

# Memorandum for the Record

## Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization Meeting

### May 1, 2014 Meeting

10:20 AM – 12:40 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 (MPO) agreed to the following:

- The MPO will set aside its own requirement to review its Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) each year. Any member can, however, ask for the MPO to review the MOU

### Meeting Agenda

#### 1. Public Comments

Members of the public made comments on the following projects:

##### ***Bruce Freeman Rail Trail Project***

Tom Michelman, Friends of the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail, gave an update on the *Bruce Freeman Rail Trail* project. The 100% designs for Phase 2A have been submitted to MassDOT. Outstanding work on this phase includes environmental permitting and preparing bid documents. The 75% design plans are proceeding for Phase 2C as is an agreement with the MBTA for a railroad crossing. Phase 2B includes a bridge over Route 2. Consultants are engaged for the bridge design. T. Michelman asked the MPO to continue to include these projects in the federal fiscal years (FFYs) 2015-18 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).

##### ***Lexington - Reconstruction on Massachusetts Avenue, from Marrett Road to Pleasant Street Project***

State Senator Kenneth Donnelly advocated for the *Massachusetts Avenue* project noting that the project would address a traffic problem that has regional impacts. He also remarked that the project area is part of the historic Battle Road and that the project would improve safety for bicyclists and pedestrians. The senator thanked

MassDOT and Secretary Richard Davey for leadership that has ensured that funds are available for transportation projects.

Richard Canale, speaking on behalf of the Town of Lexington, asked that the MPO fund the project through the TIP if additional funds become available. He noted that the project ranks second on the MPO's First Tier List of projects for consideration for the TIP, following the *Boston – Reconstruction of Causeway Street* project, which may have an alternative funding source. He further discussed that the Town of Lexington has followed up on recommendations from two Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) studies of the project area. The project is the top priority of the Board of Selectmen for the Town of Lexington. (A letter from the selectmen was distributed to members.)

John Livsky, Town Engineer for Lexington, provided information about the project and its status. The project area is a three-quarters mile section Massachusetts Avenue and its intersections with Marrett Road, Maple Street, and Pleasant Street. Average daily traffic counts are about 15,000 vehicles for Massachusetts Avenue, 8,000 for Marrett Road, and between 12,000 and 13,000 for Maple and Pleasant Streets. Massachusetts Avenue is a major east-west roadway incorporating parts of Routes 2A, 4, and 225. The area includes residential and commercial properties and is a critical node connecting commercial areas in Lexington, Waltham, and Arlington. There are six schools and a museum within a mile of the area. There are also transit operations on the roadway including the Lexpress bus and MBTA buses. The roadway experiences a crash rate higher than the state average. The roadway operates at a level of service of F.

There is significant bicycle and pedestrian activity on the roadway, which is currently unsafe for these activities. The project will adhere to Complete Streets principles to improve these conditions. Bicycle lanes will be added to the entire length of the project, and there will be protected pedestrian crossings at signalized intersections and improved sidewalks. Additionally, there will be improvement to bus stops. Meetings have been held with the public and with abutters, and the project has the support of the public. The proponents have submitted the 25% design plans to MassDOT Highway Division and are awaiting comments from District 4. A public hearing will be held after comments are incorporated. Little right-of-way is needed for the project; some temporary easements will be required. The current cost estimate is about \$5.5 million including a 10% contingency. A vote at Lexington's Town Meeting was unanimous in support of bringing the project to 100% design.

Anthony Sacco, Office of State Representative Jay Kaufman, expressed Representative Kaufman's support for the project and discussed its benefits. The project is expected to reduce congestion and improve traffic flow by signalizing the intersections and adding

turn lanes and areas for buses to pull out of traffic. The Lexpress transit service would also benefit from reduced congestion. The project is expected to improve safety for bicyclists and pedestrians by adding bicycle lanes and improving sidewalks. He noted that there have been 88 crashes in the project area over a five-year period, one of which resulted in a pedestrian fatality, and that the project will help prevent crashes from happening in the future.

***Weston - Intersection and Signal Improvements at Route 30 (South Avenue) and Wellesley Street Project***

Tom Cullen, Town of Weston, provided an update on the *Route 30* project. The project is at the 100% design stage. The current cost estimate is \$1.62 million. The project was first initiated in 1996. All necessary permits have been acquired. The intersection processes about 30,000 vehicles per day. It is currently operating at a level of service of F; the project is expected to improve the level of service to C. The project will have a regional benefit. The proponents are working with MassDOT to secure right-of-way, most of which is owned by the Town of Weston. There is an earmark for the project in the state transportation bill. (A description of the project was distributed to members.)

***Holbrook - Intersection Improvements and Related Work at Weymouth, Pine, and Sycamore Streets Project and Reconstruction of Union Street (Route 139)***

Bill Fallon, Town of Holbrook, advocated for two projects in Holbrook that the town would like to have moved to an earlier element on the TIP.

The *Weymouth, Pine, and Sycamore Streets* project is the town's top priority for improvement because it has been the site of multiple accidents, one which was nearly fatal. The project is at the 25% design stage. The town has used its Chapter 90 funds for the design. The project cost estimate is \$1.2 million.

The *Union Street* project is also at the 25% design stage and the town has used Chapter 90 funds for the design. The project has a cost estimate of \$1.9 million. An earmark would cover approximately \$1.5 million of the project.

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

C. Bench reported that the state legislature has passed a transportation bond bill and the Governor has signed it. He also reported that the Project Selection Advisory Council held its fifth meeting this week. The Council formed as an outcome of state legislation to refine the criteria used to prioritize transportation projects. The Council is developing a draft set of performance measures and project selection criteria, which will be available for public review. The first public hearing is tentatively scheduled for May 20 in Pittsfield. Lastly, he announced that the Lynn ferry will be beginning service on May 19.

Tom Bent, Inner Core Committee (City of Somerville), reported that the Governor has announced that the *Community Path* will be constructed along with the *Green Line Extension* project. He expressed the City of Somerville's thanks to MassDOT Secretary Richard Davey, David Mohler, and the staff of MassDOT and the MBTA. Approximately 100 people turned out for the Governor's announcement.

### **3. Committee Chairs' Reports**

Pam Wolfe, Manager of Certification Activities of the MPO staff, reported that the Congestion Management Process (CMP) Committee will meet this afternoon.

Sree Allam, MassDOT, reported that the UPWP Committee met this morning to discuss the staff recommendation for the FFY 2015 UPWP. The Section 5303 funding for projects in the new UPWP has not yet been allocated. The Committee also discussed its role in reviewing MPO work programs. (This issue was discussed further in Agenda Item #8.)

### **4. Regional Transportation Advisory Council Report—*David Montgomery, Chair, Regional Transportation Advisory Council***

D. Montgomery reported that the Advisory Council will meet next on May 14. The agenda will focus on a discussion of the TIP and UPWP. The Advisory Council's TIP/UPWP Committee will be meeting today at 2:00 PM. Its Long-Range Transportation Plan Committee will meet prior to May 14. The Council will soon be reviewing the MPO's draft Public Participation Plan.

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

There was none.

### **6. FFYs 2015-18 Transportation Improvement Program—*Sean Pfalzer, MPO Staff***

C. Bench introduced today's discussion by giving an overview of the TIP. The TIP is a fiscally constrained document that programs capital projects in the region that will receive federal surface transportation funds, as well as projects that are regionally significant (regardless of their funding source). The FFYs 2015-18 TIP is under development now; it will become active in October 2014.

Today, the MPO continued the discussion about the Regional Target portion of the TIP, and began discussing the other components of the TIP: the Bridge Program; Statewide Infrastructure Items; earmarks; debt payments; State Implementation Plan (SIP)

commitments; the MBTA Capital Program; and the Regional Transit Authority (RTA) Programs.

Members were presented with working tables showing the staff recommendation for the TIP. S. Pfalzer began the discussion with a presentation on the highway portion of the TIP and discussed changes made to the various elements since members last reviewed the staff recommendation.

### ***Available Funding***

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) will provide approximately \$600 million per year in federal funds to the Commonwealth for transportation projects. Of that amount, about \$77 million will be applied as repayments for MassDOT's Accelerated Bridge Program. The remaining \$523 million of federal dollars would be matched by \$120 million of state funds.

These funds will be applied to the following funding categories within the Highway Program: Bridge Program, Statewide Items, Major Infrastructure, and Regional Targets. MPOs have discretion to program the portion of funds designated for the Regional Targets category. The Regional Target funding available to the Boston Region MPO over the four years of the TIP is \$68 million in FFY 2015 and \$75 million each in FFYs 2016 through 2018. The Boston Region MPO's target funds represent 10% of the funding in the state's Highway Program for FFYs 2015-18, which totals \$2.88 billion.

### ***Regional Target Program - Highways***

Since the members last reviewed that staff recommendation for the Regional Target Program, the following changes were made to the tables:

The start of the *Weymouth and Abington – Reconstruction and Widening on Route 18* project was moved from the FFY 2015 element to the FFY 2016 element and cash flows were adjusted over the three-year timespan of the project.

This change allowed for the *Bedford, Billerica, and Burlington – Middlesex Turnpike Improvements, Phase 3* project to be programmed in FFY 2016. The project is programmed at a cost of \$22.7 million (including \$1 million from the Northern Middlesex Council of Governments). A new cost estimate is expected.

Cash flows were adjusted for the *Needham and Wellesley – Route 128 Add-a-Lane* project.

The amount programmed for the *Green Line Extension to Route 16* project in FFY 2018 was reduced by \$4.2 million. This change was approved by the MBTA with the

understanding that the change does not represent a reduction in the overall project cost estimate and that the funding needs of the project will become more definitive as the project design advances. Additional funding for this project will need to be included in future TIPs.

With these changes, the TIP is within fiscal constraint. However, if the cost estimate for the *Middlesex Turnpike* project increases, this programming structure might push the TIP out of fiscal constraint.

### ***Discussion***

Tom O'Rourke, Three Rivers Interlocal Council (Town of Norwood), asked when the new cost estimate for the *Middlesex Turnpike* project will be available. David Anderson, MassDOT, replied that the project designer has submitted a new figure of \$28.169 million and that MassDOT will be reviewing the figures.

### ***Bridge Program***

The Bridge Program has had an increase in funding.

The costs of several bridge projects have been adjusted:

- *Lexington – Route 2 over Route 128*
- *Boston – Massachusetts Avenue over Commonwealth Avenue*
- *Cohasset – Atlantic Avenue over Little Harbor Inlet*
- *Boston – North Washington Street over the Charles River*
- *Lynn and Saugus – Route 107 over the Saugus River*

Several projects were moved to a later TIP element:

- *Hopkinton and Westborough – Fruit Street over CSX and Sudbury River*
- *Quincy – Robertson Street over Interstate 93/Route 1/Route 3*
- *Marshfield – Beach Street over the Cut River*
- *Waltham – Woerd Avenue over the Charles River*

The *Topsfield and Rowley – Bridge Road over the Ipswich River* project was removed from the TIP because MassDOT Highway already made the improvements.

Several projects were added to the TIP:

- *Braintree – Route 3 over Ramp C (Quincy Adams)*
- *Hanover and Norwell – Route 3 over Route 123*
- *Danvers – Route 128 over Waters River*
- *Newton, Wellesley, and Weston – Bridge Maintenance on Interstate 95/Route 128*

### **Statewide Items**

The Statewide Items Program also has had an increase in funding.

The costs of the following interstate maintenance projects have been adjusted:

- *Foxborough, Plainville, and Wrentham – Interstate Maintenance and Related Work on Interstate 495*
- *Randolph, Quincy, and Braintree – Resurfacing and Related Work on Interstate 93*

The *Franklin – Interstate Maintenance and Related Work on Interstate 495* project has been moved to a later TIP element to address the fiscal constraint issue.

Costs were adjusted for two pavement preservation projects:

- *Chelsea and Revere – Resurfacing and Related Work on Route 1*
- *Lynnfield and Peabody – Resurfacing and Related Work on Route 1*

Several resurfacing projects were added:

- *Beverly – Resurfacing and Related Work on Route 128*
- *Saugus – Resurfacing and Related Work on Route 1*
- *Marshfield and Plymouth – Resurfacing and Related Work on Route 3*
- *Marshfield – Resurfacing and Related Work on Route 3*

Several highway lighting projects were added:

- *Lexington and Woburn – District 4 – Highway Lighting Branch Circuit Re-cabling from 6 Lighting Load Centers along Interstate 95*
- *Medford, Stoneham, Woburn, and Reading – Highway Lighting Rehabilitation on Interstate 93 (Phase 2)*
- *Boston – District 6 – Highway Lighting System Replacement on Interstate 93*
- *Arlington and Belmont – Highway Lighting Repair and Maintenance on Route 2*

### **Earmarks**

An earmark for the *Weymouth and Abington – Reconstruction and Widening on Route 18* project was reprogrammed to correspond with the proposed new funding schedule of the project. The earmark is now programmed in the FFYs 2016 and 2017 elements.

### **Discussion**

D. Anderson inquired about the earmark for the *Holbrook – Reconstruction of Union Street (Route 139)* project. S. Pfalzer noted that the project cost exceeds the earmark

amount. Either target funding could be used to fund the remainder or the project could be re-scoped to conform to the earmark amount.

***Grant Anticipation Notes (GANs) Payments and State Implementation Plan (SIP) Commitments***

Adjustments have been made to the GANs payment amounts for the Accelerated Bridge Program. These amounts are lower because the Commonwealth did not borrow as much GANs as anticipated.

The cash flows for the *Green Line Extension to College Avenue* project have been changed to reflect the programming in the MBTA's Capital Investment Program (CIP). This assumes state funding for the project (in FFYs 2013 and 2014) and \$100 million a year in federal New Starts funding (starting in FFY 2015).

The programming changes for the *Fairmount Line Improvement* project reflect the delays in the construction of the Blue Hill Avenue Station.

Funding for the *Red Line – Blue Line Connector (Design)* project has been moved forward to FFYs 2015, 2016, and 2017. MassDOT requested permission to remove the project from the SIP in 2011. The Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection approved the request in 2013, but the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has not issued its decision.

***MBTA Capital Investment Program***

Victor Rivas, Director of Capital Budget for the MBTA, gave a presentation on the MBTA's FYs 2015-19 Capital Investment Program (CIP). The CIP is a rolling five-year plan that implements projects in the MBTA's Program for Mass Transportation (PMT), a 25-year vision plan. The CIP is a fiscally-constrained document that is focused on state-of-good-repair projects that address the MBTA's revenue vehicles, stations, tracks, bridges, tunnels, maintenance shops, and other infrastructure. The PMT is not fiscally constrained.

The source of funds programmed in the CIP are from federal grants, non-federal aid (MBTA revenue bonds, pay-as-you-go, and state funds), and alternative financing (such as GANs). Approximately \$6.2 billion is programmed in the FYs 2015-19 CIP. About half of those funds are reflected in the programming of MassDOT's FYs 2014-18 CIP, which programs more than \$12 billion for the MassDOT divisions and programs.

The breakdown by funding source in the MBTA's FY 2015-19 CIP is as follows:

- State funding: \$3.1 billion (50.1%)



- Federal Transit Administration (FTA) funding: \$2.38 billion (38.5%)
- MBTA revenue bonds: \$648.5 million (10.5%)
- Homeland Security funding: \$50.9 million (0.8%)
- Capital Maintenance Fund: \$6.4 million (0.1%)

State funds have become a critical component of the CIP in recent years. Funds from the state's transportation finance legislation make up half of the CIP funding program. This portion includes approximately \$600 million in funding for the *Green Line Extension* project.

The FTA formula funding program is crucial to the MBTA's operations. These funds are programmed through the MPO's TIP. The FTA provides 80% of the funds and the MBTA must match 20%. The MBTA uses revenue bonds to match federal funds. The MBTA has been working in recent CIP cycles to reduce its reliance on revenue bonds because it cannot afford to keep borrowing at the same rate.

Current federal funding is not sufficient to address the MBTA's backlog of state-of-good-repair projects, which is estimated to cost between \$3 billion and \$4 billion. Through the federal surface legislation, Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century (MAP-21), the MBTA received \$323 million in FY 2013 and \$328 million in FY 2014. The MBTA would need to spend twice as much as MAP-21 has provided each year over the next five years to address the backlog.

Charts were shown depicting the MBTA's investments by transit mode and by infrastructure category. This information is also detailed in the CIP.

### ***TIP Transit Program***

S. Pfalzer followed by discussing the MBTA capital program in the TIP. The majority of funding is programmed for state-of-good-repair projects.

Funding has been added for the following projects:

- *Red/Orange Lines – New Vehicle Procurement* in FFY 2018
- *Bridge and Tunnel Program* in FFY 2018
- *Green Line Signal Upgrades* in FFY 2014
- *System Upgrades* in FFY 2018
- *Preventative Maintenance* in FFY 2018

Funding for the *Red/Orange Lines – New Vehicle Procurement* project has been removed from the FFY 2014 element because state funding will be used. That \$30 million will be applied to the *Green Line Signal Upgrades* project in FFY 2014.

### ***Regional Transit Authority Programs***

Members then heard presentations from representatives of the other two regional transit authorities (RTAs) in the region, the MetroWest RTA (MWRTA) and the Cape Ann Transportation Authority (CATA).

Lynn Ahlgren, MWRTA, gave an overview of the MWRTA's FY 2015-18 Capital Program. The MWRTA was formed in FY 2006 and began operations in FY 2007. It offers five commuter services and ten fix-route services. Since last year, the MWRTA has added the Town of Hudson to its service area and increased its hours of operation. Ridership has increased 72% since 2008 and is expected to reach 600,000 customers in FY 2014.

The MWRTA receives federal, state, and local funding. Funds programmed in the FYs 2015-18 Capital Program are based on expected Section 5307 federal funding levels. Of the \$156 million expected for RTA's in the Boston Urbanized Area (UZA), the MWRTA would receive \$1.7 million based on a negotiated split with the other RTAs in the UZA. It would spend \$1.3 million of that amount on its paratransit expenses and more than \$300,000 on capital projects. These federal funds are matched with 20% local funds received through the state's RTA Capital Assistance Program. The MWRTA also receives toll credits.

Items that RTAs request funding for include vehicles (replacement and expansion), paratransit operations, preventative maintenance, shop and communications equipment, intelligent transportation systems, safety and security, and enhancements.

The MWRTA acquires its vehicles through MassDOT and those costs are reflected on the State TIP.

Going forward the MWTRA will be working to hold its paratransit operation costs to \$1 million a year over next four years. This will be achieved with the help of about \$300,000 a year in state funding. The MWRTA will also be conducting travel training programs to help paratransit customers switch to fixed-route service (a program funded by a federal New Freedom grant). Also, the MWRTA will become a brokerage in the statewide human service transportation business which will allow it to accept Medicaid paid trips.

Another factor that will drive down the paratransit costs is the MWRTA's new Blandin Avenue facility, which the MWRTA has been able to purchase with a \$7.2 million grant. The MWRTA will invest \$1.87 million in the facility between FY 2015 and FY 2018. The MWRTA has also received a \$1 million grant from the Veterans' Transportation Community Living Initiative to develop a Mobility Management Center.

The MWRTA is investing approximately \$100,000 a year from FY 2015 to FY 2017 in the shop equipment, communication systems, safety and security, and enhancements categories. These costs will be offset by grants received through the federal Job Access and Reverse Commute Program and the New Freedom Program.

Paul Talbot, CATA, then gave an overview of CATA's Capital Program. CATA serves towns on the North Shore and has been in existence since 1974. CATA's primary capital need is to replace buses that have exceeded their useful life after 12 years.

CATA expects to receive approximately \$600,000 in Section 5307 funds for each year of this TIP cycle. Approximately \$200,000 will be allocated each year for preventative maintenance. The remainder will be used to purchase 30-foot buses.

CATA purchased a bus storage and maintenance facility in 2001. There is no need for investment in the facility during this funding cycle.

### ***Discussion***

E. Bourassa asked if, for the purposes of modeling and air quality analyses, roadway changes related to potential casino projects on the North Shore would have to be included in the TIP. Anne McGahan, MPO staff, replied that capacity adding changes would have to be included because the cities of Boston and Everett are considered by the EPA as a maintenance area for carbon monoxide.

Tom Kadzis, City of Boston, posed a potential solution to accommodate the increased cost of the *Middlesex Turnpike* project. He suggested that consideration be given to whether costs for items in the FFY 2016 element of the TIP, such as vehicle acquisition for the *Green Line Extension to Route 16* project, could be moved to a later TIP element so that the increased cost of the *Middlesex Turnpike* project could be incorporated.

Richard Reed, Minuteman Advisory Group on Interlocal Coordination (Town of Bedford), asked for more information about the highway lighting projects on the Statewide Items list. D. Anderson noted that MassDOT is not proposing to add lighting where lighting does not already exist.

C. Bench then discussed a new approach to funding van pools, which is described in FTA's Capital Cost of Contracting rules. This approach allows the use of federal transit Section 5307 funds to subsidize the capital costs of van pool programs. In the Commonwealth, this program is overseen by MassRIDES. Over the next two years, MassDOT will be asking MPOs for approval to add these new recipients to the Section 5307 funding list of TIPs. When funding from this program becomes available it will be distributed via a new funding split agreement by the RTAs. In the meantime, MassDOT

will be tracking van pool ridership to report to FTA. In addition, MassDOT will be reporting passenger miles and boardings for commuter and long-distance buses. C. Bench also remarked on recent investments in MassDOT's BusPlus Program.

## **7. MPO Organizational Matters—Karl Quackenbush, Executive Director, Central Transportation Planning Staff**

Members discussed two matters: technical presentations that are given to the MPO and the MPO's Memorandum of Understanding (MOU).

### ***Technical Presentations***

Members of the UPWP Committee discussed their recommendation to the MPO regarding the issue of presentations on technical matters.

E. Bourassa summarized the motion that was made by Dennis Giombetti, MetroWest Regional Collaborative (Town of Framingham) at the UPWP Committee meeting. The proposal was to move the discussion of work programs below action items on the MPO agendas in a section of the agenda called the Consent Agenda. The Executive Director would give a brief description of the work programs. Members could then make motions if they wished to change the work programs, but they would not have to vote to approve each work program.

The UPWP Committee was not unanimous in this vote. Members also had some disagreement as to whether this policy would apply to all work programs (MPO- and agency-funded) or only those that were originally included in the UPWP.

D. Giombetti noted that work programs in the UPWP have already been vetted by the MPO staff and that the MPO generally does not disapprove work programs that are included in the UPWP. He stated that the MPO should only take action on a work program if it is rejecting a concept.

D. Koses argued against this recommendation by stating that all MPO members should have an opportunity to hear presentations on all work programs, especially MPO-funded work programs, and have the opportunity to discuss them.

J. Romano raised the concern that work program discussions can take time away from other MPO agenda items. He noted that the MPO already approves the UPWP, which includes study descriptions, so that it is unnecessary to approve work programs a second time. He also suggested that the MPO could better use its committees for purposes of informing members about the details of work programs and for discussion. He recommended that staff continue to distribute work programs to members for their review.

T. Bent suggested that staff be sensitive when scheduling work program discussion items on the MPO meeting agendas when there are other more pressing items, such as certification documents, on the agenda. C. Bench noted that the Chair, Vice Chair, and MPO staff do take meeting length into consideration when preparing agendas.

T. Kadzis suggested that consideration be given to what members could be doing better in terms of preparing for MPO meetings so that, for example, they are not asking questions at meetings that are evident in the text of work programs. There is value, he said, in having the opportunity for members to ask questions about work programs. He suggested that work program items might be placed later on the agenda, however.

In response to a question, K. Quackenbush and Laura Wiener, At-Large Town of Arlington, explained that the UPWP Committee discussed having the MPO approve work programs by consent, not by voting.

D. Koses responded to the idea that MPO approval of work programs is redundant since studies are already approved in the UPWP by making the point that what the MPO approves in the UPWP are simply the study concepts. He advocated for the MPO preserving the opportunity to review and improve work programs, which include the study details.

#### ***Memorandum of Understanding***

The MPO periodically reviews its MOU. This item was discussed at the April 17 meeting. C. Bench asked if any members had additional comments. There were no further comments.

By unanimous consent the MPO agreed that the MOU does not need to be reviewed, as a rule, every year. Any member may request, however, to have the MPO review the MOU.

At this point, members heard a public comment from Robert McGaw, Belmont resident. He remarked upon the lack of discussion during the TIP agenda item about major upcoming projects such as the straightening of Interstate 90 in Boston and the impacts of casinos on the transportation system, and he noted that the presentations were focused mostly on state-of-good-repair projects. E. Bourassa responded that the MPO has approved a work program to study the impacts on the straightening of Interstate 90. He also noted that when the Gaming Commission chooses a site for the casino and the design begins, those plans will be incorporated into the air quality analysis for the TIP and the MPO will receive a presentation. He also pointed out that the TIP is addressing more than just the maintenance of the transportation system. The *Green Line Extension to Route 16* project, for instance, will be transformative.

## **8. Members' Items**

There were none.

## **9. Adjourn**

A motion to adjourn was made by the MassDOT Highway Division (J. Romano) and seconded by the MAPC (E. Bourassa). The motion carried.

## Attendance

<b>Members</b>	<b>Representatives and Alternates</b>
At-Large City (City of Everett)	Tony Sousa
At-Large City (City of Newton)	David Koses
At-Large Town (Town of Arlington)	Laura Wiener
At-Large Town (Town of Lexington)	Richard Canale
City of Boston (Boston Redevelopment Authority)	Lara Mérida
City of Boston (Boston Transportation Department)	Tom Kadzis
Inner Core Committee (City of Somerville)	Tom Bent
Massachusetts Department of Transportation	Clinton Bench
	David Anderson
MassDOT Highway Division	John Romano
MBTA	Ron Morgan
Metropolitan Area Planning Council	Eric Bourassa
MetroWest Regional Collaborative (Town of Framingham)	Dennis Giombetti
Minuteman Advisory Group on Interlocal Coordination (Town of Bedford)	Richard Reed
North Shore Task Force (City of Beverly)	Denise Deschamps
North Suburban Planning Council (City of Woburn)	Tina Cassidy
Regional Transportation Advisory Council	David Montgomery
South West Advisory Planning Committee (Town of Medway)	Tom Holder
Three Rivers Interlocal Council (Town of Norwood/NVCC)	Tom O'Rourke

<b>Other Attendees</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>
Lynn Ahlgren	MetroWest Regional Transit Authority
Sree Allam	MassDOT Office of Transportation Planning
Sarah Bradbury	MassDOT District 3
M. Christine Corr	Friends of the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail
Tom Cullen	Town of Weston
Kenneth Donnelly	State Senator
Bill Fallon	Town of Holbrook
Stephen Fogg	Town of Weston

Mike Gowing	Board of Selectmen
Kristen Guichard	Town of Acton
John Livsty	Town of Lexington
Owen MacDonald	Town of Weymouth
Rafael Mares	Conservation Law Foundation
Robert McGaw	Belmont resident
Tom Michelman	Friends of the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail
Steve Olanoff	Three Rivers Interlocal Council (Town of Norwood)
Joe Onorato	MassDOT Highway District 4
Hunter Richard	Massachusetts Office of International Trade and Investment
Victor Rivas	MBTA
William Phelan	Town of Holbrook
Anthony Sacco	Office of State Representative Jay Kaufman
Tim Snyder	Office of State Senator Patricia Jehlen
Roy Sorenson	Minuteman Advisory Group on Interlocal Coordination (Town of Bedford)
Paul Talbot	Cape Ann Transportation Authority

---

---

**MPO Staff/Central Transportation Planning Staff**

---

Karl Quackenbush, Executive Director  
Maureen Kelly  
Robin Mannion  
Anne McGahan  
Scott Peterson  
Sean Pfalzer  
Michelle Scott  
Pam Wolfe

---