

Draft Memorandum for the Record

Transportation Planning and Programming Committee of the Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO)

August 20, 2009 Meeting

9:00 AM – 12:30 PM, State Transportation Building, Conference Room 4, 10 Park Plaza,
Boston

David Mohler, Chair, representing James Aloisi, Executive Office of Transportation &
Public Works (EOT)

Decisions

The Transportation Planning and Programming Committee voted to take the following
action:

- approve for public review and comment the draft Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Amendment
- approve for public review and comment the draft Federal Fiscal Years (FFYs) 2010-2013 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)
- approve the minutes of the meeting of August 6

Meeting Agenda

1. Public Comments

Dick Williamson, Mass Community Path Alliance, requested that the RTP address the use of enhancement funding as urged by MAPC. He estimated that the rail trail and town common projects make up 2% of the RTP, which falls short of the required federal guideline of 10% for enhancement projects. He stated that members of the public at town hall meetings are disappointed with the status of the enhancement program.

John Businger, National Corridors Initiative and Advisory Council, expressed disappointment that the Committee did not include the North-South Rail Link in the RTP. He stated that numerous officials have expressed their support of the project, including

the Governor, Lt. Governor, MAPC, Secretary of Transportation, and numerous Senators. He noted that the project has several earmarks, including a \$4 million earmark from Senator Ted Kennedy. He believes this project meets the selection criteria and advocates that the Committee not leave it off the Illustrative List.

Edward Marsteiner, National Development, discussed the potential for ARRA funding for traffic improvements at Exit 42 in Wakefield and 43 in Lynnfield along I-95/Route 128. He stated that the project is federal aid eligible, through 25% design with MassHighway, and is on schedule to be advertised by February 2010. He believes this project would be a good candidate for stimulus funding and would benefit the Meadow Walk development in Lynnfield. The Meadow Walk will consist of apartment units, retail uses, and office uses and he estimates that it will generate 1200 permanent jobs.

In response to members' questions, E. Marsteiner provided the following information about the project:

The estimated cost, with 25% contingency, is \$6 million, but he anticipates that it will cost closer to \$5 million. National Development will fund traffic improvements, sidewalk enhancements, and sewer mitigation, but the mitigation will not be at the project's intersection.

Bill Gustus, City of Lynnfield, echoed E. Marsteiner's comments that the project is critical to the Town of Lynnfield. He stated that the Meadow Walk is a Smart Growth project and will generate construction jobs and permanent employment. The project consists of over 200 housing units, including 45 affordable housing units and 48 elderly housing units, in addition to preservation of 100 acres of conservation and recreation land. He believes that the economic downturn slowed down the project and that ARRA funding would provide a needed jumpstart.

Richard Stinson, Wakefield Town Parks, expressed support for the project and noted that it ties into the Salem Street project in Wakefield currently programmed in the 2010 Element of the 2010-2013 TIP.

Donald DiMartino, Town of Bellingham Department of Public Works, thanked the Committee for including Pulaski Boulevard on the 2010 Element of the TIP and updated members on the status of the project. Easements are recorded and the letter on the review of the Plans, Specifications and Estimates was received last week.

Wig Zamore, Somerville resident, expressed concern with the route map of the Urban Ring Phase 2 displayed in the Illustrative project list of the draft RTP. He stated that the route is not consistent with current plans and does not reflect the routing supported by the Urban Ring Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC).

David Knowlton, City of Salem, asked for continued support of the Bridge Street project on the current TIP year. The project has no environmental issues, but has experienced some increases in cost. He noted that the mayor would be in later to further discuss the project.

Remo Vito, Town of Norfolk, updated the Committee on the status of the Reconstruction of Route 115 project in Norfolk, Foxborough, and Wrentham. He noted that the municipalities have funded 15-20% of the project and that it has undergone value engineering, and it is 100% ready to go.

2. Chair's Report – *David Mohler, EOT*

D. Mohler circulated for members' signatures the MPO self certification statement for inclusion in the MPO certification documents.

3. Subcommittee Chairs' Reports

There were none.

4. Regional Transportation Advisory Council – *Kristina Johnson, Regional Transportation Advisory Council*

The Advisory Council will hold its annual elections and host Secretary Aloisi at its September meeting.

5. Director's Report – *Arnie Soolman, Director, Central Transportation Planning Staff (CTPS)*

A. Soolman informed members that there is a job opening on the CTPS website for a Transit Service Planner. He asked members to notify individuals who may be interested in the position.

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

A motion to approve the minutes of the meeting of August 6 was made by Steve Woelfel, MassHighway, and seconded by Paul Regan, MBTA Advisory Board. The motion passed unanimously. Bill Tuttle, MassPike abstained.

7. Amendment to the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) – *Anne McGahan, Regional Transportation Plan Manager, MPO Staff*

Members were provided with draft versions of the following chapters of the RTP Amendment (see attached):

- Chapter 3: Plan Development
- Chapter 10: Environment
- Chapter 11: Land Use and Economic Development
- Chapter 12: The Finance Plan
- Chapter 13: The Recommended Transportation Plan
- Chapter 14: Environmental Justice Assessment
- Chapter 15: Air Quality Conformity Determination
- Chapter 16: Illustrative Projects

Members decided to review and approve the Chapters in sequence. Chapters with minor or no changes made at this meeting were considered approved by consensus.

A. McGahan briefed members on updates to Chapter 3: Plan Development, which serves as an introduction to the plan and now explains why the amendment has been developed. Members discussed the text.

Were the main reasons for developing the amendment to include the housing and employment information, the State Implementation Plan (SIP) commitments, and develop guidance to create a financially constrained document? (Eric Bourassa, MAPC)

The amendment was developed to include the SIP commitments that were previously not approved by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), incorporate MetroFuture demographics, include illustrative projects, and update financial information based on federal guidance. (A. McGahan)

Was the guidance from the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Federal Transit Administration (FTA) given to ensure that more funding was dedicated to infrastructure and state of good repair? (E. Bourassa)

FHWA and FTA were concerned about the financial plan because they believed the current RTP made overly-optimistic assumptions about future funding and the RTP Amendment hopes to make more accurate assumptions. (D. Mohler)

A motion to add text on page 2 under “Revised Financial Assumptions” before the colon, that says, “as part of overall reassessment of the issue of fiscal constraint,” and approve the chapter, as revised was made by E. Bourassa, and seconded by M. Pratt. The motion passed unanimously.

A. McGahan briefed members on Chapter 10: Environment and notified members that the following five projects were added since the Committee received the last version of Chapter 10 several weeks ago in order to include bicycle projects and projects over \$10 million:

- Bellingham: Pulaski Boulevard
- Belmont: Trapelo Road
- Framingham to Acton: Bruce Freeman Rail Trail

- Hudson to Acton: Assabet River Rail Trail
- Danvers and Peabody: Route 128 at Routes 62 and 35

Members raised several issues:

In response to a question from Jim Gillooly, City of Boston, A. McGahan advised the Committee that the appropriate time to discuss bridge projects will be as part of the discussion of Chapter 13: The Recommended Transportation Plan.

Lourenço Dantas, Massport, noted that tables in Chapter 10 and Chapter 13 contain some projects, including Bridge St. (Salem), CONRAC (Boston), and S. Weymouth Naval Air Station Access Improvements (Weymouth), which do not impact MPO discretionary resources. He recommended adding a footnote to distinguish the projects that do not have an impact on MPO funds.

Answering a question from D. Mohler, A. McGahan said that our partner's Federal guidance required the MPO to include associated costs with projects in Chapter 10. D. Mohler then recommended that all text remain consistent. The Committee agreed to correlate Tables 10-1 and 13-1 with the notations for projects whose funding will not impact MPO discretionary resources as done in Table 13-3.

E. Bourassa briefed members on the textual changes to Chapter 11, which included the addition of several paragraphs regarding the adoption of MetroFuture. Members proposed no further changes.

A. McGahan briefed members on Chapter 12: The Finance Plan which includes financial information on the Statewide Road and Bridge Program, Central Artery/Tunnel project, and regional public transportation system.

Members discussed related issues:

Thomas Bent, City of Somerville, said that there were some questions and concerns in his community about the funding of the Green Line Extension. He noted that the New Starts application has not been filed yet, and the community is interested to know how EOT plans to finance the Green Line Extension from Lechmere Station to College Avenue. He would like to hear how EOT plans to fund the project if they do not receive the New Starts grant

D. Mohler explained that EOT expects to fund the project with a 50% contribution from FTA's New Starts program, as EOT views it to be a strong, competitive project for funding. If it is not approved, however, the Commonwealth will fund the project. This would require projects around the Commonwealth, potentially projects from this region, to be removed in order to make funds available and stay within the bond cap. EOT still hopes to receive New Starts funds so that no additional projects have to be removed. (D. Mohler)

Do you have a sense of when the New Starts application will be filed? (T. Bent)

EOT is involved in discussions with the city regarding the location of the required maintenance facility. These negotiations are delaying the final application. Hopefully an agreement will be reached soon. (D. Mohler)

The fare and revenue section on page 9 assumes a 19.5% fare increase, but the fare increase hearings are on hold pending a stem to stern review. Should these fare increase assumptions be included in the RTP despite the fact that fare increases are unlikely to be implemented in FFY 2010? How confident can we be going forward with these fare revenue projections? (Paul Regan, MBTA Advisory Board)

D. Mohler stated that the MPO can be confident with these fare revenue projections and that the revenue projections provided are based on the best projections currently available. Similar to fare revenue projections in the out years, if revenue falls below operating need, then revenue will be adjusted by either increasing fares or reducing service. The assumption is that people would rather choose to pay higher fares than to lose service.

The stem to stern review will hopefully demonstrate whether the fare revenue assumptions are accurate. Until the review is complete, we must rely on the financial assumptions given to us by the MBTA. (D. Mohler)

Has ARRA operating support for the MBTA, now allowed in federal law, been incorporated into the RTP? Has the Commonwealth or MPO made a decision whether ARRA funds will be used for operating support to the MBTA? If so, how much? (M. Draisen)

No. It is both the Commonwealth's and the MPO's decision. It is up to the implementing agency or the Commonwealth to apply for how to spend the money, but it must be approved by the MPO. (D. Mohler)

M. Draisen suggested adding another sentence to clarify how to deal with these uncertainties. He recommended that other resources for balancing revenue with need would include possible use of ARRA funds, potential savings from the stem to stern review, and/or fare increases.

M. Pratt expressed concern that the highway funds being flexed to transit in the out years of the Plan are not reflected in the current cost and suggested that the money removed from the Boston Region MPO's target for the Fitchburg Line should be reflected in the finances.

D. Mohler explained that the money for the Fitchburg Commuter Rail Line was already taken off the top when the targets were reduced and listing it would be double counting. He suggested that reference to the Fitchburg Line be made after the reference to the flexing of highway funds in the text.

Members discussed the cost comparison between highway and transit projects. D. Mohler explained that based on the assumptions that revenue increases by 3% annually and project costs increase by 4% annually, the proportional (to the total) cost of a project is higher the farther out it is programmed in the RTP. Unless the amount of each project is

programmed into bands, then no additional information can be gained over referring to current cost.

A motion to add the following text to Chapter 12 on page 9 at the end of the first paragraph in Fare Revenue, “Efforts to ensure attainment of the revenue projections included in the plan will likely include a combination of the following: savings or additional revenue identified by the stem to stern review, the allocation of ARRA funds for operating support of the MBTA; and/or fare increases, if needed.” was made by M. Draisen. The motion passed unanimously.

A motion to add text to page 4 about flexing funding to the Fitchburg Commuter Rail line – that says, “In addition to these projects, \$16.1 million of highway funds have been flexed to the Fitchburg Commuter Rail Line in FFYs 2010, 2011, and 2012” was made by M. Pratt. The motion passed unanimously.

A motion to change the column title of Table 12-3 on page 5 from "Total to be Expended" to “Total Cost” was made by Lidy Chan, MassPike. The motion passed unanimously.

Joe Cosgrove, MBTA, recommended adding a third listing to the New Starts Program on page 12 to include “Green Line Extension to College Avenue.”

Will EOT be applying for three New Start grants in the same time period? (P. Regan)

Yes, one is a Small Starts grant and it is secured and funded. Another application is exempt. (D. Mohler)

Is the Green Line Extension New Starts application for Route 16/Mystic Avenue or College Avenue? (E. Bourassa) I was under the assumption that the application was for the whole project out to Route 16/Mystic Avenue, with the extension beyond College Avenue taking place in another phase and that the MPO flexed highway funds to transit

to extend the project to Route 16/Mystic Avenue. Isn't the MPO asking for New Starts money for the remainder of the project? (M. Draisen)

The Committee voted to flex funds to the Green Line Extension because the EOT Finance Plan demonstrated that funds were not available to construct the Green Line Extension to Route 16/Mystic Avenue with the New Starts project. Funds are only available to construct the project to College Ave. EOT cannot demonstrate to the federal government that they have the ability to finance 50% of the costs to extend the Green Line from College Avenue to Route 16/Mystic Avenue because the Commonwealth does not have the match. (D. Mohler)

How will the MPO pay for the whole cost of the project if we do not have half the funds of the project? (M. Draisen)

The MPO flexed the highway funds to transit with the understanding that highway funds come with a 20% match. The state match was 20% because the state agrees to match all federal funds with a 20% match. The budget used in the Plan was build around this assumption. The commonwealth does not have a 50% match for the extension of the project to College Ave, but it would have the 20% match available for flexed highway funds since this is already built into the budget. The project is still in the environmental review process and in the event that revenue projections change and EOT has the ability to match funds at 50%, then they may try to get the whole project funded with New Starts funding. (D. Mohler)

What strategy would have allowed us to file the Green Line Extension project under one New Starts application? (M. Draisen)

There is not one. The Commonwealth was able to fulfill the state match of 20% for highway flexed funds, but was not able to fulfill the state match of 50% required for New Starts projects. (D. Mohler)

What happens if the Green Line Extension does not receive New Starts funds? (M. Pratt)

If the project does not receive New Starts funds, then the Commonwealth will have to fund the entire cost using commonwealth revenue. Since it is a SIP commitment, it would receive priority over other programs and projects across the Commonwealth. (D. Mohler)

I recall past MBTA projects that applied for New Starts funding at the same time as being presented as funded with formula funds. Why can't the MPO apply for New Starts for projects with this approach? (P. Regan)

New Starts applications require a 50% match and federal highway funds flexed to transit cannot be used as part of that match because we are unable to match federal funds with federal funds. (D. Mohler)

In order to fund the Green Line Extension from College Ave. to Route 16/Mystic Avenue the MPO will fund an 80% share with highway funds in order to fulfill the needed 30% of funds unavailable from state funds. I'm still for the project, but I am concerned that it is a financial hit to the Commonwealth's available funds. By not extending the Green Line to Route 16/Mystic Avenue and missing out on the additional ridership, will the New Starts application be less likely to receive funding? (M. Draisen)

The College Avenue to Route 16 portion of the Green Line Extension is expensive and although it would increase ridership on the line, it would not be significantly more cost effective. (S. Woelfel) Although the numbers are better, they are not significant enough to affect the outcome of the New Starts application. EOT has already made cuts to afford the 50% match for the application and there is no more money available. (D. Mohler)

Is the legal SIP commitment to College Avenue? (M. Pratt)

Yes, EOT is obligated to extend the Green Line to College Avenue. (D. Mohler)

A motion to add text on page 12, changing "two" to "three" and adding text listing as #3 the Green Line Extension to College Avenue and Union Square (50% of total cost) was made by Marc Draisen. The motion passed unanimously.

A. McGahan briefed members on Chapter 13: The Recommended Transportation Plan, which included the projects.

J. Gillooly requested that the Northern Avenue Bridge in Boston, a \$45 million project, be added to the list of bridge projects.

Does this bridge list come from the Commonwealth? (M. Draisen)

The bridge list includes bridges that are in the Accelerated Bridge Program, MassHighway Bridge Program, those to be constructed with Special Bridge funding, and those with MassHighway Project Review Committee (PRC) approval. (Special bridge money was allocated by Congress in the wake of the Minnesota bridge collapse to repair bridges nationwide and is only available in 2010.) (Hayes Morrison, MPO Staff)

D. Mohler added that this Bridge list includes all bridges in the MassHighway system over \$10 million.

What would be the reason for incorporating the Northern Avenue Bridge into this list? (M. Draisen)

The City of Boston would like to access federal High Priority Project (HPP) funds to advance design to help obtain PRC approval. The bridge has economic development benefits and can be utilized in emergency evacuation. The advancement of the project is currently delayed because FHWA will not allow earmark design funds to be accessed until construction funds are scheduled; the project cannot be programmed on the TIP until it has sufficient design status. He would like to put the bridge in the RTP Amendment so that no further delays remain when the project is ready to go. (J. Gillooly)

Does the inclusion of the Northern Avenue Bridge require other projects to be removed from the RTP due to fiscal constraint? Are there any other bridges, not currently listed, that might need to be included in the list? (M. Draisen)

The project is not entirely earmarked, but the Congressional Delegation has demonstrated consistent support for this project in the form of three or four earmarks. (J. Gillooly)

Michael Chong, FHWA, asked if staff could provide information on the bridge projects regarding how they would be funded and the timeline of construction to ensure that revenue is aligned. D. Mohler stated that, based on FHWA guidance, the Committee must band the bridge projects in the years they plan to fund them. He stated that a problem with the Northern Avenue Bridge project is that it is not PRC approved, and there is no assigned advertising date for projects without PRC approval.

D. Mohler stated that during the public comment period, the MPO expects to revise Table 13-4 and include a banded spreadsheet with costs and construction time frames. The federal agencies are likely to ask the MPO to identify the components of the DCR \$100 million bridge preservation item. This will help ensure that future revenue is matched with project selection.

M. Draisen suggested that the bridge projects that need to access federally earmarked money for design be added, with the understanding that some projects may be removed or adjusted in the next six weeks based on FHWA guidance and fiscal limitations.

D. Mohler also noted that the Northern Avenue Bridge is currently closed to vehicular traffic and constructing it to accommodate vehicular traffic would add capacity to the system. If so, the project would have to be modeled in order to comply with federal guidelines for air quality impacts. Addition of the bridge would require additional model runs by CTPS.

D. Mohler acknowledged that there is still a question of whether to include the bridge in the Accelerated Bridge Program (ABP). He stated that the construction of new bridges or bridges that renew service is typically not funded through the ABP or MassHighway's bridge program.

The Committee discussed the impacts to the schedule of including a project that would expand capacity and therefore would need to be modeled, whether it would have air

quality impacts or not. Members acknowledged that public comments may call for a change in the project list and additional modeling, anyway.

J. Gillooly explained that the plans regarding the modes allowed on the bridge still need to be finalized. It can be thought of as a non-capacity adding bicycle and pedestrian bridge.

D. Mohler said that the Committee would make adjustments if the function of the bridge changes.

A motion to add the Northern Avenue Bicycle and Pedestrian Bridge for \$45 million, to Table 13-4 was made by J. Gillooly. The motion passed unanimously.

What bridges are being funded with the \$100 million DCR Bridge Program? (D. Koses)
I believe the program consists of \$100 million of bridge maintenance over a five-year period. (D. Mohler)

J. Cosgrove stated that there are no transit bridges in the table and the table should clarify that it only contains highway bridges. D. Mohler added that there are no transit bridges because FTA does not require transit bridges to be included in the RTP. The Committee agreed to add "Highway" to the heading of Table 13-4.

A motion to revise Table 13-1 to reflect and explain non-MPO funding sources as shown in Table 13-3, showing and explaining which projects will have no impact on MPO discretionary funding was made by L. Dantas. The motion passed unanimously.

The Committee agreed to include a request by Jim Gallagher, MAPC, to revise Table 13-5 to add an asterisk that says, "These projects are funded with commonwealth revenue" to the appropriate projects on the list. For the Green Line, text would be added to say, "The Green Line assumes New Starts funding."

How did we recognize the Fitchburg project? (J. Cosgrove)

The Fitchburg project is listed in the Montachusett Regional MPO's plan. (A. McGahan)

The July 23 meeting minutes read that the Route 85 and Wonderland Parking Garage projects are candidates for ARRA funding, while both projects are also listed for funding in 2016-2020. If the projects were to receive ARRA funding, would that affect the model or make room for other projects to be funded in the 2016-2020 band? (Judy LaRocca, Town of Concord)

ARRA funding for those projects would not affect the model. The MPO would have to decide how to fill the funding gap in the 2016-2020 band if they received ARRA funding. (D. Mohler)

How were the updated costs of I-90/I-495 and I-495/Route 9 calculated? (M. Pratt)

These are costs from the Central Massachusetts Regional Transportation Plan. (A. McGahan)

Alicia Wilson, MPO staff, briefed members on Chapter 14: Environmental Justice Assessment and informed them that the 2030 Build model run demonstrated an improvement over the no-build, and that the RTP improved transportation access slightly more for EJ communities than for non-EJ communities.

A. McGahan briefed members on Chapter 15. She informed members that the RTP complied with air quality conformity and that a new table, Table 15-1, had been added to include all projects in Massachusetts. M. Chong noted that all the projects on the list are in financially constrained plans.

M. Draisen requested that the phrase "MetroFuture Method" be replaced with "MetroFuture Scenario" in two places on page 4. The Committee agreed by consensus.

The Committee opened the discussion of the draft Chapter 16: Illustrative Projects.

M. Chong noted that FHWA would not be able to sign environmental documentation for the following projects on the illustrative list:

- Route 3 South Add-a-lane (Weymouth to Duxbury)
- Route 128/Brimbal Avenue (Beverly)
- Concord Rotary/Route 2 (Concord)
- I-495/I-290/Route 85 Connector (Marlborough and Hudson)

FHWA cannot sign environmental documentation for projects that are on the illustrative list? It was my understanding that FHWA would allow illustrative projects to go through the environmental process, but would not be able to start design. (D. Mohler)

Yes, the illustrative projects are not considered priority projects. The project can prepare the environmental documentation, but FHWA will not be able to sign. (M. Chong)

Will FHWA sign a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI)? (D. Mohler)

No, FHWA will not sign a FONSI. If the MPO does not support a project in the financially constrained section, then FHWA cannot sign off; it is against federal environmental regulations. (M. Chong)

S. Woelfel introduced proposed text to be included in the chapter. Massport provided its version with several changes shown in redlines. (See attached handouts.) Members discussed the text and expressed the following concerns:

- It is not appropriate at this time to give priority to projects within the list of illustrative projects or to identify the Northern Tier as the preferred alternative for Urban Ring Phase 2.
- Identifying the Blue Line Extension as the highest priority implies that expansion is more important than the state of good repair.
- Emphasizing transit expansion over state of good repair could send the wrong message to the public.

D. Mohler and S. Woelfel emphasized that EOT is promoting transit access, and these priorities are a preview of the future MassDOT priorities.

A motion to add the EOT text to Chapter 16-3 was made by S. Woelfel. The motion failed. (MassPike, EOT, and MassHighway voted aye. Advisory Council, Bedford, Boston, Braintree, Framingham, Hopkinton, MAPC, Massport, MBTA, MBTA Advisory Board, Newton, Somerville, voted no.)

A motion to add a bullet at the bottom of the project selection criteria that says, “Maximize the use of transit, bicycle, and walking in both urban and suburban settings” was made by M. Draisen, and seconded by J. Cosgrove. The motion was revised by M. Draisen to incorporate a revision suggested by K. Johnson adding a highway reference and so to read, “Maximize the implementation of multi-modal transportation approaches in both urban and rural settings, including roadway, transit, bicycling, and pedestrian.” The motion passed. (EOT, Hopkinton, MassHighway, MassPike, MBTA, and Newton voted no. Advisory Council, Bedford, Boston, Braintree, Framingham, MAPC, Massport, MBTA Advisory Board, Somerville, voted aye.)

A motion was made by Rick Reed, Town of Bedford to take this list of policies used in the project selection criteria out of Chapter 16 and compare it with the list of policies in Chapter 4 and if needed, add the new bullet text just approved by the Committee to Chapter 4; and to add to Chapter 16 the following text: “Projects for the Illustrative Project List were selected consistent with the policies outlined in Chapter 4.” The motion passed unanimously.

A motion to revise text by adding at the end of the third paragraph in the Transportation Needs and Financial Constraint section and directly after the sentence about DCR bridges and parkways, “In addition, The Massachusetts Turnpike Authority has been under-investing in maintenance and rehabilitation of its facilities. Since the reports were published, MassHighway has implemented the Accelerated Bridge Program to address some of this backlog, but this program is funded entirely via debt, and the servicing of this debt will cut into not only federal transportation funds in future years, but also state gas tax revenue” was made by M. Draisen. The motion passed. (EOT and MassHighway

voted no. Advisory Council, Bedford, Boston, Braintree, Framingham, MAPC, MBTA, MBTA Advisory Board, Newton, and Somerville voted aye. Hopkinton, Massport, and Somerville abstained. MassPike was out of the room.)

A motion to change the second sentence of the first paragraph of the section Role of Illustrative Projects to read, “to stay competitive with other geographic regions across the country and throughout the world, the greater Boston region...” followed by the existing text, “...must fund enhancements that increase the capacity of the existing system as well as expand it,” and to revise the third sentence of this paragraph to add the text, “These projects will foster quality of life improvements and economic prosperity by relieving...” was made by M. Draisen. The motion passed unanimously.

A motion to conform the map for Urban Ring Phase 2 to the project description was made by T. Bent, and seconded by K. Johnson. The motion passed unanimously. D. Mohler abstained.

A motion to release the draft RTP Amendment for public review was made by P. Regan, and seconded by M. Pratt. The motion passed unanimously.

8. FFY 2009 Element of the FFYs 2007-2010 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) – Hayes Morrison, TIP Manager, MPO Staff

Mayor Kimberley Driscoll, City of Salem, updated members on the current status of the Route 1A (Bridge Street) project in the City of Salem that is programmed in the 2009 Element of the FFY 2007-2010 TIP. She explained to the Committee that although the project has experienced cost increases, it is ready to go and will bring numerous benefits to the City of Salem.

D. Mohler notified members that the following three projects have experienced combined cost increases of approximately \$8 million:

- Route 1A (Bridge Street) - Salem

- Middlesex Turnpike, Phase Two - Bedford, Billerica, and Burlington
- Route 115 (Pond/Pine St.) – Foxborough, Norfolk, & Wrentham

D. Mohler added that these are the only three projects that have not yet been advertised in the 2009 TIP Element and the Committee will have to make a funding decision at the next meeting, September 3.

Trish Domigan of Vannesse, Hangen, Brustlin, briefed members on the status of the Middlesex Turnpike, Phase Two project and noted that the project had experienced \$2 million in cost increases mainly due to costs associated with flaggers and police.

M. Draisen expressed concern regarding the routine occurrence of project cost increases due to flaggers and police, which MassHighway has attempted to minimize.

Members discussed the potential to fund projects with ARRA money to maintain room on the TIP for all the projects currently programmed, but that are threatened due to cost increases. D. Mohler noted that the Governor will come forward with the list of projects that will receive ARRA funding.

D. Koses noted that the FFY 2010 TIP element would have to be amended to accommodate the FFY 2009 projects with cost increases that might be removed from the 2009 element and the added ARRA projects and any projects that might have to be added to the RTP if they exceed \$10 million.

Would the Middlesex Turnpike, Phase Two project still be able to access the \$4.3 million in Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) funds if it were not advertised in FFY 2009? (T. Domigan)

The Commonwealth would still be able to access the HSIP funds. (D. Mohler)

Ken Caputo, Town of Milford, briefed members on the status of the Route 115 project and noted the Town of Norfolk was diligent to the budget throughout the process. The

Town contributed \$600,000 to ensure certain features were implemented and the \$1 million in cost overruns is primarily attributed to the construction time frame adjustment from 12 to 24 months.

M. Draisen reiterated his concern about the overages from police and flaggers so late in the process. K. Caputo stated that the MassHighway Project Director added a contingency of 9% to the cost of the Route 115 project. The Bridge Street project experienced the same directive. M. Draisen suggested that it might be useful to seek clarity on these MassHighway directives, issued late in the process, for discussion at the next meeting.

Bob Mercier, Town of Burlington, noted that their cost increases consisted of \$1,000,000 for police and \$750,000 for flaggers. The construction duration was also extended from 24 to 36 months.

R. Reed noted that he would be unable to attend the September 3 meeting and that the Town of Bedford's Public Works Director would serve as his alternate. He stated that the Middlesex Turnpike, Phase Two is a tri-town, regional project, with a history of 25 years of cooperation among the municipalities and interested parties. Also, Bedford alone has spent approximately \$5.1 million for land acquisition, mitigation and other items. This project's cost increases were 15-16%, while the Salem project cost increases were close to 40%.

Mayor Driscoll stated that she hopes there is a way, whether through ARRA funds or TIP amendments, for all three projects to go through and be advertised because the projects are each municipality's number one priority. She stated that the city would attempt to reduce the cost of the project before the next meeting and hopes that the bids for the project will be lower than expected.

Has the Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) approved all the necessary documents for the Middlesex Turnpike project? (M. Pratt)

DEP is reviewing our comments to their variance. The review has no design changes and the final cost will not change. All other documents have been approved and right-of-way will have been secured by the end of the day. (T. Donagen)

D. Mohler said that a TIP amendment would probably have to be made at the next meeting.

9. FFYs 2010-2013 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) – Hayes Morrison, TIP Manager, MPO Staff

H. Morrison notified members of the following changes to the draft FFYs 2010-2013 TIP:

- Addition of the Taylor Street Bridge over I-495 (Littleton)
- Addition of Subway Vehicle Program to the FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 Elements
- Addition of the MBTA Section 5307 and 5309 funding shown in the FFY 2012 Element to the FFY 2013 Element
- Incorporation of the Bridges, Interstate Maintenance, and National Highway System Pavement Preservation funding categories

A motion to include a \$1 million earmark for design of the Northern Avenue Bicycle and Pedestrian Bridge into the 2010 TIP Element was made by J. Gillooly, and seconded by T. Bent. The motion passed unanimously. D. Mohler noted that municipalities are responsible for the match when they use earmarks for design.

Why was the Central Street Bridge project in Framingham removed from the TIP and how can I get it back on the TIP? (G. Esty)

The Fitchburg Line improvements reduced all the MPO's target funding and the federal bridge program, and some projects had to be removed. (H. Morrison)

Why was the Route 126 project in Framingham removed from the TIP? Could an earmark be used for construction? (G. Esty)

This project was initially to be funded with National Highway System Pavement Preservation funding, but now it is not. (H. Morrison)

A change in the use of the earmark would require congressional action. (D. Mohler)

Secretary Aloisi entered the room and answered several questions from members, then left the meeting room.

D. Mohler informed us that the list of ARRA projects would soon be available. Do you know when the list of those projects will be available? (E. Bourassa)

We should be closer to finalizing the list after today. I have given the list a preliminary review and I am conversing with the Governor's office. (Secretary Aloisi)

Will the ARRA projects be included in the 2009 or the 2010 TIP Element? (K. Johnson)

After the list is approved, EOT will ask the MPOs to incorporate the ARRA projects into the appropriate TIP elements. (D. Mohler)

W. Zamore expressed concern that the Green Line Extension funding was not included in the FFYs 2010-2013 TIP when part of the project must be constructed during those TIP years. He stated that although the TIP is not required to show financial constraint when no federal funds are used, it is good practice to inform citizens of the top priority projects that are programmed over the next few years. He also stated that according to federal conformity regulations, the TIP and RTP must show priority of SIP commitments, but the TIP does not reference the Green Line Extension or SIP transit commitments.

D. Mohler stated that this is an issue of changing practice. The past agreement with EPA and FTA allowed SIP commitment prioritization to be reflected through inclusion in the air quality model. Now, EPA and possibly, FTA, would like to see the cash flows of the SIP commitments in the appropriate years. The final TIP will contain the appropriate cash flows and it will show the assumed New Starts funding for the Green Line Extension.

Has the Woburn bridge project been removed for the same reason as the Framingham bridge? Have the project contacts been notified? (P. Regan) T. Bent noted the importance and timeliness of notifying project contacts of TIP changes and recommended a prompt MPO notification process. Yes, the Woburn project was also removed due to fiscal constraint. I am still in the process of notifying the project contacts about projects being removed from the TIP. (H. Morrison)

Why were the projects in the National Highway System Pavement Preservation funding category eliminated? (Jim Gallagher)

It is a statewide program and I believe that there has been a shift in priority with those funds to other projects. I will double check to see if the Route 2A project in Lexington is on the Accelerated Bridge Program list. (H. Morrison)

Are the National Highway System Pavement Preservation projects on state or municipal rights-of-way? (R. Reed)

The projects could be on municipal or state rights-of-way but must be designated as an NHS route. Some could be done with Chapter 90 monies. (D. Mohler)

Would it be possible to include a note about the SIP commitments in the TIP to minimize public comments about the issue? (W. Zamore)

Yes. (D. Mohler)

In response to a question about Route 114 Bridge project in Danvers and Middleton, D. Mohler reminded members that MassHighway provides the bridge list to the MPO.

Regarding the process for changing the earmark for the Framingham, Route 126 project, D. Mohler explained that the earmark must be changed before it can be programmed in the TIP.

A motion to release the draft FFYs 2010 – 2013 TIP for public review was made by L. Dantas, and seconded by J. Gillooly. The motion passed unanimously.

10. Members Items

T. Bent requested that a list of ARRA projects be distributed before the next meeting on September 3.

J. Cosgrove notified members that the MBTA is looking to add Ferry Boat Dock Repairs to the FFY 2009 Element of the FFYs 2007 – 2010 TIP during the upcoming TIP amendment process.

11. Adjourn

A motion to adjourn was made by the City of Boston, and seconded by the MBTA Advisory Board. The meeting adjourned at 12:30pm.

Transportation Planning and Programming Committee Meeting Attendance
Thursday, August 20, 2009, 9:00 AM

Member Agencies

EOT
City of Boston

City of Newton
City of Somerville
FHWA
MAPC

MassHighway
MassPike

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
Jim Gillooly
Thomas Kadzis
David Koses
Thomas Bent
Michael Chong
Marc Draisen
Eric Bourassa
Jim Gallagher
Stephen Woelfel
Bill Tuttle
Lidy Chan
Lourenço Dantas
Joe Cosgrove
Paul Regan
Kristina Johnson
Steve Olanoff
Richard Reed
Christine Stickney
Ginger Esty
Mary Pratt

MPO Staff/CTPS

Michael Callahan
Anne McGahan
Hayes Morrison
Sean Pfalzer
Arnie Soolman
Mary Ellen Sullivan
Alicia Wilson
Pam Wolfe

Other Attendees

Lynn Ahlgren
John Businger
Rob Cahoon
Ken Caputo
Dan Dimantino
Trish Domigan
Jack Gillon
William Gustus
Dennis Harrington
David Knowlton
Judy LaRocca
Edward Marsteiner
Bob Mercier
Mike Rademacher
Richard Stinson
Remo Vito
Dick Williamson
Wig Zamore

MWRTA
National Corridors Initiative
Coler & Colantonio
Coler & Colantonio
Bellingham DPW
VHB
City of Quincy
Town of Lynnfield
City of Quincy
City of Salem
Town of Concord
National Development
Town of Burlington
Town of Arlington
Wakefield Town Parks
Town of Norfolk
Mass Community Path Alliance
Somerville resident