

# Memorandum for the Record

## Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization Meeting

### November 1, 2012 Meeting

10:00 AM – 1:15 PM, State Transportation Building, Conference Rooms 2&3, 10 Park Plaza, Boston

Ned Codd and David Mohler, Chairs, 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 the *MBTA Silver Line to Chelsea: Alternatives Analysis, Phase 2*
- accept staff's recommendation to study four locations in the *FFY 2013 Safety and Operations of Intersections* study:
  - South Franklin Street (Route 37) at Union Street (Route 139) in Holbrook
  - Western Avenue (Route 107) at Washington Street (Route 129) in Lynn
  - Lexington Street at Beaver Street in Waltham
  - Franklin Street (Route 37) at West Street in Braintree
- select roadway segments on the following corridors for study in the *Priority Corridors for LRTP Needs Assessment* study:
  - Route 30 in Framingham
  - Route 2 in Concord and Lincoln

### Meeting Agenda

#### 1. Public Comments

Frank DeMasi, Regional Transportation Advisory Council, commented on the MPO's *Priority Corridors for LRTP Needs Assessment* work program. He noted that the work program makes reference to studying all transportation modes, but the truck mode is not represented. Referencing a recent fatality in Wellesley where a bicyclist was struck by a truck and the fact that semi-trailers are increasingly being used to make local deliveries to businesses, he emphasized the importance of incorporating the truck mode in studies. He noted that MassDOT has completed the State Rail and Freight Plan and that the MPO has completed the first phase of a Freight Study and that these provide good information for MPO planning.

## **2. Chair's Report—*Ned Codd, MassDOT***

N. Codd noted that the public review period for draft Amendment Two of the federal fiscal years (FFYs) 2013-16 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) is open until Monday, November 5. The MPO is scheduled to vote on the amendment at the meeting of November 15.

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

Lourenço Dantas, Massachusetts Port Authority, announced that a meeting of the Congestion Management Process (CMP) Committee is being planned for December 6.

Eric Bourassa, Metropolitan Area Planning Council (MAPC), reported that MAPC held its Fall Council meeting where the MPO elections were held. The towns of Braintree and Bedford were re-elected to the MPO.

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

S. Olanoff announced that the next Advisory Council meeting will be held on November 14. The agenda includes the following items: a presentation on plans for housing growth by Jessica Casey, Executive Office of Housing and Economic Development; a presentation about land use policy and smart growth in the Interstate 495 corridor by Barry Keppard, MAPC; and a report on the results of the MPO's recommendations regarding the Advisory Council's elections procedures by Paul Regan, MBTA Advisory Board.

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

### ***Public Comments on TIP Amendment***

K. Quackenbush reported that staff has received two public comments so far pertaining to the draft Amendment Two of the FFYs 2013-16 TIP. Sean Pfalzer, MPO staff, then summarized the comments.

One comment came from MassDOT, which notifies the MPO that MassDOT has paid the advance construction (AC) balances in full for the *Route 99 (Alford Street)* bridge project in Boston. The MPO can remove approximate \$10 million in funding for the project's AC balances that was programmed in the TIP in FFYs 2013 and 2014.

Another comment from the MetroWest Regional Transit Authority (RTA) informs the MPO that the RTA has received a \$1 million discretionary grant from the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) for a paratransit call center. Staff is working with the RTA to program those funds on the TIP.

Members discussed this information.

Jim Gillooly, City of Boston (BTD), noted that the Alford Street Bridge is still under construction and questioned how it could be paid for already. N. Codd explained that MassDOT was able to pre-pay bridge AC balances from a number of projects programmed in the TIP in FFYs 2013-16, as a result of a decision (made in concert with the Federal Highway Administration) to merge two projects in Fall River – the *Braga Bridge* and the *Interstate 95/Route 79 Ramps* projects – into a single project for advertising in FFY 2013.

S. Olanoff asked in which year the MetroWest RTA project would be programmed. S. Pfalzer replied that it would be programmed in FFY 2013.

Joe Cosgrove, MBTA, asked if the \$10 million for the Alford Street Bridge project would need to be re-programmed in the TIP. N. Codd replied no and explained that the money came from statewide bridge funds and not MPO target funds.

Christine Stickney, South Shore Coalition (Town of Braintree), asked if these changes would require changes to MPO programming in the future. N. Codd replied that the amendments pertaining to the repurposing of federal earmarks and shifts in accelerated bridge funding will all be addressed by November 15.

#### ***December 6 MPO Meeting Location***

K. Quackenbush alerted members that the MPO meeting of December 6 will be held in the Norwood Community Center. Staff will provide information about transportation options to reach that location prior to the meeting.

#### **6. Work Program for MBTA Silver Line to Chelsea—Karl Quackenbush, Executive Director, Central Transportation Planning Staff**

K. Quackenbush introduced the work program for the *MBTA Silver Line to Chelsea: Alternatives Analysis, Phase 2*. This work program represents the second round of travel forecasting work that CTPS will conduct to study proposed Silver Line routes to Chelsea. The work would produce ridership and revenue estimates and an environmental justice analysis. This study would be funded by MassDOT.

Several factors have led to a continued interest in expanding transit service to Chelsea. First, MassDOT has acquired the right-of-way to the Grand Junction Railway, which provides a possible avenue for extending transit service to Chelsea. Secondly, previous planning on the Urban Ring's Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) identified locations in Chelsea where it might be relatively cost-effective to provide transit and where there would be relatively high ridership. Chelsea, which is three miles from

downtown Boston and has no rapid transit, has a demographic base that is associated with high transit need and high ridership.

A map of two potential Silver Line routes was distributed. This map was developed during the first round of work on this project that was previously executed by CTPS. The two alternatives shown on the map would extend the Silver Line from Logan Airport through East Boston and into Chelsea using the East Boston Bypass Road in East Boston and crossing into Chelsea via the Chelsea Street Bridge. There were two different options presented for the potential route in Chelsea. In Alternative 2, the Silver Line would run along the Grand Junction Busway to the Chelsea commuter rail station. In Alternative 3, it would run along Central Avenue and terminate at Bellingham Square.

Members discussed the work program.

J. Gillooly suggested adding text to the work program to clarify that the Silver Line extension would provide connections to South Station.

P. Regan asked if the proposed Silver Line service would have any impact on existing freight rail traffic or commuter rail service. N. Codd replied that all of the track on the Silver Line right-of-way is currently out of service.

P. Regan inquired about capital costs. K. Quackenbush replied that this study does not address capital costs. L. Dantas noted that this study is part of a larger one. N. Codd added that MassDOT is procuring a consultant to lead the next phase of the alternatives analysis and that work will address cost and operational issues.

P. Regan pointed out that the existing bus fleet is two-thirds through its useful life and that it will be necessary to acquire more rolling stock. N. Codd noted that this issue is being taken into consideration.

N. Codd encouraged MPO members to participate in the public involvement component of the study.

David Koses, At-Large City of Newton, raised concerns that Alternative 2 would route the Silver Line in a way that would bypass much of the concentration of population of Chelsea. Alternative 3, which goes through the heart of the city, would likely reach more people. He expressed interest in seeing the model results from the first round of work that CTPS conducted.

L. Dantas suggested that using a horizon date of 2020 (rather than 2035) for the modeling would be useful as 2020 would be closer to the time that the project might be implemented.

J. Gillooly raised the idea of planning for a Silver Line stop in East Boston (beyond the Airport Station). N. Codd noted that a conversation about that topic could occur in the context of this study.

D. Koses asked if changes to MBTA bus route #111 would be assumed in the modeling. K. Quackenbush replied that changes to existing routes would be determined as the alternatives for study are developed. Scott Peterson, MPO staff, added that in the previous study the only changes assumed were to bus route #112. He also noted that proposed changes to bus routes would be determined by the consultant team.

Rafael Mares, Conservation Law Foundation, noted that Alternative 2 would terminate at the Chelsea commuter rail station, while Alternative 3 would not. He raised the possibility of extending Alternative 3 to the commuter rail station. K. Quackenbush noted that the idea could be considered when MassDOT and the consultant team specify alternatives for study. N. Codd added that the modeling will help determine desirable connections.

R. Mares asked if the study would include an air quality and greenhouse gas emissions analysis. K. Quackenbush and S. Peterson replied yes.

A motion to approve the work program for the *MBTA Silver Line to Chelsea: Alternatives Analysis, Phase 2* was made by the Inner Core Committee (City of Somerville) (Tom Bent), and seconded by MAPC (E. Bourassa). The motion carried.

## **7. Meeting Minutes—Maureen Kelly, MPO Staff**

The draft minutes of the meeting of October 18 were not posted in time for the members to vote on them. This item will be addressed at the next MPO meeting.

## **8. MPO Certification Activities Schedule—Pam Wolfe, Manager of Certification Activities, MPO Staff**

A draft schedule of Certification Activities in FFY 2013 was distributed. P. Wolfe provided an overview of these activities.

These activities include ongoing work including public participation work (such as hosting public workshops and publishing the *TRANSREPORT* newsletter), staff's work with the Advisory Council, air quality analyses and climate change activities, disability

access support for the Access Advisory Committee to the MBTA, the Transportation Equity Program, the CMP Program, and safety and security work.

Also included is work on the MPO's annual programs: the Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP), the UPWP, the TIP, the Clean Air and Mobility Program, and the Intersection Improvement Program. Work on the LRTP will include the development of performance measures and the Needs Assessment. There will be public outreach for each. Work is already underway on the development of the UPWP and the TIP. Staff are reviewing the project evaluation criteria for the TIP and are expected to recommend modest changes at an upcoming meeting. Outreach for these documents will begin in November and will include meeting with the MAPC Subregions, notifying municipal officials, and holding UPWP- and TIP-Building workshops and an MPO Open House.

Milestone dates include the following: February 1, when municipalities must submit their TIP Project Funding Request Forms; March 1, when the MPO would expect to be notified of the amount of target funds available for the TIP and UPWP; April 4, when the MPO will review staff recommendations for TIP projects and UPWP studies; April 18, when the MPO would vote to release the draft TIP and UPWP for public review; and June 27, when the MPO would vote to approve the final TIP and UPWP.

The MPO will review work scopes as they are available and the subsequent studies and reports. The UPWP Committee will be receiving quarterly reports throughout the year to track project implementation.

Members discussed the schedule.

N. Codd reported that MassDOT is working closely with FHWA and FTA to be able to deliver the MPO its targets by March 1, but that even if they are not available on that date, the document development process should continue based on reasonable assumptions for the federal targets. It is necessary for the MPO to remain on the proposed schedule in order to meet MassDOT's schedule for developing the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), and to enable the submission of the TIP and STIP to FHWA and FTA on time for approval by the beginning of the following federal fiscal year.

Ed Tarallo, North Suburban Planning Council (City of Woburn), suggested moving the date for releasing the draft TIP and UPWP from April 18 to May 2 to allow more time for the review of the documents. Members agreed to make the change to the schedule.

T. Bent asked if staff anticipates convening the TIP Criteria Committee to discuss the possible changes to the TIP criteria. P. Wolfe replied that staff expects that the changes

to the criteria will be fairly minor. She noted that it is staff's understanding that the MPO wishes to discuss TIP matters at the full MPO meeting.

## **9. Transportation Improvement Program Update—Sean Pfalzer, MPO Staff**

S. Pfalzer gave a PowerPoint presentation on TIP programming for FFYs 2008-16 and described investments in the TIP by project type and subregion location. This presentation provided an update on information that was provided to members in an October 2010 memorandum.

During the FFY 2008-16 time period, the MPO programmed approximately \$65 million annually from the Regional Discretionary Program ("Target Program") and approximately \$284 million annually from the Highway Program.

Staff organized the presentation to show spending in terms of the following investment categories: major highway, arterial and intersection, bicycle and pedestrian, clean air and mobility, bridge, transit, and other. S. Pfalzer noted that arterial and intersection projects may also include bicycle and pedestrian facilities. He provided examples of funded projects in each category.

Graphs were shown that depicted annual investments in the Target Program and Highway Program. The overall amount of funding for the Target Program has increased with the current TIP, with more than \$70 million available in FFYs 2014 and 2016. Investments in major highway projects – such as the *Crosby's Corner* project in Concord and Lincoln – have increased in recent years. Arterial and intersection projects also represent a large share of the annual investments. Investments in bicycle and pedestrian projects were largest in FFYs 2009 and 2013-15. Highway funds were flexed to fund transit projects in FFY 2009 (for the *Orange Line Station at Assembly Square* project) and in FFYs 2014-15 (for the *Green Line Extension* project). Approximately two million dollars a year was invested in the Clean Air and Mobility Program, except for FFYs 2014-15 when funding for this program was reduced.

The graph for the Highway Program showed a spike in bridge funding in FFY 2012 due to the significant investment of the state's Accelerated Bridge Program (ABP). Projects funded included the *Longfellow Bridge* in Boston and Cambridge, and the *Fore River Bridge* in Quincy. Increased funding in FFYs 2009 and 2010 reflects federal stimulus funding.

Pie charts depicted funding for the FFY 2008-16 time period based on project type. Through the Target Program, the MPO made the largest investment in arterial and

intersection projects (representing 51% of all investments), followed by major highway projects (39%), transit (flexed funds) (3.5%), bicycle and pedestrian projects (3.4%), clean air and mobility projects (2.3%), and other (0.7%).

Through the Highway Program, the largest investment was in bridge projects (48% - one-third of which is APB funding), followed by major highway projects (24%), arterial and intersection projects (21%), bicycle and pedestrian projects (3.5%), transit (flexed funds) (1.8%), other (1.6%), and clean air and mobility projects (0.5%).

Graphs were also shown that depicted investments by subregion. One displayed data on demographics (population and employment) and vehicle miles travelled (VMT) for each subregion along with TIP funding. Another showed investment by project type in each subregion.

Transit funding was not incorporated in the data shown (except for funds flexed to transit). Funds for transit projects are distributed to the state's RTAs by formula. The MBTA receives approximately \$286 million annually, the MetroWest RTA receives approximately \$2 million, and the Cape Ann Transportation Authority (CATA) receives less than \$1 million.

The information provided can be used to provide a baseline to inform future investment strategies for the LRTP, to help gauge consistency with MAP-21 guidelines, and to support the development of performance targets. It can, for example, help the MPO to understand the level of investment needed to meet goals for greenhouse gas emission reductions.

Members discussed this information and asked questions.

Laura Wiener, At-Large Town of Arlington, asked how Complete Streets projects were categorized. S. Pfalzer replied that they are considered arterial and intersection projects. The *Trapelo Road* project in Belmont is an example of a Complete Streets project.

L. Dantas asked for more specificity about how the information can help gauge consistency with MAP-21. S. Pfalzer explained that the data could be used to assess if past TIP spending comply with new funding targets for programs like the Highway Safety Improvement Program.

Richard Reed, Minuteman Advisory Group on Interlocal Coordination (Town of Bedford), asked how staff collects VMT data, particularly in regards to inter-regional travelers. S. Peterson replied that VMT is determined by the travel demand model. It



captures the VMT of people moving within the region and those traveling into and out of the region collectively.

Dennis Giombetti, MetroWest Regional Collaborative (Town of Framingham), asked staff to provide a list of projects by type and subregion. He noted that the information will be helpful in terms of understanding where specifically funds are allocated within each region (given that one large highway project in a region could skew the graphs showing funding by subregion).

D. Mohler asked how staff allocated project funding for projects that are within more than one subregion. S. Pfalzer replied that if the project crosses two subregions, the cost was split between those subregions. This was the case for the Route 128 Add-a-Lane project.

Wig Zamore, Somerville Transportation Equity Partnership and Mystic View Task Force, suggested that staff could use the travel model to compare VMT by traffic analysis zone. He noted that it would be useful to know year of spending as well as year of allocation for projects. He also commented that the investment in bicycle and pedestrian projects is drastically out of synch with MassDOT's new mode shift goals. Lastly, he suggested that staff separate out the data on Boston from the Inner Core subregion. This would be especially interesting considering that this subregion represents half of the region's population.

T. Bent asked staff to add Somerville to the slide that lists the communities that have the Hubway bicycle program. He remarked that the program has been very successful in Somerville.

### **10. Location Selection—Karl Quackenbush, Executive Director, Central Transportation Planning Staff**

Staff made recommendations on potential locations to study for two projects.

#### ***FFY 2013 Safety and Operations of Intersections***

K. Quackenbush noted that the *FFY 2013 Safety and Operations of Intersections* study represents the sixth round of analyses that staff has conducted to identify safety and operation improvements at selected locations. Members were presented with a memorandum and tables describing the decision process for location selection and indicating proposed locations for study:

- South Franklin Street (Route 37) at Union Street (Route 139) in Holbrook
- Western Avenue (Route 107) at Washington Street (Route 129) in Lynn
- Lexington Street at Beaver Street in Waltham

- Franklin Street (Route 37) at West Street in Braintree

Members discussed these recommendations.

D. Mohler inquired about the choice of intersections, and why two in Lynn that scored highly in staff's evaluation process were not selected. K. Quackenbush explained that staff selected the intersection in Lynn that scored the highest and then selected an intersection in Braintree that also scored highly. Geographic equity was a consideration in this decision.

Members reached consensus to accept staff's recommendation.

### ***Priority Corridors for LRTP Needs Assessment***

K. Quackenbush reported that staff is recommending studying two roadway segments for the *Priority Corridors for LRTP Needs Assessment* study. The first is a section of Route 30 in Framingham between Interstate 90 and Route 9. For the second location staff asked members to provide guidance on selecting one of two choices: a section of Route 2 in Concord and Lincoln between the Concord Rotary and Interstate 95 (excluding Crosby's Corner); or a section of Routes 3 and 3A in Woburn and Burlington.

If members were to support the choice of Route 2 as a study location, their decision would be consistent with the decision process outlined in the work program. That process emphasizes the importance of implementability, and because this location is supported by MassDOT District 4, the probability of implementation is relatively high. By choosing Route 3 /3A, members would be diverging from this approach because MassDOT does not support changes in that corridor.

In response to a member's question, K. Quackenbush and Seth Asante, MPO staff, explained that locations identified as being among MassDOT's Top High Crash Locations are assigned their crash ranking based on an "Equivalent Property Damage Only" evaluation, which gives numeric weight based on the number of crashes at a particular location involving fatalities, injuries, or property damage.

S. Asante then provided a PowerPoint presentation about the location selection process. Staff began with 31 arterial segments as candidates for study. After gathering data on each segment, staff forwarded the data to MassDOT for review. In addition to MassDOT's input, staff reviewed input from the MPO subregions and municipalities. The locations were then evaluated based on criteria having to do with safety, congestion, transit, regional significance, implementation potential of recommendations, and geographic equity. Staff ranked each segment as high, medium, or low priority.

The locations that staff recommended as high priority locations were chosen for the following reasons. Route 30 in Framingham has safety and mobility problems and is among the Top 200 Crash Locations. The Town of Framingham and MassDOT are interested in implementing improvements at this location. Route 2 in Concord and Lincoln also has high crash locations and has been prioritized by MassDOT District 4 for short-term improvements for safety.

The North Suburban Planning Council (NSPC) and the City of Woburn have identified the need for a study on Routes 3/3A in Woburn and Burlington. MassDOT District 4 does not support the selection of this location due to right-of-way issues in the area.

Members discussed the choices before them.

D. Giombetti asked about the rationale for staff's decision to study only two locations given that there are multiple high priority locations identified. S. Asante explained that the decision to limit the number of locations studied is due to available funding.

D. Mohler asked for more detail about how staff prioritized the three locations. S. Asante explained that staff chose locations that did not require staff to use its modeling resources.

E. Tarallo provided an explanation of how the Route 3/3A location came to be suggested as a possible study location. He explained that the idea for a study in that area arose at a meeting of the NSPC. Representatives from the City of Woburn and the towns of Burlington and Winchester all agreed that the corridor was a priority for study. E. Tarallo, from his role as chair of the Woburn Traffic Commission, reported that the problems with the corridor are frequently on the Commission's agenda. The city has been working with MassDOT to address the problems. The NSPC believes that the corridor needs to be studied as a whole, rather than addressing problems piecemeal.

R. Reed asked about what limits staff from studying all three locations, and whether staff anticipates conducting a similar study next year. K. Quackenbush replied that staff is limited based on the project budget defined in the UPWP. He noted that staff would be inclined to recommend doing a similar study next year.

R. Reed asked if the MPO must decide on the locations today (or whether they could postpone the decision until the next meeting). Efi Pagitsas, MPO staff, explained that staff intends to start the data collection work soon, before the onset of winter (when data collection becomes more difficult) and in order to keep the project within the fiscal year.

R. Reed asked if the Towns of Concord and Lincoln were aware that the MPO was scheduled to make a decision today. D. Mohler and K. Quackenbush replied that there was no special outreach to those communities.

In response to questions from R. Reed, S. Asante and E. Pagitsas provided more details about the two corridors. They noted the length of the segments on a map. E. Pagitsas noted that the Route 2 segment does not include Crosby's Corner, and that the segment runs from west of Bedford Road to the Route 126 intersection.

Richard Canale, At-Large Town of Lexington, noted that the Route 3/3A corridor has more challenges and opportunities for creative solutions, but the implementation of any recommendations would take time. He expressed support for studying Route 2 in this project noting that the recommendations may be more able to be implemented and that the improvements would be regional.

Laura Wiener, At-Large Town of Arlington, suggested waiting to study Route 2 until after the *Route 2/Crosby's Corner* project is complete. E. Pagitsas replied that the MassDOT District Office would like to implement signal retiming and coordination improvements on Route 2 that are not associated with the impacts of the *Route 2/Crosby's Corner* project. The study would also focus on bicycle and pedestrian crossing of Route 2.

S. Olanoff asked if the Route 2 locations would focus on intersections only. E. Pagitsas replied that the study would likely focus mostly on crossings.

J. Gillooly asked for staff's perspective on why they had difficulty choosing between the two locations. E. Pagitsas explained that the possibility of studying Route 3/3A was raised in discussions with the NSPC. Subsequently, staff contacted MassDOT to ask if the agency would be able to implement potential recommendations from the study. MassDOT expressed that it would not support including the location in this study.

J. Gillooly then inquired as to how MassDOT could know that there would be a problem with implementing potential recommendations prior to the study. D. Mohler noted that MassDOT confers with municipalities regarding projects on locally-maintained facilities and that if the municipalities are not interested in having those improvements made, then MassDOT will focus its energy on other projects.

Joe Onorato, MassDOT Highway, explained that the agency recommended against Route 3/3A because of right-of-way issues that could involve acquiring conservation land and land owned by the City of Boston. These acquisitions would require legislative approval. The criteria used to determine the study locations calls for no major right-of-

way takings and the ability to implement recommendations in a reasonable amount of time.

J. Onorato further noted that MassDOT Highway recommends that the City of Woburn bypass any further studies and that the city join MassDOT in the project development process for the Bedford Street intersection, with the understanding that the right-of-way acquisition will be a long and complicated process. The project would have to be developed to the point of having 100% right-of-way plans before it could go before the legislature to address the right-of-way acquisitions.

S. Olanoff asked if MassDOT would fund recommendations stemming from a study of Route 2. D. Mohler replied that MassDOT is interested in improvements to Route 2 and could potentially fund it out of non-federal aid funds. MassDOT, however, has not committed to funding the potential recommendations at this point. E. Pagitsas added that recommendations could be implemented with the use of MassDOT District maintenance funds.

E. Tarallo provided more detail on his conversations with staff about this project and noted that he was initially contacted by staff about the possibility of including the Route 3/3A location in this study. He noted again that representatives of the towns of Burlington and Winchester identified Route 3/3A as areas in need of study at a NSPC meeting. He noted that the Bedford Street intersection, the Four Corners intersection, and an area near the Winchester line have been identified as problematic. As a corridor study, Route 3/3A would be more appropriate than Route 2, he said, since the Route 2 segments would be better for an intersection study.

In response to a question from R. Reed, E. Pagitsas noted that both corridors are state owned, but improvements on Route 2 would not involve right-of-way takings. R. Reed suggested that the state is giving priority to a project on state right-of-way. J. Onorato responded that MassDOT Highway believes that recommendations from a study on Route 2 could be implemented quickly, while those for Route 3/3A would take much longer.

L. Dantas expressed that the MPO needs more time before approving the study locations as many questions still remain.

E. Tarallo expressed willingness to confer with MassDOT District 4 about other avenues, referenced today, for addressing the problems on Route 3/3A. He suggested delaying the vote for two weeks.

J. Onorato explained that MassDOT Highway recommended studying Route 2 because there is a need for signal coordination in the corridor. Previous studies on Crosby's Corner and the Route 2 Rotary have pointed to the need for signal coordination. Such improvements could be implemented within MassDOT Highway's existing budget. He again advised against the Route 3 and 3A study and suggested going straight to project development for the Bedford Street intersection.

K. Quackenbush noted that Route 2 does qualify as a corridor study. He noted that it was his decision to bring this question of Route 3/3A before the MPO given that discussions with a board member had revealed an issue pertaining to the essential way in which study locations are selected that the MPO should have an opportunity to discuss.

L. Dantas suggested that the Route 2 study could be conducted outside the scope of this project or that a consultant could do the retiming of signals on Route 2. J. Onorato noted that MassDOT recommended Route 2 based on the criteria of the study.

In response to a question from D. Mohler, E. Pagitsas confirmed that the idea for studying Route 2 was generated by staff, who then presented the idea to MassDOT Highway.

S. Olanoff expressed support for studying Route 2 given that two of the four intersections in this proposal are among the Top 200 High Crash Locations.

R. Canale asked if MassDOT would be ready to design the Route 2 intersections. J. Onorato replied that the signal timing at that location needs to be studied. He reiterated that Route 2 improvements would be more implementable than recommendations for Route 3/3A.

R. Reed expressed his inclination to support Route 2.

Several members indicated a willingness to postpone the vote.

A motion to select Route 30 in Framingham as an area for study in the *Priority Corridors for LRTP Needs Assessment* study was made by the MetroWest Regional Collaborative (Town of Framingham) (D. Giombetti), and seconded by the Inner Core Committee (City of Somerville) (T. Bent). The motion carried.

A motion to select Route 2 in Concord and Lincoln as an area for study in the *Priority Corridors for LRTP Needs Assessment* study was made by MassDOT Highway Division (J. Romano), and seconded by the Inner Core Committee (City of Somerville) (T. Bent).

The motion passed. The following members voted no: Massachusetts Port Authority (L. Dantas); MBTA Advisory Board (P. Regan); At-Large City of Newton (D. Koses); and North Suburban Planning Council (City of Woburn) (E. Tarallo).

### **11. Priority Corridors for LRTP Needs Assessment—Karl Quackenbush, Executive Director, Central Transportation Planning Staff**

Staff presented the results of two corridor studies from the *FFY 2012 Priority Corridors for LRTP Needs Assessment* study.

#### ***Route 203 Corridor Study, Boston - Seth Asante, MPO Staff***

S. Asante gave a PowerPoint presentation on the results of the *Route 203 Corridor Study*. This study focused on the segments of Gallivan Boulevard and Morton Street in Boston; the roadways are maintained by MassDOT.

Problems in the study area include poor bicycle and pedestrian accommodations (ADA non-compliance), lack of bus shelters and benches, lighting equipment in need of repair, high crash rates at intersections, poor pavement condition, traffic congestion, outdated signal timing, absence of emergency preemption capability, and poor signage.

Recommendations for pedestrian improvements included reconstructing sidewalks, constructing bulb-outs, and installing detectable warning panels, accessible pedestrian signals, and countdown displays. Recommendations for bicycle improvements include installing bicycle detection at signalized intersections, marking pavement for bicycle detectors, and marking for sharrows. The recommendations also call for upgrades to substandard traffic signal equipment, adding emergency-vehicle preemptions systems, retiming and coordinating traffic signals, upgrading street lighting, and improving signage.

Staff is also recommending a road diet on a section of Gallivan Boulevard between Wilmington Avenue to Wessex Street. Other suggestions for roadway and transit improvement include rehabilitating pavement and curbing, improving drainage, extending medians, upgrading landscaping, and adding bus shelters.

Some of the recommendations are already being implemented. MassDOT District 6 has been adding signs and sharrows, and two projects (as yet unfunded) have been developed.

Members discussed this study.

J. Romano praised staff for their work on this project and he advocated for continuing to fund this type of studies. J. Gillooly echoed these comments and expressed the City of Boston's appreciation.

Tom Kadzis, City of Boston, asked if staff recommended replacing trees on the corridor. S. Asante replied that staff did recommend improving the aesthetics on medians and making landscaping improvements, including replanting trees on Gallivan Boulevard. J. Romano added that District 6 recently replaced trees on Gallivan Boulevard.

***Route 114 Corridor Study, Danvers - Chen-Yuan Wang, MPO Staff***

C. Wang gave a PowerPoint presentation on the results of the *Route 114 Corridor Study*. The study area was a one mile segment of Route 114 in Danvers and Peabody with six signalized intersections and four unsignalized intersections.

The results of a safety analysis determined that the corridor has a high crash rate with primarily angle and rear-end collisions. There are, however, lower crash rates at the intersections. Many of the crashes occur within sections with two-way left-turn lanes. Recently, a pedestrian fatality occurred on the corridor. There were three crashes involving bicyclists from 2005 to 2010.

An analysis of operations in the corridor determined that there is an acceptable level of service at the intersections, but there are heavy left turns to Garden Street. Other problems identified include the lack of medians on wide roadway sections and problematic two-way left-turn lane operations, resulting in safety issues. Staff identified the potential for adding sidewalks, crosswalks, and bicycle lanes, and for making connections to the Danvers Rail Trail.

Recommendations for short-term improvements include adding pavement-marking medians and stamped-concrete medians, adding signage at Garden Street, and modifying access to driveways.

Staff presented two alternatives for long-term improvements. Alternative 1 would involve adding stamped-concrete medians, building a pedestrian and bicycle ramp to the Danvers Rail Trail, widening the sidewalk near the Danvers Rail Trail, and managing driveway access. Alternative 2 is larger in scale and would require an expansion of the roadway service to enhance the bicycle and pedestrian usage in the corridor. It would create a five-foot sidewalk, five-foot bicycle lanes or four-foot shoulders, add crosswalks, build a pedestrian and bicycle ramp to the Danvers Rail Trail, reconstruct the Danvers Rail Trail bridge, add raised and stamped-concrete medians, and manage driveway access. A map was shown depicting areas where these improvements could be implemented.



Implementation of short-term recommendations has begun. MassDOT has installed a sign at the Garden Street intersection. Roadway markings are being funded through MassDOT maintenance funds. Regarding long-term recommendations, the study has provided a conceptual plan for the future development of Route 114. Implementation will require coordination between MassDOT and the communities and businesses along the corridor.

Members discussed this study.

D. Koses inquired about the use of stamped-concrete for medians and the impact that type of material has on access to properties. He asked if there have been discussions with the property owners on Route 114 about using such medians and whether they have been installed elsewhere in the state.

C. Wang noted that the material affects access to an extent. Some drivers will be deterred from driving over the material because it produces a rumbling sensation and can be visually deterring. The material is flush with the pavement, however, so one can drive over it.

C. Wang explained that these types of medians are included as access management tools in MassDOT's Project Development and Design Guide. The use of this type of median requires cooperation with property managers and other stakeholders.

## **12.Members Items**

D. Mohler reported that it may be necessary to revise the draft Amendment Two of the FFYs 2013-16 TIP, which includes funding from a repurposed earmark that would be directed to CATA for the repair of the roof of its maintenance facility. FTA has informed MassDOT that CATA may not be able to access those funds because CATA has outstanding civil rights compliance issues. MassDOT will have more definite information by November 15, when the MPO will vote on the amendment. If the funds are withdrawn from CATA, MassDOT would redirect them to a project of the Montachusett Regional Transit Authority.

## **13.Adjourn**

A motion to adjourn was made by the MassDOT Highway Division (J. Romano) and seconded by the Inner Core Committee (City of Somerville) (T. Bent). The motion carried.

---

## Attendance

---

### Members

### Representatives and Alternates

---

At-Large City (City of Newton)	David Koses
At-Large Town (Town of Arlington)	Laura Wiener
At-Large Town (Town of Lexington)	Richard Canale
City of Boston (Boston Redevelopment Authority)	Lara Mérida
City of Boston (Boston Transportation Department)	Jim Gillooly
	Tom Kadzis
Federal Highway Administration	Michael Chong
Inner Core Committee (City of Somerville)	Tom Bent
Massachusetts Department of Transportation	David Mohler
	Ned Codd
	David Anderson
MassDOT Highway Division	John Romano
Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority (MBTA)	Joe Cosgrove
Massachusetts Port Authority	Lourenço Dantas
MBTA Advisory Board	Paul Regan
Metropolitan Area Planning Council	Eric Bourassa
	Eric Halvorsen
MetroWest Regional Collaborative (Town of Framingham)	Dennis Giombetti
Minuteman Advisory Group on Interlocal Coordination (Town of Bedford)	Richard Reed
North Shore Task Force (City of Beverly)	Denise Deschamps
North Suburban Planning Council (City of Woburn)	Ed Tarallo
Regional Transportation Advisory Council	Steve Olanoff
South Shore Coalition (Town of Braintree)	Christine Stickney
Three Rivers Interlocal Council (Town of Norwood/NVCC)	Tom O'Rourke

---

---

<b>Other Attendees</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>
Calli Cenizal	MassDOT
Frank DeMasi	Regional Transportation Advisory Council
Ivria Fried	Conservation Law Foundation
Rafael Mares	Conservation Law Foundation
Joe Onorato	MassDOT Highway
Wig Zamore	Somerville Transportation Equity Partnership and Mystic View Task Force

---

---

**MPO Staff/Central Transportation Planning Staff**

---

Karl Quackenbush, Executive Director  
Daniel Amstutz  
Seth Asante  
David Fargen  
Maureen Kelly  
Robin Mannion  
Anne McGahan  
Elizabeth Moore  
Efi Pagitsas  
Scott Peterson  
Sean Pfalzer  
Chen-Yuan Wang  
Pam Wolfe

---