

# Draft Memorandum for the Record

## Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization Meeting

### June 15, 2017 Meeting

10:00 AM – 1:00 PM, State Transportation Building, Conference Rooms 2 & 3, 10 Park Plaza, Boston

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

### Decisions

The Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization agreed to the following:

- approve the minutes of the meeting of May 4, 2017
- approve the Central Transportation Planning Staff (CTPS) State Fiscal Year (SFY) 2018 Operating Budget
- approve the work program for *Union Point Redevelopment Modeling Support*
- approve the Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2018 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)
- release the Draft Boston Region MPO 2017 Title VI Triennial Report for a 30-day public review period

#### 1. Introductions

See attendance on page 14.

#### 2. Public Comments

Ivey St. John (Rutherford Corridor Improvement Coalition) expressed opposition to the City of Boston's preferred design concept for Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) project #606226 (Reconstruction of Rutherford Ave., Boston). The Coalition's position is that the surface option is the superior alternative to the one presented, which includes two underpasses. RCIC requests that CTPS re-analyze all MassDOT Project Review Committee (PRC) approved projects that are at less than 25% design to comply with new federal regulations on trip measurement (person-trips vs. vehicle-trips). Rachel Brown (Rutherford Corridor Improvement Coalition) agreed with I. St. John and added that a multi-dimensional analysis of the two options (surface and underpasses) is necessary to quantify the impacts of each on economic vitality in Charlestown.

Pat Brown (Sudbury Resident) expressed concern regarding submitted TIP comments that did not appear in the final document. *Note: The comments P. Brown is referring to were made prior to the official public review period for the TIP. Only public comments*

*submitted during the public comment appear in the TIP document.* P. Brown expressed concern that TIP project #607249 (Intersection improvements at Route 20 and Landham Road), a MassDOT proposed project, has not been programmed in the FFY 2018-22 TIP, while #608164 (Bruce Freeman Rail Trail, Phase 2D) has. P. Brown added that the TIP Interactive Database, located on the MPO's website, once listed scores for projects, which MPO staff use to rank projects during the TIP development process; she requested that these rankings be added back to the database. Karl Quackenbush, MPO Executive Director, stated he would follow-up with P. Brown on the documentation of TIP comments after the meeting.

Georgia McEaddy (Boston Resident) expressed opposition to the relocation of an MBTA bus stop on Washington Street in Roslindale. Jim Gillooly (City of Boston) (Boston Transportation Department) replied that he believed this bus stop was moved in response to the death of a pedestrian on this corridor in order to accommodate road work and short-term road calming measures. G. McEaddy added that there was no notification of the stop's relocation and that its new location is not convenient or safe for people with disabilities and other residents. J. Gillooly asked that G. McEaddy leave her phone number so that he may follow up.

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

There was none.

### **4. Committee Chairs' Reports**

There were none.

### **5. Regional Transportation Advisory Council Report—*Mike Gowing, Regional Transportation Advisory Council***

M. Gowing reported that the Advisory Council met on June 14 and heard a presentation on the Core Capacity Constraints study from MPO Staff members Bill Kuttner and Bruce Kaplan. The Advisory Council is not meeting in July and will instead take a field trip to Conley Terminal in South Boston on Wednesday, July 12, 2017. There will be no meeting in August. In September, the Advisory Council will hold elections for officers.

### **6. Executive Director's Report—*Karl Quackenbush, MPO Executive Director***

K. Quackenbush reminded the board that the 2014 federal certification review resulted in a recommendation that the MPO update its Urbanized Area (UZA) agreement among MPOs to take into account the 2010 Census, which documented that the population and area of the UZA had increased since the previous Census. The agreement is currently between the Boston Region MPO, Merrimack Valley Planning Commission, Northern

Middlesex Council of Governments, Southeastern Regional Planning and Economic Development District, and Old Colony Planning Council. Due the increase in size of the UZA, it now includes Montachusett Regional Planning Commission, Central Massachusetts Regional Planning Commission, as well as 3 regional planning commissions in New Hampshire and the State Planning Council in Rhode Island. The new or revised agreement must address the division of responsibilities between agencies regarding data collection/sharing, coordinated decision-making, performance-based planning, and dispute resolution. The Federal Highway and Transit Administrations (FHWA and FTA) would like all three state DOTs to be included, as well as Regional Transit Authorities (RTAs). K. Quackenbush expects that draft language should be available in the fall. MPO Staff member Lourenço Dantas is heading this effort and is coordinating with the MassDOT Office of Transportation Planning. Discussion followed. Ken Miller (FHWA) noted that the federal agencies aren't prescribing the means by which the MPOs and transportation agencies will need to coordinate, but they want to ensure that MPO decisions are considered with reference to information from other MPOs in the UZA. One of the areas of coordination that will need to be addressed is performance-based planning.

K. Quackenbush announced that this is the last MPO meeting for Liz Moore, CTPS's Director of Transportation Policy and Planning, who is retiring at the end of the month.

### **7. Approval of Meeting Minutes—*Róisín Foley, MPO Staff***

A motion to approve the minutes of the meeting of May 4 was made by At-Large Town (Town of Lexington) (Richard Canale) and seconded by the Regional Transportation Advisory Council (M. Gowing). The motion carried.

### **8. Action Item: CTPS State Fiscal Year (SFY) 2018 Operating Budget—*Paul Regan, Chair, Administration & Finance Committee and MBTA Advisory Council***

P. Regan presented the CTPS SFY 2018 Operating budget for approval. The proposed budget totals \$6,070,650 and supports 58 full-time positions. The budget represents a decrease of 5% from the approved SFY 2017 level.

#### ***Discussion***

M. Gowing asked whether there is reduction in the number of Full Time Equivalent (FTE) positions reflected in this budget. K. Quackenbush responded that this budget supports 58 FTE positions and the previous budget supported 62.

***Vote***

A motion to approve the CTPS SFY 2018 Operating Budget was made by the Metropolitan Area Planning Council (Eric Bourassa) and seconded by the Inner Core Committee (City of Somerville) (Tom Bent). The motion carried.

**9. Action Item: Work Program for Union Point Redevelopment  
Modeling Support—*Scott Peterson, Director of Technical Services,  
MPO Staff***

S. Peterson presented the work program for *Union Point Redevelopment Modeling Support*. The South Weymouth Naval Air Station, located in Weymouth, Abington, and Rockland, was closed in 1997. In 1998, the Massachusetts Legislature created the South Shore Tri-Town Development Corporation, subsequently reconstituted as the Southfield Redevelopment Authority, to reinforce municipal control over land use and redevelopment at the former base. The 1,400 acre site was recently purchased by a development company, LStar, which has an ambitious redevelopment plan, known as Union Point, for eight million square feet of commercial development and approximately 4,000 housing units. LStar has received feedback from the Massachusetts Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs stating that further analysis of the transportation impacts would be required in order for Union Point to receive a Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act (MEPA) certificate.

Much of the traffic generated from the site is expected to use State Route 3 via interchanges at State Route 18 and Derby Street in Hingham. The South Weymouth Station on the Kingston/Plymouth MBTA commuter rail line is immediately west of the site.

MPO Staff will work with the project team—which consists of MassDOT, primary consultant Howard Stein Hudson, and other sub-consultants—to define the study area and acquire updated traffic counts for a selection of intersections. MPO Staff will produce forecasts of travel demand for 2017 and two horizon years—2040 and an interim year between 2017 and 2040 to be determined by the project team. It is estimated that this project will be completed in eight months after work commences. The total cost of this project is estimated to be \$245,200; the project will be paid for via a future contract with the Southfield Redevelopment Authority.

***Discussion***

Kenneth Miller (FHWA) asked whether MPO Staff has previously completed work for private entities. K. Quackenbush replied that this has happened occasionally, and further noted that the Southfield Redevelopment Authority is a quasi-public agency

created by the state legislature. K. Quackenbush added that there are some analyses MPO Staff are in the best position to deal with.

Marie Rose (MassDOT Highway) asked how this work interacts with MassDOT's Route 18 widening project. S. Peterson replied that staff will supply traffic volumes for a number of locations on Route 18 and reassess previous recommendations for an East-West connector road.

Christine Stickney (South Shore Coalition) (Town of Braintree) expressed support for both the work program and the Union Point redevelopment project on behalf of the South Shore Coalition, noting that the project will be a significant economic driver for the subregion.

***Vote***

A motion to approve the work program for *Union Point Redevelopment Modeling Support* was made by the Metropolitan Area Planning Council (E. Bourassa) and seconded by the City of Boston (Boston Transportation Department) (J. Gillooly). The motion carried.

**10. Action Item: Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2018 UPWP—Sandy Johnston, MPO Staff**

S. Johnston reviewed the public comments received on the draft FFY 2018 UPWP and presented the final document for approval. He noted several minor changes to the document from the draft released for public review on May 4, including the addition of a table in Chapter 9 that breaks down FTA funding by program item. Appendix B in the final UPWP document includes a summary table of comments received as well as responses from the MPO.

The MPO received 13 distinct comment letters and communications relating to 35 individual items. Comments included expressions of support for individual studies, ideas for future studies, offers of logistical or data support for programmed studies, and comments on the public outreach process. Several of the comments that were received were in regards to Appendix A, which lists planning studies that will be conducted in the Boston MPO area by individual agencies, such as MassDOT and the MBTA; MPO discretionary funding will not be used for these studies, but these study descriptions are included in the document to provide a more complete picture of all the surface-transportation-planning projects occurring in the region. MPO Staff are working on re-routing these comments to the relevant authorities.

Following the MPO's endorsement, Staff will submit the final document to MassDOT and the federal agencies for their review and approval.

**Vote**

A motion to approve the FFY 2018 UPWP was made by the City of Boston (Boston Transportation Department) (J. Gillooly) and seconded by the Inner Core Committee (City of Somerville) (T. Bent). The motion carried.

**11. Action Item: Draft MPO 2017 Title VI Triennial Report—Betsy Harvey, MPO Staff**

B. Harvey presented the Draft Boston Region MPO 2017 Title VI Triennial Report. Title VI is part of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, a federal law that prohibits discrimination by all recipients and subrecipients of federal financial assistance on the basis of race, color or national origin, including those with Limited English Proficiency (LEP). FTA requires its recipients and subrecipients to report every three years, while FHWA requires annual reporting. Specific FHWA requirements for these reports are communicated through MassDOT's Office of Diversity and Civil Rights (ODCR). FTA requires reporting from transit agencies, state DOT's and MPOs. FHWA requires reporting from all recipients and subrecipients. FHWA's Title VI program also covers discrimination based on age, sex, income, and disability.

The report discusses how the MPO analyzes the impacts of its activities on protected populations, as well as public participation efforts.

As a subrecipient of both FTA and FHWA, the report covers requirements from both agencies, acting as both the FHWA's 2017 annual report and the FTA's 2017 Triennial report. Because the MPO is a subrecipient of the federal funds via MassDOT, the report will be submitted to MassDOT's ODCR upon final approval by the MPO.

**Vote**

A motion to release the Draft MPO 2017 Title VI Triennial Report for a 30-day public review period was made by the Metropolitan Area Planning Council (E. Bourassa) and seconded by At-Large City (City of Everett) (Jay Monty). The motion carried.

**12. Scenario Planning for Developing the Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP)—Anne McGahan, MPO Staff**

A. McGahan presented staff recommendations for *Scenario Planning for Developing the LRTP*. The MPO will conduct several rounds of scenarios prior to the next LRTP, which is scheduled for adoption in 2019. For the initial set of scenarios, staff is proposing a focus on transit for a number of reasons:

- Transit demand is expected to grow in the future even without changes to the transit system
- During the public outreach process for the last LRTP, the public highlighted the importance of investments to improve transit availability and reliability.
- Many of the MPO's adopted objectives relate to transit.
- The MPO did not allocate funding to major infrastructure for the time period from 2031 to 2040 in *Charting Progress to 2040*, awaiting the completion of several relevant planning processes including MassDOT's Focus 40 (the MBTA's long-range transit investment plan).

Ultimately, the MPO could flex highway funding to support specific transit projects, as was done for the Green Line Extension (GLX). The MPO could also use target funding for roadway investments that benefit bus transit, including transit signal priority and bus lanes.

***Staff Recommendations for Transit-Oriented Scenarios:***

1. Transit Expansion: Test Groups of Transit Expansion Projects from a Universe of Projects List
2. Transit Reliability and Modernization: Test Outcomes of Changes to Transit Operations

The two sets emphasize different aspects of MassDOT/MBTA investment goals: reliability, modernization, and expansion. These goal areas overlap with several areas of importance to the MPO: safety, system preservation, and capacity management and mobility. The two sets of proposed scenarios will describe what the region is expected to look like in 2040 and assume the demographics and baseline land use used in *Charting Progress to 2040*. Neither of the scenarios will reflect financial constraints. The goal for this set of scenarios is to investigate the results of programming certain types of transit projects.

Staff will use a number of tools to analyze the scenarios including the MPO's upgraded regional travel demand model, CubeLand (the MPO's land use model), Geographic Information Systems (GIS), transit asset management (TAM) tools being developed by the MBTA and regional transit agencies, transit service planning information, and data from the LRTP Needs Assessment and the MPO's All-Hazards Planning application.

Staff is working with MassDOT, MAPC, and transportation managers from other MPOs to update the demographic projections to be used in the next LRTP. Staff will use the

same milestone years (2020, 2030, and 2040) that were used in *Charting Progress to 2040* and update them with new American Community Survey data.

Staff is proposing no financial constraints for this set of scenarios. In later phases, the MPO may wish to consider financial constraint as a contextual factor.

### ***Discussion***

There was some discussion of the distinctions between the two sets of scenarios.

D. Mohler sought clarification that the second set would present a world in which the system maximized service without “expansion” as defined by significant additions to the network i.e. new stations or lines.

Jim Fitzgerald (City of Boston) (Boston Planning & Development Agency) felt it would be wise to model the second set (reliability and modernization) with different land use and demographic options, including transit-oriented development.

M. Gowing asked whether the scenarios would include Commuter Rail. A. McGahan replied that they would.

J. Monty asked how staff will select which expansion projects to model in the first set of scenarios. A. McGahan replied that staff will draw from the possible expansion projects in the *Charting Progress to 2040* Universe of Projects (Appendix B) as well as any projects that may be included in plans from other agencies, such as the MBTA’s Focus40 plan.

J. Monty asked whether the cost for users of the system (fares or tolls) would be factored into the scenarios to determine mode shift.

D. Mohler questioned whether it was wise to include all the possible expansion projects included in the LRTP, even ones that are unlikely to be constructed. D. Mohler expressed the opinion that these two sets of scenarios are designed to show that an approach focused on expansion costs more and does less to improve the system than an approach that focuses investments on reliability and modernization efforts. Additionally, D. Mohler questioned how modeling these scenarios without financial constraint would help members choose an eventual list of projects to include in the next LRTP.

K. Quackenbush added that, at this stage in the planning process, the MPO might want to err on the side of optimism and inclusivity when modelling scenarios in order to test the extent to which large-scale expansion does or does not improve the overall system.



E. Bourassa reviewed the schedule for scenario planning over the next year and asked whether there is a limit on the number of times staff may run the regional travel demand model. K. Quackenbush replied that within time and budget constraints, this number of model runs is flexible.

E. Bourassa asked about the metrics by which staff will determine the comparison between the outcomes of the two scenarios. E. Bourassa added that he liked the idea of looking at the system through an operations framework and wondered if it was possible to also think about modeling pricing strategies within the reliability and modernization scenario. He encouraged the MPO to also look at these issues along with highway scenarios, for example modeling the implementation of congestion pricing or VMT fees.

J. Monty added that modeling the implementation of carbon pricing or parking fee structures would be useful.

R. Canale noted that one unknown variable in this process is the introduction of Automated Vehicles/Connected Vehicles (AV/CVs) and wondered if there was a way to incorporate this into the development of the LRTP. K. Quackenbush replied that MPO staff (led by S. Peterson) is currently conducting some work related to AV/CVs and that a future round of scenario planning for the LRTP could potentially look at their impact on the system.

K. Miller agreed with other members that conducting scenarios unconstrained by finances might not yield the best results given that any one of the possible expansion projects could cost more than the entirety of the MPO's allocated target funding. He asked that staff reserve time for model runs that reflect cost. Also, K. Miller asked whether either set of transit scenarios will include the bus network, adding that this has implications for equity issues given that users of the bus network are generally more low-income than rapid transit users. A. McGahan replied that staff initially considered proposing a third scenario to investigate redesigning the bus network, but subsequently discovered that MassDOT is conducting a study regarding the bus network and decided to hold off in order to review the results of that work first.

David Koses (At-Large City) (City of Newton) added that scenarios looking at AV/CVs and different tolling options would be useful.

J. Gillooly agreed that it is unclear how the MPO would use the information gathered from scenarios that are financially unconstrained.

Dennis Giombetti (MetroWest Regional Collaborative) (Town of Framingham) added that these scenarios seemed more academic in nature, when the MPO must eventually make concrete financial decisions for the next LRTP.

K. Quackenbush stated that he understood members' reservations regarding unconstrained financial scenarios, but added that the fact that there is so much time before adopting the next LRTP means that there is room to investigate some more academic ideas in order to gather the most data possible.

D. Mohler reiterated that he is not convinced these scenarios are the way to go. He asked how long a regional travel demand model run takes and the relative cost of each run. S. Peterson replied that a complex transit-related model run would cost approximately \$10,000 and take 3 weeks.

E. Bourassa asked D. Mohler to clarify his concern. D. Mohler restated that his concern is modeling a future that will never happen i.e. one in which an infinite amount of funds for transit expansion exists, as well as the opinion that these scenarios were designed to prove a hypothesis that staff and members already believe is true—that investing in reliability and modernization is more efficacious than expansion. D. Mohler added that scenario planning should consist of a range of possible futures and staff should select projects that serve each possible future.

E. Bourassa agreed but added that what staff has proposed is not that far removed from what D. Mohler suggests, but that scenarios should possibly be more nuanced and financially conservative. E. Bourassa added that testing policies is worthwhile and he is personally interested in testing policies related to pricing.

M. Gowing agreed that funding is always an issue but felt it was useful to determine what kind of funding is necessary (federal, state, or otherwise) to achieve desired impacts.

K. Quackenbush stated that he heard the concerns of members, and asked if the board would be more comfortable with a scenario that concentrates on operations and management improvements in order to move away from expansion projects.

J. Gillooly felt that focusing on maintenance and improving the existing network but modeling improvements with different amounts of funding would be useful in order to show the real benefits of additional investment.

K. Quackenbush stated that the general consensus of the board seemed to be that the scenarios presented at this meeting were not exactly what the MPO is comfortable pursuing, and agreed that staff should propose new scenarios to the MPO.

### **13. Representation of Regional Transit Agencies on the MPO Board— *Elizabeth Moore, Director of Policy and Planning, MPO Staff***

E. Moore presented the discussion topic of representation of Regional Transit Agencies (RTAs) on the MPO Board. Based on MAP-21 and the FAST Act, as well as the 2014 certification review, the MPO must have formal representation from MetroWest Regional Transit Authority (MWRTA) and Cape Anne Transportation Authority (CATA). The requirements specify that the board must have members that represent collective operator interests, have equal decision-making rights, and notes that transit operators may also serve as a local representative.

At the end of previous discussion on this topic (January 19, 2017), MPO members expressed an interest in learning more about the possibility of creating a transit committee and tasked staff with researching the structure of transit committees on other MPOs. Staff investigated five MPOs with transit committees:

1. Portland Area Comprehensive Transportation System (PACTS), Portland, ME
2. Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission (SPC), Pittsburgh, PA
3. Northeast Ohio Areawide Coordinating Agency (NOACA), Cleveland, OH
4. Mid-America Regional Council (MARC), Kansas City, MO and KS
5. Atlanta Regional Commission (ARC), Atlanta, GA.

The primary functions of transit committees at other MPOs are to integrate transit planning in the MPO process, discuss general transit policy, improve coordination among transit services, select and prioritize transit projects for programming, and allocate federal funding among transit operators. A transit committee at the Boston Region MPO could potentially do all of these except allocate federal funding among transit operators [a function held by MassDOT]. In addition, the committee could weigh in on transit investments, develop metrics/targets for FTA-required safety and transit asset measures, provide data or coordinate data collection for different initiatives, advocate for TIP roadway projects to support transit, review proposed projects, confirm whether and where various services are using the network, and provide input to the Community Transportation Investment Program.

Possible members of a committee could include public transit operators, private operators, Transportation Management Associations (TMAs,) MPO local representatives, state DOTs or other transportation agencies (voting or non-voting),

FTA (non-voting), advocates or other interested parties (non-voting), Mass Bus Association, Mass Commute, Councils on Aging, Regional Coordinating Councils, AMTRAK, and the Northern New England Passenger Rail Authority (NNEPRA).

Staff also collected data on transit operators in the region and the extent of their services. CATA and MWRTA operate entirely within the MPO region. Greater Attleboro Taunton Regional Transit Authority (GATRA) has almost as many routes operating in the MPO as MWRTA. Brockton Area Transit (BAT) and GATRA operate a high number of trips in the region and BAT makes a significant number of stops. TMAs include 128 Business Council, Charles River, CrossTown Connect, MASCO, Middlesex 3, and Neponset Valley. MASCO operates a significant number of trips and stops in the region. Charles River makes more stops than CATA, while 128 serves the most towns. The 128 and Charles River TMAs operate almost as many trips as CATA. Municipal transit services in the region include Bedford Local Transit, Beverly Shuttle, Burlington Public Transit, Dedham Local Bus, Lexpress, and Mission Hill LINK. All of these services operate within the MPO region and trips are comparable to some of the TMAs, as are stops. InterCity Bus services include Concord Coach and Peter Pan, which make almost as many trips as CATA. Half of Inter-City buses make no stops in the MPO on their way to Boston, others make several.

Members must resolve the following questions: Is a transit committee the model to pursue? Which operators would be represented? Which members would have a vote, and how would votes be allocated? How would the committee be represented on the MPO board? If this is not the correct model, what is? Other models include giving CATA and MWRTA each a vote on the MPO, having subregional reps also represent the interests of transit operators in their regions, having MassDOT Rail & Transit represent the interests of all transit operators, or having the MBTA represent the interests of all transit operators. The MPO had committed to having this issue resolved by November 2016 and FTA is anxious for progress. The MPO should aim to have something in place by fall 2017, so that the MPO board has full RTA representation in place for the next TIP and UPWP development cycles.

### ***Discussion***

Ed Carr (MWRTA) stated that MWRTA would like a seat on the MPO board. E. Carr added that while he cannot speak for other operators, he felt the perspective of additional operators would be useful, particularly regarding First Mile/Last Mile and Complete Streets efforts.

E. Bourassa noted that he felt that a transit committee would better serve the voices of all operators and that there may be a concern that adding RTA seats to the board would

add extra voice to specific municipal subregions. E. Bourassa added that he has spoken with TMAs and his sense is that a transit-specific committee would be welcomed. (Some TMAs already participate in the Advisory Council.) P. Regan suggested that this may impact the structure of the Advisory Council.

D. Giombetti was of the opinion that the MPO should keep it simple and have a rotating seat for CATA and MWRTA.

Steve Olanoff (Three Rivers Interlocal Council) (Town of Norwood/NVCC) expressed support for a Transit Committee model.

D. Koses added that an option is that transit operators could run for election for a seat, like cities and towns.

P. Regan reiterated that the priority for FTA is representation for MWRTA and CATA.

E. Moore noted that other MPOs with transit committees felt having a forum for transit operators to coordinate was quite useful.

K. Miller added that it would be possible to have a hybrid model with seats for MWRTA, CATA, and a transit committee.

D. Mohler noted that adding members raises concerns of misbalancing voting strength. D. Mohler ended the discussion by asking staff to speak with operators to gauge interest in a transit committee, and to add as an action item at an upcoming meeting agenda, the discussion regarding the establishment of a committee.

#### **14.Members' Items**

There were none.

#### **15.Adjourn**

A motion to adjourn was made by the MBTA Advisory Board (P. Regan) and seconded by At-Large Town (Town of Lexington) (R. Canale). The motion carried.

## Attendance

---

<b>Members</b>	<b>Representatives and Alternates</b>
At-Large City (City of Everett)	Jay Monty
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 Planning & Development Agency)	Jim Fitzgerald
City of Boston (Boston Transportation Department)	Jim Gillooly
Federal Highway Administration	Kenneth Miller Nelson Hoffman
Federal Transit Administration	
Inner Core Committee (City of Somerville)	Tom Bent
Massachusetts Department of Transportation	David Mohler
MassDOT Highway Division	Marie Rose
Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority (MBTA)	Eric Waaramaa
Massachusetts Port Authority	Laura Gilmore
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)	Richard Reed
North Shore Task Force (City of Beverly)	
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)	
Three Rivers Interlocal Council (Town of Norwood/NVCC)	Steve Olanoff

---

---

<b>Other Attendees</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>
Ivey St. John	RCIC
Rachel Brown	RCIC
Dave Matton	HSH
Bryan Pounds	MassDOT OTP
Tom Kadzis	COB-BTD
Ed Carr	MWRTA
Tom Berkley	LSTAR
Carl Seglem	Boston Resident
Pat Brown	Sudbury Resident
Georgia McEaddy	Boston resident
Yvonne Lalyre	UNLR, Boston

---

---

**MPO Staff/Central Transportation Planning Staff**

---

Karl Quackenbush  
Lourenço Dantas  
Róisín Foley  
Hiral Gandhi  
Betsy Harvey  
Sandy Johnston  
Ali Kleyman  
Robin Mannion  
Anne McGahan  
Elizabeth Moore  
Florence Ngai  
Scott Peterson  
Jen Rowe  
Michelle Scott

---