

MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF THE

Southeastern Massachusetts Metropolitan Planning Organization (SMMPO)

Wednesday August 31, 2011

Held at Southeastern Regional Planning and Economic Development District (SRPEDD)

88 Broadway, Taunton, MA

The meeting was called to order by acting chairman Clinton Bench at 1:10pm.

The following SMMPO Members were in attendance:

Ray Ledoux, SRTA Representative

Jean Fox, Town of Freetown

Randall Kunz, SRPEDD Chair

Francis Gay, GATRA Administrator

Byron Holmes

Clinton Bench, MassDOT

Pamela Haznar, MassDOT

Representing William Flanagan, Mayor-City of Fall River

Representing Jeffrey Mullan, Secretary of MassDOT, SMMPO Chair

Representing Acting Commissioner DePaola, MassDOT Highway

The following were also present:

Trey Wadsworth, MassDOT Planning

Louise Hardiman, SRPEDD

Lisa Estrela-Pedro, SRPEDD

Steve Smith, SRPEDD

Linda Lally, SRPEDD

Angela Azevedo, SRPEDD

Tim Kochan, MassDOT Highway Division District 5

Paul Mission, SRPEDD

Jim Hadfield, SRPEDD

Adam Recchia, SRPEDD

Christopher Cardaci, SRPEDD

1. **Call to Order:** The meeting was called to order at 1:10 by Acting Chairman Clinton Bench.
2. **Approval of Minutes: July 27, 2011:** Mr. Ledoux noted that he is not SRTA's Acting Administrator and would like to be titled as SRTA Representative instead and the minutes should be revised to correct this. A motion was made to approve the minutes with the corrections as requested for the July 27, 2011 meeting of the SMMPO held at the SRPEDD Offices in Taunton. The motion was seconded and approved UNANIMOUSLY.

3. FY 2011-2014 TIP Amendments

- **Berkley-Dighton Bridge Amendment to the FY11-14 TIP (to fund the entire project in FY11):** Mr. Hadfield discussed a change in the programming of the Berkley-Dighton Bridge. He explained that the project was programmed as an advanced construction project in FY2011-2014, and that MassDOT has requested that the entire \$16.5M amount be programmed in FY2011, and to remove the project from year FY2014.

A motion was made to approve the amendment. The motion was seconded and approved UNANIMOUSLY.

- **GATRA Amendment to the FY11-14 TIP (Add Const./Eng./Site Improvements to Attleboro Intermodal Center):** Mr. Hadfield requested changes to GATRA Section 5309 of the FFY2011-2014 TIP. He explained that an amendment was necessary to add the "Attleboro Construction, Engineering and Site Improvements at the Attleboro Intermodal Center" project to FY2011 GATRA Section 5309 Bus & Bus Facilities HPP to facilitate GATRA's use of this funding. At the last meeting Ms. Gill clarified that originally the project was under control of the Attleboro Redevelopment Authority and that GATRA has taken control of the project and that is why they are applying for these funds. Also at the last meeting Mr. Bench clarified that the project was funded with \$451,440 of Federal funds and the rest of the project is funded through an ITC match.

The amendment to the FY2011-2014 TIP to include the "Attleboro Construction, Engineering and Site Improvements at the Attleboro Intermodal Center" project to FY2011 GATRA Section 5309 Bus & Bus Facilities
A motion was made to approve the amendment. The motion was seconded and approved UNANIMOUSLY.

- **SRTA Amendment to the FY11-14 TIP (Change in Operating Expenses in FY2011):** Mr. Hadfield discussed a request from SRTA to modify their operating expenses for FY2011 from \$12 million to \$13.5 million. At the last meeting Mr. Ledoux clarified that the request also included a change to the federal amount from \$4.4 million to \$5.4 million. Also at the last meeting Mr. Bench inquired about the source of the funding and match. Mr. Ledoux replied that the source was unused prior years Section 5307 funding and the match was local funds, local assessments and state contract assistance (SCA).

A motion was made to approve the amendment. The motion was seconded and approved UNANIMOUSLY.

- Additionally, there were some cost increases/changes in the existing FY 13 TIP.
 - i. Mr. Hadfield stated that there was a slight decrease in cost of the Fairhaven signalized intersection at Huttleston Ave/Route 6 safety improvements.
 - ii. Mr. Hadfield also stated that there was an increase in cost of two Middleboro projects including signal and intersection improvements at Route 105 and Route 1-495 ramps as well as the Nemasket River Stormwater Pollution Mitigation Project.
 - iii. Mr. Hadfield noted that there was a balance of roughly \$16,000 in FY 11 and the cost changes in FY 13 resulted in the over programming of \$5,500. Mr. Bench stated that that was acceptable.

A motion was made to approve the amendment with the cost changes to the FY2013 TIP. The motion was seconded and approved UNANIMOUSLY.

Mr. Bench asked that we reorder the agenda and discuss the HUD Sustainability Grant now in order to allow others time to arrive. There was no objection.

4. **Discussion of HUD Sustainability Grant - Request for Support from the MPO:** Mr. Smith stated that SRPEDD is putting together a consortium in order to apply for a HUD Regional Planning Sustainability Grant and would like the MPO to sign on in support of the grant. SRPEDD applied last year and was unsuccessful. The grant provides funding to create a 3-year regional sustainable plan by bringing together a consortium of influential citizens, organizations, and groups. MPOs are specifically mentioned as one of those "groups" in the regulations. The emphasis this year more so than last time is on groups that have traditionally been overlooked in planning processes and are under served, especially on social equity. SRPEDD has reached out to several organizations to solicit a partnership in obtaining the grant. SRPEDD is asking for \$1,700,000 in order to complete the comprehensive 3-year regional plan.

Mr. Bench asked what the source of the funds is. Mr. Smith replied that HUD is the source of the money but the actual program is a joint effort of HUD, DOT, and the EPA. Mr. Bench also stated that he feels it would be appropriate for the MPO to sign on as a member of the consortium. Ms. Haznar stated that she believes that SRPEDD applying for the grant is in line with they're activities and she's happy to see the support for environmental justice.

A motion was made to declare support for the application and join the consortium. The motion was seconded and approved UNANIMOUSLY.

Mr. Bench noted that four MPOs have made the determination that they no longer wish to sign endorsement pages for certification document votes. Instead, these MPOs have acknowledged that since meetings are held in accordance with the Commonwealth's open meeting law and all votes are recorded in the official meeting minutes that there is no need to complete signature pages. Mr. Bench also stated that it is MassDOT's position that signature pages are not necessary. Mr. Bench asks that staff take this into consideration and if at the next meeting a motion be introduced to make the minutes legal record of all certification votes MassDOT would support it.

Mr. Hadfield noted that he thinks it's good to hear that the other regions are deciding against signature pages and he thinks that it is something the SMMPO should consider.

5. **2012 Regional Transportation Plan – Consideration to Endorse:** Mr. Bench noted that the draft 2012 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) has ended its 30 day public comment period and staff has given many robust presentations about the plan. Mr. Bench also noted that MassDOT is very pleased with the product.

Comments on the draft 2012 Regional Transportation Plan received within the 30 day comment period: Mr. Mission stated that SRPEDD received three sets of comments including one from Federal Highway, one from the Office of Transportation Planning, and one from MassDOT District 5. Mr. Mission noted that SRPEDD also received comments from the general public that were already included in the RTP and he responded to those comments with the explanation of where the information was.

Federal Highway: [Comments included below, along with SRPEDD responses in red]

- Page 6-1 – SRPEDD continues to be a leader in the area of safety planning, and the effort in the TPLAN is a reflection of that.
 - Thank you
- Page 8-5 – The staff’s work on pavement management is very thorough and comprehensive. The document discusses “that a onetime cost of \$176 million is needed to improve all federal aid eligible roads in the SRPEDD region to excellent condition and of which, \$167 million is necessary to repair roads in fair or poor condition. An additional \$9 million is needed to maintain roads in good or excellent condition.” It would be informative to see the impact on pavement conditions based on the projects recommended in the financial plan.
 - That is something that SRPEDD can begin to track for the future and include with our on-going pavement management task as part of our UPWP.
- Page 18-11 – Air Quality Conformity, the complete list of regionally significant projects appears to be advertently excluded. Only two projects are shown in the document. Also, it would be informative to see the projects highlighted that are under construction and those that are recommended in the financial plan of the TPLAN.
 - The table was truncated and more projects were on that list. This will be corrected for the final version. In any event, here is the complete list of projects for the Air Quality Conformity:

Analysis Year	Community	Project Description – Southeastern Massachusetts Region
2016	Fall River, Somerset	New Brightman Street Bridge - capacity improvements to 4 lane divided facility
2016	Fall River	Route 79/Davol Street (interchange improvements and new traffic circulation)
2016	Freetown	Route 24 - New Interchange (Exit 8 ½)
2016	Mansfield	Route 140 / I-495 New Southbound On-Ramp
2020	Dartmouth	Route 6 (Faunce Corner Rd) / I-195 Interchange - Bridge Widening to 5 Lanes
2035	Taunton	Route 24 / 140 - Interchange Reconstruction

- Page 19-1 – Note SAFETEA-LU expires at the end of September 2011.
 - So Noted
- Page 19-2, Table 19.1 – The timeframe of the TIP is 2012-2015, and please adjust the table to reflect this.
 - So noted and changed
- Page 19-3, 19.2 – The revenue from 2011 cannot be used to fund projects in the 2012-2035 TPLAN. Please add a column that will be a summation of the revenue from each timeframe (2012-2015, 2016-2020 etc), which will allow FHWA to do a financial constraint comparison with the projects recommended in the following tables 19.4, 19.5, 19.6 and 19.7.
 - So noted and changed within the description of text provided with the funding totals. MassDOT provided funding totals in 5 year increments for RPAs to use with the Financial Planning of the RTP including 2011. Since RPAs are not provided with information on how MassDOT spent the 2011 money on Interstate/NHS Maintenance, Federal Bridge Program, Major Infrastructure Projects or Statewide Maintenance, we had no

means to separate 2011 financial information from the 5 year budget total provided by the Office of Transportation Planning at MassDOT.

- Tables 19.4, 19.5, 19.6 and 19.7. – We are aware the staff will include a table for the first timeframe of the TPLAN, 2012-2015, in addition to including the Route 79 Spaghetti Ramp project. Please ensure the project costs are inflated to Year of Expenditure. All projects over \$10M will need to be specifically listed in the financial constrained project listing prior to any FHWA action.
 - These tables especially 19.4 and 19.5 will be revised

Office of Transportation Planning: [Comments included below, along with SRPEDD responses in red]

Mr. Mission stated that Mr. Wadsworth had made a number of comments prior to the official release of the draft. As a result of this Mr. Wadsworth commented and made suggestions on items that were already addressed when his comments were received. One comment Mr. Wadsworth made regarding environmental justice issues and how you can correlate environmental justice with TIP projects, safety planning, congestion planning, etc. During the collection of the data for the HUD grant that Mr. Smith spoke about earlier, SRPEDD is gathering the latest EJ information based on the 2010 Census and the American Community Survey which is something that SRPEDD is going to start incorporating into all of the TIP, Title VI, safety, and pavement management programs.

OTP has taken the opportunity to review the draft document and would like to note that the RTP's finance planning needs some revision to ensure fiscal constraint. Please see the comments below:

- Overall – How does the pavement preservation strategy outlined on Page 8-5 in the Pavement Management chapter relate to the Financial Chapter?
 - It doesn't, it is simply a summation of the needs assessment of the region's Non state maintained federal aid roads.
- Is there enough funding available to the MPO to follow the strategy suggested in the chapter?
 - No, see next bullet
- If there is enough funding please demonstrate that in the Finance Chapter. If there is not enough funding please update the strategy in Chapter 8.
 - A stated before, this is what is theoretically needed to bring the roads up to a good/excellent condition. As stated in the chapter, our present funding sources (Fed Aid and Chapter 90) cannot meet the pavement needs due to either the flexibility in how that money is spent (safety, congestion, pavement etc) or the design requirements associated with federal aid funding, and the fact that both federal aid funds and chapter 90 have been essentially level funded over the years while construction costs continue to rise. As also state on page 8-10, the intent of the project list as well as the funding strategies are to act as a guide for state and local officials to use for planning pavement improvements.
- It is necessary to ensure that each five year time band identified in the tables throughout Chapter 19 are fiscally constrained for each funding source; please double check tables in Chapter 19 for fiscal constraint.
 - So noted and will be checked again and changed
- Page 19-1 – In the third paragraph, the first sentence needs to be revised. Not all Federal Transit Administration funds pass through MassDOT, rather the Regional Transit Authorities are direct federal aid recipients of many funding sources.
 - So noted and will be changed
- Page 19-2 – Table 19.1 – This table should be updated and reference 2012-2015, rather than 2011-2014.
 - So noted and will be changed

- Pages 19-5 through 19-7 – Tables 19-4 through 19-7 The fiscal constraint tables should not include an itemized list of projects, unless they are regionally significant. Simply listing the amount of funds expected to be divided among the regional priorities is sufficient (roadway improvements, congestion improvements etc.).
 - So noted and will be changed
- Bridge projects should not be itemized, unless they are considered regionally significant, since bridges in the Commonwealth are programmed by the MassDOT Highway Division.
 - So noted and will be changed
- Page 19-11 – Table 19-8 Please explain the difference between Congestion Mitigation Air Quality projects and “Congestion Improvements.” This is unclear to the reader.
 - An explanation can be added or we can combine the two categories, but briefly, we broke out the Discretionary Funding (Reserved for the TIP) that follows categories the SMMPO have used over the years. The intent here was to show how the SMMPO has and will continue to spread funding around to address different problems our transportation system faces. We also acknowledge the confusion this difference is to the reader. In the final version both congestion categories were combined into one.
- Pages 19-15 through 19-19 – Tables 19-12 through 19-26 Please update the table formatting for improved clarity.
 - We were under the impression that we were to be placed in the RTP as is. We understand these numbers have also changed and can make these tables more presentable in the final version.

MassDOT District 5: [Comments included below, along with SRPEDD responses in red]

- You and your staff did an outstanding job on the revised RTP! It was extremely readable, current, forward thinking and comprehensive. I realize it is the 11th hour, but I am taking the opportunity to provide the following comments on the subject document anyway:
 - Thank you
- P. 1-2 - in the first series of bullets following 'Elements from this plan...' I would consider adding another bullet which loosely states 'Promotes improved bicycle and pedestrian accommodations along existing regional roadway network';
 - Because this is the vision statement, it is intended to generalize what this plan will identify and outline for improvements. It is implied that bicycle networks include road networks.
- P. 1-6 - Under Guideline 2, consider adding another bullet similar to above loosely stated as 'Continue to promote improved bicycle and pedestrian accommodations along existing regional roadway network';
 - It is implied that bicycle networks include existing road networks.
- P. 1-7 - Under Guideline 3 - Develop a Disaster Mitigation Plan - consider adding another bullet loosely stated as 'Coordinate/participate with the other SE MA RPAs relative to emergency management/evacuation planning efforts.
 - This could be added, but then I think we need to include other agencies with this effort including the State Police, MEMA, Homelands Security, etc. A general statement to say: Assist all state and federal agencies with the development of a Disaster Mitigation Plan.
- P. 5-19 - re County Street @ Hart Street (1ST PAR.) - Amend 'Plans are pre-25% design' to loosely read 'The project is at the 25% design stage - plans received by MassDOT';
 - So noted
- P.6-5 - re Table 6-2 Signalized Intersections exceed crash rate... - I think it would be useful to add another table containing the same data sorted by ACC/MEV in descending order so we can see the highest crash locations from top to bottom. I noticed Hart St. @ County Street has an ACC/MEV of 1.67, which puts it well above the .77 rate for signalized intersections in the region;

- We felt the list was easier to read alphabetized by community. The Most Dangerous Crash Location in Southeastern Massachusetts lists location based on severity or crash rates
- P. 6-29 -re Table 6-10 High Pedestrian Crash locations - Q: Has staff surveyed the locations identified in the table relative to adequacy of pavement markings, signage, ADA accessibility, etc? If not, I think it would be a useful exercise.
 - Part of the Pedestrian Safety Audits in our FY2012 UPWP
- P. 8-8 - 2nd PAR. - reads in part '...it has been the SMMPO's policy to give precedence to projects that address safety and mobility issues...' - in the context of this new era of diminished federal funding resources, it may sense to revisit the TIP Project funding criteria to seek a balance between programming projects addressing safety/congestion and needed roadway reconstruction/rehabilitation projects - my point being if we allow arterials to deteriorate to the point where they are impassable - it will only further compromise existing safety and congestion issues. ;
 - We have considered this issue and it will be addressed as part of our FY2012 UPWP
- P. 10-22 - last par. - 2ND SENTENCE referring to cost of extending commuter rail to SE MA being between \$1.4 and \$2 billion - I could be wrong but I thought that the long established overall cost cited has been in the \$4 billion range?;
 - Our cost estimate was taken from the Draft Environmental Impact Statement and verified by Kristina Egan (Southcoast Rail Project Manager) in later spring/early summer 2011.
- P. 11-9 - 'Study' should consider another bullet something to the effect of 'Conduct a study of alternative ridership, fare structure and schedule scenarios, e.g. 7 day and 30 day passes and the impact on farebox recovery ratio' - the reason I advocate this is because of the long haul nature of intercity bus service - it may contribute to much lower farebox recovery ratios compared to fixed route service and therefore in this era of fiscal retrenchment, it is important to structure fares to produce some minimum acceptable recovery ratio.;
 - Clarification needed on where specifically he referenced this comment. We also felt that because the idea of testing a universal farecard is being considered, this "Study on Farebox Recovery" would be more appropriate after the implementation of that pilot program.
- PPs 12-23 - I applaud the major effort your agency is involved in to develop a regional bicycle network and additional on-road bike connections. However, serving as the D5 Bicycle/Pedestrian Coordinator, I am also concerned that the RPAs engage in studies of bike and ped accommodation needs on more localized roads, e.g. collectors and minor arterials. For example, the CCC proposes to perform a Regional Bike LOS study concentrating on village centers within their 15 communities. I have asked them to consider future bike/ped studies that include assessing the needs and LOS along commercial corridors outside of the CBD where there is a history of significant bike and ped activity; therefore, I recommend that the following loosely worded pursuit be considered to add to the list: 'Conduct bicycle and pedestrian studies in urban and suburban centers' - and another 'Promote MassDOT GreenDOT goals of reducing Green House Gases, promote the healthy transportation options of walking, bicycling, and public transit; and support smart growth development';
 - This was loosely discussed in bullet 12-5 on page 12-23 by saying, "Encourage the construction of bicycle amenities by MassDOT and local communities on all roadway projects in accordance with the provisions of Mass. General Law 87 and the guidance provided for bicycle facility planning (Mass DOT Project Development and Design Guide, AASHTO publications), particularly along those roadways identified in Figure 12-7 as having adequate existing width for bike lanes."
 - This was also discussed in bullet 12-19 on page 12-32 regarding pedestrian facilities with commercial developments and urban areas.
- P13-21 - Relative to 13-5 - Does the Federal Homeland Security Agency and/or TSA play a role in coordinating safety and security at the regional airports within your region? If so, it may be worth mentioning.
 - No, they do not. See section 13.5 for details on security.
- P15-10 - Last PAR. Before 15.7 Homeland Security - 'The remaining project concepts, including an Aircraft Detection Alert System...can be designed and implemented under a separate scope and budget' I continue to be troubled by

the plan to install video surveillance cameras within Housing Authority housing...and the apparent lack of attention to the Regional Airport.

- So noted
- P17-6 - I'll be interested to see how the EOPSS emergency mgt./evacuations procedure work out vis-à-vis Hurricane/Tropical Storm Irene....this is one scary storm potential
 - The "key" is advance warning, tested during potential hurricane last year and seemed to work. Table top exercises between the various entities continue each year to prepare for these events.
- P17-12 - Under Conclusions, I would recommend adding a bullet 'Enhanced multi-regional involvement/coordination in emergency management/evacuation planning efforts'
 - I believe this is being done through MEMA with members of MassDOT and State Police involved with planning. I believe the efforts from the RPAs in Southeastern Massachusetts along with the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina opened the eyes of MEMA to develop a better plan. Discussion at MEMA Region 2's director James Manion indicated that when I met with his department regarding the development of this plan.
- P19-8 - Under 19.3 Major Investments - I don't see the previously referenced Raynham/Taunton Route 24 Corridor Add-a-lane project that was referenced in Chapter 5 (Congestion Management Plan). You had stated 'There is an immediate need for an engineering study of the future operation of Route 24 to verify the need and begin the process of adding lanes.' I think this is a worthy major investment project.
 - Although you are correct in saying that it is worthy of a major investment project, it cannot be listed as so because it still requires study and design with cost estimates to be fiscally constrained as part of the Financial Chapter (Chapter 19). It is partially listed under major investments in Ch. 19 as Projects Needing Further Study. In Chapter 5 Congestion, we mention that part of the problem with Route 24 congestion is the substandard interchanges along the corridor adding to the delay of the road. Additional study is needed to determine what the needs and costs are for replacement throughout the corridor as agreed upon by SRPEDD, OCPC, and MAPC.

A motion was made to endorse the FY2012 Regional Transportation Plan. The motion was seconded and approved UNANIMOUSLY.

6. **FY12-14 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) – Consideration to Endorse:** Mr. Hadfield stated that there were comments from Federal Highway and MassDOT. Many of the suggestions were cosmetic changes and updates as well as the addition of a safety project to the list.
 - **Highway Comments**
 - i. Mr. Hadfield discussed projects listed in FY12 that are using earmark money: The Route 24/Route 140 interchange and the New Bedford/Fairhaven Bridge replacement have been carried in recent TIPs and the region's intent is to advance the projects due to their because regional significance. Continuation of study to identify what is needed at the Route 140/Route 24 interchange has yet to be completed and the demands of the Route 24 corridor continue to increase. Mr. Hadfield also stated that he understands that MassDOT requires precise construction figures however the current number is an estimation of the costs of a feasibility study to see what is needed.
 - ii. Mr. Hadfield also noted that the New Bedford/Fairhaven bridge project requires that both communities discuss their desires for what needs to be done.
 - iii. Mr. Hadfield noted that some of the changes to the funding were comments that Mr. Wadsworth had made regarding projects in 2014 and 2015, particularly the Wareham project. Currently, SRPEDD has been working with persons in the safety office at MassDOT regarding adding one million dollars of HISD statewide money to the current TIP. This would allow for the movement of the Raynham project (Orchard/Route 44) from FY2015 to FY2014.

- iv. Mr. Bench noted that the template for the new TIP is presented nicely. Mr. Hadfield noted that there have been some problems with the new templates for both highway and transit that have had to be worked through.

- **Transit Comments**

- i. Mr. Gay noted that the majority of the problems they have had has been a result of the new template but things are getting worked out as we move ahead. Mr. Gay also noted that the template does not reflect carryover balances that the Authority has in federal money at any time. He stated that the purpose of the template is to show where money is going but also to make sure that the money is fiscally constrained. Mr. Bench noted that it is important to show what the Authority is spending carryover money on in order for people looking at future grant proposals to be able to confirm the match. He asked how much carryover funds GATRA has presently. Mr. Gay responded that they have approximately \$2 million at the moment and it comes from FY10 and FY11.

Mr. Wadsworth stated that other transit authorities have solved this problem by listing the year and amount of the carryover, not including any carryover in the current FY federal funds, and below in the fiscally restrained box only tallying the projects in the FY you're working in.

Mr. Bench noted that this is a problem and one of the first issues addressed going forward will be to add cells to the template to capture carryover balances. He also noted that there will in fact need to be 4 cells added, one for each year of carryover available, and that OTP now has all the most recent carryover totals available to them.

Mr. Gay noted that there will also have to be some sort of formula that will deduct carryover that has been used and show the current amount available on the next page. He also asked how 5311 funds are being handled because the money is disbursed like a grant program and the total money available to each RTA is not known very far in advance. Mr. Bench noted that he is aware of this problem and the solution would be to zero out those cells at the moment and put the total 5311 funds in when they are known so the TIP will have to be amended at that time.

Mr. Ledoux noted that he is unsure if the number in the TIP for the new Fall River Terminal Project encompasses the total funds needed including funds spent or not. He also stated that the funds for the project will need to be revisited as time goes on and the project becomes more defined.

Mr. Ledoux also asked that the body recognize that both the federal and state funding increase by 3% each year. Mr. Bench agreed that both the federal and state funds should indeed increase each year and that if that is not currently reflected in the TIP it should be. Mr. Bench noted that the state contact assistance number does in fact increase in the available SCA funds at the bottom of the template but the full amount is not programmed above. The 5307 money should increase each year and needs to be changed on the TIP.

- ii. Mr. Smith stated that he has discussed with others the fact that it takes awhile to get final funding numbers from MassDOT. He stated that during his discussion with Mr. Mohler, Mr. Mohler stated that MPOs and regional planning agencies need to take more responsibility in creating the TIPs because we can no longer depend on the RTAs to provide the numbers.

Mr. Bench added that the delay in the numbers is partly due to negotiations between the Rail and Transit Division and MARTA as well as simply miscalculations/errors on the part of the Rail and Transit Division. He also mentioned a 3% inflationary increase that was added to each year by John Englert causing a change in the final numbers. Finally, he mentioned that prior to this year there wasn't really a proper process for MassDOT to give financial advice to the RTAs. Moving forward, now that the initial process has been figured out, the process will be far more streamlined and transparent.

A motion was made to endorse the FY2012-2015 Transportation Improvement Program with the following changes made to the transit section included:

- Zero out the 5311 category for GATRA.
- Add the \$2 million dollars in carryover funds.
- Make sure the 3% increase in 5307 and SCA funds is reflected for both SRTA and GATRA.
- Highway project 605668 is moved from FY15 to FY14 with HISD funds.

The motion was seconded and approved UNANIMOUSLY.

FY12 Unified Planning Work Program – Consideration to Endorse

- **Comments:**

- i. Mr. Mission stated that the OTP has requested that a capital plan task be added to the SRTA technical planning assistance section that will include funding sources and revenue forecast for capital projects. This task would be funded using the current SRTA 5307 funds already allocated and will be done alongside the comprehensive service plan task.
- ii. Mr. Mission also stated that other OTP comments were already addressed and included in the text, including the addition of the EJ data. He also stated that Federal Highway had a question on whether security and freight was included in the UPWP. Mr. Mission stated that SRPEDD continually works with a number of organizations on security and freight planning issues but this wasn't stated explicitly in the UPWP. He also stated that Federal Highway asked that the 80/20 funding rule be broken out for each task. Mr. Mission stated that the rule is explained in the beginning of the UPWP.

A motion was made to endorse the FY2012 Unified Planning Work Program with the change to the SRTA technical planning task. The motion was seconded and approved UNANIMOUSLY.

7. **Other Business:** No other business was discussed.
8. **Date, Time, Place for Next Meeting:** The next meeting will be held on Tuesday October 18 at 1pm.
9. **Adjourn:** The meeting was adjourned at 2:25pm by Acting Chairman Clinton Bench.