

MPO Meeting Minutes

Draft Memorandum for the Record

Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization Meeting

November 17, 2022, Meeting

10:00 AM–11:53 AM, Zoom Video Conferencing Platform

David Mohler, Chair, representing Jamey Tesler, 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 minutes of the meeting of October 6, 2022
- Approve the Federal Fiscal Years (FFYs) 2023–27 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Amendment One
- Approve the FFY 2023 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) Adjustment One

Meeting Agenda

1. Introductions

See attendance on page 14.

2. Chair’s Report—*David Mohler, MassDOT*

There were none.

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

T. Teich updated the board on the lab and municipal parking study, which was proposed for the FFY 2023 UPWP. Per MPO board policy, staff is using up to 10 percent of the project budget to perform background research for a proposed project. The full scope and budget of the study will be presented to the MPO board for approval.

T. Teich explained the development of the MPO’s Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP). Staff are gathering data and public input on transportation needs and synthesizing them to update the MPO’s vision and goals that would shape the LRTP and inform investment priorities. As part of this effort, staff conducted outreach with MPO board members and the Regional Transportation Advisory Council (Advisory Council) and are going to meet with the Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority (MBTA), regional transit authorities, Metropolitan Area Planning Council (MAPC), and

other MPO partners to discuss the investment programs. Staff are also currently developing a survey to collect public feedback on updates to the MPO's goals and priorities. Lastly, staff have been reviewing the Universe of Projects for the current LRTP and receiving project updates to develop the next universe of projects.

T. Teich reported on the status of the Safe Streets for All (SS4A) grant application, a federal discretionary grant program for which the MPO had applied. In addition to stakeholder outreach, the MPO staff presented and discussed the application with the board twice, which led to the board approval of the application of a regional proposal. Since submitting the application, the MPO has learned that four municipalities from the Boston region submitted their own grant proposals. The federal government advised the MPO against duplicative applications, prompting the MPO to meet with those municipalities and representatives to discuss alternatives. The MPO decided to move forward with the application that was originally proposed and approved by the board and will continue to work with the four municipalities that applied for the grant individually.

T. Teich stated that the Transit Working Group recently hosted a coffee chat that was focused on updates on the MPO's LRTP and Coordinated Human Services Transportation—Public Transit Plan.

T. Teich stated that staff have been meeting with subregional groups to discuss LRTP processes and subregional priorities. Staff met with five of the eight groups and are working on the remaining three meetings to wrap up the outreach.

T. Teich informed the board of the How-To sessions that the MPO has been hosting on the TIP. The sessions provided guidance for municipal stakeholders on their participation in the TIP development and successful applications for funding. The next How-To session is going to be held after this MPO meeting.

T. Teich announced the upcoming meeting with the 495 MetroWest Partnership, which is organized to discuss the MPO's next LRTP. The meeting is scheduled for November 30.

T. Teich went over the agenda for this meeting. The first part of the meeting consists of action items regarding the TIP amendment and the UPWP adjustment. The second part of the meeting features presentations of 2024–28 TIP Universe of Projects and two studies undertaken by staff, one addressing equity and access in the Blue Hills and the other addressing integrated transit and freight priority. The next MPO meeting is scheduled for December 1.

Discussion

Melissa Tintocalis (North Suburban Planning Council) asked which municipalities had submitted the SS4A application. T. Teich replied Weymouth, Sharon, Dedham, and Salem. M. Tintocalis asked about the timeline after the submission of the regional application. Rebecca Morgan stated that the federal government will be finalizing decisions by the end of the calendar year and no later than January.

4. Public Comments

There were none.

5. Committee Chairs' Reports

Derek Krevat (MassDOT) reported on the UPWP Committee meeting that took place on November 3. The committee recommended for endorsement the proposed adjustment of the FFY 2023 UPWP. The adjustment entails increased funding allocation to the MAPC within the FFY 2023 UPWP.

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

L. Diggins (Advisory Council) reported on the discussion with T. Teich at the most recent Advisory Council meeting. At the meeting, T. Teich spoke about the peer exchange with Miami-Dade MPO and the Association of Metropolitan Planning Organization conference that took place in July and October respectively. L. Diggins stated that the discussion was very informative and gave the motivation to reach out to other advisory councils in the Commonwealth and learn about the work of their MPOs.

L. Diggins stated that he was elected to his fourth term as the Advisory Council chair. Franny Osman will serve as the Vice-chair. He expressed that he will not seek reelection after this year to allow more diverse opinions within in the Advisory Council.

7. Action Item: Approval of October 6, 2022, MPO Meeting Minutes—*Logan Casey, MPO Staff*

Vote

A motion to approve the minutes of the meeting of October 6, 2022, was made by the MAPC (Eric Bourassa) and seconded by the Inner Core Committee (City of Somerville) (Tom Bent). The motion carried.

8. Action Item: FFYs 2023-27 TIP Amendment One—*Ethan Lapointe, MPO Staff*

Documents posted to the MPO meeting calendar

1. [FFYs 2023–27 TIP Amendment One \(pdf\)](#)

2. [FFYs 2023–27 TIP Amendment One \(html\)](#)
3. [FFYs 2023–27 TIP Amendment One Table 1](#)
4. [FFYs 2023–27 TIP Amendment One Table 2](#)
5. [FFYs 2023–27 TIP Amendment One Table 3](#)

E. Lapointe requested the board endorse the FFYs 2023–27 TIP Amendment One, which concerns the transfer of FFY 2022 MBTA funding to FFY 2023 including Federal Transit Administration Section 5307 and 5337 and federal discretionary grant awards. Section 5307 and 5337 funding concerns state of good repair, maintenance of existing rolling stock, and other MBTA capital uses. Federal discretionary grant awards that are being carried forward to FFY 2023 will support MBTA projects. In October, Staff opened a public comment period with regards to the proposed changes to the TIP and received three comments: support of Lynnway Multimodal Corridor Project, which was awarded one of the discretionary grant awards being carried forward to FFY 2023; inquiry regarding the Low-No Emissions Grant Awards for the MBTA's Battery Electric Bus project; and clarification of location of the amendment details and summary on the MPO website.

Vote

A motion to approve Amendment One, was made by the MAPC (E. Bourassa) and seconded by the Advisory Council (L. Diggins). The motion carried.

9. Action Item: FFY 2023 UPWP Adjustment One—*Srilekha Murthy, MPO Staff*

Documents posted to the MPO meeting calendar

1. [FFY 2023 UPWP Adjustment One Memo \(pdf\)](#)
2. [FFY 2023 UPWP Adjustment One Memo \(html\)](#)
3. [FFY 2023 UPWP Adjustment One \(pdf\)](#)
4. [FFY 2023 UPWP Adjustment One \(html\)](#)
5. [FFY 2023 UPWP Adjustment One Appendix \(html\)](#)
6. [FFY 2023 UPWP Adjustment One Redline Version](#)

S. Murthy requested the board endorse the FFY 2023 UPWP Adjustment One, which focuses on increases to MAPC's tasks in the UPWP. She explained that the change is an adjustment rather than amendment because the increased budget for each task is less than 25 percent.

E. Bourassa (MAPC) explained that he had learned over the summer that the Boston region had received increased federal funds while the UPWP draft was released for public comment. The UPWP Committee decided to revisit the surplus funding to avoid a

further delay in finalizing and delivering the UPWP to the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Federal Transit Administration (FTA). E. Bourassa stated that the adjustment concerns increased budget for nine MAPC task items in the UPWP. The two biggest increases are the Corridor/Subarea Planning Studies and the Alternative-Mode Planning and Coordination, each to support MAPC’s technical assistance for the MBTA communities law and electric vehicle charging infrastructure across the region.

Table 1
FFY 2023 UPWP Adjustments

Project Number	Project Name	Approved FFY 2023 Budget	Total Adjustments	Proposed FFY 2023 Budget
MAPC1	Corridor/Subarea Planning Studies	\$213,000	\$40,518	\$253,518
MAPC2	Alternative-Mode Planning and Coordination	\$218,509	\$20,000	\$238,509
MAPC3	MetroCommon 2050	\$105,000	\$10,000	\$115,000
MAPC4	Land Use Development Project Reviews	\$94,696	\$1,000	\$95,696
MAPC5/2423	Community Transportation Technical Assistance Program	\$48,156	\$0	\$48,156
MAPC6	MPO/MAPC Liaison and Support Activities	\$175,000	\$10,000	\$185,000
MAPC7	UPWP Support	\$12,000	\$2,000	\$14,000
MAPC8	Land Use Data and Forecasts for Transportation Modeling	\$105,000	\$10,000	\$115,000
MAPC9	Subregional Support Activities	\$214,000	\$6,000	\$220,000
Grand Total:		\$1,185,361	\$99,518	\$1,284,879

FFY = Federal Fiscal Year. MAPC = Metropolitan Area Planning Council. MPO = Metropolitan Planning Organization. UPWP = Unified Planning Work Program.

Vote

A motion to approve Adjustment One was made by the Advisory Council (L. Diggins) and seconded by the Inner Core Committee (T. Bent). The motion carried.

10. Presentation: FFYs 2024-28 TIP Universe of Projects—Ethan Lapointe, MPO Staff

Documents posted to the MPO meeting calendar

1. [FFY 2024–28 TIP Universe of Projects Table \(pdf\)](#)

2. [FFU 2024–28 TIP Universe of Projects Table \(html\)](#)

E. Lapointe gave an overview of the FFYs 2024–28 TIP, including the project development timeline, project development process, Universe of Projects, and the outlook for the new TIP in comparison with the current TIP. Development for the next TIP has already begun, with a target date of endorsement for the final TIP being June 1, 2023. Since October, staff have been facilitating how-to meetings and one-on-one meetings with municipalities to gather data about potential projects. At the time of this meeting, applications were open for all types of projects, and they will remain open until late December. Project scoring will take place until late January, and preliminary results will be presented to the MPO board in mid-February, which will then feed into the development of programming scenarios. The board will select the best scenario at the April 20 meeting and release it for public review before endorsing the final TIP on June 1.

E. Lapointe stated that the current TIP allocates funding to 23 new projects, which is an increase from 10 in the previous TIP (FFYs 2022–26) and eight in the year prior (FFYs 2021–25). The reason for this trend is largely driven by signing of the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law, which resulted in an increase in regional target funding.

Communication with state partners at MassDOT is crucial to the development of the TIP. Due to fluctuations in costs, projects must meet the 25 percent design threshold to be considered for funding. MassDOT facilitates the design process for projects leading to MassDOT Project Review Committee approval, which not only ensures that projects applying for TIP have met the minimum design criteria, but informs which projects take higher priority than others.

E. Lapointe gave a breakdown of the Universe of Projects for the upcoming TIP. The Universe of Projects is a list of projects that were informed by various MPO partners and engagements but were not programmed into the existing TIP. It gives a glimpse into the next year's TIP, although not all projects will be scored. For the upcoming TIP, as shown in Table 2, the Universe contains 105 projects, an increase from 95 for the current TIP. The list will evolve as MPO staff continue dialogue with partner agencies and member municipalities. Of the 105 projects, approximately 20 projects are new to the Universe.

E. Lapointe stated that the introduction of Community Connections funding was helpful to attract more applicants for the TIP. However, the number of projects does not indicate total funding levels, due to a wide range of project costs determined by project types.

Table 2
FFYs 2024–28 TIP Universe of Projects

Subregion	Total in Universe	Complete Streets	Intersection Improvements	Bicycle/ Pedestrian Infrastructure	Major Infrastructure
ICC	37	17	6	6	8
MAGIC	7	1	1	2	3
MWRC	7	2	2	2	1
NSPC	8	6	1	1	0
NSTF	13	10	1	1	1
SSC	6	4	2	0	0
SWAP	16	6	5	4	1
TRIC	11	7	2	1	1
Total	105	53	20	17	15

ICC = Inner Core Committee. MAGIC = Minuteman Advisory Group on Interlocal Coordination. MWRC = MetroWest Regional Collaborative. NSPC = North Suburban Planning Council. NSTF = North Shore Task Force. SSC = South Shore Coalition. SWAP = South West Advisory Planning Committee. TRIC = Three Rivers Interlocal Council.

Discussion

E. Bourassa asked whether the number of projects that are getting scored declined, with the exception of the Community Connections program. E. Lapointe confirmed that the number of projects outside of Community Connections is down and explained that because of the COVID-19 pandemic, fewer projects were applied for and are being scored. Also, fewer projects came in during the pandemic for various reasons, including uncertainty and staffing restrictions. Community Connections projects helped to reverse the trend because many of the projects that were eligible for funding were tactical improvements that are relatively low cost and quick to implement. He hopes to see more projects applying this year, with better adaptation to pandemic conditions and a longer application window. E. Bourassa expressed that since the MPO has increased the allocation of TIP targets on a discretionary basis this year, staff need to communicate to people about the funding process, so that the funding is channeled to projects through the designated pipeline.

L. Diggins (Advisory Council) asked about the maximum number of projects that staff can score. E. Lapointe stated that there is no limit of projects that the staff will score, and that project scoring is constrained by availability of staff and funding. L. Diggins asked how long it takes to score a project, given that sometimes the board needs to make fast decisions without project scoring. E. Lapointe explained that it depends on skill sets that the MPO staff has available. The MPO plans to have internal discussions on staff capacity to determine per project application delivery.

Dennis Giombetti (MetroWest Regional Collaborative) asked about the rationale for a decline or increase in the number of projects in the TIP development. E. Lapointe stated that during public engagement and one-on-one with municipalities, he has heard not only of pandemic-induced changes, but also other factors, such as availability of match funding, ability to execute projects, and uncertainty, including inflation.

Chris Timmel (Federal Highway Administration) asked about the eligibility threshold for project scoring. E. Lapointe explained that the minimum threshold is 25 percent design, which was recently endorsed by the TIP Project Cost Ad Hoc Committee. The threshold was introduced to minimize the effect that cost increases to projects that are already programmed for the TIP have on funding new projects.

Jim Fitzgerald (City of Boston) asked whether project information needs to be submitted to MPO staff by December 23 for consideration in the Universe of Projects. E. Lapointe stated that projects can be added to the Universe at any time; December 23 is the deadline for project scoring and evaluation for funding. J. Fitzgerald asked whether the December 23 deadline applies to only new projects, or projects that are already included in the Universe. E. Lapointe stated that the said deadline is for both new projects and projects that are already appended to the Universe. With regards to projects that are already registered in the Universe, project proponents are encouraged to remind MPO staff of reevaluation.

11. Presentation: Addressing Equity and Access in the Blue Hills—*Stella Jordan and Sean Rourke, MPO Staff*

Documents posted to the MPO meeting calendar

1. [Unlocking the Blue Hills \(link\)](#)

S. Jordan and S. Rourke presented background and findings of the Blue Hills study, a joint effort between the MPO and a coalition of advocacy organizations to conceptualize a new transit service between the Blue Hills Reservation and Mattapan. In early 2021, the coalition, which later formed an advisory group, proposed to the MPO a study that outlines solutions for transit-dependent Boston residents in accessing the Blue Hills. Over the course of the study, the MPO hosted 25 engagement events to discuss people's experiences and opinions on transit access to Blue Hills and other green spaces. Participants included community groups, advocacy groups, nonprofit organizations, neighborhood associations, and other relevant organizations and agencies. MPO staff also conducted a literature review to support what they heard from stakeholders, particularly concerning physical and mental health benefits of access to green spaces.

S. Jordan discussed the challenge of getting to the Blue Hills despite its importance as a recreational and educational destination. MPO staff focused on access from Roxbury, Dorchester, Hyde Park, and Mattapan, neighborhoods in Boston that are known to have a higher prevalence of minority, low-income, transit dependent populations than regional average. A GIS analysis shows that the Blue Hills is more accessible by a car, even if the starting location is farther away from the Reservation than the study area. There are several transit options to travel to or near the Blue Hills; however, their service availability and coverage are limited, making them a far less competitive mode choice than driving.

MPO staff designed two possible transit service improvements: a modification of MBTA bus Route 716 and a new route, each with several variations. The routes were created based on input from the Advisory Group and feasibility and operation costs of running a small bus during the peak visitor season. Costs ranged from \$20,000 to \$80,000, depending on service frequency and coverage. All routes start in Mattapan Square, although none of the routes touched every destination identified by stakeholders. The microtransit option was not considered because of cost implications and poor reception within the Blue Hills. Other routing considerations suggested by stakeholders include the need for sensitivity to neighborhood characteristics and accessibility of transit amenities within the Blue Hills. Stakeholders had also expressed an interest in expanding access to more destinations and connecting to Dorchester and Hyde Park.

In sharing post-study engagement plans, S. Rourke emphasized the importance of continuous engagement to the success of future MPO work. Continued efforts for stakeholder engagement ensure that the MPO's resources are addressing the needs of the communities. Moreover, engagement strengthens MPO's relationships with communities in the Boston region and increases stakeholder understanding of the MPO's role in the regional transportation process. S. Jordan stated that MPO staff plans to present the story map at community and advocacy group meetings, and to continue to support stakeholders in their effort to secure funding for a pilot.

Discussion

E. Bourassa (MAPC) expressed appreciation for putting together the content in a story map format, which he had not seen in any other work undertaken by the MPO. He also asked whether staff have looked at seasonal services. The MPO has previously provided seed money to create a seasonal bus service in Ipswich that travels between the commuter rail station and Crane Beach, which the Cape Ann Transportation Authority (CATA) has been operating since its launch. S. Rourke stated that the MPO has produced story maps in the past, although this study might be the first MPO study that presented all of its work and results in the story map format. He explained the cost

estimates are designed for a seasonal service between April 1 and October 31, based on existing location-specific seasonal shuttle services and previous work by Central Transportation Planning Staff, including the Ipswich Essex Explorer.

L. Diggins asked if the pilot program touches all of the important stops that the proponents had requested. S. Rourke explained that while there is no pilot in development, the outcome of the study is intended to be a resource for advocates to put together a proposal for a new bus service. He stated that the proposals that the study team created hit as many destinations identified by the advisory group as possible. However, some of the destinations in the southernmost portion of the Blue Hills were taken out to keep the feasibility of the proposed service routes. Depending on the usage of the service, serving those destinations that were not included in the proposals could also be a possibility.

L. Diggins pointed out that a 75-minute headway is a long waiting time for riders. If the proposed service were to be offered, bus shelters along the route would be desirable to make waiting easier. Bus shelters could certainly make up for the lack of reception in the proposed service area. He also asked where to locate the link to the story map. S. Rourke explained that he chose to present an abbreviated version of the story map to the board to make the content easier to follow in Zoom's screen-sharing feature. The link to the full story map was shared with MPO meeting participants in the chat and is linked on the MPO website. If more story maps are going to be brought to board meetings in the future, the MPO needs to determine the timing to share the work with the audience.

Bill Conroy (City of Boston) asked what types of shuttle services are currently offered in the Blue Hills, given the seasonality and popularity of the Blue Hills. S. Rourke stated that there are currently no regular services that transport people to destinations in the Blue Hills. The easy availability of parking indicates that the reservation is designed to be accessible to car users rather than transit users. B. Conroy expressed an interest in getting the community's perspective on the level of service frequency and coverage to make the service equitable and feasible.

J. Fitzgerald stated that diverting MBTA bus Route 716 on weekends could be an early action, since it takes time to sort out funding and operations for a new service. He also asked how receptive the MBTA was to the proposed changes to Route 716, given that the Bus Network Redesign (BNRD) is currently being voted on for board approval. S. Rourke stated that MPO staff had connections to the BNRD project. He explained while the timing is not ideal for rerouting existing bus routes, there is more flexibility to adjust Route 716 outside of the BNRD, since the service is contracted out.

Abby Jamiel (Livable Streets Alliance) voiced support for the pilot program that was recommended in the study. She also expressed the need for transit connections in Boston's inner-city neighborhoods.

12. Presentation: Scan of Integrating Transit and Truck Priority—Sandy Johnston, MPO Staff

Documents posted to the MPO meeting calendar

3. [Scan of Integrating Transit and Truck Priority Memo \(pdf\)](#)
4. [Scan of Integrating Transit and Truck Priority Memo \(html\)](#)

S. Johnston presented a memo that explores case studies of shared truck and transit priority on roadways. This research was done in consideration of the multimodal corridor improvements on Summer Street in the Seaport area of Boston, a collaboration between the City of Boston and MBTA. The Summer Street project features installation of bus priority lanes, part of which will allow use by trucks traveling between a Massport terminal and the Interstate network. S. Johnston stated that the designation of shared transit and truck priority on Summer Street is important for both transit and freight, as a high-frequency transit corridor and a Critical Urban Freight Corridor. As the design process for Summer Street was just beginning, S. Johnston was hoping that findings from the research would be a useful insight for project stakeholders.

A literature review, which was confined to English sources, reveals limited research done on freight priority lanes on surface roadways; and what is available on the subject matter does not involve quantitative measurement of actual experience or experiments. Implementation of shared truck and transit priority has been a rare occurrence, despite increased intellectual traction in the planning community.

S. Johnston briefly explained each case study that was chosen for the study, which is also illustrated in a matrix format in Appendix A of the memo.

New York City has numerous busways that are designed to accommodate delivery trucks, including the high-profile 14th Street busway in Manhattan. Most of the busways have been around since 2017, although Fulton Street Busway dates back to the 1970s.

Seattle tested a freight and transit lane as part of a major roadway project, called the Alaskan Way Viaduct Replacement program. Evaluation by a University of Washington team indicates mildly positive results. Incidentally, the city has developed a modal integration plan for each mode to feed into the master plan, in part to balance between freight and transit priority. The draft freight lane policy calls for consideration of trucks

using transit lanes where there are fewer than 20 buses per hour. A pilot is currently in development to test the policy.

Newcastle, United Kingdom, implemented no-car lanes in the 1990s that ban cars on a full- or part-time basis. Results are mixed because these lanes were built with no real attempt to build a coherent network and had to be reconstructed later through modeling. Many of the lanes were eventually converted to bus lanes.

Ottawa, the capital city of Canada, has designated a short street in downtown as a dedicated truck lane for two disparate highway networks. The lane was designed to reduce bus queues caused by highway pump trucks. There seems to be no clear marking on the street, but it seems to be effective at times.

Portland has been piloting transit, truck, and turn lanes on a one-way arterial road in tandem with the rollout of transit priority lanes. These lanes connect an important industrial area to the interstate network. They have been received favorably by stakeholders and well used by heavy trucks heading to the interstate network, although there is no monitoring in place for formal implementation.

The literature review and case studies indicate that shared interests between freight and transit could materialize in freight and transit shared priority that can be highly effective. However, little research has been conducted that generates quantitative outputs on shared transit and truck priority, making it difficult to advance new ideas or projects. Setting specific goals and priorities, as well as a treatment design, was also recommended, as S. Johnston described transit and truck priority as a spectrum. Different factors, such as vehicle types, roadway geometry, and route attributes, should be evaluated in advance.

In the context of the Summer Street project, S. Johnston pointed out that collection of data before and after project implementation is missing from the discussion of shared freight and transit priority. Additional research is imperative, focused on countries where English is not the official language. S. Johnston also suggested looking to the characteristics to help identify future corridor analyses.

Discussion

L. Diggins asked S. Johnston for more comments on the case study in Barcelona, where timeshare is in effect that only allows trucks to drive on roadways during off-peak hours. S. Johnston indicated peak hours for trucks and the car and transit counterpart are not identical, although there is overlap; for example, on the truck-heavy corridors of I-90 or I-495, trucks can be seen after the morning rush hours. While planners could

develop a timeshare strategy in roundabout ways, there are not enough cases where the public sector mandates freight companies to limit deliveries only to off-peak hours.

Laura Gilmore (MBTA) commented on the need for context-sensitive analyses where specific corridors are evaluated with respect to elements such as road users, vehicle types, and bus stop access for pedestrians. She suggested that intersection design be taken into consideration. She also stated that the study generates an opportunity to refine the framework that could be applied more generally.

J. Fitzgerald commented that shared truck and transit priority could be a new possibility as the City of Boston tries to advance multimodal improvements on Summer Street.

L. Diggins suggested that a future study could estimate the effect of existing limits imposed on truck movement. Creating laws and regulations, such as timeshare, necessitates a high-level goal aimed at sustainability of the environment and of the policy. He asked S. Johnston to clarify the sudden drop in freight flow on Jay Street from the New York case study. S. Johnston stated that such a tendency is not uncommon when there is a rush of regulatory changes, and it might have to do with the existing tension with regards to law enforcement in New York City. L. Diggins also asked whether S. Johnston looked into shared truck and transit priority that also accommodates cyclists. S. Johnston stated that a relevant case study would be Portland where shared lanes involve both buses and street cars. Those priority lanes are not popular among cyclists due to the streetcar rails. In Boston, bus and bike lanes have generated mixed reactions from cyclists. Getting trucks to share a lane with buses and cyclists might be excessive. J. Fitzgerald explained that the Summer Street project will implement a bike lane separately from the shared bus and truck lane.

T. Bent commented how people often complain about a long stretch of a dedicated bus lane on a two-lane roadway that forces drivers to move to the one lane, while the adjacent dedicated bus lane remains unused. Allowing trucks on bus lanes would certainly alleviate traffic.

13. Members' Items

There were none.

14. Adjourn

A motion to adjourn was made by the MAPC (E. Bourassa) and seconded by the Inner Core Committee (City of Somerville) (T. Bent). The motion carried.

Attendance

Members	Representatives and Alternates
At-Large City (City of Everett)	Jay Monty
At-Large City (City of Newton)	David Koses
At-Large Town (Town of Arlington)	Claire V. Ricker
At-Large Town (Town of Brookline)	Heather Hamilton
City of Boston (Boston Planning & Development Agency)	Jim Fitzgerald
City of Boston (Boston Transportation Department)	William Conroy
Federal Highway Administration	Chris Timmel
Federal Transit Administration	
Inner Core Committee (City of Somerville)	Tom Bent
Massachusetts Department of Transportation	David Mohler
MassDOT District 2	John Bechar
MassDOT Highway Division	John Romano
Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority (MBTA)	Laura Gilmore
Massachusetts Port Authority	
MBTA Advisory Board	Amira Patterson
Metropolitan Area Planning Council	Eric Bourassa
MetroWest Regional Collaborative (City of Framingham)	Dennis Giombetti
Minuteman Advisory Group on Interlocal Coordination (Town of Acton)	Austin Cyganiewicz
North Shore Task Force (City of Beverly)	
North Suburban Planning Council (Town of Burlington)	Melisa Tintocalis
Regional Transportation Advisory Council	Lenard Diggins
South Shore Coalition (Town of Hull)	
South West Advisory Planning Committee (Town of Medway)	
Three Rivers Interlocal Council (Town of Norwood/Neponset Valley Chamber of Commerce)	Tom O'Rourke

Other Attendees	Affiliation
Rich Benevento	
Miranda Briseño	MassDOT
Robert Craig	Town of Rockport
Beth Debski	Salem Partnership
Breanne Frank	Conservation Law Foundation
Michael Garrity	MassDOT
Paul Graveline	
Perry Grossman	
Michelle Ho	MassDOT District 5
Abby Jamiel	
Brian Kane	MBTA Advisory Board
Ali Kleyman	MBTA
Josh Klingenstein	MBTA
Rassiah Kouame	MassDOT
Derek Krevat	MassDOT Office of Transportation Planning
Judy Lehrer	Jacobs
Josh Levin	
Owen MacDonald	Town of Weymouth
Adi Nochur	MAPC
Steven Olanoff	Town of Westwood
Shella Page	Lexington
Jon Rockwell	TED inc.
C Senior	MassDOT
Jon Seward	
Derek Shooster	MassDOT Office of Transportation Planning
Tyler Terrasi	MWRTA
Andrew Wang	MassDOT

MPO Staff/Central Transportation Planning Staff

Tegin Teich, Executive Director

Silva Ayvazyan

Logan Casey

Jonathan Church

Annette Demchur

Adriana Fratini

Hiral Gandhi

Betsy Harvey

Sandy Johnston

Stella Jordan

Ethan Lapointe

Marty Milkovits

Rebecca Morgan

Srilekha Murthy

Meghan O'Connor

Gina Perille

Sean Rourke

Michelle Scott

Judy Taylor

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>.