

# Memorandum for the Record

## Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization Meeting

### November 15, 2018 Meeting

10:00 AM–12:40 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 on the following items:

- Approve the minutes of the October 4, 2018, meeting
- Approve the work program for *Transportation Access Studies of Central Business Districts (CBD)*
- Release Amendment One to the Federal Fiscal Years (FFY) 2019–23 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for a 21-day public review period
- Re-elect the Metropolitan Area Planning Council (MAPC) to serve as Vice-Chair of the MPO board

### Meeting Agenda

#### 1. Introductions

See attendance on page 17.

#### 2. Public Comments

John D. Petrin (Town Administrator, Town of Burlington), Rick Parker (President, Burlington Area Chamber of Commerce [BACC]), and Stephanie Cronin (Executive Director, Middlesex 3 Coalition) advocated for the MPO board to adopt TIP Amendment One. The proposed amendment would provide \$290,000 in seed funding for Middlesex 3 Transportation Management Association (M3TMA) to lease a 25-passenger vehicle for fixed-route shuttle service between Lowell and Burlington. A written summary of the funding request is available on the [MPO meeting calendar](#). Burlington is at the edge of the MAPC and Boston Region MPO area, and the Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority (MBTA) service area. The Lowell Regional Transit Authority (LRTA) and the Northern Middlesex Council of Governments (NMCOG) serve municipalities to the north and west of Burlington. There is little transit service between the two different service

areas, and transit-dependent workers from Lowell are unable to reach Burlington. Burlington area employers have been unable to fill as many as 600 jobs in the hospitality and restaurant industries. The BACC has received a financial commitment from local business owners to assume the cost of operating the shuttle after it has operated for three years with the seed capital in this request. The \$290,000 that M3TMA is requesting from the MPO would be matched by funds from the state operating budget, businesses, developers, property owners, municipalities, educational institutions, and ridership. The majority of the funding for the shuttle service is coming from private sector employers in Burlington, and following the third year of the shuttle will run without state or MPO funding.

### ***Discussion***

Jim Gillooly (City of Boston) (Boston Transportation Department) asked how M3TMA plans to promote ridership and structure the shuttle service. S. Cronin replied that M3TMA will collaborate with the business community in Burlington and the City of Lowell to promote ridership. The planned route includes two to three stops in Lowell based upon employee zip code data and several stops in Burlington based upon the location of participating employers. M3TMA expects to start with two runs in the afternoon and evening, which will likely grow as ridership does.

Eric Bourassa (MAPC) asked whether M3TMA will charge fares. S. Cronin replied that they do not plan to charge fares. Employers, property owners, and developers will offset costs.

J. Gillooly asked whether M3TMA already has the \$125,000 in state funds. Rick Reed (Minuteman Advisory Group on Interlocal Coordination) (Town of Bedford) replied that this funding has been appropriated by the state legislature in FFY 2019 and Middlesex 3 Coalition just has to submit an invoice to receive the funds.

### **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 met on November 14, 2018, and discussed the development of the MPO's Disparate Impact and Disproportionate Burden Policy. The Advisory Council will meet on December 12, 2018.

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

K. Quackenbush announced that the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) Committee will meet immediately prior to the next MPO meeting on December 6, 2018.

K. Quackenbush added that MPO staff plans to bring a proposed amendment to the MPO's Public Participation Plan no later than February 2019. D. Mohler added that at the joint MBTA Fiscal and Management Control and MassDOT Board meeting on Monday, November 19, 2018, MPO, MassDOT, and MAPC staff will participate in a presentation about transportation modeling.

## **7. Approval of October 4, 2018, MPO Meeting Minutes—*Róisín Foley, MPO Staff***

A motion to approve the minutes of the meeting of October 4, 2018, was made by MAPC (E. Bourassa) and seconded by the SouthWest Advisory Planning Committee (Town of Medway) (Glenn Trindade). The MetroWest Regional Collaborative (City of Framingham) (D. Giombetti) abstained. The motion carried.

## **8. Work Program for Transportation Access Studies of CBDs—*Andrew Clark, MPO Staff***

The curbside lane in a municipality's CBD has been used traditionally for parking, but the growing popularity of dedicated bus lanes and the rise of ride hailing have challenged that status quo. As the curbside lane is reimagined in the Boston region, it is important to understand the effects not only on traffic and bus riders but also on the businesses that the transportation system serves. The goal of this study is to understand better the transportation access modes of CBD patrons in the Boston region. The findings from this study could be used to inform planning processes that address transportation access of CBDs and the use of the curbside travel lane, and to develop policies that better serve transit and non-motorized modes.

MPO staff will identify the CBDs in the Boston region and classify them into groups based on their characteristics. Staff initially will identify CBDs in the Boston region based on the locations within a municipality with the highest densities of population, employment, civic uses, and roads. Staff will classify the CBDs in the Boston region according to characteristics that may affect patrons' mode choices. The initial classification will reflect the type and level of transit service available, with one group comprised of CBDs with no transit service. Staff will survey a sample of business owners in each of the selected CBDs to ask about the modes that they think their patrons use to access their businesses. Then staff will survey a sample of the patrons of those businesses to ask about their access modes, shopping habits, and demographics.

Staff will also inventory existing curb-lane designations and off-street parking near the selected businesses. Staff will produce a final report and present the findings of the study to the MPO board. The work completed through this study will address the following goal areas established in the MPO's Long-Range Transportation Plan: capacity management and mobility, clean air and clean communities, transportation equity, and economic vitality. The results of this study will be used in the subsequent Future of the Curb study, which will explore current demands on the curbside lane, the ways progressive regions are repurposing the lane, and potential considerations for usage of the curb in the future. The budget for this project is \$85,000 and it is estimated to take 10 months to complete.

***Discussion***

E. Bourassa asked if staff know how many CBDs they will be able to survey. A. Clark replied that staff is currently planning to assess four CBDs, depending on available data and budget. A. Clark added that staff intends to reach out to all area municipalities and encourage participation.

David Kucharsky (At-Large Town) (Town of Lexington) asked whether staff will note whether local zoning in selected CBDs requires implementation of transportation demand management (TDM) measures. A. Clark replied that MPO staff will be analyzing zoning considerations.

Daniel Amstutz (At-Large Town) (Town of Arlington) registered interest in participation on behalf of Arlington, citing experience with implementing a bus rapid transit (BRT) pilot on Massachusetts Avenue. D. Amstutz asked how staff will approach the issue of municipalities that have more than one CBD. A. Clark replied that staff will use the guidance of municipalities on this issue to select one CBD.

Jay Monty (At-Large City) (City of Everett) registered interest in participation on behalf of Everett and advocated for the inclusion of municipalities that have made BRT and other improvements a local priority. J. Monty also advocated for expanding the study budget to include more CBDs.

David Koses (At-Large City) (City of Newton) registered interest in participation on behalf of Newton.

Tom Bent (Inner Core Committee) (City of Somerville) registered interest in participation on behalf of Somerville.

Tom Kadzis (City of Boston) (Boston Transportation Department) suggested that staff coordinate with municipal staff responsible for issuing valet permits, which can offer a picture of changing curbside dynamics.

T. Teich registered interest in participation on behalf of Cambridge and Advisory Council support for the study. T. Teich added that a way to promote coordination on this issue might be to convene a conversation with multiple communities.

***Vote***

A motion to approve the work program for Transportation Access Studies of CBDs was made by the Inner Core Committee (City of Somerville) (T. Bent) and seconded by the SouthWest Advisory Planning Committee (Town of Medway) (G. Trindade). The motion carried.

**9. Amendment One to the FFYs 2019-23 TIP—*Alexandra (Ali) Kleyman, MPO Staff***

***Documents posted to the MPO meeting calendar***

1. [FFYs 2019–23 TIP Draft Amendment One Summary: Highway](#)
2. [FFYs 2019–23 TIP Draft Amendment One Summary: Transit](#)

Amendment One includes changes to highway funding in FFY 2019 and transit funding in FFYs 2019–23. The amendment moves federal earmarks for project #606226 (Reconstruction of Rutherford Avenue in Boston) from FFY 2021 to FFY 2019, to be used for project design costs, and uses remaining MPO funds in FFY 2019 to provide seed capital for M3TMA to run second shift and weekend shuttle service between Lowell and Burlington. Other changes to highway funding include the addition of two new projects, an increase in funding for one project, and an increase in cost for another project.

The changes to transit projects reflect funds carried over from FFY 2018 to FFY 2019, and align the TIP with the Capital Investment Program approved in June 2018. The amendment reflects the addition of MBTA projects including Automatic Train Control for Commuter Rail, Green Line track upgrades, Red Line interlocking upgrades, Alewife Crossing improvements, additional funding for battery-electric buses, and the procurement of maintenance vehicles. The amendment removes the North Station Draw 1 bridge project, which will be completed without federal funds. In addition, the amendment removes the Elevator and Escalator Program and includes elevator and escalator initiatives under the overall Stations and Facilities Program.

### ***Discussion***

Steve Olanoff (Three Rivers Interlocal Council) (Town of Norwood/Neponset Valley Chamber of Commerce) asked why the cost for project #608608 (Highway Lighting Improvements at I-93/Route 3 Interchange in Braintree) increased by \$2,688,726. John Bechard replied that he was not able to speak to the project manager about this prior to the meeting.

T. Teich asked for additional clarity on project #607954 (Bridge Replacement, D-03-018, ST 128 over Waters River in Danvers). D. Mohler replied that this project was advertised in FFY 2017 for \$17.3 million. The project did not advance, but the money is still available. An additional \$4.3 million will be obligated from the FFY 2019 bridge program. T. Teich added that as much clarity and transparency related to bridge projects that can be made available to MPO members is appreciated.

E. Bourassa clarified that the \$290,000 requested by M3TMA would come out of the \$1.6 million remaining MPO target funds in FFY 2019.

Paul Regan (MBTA Advisory Board) asked about funding for the MBTA's Signals/Systems Upgrade Program and the Green Line Extension (GLX). Samantha Silverberg (MBTA) clarified that the MBTA has secured federal loans for signals upgrade but currently has access to lower borrowing rates elsewhere. The MBTA is obligating these funds for Automatic Train Control in order to have the option of not using the federal loans when they become available should rates remain favorable. S. Silverberg added that the funds for GLX are not the MPO's target funds, but from Federal Transit Administration's (FTA) New Starts grant program.

### ***Vote***

A motion to release Amendment One to the FFYs 2019–23 TIP for a 21-day public review period was made by the MBTA Advisory Board (P. Regan) and seconded by MAPC (E. Bourassa). The motion carried.

## **10. Election of the Vice Chair of the MPO Board—*Karl Quackenbush, Executive Director, Central Transportation Planning Staff***

K. Quackenbush stated that the Vice Chair is elected to a one-year term, and eligible entities are MAPC, the MBTA Advisory Board, and At-Large and subregional municipal representatives. The chief duties of the Vice Chair are to participate in agenda setting and preside at meetings when the Chair is unavailable.

***Vote***

A motion to nominate MAPC (E. Bourassa) to serve as Vice Chair of the MPO board was made by the MBTA Advisory Board (P. Regan) and seconded by the South Shore Coalition (Town of Braintree) (Melissa Santucci Rozzi). The motion carried.

**11. Work Plan for Regional Model Enhancements—Edward Bromage, MPO Staff**

MPO staff's Travel Model Development (TMD) group is funded principally by this work plan. The TMD group is responsible for revising regional travel demand forecasting model (regional model) functionality to address needs, and investigating and developing new modeling tools. E. Bromage stated that the Boston Region MPO's model is superior to many other regional models and unique in that it is developed entirely in house. The regional model is a key tool that supports the analyses in the Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP), the TIP, and numerous agency-funded technical studies, such as MassDOT's Rail Vision initiative. E. Bromage highlighted several important tasks included in the work plan.

***Activity Based Model (ABM) Development***

The current regional model is a trip-based model, which views the trip-making activity of similarly sized households uniformly across the region. Under this work plan, the TMD group will continue development of an Activity Based Model (ABM). ABMs are valued for their ability to provide answers to complex questions such as traveler responses to pricing proposals, time-of-day dynamics, and finer-grained analyses of impacts on individuals and households. This will allow the model to more accurately reflect the impact of forecasted population and demographic shifts.

***Tool to Provide Forecasting Interval Estimates***

Also included in this work plan is the creation of an add-on tool that will allow staff to quantify forecasting uncertainty and ascertain whether the impacts of a proposed project, plan, or policy would have a disparate impact on minority or low-income communities beyond the margin of forecasting error in the model. The resultant tool could also be used to provide ranges of outputs or forecasting intervals for other types of analyses typically performed with the regional model, such as project screening.

***Study and Analysis of Transportation Network Companies (TNCs)***

Under this work plan, staff will work to address the knowledge gaps regarding TNCs (such as Lyft and Uber) by analyzing currently available sources and conducting background research on how other regions of the country are analyzing and modeling TNCs. Recently, computer science researchers at Northeastern University conducted a

study of TNC trips in Boston proper and were able to collect a significant amount of travel data, which could be mined to approximate trip generation and travel patterns.

### ***Four-Step Model Lite***

Currently, model run times are between 12 and 28 hours. To help with project screening and alternatives analyses, users have requested a faster, lighter version of the regional model that can be run in less than 30 minutes. This “model lite” will run from the existing TransCAD model databases, so updates to the larger model will be included in the “lite” version.

### ***Discussion***

E. Bourassa asked about the timeline for completion of the various tasks. E. Bromage replied that staff has already begun the TNC work, and that the model lite would likely be ready by February or March of 2020.

J. Gillooly asked about the level of detail that is lost between the full model and the lite version and why staff would not want to use the lite version for all analyses. E. Bromage stated that parts of the region would be represented at a much higher level in the lite version. The model currently includes the entire state. For many localized projects, this may be adequate.

Jim Fitzgerald (City of Boston) (Boston Planning & Development Agency) asked whether a budget for the availability of the lite version has been developed. E. Bromage replied that once it is developed and documented, the availability of the model lite will depend on budget priorities similar to those of the larger model.

S. Olanoff asked whether it is time to conduct a new household travel survey, given the age of the 2011 Massachusetts Travel Survey on which much of the model is based. E. Bromage replied that a discussion about conducting a new survey should be had, perhaps planning for 2021. E. Bromage added that some cell phone data are available that could supplement or replace the need for a full survey such as the one conducted in 2011.

D. Mohler asked what cell phone data staff currently own. E. Bromage responded that staff has INRIX and Bing data, and has tested some data from StreetLight.

## **12. Long-Range Transportation Plan Needs Assessment, Goals, and Objectives—Anne McGahan, MPO Staff**

### ***Documents posted to the MPO meeting calendar***

1. [Draft Needs Assessment Summary and Recommendations](#)



2. [Proposed Changes to Existing Vision, Goals, and Objectives](#)

***Draft Needs Assessment Summary and Recommendations***

The LRTP Needs Assessment includes data and analyses about existing transportation, population, and employment conditions, and projections of future transportation demand. The final Needs Assessment will inform the MPO's discussion of investment strategies for *Destination 2040*. The Draft Needs Assessment Summary and Recommendations memorandum presents a summary of needs identified from off-model and model analyses, studies conducted by the MPO and others, and public outreach. The memo lists recommendations for addressing these identified needs. The memo identifies under which of the MPO's six goal areas the recommendations fall. The six goal areas are Safety, System Preservation, Capacity Management and Mobility, Clean Air and Clean Communities, Transportation Equity, and Economic Vitality.

For each goal, the memo lists:

- existing or planned MPO programs and studies that address identified needs;
- potential programs and studies that would address identified needs, to be considered for implementation in *Destination 2040*; and
- other actions the MPO may take to address needs.

This information is listed in tables 7–11 in the memorandum.

The memo includes information gleaned from the MPO's performance-based planning process, recent studies, and public input. Notable changes from the Needs Assessment for the previous LRTP, *Charting Progress to 2040*, include information related to transit safety, connected and autonomous vehicles, transit asset state of good repair and modernization, climate resiliency, ride hailing, and accessibility. In particular, the Transportation Equity goal area has expanded to consider the needs of elderly adults, youth, people with limited English proficiency, people with a disability, and transit dependent households.

The travel model analyses used to design this memo used demographic projections from *Charting Progress to 2040*. New demographic projections are now available, and staff will be rerunning the model. Once the travel model results have been updated, staff will review the draft recommendations presented in the memo and report with any revisions. The final Needs Assessment will be completed in the winter.

Staff asks that the board review the Draft Needs Assessment Summary and Recommendations and provide any desired input prior to the presentation of the final Needs Assessment and discussion of possible investment strategies for *Destination 2040*.

### **Discussion**

D. Mohler asked why “Explore the viability of an MPO-funded transit state-of-good-repair and modernization program” is listed under “Other Potential MPO Actions” (Table 11, Page 55) and not under “Potential Programs to be considered for Implementation by the MPO.” A. Mcgahan stated that staff did not want to make the leap to suggest this as a program. D. Mohler stated that if staff thinks something is a good idea, they should suggest it, regardless of any pushback they think may come from members of the board related to flexing highway funds to transit. D. Mohler asked whether the inclusion of “Conduct congestion pricing research,” under “Potential Studies to be considered by the MPO” (Table 10, Page 53) means that staff believes the board should discuss funding congestion pricing research. K. Quackenbush replied that these recommendations are included for the board to discuss and consider. D. Mohler encouraged board members to read the entire Draft Needs Assessment Summary and Recommendations memo, particularly the recommendations tables.

E. Bourassa thanked A. Mcgahan and staff for their work and stated that he appreciated the opportunity to do this kind of strategic thinking in the context of the LRTP process.

Nelson Hoffman (Federal Highway Administration) asked about the inclusion of bridge and other major infrastructure projects in Table 2, “System Preservation Needs in the Boston Region Identified through Data Analysis and Public Outreach” (Page 13), given that the MPO does not generally program major infrastructure. A. Mcgahan replied that the MPO has programmed major infrastructure projects, including interchange modernization, in the past, and will have to decide whether it wishes to do so going forward.

S. Silverberg stated that she was pleased to see an emphasis on modernization and state-of-good-repair, as well as the recommendation of a “Dedicated Bus Lanes” program (Table 8, Page 51). S. Silverberg recommended expanding this recommended program to include other bus infrastructure (shelters, transit signal priority, curbs cuts) that municipalities could take the lead on. S. Silverberg stressed the importance of planning for climate resiliency, and suggested that the MPO set project evaluation policies for resilience.

### ***Proposed Changes to Existing Vision, Goals, and Objectives***

The revised LRTP vision, goals, and objectives will be used to guide future transportation investments in the region and will be the basis for the evaluation criteria used in selecting investments for *Destination 2040*. They will also be used to revise TIP evaluation criteria.

Staff used input collected during outreach for the Needs Assessment, and data collected through studies and analyses, to suggest revisions to the existing vision, goals, and objectives from *Charting Progress to 2040*. Most of the existing goals and objectives were broad enough to cover the topics and concerns identified during outreach, but that some changes were needed in order to better align with the roles and responsibilities of the MPO, and incorporate public feedback and new planning requirements.

The majority of the suggested changes are to the Transportation Equity goal and objectives. Staff heard extensive feedback about accessibility issues, climate change, resiliency, and the effects of emerging technologies such as TNCs (for example, Uber and Lyft). These have been incorporated into the following suggested revisions to the current vision:

#### **Current Vision**

The Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization envisions a modern transportation system that is safe, uses new technologies, and provides equitable access, excellent mobility, and varied transportation options—in support of a sustainable, healthy, livable, and economically vibrant region.

#### **Proposed Changes**

The Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization envisions a modern, **well-maintained** transportation system that is safe, **resilient, incorporates emerging technologies**, and provides equitable access, excellent mobility, and varied transportation options—in support of a sustainable, healthy, livable, and economically vibrant region.

A. Mcgahan described the suggested revisions to each goal area.

#### ***Safety***

The proposed revisions to the objectives for the Safety goal area are designed to incorporate additional types of safety events besides crashes, and to better align with the MPO's focus on capital investment as opposed to operations.

### ***System Preservation***

Staff proposes to incorporate modernization into the System Preservation Goal statement, including changing the goal name from System Preservation to System Preservation and Modernization. Staff also proposes to include resiliency in the System Preservation goal statement. Addressing climate change remains a priority for the MPO and has become a core goal of the Commonwealth. Feedback from public outreach also indicated the importance of creating a resilient transportation network.

### ***Capacity Management and Mobility***

As a result of outreach and analysis, staff believed that while the Capacity Management and Mobility goal requires little modification, the objectives required some re-arrangement and minor modifications. The recommended revision to the existing goal to “increase transportation options” reflects analysis as well as public input that the MPO should promote transit, walking, and biking while attempting to support congestion mitigation. It should also remain flexible in the face of emerging technologies and mobility paradigms such as Connected and Autonomous Vehicles and TNCs.

In addition, the MPO must respond to a wide variety of federal performance metrics, as well as values and mandates that derive from state-level legislation. The updates to the Capacity Management and Mobility goals and objectives are intended to capture public input and new MPO commitments, as well as to align the objectives better with the MPO’s role in the transportation planning process.

### ***Transportation Equity***

The proposed changes to the goals and objectives for Transportation Equity reflect

- Public input and analyses documented in the Needs Assessment
- FTA and Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Title VI, environmental justice (EJ), and other nondiscrimination guidance
- Consideration of all equity populations in all aspects of the MPO’s planning and decision-making process beyond people who identify as minority or are members of low-income households

The changes would tie the equity goal more closely with the other MPO goals, recognizing that equity is integral to all MPO activities. Because of themes that have emerged as part of the Needs Assessment, staff is proposing to add two new objectives—improved accessibility for people with a disability and investments to support transportation needs of the elderly (people 75 years old or older) and youth (people 17 years old or younger) populations in the region.

The existing goal and objectives have been refined to focus on the potential impacts—whether benefits or burdens—of MPO investments on equity populations. This change reflects the MPO’s recent and planned work that examines the potential benefits and burdens associated with MPO investments.

In addition, the objective related to public outreach has been removed because the goals and objectives are concerned with transportation system outcomes, rather than the MPO’s planning processes. This change in no way reflects the MPO’s commitment to ensuring that all people have meaningful opportunities to be engaged in MPO activities. Instead, this commitment will be described in detail in a revised MPO Public Participation Plan, and documented in the public outreach process for the LRTP, *Destination 2040*.

The changes to the existing goal and objectives will also bring them into alignment with guidance from FHWA and FTA by clarifying which equity populations are covered and by expanding the populations that are covered to include all equity populations, per federal guidance. The current goal and objectives refer only to minority and low-income populations, whereas FTA and FHWA recommend including all populations protected by federal mandates throughout the entire MPO planning process. As defined under Title VI, EJ, or other nondiscrimination mandates, “equity populations” are people who identify as minority, have limited English proficiency, are 75 years old or older or 17 years old or younger, or have a disability; or are members of low-income households.

### ***Clean Air/Clean Communities***

Staff proposes to change name of the goal area from Clean Air/Clean Communities to Clean Air/Green or Sustainable Communities, as “Green or Sustainable Communities” could include more types of environmental initiatives. Staff proposes changes to the objectives to include other state and regional climate change plans and policies.

### ***Economic Vitality***

Staff proposes a change to one objective based on public input regarding the workforce population. This should be inclusive of all populations. A second change incorporates freight as an important part of targeted development.

A. Mcgahan stated that once the MPO discusses and approves the revisions, they will be released for public comment for at least 30 days. The MPO will vote to approve the revised vision, goals, and objectives at the first meeting in January.

### ***Discussion***

S. Olanoff asked about the inclusion of people with limited English proficiency (LEP) in the goal statement for Transportation Equity. Elizabeth Harvey (MPO Staff) clarified that

for the purposes of the Civil Rights Act, “national origin,” has been clarified to protect LEP populations.

R. Reed asked whether the Transportation Equity goal statements should refer to gender rather than “sex.” E. Harvey clarified that sex is protected under federal law, not gender.

D. Koses asked about the use of the word “comparable,” in the Transportation Equity goal statement. D. Mohler suggested that better wording may be “at least comparable.” E. Harvey agreed that the board could use stronger language. T. Teich agreed, stating that it was the opinion of the Disparate Impact/Disproportionate Burden Policy Stakeholder Working Group that the MPO should attempt to redress existing inequities in the system, not just avoid creating new ones.

T. Kadzis asked how the MPO could “ensure” that its investments were redressing existing inequities, if stronger language is chosen. D. Amstutz suggested editing the suggested goal statement to “at least comparable,” or “comparable or better.”

E. Harvey clarified that because the goals and objectives will be used to guide the MPO’s thinking when creating TIP evaluation criteria, and the DI/DB policy relates only to the investments in the LRTP in the aggregate, the goals can be broader or more aspirational than the policy if the board wishes.

D. Mohler noted that should the MPO choose a goal statement that looks toward redressing systemic racial and economic inequalities, it would not necessarily be enough just to score projects but also to advance projects that redress these issues. E. Harvey replied that if the MPO wants to have that discussion as it relates to project selection, it can.

J. Monty stated his feeling that one of the existing Transportation Equity objectives actually reflects the desire to redress inequities better than the proposed revision, given that the existing objectives states “target investments to areas that benefit high percentages of low-income and minority populations,” rather than, “ensure all equity populations receive benefits comparable to those received by non-equity populations from MPO investments.” E. Harvey clarified that that change was meant to move away from an emphasis on benefiting specific geographies and towards ensuring benefits to people.

T. Teich advocated for stronger language that covers all equity populations.

J. Monty suggested changing the statement to “target investments to ensure that all equity populations receive benefits,” or something similar. T. Kadzis agreed.

A. McGahan asked the board to weigh in on changing Clean Air and Clean Communities to Clean Air and Green Communities or Clean Air and Sustainable Communities. The consensus was to use Clean Air and Sustainable Communities.

### **13. FFYs 2020-24 TIP and FFY 2020 UPWP Schedules—Ali Kleyman, MPO Staff**

#### ***Documents posted to the MPO meeting calendar***

1. [Key Document Schedules and Updates](#)

A. Kleyman reviewed the planned schedule for the development of the FFYs 2020–24 TIP and the FFY 2020 UPWP. Staff has begun outreach for both documents, meeting with MAPC subregions throughout the fall, but the majority of development will take place in February and March. A. Kleyman reminded the board that relevant materials are posted to the [UPWP](#) and [TIP Development](#) webpages and encouraged members to suggest any changes or revisions to the presentation of development materials, such as project evaluation results, that may help them better understand the process.

### **14. FFYs 2020-24 TIP and LRTP Universe of Projects—Ali Kleyman, MPO Staff**

#### ***Documents posted to the MPO meeting calendar***

1. [FFYs 2020–24 Draft TIP Universe of Projects Table 1: Currently Programmed](#)
2. [FFYs 2020–24 Draft TIP Universe of Projects Table 2: TIP Projects to Consider for Programming](#)
3. [FFYs 2020–24 Draft TIP Universe of Projects Table 3: LRTP Projects to Consider for Programming](#)
4. [FFYs 2020–24 Draft TIP Universe of Projects Table 4: Inactive, Low Priority, or Completed Projects](#)

A. Kleyman reviewed the initial Universe of Projects eligible for funding the FFYs 2020–24 TIP, and asked attendees to review the materials and submit project data where available.

#### ***Discussion***

D. Amstutz asked about a project in Arlington and whether it could be programmed. A. Kleyman clarified that, generally speaking, projects that are not yet approved by MassDOT’s Project Review Committee do not have the information necessary to be evaluated, but that she and D. Amstutz could discuss further.

### **15.Members' Items**

D. Kucharsky announced that this would be his last meeting representing the Town of Lexington on the MPO board, as he had accepted a position with the City of Salem.

G. Trindade asked whether tablets could be provided for MPO members in order to cut down on the amount of paper handouts. K. Quackenbush replied that this issue had come up in the past, and tablets had been found not to be a feasible solution financially or technically.

### **16.Adjourn**

A motion to adjourn was made by the Inner Core Committee (City of Somerville) (T. Bent) and seconded by the South West Advisory Planning Committee (Town of Medway) (G. Trindade). The motion carried.



## Attendance

<b>Members</b>	<b>Representatives and Alternates</b>
At-Large City (City of Everett)	Jay Monty
At-Large City (City of Newton)	David Koses
At-Large Town (Town of Arlington)	Daniel Amstutz
At-Large Town (Town of Lexington)	David Kucharsky
City of Boston (Boston Planning & Development Agency)	Jim Fitzgerald
City of Boston (Boston Transportation Department)	Jim Gillooly
Federal Highway Administration	Nelson Hoffman
Federal Transit Administration	
Inner Core Committee (City of Somerville)	Tom Bent
Massachusetts Department of Transportation (MassDOT)	David Mohler
MassDOT Highway Division	John Bechard
	John Romano
Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority (MBTA)	Samantha Silverberg
Massachusetts Port Authority	
MBTA Advisory Board	Paul Regan
Metropolitan Area Planning Council	Eric Bourassa
MetroWest Regional Collaborative (City of Framingham)	Dennis Giombetti Thatcher Kezer III
Minuteman Advisory Group on Interlocal Coordination (Town of Bedford)	Rick 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)	Melissa Santucci Rozzi
South West Advisory Planning Committee (Town of Medway)	Glenn Trindade
Three Rivers Interlocal Council (Town of Norwood/Neponset Valley Chamber of Commerce)	Steve Olanoff

---

<b>Other Attendees</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>
Bryan Pounds	MassDOT
Stephanie Cronin	Middlesex 3 Coalition
Victoria Mier	MassDOT
Rick Parker	Burlington Chamber of Commerce
Tim Bethke	TomTom
Ed Carr	MWRTA
Tom Kadzis	City of Boston
Eva Willens	MWRTA
Frank A. Tramontozzi	City of Quincy
Kenneth Zauderer	MBTA

---

---

**MPO Staff/Central Transportation Planning Staff**

---

Karl Quackenbush, Executive Director  
Robin Mannion  
Ed Bromage  
Andrew Clark  
Róisín Foley  
Betsy Harvey  
Alexandra (Ali) Kleyman  
Anne McGahan  
Scott Peterson  
Katie Pincus-Stetner  
Michelle Scott

---