

Memorandum for the Record
Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) Meeting

December 15, 2011 Meeting

10:00 AM – 12:20 PM, State Transportation Building, Conference Rooms 2 & 3, 10 Park Plaza, Boston

David Mohler, 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 work program for *TIP Project Impacts Before-After Evaluation, FFY 2012*
- approve the minutes of the meeting of December 1
- approve by consensus two items related to certification activities: the plan for implementing the MPO meetings to be held outside of Boston, and the federal fiscal year (FFY) 2012 Certification Activities schedule

Meeting Agenda

1. Public Comments

There were none.

2. Chair's Report – David Mohler, MassDOT

The Federal Highway and Transit Administrations (FHWA and FTA) have approved the FY 2012 – 2015 Statewide Transportation Improvement Program and have completed their air quality conformity reviews of the Long Range Transportation and Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) plans for the MPOs in Massachusetts. Members were provided with copies of two letters from the federal agencies regarding these approvals.

3. Subcommittee Chairs' Reports

There were none.

**4. Regional Transportation Advisory Council Report – Steve Olanoff, Chair,
*Regional Transportation Advisory Council***

Stephanie Pollack of the Dukakis Center for Urban and Regional Policy at Northeastern University was the guest speaker at the Advisory Council's December meeting where there was a discussion of transportation finance issues. The Advisory Council will meet next on January 11 and the guest speaker will be Secretary of Transportation Richard Davey.

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

Central Transportation Planning Staff (CTPS) has hired Ruairi O'Mahony as Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Manager. He will start work after the holidays. CTPS is currently accepting applications for a modeling position.

6. Work Program for TIP Project Impacts Before-After Evaluation, FFY 2012 – *Karl Quackenbush, Executive Director, Central Transportation Planning Staff*

At the meeting of December 1 members were presented with the draft work program for *TIP Project Impacts Before-After Evaluation, FFY 2012*, a pilot study that would examine the impacts of up to six constructed transportation projects. Since then, staff has made several changes to the document in response to comments from MPO members and members of the public.

The document was revised to reflect that:

- projects will be selected for the study that have robust crash data (three years of crash data)
- the Metropolitan Area Planning Council (MAPC) has volunteered to work with CTPS to obtain information on users' perceptions about the selected projects and to collect employee survey data
- greenhouse gas emissions will be included in air quality assessments (if pre-construction data is available for comparison)
- staff will include any information uncovered about best practices associated with conducting these sorts of evaluations

These changes do not affect the project's schedule or cost.

A motion to approve the work program for *TIP Project Impacts Before-After Evaluation, FFY 2012* was made by Jim Gillooly, City of Boston (Boston Transportation Department), and seconded by Ed Tarallo, North Suburban Planning Council (City of Woburn). The motion carried.

7. Meeting Minutes – *Maureen Kelly, MPO Specialist, MPO Staff*

A motion to approve the minutes of the meeting of December 1 was made by Lourenço Dantas, Massachusetts Port Authority, and seconded by Eric Bourassa, MAPC. The motion carried. John Romano, MassDOT Highway Division, abstained.

8. MBTA Capital Investment Program – *Victor Rivas, Deputy Director of Capital Budget, MBTA, and Joe Cosgrove, MBTA*

V. Rivas gave a PowerPoint presentation on the MBTA's Capital Budget Program. He began by providing background information on the MBTA, the fifth largest transit system in the nation which serves approximately 4.5 million people. Ridership has surpassed 1.3 million trips per day and continues to increase. The MBTA is the largest land owner and the largest single consumer of electricity in Massachusetts. He then discussed the MBTA's finances.

MBTA Capital Investment Program

The MBTA has an operating budget of \$1.6 billion (as of FY 2010) and a capital budget of \$4 billion for FYs 2013 – 2017. The Capital Investment Program (CIP) is the MBTA's five year program for funding state of good repair projects. It is a financially constrained document which implements the MBTA Program for Mass Transportation. The CIP is funded by federal grants, non-federal sources (revenue bonds, state funds, and pay-as-you-go), and alternative financing (project financing and Grant Anticipation Notes).

Investment Categories

The CIP supports all transit modes (subway, commuter rail, ferry, bus, and THE RIDE). A pie chart showing the breakdown of spending by mode was shown. The most spending in the FY 2013 – 2017 CIP is on the Green Line due to the *Green Line Extension* project.

Another graph depicted the categories of investment in the CIP, with the largest amount of investment in the areas of revenue vehicles (nearly \$1.3 billion) and statewide transportation projects (\$914 million) over the course of the CIP. (The latter includes the costs of the *Green Line Extension* project.) Other categories where there is spending of over \$200 million in the CIP are in the areas of power systems, stations, bridges, and accessibility.

A graph was shown that depicts the MBTA's investment in its power systems starting from FY 2006. Investment in this category of projects increased significantly in the FYs 2011 – 2015 CIP and going forward. The draft FYs 2013 – 2017 CIP programs \$261.4 million in this category.

Investment in bridges has also increased in recent years. The draft FYs 2013 – 2017 CIP programs \$234.6 million in this category. The needs for bridges are expected to increase exponentially in the coming years posing funding challenges for the MBTA. As an example, V. Rivas discussed a \$100 million project to replace the Merrimack River Bridge and explained that \$10 million in federal funds were awarded for the project, but that the MBTA must come up with the remainder.

Project Review

Each year the MBTA's Capital Budget Group reviews over 300 requests for capital funding amounting to about \$5 billion in requests. The Capital Budget Group uses project selection criteria set out by the state legislature to prioritize projects. The criteria require consideration of a project's impact on the health of passengers and employees and the environment, state of good repair, impact to operations, cost/benefit, and legal commitments.

State of Good Repair Needs

An average of \$300 million per year has been provided for the CIP in recent years, but needs for the current fiscal year will surpass \$1 billion. This is due in part to the need to replace Red and Orange Line vehicles which are 30 to 40 years old. Currently, the MBTA maintenance operation is keeping those vehicles running beyond their useful life.

V. Rivas noted that deferring such replacements comes with a cost as investment must then be made to keep the older vehicles running.

Funding Sources

A pie chart showing the funding sources for the draft FYs 2013 – 2017 CIP was shown. Fifty-eight percent of the funding is expected to come from the FTA (\$2.3 billion), 18 percent from MBTA revenue bonds (\$703 million), 23 percent from state funding (\$914 million), and one percent from Homeland Security funding (\$47 million). These figures assume level funding for the future.

The federal formula program provides funding through Section 5307 for transit projects and through Section 5309 for rail projects. The federal contribution is 80 percent and the MBTA must provide a 20 percent match (made largely through the MBTA revenue bonds). The total amount the MBTA expects to raise from the federal formula program (including the MBTA match) will be about \$284 million annually or \$1.4 billion over the course of the FYs 2013 – 2017 CIP.

Planning for Potential Funding Cuts

The MBTA, however, is planning for funding cuts at the federal level. The MBTA has considered several scenarios including cuts of up to 30 percent. Cuts of 10 to 30 percent could result in reduction of funding for the MBTA over FYs 2013 – 2017 of between \$141 million to \$425 million. Therefore, the MPO can expect the MBTA to submit more funding requests through the TIP process, particularly for bridge and infrastructure projects.

Discussion

Following the presentation, J. Cosgrove alerted members that the MBTA will be requesting an amendment to the TIP next month to accommodate a request from FTA for categorizing projects and programs in a way that resembles those in the CIP.

E. Bourassa asked whether the investment in the areas of revenue vehicles would involve upgrades or the purchase of new vehicles. V. Rivas replied that it would be a combination of procurements and vehicle overhauls. He also noted that FTA is providing guidance that the MBTA should be requesting full funding for large projects, rather than requesting milestone payments, as has been done in the past.

D. Mohler asked whether the replacement of the Red and Orange Line vehicles are programmed in the draft FYs 2013 – 2017 CIP showing the federal dollars and the MBTA match. V. Rivas replied that the CIP does include the replacement and includes the MBTA match. He said that a combination of sources will be used for that match. He noted again that the CIP figures assume level funding in the future.

Dennis Giombetti, MetroWest Regional Collaborative (Town of Framingham), asked for more information on the categorization of monies funding current services and expansion services. V. Rivas reported that the MBTA is not using formula funds for expansion projects. The expansion projects are funded by the state. These include the *Green Line*

Extension, Fairmount Line Improvement, and Assembly Square Orange Line Station projects.

D. Giombetti asked if the MBTA expects any other areas to require significant increases in investment as was the case in the bridge and power categories. V. Rivas pointed to the need to focus on bridges, signals, and track improvements.

Dennis Crowley, South West Advisory Planning Committee (Town of Medway), asked about what percentage of the Red and Orange Line vehicles would be replaced and when the MBTA would be requesting more funding for the balance. V. Rivas replied that all 74 Red Line vehicles in Fleet 1 will be replaced. The MBTA is currently overhauling Fleet 2 of the Red Line. The procurement process may include an option to replace the next oldest fleet. The entire Orange Line fleet will eventually be replaced and will expand from about 120 vehicles to 150 vehicles.

D. Crowley asked if the procurements will include repair parts and the like. J. Cosgrove replied yes.

D. Mohler asked V. Rivas to report on the amount of the MBTA's annual state of good repair need and the amount programmed in the draft FYs 2013 – 2017 CIP. V. Rivas stated that an estimate from the mid-2000s puts the need at about \$470 million each year for 20 years. At the end of that time the MBTA would still have a backlog of \$2.7 billion. The estimate from the more recent D'Alessandro report put the need at \$694 million each year, still leaving a \$2.7 billion backlog at the end of a 20 year period. The MBTA is currently re-evaluating all of its assets, so the estimate may change. The state of good repair projects programmed in the draft CIP amounts to over 90 percent of the funding in the CIP. V. Rivas showed an additional graph that showed the amount of state of good repair funding rising over the years from 63 percent in 1993 to 95 percent in 2012. He noted that the MBTA considers ADA-required improvements to stations as part of its state of good repair expenses.

The PowerPoint presentation will be provided to members and will be available on the MPO's website in the meeting minute archives.

9. Work Programs – Karl Quackenbush, Executive Director, Central Transportation Planning Staff

Members were provided with the draft work programs for the *Callahan Tunnel Construction Impact Study* and the *Analysis of JARC and New Freedom Projects*. K. Quackenbush provided an overview of each project.

Callahan Tunnel Construction Impact Study

Through the work program for the *Callahan Tunnel Construction Impact Study*, CTPS will provide travel modeling assistance to MassDOT to assess potential traffic impacts that could result from work to repair the deck and walls of the Callahan Tunnel, and to evaluate alternatives for mitigating transportation impacts during construction. This work program does not describe mitigation alternatives because they are not yet developed.

The objectives of the study are to analyze existing traffic patterns in and around the tunnel, model the traffic impacts that would be associated with the rehabilitation, and analyze the traffic impacts of mitigation measures. The work will include examining the traffic impact at up to ten locations on surrounding roadways; these locations have not yet been selected. CTPS will use the regional transportation model as well as the Logan Passenger Ground Access Model for this work.

Members discussed this study.

Jim Gillooly, City of Boston (Boston Transportation Department) noted that the work program calls for developing a 2009 base-year model and asked why CTPS is not developing a more current model. K. Quackenbush explained that any modeling project begins with a so-called calibration process in which the model is run and adjusted until it correctly replicates observed travel patterns and traffic counts. The process requires a comprehensive, full set of traffic counts and transit boardings for the entire regional travel network. Such comprehensive count sets, due to the effort involved in producing them, are typically a couple of years old by the time they are available.

L. Dantas questioned the ordering of some tasks in the work program. K. Quackenbush stated that the intent is to first model existing conditions, then model conditions that would be likely while the rehabilitation work is occurring, and then conduct three model runs that test the mitigation measures. D. Mohler indicated that the study would help inform how MassDOT conducts the project (whether the tunnel is closed, reduced to one lane of traffic, etc.)

J. Romano expressed his support for this study. As the public affairs officer for MassDOT, he asked to be kept informed. He also noted that next year MassDOT will be closing lanes on the Tobin Bridge for painting.

J. Gillooly also suggested being mindful of other construction activities that may be occurring during the rehabilitation of the Callahan Tunnel. Tom Bent, Inner Core Committee (City of Somerville), added that the tunnel closure could affect streets in Everett and Chelsea, and suggested considering those impacts. He also suggested that CTPS refer to historical data on past work in the tunnel.

T. Bent asked if the project budget is large enough. K. Quackenbush indicated that CTPS would not be asking the MPO for more funding.

Rafael Mares, Conservation Law Foundation, asked whether air quality impacts would be considered when evaluating mitigation alternatives. K. Quackenbush reported that they typically are included in such tasks. R. Mares urged CTPS to include greenhouse gas impacts in that task as well.

Analysis of JARC and New Freedom Projects

K. Quackenbush introduced the work program for the *Analysis of JARC and New Freedom Projects* by describing the two FTA formula grant programs to which the work program pertains. The Job Access and Reverse Commute Program (JARC) provides grants for projects and programs that enable eligible people with low-incomes to access jobs, sometimes by reverse commute. The New Freedom Program provides grants for projects and programs that promote transportation for people with disabilities; it supports programs that go beyond the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). MassDOT is the recipient of funds from both of these programs, but the MPO conducts outreach to solicit proposals and evaluate applications from potential sub-recipients. The MPO makes recommendations to MassDOT regarding which projects to fund and MassDOT makes the final determination.

This work program is designed to examine the effectiveness of JARC and New Freedom projects that have been funded in this region in the past. The findings will inform the process going forward. The tasks of the work program are to select measures upon which to evaluate projects, obtain information from service providers, examine the effectiveness of projects, and make recommendations for the future. This study will be patterned after FTA's evaluation process for projects in these programs.

Members discussed this study.

David Koses, At-Large City (City of Newton), suggested coordinating this study with the work program for the *TIP Project Impacts Before-After Evaluation, FFY 2012* since the two studies have similar goals. K. Quackenbush pointed out that the studies would be conducted at the same time but that they will examine different types of projects.

E. Bourassa asked if the goal of the study is to provide recommendations for future project selection. K. Quackenbush replied that it is the intent.

K. Quackenbush also pointed members to the MPO's Coordinated Human Services Plan, which contains human-service provider information for this region and information on gaps in service. It is available on the MPO's website. The JARC and New Freedom funding occurs in the context of this plan.

T. Bent raised the issue of possible federal funding cuts and questioned whether money should be spent on the work program if the future of the JARC and New Freedom Programs are uncertain. D. Mohler reported that he was not aware that the two programs were in danger of being cut.

10. MPO Committees – Karl Quackenbush, Executive Director, Central Transportation Planning Staff

Members were provided with a memorandum describing the history of MPO committees, which are as follows:

- Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) Committee
- Administration and Finance (A&F) Committee

- Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Criteria Committee
- Clean Air and Mobility Committee

K. Quackenbush gave an overview of the committees and noted the advantages of having them, which include allowing the MPO to tap into individual members' expertise on particular subjects, to provide guidance to staff on MPO activities and programs, and to expedite the work of the larger body.

Staff recommended that the MPO retain the UPWP and A&F Committees, and support the practice of using ad hoc committees as needed. The TIP Criteria and Clean Air and Mobility Committees could be regarded as ad hoc committees. In addition, staff recommended that the MPO consider forming an ad hoc Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) Committee.

Finally, staff proposed a standing Congestion Management Process (CMP) Committee to work with staff to advance management and operations strategies, such as in the area of Intelligent Transportation Systems. The CMP is an increasingly important aspect of the MPO's work as the results of it help generate study ideas, and inform the LRTP and the TIP. Most, if not all, of the projects that emerge from this process can be characterized as management and operations projects.

Members then discussed this topic.

L. Dantas noted the value of committees, which allow for a more detailed focus on subjects, and he expressed support for the CMP and LRTP Committees.

E. Bourassa expressed support for retaining the UPWP and A&F Committees, and keeping the TIP Criteria and Clean Air and Mobility Committees as ad hoc committees. He asked for more on staff's thoughts about what type of products the CMP Committee might produce. K. Quackenbush explained that the CMP is an important aspect of the MPO's work that could benefit from having a committee to steer it. While the potential products remain to be seen, one area where that committee might provide guidance is on the selection of performance measures and in helping to orient the work of the CMP in the most productive way possible. There is, for example, the ongoing issue of how to encourage implementation of the recommendations coming out of the CMP-inspired studies that the committee could grapple with. He also noted that at other MPOs such committees sometimes include technical staff from agencies.

L. Dantas pointed out that it would be beneficial for the MPO to have a smaller committee that could focus on CMP related studies. He also noted that other MPOs involve technical staff on such committees, which promotes coordination between entities.

D. Mohler noted that the chair will consult with the vice chair on the formation of the committees and would bring their conclusions to the MPO at a future meeting.

11. Planning for Meetings Outside of Boston – *Michael Callahan, Public Involvement Manager, MPO Staff*

The MPO's new Memorandum of Understanding requires the MPO to meet outside of Boston on a quarterly basis. The MPO staff regularly holds meetings outside of Boston for TIP workshops, during the public comment period for draft certification documents, and other public outreach events. A memorandum and map was provided to members that indicate where the MPO has conducted outreach in the past several years and makes recommendations for potential meeting sites for 2012.

The proposed locations for 2012 meeting sites were chosen based on corridors identified in the LRTP and with an eye to geographic equity. The suggested locations are those where the MPO has not recently held a public meeting and that are accessible by transit. Staff suggested four dates for meetings: March 1, June 7, September 6, and December 6.

Members discussed this proposal.

S. Olanoff recommended considering the transit schedule when identifying meeting locations. M. Callahan noted that staff does this routinely when planning meetings outside Boston. For the proposed meeting locations, staff checked to ensure that transit service is available before the meeting and in the afternoon.

D. Koses suggested that the MPO survey meeting attendees to gather information about how they got to the meeting and to provide input for future use on how often the MPO should meet outside of Boston. S. Olanoff suggested adding the question to the sign-in sheet.

J. Gillooly suggested announcing the meetings early.

L. Dantas suggested coupling meetings outside of Boston with site visits to MPO-funded project areas.

D. Koses recommended taking into account the agenda topics when meeting outside of Boston, so as not to inconvenience people who might have an interest in specific agenda items.

T. Bent recommended holding all TIP-related meetings in Boston, which is the most accessible location for the region as a whole. P. Wolfe, Manager of Certification Activities, MPO Staff, noted that it may be difficult to do so given that the TIP appears on many MPO agendas and often requires timely attention.

M. Callahan added that staff will ensure that chosen locations are handicap accessible.

Staff was directed to schedule the meetings as proposed.

12. Revised Certification Activities Schedule – *Pam Wolfe, Certification Activities Manager, MPO Staff*

Members were provided with a revised schedule for the work of the Certification Activities Group in FFY 2012. This schedule was revised to reflect changes requested by members for the development of the UPWP and the TIP. The revised schedule has the MPO endorsing the two documents at the end of June (previously the endorsement was scheduled in August). This schedule also built in more time for the MPO to review public comments before endorsing the documents.

Moving the endorsement to June will require the MPO to start the UPWP and TIP process earlier than in past years, and condense certain elements, so that there will be intensive work on these documents, involving both the municipal project proponents and MPO staff, starting immediately in January and continuing through February.

Based on this schedule, the milestones for the UPWP would be as follows:

- January: Development of the UPWP project universe
- First week of February: UPWP Committee meets to review projects
- February: Project evaluations conducted
- March 15: UPWP Committee makes its recommendations
- April 5: Recommendations discussed by the MPO
- April 19: Draft FFY 2013 UPWP released for public review

The milestones for the TIP would be as follows:

- December 22, 2011: Letter to municipalities announcing schedule change
- February 3: Municipalities must submit updated Project Information Forms
- February: Staff conducts project evaluations
- March 8: MPO receives funding targets
- March 22: First Tier list of projects developed
- April 5: Staff recommendation and First Tier List discussed by the MPO
- April 19: Draft FFYs 2013 –16 TIP released for public review

This schedule assumes level-funding for the UPWP and the TIP for the initial development work, that MassDOT will provide financial guidance in early March, and that project proponents can expedite their work.

P. Wolfe noted that if the MPO chooses to implement this schedule, it may cause some discomfort for the public and project proponents as they adjust to the new schedule. She said that staff would start the development process earlier next year (at the start of FFY 2013) to provide more time. She also noted that the new schedule would require the MPO to develop draft documents for future year(s) very early in the implementation of the current year's programs. There could be changes to this year's programs that would require changes to the draft TIP or UPWP already out for public review. For example, the new draft TIP will not be able to account for implementation changes in the existing TIP, such as to the programming of projects that cannot be made ready in the programmed year. If the changes were significant, the MPO may have to circulate draft documents for public review more than once.

Members discussed the schedule.

E. Bourassa noted that he has informed subregional coordinators that the topic of the UPWP and TIP should be on the February agendas at the subregional meetings. Mary Ellen Sullivan, UPWP Manager, MPO staff, added that staff is considering beginning solicitation of project ideas from the subregional managers in January.

Members approved the revised schedule.

13. State Implementation Plan – David Mohler, MassDOT

MassDOT released its December progress report on the status of the State Implementation Plan (SIP) projects. D. Mohler provided an update on changes since the November report.

The mitigation measures for the delays to the *Fairmount Line Improvement Program* have been modified. Improvements will be made to the Route 31 bus, but not the Route 29 bus due to operational constraints. Also, a weekday shuttle will be run from Andrews Station to the Boston Medical Center starting on January 2.

MassDOT is proposing to implement weekend improvements to the Route 111 bus in January to mitigate for delays to the *Construction of 1,000 New Parking Spaces* project.

MassDOT has petitioned the Department of Environmental Protection to remove the *Red Line – Blue Line Connector (Design)* project from the SIP.

Regarding the *Green Line Extension* project, the public review period for the federal environmental review documents (NEPA) is completed and MassDOT will be responding to public comments. MassDOT has finalized the New Starts application and will submit it this month. A public workshop on Lechmere Station was held on December 14 and other station workshops will be held soon.

Members asked questions and made comments.

S. Olanoff asked about changes to the schedule for the trains on the Fairmount Line. D. Mohler replied that trains will stop at the new stations as they open. There will not be an increase in frequency of trains, however.

T. Bent expressed the City of Somerville's gratitude for MassDOT's commitment to the *Green Line Extension* project.

14. Members Items

J. Cosgrove reported that the MBTA has a notice to proceed on the construction of the *Orange Line at Assembly Square* project.

15. Adjourn

A motion to adjourn was made by J. Romano, and seconded by E. Tarallo. The motion carried.

**Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization Meeting Attendance
Thursday, December 15, 2011, 10:00 AM**

Members

At-Large City (City of Everett)
At-Large City (City of Newton)
At-Large Town (Town of Arlington)
At-Large Town (Town of Lexington)
City of Boston (Boston Redevelopment Authority)
City of Boston (Boston Transportation Department)

Inner Core Committee (City of Somerville)
Massachusetts Department of Transportation
MassDOT Highway Division

Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority (MBTA)
Massachusetts Port Authority
MBTA Advisory Board
Metropolitan Area Planning Council

MetroWest Regional Collaborative (Town of Framingham)
Minuteman Advisory Group on Interlocal Coordination
(Town of Bedford)
North Shore Task Force (City of Beverly)
North Suburban Planning Council (City of Woburn)
Regional Transportation Advisory Council
South Shore Coalition (Town of Braintree)
South West Advisory Planning Committee (Town of Medway)
Three Rivers Interlocal Council (Town of Norwood/NVCC)

Representatives and Alternates

Marzie Galazka
David Koses
Laura Wiener
Richard Canale
Lara Mérida
Jim Gillooly
Tom Kadzis
Tom Bent
David Mohler
David Anderson
John Romano
Joe Cosgrove
Lourenço Dantas
Paul Regan
Eric Bourassa
Eric Halvorsen
Dennis Giombetti
Richard Reed

Tina Cassidy
Ed Tarallo
Steve Olanoff
Christine Stickney
Dennis Crowley
Tom O'Rourke

MPO Staff/Central Transportation Planning Staff

Karl Quackenbush, Executive Director

Walter Bennett

Michael Callahan

David Fargen

Maureen Kelly

Robin Mannion

Anne McGahan

Efi Pagitsas

Sean Pfalzer

Mary Ellen Sullivan

Alicia Wilson

Pam Wolfe

Other Attendees

Callida Cenizal

Ned Codd

Chris Dippel

Rafael Mares

Joe Onorato

Chris Reilly

Victor Rivas

MassDOT Office of Transportation Planning

MassDOT Office of Transportation Planning

Brookline Bicycle Advisory Committee

Conservation Law Foundation

MassDOT Highway

Town of Lincoln

MBTA