOT
Jon Seward	
Frank Tramontozzi	City of Quincy
Janie Dretler	
Pat Brown	
Steve Olanoff	

MPO Staff/Central Transportation Planning Staff

Tegin Teich, Executive Director
Matt Archer
Jonathan Church
Annette Demchur
Róisín Foley
Hiral Gandhi
Matt Genova
Betsy Harvey
Sandy Johnston
Anne McGahan
Ariel Patterson
Scott Peterson
Barbara Rutman
Michelle Scott
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)