

Draft Memorandum for the Record

Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization Meeting

January 19, 2017 Meeting

10:00 AM – 12:40 PM, State Transportation Building, Conference Rooms 2&3, 10 Park Plaza, Boston

David Mohler and Steve Woelfel, Chairs, 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 the *Planning for Connected and Autonomous Vehicles* study
- approve the work program for the *Promising Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Reduction Strategies* study
- approve the minutes of the meetings of December 1 and December 15, 2016
- release Draft Amendment 2 to the Federal Fiscal Years (FFYs) 2017-21 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for a 30-day public review period
- release Draft Amendment to the Public Participation Plan (PPP) for a 45-day public review period

Meeting Agenda

1. Introductions

See attendance on Page 16.

2. Public Comments

There were none.

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

D. Mohler announced that USDOT has adopted the final rule on MPO coordination. He also noted that there was a meeting of the Capital Programs Subcommittee and the MassDOT Board of Directors on December 17. D. Mohler made a presentation to the MassDOT Board on the status of municipal contributions policy development. MassDOT staff proposed that the Board consider changes to the municipal contributions policy for transit expansion projects. The MassDOT Board has not made a final determination on this issue.

4. Committee Chairs' Reports

There were none.

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

T. Bennett reported that the Advisory Council's January 11 meeting included a discussion of electric vehicles.

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

K. Quackenbush noted the intention to hold an MPO meeting on March 30. He introduced the new Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) Coordinator on the MPO staff, Sandy Johnston.

D. Mohler asked whether an MPO Away meeting has been scheduled. K. Quackenbush replied that staff struggled to schedule one in February but work is ongoing. D. Mohler remarked that members should think about the costs and benefits of MPO Away meetings overall, and whether the policy of having four meetings outside of Boston per year is still useful. This discussion will be scheduled at a future meeting.

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

A motion to approve the minutes of the meeting of December 1, 2016 was made by the Metropolitan Area Planning Council (Eric Bourassa) and seconded by the Regional Transportation Advisory Council (T. Bennett). The motion carried. South West Advisory Planning Committee (Town of Medway) (Dennis Crowley) abstained.

A motion to approve the minutes of the meeting of December 15, 2016 was made by the Metropolitan Area Planning Council (Eric Bourassa), and seconded by the Regional Transportation Advisory Council (T. Bennett). The motion carried. South West Advisory Planning Committee (Town of Medway) (Dennis Crowley) and South Shore Coalition (Town of Braintree) (Christine Stickney) abstained.

8. Draft Federal Fiscal Years (FFYs) 2017-21 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Amendment 2—*Alexandra Kleyman, MPO Staff*

A. Kleyman presented *Draft FFYs 2017-2021 TIP Amendment Two*. A table was provided which summarized proposed changes. The summary table identified the individual project, described the proposed change and the impact of that change, identified the funding source and resulting difference in funding, and pointed to the section of the TIP tables where the proposed changes are located.

Proposed adjustments to transit projects in Amendment Two include the reallocation and addition of MetroWest Regional Transit Authority (MWRTA) funding for the purchase of bus support equipment/facilities, as well as the removal of Cape Ann Transportation Authority (CATA) funding for a replacement trolley bus from FFY 2018 to FFY 2019. Adjustments to highway projects include the addition of Project ID numbers for repurposed earmarks approved by the board in Amendment One, and the addition of information related to the Advanced Construction year for the Green Line Extension (GLX).

There are no amendments related to transit projects included in Amendment Two. Amendments to highway projects include proposed changes to Middlesex Turnpike Improvements, Weymouth-Abington-Reconstruction & Widening on Route 18, and the Hanover-Norwell Superstructure Replacement as a result of the August 2016 Redistribution of federal funds which removed funding from FFY 2017 to FFY 2016. The Lynnfield-Peabody- Resurfacing and Related Work on Route 1 is proposed to increase in cost. Medford-Stoneham-Woburn-Reading-Highway Lighting Rehab on I-93 also has a proposed cost increase. Transfers of funds to Eastern Federal Lands for design and construction at Assabet River and Great Meadows Wildlife Refuges are added in FFY 2017.

Changes to FFYs 2018 and 2019 include the replacement and increase in funding of Dedham-Reconstruction on Route 109 and Ames Street, the rehab of Brookline-Pedestrian Bridge over MBTA off Carlton Street, and a transfer to Eastern Federal Lands for the replacement of the Hellcat Trail Boardwalk at the Parker River National Wildlife Refuge.

Discussion

Laura Wiener (At Large Town) (Town of Arlington) asked about the meaning of a transfer to Eastern Federal Lands. D. Mohler replied that the money is transferred to the Federal Highway Administration's Eastern Federal Lands. The Federal Highway Administration will administer these projects.

Tom O'Rourke (Three Rivers Interlocal Council) (Town of Norwood) asked whether the increases in funding all come from the August Redistribution. D. Mohler replied that some are, while some are leftover un-programmed TIP funds.

Kenneth Miller (Federal Highway Administration) asked whether any of the proposed changes have an impact on MPO Target Funding. D. Mohler replied that there is no impact.

K. Miller also remarked that traditionally Massachusetts has not received less than 50 million dollars of redistribution funds and MPOs should program more funding in general to avoid making adjustments like these at the end of the TIP development cycle.

T. Bennett asked for clarification related to the funding/cost increase for the I-93 project. D. Mohler replied that this was originally an Advanced Construction project which was to be funded over two years. New standards and STIP funds have moved all funding for this project to FFY 2017.

Vote

A motion to release Amendment Two for a 30-day public review period was made by MassDOT Highway Division (John Romano) and seconded by the MBTA (Eric Waaramaa). The motion carried.

9. Public Participation Plan (PPP) Amendment—*Karl Quackenbush, Executive Director, MPO Staff*

K. Quackenbush introduced a proposed amendment to the MPO's Public Participation Plan (PPP), which would reduce the public comment period for all certification documents from 30 to 21 days. K. Quackenbush explained that MassDOT is attempting to better align their STIP and CIP development processes. They are asking MPOs to speed up the development of their individual TIPs because those documents feed into the statewide STIP. One way to shorten the process is to reduce the length of public comment periods for MPO certification documents like the TIP.

K. Quackenbush remarked that federal regulations ask the MPO to promote engagement by a full spectrum of the public. He mentioned that some groups are less engaged with the process and may be impacted by a shorter public comment period. These include individuals with limited access to the internet or people who do not speak English. Staff is considering the impact on these individuals and taking steps to remediate them in the event the public comment period is reduced.

Discussion

T. Bennett raised the concern that groups that meet monthly, like the Regional Transportation Advisory Council, may not have adequate time to meet, discuss, and organize comments in less than a month's time. She additionally mentioned the layers of approval needed to provide comments by municipal entities and raised the possibility of reducing the comment period just for the TIP, but allowing flexibility for longer comment times for other certification documents.

E. Bourassa commented that staff should monitor the level of public input and notify the Board if, in the event the public comment period is reduced, there is a significant drop-off in comments.

Jim Gillooly (City of Boston, Boston Transportation Department) asked whether the current practice is to allow late comments to be presented to the Board. K. Quackenbush replied that staff certainly does not stifle comments that miss the official deadline.

K. Miller asked whether the intention behind this proposed change is to allow MPO staff to receive and compile comments to present to the Board in a timely fashion, particularly in MPO regions where Boards meet monthly. He pointed out that the only public comment period length explicitly stated in the federal regulations is the length of the period for amendments to the Public Participation Plan itself, which is 45 days. D. Mohler replied that because the Boston Region MPO meets every 14 days, a 21 day comment period would allow the public 21 days to comment and an additional week for staff to summarize and submit comments to members for review before a vote at a meeting. He added that this avoids scheduling additional meetings to accommodate a comment period.

Rafael Mares (Conservation Law Foundation) asked about the CIP development schedule and inquired about other measures that are being taken to meet that deadline. D. Mohler replied that the goal is to have the CIP in effect by the beginning of the state fiscal year in July. This means a draft should be available for comment in May. MassDOT is planning "Readiness Days" in February to provide MPOs with current cost and project readiness estimates so that they may draft their TIPs in March and release them for comment in April. D. Mohler added that the state is strongly encouraging other MPOs in the state to meet monthly.

Jim Purdy (member of the public) emphasized that organizations with many layers of approvals may find it difficult to organize comments in 21 days, and the Board should expect push back.

Vote

A motion to approve the release of the amendment to the Public Participation Plan for a 45-day public review period was made by the Metropolitan Area Planning Council (E. Bourassa) and seconded by the Inner Core Committee (City of Somerville) (Tom Bent). The motion carried. The Regional Transportation Advisory Council (T. Bennett) abstained.

10. Work Program: Planning for Connected and Autonomous Vehicles— *Scott Peterson, Director of Technical Services, MPO Staff*

S. Peterson introduced the work program for *Planning for Connected and Autonomous Vehicles*. Autonomous and connected vehicles (AV/CVs) represent a major shift in technology. This work program intends investigate the existing questions about and implications of AV/CVs which impact the MPO region.

At the federal level, the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) has produced guidance classifying the levels of vehicle automation on a scale of 0 to 5. At the state level, Governor Baker signed an Executive Order in September creating a special working group on autonomous vehicles. This group is charged with consulting with industry experts, collaborating with government on proposed legislation, and supporting Memorandum of Understanding agreements between companies that propose to test self-driving vehicles and MassDOT or other affected state agencies and municipalities. Several locations in the state have been identified as testing grounds.

The objectives of the work program are to review existing literature and practices concerning AV/CV technology, and answer the following questions:

- What factors will influence a person's decision to utilize AV/CV technology?
- What are the range of possible impacts that AV/CV technology may be expected to cause to transportation demand, travel patterns, development patterns, and housing location choice in the Boston region?
- How can the MPO incorporate AV/CV technology into our modeling tools?
- How could AV/CV technology be incorporated into LRTP scenario planning?
- What types of infrastructure and programs will be needed to support AV/CV technology, and how could the MPO allocate funding to support them?

Staff will coordinate with stakeholders involved in the research, development, testing, and use of AV/CV technologies in the Boston region, conduct a literature review, develop a range of possible short-term planning measures to pursue, investigate current travel demand modeling practices, and prepare a report for the Board. The project is estimated to take 8 months and cost \$50,000.

Discussion

Jay Monty (At-Large City) (City of Everett) asked whether staff will focus on implications for Massachusetts specifically. S. Peterson responded that much of the current literature is general but that staff will try to focus in on impacts to the region.

T. Bennett mentioned the problematic aspects of partial implementation of AV/CVs for equity and safety. S. Peterson answered that market penetration is one of the large unanswered questions.

Richard Canale (At-Large Town) (Town of Lexington) asked about the interaction of autonomous vehicles with pedestrians and bicycles. S. Peterson replied that staff will attempt to account for this issue in the literature review. A recommendation of the final report may be for staff to do related research in partnership with another institution.

Micha Gensler (MBTA Advisory Board) highlighted the interaction of AV/CVs with transit users, particularly bus service. S. Peterson replied that some research on transit and freight is available.

Laura Gilmore (Massport) asked whether the focus will be on passenger vehicles specifically. S. Peterson responded that the project will consider all modes for which research exists.

R. Mares asked whether the project will consider the possibility of shared use and mobility services. S. Peterson responded that staff has reached out to a number of rideshare providers in the past and data limitations have been an issue.

J. Gillooly added that he hoped staff could emphasize the need for technology to be incorporated proactively into planning, particularly as related to state review cycles and allowable items for projects.

T. Bent highlighted that Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) discussions conceptualized this work program as the beginning of ongoing work by MPO staff.

Vote

A motion to approve the work program *Planning for Connected and Autonomous Vehicles* was made by the Metropolitan Area Planning Commission (E. Bourassa) and seconded by the Inner Core Committee (City of Somerville) (T. Bent). The motion carried.

**11. Work Program: Study of Promising Greenhouse Gas (GHG)
Reduction Strategies—Bruce Kaplan, MPO Staff**

B. Kaplan introduced the work program *Study of Promising Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Reduction Strategies*. This is a UPWP-funded follow-up to previous study, *Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy Alternatives: Cost-Effectiveness Analysis* (2016). The cost-effectiveness analysis recommended 14 strategies for further investigation based on

national level data. The intent of the new study is to look at regional data and create a more granular picture of the impacts of different GHG reduction strategies on the region.

Staff will select a subset of the 14 strategies identified in the 2016 study for analysis. Priority will be given to the strategies that the MPO has the ability to influence through its funding programs or those that could be advanced by other entities with encouragement from the MPO.

Staff will survey agencies in the northeastern United States to learn their experiences and gather available data on the strategies that have been implemented—particularly by agencies in Massachusetts—to evaluate their regional impact. Staff will determine which strategies best suit the MPO in terms of cost-effectiveness, implementation, impact, and ease of incorporation into MPO planning and decision-making processes. Staff will present a summary of the most promising set of recommended practices, policies, and approaches for consideration by the MPO board. The project is estimated to take eight months and cost \$55,055.

Discussion

E. Bourassa asked whether the 14 strategies include pricing strategies like VTM fees or tolling. B. Kaplan responded that these were not included because the MPO does not have control over price-setting.

R. Mares asked what models or tools staff will be using to evaluate the impact of the various strategies. B. Kaplan responded that staff will be leaning heavily on the MassDOT sustainability group to determine the cost effectiveness of different metrics.

Vote

A motion to approve the work program for the *Study of Promising Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Reduction Strategies* was made by the City of Boston (Boston Transportation Department) (J. Gillooly) and seconded by the Regional Transportation Advisory Council (T. Bennett). The motion carried.

12. State Implementation Plan (SIP) Update—Bryan Pounds, MassDOT

B. Pounds reported that comments have been received on the annual SIP and responses to those comments were submitted to the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) on January 4.

13. Members Items

K. Miller reported that on January 8 USDOT released the final two performance measurement rules required by MAP-21. One relates to Pavement and Bridge Conditions performance measures and one to system performance and freight. The

state has one year from the effective date of the rule to develop targets for these performance measures. MPOs will subsequently have 6 months to develop their own targets. He also reported that FHWA will be posting a job opening for a Planning and Environmental Team Leader with the Massachusetts Federal Highway Division on the usajobs.gov jobs website.

E. Bourassa added that the performance measures K. Miller described are part of the performance-based planning process, about which Anne McGahan (MPO Staff) has previously presented to the Board. A. McGahan added that as noted in the work program for the Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP), staff will present to the Board in February on the ongoing work related to performance measures. The presentation will serve to re-introduce the requirements to the Board. E. Bourassa added that Transportation for America and FHWA held a national training, which A. McGahan and others attended, related to these measures.

Leah Sirmin (Federal Transit Administration) added that there are also a final rule related to transit asset performance measures and a new safety rule.

Dennis Crowley (South West Advisory Planning Committee) (Town of Medway) asked how the MPO Staff-Generated Research Topics project is coming along. K. Quackenbush replied that several ideas are under consideration.

J. Gillooly announced two public meetings. One concerning the South Bay Harbor Trail will take place on January 26 at 6 pm. A meeting concerning the Rutherford Avenue/Sullivan Square Project has not been scheduled but will likely occur in late February.

14. Representation of Regional Transit Agencies (RTAs) on the MPO Board—Elizabeth Moore, Director of Policy and Planning, MPO Staff

E. Moore presented on the issue of providing for representation of Regional Transit Agencies (RTAs) on the MPO Board. Regulations require representation by appropriate local, state, and public agencies, including providers of public transportation. Whoever sits on the MPO board must represent the collective interests of operators in the region and have equal decision making power. They may also serve as a representative of a local municipality. E. Moore presented data on how other MPOs handle RTA representation.

All MPOs have a policy board that makes final decisions. Most MPOs also have technical committees with different membership from the policy board. Currently, the Boston Region MPO does not have technical committees in the way that others do. Previously, there was a Transportation Planning and Programming Committee (TPPC)

that was discontinued because it had essentially the same membership as the MPO Board. Some MPOs specifically have a Transit Committee. There is a lot of variability in the number and type of transit operators represented on these committees and the general policy board, but they can be divided into four basic categories;

1. Fractional representation on policy board and committees
2. No representation on policy board
3. Full representation on transit committee, which votes on policy board
4. Full representation on policy board

Currently, the MBTA is represented on the Boston Region MPO Board. Cape Ann Transportation Authority (CATA) and MetroWest Regional Transportation Authority (MWRTA) are not. They are the only RTAs in Massachusetts with no representation on any MPO board.

There are three other RTAs that provide some service in the MPO region, as well as municipal transit, shuttle, and intercity bus services that are not specifically RTAs but may receive some federal financial assistance.

E. Moore presented five possible options for RTA representation on the MPO, realizing that the MPO may wish to consider other options as well:

1. Seats for CATA and MWRTA on the Board with equal decision-making power to the MBTA (and other MPO members)
2. Subregional representatives--the North Shore Task Force and MetroWest Regional Collaborative--would represent CATA and MWRTA, respectively
3. A Transit Committee with as many or as few transit operators as the MPO deemed necessary with one seat on the Board
4. MBTA represents the interests of all operators
5. MassDOT re-dedicates one of their three seats on the board to Rail and Transit to represent the interests of operators

The MPO must decide which providers should have representation, which model of representation it prefers, and how the new structure be implemented. Any changes will have to be reflected in the MPO's Memorandum of Understanding.

Discussion

M. Gensler asked whether the MBTA advisory board would be considered representation. E. Moore replied that the advisory board represents the interests of transit riders rather than the interests of transit operators.

Dennis Giombetti (MetroWest Regional Collaborative) (Town of Framingham) remarked that RTAs should have a seat at the MPO table. He felt that neither the MBTA nor subregional representatives could adequately represent the interests of RTAs. He continued that the MPO would be best served by representation directly from the RTA, with one vote on the board. He suggested a rotating three year term like those of subregional representatives.

S. Woelfel asked D. Giombetti how he felt about the inclusion of other RTAs that operate some service in the region. D. Giombetti replied that he felt the RTA model was similar enough across regions that CATA and MWRTA might be sufficient to represent the interests of any RTAs with service in the region.

J. Gillooly asked whether additional RTAs might want to be on a Transit Committee. E. Moore replied that a Transit Committee could certainly offer seats to additional RTAs.

D. Crowley raised the concern that some RTAs (GATRA, BAT, and LRTA) that do not operate entirely in the MPO's region do in fact serve a number of communities. Therefore, the MPO should not exclude them. He asked how many communities in the region are served by these additional RTAs. E. Moore did not know exactly how many communities have some service from these other providers.

T. O'Rourke agreed that a Transit Committee with one seat on the MPO board would be most useful, given the rise of community transportation options like First Mile Last Mile programs.

R. Canale concurred on the idea of a Transit Committee with a seat on the MPO, and asked how many TMAs and other municipal transit service providers are represented on the Regional Transportation Advisory Council.

T. Bennett replied that a few providers are included as voting members of the Advisory Council, but that they do not always participate as the discussion is not always specifically about transit issues. She continued that she is leaning towards a more transit focused committee. Another option might be to have a Transit Committee with representation on the Board in addition to a rotating seat for RTAs.

E. Bourassa added that the LRTP and TIP include 2 million dollars a year in FFY 2021 and on for community transportation and instituting a Transit Committee would be useful for discussions related to those goals.

L. Gilmore asked about the structure of the previous TPPC. E. Moore replied that the committee's membership was essentially the same as the MPO Board's. The idea was

that the MPO would consist of the chief elected officials of member municipalities, while members of the TPPC would be their designees. In practice, the same people served on both boards, so the TPPC was discontinued.

John Romano (MassDOT Highway Division) added the distinction that RTAC was originally a voting member of the TPPC, but not the MPO.

D. Giombetti stated that the Board needs to know the actual numbers of providers and municipalities who might sit on a Transit Committee in order to make an informed decision related to forming that body. He asked what Federal Transit and Highway need from the MPO in order to satisfy their requirements. L. Sirmin replied that there is no minimum requirement. The expectation is that MPOs will work with regional providers to find a structure that works. She added that whatever structure is decided upon should be included in the MPO's MOU with the same detail as the structure of RTAC.

S. Woelfel added that the challenge of finding exact numbers on who might be eligible to sit on a Transit committee is the variety in providers. He suggested that staff will need to look at how many communities and providers would be included if the various options for representation were implemented.

K. Miller added that there is no prescription for how this works on the part of Federal Highway, but that we should make sure there is interest in participating from RTAs and other providers, and that staff may need to do some outreach in order to determine this.

E. Bourassa added that it would be helpful if staff could create a chart of providers, their service areas, and a sense of ridership. He raised the concern that providing MWRTA and CATA with an equal vote on the MPO Board would in essence be an extra vote for MetroWest and the North Shore. A committee with one vote might circumvent this issue.

D. Giombetti added that a Transit Committee might become too large to manage.

T. Bennett added that any staff chart should include whether they are already represented on RTAC or have seats on another board.

D. Crowley added that subregional representatives could sit on the Transit Committee with the RTAs.

K. Quackenbush reminded the Board that staff time and resources are an issue, particularly if a Transit Committee were to need the same support as the Advisory Council.

J. Gillooly agreed that a list of possible candidates for representation would be useful. He suggested that a Transit Committee might have rotating membership for specific providers (bus companies, for example) in the same way as municipalities.

Richard Reed (Minuteman Advisory Group on Interlocal Coordination) (Town of Bedford) agreed that there is a question of interest, and asked whether a Transit Committee would be involved in the approval of the TIP transit element.

D. Giombetti highlighted the importance of simplicity.

S. Woelfel concluded that staff has some issues to look at before bringing more information before the board.

15. Pedestrian Level-of-Service Metric Development—*Ryan Hicks and Casey-Marie Claude, MPO Staff*

R. Hicks and C. Claude presented the technical memorandum *Pedestrian Level-of-Service*, which compiles the results of FFY 2016 UPWP funded work to create a Pedestrian Report Card Assessment (PRCA). The PRCA is a performance monitoring tool intended to assess the pedestrian suitability of intersections and roadway segments. The PRCA allows planners, engineers, municipalities, and the MPO to evaluate the importance of pedestrian improvements at specific locations.

The PRCA has four Performance Measure grading categories based on LRTP goals; safety, system preservation, capacity management and mobility, and economic vitality. It also incorporates a rating called the Transportation Equity Factor (TEF). The TEF identifies which areas are of the greatest importance for pedestrian facilities based on the existence of Environmental Justice zones, proximity to schools, elderly populations, and local households without a vehicle. Areas with at least three out of four of these are considered to have a High TEF and thus are important for pedestrian suitability. The PRCA uses multiple factors rather than a single grade or score to allow for a more complete picture of the suitability of facilities and the necessity of improvement.

Staff presented two examples of PRCA “test-runs”; the intersection of Lowell/East Street in Lexington and the roadway segment of Route 9 from Tremont/Ruggles in Boston. The Lexington intersection rated poorly for the four Performance Measures and High for TEF, marking it as an important location for pedestrian improvements. Route 9 had a high TEF but rated well on the performance measures, meaning that the pedestrian environment at the location is well-suited to the needs of the area.

Staff plans to do outreach to publicize the PRCA among engineers, planners, and municipalities in the region. They recommend a monitoring program and follow-up

project to evaluate feedback and the institution of a dashboard or other application to display the data. They hope to create a similar tool for bicycle improvements.

Discussion

L. Gilmore pointed out that land-use was a major factor in the differences between the two examples.

T. Bennett asked how this project compares to other tools that are available. R. Hicks replied that a notable difference is that there is not one cumulative score for an intersection or roadway section, but rather each of the four performance measures are rated to create a more complete picture of the issues. C. Claude added that most tools do not break factors down as specifically as the PRCA. T. Bennett added that economic vitality and other factors are hard to measure and asked about how pedestrian volumes and adjacent bicycle accommodations are used to rate economic vitality. R. Hicks replied that studies have shown that areas with adjacent bicycle accommodations tend to have higher levels of economic vitality. C. Claude added that adjacent bicycle accommodations are essentially serving as a proxy for economic vitality.

L. Wiener asked about roadways where there is no parking lane and thus no buffer between pedestrians and vehicles. R. Hicks and C. Claude replied that the existence of a Pedestrian-Vehicle Buffer is included under the Safety performance measure.

R. Canale asked what the MPO can do to utilize the PRCA, highlighting that municipalities do traffic studies and may incorporate this tool. C. Claude replied that they hope municipalities and planners begin using the tool as soon as possible and hopefully a future UPWP project will fund a monitoring tool.

A. McGahan added that this information can also be used by the Board as part of project selection and scenario planning.

E. Bourassa asked whether staff envisioned use of the PRCA in project development and design process, or more to identify where deficiencies are located. C. Claude replied that they envision the PRCA as a way of prioritizing funding for pedestrian projects. E. Bourassa added that MAPC's Local Access Score project created a tool for municipalities to prioritize funding by identifying areas that are important connectors for individuals to economic centers. He asked how these two tools might work together and added the critique that there is not necessarily a lot of data on pedestrian volumes, which PRCA uses as a proxy for economic vitality. C. Claude replied that Local Access provides municipalities with the ability to identify where there might be demand for pedestrian or bicycle facilities, and the PRCA allows a more nuanced exploration of the

conditions at a specific location and what types of improvements might make a location more suitable for pedestrians.

R. Reed asked for a clarification related to whether a Poor rating on a performance measure translates to a High need for intervention. C. Claude replied that Poor ratings on the four main performance measures indicate a need for improvement. The TEF indicates how important it is for a particular location to have suitable pedestrian facilities. Thus, a High TEF indicates that a location is in need of improvement if it has Poor ratings on performance measures. R. Reed added that it may be useful to try and make the terminology more consistent to make that conclusion clearer.

K. Miller commended staff for not reducing locations to one score but providing various measures. He pointed out that the PRCA did not include ADA requirements and whether locations comply with the ADA. He added that MassDOT has tools they are working on to measure compliance. R. Hicks replied that staff recently attended MassDOT training on this issue. S. Woelfel added that if anyone is interested in training they should contact himself or B. Pounds.

D. Koses pointed out that lighting was one safety feature that was not included. R. Hicks replied that it was hard to find a data source for lighting deficiencies.

D. Crowley stated that he was unsure of the future usage of this tool, whether it was going to municipalities to use for rating their facilities, or if the MPO would use it to prioritize funding. He felt the evaluation criteria would eliminate suburban or rural areas from receiving funding.

K. Quackenbush advised that the immediate task is to get people using the PRCA so staff can collect feedback and make improvements. He added that staff should and will eventually be having some conversations with the Board about whether and how to use this tool for evaluating projects.

16. Adjourn

A motion to adjourn was made by the Metropolitan Area Planning Council (E. Bourassa) and seconded by the City of Boston (Boston Transportation Department) (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 and Development Agency)	Lara Mérida
City of Boston (Boston Transportation Department)	Jim Gillooly
Federal Highway Administration	Kenneth Miller
Federal Transit Administration	Leah Sirmin
Inner Core Committee (City of Somerville)	Tom Bent
Massachusetts Department of Transportation	David Mohler
Massachusetts Department of Transportation	Steve Woelfel
MassDOT Highway Division	John Romano
Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority (MBTA)	Eric Waaramaa
Massachusetts Port Authority	Laura Gilmore
MBTA Advisory Board	Micha Gensler
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)	Denise Deschamps
North Suburban Planning Council (City of Woburn)	
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
Jim Purdy	MAGIC
Jonathan P. Chance	Boston Resident
Felicia Webb	CATA
Joy Glynn	MWRTA
Ed Carr	MWRTA
Steve Olanoff	TRIC
Eileen G.	MassDOT
Bryan Pounds	MassDOT
Rafael Mares	Conservation Law Foundation

MPO Staff/Central Transportation Planning Staff

Karl Quackenbush, Executive Director
Mark Abbott
Casey-Marie Claude
Lourenço Dantas
Róisín Foley
Ryan Hicks
Sandy Johnston
Bruce Kaplan
Alexandra Kleyman
Robin Mannion
Anne McGahan
Elizabeth Moore
Scott Peterson
Jennifer Rowe
