

# **Memorandum for the Record**

## **Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization Meeting**

### **December 17, 2015 Meeting**

10:05 AM – 12:45 AM, State Transportation Building, Conference Rooms 2&3, 10 Park Plaza, Boston, MA

David Mohler, Chair, representing Stephanie Pollack, Secretary and Chief Executive Officer, Massachusetts Department of Transportation (MassDOT)

### **Decisions**

The Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) agreed to the following:

- release Draft Amendment Two to the federal fiscal years (FFYs) 2016-20 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for a 30-day public review period
- approve the minutes of the MPO meeting of December 3

### **Meeting Agenda**

#### **1. Public Comments**

There were none.

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

The Chair announced that the Federal Railroad Administration has released the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for NEC Future (A Rail Investment Plan for the Northeast Corridor) for public review. Comments will be accepted through January 30, 2016. The EIS is available at [www.necfuture.com](http://www.necfuture.com).

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

Lourenço Dantas, Director of Certification Activities, MPO Staff, reported that the MPO's Congestion Management Process (CMP) Committee met this morning. The City of Everett representative expressed an interest in chairing the committee. Other members who are interested in becoming involved on the committee are invited to contact L. Dantas or Jay Monty, At-Large City of Everett.

At the next meeting of the committee, there will be a discussion about the CMP work plan, which will involve providing guidance to staff regarding the development of data analysis tools. There will also be an update on the MPO's Intersection Improvement Program.

#### **4. Regional Transportation Advisory Council Report—*Tegin Bennett, Advisory Council Chair***

T. Bennett reported that the December meeting of the Advisory Council included an update on Green Line Extension project issues. The Council also provided input regarding the evaluation criteria for the TIP. She also reported that notifications were sent to Council members regarding their membership status.

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

K. Quackenbush reported that staff is in the process of gathering information to provide a briefing to the MPO on the Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act.

He then introduced Jennifer Rowe, who has been hired as the Public Participation Coordinator in the Certification Activities Group at CTPS.

#### **6. MassDOT Capital Investment Plan—*Steve Woelfel, MassDOT***

S. Woelfel provided an update on the development of MassDOT's Capital Investment Plan (CIP). He discussed how the recommendations of the Project Selection Advisory Council have been incorporated in the CIP development process, the new management process being used, project selection scoring, stakeholder engagement, and the schedule for developing the draft CIP.

The planning process for the CIP incorporated recommendations from the state's Project Selection Advisory Council. The Council established overarching goals to guide MassDOT's decision-making about transportation investments, and it set weights for project evaluation criteria. The steps in the process recommended by the Council are summarized as follows:

1. evaluate and score projects
2. determine performance targets and funding needs
3. re-score projects that scored above thresholds on an annual basis
4. evaluate the outcome of prioritized projects against asset targets
5. rebalance projects to better meet asset targets or ensure equity across regions or modes

MassDOT staff is currently at the second and third stages in the process.

MassDOT is using an "agile scrum" management process to develop the new CIP. This management process engages a broad range of participants in the agency and District

offices. Group leaders oversee the various threads of project management, investment development, public engagement, funding availability, and document development.

The result of this effort will include a complete project “universe” and a database for tracking the status of projects in the evaluation process. The “universe” will contain the following: roadway and path projects that have had a design submittal within the last eight years; projects with designs predating that time if identified by the MassDOT Highway District staff or MPOs’ Long-Range Transportation Plans; and all projects approved after October 1, 2005. The “universe” will also contain transit projects submitted by the MBTA; projects from other Regional Transit Authorities (RTAs) seeking more than \$500,000 of state funding; new project ideas heard from the Capital Conversations meetings; projects identified in the state bond bill; currently funded projects; and projects that were dropped from previous CIPs.

The CIP development process involved comparing the project selection criteria that all the MassDOT divisions use with those criteria recommended by the Project Selection Advisory Council. The criteria fall into the following categories: cost effectiveness; environmental and health effects; mobility; policy support; safety; system preservation; and social equity and fairness.

A hierarchy for scoring projects was developed so that priority will be given to projects in the following order:

6. projects on the FFYs 2016-19 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)
7. projects in the first five-year time band of each region’s LRTP that are approved by MassDOT’s Project Review Committee
8. projects not included in the STIP, but that have an advertising date between October 1, 2016 and September 30, 2019
9. projects with an advertising date after September 30, 2019

A tool developed for the WeMove Massachusetts effort a couple of years ago has been updated and is being used to track progress on balancing investments and meeting targets in various asset categories. The tool now contains a data layer that matches funding sources with eligible projects. This tool allows planners to estimate the impact of making investments in various asset categories across the agency’s divisions.

At the advice of the Project Selection Advisory Committee, MassDOT formed a Stakeholder Committee which will provide input on the development of metrics, balancing investments, transparency, and data issues. A joint meeting of both committees is scheduled for January. Outreach to other stakeholders, including MPOs,

is also underway. Also in January, the MassDOT Board of Directors will have a public discussion of the CIP, prior to the release of the document for public review.

During the development of the Draft CIP, MassDOT held a series of “Capital Conversations” meetings that drew more than 500 attendees. During the outreach period, MassDOT received more than 1,400 comments from members of the public.

### ***Discussion***

Jim Gillooly, City of Boston, inquired about how the MPO’s project evaluation process fits in with the CIP process. In response, S. Woelfel discussed how the CIP process will guide MassDOT as the agency evaluates projects being considered by all MPOs in the Commonwealth. In the event that MassDOT and the MPOs have differences about project prioritization, those issues would be discussed with the MPO boards.

J. Gillooly suggested that the process for amending MPO TIPs should be aligned with the CIP amendment process. S. Woelfel stated that MassDOT is planning to better align the schedules for the TIPs and CIP, and to standardize the project initiation forms used by MassDOT and the MPOs.

The PowerPoint presentation given today will be made available on the MPO’s online meeting calendar.

## **7. Draft FFYs 2016-20 Transportation Improvement Program, Amendment Two—Sean Pfalzer, MPO Staff**

S. Pfalzer presented Draft Amendment Two to the FFYs 2016-20 TIP and provided details of the proposed changes therein.

Amendment Two would remove certain line items in the TIP to reflect highway improvement projects that were completed earlier than originally planned as part of other maintenance or resurfacing projects, and those with changed work scopes that no longer need to be listed on the TIP because the projects are now outside of the region. It would also include changes to project costs that reflect further refinements to project work scopes. In addition, it would program funding for several new projects, and change the funding source of one project. Details are provided below.

Projects that would be removed from the TIP are as follows:

- *Bridge Replacement, L-10-009, Route 2 over Interstate 95 (Lexington)* – final funding for this multi-year project was obligated in FFY 2015, so funding does not need to be programmed in this TIP

- *Interstate Maintenance and Related Work on Interstate 495 (Foxborough, Plainville, Wrentham)* – this project now includes work in municipalities that are outside the Boston MPO region, so it will be accounted for on the STIP
- *Stormwater Improvements along Route 3A and Route 28 (Brockton and Hingham)* – this project will no longer include work in Hingham, so can be removed from the Boston MPO TIP
- *Bridge Deck Replacement, W-01-021, Hopkins Street over Interstate 95 (Wakefield)* – this bridge deck was replaced as part of a resurfacing project
- *Resurfacing and Related Work on Route 20 (Marlborough)* – this work was completed in FFY 2015
- *Stormwater Improvements along Interstate 93 (Milton)* – this project will be part of the *Interstate Maintenance and Related Work on Interstate 93 (Quincy, Milton, Boston)* project

There are changes to cost estimates for the following projects:

- *Intersection and Signal Improvements at Two Locations: Route 53 at Mutton Lane and Pleasant Street (Weymouth)* – cost increase due to an expansion of the project scope
- *Resurfacing and Related Work on Interstate 93 Southbound (Randolph, Quincy, Braintree)* – cost decrease due to a change in the project scope as work on the northbound lane was completed in FFY 2015
- *Resurfacing and Related Work on Interstate 95 (Reading, Wakefield)* – cost decrease
- *Bridge Replacement, L-18-016 and S-05-008, Route 107 over the Saugus River (Lynn, Saugus)* – the cash flows have changed but the overall project cost remains the same
- *Interstate Maintenance and Related Work on Interstate 93 (Quincy, Milton, Boston)* – cost decrease due to components of the project accounted for under the Stormwater Program
- *Interstate Maintenance and Related Work on Interstate 495 (Foxborough, Plainville, Wrentham, Franklin)* -- cost decrease because pavement work is occurring under another project

Funding for the following projects would be added:

- *Stormwater Improvements along Route 20 (Marlborough and Sudbury)*
- *Bridge Preservation of Three Bridges: B-16-165, R-01-005, R-01-007 (Boston, Randolph)*
- *Pavement Preservation on Route 2 (Lexington, Belmont, Arlington, Cambridge)*

There is a change in funding source for the following project:

- *Interstate Maintenance and Related Work on Interstate 93 (Quincy, Milton, Boston)*

Staff requested the MPO's approval to release the amendment for a 30-day public review period beginning on December 21, 2015 and ending on January 19, 2016. The MPO could then vote on the amendment at its meeting on January 21, 2016.

### ***Discussion***

Tom Bent, Inner Core Committee (City of Somerville), inquired about the reason for the doubling of cost of the *Intersection and Signal Improvements at Two Locations: Route 53 at Mutton Lane and Pleasant Street (Weymouth)* project. S. Pfalzer explained that the scope of the project has expanded to cover two intersections. The cost estimate has increased as the project has advanced through the design process. The project area has been the subject of a road safety audit and the project will incorporate recommended safety improvements. T. Bent then asked what stage of design the project was at when the initial cost estimate was made. S. Pfalzer replied that the initial estimate was made when the project was at the Project Review Committee approval stage.

Christine Stickney, South Shore Coalition (Town on Braintree), asked if municipalities have been notified of projects proposed for removal from the TIP. She was informed that the MPO staff did not notify the municipalities of the changes to the state-sponsored projects.

C. Stickney asked if the *Stormwater Improvements along Route 3A and Route 28 (Brockton and Hingham)* project is a part of another project. D. Mohler replied that the project is an independent stormwater retrofit project. David Anderson, MassDOT, then provided information about MassDOT Highway Division's Stormwater Program, which has two components. Some of the stormwater work is conducted as a result of a consent order which requires the agency to consider impaired water bodies in the vicinity of its projects. In these case, the agency implements best management practices to treat water before it flows off the highway area. In addition, MassDOT implements specific stormwater improvement projects.

T. Bennet remarked on the cost savings in the early years of TIP (resulting from projects removed from the TIP) and asked if the funds that would have been directed to those projects are being reprogrammed elsewhere. S. Pfalzer explained that the projects were funded through statewide programs, so it is possible that MassDOT could reprogram the funds outside of the Boston region.

J. Gillooly asked staff to check on which Boston bridge is included in the line item for the *Bridge Preservation of Three Bridges: B-16-165, R-01-005, R-01-007 (Boston, Randolph)* project.

Tom O'Rourke, Three Rivers Interlocal Council (Town of Norwood/Neponset Valley Chamber of Commerce), asked if there was a common reason for the project cost reductions. David Anderson, MassDOT, explained that the cost reductions are reflective of refinements to work scopes as projects advance through the design process, project delivery dates, and available funding. Cost reductions to some projects may reflect that some elements of the project have been reassigned to other projects.

A motion to release Draft Amendment Two to the FFYs 2016-20 TIP for a 30-day public review period was made by the Minuteman Advisory Group on Interlocal Coordination (Town of Bedford) (Richard Reed), and seconded by the Metropolitan Area Planning Council (MAPC) (Eric Bourassa). The motion carried.

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

A motion to approve the minutes of the meeting of December 3 was made by the Inner Core Committee (City of Somerville) (T. Bent), and seconded by the MAPC (E. Bourassa). The motion carried. The South Shore Coalition (Town of Braintree) (C. Stickney) abstained.

#### **9. Transportation Improvement Program Project Evaluation Criteria—Sean Pfalzer, MPO Staff**

S. Pfalzer presented revisions to the TIP project evaluation criteria based on comments received from MPO members at their meeting of November 19 and comments received from the Regional Transportation Advisory Council. Additional feedback received from members today will be incorporated into the criteria for further discussion in January. The MPO staff typically evaluates TIP projects for the upcoming cycle of TIP development in February.

##### ***Updates to Main Criteria***

Updates to the main criteria include the following:

- inclusion of a criterion for Equivalent Property Damage Only (EPDO) index rate and crash severity rate per vehicle miles traveled (VMT) under the Safety goal
- changes under the Capacity Management/Mobility goal to reflect that consideration is given to projects that improve transit reliability and service
- changes under the Capacity Management/Mobility goal to reflect the MPO's interest in maintaining a strong emphasis on Complete Streets; additional

criteria were added to explicitly state that the MPO considers a project's ability to improve the bicycle and pedestrian network

- removal of redundant criteria relating to a project's ability to reduce congestion under the Capacity Management/Mobility goal
- removal of a criterion under the Transportation Equity goal that assesses whether a project addresses MPO-identified Title VI and non-discrimination population transportation issues; the remaining criterion will focus on whether the project serves Title VI and non-discrimination populations

### ***Discussion on Updates to Main Criteria***

D. Anderson recommended including a criterion for assessing a project's ability to improve accessibility or remove barriers to accessibility, and that this criterion should be explicit among the main criteria. S. Pfalzer noted that currently accessibility is recognized among two of the subcriteria used for scoring projects that assess whether a project improves pedestrian network and whether it improves intermodal accommodations or connections to transit.

### ***Updates to Subcriteria***

Updates to the subcriteria that are used to score projects were also presented. Staff assigned weight to the various scoring goal categories based on the hierarchy the MPO established for each goal last year. S. Pfalzer addressed the details of the scoring system and made note of updates. Details and discussion points are provided below (organized by goal topic).

### ***Safety***

Staff proposes to bolster the weight of the Safety category by adding points under several criteria. A project would be able to score up to five points based on EPDO values for the project locations, and up to five points depending on crash severity rate per VMT.

Also criteria for assessing whether a project would improve a freight-related safety issue, improve bicycle safety, and improve pedestrian safety would be increased from three to five points each. For each of these mode specific criteria, consideration would be given to whether the project location is in a Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) crash cluster, and for the bicycle and pedestrian modes, whether the project location is in a HSIP bicycle or pedestrian cluster. The freight criteria recognize whether a project addresses an MPO-identified truck cluster.



### ***Safety Discussion***

Members discussed the safety criteria. D. Mohler asked for assurance that projects would not earn points for safety simply for being located in an HSIP cluster, but only if they address a safety issue at the location. S. Pfalzer confirmed that is the case.

The discussion then turned to the topic of security. T. Bennett noted that there are no criteria addressing the goal for security. And Dennis Giombetti, MetroWest Regional Collaborative (Town of Framingham), asked how staff would evaluate projects for their security benefits. Anne McGahan, MPO Staff, pointed out that specific metrics for security at the system-wide level can be considered as work progresses on the work program for the Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP). At the project level, S. Pfalzer noted, security elements of projects can be identified when staff reviews projects' functional design reports.

E. Bourassa suggested adding a criterion now for assessing whether a project improves security, and providing points depending on whether it improves security to a high, medium, or low degree. A project that includes security cameras or intelligent transportation system (ITS) improvements, for example, could qualify. As the performance-based planning work progresses, more specific metrics could be added.

K. Quackenbush noted that projects that have security as an objective – such as those that add cameras – will be obvious, whereas a typical TIP project may not have an element of security.

J. Gillooly commented that aside from those obvious security projects, TIP projects that would have security benefits include those that provide critical redundancies in the transportation system. Projects addressing a harbor tunnel or a bridge, such as the North Washington Street Bridge in Boston, are examples.

Nicolas Garcia, Federal Transit Administration, remarked on other security elements in the design of projects, such as improvements to lighting.

Turning back to the safety criteria, David Koses, At-Large City of Newton, raised questions about the scoring for ADA-related improvements that improve access for people with disabilities. S. Pfalzer explained that ADA-related improvements are recognized under various criteria. He confirmed that a project with such improvements could score up to five points under the “improves pedestrian safety” criterion if the pedestrian improvements were at an HSIP pedestrian cluster.

Members further discussed the use of HSIP clusters and mode-specific HSIP clusters. T. Bennett raised the concern that the emphasis on these clusters could bias the project

evaluations toward high-use locations. S. Pfalzer discussed how the inclusion of subcriteria for the HSIP clusters gives additional points to areas where the safety needs are highest, while still allowing projects that include safety treatments outside the crash cluster areas to earn points.

D. Mohler asked for clarification about how staff is using the EPDO value and crash severity rate and the HSIP clusters to evaluate projects. He was concerned specifically about how staff would determine project rankings using the EPDO values, and whether there would be a correlation between the EPDO rankings and the state's HSIP locations. S. Pfalzer explained that in ranking projects based on EPDO values, staff would be comparing the EPDO values among the group of projects selected for evaluation in a particular TIP cycle (as opposed to the entire TIP "universe" of projects). There would be no direct correlation between the EPDO and HSIP rankings, though most project locations are in locations with significant safety needs.

Tom Kadzis, City of Boston, asked staff to provide more information, or to direct members to resources, about the HSIP crash clusters and MPO-identified truck-related crash clusters. S. Pfalzer noted that MassDOT has interactive maps of the HSIP crash clusters on its website. He also noted that while the state does not compile HSIP clusters for truck-related crashes, the MPO's GIS staff is using the state's methodology to identify these locations. D. Mohler also asked staff to provide more information about how staff is identifying and coding the truck-related crash clusters.

T. Bennett expressed concern that transit is not well incorporated in the criteria.

Returning to the issue of security, T. Kadzis noted that, in the past, the MPOs around the country were concerned about using limited transportation funds on Homeland Security issues.

### ***System Preservation***

Staff proposes to add a new System Preservation criterion to award points to projects that improve substandard bridges; improve a transit asset; or improve substandard sidewalks. Staff also proposes to reduce the available points for projects that improve substandard signal equipment, and keep greater weight on an existing criterion for projects that improve substandard pavement.

Also, staff proposes to remove two redundant subcriteria addressing projects that improve the ability to respond to extreme conditions. New criteria would be added to recognize projects that implement recommendations from hazard mitigation or climate adaptation plans, and that protect freight network elements. These new criteria respond to recommendations from the MPO's federal recertification review.

### ***System Preservation Discussion***

C. Stickney asked for more clarification about the criterion for improving substandard bridges. S. Pfalzer stated the criterion applies only to the bridge asset itself (not associated infrastructure).

J. Gillooly remarked that some of the most important improvements that can be made to the transportation system are signal improvements, such as pre-emption for transit vehicles and pedestrian safety at crossings. He expressed concern about reducing the weight given in the scoring system for projects that improve substandard signal equipment. S. Pfalzer then pointed out that some of the benefits that signals provide are captured under the Capacity Management/Mobility category.

A member of the public inquired about whether staff gave consideration to bicycle facilities in the System Preservation criteria. S. Pfalzer noted that bicyclists will benefit from improvements to substandard pavement; however, the criterion addressing substandard pavement does not capture whether a bicycle facility is part of a project. S. Pfalzer added that the state's healthy transportation policy directive is leading to bicycle lanes being an integral part of roadway projects, so some benefits for bicyclists will be captured under this criterion.

D. Mohler raised a question about the criterion for projects that improve a transit asset. A project may score points under this criterion if it brings a transit asset into a state-of-good repair or if it meets a need identified in an asset management plan. He posed question about a case in which a project brings an asset that has not been identified in an asset management plan into a state-of-good repair. S. Pfalzer noted that the MBTA has an asset management plan and the other regional transit authorities in the region are working on them.

Janice Ramsay, MBTA, asked staff to clarify if the criteria in this category pertaining to signals and bridges applies to transit as well as roadways.

D. Mohler pointed out that the subcriterion recognizing improvements to a functionally obsolete bridge should be included under the Capacity Management/Mobility category rather than System Preservation or, if the subcriterion remains under System Preservation, that the eligible points be reduced from two to one. Functionally obsolete bridges were designed to carry a lesser load of traffic than they currently experience, so improvements to them are capacity adding. He emphasized the greater importance of addressing structurally deficient bridges, which should be reflected in this criteria.

### ***Capacity Management / Mobility***

Staff is proposing to revise a Congestion Management/ Mobility criterion that recognizes projects that improve transit reliability; the revised criterion would capture the transit service element as well. It would assess whether a project reduces transit delay to a high, medium, or low degree, and whether the project serves a transit route that is over capacity (based on the vehicle load standard). Also, new criteria and subcriteria are proposed to recognize projects that improve the pedestrian and bicycle networks, and freight movement.

### ***Capacity Management / Mobility Discussion***

T. Bennett commented on the criterion for improving transit reliability and service, and the subcriteria for assessing reduction in transit delay. She asked staff to also consider the reliability of transit service (in addition to delay), and delay by load (to assess the number of people affected by the delay). Paul Regan, MBTA Advisory Board, noted that the MBTA has load data by transit stop.

P. Regan asked what type of projects are expected to score well under this criterion.

S. Pfalzer gave an example of a roadway project that includes improvements at an intersection for buses. E. Bourassa and S. Pfalzer noted that this criterion is designed to address transit elements of roadway projects.

J. Monty suggested that more definition should be given to the subcriteria that rate improvements to transit reliability and service at a high, medium, or low degree.

S. Pfalzer replied that staff will work on developing thresholds for each of those measures. J. Monty suggested options for thresholds, including boarding time and travel time.

Rafael Mares, Conservation Law Foundation, suggested broadening the Capacity Management / Mobility category to recognize projects that increase transit frequency or allow for the addition or extension of transit service.

D. Koses pointed out that another subcriterion in this category addresses whether a project facilitates a high volume of new pedestrian trips, but the threshold for “high volume” is not apparent. He suggested that the criterion simply measure whether the project facilitates new pedestrian trips.

Richard Reed, Minuteman Advisory Group on Interlocal Coordination (Town of Bedford), observed that all modes are specified in the Capacity Management / Mobility criteria except for autos. He suggested making reference to autos under the criterion that address congestion reduction.

### ***Clean Air / Clean Communities***

Staff is proposing revisions to the Clean Air / Clean Communities category to include subcriteria with quantitative measures. Staff has conducted air quality analyses for all projects being considered for the TIP using a Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) spreadsheet, which has provided figures on emission reduction potential for each project. Also, more specific subcriteria have been proposed for a criterion that assesses whether a project addresses environmental impacts.

### ***Clean Air / Clean Communities Discussion***

Tom O'Rourke, Three Rivers Interlocal Council (Town of Norwood/Neponset Valley Chamber of Commerce), addressed an existing criterion that awards four points to projects that are located in a designated "Green Community." He noted that four points are too high for that criterion. He also stated that not all municipalities choose to apply for the "Green Community" designation, but that those municipalities may still have adopted "green" policies.

E. Bourassa reflected that the MPO added this criterion several years ago to recognize communities that were linking other state policies and initiatives to transportation. He expressed support for providing points in this category.

P. Regan suggested looking to see if the use of the criterion had the desired effect.

R. Mares suggested that there should be points in the negative range for projects that would have negative air quality impacts. He also expressed concern that there is no absolute value for the scoring under the air quality criteria; i.e. a project will only be compared to other projects in the group to be evaluated, so a project could score highly even though it does not provide a high level of benefit. E. Bourassa suggested that staff could look into this issue and best practices in the development of the performance metrics.

### ***Transportation Equity***

Staff proposes to expand the populations covered under the Transportation Equity category from low-income and minority populations to also include Limited-English Proficiency populations, the elderly, people with disabilities, and zero-vehicle households. New subcriteria would measure the concentration of populations of concern affected by a project. The scoring in this category would include a negative value for projects that place a burden on the populations under consideration. These changes reflect recommendations from the federal certification review.

### ***Transportation Equity Discussion***

Dennis Crowley, South West Advisory Planning Committee (Town of Medway), expressed concern that projects in small suburban communities would not be able to score in this category. E. Bourassa then pointed out that the evaluation criteria represent one piece of how staff develops a recommended project list for the TIP; staff also considers other factors such as geographic equity. D. Crowley continued to express concern, however, that the scoring system is not equitable for all areas of the region. He discussed how the MPO relies heavily on the project evaluation scores when planning to program projects in outer years of the TIP. He suggested that staff conduct an evaluation of some TIP projects to compare how they would score under the existing scoring system and the newly proposed system in order to determine if there would be an imbalance using the new system.

K. Quackenbush responded to D. Crowley's concern by noting that for this scoring category staff is proposing to expand the definition of non-discrimination populations. The definition would now include the elderly and people with disabilities, which would make smaller, suburban towns eligible to earn points in this category. He noted that staff could perform a sensitivity analysis, as D. Crowley suggested, to better understand how the new scoring system would perform in comparison to the existing one.

Elizabeth Moore, Director of Policy and Planning at CTPS, added that based on proposed thresholds for this category, only six municipalities in the region would be ineligible to score points under the Transportation Equity criterion. She added that the threshold for this criterion is not an absolute value, rather it is based on the proportion of the population of concern as compared to the average of the proportion for the area. Even a small community could score in this category if it has a high concentration of the populations of concern.

D. Crowley continued to express concern that the scoring system as a whole may disadvantage smaller communities as there are other criteria in other categories relating to freight and transit improvements that would also disadvantage smaller communities. He again suggested that staff conduct an evaluation to see if the new scoring system would be biased against smaller communities.

N. Garcia suggested analyzing the transportation funding per capita for municipalities to determine if there are inequities.

Dennis Giombetti, MetroWest Regional Collaborative (Town of Framingham), remarked that there is a perception in the Metro West communities that the TIP scoring process is biased. As a result, some communities are reluctant to design projects because they

feel they will not be able to get funding. He expressed that the MPO should make sure that the new scoring system is not skewed even more against those communities. He supported D. Crowley's recommendation to evaluate some previously evaluated projects under the new scoring system to see if there are significant differences. This, he suggested, should be done prior to the evaluation of projects under consideration in the new TIP cycle.

K. Quackenbush agreed that a sensitivity analysis would be helpful to ensure that there are no unintended consequences from using the new scoring system that would be contrary to the goals and objectives that the MPO has established.

Marie Rose, MassDOT, suggested that staff conduct the sensitivity analysis on a sampling of projects that have already been advertised (with funds already obligated), so that no project would be at risk of losing its current standing in the TIP process. K. Quackenbush added that staff's intent would be to preserve the integrity of TIP programming decisions the MPO has already made; i.e. projects would not lose their current standing in the TIP.

### ***Economic Vitality***

Staff proposes to add new criteria to the Economic Vitality category to credit projects that would provide freight access to an activity center and those that would leverage other investments.

### ***Economic Vitality Discussion***

Tina Cassidy, North Suburban Planning Council (City of Woburn), suggested a correction to the subcriteria for leveraging other investments as there is a gap in the thresholds for project cost.

At the conclusion of the discussion about the criteria, E. Bourassa (now chairing) directed staff to proceed with making the suggested revisions to the criteria and to present a strategy for a sensitivity analysis at the next meeting of the MPO.

## **10. Roadway-Monitoring Dataset Analysis—*Ryan Hicks, MPO Staff***

This agenda item was postponed to the meeting of January 7.

## **11. Federal Certification Review - Responses to Recommended Actions—*Elizabeth Moore, Director of Policy and Planning, CTPS***

This agenda item was postponed to the meeting of January 7.

## **12. State Implementation Plan—*Bryan Pounds, MassDOT***

B. Pounds reported that MassDOT and the Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) held a public meeting on November 16 concerning the annual status report for the State Implementation Plan. The public review period for the report closed on November 20. MassDOT has prepared the responses to the public comments received during the public review period and will be submitting them to DEP by the end of the year.

## **13. Members Items**

There were none.

## **14. Adjourn**



## Attendance

<b>Members</b>	<b>Representatives and Alternates</b>
At-Large City (City of Everett)	Jay Monty
At-Large City (City of Newton)	David Koses
At-Large Town (Town of Arlington)	Wayne Chouinard
At-Large Town (Town of Lexington)	Richard Canale
City of Boston (Boston Transportation Department)	Jim Gillooly Tom Kadzis
Federal Transit Administration	Nicolas Garcia
Inner Core Committee (City of Somerville)	Tom Bent
Massachusetts Department of Transportation	David Mohler David Anderson Marie Rose
MBTA	Janice Ramsay
MBTA Advisory Board	Paul Regan
Metropolitan Area Planning Council	Eric Bourassa
MetroWest Regional Collaborative (Town of Framingham)	Dennis Giombetti
Minuteman Advisory Group on Interlocal Coordination (Town of Bedford)	Richard Reed
North Suburban Planning Council (City of Woburn)	Tina Cassidy
Regional Transportation Advisory Council	Tegin Bennett
South Shore Coalition (Town of Braintree)	Christine Stickney
South West Advisory Planning Committee (Town of Medway)	Dennis Crowley
Three Rivers Interlocal Council (Town of Norwood/Neponset Valley Chamber of Commerce)	Tom O'Rourke

<b>Other Attendees</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>
Ed Carr	MetroWest Regional Transit Authority
Kurt Kelley	Town of Arlington
Erin Kinehan	MassDOT Highway District 6
Rafael Mares	Conservation Law Foundation

Britteny Montgomery	Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge resident
Daniel Morrissey	Office of State Representative William Straus
Steve Olanoff	Three Rivers Interlocal Council (Town of Norwood)
Bryan Pounds	MassDOT Office of Transportation Planning
Constance Raphael	MassDOT Highway District 4
Mark Sanborn	Regional Transportation Advisory Council
Ellie Spring	Office of State Representative Denise Garlick

---

---

**MPO Staff/Central Transportation Planning Staff**

---

Karl Quackenbush, Executive Director  
Robin Mannion, Deputy Executive Director

Mark Abbott  
Lourenço Dantas  
Maureen Kelly  
Anne McGahan  
Elizabeth Moore  
Scott Peterson  
Sean Pfalzer  
Jennifer Rowe  
Alicia Wilson

---