

**Draft Memorandum for the Record
Transportation Planning and Programming Committee of the
Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO)**

May 26, 2011 Meeting

10:00 AM – 3:45 PM, State Transportation Building, Conference Rooms 2 & 3, 10 Park Plaza, Boston

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

Decisions

The Transportation Planning and Programming Committee agreed to the following:

- approve the following changes to the MPO's membership as established in the MPO's Memorandum of Understanding (MOU):
 - have eight new municipal members who will come from each of the eight subregions and will be elected by the 101 municipalities in the MPO region with no distinction regarding whether the candidates are cities or towns
 - have four municipal at-large members with two from cities and two from towns
 - require that permanent members are not allowed to run for elected seats
 - the City of Boston will have one additional seat (for a total of two seats)
 - the MPO will do away with the Transportation Planning and Programming Committee
 - the Regional Transportation Advisory Council will become a voting member of the MPO
- conduct an annual review of the MPO's MOU
- table a motion regarding the addition of a seat on the MPO for a regional transit authority (RTA) until June 2
- table a motion regarding the adoption of a set of projects for the Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) until June 2

Meeting Agenda

1. Public Comments

Victor Pap, Weymouth Town Council, asked that the MPO put the topic of the *Quincy – Fore River Bridge* replacement project on an MPO agenda so that concerns that the public has about the project can be discussed. He was joined by Sandra Gildea, North Weymouth Civic Association, Michael Long, East Braintree Civic Association, and Gary Peters, Fore River Bridge Neighborhood Association.

Glenn Clancy, Town of Belmont, provided an update on the *Belmont – Trapelo Road* project. He provided a timeline for the project and stated that the project could be ready for advertising in federal fiscal year (FFY) 2012. He asked the MPO to consider funding

this project. Representative Will Brownsberger also supported these comments and asked the MPO to keep the project on the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).

Kristina Johnson, City of Quincy, asked the MPO to consider programming funding for a new bridge structure in Quincy center that would connect Hancock Street to the Burgin Parkway. She indicated that the new bridge structure would improve pedestrian and bicycle safety, allow transit to move more efficiently in the center, and catalyze economic development in the center. She reported that the project is under preliminary design and that the city owns the air rights at the proposed bridge location. She was not able to comment on whether the project would require eminent domain takings since the project is in the preliminary stages. Anne McGahan, Plan Manager, MPO Staff, noted that the project must be in the Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) because it has air quality impacts as it adds a connection that does not currently exist.

State Representative Carl Sciortino expressed support for the *Green Line Extension to Route 16* and asked that the MPO include the project in the LRTP. He noted that the terminus to Route 16 was the preferred alternative in the Draft Environmental Impact Report.

Roland Bartl, Town of Acton, voiced support for the *Assabet River Rail Trail* and the *Bruce Freeman Rail Trail* projects. Regarding the *Assabet River Rail Trail*, he reported that an issue has been addressed regarding access to a commuter rail station, that the design of the trail is going forward, and that the proponents are working to include two miles of trail in Stowe. Don Rising, Town of Stow, added that he supported the MPO's Investment Strategy #1 for the LRTP, which includes funding for the trail in the near term. In response to a member's question, R. Bartl estimated the cost of the *Assabet River Rail Trail* as approximately \$17-19 million and the *Bruce Freeman Rail Trail* as approximately \$29 million.

Michael Donovan, Boston University, expressed support for the *Boston – Commonwealth Avenue, Phase 2* project. He reported that Boston University will provide funding for the project design; the University has secured \$2.7 million in federal earmarks for the project and will seek more.

2. Chair's Report – David Mohler, MassDOT

There was none.

3. Subcommittee Chairs' Reports

There were none.

**4. Regional Transportation Advisory Council Report – Laura Wiener, Chair,
Regional Transportation Advisory Council**

There was none.

**5. Director's Report – Karl Quackenbush, Acting Director, Central Transportation
Planning Staff (CTPS)**

The Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) Subcommittee is scheduled to meet next week.

6. MPO Memorandum of Understanding –*David Mohler, MassDOT*

D. Mohler presented MassDOT's proposal for changes to the MPO's Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). (See attached.)

MassDOT proposed to double the size of the MPO's municipal membership to 14 members. Eight of those members would represent subregions and would be elected by subregion (one per subregion) with no distinction regarding whether the candidates are cities or towns. Four members would be at-large with two from cities and two from towns. The City of Boston would have one additional seat (for a total of two seats).

Additionally, the body currently referred to as the Transportation Planning and Programming Committee would no longer exist. Members would meet simply as the MPO. The change would result in the Regional Transportation Advisory Council becoming a voting member of the MPO.

MassDOT believes that increasing local representation on the MPO will increase civic engagement, local involvement and transparency.

Members then offered opinions on MassDOT's proposal.

Jim Gillooly, City of Boston, thanked MassDOT for taking proportional representation into account in its proposal. He suggested admitting a non-voting member from any subregion that does not have an elected representative on the MPO. He also emphasized that the City of Boston contains 20% of the region's population and 30% of its jobs and much of the region's built infrastructure, and that it is important to have proportional representation.

Paul Regan, MBTA Advisory Board, voiced disagreement about the premise of expanding the MPO. He stated that MassDOT's proposal could actually weaken municipal stakeholders vis-à-vis the state since the state would maintain veto authority and still have the power to set the MPO's agenda. D. Mohler replied that MassDOT is willing to give up its veto power, but not to cede the MPO chairmanship.

Mary Pratt, Town of Hopkinton, and David Koses, City of Newton, stated that all MPO members should represent the entire MPO region. D. Koses added that having subregional representatives will result in members focusing on their own subregions, rather than the entire region. M. Pratt also expressed support for giving a vote to the Advisory Council.

Michael Chong, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), expressed support for MassDOT's proposal for adding more municipal members.

John Westerling, Town of Hopkinton, voiced support for the MassDOT proposal since it would add transparency. He suggested that the MPO add a seat for the MetroWest Regional Transit Authority (MWRTA). He also suggested that the Advisory Council remain in an advisory position.

Tom Bent, City of Somerville, expressed concern that the changes in MassDOT's proposal could pit subregions against each other and be detrimental to the Inner Core in terms of the proportion of votes that would go to that subregion.

Richard Reed, Town of Bedford, noted that MassDOT's proposal would result in the state having less than a third of the vote. He suggested doubling the weight of Boston's vote rather than adding an additional seat for Boston. He stated that subregional candidates should run region-wide.

Laura Wiener, Regional Transportation Advisory Council, voiced support for the Advisory Council having a vote on the MPO given that the Advisory Council represents numerous entities. She expressed concern about adding seven new members citing that it would be difficult to get work accomplished with such a large body. She suggested keeping the existing number of local members and adding two at-large members.

Marc Draisen, Metropolitan Area Planning Council (MAPC), reported that MAPC is undecided about the proposal, but that it supports having as many regional voices on the MPO as possible. He noted that people do not restrict themselves to travelling in just one subregion but are concerned about the transportation system wherever they travel in the region. He voiced support for giving the vote to the Advisory Council. Speaking to the issue of whether a seat should be given to a regional transit authority (RTA), he expressed concern that adding a seat could give short shrift to the MBTA. He suggested that the MPO consider which RTAs serve the most people in the region (including those that are not based in the region).

Regarding the issue of RTA membership, P. Regan noted that it would be unfair to appoint a single RTA to the MPO when there are others outside the region, which provide more service to the Boston Region. He suggested that the Massachusetts Association of RTAs (MARTA) would be a more appropriate entity to serve than any single RTA.

Dennis Giombetti, Town of Framingham, voiced support for adding an RTA seat that would represent all the RTAs serving the region. He noted that since the existing MOU was formed, new RTAs have developed to serve growing areas.

David Anderson, MassDOT, expressed support for the proposal and noted that it would increase civic engagement.

A motion to accept MassDOT's proposal for changes to the MPO's Memorandum of Understanding was made by Stephen Woelfel, MassDOT, and seconded by J. Gillyooly. This action would implement the following changes:

- add eight new municipal members would represent subregions and would be elected by subregion (one per subregion) with no distinction regarding whether the candidates are cities or towns
- add four municipal members who would be at-large, with two from cities and two from towns
- the City of Boston would have one additional seat (for a total of two seats)
- the body currently referred to as the Transportation Planning and Programming Committee would be referred to as the MPO
- the Regional Transportation Advisory Council would become a voting member of the MPO

An amendment to the motion to clarify that the municipal representatives would be elected by the 101 municipalities in the region was made by R. Reed, and seconded by T. Bent. The amended motion did not carry.

An amendment to the original motion to redraw the boundaries for MPO elected municipalities was made by L. Wiener, and seconded by P. Regan. This action would combine MAPC subregions, increase population represented by these subregional elected members, and reduce the number of a subregional elected members to five. There would be one subregional representative each from the North, West, and South areas of the MPO, two from the Inner Core, and one from Boston, as well as two at-large members (one from a city and one from a town) elected by the 101 municipalities, This amended motion did not carry.

An amendment to the RTAC motion to add one additional seat to the Inner Core with three municipal members at-large, was made by T. Bent, and seconded by J. Gillooly. This amended motion did not carry.

Members then voted on the original motion. The motion carried but consensus was not reached.

A motion to accept MassDOT's proposal for changes to the MPO's MOU, with the clarification that subregional representatives would be elected by the 101 municipalities in the region and that permanent members would not be allowed to run for at-large seats, was made by M. Draisen, and seconded by S. Woelfel. The motion carried and members reached consensus.

A motion to conduct an annual review of the MPO's MOU was made by D. Mohler, and seconded by J. Gillooly. The motion carried.

A motion to add one seat for an RTA was made by J. Westerling, and seconded by D. Giombetti.

During a discussion of this motion, P. Regan stated that MARTA would bring a broader perspective than a single RTA. M. Pratt expressed agreement.

M. Draisen suggested that eligible RTAs should be those serving at least one municipality in the MPO region, and that one RTA could represent all the RTAs serving the region. He suggested that MARTA could oversee the process for choosing an RTA to serve on the MPO.

D. Mohler advocated for selecting either the MetroWest RTA or the Cape Ann Transportation Authority (CATA) since they are wholly located within the Boston Region MPO area and are oriented toward serving customers in the Boston area. P. Regan noted, however, that there are RTAs outside of this region that provide service to Boston.

J. Westerling revised his motion to add one seat on the MPO for either MWRTA or CATA (since they are wholly located within the MPO). D. Giombetti concurred with the revision.

Members discussed this motion and their need to have more information regarding the service RTAs provide to this region before voting on this matter.

A motion to table J. Westerling's motion until June 2 was made by M. Draisen, and seconded by J. Gillooly. The motion carried.

Staff was directed to research information on the RTAs serving the region and provide ridership figures for the MPO's continued discussion on June 2.

A motion to add two seats to the MPO for legislators (one for a senator and one for a representative to be chosen by the Senate President and House Speaker respectively) was made by D. Mohler, and seconded by S. Woelfel. The motion did not carry.

During a discussion of the motion, several members cited reasons for their vote against adding the legislative seats. M. Pratt noted that legislators act only for their constituents (rather than for the region). M. Draisen added his concern that difficulties could arise when the MPO would discuss projects in a legislator's district, and that there is normally a separation of executive and legislative functions. J. Gillooly noted that the action the MPO took earlier to add subregional representatives addresses the legislators' interest in having increased representation.

The Chair asked if any members would make a motion to add a seat to the MPO for a member of the business community or a non-profit. No member made that motion.

Members then addressed the question of whether the MPO should consider population, employment, and the amount of infrastructure in an area when making membership decisions. J. Gillooly expressed concern that the vote on membership this morning would result in diminished representation for the Inner Core communities. L. Wiener concurred and noted that the MPO's action on that vote was a move away from the MPO's goals of promoting smart growth. She expressed support for considering population when making membership decisions.

Members agreed to continue the discussion of MOU issues on June 2. The topics to be discussed would be term limits, RTA membership, quorum requirements, voting requirements, and the state veto power.

7. Long-Range Transportation Plan – *Anne McGahan, Plan Manager, MPO Staff*
Members were provided with the most recent public comments that have been submitted on the Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) and a matrix containing summaries of those comments. (See attached comment matrix.) A. McGahan summarized the new comments. They include 30 comments supporting the *Green Line Extension to Route 16*, seven opposed to the *Green Line Extension to Route 16*, and other comments voicing support for early action items on the *Urban Ring*, and the *Boston – Commonwealth Avenue Phase 2*, *Community Path*, and *Boston – Causeway Street* projects.

Members were provided with financial tables showing potential investment strategies for the LRTP. (See attached.) A. McGahan started the discussion of projects and programs by stating that the members decided, at the last meeting, to begin working with Investment Strategy #1 (as shown on Table 1A of the attached financial tables).

A. McGahan and H. Morrison provided a recap of the financial information that was presented to members at the last meeting. They explained that the MPO normally has two categories of funding available to it for programing: Regional Discretionary and Major Infrastructure funding. However, there is an expectation that nearly \$70 million of Major Infrastructure funds may not be available to the MPO for the first timeband of this LRTP, FFYs 2011 – 2015. That would leave the MPO with over \$305 million of Regional Discretionary funding available in that timeband. Of that amount, approximately \$282 million is already committed to projects programmed in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), leaving nearly \$23 million left for programing in that timeband.

At the last meeting, members decided to move several projects, originally programmed in *JOURNEY TO 2030*, out of the first timeband of this LRTP: the *Belmont – Trapelo Road*, *Canton – I-95 Northbound/Dedham Street Ramp/Dedham Street Corridor*, and *Assabet River Rail Trail* projects.

Since the last meeting, the Massachusetts Port Authority requested that the MPO program \$25 million in the first timeband of the LRTP for the *Boston – Haul Road* project. The Massachusetts Port Authority would fund this project.

Members then discussed programming the first timeband.

M. Draisen expressed concern about moving the *Belmont – Trapelo Road* project from the timeband since the project is at the 75% design stage, incorporates Complete Streets concepts, and could be ready within the FFY 2011 – 2015 period. D. Mohler added that the project is the most ready of any project in that timeband. Under federal rules, projects costing over \$10 million must be programmed in the LRTP. The MPO could, however, program the *Trapelo Road* project when it develops the TIP and then amend the LRTP at

to add the project into the appropriate timeband. Since the project does not have an air quality impact, there would be no impact to the model run by excluding it from the LRTP project list now.

At the last meeting, members had discussed the constraints that the \$10 million rule places on the MPO when programming projects and expressed their desire for the federal transportation agencies to remove that restriction.

D. Mohler also noted that FHWA will not take final action on environmental certification documents for projects that are not in the LRTP.

The scenario under consideration (shown on Table 1A) had 84% of dollars programmed for named projects and left 16% of dollars unprogrammed during the first timeband. D. Mohler noted that the MPO has programmed too much in that timeband for named projects and advised that the MPO should leave more funds unprogrammed for maintenance projects. Stephen Woelfel, MassDOT, added that the financials presented to members do not assume a possible 20 – 30% cut in funding that could result from Congressional action. He also cautioned against fully allocating funding.

D. Mohler stated that the project list shown in Strategy #2 (Table 2A) shows a more appropriate allocation of revenues in terms of the split between funding for named projects and funding left unallocated. In the second scenario, 74% is programmed to named projects and 26% is unallocated.

J. Gillooly inquired as to when the MPO would know if it has access to the Major Infrastructure funds. D. Mohler replied that MassDOT will make the decision on how to spend the funds by the end of this year. If the funds are not directed to a specific project, they could be distributed to fund bridges, maintenance, or possibly MPO targets.

Members further discussed how to handle the issue of programming the *Trapelo Road* project in the TIP and the LRTP. D. Mohler advised not programming the project in the LRTP now, but rather addressing the project in the TIP development. He expressed confidence that the project could be programmed before FFY 2015 in the TIP due to its readiness. He also noted that there are other projects that will need to have their opportunity to compete for TIP funding.

A. McGahan also recommended working with Strategy #2, noting that the MPO has limited funds and that this scenario was developed using the Needs Assessment to determine which projects meet the region's needs. L. Dantas also expressed support for working with Strategy #2 and suggested that the members could add projects to this scenario.

Members, however, decided to continue working with Strategy #1 (Table 1A).

D. Mohler asked about which projects in Strategy #1 do not need to be included in the model runs because they are not air quality significant. A. McGahan named the following

projects: *Boston – Sullivan Square, Newton/Needham – Needham Street/Highland Avenue* (if the project is split), *Belmont – Trapelo Road, Assabet River Rail Trail, and Bruce Freeman Rail Trail*.

J. Gillooly provided details on the *Boston – Sullivan Square* project and distributed a project description. He expressed concern about removing the project from the LRTP since the project may be air quality significant. This project will remove an underpass and create a new grid of streets. It would involve a “road diet” and result in safer crossings from Charlestown to Sullivan Square and better bicycle network connections. This project costs \$40 million. The associated *Boston – Rutherford Avenue* project costs \$31 million.

A. McGahan stated that if the *Sullivan Square* and *Rutherford Avenue* projects were combined they would need to be in the LRTP since the Rutherford portion involves a lane reduction (and thus has an air quality impact). J. Gillooly reported that the City of Boston is willing to phase the project. Staff was advised to list the project segments as one project costing \$71 million in the FFY 2016 – 2020 timeband.

D. Mohler asked members if they wished to begin moving projects to or from each timeband of the LRTP. Members took no action on the suggestion.

A motion to approve Strategy #1 (including the *Boston – Sullivan Square and Rutherford Avenue* project in the FFY 2016 – 2020 timeband) as the approved list of projects for the LRTP was made by J. Gillooly, and seconded by Joe Cosgrove, MBTA. The motion did not carry.

A motion to approve Strategy #1, with the addition of the *Cambridge – Route 2/Route 16 Intersection* and the *Revere – Route 1/Route 16 Interchange* in the FFY 2031 – 2035 timeband, as the approved list of projects for the LRTP was made by L. Dantas, and seconded by L. Wiener. The motion did not carry.

D. Koses cautioned that the MPO should be considering the maintenance needs of the MBTA when making these decisions. The issue was then raised about whether it would make sense to flex highway funds to a transit expansion project (the *Green Line Extension to Route 16*).

D. Mohler expressed concern about the number of projects on the list given the MPO’s funding constraints and given that the scenario under consideration only provides 11% of funding for maintenance needs.

A motion to approve Strategy #2 as the approved list of projects for the LRTP was made by D. Mohler, and seconded by L. Wiener.

An amendment to the motion, to add the *Green Line Extension to Route 16* project to the FFY 2016 – 2020 timeband, was made by L. Wiener, and seconded by T. Bent. The motion did not carry.

During a discussion of the amended motion, L. Weiner stated that the segment to Route 16 makes the *Green Line Extension* much better and noted that it would serve many more people. T. Bent concurred and added that the state has made a commitment to the project. D. Mohler expressed support for the project but maintained his concern about the small amount of unallocated money in the scenario under consideration.

An amendment to the original motion on Strategy #2, to split the *Boston – Sullivan Square and Rutherford Avenue* so that the Sullivan Square portion is in the FFY 2016 – 2020 timeband and the Rutherford Avenue portion in the FFY 2021 – 2025, was made by J. Gillooly. The motion did not advance for lack of a second.

An amendment to the original motion on Strategy #2, to add the *Framingham – Route 126/Route 135 Grade Separation* to the FFY 2026 – 2030 timeband and to remove the *Isolated Intersection Improvement Program* from that timeband, was made by D. Giombetti. The motion did not advance for lack of a second.

An amendment to the original motion on Strategy #2, to add the *Boston – Sullivan Square* project to the FFY 2016 – 2020 timeband, was made by J. Gillooly, and seconded by D. Koses. The motion did not carry.

A motion to move the original motion and approve Strategy #2 as the approved list of projects for the LRTP was made by P. Regan, and seconded by R. Reed.

During a discussion of this motion, Roland Bartl, Town of Acton, voiced concern that Strategy #2 contains no bicycle trail projects. He expressed concern that a federal earmark for the *Assabet River Rail Trail* could be lost if the project is not programmed in the LRTP.

Several members recommended tabling the motion to have more time for discussion. L. Dantas also pointed out that if Strategy #2 were approved, the Green Line Extension to Route 16 would not be modeled and its impacts would not be assessed.

A motion to table the motion to approve Strategy #2 was made by T. Bent, and seconded by J. Gillooly. The motion carried.

8. Members Items

Staff distributed the draft staff recommendation for the FFYs 2012 – 2015 TIP. (See attached.)

9. Adjourn

A motion to adjourn was made by S. Woelfel and seconded by P. Regan. The motion carried.

Transportation Planning and Programming Committee Meeting Attendance
Thursday, May 26, 2011, 10:00 AM

Member Agencies

MassDOT

MassDOT Highway
City of Boston

City of Newton
City of Somerville
Federal Highway
Administration
MAPC

MassPort
MBTA
MBTA Advisory Board
Regional Transportation
Advisory Council
Town of Bedford
Town of Braintree
Town of Framingham
Town of Hopkinton

Representatives and Alternates

David Mohler
Stephen Woelfel
David Anderson
Jim Gillooly
Tom Kadzis
David Koses
Tom Bent
Michael Chong

Marc Draisen
Eric Halvorsen
Lourenço Dantas
Joe Cosgrove
Paul Regan
Laura Wiener
Steve Olanoff
Richard Reed
Christine Stickney
Dennis Giombetti
Mary Pratt
John Westerling

MPO Staff/CTPS

Maureen Kelly
Anne McGahan
Hayes Morrison
Sean Pfalzer
Karl Quackenbush
Pam Wolfe

Other Attendees

Roland Bartl
Justin Bensan
Will Brownsberger
Ed Carr

Glenn Clancy
Rocco DiRico
Michael Donovan
Sandra Gildea

Mike Gowing
Tom Hauenstein
Kristina Johnson
Brian Kane
Erin Kinahan
Patrick Lally
Judy LaRocca

Michael Long
Rafael Mares

Town of Acton
MBTA Advisory Board
State Representative
Metro West Regional Transit
Authority
Town of Belmont
Office of Representative Markey
Boston University
North Weymouth Civic
Association
Acton
MAPC
City of Quincy
MBTA Advisory Board
MassDOT District 6
Office of Representative Markey
Bruce Freeman Rail Trail
Advisory Committee
East Braintree Civic Association
Conservation Law Foundation

Robert McGaw	Town of Belmont
John McQueen	Regional Transportation Advisory Committee
Alan Moore	Friends of the Community Path
Joe Onorato	MassDOT District 4
Mary Anne Padien	Office of State Senator Karen Spilka
Victor Pap	Weymouth Town Council
Karen Pearson	MassDOT
Gary Peters	Fore River Bridge Neighborhood Association
Elin Reisner	Somerville Transportation Equity Partnership
Dan Rising	Town of Stowe
Carl Sciortino	State Representative
Stephen Silveira	ML Strategies
Clodagh Stoker-Long	City of Medford
Sheri Warrington	Office of State Senator Thomas McGee
Wig Zamore	Somerville Transportation Equity Partnership / Mystic View Task Force

**Draft Memorandum for the Record
Transportation Planning and Programming Committee of the
Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO)**

June 2, 2011 Meeting

10:00 AM – 1:30 PM, State Transportation Building, Conference Rooms 2 & 3, 10 Park Plaza, Boston

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

Decisions

The Transportation Planning and Programming Committee agreed to the following:

- release a second revised Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) for a 30 day public review period, incorporating changes approved at this meeting which would require:
 - twelve members to be present to create a quorum, with no requirement as to whether those members are state agencies, cities, or towns
 - a two-thirds majority in the affirmative to pass a motion regarding the certification documents, with no requirement as to whether those members are state agencies, cities or towns (i.e. the elimination of the state agency veto power)
 - a majority to pass a vote on regular MPO business and a two-thirds vote to pass certification documents, which are the Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP), Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP), amendments to those documents, and the MOU
- approve the projects for the LRTP and their funding scenario (attached to this document) as proposed by the Metropolitan Area Planning Council (MAPC), with two changes – moving the *Hanover – Route 53* project to the FFY 2016 – 2020 timeband and removing the *Belmont – Trapelo Road* project

Meeting Agenda

1. Public Comments

State Representative Carl Sciortino expressed support for the *Green Line Extension to Route 16*. He referenced a letter of support for the project that was sent to the MPO by Mayor Michael McGlynn of Medford. (See attached.)

Cindy McLain spoke in support of the *Bruce Freeman Rail Trail* project and noted that the Phase 2A and 2C design contract is being reviewed by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). She asked whether there would be problems accessing funding or getting FHWA to review the project if it is not included in the MPO's Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP). She reminded the MPO that \$1.4 million has been appropriated for design work already and expressed concern about the project losing momentum. She urged the MPO to program the project in the FFY 2016 timeband of the LRTP.

In response to her question, Anne McGahan, Plan Manager, and Pam Wolfe, Manager of Certification Activities, MPO Staff, explained that FHWA would prioritize their review of projects based on how the MPO has prioritized projects in the LRTP, and that FHWA might not be able to give final approval to the project. David Anderson, MassDOT Highway, added that FHWA typically does not take action (such as giving environmental approvals) for projects that are not programmed in the LRTP. Marc Draisen, Metropolitan Area Planning Council (MAPC), noted that he would like to hear from FHWA regarding what would be the impact on the project depending on which timeband of the LRTP it is programmed in.

Roland Bartl, Town of Acton, raised concerns about the possibility of losing access to a \$600,000 federal earmark for the *Assabet River Rail Trail* if the project is not programmed in the LRTP. (He has also sent a letter to the MPO in regard to this matter.)

Steve Dungan of Stow also advocated for maintaining design and construction funding for the *Assabet River Rail Trail* project. He noted that the Town of Stow's support for the project.

Michelle Ciccolo, Minuteman Advisory Group on Interlocal Coordination (MAGIC), expressed MAGIC's support for the *Assabet River Rail Trail*, *Bruce Freeman Rail Trail*, and *Concord/Lincoln – Route 2 (Crosby's Corner)* projects, as well as projects with a regional and multimodal focus. She stated that MAGIC will be submitting a letter to the MPO in this regard.

Alan Moore, Friends of the Community Path, voiced support for the *Community Path* project. He noted that the project is necessary for the state to meet the goals of its GreenDOT initiative and reduce greenhouse gas emissions. He asked the MPO to include the project in the LRTP and advocated for constructing the project along with the *Green Line Extension*. He noted that the MPO has received approximately 150 letters of support for the *Community Path*.

John Westerling, Town of Hopkinton, asked staff to provide information regarding federal funding levels.

2. Chair's Report – David Mohler, MassDOT

The Chair advised members to reserve time each week in July for additional Committee meetings.

3. Subcommittee Chairs' Reports

There were none.

**4. Regional Transportation Advisory Council Report – Laura Wiener, Chair,
Regional Transportation Advisory Council**

There was none.

5. Director's Report – *Karl Quackenbush, Acting Director, Central Transportation Planning Staff (CTPS)*

In response to members' requests to have access to the electronic spreadsheets that staff uses to prepare the MPO's programming documents, staff will work on a way to make those spreadsheets, or variants of them, available online or by other means.

Tom Bent, City of Somerville, requested that staff mark the revision dates on their documents.

6. Meeting Minutes – *Pam Wolfe, Manager of Certification Activities, MPO Staff*
This action item was deferred.

7. MPO Memorandum of Understanding – *David Mohler, MassDOT*

Members were provided with a matrix summarizing the votes that the MPO took at the meeting of May 26 regarding the membership of the MPO. (See attached.) Members then continued their discussion of topics raised regarding the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), which included the expansion of MPO membership to include regional transit authorities (RTAs), Inner Core representation, quorum requirements, voting requirements, state veto power, and term limits. The discussion of these topics is summarized below.

Will the membership of the MPO be further expanded to accommodate RTAs?

At the last meeting, staff was asked to prepare data on the services RTAs provide to the Boston region. Staff prepared a chart and map showing this information. (See attached.) Sean Pfalzer, MPO staff, provided an overview.

For each RTA, staff provided information on the number of municipalities served by the RTA, service routes, population of served areas, connections to MBTA stations, total annual ridership, and ridership per capita. All RTA service routes are shown on the map except for the Merrimack Valley RTA's bus service to Boston, and the Montachusett RTA's paratransit service. Comparable data were also provided for the MBTA's services.

D. Mohler asked if route level ridership is available. P. Wolfe stated that staff could collect that information.

Staff was asked to provide information about how much money the MPO has provided to these RTAs over the past five years. Members turned to other questions while staff prepared that information.

Will the membership of the MPO be further expanded to add another member from the Inner Core?

Marc Draisen, MAPC, reported that MAPC has heard concern from the mayors of the Inner Core communities about the decisions the MPO made at the last meeting which proposed changing the make-up of the MPO's membership to include municipal representatives from each of the eight subregions. (They reached consensus by a 13-2 vote to change the membership of the MPO.) He noted that the Inner Core communities

(excluding Boston) represent about 32% of the region's population (more than the City of Boston's population), while the other subregions each represent a much smaller percentage of the population. While the City of Boston will have two seats on the MPO, the Inner Core subregion will have only one. The decision to eliminate the distinction between cities and towns in the MPO elections will also limit the representation of cities on the MPO, he said. MAPC believes that this issue needs to be redressed.

A motion to eliminate one at-large seat on the MPO and add a second seat for an Inner Core municipality (not Boston), with that member being elected by the entire MPO region and without city/town distinction, was made by M. Draisen, and seconded by L. Weiner. The motion did not carry.

During a discussion of this motion, several members advocated for increasing the Inner Core's representation on the MPO.

David Koses, City of Newton, commented that even adding one more seat would still leave the Inner Core under-represented. T. Bent added that it is a matter of fairness to increase the Inner Core's representation considering that the Inner Core contains much of the jobs in the region and a large amount of transportation infrastructure that needs to be managed.

Jim Gillooly, City of Boston, remarked upon the implications of the previous vote which would have three members representing the Inner Core while seven would represent the rest of the region. He noted that the proposed motion would increase the Inner Core representatives to four while maintaining seven representatives for the rest of the region.

L. Wiener expressed support for having more city representation on the MPO given that the MPO is supporting smart growth. She noted that the MPO's prior decision gives more voting power to rural areas and that it could result in more dispersed development. She advocated for supporting urban centers.

Several members raised other points. Dennis Giombetti, Town of Framingham, noted that nothing precludes an Inner Core community from running in an MPO election. M. Pratt, J. Westerling, and D. Koses expressed that all members should be representing the entire region. Lourenço Dantas, Massachusetts Port Authority stated that if the MPO relies on data and its criteria in selecting projects then it cannot shift away from Inner Core projects.

A motion to require that one of the at-large seats be designated for a second Inner Core member and of the remaining three at-large seats, two be held by cities and one by a town was made by L. Wiener, and seconded by Paul Regan, MBTA Advisory Board. The motion did not carry.

How many members make a quorum?

A motion to require twelve members to be present to create a quorum, with no requirement as to whether those members are state agencies, cities, or towns, was made by D. Mohler, and seconded by P. Regan. The motion carried.

Will there be a state veto?

A motion to eliminate the state agency veto power was made by D. Mohler, and seconded by J. Gillooly. The motion carried.

During a discussion of this motion, Joe Onorato, MassDOT District 4, expressed that the state should maintain veto power with regard to issues of safety, constructability, and project readiness. D. Mohler provided assurance that the state representatives will address those issues without using their veto power.

What margins will be required to pass a motion?

Under current rules, a two-thirds vote is required to pass a motion.

A motion to require a majority to pass a vote on regular MPO business and a two-thirds vote to pass certification documents, was made by M. Draisen and seconded by L. Wiener. Certification documents are the Long-Range Transportation Plan, Transportation Improvement Program, Unified Planning Work Program, amendments to those documents, and the Memorandum of Understanding. The motion carried.

What is the length of terms for elected members? Should there be term limits?

A motion to institute a three term limit (nine years) was made by P. Regan, and seconded by Christine Stickney. The motion did not carry.

During a discussion of this motion, it was noted that the issue of term limits was raised during the public outreach regarding the MOU, and that the federal transportation agencies raised the issue during the development of the current MOU.

Several members expressed reasons for not instituting term limits. They noted that longer serving members gain a better understanding and familiarity with the subject matter the MPO deals with and that members that are willing to serve on the MPO are providing service for the whole region.

Will the membership of the MPO be further expanded to accommodate RTAs?

Members returned to the subject of RTA membership. Hayes Morrison, TIP Manager, provided a document showing the amounts of funding that the MPO has provided to RTAs in the region over the past five years.

A motion to add one seat to the MPO for an RTA which is wholly located within the MPO area (either the MetroWest RTA or the Cape Ann Transportation Authority), and to have that member be chosen by those RTAs, was made by D. Giombetti, and seconded by J. Westerling. The motion failed.

During a discussion of this motion, P. Regan expressed opposition to adding a seat for an RTA given the very small percentage of the population that they serve, and because the decision would go against the federal environmental justice guidelines that the MPO follows. M. Draisen also cited the RTA's low ridership numbers and noted that the motion would result in two votes for either the MetroWest or North Shore subregion.

A motion to release a revised MOU, incorporating the approved changes, for a second 30 day public review period, was made by D. Giombetti, and seconded by J. Westerling. The motion carried.

Staff will prepare a red-lined version showing the changes to the MOU document for the public to review.

8. Long-Range Transportation Plan – Anne McGahan, Plan Manager, MPO Staff

At the meeting of May 26, members agreed to continue their discussion about selecting projects and programs for the Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) by working with Investment Strategy #2 (as shown on Table 2A of the attached financial tables). At this meeting, however, MAPC presented another scenario. (See attached MAPC memorandum and financial table.) M. Draisen discussed the new scenario and explained that while MAPC staff adjusted project cost figures in the chart for inflation, they did not factor in earmarks.

M. Draisen inquired as to why three projects (each costing less than \$10 million) were included in the MPO staff's scenarios as opposed to other projects: the *Woburn – New Boston Street Bridge*, *Woburn – Montvale Avenue*, and the *Hanover – Route 53* projects. A. McGahan explained that those projects must be in the LRTP because they would add capacity to the system. Eric Halvorsen, MAPC, asked if there were other low-cost capacity adding projects in the Universe of Projects. A. McGahan stated that there are, but that these three were included because they were in the last LRTP, *JOURNEY TO 2030*. D. Mohler pointed out that other capacity adding projects that might be programmed during the TIP development would have to be included in the LRTP after the MPO programs projects for the TIP.

P. Regan inquired of MAPC as to why they chose to program those three regionally-significant projects in an outer timeband of the LRTP – the FFYs 2021 – 2025 timeband – rather than move the *Assabet River Rail Trail* project to an outer year instead. M. Draisen replied that MAPC staff's rationale was to try to program a mix of projects and commit to different modes.

Jim Gallagher noted that MAPC's approach leaves more funds unallocated in the LRTP, which would give the MPO the flexibility to add in more projects after programming the TIP.

P. Regan suggested that the members consider whether they are going to value programming projects that have been in the queue to receive funding or projects that are new to the MPO process. He noted that project proponents can be frustrated when the

MPO decides to discontinue programming for projects that have been in the works. D. Mohler agreed that the MPO should honor its commitments, barring funding constraints.

Roland Bartl, Town of Acton, voiced appreciation of the MAPC proposal which provides early funding for the *Assabet River Rail Trail* and *Bruce Freeman Rail Trail*. He noted that his concern is about the ability to access an earmark for design.

Members then took up the motion that was tabled at the meeting of May 26, which was to approve Strategy #2 as the approved list of projects for the LRTP.

A motion to withdraw the motion to approve Strategy #2 as the approved list of projects for the LRTP was made by D. Mohler, and seconded by P. Regan. The motion carried.

A motion to approve MAPC's funding scenario as the approved list of projects for the LRTP was made by M. Draisen, and seconded by D. Giombetti.

During a discussion of this motion, M. Draisen asked for the MPO staff's comments on this scenario. A. McGahan reminded members to leave enough money unallocated to fund a Pavement Management Program. The MPO staff will be conducting a UPWP study to estimate the cost of a Pavement Management Program.

P. Regan proposed an amendment to M. Draisen's motion, which would move four projects to different timebands of the LRTP. The amendment would move the *Assabet River Rail Trail* project from the FFYs 2016 – 2020 timeband to the FFYs 2021 – 2025 timeband, and move the *Woburn – New Boston Street Bridge*, *Woburn – Montvale Avenue*, and the *Hanover – Route 53* projects from the FFYs 2021 – 2025 timeband to the FFYs 2016 – 2020 timeband.

During a discussion of the proposed amendment, M. Draisen stated that the readiness of the Woburn and Hanover projects would be a factor in his decision to accept the amendment.

Timothy Kochan, MassDOT District 5, then provided an update on the *Hanover – Route 53* project. He stated that the project is the final phase of the improvements to Route 53 and that it is at the 25% design stage. The \$1 million project could be ready by FFY 2012 or 2013. MassDOT District 5 advocates for moving the project to the FFYs 2011 – 2015 timeband of the LRTP.

District 5 also requests the reinstatement of the *Weymouth/Duxbury – Route 3 South Improvements* project since the project is critical to addressing congestion issues.

A. McGahan noted that the Woburn projects are in the preliminary design stages.

R. Bartl spoke regarding the *Assabet River Rail Trail* project, which he stated is near the 25% design stage. He stated that this project has synergy with the MBTA's project to

upgrade the South Acton commuter rail station. He expressed concern about losing access to a federal earmark if the project moves out too far in the LRTP.

E. Halvorsen raised the possibility of addressing the *Hanover – Route 53* project in the TIP so that it could eventually move to an earlier timeband of the LRTP. A. McGahan noted that if the project were moved forward by TIP action to an earlier year of the LRTP, staff would have to rerun the model for that year of the LRTP for air quality compliance purposes. Also, the LRTP would have to be amended.

In further discussion about the *Assabet River Rail Trail*, Michelle Ciccolo asked about what the impact would be on the \$600,000 earmark if the project were programmed in a later year. D. Mohler indicated that FHWA would have to provide the definitive answer.

M. Draisen expressed concern about jeopardizing the earmark and expressed reluctance to accept the amendment to the motion. P. Regan pointed out that the earmark for the *Assabet River Rail Trail* project would pay for only \$600,000 of a \$23 million project.

D. Mohler clarified that the *Assabet River Rail Trail* project is not in danger of losing its earmark, however, if the MPO moves the project farther out, then it could affect the ability to access the earmark and thus slow the project design. R. Bartl expressed concern that Congress could rescind the earmark. D. Mohler noted that Congress is rescinding earmarks from 1998 on projects for which less than 10% has been spent. The *Assabet River Rail Trail* earmark was issued in 2005.

C. Stickney suggested that the MPO take more time to consider the MAPC proposal since members received the proposal today.

Members then discussed the timing for the LRTP. A. McGahan noted that the MPO originally planned to vote on a list of projects by May 19. The MPO is currently two weeks behind schedule. D. Mohler stated that a further delay would affect the projects in the next TIP.

P. Regan withdrew his amendment in light of a new amendment proposed by M. Draisen.

A motion to amend the original motion (to approve MAPC's funding scenario as the approved list of projects for the LRTP) by moving the *Hanover – Route 53* project to the FFY 2016 – 2020 timeband and to remove the *Belmont – Trapelo Road* project from that timeband, was made by M. Draisen, and seconded by P. Regan.

During a discussion of this amended motion, M. Draisen explained that the *Trapelo Road* project could be addressed in the TIP development, since it does not have to be in the LRTP for modeling purposes (it must be listed in the LRTP because it costs more than \$10 million).

T. Bent asked if the *Community Path* project could be programmed in two phases, each costing under \$10 million, so that it would not have to be programmed in the LRTP, but

only the TIP. D. Mohler advised against such action because the project is being designed as a one phase project.

J. Gillooly asked for assurance that the MPO could still program projects costing over \$10 million, but with no air quality impacts, in the TIP and then amend those projects into the LRTP at a later date. D. Mohler provided that assurance.

M. Pratt expressed opposition to MAPC's proposal to move the *Braintree – I-93/Route 3 (Braintree Split)* project to outer years of the LRTP, the FFY 2031 – 2035 timeband. She expressed that the trail projects should be moved to the outer years instead. E. Halvorsen explained that the decision had to do with the readiness of the *Braintree Split* project.

D. Mohler expressed that the *Canton – I-95/I-93 Interchange* project should be moved to an earlier year in the LRTP, but that he would vote yes on the motion.

C. Stickney stated that she would vote against the motion because members have unanswered questions about projects on the list and because they were presented with this new scenario just today.

A motion to table M. Draisen's motion was made by C. Stickney, and seconded by D. Mohler. The motion did not carry.

Members then addressed M. Draisen's motion to approve MAPC's funding scenario as the approved list of projects for the LRTP with two changes – moving the *Hanover – Route 53* project to the FFY 2016 – 2020 timeband and removing the *Belmont – Trapelo Road* project from that timeband. The motion carried.

9. Members Items

J. Romano announced that the *I-93 Fast 14 Bridge* replacement project is underway with bridge replacements starting this weekend.

D. Mohler announced that the UPWP subcommittee meeting will be postponed until next week.

10. Adjourn

A motion to adjourn was made by P. Regan and seconded by J. Romano. The motion carried.

Transportation Planning and Programming Committee Meeting Attendance
Thursday, June 2, 2011, 10:00 AM

Member Agencies

MassDOT
MassDOT Highway

City of Boston

City of Newton
City of Somerville
MAPC

MassPort
MBTA
MBTA Advisory Board
Regional Transportation
Advisory Council
Town of Bedford
Town of Braintree
Town of Framingham
Town of Hopkinton

Representatives and Alternates

David Mohler
David Anderson
John Romano
Jim Gillooly
Tom Kadzis
David Koses
Tom Bent
Marc Draisen
Eric Halvorsen
Lourenço Dantas
Joe Cosgrove
Paul Regan
Laura Wiener
Steve Olanoff
Richard Reed
Christine Stickney
Dennis Giombetti
Mary Pratt
John Westerling

MPO Staff/CTPS

Michael Callahan
Maureen Kelly
Anne McGahan
Hayes Morrison
Sean Pfalzer
Karl Quackenbush
Pam Wolfe

Other Attendees

Lynn Ahlgren
Roland Bartl
Will Brownsberger
Michelle Ciccolo
Steve Dungan
Jim Gallagher
Brian Kane
Timothy Kochan
Rafael Mares
Robert McGaw
Cindy McLain
Alan Moore
Joe Onorato
Tom O'Rourke

Mary Anne Padien

Jonah Petri
Karen Pearson

MetroWest RTA
Town of Acton
State Representative
Town of Hudson
Stow Rail Trail

MBTA Advisory Board
MassDOT District 5
Conservation Law Foundation
Town of Belmont

Friends of the Community Path
MassDOT District 4
Neponset Valley Chamber of
Commerce
Office of State Senator Karen
Spilka
Somerville resident
MassDOT

Leah Robins	Office of State Representative Carolyn Dykema
Carl Sciortino	State Representative
Sheri Warrington	Office of State Senator Thomas McGee
Lynn Weissman	Friends of the Community Path
Wig Zamore	Somerville Transportation Equity Partnership / Mystic View Task Force

**Draft Memorandum for the Record
Transportation Planning and Programming Committee of the
Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO)**

June 9, 2011 Meeting

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

Clinton Bench, Chair, representing Jeffrey Mullan, Secretary and Chief Executive Officer, Massachusetts Department of Transportation (MassDOT)

Decisions

The Transportation Planning and Programming Committee agreed to the following:

- approve the minutes of the meetings of May 12 and 19
- approve the following work programs:
 - *McGrath Highway De-elevation, and Urban Streetscape and Adaptive Reuse Plan for the Inner Belt/Brickbottom Districts*
 - *Roxbury/Dorchester/Mattapan Transit Needs Study*
 - *Emergency Evacuation and Hazard Mitigation Mapping, Phase 2*
 - *SIP Mitigation for Green Line Extension Delay*

Meeting Agenda

1. Public Comments

State Representative William Brownsberger and Glenn Clancy, Town of Belmont, expressed gratitude for the programming of the *Belmont – Trapelo Road* project in the draft Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). They have met with MassDOT Highway, the consulting engineers, the Belmont Board of Selectmen, and the Housing Authority to discuss environmental issues and right-of-way issues. They see no problems with moving forward on this project.

State Representative Jason Lewis spoke in support of the *Winchester – Signal Upgrades at Four Locations* project and the *Stoneham, Winchester, Woburn – Tri-Community Bikeway* project. He noted that the signal upgrade project addresses safety issues and that the project design was completed in 2006. He explained that the bikeway project would connect three towns and provide access to two commuter rail stations and seven schools. He noted the importance of the bikeway to the Town of Stoneham since school bus service is no longer provided there and that the bikeway would produce economic opportunities for the downtowns. He stated that the project proponents have a notice to proceed to the 75% design stage. Already, \$800,000 has been spent on design. The project is expected to be ready for construction next year and is expected to cost \$5 million. He requested that the MPO program the project.

Alan Moore, Friends of the Community Path, thanked the MPO staff for recommending the *Somerville – Community Path* project in the draft TIP. He also thanked the MPO for including the *Green Line Extension to Route 16* in the draft Long-Range Transportation

Plan (LRTP) and asked that the MPO consider also including the *Community Path* project in the LRTP.

Wig Zamore, Somerville resident, recommended that the MPO reconsider the proposed changes to the MPO's Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) specifically in regard to the representation of the Inner Core. He noted that the Inner Core has the densest population in the region and the densest immigrant population. He also expressed that he is pleased that the MPO is going forward with the work programs for the *McGrath Highway De-elevation, and Urban Streetscape and Adaptive Reuse Plan for the Inner Belt/Brickbottom Districts* and the *SIP Mitigation for Green Line Extension Delay*. He suggested that the design of the *Somerville – Community Path* project be worked into the State Implementation Plan (SIP).

Jeff Levine, Town of Brookline, thanked Hayes Morrison, TIP Manager, MPO staff, for her responsiveness in working with the town's staff. He then spoke in support of the *Brookline – Gateway East* project. The project involves removing an overhead pedestrian bridge, reconstructing the roadway and pavement, building a pedestrian crossing, and improving signalization. It is at the 25% design stage. He stated that Children's Hospital has offered to pay one percent of the construction costs of the project. Noting that the project scored highly on the TIP evaluation process, he requested that the MPO include the project on the TIP. The project costs \$4.35 million.

Ellin Reisner, Somerville Transportation Equity Partnership, expressed agreement with W. Zamore's comments regarding the MOU. She also expressed support for *McGrath Highway De-elevation* study and for the *Community Path* project.

2. Chair's Report – Clinton Bench, MassDOT

MassDOT is close to naming a consultant for the second phase of the youMove Massachusetts initiative. The second phase will involve developing strategies to address mobility gaps, which were identified in the first phase.

MassDOT has also released an RFP for the Statewide Transit Study, which will involve an evaluation of regional transit authorities (RTAs). It will examine the RTA's administrative and financial situations and the services they provide, and it will identify opportunities to improve connectivity and efficiency of those services.

3. Subcommittee Chairs' Reports – Paul Regan, MBTA Advisory Board

The MPO's Subcommittee for Administration and Finance will meet on June 16 at 9 AM to discuss the Central Transportation Planning Staff (CTPS) operating budget.

4. Regional Transportation Advisory Council Report – Laura Wiener, Chair, Regional Transportation Advisory Council

The Advisory Council met on June 8 and heard a presentation on high speed rail. The Council's Subcommittees on the LRTP and TIP will be meeting over the next few weeks.

5. Director's Report – *Karl Quackenbush, Acting Director, Central Transportation Planning Staff (CTPS)*

Staff has released a flyer announcing the upcoming public workshops on the MOU. (See attached.) It would be great if members can attend.

The MPO's Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) Subcommittee is scheduled to meet today.

6. Meeting Minutes – *Pam Wolfe, Manager of Certification Activities, MPO Staff*

A motion to approve the minutes of the meetings of May 12 and 19 was made by P. Regan, and second by John Romano, MassDOT Highway Division. The motion carried.

7. Work Programs – *Karl Quackenbush, Acting Director, Central Transportation Planning Staff (CTPS)*

Members were presented with four work programs (see attached), which had been posted on the members' web page in advance of the June 2 Transportation Planning and Programming Committee meeting:

- *McGrath Highway De-elevation, and Urban Streetscape and Adaptive Reuse Plan for the Inner Belt/Brickbottom Districts*
- *Roxbury/Dorchester/Mattapan Transit Needs Study*
- *Emergency Evacuation and Hazard Mitigation Mapping, Phase 2*
- *SIP Mitigation for Green Line Extension Delay*

K. Quackenbush provided an overview of each work program and members commented on them.

McGrath Highway De-elevation, and Urban Streetscape and Adaptive Reuse Plan for the Inner Belt/Brickbottom Districts

K. Quackenbush distributed a map showing the study area in Somerville for the *McGrath Highway De-elevation, and Urban Streetscape and Adaptive Reuse Plan for the Inner Belt/Brickbottom Districts* study. This study will support two other efforts: MassDOT's study on the de-elevation of the McCarthy overpass and the City of Somerville's Adaptive Re-use Planning study for the area.

CTPS will conduct travel forecasting for up to four de-elevation plans using the land use and background transportation assumptions in the LRTP. The results will provide forecasts on vehicle miles travelled, transit boardings, emissions, and traffic consequences that would result if the plans were implemented. CTPS has already conducted an origin and destination survey in the study area, the results of which will be used to calibrate the travel model. CTPS will also conduct additional model runs using the City of Somerville's land re-use plan in combination with one or two of the most promising de-elevation plans. An environmental justice analysis will also be performed. The product of the study will be two memoranda.

In response to a member's question, K. Quackenbush explained that the environmental justice analysis will determine whether proposed changes to the transportation system

would benefit or burden environmental justice communities more or less so than non-environmental justice communities. Scott Peterson, Project Manager, added that the analysis will determine whether the proposed changes would improve or degrade travel time or access to services (such as health care) for people living in environmental justice communities.

In response to a question regarding the City of Somerville's land use plan for the study area, Tom Bent, City of Somerville, explained that the Union Square area has been rezoned and the Inner Belt area is undergoing rezoning. It is expected that there will be more mixed-use development in the area.

A motion to approve the work program for the *McGrath Highway De-elevation, and Urban Streetscape and Adaptive Reuse Plan for the Inner Belt/Brickbottom Districts* was made by T. Bent.

Roxbury/Dorchester/Mattapan Transit Needs Study

K. Quackenbush explained that the work program for the *Roxbury/Dorchester/Mattapan Transit Needs Study* will support MassDOT's transit planning work for the neighborhoods of Roxbury, Dorchester, and Mattapan. MassDOT's consultant will be assessing the existing bus transit services in and evaluating possible new service strategies this highly bus-dependant area. CTPS will support this work by conducting travel modeling for up to five service improvement alternatives and will conduct an environmental justice analysis.

David Koses, City of Newton, asked if the model has the ability to factor in additional walking time that could result from bus stop consolidation, so that the model captures the inconvenience that people may experience if bus stops are eliminated. K. Quackenbush replied that the model that would be used for this study does not include every single bus stop, but does factor in the relationship between walking time and waiting time, thus providing an ability to evaluate the probable impacts of changes to these times at a general level. S. Peterson added that the size of each traffic analysis zone (TAZ) in the model determines the level of detail in the model.

C. Bench concurred that the impacts of eliminating bus stops must be understood. He suggested that there are off-model approaches that could be taken to ensure that stops are not eliminated in areas where there are concentrations of people with disabilities and the elderly who rely on close bus service, or where there are no other transit service options.

Mary Pratt, Town of Hopkinton, also suggested that consideration be given to safety given that safety may be an issue for people who have to walk farther to bus stops. C. Bench added that MassDOT has heard these concerns voiced during its public outreach.

A motion to approve the work program for the *Roxbury/Dorchester/Mattapan Transit Needs Study* was made by Eric Bourassa, MAPC, and seconded by T. Bent. The motion carried.

Emergency Evacuation and Hazard Mitigation Mapping, Phase 2

K. Quackenbush explained that the work program for *Emergency Evacuation and Hazard Mitigation Mapping, Phase 2* is the next phase of the work that created map overlays showing natural hazard zones in relation to the transportation networks, evacuation routes, and TIP projects.

Phase 2 will involve three tasks. The first will add to the body of material gathered in Phase 1. The second will create new map overlays based on suggestions from Committee members to include hazards associated with infrastructure. These maps will plot areas that would be inundated if there were dam breaks (again in relation to the transportation network and TIP projects), liquefied natural gas (LNG) storage facilities and transport routes, and, if the budget allows, nuclear plant evacuation areas. The third task will develop an interactive online tool that make the map coverages available to entities engaged in evacuation and security planning, and to the public. Some of the data provided for the first phase of this project was not available for public release, so staff will continue to be careful with that information and limit the viewing of some of the data.

M. Pratt offered a contact at the Department of Conservation and Recreation who has data on dams in the region.

E. Bourassa stated that MAPC is working on a similar project and suggested that MAPC and CTPS coordinate.

Jim Gillooly, City of Boston, asked if the project would identify critical links, such as bridges, that are in poor condition and should be prioritized. K. Quackenbush noted that new TIP criteria do recognize projects that would address such critical links and that would strengthen evacuation routes and alternative evacuation routes. P. Wolfe added that the maps from the first phase of the project can be used to identify those locations. K. Quackenbush noted that a coverage of structurally deficient bridges could be brought into the online tool.

Christine Stickney, Town of Braintree, noted that municipalities in the region are updating their Hazard Mitigation Plans, which are a source of data for this project.

A motion to approve the work program for *Emergency Evacuation and Hazard Mitigation Mapping, Phase 2* was made by John Romano, MassDOT Highway Division, and seconded by C. Stickney. The motion carried.

SIP Mitigation for Green Line Extension Delay

K. Quackenbush explained that the work program for the *SIP Mitigation for Green Line Extension Delay* will involve travel modeling of so-called interim offset projects. These projects are those that the state would implement because of delays in the implementation of the *Green Line Extension* project, which the state is legally required to construct as mitigation for the Central Artery/Tunnel project. The modeling effort will determine the emission consequences of the interim offset projects, which must be as beneficial as the

emission consequences of the *Green Line Extension* project would be. Up to seven interim offset projects will be modeled. CTPS will also support MassDOT's public outreach work.

T. Bent asked staff to change the language in the work program to clarify that the projects to be studied are temporary mitigation projects rather than "substitute" projects. He also asked staff to add language to the work program to allow for community input at each stage of the mitigation process. The City of Somerville wants to make sure that the mitigation measures benefit the residents of Somerville.

P. Regan raised the issue that it may be unlikely that the state could identify projects in that corridor that can be implemented by 2014 and which would have the same air quality improvement benefits as the *Green Line Extension*, and that the state may have to select regional projects. He also commented that air quality impacts of the *Green Line Extension* are not well known at this time. Stephen Woelfel, MassDOT, noted that MassDOT does have good sense of what the air quality benefits would be.

P. Regan asked about who would be financially obligated to implement the interim projects. S. Woelfel replied that while the Commonwealth is obligated to fund the SIP projects, it is unclear at this time where the obligation for the interim projects would fall since they would require capital and operating costs.

A motion to approve the work program for the *SIP Mitigation for Green Line Extension Delay* was made by T. Bent, and seconded by E. Bourassa. The motion carried.

8. Transportation Improvement Program – Hayes Morrison, TIP Manager, MPO Staff

Members were provided with the draft staff recommendation for the FFYs 2012 – 2015 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), a spreadsheet showing project evaluations for the Universe of TIP projects, and public comments received to date. (See attached.)

H. Morrison gave a PowerPoint presentation regarding the TIP development. (See attached PowerPoint.) She summarized the changes the MPO made to the TIP process this year and the results of the MPO's outreach regarding the TIP.

The MPO began outreach to municipalities in January and received 138 requests for project funding. These projects are shown on the attached project evaluation spreadsheet. About half of the projects are evaluated. To fully evaluate projects staff needs a functional design report. Forty-two of the projects were designed to the point at which staff could do a full evaluation. Twenty-nine received partial evaluations. The projects were prioritized based on the MPO's TIP criteria, project readiness (as determined by MassDOT), ability to implement the LRTP, and geographic equity.

The staff recommendation programs \$301 million worth of projects in this TIP. Due to changes in the cash flows for the *Route 128 Improvement Program* projects, the *Cambridge – Cambridge Common* project was moved to the FFY 2012 element of the

TIP from the FFY 2014 element. The *Weymouth – Route 18* project was moved forward to the FFY 2013 element due to readiness issues. Two new projects were added: the *Belmont – Trapelo Road* and *Lynn – Route 129 (Broadway)* projects. The *Trapelo Road* project was selected because it was highly rated in the TIP evaluations and it was included in the current LRTP. The *Route 129* project was selected due to its evaluation score and because of geographic equity considerations.

Charts were provided to show proposed TIP target funding by subregion and corridor (shown in the attached PowerPoint presentation). The First Tier list of projects is available on the MPO's website (and attached).

During a discussion of the staff recommendation, J. Gillooly noted that the cost shown for the *Boston – Commonwealth Avenue, Phase 2* project may not be accurate. The cost estimate of \$11.5 million was taken from MassDOT Highway Division's Project Information database.

In response to a question from M. Pratt, H. Morrison stated that the *Natick – Route 27* project does not include a bridge segment.

E. Bourassa inquired as to how much funding is available from the changes to the cash flows for the *Route 128 Improvement Program* projects. H. Morrison stated that three contracts total \$22 million. There is \$500,000 remaining, but there is no project of that size to program.

In response to a question from D. Koses, C. Bench explained that the programming of the *Concord/Lincoln – Route 2 (Crosby's Corner)* project reflects the cash flows of the project.

D. Koses raised a question about the reason staff proposed programming the *Lynn – Route 129 (Broadway)* project instead of the *Brookline – Gateway East* project, given that the Brookline project scored slightly higher on project evaluations and is bringing private funding to the TIP process. H. Morrison said that bringing private funding was not a criteria for the staff recommendation. J. Romano expressed support for programming the Lynn project because of geographic equity considerations and noted that the difference in the evaluation score between the two projects was small. M. Pratt pointed out the Brookline project's proximity to major Boston hospitals. Jeff Levine, Town of Brookline, noted that the Children's Hospital will contribute approximately \$1.25 million for the project.

D. Koses suggested reducing the funding for the Clean Air and Mobility Program in the FFY 2015 element and applying that funding to the Brookline project. P. Regan and E. Bourassa advised against defunding the Clean Air and Mobility Program. The MPO has already made commitments though that program.

Marie Rose, MassDOT Highway Division, recommended that the *Needham/Wellesley – Route 128 Improvement Program Contract 5* project be moved back, out of the FFY

2012 and 2013 elements because MassDOT Highway does not believe the project will be ready in that timeframe.

J. Gillooly noted that the City of Boston has several priority projects: *Commonwealth Avenue, Causeway Street, and Signal Upgrades at 17 Locations.*

D. Koses then suggested reducing the funding for the Clean Air and Mobility Program in the FFY 2015 element from \$3 million to \$2 million. He also suggested the possibility of over-programming that element. Michael Chong, FHWA, and C. Bench both stated that it is not permissible to over-program the TIP. P. Wolfe added that reducing the Clean Air and Mobility Program would reduce the program even more if inflation is factored in.

In response to a question about the impact of reducing funding for the *Needham/Wellesley – Route 128 Improvement Program Contract 5* project in the FFY 2012 element, H. Morrison explained that the change could make \$13.7 million available in the FFY 2012 element and she noted that she will need more information to identify the impact in the later TIP years.

Later in the meeting, C. Bench asked staff to evaluate the *Natick/Wellesley – Oak Street* project for potential programming in the TIP. The project cost estimate is \$6.3 million with a \$1.4 million earmark.

9. Long-Range Transportation Plan – Anne McGahan, Plan Manager, MPO Staff
Over the past week, the MPO has received 40 new public comments on the Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP). Of those comments 17 supported the *Boston – Rutherford Avenue and Sullivan Square* project, 12 supported the *Somerville – Community Path*, one supported the *Silver Line, Phase 3 and T Under D* projects, one supported the *Framingham – Route 126/135 Grade Separation* project, one supported the *Bruce Freeman Rail Trail*, and one supported the *Assabet River Rail Trail*. (See attached comment matrix.)

Members were provided with an updated spreadsheet showing the projects that members selected for the LRTP at the meeting of June 2. (See attached.) A. McGahan noted one change in the spreadsheet: the cost of the *Woburn/Reading/ Stoneham/Wakefield – I-93/I-95 Interchange* project was reduced to \$410 million.

A. McGahan also provided members with an updated draft outline for the LRTP document. (See attached.) Members also received a draft of the Transportation Equity chapter, and were asked to provide comments to staff by June 15.

M. Pratt asked if data from the 2010 census could be used in the LRTP. K. Quackenbush replied that some of the census information is available, and that he could provide more information about what portions of the data are available.

A. McGahan asked members to consider whether they want to include Illustrative Projects in this LRTP. E. Bourassa noted that he is not in favor of including Illustrative

Projects. C. Bench, P. Regan, T. Bent, and D. Koses also expressed concerns about listing Illustrative Projects. They noted that listing those projects may give the impression that there is more momentum behind those projects than exist given the current fiscal conditions. By not listing the projects, there may be an opportunity to get advocates for those projects to redirect their energies to advocate for more transportation funding. J. Gillooly recommended postponing the discussion of Illustrative Projects until the next meeting so that he could consult with others in City offices to learn their views on the question.

A. McGahan released an update schedule for the development of the LRTP. (See attached.)

10. Technical Memorandum: Low Cost Improvements to Bottleneck Locations – Karl Quackenbush, Acting Director, Central Transportation Planning Staff, and Seth Asante, Project Manager, MPO Staff

Members were provided with a memorandum describing the results of a study that examined low cost improvements to bottlenecks at four express highway locations in the region. (The results of this study are posted on the MPO's website.) K. Quackenbush noted that this work is particularly timely, given the severe financial constraints affecting transportation infrastructure programming. S. Asante provided an overview of the study.

The study was carried out as a result of FHWA's recommendations regarding the FFY 2009 UPWP. FHWA recommended that the MPO identify bottlenecks in the region that can be mitigated with low-cost improvements and develop recommendations for such improvements. Congestion has been increasing over the past 20 years in the region. Much of that congestion has been due to bottlenecks, which can be caused by operational or design constraints.

MPO staff selected locations to study based on MPO knowledge of bottleneck locations, previous MPO studies and data from the MPO's Congestion Management Process, and from consultations with the MassDOT Highway Division. Four locations were ultimately selected on express highways in Weston, Braintree, Burlington, and near the Hingham-Weymouth town line. Two other locations that were studied were not capable of being improved with low-cost solutions and so were dropped from consideration.

Staff recommended actions involving using shoulders as auxiliary lanes or for lengthening acceleration or deceleration lanes, restriping merge and diverge areas, and using traveller information signs to inform drivers of temporary changes on the highway.

As next steps, MassDOT Highway may wish to further examine MPO staff's recommendations and initiate projects through the MassDOT and MPO processes. A second bottleneck study is included in the FFY 2011 UPWP.

During a discussion of the study, M. Rose asked what the criteria were for low-cost improvements. S. Asante stated that the cost was considered in comparison to the cost of adding capacity, such as roadway widening or lane additions. K. Quackenbush added

that, as an example, the alternative measures analyzed for the Weston location could cost up to \$5 million.

11. Members Items

J. Romano reminded members that the *I-93 Fast 14* bridge replacement project continues this weekend.

Members are asked to reserve every Thursday in July for Committee meetings.

12. Adjourn

Transportation Planning and Programming Committee Meeting Attendance
Thursday, June 9, 2011, 10:00 AM

Member Agencies

MassDOT
MassDOT Highway

City of Boston

City of Newton
City of Somerville

Federal Highway
Administration

MAPC

MBTA

MBTA Advisory Board
Regional Transportation
Advisory Council

Town of Bedford

Town of Braintree

Town of Framingham

Town of Hopkinton

Representatives and Alternates

Clinton Bench
David Anderson
Marie Rose
John Romano
Jim Gillooly
Tom Kadzis
David Koses
Tom Bent
Michael Chong

Eric Bourassa
Eric Halvorsen
Joe Cosgrove
Paul Regan
Laura Wiener
Steve Olanoff
Richard Reed
Christine Stickney
Dennis Giombetti
Mary Pratt
John Westerling

MPO Staff/CTPS

Ying Bao
Bruce Kaplan
Maureen Kelly
Robin Mannion
Anne McGahan
Hayes Morrison
Sean Pfalzer
Karl Quackenbush
Alicia Wilson
Pam Wolfe

Other Attendees

Will Brownsberger
Cameron Bain

Rob Cahoon
Glenn Clancy
Donny Daily

Meaghan Hamill

Jeff Levine
Rep. Jason Lewis
Robert McGaw
Kevin McHugh
Alan Moore
Joe Onorato
Karen Pearson

State Representative
Stoneham/Tri Community
Bikeway
Coler & Colantonio
Town of Belmont
MassDOT Public Affairs

Office of State Senator Thomas
McGee
Town of Brookline
State Representative
Town of Belmont
Coneco Engineers and Scientists
Friends of the Community Path
MassDOT District 4
MassDOT

Ellin Reisner	Somerville Transportation Equity Partnership
Joseph Stiglizni	Town of Hull
Lynn Weissman	Friends of the Community Path
Wig Zamore	Somerville Transportation Equity Partnership / Mystic View Task Force
George Zambouras	Town of Reading