

**Memorandum for the Record
Transportation Planning and Programming Committee of the
Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO)**

February 17, 2011 Meeting

10:00 AM – 11:45 AM, State Transportation Building, Conference Rooms 2 and 3, 10 Park Plaza, Boston

Stephen Woelfel, Chair, representing Jeffrey Mullan, Secretary and Chief Executive Officer, Massachusetts Department of Transportation (MassDOT)

Decisions

The Transportation Planning and Programming Committee agreed to take the following actions:

- approve the minutes of the meeting of January 27
- approve for public review a proposed Amendment Three of the federal fiscal year (FFY) 2011 element of the FFYs 2011-14 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) that would add an approximate \$5 million earmark for the *Somerville – Assembly Square Multimodal Access Improvement* project, would remove the *Somerville Community Path, Phase 1* project and reallocate those funds and funds from the *Concord and Lincoln – Route 2 (Crosby's Corner)* project to the *Somerville – Assembly Square Multimodal Access Improvement* project, and release the document for a 30-day public review period
- approve the work program for *Maintenance Costs for Municipally Controlled Federal-Aid Eligible Roadways*

Meeting Agenda

1. Public Comments

Several members of the public expressed their support for the *Somerville – Community Path* project, which would be affected if the MPO approves the proposed Amendment Three to the FFYs 2011 – 2014 TIP. The amendment would remove the *Community Path* project from the FFY 2011 element of the TIP in order to make funding available for the *Somerville – Assembly Square Orange Line Station* project. It would also reduce the FFY 2011 cash flows in FFY 2011 of the *Concord and Lincoln – Route 2 (Crosby's Corner)* project.

David Watson, Executive of the Massachusetts Bicycle Coalition, noted that the *Community Path* would provide access to transit and would be part of a growing network of trails in the region. He urged the MPO to reprogram the project in the FFY 2012 element of the TIP.

Renata von Tscherner, President of the Charles River Conservancy, stated that the *Community Path* will be an important part of the growing network of bikeways and pathways in the Charles River area. She noted that the Conservancy has raised \$2.5 million for a skate park, that federal funds are being used to construct a pedestrian bridge

connecting North Point to Charlestown, and that mitigation for the Central Artery project will also fund connections in the area. She noted that the *Community Path* is a vital link in the network and asked the MPO to keep the project high on their list of priorities.

Carl Wagner, Arlington resident, spoke about how the *Community Path* project has a role in making the metropolitan area more bike- and pedestrian-friendly, and in helping people reduce automobile usage.

Mark Jaquith, Association of Cambridge Neighborhoods, noted that the *Community Path* would fill a gap in the bicycle and pedestrian network serving Cambridge. He asked the MPO to support it.

Lynn Weissman, Co-president of the Friends of the Community Path, expressed understanding about the MPO's proposed amendment and approval of the decision to fund the *Assembly Square* project. She asked the MPO members to keep in mind the importance of the *Community Path*, that the synergy between the path and Green Line will increase transit ridership, that the path is a zero emissions transportation project, and that it will connect the Minuteman Bikeway to the Charles River path networks. She asked the members to re-allocate funds in a future TIP element and possibly increase funding for the project.

Tim Higgins, Town Administrator for the Town of Lincoln, reported that he would be available to answer any questions members might have about the schedule of the *Crosby's Corner* project. He noted that the variance process is expected to be complete by early summer and the project is on schedule to be advertised in August. He expressed understanding of the MPO's need to balance priorities, and hope that the MPO will sustain its support for the *Crosby's Corner* project.

Alan Moore, Friends of the Community Path, expressed understanding for the MPO's decision to shift funds from the *Community Path* to the *Assembly Square Orange Line Station* project. He asked that the MPO reprogram funds for the *Community Path* in the next TIP.

Wig Zamore, Somerville Transportation Equity Partnership and Mystic View Task Force, spoke in support of shifting funds to the *Assembly Square Orange Line Station* project and agreement with the previous comments regarding the *Community Path*. He remarked that the City of Somerville has the most highway and diesel rail through traffic in the region and that for a more sustainable future, transit and bicycle travel must be encouraged in the corridor. He also remarked upon what he called the "local sacrifice" being made by residents of the City of Somerville to move the Assembly Square development forward. The City has received an I-Cubed grant from the Commonwealth which it will have to repay if the development does not produce a certain number of jobs.

Jonah Petri, Friends of the Community Path, spoke in support of the *Community Path* and asked members to program the project in the next TIP. He noted that he chose Somerville as his residence because the city supports the ideals of smart growth and alternative

transportation and because of the *Community Path*, which will provide connections to the Minuteman Bikeway and Boston in the future.

Chelsea Clarke, Groundwork Somerville, expressed support for funding the *Assembly Square* and *Community Path* projects. She reported that she works with youth in Somerville and that the *Community Path* is important to them. She also noted that the path will allow them to bicycle to Boston and to the Minuteman Bikeway. She asked the members to program the project in the next TIP.

2. Chair's Report – *Stephen Woelfel, MassDOT*

There was none.

3. Subcommittee Chairs' Report – *Eric Bourassa, Metropolitan Area Planning Council (MAPC)*

The Clean Air and Mobility Program Subcommittee will meet this afternoon after the Transportation Planning and Programming Committee meeting to begin reviewing applications for Clean Air and Mobility Program funding.

4. Regional Transportation Advisory Council Report – *Steve Olanoff, Regional Transportation Advisory Council*

The Advisory Council met last week and discussed the Needs Assessment for the Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP). The Freight Committee is preparing a comment letter expressing concerns that the region relies too heavily on trucks for freight distribution, that freight distribution facilities in the urban core should be preserved, and that freight rail traffic is restricted due to the sharing of lines with passenger rail.

The Advisory Council will meet next on March 9 for a special Health and Transportation meeting.

5. Director's Report – *Karl Quackenbush, Acting Director, Central Transportation Planning Staff (CTPS)*

Members were provided with two memoranda that discuss the MPO's Walkable Community Workshops and Livable Communities Workshops Program. (See attached.) The first discusses Walkable Community Workshops that were held in 2009 and 2010 and the outcomes of those meetings. The second discusses plans for the Livable Communities Workshops Program, a collaboration between CTPS and MAPC. These plans include offering regional forums, workshops, and a website of resources.

6. Meeting Minutes – *Pam Wolfe, Manager of Certification Activities, MPO Staff*

A motion to approve the minutes of the meeting of January 27 was made by E. Bourassa, and seconded by S. Woelfel. The motion passed unanimously.

7. Transportation Improvement Program Amendment – *Hayes Morrison, TIP Manager, MPO Staff*

Members were provided with tables showing the proposed Amendment Three of the FFY 2011 element of the FFYs 2011-14 TIP. (See attached.) H. Morrison explained that this

amendment would reduce funds to the *Concord and Lincoln – Route 2 (Crosby’s Corner)* project and remove the *Somerville Community Path, Phase One* project and funds from the FFY 2011 TIP element. This action would flex \$12.5 million to the *Somerville – Assembly Square Orange Line* project. The MPO would then have to program approximately \$9.12 million to the Crosby’s Corner project in the FFY 2015 element of the FFYs 2012-15 TIP.

Joe Cosgrove, MBTA, explained that the local match for the Assembly Square project includes \$15 million from Federal Realty (the developer of Assembly Square), and \$19 million from the Executive Office of Housing and Economic Development. He stated that there is a federal authorization for \$24.9 million. He asked staff to program an additional \$5 million highway earmark for the *Somerville – Assembly Square Multimodal Access Improvement* project.

A motion to release Amendment Three of the FFY 2011 element of the FFYs 2011-14 TIP for a 30-day public review period was made by Tom Bent, City of Somerville, and seconded by Ginger Esty, Town of Framingham.

During a discussion of this motion, David Anderson, MassDOT Highway Division, described the status of the two projects that would be affected by the amendment. The *Community Path* project is moving forward in the design process. The City of Somerville has selected a consultant and a work scope is being developed. The design process will take a year. MassDOT is moving this project forward.

D. Anderson noted that the *Crosby’s Corner* project is moving along well in terms of design; it is at the 100% design stage. The environmental permitting process is proceeding, though this is a lengthy process. The project has its MEPA certification. Acquisition of right-of-way is also occurring. This amendment will not affect the progress of the project. D. Anderson stated that it is important to MassDOT Highway that the MPO programs sufficient funding for the project in future TIP elements.

L. Dantas asked if there was a risk of losing earmarked funds for the *Community Path* due to the federal reauthorization. H. Morrison replied that there is a potential for that to happen.

E. Bourassa asked whether moving the *Crosby’s Corner* project forward would increase the cost of the project. H. Morrison replied that the project cost would not increase because the year of expenditure would still be 2011, however, approximately \$30 million has already been spoken for in the FFY 2012-15 TIP.

G. Esty and Mary Pratt, Town of Hopkinton, raised the possibility of programming earmarks now so that they would not be affected by the federal reauthorization. H. Morrison noted that earmarks cannot be programmed for design unless there is also construction funding available.

T. Bent expressed that the City of Somerville supports the proposed amendment. The city recognizes that the *Community Path* will not be ready for FFY 2011 and appreciates the cooperation from the Towns of Concord and Lincoln to enable the *Assembly Square* project to go forward. He reminded members that the *Community Path* is a regional project.

A motion to amend the previous motion to add a \$5 million earmark for the *Somerville – Assembly Square Multimodal Access Improvement* project to Amendment Three of the FFY 2011 element of the FFYs 2011-14 TIP, and to release the document for a 30-day public review period, was made by J. Cosgrove, and seconded by T. Bent. The motion passed unanimously.

8. Plan Update – Anne McGahan, Plan Manager, MPO Staff

A. McGahan provided three handouts providing information on the Universe of Projects for the Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP). (See attached.)

She gave an overview of the information prepared for one highway corridor. She noted that the document indicates whether projects are programmed in the LRTP or TIP, are under construction or completed, are recommendations from a MPO study, have MassDOT Project Review Committee approval, are under environmental review, or meet needs identified in the Needs Assessment for the LRTP. The list of projects also includes projects that have been identified through public comments.

Another handout provides information on the universe of transit projects. This document indicates whether projects are in an MPO or MBTA planning document, are recommendations of the MPO's Congestion Management Process, or meet needs identified in the Needs Assessment for the LRTP.

All the projects in the universe are initially evaluated to determine if they meet the MPO's visions and policies for the LRTP. This information will be used for project selection for the LRTP.

Moving forward in the development of the LRPT, members will have to make decisions about the split between maintenance and expansion, whether to reserve funds for programs, whether to flex funds from highway to transit, and whether to include illustrative projects.

Members discussed the materials.

S. Woelfel stated that projects of the regional transit authorities (RTAs) should be included.

Brian Kane, MBTA Advisory Board, asked for more information about how staff used the MBTA's Capital Investment Program (CIP) and Program for Mass Transportation (PMT) to determine needs. A. McGahan replied that staff used information from the PMT scorecards, such as information on schedule adherence.

J. Gillooly asked if project information would be broken out for the Central Area. A. McGahan stated that it would.

L. Dantas noted that many transit projects do not score well under certain vision and policy categories, such as Mobility and Transportation Equity. A. McGahan noted that the reason may be because many are maintenance projects.

D. Koses asked if costs are available for the projects and raised the issue of whether costs should be included in the lists. A. McGahan stated that projects from the CIP do have costs associated with them.

B. Kane raised a concern about giving the same priority to projects identified in the PMT and from public comments as those that have already been vetted and included in fiscally constrained plans like the CIP and TIP. A. McGahan noted that the latter are short-term plans and the LRTP is a 20-year plan. M. Pratt added that most transit projects are not from public comments and she expressed support for recognizing projects identified from public comments. She noted that this is important for addressing environmental justice issues.

Staff was advised to reformat the information to more clearly delineate which projects were generated from public comments and to include costs where available.

Michael Callahan, MPO staff, then provided an update on the public outreach events that the MPO staff has held this month, which include two workshops on the LRTP Needs Assessment, two TIP Building workshops, and one open house. More than 100 people attended the events. Staff has received about 20 public comments through the MPO's web portal and through email. Staff will summarize the comments for members by next week.

A. McGahan also noted that staff will be going to MAPC subregional meetings to discuss the LRTP Needs Assessment.

9. Pavement Management Work Program – *Karl Quackenbush, Acting Director, Central Transportation Planning Staff*

Members were provided with the work program for *Maintenance Costs for Municipally Controlled Federal-Aid Eligible Roadways*. (See attached.)

K. Quackenbush reminded members that the MPO's federal partners had recommended that MPOs include a project in their 2010 Unified Planning Work Programs (UPWPs) for estimating the costs of maintaining federal-aid eligible roadways. In response, the Massachusetts Association of Regional Planning Agencies (MARPA) and MassDOT formed a pavement management and maintenance subcommittee to discuss ways to develop cost estimates. CTPS was part of those conversations.

Last December, staff distributed a memorandum which included rough cost calculations, an explanation of what a pavement management system is, and suggestions for next steps toward developing one for the MPO. Staff was then directed to develop this work program.

Through this work program, staff would survey municipalities in the region to determine which ones have pavement management systems and to find out how they are run and what software they are using. Staff would also research the pavement management systems of other states and regions. Also, staff would examine the costs and benefits of having a pavement management system that would be funded through the UPWP.

Members discussed the work program.

M. Pratt advised staff to contact every Department of Public Works in the region to find out if they have a pavement management system. She stated that every municipality should know which roads are federal-aid eligible. D. Anderson noted that the MassDOT Office of Transportation Planning (OTP) has maps showing functional roadway class and suggested making those maps public. Michael Chong, FHWA, suggested that Mark Berger, MassDOT OTP, could help coordinate.

A motion to approve the work program for *Maintenance Costs for Municipally Controlled Federal-Aid Eligible Roadways* was made by T. Bent, and seconded by M. Pratt. The motion passed unanimously.

10. Certification Review – *Stephen Woelfel, MassDOT, and Pam Wolfe, Manager of Certification Activities, MPO Staff*

S. Woelfel reported that FHWA and FTA have provided a draft report on the certification review that the federal agencies conducted on the MPO last summer. He noted that the federal agencies invited staff to fact-check the report and that this was completed.

P. Wolfe then drew members' attention to two handouts. One outlines the edits and minor corrections of factual issues that staff would like to the federal agencies to address. She asked members for consensus to have the MPO send a letter to the federal agencies notifying them of the items noted. The other handout is a table summarizing the observations and commendations made; the conclusions drawn by the federal agencies; and the corrective action on which the MPO would be required to take action. (See attached.)

During a discussion of this topic, Frank DeMasi, Regional Transportation Advisory Council, noted that members of the Council's Freight Subcommittee have conducted outreach to freight organizations over the past several years. He recommended that the federal agencies recognize this outreach in the report. M. Chong advised staff to include those suggestions in the MPO's recommendations for changes to the report.

The MPO will discuss the final report when the federal agencies release their final report. S. Woelfel asked that the MPO representatives from FHWA and FTA attend the meeting at which this topic is discussed to answer questions.

11. State Implementation Plan Update – *Stephen Woelfel, MassDOT*

S. Woelfel provided an update on projects in the State Implementation Plan (SIP).

Fairmount Line Improvement Project

At the end of this month, it is expected that notices to proceed will be granted for projects to replace the Neponset River Bridge and two other Neponset River bridges. The construction of the Talbot Avenue Station and Talbot and Woodrow Avenue Bridges is 15 percent complete. The construction of Newmarket Station is two percent complete. Regarding the Blue Hill Avenue Station, MassDOT and the MBTA are working with abutters who have concerns about the station design and are getting close to a resolution.

Construction of 1,000 New Parking Spaces

Construction is beginning on the Wonderland Garage. The project is scheduled to be completed by the end of 2011.

The Beverly Garage is no longer a SIP commitment. The MBTA will be requesting contract approval for the project at the MBTA Board of Directors meeting in March.

Green Line Extension Project

MassDOT and MAPC are conducting a land use study around the proposed Route 16 terminus. The first meeting was held last night.

MassDOT and the MBTA are addressing access issues around the Washington Street Station.

A considered lawsuit regarding the Brickbottom Station is not going forward. The petition to sue was filed under MEPA and the timeframe in which the suit could be filed has expired.

A risk assessment workshop for the New Starts process will be held in March.

A procurement for Green Line vehicles was advertised in January.

12. Members Items

There were none.

13. Adjourn

A motion to adjourn was made by J. Romano, and seconded by B. Kane. The motion passed unanimously.

Transportation Planning and Programming Committee Meeting Attendance
Thursday, February 17, 2011, 10:00 AM

Member Agencies

MassDOT
MassDOT Highway

City of Boston

City of Newton
City of Somerville

Federal Highway
Administration
MAPC

MassPort
MBTA
MBTA Advisory Board
Regional Transportation
Advisory Council
Town of Bedford
Town of Braintree
Town of Framingham
Town of Hopkinton

Representatives and Alternates

Stephen Woelfel
David Anderson
John Romano
Jim Gillooly
Tom Kadzis
David Koses
Tom Bent
Michael Lambert
Michael Chong

Eric Bourassa
Eric Halvorsen
Lourenço Dantas
Joe Cosgrove
Brian Kane
Laura Wiener
Steve Olanoff
Richard Reed
Christine Stickney
Ginger Esty
Mary Pratt

MPO Staff/CTPS

Ying Bao
Cathy Buckley
Michael Callahan
Ariel Godwin
Maureen Kelly
Robin Mannion
Anne McGahan
Hayes Morrison
Efi Pagitsas
Sean Pfalzer
Karl Quackenbush
Mary Ellen Sullivan
Alicia Wilson
Pam Wolfe

Other Attendees

Dan Boynton
Chelsea Clarke
Frank DeMasi

Tim Higgins
Mark Jaquith

Robert McGraw
Alan Moore
Joe Onorato
Tom O'Rourke

Town of Lincoln
Groundwork Somerville
Regional Transportation
Advisory Committee
Town of Lincoln
Association of Cambridge
Neighborhoods
Edwards Angell
Friends of the Community Path
MassDOT Highway Division
Neponset Valley Chamber of
Commerce

| | |
|----------------------|---|
| Karen Pearson | MassDOT Office of Transportation Planning |
| Jonah Petri | Friends of the Community Path |
| Chris Reilly | Town of Lincoln |
| Bill Renault | Town of Concord |
| Renata von Tscharner | Charles River Conservancy |
| Carl Wagner | Arlington resident |
| David Watson | Massachusetts Bicycle Coalition |
| Lynn Weissman | Friends of the Community Path |
| Wig Zamore | Somerville Transportation Equity Partnership / Mystic View Task Force |



State Transportation Building
Ten Park Plaza, Suite 2150
Boston, MA 02116-3968
Tel. (617) 973-7100
Fax (617) 973-8855
TTY (617) 973-7089
www.bostonmpo.org

Jeffrey B. Mullan
MassDOT Secretary and CEO
and MPO Chairman

Karl H. Quackenbush
Acting Director, MPO Staff

The Boston Region MPO,
the federally designated
entity responsible for
transportation decision-
making for the 101 cities
and towns in the MPO
region, is composed of:

MassDOT Office of Planning and
Programming
City of Boston
City of Newton
City of Somerville
Town of Bedford
Town of Braintree
Town of Framingham
Town of Hopkinton
Metropolitan Area Planning Council
Massachusetts Bay Transportation
Authority Advisory Board
Massachusetts Bay Transportation
Authority
MassDOT Highway Division
Massachusetts Port Authority
Regional Transportation Advisory
Council (nonvoting)
Federal Highway Administration
(nonvoting)
Federal Transit Administration
(nonvoting)

MEMORANDUM

DATE January 27, 2011
TO Transportation Planning and Programming Committee
FROM Cathy Ann Buckley, MPO Staff
RE Walkable Community Workshops Update

The last report on the Walkable Community Workshop Program covered workshops held in calendar year 2008. This report covers the 10 workshops held in calendar years 2009 and 2010. To date, there have been 43 workshops in the region, including the initial round of 8 given by national experts in 2003. As of October 1, 2010, Walkable Community Workshops became part of the Livable Communities Workshop program.

Marketing

As in the past, an article in *TRANSREPORT* and a notice sent out via MPOinfo, the MPO's listserve, offered the workshops to the communities in the region. Information also was distributed to the Regional Transportation Advisory Council and the MAPC subregions. In March 2010, staff sent a tweet, with a link to a description of the program on the MPO's website. After receiving a response from a community, staff followed up quickly to facilitate the local tasks and to plan a site visit.

Publicity

Once a workshop had been scheduled, it was publicized at the regional level through *TRANSREPORT*, when time permitted, and on the MPO's website. At the local level, MPO staff created flyers that the local coordinators posted in the host community and distributed to local officials and interest groups. MPO staff also provided press releases for the local coordinators to distribute to the media. Articles about the upcoming workshops appeared in the press in most communities that hosted workshops. Some communities also publicized the workshop on the local cable television channel.

Workshop Format

The workshop format consisted of introductions, a PowerPoint presentation, a walk around the area of interest, and a planning

session. The presentation included a discussion of overall best practices for pedestrian design and safety. Staff showed examples, good and bad, international and national, around our region and within the host community. The many reasons for providing a good walking environment were emphasized, including safety, mobility, health, and economic development. A handout included a list of resources for further information and a map of the community showing the locations of pedestrian and bicycle crashes.

The walk gave participants an opportunity to view a local area primarily from the point of view of pedestrians. The postwalk planning session allowed attendees to discuss possible changes to the location by incorporating new design elements. One of the most important aspects of the workshops was the opportunity it provided to discuss how to better incorporate pedestrian issues into the community's agenda.

Individual Workshops

Five workshops were held in 2009: in Chelsea, Stow, Wayland, Hopkinton, and Rockland. Five were held in 2010: in Bedford, Natick, Needham, Quincy, and Walpole. The workshops are listed below in the order in which they occurred, from the June 2009 Chelsea workshop to the one held in Natick in October 2010.

Chelsea: Tuesday, June 23, 2009, 4:30–6:30 PM

Williams Middle School Library, 180 Walnut Street

Local Coordinator: John DePriest, Director of Planning and Development.

Attendance: 7. City planning staff, safety officer, school officials, and residents.

Walk location: Between the school and downtown Chelsea.

Summary: The workshop was an offshoot of the work done in Chelsea as part of the MPO's *Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements in Urban Centers* study. Some of the recommendations of the study were presented. A myriad of problems in the area were highlighted, including the fire department's nixing of plans for pedestrian improvements at one location, sight distance issues, long crosswalks, and driver confusion regarding the one-way street patterns.

Post-workshop: Safe Routes to School funds are being used to make improvements near the Williams Middle School, on 5th, 6th, and Walnut Streets. Improvements include a corner extension, new crosswalks and bulb-outs. Chelsea is also working on a Healthy Chelsea Initiative with funds from a Massachusetts General Hospital grant to promote physical activity and pedestrian connections.

Stow: Monday, August 24, 2009, 3:30–5:30 PM

Town Building, 380 Great Road

Local Coordinator: Karen Kelleher, Planning Coordinator.

Attendance: 20. Three members of the Board of Selectmen, several Planning Board members, town planner, members of the conservation commission and the sidewalk committee, and residents.

Walk location: From the town building to the library.

Summary: A member of MAPC's Pedestrian Study Committee lived in Stow and requested the workshop. The major concern was the lack of sidewalks and the resulting isolation of

some residents, including the elderly. There were also a couple of people who thought there was simply no room for sidewalks and that they were not important. There was much interest in the presentation on roundabouts. It was a very good turnout for a community the size of Stow, and the discussion was animated.

Post-workshop: Shortly after the workshop, the Planning Board formed a Pedestrian Walkway Planning Committee. The committee is working on Phase I engineering plans. This phase is short-term and focuses on connecting the existing walkways along the Route 117 corridor. The \$249,000 budget comes from contributions from developers who opted not to build walkways. Construction is anticipated to be completed by the end of 2011. Phase I includes improvements in the area of the workshop's walking audit. Phase II is longer-term, and will create a list of recommended projects with design, construction, and maintenance cost estimates.

Wayland: Wednesday, September 23, 2009, 4:00–6:00 PM

Wayland Town Building, 41 Cochituate Road

Local Coordinator: Mary Antes, Wayland League of Women Voters; workshop sponsored by the Wayland League of Women Voters.

Attendance: 20. Town planner, DPW staff member, conservation officer, member of the rail trail organization, officer of the business association, members of the League of Women Voters, and residents.

Walk location: From the Town Building to the library, following along Route 27, and back along the Central Mass railroad right-of-way.

Summary: Participants had concerns about large volumes of traffic and a lack of sidewalks in some parts of town. There was also discussion of continuing efforts within Wayland to utilize the railroad right-of-way as a trail. An informal committee was formed at the end of the meeting to follow up on walking issues.

Post-workshop: There were several follow-up meetings after the workshop.

Hopkinton: Saturday, October 3, 2009, 1:30–3:30 PM

Fire Station Meeting Room, 73 Main Street

Local Coordinator: Elaine Lazarus, Hopkinton Planning Director.

Attendance: 10. Planning Director, police officer, Planning Board member, business owner, town committee members, and residents.

Walk location: From the fire station, through the Main Street commercial center, and back.

Summary: Despite the rain, the walking audit was very informative. The focus was on physical improvements to the pedestrian environment as well as economic development of the center.

Post-workshop: The Town hired the Conway School of Design to create a plan to make the downtown safer and more pleasant for walking and driving, to attract more businesses, and to better serve as a center of community life. The report *Visions of Hopkinton – Steps Toward Downtown Revitalization* was completed in early 2010. Building on the workshop and the Conway report, the Town appropriated \$450,000 at the May 2010 annual town meeting for the design of infrastructure, streetscape, and pedestrian improvements in the downtown area. The Town appropriated \$10,000 at the May 2010 town meeting to purchase and install two pedestrian warning signals at the crosswalk across Main Street at Church Street.

Rockland: Thursday, October 22, 2009, 8:00–10:00 AM

Town Hall, 242 Union Street

Local Coordinator: Allan R. Chiocca, Town Administrator.

Attendance: 15. Member of the Board of Selectmen, Town Administrator, Chair and another member of the planning board, member of the Community Development Office, Open Space Committee member, Highway Superintendent, several business owners, and residents.

Walk location: Along Union Street, north to the library, and south past Water Street.

Summary: The Town's primary interest in having the workshop was economic development. Some storefronts were vacant. The town center has adequate pedestrian facilities and the potential for a very inviting walking environment.

Post-workshop: The Town received an American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) grant, which funded a sidewalk replacement project on Union Street, including bump-outs, which are "universally praised by pedestrians (somewhat angering former speeders through downtown)."

Needham: Thursday, May 13, 2010, 4:00–6:15 PM

Needham Public Library, 1139 Highland Avenue

Local Coordinator: Tad Staley, member, Needham Bikes; workshop part of Needham in Motion initiative.

Attendance: 5. Members of the League of Women Voters and Green Needham.

Walk location: From the library to Needham Center, along Highland Avenue and Chapel Street, returning via Highland.

Summary: Due to a mix-up on the time the meeting room would be available, the walk happened first. The major issues were getting more attention paid to the pedestrian environment by the Town and improving conditions throughout Needham, including along Webster Street.

Post-workshop: The League of Women Voters formed a Walkable Community Task Force, which will submit a report to the Planning Board next spring. The task force plans to recommend the creation of an ongoing pedestrian committee. Work is underway on a map application that will allow residents to record issues, concerns, and priorities.

Bedford: Friday, May 14, 2010, 8:00–10:30 AM

Bedford Public Library, 7 Mudge Way

Local Coordinator: Margot Fleischman, Planning Board. Workshop sponsored by the Bedford Board of Selectmen, the Planning Board, the Board of Health, the Transportation Advisory Committee, and the Bedford Chamber of Commerce. The workshop was initiated through contacts provided by a member of the Safe Routes to School staff.

Attendance: 33. Two members of the Board of Selectmen, the DPW Director and two DPW engineers, the police chief, the planning director, the Board of Health director, the recreation director, the Safe Routes to School Coordinator, three members of the Planning Board, and members of the School Committee, Board of Health, Transportation Advisory Committee and Energy Task Force.

Walk location: The library to Concord Road, to Wilson Park, and north on Route 4/225 to a local ice cream stand, and back along Great Road.

Summary: Attendance was very high, especially for early on a Friday morning, and included many individuals in the community who are in a position to implement improvements for the walking environment. Participation was energetic and informed.

Post-workshop: The workshop was available on the local cable television network. The local contact wrote a summary of the workshop and distributed it widely in town. Based partly on the workshop and on other ongoing work, the selectmen agreed to change the focus of a consultant contract to pedestrian and bicycle issues in the same general area covered by the workshop. Staff was asked to attend the first public outreach meeting for that project, held December 2, 2010.

Walpole: Tuesday, June 29, 2010, 3:00-5:30 PM

Walpole Town Hall, 135 School Street

Local Coordinator: Stephanie Mercandetti, Walpole Economic Development Department

Attendance: 12. Economic Development Department staff member, several members of the Council on Aging, member of the Health Department, town planner, member of the Chamber of Commerce, and residents.

Walk location: Town Hall to Walpole Center via East Street, along Main Street, and back along Stone Street.

Summary: CTPS and MAPC did an analysis of Walpole Center under the MPO's Community Transportation Technical Assistance Program. When asked if the Town would like a workshop to follow up on that work, Walpole staff agreed. A chance meeting with a Council on Aging member at another event led to their involvement. Many of the attendees were elderly and brought up issues that made walking difficult for them, including snow and ice on sidewalks.

Post-workshop: Local staff met with downtown businesses to receive input on improvements that they would like to see. Town Officials want to fold traffic signalization and moving and re-striping of crosswalks into a larger infrastructure project which would include roadway and sidewalk improvements. The Town received an offer to install a midblock crosswalk detection system, compliments of a local company, and is determining costs of installation and the best location.

The Master Plan Implementation Committee (two of the members were at the workshop) has taken on a project that includes pedestrian access and walkability in the downtown. The Committee is seeking to create a pocket park on underutilized green space off of East Street near Town Hall (part of the walking tour), and is looking to relocate a portion of the Bay Circuit Trail in this green space. The Town submitted a Recreational Trails Grant in November for the project. This project resulted, in part, from the workshop.

Quincy: Thursday, July 12, 2010, 1:30-4:00 PM

Wollaston Public Library, 41 Beale Street

Local Coordinator: Kristina Johnson, Quincy Planning Department. Also sponsored by the Chamber of Commerce.

Attendance: 20. City Councilor, Planning Director and several staff members, Chamber of Commerce members, Chair of the Quincy Disability Commission, Quincy Traffic Engineer.

Walk location: Wollaston Center, from the library along Beale Street, south on Hancock Street, and return.

Summary: A very well-attended and spirited workshop. There was an emphasis on getting local business people to attend. The Wollaston Library quarters worked surprisingly well despite seemingly difficult conditions—not much space and not a separate room. The PowerPoint presentation was posted on the City’s website. Quincy Access Television filmed the workshop and aired it on their channel.

Post-workshop: The City installed audible signals on Beal Street at Hancock Street and at Newport Avenue. NSTAR replaced the streetlight pole on Newport Avenue near the Wollaston MBTA station, where the exposed foundation was pointed out as a hazard during the walking audit.

Natick: Friday, October 22, 2010, 8:00–10:30 AM

Town Hall, 345 Main Street

Local Coordinator: Charles Planck, Member of the Bicycle-Pedestrian Committee

Attendance: 4. Member of the Board of Selectmen, chair of the Open Space Committee, and the chair and a member of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee.

Walk location: Was to be downtown Natick. The attendees opted to discuss ongoing projects and strategies rather than do the walking audit.

Summary: Attendance was low, partially due to a town meeting that went late into the previous evening. The few in attendance were key participants in making Natick more walkable.

Post-workshop: The Board of Selectmen attendee developed an outline of a pedestrian plan which the Board of Selectmen has asked the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee to develop further.

General Findings

As in years past, the workshops attracted many who walk a great deal and are dedicated to improving walking conditions. The discussions focused on how to make an area both safer and more enticing to pedestrians; the latter ties in to economic development and viability. More information was added to our presentation on the need for more exercise and the health benefits of walking.

Most of the local contacts did a good job in terms of getting the word out and setting up the logistics for the sessions—some did outstanding work. There was also much success in getting elected officials and staff members to attend. Media coverage was good. For the first time, the workshops were shown on local cable channels, in Bedford and Quincy.

CAB/cab



State Transportation Building
Ten Park Plaza, Suite 2150
Boston, MA 02116-3968
Tel. (617) 973-7100
Fax (617) 973-8855
TTY (617) 973-7089
www.bostonmpo.org

Jeffrey B. Mullan
MassDOT Secretary and CEO
and MPO Chairman

Karl H. Quackenbush
Acting Director, MPO Staff

The Boston Region MPO, the federally designated entity responsible for transportation decision-making for the 101 cities and towns in the MPO region, is composed of:

MassDOT Office of Planning and Programming
City of Boston
City of Newton
City of Somerville
Town of Bedford
Town of Braintree
Town of Framingham
Town of Hopkinton
Metropolitan Area Planning Council
Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority Advisory Board
Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority
MassDOT Highway Division
Massachusetts Port Authority
Regional Transportation Advisory Council (nonvoting)
Federal Highway Administration (nonvoting)
Federal Transit Administration (nonvoting)

MEMORANDUM

DATE January 27, 2011
TO Transportation Planning and Programming Committee
FROM Cathy Buckley, Mike Callahan, and Sean Pfalzer, MPO Staff
RE Livable Communities Workshop Program

BACKGROUND

Since 2004, the Boston Region MPO has conducted the Walkable Community Workshop (WCW) Program to promote safe, accessible, and aesthetic walking environments. The WCWs bring together various community members to learn about good pedestrian design, identify local shortcomings, and discuss possible strategies for improvements.

The MPO has established the Livable Communities Workshop Program in the FFY 2011 UPWP (ID # 13801; \$55,000 budget, \$30,000 to CTPS, \$25,000 to MAPC; \$27,500 PL and \$27,500 Section 5303). This program will build upon the model and success of the WCW Program by expanding the scope beyond walking, including other active transportation modes. According to Secretary of the U.S. Department of Transportation Ray LaHood, a livable community is one “where if people don’t want to have an automobile, they don’t have to have one. A community where you can walk to work, your doctor’s appointment, pharmacy, or grocery store. Or you could take light rail, a bus, or ride a bike.”

The Livability Program will offer three components: regional forums, workshops, and a website of resources. The forums will allow in-depth topical discussions and allow input from a broad range of participants. The workshops will continue to focus on issues at the level of a particular neighborhood or community. The website will be a source of information for all, from state, regional and municipal staff members to individual residents.

The forums, workshops and website will address parking, land use, urban design, public health, energy, climate change and other environmental issues. This program will further the goals of the state’s Healthy Transportation Compact as well as the Partnership for Sustainable Communities, established by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), the U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT), and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

REGIONAL FORUMS

The regional forums will bring together municipal officials, community and business leaders, and members of the public to raise awareness about livability and discuss opportunities and challenges to improving livability in the region. The first regional forum will be held in March 2011 through the Regional Transportation Advisory Council (RTAC) meeting and will focus on the linkage between transportation and public health.

LIVABLE COMMUNITY WORKSHOPS

Solicitation

The MPO will publicize the Livable Community Workshop Program through various channels, including *TRANSREPORT*, MPOinfo, Twitter, the MPO website, and the MAPC subregions. Requests for services will be fielded and prioritized by staff on an ongoing basis. The communities selected will have the opportunity to focus their workshop on relevant objectives by choosing from a menu of livability topics. The menu will include the issues listed above; bicycling, walking, transit, parking, land use, urban design, public health, energy, climate change and other environmental issues. It is anticipated that the program will include approximately two forums and five workshops in federal fiscal year 2011.

Workshop

Each Livable Community Workshop will have two parts. The first is a presentation by staff on elements of livability that have been incorporated at the local, regional, national, and international level. Each presentation will emphasize the livability topics identified by the host community. The second part would usually commence with a walk through a local area (chosen by the community), followed by a brainstorming session: identifying shortcomings, discussing possible strategies for resolving them, and envisioning other potential improvements. All members of the community, including elected officials, business owners, residents, and local professionals in the fields of planning, engineering, law enforcement, health, sustainability, and education, are encouraged to participate. The workshop will help stimulate local awareness and generate more discussion on both living in the area without a car and how the built environment can be changed to facilitate such travel.

Following the workshop, staff will produce a memorandum on the consultations to document the work, recommendations, and outcomes. The memorandum will consist of both short- and long-term recommendations, but staff will not perform design or planning studies. Staff will be available for follow-up discussions or to assist with next steps toward improving livability.

LIVABILITY WEBSITE

The Livability website will store all information and activities developed in the program. The website will be a source for livability indicators and livability planning materials by topic. It will feature an interactive database that allows cities and towns of the Boston region to analyze aspects of their community's livability by viewing indicators, including population and employment density, sidewalk coverage, bicycle coverage, bicycle and pedestrian crash rates, vehicle miles traveled (VMT) per household, and average household transportation costs. In addition, the interactive database will allow communities to compare their livability with similar municipalities in the region. The website will also contain links to resources on specific livability planning topics.

TENTATIVE SCHEDULE

January 27: Provide program update to the Transportation Planning and Programming Committee

February 16: Solicit Livable Community Workshops through various MPO media channels

March 9: Regional Transportation Advisory Council/Livability Program: Transportation and Public Health Forum

April – September: Conduct Livable Community Workshops

September: Regional Forum #2: Topic to be determined from workshop experiences

Draft Amendment Three

FFY 2011 Element

Indicates a change in project cost

Indicates removed from TIP (cost not reflected in total)

Indicates a project moved in from another TIP element

Indicates a project moved out to another TIP element (cost not reflected in total)

Indicates a new addition to the TIP (action taken as denoted)

Indicates a new funding category

Regional Highway Program

FEDERAL-AID TARGET PROJECTS

Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program

| | | | <i>Federal Funds</i> | <i>State Funds</i> | <i>Total Funds</i> | <i>Previous Funds</i> |
|--|---------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|
| Concord & Lincoln | 602984 | Route 2 (Crosby's Corner) | \$2,784,000 | \$696,000 | \$3,480,000 | \$10,000,000 |
| Milford | 606142 | Route 16 Intersection Improvements | \$2,800,000 | \$700,000 | \$3,500,000 | |
| Somerville | 604331 | Somerville Community Path, Phase 1 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$3,487,611 |
| | | | <i>Federal Funds</i> | <i>State/Local Funds</i> | <i>Total Funds</i> | |
| Boston Region | 456661 | Clean Air and Mobility Program | \$1,600,000 | \$400,000 | \$2,000,000 | |
| | <i>Acton</i> | <i>Acton Shuttle Year 2</i> | <i>\$99,913</i> | <i>\$19,983</i> | <i>\$119,896</i> | |
| | <i>Boston</i> | <i>Boston Bike Maps Year 2</i> | <i>\$30,000</i> | <i>\$6,000</i> | <i>\$36,000</i> | |
| | <i>Hull</i> | <i>Hull Ferry Service Year 2</i> | <i>\$33,116</i> | <i>\$6,623</i> | <i>\$39,739</i> | |
| Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program Total | | | \$7,184,000 | \$1,796,000 | \$8,980,000 | |
| | | | <i>Minimum CMAQ Regional Target</i> | | <i>\$0</i> | |

National Highway System

| | | | <i>Federal Funds</i> | <i>State Funds</i> | <i>Total Funds</i> |
|--------------------------------------|--------|---|----------------------|--------------------|---------------------|
| Canton, Randolph & Westwood | 087800 | Route 128 Improvement Program Contract 3, Year Five of Six | \$4,800,000 | \$1,200,000 | \$6,000,000 |
| Dedham, Needham & Westwood | 603206 | Route 128 Improvement Program Contract 4, Year Three of Six | \$9,600,000 | \$2,400,000 | \$12,000,000 |
| National Highway System Total | | | \$14,400,000 | \$3,600,000 | \$18,000,000 |

Surface Transportation Program

| | | | <i>Federal Funds</i> | <i>State Funds</i> | <i>Total Funds</i> |
|---|--------|---------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|---------------------|
| Concord & Lincoln | 602984 | Route 2 (Crosby's Corner) | \$831,590 | \$207,897 | \$1,039,487 |
| Hudson | 604812 | Route 85 | \$8,651,584 | \$2,162,896 | \$10,814,480 |
| Marshfield | 604915 | Route 139 | \$4,546,128 | \$1,136,532 | \$5,682,660 |
| Somerville | | Assembly Square Flex to Transit | \$8,000,000 | \$2,000,000 | \$10,000,000 |
| Surface Transportation Program Total | | | \$22,029,302 | \$5,507,325 | \$27,536,627 |

Draft Amendment Three

FFY 2011 Element

Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) Project

| | | <i>Federal Funds</i> | <i>State Funds</i> | <i>Total Funds</i> |
|---|----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Concord & Lincoln | 602984 Route 2 (Crosby's Corner) | \$3,867,039 | \$429,671 | \$4,296,710 |
| Highway Safety Improvement Program Total | | \$3,867,039 | \$429,671 | \$4,296,710 |
| | | <i>Minimum HSIP Regional Target</i> | | <i>\$4,296,710</i> |

Surface Transportation Program/Enhancement

| | | <i>Federal Funds</i> | <i>State Funds</i> | <i>Total Funds</i> |
|---|--|----------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Ipswich | 604945 North Green Improvements (Construction) | \$860,988 | \$215,247 | \$1,076,235 |
| Surface Transportation Program/Enhancement Total | | \$860,988 | \$215,247 | \$1,076,235 |

Total Regional Target Programming **\$59,889,572**
Boston Region MPO Regional Target with State Match *\$59,897,183*

FEDERAL AID NON-TARGET PROJECTS

High-Priority Projects (TEA-21)

| | | <i>Federal Funds</i> | <i>State/Local Funds</i> | <i>Total Funds</i> |
|--------|---|----------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|
| Boston | 604871 Huntington Ave/Symphony Area Streetscape Constriction (HPP 447) | \$2,140,232 | \$535,058 | \$2,675,290 |
| Boston | 604871 Huntington Ave/Symphony Area Streetscape Construction (HPP 1811) | \$820,080 | \$205,020 | \$1,025,100 |

High-Priority Projects (SAFETEA-LU)

| | | <i>Federal Funds</i> | <i>State/Local Funds</i> | <i>Total Funds</i> |
|--------|--|----------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|
| Boston | 605791 Warren St/Blue Hill Ave Construction (HPP 2129) | \$240,000 | \$60,000 | \$300,000 |
| Boston | Northern Avenue Bridge Design (HPP 4271) | \$800,000 | \$200,000 | \$1,000,000 |
| Boston | Rutherford Ave Design (HPP TI 174) | \$2,400,000 | \$600,000 | \$3,000,000 |
| Boston | Sullivan Square, Phase 1 Design (HPP 3568) | \$897,498 | \$224,375 | \$1,121,873 |
| Boston | North Washington St Bridge Design (HPP 2586) | \$1,760,000 | \$440,000 | \$2,200,000 |
| Quincy | 606235 Adams Green Design (HPP 4272) | \$640,000 | \$160,000 | \$800,000 |

| | | | | | |
|-------------------|---|-----|-----|-----|-------------|
| Somerville | 604331 Somerville Community Path Design and Construction (HPP 2782) | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$1,012,389 |
|-------------------|---|-----|-----|-----|-------------|

| | | | | |
|------------|---|-------------|-----------|-------------|
| Somerville | 605219 Improvements to Broadway in Somerville Construction (HPP 431)* | \$1,987,798 | \$496,950 | \$2,484,748 |
| Somerville | I-93 Mystic Avenue Interchange Study (HPP 792) | \$359,000 | \$89,750 | \$448,750 |
| Somerville | 604778 Union Square Improvements Study (HPP 999) | \$73,961 | \$18,490 | \$92,451 |
| Walpole | 605187 Washington St Construction (HPP 2431) | \$1,259,860 | \$314,965 | \$1,574,825 |
| Weymouth | 601630 Route 18 Design (HPP 1236) | \$1,336,000 | \$334,000 | \$1,670,000 |

Section 117

| | | <i>Federal Funds</i> | <i>Other Funds</i> | <i>Total Funds</i> |
|------------|--|----------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Somerville | Adaptive Reuse and Streetscape Improvements Construction | \$350,000 | | \$350,000 |

PLHD Awards (2003)

| | | <i>Federal Funds</i> | <i>Other Funds</i> | <i>Total Funds</i> |
|--------|-------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Boston | Long Island Pier Improvements | \$198,700 | | \$198,700 |

Section 112

| | | | | |
|-----------|---|-----------|-----|-----------|
| Cambridge | 605684 Kendall Square/Broadway Streetscape Construction | \$750,000 | \$0 | \$750,000 |
|-----------|---|-----------|-----|-----------|

Draft Amendment Three

FFY 2011 Element

| | | | | |
|--|---|----------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|
| 2004 Ferry Boat Discretionary Commuter Ferry | | <i>Federal Funds</i> | <i>State/Local Funds</i> | <i>Total Funds</i> |
| Winthrop | Winthrop Ferry Improvements Construction | \$264,232 | \$66,058 | \$330,290 |
| 2005 Ferry Boat Discretionary Ferry Infrastructure | | <i>Federal Funds</i> | <i>State/Local Funds</i> | <i>Total Funds</i> |
| Winthrop | Winthrop Ferry Improvements Construction | \$208,167 | \$52,042 | \$260,209 |
| Transportation Community and System Preservation (TCSP) | | <i>Federal Funds</i> | <i>State/Local Funds</i> | <i>Total Funds</i> |
| Cambridge | 606116 Longfellow Bridge Gateway Improvements | \$889,200 | \$222,300 | \$1,111,500 |
| High-Priority Projects Total | | \$17,374,729 | \$4,019,007 | \$21,393,736 |

NORTH CORRIDOR TRANSIT UNIVERSE

| | PMT Transit Enhancement Project | PMT Transit Expansion Project | PMT Transit SGR Project | In MBTA's Draft FY 2012-2016 CIP SGR List | In MBTA's Draft FY 2012-2016 CIP Enhancement Project List | In MBTA's Draft FY 2012-2016 CIP Expansion Project List | Transit Project Recommended from MPO's CMP | Transit Project in the Current L RTP | Meets Plan Identified Need |
|---|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------|---|---|---|--|--------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| Accessibility | | | | | | | | | |
| Station Elevator/Escalator Replacement and Modernization Program | | | | | x | | | | x |
| Wedgemere Station access | | | | | x | | | | x |
| Communications/Technology | | | | | | | | | |
| Automated Fair Collection, Phase II (CharlieCards on commuter rail) | | | | | x | | | | |
| Enhancements | | | | | | | | | |
| Haverhill Line Double Tracking | x | | | | | | | | x |
| Improved Bus Amenities and System Identity for Bus Routes | x | | | | | | | | x |
| Expansion | | | | | | | | | |
| Green Line Extension College Ave to Route 16 | | x | | | | x | | x | x |
| Lowell Commuter Rail Line Extension (Nashua/Manchester) | | x | | | | | | | x |
| New Orange Line Station at Assembly Square | x | | | | | | | x | x |
| Urban Ring, Phase 2 | | x | | | | | | x* | x |
| Extend Blue Line from Bowdoin to West Medford | | | | | | | | | |
| Orange Line North Extension from Oak Grove to Reading/Route 128 | | | | | | | | | |
| Maintenance Facilities | | | | | | | | | |
| Move Bradford Layover Facility on Haverhill Line with Plaistow | | x | | | | | | | x |
| Wellington Maintenance Facility Improvements | | | | x | | | | | x |
| Parking | | | | | | | | | |
| Stations | | | | | | | | | |
| Rapid transit station midlife rehab upgrades | | | | x | | | | | x |
| Winchester Station Renovation | | | | x | | | | | x |
| Support Infrastructure | | | | | | | | | |
| Haverhill Line (Andover Station) - Bike Signage and Shelter | | | | | | | x | | |
| Haverhill Line (Bradford Station) - Bike Signage | | | | | | | x | | |
| Lowell Line (Lowell Station) - Bike Racks and Shelter | | | | | | | x | | |
| Lowell Line (Winchester Center Station) - Bike Racks | | | | | | | x | | |
| Merrimack River Bridge Rehab | | | | x | | | | | x |
| Orange Line (Oak Grove Station) - Bike Shelter Improvements | | | | | | | x | | |
| Orange Line Power Improvements | | | | | x | | | | x |
| Rehab of Three Shawsheen River Bridges | | | | x | | | | | x |
| Track and Signals | | | | | | | | | |
| Haverhill Line Double Tracking | | | | | x | | | | x |
| Orange Line North Signal System Upgrade | | | | | x | | | | x |
| Vehicles | | | | | | | | | |
| Orange Line Car Procurement | | | x | | | | | | x |

* Included as an Illustrative Project

NORTH CORRIDOR TRANSIT NEEDS EVALUATION

| | Maintenance, Modernization and Efficiency | Livability and Economic Benefit | Mobility | Environment and Climate Change | Transportation Equity | Safety and Security |
|--|---|---------------------------------|----------|--------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|
| Accessibility | | | | | | |
| Station Elevator/Escalator Replacement and Modernization Program | x | | | | | x |
| Wedgemere Station access | x | x | | | | x |
| Communications/Technology | | | | | | |
| Enhancements | | | | | | |
| Improved Bus Amenities and System Identity for Bus Routes | x | x | | | x | |
| Expansion | | | | | | |
| Green Line Extension College Ave to Route 16 | | x | x | x | x | |
| Lowell Commuter Rail Line Extension (Nashua/Manchester) | | | x | x | | |
| New Orange Line Station at Assembly Square | | x | x | x | x | |
| Urban Ring, Phase 2 | | x | x | x | x | |
| Maintenance Facilities | | | | | | |
| Move Bradford Layover Facility on Haverhill Line with Plaistow | x | | | | | |
| Wellington Maintenance Facility Improvements | x | | | | | |
| Parking | | | | | | |
| Stations | | | | | | |
| Rapid transit station midlife rehab upgrades | x | | | | | x |
| Winchester Station Renovation | x | | | | | |
| Support Infrastructure | | | | | | |
| Merrimack River Bridge Rehab | x | | | | | x |
| Orange Line Power Improvements | x | | | | | |
| Rehab of Three Shawsheen River Bridges | x | | | | | x |
| Track and Signals | | | | | | |
| Haverhill Line Double Tracking | x | | x | x | | |
| Orange Line North Signal System Upgrade | x | | | | | x |
| Vehicles | | | | | | |
| Orange Line Car Procurement | x | | | | | x |

The projects included in this table are those from this corridor's Highway Universe that meet a Plan identified need. An initial evaluation was performed using criteria derived from the MPO's visions and policies.

| NORTH CORRIDOR HIGHWAY UNIVERSE | CTPS Corridor Study and/or Recommendation | Highway Project with PRC Approval | Project Under MassDOT Environmental Review | Major Highway Project Pending, On Hold or Inactive | Project Programmed in the MPO's Current LRTP | Construction Funds in FFYs 2011-14 TIP | MassDOT CIP High Priority Path | Meets Plan Identified Need |
|---|---|-----------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--------------------------------|----------------------------|
| | | | | | | | | |
| Long Range Transportation Plan Projects currently programmed and/or under construction | | | | | | | | |
| Route 16/Revere Beach Parkway Bridges(Everett, Medford, and Revere) | | | | | x | x | | |
| Long Range Transportation Plan Universe Roadway Projects | | | | | | | | |
| I-93/I-95 Interchange (Woburn, Reading, Stoneham, and Wakefield) | | x | x | | x | | | x |
| Route 1 Add-a-Lane (Malden, Saugus, and Revere) | | x | x | | x | | | x |
| Middlesex Turnpike Phase III (Bedford, Burlington, Billerica) | | x | x | | x | | | x |
| I-93/Route 129 Interchange Improvements (Wilmington and Reading) | | | | x | | | | |
| Interstate 93 Capacity Improvements (Somerville to Woburn) | x | | | | | | | x |
| Route 16/Revere Beach Parkway Roadway Improvements (Everett, Medford, and Revere) | | | | | | | | x |
| I-93/Route 125/Ballardvale Road (Wilmington) | | x | | x | | | | |
| Tri Town I-93/Lowell Junction Interchange (Andover, Tewksbury, and Wilmington) | | x | x | | | | | |
| New Boston Street Bridge (Woburn) | | x | | | x | | | |
| Montvale Avenue (Woburn) | | x | | | x | | | |
| Telecom City Boulevard (Everett, Malden, and Revere) | | | | | | | | |
| Route 128 Capacity Improvements (Lynnfield to Reading) | x | | | | | | | x |
| Route 128 HOV (Wellesley to Woburn) | | | | | | | | x |
| Route 16/I-93 Connection (Medford) | | | | | | | | |
| Cambridge Street Improvements (Burlington, Woburn, Winchester) | x | | | | | | | x |
| Sullivan Square (Boston) | | x | | | x | | | x |
| Rutherford Avenue (Boston) | | x | | | x | | | |
| Charlestown Haul Road (Boston) | | | | | | | | |
| Route 60 Improvements (Malden, Medford) | x | | | | | | | x |
| Long Range Transportation Plan Universe of Bicycle and Pedestrian Projects | | | | | | | | |
| Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Projects currently programmed and/or under construction | | | | | | | | |
| Pleasant Street (Malden) | | x | | | | x | | |
| Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Universe Roadway Projects (Corridor) | | | | | | | | |
| Air Force Road Rehab (Everett) | | | | | | | | |
| Beacham Street Reconstruction (Everett) | | | | | | | | |
| Lebanon Street (Melrose) | | x | | | | | | |
| West Street (Reading) | | | | | | | | |
| Streetscape Improvements High and Haven Streets (Reading) | | | | | | | | |
| Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Universe Roadway Projects (Intersection) | | | | | | | | |
| Main Street Intersections at Emerson, Essex, Foster, and Grove Streets (Melrose) | | x | | | | | | x |
| Wildwood Intersections (Wilmington) | | x | | | | | | |
| Signal Upgrade at 4 Intersections on Cambridge Street (Winchester) | | x | | | | | | |
| Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Universe Bicycle and Pedestrian Projects | | | | | | | | |
| Northern Strand (Everett, Malden) | x | | | | | | x | x |
| Improving Bicycle and Ped Access to transit stations (Malden) | x | | | | | | | |
| Tri-Community Bikeway (Stoneham, Winchester, Woburn) | x | x | | | | | | x |
| Woburn Loop Bikeway (Woburn) | | | | | | | | |
| Minuteman Bikeway Extension (Billerica) | x | | | | | | | |

| NORTH CORRIDOR HIGHWAY NEEDS EVALUATION | Maintenance, Modernization and Efficiency | Livability and Economic Benefit | Mobility | Environment and Climate Change | Transportation Equity | Safety and Security |
|---|---|---------------------------------|----------|--------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|
| | | | | | | |
| Long Range Transportation Plan Projects currently programmed and/or under construction | | | | | | |
| Long Range Transportation Plan Universe of Roadway Projects | | | | | | |
| I-93/I-95 Interchange (Woburn, Reading, Stoneham, and Wakefield) | x | | x | | | x |
| Route 1 Add-a-Lane (Malden, Saugus, and Revere) | x | | x | | x | x |
| Middlesex Turnpike Phase III (Bedford, Burlington, Billerica) | x | | x | | | x |
| Interstate 93 Capacity Improvements (Somerville to Woburn) | | | x | | | x |
| Route 16/Revere Beach Parkway Roadway Improvements (Everett, Medford, and Revere) | x | | x | | x | x |
| Route 128 Capacity Improvements (Lynnfield to Reading) | | | x | | | x |
| Route 128 HOV (Wellesley to Woburn) | | | x | x | | |
| Cambridge Street Improvements (Burlington, Woburn, Winchester) | | | x | | | |
| Sullivan Square (Boston) | x | x | x | | x | |
| Route 60 Improvements (Malden, Medford) | x | | x | | | |
| Long Range Transportation Plan Universe of Bicycle and Pedestrian Projects | | | | | | |
| Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Projects currently programmed and/or under construction | | | | | | |
| Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Universe Roadway Projects (Corridor) | | | | | | |
| Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Universe Roadway Projects (Intersection) | | | | | | |
| Main Street Intersections at Emerson, Essex, Foster, and Grove | x | | | x | | |
| Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Universe Bicycle and Pedestrian Projects | | | | | | |
| Northern Strand (Everett, Malden) | | x | | x | | |
| Tri-Community Bikeway (Stoneham, Winchester, Woburn) | | | | x | | |

The projects included in this table are those from this corridor's Highway Universe that meet a Plan identified need. An initial evaluation was performed using criteria derived from the MPO's visions and policies.

SYSTEMWIDE TRANSIT UNIVERSE

| | PMT Transit Enhancement Project | PMT Transit Expansion Project | PMT Transit SGR Project | In MBTA's Draft FY 2012-2016 CIP SGR List | In MBTA's Draft FY 2012-2016 CIP Enhancement Project List | In MBTA's Draft FY 2012-2016 CIP Expansion Project List | Transit Project Recommended from MPO's CMP | Transit Project in the Current L RTP | Meets Plan Identified Need |
|---|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------|---|---|---|--|--------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| Accessibility | | | | | | | | | |
| Accessibility Program | x | | | | x | | | | x |
| Elevator Program | x | | | | x | | | | x |
| Escalator Program | x | | | | x | | | | x |
| Wayfinding Program | x | | | | x | | | | |
| Communications/Technology | | | | | | | | | |
| Automated Bus Passenger Counters | | x | | | x | | | | |
| Bid/Dispatch - Advanced Scheduling System | x | | | | x | | | | |
| Computer Technology Upgrades | x | | | | x | | | | |
| Train & Bus Arrival Announcements | x | | | | x | | | | |
| Enhancements | | | | | | | | | |
| Daily Operations Resource Management System | | x | | | x | | | | |
| Homeland Security | x | | | | x | | | | |
| Key Bus Routes Project | x | | | | x | | | x | |
| Expansion | | | | | | | | | |
| Maintenance Facilities | | | | | | | | | |
| Bus Facilities Upgrade | | | x | x | | | | | x |
| Bus Facility Analysis | | | | | x | | | | x |
| Carwash Upgrades Systemwide | | | x | x | | | | | x |
| Commuter Rail Maintenance Facilities Upgrades | | | x | x | | | | | x |
| Maintenance Facilities Upgrades | | | x | x | | | | | x |
| MBTA Bus Facility Rehab & Improvements | | | x | x | | | | | x |
| Subway Facility Improvements | | | x | x | | | | | x |
| Parking | | | | | | | | | |
| Enhanced Bicycle Parking Facilities | x | | | | x | | | | |
| Parking Upgrades | x | | | | x | | | | |
| Stations | | | | | | | | | |
| Commuter Rail - Various Stations Projects | x | | | | x | | | | |
| Commuter Rail Stations Upgrades | | | x | x | | | | | x |
| Emergency Station Lighting Program | | | x | x | | | | | x |
| Station Management Project - Phase II | x | | | | x | | | | |
| Subway Station Platform Improvement Program | | | x | x | | | | | x |
| Subway Station Rehabilitation | | | x | x | | | | | x |
| Support Infrastructure | | | | | | | | | |
| Bridge Program | | | x | x | | | | | x |
| Commuter Rail - Bridge Projects | | | x | x | | | | | x |
| Environmental Compliance Management | x | | | | x | | | | |
| Groundwater Remediation | | | x | x | | | | | x |
| MBTA Systemwide Fencing | | | x | x | | | | | x |
| MBTA Tunnel Signage Project | x | | | | x | | | | |
| Power Program | | | x | x | | | | | x |
| Rectifier Transformer Replacement | | | x | x | | | | | x |
| Rehab Traction Power Substations | | | x | x | | | | | x |
| Renewable Wind Energy Project | | | | | x | | | | |
| Substation Control Battery Set Replacement Program | | | x | x | | | | | x |
| Systemwide Fire Suppression Systems | | | x | x | | | | | x |
| Systemwide Tunnel Lighting | | | x | x | | | | | x |
| Tunnel Dewatering Pump Station Rehabilitation Program | | | x | x | | | | | x |
| Tunnel Rehabilitation | | | x | x | | | | | x |
| Unit Substation Upgrades | | | x | x | | | | | x |
| Track and Signals | | | | | | | | | |
| Systemwide Signal Maintenance | | | x | x | | | | | x |
| Systemwide Track Maintenance | | | x | x | | | | | x |
| Yard Switch Replacement and Track Reconstruction | | | x | x | | | | | x |
| Vehicles | | | | | | | | | |
| Bus Fleet Rehabilitation (2004/2005 fleet) | | | x | x | | | | | x |
| Commuter Rail Coach Procurement | | | x | x | | | | | x |
| Commuter Rail Locomotive Procurement | | | x | x | | | | | x |
| Commuter Rail Locomotive Top Deck Overhaul | | | x | x | | | | | x |
| Commuter Rail Positive Train Control Efforts | x | | | | x | | | | |
| Kawasaki Commuter Rail Coach Overhaul | | | x | x | | | | | x |
| Procurement of 480 Buses | | | x | x | | | | | x |
| RIDE Vehicle Program | | | x | x | | | | | x |
| Snow Fighting Equipment | | | x | x | | | | | x |
| Systemwide Non-Revenue Vehicle Program | | | x | x | | | | | x |

SYSTEMWIDE TRANSIT NEEDS EVALUATION

| | Maintenance, Modernization and Efficiency | Livability and Economic Benefit | Mobility | Environment and Climate Change | Transportation Equity | Safety and Security |
|--|---|---------------------------------|----------|--------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|
| Accessibility | | | | | | |
| Accessibility Program | x | x | | | | x |
| Elevator Program | x | x | | | | x |
| Escalator Program | x | x | | | | x |
| Communications/Technology | | | | | | |
| Enhancements | | | | | | |
| Key Bus Routes Project - bus stop amenities and customer service | x | x | | | | |
| Expansion | | | | | | |
| Maintenance Facilities | | | | | | |
| Bus Facilities Upgrade and Rehabilitation | x | | | | | |
| Bus Facility Needs Assessment | x | | | | | |
| Carwash Upgrades Systemwide | x | | | | | |
| Commuter Rail Maintenance Facilities Upgrades | x | | | | | |
| Maintenance Facilities Upgrades | x | | | | | |
| MBTA Bus Facility Rehab & Improvements | x | | | | | |
| Subway Facility Improvements | x | | | | | |
| Parking | | | | | | |
| Stations | | | | | | |
| Commuter Rail Stations Upgrades and Renovation | x | x | | | | |
| Emergency Station Lighting Program | x | | | | | x |
| Subway Station Platform Improvement Program | x | | | | | x |
| Subway Station Rehabilitation | x | x | | | | |
| Support Infrastructure | | | | | | |
| Bridge Program | x | | | | | x |
| Commuter Rail - Bridge Projects | x | | | | | x |
| Groundwater Remediation | | | | x | | |
| MBTA Systemwide Fencing | x | | | | | x |
| Power Program | x | | | | | |
| Rectifier Transformer Replacement | x | | | | | |
| Rehab Traction Power Substations | x | | | | | |
| Substation Control Battery Set Replacement Program | x | | | | | |
| Systemwide Fire Suppression Systems | x | | | | | x |
| Systemwide Tunnel Lighting | x | | | | | x |
| Tunnel Dewatering Pump Station Rehabilitation Program | x | | | | | x |
| Tunnel Rehabilitation | x | | | | | x |
| Unit Substation Upgrades | x | | | | | |
| Track and Signals | | | | | | |
| Systemwide Signal Maintenance | x | | | | | x |
| Systemwide Track Maintenance | x | | | | | x |
| Yard Switch Replacement and Track Reconstruction | x | | | | | |
| Vehicles | | | | | | |
| Bus Fleet Rehabilitation (2004/2005 fleet) | x | | | | | x |
| Commuter Rail Coach Procurement | x | | x | | | |
| Commuter Rail Locomotive Procurement | x | | | x | | |
| Commuter Rail Locomotive Top Deck Overhaul | x | | | | | |
| Kawasaki Commuter Rail Coach Overhaul | x | x | | | | |
| Procurement of 480 Buses | x | | | | | |
| RIDE Vehicle Program | x | x | | | | |
| Snow Fighting Equipment | x | | | | | |
| Systemwide Non-Revenue Vehicle Program | x | | | | | |

The projects included in this table are those from this corridor's Highway Universe that meet a Plan identified need. An initial evaluation was performed using criteria derived from the MPO's visions and policies.



BOSTON REGION METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

State Transportation Building
Ten Park Plaza, Suite 2150
Boston, MA 02116-3968
Tel. (617) 973-7100
Fax (617) 973-8855
TTY (617) 973-7089
www.bostonmpo.org

Jeffrey B. Mullan
MassDOT Secretary and CEO
and MPO Chairman

Karl H. Quackenbush
Acting Director, MPO Staff

The Boston Region MPO,
the federally designated
entity responsible for
transportation decision-
making for the 101 cities
and towns in the MPO
region, is composed of:

MassDOT Office of Planning and
Programming
City of Boston
City of Newton
City of Somerville
Town of Bedford
Town of Braintree
Town of Framingham
Town of Hopkinton
Metropolitan Area Planning Council
Massachusetts Bay Transportation
Authority Advisory Board
Massachusetts Bay Transportation
Authority
MassDOT Highway Division
Massachusetts Port Authority
Regional Transportation Advisory
Council (nonvoting)
Federal Highway Administration
(nonvoting)
Federal Transit Administration
(nonvoting)

MEMORANDUM

DATE February 24, 2011
TO Transportation Planning and Programming Committee
of the Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization
FROM Karl H. Quackenbush, CTPS Acting Director
RE Work Program for: Maintenance Costs for Municipally
Controlled Federal-Aid-Eligible Roadways

ACTION REQUIRED

Review and approval

PROPOSED MOTION

That the Transportation Planning and Programming Committee of the Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization vote to approve the work program for Maintenance Costs for Municipally Controlled Federal-Aid-Eligible Roadways in the form of the draft dated February 24, 2011.

PROJECT IDENTIFICATION

Unified Planning Work Program Classification

Technical Support/Operations Analysis Projects

CTPS Project Number

13251

Client

Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization

CTPS Project Supervisors

Principal: Efi Pagitsas

Manager: Seth Asante

Funding

MassDOT 3C PL Contract #66104

IMPACT ON MPO WORK

This is MPO work and will be carried out in conformance with the priorities established by the MPO.

BACKGROUND

On December 16, 2010, staff presented to the Transportation Planning and Programming Committee (TPPC) the results from a study described in the memorandum: Federal-Aid-Eligible Boston Region MPO Roads: A Rough Estimate of Maintenance Costs for FFYs 2010–2014 and Recommendations on the Development of a Pavement Management System (PMS), December 16, 2010.

The purpose of that study was threefold:

- To roughly estimate the costs required to maintain the Boston Region MPO's Federal-Aid (FA) roads
- To define and describe the principles of a pavement management system (PMS)
- To bring to the TPPC's attention the recommended next steps in exploring the development of a pavement management system that would facilitate informed decision making regarding pavement investment strategies for the Boston Region MPO

The study's conclusions were summarized as follows in the memo:

- A PMS can provide an extremely important input to investment strategy decisions regarding the maintenance of the MPO's roadways.
- The MPO should consider maintaining such a system in order to:
 - Estimate accurately the maintenance costs for FA-eligible roads in the region
 - Help develop and choose from maintenance strategies for the effective use of increasingly limited resources
 - Reduce the number of Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) "Reconstruction" projects that include a very costly deep pavement-reconstruction component
- In preparation for a possible PMS for the MPO region, staff seeks authorization to begin exploring potential development of such a system.

During the discussion that followed at the December 16, 2010, meeting, the TPPC authorized staff to begin planning for possible development of a PMS system by exploring how the MPO municipalities make pavement management decisions presently, what methods and tools they use, what PMS methods and software would be available to the MPO (were the MPO to decide to implement a PMS), and what the cost would be of developing and maintaining a PMS. The present work program has been designed to answer these questions by performing the tasks that follow.

OBJECTIVE

The purpose of this study is to address the following questions of the TPPC:

- How do the 101 cities and towns in the region make pavement management decisions?
- What methods and software are presently available for pavement management, how effective are they, and which of these do MassDOT, Boston Region MPO municipalities, and other MPOs use?
- How would a potential Boston Region MPO PMS relate to PMS decisions made by MPO municipalities?
- What would be the cost of implementing a PMS in the Boston MPO Region?

WORK DESCRIPTION

Task 1 Survey Pavement Management Practices and Interview Officials at MPO Municipalities

This task will include the following actions:

- Designing a survey instrument addressed to city or town administrators and public works directors regarding their method of managing federal-aid-eligible and other roadways in their municipality, including the software that they use, if any.
- Posting the survey on the MPO website for officials to respond directly.
- Analyzing responses and developing appropriate tabulations and summaries.
- Interviewing municipal officials about municipal pavement management practices, including their views on a potential MPO-supported PMS for federal-aid-eligible roadways
- From the analysis results and the interviews, staff will determine if it is feasible, and under what conditions, for the municipality-available PMS data to be incorporated into a potential Boston Region MPO PMS.
- If the data cannot be incorporated, staff will identify and recommend to the MPO and the municipalities a plan defining the relationship between the existing municipal practices and a potential MPO PMS for federal-aid-eligible roadways.

Products of Task 1

Task 1 will produce the following products:

- A survey instrument for municipal administrators and DPW directors to fill out regarding municipality PMS practices
- A memorandum documenting interviews with municipal officials about their pavement management process to maintain federal-aid-eligible roads, and tables and other summary forms documenting the results of the survey, including findings and recommendations

Task 2 Research and Evaluate PMS Methods and Software

In the event that the TPPC directs staff to develop a PMS system for the Boston Region MPO, staff must be knowledgeable about the various PMS software packages that exist and the advantages and disadvantages of applying each one, including purchase cost. To this end, staff will perform the following subtasks:

- Perform literature search on the various PMS methods and software packages that exist today
- In addition to surveying the MPO municipalities on this issue, survey Massachusetts MPOs and other MPOs in the country about the systems they use
- Describe each software package, including advantages and disadvantages of the methodology it offers and the products it outputs
- Develop evaluation criteria and evaluate methods and software packages

Products of Task 2

Summaries describing available PMS methods and software packages, associated purchase prices, and evaluation results, including tables showing which methods and software packages MassDOT, Boston Region MPO municipalities, and other MPOs use

Task 3 Estimate Costs for PMS Data Collection and Analysis

In this task, staff will estimate the annual cost of collecting and analyzing pavement condition data for the 2,768 federal-aid-roadway miles in the Boston Region MPO that are maintained by municipalities. A five-year cycle will most likely be assumed for this analysis but possibly some other more appropriate analysis cycle, based on literature search and communications with MassDOT and other Massachusetts MPOs. Also, staff will consider per-mile costs spent by neighboring Massachusetts MPOs, including car rentals, staff time, and fuel costs. Other costs include the cost of modeling several pavement investment strategies that would be of interest to the TPPC.

Products of Task 3

Summaries of annual costs for a five-year—or other appropriate length—cycle of pavement data collection, analysis of pavement conditions, and modeling up to five pavement investment strategies of interest to the TPPC

Task 4 Document All Findings and Recommendations

Staff will document study tasks in a technical memorandum.

Product of Task 4

A technical memorandum documenting Tasks 1 through 3

ESTIMATED SCHEDULE

It is estimated that this project will be completed six months after the notice to proceed is received. The proposed schedule, by task, is shown in Exhibit 1.

ESTIMATED COST

The total cost of this project is estimated to be \$62,499. The total cost includes the cost of 23.1 person-weeks of staff time, overhead at the rate of 90.69 percent, and travel. A detailed breakdown of estimated costs is presented in Exhibit 2.

KHQ/EP/ep

Exhibit 1
ESTIMATED SCHEDULE
Maintenance Costs for Municipally Controlled Federal-Aid-Eligible Roadways

| Task | Month | | | | | |
|---|-------|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 1. Develop, Administer PMS Survey, Interviews | A | | | | | |
| 2. Research, Evaluate PMS Software | | B | | | | |
| 3. Estimate PMS Implementation Costs | | | | C | | |
| 4. Document Findings | D | | | | | |

Products/Milestones

- A: A survey instrument and a memorandum documenting survey and interview findings
- B: Summaries of findings on methods and software
- C: Summaries of costs to implement a PMS
- D: Technical memorandum documenting findings and recommendations

Exhibit 2

ESTIMATED COST

Maintenance Costs for Municipally Controlled Federal-Aid-Eligible Roadways

Direct Salary and Overhead **\$62,314**

| Task | Person-Weeks | | | | Direct Salary | Overhead (@ 90.69%) | Total Cost |
|---|--------------|------|------|-------|---------------|---------------------|------------|
| | M-1 | P-5 | Temp | Total | | | |
| 1. Develop, Administer PMS Survey, Interviews | 1.5 | 5.5 | 2.0 | 9.0 | \$12,248 | \$11,108 | \$23,356 |
| 2. Research, Evaluate PMS Software | 0.3 | 3.5 | 2.0 | 5.8 | \$7,093 | \$6,432 | \$13,525 |
| 3. Estimate PMS Implementation Costs | 0.3 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 2.3 | \$3,682 | \$3,339 | \$7,021 |
| 4. Document Findings | 2.0 | 4.0 | 0.0 | 6.0 | \$9,656 | \$8,757 | \$18,412 |
| Total | 4.1 | 15.0 | 4.0 | 23.1 | \$32,678 | \$29,636 | \$62,314 |

Other Direct Costs **\$185**

Travel \$185

TOTAL COST **\$62,499**

Funding

MassDOT 3C PL Contract #66104

Draft Report – Transportation Planning Certification Review – February 2011

Notes on Draft Recommendations

February 17, 2011

| Topic | Page | Federal Observations and Conclusions on Issue to Address | Federal Recommendations/Commendation (shown in bold italics)/ Corrective Action (shown in bold) | Comment/Action |
|------------------------|------|--|---|----------------|
| Election Process | | | | |
| | 4 | The process' geographic limitations for cities/towns eligibility for candidacy limits some municipalities | | |
| | 4 | Continue outreach to municipalities to educate about MPO process and encourage more participation in MPO elections | | |
| | 4 | | Consider expanding the municipal membership beyond the current numbers to ensure greater geographic diversity and representation | |
| RTP and SAFETEA-LU | | | | |
| | 6 | The MPO's work incorporating environmental mitigation, new consultations and consistency with planned growth meets intent of requirements | | |
| Climate Change | | | | |
| | 7 | FHWA requests that LRTP include discussion of efforts to address Climate Change and strategies for reducing AQ impacts MPO has begun to address Climate Change MPO is participating in TRB Expert Task Group | | |
| | | | LRTP should include strategies to reduce GHG emissions and VMT | |
| Livability | | | | |
| | 9 | The MPO is addressing livability through the WCWs and LCWs and through TIP criteria. MAPC work also supports livability and sustainable growth | | |
| | 9 | | The MPO should make sure that the LRTP Livability chapter is consistent with the six livability principles | |
| RTP/Finance Plan/O & M | | | | |
| | 11 | MassDOT's guidance on bridge funding is not binding for fiscal constraint. | | |
| | 11 | There is no supporting data (quantitative data showing how the assumptions and estimates are applied in deriving funding allocations) for a reasonableness check for Journey to 2030 tables 12-1, 13-3 and 13-4 | | |
| | 11 | Further justification and updating of the finance projections is needed | | |
| | 12 | Transit revenue stream assumptions seem reasonable, but recession-related impacts may merit consideration as part of a broader, comprehensive review of the financial plan. | | |
| | 12 | | Financial plans and information in LRTP and TIP needs more detail; more credible support is needed to substantiate sufficient funds for the program, especially the TCMs. | |
| | 12 | | Need more substantiation for Commonwealth's commitment to funding the nonfederal share of expansion projects. Historic trends should be documented and used for future projections. | |

| Topic | Page | Federal Observations and Conclusions on Issue to Address | Recommendations/Commendation/ Corrective Action (shown in bold below) | Comment |
|---|---------|--|---|---------|
| | 12 | | Present financial assumptions and information quantitatively in tables, with the apportionment levels and obligation limits specified. | |
| | 12 | | Use the procedures developed by the TMG group pavement subcommittee to address how the municipally-owned roadway network is to be maintained for reporting in the LRTP | |
| RTP/AQ Conformity/SIP | | | | |
| | 13 | MassDOT needs to prepare an interim emission offset | MassDOT should continue to report on SIP progress in its monthly SIP report | |
| Congestion Management Process | | | | |
| | 13 | The Boston MPO has taken significant steps to implement an effective CMP and it is integrated into and used in 3C planning; this is a good practice | | |
| | 14 | The CMP data site provides convenient access to information and greatly benefits public awareness | | |
| | 14 | The CMP does not incorporate information on TIP project implementation and it should; also should include monitoring strategies to gauge the success of the CMP | Continue to identify ways to monitor and evaluate projects and operation improvements before, during, and after implementation | |
| Safety | | | | |
| | 16 & 17 | The certification documents show the importance the MPO has placed on studies and projects addressing safety | | |
| | 16 | The MPO includes safety consideration in all major aspects of planning | | |
| | 17 | | Commendation for staff on the MPO interactive CMP intersection map, particularly as it describes safety deficiencies at priority intersections; tool is used in programming and also a good visualization technique | |
| Metropolitan Planning Agreements | | | | |
| | 19 | The MPO has been directed to develop a new MOU to outline the mutual roles, responsibilities and procedures governing the voting membership of the MPO; new relationship needs to be specified between MassDOT, transit operators, MAPC and others | Develop an MOU (between MPO, MassDOT and the transit operators) to determine their mutual responsibilities in the 3C process; provisions for cooperatively developing and sharing information related to financial plans for the LRTP and TIP; and MPO voting membership. This should be in place prior to development of the FFYs 2012 – 2015 TIP | |
| Coordination with Transit Authorities | | | | |
| | 20 | MassDOT will work with the RTAs in identifying needs and local funds to advance projects and will provide input on this to TIP development | | |
| TIP | | | | |
| | 21 & 23 | Descriptions of the TIP process and related information are helpful | | |
| | 23 | The TIP Development Process section gives helpful information and facilitates understanding | | |
| | 21 & 23 | Documentation of fiscal constraint is missing; TIP should show the total cost of all TIP projects together with expected revenue | Add a brief discussion explaining that project costs are considered with revenue for advancement within the regional target | |
| | 22 & 23 | MAPC has suggested that sometimes projects advertised are not consistent with project evaluations | | |

| Topic | Page | Federal Observations and Conclusions on Issue to Address | Federal Recommendations/Commendation (shown in bold italics)/ Corrective Action (shown in bold) | Comment/Action |
|---|---------|---|--|----------------|
| | 22 & 23 | There is a lack of project descriptive information | The Project Listing section of the TIP lacks information for programmed projects; include detailed information (such as phase of project and limits of work) in list of programmed projects, as well as in Chapter 4 | |
| | 22 & 23 | Information is sometimes confusing as shown in the document and should be presented more clearly; some specific information should be clarified; some missing information should be added | Clarify (for the FFY 2012 – 2015 TIP) information on financial constraint, particularly how it is determined and calculated; add a notation on AC year for AC projects, as well as possibly revisit the format of the TIP document | |
| | 23 | | <i>Commendation for developing the MPO's Project Information Form and facilitating public access to programmed projects on the Interactive TIP map; allows for access to information and is an enhanced visualization technique</i> | |
| TIP Target Timeliness | | | | |
| | 24 | Target information should be provided by MassDOT to the MPOs prior to the Spring MARPA meeting | MassDOT should provide target information for TIP development in a timely manner | |
| | 24 | The RPAs have asked to be included in consultations with MassDOT on funding for statewide line item categories | MassDOT should provide a reasonable opportunity for cooperative consultation during target-development process; a target development schedule (including opportunities for consultation) should be shared in December | |
| Year of Expenditure | | | | |
| | 25 | The description of the application of the 4% inflation factor is unclear, including whether it has been applied | Clarify in the TIP the application of year of expenditure dollars; all projects in the TIP should be inflated to the year of expenditure; address in the FFYs 2012 – 2015 TIP | |
| First Year Programming | | | | |
| | 27 | Criteria used for project selection appears effective; is a high percentage of obligation | | |
| | 27 | | Earmark projects should follow a similar process (for selection for programming) as target projects | |
| | 27 | | Maintain close coordination and communication with municipalities with programmed projects, particularly in the 1 st year | |
| | 27 | | Meetings should include a brief update on status of progress for target projects | |
| | | | Track the progress of projects in 1 st year of original TIP to see how many are not advanced; inform MPO on reason; add this data to subsequent TIP | |
| Coordination of Project Development and Environmental Processes | | | | |
| | 28 | | The MPO should work closely with MassDOT to ensure that environmental documents prepared for projects have MPO support/endorsement | |
| Annual Listing of Projects | | | | |
| | 29 | | Make available to the public within 90 days of the start of the new fiscal year the list of highway projects advertised in the preceding year | |
| Universe of Projects | | | | |
| | 30 | The MPO has programmed bridge projects with target funds | | |

| Topic | Page | Federal Observations and Conclusions on Issue to Address | Federal Recommendations/Commendation (shown in bold italics)/ Corrective Action (shown in bold) | Comment/Action |
|----------------------|---------|--|--|----------------|
| | | | There should be a discussion of the evaluation of projects in Appendix A (Universe of Projects and Evaluation of Projects); clarify that bridge projects are not financially constrained and are not being advanced at this time | |
| Public Participation | | | None listed | |
| Title VI, EJ, LEP | | | None listed | |
| Freight Planning | 36 & 37 | | Concerns to be considered are: traffic congestion, crashes, closed and weight-restricted bridges are major concerns that have serious negative impacts to freight operators; More off-road truck-parking facilities, closer to the MPO region, are needed; dedicated truck lanes would reduce auto/truck crashes and improve travel time and reduce congestion; better (direct) access to the port and rail facilities would reduce shipping time and costs; there is a lack of rail service to most port facilities, including to the Port of Boston at Conley Terminal, Moran Terminal, and Charlestown; the region would benefit from more intermodal freight centers accessible to all modes of freight; there is a need for overweight truck routes in the Port of Boston area; the channel into the Port should be dredged to at least 48 feet | |
| Self-certifications | 38 | | The MPO should develop documentation to support the required annual self-certification. | |