

Memorandum for the Record

Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization Meeting

October 18, 2012 Meeting

10:00 AM – 12:45 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:

- recommend to the Advisory Council that no MPO member entity, individual representing an MPO member entity, or Subregion should be voting members of the Advisory Council
- approve the report by the ad hoc committee on the Advisory Council's election process and forward the recommendations from the report to the Advisory Council
- approve the work program for the *MASCO Bus Routes Study*
- release draft Amendment Two of the federal fiscal years (FFYs) 2013-16 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for a 15-day public review period
- approve the minutes of the meeting of October 4 as amended

Meeting Agenda

1. Public Comments

Wig Zamore, Somerville Transportation Equity Partnership and Mystic View Task Force, commented on several matters. First, he thanked the MPO for holding a meeting on October 4 focused on climate change. He called attention to the issue of black carbon pollution and particulate matter pollution. He also raised a concern about pollution from emissions of MBTA commuter boats and suggested that marine diesel regulations be followed.

Then he commented about MassDOT's State Implementation Plan (SIP) reports. He asked MassDOT staff to highlight the new text in each monthly report.

Turning to the MPO's Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP), he asked if staff could be asked to prepare material explaining the federal and regional metrics referenced in the document.

Lastly, he remarked on MassDOT's Moving Together walking and bicycling transportation conference and its focus on mode shift. He suggested that more examination be given to bicycle connections in environmental justice communities. And, he suggested that the MPO conduct environmental justice and Title VI analyses by mode to ensure that investments in bicycle and pedestrian projects are equitable.

2. Chair's Report—*David Mohler, MassDOT*

There was none.

3. Committee Chairs' Reports —*Callida Cenizal, MassDOT, and Paul Regan, MBTA Advisory Board*

Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) Committee

C. Cenizal reported that the UPWP Committee met this morning to review the project schedule for the fourth quarter of FFY 2012 and the first quarter of FFY 2013. The UPWP Committee will meet next in January or February.

Ad Hoc Committee on Elections

P. Regan reported as chair of a special Ad Hoc Committee on Elections that met to discuss issues raised about the Regional Transportation Advisory Council's election process. The issue stemmed from concerns about this year's election, the Advisory Council's election process, and the comments made by one Advisory Council member in opposition to a candidate for chair that some in attendance found offensive.

P. Regan reported that he had a conversation with the person who voiced opposition to the candidate. Prior to meeting with that person, P. Regan had reviewed the audio record of the meeting at which the election occurred. He said that after listening, he did not interpret the person's comments as overtly sexist, but that he did believe that the statements made were wrong. (P. Regan had not attended that Advisory Council meeting.) P. Regan said that he conveyed this information to the person. He noted that the person who was the object of the comments could have perceived the comments differently. He also said that there were several people at the meeting who expressed their strong opinions that they viewed the comments to be offensive. The incident points to an ongoing problem on the Advisory Council.

The Ad Hoc Committee discussed these concerns and recommended that the MPO direct the Advisory Council to begin the election process earlier, in July, at which time a Nominating Committee would be formed to solicit nominations for the chair and vice chair positions. Nominations from the floor would be accepted at the Advisory Council's September meeting, and would close at the end of that meeting. The election would be held in October. (A memorandum summarizing the recommendations was distributed.)

Other issues raised by the ad hoc committee concerned who is empowered to run the election and who can vote on the Advisory Council. P. Regan noted that an independent party should be charged with oversight of the election and suggested that the MPO staff could perform this function.

He also thanked Pam Wolfe, Manager of Certification Activities, MPO staff, for her work with the committee.

Members then discussed these issues.

Dennis Giombetti, MetroWest Regional Collaborative (Town of Framingham), asked that the MPO be kept informed of decisions the Advisory Council makes regarding changes to its election process.

In response to a question from Laura Wiener, At-Large Town of Arlington, D. Mohler stated MassDOT's position regarding who should vote on the Advisory Council. MassDOT believes that MPO members should not be allowed to be voting members of the Advisory Council because those members could have undue influence on MPO decisions through having direct representation on the MPO plus indirect representation through the Advisory Committee representation as a voting member of the MPO. MassDOT also believes that subregional representatives should not be voting members of the Advisory Council as this could cause confusion and problems in terms of consistent voting. For instance, a subregional representative on the Advisory Council might vote differently on an issue than someone representing the same subregion on the MPO.

Richard Canale, At-Large Town of Lexington, commented that the MPO needs to clarify what MPO membership means, particularly in the case of members designated as "at-large city" or "at-large town" given that those members have a duty to represent both their municipality and the other cities or towns in the region. He said that it is incumbent upon the MPO to advise the Advisory Council about membership.

S. Olanoff stated that subregions should be represented and have a vote on the Advisory Council. He called for further discussion about whether different people from the same subregion should be allowed to vote.

Eric Bourassa, MAPC, voiced support for MassDOT's position (that MPO members should not vote on the Advisory Council) and recommended that the MPO act today to give a recommendation to the Advisory Council.

L. Wiener remarked that the change made to the MPO body last year (admitting more municipal and subregional members) is having an impact on the Advisory Council. She also expressed support for MassDOT's position, and noted that the way to make the Advisory Council stronger is to reach out to more municipalities.

R. Canale reiterated that the MPO needs to clarify what MPO membership means. He expressed that subregions should not be precluded from holding a voting seat on the Advisory Council.

Lourenço Dantas, Massachusetts Port Authority, pointed out differences in the make-up of the membership of the MPO and Advisory Council. Whereas the MPO is largely composed of governmental agencies and elected officials, the Advisory Council is more representative of non-political entities.

S. Olanoff noted that municipalities and state agencies are represented on the Advisory Council. He noted that members must apply for membership.

Tom O'Rourke pointed out that some individuals vote on both bodies but represent different entities. A member, for instance, may represent a municipality on the MPO and a subregional entity, such as a chamber of commerce, on the Advisory Council.

Richard Reed, Minuteman Advisory Group on Interlocal Coordination (Town of Bedford), noted that he had no objection to subregional membership on the Advisory Council, but he advised against having individual members serving dual roles. He suggested that individuals other than MPO members should hold positions on the Advisory Council. He also expressed that the Advisory Council should make it clear how its membership is structured and how one becomes a member.

D. Giombetti noted that the Advisory Council is a good training ground for municipalities who would like to serve on the MPO.

In response to a question, P. Wolfe summarized the procedure for becoming a member of the Advisory Council. A prospective member attends several meetings, applies for membership, and then the Advisory Council votes to admit them. The members remain on the Advisory Council unless they do not participate. The Advisory Council's Membership Committee provides guidance to staff regarding outreach to new member entities. Staff is working now to expand the membership by making contacts with social service organizations that represent low-income and minority people.

R. Canale recommended that given the expansion of municipal representation on the MPO, the MPO have further discussions to revisit the purpose of the Advisory Council and to clarify roles and responsibilities of member entities.

Ed Tarallo, North Suburban Planning Council (City of Woburn), raised the question of whether the MPO has the right to dictate the membership of the Advisory Council. D. Mohler noted that MPO members are not permitted to vote on the Advisory Council under existing bylaws, and that the MPO cannot dictate the membership of the Advisory Council. E. Tarallo suggested that the MPO does not need to be involved in the Advisory Council election process if the MPO is not going to weigh in regarding that body's membership.

Members then took a series of votes regarding the Advisory Council's membership.

Motion #1

A motion to have the MPO take no position regarding the membership of the Advisory Council and to ask the Advisory Council's representative to the MPO to report to the MPO on the outcome of the Advisory Council's decision regarding its membership was made by the MetroWest Regional Collaborative (Town of Framingham) (D. Giombetti), and seconded by the At-Large Town of Lexington (R. Canale).

During a discussion of this motion, D. Mohler restated the position of MassDOT and advocated for the MPO to take a position on the membership issue. Subsequently, D. Giombetti withdrew his motion.

Motion #2

A motion to have a vote on whether to make a recommendation to the Advisory Council that MPO members (in particular, municipalities or entities elected to the MPO) should be prohibited from voting as members of the Advisory Council was made by the MBTA Advisory Board (P. Regan), and seconded by MAPC (E. Bourassa).

During a discussion of this motion, S. Olanoff asked the MPO for input regarding two questions: 1) Should MPO members be allowed to vote on the Advisory Council? and 2) Should subregions be allowed to vote on the MPO?

D. Mohler restated MassDOT's position. The agency believes that a person or municipality seated on the MPO should not be allowed to vote on the Advisory Council, and that subregions should not have a vote on the Advisory Council. John Romano, MassDOT Highway Division, added that if a person were to vote on both bodies, that person would have more influence on MPO votes than a person who served only on one of the bodies.

E. Tarallo raised the question again of whether the MPO has the ability to dictate the Advisory Council's membership. If not and the MPO only has an advisory role, it should not take a position on Advisory Council membership, he said.

D. Mohler noted that the election procedures are part of the Advisory Council's bylaws and that the MPO would now be voting to recommend changes to the bylaws.

S. Olanoff asked for four separate votes on each issue.

Members then voted on the motion. The motion carried. The following members voted no: City of Boston (J. Gillooly), At-Large Town Lexington (R. Canale), and North Suburban Planning Council (City of Woburn) (E. Tarallo). The Advisory Council (S. Olanoff) abstained.

Motion #3

A motion to recommend to the Advisory Council that individual MPO members and their alternates should be prohibited from being voting members of the Advisory Council was made by MAPC (E. Bourassa), and seconded by the MassDOT Highway Division (J. Romano).

During a discussion of this motion, J. Gillooly asked about what percentage of the voting population of the Advisory Council holds a seat on the MPO. S. Olanoff replied that three or four people have this dual role currently.

R. Reed raised the question of why subregional representation is needed on the Advisory Council given that every municipality can apply for membership. R. Canale explained that the bylaws specify subregions as standing members and that the Advisory Council recognizes that subregions should have a voice because those members have a different perspective than municipal members. Although there can be municipal members from a subregion that is also represented on the Advisory Council, one person cannot have two votes by representing both seats.

Members voted on the motion. The motion carried. The following members voted no: Three Rivers Interlocal Council (Town of Norwood/NVCC) (T. O'Rourke), and Massachusetts Port Authority (L. Dantas). The following members abstained: Advisory Council (S. Olanoff) and North Suburban Planning Council (City of Woburn) (E. Tarallo).

Motion #4

A motion to recommend to the Advisory Council that municipal members of the MPO should be prohibited from being voting members of the Advisory Council was made by MAPC (E. Bourassa), and seconded by the Massachusetts Port Authority (L. Dantas).

The motion carried. The following members abstained: Advisory Council (S. Olanoff), and North Suburban Planning Council (City of Woburn) (E. Tarallo).

Motion #5

A motion to recommend to the Advisory Council that subregions should be prohibited from being voting members of the Advisory Council was made by MAPC (E. Bourassa), and seconded by the MassDOT Highway Division (J. Romano).

During a discussion of this motion, D. Crowley suggested that the Advisory Council notify subregional groups of any changes affecting their status. S. Olanoff replied that the Advisory Council's Membership Committee would pass on recommendations to the full Council. D. Mohler added that MPO staff would notify all municipalities in the region of any changes.

R. Canale expressed strong opposition to the motion saying that, if passed, it would be a vote against regionalism. He cautioned that the vote could lead to parochialism. He advocated for regionalism in transportation planning.

E. Bourassa countered that regional decisions are made at the MPO level. He also noted that allowing subregional votes on the Advisory Council can cause confusion, and that subregional interests can be represented by municipal members.

Members voted on the motion. The motion carried. The following members voted no: At-Large Town Lexington (R. Canale) and North Suburban Planning Council (City of Woburn) (E. Tarallo). The Advisory Council (S. Olanoff) abstained.

Motion #6

A motion to approve the report by the ad hoc committee on the Advisory Council's election process and to forward the recommendations from the report to the Advisory Council was made by the MBTA Advisory Board (P. Regan), and seconded by MAPC (E. Bourassa). The motion carried.

Staff was advised to draft a letter with the recommendations to the Advisory Council.

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

S. Olanoff reported that at the October Advisory Council meeting MPO staff gave a presentation on the Regional Household Travel Survey.

The Advisory Council also prepared a letter regarding scoping for the High Speed Rail Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) being considered by the Federal Railroad

Administration (FRA) for improvements to the Northeast rail corridor. The Advisory Council requested that the MPO either forward the comments to the FRA or incorporate the comments in an MPO comment letter to the FRA. The Advisory Council's comments had been provided to MPO members for discussion.

The Advisory Council will meet next on November 14.

Motion #7

A motion to have the MPO draft a letter to the FRA expressing the Advisory Council's comments on the High Speed Rail EIS and expressing that the MPO agrees with those comments was made by the Advisory Council (S. Olanoff), and seconded by the Three Rivers Interlocal Council (Town of Norwood/NVCC) (T. O'Rourke).

During a discussion of the motion, Tom Kadzis (Boston Redevelopment Authority) expressed concerns that the Advisory Council's final letter endorses a particular project, the *North-South Rail Link* project. While he expressed support for other comments in the letter relating to the EIS, he expressed concern about the possible implications of the MPO voicing support for the *North-South Rail Link*. S. Olanoff responded that the action would not commit the MPO to funding the *North-South Rail Link*, rather it would ask the FRA only to consider the project in the EIS scoping.

E. Tarallo expressed concerns about the cost impacts of the items referenced in the letter. He noted that those impacts would return to the MPO and could have an impact on the MPO's funds. S. Olanoff noted that federal money would be used on the study. He also raised the possibility that the FRA could potentially pay for projects referenced in the letter, with no cost impact to the MPO or state.

P. Regan noted that the MPO voted to exclude the *North-South Rail Link* from its list of Illustrative Projects in a previous Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP). He recommended that statements coming from the MPO should not contradict those in the MPO's LRTP. S. Olanoff then reiterated that there would be no cost to the state. He noted that the economy of this region depends on high-speed rail and that the Northeast corridor should not be left out of federal planning.

Members voted on the motion. The motion failed. The Advisory Council voted yes. The following members abstained: At-Large Town of Lexington (R. Canale), MAPC (E. Bourassa), and Massachusetts Port Authority (L. Dantas).

Motion #8

A motion to forward the Advisory Council's comments on the High Speed Rail EIS to the FRA (without the endorsement of the MPO) was made by the Advisory Council (S.

Olanoff), and seconded by the Three Rivers Interlocal Council (Town of Norwood/NVCC) (T. O'Rourke).

During a discussion of this motion, E. Tarallo suggested that the Advisory Council forward its comments directly to the FRA without going through the MPO. D. Mohler noted that the MPO must endorse any public statement from the Advisory Council to avoid creating confusion that the Advisory Council's views are the MPO's views. The Advisory Council acts only in an advisory role to the MPO.

Members voted on the motion. The motion failed. The Advisory Council voted yes. The Massachusetts Port Authority (L. Dantas) abstained.

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

Members were presented with an updated organizational chart for CTPS. One of the members had suggested that it would be helpful to periodically receive an updated chart so that, when staff present at meetings, members can readily see where they fit into the structure of the organization

6. Work Program for MASCO Bus Routes Study—*Karl Quackenbush, Executive Director, Central Transportation Planning Staff*

K. Quackenbush introduced the work program for the *MASCO Bus Routes Study*. CTPS will provide travel forecasting and analytical support associated with possible modifications to MBTA bus routes CT2 and CT3. The Medical Academic and Scientific Community Organization, Inc. (MASCO) is the client for this project. K. Quackenbush noted that this is an example of an occasional project that is done for an entity other than the MPO, its constituent members, or a local community, and he assured members that this work would not impact other CTPS work.

Sarah Hamilton, MASCO, provided more detail about MASCO and the project. MASCO represents 24 institutions in the Longwood Medical Area (LMA) and serves as the transportation management association (TMA) for the area. As such, MASCO is focused on reducing demand for single occupancy vehicle travel to the LMA. Approximately 107,000 people commute to the LMA each workday. MASCO operates three fixed-route private bus services to transit stations and a park and ride service.

With continued development in the LMA and the Fenway and constraints on the Green and Red Line, more bus service is needed to meet demand. This work program was developed in concert with MassDOT, the MBTA, and the consulting firm AECOM. It will involve travel modeling to identify new opportunities for service to ease congestion.

Members discussed the work program.

Christine Stickney, South Shore Coalition (Town of Braintree), asked if MASCO would be covering the costs for staff salaries and benefits. K. Quackenbush replied yes.

J. Gillooly recognized MASCO as a champion of the public-private partnership and expressed that the City of Boston needs MASCO as a partner to help make public transit in the city more efficient. He urged members to support the work program.

D. Mohler stated that MASCO has worked with MassDOT in the development of this project and that MassDOT is supportive of it.

P. Regan noted that MASCO has been partnering with the MBTA for years.

D. Crowley asked about the source of MASCO's funding. S. Hamilton replied that MASCO earns revenue from leases it holds at 375 Longwood Avenue and from leased parking spaces at an off-site location.

L. Wiener asked if MASCO receives funding from membership dues. S. Hamilton replied that MASCO no longer requires dues from members.

Motion #9

A motion to approve the work program for the *MASCO Bus Routes Study* was made by the MBTA Advisory Board (P. Regan), and seconded by the North Suburban Planning Council (City of Woburn) (E. Tarallo). The motion carried.

7. Transportation Improvement Program Amendment—Sean Pfalzer, MPO Staff

Members were presented with tables showing draft Amendment Two of the FFYs 2013-16 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). S. Pfalzer explained that the proposed changes would program federal earmark dollars that have been repurposed for two projects. It programs \$693,000 for the *Longfellow Bridge* project in Boston and Cambridge, and \$408,179 for repairs to the roof of the Cape Ann Transportation Authority's maintenance facility.

MassDOT has requested that the MPO hold an abbreviated public review period because these earmarks must be advertised by the end of the calendar year. If the MPO held a full 30-day review period, it could endorse the amendment on December 6.

Members discussed the timing for the public review period.

Joe Cosgrove, MBTA, and Michael Chong, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), expressed concern that the endorsement of the amendment on December 6 would not allow enough time for the federal agencies to obligate funding for the projects by the end of the year.

E. Tarallo suggested holding a shorter review period and taking action on the amendment on November 15. T. Bent suggested waiving the review period. P. Wolfe noted that the MPO has the option to waive the review period in unusual circumstances, such as when the MPO would lose funding by not acting by a certain time. She also suggested that there would be time to hold a 15-day review period and ask the MPO to act on the amendment at its November 15 meeting.

Motion #10

A motion to release draft Amendment Two of the FFYs 2013-16 TIP for a 15-day public review period was made by the North Suburban Planning Council (City of Woburn) (E. Tarallo), and seconded by the Inner Core Committee (City of Somerville) (T. Bent). The motion carried.

8. Meeting Minutes—Maureen Kelly, MPO Staff

Motion #11

A motion to approve the minutes of the meeting of October 4 – with a clarification to an item on page seven, as recommended by L. Dantas – was made by the Inner Core Committee (City of Somerville) (T. Bent), and seconded by MAPC (E. Bourassa). The motion carried.

9. Report: TIP Projects Before and After Evaluation—Mark Abbott, MPO Staff

K. Quackenbush introduced the completed pilot study for the *TIP Project Impacts Before and After Evaluation*, which was in the FFY 2012 UPWP. The project evaluated TIP projects to determine the effectiveness of certain safety and operations strategies employed. He noted that there were two reasons for engaging in this work. First, staff and the UPWP Committee thought it was a good idea and in the MPO's interests to see if the effectiveness of projects funded through the TIP could be determined. Second, FHWA requires that evaluations of this sort be undertaken as part of the Congestion Management Process (CMP).

M. Abbott then gave a report on the study with a PowerPoint presentation. He reported that staff selected TIP-funded projects completed in FFYs 2008 and 2009 to evaluate. Data about roadway conditions before the projects were implemented was obtained

from Functional Design Reports (FDRs). Staff collected data in the field after the projects were completed.

Two projects were selected for study: the *Route 2A – Summer Street Roadway Reconstruction* project in Arlington, and the *High Street (Route 109) Improvements* project in Westwood. Both projects were implemented due to the need for safety and operational improvements at the intersections.

Three intersections were within the Arlington project area: Park Avenue Extension at Summer Street (Route 2A); Forest Street South at Summer Street (Route 2A); and Brattle and Hemlock Streets at Summer Street (Route 2A).

Before the project was constructed there was a high crash rate at the Park Avenue Extension/Summer Street location as a result of drivers not being able to clearly see the post mounted signal heads. The pedestrian crossings were also too wide. The project addressed these problems by installing mast arms for the signals to improve visibility, and by providing pedestrian accommodations.

The Forest Street South/Summer Street intersection included a traffic island with yield and stop sign controls. This configuration produced points of conflict for traffic. As a result of the improvements, the island was removed and signals on mast arms were installed. As a result, the level of service (LOS) at the intersection improved.

The Brattle and Hemlock Streets at Summer Street intersection had poor signal visibility for drivers because of a curvature on the road and because the signal heads were post mounted. Signals on mast arms and pedestrian equipment were installed, and the Brattle Street approach was widened to accommodate two lanes of traffic. As a result, the crash rate was reduced and LOS improved.

The intersection in Westwood was at High Street (Route 109) at Barlow Lane and Westwood Glen Road. The problem at the location was due to congestion. To remedy this problem, left turn lanes were installed as well as signals on mast arms on all approaches. As a result the intersection operations improved tremendously.

Staff has drawn several conclusions from this study: signal visibility is a key component of safety (signals mounted above lanes are recommended); proper signal timing and phasing is important to operations at signalized intersections; signalization of stop sign controlled intersections improves operations; and adding left turn lanes to single lane approaches improves operations.

Members discussed the study.

D. Mohler complimented M. Abbott on the study and analysis, and raised a question about the reduction in peak traffic volumes at the Westwood intersection. M. Abbott noted that the figure could be an aberration or the data in the project's FDR might have been old. S. Olanoff commented that the intersection studied is part of a larger TIP project on Route 109 and that the volumes may be reflective of the larger project or the result of drivers choosing alternate routes to avoid signals. He noted that other improvements on Route 109 were more significant in terms of safety and operations.

K. Quackenbush pointed out that a constraint when conducting a "before and after" study has to do with getting objective "before" data. M. Abbott added that staff was looking for effective strategies that could be employed in other locations.

L. Wiener expressed thanks on behalf of the Town of Arlington for the study and the data staff provided. She noted that two of the intersections in that town were very confusing before the improvements were made and that they operate much better now. She also noted that the improvements at the Brattle Street location are timely because a residential and assisted living development will be built near the location.

L. Dantas remarked that the study is illuminating in that it shows that even modest improvements to intersections can have a large impact on safety and operations. M. Abbott emphasized the importance of signal timing and phasing for crash reduction.

Marie Rose, MassDOT Highway Division, stated that staff will have better access to FDRs in the future because MassDOT will be archiving them electronically. M. Abbott added that this will be important because staff will be required through the CMP to conduct more "before and after" studies.

D. Crowley expressed interest in knowing the project costs to understand the MPO's return on investment. M. Abbott stated that staff can make the costs for the projects in this study available.

D. Crowley also noted that he has not been receiving the list of projects that staff is working on. K. Quackenbush noted that staff is distributing the list after each meeting. Staff will check to see why they are not reaching him.

D. Crowley asked how a municipality can gain access to crash data. M. Abbott replied that crash rate data can be found on MassDOT's website. The crash data is obtained from the Registry of Motor Vehicles.

As a member of the UPWP Committee who advocated for this project, T. Bent thanked staff for their work. He noted that the study shows that significant improvements to safety and operations can be made with relatively small investments.

S. Olanoff noted that the study did not prove the cost effectiveness of the TIP projects. D. Mohler and Efi Pagitsas, Manager of Traffic Analysis, replied that the point of the study was to evaluate discrete project elements and specific strategies for effectiveness, not the success of the entire project.

10.MPO Certification Activities Schedule

This agenda item was postponed to the meeting of November 1.

11.TIP Update

This agenda item was postponed to the meeting of November 1.

12.State Implementation Plan Update—D. Mohler, MassDOT

D. Mohler provided an update on the projects in the State Implementation Plan (SIP).

The public review period has closed for a proposed amendment to the SIP, which would remove the requirement that MassDOT design the *Red-Blue Line Connector* project.

The groundbreaking on phase one of the *Green Line Extension* project will occur in early November. Phase one includes the construction of the Harvard Street and Medford Street bridges and the demolition of 21 Water Street.

13.Members Items

E. Bourassa reminded members that MAPC will hold its Fall Council meeting on October 24 at the Omni Parker House. The MPO election will be held at the meeting. The Towns of Bedford and Braintree are running unopposed. Ballots have been distributed.

T. Bent reported that the Somerville Board of Alderman has approved the Union Square Revitalization Plan, a necessary step toward acquiring properties for the Union Square Green Line station.

14.Adjourn

A motion to adjourn was made by the MassDOT Highway Division (J. Romano) and seconded by the City of Boston (J. Gillooly). The motion carried.

Attendance

Members	Representatives and Alternates
At-Large City (City of Everett)	James Errickson
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)	Tom Kadzis
City of Boston (Boston Transportation Department)	Jim Gillooly
Federal Highway Administration	Michael Chong
Inner Core Committee (City of Somerville)	Tom Bent
Massachusetts Department of Transportation	David Mohler
MassDOT Highway Division	Marie Rose
Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority (MBTA)	John Romano
Massachusetts Port Authority	Joe Cosgrove
MBTA Advisory Board	Lourenço Dantas
Metropolitan Area Planning Council	Paul Regan
MetroWest Regional Collaborative (Town of Framingham)	Eric Bourassa
Minuteman Advisory Group on Interlocal Coordination (Town of Bedford)	Dennis Giombetti
North Shore Task Force (City of Beverly)	Richard Reed
North Suburban Planning Council (City of Woburn)	Tina Cassidy
Regional Transportation Advisory Council	Ed Tarallo
South Shore Coalition (Town of Braintree)	Steve Olanoff
South West Advisory Planning Committee (Town of Medway)	Christine Stickney
Three Rivers Interlocal Council (Town of Norwood/NVCC)	Dennis Crowley
	Tom O'Rourke

Other Attendees Affiliation

Guy Bresnahan	MassDOT
Callida Cenizal	MassDOT
Nicholas Downing	MAPC
Ivna Fried	Conservation Law Foundation
Sarah Hamilton	Medical Academic and Scientific Community Organization, Inc.
Joanne Haracz	AECOM
Rafael Mares	Conservation Law Foundation
Joe Onorato	MassDOT District 4
Amanda Richard	Office of State Senator Thomas McGee
Paul Talbot	Cape Ann Transportation Authority
Wig Zamore	Somerville Transportation Equity Partnership / Mystic View Task Force

MPO Staff/Central Transportation Planning Staff

Karl Quackenbush, Executive Director
Mark Abbott
Daniel Amstutz
David Fargen
Bruce Kaplan
Maureen Kelly
Robin Mannion
Anne McGahan
Efi Pagitsas
Scott Peterson
Sean Pfalzer
Pam Wolfe
