MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF THE
Southeastern Massachusetts Metropolitan Planning Organization (SMMPO)
Tuesday, February 19, 2019
Held at SRPEDD
88 Broadway, Taunton, MA 02780

The following SMMPO Members were in attendance:

Bryan Pounds Representing Stephanie Pollack, Secretary and CEO of MassDOT Chair
Ron Morgan Representing Frank Gay, GATRA Administrator
Pamela Haznar Representing Jonathan Gulliver, MassDOT Highway Div. Administrator
Manuel Silva Representing Jon Mitchell, Mayor of the City of New Bedford
Joe Callahan Representing Deborah Melino-Wender, SRPEDD Commission Chair
Fred Cornaglia Representing Thomas Hoye, Mayor of the City of Taunton
Alan Slavin Representing the Town of Wareham
Brandon Wilcox Representing Jeff McEwen, FHWA Division Administrator
Bill Roth Representing Jasiel F. Correia II, Mayor of the City of Fall River
Steve Ouellette Representing the Town of Westport

The following were also present:

Christopher Betourney, MassDOT District 5 Lilia Cabral-Bernard, SRPEDD
Tim Kochan, MassDOT District 5 Lisa Estrela-Pedro, SRPEDD
Paul Mission, SRPEDD Charlie Mills, SRPEDD
Mary Ellen DeFrias, MassDevelopment Ben Muller, MassDOT

Handouts:
   I.  FFY 2019-2023 TIP Proposed Amendment #1
   II. SMMPO/SRPEDD TIP Evaluation Criteria
   III. FFY 2020-2023 Existing Project List
   IV.  FFY 2020-2024 Scenario 1 Project List
   V.   FFY 2020-2024 Scenario 2 Project List

1. **Call to Order and Introductions**: The meeting was called to order 1:01 PM by Chairman Bryan Pounds, after which attendees introduced themselves.

2. **Public Comments**: Chairman Pounds opened the floor to give an opportunity for the public to address the SMMPO. No public comments were made.

3. **Approval of SMMPO January 15, 2019 Minutes**: Chairman Pounds asked if everyone had reviewed the minutes of the January 15, 2019 meeting of the SMMPO and if there were any comments or changes. Mr. Paul Mission made a note that there were no attachments accompanying the minutes as they were sent along prior to the last meeting. Chairman Pounds had a comment that there was a typo next to Secretary Pollock’s title; instead of saying “CEP” it should read “CEO”. A motion was made to accept the minutes of the January
15, 2019 meeting of the SMMPO, with the changes noted, into the record. The motion was seconded and APPROVED, with one voter, MassDOT’s Pamela Haznar abstaining.

4. Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) –


   **2019**
   - Norton – Corridor Improvements on Route 123 – The PS&E is due in April.
   - Seekonk – 114A and County Street – MassDOT just received the 100% design and it is on the FFY 2019-2023 TIP.
   - New Bedford Corridor Improvements on Kings Highway – MassDOT was expecting the 100% design at the end of January and did not receive them. They are overdue but should be in shortly, MassDOT is comfortable with keeping it in FY 2019 of the FFY 2019-2023 TIP.
   - Middleboro – Resurfacing on Route 44 – The bids will be open in March.
   - Rehoboth – Route 44 Resurfacing – The bids will be open in April.

   **2020**
   - Taunton – Corridor Improvements on Route 138 from Leonard Street to Purchase Street (Phase 1)– 75% design is under review.
   - Lakeville – Reconstruction and Related Work on Rhode Island Road (Route 79) from the Taunton City Line to Clear Pond Road – MassDOT met with the town and their designer, there was concern with the town regarding the Right of Way Process. MassDOT is requesting a commitment letter from the town so they know that the town will commit to all of the takings.
   - New Bedford – Intersection Improvements at Hathaway Road, Mount Pleasant Street and Nauset Street – 75% design is due in March.
   - Middleborough – Intersection Improvements and Related Work at John Glass Square – 75% design is under review.
   - Middleborough – Resurfacing on I-495 – It is an in-house design and MassDOT is expecting to get the design in June 2019.
   - Acushnet – Hamlin River Bridge – This was approved years ago and is located on a historic site, providing a myriad of environmental factors. It was brought up to 25% design but the MassDOT Bridge section is looking to minimize the cross section to try and avoid as many impacts as possible.

2021
Raynham – Resurfacing and Related work on Route 138 – 25% design is under review and there was a comment resolution meeting last week. There was a cost increase so MassDOT is looking to reduce the scope and phase the project to make it more palatable to fit in the TIP.

Taunton – Scatting Street over the Snake River – Received 25% design but it is on the bridge list so it is not a regional target.

Swansea – Intersection Improvements at Route 118 at the Mall and Route 136 and Maple Avenue – At 25% design, waiting for comment resolution meeting.

Seekonk Route 44 – Waiting for 25% design. It’s a NHS project but there are two Top-200 crash locations in this project. MassDOT asked the designer to match Rhode Island’s Road Diet. At the moment the project goes all the way to Rehoboth so MassDOT is trying to work through some issues while also trying to stay fiscally constrained. The two high crash locations are Arcade Avenue and 114A.

Attleboro/North Attleboro – Work on Route 1 and Route 1A – Expecting 25% design in May. This is an NHS resurfacing project but MassDOT is trying to incorporate complete streets into as many projects as they can.

Fall River – Corridor Improvements on Route 79 and Davol Street – The PM is working on setting up a working group meeting within the next couple of months.

Mansfield – Intersection Improvements at 140 and 106 – 25% Design is under review. At the JTPG Lee Azinheira mentioned that MassDOT needs to speak with the town because they have a corridor project abutting it. MassDOT will be in contact with Mansfield to try and coordinate the purview of the project.

Marion – Shared use Path – There is a comment resolution meeting scheduled for this month.

Norton/Mansfield – Rail Trail – Site walk will be held later this month.

2022

Dartmouth – Realignment of Tucker Road to Route 6 and Hathaway Road, Including Intersection Signalization – MassDOT had the comment resolution meeting so the next step would be a utilities and site walk. It has been some time since MassDOT moved with this project because they wanted to have the Complete Streets Engineer go through the project before it moved on.
New Bedford – Intersection Improvements and Related Work at Rockdale Avenue and Allen Street – 25% design plans are under review.

Mattapoisett – Corridor Improvements and Related Work on Main Street, Water Street, Beacon Street, and Marion Road – MassDOT reviewed a Concept Plan (10% Design) and provided comments. They are waiting to hear from the Project Manager and the town on those comments.

Rehoboth – Intersection Improvements and Related Work at Winthrop Street (Route 44) and Anawan Street (Route 118) – MassDOT is expecting the 25% design in March.

New Bedford – Corridor Improvements and Related Work on County Street from Nelson Street to Union Street – MassDOT is expecting 25% design by the end of April.

2023

Wareham – Construction of Bike Lanes along Narrows Road and a shared use path adjacent to Minot Avenue including related work – The town just recently secured a designer and MassDOT has requested a schedule.

Mansfield – Reconstruction on Chauncey Street (Route 106) – The project was approved by PRC and MassDOT is waiting on a schedule.

Taunton – Corridor Improvements and Related work on Broadway (Route 138), from Purchase Street to Jackson Street (Phase 2) – MassDOT is waiting for a schedule.

Plainville – Intersection Improvements at Washington Street (Route 1) and George Street – MassDOT had a meeting with the town and are meeting with their Design Consultant to look at concepts.

Swansea – Route 6 at Gardner Street – Pre 25%

Plainville – Route 1A is at 25% design.

2. Amendment – 5310 grant award to the FFY2019 of the FFY 2019-2023 TIP –

Lisa Estrela-Pedro explained that there were some grant awards that have to be amended to the transit element of the TIP. GATRA, SRTA received several projects as well as Family Services Association and M.O.L.I.F.E., Inc, they are buying buses and vans. There are three projects for GATRA, one project for SRTA, and the rest for other transit service agencies throughout the region. They were released for the 21-day comment period at the last SMMPO meeting. SRPEDD held a Public Meeting on February 4, 2019
where there were no public comments. We are asking this board to amend these items into the TIP.

Brandon Wilcox raised a question asking if these were all project additions. Ms. Estrela-Pedro clarified that they were all project additions. Mr. Pounds explained that with these projects they put a placeholder line item in the STIP every year and once the grants are awarded, they get amended into the region’s TIP and the placeholder line item from the STIP gets removed. Mr. Wilcox asked that if the grant awarded varied significantly from the original budgeted amount. Mr. Pounds clarified that the grants are awarded up-to the programmed line item in the STIP. That works for both of the 5310 grant and the 5339 grants. A motion was made to amend the 5310 Grants into the FFY2019-2023 TIP. The motion was seconded and APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

3. Presentation of Final Revisions to the Evaluation Criteria Scoring process with JTPG recommendations –

SRPEDD has updated the Evaluation Criteria. Ms. Estrela-Pedro explained that there was a sub-committee set up with representatives from some of the communities sitting on that committee. We went through every question to get a feel for what some of the communities wanted to accomplish. The scoring was brought up to an even 100. Every question and answer is now shown in the rubric so you can see how many points you are eligible to receive. This was presented to the JTPG last week and there were some comments on drainage and there was a revision that went along with that: “If there is not an identified problem can it still get points?” Ms. Estrela-Pedro explained that text was added that during the design process if this comes up as an issue it can still receive points. SRPEDD revisits the process so that it can be modified. At times some of these projects cannot score well without 25% design so some of the projects may not score well in the beginning of the process. After discussing with Jackie this morning it was noticed that on question 4 of ‘Community Impact and Support’ the negatives did not add up to ‘-5’ so if this gets approved today we would like to add a ‘-1’: “If the project does not address or identify a noise pollution problem” before we ask the SMMPO to approve this Evaluation Criteria.

Chairman Pounds asked for a motion to second and then opened the floor to questions. Mr. Pounds asked Ms. Estrela-Pedro to clarify what was being added to question 4. Ms. Estrela-Pedro clarified that it was originally part of the discussion questions that went along with the question but it just fell off. Mr. Pounds asked how often the Evaluation Criteria gets addressed. Ms. Estrela-Pedro clarified that it does not get addressed every
year, but as part of the SHARP II program the comprehensive department received a grant to look at the Evaluation Criteria and make recommendations. Ms. Estrela-Pedro explained that when the Evaluation Criteria was brought to the JTPG there was a lot of concern about the negative points and why they were present. Mr. Pounds asked if it was a significant overhaul to what was originally in place. Ms. Estrela-Pedro said that it was not a significant overhaul and some of the questions were added points and other were revamped. It was stressed that safety remained the number one priority of the region. Mr. Pounds clarified that it wasn’t that the criteria were changed just the points were made clearer.

Mr. Pounds stressed that it was important to keep Environmental and Resiliency in place because it was being stressed by federal partners FHWA and FTA and incorporating that more in project planning is important.

Tim Kochan mentioned that the Pre-PRC committee has a similar criteria and that cost effectiveness should be considered to deal with fiscal constraint issues and being able to compare similar project types during a particular Fiscal year. Ms. Estrela-Pedro replied that the cost benefit analysis that MassDOT does would be a tiebreaker to projects scoring the same. Mr. Pounds clarified Mr. Kochan’s point explaining that one of the things MassDOT is looking at in their own scoring criteria is the economic impact. He clarified that it is in its infancy but going forward it is something that should be considered.

Mr. Mission mentioned that it is not until the first 2 years of the TIP that a cost estimate is even remotely accurate. When SRPEDD looks at a project 5 years out there is only a best guess at the overall cost of the project. There are so many factors as the design moves forward that affect the cost that if a cost-benefit analysis is done five years out and the cost increases by 50% does the cost benefit analysis become a detriment rather than a benefit? The idea of the tiebreaker is better because you are dealing with projects that are ready to go rather than ones that are years away from being advertised. Mr. Wilcox wanted to know how the SHARP II grant through PLAN WORKS inform the TIP selection criteria. Was there more consideration for projects that had better economic development? Ms. Estrela-Pedro explained that SRPEDD’s Comprehensive Department created a model that showed the wider benefits of Economic Development and it is something that can be considered in the event of a tiebreaker.
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Alan Slavin mentioned that the Town of Wareham and the Town of Mattapoisett had a few bike paths in the same position and because their project was more advanced they got the opportunity to move forward with the project.

Ms. Haznar mentioned a typo that under ‘Environmental and Resiliency’ you cannot get the ‘-5’. Ms. Estrela-Pedro clarified that it was a typo. Ms. Haznar mentioned in the safety and security section it does not address the size of the project and sometimes there is a long corridor with one high crash location. Ms. Haznar then provided an example in Seekonk with two Top 200 High Crash Locations but it is in a major corridor. She believed that it does not seem equitable to group long corridor projects and intersection projects. Mr. Pounds asked if there was a discussion on weighting the size of the projects. Ms. Estrela-Pedro clarified it was a conversation that has not been had yet. She clarified that we are scoring different types of projects with the same criteria and at some point there may need to be consideration for different criteria for different types of projects.

Mr. Pounds clarified that the Evaluation Criteria is a living document and can be revisited at any point in the future, whether it be in the fall or before the next TIP cycle. Mr. Slavin mentioned that once we get to 2024 these issues will arise for that year.

There were no further questions.

Mr. Pounds put the motion to a Vote where the revisions of the Evaluation Criteria as presented were APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

4. Proposed Recommendations for Consideration for FFY 2020-2024 – Ms. Estrela-Pedro explained that these are not scenarios, but recommendations that were used to present to the JTPG last week. Ms. Lisa Estrela-Pedro stated that the handouts came from discussions with MassDOT in reviewing project costs that changed daily. Each sheet has a project list from the accompanying FFY. The existing list shows a list of the project with cost increases to give the JTPG Board some insight into what SRPEDD is dealing with when developing the TIP. Ms. Estrela-Pedro clarified that the board does not need to make any decisions but any feedback that could be provided is extremely helpful. Ms. Estrela-Pedro went through the existing TIP and the scenarios to move projects around due to project cost increases.

Ms. Estrela-Pedro explained the cost increases and elaborated on the different scenarios that the SMMPO can agree upon moving forward. In Scenario I the Lakeville
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The meeting started with the presentation of the STIP in the year 2021. The projects had a significant cost increase with major concerns that led to putting it in 2021. Ms. Estrela-Pedro had an initial conservation with Ms. Haznar and there is a resurfacing project in Dighton that can use some of the remaining funds from that year. Lakeville would be programmed in 2021 and other projects would be shifting between 2020-2024. Due to that projects in the future element would not be brought into the out year 2024.

Mr. Pounds explained MassDOT’s Readiness Week and the process that MassDOT goes through to better understand the entire project development process to make sure that everything is in order. For the sake of the TIP, STIP, and CIP MassDOT needs a snapshot for the development.

Ms. Estrela-Pedro explained that the Lakeville project was recommended to move out 2 years but for the purpose of this exercise it was decided to only move it out 1 year. The town is supposed to be providing a commitment letter and if that commitment is not there the project can then move out 2 years. The higher cost projects make it difficult because if they fall off the TIP there is nothing there to utilize available target funds.

Mr. Pounds asked the SMMPO to focus not so much on the percentage of the design but focus more on when they can be delivered.

Ms. Estrela-Pedro explained Scenario II where she moved Lakeville to 2021 and fully funded the Raynham project in 2022. The issue with this scenario is that when we get to 2024 a number of projects may have to fall off the TIP due to a lack of funding. This was presented to the JTPG and there were some comments particularly from New Bedford about the County Street project that is currently in 2022 and being shifted to 2023. All things are being considered and when all the information is gathered, there can be a number of different scenarios. Ms. Estrela-Pedro also explained that at the JTPG meeting it was announced that the next TIP cycle it is mandatory that all project schedules for projects being considered for inclusion on the TIP be shared with SRPEDD.

Mr. Pounds explained that the lack of available project schedules was a common theme among many of the MPO’s. In many cases, there also needs to be a commitment from the designer to be involved through PS&E process.

Mr. Mission asked about the schedule of implementation for the TIP. Mr. Pounds then explained the TIP schedule and explained that the preferred project list needs to be finalized in March because that is the first round of STIP and CIP development and first fiscal constraint check with all MassDOT divisions. MassDOT feels pretty confident about the schedule going forward. In April, the draft TIP goes out for the 21-day public comment period. The SMMPO then endorses the TIP in May. The RTP has a timeline of
July to give the federal partners time to review it, but the MPO body has a strict timeline of the end of May to endorse the RTP. The RTP is a long range plan and does not need to be pigeon holed into a financial constraint table. This document is the vision for the region moving forward.

5. **Performance Based Planning:** Discussion of the Performance Based Planning Agreement –

Mr. Mission explained that Performance Based Planning is an agreement between all the MPO’s, RTA’s and with MassDOT to do performance based planning or programming as part of the process. Mr. Pounds explained further Performance Based Planning stating that Map-21 was the kick start of PBP programming. Last year, the focus was on the Boston UZA Agreement. It was important to include new data from the most recent census.

This document is specifically for the Commonwealth it discusses how the MPO’s adopt certain targets. It also goes into details about the RTA’s and the measures that it takes on the TAM Plans. The transit safety plans are also in the PBP and the gist of the document is to document what MassDOT and the regional partners are supposed to do. MassDOT is asking the MPO’s to give them feedback on the document and see if they touched upon everything and to see if there are ways that they can improve. MassDOT believes that it has good coordination with the MPO’s, chairing the MPO meetings.

MassDOT believes that if the targets are not met there will be conversations with MPO staff on being able to find ways to meet those specific targets.

Mr. Wilcox provided some input from the federal perspective saying that the submission is May/June. Overall, the document provides an outline of the roles and responsibilities of MassDOT, MPO’s and RTA’s.

Mr. Pounds reiterated that this document is still in the draft format as MassDOT is still working with their federal partners. It is important to keep in mind that the document could look different next month. MassDOT is looking to bring the document to MARTA for input. Largely, it outlines the process and the coordination between all partners are strong.

Mr. Mission suggested that all SMMPO members look at a copy of the PBP that was sent with the mailing list. Additional copies can be resent if needed. There is information in the document that is important for the RTA’s and how their targets can be incorporated into the MPO’s Planning process. Next month, we will need the RTA’s to present their TAM plan so they can be formally adopted as part of the MPO process. Another thing to be brought up at the MARTA meeting is to make sure that the RTA’s are working with
their MPO’s to make sure that they are adopted as a part of the process. Mr. Mission raised a question asking that PBP is more of an outline for the TIP and the UPWP due to the fact that the RTP is a 20-year document it is difficult to know what the targets will be 5 years from now, let alone 20 years down the road.

Mr. Pounds explained that the Transit targets are triggered by updates to the TIP. To the extent that the targets may have changed the MPO would need to consider new measures to incorporate and update their TIP. If they are the same, and already adopted nothing would need to be changed.

Mr. Wilcox explained that it just needs to be considered and it is important that the Transit Authorities are reporting to the MPO’s and that the MPO’s are reporting those measures.

Mr. Mission explained that typically an update to the RTP is something that we didn’t foresee, it must be in the RTP in order to qualify for TIP funds. Typically, unless it is significant we usually do not go back and do amendments to the RTP. With the PBP if we need to keep going back and updating the RTP it is more of a bookkeeping thing, if it is designed for TIP planning it is more logical because it is a document that is updated every year.

Mr. Pounds opened the floor to questions and explained that MassDOT will come back next month with a more defined PBP document. The goal of MassDOT is to have the document endorsed by the MPO’s in April.

6. Regional Transportation Plan

a. Open House Meeting Schedules/Public Comments – Last week we had the first open house to solicit comments on the Regional Transportation Plan. Our next one will be February 20, 2019 at the Southworth Public Library in Dartmouth.

b. Overview of the Goals and Objectives of the Plan – The intent of these meetings is to let the public come in and talk to us about transportation issues that are happening in our region. The Plan forecasts 20 years into the future and sets the stage for transportation growth in the SRPEDD region. The goals of the plan are to incorporate the Performance Measures that are required from Map-21 and the FAST Act. The second one is to address different scenarios over the next 20 years with the big one being climate change. Mr. Bill Napolitano, of SRPEDD, has been studying the effects of climate change on the coastal cities for the past 20 years and has ample data of how the changing climate will affect our
transportation system. The other scenario is Smart Growth and how we will be able to incorporate the commuter rail and TOD’s. We will likely combine the two scenarios of smart growth and climate change as a part of the RTP.

We are asking the MPO members that if there are any issues in their community to submit it in writing or make SRPEDD aware of these issues so they can be documented. Part of the schedule for the development of the RTP is March and April. It is currently being updated and they need to start being submitted to MassDOT so they can review the chapters. All of the projects that we choose to include in the RTP need to be fiscally constrained. We ran into an issue in 2016 with some of the projects not being fiscally constrained. The issue is if the facility was owned and operated by MassDOT why does the project need to use the MPO’s discretionary funds? If the Middleboro rotary was not programmed in the out years of the TIP it could not be included on the list of preferred projects. SRPEDD is looking for a way to identify the preferred projects without having to use the regional discretionary funds.

The New Bedford-Fairhaven Bridge is a project that always comes up and SRPEDD is not required to program it because it comes from a separate funding category. Is SRPEDD required to include that in the regional discretionary funds? The Route 24/Route 140 interchange is another major facility. SRPEDD needs to have the flexibility to say that some projects can get funded in other ways and does not require the use of the regional discretionary funds.

Mr. Pounds explained that major projects that may fall out of MPO funding should still be listed in the RTP. If they are regionally significant to the MPO it should be listed. However, whether the MPO chooses to include it with discretionary funds is entirely up to the SMMPO board. Route 79/Davol Street is funded by MassDOT, is regionally significant and should be included in the plan as well as listed outside of the discretionary funding category. MassDOT’s governing document is the CIP, so that is what the MPO’s need to use when looking at what projects are funded and what stages they are funded. MPO’s should list all projects that are regionally significant and outside of the discretionary funding but also should list the appropriate funding sources associated with it.
Mr. Wilcox explained that this situation will more than likely be in the beginning of the document, identifying regional needs and anything that does not have funding associated should still be listed in the document.

Mr. Slavin explained that there is a commitment from MassDOT rail for commuter rail by 2022. When he looks at the CIP the money is not really there for the project. If it actually happens in 2022, the Middleboro rotary will need to be addressed due to the fact that there will be an increase of traffic congestion heading into Middleboro. The rotary will be even more critical because the dynamics of the traffic flow will be changed.

Mr. Pounds said that South Coast Rail falls outside of the discretionary funds but should be included in the document. The approach for the CIP is another update year.

Mr. Wilcox asked Mr. Pounds if MassDOT provides a list of approved projects to the region. Mr. Pounds said that the starting point is when a list of the statewide projects gets delivered to the MPO’s.

Ms. Haznar mentioned another major project that is currently in 2023 is the New Bedford Viaduct, it is about $110 million. Ms. Haznar asked if the larger projects that are not funded right now would not go in the fiscally constrained chapter but in another section?

Mr. Wilcox clarified that they can go in the narrative when you talk about the overarching needs, and the regionally significant projects, but they would not be included in the fiscally constraint portion.

Ms. Estrela-Pedro mentioned that those types of projects usually go in the specific appendices.

Mr. Mission mentioned that four years ago the big discussion was being fiscally constrained and not the overall long-term planning of the region. MassDOT said that if SRPEDD wanted the Middleboro rotary they needed to program it, and SRPEDD had their backs against the wall because everyone wanted the rotary improvements. It was not until after 2030 that the project would have been fully funded.
Mr. Mission mentioned that March and April will be a review of the draft chapters. April and May will be the presentations to the SMMPO Board and the JTPG. SRPEDD intends to release the document for public comment in June and endorse the document in July.

c. Discussion of the Regional Transportation Plan Issues from the SMMPO Board

Ms. Haznar mentioned that the interim improvements to the Middleborough Rotary were done in the Boston office and there has been a lot of positive responses to the improvements. MassDOT District 5 have begun studying the Level of Service and looking at the crashes.

Mr. Mission asked if that could be shared and incorporated into the RTP.

Ms. Haznar said that they do not have that information yet and are starting to look at that data.

Ms. Haznar asked Mr. Pounds when the state lists are expected for the benefit of the MPO.

Mr. Pounds mentioned that this week he will be sending out the template to the program managers and will be taking the readiness day conversation list and ask them to develop the program list sometime in the beginning of March.

7. Other Business

a. SRPEDD Transportation Employment Opportunities – Mr. Mission explained that SRPEDD is looking for summer interns to help out with data collection, bus riding and traffic counting. We are trying to secure interns by March so they are ready to go for the summer. There is a job advertisement on our website, or they can get into contact with me or Lisa Estrela-Pedro.

b. Mr. Mission clarified that Mr. Pounds explained the CIP process earlier in the meeting.

c. MassDOT Innovation Conference – April 9th and 10th in Worcester at the DCU Center it is advertised through Bay State Roads and it talks about the innovative ideas in transportation that is being implemented by MassDOT and others.
d. Mr. Mission explained how he heard on the news an interview by WBZ with Mayor Walsh and how adaptive signal controls will be tested at certain locations in Boston. They will be using adaptive signal control technology. This is interesting because it is a way to alleviate the traffic and congestion issues within the city streets it is currently associated at Faunce Corner Road and Route 6. It will be interesting to see if this idea starts to spread if effective. Mr. Mission continued by explaining that a report released by T for Massachusetts, (Transportation for Massachusetts) saying that Massachusetts has the worst traffic in the nation, worse than Los Angeles. Ms. Mr. Mission also heard on NECN news that the mayor from Hamden, Connecticut wants to implement red light running cameras for law enforcement but state legislation, like in Massachusetts, does not allow law enforcement to use red light running cameras to ticket violators. The mayor of Hamden had an interesting statement: “Even if it is not legal for law enforcement, he would like to see them be implemented for data collection on the amount of red light running.” With the data collected they may be able to make the case that red light running cameras may be more practical. Ironically, when NECN was filming, during an all red cycle, someone ran through a red light. Mr. Mission noted that it was an interesting statement from the mayor that may stimulate discussion on overturning this legislation in the future.

e. Mr. Pounds mentioned that the Safe Routes to School Application Process has closed and they received a ton of applications. There will be a SRTS Committee to select applicants. Ms. Haznar asked if all the applicants were members. Mr. Pounds mentioned that was one of the requirements.

8. **Date, Time, Place for Next Meeting:**
   a. March 19, 2019 at 1:00 PM in SRPEDD

9. **Adjourn:**

   A motion was made to adjourn the meeting at 2:33. **The motion was seconded and APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**
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