

Administration and Finance (A&F) Committee Meeting Minutes Draft Memorandum for the Record Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization Meeting

November 3, 2022, Meeting

9:00 AM–10:00 AM, Zoom Video Conferencing Platform

Brian Kane, Chair, representing the MBTA Advisory Board

Decisions

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

- Approve the minutes of the meeting of September 22, 2022

Meeting Agenda

1. Introductions

See attendance on page 6.

2. Public Comments

There were none.

3. Action Item: Approval of September 22, 2022, A&F Meeting Minutes—*Brian Kane, Chair*

Documents posted to the MPO meeting calendar

1. [September 22, 2022, A&F Meeting Minutes \(pdf\)](#)
2. [September 22, 2022, A&F Meeting Minutes \(html\)](#)

Vote

A motion to approve the minutes of the meeting of September 22, 2022, was made by the Metropolitan Area Planning Council (MAPC) (Eric Bourassa) and seconded by the Massachusetts Department of Transportation (MassDOT) Office of Transportation Planning (Derek Krevat). The motion carried.

4. Discussion: Operations Plan: Board member roles for non-officers—*Brian Kane, Chair*

Documents posted to the MPO meeting calendar

1. [Operations Plan Worksheet: Board Member Responsibilities \(pdf\)](#)
2. [Operations Plan Worksheet: Board Member Responsibilities \(html\)](#)

B. Kane introduced the Operations Plan worksheet for Board member roles for non-officers and requested discussion from the Committee.

Discussion

Tegin Teich, Executive Director, noted that this document does not define roles and responsibilities of ex-officio members or non-voting members, and that more discussion was needed if the Committee wanted to include additional language.

B. Kane asked if T. Teich had any examples of what ex-officio members are tasked with in other MPOs. T. Teich replied that ex-officio members typically serve an advisory position and share information, not formalized among other MPOs. Derek Krevat added that he was not aware of ex-officio roles being articulated in a Memorandum of Understanding or other documents.

Lenard Diggins suggested clarifying the role of ex-officio members now to allow for modification in the future.

Dennis Giombetti, MetroWest Regional Collaborative, suggested that there does not seem to be a need to change the current roles of ex-officio members.

B. Kane suggested the Committee move to discuss Board member expectations.

Eric Bourassa, MAPC, agreed with the language in the worksheet and stated setting the expectation of having Board members participate in relevant subregional meetings would be beneficial.

B. Kane asked E. Bourassa to explain how subregional meetings work. E. Bourassa responded that MAPC has a staff member who coordinates each of the subregional meetings monthly and the subregional groups identify topics to discuss. Subregional groups are also given updates on happenings within the region.

L. Diggins asked if meeting attendance for subregional meetings has improved because of the virtual meeting format. E. Bourassa answered that virtual subregional meetings have seen better attendance than in-person meetings, but the robustness of conversation has decreased.

D. Krevat suggested that the subregional group meetings would be a good place to educate municipalities on the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) project development timeline and to give an overview of the TIP process.

Brad Rawson, City of Somerville, stated that at a recent Inner Core Committee meeting the Long-Range Transportation Plan was discussed. B. Rawson agreed that education would be a helpful tool in getting members involved in the process.

B. Kane suggested the Committee move to discuss item H of Board member expectations.

Jonathan Church, MPO staff, stated that MPO staff added additional text regarding Board members participating in creating more public engagement opportunities, which could include attending staff-led events, recommending to the staff ways to engage with local municipalities or subregion, or engaging with stakeholders in the subregion or municipality.

5. Discussion: Operations Plan: Standing and Ad Hoc Committees— *Brian Kane, Chair*

T. Teich gave an overview of the background information related to Standing and Ad Hoc committees presented in the Operations Plan worksheet. T. Teich presented questions for Committee members to discuss.

Discussion

B. Kane suggested that the Operations Plan include language about standing committees and other committees. B. Kane further suggested including language about committee elections and the Chair nomination process. B. Kane suggested discussing a technical committee and asked T. Teich if she had suggestions on how to structure a technical committee. T. Teich replied that a committee that focused on the TIP to facilitate in-depth conversations regarding the TIP process could be useful to bring certain recommendations to the MPO Board. The committee would operate similarly to the current Unified Planning Work (UPWP) committee, although the TIP committee would not make policy recommendations to the MPO Board.

B. Kane suggested that certain reports and studies that MPO staff completes could be presented at a committee level. B. Kane further stated that many Board members may want to be on a TIP committee due to the important nature of the work.

E. Bourassa stated that he sees value in having a small TIP committee to discuss issues with projects in detail with MPO staff, as well as staff from MassDOT. This committee could help with addressing the challenges of project readiness and cost increases that are typically rush decisions. E. Bourassa emphasized the importance of a small committee and noted that there should still be a discussion surrounding the TIP and projects with the full MPO Board.

D. Giombetti stated his concerns with undue influence of a potential TIP committee over the TIP process and project selection.

L. Diggins stated that the TIP committee would have to include a small number of members, although any member should be able to join to ask questions and gain more information about projects.

Jen Rowe, City of Boston, suggested using an alternative meeting format other than Robert's Rules when discussing TIP projects to better facilitate conversation. J. Rowe further suggested using the TIP committee to focus on evaluating the TIP process and to only discuss specific projects when necessary.

D. Krevat agreed that there is a need for a TIP committee. D. Krevat suggested that a TIP committee could be a place for discussion between MPO board members and MPO staff to assist with evaluating project scoring criteria and project readiness during months before or after the yearly TIP development process.

E. Bourassa noted that when he first joined the MPO, the MPO would host a day-long meeting where municipalities would present their projects for consideration in the TIP. The process was overwhelming due to the number of projects being presented in one day. E. Bourassa stated he supports a TIP committee that focuses on projects and project readiness as it would be good way to have detailed conversations about projects. E. Bourassa asked D. Krevat what he meant by having TIP committee meetings before or after the TIP development process. D. Krevat stated that in February, MassDOT evaluates existing projects that are already programmed for project readiness with the purposes of building the next year's State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). This evaluation allows TIP managers and others to get a sense of project readiness in advance of creating the upcoming TIP.

E. Bourassa stated it would be helpful to have a TIP committee that was tasked with evaluating project readiness, but the TIP committee should not be charged with developing a TIP recommendation.

L. Diggins stated he liked the idea of a TIP committee and allowing MPO board members to have a better understanding of the project scoring process.

B. Kane agreed with E. Bourassa and stated that a TIP committee would be valuable to the MPO board and could allow small technical issues to be discussed at this committee.

6. Members' Items

There were none.

7. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at approximately 9:55 AM.

Attendance

Members

Representatives and Alternates

MBTA Advisory Board	Brian Kane
Metropolitan Area Planning Council	Eric Bourassa
Regional Transportation Advisory Council	Lenard Diggins
MassDOT Office of Transportation Planning	Derek Krevat
MetroWest Regional Collaborative, City of Framingham	Dennis Giombetti

Other Attendees

Affiliation

JR Frey	Town of Hingham
Brad Rawson	City of Somerville
Jen Rowe	City of Boston
Simon Alexandrovich	

MPO Staff/Central Transportation Planning Staff

Tegin Teich, Executive Director
Silva Ayvazyan
Logan Casey
Jonathan Church
Annette Demchur
Hiral Gandhi
Sandy Johnston
Srilekha Murthy
Gina Perille

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. 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

By Telephone:

857.702.3700 (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>.