

# Memorandum for the Record

## Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization Meeting

### October 4, 2018, Meeting

10:00 AM–12:15 PM, State Transportation Building, Conference Rooms 2 and 3, 10 Park Plaza, Boston

David Mohler and Steve Woelfel, Chairs, 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 July 19, 2018, meeting
- Approve the work program for *Updates to Express Highway Volume Charts*
- Approve the work program for the *Pedestrian Report Card Assessment Dashboard*

### Meeting Agenda

#### 1. Introductions

See attendance on page 15.

#### 2. Public Comments

There were none.

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

There was none.

#### 4. Committee Chairs' Reports

There were none.

#### 5. Regional Transportation Advisory Council Report—*AnaCristina Fragoso, Vice Chair, Regional Transportation Advisory Council*

There was none.

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

K. Quackenbush reported that the November 1, 2018, MPO meeting had been rescheduled to November 8, 2018. The meeting on November 8 would take place at

Braintree Town Hall. The MPO will also meet on November 15, 2018, in the usual conference rooms at the State Transportation Building.

K. Quackenbush reviewed the events that transpired during the last federal fiscal year (FFY) at the MPO and Central Transportation Planning Staff (CTPS – the MPO staff). Eight staff members departed from CTPS during FFY 2018, and three new staff members were hired. Now, CTPS is recruiting for several positions, including Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Manager. Six new representatives on the MPO board began attending MPO meetings. The MPO board met nineteen times, including off-site in Bedford, Westwood, and Woburn. MPO staff presented eighty-two times; the majority of the presentations were about work programs and the TIP.

In May 2018, the MPO endorsed the FFY 2019-23 TIP, which programs approximately \$1.3 billion for roadway projects and \$3.2 billion for transit. The MPO's target-funded projects represent \$515 million of the overall TIP funding. The MPO amended the current (FFY 2018-22) TIP six times, the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) once, and the Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) once.

MPO staff conducted eight MPO-funded discrete studies, the results of which will be presented in the coming months, and contributed to 30 distinct outside agency-funded studies and processes throughout the year. The work for the agencies included the MBTA's systemwide passenger survey, support to the Lower Mystic Working Group, data analysis for North/South Rail Link, MBTA commuter rail passenger counts, support for MBTA service planning, support for MassDOT's roadway inventory update, and support for the Massachusetts Port Authority's (Massport) data collection and modeling work.

The MPO adopted Performance-based Planning and Programming (PBPP) targets for federally required performance measures regarding transit asset management, highway safety, and congestion reduction and air quality.

MPO staff also supported MassDOT and the MBTA's Title VI reporting and conducted a major public outreach process to develop a recommended disparate impact and disproportionate burden (DI/DB) policy for the LRTP. MPO staff made improvements to public engagement and posted to the MPO's blog, *TRANSREPORT*.

K. Quackenbush noted that MPO staff received unfortunate press regarding travel modeling, but he stated that staff was able to reinforce the message that the modeling results were consistent with the input assumptions.

K. Quackenbush reminded the board that on-site meetings related to the MPO's federal recertification review would take place on October 16 and October 17, 2018, with a public meeting on the evening of October 17, 2018. As part of the review, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Federal Transit Administration (FTA) invite MPO members to speak one-on-one with federal staff from the US Department of Transportation's Volpe Center if they wish to do so.

In the coming year, the board will hear about more PBPP targets, an update to the MPO's Public Participation Plan, the adoption of a new LRTP, project selection for the Community Transportation Program, the results of nine discrete studies, work to create an activity-based regional travel model, and coordination with MassDOT and the Metropolitan Area Planning Council (MAPC) on new tools and data sources.

K. Quackenbush stressed that he and MPO staff are available to board members and encouraged them to reach out with any questions or concerns.

### **7. Approval of July 19, 2018, MPO Meeting Minutes—*Róisín Foley, MPO Staff***

A motion to approve the minutes of the meeting of July 19, 2018, was made by MAPC (Eric Bourassa) and seconded by the Three Rivers Interlocal Council (Town of Norwood/Neponset Valley Chamber of Commerce) (Steve Olanoff). The South Shore Coalition (Town of Braintree) (Christine Stickney) abstained. The motion carried.

### **8. Work Program for Updates to Express Highway Volume Charts—*Scott Peterson, MPO Staff***

In 2002, to support numerous planning efforts undertaken in response to the new regional traffic flow patterns created by the Central Artery/Third Harbor Tunnel (CA/T) Project, the former Central Area Group of CTPS (MPO staff) developed an integrated set of express highway volume charts. These charts were updated in 2010–11. The data in these charts have been useful in studies conducted by MPO staff, and are requested frequently by members of the public. Currently this data is only available in PDF format. The work program for *Updates to Express Highway Volume Charts* is a pilot project to develop up-to-date balanced volume data and make it available for viewing online in graphical and tabular forms, as well as available for download.

The pilot project will focus on two routes: 1) Route 3 between Braintree and the southern border of the MPO region in Marshfield; and 2) Interstate 93 between the northern border of the MPO region in Wilmington and Braintree to the south. MassDOT has recently collected traffic count data for Route 3 and is planning to collect traffic count data for Interstate 93 in fall 2018 or spring 2019. If the new I-93 counts are not available by late spring 2019, the project will focus on I-495 instead. The work program

will also make this historical data available in the same presentation framework used for the newly developed balanced volume data, which would allow historical and newly developed data to be compared. The budget for this project is \$85,000.

**Discussion**

Tina Cassidy (North Suburban Planning Council) (City of Woburn) advocated for the use of I-93 counts rather than the alternative, I-495, given the amount of development along I-93.

E. Bourassa asked whether MPO staff have access to cell phone data that could be mined for traffic counts. S. Peterson replied that staff has looked into several vendors that provide this information, but that cell phone data provides a sample rather than a complete count. E. Bourassa suggested that it would be interesting to compare the eventual volumes to transit ridership in nearby corridors. S. Peterson agreed and suggested that this could be an idea for a future UPWP study or considered in the MPO's Congestion Management Process.

David Kucharsky (At-Large Town) (Town of Lexington) asked whether the volume charts include vehicle classification or just volumes. S. Peterson replied that it is just volumes.

Laura Gilmore (Massport) added that it would be useful to be able to differentiate between users, particularly in relation to freight. S. Peterson agreed it would be useful, but he noted that this level of detail is not available via current counters.

K. Quackenbush added that MPO staff has an ongoing freight program and the board will hear more about developing comprehensive freight data going forward.

Jim Fitzgerald (City of Boston) (Boston Planning & Development Agency) asked about the age of data for roadways other than I-93 and Route 3. S. Peterson replied that due to the existence of the electronic tolling on the Massachusetts Turnpike, there are estimates of volumes by vehicle type. There are also recent counts for a stretch of I-495. Other roadways, like Route 1 or Route 128, are counted by MassDOT in cycles of two to three years based on resources, but MPO staff does not create balanced volumes for all the roadways in the region.

**Vote**

A motion to approve the work program for *Updates to Express Highway Volume Charts* was made by MAPC (E. Bourassa) and seconded by MassDOT Highway Division (John Romano). The motion carried.

## **9. Work Program for Pedestrian Report Card Assessment Dashboard— *Casey-Marie Claude, MPO Staff***

The work program for the *Pedestrian Report Card Assessment Dashboard* outlines a follow up to the FFY 2015 Pedestrian Level-of-Service Metric project, which developed the Pedestrian Report Card Assessment (PRCA) tool. The PRCA provides a methodology for assessing conditions for pedestrians along route segments and at intersections throughout the Boston region's pedestrian network, and for grading locations on safety, system preservation, capacity management and mobility, and economic vitality. The tool also prioritizes locations for improvement based on a transportation equity factor.

The intent of this work program is to create an interactive dashboard that will document the suitability for pedestrian travel of intersections and route segments throughout the Boston region's pedestrian network using the PRCA tool. MPO staff has been applying the PRCA tool in roadway studies since January 2017. Under this work program, staff will compile the data that has been gathered and create an interactive, web-based dashboard that will be accessible to the public. In the future, staff expects to make the tool widely available so that users may submit their own scores to the dashboard.

### ***Discussion***

Brad Rawson (Inner Core Committee) (City of Somerville) noted that poor conditions for pedestrians can depress the number of users on a roadway or intersection, creating the impression that a location is not desirable for pedestrian improvements. B. Rawson asked whether this is accounted for in the PRCA scoring method. C. Claude replied that this is accounted for in the tool, given that the PRCA grades the environment and does not over-prioritize areas that are already well-trafficked.

S. Olanoff asked how much data the PRCA tool has gathered so far, noting that the work program prioritizes using the tool to rate proposed TIP projects. C. Claude replied that using the tool to evaluate proposed TIP projects is a starting point, but that staff wants to use the tool in as many studies and projects as possible in order to build the data set for the dashboard. K. Quackenbush added that staff has been applying the PRCA tool in studies since it was originally presented in 2017, and staff has data related to less than one hundred roadways and intersections. C. Claude added that staff hopes to grow the dataset for the dashboard and make it accessible to municipalities and agencies.

E. Bourassa asked if there is a way to coordinate this effort with MassDOT's Road Safety Audits (RSA), which MPO staff often participate in. Mark Abbott (MPO staff)

replied that staff can recommend that MassDOT and its consultants utilize the PRCA in RSA reports.

B. Rawson suggested that the tool could also be utilized when MassDOT's Safe Routes to School (SRTS) team conducts assessments. C. Claude agreed. B. Rawson added that the City of Somerville is in the process of finalizing a small-scale SRTS project that included an RSA and that he would be happy to help coordinate assessments.

J. Fitzgerald asked whether the dashboard tool will include instructions for users who want to apply the tool. C. Claude replied that the final dashboard will include user-friendly instructions for applying the PRCA tool.

#### **Vote**

A motion to approve the work program for the *Pedestrian Report Card Assessment Dashboard* was made by MAPC (E. Bourassa) and seconded by the Three Rivers Interlocal Council (Town of Norwood/Neponset Valley Chamber of Commerce) (S. Olanoff). The motion carried.

### **10. Disparate Impact/Disproportionate (DI/DB) Burden Policy Development Update—Betsy Harvey, MPO Staff**

B. Harvey presented to the MPO board in February 2018 concerning the development of a policy that would identify potential future DI/DBs on minority and low-income populations that may result from the implementation of the program of projects in the LRTP. This policy would allow the MPO to better comply with federal Title VI and environmental justice (EJ) regulations. Throughout the spring and summer of 2018, staff undertook a public engagement process to support the development of the policy, which involved a stakeholder working group and a public workshop. B. Harvey thanked stakeholders for the time and effort they put into the working group and other members of the MPO staff who assisted in the DI/DB effort.

As part of compliance with Title VI, MPOs are required to analyze the impacts of projects and programs implemented with state and federal funds in the aggregate and to identify potential disparate impacts resulting from those investments on minority populations. A disparate impact is a facially neutral policy or practice that disproportionately affects members of a group identified by race, color, or national origin, where the policy or practice lacks a substantial legitimate justification and where there are one or more alternatives that would serve the same legitimate objectives but with less disproportionate affect. Similarly, EJ guidance requires MPOs to avoid, minimize, or mitigate disproportionately high and adverse human health and environmental effects of MPO activities on minority and low-income populations. In this

context, MPO activities that disproportionately affect low-income populations more severely than non-low-income populations are called disproportionate burdens.

While MPOs are not required to have a defined DI/DB policy, there are good reasons to adopt one. A policy allows the MPO to comply with both Title VI and EJ regulations in a clear, consistent, and transparent manner. A policy also provides the MPO with guidance throughout the duration of an LRTP, helping the MPO meet its equity objectives. B. Harvey added that the Boston Region MPO has long been a leader in the transportation equity field, and defining a policy helps to continue that tradition.

There are three general components of a DI/DB policy. First, there needs to be a numeric threshold that specifies when impacts are disparate or disproportionate. This threshold is what the public engagement process focused on. Second, the policy should identify which populations are being compared. The populations of focus are defined by FTA and FHWA. The impacts on minority populations will be compared to those on non-minority populations, and the impacts on low-income populations will be compared to those on non-low-income populations. Finally, the policy describes the analytical methods the MPO uses to identify DI/DBs.

Since 2004, the MPO has analyzed the potential impacts of the LRTP program of projects on EJ populations. Following the introduction of new federal guidance that required MPOs to identify and address DI/DBs, the MPO applied a draft policy to the program of projects in the current LRTP, *Charting Progress to 2040*. This was accompanied by a commitment to finalizing a DI/DB policy to apply to the next LRTP.

All highway and transit major infrastructure projects in the LRTP will be analyzed for DI/DBs, which include human health, environmental, or other transportation-related impacts. Projects will be analyzed in the aggregate. For the LRTP that is currently being developed, *Destination 2040*, staff will apply the policy once the program of projects has been selected. This existence of DI/DBs does not mean that the MPO cannot endorse the LRTP. It means that the MPO needs to address them in the future by avoiding, mitigating, or minimizing them. Strategies to do so will vary depending on the impact in question and its severity, and strategies will be weighed against the other benefits that the program of projects confers. When the time arises, staff will present strategies for addressing disparate impacts for your consideration.

### ***Public Engagement***

MPO staff formed a stakeholder working group consisting of several MPO members—Tegin Teich representing the Advisory Council, Jay Monty representing the City of Everett, Bryan Pounds and Derek Krevat, who alternated representing MassDOT, and

Tom Kadzis and Jim Gillooly, who alternated representing the City of Boston—and eight stakeholders representing EJ populations in the region. These stakeholders included representatives from the Conservation Law Foundation, the MBTA Rider Oversight Committee, TransitMatters, TRIPPS (which educates and coordinates transportation for the elderly and people with disabilities in Newton and Brookline), Hessco Elder Services (which provides and coordinates transportation for people with disabilities and the elderly in the Neponset Valley region), Livable Streets, the Mattapan Food and Fitness Coalition, and the Four Corners Action Coalition. Staff held three working group meetings and one public workshop.

The goals of the public engagement process were to get input from stakeholders and the general public about transportation impacts that affect the region with the purpose of using that input to update the metrics in the draft DI/DB policy. Additionally, staff hoped that the working group would reach a consensus on a recommendation for a specific threshold to include in the policy. Staff approached this process as a collaboration, focusing on listening to stakeholders' and the public's input in order to build a stronger, more effective DI/DB policy.

The working group discussed potential thresholds, the implications of a DI/DB policy, and transportation impacts that staff could assess for DI/DBs that are meaningful to the Boston region. Stakeholders brought perspectives that enriched the process and helped staff reach both goals. Gaining the early involvement of stakeholders was an effective approach that allowed staff to address concerns before the presentation of a recommended policy.

Staff asked stakeholders and the public to provide input on the transportation impacts that most affect the region and to prioritize the impacts that staff currently has the tools to analyze. The working group prioritized the following impacts, in this order:

- 1. Access to jobs**
- 2. Access to healthcare**
3. Transportation network connectivity
4. Access to public transit at off-peak hours
- 5. Congestion**
- 6. Emissions—carbon monoxide and particulate matter**
- 7. Travel time to work**
8. Mode share

Staff recently used this feedback to update the metrics the MPO will evaluate for DI/DBs in *Destination 2040*. Those in bold are those that staff will analyze. Staff heard about



other impacts that are more challenging to analyze—such as the effects of autonomous vehicles and the cost of transportation as a function of household income. These topics will require more research before staff can assess them.

During the working group meetings, stakeholders raised the concern that allowing any difference in the impacts between the EJ and non-EJ populations, no matter how small, would perpetuate inequities. Stakeholders also asked for more information about the practical implications of choosing one threshold over another, and several thought the MPO should set a threshold for each individual metric to better reflect the magnitude of change that would meaningfully affect people.

Stakeholders agreed that the MPO should do further work to identify appropriate thresholds for each metric and recommended that, until those are determined, the MPO should use a zero-percent threshold. They agreed with staff that the threshold would be applied to any results that fell outside of the margin of error of the modeling results.

Ultimately, staff believes that the final policy the MPO endorses should have a threshold that exceeds zero-percent. Staff agrees that the board needs more information to make a decision about a threshold, and that the MPO should explore having a threshold for each metric. Staff advocates for a threshold that exceeds zero-percent because statistically, it is difficult to obtain parity between two groups. The MPO's travel demand model produces fine-grained numeric results, such that a tiny difference can show up as a huge disparity. Staff wants to make sure the policy identifies impacts that are truly disproportionate and harmful.

### ***Next Steps***

First, staff will identify the margin of error for each metric. Any impact that falls outside the margin of error will be analyzed for disparate impacts. Second, staff will further explore thresholds for each metric, based on changes that are meaningful. Later in the fall, B. Harvey will provide the board with more information about possible thresholds. Staff hopes to have a presentation on the margins of error for the model results in January, and a draft DI/DB policy in February.

### ***Discussion***

E. Bourassa asked whether the stakeholder group discussed the comparison populations, and whether these are analyzed at a local level. B. Harvey replied that the comparison populations (minority vs. non-minority, and low-income vs. non-low-income) are set by the federal regulations, as well as the need to assess them at a regionwide level. E. Bourassa noted that for a metric such as *access to transit*, conducting a regionwide analysis may create the impression that no disparities exist, and a more

localized analysis may be more effective. B. Harvey replied that if the board wants to do other analyses member can instruct staff to do so, but that federal regulations require a regionwide analysis of projects in the aggregate. B. Harvey added that *access to transit* is not one of the metrics that staff will analyze. E. Bourassa asked B. Harvey to explain the mode-share impact that was listed as a priority by the working group. B. Harvey replied that staff will not analyze this impact, as it is very subjective and hard to quantify.

B. Rawson asked whether MPO staff will forecast the location or size of EJ populations in the LRTP. B. Harvey replied that staff do not forecast the size or location of low-income or minority populations for the horizon year of the LRTP, which is a caveat of this process.

S. Olanoff asked how the MPO can determine DI/DBs at the project-level if they are only analyzed regionwide. B. Harvey replied that staff would devise mitigation strategies on a regionwide basis, and would not recommend analyzing individual projects (outside of the equity analysis that is already conducted as part of TIP evaluations). The MPO can have more discussions about this topic. Because the eventual policy will be applied once *Destination 2040* is finalized, changing the specific project mix is not practical.

D. Mohler asked how it is possible to mitigate any DI/DBs that may be found in the project mix for *Destination 2040* without revising the inclusion of specific projects, given that this would violate federal regulations. K. Quackenbush replied that the regulations do not require a policy but only require the MPO to analyze the project mix at the aggregate level for DI/DBs and take steps to mitigate them if they are found. This would not necessarily require the MPO to alter the project mix if other strategies can be found to mitigate impacts. D. Mohler stressed that if the MPO adopts a policy which uses an analysis of a specific program of projects to establish whether there are DI/DBs and DI/DBs are found, it would be incumbent upon the MPO to address this by changing the specific projects that the analysis was conducted on. D. Mohler explained that it would not be effective to present a policy to the public that established the existence of DI/DBs as a result of the LRTP program of projects, and then to offer mitigation strategies that do not specifically alter the projects analyzed. D. Mohler suggested conducting this analysis before the program of projects is finalized to allow time for any alterations to be made. B. Harvey agreed that this makes sense, but that the schedule for the development of *Destination 2040* does not allow the time for this analysis. B. Harvey also noted that there are other considerations that affect project selection, which is why the federal regulations include language concerning “the substantial legitimate justification” for the inclusion of projects that produce DI/DBs.

*(Note: At this point, S. Woelfel assumed the chair's seat.)*

E. Bourassa questioned whether the LRTP is the correct place to apply the policy, given that the MPO only programs a fraction of its federal dollars in the LRTP.

Nelson Hoffman (FHWA) stated that FHWA sees this policy as evolving over time; and suggested applying the policy to past project mixes to see what the results would be.

David Koses (At-Large City) (City of Newton) noted that some of the impacts which will be analyzed, for example congestion, may be made worse by certain types of projects, such as Complete Streets, that the MPO knows are worthwhile for other reasons, and he expressed concern that the analysis would not capture such benefits. B. Harvey replied that this is a good point, but that this may not be a huge issue for analyzing the LRTP program of projects given that these are major infrastructure projects costing in excess of \$25 million dollars. Staff is considering developing a DI/DB policy for the TIP, which is where this issue may come into play.

S. Olanoff noted that while the LRTP includes transit projects, the MPO has not traditionally exercised much control over the prioritization of these projects. He asked how the MPO might respond if a DI/DB is found that could only be addressed by changes to transit. E. Bourassa replied that the board would likely focus on mitigating any DI/DBs regarding the highway funding that it has the most discretion over. Paul Regan (MBTA Advisory Board) noted that the MPO has flexed highway money to transit, notably to the Green Line Extension. He added that there is an extensive public process around the MBTA's Capital Investment Plan (CIP), so the MPO's process is not the only place for influence over project selection.

B. Rawson stressed that land use is a part of this equation, noting changes in housing and development that will likely occur between now and 2040. He urged the board to remember this when thinking about projects.

### **11. Intermodal Warehouses in Massachusetts and Update on the MPO's Freight Programs—*Bill Kuttner, MPO Staff***

B. Kuttner stated that most of the MPO staff's freight related work prior to 2013 was conducted in reaction to problems. In 2013, the MPO's Freight Action Plan laid out a proactive agenda that included annual funding for MPO staff to pursue planning and study opportunities regarding freight issues. Past studies have included analyses of truck traffic in Everett and Chelsea, and rest locations for long distance truck drivers. MPO staff conducts stakeholder outreach, including meetings with the state Freight Advisory Council and state and federal truck safety working groups. MPO staff is working on developing better modeling tools for freight analyses.

FHWA recently made available a draft intermodal database. MPO staff decided that further study was required before making use of these data. The focus of this study is commercial intermodal warehouses that offer logistic services. These facilities offer truck loading docks, an on-site rail siding, and a number of value-added logistic services. Because much of their revenue is derived from storage and logistic services, these facilities do not necessarily generate the large volumes of truck movements associated with the large intermodal terminals that merely transfer cargoes from one mode to another. These facilities provide services such as inventory management, local and regional pickup and delivery, and import-export customs compliance.

B. Kuttner briefly summarized three case studies of commercial intermodal warehouses identified in the study.

### ***Wilmington, Woburn, and Winchester Industrial Corridor***

Two warehouses on this corridor are approximately two miles apart, situated next to the MBTA commuter rail line to Lowell, in a transforming industrial area. Freight cars are brought by Pan Am Railways. This industrial corridor has evolved in response to real estate and transportation trends. The Anderson-Woburn Regional Transportation Center has been a catalyst. This remains a viable location for many industrial users, given the favorable zoning and freeway access. Both warehouses depend on the road network for both intermodal truck and truck-only movements. The company that owns both warehouses re-established carload rail service at its Winchester warehouse in 2013. It is noteworthy that the two carload rail freight customers in this area are distributors of construction materials. Construction materials are one freight traffic market in which carload rail freight is still competitive.

### ***Devens***

Devens is an emerging intermodal nexus with convenient rail access, and companies using carload freight rail service have been encouraged to establish operations there. Most of the industrial parcels at Devens have been developed. Some use both trucks and carload rail freight, and some operations use only trucks. Long-distance intermodal rail freight has enjoyed a long-term growth trend. The Pan Am Southern lift operations at this location will probably participate in this positive trend into the foreseeable future, and there are opportunities to further expand and modernize this terminal.

### ***Westfield***

Westfield offers logistic operations two important benefits: abundant land and convenient access to the express highway system. At this important nexus of the interstate highway system, the availability of carload rail freight service provides an additional transportation capability for companies to use. The nationwide home

improvement store chains, Lowe's and Home Depot, have constructed major distribution operations in Westfield.

### ***Summary***

The study found that commercial intermodal warehouses operate successfully with a variety of sizes and in diverse locations. The locations and facilities are appropriate to provide value-added services to customers, and different warehouses have different business emphases. The FHWA database was a useful starting point but should be reviewed and expanded upon.

### ***Discussion***

L. Gilmore asked about the use of the term "intermodal warehouses." B. Kuttner replied that he proposed the concept of commercial intermodal warehouses for the purposes of the study. L. Gilmore noted that there are other modes, such as air and ocean shipping, that factor into freight distribution.

J. Monty stated that the trend of warehouses moving farther out from urban centers most likely contribute to congestion and an increase in vehicle-miles traveled, and he asked whether this can be quantified. B. Kuttner agreed that this is an issue that should be explored further in the future. K. Quackenbush added that having done this work, B. Kuttner now has a better understanding of the overall freight network in the region and the state, and can add this information into the truck model and the regional travel demand model.

N. Hoffman agreed that the work is useful and suggested that this work be integrated into the next update of the state Freight Plan.

Thatcher Kezer III (MetroWest Regional Collaborative) (City of Framingham) noted that before becoming the chief operating officer for the City of Framingham he served as senior vice president of operations for MassDevelopment at the Devens site. He suggested that in future work, B. Kuttner speak with Quiet Logistics, given that internet sales will drive much of freight traffic going forward. T. Kezer stated that for many of these companies, timing and logistics trump land prices when choosing to locate facilities outside of urban centers.

S. Olanoff asked whether the MPO is any closer to making recommendations that can reduce the proliferation of trucks in urban areas. B. Kuttner replied that the state is working to strengthen rail, but that the proliferation of trucks is a function of the economy and private industry.

L. Gilmore asked about the current freight data sources that B. Kuttner utilizes.  
B. Kuttner replied that sources vary, but include electronic tolling and big data sources.

## **12.Members Items**

E. Bourassa reported that nomination papers for MPO elections were due on September 28, and all incumbents are running uncontested. The City of Woburn is running unopposed for the North Suburban Planning Council (NSPC) seat, the Town of Norwood is running unopposed for the Three Rivers Interlocal Council (TRIC) seat, the Town of Arlington is running unopposed for the At-Large Town seat, and the City of Newton is running unopposed for the At-Large City seat. The election will be held at MAPC's Fall Council Meeting on October 31, 2018.

N. Hoffman reminded the board that if they are interested in speaking with Rachel Strauss McBrien at the Volpe Center as part of the certification review, they are encouraged to do so.

## **13.Adjourn**

A motion to adjourn was made by MAPC (E. Bourassa) and seconded by the City of Boston (Boston Transportation Department) (T. Kadzis). 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)	Dave Kucharsky
City of Boston (Boston Planning & 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)	Brad Rawson
Massachusetts Department of Transportation	David Mohler
MassDOT Highway Division	John Romano
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 (City of Framingham)	Thatcher Kezer
Minuteman Advisory Group on Interlocal Coordination (Town of Bedford)	Richard Reed
North Shore Task Force (City of Beverly)	Denise Deschamps
North Suburban Planning Council (City of Woburn)	Tina Cassidy
Regional Transportation Advisory Council	AnaCristina Fragoso
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)	Steve Olanoff

---

---

<b>Other Attendees</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>
Frank A. Tramontozzi	City of Quincy
Bryan Pounds	MassDOT
Victoria Mier	MassDOT
Alexandra Schluntz	Conservation Law Foundation
Lenard Diggins	MBTA Rider Oversight Committee
Brandon Wilcox	Federal Highway Administration

---

---

**MPO Staff/Central Transportation Planning Staff**

---

Karl Quackenbush, Executive Director  
Robin Mannion  
Mark Abbott  
Casey-Marie Claude  
Róisín Foley  
Betsy Harvey  
Ryan Hicks  
Ali Kleyman  
Ben Krepp  
Bill Kuttner  
Anne McGahan  
Scott Peterson

---