

Draft Memorandum for the Record

Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization Meeting

November 20, 2014 Meeting

10:05 AM – 12:40 PM, State Transportation Building, Conference Rooms 2&3, 10 Park Plaza, Boston

Steve Woelfel, Chair, representing Frank DePaola, Acting Secretary and Chief Executive Officer, Massachusetts Department of Transportation (MassDOT)

Decisions

The Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization agreed to the following:

- release the Coordinated Public Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan for a 30-day public review period
- approve the work program for the *Low-Cost Improvements to Express-Highway Bottleneck Locations: FFY 2015*

Meeting Agenda

1. Public Comments

Lee Auspitz, Somerville resident, raised a topic that he has discussed at previous MPO meetings regarding the use of the term “Medford Hillside” to describe the location of the terminus of the *Green Line Extension* project. Mr. Auspitz contends that the use of the term is erroneous and does not comply with federal geographic naming standards. He has raised this issue a total of eight times before the MPO and the MassDOT Board. The remedy he suggests is for the MPO and MassDOT to make amendments or administrative corrections to the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), State TIP, and Green Line Extension maps to correct the description of the project terminus, and to issue an administrative reminder to subcontractors to inform them that they are bound by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Master Agreement to comply with relevant federal geospatial standards and nomenclature. Mr. Auspitz noted that failure to correct these irregularities could result in investigation, remediation, or punitive actions levied by federal agencies. He asked that this topic be placed on an MPO meeting agenda.

David Knowlton, City of Salem, informed members that the Canal Street project in Salem is ready to be advertised and that the city would like to incorporate the second phase of a bicycle path project into the Canal Street project. The city will be requesting an additional \$1 million for the project. More details will be provided at the next MPO

meeting. Marie Rose, MassDOT Highway Division, added that the Highway Division is exploring the possibility of using Statewide Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) funding for the project.

2. Chair's Report—*Steve Woelfel, MassDOT*

S. Woelfel welcomed a new MPO representative, Janice Ramsay, who is representing the MBTA. He thanked Ron Morgan, MBTA, for his work on the MPO.

3. Committee Chairs' Reports

There were none.

4. Regional Transportation Advisory Council Report—*Mike Gowing, Chair, Regional Transportation Advisory Council*

M. Gowing reported that the last Advisory Council meeting featured a discussion about healthy transportation planning, policies, and practices. The presenters were Steve Miller, the Executive Director of the Healthy Weight Initiative at the Harvard School of Public Health and a member of the Board of Directors of the Livable Streets Alliance, and Barry Keppard, Public Health Manager at MAPC. They discussed linking health and transportation in project performance evaluations and the project selection process. They also discussed studies that point to the benefits walking, bicycling, and traffic calming measures.

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

K. Quackenbush discussed the federal certification meetings scheduled for December 10 and 11. The agendas are being formulated.

Nicolas Garcia, FTA, encouraged all members to participate noting that it will be an opportunity to discuss the planning process, how the MPO has evolved, and the MPO's coordination with various agencies. The draft agenda will be available by Thanksgiving.

L. Auspitz asked if there will be an agenda item on compliance with federal regulations.

N. Garcia confirmed that the meetings are focused on compliance with federal regulations as they relate to the planning process.

6. Coordinated Human Services Transportation Plan—*Alicia Wilson, MPO Staff*

A. Wilson presented the MPO's Coordinated Public Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan. This plan identifies the transportation needs of people with disabilities, the elderly, and people with low incomes, as well as strategies for meeting

those needs. It also prioritizes transportation services for funding and serves as a resource for topics for MPO forums and meetings. The MPO's last Coordinated Plan was developed in 2008 and was updated in 2010.

The former federal surface transportation legislation, SAFETEA-LU, required MPO's to produce a Coordinated Plan to include three federal programs: Job Access and Reverse Commute (JARC), New Freedom, and Mobility for Seniors and Persons with Disabilities (Section 5310). The current legislation, MAP-21, eliminated JARC and New Freedom as stand-alone programs and incorporated New Freedom type activities into Section 5310. MassDOT has asked all MPO's to update their Coordinated Plans to be consistent with MAP-21.

Since the last update the demographic served by Section 5310 has changed and will continue to grow. The new Coordinated Plan uses 2010 census and 2012 American Community Survey data. Thirteen percent of the region's total population is age 65 or older. MAPC projects that demographic will increase to 28% by 2030. Persons with disabilities represent 10% of the non-institutionalized population in the MPO region. Approximately half of people with disabilities and 44% of seniors in this region live in low-income households.

Public input for this plan came from the MPO's Transportation Equity Forum held in January 2014, the Access Advisory Committee to the MBTA's forum in November 2013, and the Advisory Council's meeting in September 2014. Additional public input came from Regional Coordinating Councils (RCCs). There are 13 RCCs in the Commonwealth and five more in formation; the RCCs gather information through surveys, meetings, and forums.

Unmet needs fall into four categories: service and infrastructure improvement, customer relations, coordination, and service expansion. Coordination of services is a priority identified in Governor Patrick's Executive Order 530. As such, this should be the MPO's priority as well.

Motion and Discussion

A motion to release the Coordinated Public Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan for a 30-day public review period was made by the MassDOT Highway Division (John Romano), and seconded by the Advisory Council (M. Gowing).

Laura Wiener, At-Large Town of Arlington, asked about when funds would be available for transportation programs. A. Wilson reported that MassDOT holds an annual solicitation for applications, typically in February.

M. Gowing asked how inputs from the RCCs are factored into the Coordinated Plan considering that not all RCCs are formed yet. A. Wilson noted that the RCCs are rapidly developing and that staff will be able to incorporate any different needs and services they may identify.

N. Garcia asked if there would be a connection between the Coordinated Plan and the Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP). S. Woelfel replied yes.

Richard Reed, Minuteman Advisory Group on Interlocal Coordination (Town of Bedford), asked staff to check on the accuracy of a statement about the connections between MBTA services and transit services in Bedford and Lexington.

Rafael Mares, Conservation Law Foundation, suggested exploring the connection between the population that is disabled and the services used by that population. He remarked that the customers of the MBTA's paratransit service, THE RIDE, are mostly white, which does not reflect the demographic of people with disabilities. A. Wilson noted that people may be using services of other agencies for which the MPO staff does not have demographics. Members then discussed asking staff to research the demographics of these agencies' customers.

Dennis Giombetti, MetroWest Regional Collaborative (Town of Framingham), suggested that members release the plan for public review today and incorporate any updates during the public review period.

M. Gowing noted that the paratransit services of the Lowell Regional Transit Authority (LRTA) are not reflected in the Coordinated Plan. A. Wilson noted that LRTA ceded its authority for some paratransit service to CrossTown Connect. M. Gowing indicated that LRTA still provides paratransit service to towns in the MPO region that are not part of CrossTown Connect.

David Koses, At-Large City of Newton, remarked that the issue of inaccessible transit stations is not addressed in the document. A. Wilson noted that station accessibility is an ADA requirement; the New Freedom Program, however, funds services that exceed ADA requirements. S. Woelfel suggested adding a statement to the text to explain that point.

Members then voted on the motion to release the Coordinated Public Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan for a 30-day public review period. The motion carried.

7. Work Program: Low-Cost Improvements to Express-Highway Bottleneck Locations—Karl Quackenbush, Executive Director, Central Transportation Planning Staff

K. Quackenbush gave an overview of the work program for the *Low-Cost Improvements to Express-Highway Bottleneck Locations: FFY 2015*.

Bottlenecks on the express highway system are locations where there is recurring congestion due to a specific reason. Two years ago, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) promoted the idea of identifying bottlenecks that could be corrected by low cost means, such as pavement restriping, using shoulders as travel lanes, or minor reconfigurations. At FHWA's urging, the MPO funded work programs in 2011 and 2012 which yielded improvements on the region's express highway system.

Prior to beginning this new work program, staff will present recommendations to the MPO for three proposed study locations. Staff will then conduct analyses on the selected locations to develop counter-measures and implementable solutions.

Motion and Discussion

A motion to approve the work program for the *Low-Cost Improvements to Express-Highway Bottleneck Locations: FFY 2015* was made by MAPC (Eric Bourassa), and seconded by the Three Rivers Interlocal Council (Town of Norwood/NVCC) (Tom O'Rourke).

Richard Canale, At-Large Town (Town of Lexington), raised a concern that recommendations from MPO studies are not being conveyed to project designers. He cited the project for the interchange of Interstate 95 and Route 2 as an example. K. Quackenbush replied that staff would take this issue under advisement.

M. Gowing suggested the Route 2 rotary in Concord as a possible study location.

Members then voted on the motion to approve the work program for the *Low-Cost Improvements to Express-Highway Bottleneck Locations: FFY 2015*. The motion carried.

8. Long-Range Transportation Plan Development—Anne McGahan, MPO Staff

K. Quackenbush introduced the agenda item on the development of the LRTP. He noted that the objectives of today's meeting were to: 1) get the MPO's concurrence on the vision, goals, and objectives of the LRTP and to get a sense of members' priorities;

2) expose members to Universe of Projects; and 3) expose members to performance measures that staff proposes to use in the scenario planning process.

Staff proposes to present two draft scenarios to members at the meeting of December 18. With members' approval staff will begin the analyses thereafter. Scenarios have already been conducted for the 2040 No Build and the projects in the current LRTP, *Paths to a Sustainable Region*.

Then, A. McGahan drew members' attention to several handouts. One detailed changes to the goals and objectives that stemmed from the discussion at the MPO's meeting on November 6. Others provided comments members conveyed through an online survey, and comments from MassDOT staff.

Discussion

Members discussed revisions to the vision, goals, and objectives. Key points are included below.

Vision

One topic of discussion was the text of the vision statement and whether to reference the idea that the MPO envisions a transportation system that *uses new technologies*. E. Bourassa reported that attendees at MAPC's subregional meetings expressed a desire for the MPO, MassDOT, and the MBTA to consider how technology could be used to improve the transportation system (as is being done by companies such as Uber and Lyft). He advocated for including this idea in the vision statement.

J. Ramsay suggested further revising the vision statement to include the idea that the MPO envisions a *modern* transportation system. Paul Regan, MBTA, concurred and remarked upon the technology upgrades that have already been funded to modernize the transit system, such as those for the MBTA's new control center.

Members concurred that the new vision statement will read, "The Boston Region MPO envisions a modern transportation system that is safe, uses new technologies, provides equitable access, excellent mobility, and varied transportation options – in support of a sustainable, healthy, livable, and economically vibrant region."

Safety

MassDOT proposed rewording the goals under the Safety category to include a statement about protecting customers and employees from safety and security threats. S. Woelfel discussed the need to have strong, actionable goals for performance measurement.

Members then discussed whether security considerations are in the purview of the MPO's capital planning work, or whether they are more in the realm of police functions and more appropriately addressed by Homeland Security funding. S. Woelfel cited an example of MPO funding that has supported MBTA security measures. He also noted that statistics on assaults against MBTA employees are available for performance measurement.

Paul Regan, MBTA Advisory Board, and Hayes Morrison, Inner Core Committee (City of Somerville), also pointed out that security issues could be considered under the System Preservation category, which has a proposed objective for "prioritizing projects that support planned response capability to existing or future extreme conditions."

Members agreed to accept MassDOT's revised wording for the Safety goal and to include objectives for security considerations under the System Preservation category.

System Preservation

MassDOT proposed to revise the System Preservation goal so that it reads, "The transportation system will be maintained fully," and to revise the wording of an objective to reflect that the MPO will prioritize projects that support planned response capability to existing or future extreme conditions (sea level rise, flooding, and other hazards).

During the discussion, Elizabeth Moore, Director of Policy and Planning, MPO staff, noted that MassDOT's proposed changes reflect a philosophical difference between how MassDOT staff and MPO staff are considering the goals and objectives. The MPO staff views the goal as the end state that one strives to achieve and the objective as the action to reach the goal. MassDOT staff, on the other hand, wish to have goals that are actionable.

Rafael Mares, Conservation Law Foundation, raised a question about why the idea of maintaining and modernizing transit assets was not specified in the objectives. P. Regan suggested revising one of the objectives to read, "Maintain and modernize capital assets, *including transit assets*, throughout the system. Members concurred.

Members also agreed to accept MassDOT's suggestion to make a reference to security hazards in an objective about supporting planned response capability to existing or future extreme conditions.

Congestion Reduction and Transportation Options / Healthy Modes

MassDOT proposed substantial changes to the Congestion Reduction and Transportation Options / Healthy Modes categories, which would combine the two into a new category called, Capacity Management and Mobility.

A question was raised about how the term “bicycle facility” is defined in the objectives. It was noted that the term refers to on-road bicycle lanes and off-road trails as well as support facilities, such as bicycle parking.

D. Giombetti raised a concern that combining the two categories could have an effect on project evaluations. K. Quackenbush also noted that each existing category has distinct aspects and that MassDOT’s proposed changes would eliminate the terms “congestion” and “delay.” The proposed changes could then have an effect on project evaluations. Tom Kadzis, City of Boston, suggested that consideration of reducing highway congestion and delays could be accomplished through the performance measures.

Pam Wolfe, Manager of Certification Activities, discussed the distinctions between the Congestion Reduction and Transportation Options / Healthy Modes categories. The goals and objectives in the Congestion Reduction category make reference to investments in highways and arterial roadways, some of which could be large scale. MassDOT’s proposal removes these references and focuses on a management and operations, lower cost, approach to improving efficiency of the roadway and transit systems. The proposal also recognizes that while the roadway network is mature, the infrastructure for healthy transportation options is not yet built out. S. Woelfel added that MassDOT’s proposal also takes into account the realities of fiscal constraint, which will present a challenge going forward.

Several members expressed support for MassDOT’s proposed changes. E. Bourassa supported the idea of focusing on using existing facilities more efficiently while making the connection to healthy transportation options. He remarked that MAPC’s subregional groups have recognized that a substantial mode shift cannot be obtained if there is significant reduction of highway congestion.

T. Kadzis also expressed support for MassDOT’s revisions noting that “capacity management” is a more realistic and honest term to use than “congestion reduction,” considering the fiscal situation. H. Morrison also expressed support for the use of the term “capacity management” citing the need to manage the system across multiple modes to improve efficiency.

Other members expressed concern about the revisions. M. Rose noted that the proposed revisions leave out motor vehicles entirely. D. Giombetti noted that most suburban travel is done by auto and that there should not be an attempt to skew the goals and objectives in a particular direction. He suggested that the MPO have a discussion about equity. S. Woelfel remarked that the MPO has flexed a significant

amount of highway funding to transit already and that MassDOT's proposal is prompting the MPO to have the discussion about what the goal should be.

K. Quackenbush then drew the distinction between congestion reduction that does and does not induce mode shift. There are areas in the region where highway congestion reduction will have no impact on the transit system because there are no transit options available. There are other areas where highway congestion reduction could lead to reduced transit usage. On the other hand, some highway congestion reduction may benefit transit riders, for example, in areas where there is bus service. Staff will be proposing a performance measure that will parse out whether projects would have impacts to transit that are harmful, beneficial, or neutral.

J. Romano stated that the MPO cannot disregard highway congestion reduction because there are areas where people do not have access to transit.

T. Kadzis asked staff to consider using two performance measures: reliability of travel for highway and on-time performance (average speed) for transit.

Members discussed using scenario planning to show the potential impacts of the two approaches. When Lourenço Dantas, Massachusetts Port Authority, inquired about what type of projects would be included in a scenario guided by MassDOT's proposal, A. McGahan explained that it would not include any highway expansion projects or highway modernization projects that would add lanes. Members then discussed whether highway safety projects could be included as long as they did not add capacity.

S. Woelfel spoke about the impetus for MassDOT's proposal citing the agency's aggressive mode shift goal, investments in bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure, and aggressive greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction goals. He noted that MPOs will be held accountable for GHG reductions.

E. Bourassa suggested that when the MPO evaluates highway projects it should first consider whether the project addresses a major safety issue. If it is determined that the primary reason for the project is to reduce congestion to facilitate single-occupancy vehicle travel, the project would not score as well.

L. Dantas raised a question about whether the MPO will have the opportunity to apply federal funds in the manner MassDOT's proposal would indicate, considering that federal funding is provided in various funding categories and each has restrictions on how the funds are used. N. Garcia noted that funds from the federal Surface Transportation Program may be flexed to transit.

Staff and members then addressed a comment from a member of the public who saw inconsistencies in the objectives to reduce congestion and to add parking spaces to transit stations, and who noted that pricing is not being addressed. They explained that the objectives are aimed at addressing parking needs at lots that are full and that contribute to a reduction in vehicle miles traveled (VMT). The MPO does not address pricing issues, they noted. C. Stickney added that transit station parking is an issue in Braintree, for example, where the parking lot reaches capacity early.

R. Mares suggested that the MPO should give guidance to staff to prepare a scenario that includes highway expansion projects for the purpose of comparison to a more transit focused scenario.

The chair then took a straw poll to gauge members' opinions about running two scenarios, one that focuses on MassDOT's proposal and another that includes highway expansion projects. Members generally expressed agreement. T. Kadzis, however, expressed concern about setting transit-focused and highway-focused scenarios against each other. He noted that the majority of people in the region use autos and that all modes need to be accommodated. S. Woelfel then discussed that the MPO will have to address the issue of transit versus highway funding considering the upcoming *Green Line Extension, Phase 2 (from College Avenue to Route 16)* project.

GHG / Air Pollution / Environment

MassDOT proposed renaming the GHG / Air Pollution / Environment category to Clean Air and Clean Communities, and making revisions to the objectives in this category.

P. Regan expressed opposition to renaming the category and moving the focus away from GHG reduction considering that GHGs are the major driver of global warming.

E. Bourassa voiced support for MassDOT's proposed changes, but also noted that the Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) is updating regulations of the Global Warming Solutions Act (GWSA) regarding how MPO's will incorporate GHG reduction in their planning. Regardless of the goals that the MPO sets, it will be required under regulations to address GHG emissions.

Members then discussed DEP's authority to regulate MPO activities. S. Woelfel noted that DEP has the authority to make the conformity determination for the STIP.

Wig Zamore, Somerville Transportation Equity Partnership / Mystic View Task Force, added that the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has the authority to regulate the MPOs' targets, while MPOs have the right to determine the tactics for

reaching those targets. He then reminded members about the health impacts of black carbon, which is not a GHG.

T. O'Rourke expressed support for MassDOT's proposal noting that the changes provide the MPO more flexibility. He noted that GHG reduction is addressed in the objectives. T. Kadzis expressed agreement as well, noting that consideration of GHG pollutants would be included in the performance measures.

Members accepted MassDOT's revisions.

R. Mares asked that a reference to the GWSA be included in the objectives.

Transportation Equity

MassDOT proposed rewording the goal of the Transportation Equity category to state the goal as being to "Provide comparable transportation options and service quality among communities regardless of income level or minority population." A. McGahan suggested that the statement should instead reference providing comparable transportation *access*, rather than *options*. S. Woelfel noted that MassDOT intended the statement about options to refer to level of service.

Economic Vitality and Freight Movement

MassDOT made several suggested revisions to the goals and objectives in the Economic Vitality and Freight Movement category.

J. Ramsey suggested moving an objective about protecting the freight network from climate change impacts from this category to the System Preservation category. Members were in agreement.

H. Morrison expressed concern that the objectives for the Economic Vitality and Freight Movement categories have little connection to one another. She suggested that there should be two separate categories.

Members then discussed moving the Freight objectives under the Capacity Management and Mobility category.

T. Kadzis suggested revising the text of a Freight Movement objective about eliminating bottlenecks to provide flexibility for meeting federal mandates.

E. Bourassa discussed an objective relating to retaining the population aged 25-34 in the region. He advocated for restoring the original text of the objective which stated that the MPO would aim to minimize the net loss of this population. (MassDOT's revised

objective makes reference to responding to the needs of this population.) He noted that MAPC's projections show this cohort leaving the region because of a lack of affordable housing. The idea behind the original objective was to support transportation investments that encourage dense development and policies that help retain this population.

T. Kadzis suggested adding a performance measure to address this issue. T. O'Rourke noted that MassDOT's revisions reference what is in the MPO's control; while the MPO can have an effect on mobility, it has little control over housing options.

Prioritization of Goals and Objectives

Members turned their attention to the results of the survey on the goals and objectives. Responses from MPO members and the public were provided with a ranking showing the order of priority. It was noted that the survey represents a snapshot in time and that the MPO is still in the process of revising the goals and objectives.

R. Reed noted that from a statistical standpoint there is not sufficient reason to prioritize one goal over another.

Universe of Projects

A. McGahan discussed the Universe of Projects for the LRTP. The Universe includes highway projects initiated through the MassDOT Highway Division and transit projects included in the MBTA's Program for Mass Transportation (PMT). The Universe will also include state-of-good-repair projects from the MBTA's Capital Investment Program (CIP) once that document has been released for public review.

The projects in the Universe are among the inputs into the scenario planning process. The other inputs are the LRTP Needs Assessment; the LRTP vision, goals, and objectives; and land use.

Members were presented with a table showing three categories for projects in the Universe: projects that are programmed in the existing LRTP, *Paths to a Sustainable Region*, but that are not yet programmed in the TIP; projects that add capacity to the system or that cost more than \$20 million; and projects that do not add capacity or that cost less than \$20 million. The FHWA has provided guidance allowing the MPO to raise the cost threshold for LRTP projects from \$10 million to \$20 million. Therefore projects that do not add capacity and cost less than \$20 million do not have to be programmed in the LRTP; those projects may be funded through the TIP.

Each project was characterized based on the type of investment program that it would fall under (i.e. Bottlenecks, Complete Streets, Major Infrastructure, Bike Network,

Interchange, Transit Capacity, Intersection Improvements, Pedestrian Connections, or Freight Movement). Staff also provided the programming status for each project, and the estimated project cost, if available. Members were also provided with pie charts showing the breakdown of project types and investment categories in the Universe of Projects.

Staff asked members to review the Universe of Projects and provide any necessary changes by next week. Staff will then evaluate projects based on how well they meet the goals and objectives.

Discussion

L. Dantas asked whether any new projects may emerge from the Needs Assessment. A. McGahan replied yes; staff is working on that now.

9. State Implementation Plan Update—*Sreelatha Allam, MassDOT*

S. Allam gave an update on the projects in the State Implementation Plan (SIP).

Regarding the *Fairmount Line Improvement* project, the 90% design plans for the Blue Hill Avenue Station are expected to be ready in January. Construction is anticipated to begin in the fall of 2015.

Regarding the *Green Line Extension* project, MassDOT is working with FTA on the Full-Funding Grant Agreement. Construction activity updates include ongoing work on the Harvard Street and Medford Street bridges. The relocation of the outbound commuter rail track at the Harvard Street Bridge was completed in October.

Regarding real estate issues, Memoranda of Agreement (MOA) are being prepared, including those for the Union Square, Inman Square, and College Avenue Stations. Tufts University has proposed design changes to the College Avenue Station to align with the University's master plan; those design changes are being reviewed.

A public meeting about the design of Lechmere Station was held on October 28. Other meetings will be scheduled this coming winter and spring to discuss the station shut down and busing plans.

Discussion

In response to a question, clarification was provided about the portion of the *Green Line Extension* project that will be funded by the MPO. The SIP report only references the portion of the *Green Line Extension* project that extends to the College Avenue Station. The MPO is not funding this portion of the project.

10. Members Items

P. Regan announced that the MBTA and MBTA Advisory Board have a new online tool, at www.transitdiary.com, which allows people to document their commutes. He encouraged people to spread the word about it.

11. Adjourn

Attendance

Members	Representatives and Alternates
At-Large City (City of Newton)	David Koses
At-Large Town (Town of Arlington)	Laura Wiener
At-Large Town (Town of Lexington)	Richard Canale
City of Boston (Boston Redevelopment Authority)	Lara Mérida
City of Boston (Boston Transportation Department)	Tom Kadzis
Federal Transit Administration	Nicolas Garcia
Inner Core Committee (City of Somerville)	Hayes Morrison
Massachusetts Department of Transportation	Steve Woelfel
	Marie Rose
MassDOT Highway Division	John Romano
Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority (MBTA)	Janice Ramsey
Massachusetts Port Authority	Lourenço Dantas
MBTA Advisory Board	Paul Regan
Metropolitan Area Planning Council	Eric Bourassa
MetroWest Regional Collaborative (Town of Framingham)	Dennis Giombetti
Minuteman Advisory Group on Interlocal Coordination (Town of Bedford)	Richard Reed
North Shore Task Force (City of Beverly)	Aaron Clausen
North Suburban Planning Council (City of Woburn)	Tina Cassidy
Regional Transportation Advisory Council	Mike Gowing
South Shore Coalition (Town of Braintree)	Christine Stickney
South West Advisory Planning Committee (Town of Medway)	Dennis Crowley
Three Rivers Interlocal Council (Town of Norwood/NVCC)	Tom O'Rourke

Other Attendees Affiliation

Sreelatha Allam	MassDOT Office of Transportation Planning
Lee Auspitz	Somerville resident
Sarah Bradbury	MassDOT District 3
Brian Francis	MBTA
David Knowlton	City of Salem
Rafael Mares	Conservation Law Foundation
Brian Myers	AECOM
Steve Olanoff	Three Rivers Interlocal Council
Joe Onorato	MassDOT District 4
Tom Stokes	Howard Stein Hudson
Nikki Tishler	MassDOT
Trey Wadsworth	MassDOT
Wig Zamore	Somerville Transportation Equity Partnership / Mystic View Task Force

MPO Staff/Central Transportation Planning Staff

Karl Quackenbush, Executive Director
Mark Abbott
Maureen Kelly
Robin Mannion, Deputy Executive Director
Anne McGahan
Elizabeth Moore
Scott Peterson
Natalie Raffol
Alicia Wilson
Pam Wolfe
