

Memorandum for the Record

Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization Meeting

April 17, 2014 Meeting

10:10 AM – 12:25 PM, State Transportation Building, Conference Rooms 2&3, 10 Park Plaza, Boston

Clinton Bench, Chair, representing Richard Davey, Secretary and Chief Executive Officer, Massachusetts Department of Transportation (MassDOT)

Decisions

The Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization agreed to the following:

- Approve the minutes of the meeting of April 3

Meeting Agenda

1. Public Comments

The MPO heard comments regarding projects under consideration for inclusion in the federal fiscal years (FFYs) 2015-18 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).

Brookline - Intersection and Signal Improvements at Route 9 and Village Square (Gateway East) Project

Joe Viola, Town of Brookline, thanked the MPO for its continued support of the *Gateway East* project. He noted that the staff recommendation for the draft FFYs 2015-18 TIP would move the project from the FFY 2015 element of the TIP to the FFY 2016 element. This move is not considered ideal by the town. The town is committed to improving bicycle and pedestrian access in Brookline Village and to making the area more livable and vibrant.

Hopkinton - Intersection and Signal Improvements on Route 135 Project

Speaking in support of the *Route 135* project were the following: John Westerling and David Daltorio, Town of Hopkinton; Pujja Mehta, Office of State Senator Karen Spilka; and Leah Robins, Office of State Representative Carolyn Dykema.

J. Westerling thanked the MPO for its continued support of the project. He reported that the roadway provides access to the Massachusetts Turnpike, Interstate 495, and Route 9, and MBTA stations. The roadway is expected to see a 75% increase in traffic in the next ten years. Properties on either end of the roadway are designated by the state as

priority development areas. The roadway provides critical access to town facilities including the police and fire stations, town hall, library, and an elementary school. Also, the starting point of the Boston Marathon is within the project limits.

D. Daltorio added that the 25% design plans for the project have been submitted to the MassDOT Highway Division and that the town has received the final road safety audit report for the roadway. The project proponents expect that the 75% plans will be underway this summer and the 100% plans ready by next year. The town is using its own funds for the design of the project.

L. Robins expressed Representative Dykema's appreciation for the MPO's support and noted that the project will have positive economic development and public safety impacts. P. Mehta also expressed Senator Spilka's appreciation.

Green Line Extension to Route 16 Project

Tim Snyder, Office of State Senator Patricia Jehlen, expressed Senator Jehlen's appreciation for the MPO's commitment the *Green Line Extension to Route 16* project and its reaffirmation of that commitment last year. The terminus of the Green Line at Route 16 is a crucial component of the *Green Line Extension* project because of the regional connectivity that it will provide, he said. He also noted that the President's budget includes \$100 million for the project – indicative of the support the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) has for the project – but that a full-funding agreement has not yet been reached. A full-funding agreement would provide \$500 million in federal funds for the project. He noted that it is important for FTA to see a local commitment to this project.

Pooja Phalpankar, Office of State Representative Denise Provost, expressed Representative Provost's appreciation for the MPO's continued support for the *Green Line Extension to Route 16* project. She noted that the project will produce significant benefits for the corridor in terms of improved air quality and increased economic development.

Maxwell Chalkin, Office of State Representative Sean Garballey, expressed Representative Garballey's appreciation for the MPO's continued support for the *Green Line Extension to Route 16* project. He noted that the project will have significant benefits for Arlington and West Medford.

Bedford, Burlington, Billerica - Middlesex Turnpike Improvements, Phase 3 Project

Speaking in support of the *Middlesex Turnpike* project were: Trish Domigan, Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc. (VHB); Margot Fleischman, Board of Selectmen for the Town of

Bedford; John Sanchez, Town of Burlington; Brendan Berger, Office of State Senator Michael Barrett; and Sam Larson, Office of State Representative Kenneth Gordon. They requested that the MPO keep the project programmed in the FFY 2016 element of the TIP.

T. Domigan provided a handout summarizing the project's history, design status, public and private investments to date, and consistency with state requirements and MPO policies. She noted that the project has been planned since the 1980s and that this project is the last phase of a significant infrastructure project in the three towns. She also noted the number of projects that have already been completed as part of this initiative and the public investments to date. The towns have spent more than \$5 million for design and permitting, and have also invested in mitigation and land acquisition. The Commonwealth has contributed MassWorks and MORE grants. The Northern Middlesex Council of Governments, which includes the Town of Billerica, is committing \$1 million to the project on its TIP in the FFY 2016 element.

She also discussed the status of the project. The proponents will be submitting the 75% design plans to the MassDOT Highway Division in late April. MassDOT has committed to a timely review of the bridge portion of the project. The environmental variance process is underway. Land takings in Bedford are completed; some rights-of-entry will be required. Land takings in Billerica will initiate after the 75% design is submitted.

Lastly, she discussed how the project is compliant with the MPO's policies and MassDOT's Complete Streets policies. The project will include bicycle and pedestrian accommodations, and signals will be coordinated, which will reduce greenhouse gas emissions. She also noted that the project scored highly in the MPO's evaluation process.

M. Fleischman then discussed the substantial financial investment that the towns have made in the project. As a member of the Middlesex 3 Coalition, the Town of Bedford recognizes that the project area represents the greatest potential for improving the economic vibrancy in the corridor. The Coalition members believe that this project is key to moving forward and keeping up momentum.

J. Sanchez expressed the Town of Burlington's continued commitment to the project. He remarked that the tri-town community group formed in 1980s and advanced this project. He noted that the improvements made already to the turnpike have brought tremendous economic development to the corridor and that the last leg of the project is needed.

B. Berger expressed Senator Barrett's support for the project. And, S. Larson expressed Representative Gordon's support for the project and his hope the project remains programmed in the FFY 2016 element of the TIP.

Later in the meeting, John Curran, Town Manager for the Town of Billerica, spoke regarding the project. He urged the MPO to keep it programmed in the FFY 2016 element of the TIP, and appealed to the MPO's interest in fairness in planning, supporting local municipal projects through the TIP, and promoting economic development. He noted that the project has been in development since the 1980s, that more than \$5 million of local funds have been invested in planning and design, and that the project has the support of the Executive Office of Housing and Economic Development and the tri-town coalition. He emphasized the need to keep the project on track as the Middlesex Turnpike is an important infrastructure issue for increasing economic development in the Merrimack Valley.

Southborough - Reconstruction of Main Street (Route 30) Project

Karen Galligan, Town of Southborough, provided an update on the *Route 30* project. The 25% design hearing is scheduled for June 18.

2. Chair's Report—*Clinton Bench, MassDOT*

C. Bench reported that the Patrick Administration announced its 2014 Pothole and Winter Recovery Program. The Commonwealth will provide \$40 million to municipalities statewide to repair the winter's damage to roadways. The funds will be distributed by planning formulas. Municipalities must spend the funds by June 30, 2014. This is a reimbursable program.

He also reported that news about next year's Chapter 90 funding is imminent. The House has passed a transportation bond bill and the Senate is scheduled to vote on it today.

3. Committee Chairs' Reports

Sree Allam, MassDOT, reported that the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) Committee met this morning to discuss the FFY 2015 budget and projects. The Committee's recommendations will be presented at the MPO meeting on May 1.

Lourenço Dantas, Massachusetts Port Authority, announced that the next Congestion Management Process (CMP) Committee meeting is tentatively scheduled for May 1.

On another subject, members discussed uncertainties regarding federal funding for transportation projects given that the federal Highway Trust Fund is on track to become insolvent this year and that the current surface transportation legislation, Moving Ahead

for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21), is set to expire this year. In the absence of the passage of new surface transportation legislation, Congress could address the latter issue with a continuing resolution for MAP-21.

4. Regional Transportation Advisory Council Report—*David Montgomery, Chair, Regional Transportation Advisory Council*

D. Montgomery reported on several of the Advisory Council's activities.

The last meeting of the Advisory Council featured presentations by Scott Peterson, Director of Technical Services of the MPO Staff, and Meghna Hari, Metropolitan Area Planning Council (MAPC), on the use of demographics in the MPO's travel demand models.

The Advisory Council has formed a TIP/UPWP Committee that will be discussing possible comments the Advisory Council might want to present to the MPO and how the Advisory Council provides its input to the MPO.

The Advisory Council's meeting in May will focus on a discussion of the MPO's TIP and UPWP. There will not be a guest speaker.

MPO members were reminded to respond to the survey that the Advisory Council distributed to them.

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

K. Quackenbush discussed an issue that was raised at a previous meeting regarding the balance of technical and policy content of MPO meetings. Some members had expressed interest in reducing the amount of time spent discussing technical issues and spending more time on policy considerations. This topic was discussed by the UPWP Committee this morning.

There are currently three cases when the MPO staff presents technical content to the MPO – when presenting work programs, discussing the selection of study locations, and reporting on completed work. K. Quackenbush advised that staff should continue to present proposed study locations and completed reports to the MPO, while finding ways to scale back on the amount of time spent discussing work programs. The MPO is presented with two types of work programs: those in the UPWP that are mostly MPO-funded, and those that are not in the UPWP because the projects arose after the UPWP was prepared (generally representing work to be done for agencies).

The UPWP Committee discussed the idea of limiting presentations of MPO-funded work programs at the MPO meetings since those studies are included in the UPWP. Staff could instead present those work programs to the UPWP Committee, and the work programs could be referenced during the Executive Director's Report at the MPO meetings. Staff could continue to present the work programs that are not in the UPWP to members at the MPO meetings.

K. Quackenbush cautioned the MPO members against becoming divorced from the technical content of the MPO's work. He advised that, if members choose to reduce the amount of technical discussion at the MPO meetings, then there should be more interaction on these matters with the UPWP Committee. The UPWP is one of the three core activities of the MPO's work.

[At this point in the meeting, members paused this discussion to hear a public comment from John Curran, Town of Billerica. The comment is recorded under Agenda Item #1.]

Discussion

When the discussion resumed, several members had comments.

Paul Regan, MBTA Advisory Board, suggested that the MPO could make better use of its committees for discussing technical content.

Laura Wiener, At-Large Town of Arlington, suggested that the committee meeting agendas could be more descriptive so that MPO members know what topics will be discussed. D. Montgomery concurred.

Tom Kadzis, City of Boston, expressed support for K. Quackenbush's recommendation. He stated that it is important for the MPO to be exposed to the results of technical work. He suggested, however, that during times when the MPO is discussing certification documents that those discussions be given priority on the meeting agendas.

C. Bench summarized the MPO's feeling of possibly leaning toward having the UPWP Committee examine work programs in depth and determine whether work programs that are not in the UPWP require more discussion at the MPO meetings. K. Quackenbush noted that there may be instances in the agenda setting process when it will be determined that an MPO-funded work program warrants a presentation before the MPO (such as a work program for the Long-Range Transportation Plan).

Dennis Crowley, South West Advisory Planning Committee (Town of Medway), added that the UPWP Committee had discussed possibly developing a plan about how it would like to proceed and recommendations that it will present to the MPO at its next meeting.

C. Bench stated that staff will provide more detailed agendas for committee meetings that describe the topics to be discussed.

[In light of this discussion, members decided to postpone the agenda item for a report on a technical memorandum to follow a discussion on the TIP at today's meeting.]

6. MPO Meeting Minutes—Maureen Kelly, MPO Staff

A motion to approve the minutes of the meeting of April 3 was made by MAPC (Eric Bourassa), and seconded by the Inner Core Committee (City of Somerville) (Tom Bent). The motion carried. The At-Large City of Everett (Tony Sousa) and South Shore Coalition (Town of Braintree) (Christine Stickney) abstained.

7. MPO Memorandum of Understanding—Karl Quackenbush, Executive Director, Central Transportation Planning Staff

K. Quackenbush discussed the MPO's Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), which defines the MPO's comprehensive, continuing, and cooperative (3-C) planning process. The MOU is on the agenda because the MOU stipulates that the MPO members will have an opportunity to review the document annually. The primary elements of the document relate to the composition of the MPO, roles of officers, membership, elections, record keeping, voting rules, role of the Advisory Committee, certification documents, and roles of staff.

K. Quackenbush provided a brief history of the MOUs of the Boston Region MPO. The first MOU in 1973 established the MPO. The MOU was revised six times thereafter, in 1976, 1982, 1984, 1997, 2001, and lastly in 2011 when the MPO membership was expanded to its current structure. C. Bench added that the MPO's Public Participation Plans have also changed substantially over the years as new methods became available for the MPO to communicate with its constituents.

C. Bench asked if members had any concerns about how the current MOU is operating. No concerns were raised. D. Montgomery noted, however, that the MPO will be revising its Public Participation Plan and that dialog may continue over the coming months. The Advisory Council is charged in the MOU with participating in the implementation of the Public Participation Plan.

C. Bench asked staff to add an item regarding the MOU to the next agenda.

8. FFYs 2015-18 Transportation Improvement Program—Sean Pfalzer, MPO Staff

C. Bench introduced the discussion about the FFYs 2015-18 TIP by giving an overview of the TIP. MPO's are required to prepare a TIP annually to cover a four-year period. The currently active TIP is the FFYs 2014-17 TIP and the MPO is operating in FFY 2014. The MPO is now preparing the FFYs 2015-18 TIP. The new TIP will be released for a 30-day public review period prior to endorsement by the MPO. The MPO is expected to vote to finalize the TIP on June 26. TIPs are fiscally-constrained documents that include all capital projects in the region that will receive federal surface transportation funds, as well as projects that are regionally significant (regardless of their funding source). The TIP includes multimodal projects.

Members were provided with the working draft for the staff recommendation for the FFYs 2015-18 TIP (as shown in Table 7) and a summary of projects that staff has evaluated.

Sean Pfalzer, MPO staff, then reviewed the updates made to Table 7 since the last MPO meeting on April 3. Since that time, and at the suggestion of the chair, staff communicated with the MBTA to determine if the cash flows for the *Green Line Extension to Route 16* project could be adjusted. The MBTA could not recommend changes to the cash flows, however, because the design for the project has not yet begun. Therefore, the dollars programmed for the project remain at \$8.1 million in the FFY 2016 element, \$29.9 million in FFY 2017, and \$44.2 million in FFY 2018. There is a shortage of funding to meet those commitments in FFYs 2017 and 2018.

Other proposed changes include moving the *Southborough – Reconstruction of Main Street (Route 30)* project from the FFY 2016 element to FFY 2017. This reprogramming fits better with the current project design schedule. While this change would free funds in FFY 2016, it would exacerbate the shortages in FFY 2017 and 2018. The project has increased in cost by about \$1.8 million.

The MPO has some flexibility to change cash flows of multi-year projects, such as the *Weymouth and Abington – Reconstruction and Widening on Route 18* project, but such changes would not solve the fiscal constraint issue.

There may be an opportunity to fund the *Boston – Improvements at Audubon Circle* project with non-federal aid. Again, however, this would not put the TIP in fiscal constraint.

Discussion

David Anderson, MassDOT, and T. Kadzis confirmed that MassDOT and the City of Boston have executed an agreement to access state funds for the *Audubon Circle* project. C. Bench noted that this will free approximately \$5.5 million of target funds in the FFY 2017 element. The project would be documented in the TIP as using non-federal aid.

C. Bench asked if there are any projects programmed in the current TIP that are not reflected on Table 7. S. Pfalzer replied that Table 7 includes all the projects that would be funded through the MPO's target program.

John Romano, MassDOT Highway Division, offered a potential solution to the fiscal constraint problem by suggesting that the funding for the *Route 18* project be moved forward one year so that funding would be programmed for it in FFY 2016 through FFY 2018. Staff would have to confirm that it is possible to make that change with MassDOT Highway District 6 and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA).

E. Bourassa inquired about the status of the *Woburn – Reconstruction of Montvale Avenue* project and suggested the possibility of moving that project forward one year to program it in FFY 2016. Tina Cassidy, North Suburban Planning Council (City of Woburn), reported that comments from the Woburn City Council on the 25% design review need to be incorporated. A design public hearing has not yet been held. D. Anderson noted that there may be a challenge to constructing the project earlier because of the need to incorporate multimodal accommodations.

Dennis Giombetti, MetroWest Regional Collaborative (Town of Framingham), asked whether a project would need to be cut from the FFY 2017 element if a project could not be moved out of that element. C. Bench replied yes, unless the MBTA could identify potential changes to the cash flows for the *Green Line to Route 16* project.

T. Bent asked when the MBTA would be comfortable making decisions about the cash flows for the *Green Line to Route 16* project. Ron Morgan, MBTA, replied that the MBTA's Design and Construction Office is not comfortable projecting cash flows or a schedule at this time. They will be better able to do that in about a year when the design of the project will begin.

C. Bench stated that it is imperative that the MBTA report to the MPO soon as to whether the MPO is using the correct cash flows for the *Green Line to Route 16* project.

D. Crowley inquired about the status of the federal New Starts funding for the *Green Line Extension* project (which would fund the extension to College Avenue) and whether

the MPO would still fund the extension to Route 16, if the New Starts funds are not awarded. T. Bent noted that the Commonwealth has committed to funding the *Green Line Extension to College Avenue* regardless of whether the New Starts funding is awarded. C. Bench discussed the uncertainty around the funding for the phase to College Avenue but noted that the President has included the project in his FFY 2015 budget. The U.S. Department of Transportation would have to award the funding based on the FFY 2015 budget. T. Bent added that an announcement about the award would be expected at the end of the year.

T. Kadzis expressed his interest in having more information about the project cash flows for the *Green Line Extension to Route 16* project from the MBTA. He also expressed concern about delaying the *Middlesex Turnpike* project because it has been a long standing commitment of the MPO. He remarked upon the challenge that the MPO faces because there have been significant cost increases to some projects, though he noted that the MassDOT Highway Division's work on utilities reimbursement will result in project cost estimates in the future that the MPO can have more confidence in. He stated that the MPO should do its best to meet its current commitments.

David Koses, At-Large City of Newton, asked how expensive a project must be in order to divide construction over multiple years. C. Bench replied that if a project cost exceeds the amount of funds in the Surface Transportation Program target, the Advance Construction method could be used. Pam Wolfe, Manager of Certification Activities of the MPO staff, and S. Pfalzer added that, for the Boston Region MPO, FHWA considers \$25 million the project cost threshold for funding projects in multiple years. The *Middlesex Turnpike* project is close to that threshold with a cost estimate of \$24.5 million.

T. Bent asked if the figures programmed for the *Middlesex Turnpike* project are based on current cost or inflated to the year of programming. S. Pfalzer explained that the figures are inflated to the year of programming. The figures shown in Table 7 include the \$1 million contribution from the Northern Middlesex Council of Governments.

D. Anderson raised the idea of seeing whether FHWA would be flexible in changing the \$25 million threshold. P. Wolfe noted that the MPO received that threshold in guidance from FHWA..

T. Domigan, VHB, reported that the cost estimate for the *Middlesex Turnpike* project is based on the 25% design submission in 2008. It does not include the amount for utility reimbursements. The cost estimate will be updated at the end of this month. The new cost estimate will likely be larger than the current estimate.

C. Bench summarized the outcome of the discussion noting the members' interest in preserving the projects that are programmed to receive regional target funds in the TIP and their concern about delaying the *Middlesex Turnpike* project. He also recapped the potential solutions to the fiscal constraint issue for the FFYs 2017 and 2018 elements of the TIP, which could involve using the Advance Construction method for programming the *Middlesex Turnpike* project (if over \$25 million) and moving the *Montvale Avenue* project to the FFY 2016 element. He asked staff to discuss the possibility of moving the *Montvale Avenue* project with the MassDOT Highway District 4 Office. He again emphasized the need for the MBTA to provide feedback within the next two weeks regarding whether the cash flows for the *Green Line Extension to Route 16* project could be changed.

C. Bench noted that the MPO has not yet had the opportunity to discuss other projects in the Universe of Projects, and asked if members had any concerns or strategies to raise.

Lourenço Dantas, Massachusetts Port Authority, proposed that staff also explore the possibility of delaying the *Route 18* project one year to allow the *Middlesex Turnpike* project to remain programmed in FFY 2016. He noted that a relatively small amount of money (\$15,383) is programmed for the *Route 18* project in FFY 2015. D. Anderson explained that the amount is programmed because the project will be advertised at the end of FFY 2015. S. Pfalzer noted that there is an earmark associated with the *Route 18* project.

Roy Sorenson, Minuteman Advisory Group on Interlocal Coordination (Town of Bedford) asked if the *Route 18* project would be ready for advertisement in FFY 2015. D. Anderson noted that there are concerns about the schedule because of the need to acquire right-of-way from a number of property owners.

Richard Canale, At-Large Town of Lexington, expressed that the Town of Lexington believes that projects already programmed on the TIP should be prioritized. The town is committed the *Green Line Extension to Route 16* project, he said.

D. Montgomery inquired about the funding situation beyond FFY 2018 noting that with fewer funds available (while the MPO is funding larger projects).. C. Bench discussed how the MPO periodically makes a major investment in a transformative project, such as the *Green Line Extension to Route 16*, which will be a core issue in the debate in this TIP. T. Bent then discussed how the public has been supporting the project since the 1960s. He noted that supporters of large projects need to have that kind of staying power. S. Pfalzer reported that the MPO has committed \$190 million to the *Green Line*

Extension to Route 16 project; \$110 million of that amount would be programmed in the FFYs 2019, 2020, and 2021 elements, which represents about half of the MPO's target funding for those years.

D. Giombetti raised the idea of using non-federal aid to fund part of the *Green Line Extension to Route 16* project.

As the transit element of the TIP will be discussed at the meeting of May 1, C. Bench asked staff to invite representatives of the Cape Ann Transportation Authority and the MetroWest Regional Transit Authority to the meeting.

D. Anderson asked if the project proponents for the *Middlesex Turnpike* project to provide a new cost estimate for the project in a timely manner for the TIP discussion.

9. Technical Memorandum: Routes 127A/127 Subregional Priority Roadway Study in Gloucester and Rockport—Chen-Yuan Wang, MPO Staff

C. Wang presented the results of the Routes 127A/127 Subregional Priority Roadway Study in Gloucester and Rockport. This corridor study was funded through the work program for *Addressing Safety, Mobility, and Access on Subregional Priority Roadways*. (Staff presented the other corridor study conducted through the work program, the Route 3A Subregional Priority Roadway Study in Cohasset and Scituate, to the MPO earlier this year.)

The study area encompassed Routes 127A and 127 in Gloucester and Rockport. The roadways studied are municipally owned and classified as urban minor arterials. Issues and concerns in the corridor include discontinuous and substandard sidewalks, long crossing distances for pedestrians, lack of bicycle accommodations, high travel speeds in residential areas, and traffic congestion at popular locations in the summer.

Most locations have average daily traffic counts of between 5,000 and 10,000 vehicles. These volumes can increase by 20-30% on summer weekends and by 40-50% in Rockport. In downtown Rockport, there can be as many as 500 to 1,000 pedestrian crossings at peak times. Bicycle counts show that there can be 40-50 bicycles traveling at peak hours on the weekend.

An analysis of crash data showed that all of the roadway segments have a crash rate lower than the state average. Over five years, there were seven pedestrian crashes (most in the downtown Rockport area) and four bicycle crashes. Detailed analyses of the traffic count and crash data are included in the report.

Many sections of the roadways have a narrow right-of-way, which are only suitable for shared use travel for vehicles and bicycles, but about 30% of the area could be configured to have separate bicycle accommodations by reducing the width of the vehicle travel lane.

Graphics were shown that depict cross-sections of roadways showing the proposed configurations of vehicle travel lanes, bicycle lanes, and sidewalks. Recommendations from the study include adding or upgrading sidewalks in dense residential areas, designating the Bearskin Neck section of Rockport as a pedestrian only zone, creating separate bicycle accommodations in certain areas, and making traffic and operation improvements to intersections.

The study provides a blueprint for making improvements to the area in the long-term as well as short-term recommendations that municipalities can implement. The Town of Rockport has already expressed interest in using Chapter 90 or community development funds for improvements to Dock Square.

Discussion

C. Bench inquired about the proposal to convert Bearskin Neck to a pedestrian only zone. C. Wang explained that staff is recommending that residents of the area and people with handicap permits would be allowed to drive in the area, but that other visitors would be restricted from driving there. The town could determine at what times the vehicle access restrictions would be in place.

C. Bench stated that he was pleased to see the recommendations for pedestrian access near Good Harbor Beach. He asked staff to work with the MassDOT to identify projects that should be entered into the project database for future consideration by the MPO.

10. State Implementation Plan Update—*Sree Allam, MassDOT*

S. Allam provided an update on *Green Line Extension* project, which is included in the State Implementation Plan (SIP).

The project team is comparing the results of a risk workshop held in January with the FTA's results to develop the updated program cost estimate and schedule. The cost estimate will be used to update the project finance plan, which is part of the New Starts full-funding grant agreement application. The project team also met with FTA in March to discuss the process for submitting the Letter of No Prejudice, which is required to complete the application. The application was submitted on March 31.

Real estate acquisition packages have been submitted for Phase 2 and early Phase 4 construction. Meetings are being held between individual property owners and the

project team. Also, meetings to discuss the construction phasing are ongoing with the developer, with public meetings scheduled for June.

The developer will submit the 25% design plans for the project to MassDOT and the City of Somerville in June. The City of Somerville and the MBTA are preparing Memoranda of Agreement (MOA), including a MOA to address property takings for the *Community Path* project.

In April, the project team met with the Board of Directors of the Brickbottom artist building. The team will meet with the residents later this month.

11. Members Items

T. Bent commended the staff of MassDOT who are working on the *Green Line Extension* project. He noted that they have done a top notch job at presenting information.

J. Romano reported that the work on the Prudential Tunnel is nearly completed and he provided details about the remaining times when lane closures will be in place.

12. Adjourn

A motion to adjourn was made by the Inner Core Committee (City of Somerville) (T. Bent) and seconded by the MBTA Advisory Board (P. Regan). The motion carried.

Attendance

Members	Representatives and Alternates
At-Large City (City of Everett)	Tony Sousa
At-Large City (City of Newton)	David Koses
At-Large Town (Town of Arlington)	Laura Wiener
At-Large Town (Town of Lexington)	Richard Canale
City of Boston (Boston Redevelopment Authority)	Lara Mérida
City of Boston (Boston Transportation Department)	Tom Kadzis
Inner Core Committee (City of Somerville)	Tom Bent
Massachusetts Department of Transportation	Clinton Bench
	David Anderson
MassDOT Highway Division	John Romano
Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority (MBTA)	Ron Morgan
Massachusetts Port Authority	Lourenço Dantas
MBTA Advisory Board	Paul Regan
Metropolitan Area Planning Council	Eric Bourassa
MetroWest Regional Collaborative (Town of Framingham)	Dennis Giombetti
Minuteman Advisory Group on Interlocal Coordination (Town of Bedford)	Roy Sorenson
North Shore Task Force (City of Beverly)	Aaron Clausen
North Suburban Planning Council (City of Woburn)	Tina Cassidy
Regional Transportation Advisory Council	David Montgomery
South Shore Coalition (Town of Braintree)	Christine Stickney
South West Advisory Planning Committee (Town of Medway)	Dennis Crowley
Three Rivers Interlocal Council (Town of Norwood/NVCC)	Tom O'Rourke

Other Attendees	Affiliation
Sree Allam	MassDOT Office of Transportation Planning
Roland Bartl	Town of Acton
Brendan Berger	Office of State Senator Michael Barrett
Maxwell Chalkin	Office of State Representative Sean Garballey
John Curran	Town of Billerica
David Daltorio	Town of Hopkinton

Trish Domigan	Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc.
Louis Elisa	Seaport Advisory Council
Margot Fleischman	Board of Selectmen, Town of Bedford
Karen Galligan	Town of Southborough
Kristin Guichard	Town of Acton
Eric Halvorsen	Metropolitan Area Planning Council
Sam Larson	Office of State Representative Kenneth Gordon
Matt Lash	IBEW Local 103
Rafael Mares	Conservation Law Foundation
Melody Madia	Conservation Law Foundation
Puja Mehta	Office of State Senator Karen Spilka
Owen McDonald	Town of Weymouth
Steve Olanoff	Three Rivers Interlocal Council (Town of Norwood)
Joe Onorato	MassDOT Highway District 4
Pooja Phalpankar	Office of State Representative Denise Provost
Leah Robins	Office of State Representative Carolyn Dykema
John Sanchez	Town of Burlington
Tim Snyder	Office of State Senator Patricia Jehlen
John Westerling	Town of Hopkinton
Joe Viola	Town of Brookline

MPO Staff/Central Transportation Planning Staff

Karl Quackenbush, Executive Director
Maureen Kelly
Robin Mannion
Anne McGahan
Elizabeth Moore
Scott Peterson
Sean Pfalzer
Michelle Scott
Pam Wolfe
