

Draft Memorandum for the Record

Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization Meeting

March 6, 2014 Meeting

10:10 AM – 12:40 PM, Grand Army of the Republic Meeting Room, Memorial Hall,
Melrose

Clinton Bench, Chair, representing Richard Davey, Secretary and Chief Executive Officer, Massachusetts Department of Transportation (MassDOT)

Meeting Agenda

1. Public Comments

There were none.

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

C. Bench announced two upcoming staffing changes at MassDOT. Ned Codd, who has been overseeing MPO Activities Group of the Office of Transportation Planning, will be taking a new position working on sustainability planning and MassDOT's GreenDOT plan. Steve Woelfel, Director of Strategic Planning, will be taking on new duties with the MPO Activities Group.

C. Bench provided information about MassRIDES, MassDOT's statewide travel options program. The program works with business to identify strategies for employees to travel to and from work by means other than single occupancy vehicle travel. A new five-year contract has been awarded to the current vendor that operates the program. Going forward MassRIDES will be focusing more on new strategies such as dynamic ride sharing (for example, where customers use smart phone applications to arrange ridesharing). The MassDOT Board of Directors will be seeing a presentation on MassRIDES.

C. Bench also reported that MassDOT has identified regional funding targets for programming the federal fiscal years (FFYs) 2015-18 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) and the MPOs' Transportation Improvement Programs (TIPs).

3. Committee Chairs' Reports

There were none.

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

D. Montgomery reported that letters have been sent to municipalities that are currently not represented on the Advisory Council to encourage them to attend a meeting. Another round of letters will be sent to remind them of the Council's meeting on March 12.

At the next meeting, the Council will hear a presentation from Sean Pfalzer, MPO staff, on the TIP, and from Rob Guptill, MBTA, on the MBTA's Capital Investment Program (CIP). The Council will also continue its discussion about how to become more relevant to the MPO. A questionnaire will be sent to MPO members to gather their thoughts about what input from the Council would be useful.

The Council's Freight Committee will meet at 1:00 PM on March 12. Guy Bresnahan, MassDOT, will give a presentation on MassDOT's Industrial Rail Access Program.

For the benefit of new visitors, C. Bench gave an overview of the Council and the role it plays in community engagement for the MPO.

5. Executive Director's Report—*Robin Mannion, Deputy Executive Director, Central Transportation Planning Staff*

R. Mannion reported that CTPS has been experiencing connectivity problems with its website and apologized for any problems members may have had in downloading meeting materials. The MPO staff is in contact with its internet provider to resolve the issues.

She also introduced Jane Gillis, Manager of Graphics for CTPS, who attended to take photos of the meeting. Staff keeps photos on file of public involvement events for use in its graphics work.

6. Welcome from Host Municipality—*Denise M. Gaffey, Director, Office of Planning and Community Development, City of Melrose; Andy Street, City Engineer; Mayor Robert Dolan; Tom Bent, Inner Core Committee*

On behalf of Mayor Robert Dolan, Denise Gaffey welcomed the MPO members to Melrose. She thanked the MPO for its support of transportation planning work and projects in Melrose in recent years.

She provided an overview of Melrose, which is a city of about 4 square miles with a population of about 27,000 and a thriving downtown. Melrose is well served by transit.

The MBTA station at Oak Grove is the northern terminus of the Orange Line. Melrose also has three commuter rail stations and is served by several bus routes. This good access to transit is considered to be largely responsible for the strength of the city's housing market.

D. Gaffey also discussed the city's transit-oriented development (TOD) projects. About 15 years ago, Fidelity, which owned land near Oak Grove Station, approached the city with a concept of developing a smart growth community of about 550 residential units and about 20,000 square feet of retail. The city approved the development and now Oak Grove Village is a successful TOD project with between 60% and 70% of residents who are transit users.

The city has since put zoning in place for smart growth modeled on 40R zoning. This smart growth overlay has been applied to a section of Washington Street near Oak Grove and an industrial zone where old mill buildings are now being redeveloped into about 300 units of housing. The city is now turning its attention to the commuter rail corridor. The city has worked with MAPC on a visioning process and is now rezoning to connect to commuter rail nodes. The Commonwealth has awarded Melrose a MassWorks grant that will be focused on the Highlands commercial area.

Andy Street then gave members an overview of the city's work on roadways. With funding from the TIP, a half-mile section of the Lebanon Street corridor will be transformed to include new sidewalks, curbing, signal timing, and bicycle accommodations. The city will be using its \$1 million MassWorks grant to revitalize the business district in the Highlands area on Franklin Street by improving the roadway and parking lots, and providing bicycle access.

The city is also improving roadways through its own roads program, and is working to improve bicycle and pedestrian accommodations. The city has a newly formed bicycle and pedestrian committee – comprised of members of the planning department, the department of public works, police, and residents – that will be making recommendations.

Later in the meeting Mayor Robert Dolan addressed the MPO. He expressed appreciation that the MPO members have come to Melrose and provided a historic overview of the meeting venue in Memorial Hall, which was built in 1867 to commemorate those who served in the Civil War.

Mayor Dolan discussed the importance of the MPO and municipalities working together to advance infrastructure projects and programs in a timely fashion. He urged the MPO

to advocate to the state legislature and government for Chapter 90 funding for municipalities. He thanked the MPO for their work.

Also, later in the meeting, Tom Bent, Inner Core Committee (City of Somerville), provided an update on transportation priorities and issues in the Inner Core subregion, which includes Melrose. He reported that U.S. Representative Michael Capuano recently announced that the *Green Line Extension* (GLEX) project has been included in the President's FFY 2015 budget. This is an important step toward securing federal New Starts funding for the project.

T. Bent also reported that the Inner Core communities have been discussing the potential impacts that a new casino in Everett or Revere could have on the transportation system. The MPO may have a role to play once a determination has been made; the MPO may be asked to fund a UPWP study, for example.

Discussion

E. Bourassa raised a question about the status of the New Starts funding for the GLEX project and the amount included in the President's budget. Steve Woelfel, MassDOT, noted that inclusion of the project in the President's budget is a positive sign, but that the Commonwealth has not officially been awarded New Starts funding, and will not be assured of it until there is a full funding agreement. T. Bent stated that \$100 million is included in the President's budget for FFY 2015.

Regarding the casino issue, C. Bench noted that MassDOT officials are meeting regularly with the developers that are proposing the casinos to discuss traffic impacts and mitigation.

7. Report on MAPC Transportation Oriented Development Study in Melrose—Eric Halvorsen, MAPC

E. Halvorsen gave a presentation on MAPC's *Melrose Commuter Rail Corridor Visioning* study. The study focused on the Tremont and Essex Street corridor between two commuter rail stations, the Melrose Highlands and Cedar Park Stations. The purpose of the study was to help the City of Melrose to identify where to focus new residential and commercial growth. The corridor has a number of elements that can make TOD successful, lower single occupant vehicle trips, and increase bicycle and pedestrian trips.

MAPC held two public meetings where participants expressed interest in having more opportunities for bicycling and walking, and improving safety and accessibility. They

also expressed interest in developing new commercial opportunities around the train stations, such as restaurants and other services.

MAPC hired a consultant to conduct a market study of the corridor, including the housing, retail, and office markets. The housing market was found to be strong, but the study identified a need for larger size units. The downtown retail market is thriving, but there is room to increase retail activity around the train stations by between 10,000 to 15,000 square feet. There are minimal opportunities to expand office space in the study area.

Current zoning in the corridor is restrictive and does not match the community vision for a mixed-use corridor. As such, MAPC proposed new base zoning around the train stations that would provide more flexibility for developers by allowing for lower parking requirements, lower set-backs, increased building heights, and lower open space requirements. MAPC also suggested an overlay district between the train stations that would provide flexibility for property owners to develop more in line with community interests as ownership of existing businesses turn over naturally.

To address the community's interest in improved connectivity for bicycling and walking, MAPC made recommendations for low-cost infrastructure improvements – such as upgrades to sidewalks, crosswalk restriping, and installation of accessible ramps – as well as suggestions for streetscape and bicycle access improvements.

Now, the City of Melrose is developing new base zoning, and MAPC is developing an overlay district. The MassWorks grant is funding bicycle and pedestrian access improvements, and streetscape improvements on Franklin Street.

The *Melrose Commuter Rail Corridor Visioning* study is available on MAPC's website.

Discussion

Dennis Crowley, South West Advisory Planning Committee (Town of Medway), asked if the City of Melrose commissioned the study. E. Halvorsen replied that MAPC approached the city first about the study and that the study was done in partnership with the city.

8. Transportation Improvement Program: Highway Program Update— *Sean Pfalzer, MPO Staff*

S. Pfalzer provided an update on the costs of several projects programmed in the FFYs 2014-17 TIP. He also reported on the evaluation results for projects being considered for the FFYs 2015-18 TIP, and discussed the regional targets for programming the new TIP.

FFYs 2014-17 TIP Project Cost Increases

The following projects programmed in the FFYs 2014-17 TIP have cost increases:

- *Beverly – Reconstruction and Signal Improvements on Rantoul Street (Route 1A), from Cabot Street (South) to Cabot Street (North)*
- *Hanover – Reconstruction of Washington Street (Route 53) and Related Work from the Route 3 Northbound Ramp to Webster Street (Route 123)*
- *Salem – Reconstruction on Canal Street, from Washington Street and Mill Street to Loring Avenue and Jefferson Avenue*
- *Weymouth and Abington – Reconstruction and Widening on Route 18 (Main Street), from Highland Place to Route 139*

The first three projects are programmed in the FFY 2014 element of the TIP. The Weymouth project is programmed in the outer years of the TIP.

The cost estimate for the Beverly project has increased from \$15.7 million to \$19.9 million. The \$4 million increase is largely attributed to the need for improvements at two railroad crossings in the project area, the reimbursement MassDOT will provide for utility work in the corridor, and increases in paving costs.

The cost estimate for the Hanover project has increased from nearly \$1.2 million to \$1.8 million. The \$683,312 increase is largely attributed to increases in costs of materials (over the five-year period between the submission of the 25% and 75% designs), reimbursements for utilities, and the addition of required drainage work to the project design.

The cost estimate for the Salem project has increased from nearly \$6.6 million to \$7.8 million. The nearly \$1.3 million increase is due to the redesign of the intersection of Loring Avenue, Canal Street, and Jefferson Avenue, as well as a new geotechnical design for an area of Canal Street that is currently settling between Ocean Avenue and Forest Avenue.

The cost estimate for the Weymouth project has increased from \$40.6 million to \$57.7 million. The \$17 million cost increase associated with the 75% design is due to a number of factors including the following: earth excavation costs; hazardous materials removal; revised pavement design; increased use of walls to save wetlands; requirements for wetland replication and storm water retention basins; underestimation of the original bridge cost; utility reimbursement costs; and costs for flaggers. A value engineering study is being conducted to find ways to reduce costs.

The MPO staff has not prepared a recommendation to address these cost increases in the TIP, which is currently fully programmed. In the past, it has been the MPO's practice, when there are cost increases to projects, to retain its commitment to projects already programmed in the TIP by applying funds available in the outer years of next TIP under development. This practice, however, can delay other projects and reduce the amount of funding available for new projects. The impact of these cost increases will be discussed as the MPO develops the FFYs 2015-18 TIP.

Discussion

Richard Reed, Minuteman Advisory Group on Interlocal Coordination (Town of Bedford), asked for details on the programming of the Weymouth project. S. Pfalzer replied that the project is programmed over three years; \$10 million is programmed in FFY 2015, \$8 million in FFY 2016, and \$8 million in FFY 2017. The project also has a \$14 million earmark.

[At this point, members paused their discussion to hear a presentation from Mayor Dolan. His comments are summarized under Agenda Item 6.]

When the discussion resumed about the TIP, David Anderson, MassDOT, discussed new measures that MassDOT's Highway Division is implementing to control project cost increases and to get more reliable cost estimates. These include new requirements for consulting engineering firms to use when estimating costs, MassDOT's new practice of acquiring right-of-way from utilities, and its policy of reimbursing utilities for utility relocation costs if the work is completed on deadline.

D. Anderson also provided more details regarding the cost increase of the Weymouth project. The cost estimate increased between the development of the 25% and 75% design plans because of environmental work associated with mitigation for impacts to wetlands and the excavation of hazardous materials at the site.

Richard Canale, At-Large Town of Lexington, asked staff to include the percentage for project cost increases when preparing materials for the members in the future.

Paul Regan, MBTA Advisory Board, asked if MassDOT has any opportunities to pursue known polluters to make up for costs associated with hazardous materials removal. D. Anderson noted that MassDOT is pursuing two cases for damages related to property clean-up costs, but they do not appear to be successful at this time.

In response to a question from E. Bourassa, D. Anderson noted that MassDOT conducts a value engineering studies on projects that cost more than \$25 million. MassDOT has received recommendations from the study on the Weymouth project,

which includes recommendations regarding the bridge structure. MassDOT is evaluating those recommendations now.

E. Bourassa inquired about the costs for flaggers on the Weymouth project. D. Anderson replied that the amount needed for flaggers on the bridge construction portion of the project has been further refined.

In response to a question from Tom O'Rourke, Three Rivers Interlocal Council (Town of Norwood/NVCC), D. Anderson further explained that the under-estimation of costs on projects can be attributed to human error, lack of specifics when projects are at the conceptual level, and changes in project scope.

D. Crowley suggested that the cost of legal fees associated with acquiring easements and right-of-way should be built into the project budgets as these costs often fall to municipalities. D. Anderson described MassDOT's policy. For projects that MassDOT is the proponent of, MassDOT must acquire right-of-way. Regarding municipally proposed projects, MassDOT strongly encourages municipalities to take this action early to facilitate construction.

D. Crowley asked whether there is a plan for providing funding for projects (now at the 75% design stage) currently programmed in the FFY 2014 element of the TIP, if those projects do not get advertised by the close of FFY 2014. S. Pfalzer replied that, though there is a possibility that projects at the 75% design stage may not make it to the 100% design stage by the close of the year, all of the projects programmed in the FFY 2014 element of the TIP are on schedule to be advertised in mid-summer. D. Anderson then gave an update on the readiness of the four projects that are increasing in cost. The Salem project, which is at the 75% design stage, has a right-of-way issue that must be resolved. MassDOT has completed the 75% review of the Beverly project; some ADA accessibility issues must be addressed. The Hanover project is at the 100% design stage. The Weymouth project (which is programmed in the outer years of the TIP) will be more challenging to finalize as it will impact many property owners.

R. Reed asked if the right-of-way required for the Weymouth project is municipal or state. D. Anderson replied that it is state right-of-way.

R. Reed expressed his understanding that MassDOT will not advertise a project until all right-of-way (including for utilities) necessary to accomplish the project are acquired. D. Anderson stated that it is MassDOT's policy to strongly encourage municipal proponents to acquire all right-of-way, but there is no mandate to do so for utility right-of-way. R. Reed noted that acquiring utility right-of-way is an important part of accomplishing a project and that this should be a requirement. D. Anderson discussed

that it is MassDOT's position not to place this mandate on municipalities, and he explained that MassDOT is under no obligation to demonstrate that property rights for utilities have been acquired.

R. Reed noted that many parties may be involved in the relocation of utilities (as multiple companies may be using any given utility pole). He said that consideration should be given as to who is getting paid with state reimbursements and how they are being held accountable for completing the relocation work. D. Anderson noted that MassDOT holds the company that owns the utility pole accountable. R. Reed expressed his hope that MassDOT does not reimburse the utilities until the work is completed by all parties involved. D. Anderson confirmed that this is MassDOT's practice.

Tom Bent, Inner Core Committee (City of Somerville), expressed concern about significant cost increases to projects that occur after they have been programmed by the MPO. He noted that if the MPO had known the current cost estimate of the Weymouth project, the MPO may have chosen not to program it. He noted that these cost increases will have impacts to the MPO's ability to fund projects for years to come.

Tom Kadzis, City of Boston, asked for more specifics about the cost increase to the Weymouth project as relates to the revised pavement design. D. Anderson explained that an assumption of the pavement costs were made at the 25% design stage and the estimate was revised to be more accurate at the 75% design stage. The project will pave four lanes for a long distance and minor design changes can have a sizable impact on the pavement cost estimate. Also the cost per ton of pavement changed between the time the two designs were submitted.

T. Kadzis asked for the name of the primary design consultant on the Weymouth project. D. Anderson replied that it is Tetra Tech Inc.

D. Crowley asked why MassDOT does not have a policy requiring that all right-of-way acquisition and land takings be completed prior to advertising a project, given that lack of all necessary easements and rights-of-way could delay implementation of a project. D. Anderson explained that MassDOT does require municipalities to acquire property associated with the roadway construction elements of its contract, and MassDOT must certify to FHWA that those properties have been acquired before advertising. However, MassDOT does not mandate that municipalities acquire property associated with the utility relocation elements of projects, and FHWA does not require that certification. C. Bench added that in 2013 MassDOT changed its approach regarding utilities and began contributing to most of utility relocation costs to give utility companies an incentive to complete their work so as not to slow projects down.

D. Anderson offered to get clarification from MassDOT's engineering directors regarding the agency's policies on this topic.

Project Evaluations for the FFY 2015-18 TIP

S. Pfalzer gave an overview of the TIP development process to date and presented the staff evaluations for projects that are being considered for inclusion in the FFY 2015-18 TIP.

Staff began conducting outreach to the subregions of the MPO and municipalities last November, and had compiled a Universe of Projects by January. The staff of the MPO and MAPC then evaluated the projects in February against the MPO's project evaluation criteria. The criteria are designed to help determine which projects would be most effective in advancing the MPO's visions and policies. The 35 questions cover six policy topic areas: System Preservation; Livability; Mobility; Environmental Justice; Environment and Climate Change; and Safety and Security.

Members were provided with a spreadsheet showing the evaluation results for 60 projects, sorted highest to lowest. Twenty-three of the projects are already programmed on the current TIP. Six of nine new projects evaluated scored highly (above 70 points). Consideration was given to geographic equity when sorting the projects; projects from each subregion are included in the first two pages of the spreadsheet.

The evaluation results will be posted on the MPO website for the public and members to review. Comments may be sent to S. Pfalzer by March 20. Staff will then create a First Tier List of Projects considering the following: comments received; project evaluation score; ability of the project to be made ready for construction over the next four years; implementation of projects in the Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP); geographic equity; and project cost for maintaining fiscal constraint. The First Tier list and the staff recommendation for TIP programming will be available by March 27 and discussed at the MPO meeting on April 3.

Discussion

T. Bent asked how staff determined the ranking of projects within the same subregion that scored equally. S. Pfalzer replied that consideration was given to the projects' cost and readiness, and whether the proponent communities had recently received TIP funding.

J. Romano asked for more details about the scoring process. S. Pfalzer explained how various staff members are responsible for evaluating the individual questions.

S. Olanoff asked why the *Weymouth and Abington – Reconstruction and Widening on Route 18 (Main Street)* project is not included in the spreadsheet. S. Pfalzer explained that the project was not evaluated because it is one of the projects that were programmed on the TIP prior to the establishment of the evaluation criteria. The evaluation criteria are a tool for determining which new projects to include in the TIP.

D. Crowley asked for more details about what staff expects to accomplish at the meeting on April 3. S. Pfalzer replied that there will be two meetings in April where members will discuss the staff recommendation, then members will vote to release a draft TIP for public review in May.

D. Crowley asked that staff, when preparing the staff recommendation for the TIP, identify those projects that are proposed to move out of the TIP.

James Errickson, At-Large City of Everett, asked if there is a process by which a municipal project proponent could work to improve a project's score and request a re-evaluation. S. Pfalzer replied noting that there are some criteria that do not apply to a project's design. For example, a project can receive points if it is in a certified Green Community, so a municipality could apply to the Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs to receive that designation. Also, staff re-evaluates projects when new data – such as Registry of Motor Vehicle crash data – becomes available.

D. Koses asked about how projects programmed in the LRTP are considered when staff prepares the First Tier list of projects. Specifically, he asked whether a project programmed in a future timeband of the LRTP, could be programmed in the TIP if it could be made ready sooner. S. Pfalzer explained that staff's policy is to program those projects that are in the current timeband of the LRTP (FFYs 2016-20), as the LRTP drives the development of the TIP.

D. Koses asked whether a project programmed in a future timeband of the LRTP could be programmed earlier in the TIP if it were broken into smaller projects (so that it would not have to be programmed in the LRTP). S. Pfalzer noted that due to the MPO's limited resources, a certain percentage of funding is reserved in the LRTP for large scale projects and about 50% of funding is reserved for smaller scale projects to be implemented through the TIP. Funding larger scale projects through the TIP would unbalance that distribution. Also, projects costing more than \$10 million or that add capacity to the transportation system still must be programmed in the LRTP.

C. Bench then provided an overview of the LRTP and how it relates to the TIP for the benefit of those who are unfamiliar with the MPO's process. The LRTP is the foundation of the MPO's planning. It is a fiscally constrained document that lists projects of major

regional significance that are planned for implementation over the next 25 years. The TIP is a programming document that lists all projects to be funded over the next four years. The TIP must be consistent with the LRTP.

Target Funding

Members were provided with a table showing the regional target funding for the development of the FFYs 2015-18 TIP, which are based on the funding targets recently released by MassDOT. For the four-year period of the TIP, the MPO has \$293 million to program.

Overall, the funding level is slightly higher compared to the current TIP. The targets are slightly lower for two funding categories – the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Program (CMAQ), and the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) – meaning that the MPO is not required to program as much funding in these categories as was programmed in the current TIP. The target for the Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) is higher this year.

C. Bench then provided an overview of the various funding categories.

[At this point in the meeting, T. Bent discussed transportation priorities of the Inner Core subregion. His comments are included under Agenda Item #6 along with members' discussion points.]

9. MassDOT and MBTA Capital Investment Programs and we Move Massachusetts—Steve Woelfel, MassDOT

S. Woelfel gave an overview of MassDOT's Capital Investment Programs (CIPs) and the *we Move Massachusetts* planning process.

We Move Massachusetts is MassDOT's strategic multi-modal plan that meets requirements set by the FHWA and the state legislature. It is grounded in customer outreach that began several years ago through the *you Move Massachusetts* program, which won national awards for its innovative approach to public outreach. *We Move Massachusetts* is intended to prioritize MassDOT's investments across all modes.

There is a summary report on MassDOT's website describing the outreach that was conducted in the making of this plan. In response to guidance from FHWA, which called on MassDOT to put greater focus on populations protected by Title VI, MassDOT reached out to new partners in the environmental justice communities. Outreach took the form of interviews, questionnaires in multiple languages, open houses, and public meetings.

The plan provides a “30,000-foot view” for how best to invest in MassDOT’s asset categories. The plan is not project specific. During the development of the plan, each MassDOT division identified their most critical assets and metrics were developed based on those used for decision-making by the divisions. A tool was created that can be used to explore how shifting money between categories would affect various metrics. Examples of metrics were provided for several asset categories including pavement, highway mobility, MBTA elevators and escalators, and buses and trains.

Over the next six months, MassDOT will be exploring the impact of various investment scenarios on MassDOT’s goals for sustainability, mode shift, and healthy transportation. MassDOT will also work to include more asset categories across its divisions.

While other states have developed highway performance management plans, Massachusetts is the first state in the nation to prepare a multi-modal performance management plan.

Discussion

D. Koses inquired whether this tool would help explore the impact of investment in system expansion as well as existing infrastructure. S. Woelfel explained that the development of metrics was first focused on state-of-good repair, but there is a metric for measuring how many more people will have access to transit as a result of transit expansion projects. It can be assumed that the Administration’s priority transit expansion projects – *Green Line Extension*, *South Coast Rail*, and *South Station Expansion* – are reflected in the overall pool of funds accounted for in the plan.

10. Members Items

P. Wolfe announced that the MPO’s next meeting will be on March 20. Staff is proposing to schedule a UPWP Committee meeting that morning as well. At the MPO’s meeting on April 3, a discussion of the TIP will be on the agenda.

J. Romano provided updates on several MassDOT projects.

- The Callahan Tunnel will be reopening on schedule next week.
- Government Center MBTA Station will be closing on March 22 for two years. Public meetings about the closure are scheduled for March 11 in East Boston and March 13 at the State Transportation Building. Both meetings will start at 6:00 PM. Meetings are noticed on the MBTA’s website.
- MassDOT will be replacing the ceiling of the Prudential Tunnel. The work will occur over four weekends starting at 9:00 PM on March 21, March 28, April 4, and April 25. A public information meeting will be held on March 10 at 6:00 PM at

the Hynes Convention Center. More information about the project is available at this website: <http://prutunnelproject.info>.

- There will be lane restrictions on the Tobin Bridge in a couple of weeks.

P. Regan announced that the MBTA Advisory Board will be meeting on March 19.

E. Bourassa announced that MAPC is sponsoring a summit on April 8 on the topic of parking. Donald Shoup, of the University of California, will be the keynote speaker. Those interested may RSVP on MAPC's website.

D. Crowley asked about the status of Chapter 90 funding, specifically the balance for FY 2014. C. Bench noted that the transportation bond bill will be before the state senate next week. R. Reed noted that the bill before the legislature addresses Chapter 90 funding for FY 2015, not the \$100 million funding that was held up from FY 2014. The new bill includes \$300 million per year for municipalities over the next five years, but does not address the FY 2014 funds, he said.

11. Adjourn

A motion to adjourn was made by the MBTA Advisory Board (P. Regan) and seconded by MAPC (E. Bourassa). 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)	Lara Mérida
City of Boston (Boston Transportation Department)	Tom Kadzis
Inner Core Committee (City of Somerville)	Tom Bent
Massachusetts Department of Transportation	Clinton Bench
	David Anderson
MassDOT Highway Division	John Romano
Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority (MBTA)	Ron Morgan
MBTA Advisory Board	Paul Regan
Metropolitan Area Planning Council	Eric Bourassa
Minuteman Advisory Group on Interlocal Coordination (Town of Bedford)	Richard Reed
North Shore Task Force (City of Beverly)	Aaron Clausen
Regional Transportation Advisory Council	David Montgomery
South West Advisory Planning Committee (Town of Medway)	Dennis Crowley
Three Rivers Interlocal Council (Town of Norwood/NVCC)	Tom O'Rourke

Other Attendees	Affiliation
Sreelatha Allam	MassDOT Office of Transportation Planning
Mayor Robert J. Dolan	City of Melrose
Adam Duchesneau	City of Melrose
Denise M. Gaffey	City of Melrose
Eric Halvorsen	MAPC
Mike Lindstrum	City of Melrose
Rafael Mares	Conservation Law Foundation
Elena Mihaly	Conservation Law Foundation
Steve Olanoff	Three Rivers Interlocal Council (Town of Norwood)
Kathy Pigott-Brodeur	City of Melrose
Andy Street	City of Melrose
Marilyn Wellons	Regional Transportation Advisory Council
Steve Woelfel	MassDOT

MPO Staff/Central Transportation Planning Staff

Robin Mannion, Deputy Executive Director
Jane Gillis
Maureen Kelly
Robin Mannion
Elizabeth Moore
Scott Peterson
Sean Pfalzer
Pam Wolfe
