

Memorandum for the Record

Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization Meeting

October 3, 2019, Meeting

10:00 AM–11:40 AM, 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 minutes of the August 29, 2019, meeting

Meeting Agenda

1. Introductions

See attendance on page 15.

2. Public Comments

There were none.

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

There was none.

4. Committee Chairs' Reports

There were none.

5. Regional Transportation Advisory Council Report—*Ana Cristina Fragoso, Vice Chair*

Advisory Council elections will take place on October 16, 2019, for the positions of Chair and Vice Chair.

6. Executive Director's Report—*Annette Demchur, Co-Interim Executive Director, Central Transportation Planning Staff (CTPS)*

CTPS is seeking technical assistance from Transportation for America (T4America) on performance measurement and project prioritization, which includes the following:

1. Reviewing the current TIP criteria and providing recommendations to improve the criteria
2. Identifying performance measurements that can be scaled up
3. Incorporating accessibility measures
4. Exploring the application of cost benefit measures in TIP

CTPS also hired a new GIS specialist named Margaret Atkinson.

7. Approval of the August 29, 2019, MPO Meeting Minutes—*Róisín Foley and Kate White, MPO Staff*

A motion to approve the minutes of the meeting of August 29, 2019, was made by the Metropolitan Area Planning Council (MAPC) (Eric Bourassa) and seconded by the Inner Core Committee (City of Somerville) (Tom Bent). The North Shore Task Force (City of Beverly) (Denise Deschamps) abstained. The motion carried.

8. Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2020 Certification Activities Work Plans—*Alexandra Kleyman, MPO Staff*

[Document posted to the MPO meeting calendar.](#)

A. Kleyman presented the FFY 2020 Certification Activities work plans. The Certification Activities (CA) Group has seven work plans. Each work plan includes a description of the tasks, schedules, and budgets for each of the programs managed in the CA group. The work plans span the 12 months of FFY 2020. The core of the work supports the MPO and ensures that certification requirements are fulfilled. The work plans are presented to the board for review at the start of every federal fiscal year. The board can review, provide input, and ask questions. A vote is not required.

3C Planning and MPO Support

The work plan for 3C Planning and MPO Support describes the activities that will be undertaken for group-wide activities that support the overall operation and goals of the MPO and the CA group:

- Planning and conducting MPO board and committee meetings (including the Advisory Council)
- Planning and implementing outreach and communications work
- Completing tasks related to ensuring the MPO is in compliance with regulations and requirements, and following best practices
- Conducting public participation work

Kate White, Public Outreach Coordinator, has been working closely with the other program managers to plan the specifics of outreach and engagement activities for the

next year. K. White will likely give a presentation to the board later in the year. Currently, she is planning improvements for tracking outreach activities and organizing visits by staff to community events and meetings to spread the word about the MPO.

Long-Range Transportation Plan

Since the MPO completed a new LRTP, *Destination 2040*, this year, the focus of the LRTP work for 2020 will be on implementation and maintenance of the plan:

- Ensuring the LRTP's Needs Assessment is kept up to date and working to make that information more engaging
- Working with MAPC on scenario planning as MAPC's *MetroCommon* plan is updated
- Continuing coordination on performance measures and TIP criteria to help ensure that the goals and objectives of the new LRTP are integrated into all of the planning and programming activities of the MPO

Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

The main activities of carrying out the TIP process include the following:

- Maintaining and modifying the current TIP through amendments and adjustments
- Conducting outreach and communications to TIP contacts and MassDOT staff for collecting project data and updating projects' status
- Creating the new TIP:
 - Assembling the *Universe of Projects*
 - Collecting data and evaluating projects
 - Preparing a staff recommendation
 - Writing and compiling the actual TIP document
 - Conducting performance measure analysis related to the TIP projects

The main new undertaking over the next year will be the revised TIP evaluation criteria.

Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)

This work plan for the UPWP and the development of this document is similar to the TIP process:

- Maintaining and modifying the current UPWP, including amendments and maintaining the new study recommendation tracking database
- Conducting outreach for new study ideas
- Creating the new UPWP:
 - Creating the Universe of Proposed New Studies
 - Evaluating proposals for new studies and other work

- Recommending a group of new studies to fund and developing the overall budget for the next UPWP, including ongoing programs and administrative items
- Writing and compiling the UPWP document

The final part of this work is coordinating and supporting the UPWP Committee. Sandy Johnston, UPWP Program Manager, will work with the committee to continue to identify areas for improvement in the UPWP process.

Transportation Equity (TE)

The Transportation Equity work plan ensures that the MPO complies with federal mandates to consider the transportation needs of populations in the region that have been traditionally underrepresented in the transportation planning process or underserved by the transportation system and to involve those populations in the planning process.

The core of this work includes the following tasks:

- Ensuring compliance with regulations and guidance relating to Title VI, environmental justice, and nondiscrimination regulations, and implementing the MPO's Title VI program
- Developing and implementing approaches to analyses that help the MPO select investments that serve protected populations and evaluate the impacts of the MPO's investments
- Providing traditionally underserved populations with meaningful opportunities to participate in the MPO's processes

FFY 2020 is a Title VI triennial reporting year, therefore, MPO staff will complete that report as part of the work plan this year.

Performance Based Planning and Programming

This work plan is based on integrating performance management into the development of the MPO's certification documents. The main elements of the work include the following:

- Helping the MPO develop federally required performance targets
- Exploring other (non-federally required) performance measures
- Integrating performance planning elements into other MPO planning processes (LRTP, TIP, UPWP, and Congestion Management Process)
- Monitoring and reporting on performance

Air Quality Conformity and Support

The work plan for Air Quality Conformity describes work related to air quality analyses and conformity for the LRTP and TIP, and Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality program and greenhouse gas-related work that develops throughout the year.

Discussion

Daniel Amstutz (At-Large Town) (Town of Arlington) asked that for the presentation of the documents to the board there be a cover sheet to explain that seven work scopes are included. Ken Miller (Federal Highway Administration) asked staff a clarifying question about the budget and about defining all the investment programs to help with determining projects.

9. TIP Project Evaluation Criteria Revisions Update—*Matt Genova, MPO Staff*

M. Genova presented updates to the TIP project evaluation criteria revisions process.

M. Genova proposed an extension to the timeline for making revisions to the TIP project selection criteria. The original timeline, discussed at the MPO meeting on September 5, 2019, listed October 3 as the target date to present proposals for new criteria and anticipated that the revision process would be completed in mid-December.

The new timeline extends the revision process into next year's cycle for developing the FFYs 2022–26 TIP. The new timeline would give ample time for the board and staff to determine how the new criteria relate to the new investment programs outlined in the Long-Range Transportation Plan. This timeline allows the MBTA, the regional transit authorities, and municipalities more time to give meaningful feedback about the new criteria and increased opportunities to provide input for defining the new investment programs. MPO staff are also conducting public outreach to gather input about the new criteria and the proposed extension to the timeline will allow more time for this work.

MPO staff are working to reimagine the criteria and then will discuss these changes with the board in an iterative way. MPO staff also will have separate discussions about the criteria and TIP development to keep those two topics distinct. Therefore, there will be a brief hiatus from the TIP project evaluation criteria process in January and February while the MPO board discusses the FFYs 2021–25 TIP. MPO staff will present a rough draft of the new criteria in summer 2020 and use that draft for test scoring.

MPO staff are working with the MBTA to develop a list of projects that could feasibly be funded through new investment programs, which include the Transit Modernization Program and the expansion of the Complete Streets Program to fund dedicated bus lanes. This effort relates to the creation of new Transit Modernization criteria and

Dedicated Bus Lanes criteria. Staff want to make sure they are getting a good sense of what types of projects exist and what can reasonably be funded from each program before they create criteria. Staff also want to lay the foundation for a robust project intake process.

T4America is providing grant-funded technical assistance to MPO staff in support of the project selection process. This work builds on T4America's previous work with the MPO, which provided a high-level overview of different practices for determining the cost-effectiveness of projects. The new work will be more focused and allow the MPO to consider the advantages and disadvantages of employing different approaches. MPO staff also hope to learn more about employing effective accessibility measures that indicate how well the system provides access to jobs and other essential destinations, rather than continuing to use simpler proximity-based measures as has been MPO staff's practice in recent TIP project evaluation cycles.

MPO staff are also working with MAPC to develop recommendations for new criteria, focusing especially on revising the existing economic vitality measures. Staff want to coordinate the recommendations from the technical assistance work being done by T4America with the recommendations that MAPC is providing. Staff are also active internally on work that will inform the new TIP criteria, especially regarding resilience.

Even though the timeline is changing, the same basic framework for revising the TIP criteria still applies. The timeline is being adjusted to fully utilize the ongoing technical assistance, align with the roll out of new investment programs, and give staff more time to engage with the public. Extending this process allows the MPO to implement all the changes at once for use in the development of the FFYs 2022–26 TIP.

Next steps include continuing public outreach, meeting with internal and external stakeholders, advancing technical assistance work with T4America, and moving forward with the development of the FFYs 2021–25 TIP.

Discussion

Paul Regan (MBTA Advisory Board) asked how the TIP criteria process dovetails with large-scale MBTA projects such as the Better Bus Project and Rail Vision. M. Genova shared that MPO staff have had initial conversations with MBTA staff about finding ways to complement the changes to the bus network. Regarding Rail Vision, M. Genova explained that Rail Vision's scope is larger and the timeline is longer than the MPO's timeline for funding in the next five years.

D. Amstutz expressed his appreciation for the extended timeline and noted that the previous timeline would have rushed the process.

T. Bent shared his appreciation for the extended timeline. T. Bent asked if there is time to test new scenarios and make needed changes for the next TIP cycle. M. Genova responded by clarifying that MPO staff plan to do multiple rounds of test scoring next summer and bring those scores to the board to hear feedback.

Laura Gilmore (Massachusetts Port Authority) concurred with other board members about extending the timeline. L. Gilmore asked M. Genova about plans to work with the board and when members should provide feedback on the criteria. M. Genova shared that staff are open to hearing recommendations and concerns at any time. Staff plan to bring parts of the draft updates to the selection criteria to the board throughout the spring and then present a full draft to the board in the summer.

10. FFYs 2021-25 TIP Development Schedule—*Matt Genova, MPO Staff*

M. Genova presented the FFYs 2021-25 TIP development schedule to the board. M. Genova shared that staff are beginning outreach to municipalities in the fall and securing TIP contacts in every municipality. Staff will also be fielding any questions from TIP contacts about upcoming applications. Staff will come back to the board with a draft Universe of Projects in December, which includes input from municipalities and MassDOT's Highway Division. M. Genova noted that the timeline is similar to the previous year's timeline for TIP development.

Discussion

David Koses (At-Large City) (City of Newton) asked about moving key TIP meetings to accommodate school vacation weeks, especially the week of February 20, 2019.

Tom Kadzis (Boston Transportation Department) asked for clarification on project evaluation deadlines. M. Genova responded by explaining that MPO staff ask for all relevant information from municipalities on projects to begin to aggregate information to score projects. M. Genova acknowledged that the MassDOT Project Review Committee meeting will occur during the third week of December and stated that staff will accept information after that meeting. T. Kadzis asked that a link to the TIP schedule be made available since it was not available among the meeting materials. M. Genova confirmed that the schedule will be posted on the MPO's website.

K. Miller suggested collecting information on current projects early to build it into the schedule.

D. Amstutz asked when new investment programs, including Transit Modernization, go into effect. M. Genova responded that funding that could be used for dedicated bus lanes is available in the Complete Streets Program, which is in effect now. However, staff do not anticipate programming funding for dedicated bus lanes projects in this

cycle. For the Transit Modernization Program, staff plan to set aside funding beginning in FFY 2025 for programming at a future date.

11. Review of Critical Urban Freight Corridors: Crossing Mystic River—

Bill Kuttner, MPO Staff

[Document posted to the MPO meeting calendar](#)

The National Highway Freight Network (NHFN) was established by federal highway funding authorization legislation to help prioritize a portion of federal highway funds for parts of the roadway system that are especially important for freight movement. The NHFN initially focused on the entire interstate highway system and a few locally designated roadways connecting with important intermodal terminals.

The current multi-year authorization, the Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act, contained a provision to expand the NHFN. States were asked to designate additional sections of roadway as Critical Urban Freight Corridors (CUFCs) or Critical Rural Freight Corridors (CRFCs). Massachusetts was authorized to designate 75 CUFC roadway miles and 150 CRFC miles. MassDOT determined its critical freight corridors based on recommendations by the metropolitan planning organizations (MPO) in the Commonwealth. The Boston Region MPO was asked to recommend 28 miles of roadway for CUFC designation, and its recommended CUFCs were accepted by both MassDOT and the Federal Highway Administration.

The study and designation of CUFCs have been important activities of the MPO's Freight Program. Studies conducted prior to the FAST Act informed the designation of important CUFC sections. Other roadways designated as CUFCs were known to be important for freight but have not yet been the subject of a thorough study. The *Review of Critical Urban Freight Corridors: Crossing Mystic River* study continues the process of studying specific CUFC sections.

The MPO Freight Program has conducted a number of studies, but two studies specifically examined areas with importance for industry and logistics. The first study examined truck travel in the Everett-Chelsea industrial area. A study of trucks serving the South Boston Waterfront followed. These studies were conducted in close cooperation with key stakeholders, and the findings represented the needs and concerns of both MPO members and stakeholders. Results of these studies included the following:

- Identification of major truck routes
- Estimates of truck volumes on both major and minor truck routes in the study area

- Classification of truck flows by truck size and cargo type, including hazardous materials
- Recommended network improvements developed in consultation with stakeholders
- Discussion of outstanding truck and general traffic issues based on observed truck counts and consultations with stakeholders
- Observation and discussion of land use patterns with emphasis on the needs of industrial and logistic operations
- Specialized traffic counts and vehicle surveys designed to develop data specifically configured for the needs of travel demand model development

These studies and the associated data have been used in several ways. The data have been used in funding applications and to inform local traffic and urban planning efforts. The studies also serve as templates for studying similar corridors and industrial areas. They are also used as references for freight and logistics planning.

This study applied analysis similar to the earlier studies to CUFC segments between the Mystic River and the Cambridge city limits. Route 99 is a critical link in this area because trucks carrying hazardous cargoes are allowed on the highway, whereas these trucks are not permitted on the Tobin Bridge and in the Sumner, Callahan, and Ted Williams tunnels. This study found, however, that only a very small fraction of truck traffic that traverses this CUFC section is made up of trucks affixed with the red diamond hazardous cargo plaque. The true logistic importance of this corridor is simply that a very large number of trucks need to use it to travel to origins and destinations north of the Charles River or to connect with key radial express highways including Interstate 93 and US Route 1.

This corridor has been extensively studied. Study and evaluation efforts and their proponents include the following:

- Rutherford Avenue/Sullivan Square Design Project (Boston)
- Lower Mystic Regional Working Group (MassDOT)
- Lower Broadway District Master Plan (Everett)
- Encore Boston Harbor environmental review (Department of Environmental Protection)

All of these studies acknowledged the importance of accommodating trucks and the leading planning efforts made appropriate accommodations for trucks and other heavy vehicles. The necessity of these design accommodations will be clear from the truck

volume data and vehicle descriptions developed in this study, and the need to adhere to these accommodations is a key finding of this work.

Results of this study include the following:

- Truck volumes and turning movements by vehicle type, data that are appropriate for use in travel demand model calibration
- Descriptions of industrial activity, land use patterns, and network configuration that influence the movement of heavy vehicles in the study area
- Discussion of freight planning issues of concern in the study area, notably the physical size of heavy vehicles and the volumes and travel patterns of hazardous cargoes

Discussion

P. Regan asked if vehicles carrying windmill blades are restricted to specific times of day. B. Kuttner responded that windmill blades are brought at night more likely for expediency rather than any specific restrictions.

D. Amstutz asked for clarification about how hazardous cargo restrictions are enforced. B. Kuttner explained in more detail how the trucks travel through the city without using tunnels, where trucks with hazardous cargoes are restricted. B. Kuttner was unaware of enforcement issues other than incidents that occur when drivers or dispatchers drive in restricted locations because they are not up-to-date on rules. Trucks have painted markers indicating hazardous material. John Romano (MassDOT Highway Division) commented that the Boston Police Department has a truck department that pulls trucks over to confirm their destinations and routes.

Jay Monty (At-Large City) (City of Everett) asked about a corridor study completed two years ago in Everett and next steps for further freight research. B. Kuttner shared that this research will inform the regionwide model. B. Kuttner suggested pursuing a profile on the class of vehicles traveling through the Allston areas, which could be a resource for the Allston Multimodal Project.

B. Kuttner then asked the board for suggestions for future studies. J. Monty described the disparate impact caused by trucks in the Everett area and a recent fatality. J. Monty suggested thinking about other ways to move freight, such as rail. B. Kuttner replied that rail is currently used by freight customers where it makes sense, such as at Boston Sand and Gravel and for the export of scrap metal in Everett. B. Kuttner explained that there could be coordinating opportunities with freight rail operations.

L. Gilmore further explained the purpose of the study. The Massachusetts Port Authority and the City of Boston want to better understand freight movements and inform operations and design of the network. The transfer of goods between modes and the maintenance of access to those modes is relevant. Another relevant issue is designing critical routes so that freight vehicles continue to use those routes instead of alternative routes where municipalities do not want truck traffic. And lastly, the Massachusetts Port Authority wants to learn more about first- and last-mile connections for trucks.

12. Reverse Commute—Bradley Putnam, MPO Staff [Document posted to the MPO meeting calendar](#)

In general, reverse commuting is when urban residents travel to the suburbs for work. The present MBTA system is designed for traditional commuting into downtown Boston. However, there are many jobs outside of downtown Boston and, in general, the current transit system is not a viable option for reaching jobs in the suburbs.

The objectives of the *Reverse Commute Areas Analysis* study were as follows:

- Gain a better understanding of the magnitude of reverse commuting in the Boston region
- Identify barriers to commuting from the urban core to the suburbs and develop potential strategies for improving options for such trips

Staff determined the areas of reverse commuting by core region, which was defined as Boston and 13 neighboring cities and towns, and the surrounding six subregions. The core region is made up of the cities and towns that constituted the service area of the old Metropolitan Transit Authority (the predecessor to the MBTA). Staff studied two types of reverse commutes: from homes in the core to workplaces in a subregion and from homes outside the core to workplaces farther from the core within the same subregion. Staff looked at the number and magnitude of reverse commuting in the Boston region by trips from the core to subregions and trips within subregions. The Northeast subregion had the most trips.

When identifying locations for case studies, staff looked at municipalities outside the core with a large concentration of jobs, a large number of workers traveling to these jobs from the core, and existing transit service. The municipalities selected were Burlington, Needham, Waltham, and Woburn. In each of these municipalities, the employment locations are dispersed and transit service is limited. Many of the companies in these areas have a Guaranteed Ride Home program.

Woburn has dense employment areas on both sides of Route 128 near the Lowell Line commuter rail tracks. The study findings showed that 8,245 people reverse commuted from the core, which is 16 percent of all employees in Woburn. Anderson Station has six daily AM reverse commute trips; there were 55 alightings on all six trains combined, according to CTPS's 2018 commuter rail (CR) counts. Mishawum Station has three daily AM reverse commute trips; there were 29 alightings on all three trains combined in 2018 CR counts. There are more employment opportunities near Mishawum than near Anderson. However, Mishawum Station has barriers to bicycle and pedestrian access. Addressing these barriers could improve access. There are three MBTA bus routes, of which only Route 354 runs near dense employment areas. One employer in Woburn has a Guaranteed Ride Home program as part of the Junction TMO.

Burlington has dense employment areas along Route 128, including Burlington Mall and Lahey Clinic, as well as other employers along Middlesex Turnpike and Cambridge Street. The study findings showed that 9,691 people reverse commuted from the core, which is 17 percent of all employees in Burlington. There is no commuter rail service to Burlington. However, there are four MBTA bus routes: Routes 350 and 351 from Alewife Station, and Routes 352 and 354 from downtown Boston. Route 354 has five AM trips suitable for reverse commuting. The 2018 automatic passenger counter data showed an average of 15 passengers alighting at Van de Graff Drive between all five trips. Extending Route 354 could improve access. Middlesex 3 Transportation Management Association (TMA) provides a Guaranteed Ride Home program.

Waltham has dense employment areas along Route 128, west of Cambridge Reservoir, and near the Brandeis/Roberts and Waverley commuter rail stations. The study findings showed that 18,543 people reverse commuted from the core, which is 22 percent of all employees in Waltham. MBTA bus Routes 70, 70A, and 170 travel through this area. The 128 Business Council provides shuttles. The 128 Business Council is a TMA, which is a consortium of employers in the region who pool their resources to provide transportation to their employees. In October 2018, all four routes of the 128 Business Council shuttles carried an average of 386 passengers per day. Waltham has the most transit options of the municipalities selected for the case studies, and it has more transit-riding reverse commuters. The 128 Business Council provides a Guaranteed Ride Home program.

Needham has two dense employment areas: one between Route 128 and the Newton city line, and another along Highland Avenue and Chestnut Street. There are four commuter rail stations there. MBTA bus Route 59 travels through this area. The 128 Business Council provides a shuttle from Newton Highlands Station. The study findings showed that 5,703 people reverse commuted from the core, which is 20 percent of all

employees in Needham. A bike share program from Newton Highlands Station could improve access. Bicycle lanes are planned for Needham Street in Newton. The 128 Business Council provides a Guaranteed Ride Home program.

Because of widely dispersed suburban work locations and homes of urban core residents, it is difficult to provide reverse-commuting transit services that are efficient from an operations standpoint and do not require multiple transfers or long walking distances at one or both ends of a trip. Suburban employers cannot successfully recruit transit-dependent employees if no transit is available, but the MBTA may not be able to implement new reverse-commuting services that could require years for ridership to build. However, for urban core residents without direct access to the transit lines these shuttles connect with, the need to make several transfers may discourage those considering reverse commuting by transit. Employer-sponsored shuttles connecting to MBTA stations, such as those offered by the 128 Business Council, are probably the best solution for serving employment locations beyond reasonable walking distance of fixed-route transit.

Discussion

J. Monty asked about coordination between bus service and commuter rail schedules.

B. Putnam responded that staff analyzed whether schedules lined up in the report, but staff did not make recommendations about schedule changes.

A. Fragoso inquired about businesses working together to provide shuttle services. B. Putnam responded that multiple companies joined together to provide joint service, but staff did not analyze the size of the companies in the TMAs.

D. Koses asked about recommendations to improve the bike share program in Newton and Needham.

Rick Reed (Minuteman Advisory Group on Interlocal Coordination) (Town of Bedford) asked for clarification about funding for shuttle services and whether funding comes exclusively from employers in all cases. R. Reed described that some funding comes from the municipality, but this was not communicated in the report. R. Reed also commented that the report did not seem to take into account how congestion around the Alewife MBTA station affected participation in shuttle services in that area. R. Reed suggested that participation in shuttle services could be improved if congestion improves.

K. Miller commented that the report did not discuss employer-provided parking, which can be a factor when people consider whether to drive or not. K Miller asked if staff had information about whether employers provided free parking and how much parking is

provided. K. Miller also asked if TMAs in the study areas are considering a parking allowance. Eric Bourassa shared that MAPC has conducted thorough research into transportation demand management and parking cash-out programs. E. Bourassa stated that there are few employers that offer those programs now. There are a few employers in Kendall Square who offer free parking, and the companies provide \$300 a month to employees who do not drive to work. This policy is in place largely because the City of Cambridge has a strong parking and monitoring ordinance. MAPC is not aware of other employers in the region who use that policy; however, it is very popular in California in large employment areas. Tegin Teich (City of Cambridge) commented that another interesting case of parking management is at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT). MIT recently implemented a policy that conveys the true cost of parking. It is not a complete cash-out, but it covers the cost of alternative modes to reduce the number of employees who drive to work.

D. Deschamps described the North Shore TMA's Wave shuttle program, which takes employees to some of the major hubs in the subregion. The program is funded through the City of Beverly, the Town of Danvers, and many businesses in the Cherry Hill office park.

D. Amstutz described the CTPS study on bus priority around the Alewife MBTA station and the use of access roads for buses to travel to Alewife. D. Amstutz suggested that bus priority treatments could be an option for some of these shuttles and important to consider in recommendations.

13. Members Items

S. Woelfel encouraged attendees to register for the MassDOT Moving Together Conference.

14. Adjourn

A motion to adjourn was made by the South West Planning Committee (Town of Medway) (Glenn Trindade) and seconded by MAPC (E. Bourassa). 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	Ken Miller
Federal Transit Administration	
Inner Core Committee (City of Somerville)	Tom Bent
Massachusetts Department of Transportation	Steve Woelfel
	John Romano
MassDOT Highway Division	John Bechard
Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority (MBTA)	Jillian Linnell
Massachusetts Port Authority	Laura Gilmore
MBTA Advisory Board	Paul Regan
Metropolitan Area Planning Council	Eric Bourassa
MetroWest Regional Collaborative (City of Framingham)	Thatcher Keyzer III
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)	Tina Cassidy
Regional Transportation Advisory Council	Ana Cristina Fragoso
South Shore Coalition (Town of Braintree)	
South West Advisory Planning Committee (Town of Medway)	Glenn Trindade
Three Rivers Interlocal Council (Town of Norwood/Neponset Valley Chamber of Commerce)	Tom O'Rourke

Other Attendees Affiliation

Laurie Seems	MassDOT Highway, District 6
Scottie Cruz	Massachusetts Senate
Sarah Scully	MWRTA
Derrick Schuster	MassDOT Highway
Fred Sousa	City of Quincy
Tegin Teich	City of Cambridge

MPO Staff/Central Transportation Planning Staff

Annette Demchur, Co-Interim Executive Director
Scott Peterson, Co-Interim Executive Director
Margaret Atkinson
Róisín Foley
Judy Fung
Hiral Gandhi
Matt Genova
Alexandra Kleyman
Bill Kuttner
Sandy Johnston
Anne McGahan
Bradley Putnam
Ben Sadkowski
Michelle Scott
Kate White
