

MPO Meeting Minutes

Memorandum for the Record

Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization Meeting

November 7, 2019 Meeting

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

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

Decisions

The Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) agreed to the following:

- Approve the work program for Evaluation of Proof-of-Payment Fare Inspection Strategies for AFC 2.0
- Approve the work program for Exploring Resilience in MPO-Funded Corridor and Intersection Studies
- Approve the work program for Locations with High Bicycle and Pedestrian Crash Rates in the Boston Region MPO Area
- Approve the work program for Disparate Impacts Metrics Analysis
- Approve the work program for Further Development of the MPO's Community Transportation Program
- Release the draft federal fiscal years (FFY) 2020–24 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Amendment One for a 21-day public review period

1. Introductions

See attendance on page 15.

2. Public Comments

There were none.

3. Chair's Report—*Eric Bourassa, Vice-Chair, Metropolitan Area Planning Council (MAPC)*

E. Bourassa reported results of the municipal MPO elections. The Town of Rockland ran unopposed for the South Shore Coalition seat. The Town of Acton ran unopposed for the Minuteman Advisory Group on Interlocal Coordination seat. The City of Somerville ran unopposed for Inner Core Committee seat. The City of Framingham and

the Town of Ashland ran for the seat representing the MetroWest Regional Collaborative. The City of Framingham won reelection to this seat.

4. Committee Chairs' Reports

There were none.

5. Regional Transportation Advisory Council Report—*Lenard Diggins, Chair, Regional Transportation Advisory Council*

L. Diggins reported that the Advisory Council recently heard a presentation from MPO staff member Bill Kuttner regarding Critical Urban Freight Corridors. The Advisory Council also held elections and L. Diggins was elected Chair. Scott Zadakis (CrossTown Connect Transportation Management Association [TMA]) was elected Vice-Chair.

6. Executive Director's Report—*Tegin Teich, Executive Director, Central Transportation Planning Staff*

T. Teich reported that in her first month as Executive Director she is pursuing conversations with MAPC, MassDOT, the Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority (MBTA), the MPO's federal partners, board members, and all members of MPO staff. She thanked Annette Demchur and Scott Peterson for their work as Co-Interim Executive Directors. T. Teich noted that there are several positions open at MPO staff, including the manager of the Certification Activities group, and encouraged board members to circulate these job opportunities.

T. Teich highlighted three memoranda posted to the MPO calendar. These documents list proposed study locations for the FFY 2020 iterations of the MPO's Safety and Operations Analysis at Selected Intersections, Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) Priority Corridor, and Subregional Priority Roadway studies. T. Teich asked that MPO members provide staff with any feedback or questions on the proposed study locations.

T. Teich prefaced item 14 on this agenda, "MPO Transit Committee Outreach Results and Staff Recommendations," by noting that this topic was discussed and voted on by the board in November 2018. Since the last presentation on this topic, staff have conducted outreach with transit providers and stakeholders to understand how this committee could function, and the recommendations presented at this meeting were slightly modified from previous discussions to reflect this feedback.

7. Approval of September 5, 2019, and September 19, 2019, MPO Meeting Minutes—*Róisín Foley, MPO Staff*

A motion to approve the minutes of the meeting of September 5, 2019, was made by MAPC (E. Bourassa) and seconded by the North Suburban Planning Council (City of Woburn) (Tina Cassidy). The Advisory Council (L. Diggins) abstained. The motion carried.

A motion to approve the minutes of the meeting of September 19, 2019, was made by MAPC (E. Bourassa) and seconded by At-Large Town (Town of Arlington) (Daniel Amstutz). The North Suburban Planning Council (City of Woburn) (T. Cassidy) and the Advisory Council (L. Diggins) abstained. The motion carried.

8. Work Program for Evaluation of Proof-of-Payment Fare Inspection Strategies for AFC 2.0—*Steven Andrews, MPO Staff*

The MBTA will be implementing a new automated fare collection (AFC) system, known as AFC 2.0. AFC 2.0 will be a proof-of payment system in which roving fare inspectors verify that riders have paid the fare. The MBTA has requested that MPO staff perform an analysis of alternative fare inspector routing strategies, determine the most equitable strategy, and provide estimates about the sensitivity of fare inspection rates and inspection equity based on the selected strategy. This study is MassDOT funded, estimated to take 7 months to complete, and cost \$71,260.

Discussion

D. Amstutz asked S. Andrews to clarify the schedule of the AFC 2.0 rollout. Mike McGinn (MBTA) stated that this work is being done ahead of planning for the full rollout in order to determine how many fare inspectors to hire.

Sheila Page (At-Large Town) (Town of Lexington) asked whether this study includes the commuter rail. M. McGinn replied that this work focuses on modes where AFC 2.0 will implement all-door boarding i.e., bus and Green Line vehicles.

Vote

A motion to approve the work program for Evaluation of Proof-of-Payment Fare Inspection Strategies for AFC 2.0 was made by MAPC (E. Bourassa) and seconded by the City of Boston (Boston Planning and Development Agency) (Jim Fitzgerald). The motion carried.

9. Work Program for Exploring Resilience in MPO-Funded Corridor and Intersection Studies—*Seth Asante, MPO Staff*

This study is designed to increase MPO staff's familiarity with resiliency planning for transportation system infrastructure in order to provide assistance to municipalities seeking to combat climate-related challenges and incorporate resilience into MPO-funded discrete and recurring studies. This is an MPO-funded study estimated to take 12 months to complete and cost \$90,000.

Discussion

E. Bourassa noted that MAPC recently received grant funds to monitor inland flooding and stated he would follow up to coordinate with S. Asante.

L. Diggins asked S. Asante if the study will include outreach to municipal transportation staff. S. Asante replied that the plan is to choose a cross section of communities to review and then send a survey to municipalities. L. Diggins also suggested that staff look into any overlap between climate resiliency and resiliency to terrorism, and other safety concerns.

J. Fitzgerald noted that Boston has published a climate resiliency plan, *Climate Ready Boston* and offered to support S. Asante by coordinating with any ongoing work. Brad Rawson (Inner Core Committee) (City of Somerville) agreed, encouraging S. Asante to reach out to municipal officials.

Vote

A motion to approve the work program for Exploring Resilience in MPO-Funded Corridor and Intersection Studies was made by MAPC (E. Bourassa) and seconded by At-Large Town (Town of Lexington) (S. Page). The motion carried.

10. Work Program for Locations with High Bicycle and Pedestrian Crash Rates in the Boston Region MPO Area—*Casey-Marie Claude, MPO Staff*

This is an MPO-funded study estimated to take 12 months to complete and cost \$70,000. The objectives of this project are to identify high concern pedestrian and bicycle crash clusters in the region and make recommendations that would improve pedestrian and bicyclist safety and comfort.

Discussion

E. Bourassa noted that MAPC recently released a body of work analyzing data from dockless bikeshare company Lime Bike, which might be a useful tool for identifying where people are cycling on high stress corridors. C. Claude replied that MPO staff

received an internal presentation on this data and are interested in working with MAPC to explore the dataset further.

D. Amstutz asked whether this type of analysis has been done before at this scale. C. Claude responded that this is the first time MPO staff is pursuing this work and that staff is cognizant of the need not to duplicate efforts.

Vote

A motion to approve the work program for Locations with High Bicycle and Pedestrian Crash Rates in the Boston Region MPO Area was made by the City of Boston (Boston Transportation Department (Tom Kadzis) and seconded by the MassDOT Highway Division (John Bechard). The motion carried.

11. Disparate Impacts Metrics Analysis—*Betsy Harvey, MPO Staff*

This is an MPO-funded study estimated to take 11 months to complete and cost \$40,000. The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) require MPOs to identify and address impacts that may result from investments that disproportionately affect minority and low-income populations. This study will build off work undertaken in FFYs 2018 and 2019 to develop a draft disparate impact and disproportionate burden (DI/DB) policy. The goal of this study is to develop thresholds for each metric category analyzed in the MPO's LRTP, *Destination 2040*. The thresholds will allow the MPO to determine when an impact to minority populations or low-income populations would be significantly high and adverse. The findings will be used to update the draft DI/DB Policy.

Discussion

Eric Papetti (FTA) asked about the makeup of the stakeholder working group which will provide input into the study. B. Harvey replied that this stakeholder group was first convened by MPO staff in the spring of 2018 and consists of MPO members, advocacy groups, and other individuals and organizations involved in the field of environmental justice.

Vote

A motion to approve the work program for Disparate Impacts Metrics Analysis was made by the MBTA Advisory Board (Paul Regan) and seconded by MAPC (E. Bourassa). The motion carried.

12. Further Development of the MPO's Community Transportation Program—Sandy Johnston, MPO Staff

Documents posted to the MPO meeting calendar

1. [Draft Universe of Potential Community Transportation Projects for Presentation to the MPO, December 20, 2018](#)

This is an MPO-funded study estimated to take 12 months to complete and cost \$20,000. To distinguish it from the MPO's Community Transportation Technical Assistance Program and programs run by other agencies, this program is now called Community Connections (CC). The MPO included this program as one of several investment programs defined in *Destination 2040*, and has programmed \$2 million per year for it in the FFYs 2020–24 TIP, beginning in FFY 2021. Over the past year and a half, MPO staff have continued to develop the framework under which the program would operate, including development of an application form, process, and scoring rubric. An initial universe of potential CC projects was presented to the MPO in December 2018. The CC Program application was released to proponents of candidate projects identified in the CC Program Universe in October 2019. The objectives of this work scope are to administer the CC Program pilot round, review the pilot round, make changes to the program framework as necessary, and continue outreach to stakeholders to publicize the CC Program and facilitate dialogue on first- and last-mile issues.

Discussion

D. Amstutz asked whether the administration of the program will be handled by S. Johnston going forward. S. Johnston replied that MPO staff are still working through the exact details of administering the program. The expectation is that potential CC projects will eventually be incorporated into the TIP Universe, like projects eligible under the other MPO investment programs.

Vote

A motion to approve the work program for Further Development of the MPO's Community Transportation Program was made by MAPC (E. Bourassa) and seconded by North Shore Task Force (City of Beverly) (Aaron Clausen). The motion carried.

13. FFYs 2020-24 TIP Amendment One—Matt Genova, MPO Staff

Documents posted to the MPO meeting calendar

1. [FFYs 2020-2024 TIP Amendment One: Simplified and Full Tables](#)

Amendment One documents a cost increase of \$14,737,322 for statewide bridge project #604952 (Lynn, Saugus—Bridge Replacement on Route 107 over the Saugus River) in

FFYs 2020–24. Amendment One also details a \$1,372,934 cost increase for one MPO-funded project in FFY 2020 (#608347—Beverly: Intersection Improvements at Three Locations). This cost increase is being funded with statewide safety funds remaining from the removal of project #608205 (Reading to Lynnfield—Guide and Traffic Sign Replacement on Interstate 95), which was instead funded in FFY 2019. During TIP programming discussions in the spring of 2019, the City of Beverly agreed to move project #608347 from FFY 2019 to FFY 2020 to free up funding in FFY 2019.

Discussion

S. Woelfel thanked Mayor Michael P. Cahill (City of Beverly) for the municipality's willingness to allow this project to be moved into FFY 2020.

Mayor Cahill explained that the cost increases for the Beverly project largely resulted from the design public comment process, which resulted in utility pole relocation to accommodate an off-road shared-use path. Mayor Cahill stressed that this project is critical for Beverly's transit-oriented development strategy, which includes first- and last-mile shuttles, bikeshare beginning in 2020, and a rewrite of the city's master plan. Mayor Cahill stressed that this project is important for improving the walkability and safety of Beverly's roads, and meeting an advertising date in December 2019 will allow the projects to take advantage of the summer 2020 construction season. Mayor Cahill thanked the MPO and MassDOT for partnership on this project and asked for support on the amendment.

J. Bechard provided further details on the elements of the design that necessitated the cost increase.

Vote

A motion to release the draft FFY 2020–24 TIP Amendment One for a 21-day public review period was made by the North Shore Task Force (City of Beverly) (A. Clausen) and seconded by the MetroWest Regional Collaborative (City of Framingham) (Thatcher Kezer III). The motion carried.

14. MPO Transit Committee Outreach Results and Staff

Recommendations—Michelle Scott, MPO Staff

Documents posted to the MPO meeting calendar

1. [Memorandum: MPO Transit Committee Outreach Results and Staff Recommendations](#)

Discussion on this topic began in response to a 2015 recommendation from the MPO's federal partners that the MPO expand representation of regional transit authorities

(RTAs) on the MPO board. The MPO explored a number of different options for accommodating the recommendation, described in Appendix A of the posted memorandum. In November 2018, the MPO voted to create a transit committee by modifying its Memorandum of Understanding. The MetroWest Regional Transit Authority (MWRTA) was selected as its initial representative for three years. In April 2019, based on feedback from an MPO member survey, staff made preliminary recommendations about an initial committee structure. At that time, staff identified the following draft mission for the committee:

- Represent transit providers that serve the Boston region on the MPO board
- Advise the MPO on matters pertaining to transit to inform MPO transportation planning and decision making
- Provide a forum for the region's transit providers to discuss topics of mutual interest and concern

The April 2019 proposal identified an initial hierarchy of potential participants: MWRTA, the Cape Ann Transportation Authority (CATA), the MBTA, MassDOT Rail and Transit (core members), other regional RTAs, TMAs, and municipalities with transit service.

In May and June, staff conducted outreach with potential participants to gauge interest and collect feedback. Staff had 15 total conversations with transit providers not yet involved in the broader discussion, including two representatives of RTAs other than MWRTA and CATA, nine TMA representatives, and four municipal staff or volunteers responsible for providing public transportation services at the neighborhood or municipal level. This was followed by an outreach meeting that included 21 representatives from possible participant agencies, advocacy groups, and residents. Appendix C in the memorandum includes a list of preliminary interview and meeting participants, and Appendix D includes a detailed summary of feedback. Nearly all providers expressed some interest in participating in a committee. Some providers suggested piloting a committee to see how it progresses and what it can accomplish.

Staff Recommendations

MPO staff recommends piloting a transit working group for one year before deciding to make an ongoing commitment. Staff would support this pilot with funding already set aside for transit committee activities in the FFY 2020 UPWP. The committee would regularly report to the MPO on pilot participation and activities. Appendix D of the memorandum provides details about possible topics of discussion for the committee. Staff recommend keeping the group structure flexible during the pilot, based on several factors. In the past, staff heard that MWRTA and CATA would not be satisfied with a seat on a transit committee as a means for representation. However, staff has heard

feedback from other potential participants who are predominantly interested in the committee, rather than direct representation on the MPO board. As such, flexibility may better enable staff to gather information or make changes during the pilot, as necessary.

Participants may include core transit providers, affiliates, and visiting experts as outlined in Section 3.3 of the memorandum. Post pilot, the MPO can determine if a more formal structure would be desirable, and how the group should relate to the Advisory Council. MPO staff recommends that the mission of the pilot keeps the elements related to informing MPO activities and supporting coordination but wait on the element related to RTA representation until after the conclusion of the pilot. The pilot is likely to consist of three to four meetings within the next six months to a year.

MPO staff asks that the MPO discuss this recommended pilot and review its November 8, 2018, motion as part of this process.

Discussion

P. Regan asked M. Scott what kind of coordination this group would facilitate that is not offered by other forums. M. Scott replied that Appendix D of the memorandum lists some potential topics for group discussion, and stated that participants expressed an interest in coordination with the MBTA, between RTAs and TMAs, and across transit provider agency types in general.

D. Amstutz asked why the issue of representation is now removed from the discussion. M. Scott and T. Teich replied that while the original MPO vote linked the issues of a transit committee and RTA representation on the board, MPO staff have received feedback that indicates the two issues may be better suited as separate considerations. MWRTA and CATA have indicated that a committee is not a satisfactory approach to representation, while potential participants of the working group have indicated interest in coordination over direct representation on the MPO board. When the MPO revisits the motion, it could decide to keep the two issues linked.

E. Papetti asked what specific MPO-related topics the working group could discuss. M. Scott replied that the working group could consider the MPO's transit modernization program and other topics in a more focused way than is allowed by the MPO format.

L. Diggins expressed excitement at the possibility of collaboration between this group and the Advisory Council in light of the MPO's new CC Program and on last-mile issues in general.

15. Transportation Access Studies of Central Business Districts—*Andrew Clark, MPO Staff*

Documents posted to the MPO meeting calendar

1. [Transportation Access Studies of Central Business Districts](#)

There is a growing need to understand and manage multimodal access to Central Business Districts (CBDs). Studies of high density business districts and commercial corridors in Los Angeles, Toronto, and San Francisco have found that merchants tend to overestimate the percentage of their customers that drive. To understand how these dynamics might differ in the Boston region, this study sought to understand how customers access businesses across the region's diverse CBDs.

MPO staff developed a model to identify the densest area of each municipality in the region, and defined this area as the municipality's CBD. Staff classified the CBDs according to the most frequent transit service available and by population density, as these factors were expected to affect mode choice. Staff used an online region-wide business survey to gauge interest in customer surveying and obtain merchants' estimates of their customers' travel and spending patterns. Using survey responses, feedback from municipal staff, and the classifications discussed above, staff selected Arlington, Framingham, Hamilton, and Hingham as case study locations. After selecting the case studies, staff performed additional in person surveying at participating businesses regarding travel and spending patterns.

Key Findings

In Arlington, merchants overestimated the percentage of their customers that drive. The higher percentage of customers walking, biking, or taking transit is consistent with the density of that municipality and the relatively high levels of multimodal access. In Arlington and Framingham, merchants underestimated the percentage of customers that live or work within walking distance. The higher percentage of customers within walking distance is again consistent with the densities of those municipalities. Drivers spent more on average than walkers at the business where customers were surveyed. However, walkers visited the CBD more frequently and visited more businesses per trip. There are some limitations with the data collected by this study. The sample sizes are relatively small and collected on one day. A limited number of businesses were surveyed in each case study. More data collection would be necessary to support municipal and stakeholder decision making.

Discussion

P. Regan asked whether the study includes findings for people who accessed CBDs by bike. A. Clark replied that the sample size of customers who biked was too small. P.

Regan added that more information on this would be helpful in deciding where to invest in bicycle infrastructure.

B. Rawson stated that this work is invaluable for municipalities to prioritize limited right-of-way on local streets. B. Rawson asked how reporting frameworks can be created to scale this work and make it more manageable for municipalities to pursue. A. Clark noted that the business survey was originally done through SurveyMonkey and pushed out to municipal partners and then pushed out to the business community. MPO staff found that more resources are needed for surveying because of the higher success rates for in person surveys. Partnering with universities might also be an option for outsourcing labor intensive survey tasks. B. Rawson described work done in New York City during the Bloomberg mayoral administration to track how Complete Streets projects, and the lack thereof, influenced customer behavior in different parts of the city.

E. Bourassa echoed B. Rawson's remarks and noted that this kind of data is invaluable for pursuing efforts like dedicated bus lanes, particularly given the pushback from business owners and residents following recent efforts in Somerville. E. Bourassa added that further work can be a topic of upcoming discussion of studies to fund via the MPO's Unified Planning Work Program.

T. Teich acknowledged members' desire to pursue further work on this topic and agreed that this study could be a first step towards a broader framework for collecting data regularly.

D. Amstutz and A. Clausen echoed member remarks on pursuing further work.

16. Boston Region MPO Voting Procedures—E. Bourassa, MAPC

E. Bourassa stated that as part of the 2018 federal recertification review, the FHWA and FTA raised the issue of possible reevaluation of the MPO's election procedures to promote increased participation of municipalities throughout the region. E. Bourassa stated that FHWA and FTA were concerned about the fact that elections are generally uncontested and many of the MPO municipal members have served for many years. FHWA and FTA offered some suggestions including term limits, or limiting voting for subregional seats to only municipalities in that subregion. E. Bourassa stated that MAPC and the MBTA Advisory Board are thinking of pursuing a survey of municipalities to better understand barriers to participation.

P. Regan noted that while this year's elections only featured one contested race, two of the uncontested races resulted in new municipal members due to incumbents stepping down. P. Regan cited the time consuming nature of MPO membership. P. Regan added

that there was 45 percent participation from eligible communities in the region at this year's election.

Discussion

Tom O'Rourke (Three Rivers Interlocal Council) (Town of Norwood/Neponset Valley Chamber of Commerce) asked whether the two new members ran as a result of conversations at the subregional level, or pursued membership independently.

John Mangiaratti (Minuteman Advisory Group on Interlocal Coordination) (Town of Acton) stated that the Town of Bedford represented the Minuteman Advisory Group on Interlocal Coordination well for approximately 12 years, but following transition in the Town Manager's office, Bedford and Acton pursued a conversation around MPO membership, and came to a mutual agreement that Acton's membership would work for the subregion.

E. Bourassa stated that on the South Shore, MAPC essentially recruited Rockland after Braintree stepped down, adding that the time commitment was a concern for other South Shore communities.

S. Page expressed some disappointment in 45 percent participation in the elections. She added that it seems like many communities associate the MPO only with the TIP process, but there are a range of other services and opportunities to participate and communicating that can help improve participation. S. Page stated she would support changing voting procedures so that subregional representatives are only elected by the municipalities in that subregion.

T. Teich agreed that MPO staff recognizes the challenge of raising general awareness about the broad range of activities the MPO undertakes at the regional level and is boosting its outreach efforts.

B. Rawson stated that it is a timely moment for the MPO to increase its visibility and presence in the conversation around transportation issues in the Commonwealth. The release of MassDOT's *Congestion Report*, the ongoing work of the MBTA's Fiscal and Management Control Board, and the high turnout for the MAPC Mobility Forum, which hosted MPO elections, point to this being a moment for the MPO to leverage the work of the board and its staff to participate more broadly in that conversation.

T. Kadzis stated that the concern in restricting voting on subregional representatives to municipalities in that subregion was that the transportation issues facing subregions are essentially regional concerns, and opening voting to the whole region would reduce territorialism.

D. Amstutz agreed that the time commitment is a heavy lift, particularly for municipalities that do not have dedicated transportation staff. D. Amstutz stated that he does not have an official position on the issue of subregional voting, but understands the reason for keeping it open to all the municipalities in the region.

T. Kezer stated that he preferred keeping voting open to all the municipalities in the region because it promotes collaboration across subregional lines. T. Kezer noted that while there are other regional collaboratives where Framingham has taken a back seat, the city felt it was important as the largest community in the MetroWest that the City of Framingham has a seat at the MPO table.

E. Bourassa asked whether the nomination and voting process is onerous, given that it requires hard copy signatures to be submitted to MAPC. T. Kezer stated that it was onerous, but it lent validity to the process in that it forces municipal leadership to have a conversation about MPO membership.

A. Clausen stated that he did not find the process onerous, adding that perhaps one of the reasons why more races are not contested is because communities are having discussions amongst themselves at the subregional level.

J. Mangiaratti stated that the process was not onerous and lent visibility to the MPO process. The nomination process required Acton's Board of Selectmen to have multiple conversations about the MPO at the public meetings, which increases public understanding of the process.

David Koses (City of Newton) stated that he would advocate for allowing faxes or signed emails for the nomination process to cut down on the time and commitment it takes to collect signatures and submit them to MAPC. D. Koses supported the idea of a survey but added that he felt the current system was adequate and that the issue was pursuing more outreach rather than changing procedures.

Steve Olanoff (Three Rivers Interlocal Council Alternate) suggested altering when At-Large races are held to promote contested races, and agreed that requiring signatures is good policy.

E. Bourassa stated that MAPC and the MBTA Advisory Board would put a survey together and bring it back to the MPO for review.

17. Members Items

There were none.

18. Adjourn

A motion to adjourn was made by the Inner Core Committee (City of Somerville) (B. Rawson) and seconded by the MBTA Advisory Board (P. Regan). 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)	Daniel Amstutz
At-Large Town (Town of Lexington)	Sheila Page
City of Boston (Boston Planning & Development Agency)	Jim Fitzgerald
City of Boston (Boston Transportation Department)	Tom Kadzis
Federal Highway Administration	Cassie Chase Ostrander
Federal Transit Administration	Eric Papetti
Inner Core Committee (City of Somerville)	Brad Rawson
Massachusetts Department of Transportation	Steve Woelfel
MassDOT Highway Division	John Bechard
Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority (MBTA)	John Romano
Massachusetts Port Authority	Jillian Linnell
MBTA Advisory Board	Paul Regan
Metropolitan Area Planning Council	Eric Bourassa
MetroWest Regional Collaborative (City of Framingham)	Thatcher Kezer III
Minuteman Advisory Group on Interlocal Coordination (Town of Acton)	John Mangiaratti
North Shore Task Force (City of Beverly)	Aaron Clausen
North Suburban Planning Council (City of Woburn)	Tina Cassidy
Regional Transportation Advisory Council	Lenard Diggins
South Shore Coalition (Town of Rockland)	
South West Advisory Planning Committee (Town of Medway)	
Three Rivers Interlocal Council (Town of Norwood/Neponset Valley Chamber of Commerce)	Tom O'Rourke

Other Attendees	Affiliation
Steve Olanoff	Three Rivers Interlocal Council Alternate
Sara Scully	MetroWest Regional Transit Authority
Felicia Webb	Cape Ann Transportation Authority
Frank Tramontozzi	City of Quincy
Joe Blankenship	Boston Planning & Development Agency
Alyssa Sandoval	Town of Bedford
Michael Tormey	Boston Transportation Department
Mike McGinn	MBTA
Lori Steans	MassDOT District 6
Austin Cyganiewicz	Town of Acton
Derek Shooster	MassDOT Office of Transportation Planning
Leah Sirmin	Federal Transit Administration
Rich Benevento	WorldTech Engineering
Bill Conroy	Boston Transportation Department
Askani Cruz	Office of the Senate President
Scott Zadakis	Advisory Council Co-Chair/CrossTown Connect TMA
Michelle Ho	MassDOT OTP
Bryan Pounds	MassDOT OTP
Mayor Michael P. Cahill	City of Beverly

MPO Staff/Central Transportation Planning Staff

Tegin Teich, Executive Director

Mark Abbott

Steven Andrews

Seth Asante

Andrew Clark

Casey-Marie Claude

Annette Demchur

Róisín Foley

Hiral Gandhi

Matt Genova

Betsy Harvey

Sandy Johnston

Scott Peterson

Michelle Scott

Katie Stetner
