

Draft Memorandum for the Record

Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization Meeting

February 21, 2013 Meeting

10:00 AM – 12:30 PM, State Transportation Building, Conference Rooms 2&3, 10 Park Plaza, Boston

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

Decisions

The Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization agreed to the following:

- approve the minutes of the meeting of February 7 with a correction
- approve the use of new project evaluation criteria for the review of applications seeking grants from the federal Job Access and Reverse Commute (JARC) and New Freedom Programs
- approve the launch of the MPO's new accessible website

Meeting Agenda

1. Public Comments

There were none.

2. Chair's Report—*Clinton Bench, MassDOT*

There was none.

3. Committee Chairs' Reports

Callida Cenizal, MassDOT, reported that the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) Committee met on February 7 at which time the Committee reviewed the Universe of Projects to be considered for the federal fiscal years (FFYs) 2014 UPWP. Members were asked to provide feedback regarding the proposed projects that they consider to be priorities to Michelle Scott, MPO Staff, by the end of February. There is a large surplus of proposed projects given the amount of funding available. The Committee will meet next on March 21 to review the staff recommendation for the FFY 2014 UPWP.

C. Bench inquired as to whether MassDOT's proposed transportation finance plan, *The Way Forward: A 21st Century Transportation Plan*, could fund the surplus of UPWP projects. C. Cenizal replied that the plan does not propose funding for planning activities, beyond providing more Chapter 90 monies to municipalities.

4. Regional Transportation Advisory Council Report—Steve Olanoff, Chair, Regional Transportation Advisory Council

The Advisory Council met on February 13. At that meeting, Alicia Wilson, MPO staff, gave a presentation on the MPO's Transportation Equity Program, Title VI, and demographic profiles for environmental justice communities in the Boston region. Bill Kuttner, MPO staff, presented the findings of Phase 1 of the MPO's HOV lane study (*Screening Regional Express Highways for Possible Preferential Lane Implementation*).

The Advisory Council will meet next on March 13.

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

There was none.

6. Meeting Minutes—Maureen Kelly, MPO Staff

A motion to approve the minutes of the meeting of February 7 – with a correction suggested by Jim Gillooly, City of Boston – was made by J. Gillooly, and seconded by Eric Bourassa, Metropolitan Area Planning Council. The motion carried.

7. JARC and New Freedom Update—Alicia Wilson, MPO Staff

K. Quackenbush introduced a report on lessons learned from last year's Job Access and Reverse Commute (JARC) and New Freedom grant awards and the upcoming solicitation for projects in FFY 2013. Staff has evaluated the effectiveness of previous grant awards based on the proponents own stated goals. We need, he said, to be careful not to necessarily use the same standards for gauging the effectiveness of these projects as we use for other transportation projects. Most of those projects were demonstration projects, and some of the proponents' goals are social service-oriented. Not all recipients responded to staff's request for information. As a result of the evaluation and past feedback from MPO members, staff will be proposing a new evaluation procedure for FFY 2013.

A. Wilson then gave a PowerPoint presentation, which was accompanied by memoranda titled, *Job Access and Reverse Commute and New Freedom Federal Grant Program Projects in the Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization Area: An Evaluation* and, *Proposed New Criteria for MPO Evaluation of JARC and New Freedom Grant Proposals*.

JARC and New Freedom Grant Evaluation

The federal JARC and New Freedom grant program supports social service-related transportation projects that do not always lend themselves to traditional service

standards and data reporting. The projects do have real benefits, however, and, nationwide, the combined projects in these two programs provide millions of trips.

The JARC program is intended to improve access to jobs and employment-related activities for low-income individuals and to transport residents of urban areas to suburban jobs. The New Freedom program is intended to reduce transportation barriers and improve mobility for persons with disabilities. Projects that receive New Freedom funds must be providing a service that exceeds the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act.

Projects that receive JARC and New Freedom funds must be derived from the MPO's Coordinated Public Transit Human Services Transportation Plan, which was developed in 2008 in conjunction with the region's service providers and updated in 2010. The strategies in the plan include increasing hours of operation, increasing service coverage, improving accessibility, improving communications, reducing duplication of service, improving intermodal connections, and providing mobility management. There have been five solicitations in the Boston Urbanized Area (UZA) since 2008.

Staff initiated the evaluation of the JARC and New Freedom projects under SAFETEA-LU, the previous federal surface transportation act. The study was conducted in conformance with a work program approved by the MPO in December 2011.

Staff began the evaluation process by mailing and emailing grant recipients a request for information. Thirteen of the sixteen grant recipients responded. The effectiveness of projects was measured against proponents' stated goals for trips provided, information gathered or disseminated, and technology and vehicles acquired that increase availability of transit services.

A variety of agencies received funding; private nonprofits (including Area Agencies on Aging) were the most common agency type.. Other recipients were regional transit authorities (RTAs), state agencies, municipalities, and transportation management associations (TMAs). The types of projects included trip-based projects, information-based projects, and capital investment projects. (Charts were shown with the breakdown of this information.)

Some of the projects approved by the MPO included the Logan Sunrise Shuttle, a shuttle from Bellingham and Franklin to the commuter rail, the MetroWest RTA's Route 1 shuttle to the Green Line, and a mobility management information network created and managed by the Human Service Transportation Office.

A. Wilson summarized the feedback received from grant recipients and discussed the lessons learned by the proponents, which include the following:

- transportation needs expressed by potential riders do not always reflect trips they will actually make
- it is important for the provider to know its market
- it is necessary to perform in-depth studies and studies and surveys prior to launching future routes
- mobility management is about more than just a ride (a host of issues must be addressed)

The MPO study reached the following conclusions:

- the most successful proponents both know their markets and have served them in some capacity
- proponents who routinely plan for and provide transportation services are more likely to be successful
- preliminary studies are important for proponents who lack adequate knowledge of their markets

For consideration during future solicitations, the MPO should ask if applicants have conducted a planning study, if they have experience providing transportation service, and if they are able to identify unmet needs and address them.

Discussion

During a discussion, C. Bench asked A. Wilson to further discuss the quantitative goals for information-based services and the concept of mobility management. A. Wilson explained that mobility management is a means to move people more effectively, often by consolidating the request process so that a person only has to make one call to request a ride. Some of the mobility management projects set goals for counseling a certain number of people or providing a certain number of trips. Quantitative goals were requested from applicants for previous solicitations but not last year's. MassDOT Rail and Transit Division plans to revise the application this year to re-incorporate the request for quantitative goals. C. Bench added that an identified need for human service transportation is the need for coordination of services among agencies.

Lourenço Dantas, Massachusetts Port Authority, spoke about the need to provide services to people where they are and asked for more examples of mobility management projects. A. Wilson noted that coordination of services is a key issue and cited several examples of projects that have done this including a hospital that coordinated patient visits and municipalities that shared vans to provide shopping trips.

C. Bench noted that there is sometimes an overlap based on clients' certifications to use particular services. For example, a person on Medicaid may be eligible for services offered by the Executive Office of Health and Human Services while a person with a disability may be eligible for THE RIDE. Both individuals may be making similar trips for the same purpose but must use different providers.

Dennis Crowley, South West Advisory Planning Committee (Town of Medway), asked for more information about the process for awarding the grants. A. Wilson explained that the five MPOs in the Boston UZA are included in a solicitation for projects and recommend projects to MassDOT. MassDOT determines which ones receive funding. The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) has final authority to approve funding for the projects.

D. Crowley expressed concern that one of the RTAs that was awarded a grant on the recommendation of the MPO did not respond to staff's request for information for this study. He offered to follow up with the RTA.

Christine Stickney, South Shore Coalition (Town of Braintree), noted that two projects that were awarded funds did not go forward as planned. She asked staff to check into the status of the unspent funds to determine if the funds could be redistributed as part of the next solicitation.

C. Stickney also expressed disappointment that one state agency did not respond to the MPO's request for information. She suggested that applicants' willingness to cooperate with MPO staff should be considered during the next solicitation. C. Bench expressed agreement.

Tom Bent, Inner Core Committee (City of Somerville), asked if any one group of entities performed better than others (nonprofits, municipal, etc.). A. Wilson replied no. She stated that agencies that knew their market were more successful. T. Bent suggested that another criterion for project selection should measure how well the applicant knows its market. A. Wilson agreed that applicants should demonstrate knowledge of their market or be proposing to conduct a market study.

E. Bourassa noted that the MPO will be reviewing new applications at the next MPO meeting.

2013 Project Solicitation

A. Wilson reported that MassDOT began the current solicitation process in January. The process will be shorter this year, ending in March. The MPO will receive proposals during the first week of March.

During prior solicitations, a point system was used to evaluate projects. This year, staff is proposing a new evaluation system that is a synthesis of existing criteria, MassDOT's evaluation criteria, and study findings. The new proposed evaluation system would include quantitative criteria such as cost, projected trips per month, and people served. Three staffers will be involved in the evaluations.

The new proposed criteria are detailed in staff's memorandum.

Discussion

Richard Canale, At-Large Town of Lexington, asked how staff would find a balance when evaluating projects to ensure that the best projects are recognized, particularly in cases where not all of the criteria may apply to a project. A. Wilson explained that projects would be scored based on the criteria that apply to them; they would not be penalized in cases where not all of the criteria apply. In addition to using the evaluation criteria, the staff involved will be discussing each individual project.

E. Bourassa asked about the funds available this year for the Boston UZA. A. Wilson replied that there are approximately \$2 million in New Freedom funds and \$1 million in JARC funds. She confirmed that the two programs are not included in the new federal transportation legislation, MAP-21, though there will be funding for the type of projects that are currently funded through New Freedom in the Section 5310 formula funds. In the future, applicants will apply directly to MassDOT, which will coordinate project review.. One MPO staffer will continue to participate in the review of those projects.

E. Bourassa encouraged staff to invite applicants for this year's grants to attend the MPO meeting where the projects will be discussed. He also asked staff to provide information on the applicants' funding requests broken out by year.

C. Bench asked whether awardees with multi-year projects would be able to access second or third year funding considering that the JARC and New Freedom programs will be discontinued in MAP-21. A. Wilson explained that multi-year projects would receive funds for every year of the project from the funds allocated for this solicitation.

C. Bench recommended that staff use the Coordinated Public Transit Human Services Transportation Plan to its fullest extent to encourage providers who can fill identified gaps in service to apply in the event that funding continues to be available for such projects after this year.

Staff received consensus from members to use the new evaluation criteria.

8. Report on ADA and Section 508 Work and New MPO Website—*Robin Mannion, Deputy Executive Director, Central Transportation Planning Staff*

C. Bench introduced the report on the MPO's work to improve accessibility by expressing pride in staff's work to become more responsive to the provisions of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). He remarked that the Boston Region MPO is a leader in the field of accessibility and a model for other agencies. R. Mannion then recognized staff members who worked to make the MPO's website accessible.

Boston Region MPO's Compliance with ADA and Section 508

R. Mannion began a PowerPoint presentation by giving an overview of the mandates for accessibility that apply to the MPO. They include the following:

- ADA requires that all services, activities, and programs conducted by the MPO be accessible to people with disabilities
- Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1998 requires electronic communications to be accessible
- Various state regulations and policies that underscore the federal requirements
- MassDOT contractual provisions that call for universal accessibility of the MPO's operations

The MPO has addressed these requirements in conducting public meetings, preparing printed documents, and in the development of its new website. For its public meetings, the MPO releases notices that include a statement of accommodation, each meeting location is ADA compliant, and the chairman opens each meeting by announcing available accommodations. Accommodations (such as audio assistance or translation) are provided upon request. All MPO documents are prepared using accessibility guidelines for fonts, spacing, and color contrast. Large-print or alternate formats (such as Braille and audio recording) are available for most documents. Staff has developed templates for document preparation which serve as the foundation for the accessible materials that are posted on the website.

The MPO's new website is accessible and staff is working to make all of its contents accessible. During the process of redesigning the website, staff engaged the services of a faculty member of the Perkins School for the Blind and his colleague who tested the website using commercially available screen readers. Their feedback was used to improve the accessibility of the website for blind and low-vision persons. As of June 2012, it is the MPO's policy to post only accessible materials to the website. Documents are posted in both PDF and screen-readable HTML formats. Applications, such as the

TIP Interactive Database, and data catalogs have also been re-engineered to be accessible.

Discussion

R. Mannion addressed several questions from members regarding the staff's preparation of audio tapes of MPO documents, the standards used when selecting print document features for accessibility, and translation of materials into other languages.

Staff will prepare audio tapes of MPO documents upon request. Web-based screen readers – which can interpret the printed word and vocalize it – can serve this function now for documents that are posted on the MPO's website.

While there are various guidelines available for accessible printed documents it is generally advisable to use a sans serif font and a minimum font size of 14. There are also guidelines for spacing and kerning between lines and letters. While there is flexibility in selecting these features, it is advisable to adopt a style and use it consistently.

Documents on the website can be copied into GoogleTranslate for translation to other languages.

Viewing of New MPO Website

Members were given a preview of the new MPO website, which had not yet gone live. R. Mannion pointed out the new style changes which were intended to make the website appear clean and crisp, show information in a concise and complete manner, and be compliant with accessibility mandates.

There are multiple ways to access information on the website. Posted documents can be resized to expand text or translated into other languages using GoogleTranslate. Maps on the website are accompanied by HTML listings of map features. A new data catalog allows a user to browse subjects. The MPO's new site policy and accessibility statement are included on the website. Staff contact information is provided for users who may need assistance.

Discussion

Staff was commended for their work on the new website. Several members raised questions and made suggestions.

Tom O'Rourke, Three Rivers Interlocal Council (Town of Norwood/NVCC), inquired as to whether the website is mobile phone enabled. Ben Krepp, Manager of the Information

Technology and Services Group, MPO Staff, confirmed that it is and noted that staff tested the site on Android devices.

R. Canale suggested that the acronym “MPO” be spelled out on the first page of the website.

Dennis Giombetti, MetroWest Regional Collaborative (Town of Framingham), suggested that staff track the hits on the website’s pages about six months after the website goes live in order to gauge how the MPO’s work is being accessed.

C. Bench noted that the Title VI statement is included on the MPO’s homepage under the “About the MPO” link. He stated that he would encourage other MPOs in Massachusetts to use this website as model.

T. Bent asked if the website includes links to other agencies’ websites. R. Mannion replied that the website only has links to pertinent documents. Staff made a decision to not provide a “library” of external links in order to streamline maintenance of the website.

A member of the public, Wig Zamore, Somerville Transportation Equity Partnership and Mystic View Task Force, commended staff on their effort.

Members reached consensus to allow the new website to go live.

9. Transit Oriented Development Planning—*Eric Bourassa and Eric Halvorsen, MAPC*

E. Bourassa introduced the presentation on MAPC’s transit oriented development (TOD) planning work. He noted that land use planning will be a major factor in achieving MassDOT’s mode shift goal of tripling the number of trips made by biking, walking, and transit by 2030. Further, the decisions that the MPO make regarding the funding of transportation projects can have an influence on development. MAPC has been conducting work to better understand the potential for development and redevelopment around MBTA stations and ways to finance such projects.

E. Halvorsen then gave a PowerPoint presentation. He began by discussing how TOD ties in with the goals of MAPC’s MetroFuture plan and MassDOT’s mode shift goal, part of the agency’s GreenDOT policy.

TOD enables people to either live a car-free lifestyle or shift a percentage of driving trips to walking and biking trips. The benefits of TOD include decreased transportation costs

for individuals, increased transit ridership, increased housing values, less vehicle congestion, and fewer greenhouse gas emissions.

The characteristics of a TOD can vary based on the type and frequency of transit services available, the scale of the development and the mix of uses, and depending on how people are oriented to the development and transit service. The demographic make-up of a TOD will make a difference in terms of how successful the TOD is in terms of reducing car ridership. MAPC has been working to understand the demographic mix that makes a TOD successful (i.e. zero vehicle households, renters, younger or older people, etc.).

MAPC examined approximately 200 MBTA station areas around the MPO region to understand the demographic, employment, and land use characteristics of the areas and to assess the potential for development around those stations. As a result of this work, MAPC created a typology of MBTA stations. (Maps were shown that depict this information.)

MAPC determined that within these half-mile station areas, there is a potential for about 76,000 new housing units (32,700 already planned) representing 31% of new housing demand to 2035, and 133,000 jobs representing 56% of job growth to 2035. This development could occur within just 5% of the region's land area.

Through a Sustainability Grant, MAPC conducted municipal level station planning for three locations: Wollaston Station in Quincy; Beverly Station in Beverly; and the corridor between Cedar Park Station to Melrose Highlands Station in Melrose. This planning involved creating a vision for TOD development, examining existing zoning and ways to change it to enable TOD, and studying walking and bicycling connections. MAPC found potential for TOD development at each site.

Despite the benefits of TOD, developers face financial challenges to constructing these developments even in areas well-suited to them. MAPC created a TOD Finance Advisory Committee to identify these challenges. The committee found that the reasons may include the long time frame for these developments to be completed, inflexible zoning requirements, onerous and expensive parking requirements, funding challenges at the pre-development stage, and a dearth of financing for ground floor retail and infrastructure needs. New capital funding resources are becoming available to TOD developers in the region, however, through the LISC Equitable TOD Accelerator Fund and the CLF Ventures Healthy Neighborhoods Equity Fund.

E. Halverson closed his presentation by noting that the MPO has opportunities to consider how TOD works into its Long-Range Transportation Plan and Transportation Improvement Program in the coming years.

Discussion

R. Canale asked for more discussion about the typology of transit stations and what makes something a transit *oriented* development as opposed to a transit *adjacent* development. Tim Reardon, MAPC, discussed the idea of the demographic make-up of an area and the type of housing available (affordable, market rate, senior, for example) as being important factors when considering the impacts a development may have on travel behavior. He noted that MAPC drew on the work of Stephanie Pollack of Northeastern University when developing the typology of transit stations. S. Pollack is developing a rating system that considers transit, development, and community characteristics to identify where best to focus TOD.

D. Giombetti asked T. Reardon to further discuss whether MAPC considered demographic profiles for TOD as dependent on the particular location. He noted that municipalities may be considering certain demographic profiles for particular locations (for example, targeting a development on a commuter rail line to professionals who travel to the city). T. Reardon responded yes. He noted that in addition to shifting work trips to transit, considerations for TOD should also include availability of other forms of transit (such as bus service) and nearby amenities for shopping, health care, and other services that people can access without driving. He added that the demographic mix would be different depending on the context and would need to reflect local characteristics.

Richard Reed, Minuteman Advisory Group on Interlocal Coordination (Town of Bedford), raised a question about the designation of certain municipalities (shown on a map in the presentation) as “trolley suburbs.” E. Halverson stated that those municipalities tend to be more residential with a lower level of development, and may have had trolley service historically.

J. Gillooly asked whether the two capital funds referenced in the presentation provide cash infusions to projects or loans. T. Reardon explained that the LISC Equitable TOD Accelerator Fund is a revolving loan fund that offers pre-development financing while the CLF Ventures Healthy Neighborhoods Equity Fund is an equity fund that accepts private investments. He noted that the Office of Housing and Economic Development contributed \$1 million to the LISC fund. He also noted that the MPO for San Francisco, California programmed \$1 million through its Long-Range Transportation Plan to a similar fund.

T. O'Rourke asked if a development must be mixed-use to qualify for LISC or CLF Ventures funds. E. Halverson explained that the operators of both funds are in the process of developing metrics upon which projects will be evaluated. The CLF fund will have public health and sustainability components.

10. State Implementation Plan Update—Eric Bourassa and Eric Halvorsen, MAPC

C. Bench gave an update on the projects in the State Implementation Plan (SIP).

The *1,000 Parking Space* project is complete and MassDOT is no longer reporting on this project in the SIP.

The new Talbot Avenue Station, part of the *Fairmount Line Improvement* project, is complete and operational as of November 2012. To address privacy concerns, the MBTA has committed to add a six foot privacy section to a fence around the station.

The first phase of the *Green Line Extension to Somerville and Medford* is underway with the widening of the Harvard Street and Medford Street railroad bridges and the demolition of 21 Water Street. Future work will use the Construction Manager/General Contractor (CM/GC) approach. The MBTA issued a request for Letters of Interest in December and received responses from interested firms in January.

Discussion

D. Crowley asked whether the *Red Line- Blue Line Connector Design* project has been eliminated as a requirement from the SIP. Paul Regan, MBTA Advisory Board, noted that the construction of the project was originally included in the SIP, but that there is no longer money available for construction. C. Bench noted that MassDOT is proposing that the Department of Environmental Protection remove the current requirement – to only design the project – from the SIP.

D. Crowley asked whether the MPO might be asked to program TIP target funds for cost overruns that might be incurred from the *Fairmount Line Improvement* project. C. Bench replied that MassDOT has no plans to ask the MPO to pay for any potential overruns.

Further questions may be directed to C. Bench or C. Cenizal.

11. Members Items

David Anderson, MassDOT, alerted members that MassDOT will be requesting that the MPO program additional funds for the *Belmont/Watertown – Trapelo Road* project, which was programmed in the FFY 2012 TIP. The initial advertisement for this project

attracted only two contractors who bid substantially higher than expected due to the complications of the project, including those associated with working around bus catenary wires along the roadway. MassDOT rejected the two bids and plans to re-advertise the project at a higher cost, which would cover the cost for MassDOT to remove of the catenary wires while construction is underway.

Members raised a number of questions about this project.

Laura Wiener, At-Large Town of Arlington, asked if FFY 2012 funds could still be used for the project. D. Anderson replied that the original funds for the project are still available, but that the MPO would have to approve the additional costs.

T. Bent asked about the new cost estimate for the project. D. Anderson explained that the new advertisement would be approximately \$2 million higher than the original advertisement.

P. Regan inquired as to who bears the cost dismantling the catenary wires. D. Anderson replied that the MBTA has developed a cost estimate for the materials necessary to perform the work. MassDOT is working with the Federal Highway Administration on this issue. The funding would be the typical 80/20 split for federal to state funds.

S. Olanoff asked whether the cost of removing the catenary wires would be more or less expensive than working around them. D. Anderson replied that removal would be less expensive. MassDOT expects bids come in lower for the next advertisement and for there to be more competition for the job.

S. Olanoff asked if new wires would replace the existing ones when the catenary is reinstalled. D. Anderson confirmed that new wires would be installed and noted that some of the poles would be moved for pedestrian accommodation.

P. Regan suggested that the MBTA begin a public process regarding the replacement of electric buses with diesel during the course of the project to avoid delays in the project.

As requested by D. Crowley, the MassDOT representatives offered to provide more information on the cost impact of the catenary work to members at an upcoming meeting.

C. Stickney asked if MassDOT's utilities incentive policy is beginning in calendar year 2013 and whether utility costs must be considered in the new advertisements. D. Anderson replied yes and noted that all projects on the FFY 2013 TIP have costs

programmed to cover 50% of the utilities replacement cost for roadway and bridge projects. (Previously, bridge projects were 100% reimbursed and roadways were not reimbursed.)

S. Olanoff noted that the project should be completed as quickly as possible given the air quality benefits that will result from it. He asked if the removal of the catenary would enable the project schedule to be shortened. D. Anderson replied yes and C. Bench added that it is also in MassDOT's interest to complete the project as soon as possible given that the agency will have to incur the costs of operating diesel buses on an electric bus route while the project is underway.

Turning to other topics, P. Wolfe announced that the next MPO meeting, on March 7, will be held in the Braintree Town Hall. She thanked C. Stickney for helping to organize the meeting.

Members also heard comments from the public. W. Zamore announced that MassDOT Secretary Richard Davey will be addressing the MOVE Mass Conference on February 22.

12. Adjourn

A motion to adjourn was made by the Inner Core Committee (City of Somerville) (T. Bent) and seconded by the South West Advisory Planning Committee (Town of Medway) (D. Crowley). The motion carried.

Attendance

Members

Representatives and Alternates

At-Large Town (Town of Arlington)	Laura Wiener
At-Large Town (Town of Lexington)	Richard Canale
City of Boston (Boston Transportation Department)	Jim Gillooly
	Tom Kadzis
Inner Core Committee (City of Somerville)	Tom Bent
Massachusetts Department of Transportation	Clinton Bench
	David Anderson
MassDOT Highway Division	John Romano
Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority (MBTA)	Joe Cosgrove
Massachusetts Port Authority	Lourenço Dantas
MBTA Advisory Board	Paul Regan
Metropolitan Area Planning Council	Eric Bourassa
MetroWest Regional Collaborative (Town of Framingham)	Dennis Giombetti
Minuteman Advisory Group on Interlocal Coordination (Town of Bedford)	Richard Reed
North Shore Task Force (City of Beverly)	Tina Cassidy
Regional Transportation Advisory Council	Steve Olanoff
South Shore Coalition (Town of Braintree)	Christine Stickney
South West Advisory Planning Committee (Town of Medway)	Dennis Crowley
Three Rivers Interlocal Council (Town of Norwood/NVCC)	Tom O'Rourke

Other Attendees	Affiliation
Sarah Bradbury	MassDOT District 3
Callida Cenizal	MassDOT
Emily Torres-Cullinane	Metropolitan Area Planning Council
Meaghan Hamill	Office of Senator Thomas McGee
Rafael Mares	Conservation Law Foundation
Cecilia Paredes	Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Tim Reardon	Metropolitan Area Planning Council
Wig Zamore	Somerville Transportation Equity Partnership and Mystic View Task Force

MPO Staff/Central Transportation Planning Staff

Karl Quackenbush, Executive Director

Daniel Amstutz

David Fargen

Maureen Kelly

Ben Krepp

Robin Mannion

Anne McGahan

Elizabeth Moore

Kim Noonan

Kate Parker O'Toole

Scott Peterson

Sean Pfalzer

Mark Scannell

Michelle Scott

Pam Wolfe
