

Memorandum for the Record

Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization Meeting

November 6, 2014 Meeting

10:10 AM – 12:50 PM, State Transportation Building, Conference Rooms 2&3, 10 Park Plaza, Boston

Steve Woelfel and Clinton Bench, Chairs, representing Frank DePaola, Acting Secretary and Chief Executive Officer, Massachusetts Department of Transportation (MassDOT)

Decisions

The Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization agreed to the following:

- approve Amendment One to the federal fiscal years (FFYs) 2015-18 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)
- approve the work program for the *Foxborough JARC Transit Feasibility Study*
- approve the minutes of the meeting of October 16

Meeting Agenda

1. Public Comments

Lee Auspitz, Somerville resident, stated that he is expecting a response to his public records request regarding the *Green Line Extension* project. He is requesting confirmation that the federal geospatial and mapping standards defined in a federal Office of Management and Budget circular are being adhered to as the project goes forward. He asked that the response be provided prior to the MPO's upcoming federal certification process and that the issue be placed on an MPO meeting agenda.

Mr. Auspitz recommended that MassDOT and the MPO make administrative corrections to the State TIP (STIP) and TIP to change references to the Medford Hillside terminus of the Green Line to adhere to the OMB naming standards. He discussed Tufts University's plans for the station area and noted that the area will not bear the name "Medford Hillside."

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

There was none.

3. Committee Chairs' Reports

Sreelatha Allam, MassDOT, reported that the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) Committee met this morning to discuss the fourth quarter report and staff assignments. The Committee will meet next in the new year.

4. Regional Transportation Advisory Council Report—*Mike Gowing, Chair, Regional Transportation Advisory Council*

M. Gowing, the newly elected chair of the Advisory Council, expressed his interest in increasing participation and growing the membership of the Advisory Council in the coming year.

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

K. Quackenbush provided an update on the federal certification process that the MPO is undergoing. The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) have asked the MPO staff to answer questions on specific program areas. Staff will be submitting the responses on Friday. Hard copies of relevant MPO documents have already been submitted. Staff will be publicizing the upcoming certification meetings.

Michael Chong, FHWA, added that the agendas for the certification meetings are being developed. The federal agencies are encouraging the public to provide feedback about the MPO's planning process. Public comments may be sent to M. Chong or Nicolas Garcia, FTA.

6. Transportation Improvement Program Amendment One—*Sean Pfalzer, MPO Staff*

Amendment One to the FFYs 2015-18 TIP reprograms earmarks for several highway projects; updates highway project costs; changes the funding source for *Green Line Extension* (to Union Square and College Avenue) project; adjusts the funding source and cash flows for procurement of new MBTA Red Line and Orange Line vehicles; and documents the funding used for the purchase of buses for the Cape Ann Transportation Authority.

The MPO held an abbreviated public comment period for the amendment between October 20 and November 3, and received three public comments. (A summary of the comments and the full text of the comments were provided to members.) One commenter, a Medford resident, expressed support for the *Green Line Extension* project, including for the MPO's commitment to fund the extension to Route 16.

Another, from the Green Line Advisory Group of Medford (GLAM), expressed opposition to the inclusion of the *Green Line Extension to Route 16* project. GLAM also stated the following: the issue concerning the legal mandate for the terminus of the project has not been resolved; GLAM's federal lawsuit was dismissed without prejudice, meaning that certain triggers can be used to resurrect the complaint; the state made incorrect statements and discriminated against the disability community by failing to get their participation in the planning process, and the African-American community by failing to consider the project's impact on environmental justice populations; and the funding of the project will leave other important projects in the region unfunded.

The third comment, from the Malden Redevelopment Authority, expressed concern that the *Route 1 Improvement Project* in Malden was not included in the TIP. The Redevelopment Authority stated that the project is a regional priority and critical to new development. Correspondence from the Cities of Malden and Revere, and the Town of Saugus documenting the longstanding issues along the corridor were also provided.

Several changes were made to the amendment during the public review period. The first reflects a change in the cost of the *Dedham – Bridge Replacement (D-05-003), Needham Street over Great Ditch* project. The cost increase is due to wetland restoration, ADA upgrades to trail entrances and a parking lot near the bridge, revisions to the rip-rap and scour protection along the bridge, and temporary traffic control signals.

Another affects two highway preservation projects for resurfacing and related work on Route 1 in Chelsea and Revere, and on Route 128 in Beverly. Initially, this amendment included cost increases to those two projects. MassDOT Highway Division, however, has requested that the MPO delay making programming changes to these projects, while the agency reevaluates the NHS Preservation Program.

This amendment includes revised cash flows for the *Green Line Extension* project over the four-year period of the TIP (reflecting a change to the total project cost, now \$1.99 billion), and a change in the funding source for the procurement of Red and Orange Line cars, which will be funded with state dollars rather than federal. (The full cost of both projects is not reflected in this TIP.)

Motion and Discussion

A motion to approve Amendment One to the FFYs 2015-18 TIP, as presented, was made by the Inner Core Committee (City of Somerville) (Tom Bent), and seconded by the Advisory Council (M. Gowing).

Steve Olanoff, Three Rivers Interlocal Council (Town of Norwood), asked about the programming status of the *Route 1 Improvement Project* in Malden. S. Pfalzer replied that the project is programmed in the FFYs 2031-35 timeband of the Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP). The Cities of Malden and Revere, and the Town of Saugus are asking the MPO to prioritize the project so that it can be programmed on the TIP. The MPO has discussed this project in the past, but in the context of the LRTP.

Dennis Crowley, South West Advisory Planning Committee (Town of Medway), asked that the MPO receive a brief presentation on the *Green Line Extension* project in the coming month to recap the project's history and schedule, the MPO's level of commitment to it, and the impact the project will have on the MPO's finances.

S. Woelfel noted that funding shown in Amendment One is for the first phase of the *Green Line Extension* (to Union Square and College Avenue), which is the portion the Commonwealth is legally required to construct. Victor Rivas, MBTA, added that the presentation could delineate what is part of the Full-Funding Grant Agreement and what is not.

Members then voted on the motion to approve Amendment One to the FFYs 2015-18 TIP, as presented. The motion carried.

7. Work Program: Foxborough JARC Transit Feasibility Study—Karl Quackenbush, Executive Director, Central Transportation Planning Staff

K. Quackenbush presented the work program for the *Foxborough JARC Transit Feasibility Study*. This work program is funded by a grant to the Town of Foxborough from the federal Job Access and Reverse Commute (JARC) Program.

Through this work program, the MPO staff will study the feasibility of establishing intra-town transportation services for low-income residents for travelling to and from employment locations in town. Options that will be considered include fixed-route and demand-responsive services, and the potential for reverse commuting. Staff will be exploring data to understand the market for services.

Discussion and Motion

Lourenço Dantas, Massachusetts Port Authority, asked if the study will examine alternatives relating to commuter rail service, such as changes to frequency of service.

K. Quackenbush replied that while those considerations are not explicit in the work program, staff would note the information in the study. Clinton Bench, MassDOT, added

that if staff discovers travel patterns that indicate that a change in commuter rail service would be beneficial, that information would be taken into consideration.

A motion to approve the work program for the *Foxborough JARC Transit Feasibility Study* was made by the MassDOT Highway Division (John Romano), and seconded by the Inner Core Committee (City of Somerville) (T. Bent).

M. Gowing inquired about the participation of Foxborough employers in this study. The project supervisor, Sharon Wason, Town of Foxborough, replied that the town is in the process of developing its first master plan since the 1970s, and that there has been extensive participation from employers. Most of the employers in the town are located along Route 140, so if transit were available it would be within a quarter-mile of most of the employers in town. The town's planning staff has been conducting interviews with employers and is seeing excellent participation and strong support.

Members then voted on the motion to approve the work program for the *Foxborough JARC Transit Feasibility Study*. The motion carried.

8. Meeting Minutes—Maureen Kelly, MPO Staff

A motion to approve the minutes of the meeting of October 16 was made by the MBTA Advisory Board (Paul Regan), and seconded by the MAPC (Eric Bourassa). The motion carried. The following members abstained: At-Large City of Everett (Tony Sousa); MassDOT Highway Division (J. Romano); and the Advisory Council (M. Gowing).

9. Long-Range Transportation Plan Development—Anne McGahan, MPO Staff

K. Quackenbush introduced the discussion on the Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) by setting out the goals for this agenda item, which were to: 1) discuss the LRTP process, where the MPO is in the planning process, and the next steps; 2) report on public input to date; and 3) discuss the actions that the MPO will need to take in the near future.

A. McGahan then discussed the steps in the LRTP development process, referencing a packet of materials, including an MPO Member Guidebook. The four steps in the process are as follows:

- 1) Establish the vision, goals, and objectives
- 2) Identify the region's transportation needs
- 3) Conduct scenario planning to consider investment strategies that will advance the region's transportation goals
- 4) Develop the LRTP to account for transportation funding over the next 25 years

Vision, Goals, and Objectives

The goals and objectives will be used to guide the project and program selection process for the LRTP and TIP, guide MPO studies in the UPWP, and monitor and evaluate the transportation system in the future. Staff conducted public outreach on the vision, goals, and objectives and will be proposing some changes to them later in this meeting.

Needs Assessment

The MPO previewed a Web-based needs assessment tool in September. It contains information about bottleneck locations, highway congestion, high crash locations, high-priority bicycle gaps, and transit gaps in the region.

Staff is working to complete chapters for the Needs Assessment that will provide information on land use, travel patterns, and the prioritized needs in the region. This information will be used in the scenario planning process when the MPO considers different investment strategies, and then to ultimately decide on the projects and programs that will be included in the recommended LRTP.

Scenario Planning

K. Quackenbush then discussed the scenario planning process. Scenario planning provides a framework for examining relative benefits and trade-offs among possible futures and for understanding the relationships between alternative decisions. It involves specifying alternative land use futures, transportation investment strategies, and environmental and economic variables. Those various alternatives are mixed and matched to create discrete scenarios which are modeled and analyzed for performance against the MPO's goals.

Staff is proposing to conduct scenario planning in two stages. The first stage would analyze two or three scenarios that – along with information from the Needs Assessment, and available financial resources – will help inform the MPO's deliberations about the LRTP. These scenarios will be crafted based on the goals and objectives of the LRTP. The land use inputs would be held constant (to the projected household and employment distribution in MAPC's MetroFuture plan), while the transportation projects and programs would differ in each scenario. The scenarios will be constrained to the estimated financial resources for the LRTP. In the second stage, scenario planning will be used for the MPO's long-term performance-based planning work, for which there is a federal mandate, and for other purposes as well.

At the next MPO meeting on November 20, staff will be asking the MPO to take action to accept a set of goals and objectives for use in the scenario planning and to impart a

sense of priority to them. Staff will also present performance metrics, the Universe of Projects for the LRTP, and possible LRTP funding programs. At the meeting on December 18, staff will present proposed scenarios and ask for the MPO's concurrence to proceed with modeling them.

LRTP Development

The first step in developing scenarios is to examine recent investments that the MPO has programmed, continued A. McGahan. This information was presented at the last meeting, but more detail was provided in the Guidebook. The investment categories include the following: corridor investments, intersection improvements, bicycle investments, interchange investments, and transit investments. Examples of projects that would fall under each category were provided.

Also in the Guidebook, was a pie chart showing the percentage of MPO target funds by investment category that were programmed between fiscal years 2008 and 2018 along with a summary of the collective outcomes or benefits from these investments. The outcomes include reductions in carbon dioxide emissions, additional miles of bicycle lanes and sidewalks built, improved access to transit, improved safety, and additional travel lanes.

Future MPO investments will continue to be guided by the MPO's goals, which in turn will guide the prioritization of infrastructure projects funded through the TIP. Because the MPO will not have enough funding to address all the needs in the region, the MPO will have to weigh the trade-offs of different strategies before allocating funding.

As discussed at the MPO's last meeting, one strategy could be to establish LRTP programs that advance the MPO's goals. The Guidebook lists potential programs with examples of candidate projects for each program and goals that the programs would address.

Going forward, the MPO will consider the following components of the scenario planning process: prioritizing the goals and objectives; identifying the portion of each scenario that will consist of major infrastructure projects; and deciding what portion of the remaining unallocated funding could be allocated to programs.

When the MPO develops a set of recommended projects and programs for the LRTP, staff will conduct air quality conformity, greenhouse gas, and environmental justice analyses using the travel model. Staff will also develop the supporting chapters on the various aspects of the planning process and selected investment approach. The MPO will then approve a draft LRTP for a 30-day public review period to gather comments for consideration before finalizing the LRTP.

The LRTP will shape all aspects of MPO planning by providing direction for projects to include in the TIP, planning activities to include in the UPWP, and a foundation for the MPO's performance-based planning and programming process.

The Guidebook is available for members to use as a reference during the development of the LRTP.

Discussion

S. Olanoff asked why there were no examples of transit projects among the proposed LRTP program areas in the Guidebook. A. McGahan replied that there are too many transit projects to list. The projects in the LRTP will be from the MBTA's Capital Investment Program (CIP) and Program for Mass Transportation (PMT).

D. Crowley inquired about the timeline for the scenario planning. A. McGahan replied that staff hopes to have a set of scenarios defined by December 18. The process will continue through February.

Richard Reed, Minuteman Advisory Group on Interlocal Coordination (Town of Bedford), asked if the Guidebook is publicly available. A. McGahan noted that staff has prepared a similar document for outreach to the subregions.

In response to questions from the chair, K. Quackenbush noted that staff will be asking the MPO at the next meeting to approve a set of goals for use in scenario planning and to provide a sense of prioritization of the goals. Staff also would like to expose the members to the Universe of Projects and performance measures at the next meeting and get members' concurrence about these building blocks of the scenarios. Staff would also like members to determine what fraction of funding in each scenario should be directed to project and programs.

Public Comments

Then A. McGahan turned to the public comments that the MPO received when the draft vision, goals, and objectives were released for public review. During the public review period, staff held a public forum at the Boston Public Library, attended the MAPC subregional meetings, elicited public input through the MPO's website, and conducted a survey.

Members were provided with a summary of comments received. The comments relating to the vision, goals, and objectives are summarized as follows:

- geographic equity should be a goal or objective

- goals should be prioritized; some asked what the MPO will do if there are conflicts between the goals or between objectives within each goal
- cost-effectiveness is included in the goals and objectives; staff does not currently analyze for cost-effectiveness, but could consider best practices for doing this
- all modes of transportation should be included in the MPO's planning; private transportation should be acknowledged
- the goals for Economic Vitality and Freight should be separated
- include the elderly
- all transportation funding should be considered, not just the MPO target funds; the public finds it difficult to comment on just a portion of the transportation funding

The results of the survey were also distributed to members. The prioritization of goals, based on the 19 responses, has Safety as the highest priority and Transportation Equity as the lowest.

Changes to Vision, Goals, and Objectives

Members were provided with a red-line version of the draft vision, goals, and objectives. A. McGahan summarized the changes made to the document since it was released for public review.

The MPO received comments stating that the MPO should be more transformative and holistic, and reflect new technologies. For that reason, staff proposed revising the vision to read,

“The Boston Region MPO envisions a transportation system that is safe, *uses new technologies*, provides equitable access, excellent mobility, and varied transportation options – in support of a sustainable, healthy, livable, and economically vibrant region.”

There were two other comments on the vision. One stated that transportation should be compatible with neighborhoods. The other stated that the MPO should incorporate the 8-80 philosophy into its vision, i.e. a city that is good for an 8-year old and for an 80-year old is a successful city for everyone.

Comments were also received about the Congestion Reduction goal. (The original goal stated, “Congestion and delays will be reduced for all modes consistent with the MPO’s commitment to reduce single-occupant-vehicle travel and promote transit, bicycling, and walking.” The objectives were to “reduce delays for all modes,” and “achieve substantial mode shift as a means of congestion reduction.”)

Some communities expressed concern that congestion reduction for all modes emphasizes highway-centric solutions, and that rather than reduce delay for all modes, pedestrian and transit modes should be prioritized. In response to this concern, staff revised the goal to emphasize that the intent is to *increase* the transit, bicycling, and walking modes, rather than just *promote* them.

Changes were also made to the Transportation Options/Healthy Modes goals and objectives based on public comments. One commenter suggested revising the goal to read, "Transit, bicycling, and walking options will be expanded *and automobile usage in the Boston region reduced.*" These changes address another comment that called for a more aggressive statement about the mode shift goal and a focus on transit. A new objective now reads, "Create a connected network of bicycle and accessible sidewalk facilities (at a regional and neighborhood scale) by expanding existing facilities and closing gaps."

Other comments from communities called for the following: an increase in transit choices; support for non-traditional transit; support for the last mile connections and reverse commute options; acknowledgement that private entities also provide transportation options; and to address the elderly population. A new objective now reads, "Support community-based and private-initiative services and programs to meet last mile, reverse commute, and other non-traditional transit/transportation needs including those of the elderly."

Discussion

J. Romano asked whether municipal TIP contacts had provided feedback. A. McGahan noted that they received notices that were sent out on the MPO's email list-serve. Municipal representatives provided feedback at the MAPC subregional meetings.

C. Bench asked members to further consider what the Congestion Reduction goal is intended to achieve. He posed several questions. Are members comfortable supporting the expansion of arterial and highway capacity, such as adding lanes? Should the focus be on reducing traffic delays wherever they occur, or should a more strategic approach be taken? Should there be a focus on making the best use of existing highway capacity by making use of HOV lanes, HOT lanes, or expanded transit?

S. Olanoff stated that serious highway congestion should be eliminated, however, he noted that highway congestion does moderate road usage, and that expanding capacity would attract more usage. A certain level of congestion is needed to induce a mode shift to transit.

J. Romano discussed the need to consider land use as a driver of congestion. For instance, congestion can be exacerbated when new office buildings or other destinations are built along the highways. In some instances, when providing transit is not feasible, adding highway capacity may have to be an option.

E. Bourassa remarked that MAPC would not be supportive of adding highway lanes.

J. Romano discussed the need to develop strategies to address problems faced by commuters who rely on the highways because transit is not available to them. He noted, for example, that HOV lanes and carpools do not help people who commute on off-peak hours or who do not have flexible work schedules. Employers need to be involved in the strategies, he said.

C. Bench added that the solution to highway congestion might not always be to add lanes, rather consideration could be given to strategies such as adding right-of-way to better manage traffic flow, or improving highways' merge and diverge capacity. He suggested revising the goal if the MPO wants to take a more strategic approach to make the most efficient use of the existing system.

K. Quackenbush noted that the goal, as written, is consistent with the goal of reducing single-occupant-vehicle travel. A. McGahan added that more details associated with the goal will be among the performance measures.

M. Gowing suggested revising an objective in the Transportation Options/Healthy Modes category to include a reference to supporting the transportation needs of people with disabilities. Regarding the congestion issue, he discussed the concern that adding highway capacity will attract more usage to the highways, and he suggested that strategies are needed that include transit lanes.

R. Canale suggested using the scenarios to compare options such as adding a highway lane to reduce congestion compared to other options such as adding dedicated bus lanes for last-mile connections, or multimodal centers.

P. Regan discussed the idea of envisioning in the LRTP new ways to organize the uses on the highways so that they can handle traffic in different forms. For example, he pointed out that the privately-owned 128 Business Council shuttle buses carry more people than most regional transit authorities in the Commonwealth, and that bus rapid transit (BRT) holds potential for the Interstate 495 belt. A. McGahan then noted that a transit program in the LRTP could be effective for this type of planning.

R. Reed stated that he would have to support the idea of adding lanes to increase capacity in areas that are under-served by transit, such as the Route 128 area from Woburn to Waltham, considering that realistically it does not appear that there will be funding for a major investment in transit expansion in that area.

Tom Kadzis, City of Boston, expressed that it behooves the MPO to be more precise in describing its Congestion Reduction goal and to be clear about what the MPO is willing to entertain.

E. Bourassa stated that through these goals and objectives the MPO is making a statement that its policy is to not support projects that are solely aimed at expanding capacity for single-occupant vehicles, unless they are addressing safety issues or have other elements supporting transit or a mode shift. He recommended removing the objective to "Reduce delay for all modes."

C. Bench agreed with removing that objective, but expressed concern about not addressing capacity issues on major arterials or interchanges. There are locations that may not show up as high crash locations or that may be congestion points that produce negative air quality impacts.

S. Olanoff stated that adding capacity should be restricted to locations with very severe congestion issues.

D. Crowley stated that the MPO should be focused on studying ways to improve traffic flow on secondary roads.

M. Gowing suggested revising the objective to "Reduce delay for all modes," to "Increase efficiency for all modes."

C. Stickney pointed out that adding a lane on Route 3 is critical for South Shore communities. She noted that more people from that subregion would take transit if there were more parking alternatives at transit stations. These stations quickly reach capacity in the morning.

L. Dantas noted that public transit users and transit capacity issues should be considered in the objective to reduce delays.

C. Bench asked staff to consider these comments when revising the goals and objectives.

Rafael Mares, Conservation Law Foundation, suggested a revision to the Transportation Options/Healthy Modes goal to refer to expanding transit, bicycling, and waking *usage*, rather than just expanding *options* for those modes.

C. Bench asked members to consider whether the goal in the Transportation Options/Healthy Modes category should refer to reducing automobile usage, or to achieving a better mode share. He noted that the former could be problematic if the Commonwealth experiences growth in the future. J. Romano added that the statement is also problematic if more transit options are not available across the whole region. He spoke about the enormous costs of extending transit on a large scale.

E. Bourassa pointed out that scenario planning can help the MPO identify a set of transportation investment strategies that can help reduce automobile usage. He noted that this planning will be informed by MAPC's land use projections, which were developed with input from municipalities in the region and that show where in the region development is expected to occur in the coming years.

J. Romano suggested that the scenario planning should include viable solutions. A scenario for increasing transit may not be realistic given the enormous costs that might entail. He suggested incorporating ideas in the scenarios such as employer provided bus transit options.

R. Canale noted that people commuting to jobs create only part of the traffic in the region, while other traffic problems stem from people traveling short distances, and that there are many opportunities to address the issues caused by short-distance travel and to reduce automobile usage.

R. Mares commented that solutions will need to be developed to reduce vehicle miles travelled (VMT) because of the greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction requirements in the Global Warming Solutions Act.

L. Dantas discussed the vision statement. He suggested striking the phrase "uses new technologies," because that is a means to achieving the goals, not a vision.

S. Olanoff commented on an objective under the GHG/Air Pollution/Environment category, and suggested that the words "when possible" be stricken.

Arthur Strang, Cambridge resident, commented that congestion is community-centric in terms of solutions. Neighborhood has to play a role in how we think about solutions, he said.

Prioritizing Goals

Members were then asked to prioritize the goals. They were asked to fill out a survey and return it to staff prior to the next meeting. K. Quackenbush urged members to contact him or A. McGahan with any questions.

10. Project Cost Containment and TIP Project Cost Increase

Reporting—David Anderson, MassDOT, and Sean Pfalzer, MPO Staff

D. Anderson gave a presentation on the work of a committee formed to develop new guidance and procedures intended to result in more reliable project cost estimates from project inception to advertisement. The MassDOT Highway Division is partnering with the American Council of Engineering Companies in this effort.

MassDOT Highway Division currently bases its contracts on unit price (as opposed to lump sum). Cost estimates for items of work and quantities are initially developed by project designers based on the Standard Specifications for Highway Bridges (which defines items of work) and the Highway Division's Weighted Average Bid Price Application (which contains information about prices bidders are submitting for other construction jobs).

The Highway Division uses a module, the Contract Advertising and Planning Estimator (CAPE), which is part of the ProjectInfo database, to calculate information regarding project costs. (ProjectInfo is the database used by the Highway Division to store information regarding projects. It has an internal facing that is used by project managers and a public facing.)

A MassDOT project manager can use CAPE to tabulate all costs associated with a project, including office estimate, traffic police, construction contingencies, utility force accounts, and construction engineering. These can be among the federal participating costs that must be programmed on the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) and TIP.

The committee has developed recommendations to improve project cost estimates, which include accounting for design contingencies. (The Highway Division already accounts for construction contingencies.) Design contingencies would account for unforeseen costs when projects are in the design process – from project inception to 25%, 75%, and 100% design stages.

The committee recommended design contingencies for three types of projects at each stage of the design process. The types of projects are 1) complex projects, such as those requiring an environmental assessment or environmental impact statement; 2)

non-complex projects, such as minor roadway widening or footprint bridge projects; and 3) maintenance projects, which are less likely to experience cost increases. Complex projects in early stages of design have the highest contingencies.

The committee also recommended adjusting project costs for inflation to the estimated advertising date. The CAPE module can account for inflation. The Highway Division wants the CAPE application to be used by District Offices early in project development stages.

Future steps include developing better guidance for estimating the costs of utility relocation and traffic police at project inception. Also, the public facing portion of ProjectInfo will need to present cost information in a simpler way to the public.

Discussion

C. Stickney raised a question about how utility work can be figured into the planning process earlier, and whether municipalities can assist. D. Anderson discussed how the Highway Division works with utility companies on the many details of scheduling the utility companies' activities on MassDOT construction jobs. The coordination of utility work is often complicated by the fact that multiple utilities may be running on shared poles. This scheduling lies primarily with the Highway Division and the utility companies; the Highway Division's district offices employ people who are responsible for that coordination.

T. Kadzis asked about MassDOT's plans to apply CAPE estimates to the 25% design. D. Anderson discussed the agency's aim for project managers to account for all federal participating costs.

D. Crowley discussed concerns about project cost estimates from the MPO's vantage, noting that better estimates are needed at the initial point when projects are considered for the TIP. D. Anderson noted that the measures he discussed are aimed at addressing that very issue of getting better cost estimates to program on the TIP. The implementation of guidance on project scoping from the *Massachusetts Highway Department Project Development and Design Guidebook* and the measures discussed today are intended to yield more reliable cost estimates.

M. Gowing asked about how flexible MassDOT's cost estimation system would be in terms of making adjustments resulting from new legislation, such as new stormwater management rules. D. Anderson noted that currently all projects are subject to a drainage system evaluation to identify improvements for stormwater treatment. Additional requirements could be accommodated through the design contingency.

Transportation Improvement Program Cost Template

S. Pfalzer then presented a template that could be used to provide members with better tracking of project cost changes. It is a spreadsheet that provides information on the initial project cost, each cost change, an explanation for the cost changes, and the design stage of the project at each cost change. This document would be available to members when staff presents amendments to the TIP.

Discussion

S. Olanoff asked if staff would provide information in the “Explanation for Cost Increase” column of the spreadsheet to show individual cost items and percentage increase.

S. Pfalzer offered to pursue that information, which would be obtained from the Highway Division’s project managers.

C. Stickney expressed support for using this new template. She suggested that staff should have the discretion to point out to members when there is a significant cost increase on particular items.

C. Bench asked if there is any reason why the original project cost should not remain on the TIP tables. S. Pfalzer replied that the original cost could be incorporated, however, there may be a challenge with certain projects that have multiple cost increases.

M. Gowing also expressed support for the new TIP tracking system, noting that it could also be used to track when projects come off the TIP to be funded by another source.

D. Crowley noted his interest in tracking the project cost changes on projects that are funded with TIP target funds, and he clarified that he did expect staff to track cost changes on all projects. S. Olanoff, however, expressed that it would be helpful to see all projects.

11. Members Items

R. Reed inquired about the schedule of the upcoming Federal Certification meetings.

P. Wolfe reported that the federal agencies are currently planning two full days and one-half day of meetings, but the schedule is not final.

Members agreed to cancel the regularly scheduled meeting on December 4.

K. Quackenbush reported that the FFY 2015 UPWP was approved by the federal agencies and C. Bench reported that the STIP was also approved.

12. Adjourn

A motion to adjourn was made by the North Shore Task Force (Tina Cassidy) and seconded by the Inner Core Committee (City of Somerville) (T. Bent). 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 Lexington)	Richard Canale
City of Boston (Boston Redevelopment Authority)	Jim Fitzgerald
City of Boston (Boston Transportation Department)	Tom Kadzis
Federal Highway Administration	Michael Chong
Inner Core Committee (City of Somerville)	Tom Bent
Massachusetts Department of Transportation	Clinton Bench
	Steve Woelfel
	David Anderson
MassDOT Highway Division	John Romano
Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority (MBTA)	Ron Morgan
	Victor Rivas
Massachusetts Port Authority	Lourenço Dantas
MBTA Advisory Board	Paul Regan
Metropolitan Area Planning Council	Eric Bourassa
Minuteman Advisory Group on Interlocal Coordination (Town of Bedford)	Richard Reed
North Suburban Planning Council (City of Woburn)	Tina Cassidy
Regional Transportation Advisory Council	Mike Gowing
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)	Steve Olanoff

Other Attendees	Affiliation
Sreelatha Allam	MassDOT Office of Transportation Planning
Lee Auspitz	Somerville resident
Sarah Bradbury	MassDOT District 3
Rafael Mares	Conservation Law Foundation
Joe Onorato	MassDOT District 4
Arthur Strang	Cambridge resident
Sharon Wason	Town of Foxborough
Wig Zamore	Somerville Transportation Equity Partnership / Mystic View Task Force

MPO Staff/Central Transportation Planning Staff

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