

Memorandum for the Record

Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization Meeting

March 16, 2017 Meeting

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

David Mohler, Chair, representing Stephanie Pollack, Secretary and Chief Executive Officer, Massachusetts Department of Transportation (MassDOT)

Decisions

The Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization agreed to the following:

- approve the work program for *Title VI Service Equity Analysis: Scenario Testing*

Meeting Agenda

1. Introductions

See attendance on page 13.

2. Public Comments

Zach Wassmouth, Para Jayasinghe (Boston Public Works Department,) and Chuck Gregory (HDR Consultant) presented TIP project #608449 (Commonwealth Avenue, phases 3 and 4, Packard's Corner to Kelton Street.) The project spans approximately one mile of Boston's Commonwealth Avenue with the goal of increasing multimodality, improving safety, enhancing transit experiences, and re-establishing the original vision of Frederick Law Olmsted's design. The City met with advocacy groups and held community meetings in 2014 and 2015. The project design adds dedicated cycle tracks and reclaims parking in carriage lanes for bikes and green space. The design focuses on bike and pedestrian safety by truncating carriage lanes, creating dedicated left turn lanes, optimizing signals, reducing conflict points, widening existing Green Line platforms and adding accessible platforms, allowing secondary egress walkways, and providing room for landscape buffers. The current cost estimate is \$25 million.

Jay Monty (At-Large City) (City of Everett) and Tom Bent (Inner Core Committee) (City of Somerville) asked about the re-design of carriage lanes and the loss of parking. C. Gregory and Z. Wassmouth responded that public opinion around reducing parking has been positive. Right now there is an excess of parking as compared to other roadways because of additional spaces in carriage lanes.

Len Simon (Selectman, Town of Sudbury), was joined by Dan Nason (Public Works Director, Sudbury). L. Simon expressed thanks for the MPO meeting held in Wellesley on March 2, citing agenda item #9 (Off-Site MPO Meetings). L. Simon spoke in support of project #608164 (Bruce Freeman Rail Trail, Phase 2D). The Rail Trail is under construction in Acton and will soon begin construction in Concord, traveling south from Lowell. Sudbury has funded 25% of the design. In Sudbury, the Rail Trail will intersect with the Mass Central Rail Trail. There are plans to extend the Trail into Framingham and discussions with MetroWest municipalities around obtaining funds to purchase the CSX corridor are underway. L. Simon expressed the overwhelming support of the town for the Rail Trail and the hope that it will become part of a regional, comprehensive recreational and transportation network. The estimated cost of the project is \$6.9 million.

Bill O'Rourke (Town Engineer, Sudbury) spoke in support of the second project proposed by Sudbury, #607249 (Intersection improvements at Route 20 and Landham Road). This intersection is not currently signalized. There have been 170 accidents in the past 10 years, 1 of them fatal. MassDOT has recently taken over design of the project and the 25% design is complete. Sudbury has written and submitted an advocacy letter to Secretary Pollack. The estimated cost of the project is \$1.6 million.

Yolanda Greaves (Board of Selectmen, Ashland, and MetroWest Regional Collaborative) expressed gratitude that TIP Project #604123 (Reconstruction on Route 126 (Pond St.) in Ashland) has remained programmed in 2020. There was a 25% public hearing in December and the public is very excited and positive. The Pond Street Project Working Group continues to push for 75% engineering so the project can stay in 2020 or earlier. Y. Greaves also spoke as a member of the Metropolitan Area Planning Council's MetroWest Regional Collaborative Executive Board, reporting that MWRC met to talk about TIP projects in the subregion. She expressed support for currently programmed projects in Southborough, Marlborough, Natick, Ashland, and Framingham. Y. Greaves also reported that MWRC members are pursuing MAPC's Landline vision by pursuing multimodal transportation projects in their individual communities and creating connections between them.

Kristen Guichard (Assistant Town Planner, Town of Acton) was joined by Peter Berry (Chair, Acton Board of Selectmen,) and Roland Bartl (Planning Director, Town of Acton). K. Guichard spoke in support of proposed TIP project #608229 (Intersection Improvements at Massachusetts Avenue (Route 111) and Main Street (Route 27) (Kelly's Corner)). Regional through-traffic is a driving cause of congestion in Kelly's Corner. There are access management and safety issues for vehicles and pedestrians, no bike lanes, gaps in the sidewalk network, and issues with ADA compliance. K.

Guichard provided members with an aerial photograph of the project area as well as a concept plan. Acton hopes to hold the formal 25% design public hearing this coming winter. The concept plan includes strategic left turn lanes, signalization, bike lanes and sidewalks in compliance with complete streets guidelines.

P. Berry spoke about the importance of the project to Acton and asked that the MPO consider giving these improvements priority on the TIP. P. Berry stressed that the area has deteriorated, is hazardous under the current conditions, and highlighted town investment in public transit, the Bruce Freeman and Assabet River Rail Trails, and a comprehensive Complete Streets policy. He added that expected development by Stop and Shop and town work to encourage mixed use development highlights the safety, health, community, and economic importance of Kelly's Corner.

Christine Stickney (South Shore Coalition) (Town of Braintree) referred to a question asked at the March 2 meeting about 40B development. Eric Bourassa (Metropolitan Area Planning Council) responded that under the current metric, economic vitality points are not given for 40Bs because they are not considered specific targeted economic development. E. Bourassa added that the criteria will be reconsidered as part of the next Long Range Transportation Plan development process. He added that typically 40B happens when a municipality does not already have the minimum affordable housing required, and there is a question of rewarding communities for facilitating the development they are required to facilitate.

Jim Fitzgerald (City of Boston) (Boston Planning & Development Agency) asked how far the Kelly's Corner project extends down Route 27 and whether it reaches the train station. K. Guichard responded that the train station is about a mile from Kelly's Corner. P. Berry added that a study of an intersection closer to the train station is being funded in the town budget for 2017.

Kevin Hunter (Malden Redevelopment Authority) spoke on behalf of project #608275 (Lighting and Sidewalk Improvements on Exchange Street). K. Hunter noted that the MassDOT project name is a misnomer, and the plan has evolved into a Complete Streets project. Exchange Street is an important corridor connecting Malden Center MBTA station to downtown Malden. Malden's downtown has been continually developing, with 600 mixed-use units under construction. The project would increase bicycle and pedestrian safety, bring sidewalks and ramps into ADA compliance, remove angled parking, and add new landscaping improvements. The project hopes to improve connection to the Northern Strand Community Trail and serves several targeted development sites. The estimated cost is approximately \$1 million. Malden is waiting to

hear from the Mass Gaming Commission regarding a grant for design funds. The remaining funding gap would be filled by the city of Malden.

Marie Rose (MassDOT Highway Division) asked what a more appropriate project name would be, offering to change it in MassDOT's project database. K. Hunter replied that Exchange Street Complete Streets Reconstruction would be better.

Rebecca Curran (Town of Marblehead) advocated for project #608146 (Intersection improvements to Pleasant St. at Village/Vine/Cross). The town funded 25% design for the project, which has been submitted. This intersection is one of the two main accesses into Marblehead, located at the beginning of the business district. There are two schools within 1000 feet of the intersection, which is un-signalized and very congested.

Alexander Train (City of Chelsea) advocated for project #608078 (Reconstruction of Broadway, from City Hall to the Revere City Line). This corridor is the major thoroughfare connecting downtown Chelsea to Route 16. Existing pavement conditions are poor, with outdated signals and no multimodal amenities. The city plans to submit their 25% design report to MassDOT soon, and has held several community meetings. The project is a priority for Chelsea for safety, environmental health, and equity reasons. The corridor has many non-ADA compliant sidewalks, poorly placed crossings, and problems with congestion and air quality. The current cost estimate is \$20 million, and Chelsea is prepared to substantially augment any TIP funding they might receive.

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

There was none.

4. Committee Chairs' Reports—*Bryan Pounds, MassDOT*

B. Pounds reported that the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) Committee would meet immediately following the MPO meeting. The committee planned to discuss the rankings of projects under consideration for funding.

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

T. Bennett shared that the Advisory Council met on March 8 and discussed UPWP study ideas. The Advisory Council also approved a comment letter regarding the proposed Public Participation Plan amendment. While the Council understands the desire to align document production schedules, they have serious concerns about whether this amendment is the correct way to do so.

6. Executive Director's Report—Karl Quackenbush, Executive Director, MPO Staff

K. Quackenbush reminded board members to provide feedback on the Performance Dashboard presented by MPO staff on February 16. He noted that a 3 month calendar of MPO meetings was available, as well as two changes to the agenda: meeting minutes from March 2 were not available for approval in item #7, and Nick Hart would be replaced by Annette Demchur and Steven Andrews to present item #8.

7. Approval of Meeting Minutes—Róisín Foley, MPO Staff

The minutes of the meeting of March 2 were not presented for approval.

8. Action Item: Work Program for Title VI Service Equity Analysis: Scenario Testing—Annette Demchur and Steven Andrews, MPO Staff

A. Demchur presented the work program for *Title VI Service Equity Analysis: Scenario Testing* (posted to the MPO meeting calendar,) reminding the board that N. Hart previously presented to them a prototype methodology he developed for conducting the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) required service equity analysis. MPO staff developed this methodology out of a concern that the guidelines outlined in the Title VI circular did not provide for an adequate measurement of the possible adverse effects of different service changes. FTA offers two approaches for conducting service equity analyses; one using ridership data and one using population data. MPO staff found weaknesses in both methods. FTA methods do not consider the magnitude of changes or adverse effects. The methodology developed by MPO staff looks at changes in access to destinations, taking into consideration people who use or could use services, the availability of transit alternatives, and the trip travel times. This allows staff to account for all potential riders impacted by a change in service, not just the specific populations living near the affected route but also people who might use the route as part of their trip, as well as the availability of alternative services. The methodology was presented to the MBTA and MassDOT, who have requested more scenario testing. This work program would look at all MBTA key bus routes to test different scenarios. The prototype methodology includes the rapid transit system and the key bus routes. Staff has proposed work to fully develop this methodology for the entire MBTA system in the next UPWP.

Discussion

D. Mohler asked if staff feel that the goal should be to encourage FTA to adopt this methodology instead of the one they recommend. A. Demchur agreed and added that staff have submitted a service equity analysis using a method somewhere between the FTA guidelines and the MPO's method, and this analysis had been approved by FTA.

Vote

A motion to approve the work program for *Title VI Service Equity Analysis: Scenario Testing* was made by the Metropolitan Area Planning Council (E. Bourassa), and seconded by the City of Boston (Boston Transportation Department) (Jim Gillooly). The motion carried.

9. Off-Site MPO Meetings—David Mohler, MassDOT

D. Mohler opened a discussion off-site MPO Meetings by reminding members that prior to the March 2 meeting in Wellesley, staff encountered difficulty finding a suitable venue. Staff is willing to continue planning off-site meetings but want to make sure members feel they are valuable.

Discussion

K. Quackenbush stated that staff was unable to schedule off-site meetings during 2016 due to the need to hold Green Line Extension (GLX) discussions at the State Transportation building.

Dennis Giombetti (MetroWest Regional Collaborative) (Town of Framingham) stated that he felt off-site meetings were beneficial, but that the onus for finding a venue should be on subregional representatives and not staff.

Laura Wiener (At-Large Town) (Town of Arlington) noted that when coming to regular MPO meetings, she uses the MBTA, but when attending off-site meetings she drives, adding that this may send the wrong message.

Tina Cassidy (North Suburban Planning Council) (City of Woburn) added that four may not be the right number of off-site meetings; perhaps two to three is sufficient.

Laura Gilmore (Massachusetts Port Authority) stated that as much advanced notice of an off-site meeting as possible is appreciated, due to the need to rearrange schedules.

K. Quackenbush added that the general pattern of off-site meetings has been to hold them in March, June, September, and December.

D. Mohler asked how staff chooses locations and whether all subregions have been visited. K. Quackenbush replied that the process is a combination of trying to visit areas the MPO has not yet visited, constrained by the need for reasonable transit access and accessible meeting spaces. Since the MPO began holding off-site meetings, there have been 15. There has been at least one in each subregion.

J. Gillooly asked if there are opportunities to use technology to circumvent some of the issues around off-site meetings, by perhaps using Skype or other remote telecommunications services.

Dennis Crowley (South West Advisory Planning Committee) (Town of Medway) noted that the requirement that a venue being accessible by public transportation may exclude some communities and asked whether this requirement was necessary.

D. Mohler responded that the main requirement is that a venue be accessible by ADA standards. Transit accessibility has been the MPO's practice.

C. Stickney commented that it might be valuable to hold an off-site meeting in a community that is not accessible by public transit, so that members may experience what those conditions are like in some communities.

Paul Regan (MBTA Advisory Council) noted that some venues may not be accessible by the MBTA, but may be served by a local RTA.

T. Bennett stated that she felt it was important to provide members and members of the public without access to a vehicle the opportunity to attend meetings without extreme expense.

J. Gillooly added that this may point to the need to hold off-site meetings, so members of the public who may not be able to come to Boston have an opportunity to attend.

D. Mohler summarized that the feeling seemed to be to continue off-site meetings. He asked that K. Quackenbush and staff start thinking about which subregion the June meeting should be held in and reach out to representatives.

Steve Olanoff (TRIC Alternate) added that he is working on securing a venue in Westwood for a meeting in September/October.

K. Quackenbush asked whether members were comfortable with revisiting venues. The response to this was generally positive.

10. Public Participation Plan, Amendment: Review of Comments— *Lourenço Dantas, MPO Staff*

L. Dantas presented a review of public comments on the proposed amendment to the MPO's Public Participation Plan. The Amendment was presented to the MPO at the January 19 meeting, where the board voted to release it for a 45-day public comment period. The end of the comment period was scheduled for March 20. Staff compiled the

input they received prior to March 16 for review and discussion by the MPO prior to a vote on March 30.

The proposal to amend the MPO's Public Participation Plan was made by MassDOT and stemmed from the desire to align TIP and STIP development with that of the CIP. The proposal impacts the comment period duration for the Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP), Transportation Improvement Program (TIP,) and UPWP, i.e. the three main MPO certification documents. The basic premise of the amendment is to shorten the public comment period for all three documents to 21 days.

The Boston Region MPO's Public Participation Plan specifically includes a vision for public participation, which is to "hear, value, and consider the views of and feedback from the full spectrum of the public." Under that vision, staff set out to gather responses and ascertain whether 21 days offers a reasonable opportunity for comment by the full spectrum of the public.

Notices were sent via email lists, Twitter, and updates to the MPO's website. Staff designed a three-question survey to get a reaction from a broad spectrum of the public. 133 responses to the survey were received, from stakeholders including municipal officials, town and local planning staff, consultants and transportation professionals, business owners, residents, and advocacy groups. The survey asked whether there were any challenges posed by reducing comment period length. A little over a third of respondents felt this posed no challenge. 39 respondents felt there would be some difficulty. Around a third of respondents felt they could not comment in 21 days, and some said even 30 days was not enough. The survey did not find that there was a significant difference in opinion about whether the lengths of comment periods should be different for the three different certification documents. In terms of identifying potential challenges, in the survey a third of respondents indicated that formal comments must be reviewed by others in their organization. 24 said that their council/board needs to meet in person to decide on how to comment. Some respondents indicated they did not have ready access to a computer, and others indicated that disability status and English proficiency were a challenge. In addition to the survey, formal written comments were received from approximately 15 different commenters, including letters from the Advisory Council and the Conservation Law Foundation.

Discussion

Tom O'Rourke (Three Rivers Interlocal Council) (Town of Norwood/NVCC) asked for a review of the reasoning behind the amendment. D. Mohler replied that MassDOT's desired the change so that, for MPOs that meet monthly, amendments could be voted

out for public review one month and then taken to a final vote at the next month's meeting, and include time for staff review and compilation of comments. This would require a less than 30-day comment period. This does not apply to Boston, where the board generally meets every two weeks.

T. Bennett expressed that Advisory Council members understood the reasoning, but had many questions around whether this was the only way to accomplish a better alignment of development schedules. She asked whether it was possible to institute a temporary acceleration of the schedule for this year only. This would also allow for a review of how reducing the period impacts the ability of the public to comment before changing the practice in the long-term. She also asked whether it was necessary to do this for all three documents, particularly the LRTP.

D. Giombetti asked whether it would be possible to use the waiver process to change the comment period length, rather than an amendment. D. Mohler replied that the board can use waivers.

11. Federal Fiscal Years (FFYs) 2018-22 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Development: Final Evaluation Results and First Tier List of Projects— Alexandra (Ali) Kleyman, MPO Staff

A. Kleyman presented the *FFYs 2018-22 TIP Final Evaluation Results and First Tier List of Projects*. These are the final evaluation scores and ranked list of projects under consideration for funding with MPO target funds in the FFYs 2018-22 TIP.

Materials: Posted to MPO Meeting Calendar

1. *Table 1: FFY 2018-22 Revised Project Evaluation Scores*- These scores are grouped by MPO investment program. New projects appear in blue text; projects in the LRTP are in bold black; red text notes a change to a project's score from the draft evaluations presented on March 2.
2. *Table 2: FFY 2018-22 TIP First Tier List*- This list includes factors that go into developing the Staff Recommendation. Styles are the same as Table 1.
3. *FFYs 2018-22 TIP Target Funds (Boston Region MPO Discretionary Funds) and Comparison to FFYs 2017-21 Targets*
4. *FFYs 2017-21 TIP: Project Status (Section 1A, MPO Target Funds), as of March 6, 2017*

Presentation

Table 1 includes 7 projects with scores that have changed since March 2. These changes generally stemmed from feedback from TIP Contacts. In the Complete Streets category, #608275 (Malden) increased to 54 points and moved (ranked) in front of

#602310 (Danvers). In the Intersection Improvements category, #608146 (Marblehead) increased to 40 points and moved (ranked) in front of #604231 (Marlborough) and #607249 (Sudbury).

Table 2 includes factors that members asked questions about on March 2 and which staff consider when formulating a recommendation. These include the year of PRC approval and MAPC Subregions and Community Types.

The handout *FFYs 2018-22 TIP Target Funds (Boston Region MPO Discretionary Funds) and Comparison to FFYs 2017-2021 Targets* shows the funding targets for 2018-22 and compares these amounts to last year. There is an across the board increase in each year, ranging between 2.6 and 6.7%.

The handout *FFYs 17-21 TIP: Project Status (Section 1A, MPO Target Funds)*, as of March 6, 2017 summarizes cost and readiness changes to projects currently programmed in the FFYs 2017-21 TIP. In 2017, #607309 (Hingham) and #604810 (Marlborough) have increased in cost. In 2018, #606635 (Newton and Needham) and #605110 (Brookline) have increased. MassDOT recommends moving Newton and Needham and Brookline to 2019. #604989 (Southborough) may be ready for advertising in 2018. In 2019, #608352 (Salem) could advance to 2018. Two projects in 2019 are noted as having some risk of being ready to advertise in that year. #607652 (Everett) has increased in cost. In 2020, there is some uncertainty about the ability to keep #606226 (Boston) programmed. In 2021, #608347 (Beverley) and #606501 (Holbrook) may be able to advance to 2020. The impact of these changes is an approximately \$2 million deficit in 2017, the availability of approximately \$20 million in 2018, and a large deficit in 2019.

Discussion

J. Gillooly asked about project #608449 (Boston) and whether scores are still able to change prior to the March 30 meeting. A. Kleyman replied that this is possible. J. Gillooly commented that the addition of projects to the LRTP is generally fairly perfunctory unless there is a major change to the network. He asked whether #608449 (Boston) would need any extensive modeling or air quality analyses in order to be added to the LRTP. Anne McGahan (MPO Staff) replied that this project would not have to be modeled.

Richard Canale (At-Large Town) (Town of Lexington) asked whether project #608006 specifically, and other projects generally, could only happen with MPO funding, or whether MassDOT can fund some of them in another capacity.

D. Mohler replied that MassDOT will be releasing the list of statewide projects it plans to fund soon, and that it is possible some of the projects currently being proposed for MPO funding will be funded with statewide dollars.

E. Bourassa asked whether A. Kleyman had specific information related to the cost increases indicated in *FFYs 2017-21 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP): Project Status (Section 1A, MPO Target Funds), as of March 6, 2017*. A Kleyman replied that she had heard from the MassDOT Project Manager of #606635 (Newton and Needham) that the original estimate of \$15 million was generated when the scope was smaller. Construction costs, drainage reconstruction, utility work, and changes to the bridge design also contributed to the cost increase. E. Bourassa asked whether any of the increases are attributable to local advocacy for bike accommodations. David Koses (At-Large City) (City of Newton) replied that he had only recently heard about this issue but welcomed more information. M. Rose explained that there have been internal discussions related to a new cross-section of Needham Street regarding a separated bike lane. The recommendation for moving #606635 from 2018 to 2019 is not directly related to this discussion.

J. Gillooly provided feedback related to two Boston projects, #605789 (Melnea Cass) and #606226 (Rutherford Avenue). Melnea Cass will be ready to advertise in 2019, 25% design will be submitted in June of 2017. #606226 is also tracking well to be ready for advertising in 2020. J. Gillooly stressed the importance of this project to the City of Boston, indicating that the City will be ready with a definitive announcement of the design concept in April or May. The plan is to submit 25% design in spring of 2018.

D. Giombetti asked if it is possible to identify projects in 2019 and 2020 that could be moved forward to fill gaps in funding. D. Mohler replied that advancing projects currently in the TIP is the first place that staff looks to fill gaps in funding. Design, environmental, and right-of-way factors must all be considered for advancing a project.

T. Bent expressed the support of Somerville for the Rutherford Avenue project and stressed the coordination between Boston, Somerville, and Everett in the effort of keeping the project on track. J. Monty seconded this and stressed the project's importance to Everett as well.

D. Crowley referred back to *Table 2*, highlighting that the scoring on equity favors cities and is detrimental to smaller suburban communities.

K. Quackenbush commented that the scoring metrics are a reflection of the values of the MPO at the time of the scoring reevaluation last year. He stressed that the reason there are other decision factors such as those related to geographic considerations is so that staff and members can factor those into the decision-making.

12.Members Items

There were none.

13.Adjourn

A motion to adjourn was made by Metropolitan Area Planning Council (E. Bourassa) and seconded by the City of Boston (J. Gillooly). The motion carried.

Attendance

Members	Representatives and Alternates
At-Large City (City of Everett)	Jay Monty
At-Large City (City of Newton)	David Koses
At-Large Town (Town of Arlington)	Laura Wiener
At-Large Town (Town of Lexington)	Richard Canale
City of Boston (Boston Planning & Development Agency)	Jim Fitzgerald
City of Boston (Boston Transportation Department)	Jim Gillooly Thomas Kadzis
Federal Highway Administration	
Federal Transit Administration	
Inner Core Committee (City of Somerville)	Tom Bent
Massachusetts Department of Transportation	David Mohler
MassDOT Highway Division	John Romano Marie Rose
Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority (MBTA)	Eric Waaramaa
Massachusetts Port Authority	Laura Gilmore
MBTA Advisory Board	Paul Regan
Metropolitan Area Planning Council	Eric Bourassa
MetroWest Regional Collaborative (Town of Framingham)	Dennis Giombetti
Minuteman Advisory Group on Interlocal Coordination (Town of Bedford)	
North Shore Task Force (City of Beverly)	Denise Deschamps
North Suburban Planning Council (City of Woburn)	Tina Cassidy
Regional Transportation Advisory Council	Tegin Bennett
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
Zach Wassmouth	City of Boston Public Works
Para Jayasinghe	City of Boston Public Works
Chuck Gregory	HDR
Len Simon	Selectman, Town of Sudbury
Sarah Bradbury	MassDOT District 3
Yolanda Greaves	Ashland Board of Selectmen, MWRC
Dan Nason	Sudbury Public Works
John Gendall	MassDOT District 6
Kristen Guichard	Town of Acton
Peter Berry	Acton Board of Selectmen
Roland Bartl	Town of Acton
Bill O'Rourke	Sudbury
Kevin Hunter	Malden Redevelopment Authority
Melissa Zampitella	A Better City
Richard P. Merson	Needham Public Works
Erik Maki	TetraTech
Rafael Mares	Conservation Law Foundation
Alex Train	City of Chelsea
Dick Williamson	Sudbury, Bruce Freeman RT
Rebecca Curran	Town of Marblehead
Steve Olanoff	TRIC Alternate

MPO Staff/Central Transportation Planning Staff

Karl Quackenbush, Executive Director
Steven Andrews
Lourenço Dantas
Annette Demchur
David Fargen
Róisín Foley
Ali Kleyman
Anne McGahan
Elizabeth Moore
Jen Rowe
Michelle Scott
