

Memorandum for the Record

Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization Meeting

January 18, 2018 Meeting

10:00 AM–12:05 PM, State Transportation Building, Conference Rooms 2 and 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 (MPO) agreed to the following:

- Approve the minutes of the November 16, 2017, meeting
- Approve the minutes of the December 7, 2017, meeting
- Approve Amendment Two to the federal fiscal years (FFYs) 2018–22 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)
- Release draft Amendment Three to the FFYs 2018–22 TIP for a 30 day public review period

Meeting Agenda

1. Introductions

See attendance on page 14.

2. Public Comments

Lee Auspitz (resident of Somerville) previously asked the MPO, MassDOT, and Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority (MBTA) to clarify in its documents that the planned Green Line Extension (GLX) does not extend into Medford Hillside. L. Auspitz reported that this change has been made and thanked the responsible parties.

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

There was none.

4. Committee Chairs' Reports

There were none.

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

T. Teich reported that the Advisory Council recently heard from MassDOT staff regarding the state's Complete Streets program, MPO staff regarding ongoing freight analysis, and council member CrossTown Connect TMA on efforts in Acton, Boxborough, Concord, Littleton, Maynard, Sudbury, and Westford. The next Advisory Council meeting is on February 14, 2018. The council expects to begin discussing the MPO's ongoing TIP and Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) development processes. T. Teich noted that Laura Wiener, formerly the MPO representative for the Town of Arlington, is now attending the Advisory Council on behalf of Watertown.

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

K. Quackenbush noted plans to hold a UPWP Committee meeting immediately before or after the next MPO meeting on February 1, 2018. Members agreed to meet prior to the MPO meeting on February 1, 2018. K. Quackenbush noted that memoranda detailing the study location selection process for three recurring corridor studies are available on the MPO's meeting calendar. The studies are *Safety and Operations Analyses at Selected Intersections*, *Addressing Priority Corridors from the Long-Range Transportation Plan Needs Assessment*, and *Addressing Safety, Mobility, and Access on Subregional Priority Roadways*. K. Quackenbush encouraged MPO members to contact MPO staff by Monday, January 22, 2018, with any questions or concerns about selected study locations.

7. Action Item: Approval of MPO Meeting Minutes—*Róisín Foley, MPO Staff*

A motion to approve the minutes of the meeting of November 16, 2017, was made by the Metropolitan Area Planning Council (Eric Bourassa) and seconded by the South Shore Coalition (Town of Braintree) (Christine Stickney). The motion carried.

A motion to approve the minutes of the meeting of December 7, 2017, was made by the Metropolitan Area Planning Council (E. Bourassa) and seconded by the South Shore Coalition (Town of Braintree) (Christine Stickney). The motion carried.

8. Action Item: Draft FFYs 2018–22 Transportation Improvement Program Amendment Two—*Alexandra (Ali) Kleyman, MPO Staff*
Documents posted to the MPO meeting calendar:

1. Table 1: FFYs 2018–22 Draft TIP Amendment Two, MBTA Federal Capital Program, Revised, Presented to the MPO on December 21, 2017

2. Table 2: FFYs 2018–22 Draft TIP Amendment Two, Summary of Proposed Changes
3. Table 3: Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Formula Funds, FFYs 2018–22 Draft TIP Amendment Two, Project-Level Backup for Informational Purposes

Draft FFYs 2018–22 TIP Amendment Two was released for a 21-day public comment period that ended on January 16, 2018. MPO staff did not receive any public comments. Amendment Two proposes changes to MBTA transit programming between FFY 2018 and FFY 2022, with the most significant changes proposed in FFY 2018. Amendment Two mainly programs funding carried over from FFY 2017. This amendment is being proposed to better align the TIP with the MBTA's finalized Capital Investment Plan (CIP) and address changes in project readiness and funding. Table 3 in the meeting materials shows six new projects that have been added; the new projects are highlighted in green.

A. Kleyman noted that T. Teich had asked at the December 21, 2017, meeting for the MBTA to present its project prioritization process to the MPO board. Eric Waaramaa (MBTA) stated that the MBTA plans to give a presentation at a future meeting regarding the internal process for selecting projects that will eventually appear before the MPO as part of TIP amendments. E. Waaramaa added that MBTA staff will be providing MPO staff with short descriptions of projects for future amendments.

Vote

A motion to approve the FFYs 2018–22 TIP Amendment Two was made by the Massachusetts Port Authority (Laura Gilmore) and seconded by the Metropolitan Area Planning Council (E. Bourassa). The motion carried.

9. Action Item: Draft FFYs 2018–22 Transportation Improvement Program Amendment Three—Alexandra (Ali) Kleyman, MPO Staff

Draft FFYs 2018–22 TIP Amendment Three proposes changes to highway projects in FFY 2018. Amendment Three would add two new MassDOT-prioritized projects to the Boston Region TIP: (#604804) *Reading - Resurfacing and Related Work on Route 28* and (#608013) *Quincy - Intersection Improvements at Sea Street and Quincy Shore Drive*. Amendment Three would also incorporate cost increases for two projects: (#608521) *Salem - Bridge Maintenance, S-01-018 (32T), (ST 114) North Street over (ST 107) Bridge Street and MBTA*, and the MPO target-funded project (#600518) *Hingham Intersection Improvements at Derby Street, Whiting Street (Route 53), and Gardner Street*. MPO staff proposed a 30-day public review period from January 24, 2018, to February 24, 2018.

Discussion

D. Mohler stated that the public comment period for this amendment should be 21 days. (*Note: The MPO approved an amendment to the MPO's Public Participation Plan at the meeting on March 30, 2017. That amendment, which was proposed by MassDOT, allowed for shortening public comment periods for all certification documents from 30 to 21 days. The board approved the amendment for the remainder of FFY 2017, agreeing to return to this issue in FFY 2018 to determine whether the change should be made permanent.*) E. Bourassa, K. Quackenbush, and T. Teich all clarified that 30 days remains the standard pending further discussion by the board.

Dennis Giombetti (MetroWest Regional Collaborative) (City of Framingham) asked whether any projects other than the Reading and Quincy projects cited above were considered for amending into the TIP. D. Mohler replied that the Quincy project was prioritized via the MassDOT Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) prioritization process.

Vote

A motion to release the draft FFYs 2018—22 TIP Amendment Three for a 30-day public review period was made by the City of Boston (Boston Transportation Department) (Tom Kadzis) and seconded by the Metropolitan Area Planning Council (E. Bourassa). The motion carried.

10. Proposed Calendar Year (CY) 2018 Highway Safety Targets for the Boston Region—Michelle Scott, MPO Staff, and Bryan Pounds, MassDOT

Documents posted to the MPO meeting calendar:

1. 2018 Massachusetts Statewide Highway Safety Performance Measure (PM) Trends and Targets/Boston Region Highway Safety Performance Trends

M. Scott introduced proposed CY 2018 Highway Safety Targets. Under Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21) and Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act requirements, the United States Department of Transportation requires safety performance monitoring to reduce fatalities and serious injuries on public roads. Federal agencies have set rules defining specific PMs. The targets presented at this meeting are the first of three sets of highway PMs the MPO will consider. Other performance measures relate to pavement and bridge condition, the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) program, freight, and National Highway System (NHS) performance. State agencies must set annual targets for federally required highway safety measures. MPOs must establish targets by adopting state-level targets or setting MPO-level targets. Massachusetts has set CY 2018 targets for fatality and

serious injury measures. The MPO must adopt the Commonwealth's targets or set MPO-level targets by February 27, 2018.

B. Pounds noted that these targets are a starting point for tracking progress towards goals and adjusting investment decisions accordingly. To obtain the targets presented at this meeting, MassDOT examined trends based on five year rolling averages for the performance measures. B. Pounds stressed that although these are targets, they are reflective of a program of projects already in place. As such, they resemble trends rather than aspirational targets.

MassDOT must set highway safety PM targets annually, report on highway safety targets and progress to the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), and coordinate with MPOs and other stakeholders. To have made significant progress toward a target, four of the five highway PMs must be better than the baseline value or better than or equal to the target value. If significant progress is not achieved, FHWA can mandate that specific levels of money must be spent on highway safety projects.

In updates to the Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) and TIP, the MPO must describe measures and targets, progress since baseline or past targets, and the anticipated effect of investments on targets. The MPO can support statewide targets for all five safety PMs or take different approaches for different measures. If the MPO adopts the statewide target for a measure, no quantifiable target is required for the MPO area. The MPO agrees to plan and program projects to help reach statewide targets and to work with MassDOT on target narratives for the LRTP and TIP. If the MPO sets a separate target it must commit to a quantifiable target for the MPO area, define and report MPO vehicle-miles traveled (VMT) estimates and corresponding methodology, and coordinate with MassDOT on target development. FHWA will review the MPO's progress as part of certification reviews. No significant progress determination is made at the MPO level and there are no MPO-level rewards or penalties for progress on targets.

The highway safety PMs are outcome-based measures reflecting fatalities and injuries from motor vehicle collisions and apply to all public roads regardless of jurisdiction or ownership. The intent is to minimize values for all measures. The MPO will need to consider how different factors affect fatalities and serious injuries, and how infrastructure investments may contribute to improvements.

Federally Required Highway Safety PMs

1. Number of fatalities
2. Rate of fatalities per 100 million VMT

3. Number of serious injuries
4. Rate of serious injuries per 100 million VMT
5. Number of non-motorized fatalities and non-motorized serious injuries

The following tables list baseline and/or trend information for Massachusetts, and the Commonwealth's target for each of the five measures. Massachusetts has set its CY 2018 targets in accordance with federal requirements, but it has a long term goal of eliminating fatalities and serious injuries on Massachusetts roadways.

Measure	2015 Safety PM Value (2011-15 Rolling Average)	2018 Safety PM Target	MA Long-Term Goal (Move Toward Zero)
Number of fatalities	361	352	0
Rate of fatalities per 100 million VMT	0.64	0.61	0

Measure	2015 Safety PM Value (2011-15 Rolling Average)	2018 Safety PM Target	MA Long-Term Goal (Move Toward Zero)
Number of serious injuries	3,252	2,896	0
Rate of serious injuries per 100 million VMT	5.78	5.01	0

Measure	2015 Safety PM Value (2011-15 Rolling Average)	2018 Safety PM Estimated Trend Value	2018 Safety PM Target	MA Long- Term Goal (Move Toward Zero)
Number of Non- motorized Fatalities and Non-motorized Serious Injuries	540.8	618.9	540.8	0

The approach for the number of non-motorized fatalities and non-motorized serious injuries PM is different from the approach used for other measures. Because the trend shows an unacceptable increase in fatalities and serious injuries, MassDOT has set the target to an upper limit of 540.8 non-motorized fatalities and serious injuries. In the last several years, MassDOT has increased funding to Complete Streets and bicycle and pedestrian programs. While the effect of these programs on the trend is uncertain,

MassDOT staff surmises that the increase in the number of fatalities and injuries may be the result of an increase in conflicts between vehicles and pedestrians and bicyclists as more people are walking and bicycling.

Strategic Highway Safety Plans (SHSP) will continue to support the Commonwealth's performance-based planning. These documents describe safety emphasis areas, Massachusetts-level goals, and strategies to address safety. SHSP goals are not the same as the HSIP targets. However, the SHSP process provides an opportunity to establish longer-term goals and objectives to which the annual targets can align.

The MPO must meet federal requirements, but can also go beyond them. MPO staff recommends that the MPO board take time after addressing these federally required measures to talk about other measures the MPO may wish to track. At this time, MPO staff recommends that the MPO adopt all five state targets to test this approach prior to conducting the process next year in conjunction with the development of the next LRTP.

Discussion

E. Bourassa asked how MPO targets might differ from state targets. M. Scott noted that the MPO would be free to choose its own methodology for setting targets, such as a policy-driven approach as opposed to following the trend line. B. Pounds reiterated that the guidance from FHWA is to be realistic given that investments for CY 2018 have already been made.

T. Teich asked for further information on penalties for failure to make progress.

B. Pounds replied that there are no penalties as such for the MPO. If the Commonwealth does not make significant progress on at least four out of the five measures, FHWA could place requirements on the obligation of Highway Safety Improvement Program funds. The Commonwealth would also need to develop an implementation plan. T. Teich noted that this target-setting structure may incentivize setting targets that are unambitious. Nelson Hoffman (FHWA) added that if a state did not achieve its performance targets, the expectation would be that more funding would go toward making progress.

T. Teich asked B. Pounds and M. Scott to elaborate on the data related to fatality rates, particularly why it might appear that serious injury rates per 100 million VMT are declining at a faster rate in the Boston region than elsewhere in the state. She also noted that it is important to consider travel rates when looking at bicycle and pedestrian safety measures. B. Pounds replied that data for non-motorized measures is sometimes difficult to attain or unreliable, and added that MassDOT is working with MPOs to come up with better data collection methodologies to better assess non-motorized mode

measures. B. Pounds added that his personal opinion is that conflicts between bicycles, pedestrians, and vehicles are increasing as more people are using non-motorized modes. D. Mohler added that the general assumption is that total fatalities and serious injuries are declining faster in the Boston region because of congestion, with crashes occurring at lower speeds than they might in other areas of the state.

D. Giombetti suggested the MPO should be setting longer-term goals given the limitations of the one-year horizon.

M. Scott replied that this is something the MPO could look at as part of the LRTP development process. Other MPOs outside of Massachusetts have used longer-term horizons as a basis for setting a near-term target. N Hoffman added that the value of yearly targets is to focus attention on the short-term decisions that influence the long-term horizon.

E. Bourassa asked whether data is available describing safety by mode, for example whether transit is safer than driving or walking. M. Scott replied that she did not have information comparing safety measures across modes, but noted that the MPO will later be working on federally required measures related to transit safety.

Tom O'Rourke (Three Rivers Interlocal Council) (Town of Norwood/Neponset Valley Chamber of Commerce) noted that it's unlikely the state will meet the non-motorized target for 2018. B. Pounds responded that this is very possible, but that the federal requirement to demonstrate significant progress is to meet four out of five targets. T. Kadzis asked why the state might not set a higher target than in previous years, based on the trend line. D. Mohler clarified that the state is not willing to set a target that shows more serious injuries and fatalities in 2018 (than the latest reportable calendar year).

Marie Rose (MassDOT Highway) asked whether a breakdown of fatalities versus serious injuries is available for the non-motorized fatality and serious injuries measure. B. Pounds replied that this is available. M. Scott shared some additional data separating out fatalities and serious injuries by mode.

D. Mohler asked M. Scott to elaborate on what MPO staff requires from the board. M. Scott replied that staff would like a sense of direction on whether the MPO prefers to adopt the state targets or explore other options. D. Mohler asked members whether they would like to instruct staff to prepare for the adoption of state targets or otherwise. No members expressed a desire to explore targets specific to the MPO, so D. Mohler advised M. Scott to bring a vote on adopting the state targets at a future meeting.

Steve Olanoff (Three Rivers Interlocal Council alternate) asked why the rate of change of non-motorized fatalities and serious injuries seems to be more dramatic for the state than for the Boston region. D. Mohler replied that MassDOT's highway safety staff may have some analysis that could explain this.

Jim Fitzgerald (Boston Planning and Development Agency) (City of Boston) asked whether these changes could be related to changes in trip making, i.e. people are making more trips by bike, thus more crashes are occurring.

Rafael Mares (Conservation Law Foundation) concurred with the board's approach to adopt the state targets under these circumstances, but encouraged the board to consider setting its own horizon year for eliminating fatalities and serious injuries, and plan backwards to determine what investments would be needed to achieve that goal.

T. Teich asked whether the state is setting a horizon-year goal. M. Scott replied that there is an existing Strategic Highway Safety Plan (completed in 2013) that contains goals with horizon years. This plan will be updated. MassDOT has a performance tracker that will be updated in conjunction with the plan.

11. Bicycle Network Gaps: Feasibility Evaluation—Casey-Marie Claude, MPO Staff

Documents posted to the MPO meeting calendar

1. Bicycle Network Gaps Feasibility Evaluations – Massachusetts Central Rail Trail
2. Bicycle Network Gaps Feasibility Evaluations – Sudbury Aqueduct
3. Bicycle Network Gap Feasibility Evaluation for Central Square

C. Claude presented the findings of a series of feasibility evaluations of gaps in the regional bicycle network. This work builds on the 2014 Bicycle Network Evaluation study, which assessed 234 gaps in the region's bicycle network. A gap is defined as a lack of a physical connection between bicycle facilities or between a bicycle facility and a regional transit station (commuter rail and MBTA stations and key bus routes). The 2014 study resulted in a list of high priority gaps. Staff used a set of criteria to score the gaps that, if closed, would have the greatest potential to improve the region's bicycle network. MPO staff organized the identified gaps into three categories, those that are 1) less than one-half mile long ("small" gaps), 2) between one-half and one and one-half mile long ("medium" gaps), and 3) more than one and one-half mile long ("long" gaps). C. Claude evaluated one high-priority gaps in each of the size categories.

The "long" gap that staff evaluated was the Mass Central Rail Trail. This gap consists of three miles, mostly in Waltham, starting at Waverly Station in Belmont and ending near

Kendall Green Station in Weston. Trail construction began in Weston in October 2017. The Town of Waltham was interested in guidance for moving forward to address their own piece of the gap. The first memorandum provided in the meeting materials discusses best practices for shared-use paths and at-grade trail crossings.

The “medium” gap staff evaluated was the Sudbury Aqueduct Trail. This gap begins at Framingham Commuter Rail Station and ends at Summit Street. Issues identified in this gap include public access impediments, encroaching abutters, and parcels permitted by the Massachusetts Water Resources Administration (MWRA) for private use. The second memorandum provided in the meeting materials discusses a proposal for an interim route with signage and wayfinding while the City of Framingham coordinates with the MWRA to open the main route to public access.

The “short” gap evaluated was in Central Square in Cambridge. The gap runs from the northeastern end of the bicycle facilities on Western Avenue across Massachusetts Avenue to the Harvard Street bike lane in the north. The analysis focused on Prospect Street because it is the most direct connection between Inman and Central Squares. A peak-period traffic analysis was done on Prospect Street, which revealed high traffic volumes and safety issues. The left-turn lane on Prospect Street cannot be removed due to safety and bus runtime concerns. C. Claude recommended shared lane markings, additional wayfinding, provision for clear turning maneuvers, safer intersection crossings, and an alternate route to the Boston University Bridge along Western Avenue due to new bicycle facilities recently installed on this corridor.

Discussion

E. Bourassa asked whether information about priority bicycle network gaps is used in TIP evaluations. C. Claude replied that points are awarded in the TIP criteria for projects that address these gaps.

T. Teich thanked C. Claude for her work in Central Square and expressed how valuable the walk audit done by C. Claude with Cambridge staff was.

R. Mares asked whether TIP scoring includes points for closing gaps that impact a larger section of the overall network. C. Claude replied that the scoring does not currently account for this but should in the future.

Pete Sutton (MassDOT staff) added that the state is in the midst of updating the statewide Bicycle Plan and gap analysis.

Janie Dretler (Sudbury resident) asked whether MPO staff is looking at planned housing developments along Route 20 in Sudbury and how to mitigate the transportation

impacts of development. E. Bourassa asked whether members know of comprehensive planning around Route 20.¹ K. Quackenbush replied that MPO staff has analyzed various concerns along Route 20. He asked J. Dretler to stay after the meeting to speak to staff.

12. Low-Cost Improvements to Express-Highway Bottleneck Locations— *Seth Asante, MPO Staff*

S. Asante presented the findings of the most recent iteration of the recurring Low-Cost Improvements to Express-Highway Bottleneck Locations study. The purpose of this study is to identify low-cost improvements that will help reduce congestion at freeway bottleneck locations in the MPO region. This study has been conducted four times, and many of the recommendations have been implemented.

Candidate locations were selected based on input from the MassDOT Highway Division as well as Congestion Management Process (CMP) data. The screening process yielded four locations that had the potential to respond to low-cost improvement measures. MPO staff developed one or more proposals to address each bottleneck. If implemented, the modifications would result in capacity and safety improvements on these four high-volume facilities.

Location 1: Interstate 95 northbound between Exit 29 (Route 2) and Exit 30 (Route 2A/Service Plaza) in Lexington

At Location 1, high-volume traffic enters and exits I-95 northbound between Routes 2 and 2A. The merging and diverging traffic cause a localized bottleneck, which is made worse because of a short acceleration lane and the high traffic volume already on I-95. MPO staff developed three alternatives to mitigate the bottleneck. Alternative 2 uses the paved right shoulder to create an auxiliary lane for merging or diverging traffic maneuvers. The auxiliary lane would provide sufficient distance to address the issues caused by the short acceleration lane. Alternative 3 complements Alternative 2 by improving signage where the route diverges to Route 2A and the service plaza.

Location 2: Interstate 93 southbound between Exit 37C (Commerce Way) and Exit 37B (I-95) in Woburn and Reading

At Location 2, high-volume traffic exiting I-93 southbound to I-95 southbound creates long queues during the morning peak travel period. The traffic queue on I-93 southbound spills into the breakdown and right lanes. The bottlenecks interrupt traffic and reduce travel speed. Additionally, high-volume traffic merging onto I-95 southbound from Commerce Way interrupts traffic, forcing drivers to switch lanes on I-95

¹ Note: At this point in the meeting E. Bourassa assumed the Chair's seat.

southbound, and causes a high number of crashes where the route diverges to I-95 southbound. MPO staff developed three improvement alternatives to mitigate the bottleneck at this location. Alternative 1 would use the paved right shoulder to create an auxiliary lane for merging or diverging traffic maneuvers. Alternative 2 addresses the second bottleneck downstream on I-95 southbound by lengthening the short acceleration lane for high-volume traffic from Commerce Way. Alternative 3 consists of a two-lane exit ramp to address congestion and queuing at the bottleneck. MPO staff recommends both Alternatives 1 and 2, because they produce maximum operational benefits at a lower cost.

Location 3: Route 24 northbound between Exit 20 (Route 139) and Exit 21 (I-93) in Randolph, Canton, and Stoughton

At Location 3, the bottleneck is caused by intensive merge maneuvers on I-93 southbound in the AM peak period and a lane drop on the I-93 southbound on-ramp. MPO staff developed three improvement alternatives to mitigate the impacts of the bottlenecks. Alternatives 2 and 3 were recommended because of their complementary impacts. Alternative 2 consists of using the paved right shoulder to add a fourth lane on Route 24. Alternative 3 restripes the on-ramp to better meet demand during the AM peak period. Together, Alternatives 2 and 3 would reduce the impacts of the bottleneck.

Location 4: Route 24 southbound between Exit 21 (I-93) and Exit 20 (Route 139) in Randolph, Canton, and Stoughton

At Location 4, the bottleneck occurs where high-volume traffic from I-93 merges onto Route 24 southbound. The geometry where the ramps from I-93 merge is problematic because the merge distance is very short and there is a high-volume merge of two center lanes, which causes safety problems. MPO staff recommends lengthening the merge distance using the existing paved right shoulder to add a fourth lane as far as possible. This improvement would eliminate the center merge and increase safety.

Discussion

M. Rose asked how previously recommended improvements that have been implemented were funded. S. Asante replied that they were mostly accomplished through the MassDOT Highway districts with maintenance funds, or incorporated into resurfacing projects.

N. Hoffman asked if there has been any post-project analysis to assess the impact of improvements that have been built. S. Asante replied that the districts report back to MPO staff on observed impacts but no formal “after” studies have been done.

13.Members Items

There were none.

14.Adjourn

A motion to adjourn was made by the Regional Transportation Advisory Council (T. Teich) and seconded by the Massachusetts Port Authority (L. Gilmore). 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)	
At-Large Town (Town of Lexington)	David Kucharsky
City of Boston (Boston Planning and Development Agency)	Jim Fitzgerald
City of Boston (Boston Transportation Department)	Tom Kadzis
Federal Highway Administration	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	Micha Gensler
Metropolitan Area Planning Council	Eric Bourassa
MetroWest Regional Collaborative (City of Framingham)	Dennis Giombetti
Minuteman Advisory Group on Interlocal Coordination (Town of Bedford)	
North Shore Task Force (City of Beverly)	Aaron Clausen
North Suburban Planning Council (City of Woburn)	
Regional Transportation Advisory Council	Tegin Teich
South Shore Coalition (Town of Braintree)	Christine Stickney
South West Advisory Planning Committee (Town of Medway)	
Three Rivers Interlocal Council (Town of Norwood/Neponset Valley Chamber of Commerce)	Tom O'Rourke

Other Attendees Affiliation

Frank Tramontozzi	City of Quincy
David Kucharsky	Town of Lexington
Bryan Pounds	MassDOT
Lee Auspitz	Somerville resident
Steve Olanoff	TRIC Alternate
Rafael Mares	Conservation Law Foundation
Janie Dretler	Sudbury resident
Anne McKinnon	Jacobs Engineering

MPO Staff/Central Transportation Planning Staff

Karl Quackenbush, Executive Director
Robin Mannion
Mark Abbott
Seth Asante
Lourenco Dantas
Annette Demchur
Róisín Foley
Betsy Harvey
Alexandra Kleyman
Anne McGahan
Scott Peterson
Jen Rowe
Michelle Scott
Chen-Yuan Wang
