

# Memorandum for the Record

## Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization Meeting

### December 7, 2017 Meeting

10:00 AM–1:17 PM, Courtyard Marriott Hotel, 64 University Avenue, Westwood

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

### Decisions

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

- Approve the minutes of the October 19, 2017 meeting
- Approve Adjustment 2 to Federal Fiscal Years (FFYs) 2018–22 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)
- Approve the work program for *Transportation Mitigation of Major Developments: Review of Strategies*
- Approve the work program for *MBTA 2018 Title VI Program Monitoring*
- Approve the work program for *MBTA 2019 Title VI Program Monitoring*

### Meeting Agenda

#### 1. Introductions

See attendance on page 14.

#### 2. Welcome Remarks by the Host Municipality: Town of Westwood— *Michael Jaillet, Town Administrator*

M. Jaillet presented an overview of recent development in Westwood. Westwood currently has a population of 14,618. Housing stock in Westwood consists of approximately 5,000 single family and 1,000 multifamily homes. Meditech is the largest of 400 businesses located in town. Westwood boasts an easy commute into Boston, with two MBTA Commuter Rail stations and three highways. Amtrak also serves Route 128/University Avenue Station. Recent development includes the 2.1-million square foot University Station mixed-use development, where the Courtyard Marriott hotel is located. In conjunction with this project, the town pursued traffic calming measures on Canton Street. The town has also partnered with a developer on a revitalization project in Islington Center, and has built several new public safety facilities.

M. Jaillet noted that since the early 1990s, the town has pursued reconstruction of the Canton Interchange cloverleaf. The town believes that the interchange project,

abandoned in 1972, has constrained economic development in Westwood, Norwood, Canton, and other towns in the area. In the 1990s, the town worked with MassDOT to build Route 128/University Avenue Station and negotiated a settlement in which the state promised to fund the replacement of the interchange. M. Jaillet stated that the town understands that this would be an expensive project (the estimated cost is \$225 million), but stressed that the lost tax revenue has been a significant burden to Westwood and other towns since the early 1970s. M. Jaillet encouraged the MPO and the state to find a solution to advance the project.

### **3. Public Comments**

Charles Aspinwall (Town Administrator, Canton) thanked M. Jaillet for his comments regarding the Canton Interchange and expressed support for the project.

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

D. Mohler reported that four communities have officially chosen to leave the Boston Region MPO and join the Old Colony MPO. The four communities are Stoughton, Pembroke, Hanover, and Duxbury. These four communities were previously members of both MPOs and had been told by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) that this was not permitted.

D. Mohler also reported that the Massachusetts Association of Regional Planning Agencies (MARPA) will meet on January 31, 2018. At this meeting MassDOT will distribute TIP target funding amounts to MPOs.

#### ***Discussion***

Dennis Giombetti (MetroWest Regional Collaborative) (Town of Framingham) asked whether there are currently any MPO-funded projects in these communities. K. Quackenbush replied that there are no MPO target-funded projects in these communities.

Tom O'Rourke (Three Rivers Interlocal Council) (Town of Norwood/NVCC) asked whether the absence of the four departing communities would have an impact on the Boston Region MPO's funding. D. Mohler replied that MPO TIP target funding is based upon a formula determined by MARPA. This formula has not been adjusted since the early 1990s, and likely would not change. K. Quackenbush noted that there is a separate funding source for planning studies, which could be affected by the departures. MARPA has updated this formula more recently than the TIP target funding formula.

Jim Gillooly (City of Boston) (Boston Transportation Department) noted that the MPO may be owed funds, regardless of the exit of these four communities, given the growth that the region has experienced [population is one factor in the funding distribution formula]. Eric Bourassa (Metropolitan Area Planning Council) replied that this issue has surfaced among the regional planning agencies (RPAs), but there has never been a real effort to redo these formulas. If there were a process, it likely would be lengthy and deliberate.

Nelson Hoffman (FHWA) noted that the MPO boundaries need to be officially readjusted and approved by the governor. D. Mohler replied that he will work with the secretary and governor to craft a letter to FHWA [noting the redesignation of those municipalities]. MPO staff will edit the MPO's website, maps, and all printed and electronic materials to reflect the change.

## **5. Committee Chairs' Reports**

There were none.

## **6. Regional Transportation Advisory Council Report—*Tegin Teich, Chair, Regional Transportation Advisory Council***

T. Teich reported that the Advisory Council will meet on December 13, 2017, at 3:00 PM.

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

K. Quackenbush introduced Katie Pincus in her new role as manager of the Transit Analysis and Planning group at the Central Transportation Planning Staff (CTPS) (MPO staff).

## **8. Action Item: Approval of October 19, 2017, MPO Meeting Minutes—*Róisín Foley, MPO Staff***

A motion to approve the minutes of the meeting of October 19, 2017, was made by the Inner Core Committee (City of Somerville) (Tom Bent) and seconded by the North Suburban Planning Council (City of Woburn) (Tina Cassidy). The motion carried.

## **9. Action Item: Draft Adjustment 2 to Federal Fiscal Years (FFYs) 2018–22 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)—*Alexandra (Ali) Kleyman, MPO Staff***

A. Kleyman presented the draft Adjustment 2 to the FFYs 2018–22 TIP. The full TIP tables, and a simplified version, are available on the MPO's meeting calendar. All of the proposed changes qualify as adjustments; this means that they do not need to be

released for public comment but can be directly approved by the MPO Board. All of the proposed changes in Adjustment 2 take place in FFY 2018.

Adjustment 2 incorporates additional funds that the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) granted to the MetroWest Regional Transit Authority (MWRTA) as part of 5307 funds. In addition, as a result of an audit by FTA, MWRTA transferred some funding from capital programs to operating programs.

### ***Vote***

A motion to approve Adjustment 2 to the FFYs 2018–22 TIP was made by the Inner Core Committee (City of Somerville) (T. Bent) and seconded by At-Large Town (Town of Lexington) (Richard Canale). The motion carried.

## **10. Action Item: Work Program for Transportation Mitigation of Major Developments: Review of Strategies—Scott Peterson, MPO Staff**

S. Peterson presented the work program for *Transportation Mitigation of Major Developments: Review of Strategies*. This is a Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)-funded study. This study will build on the research from the MPO's *Core Capacity Constraints* study, which documented processes used by nine communities in the urban core to review proposed developments and mitigate their impacts on the transportation system. In this new study, the original study area will be expanded to include all communities in the Boston Region MPO. MPO staff will investigate those communities' experiences with transportation mitigation strategies, focusing on strategies that did or did not work during recently completed projects.

This study will identify as many as 20 recent and planned developments. Staff will meet with representatives from the communities where the developments have been planned or built. The purpose of these meetings is to learn how each community negotiated with each developer on mitigation measures and funding, and to learn resultant outcomes of the mitigations, including any lessons learned during the process. The total cost of this project is estimated to be \$50,000.

### ***Discussion***

E. Bourassa noted that Massachusetts law is fairly vague regarding what municipalities are allowed to do in terms of mitigating development. There are very few examples of developer mitigation funds that go to the transit system—the Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority (MBTA) or RTAs—because current practices are focused on roadways. E. Bourassa also stated that he and his colleagues [at MAPC] believe that the majority of traffic studies done by developers overestimate trip generation because guidance from the Institute of Traffic Engineers uses examples that are not specific to

[developments in] New England. T. Teich commented that this may point to trip thresholds as an inadequate measure of mitigation efforts.

D. Mohler expressed concern that the budget for this study is too limited to yield useful results.

T. Bent asked whether there are currently any requirements for developers or municipalities to conduct before and after counts. D. Mohler replied that monitoring is sometimes required as part of the environmental permitting process. The Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection (MassDEP) is responsible for this monitoring and enforcement. E. Bourassa replied that MAPC has received some of those reports, and that some municipalities monitor outcomes on their own.

Laura Smead (Canton Town Planner) expressed support for the study and suggested Canton, Westwood, and Sharon as possible partners for MPO staff in this effort.

#### ***Vote***

A motion to approve the work program for *Transportation Mitigation of Major Developments: Review of Strategies* was made by the Inner Core Committee (City of Somerville) (T. Bent) and seconded by At-Large Town (Town of Lexington) (R. Canale). MassDOT (D. Mohler) opposed the motion. The motion carried.

### **11. Action Item: Work Programs for MBTA 2018 Title VI Program Monitoring and MBTA 2019 Title VI Program Monitoring—Nicholas Hart, MPO Staff**

N. Hart presented the work programs for *MBTA 2018 Title VI Program Monitoring* and *MBTA 2019 Title VI Program Monitoring*. The two scopes are very similar, outlining work performed by MPO staff for the MBTA in the interim years between triennial report submissions to FTA. Every three years, the MBTA is required to submit a report to FTA's Office of Civil Rights detailing efforts to comply with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The MBTA submitted its most recent triennial Title VI report in 2017. For years in which the MBTA does not submit a triennial report, FTA requires the Authority to perform annual Title VI monitoring and internal reporting to identify and address problems early and ensure ongoing Title VI compliance. MPO staff has performed data collection and analysis for MBTA Title VI reporting since the 1980s and has produced the MBTA's 2005, 2008, 2011, 2014, and 2017 Title VI triennial reports. These two work programs represent a continuation of CTPS's involvement in the MBTA's Title VI monitoring efforts, and outline the monitoring that will be completed in state fiscal years (SFYs) 2018 and 2019.

MPO staff will assist the MBTA by collecting data and assessing performance (based on existing MBTA service standards and policies) of specific service indicators, according to the MBTA's monitoring schedule. CTPS will then compare the performance of services rendered to predominantly minority riders with the performance of services rendered to predominantly nonminority riders, as required by the MBTA's Disparate Impact and Disproportionate Burden Policy, to determine if there are disparate impacts on the basis of race, color, or national origin.

The Title VI Circular identifies a number of service indicators for service monitoring for which a comparative analysis must be completed. The MBTA monitors most service indicators annually, including vehicle load, vehicle headway, on-time performance, availability, span of service, platform accessibility, vehicle accessibility, vehicle assignment, and the distribution, and/or operability of two types of transit amenities: 1) automated-fare-collection (AFC) gates, fare vending machines, and retail sales outlets; and 2) station escalators. Some indicators are only monitored biannually, which accounts for the difference in estimated cost between the two work scopes.

The total cost of the 2018 work is estimated to be \$77,150. The total cost of the 2019 work is estimated to be \$84,260. Both scopes are funded by the MBTA.

**Vote**

A motion to approve the work programs for *MBTA 2018 Title VI Program Monitoring* and *MBTA 2019 Title VI Program Monitoring* was made by the MBTA Advisory Board (Paul Regan) and seconded by MAPC (E. Bourassa). The motion carried.

**12. Proposed Fiscal Year 2018 Transit Asset Management (TAM) Targets for the Boston Region—Michelle Scott, MPO Staff, Victor Rivas and Satyen Patel, MBTA**

***Handouts Posted to the MPO Meeting Calendar***

1. Technical Memorandum: Proposed SFY 2018 TAM Targets for the Boston Region

The MPO Board previously heard from M. Scott, V. Rivas, and S. Patel in a May 2017 presentation that introduced the concept of TAM and described a time line for transit agency and MPO compliance with FTA's TAM Rule. TAM is a business model that prioritizes funding based on the condition of transit assets to achieve or maintain transit networks in a state of good repair (SGR). SGR is defined as the condition in which a capital asset is able to operate at a full level of performance. The TAM Rule sets requirements to help achieve and maintain SGR for the nation's public transportation assets. The TAM rule requires FTA grantees to develop a TAM Plan, submit an asset inventory to the National Transit Database (NTD), and set performance targets for the

following year. Transit agencies must meet these requirements three months after the close of their fiscal years, so for the MBTA that means by October 2018. The MBTA and other agencies have four years to review and assess the condition of 100 percent of their facilities and submit them to the NTD. In SFY 2020, transit agencies will need to submit a narrative describing their progress toward addressing performance targets. This allows agencies to align their Capital Investment Program (CIP) programs to the outputs of the TAM Plan to ensure that investment on capital renewals concur with the performance objectives and goals stated within the plan, and to address the known risks directly. There are no rewards or penalties for progress toward targets. The main responsibilities for the MPO are to adopt regional targets and incorporate these targets into MPO certification documents and investment processes. MassDOT, transit agencies, and the MPO must coordinate to meet these requirements.

The MBTA, Cape Ann Transportation Authority (CATA), and MWRTA have set their SFY 2018 TAM targets. Once transit agencies set their targets, MPOs have 180 days to set TAM targets for their regions. MPO staff recommends that the MPO adopt these same targets, presented in the memo posted to the MPO's meeting calendar.

The proposed targets are based on the same one-year time frame used by transit agencies and reflect the agencies' most recent data on the number, age, and condition of their assets, and their expectations and capital investment plans for improving these assets during SFY 2018. Proposed targets are reported separately for the MBTA, CATA, and MWRTA. Transit agencies can potentially have a number of targets within each transit asset category, and reporting to NTD is highly specific. For this MPO target-setting exercise, MPO staff has aggregated targets within asset categories when practicable. These targets do not yet include other, smaller FTA 5310 funding subrecipients. MassDOT's Rail and Transit Division will coordinate with these agencies to develop targets in conjunction with developing a group TAM plan.

Table 3 on page six of the TAM memo shows the specific TAM performance measures and their types. The asset categories are equipment, rolling stock, facilities, and infrastructure. The goal for equipment and rolling stock is to minimize the percentage of assets that have met or exceeded their Useful Life Benchmark (ULB). The ULB is the expected lifecycle of a capital asset for a particular transit provider's operating environment. For this submission, the MBTA chose not to adjust the default ULB provided by FTA. The goal for facilities is to minimize the percentage of assets with condition ratings below 3.0 on FTA's Transit Economic Requirements Model (TERM) scale. The TERM scale is a condition-based rating of 1-5, with 5 as "Excellent (near new condition)". The goal for infrastructure is to minimize the percentage of track segments with speed restrictions.

Table 4 on page 10 of the memo shows proposed targets relating to equipment. Table 5 on page 11 of the memo shows targets for rolling stock. Table 6 on page 12 of the memo shows targets for facilities. Table 7 on page 13 of the memo shows targets for infrastructure. These targets have a one-year horizon. They reflect the agencies' most recent data available for the number, age, and condition of their assets, and their expectations and capital investment plans for improving these assets during SFY 2018. These targets do not reflect planned transit asset procurements that will come into service beyond SFY 2018. Because of this short time horizon, some targets may reflect short-term trends leaning opposite of the desired direction. For example, the MBTA's rolling stock target for 2018 shows that the percentage of Heavy Rail vehicles exceeding their ULB will increase from 45 percent to 58 percent. This is because the entire fleet of Red Line III cars will pass their ULB before new cars that have already been purchased come into service. V. Rivas stated that while this may seem alarming, with new Red and Orange Line car procurements, the percentage of cars that exceed the ULB should drop to zero in coming years. Internally, the MBTA is tracking these measures beyond the one-year horizon required by FTA.

V. Rivas noted that FTA is attempting to collect performance data from every transit provider in the nation, which means that some metrics may not seem tailored to the MBTA. There are other ways to measure asset condition and performance, but for equipment and rolling stock FTA has chosen to use age.

The MPO will be incorporating a set of initial TAM targets and information in the FFYs 2019-23 TIP, planned for endorsement in May 2018. Staff hopes that during TIP development, transit agencies can discuss investments proposed for the next TIP in the context for performance-targets. After the end of June 2018, transit agencies and MPO can look at the progress that has been made. Agency and group TAM Plans, asset inventories, and SFY 2019 targets are due in October 2018.

### ***Discussion***

P. Regan asked about other equipment, in particular smaller equipment for managing snow, noting that it was alarming to see the target for 2018 move from 35% to 37% when so much money has been spent. S. Patel replied that FTA defines equipment as vehicles and other wheeled equipment that serves the system but doesn't necessarily carry customers. Hand-held equipment is not included such as snow blowers. In addition, this case demonstrates the limitations of age-based targets. Much of the MBTA's recent investments have gone into refurbishing existing equipment, but this affects condition, and not equipment age.

P. Regan noted that CATA and MWRTA rent or lease some of their vehicles, and asked how this is reflected. M. Scott replied that agencies must reflect targets for assets for which they have direct capital responsibility.

K. Miller (FHWA) asked S. Patel to clarify that currently the MBTA does not have the option of using a condition-based rating for rolling stock. S. Patel replied that they can do that internally, but for the purposes of reporting to FTA and NTD they must use age. V. Rivas noted that for the purposes of this exercise the MBTA is focusing on what is required under the TAM rule, but that internal thinking is more sophisticated.

T. Teich expressed concern that reporting this data via the NTD without the benefit of projections beyond 2018 creates a negative picture for the public in terms of the MBTA's progress [as some targets seem to show deteriorating asset condition]. S. Patel agreed and stated that the MBTA has expressed this and other concerns to FTA, which they hope will be incorporated into future assessments. Joy Glynn (MWRTA) added that MWRTA staff, as well as MBTA staff, participate with FTA on TAM related trainings and coordination as often as possible.

Jay Monty (At-Large City) (City of Everett) asked about FTA's ultimate goal in collecting this data. V. Rivas replied that this is the next phase of NTD. The idea is to set performance targets and increase transparency among providers in order to create a clearer picture of the nation's transit assets. In 2019, providers will need to explain why they did or did not meet targets. This process also allows the MBTA, MassDOT, and the MPO to see which targets are linked directly to the TIP and to prioritize investments better.

D. Mohler noted that these are not targets in the sense of goals, but projections based on CIP investments that have already been planned. M. Scott noted that Transit Asset Management plans developed by transit agencies may provide a longer-term outlook on performance with respect to these measures.

J. Gillooly suggested that the MPO should be looking further ahead than what the MBTA has presented [one-year target], given that their targets are really based on investments that are already planned. The MPO may have room to be more aspirational and think more long-term. The MPO may also benefit from using other measures that the MBTA tracks internally when considering investments in the transit system.

D. Mohler asked whether the TERM scale is useful for providing an assessment of facility condition, given that employees likely would not rate facilities drastically differently from year to year. V. Rivas replied that S. Patel has worked very closely with those in charge of the facilities' maintenance. Internally, the MBTA has an SGR

database that allows them to track facility conditions beyond one year. The aggregate number does not illustrate the condition of individual facilities. S. Patel added that a single underground station can be made up of as many as 75 individual systems, such as HVAC, lighting, and communications. The single TERM scale rating does not necessarily adequately allow the MBTA to track the condition of these individual systems and target investments appropriately; this is why they are working to develop internal standards for facilities that more accurately assess condition and target investments beyond the reporting that the TAM rule requires.

D. Mohler also noted that the condition of facilities does not account for obsolescence. For example, a facility may be in good condition, but it may not meet the needs of upgraded buses. MBTA agrees with this statement, which is why the importance of Strategy and Planning, Decision Making, and Life Cycle Delivery in the management of assets is an essential core function of the MBTA.

P. Regan asked whether NTD will reflect information on individual parts of the system. V. Rivas said that more detailed information will be submitted to NTD than was included in the performance targets presentation, although he did not specify the level of detail that will be made available to the general public.

Dennis Crowley (Southwest Advisory Planning Committee) (Town of Medway) asked how transit agencies will pay for work to meet these federal requirements. V. Rivas explained that transit agencies may use a portion of their federal formula dollars to meet these requirements, as well as their own funds. V. Rivas stressed that TAM represents good business practice and that the MBTA had been engaged in these types of activities internally for years prior to the TAM rule.

### **13. MassDOT Bridge Prioritization System and the Process for Selecting Bridges for TIP Programming—*Alex Bardow, MassDOT***

Previous to the early 2000s, there were no objective statewide selection criteria for programming bridges for repair or reconstruction. Bridges only had to be structurally deficient (SD) and eligible for federal bridge funds. Under the current system, in place since January 2008, prioritization is based on the risk that a bridge's condition poses to the transportation network of which it is a part. This system uses AASHTOWare Bridge Management (BM) software (formerly PONTIS) to identify which bridges are deteriorating faster than others. AASHTO is the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials. AASHTOWare BM calculates a Health Index (HI) for each bridge and predicts the change in HI over time. This allows MassDOT to rank SD and non-SD bridges and identify non-SD bridges that need preservation.

The prioritization system assigns numerical values from 0 to 100 (higher numbers indicating a higher priority) to the three following criteria: Condition Loss (CL), HI change, and Highway Evaluation Factor (HEF). CL is a measure of the current condition of a bridge. HI change is measured over a set 15-year period. The larger the percentage change, the faster the deterioration of a bridge. The Highway Evaluation Factor (HEF) considers an average of five component values that express a particular bridge's importance to the overall highway network. The three criteria are weighted and combined to determine a value. The higher a rank value, the higher priority a bridge. This creates an objective ranking of bridges that need work sooner than others. This system is used to identify candidates for TIP funding via the Bridge Maintenance program.

The goals of the Bridge Maintenance program are to reduce the number of SD bridges overall, and SD bridges considered to be at end of their useful life. Under the 2015 federal surface transportation funding legislation, Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act, the deck area of SD bridges on the National Highway System (NHS) must be below 10 percent of the total NHS deck area.

Statewide TIP lists are prepared from candidate bridges based on these goals and available funding. The statewide ranked bridge list is sorted according to MassDOT highway district and ranked within the district. Each district bridge list is further sorted by SD and non-SD bridges and eligible funding categories. District input and geographical concerns are considered in addition to rankings.

### ***Discussion***

R. Canale asked whether the statewide ranked bridge list is publically available. A. Bardow replied that it is not, but can be supplied by the MassDOT Highway Division District Coordinator. D. Mohler clarified that it is not made publically available for security reasons.

T. Teich stressed that this process is vague from the perspective of municipalities, and asked that there be more conversation at the MassDOT Highway District level so that municipalities can better understand how bridges in their communities are or are not chosen for inclusion in the STIP.

**14.FFYs 2019-23 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)  
Development: Draft Universe of Projects and Proposed Project  
Evaluations—Alexandra (Ali) Kleyman, MPO Staff**

***Handouts Posted to the MPO's Meeting Calendar***

- a) Table 1: FFYs 2019–23 TIP Development—Currently Programmed Target Projects (Section 1A, Regionally Prioritized), 2018–22
- b) Table 2: FFYs 2019–23 TIP Development—Universe of Unprogrammed Projects

[E. Bourassa assumed the chair for this agenda item.]

Because of the length of the meeting [running behind schedule], A. Kleyman confined her presentation to the Draft Universe of Projects. MPO staff plans to evaluate projects starting the week following this meeting and lasting until mid-January 2018. The Universe list is organized by MAPC subregion. Projects in yellow are priority projects to be evaluated by MPO staff for the first time. Projects in green were previously scored and will be considered for TIP funding this year. Projects in white are active MassDOT projects that have not been evaluated and will not be ready for evaluation this year. Projects in gray are either no longer being actively pursued, no longer municipal or MassDOT priorities, or have been accomplished with other funds. There are a total of 70 active projects in the Universe, with nine to be evaluated for the first time this year.

A. Kleyman also briefly reviewed the planned schedule for TIP development, which is beginning earlier this year to accommodate the schedule instituted last year [which lines up with the state's CIP development schedule]. A. Kleyman plans to post initial project evaluations in mid-January and to present these results, municipal comments, and suggested revisions in early February.

***Discussion***

K. Miller asked why projects in white will not be evaluated. A. Kleyman replied that reasons vary, but some proponents never submitted a Functional Design Report for the project, which provides necessary information used for project evaluation. K. Miller replied that some projects without FDRs are included in the LRTP. K. Quackenbush and Anne McGahan (MPO staff) clarified that LRTP's project evaluation score has different criteria than the TIP's evaluation score. K. Miller noted that this may be, but that the MPO could have an opportunity to take on a major infrastructure project like the Canton Interchange [which is not programmed in the LRTP].

**15.Members Items**

Patricia Donovan (Hull resident) commented on transportation issues that affect Hull, including what she believes is inadequate ferry service between Hull and downtown

Boston, and fare evasion as a result of the smartphone payment app. E. Bourassa advised P. Donovan to follow up with the MBTA about these issues.

T. Bent thanked K. Quackenbush and MPO staff for participating in a presentation for Tufts University graduate students regarding TIP development and the work of the MPO.

### **16. Adjourn**

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

## Attendance

Members	Representatives and Alternates
At-Large City (City of Everett)	Jay Monty
At-Large City (City of Newton)	David Koses
At-Large Town (Town of Arlington)	Laura Wiener
At-Large Town (Town of Lexington)	Richard Canale
City of Boston (Boston Planning & Development Agency)	
City of Boston (Boston Transportation Department)	Jim Gillooly
	Tom Kadzis
	Kenneth Miller
Federal Highway Administration	
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	
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)	Aaron Clausen
North Suburban Planning Council (City of Woburn)	Tina Cassidy
Regional Transportation Advisory Council	Tegin Teich
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

---

<b>Other Attendees</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>
Nora Loughnane	Town of Westwood
Michael Jaillet	Town of Westwood
Alex Bardow	MassDOT
Victor Rivas	MBTA
Satyen Patel	MBTA
Steve Olanoff	TRIC Alternate
Kurt Salmoiraghi	FHWA
Nelson Hoffman	FHWA
Joy Glynn	MWRTA
Laura Smead	Town of Canton
Charles Aspinwall	Town of Canton
Susan Price	TRIC- Sharon
Patricia Donovan	Hull
James Pitrolo	Hull
Bryan Pounds	MassDOT
Linda Walsh	MassDOT
Pamela Marquis	MassDOT
Karen Dumaine	NVTMA

---

---

**MPO Staff/Central Transportation Planning Staff**

---

Karl Quackenbush, Executive Director  
Robin Mannion  
Lourenço Dantas  
Róisín Foley  
Nicholas Hart  
Alexandra Kleyman  
Anne McGahan  
Scott Peterson  
Jen Rowe  
Michelle Scott

---