

# **MPO Meeting Minutes**

## **Draft Memorandum for the Record**

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

#### **April 29, 2021 Meeting**

10:00 AM–12:10 PM, Zoom Video Conferencing Platform

Steve Woelfel, Chair, representing Jamey Tesler, Acting Secretary of Transportation and Chief Executive Officer of the Massachusetts Department of Transportation (MassDOT)

#### **Decisions**

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

- Approve the Federal Fiscal Years (FFY) 2021–25 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Amendment Four
- Approve the FFYs 2021–25 TIP Amendment Five
- Approve the Intersection Improvement work program
- Approve the work program for the Bus Network Redesign Equity Analysis

A video recording of this meeting is available on the Boston Region MPO's YouTube channel through this link: [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6mm0\\_qLrY34&t=6276s](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6mm0_qLrY34&t=6276s)

#### **Meeting Agenda**

##### **1. Introductions**

See attendance beginning page 15.

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

Steve Woelfel shared information about the MassDOT Innovation Conference in May. S. Woelfel handed over the rest of the Chair's Report to David Mohler (MassDOT). D. Mohler provided information about the congressional request for projects to be funded by earmarks. D. Mohler shared that there are two earmark processes occurring: one for the annual appropriations bill, the second for the reauthorization of the transportation bill. For the appropriation earmarks, there is no involvement from the MPO and MassDOT. Congress provides the earmarks and they appear in the appropriations bill. For the Transportation Reauthorization Act, D. Mohler stated that this is the first time in a decade that the House has allowed earmarks, which they are calling member designated projects. The Congressional Transportation and Infrastructure Committee

provided a set of rules and guidelines on what projects could be considered. Each congressional member was given \$20 million to earmark. There is no limit on the number of projects, but each project had to have a letter from the sponsoring agency stating that it could be implemented. D. Mohler shared that the letter needed to discuss other funding sources if the project could not be fully funded by the earmark. In addition, if the project was not on the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), the MPO needed to provide a letter stating that it could be added to the TIP in a reasonable time. MassDOT, as the MPO's Chair, wrote a letter on behalf of the MPO stating that projects could make it on to the TIP. MassDOT selected projects based on the project being fully funded by non-MPO resources and that it could be amended on to the TIP. MassDOT interpreted that as readiness, which meant that the project could be ready in the next five years. Most of the projects on this list were not on the STIP or in MassDOT's project database. MassDOT did a readiness assessment based on very limited information provided by the sponsors.

### ***Discussion***

Eric Bourassa (Metropolitan Area Planning Council [MAPC]) shared that MAPC had received questions from municipalities regarding this process and asked about the timeline to provide input. D. Mohler responded that the deadline to provide a list of proposed projects to Congressional members was the previous day, April 28, 2021. The Senate will take up the earmark discussion next, and D. Mohler said that he does not know what the deadline will be for that process. MassDOT shared the letters with MPO members on April 29, 2021. E. Bourassa asked for further clarification on qualifications for proposed projects. D. Mohler responded that MassDOT did not request funding for any MassDOT projects. The project sponsor for the proposed projects were typically a municipality, and they were required to document for the Congressional member where the nonfederal share was coming from. Most of the Massachusetts applications pledged local revenue to make up the difference if the earmark did not cover the full cost of the project. The letters did not pledge MPO funds. MassDOT did not feel comfortable pledging future target money without discussing it with the MPO. D. Mohler also shared that MassDOT had not done any independent cost assessment of proposed projects.

Tom O'Rourke (Three Rivers Interlocal Council) (Town of Norwood/Neponset Valley Chamber of Commerce) asked about the number of projects requested. D. Mohler responded that he wrote approximately 40 letters but did not have an exact number of projects.

Steve Olanoff (Three Rivers Interlocal Council Alternate) asked if the earmarks were additional funding for transportation. D. Mohler responded that the earmarks are additional money beyond what is provided for in the formula funds.

Tom Kadzis (City of Boston) (Boston Transportation Department) asked for clarification on who the letters went to. D. Mohler shared that MassDOT sent a letter for each project to the corresponding Congressional member. The Massachusetts Secretary of Transportation also sent a letter to each member with a list of projects in the corresponding congressional district. D. Mohler shared that the Congressional members will have a list of the projects they are recommending on their own websites.

Ken Miller (Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]) stated that the bill has not been voted on yet. The House and the Senate need to pass the reauthorization. As a federal entity, FHWA does not have a statement on the bill; however, whether the projects are included in the earmark, the MPO is not required to program the project if they do not want to.

Jim Fitzgerald (City of Boston) (Boston Planning and Development Agency) asked if the projects only have to be on the STIP or do they also have to be on the Boston Region MPO's TIP. D. Mohler responded that to get on the STIP, in the Boston Region, they have to be on the TIP.

### **3. Executive Director's Report—*Tegin Teich, Executive Director, Central Transportation Planning Staff***

T. Teich shared that CTPS' Strategic Plan Steering Committee, a group of some staff and board members, met for the final time. T. Teich is discussing the last of the feedback with the MPO's Chair and Vice Chair, and wrapping up a draft final plan within the next few weeks, which they will bring to the MPO board.

T. Teich shared that the new Director of Projects and Partnerships, Rebecca Morgan, will begin on May 3, 2021. This position replaces the Director of Technical Services position and has been reframed to focus on partnerships.

T. Teich provided updates on MPO outreach including information about upcoming TIP Virtual Open Houses and Pilot Transit Working Group Coffee Chats.

T. Teich previewed agenda items including the model roadmap. T. Teich shared that Marty Milkovits (MPO Staff) will discuss how CTPS is going to modify modeling tools to better support MPO decision-making based on the principles of making the tools more accessible and transparent, and being able to communicate the tools better, particularly the strengths, the usability, the values, and the limitations. This effort is to help MPO members and stakeholders in the region using these tools or that these tools are supporting better understand how and why the tools can help make decisions. The

project is driven by staff's desire to conduct scenario planning for the 2023 Long-Range Transportation Plan.

#### **4. Public Comments**

There were none.

#### **5. Committee Chairs' Reports**

There were none.

#### **6. Regional Transportation Advisory Council Report—*Lenard Diggins, Chair, Regional Transportation Advisory Council (Advisory Council)***

L. Diggins shared that the Advisory Council met to discuss the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) Universe. The Advisory Council's 3C Committee also met to discuss comments and recommendations for the UPWP.

#### **7. Action Item: FFYs 2021–25 TIP Amendment Four—*Matt Genova, MPO Staff***

*Documents posted to the MPO meeting calendar*

1. [Draft FFYs 2021–25 TIP Amendment Four](#)

M. Genova discussed the FFYs 2021–25 TIP Amendment Four that makes one change to the FFY 2021 highway programming. Details are available in the linked handout.

#### ***Vote***

A motion to approve FFYs 2021–25 TIP Amendment Four, was made by the City of Framingham (Thatcher Kezer III) and seconded by the MAPC (Eric Bourassa). The motion carried.

#### **8. Action Item: FFYs 2021–25 TIP Amendment Five—*Matt Genova, MPO Staff***

*Documents posted to the MPO meeting calendar*

2. [Draft FFYs 2021–25 TIP Amendment Five](#)
3. [Draft FFYs 2021–25 TIP Amendment Five Public Comments](#)

M. Genova discussed the FFYs 2021–25 TIP Amendment Five that addresses the cost and schedule changes for projects funded using regional target funds in FFY 2021 allowing these projects to move forward with advertisement for construction bids before the current federal fiscal year ends. Details are available in the linked handout.

The amendment aligns the active FFYs 2021–25 TIP with the draft FFYs 2022–26 TIP. Amendment Five reflects the funding decisions made by the MPO board on April 1,

2021, which include electing to allocate \$14.8 million in FFY 2021 to Phase Two of the Columbus Avenue Bus Lane project in Boston, and funding nine new MPO Community Connections projects with approximately \$2.5 million. MPO staff received two public comments in support of continued funding of Phase 2D of the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail in FFY 2022.

### ***Vote***

A motion to approve the FFYs 2021–25 TIP Amendment Five was made by the Advisory Council (Len Diggins) and seconded by the MAPC (Eric Bourassa). The motion carried.

### ***Discussion***

K. Miller asked clarifying questions on the Community Connections programming schedule over multiple years. M. Genova responded.

## **9. Action Item: Work Scope, Intersection Improvement Program— Casey-Marie Claude, MPO Staff**

### ***Documents posted to the MPO meeting calendar***

#### **4. [Work Program: Intersection Improvement Program](#)**

C. Claude presented the work scope for the Intersection Improvement Program, the newest iteration of the work that the Boston Region MPO participated in with the MassDOT Highway Division in 2014. The objectives of this study are to identify as many locations as the budget allows and provide low-cost, high-benefit improvement recommendations for the selected locations.

### ***Discussion***

Daniel Amstutz (Town of Arlington) commented that in the 2014 study, a consulting firm was used to perform the low-cost improvements for some of the identified intersections.

D. Amstutz asked if this study has a similar budget, and if MPO staff were going to provide the improvements directly. C. Claude responded that this is a different version of the study and that MPO staff will not provide the improvements directly.

L. Diggins asked if there was follow-up on the recommendations from the 2014 study to understand the impact of the improvements. C. Claude stated that she did not work on the previous study but shared that in the 2014 study, MPO staff recommended 35 different intersections for the consulting firm to provide recommendations. L. Diggins asked for more details on what is considered low-cost recommendations. C. Claude responded that low-cost improvements include signal retiming, restriping, and other short-term improvements that can have a high impact. L. Diggins asked for the specific

dollar amounts of low-cost. C. Claude responded that low-cost can be context specific. L. Diggins asked if MPO staff will work to get buy-in with municipalities to ensure that recommendations will be followed up on, and that MPO staff will try to be more equitable in selecting locations and providing resources to follow through. C. Claude affirmed that staff will.

Mark Abbott (MPO staff) reiterated that low-cost recommendations are what municipalities can do with their typical maintenance budget, such as signs, restriping, signal retiming, and some curb work for pedestrian improvements.

### **Vote**

A motion to approve the Intersection Improvements Work Program was made by the MAPC (Eric Bourassa) and seconded by the MBTA Advisory Board (Brian Kane). The motion carried.

## **10. Action Item: Work Scope, Bus Network Redesign Equity Analysis— Steven Andrews, MPO Staff**

### ***Documents posted to the MPO meeting calendar***

#### **5. [Work Plan: Bus Network Redesign Service Equity Analysis](#)**

S. Andrews said that over the past several years, MassDOT and the Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority (MBTA) have been exploring how the MBTA functions as an interconnected system and how it serves its riders and potential riders through the Bus Network Redesign project. If new routes and new route alignments are implemented this will trigger a Title VI Service equity analysis, which is a Federal Transit Administration requirement to prevent discrimination to protected groups. CTPS will measure the impacts on revenue vehicle hours and route length, two metrics specified in the MBTA's Disparate Impact and Disproportionate Burden (DI/DB) policy. MassDOT requested that CTPS also analyze the equity implications on trip coverage and regional access.

### **Discussion**

E. Bourassa asked how equitable service changes are viewed. S. Andrews replied that CTPS uses the MBTA's DI/DB policy. CTPS measures whether revenue vehicle hours attributed to each route or each service that the MBTA provides changes in a fair way. CTPS uses census data, or survey data if available. Because of the scale of this project, the location data are still to be determined for population. The analysis is to ensure that negative impacts are borne by the different populations relatively fairly and positive impacts go to groups relatively fairly. E. Bourassa asked about the schedule for this work. S. Andrews shared that the MBTA will make three broad packages of changes in

the fall. After a public process, a preferred alternative would come out. The analysis will take place during this time.

B. Kane asked if the MBTA has to do an equity analysis because they are presuming this is going to be a major change, or is this to get ahead of the impacts of changes. S. Andrews responded that it is expected that this will be a major change. The nature of the changes triggers an analysis because the addition of a single new route or the removal of a single old route by definition is enough to change the system. B. Kane asked about additional data provided by MassDOT. S. Andrews shared that to do analyses, staff need the General Transit Feed Specification (GTFS) file. S. Andrews stated that often these data are not built until weeks away of service starting and that is too late to do an adequate service equity analysis. The changes have to be approved before the scheduling process is started. The MBTA is working on creating a generalized GTFS file for planning purposes to be used in the analysis.

L. Diggins requested that when the study is complete that S. Andrews return to the MPO and the Advisory Council, and provide a detailed explanation of the study's conclusions. S. Andrews affirmed that staff will and shared that staff is working to make the data and process more transparent for the public.

D. Koses asked about where to access further information on the Bus Network Redesign project. S. Andrews shared that Caroline Vanesse is the MassDOT project manager. E. Bourassa responded that MAPC is working with MassDOT and the MBTA to engage municipalities to the Bus Network Redesign project. E. Bourassa shared that the MBTA are planning to present at the Inner Core Committee Transportation Group in the upcoming weeks. Tom Bent (Inner Core Committee) (City of Somerville) reiterated desire for MBTA and MassDOT to meet with the Inner Core Committee.

#### ***Vote***

A motion to approve the Bus Network Redesign Equity Analysis work program was made by the Advisory Council (Len Diggins) and seconded by the MAPC (Eric Bourassa). The motion carried.

### **11.FFYs 2022-26 TIP Transit Element: MBTA Projects in the TIP—*Jillian Linnell, MBTA Staff***

#### ***Documents posted to the MPO meeting calendar***

##### **6. [Draft FFYs 2022–26 MBTA TIP Programming](#)**

J. Linnell provided an update on the MBTA Capital Investment Plan (CIP), which includes the MBTA projects in the TIP. J. Linnell recapped the CIP development

schedule. The MBTA updated the CIP source adjustments. Under the Federal Program section, the MBTA is no longer planning to transfer any funds to support the operating budget. Instead, all federal formula funds are expected to be restored to the capital plan as a result of receipt of Coronavirus Response and Relief Supplemental Appropriations funds and the pending receipt of American Recovery Plan Act (ARPA) funds. The MBTA's updated source assumptions reflect approximately \$1.9 billion in FY 2022 in addition to approximately \$1.8 billion in funds from previous years.

For the FFY 2022–26 TIP, there is approximately \$2 billion in Federal Transit Administration (FTA) formula funds available to program in the TIP (including match), with section 5307, 5337, and 5339 funds. The MBTA also includes executed FTA grants and federal programs such as Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) and the Green Line Extension. The federal program is a subset of the larger MBTA capital program and the projects that are put onto the TIP are determined after the MBTA goes through the larger CIP prioritization process.

J. Linnell addressed the potential future federal funds from ARPA. There was also \$1.675 billion allocated towards capital investment grants, which includes \$103.5 million for the Green Line Extension. The MBTA has not updated any of the source assumptions based on ARPA and are awaiting details on the eligible uses of the support provided.

The MBTA CIP is aligned with the priorities and program structure developed by the MassDOT CIP. The updated TIP documents provided on the MPO website reflect the obligation of \$150 million in Section 5309 funding for the Green Line Extension, with \$41.2 million of FRA funding for Tower One. In addition, the MBTA is including a \$1 million award of a Commuter Authority Rail Safety Improvement grant for North Wilmington Station. There are five new projects funded with FTA Formula Funds and six projects that will be potentially funded by Federal Railroad Rehabilitation and Improvement Financing (RRIF) and Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act (TIFIA) Loans.

In addition to providing additional funds for existing projects, the MBTA anticipates that FTA formula funds will be programmed for the Bus Facility Modernization Program (Quincy Bus Facility, the East Street Bridge Replacement in Dedham, the Green Line Central Tunnel Signal) 25 Cycle, the Systemwide Asset Management Program Phase 3, and the Attleboro Station Improvements project.

The MBTA is exploring the use of federal loans through the Build America Bureau to finance certain capital projects at a lower interest rate than traditional tax-exempt bonds

through the RRIF and TIFIA programs. More information on these projects will be provided through a future TIP amendment if federal funds or loans are used.

J. Linnell reviewed upcoming public engagement opportunities and MPO, MassDOT, and MBTA scheduled votes. J. Linnell shared a list of public meetings, which are also available on the MassDOT CIP website.

### ***Discussion***

Brian Kane (MBTA Advisory Board) shared that the MBTA Advisory Board is going to thoroughly examine the CIP through its Capital Committee. The MBTA Advisory Board plans to provide more detailed comments after 30 days.

## **12. Exploring Resilience in MPO-funded Corridor and Intersection Studies—Seth Asante, MPO Staff**

### ***Documents posted to the MPO meeting calendar***

#### **[7. Exploring Resilience in MPO-Funded Corridor and Intersection Studies](#)**

S. Asante presented the results of Exploring Resilience in Corridor and Intersection Studies. S. Asante stressed that incorporating resilience into transportation system infrastructure is a statewide and regional priority. The objectives of the study were to increase MPO staff's familiarity with resiliency planning for transportation infrastructure, incorporate resilience into MPO-funded discrete and recurring studies, and provide assistance to municipalities seeking to address climate-related challenges. MPO staff researched resilience strategies and identified data sources and models for vulnerability and adaptation. Staff surveyed MPO municipalities to understand how they incorporate resilience practices into planning and engineering projects, and staff studied Route 1A in Revere to produce recommended ways to incorporate resiliency.

S. Asante shared the statewide and MPO resiliency activities listed in the study. S. Asante noted that 19 municipalities responded to the survey. Respondents shared that routes, bridges, culverts, pedestrian and bicycle facilities, and public transportation are the major transportation assets vulnerable to climate hazards. All respondents had a Municipal Vulnerability Preparedness Program (MVP). All but one had a Hazard Mitigation Plan (HMP). The top four types of assistance that respondents requested were offering guidance on updating design standards, providing technical assistance and resources, promoting the sharing of best practices, and convening regional discussions on climate change.

S. Asante shared that staff selected the Route 1A corridor in the City of Revere because it is vulnerable to sea level rise, coastal storms, and tidal floods. Staff worked with

MassDOT and Revere to identify the vulnerabilities and develop recommendations for Route 1A. Staff evaluated flood probabilities, determined the depth of flooding, and looked at scenarios for present day, 2030, 2050, and 2070, through the Massachusetts Coast Flood Risk Model. S. Asante noted that in 2070, there is a high probability that Route 1A will be completely under water at high tide.

S. Asante described the nature-based solutions available to incorporate resilience into Route 1A. The City of Revere has restored 6.6 acres of salt water marsh in the study areas, and is working on restoring an additional 7.3 acres. Restoring the salt water marshes in the area that have been inundated with invasive species will help prevent and control flooding.

S. Asante shared that another option for the corridor is the Saugus River Floodgate project. This is a regional effort to address climate change by providing high-level coastal protection for Everett, Lynn, Malden, Revere, and Saugus. The project consists of a floodgate on the mouth of the Saugus River and 3.1 miles of shore front improvements.

MPO staff recommend an assessment of the capacities of the culverts, stormwater pumps, and tide gates to determine necessary short-term repairs and long-term replacement. Past inspections indicate that some of the culverts are undersized, and the data for the culverts are outdated. The assets may not be adequate to handle projected storms and extreme precipitation in the future.

The final option is to elevate the roadway. In certain areas, Route 1A is just under 10 feet above sea level. Elevating the roadway will ensure that the roadway can provide vital services in the future.

S. Asante stated that there are ample resources to help MPO staff incorporate resilience into MPO activities. Staff will continue to participate in regional collaboration efforts and coordinate studies with information from the MVP Program and municipal HMPs.

### ***Discussion***

L. Diggins commented that the survey responses are helpful to the MPO and Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) efforts but that only hearing from approximately 20 percent of the region's municipalities is poor. L. Diggins stated that it is not just on the staff but on the Advisory Council since they have also had a challenge increasing membership. L. Diggins shared that outreach needs to be improved and that the Advisory Council is there to help. S. Asante shared staff were also concerned about the response rate. Staff sent several reminders to municipalities about the survey. S.

Asante noted that he thought some communities are beginning to put their resiliency plans together and they may not have enough information to participate in the survey. Róisín Foley (MPO Staff) shared that one challenge was that staff were conducting the survey in the summer of 2020, and many communities were focused on dealing with pandemic response. R. Foley also wanted to highlight that through this process and the MAPC subregional meetings, staff have strengthened relationships with municipalities, particularly communities on the South Shore, since the survey was distributed. R. Foley shared that staff have laid a lot of groundwork that can hopefully increase response rates in the future.

E. Bourassa commented that MAPC has also increasingly heard from cities and towns who are interested in understanding how to incorporate climate resiliency into infrastructure. E. Bourassa asked if MAPC and CTPS can coordinate and do another push to get more survey responses.

Elle Baker (City of Revere) thanked MPO staff and shared that the study complemented other resiliency work that the City of Revere is conducting with a focus on the planning that is necessary to protect city infrastructure and residents.

Jennifer Constable (Town of Rockland) (South Shore Committee) reiterated L. Diggins comments and asked, if there is an opportunity, to reissue the survey and lean on the South Shore Coalition to reach out to community. J. Constable shared that the South Shore communities have done a tremendous amount of work on resiliency.

### **13. Modeling Roadmap: Fundamentals and Futures of Modeling at CTPS—*Marty Milkovits, MPO Staff***

M. Milkovits presented about the fundamentals and future of modeling at CTPS. M. Milkovits shared that the model has been used primarily as a predictive tool and staff are using that tool to generate estimates of important metrics on transit and roadway conditions, and travel, given a specific set of inputs and assumptions. This work is essential, necessary, and continuing. M. Milkovits shared that in light of the uncertainty the region is living through and facing in the short- and long-term, staff have to acknowledge that the usefulness of just a single point prediction is limited considering the range of potential futures. With that as motivation, staff want to reframe how they incorporate models into the planning process. This involves how to design, implement, and run models; how staff specify and analyze the scenarios that the staff will use to run the models against; and how to think about the models themselves. M. Milkovits stated that the risk of that single point prediction is that it can appear to be an assertion of what the future will be rather than a representation of staff and stakeholder assumptions about what might happen.

M. Milkovits shared that a model is essentially a decision support tool. To make a decision, the relevant items are picked and there are assumptions on how they are related. A modeling approach to decision-making is one that uses that representation or simplification of the process to give users some information about the decision. M. Milkovits shared an analogy to describe using models. Based on the model's information, the MPO are able to make a better decision.

M. Milkovits shared that there are two essential components to the model: the inputs and the theories or assumptions. The theories and assumptions are different from the inputs because this is how the modelers are asserting that the inputs are relating to each other. For transportation models, the inputs are the orientation of where people live, where they work, what the transportation networks are like in between; the assumptions are what their travel behavior will be in response to these inputs. Modelers take those two parts and realize them on a model platform. Depending on the extent and the complexity of the inputs and assumptions, the model platform could be done with a simple mental model, or the complexity might be so great that a purpose-built software is needed to represent it, which is the case in representing the regional roadway or transit network. With this platform, you can realize the relationships between the inputs based on the assumptions, and produce some results. M. Milkovits stressed that the results cannot be any more specific or include any more information than what is provided by the inputs or assumptions.

M. Milkovits stated the essential piece of the model is the stakeholder or decision maker. Without the decision maker, the model does not have any purpose besides being a toy. The stakeholder has to have an active role in the modeling process. Their needs are what determine the relevant items to be in the model, which are the inputs, assumptions, and results. Then the stakeholder understands that they are receiving insights between those defined inputs and assumptions.

M. Milkovits stated that when considering using a modeling tool, the decision maker must answer whether the model will help make a better decision and not whether the model predicts the future accurately. The next question is can the problem be described in terms for modeling or can the important parts be represented in the model. There are constraints to using modeling tools, and the more complex the tool, the more constraints. Data are one of the largest constraints for transportation models because of the development and validation overhead. Furthermore, developing the software, testing and validating the software and the time to run it, and analyzing it can all present constraints. Can the decision maker also help people understand how the inputs and assumptions are defined and related such that they can use these outputs to make a better decision. Finally, does the model make sense and are the inputs and

assumptions captured reasonable based on the decision the stakeholder wants to make. M. Milkovits shared that models help tell the story, but they are a simplified view that often needs to be put into a broader context.

M. Milkovits stated that at CTPS, staff model to produce estimates to fill required processes. Beyond that, models can be very powerful communication tools. The MPO has a variety of stakeholders with different interests, priorities, and expectations. A model can be a platform for those needs to be communicated amongst the stakeholders and provide that consistent platform for evaluation of different projects and policies. The model results can be useful to communicate insights to that complex set of implications and avoid fallacies in thinking.

M. Milkovits listed trends in modeling state of practice. Modelers are moving away from approaches that focus on accuracy and trying to represent a lot of detail into models that are better suited to handle uncertainty. Modelers are also moving from focusing on the complexity of the model to the usability to cover a broader range of inputs and scenarios. Lastly, the next trend is a move from a unified platform to a right-sized suite of tools. The downside is that the different platforms might produce different estimates, but it is preferable to get different responses because then modelers get slightly different perspectives on the inputs and assumptions.

M. Milkovits stated that the long-term goal for modeling at CTPS is to have a reliable, robust set of well-documented travel demand tools, data, and procedures that address a diverse set of needs for transportation planning in the Boston Region and statewide with engaged and informed stakeholders, and a coordinated team of modelers who have the skills, knowledge, and experience to maintain the set of tools, data, and procedures; develop new components in the tool platforms; apply the tools and data appropriately to projects; and communicate all things related to travel demand modeling.

M. Milkovits shared that MPO staff are adapting tools to support the 2023 LRTP. Staff are reaching out to engage a broader set of stakeholders to do a review on the design decisions for the new model. Staff will come back to the MPO following the stakeholder reviews to share the feedback and updates to model development.

### ***Discussion***

S. Woelfel asked interested stakeholders to contact M. Milkovits directly to participate in the review. E. Bourassa commented that one of the challenges with the model is when a transportation project is going through the environmental permitting process where there is often one proposed future and one no-build. E. Bourassa stated that people feel more frustrated when there is little opportunity to look at many different future

alternatives. E. Bourassa stated that recognizing that tension is an important thing to explain to people.

K. Miller asked if the modeling trend to move from complexity to usability is not mutually exclusive. K. Miller stated that CTPS is still going to be maintaining a complex travel demand model to be able to do alternative analysis for projects. They may be adding other tools to do more policy level analysis. M. Milkovits responded that when discussing complexity, he is discussing the state-of-the-practice trend in travel demand modeling, a development of more disaggregate representation of travel demand and interactions within the household and coordination of trips. The complexity of the current travel demand model will be maintained.

#### **14. Members Items**

There were none.

#### **15. Adjourn**

A motion to adjourn was made by the MAPC (Eric Bourassa) and seconded by the Advisory Council (Len Diggins). The motion carried.

## 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)	Daniel Amstutz
At-Large Town (Town of Brookline)	Heather Hamilton
City of Boston (Boston Planning & Development Agency)	Jim Fitzgerald
City of Boston (Boston Transportation Department)	Tom Kadzis
Federal Highway Administration	Ken Miller
Federal Transit Administration	
Inner Core Committee (City of Somerville)	Tom Bent
Massachusetts Department of Transportation	Steve Woelfel
	David Mohler
MassDOT Highway Division	John Bechard
	John Romano
	Jillian Linnell
Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority (MBTA)	
Massachusetts Port Authority	
MBTA Advisory Board	Brian Kane
Metropolitan Area Planning Council	Eric Bourassa
MetroWest Regional Collaborative (City of Framingham)	Thatcher Kezer III
Minuteman Advisory Group on Interlocal Coordination (Town of Acton)	Austin Cyganiewicz
North Shore Task Force (City of Beverly)	
North Suburban Planning Council (City of Woburn)	Tina Cassidy
Regional Transportation Advisory Council	Lenard Diggins
South Shore Coalition (Town of Rockland)	Jennifer
	Constable
South West Advisory Planning Committee (Town of Medway)	Peter Pelletier
Three Rivers Interlocal Council (Town of Norwood/Neponset Valley Chamber of Commerce)	Tom O'Rourke

---

<b>Other Attendees</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>
Aleida Leza	
Benjamin Muller	MassDOT
Bob Frey	MassDOT
Bryan Pounds	MassDOT
Cassie Ostrander	FHWA
Collette Aufranc	Wellesley Select Board
Constance Raphael	MassDOT
David DeRosette	MBTA
Elle Baker	City of Revere
Emily Teller	Friends of the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail
Eric Johnson	City of Framingham
Frank Tramontozzi	City of Quincy
Jeanette Rebecchi	Town of Bedford
Jeremy Thompson	495 West Partnership
Jessica Boulanger	MAPC
Johannes Epke	Conservation Law Foundation
John Gonzalez	DHK
Josh Klingenstein	MBTA
Joy Glynn	MetroWest Regional Transit Authority
JR Frey	Town of Hingham
Maura Carroll	
Michelle Ho	MassDOT
Paul Cobuzzi	
Peter Falk	MBTA
Sarah Bradbury	MassDOT Highway Division, District 3
Sheila Page	Town of Lexington
Steven Olanoff	TRIC Alternate
Susan Geelmuyden	
Todd Baldwin	Town of Saugus
Valerie Gingrich	Town of Wilmington

---

---

**MPO Staff/Central Transportation Planning Staff**

---

Tegin Teich, Executive Director

Mark Abbott

Steven Andrews

Matt Archer

Seth Asante

Jonathan Church

Casey-Marie Claude

Annette Demchur

Róisín Foley

Hiral Gandhi

Matt Genova

Betsy Harvey

Sandy Johnston

Drashti Joshi

William Kuttner

Anne McGahan

Marty Milkovits

Ariel Patterson

Gina Perille

Barbara Rutman

Michelle Scott

Chen-Yuan Wang

Kate White

---

The Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) operates its programs, services, and activities in compliance with federal nondiscrimination laws including Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (Title VI), the Civil Rights Restoration Act of 1987, and related statutes and regulations. Title VI prohibits discrimination in federally assisted programs and requires that no person in the United States of America shall, on the grounds of race, color, or national origin (including limited English proficiency), be excluded from participation in, denied the benefits of, or be otherwise subjected to discrimination under any program or activity that receives federal assistance. Related federal nondiscrimination laws administered by the Federal Highway Administration, Federal Transit Administration, or both, prohibit discrimination on the basis of age, sex, and disability. The Boston Region MPO considers these protected populations in its Title VI Programs, consistent with federal interpretation and administration. In addition, the Boston Region MPO provides meaningful access to its programs, services, and activities to individuals with limited English proficiency, in compliance with U.S. Department of Transportation policy and guidance on federal Executive Order 13166.

The Boston Region MPO also complies with the Massachusetts Public Accommodation Law, M.G.L. c 272 sections 92a, 98, 98a, which prohibits making any distinction, discrimination, or restriction in admission to, or treatment in a place of public accommodation based on race, color, religious creed, national origin, sex, sexual orientation, disability, or ancestry. Likewise, the Boston Region MPO complies with the Governor's Executive Order 526, section 4, which requires that all programs, activities, and services provided, performed, licensed, chartered, funded, regulated, or contracted for by the state shall be conducted without unlawful discrimination based on race, color, age, gender, ethnicity, sexual orientation, gender identity or expression, religion, creed, ancestry, national origin, disability, veteran's status (including Vietnam-era veterans), or background.

A complaint form and additional information can be obtained by contacting the MPO or at [http://www.bostonmpo.org/mpo\\_non\\_discrimination](http://www.bostonmpo.org/mpo_non_discrimination). To request this information in a different language or in an accessible format, please contact

**Title VI Specialist**

Boston Region MPO  
10 Park Plaza, Suite 2150  
Boston, MA 02116  
[civilrights@ctps.org](mailto:civilrights@ctps.org)

**By Telephone:**

857.702.3702 (voice)

For people with hearing or speaking difficulties, connect through the state MassRelay service:

- **Relay Using TTY or Hearing Carry-over:** 800.439.2370
- **Relay Using Voice Carry-over:** 866.887.6619
- **Relay Using Text to Speech:** 866.645.9870

For more information, including numbers for Spanish speakers, visit <https://www.mass.gov/massrelay>