

use email or a computer was unaware that the review process was underway. L. Sirmin stated that there are opportunities to ensure that all gaps are being met.

L. Diggins asked how frequently MPOs receive a full certification. C. Ostrander responded that she has never completed a full certification in Massachusetts. L. Sirmin shared that it is slightly more common to have at least one corrective action on a Certification Review.

T. Teich thanked L. Sirmin and C. Ostrander for their engagement throughout the whole process. T. Teich shared that the review offers a great opportunity to strengthen the MPO's relationship with its federal partners to dig into the best practices for the MPO to adopt.

10. Summary of Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2022 Public Engagement Activities, Stella Jordan, MPO Staff

Documents posted to the MPO meeting calendar

1. [FFY 2022 Public Engagement Memo \(pdf\)](#)
2. [FFY 2022 Public Engagement Memo \(html\)](#)

S. Jordan provided an overview of the MPO's FFY 2022 public engagement activities. New changes to the Public Engagement Program were implemented in FFY 2022, including a new team, an evaluation of program effectiveness, and an expansion of program goals and strategies. The new Communications and Engagement team was created in January 2022, containing a Public Engagement Program Manager, Communications Coordinator, and Manager of Communications and Engagement.

The Public Engagement Program is guided by the Public Engagement Plan (PEP). The PEP facilitates inclusive public engagement and transparency of the MPO's planning and decision-making process. The PEP provides early and continuous public involvement opportunities and building relationships throughout the region to ensure that everyone, especially those who have been underrepresented or disproportionately impacted by transportation outcomes, can participate.

The MPO engages with a wide range of stakeholders. MPO Board members and municipal and agency partners are traditionally the most connected to the MPO's work. Advocacy and community groups and the general public require varied strategies and more time and effort to successfully engage.

Each year in support of the TIP and UPWP, public input is sought out at key points in the decision-making process. Additional support was provided to the *Destination 2050*



LRTP, the Regional Transportation Advisory Council, Transit Working Group, and building relationships with stakeholders, especially advocacy and community groups.

Tools used to support communication efforts include meetings and events, social media, email, the MPO website, and surveys through Qualtrics. Twitter is the MPO's most popular social media tool. In FFY 2022, the MPO posted 168 tweets, receiving a total of 72,184 impressions. The most widely seen tweets were about large MPO-funded projects and transportation studies. Facebook is popular for sharing information, particularly about engagement opportunities. LinkedIn helps with networking and building relationships with stakeholders. Recordings of public events are posted to the YouTube channel, receiving a total of 3,046 views in FFY 2022. Surveys contain optional demographics questions, which help to track and evaluate the distribution of responses and respond to gaps in engagement. Response data can be visualized in a variety of ways, which aids in further engagement efforts. In FFY 2022, three public surveys were deployed with a total of 1,373 individual responses.

In support of the TIP, stakeholders were engaged with the FFYs 2023–27 TIP in a series of public events to elicit feedback and track and respond to public comments. Including petition signatories, 1,292 comments were received on the FFYs 2023–27 TIP. The FFYs 2022–26 TIP was supported through eight amendments and received seven comment letters. Similar support was given to the FFY 2023 UPWP, which had one open house, discussions with relevant stakeholders, and received three comments. The FFY 2022 UPWP was supported through two amendments. Support of the *Destination 2050* LRTP included conducting a needs assessment from subregional meetings and tracking and organizing feedback across projects and programs.

Stakeholders were engaged with multiple FFY 2022 UPWP funded studies. The *Unlocking the Blue Hills* study was proposed by a group of advocates and led by the Communications and Engagement team. A stakeholder advisory group was created to guide the work. The study to identify transportation inequalities in the Boston region emerged from stakeholder feedback and was shaped by a variety of input received from stakeholder conversations. Three corridor and intersection studies were supported by conducting public surveys. Demographic information from these surveys was used to determine the most prevalent non-English languages spoken in each study area. Survey translations were provided in relevant languages.

The Regional Transportation Advisory Council was formally integrated into the Public Engagement Program to plan and strategize for membership expansion, public education, and engagement initiatives. There were 13 meetings during FFY 2022 with



an average attendance of 17 attendees per meeting and 19 views per recording on YouTube.

Each year, engagement staff meets with all of the subregional groups, coordinated by MAPC, to collect feedback for the LRTP needs assessment and share information about the TIP and UPWP development. In FFY 2022, five subregional meetings were held in addition to the 495/MetroWest Partnership and other regional collaboration groups to share information about MPO programs. The Inner Core Committee (ICC) Transportation Group is facilitated by engagement staff. The ICC held four meetings in FFY 2022 with an average of 16 attendees per meeting. The Transit Working Group held 18 meetings and events with a total attendance of 492 over four quarterly meetings, 13 coffee chats, and one microtransit forum.

A key focus for the engagement program is building and strengthening relationships with advocacy and community organizations. Staff held 26 one-on-one and small group meetings and attended six events hosted by external stakeholders.

Goals for FFY 2023 include addressing gaps in engagement, focusing on advocates and the general public, expanding relationships, varying engagement methods, improving tracking and evaluation, and continuing investment in staff capacity and resources.

Discussion

D. Mohler stated that the Communications and Engagement team has done excellent work in the last year, and it is impressive how much progress has been made. D. Mohler added that there is a lot more work to do, but it is heading in the right direction.

11. Review of Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) Project Programming Policies, Michelle Scott, MPO Staff

Documents posted to the MPO meeting calendar

1. [LRTP Policies Memo \(pdf\)](#)
2. [LRTP Policies Memo \(html\)](#)

M. Scott presented an overview of project programming policies as they relate to the LRTP. In October 2020, following the completion of *Destination 2040*, the MPO adopted a series of policies related to including projects in the LRTP. M. Scott provided clarification on these policies after the MPO has begun applying them to develop the *Destination 2050* Universe. The updated policies impact the strategies and allocations phases of *Destination 2050* development.



Prior to 2020, policies dictated that the LRTP should include all projects that change the capacity of the transportation network and projects that cost more than \$20 million. Following the completion of *Destination 2040*, FHWA altered its guidelines for the LRTP, indicating that only regionally significant projects and projects under National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) review must be included in the LRTP. Regionally significant projects, as defined by the United States Department of Transportation and FHWA, are located on facilities that serve regional transportation needs, such as Interstate and principal arterial highways, and include projects that impact air quality by adding or removing system capacity. These changes were made to limit the projects in the LRTP to those that are federally required to be listed. This allows for decisions about large funding projects to be made in the TIP, aligning with previous MPO activity to use the LRTP as a high-level policy document, while the TIP focuses on capital investments.

There is no longer direct overlap with projects in the Major Infrastructure (MI) investment program and the LRTP. Projects may meet the criteria for the MI program, but do not have to be listed in the LRTP, while other projects may not meet the cost threshold of the MI program but can have other features that require their inclusion in the LRTP.

NEPA requires an analysis of the environmental impacts of federal actions, in this case major transportation investments. Projects go through varying levels of environmental review based on their characteristics and location. FHWA and MassDOT have a variety of processes in place to move projects through the review process. The MPO will focus on projects with more elevated or extensive levels of review.

Additional policy changes from October 2020 indicate that the LRTP will restrict the programming of specific LRTP projects to the first two five-year time bands. Goal percentages and funding allocations are considered for all years included in the LRTP. All projects that are in the LRTP will be rescored using TIP criteria when it is time to consider them for TIP programming. The status of the projects in the LRTP will be reviewed during each LRTP cycle. Projects that are not moving forward may be returned to the Universe.

Discussion

L. Diggins asked for clarification on wording on page six of the posted memo. This section discusses projects that are exempt from air quality conformity determinations, as determined by FHWA. M. Scott stated that this policy helps to determine if a project is required to be included in the LRTP.



A. Kleyman asked for clarification of the phrase “new transit connections” in the posted memo. Specifically, if additions to bus service or new bus connections to rapid transit are included. M. Scott stated that the current understanding of the policy is centered on fixed guideway components, citing the Green Line Extension as an example project.

12. Parking Policy and Trip Generation, Rosemary McCarron, MPO Staff *Documents posted to the MPO meeting calendar*

1. [Parking Policy and Trip Generation Memo \(pdf\)](#)
2. [Parking Policy and Trip Generation Memo \(html\)](#)

R. McCarron presented the results of the Parking Policy and Trip Generation UPWP study, funded in FFY 2022. The study builds on the foundation of MAPC’s Perfect Fit Parking study and the Central Transportation Planning Staff’s (CTPS) Trip Generation Rate Research. Respectively, these studies found that residential parking is oversupplied and developments with constrained parking availability tend to have lower vehicle trip generation rates.

The purpose of the research was to explore the relationship between parking supply and vehicle ownership and usage. The objectives were to identify innovative parking policies to reduce auto ownership and use and to inform ongoing trip-generation and parking policy-related work.

The body of research on how parking policy affects people’s decisions to own and use vehicles is small. One reason for the limited amount of literature is the lack of systematic data collection on parking supply and utilization. Existing literature indicates that access to private parking increases vehicle ownership. The ratio of parking spaces provided per unit is a strong predictor of vehicle ownership and driving frequency. In addition, parking bundled with housing costs increases the likelihood of owning a vehicle. Uncrowded on-street parking increases the likelihood of vehicle ownership, but when controlling for total parking supply, on-street parking has less influence on driving behavior than guaranteed private off-street parking. A study focused on grocery stores found that limited commercial parking influences mode choice away from automobiles. Washington State’s Commute Trip Reduction Law found that pricing workplace parking or discounting parking for high-occupancy vehicles reduces single-occupancy vehicle (SOV) trips.

There are three key approaches to parking policy that minimize vehicle ownership and reduces SOV trips. One opportunity is to evaluate parking policy frameworks to ensure that they align with intended outcomes. The conventional framework uses the predict and provide approach, where planners predict demand and ensure that there is parking



for everyone who wants to drive. The multimodal approach acknowledges that some individuals are automobile-dependent, but prioritizes parking near commuter rail facilities and deprioritizes parking in urban and transit accessible areas. The demand management framework acknowledges that parking demand is potentially limitless, so parking policy should attempt to manage the demand. Demand management is more effective when paired with investments that create safe and effective alternatives to driving. Demand management may be an appropriate framework in the Inner Core Subregion, where walking, biking, and transit are viable transportation options. Multimodalism is appropriate for outer suburban areas or areas with access to commuter rail. It is important to note that parking policy is most effective at the regional level, as one municipality offering free parking might undermine another municipality's attempt to manage travel behavior.

Another opportunity to influence parking policy is through leveraging transportation impact analyses. The literature demonstrates that there is a connection between parking supply and trip generation rates, but this is not factored into transportation impact analyses. The addition of parking supply as an analysis factor can allow for more cohesive understanding of overall impacts. A requirement to quantify the on- and off-street parking can be useful to build a parking supply inventory to further understand the impacts of parking supply. Larger developments are required to provide monitoring of travel behavior on the site, but parking utilization data should be included in the monitoring. Requiring occupant surveys in large developments is a strategy to quantify the spillover effect of on-street parking behavior.

Additional strategies include adding off-street parking supply to assessor data to gain an understanding of the available parking supply. Developments can be required to allocate space for shared vehicles or pick up and drop off zones to reduce the amount of space available to single-occupancy vehicles. Removing the cost of parking from the cost of housing also discourages vehicle ownership.

Potential next steps focus on developing parking data in the Boston Region. On-street parking data can be gathered and combined with prior parking research and incorporated into future parking research. Household travel surveys provide robust information about how people travel but can be expanded to include questions about parking availability and pricing.

Discussion

Jay Monty, City of Everett, stated that the ongoing work on parking policy has been invaluable to the City of Everett and has allowed the City to make substantial changes to parking and zoning regulations. J. Monty noted that Everett has a lot of pre-war



apartment buildings with little to no parking and minimal availability of on-street parking. Everett examined vehicle registrations in the city to the apartment buildings to develop a vehicle registration per unit metric. Everett found a 30 percent elasticity between buildings with limited on-site parking and buildings with ample on-site parking.

David Koses, City of Newton, asked to what extent policies designed to limit vehicle ownership are undermined by factors such as convenience and ride-share services. R. McCarron responded that there is little current information about how additional factors influence congestion.

L. Diggins asked which study the finding of the availability of off-street parking is the biggest influence on vehicle ownership came from. R. McCarron stated that it comes from the *Guaranteed Parking—Guaranteed Driving* study.

L. Diggins asked for additional research to be done on the impacts of reduced vehicle ownership. For instance, if discouraging vehicle ownership will have a negative impact on individuals who travel a long distance for work. R. McCarron offered to share additional resources with L. Diggins that examine the value individuals place on car ownership.

A. Kleyman shared that the City of Somerville Mobility Division has ongoing work collecting on-street parking data and travel surveys. A. Kleyman stated that there has been moderate success working with developers close to rapid transit to conduct a usage analysis by providing different parking supply ratios for the developers to determine parking garage utilization. A. Kleyman asked if MPO staff found literature that connects parking supply to trip generation rates. R. McCarron responded that CTPS conducted a study on trip generation in 2022 that found areas with a constrained parking supply have less trip generation.

Dan, resident of Charlestown, stated that Charlestown residents are dependent on automobiles. The goal should be to reduce this dependency to create space on the streets for the bus network and implement clean air strategies. Suggestions for project focus areas include localized bus routes to rapid transit stations.

13. Members' Items

A. Patterson shared that the MBTA Advisory Board attended the Massachusetts Municipal Association Annual Trade Show and that the MBTA Advisory Board is excited to continue connecting, networking, and outreaching this year.



BOSTON REGION METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

Cira Fierdick, MassDOT Secretary and CEO and MPO Chair 13
Tina Teich, Executive Director, MPO Staff
Meeting Minutes of January 26, 2023

14. Adjourn

A motion to adjourn was made by the MBTA Advisory Board (A. Patterson) and seconded by the Inner Core Committee, City of Somerville (T. Bent). 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)	
At-Large Town (Town of Brookline)	Heather Hamilton
	Robert King
City of Boston (Boston Planning & Development Agency)	Jim Fitzgerald
City of Boston (Boston Transportation Department)	Bill Conroy
	Jen Rowe
Federal Highway Administration	Cassandra Ostrander
	Kenneth Miller
Federal Transit Administration	Leah Sirmin
Inner Core Committee (City of Somerville)	Tom Bent
Massachusetts Department of Transportation	David Mohler
	John Bechard
MassDOT Highway Division	John Romano
Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority (MBTA)	Ali Kleyman
Massachusetts Port Authority	Sarah Lee
MBTA Advisory Board	Amira Patterson
Metropolitan Area Planning Council	
MetroWest Regional Collaborative (City of Framingham)	Dennis Giombetti
Minuteman Advisory Group on Interlocal Coordination (Town of Acton)	Austin Cyganiewicz
North Shore Task Force (City of Beverly)	Darlene Wynne
North Suburban Planning Council (Town of Burlington)	
Regional Transportation Advisory Council	Lenard Diggins
South Shore Coalition (Town of Hull)	Jennifer Constable
South West Advisory Planning Committee (Town of Medway)	Peter Pelletier
Three Rivers Interlocal Council (Town of Norwood/Neponset Valley Chamber of Commerce)	Tom O'Rourke
	Steve Olanoff



BOSTON REGION METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

Cina Fiorillo, MassDOT Secretary and CEO and MPO Chair 15
Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization
Meeting Minutes of January 26, 2023
Tegan Teich, Executive Director, MPO Staff

Other Attendees

Affiliation

Sarah Bradbury	MassDOT District 3
Miranda Briseño	MassDOT
Paul Cobuzzi	
Dan	Resident of Charlestown
Dan Demille	
JR Frey	Town of Hingham
Michael Garrity	MassDOT
Joy Glynn	MWRTA
Lil Hartman	North Reading Public Services
Sandy Johnston	MBTA
Joshua Klingenstein	MBTA
Derek Krevat	MassDOT Office of Transportation Planning
Jackie LaFlam	CATA
Josh Levin	MassDOT District 4
Owen MacDonald	Town of Weymouth
Jim Nee	MWRTA
Brad Rawson	City of Somerville
Jeanette Rebecchi	Town of Bedford
Jon Rockwell	TEC, Inc.
Cheryll-Ann Senior	MassDOT District 5
Jon Seward	
Abby Swaine	
George Thiel	
Tyler Terrasi	MWRTA
Andrew Wang	MassDOT Office of Transportation Planning



BOSTON REGION METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

Gina Fiorillo, MassDOT Secretary and CEO and MPO Chair 16
Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization
Tegin Teich, Executive Director, MPO Staff
Meeting Minutes of January 26, 2023

MPO Staff/Central Transportation Planning Staff

Tegin Teich, Executive Director
Seth Asante
Logan Casey
Jonathan Church
Annette Demchur
Betsy Harvey
Ryan Hicks
Stella Jordan
Heyne Kim
Ethan Lapointe
Erin Maguire
Rosemary McCarron
Marty Milkovits
Rebecca Morgan
Srilekha Murthy
Gina Perille
Sean Rourke
Michelle Scott
Sam Taylor
Judy Taylor



The Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) operates its programs, services, and activities in compliance with federal nondiscrimination laws including Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (Title VI), the Civil Rights Restoration Act of 1987, and related statutes and regulations. Title VI prohibits discrimination in federally assisted programs and requires that no person in the United States of America shall, on the grounds of race, color, or national origin (including limited English proficiency), be excluded from participation in, denied the benefits of, or be otherwise subjected to discrimination under any program or activity that receives federal assistance. Related federal nondiscrimination laws administered by the Federal Highway Administration, Federal Transit Administration, or both, prohibit discrimination on the basis of age, sex, and disability. The Boston Region MPO considers these protected populations in its Title VI Programs, consistent with federal interpretation and administration. In addition, the Boston Region MPO provides meaningful access to its programs, services, and activities to individuals with limited English proficiency, in compliance with U.S. Department of Transportation policy and guidance on federal Executive Order 13166.

The Boston Region MPO also complies with the Massachusetts Public Accommodation Law, M.G.L. c 272 sections 92a, 98, 98a, which prohibits making any distinction, discrimination, or restriction in admission to, or treatment in a place of public accommodation based on race, color, religious creed, national origin, sex, sexual orientation, disability, or ancestry. Likewise, the Boston Region MPO complies with the Governor's Executive Order 526, section 4, which requires that all programs, activities, and services provided, performed, licensed, chartered, funded, regulated, or contracted for by the state shall be conducted without unlawful discrimination based on race, color, age, gender, ethnicity, sexual orientation, gender identity or expression, religion, creed, ancestry, national origin, disability, veteran's status (including Vietnam-era veterans), or background.

A complaint form and additional information can be obtained by contacting the MPO or at http://www.bostonmpo.org/mpo_non_discrimination. To request this information in a different language or in an accessible format, please contact

Title VI Specialist

Boston Region MPO
10 Park Plaza, Suite 2150
Boston, MA 02116
civilrights@ctps.org

By Telephone:

857.702.3700 (voice)

For people with hearing or speaking difficulties, connect through the state MassRelay service:

- **Relay Using TTY or Hearing Carry-over:** 800.439.2370
- **Relay Using Voice Carry-over:** 866.887.6619
- **Relay Using Text to Speech:** 866.645.9870

For more information, including numbers for Spanish speakers, visit <https://www.mass.gov/massrelay>.