

Minutes of the Joint Transportation Committee (JTC) Meeting

Wednesday, June 14, 2017

Pioneer Valley Planning Commission
60 Congress Street, 2nd Floor Large Conference Room
Springfield, Massachusetts 01104

Present were:

Name	Affiliation	Name	Affiliation
Glenn Barrington	UMass Transit General Manager	Jeff Hoynoski	MassDOT District 2
Mike Bolduc	MassDOT District 1	Betsy Johnson	Walk/Bike Springfield
Randy Brown	Southwick DPW	Andrew Krar	Town of Longmeadow
Sarah Brown	Springfield DPW (intern)	Nick Lapointe	Fuss & O'Neill, Inc.
Dan Call	Westfield Columbia Rail Trail	Dan Murphy	Easthampton
Maggie Chan	Northampton DPW	Dawn Nims	Town of Agawam Engineering
Matt Chase	VHB	Jim Reidy	South Hadley
Michelle Chase	Town of Agawam Engineering	Josh Rickman	PVTA
Mark Cressotti	Westfield	Matt Sokop	Springfield
Jim Czach	West Springfield DPW	Steve Williams	Belchertown DPW
Peter Frieri	MassDOT District 1		
PVPC Staff			
Rana Al-Jammal	Senior Transportation Planner	Dana Roscoe	Principal Planner
Amir Kouzehkanani	Principal Transportation Plan	Gary Roux	Principal Planner
Andy McCaul	Senior Transportation Planner	Louise Sullivan	Admin Support
Jeff McCollough	Senior Transportation Planner		

1. Introductory Remarks

Jim Czach opened the JTC meeting at 10:20 a.m. and he asked everyone to introduce themselves.

2. Minutes of Previous Meetings

Mr. Czach asked for a motion to approve the Joint Transportation Committee (JTC) minutes of May 10, 2017.

MOVED BY JIM REIDY OF THE TOWN OF SOUTH HADLEY, SECONDED BY ANDY KRAR OF THE TOWN OF LONGMEADOW, TO APPROVE THE JOINT TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE (JTC) MEETING MINUTES OF MAY 10, 2017. ALL IN FAVOR, NONE OPPOSED, THE MOTION CARRIES.

Mr. Czach then moved to take up agenda item 3

3. Review and Discussion Current Transportation Evaluation Criteria (TEC) Separate Environmental Justice and Title VI

PVPC Principal Planner Gary Roux called the JTC members' attention to the two-sided document entitled *TEC Scoring Summary* on blue paper. The side without shading, he said, lists the existing Transportation Evaluation Criteria (TEC) approved by the Pioneer Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) that was used to score the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) projects last February. Mr. Roux reported that during the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Federal Transit Authority (FTA) Certification Review last year, the FHWA and FTA Review Team required that the Environmental Justice¹ and Title VI of the Civil Rights Act categories become separate categories in the scoring whereas Environmental Justice has always incorporated Title VI.

¹ Environmental Justice (EJ) at the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) means identifying and addressing disproportionately high and adverse effects of the agency's programs, policies, and activities on minority populations and low-income populations to achieve an equitable distribution of benefits and burdens.

Mr. Roux explained that one point is given if a project is reducing adverse impacts on a community's environment²; two points are awarded if a project is improving transit for minority populations and low-income populations; and five points are taken away if a project incurs an Environmental Justice burden.³ Mr. Roux underscored that when TIP projects improve Title VI requirements, they likewise improve Environmental Justice. Mr. Roux stated that a half point is awarded if Environmental Justice population limits are being reduced; a half point is awarded for reducing impacts for a Title VI community; one point is awarded if transit is improved for either Environmental Justice or Title VI populations; and 5 points up to 10 points can be taken away if a project creates a burden on either Environmental Justice or Title VI requirements. Mr. Roux indicated that this is the staff's recommendation to the JTC members on adjusting the TEC scoring. Mr. Roux stated that this TEC scoring change requires an MPO endorsement but there is no rush to move forward with a recommendation at this time. Mr. Roux noted that the TEC can be released for public comment at an MPO meeting later this year. Mr. Roux underscored that there will not be any change to the scoring of any projects currently in the universe of projects.

Matt Sokop asked for a definition of Title VI. Mr. McCollough replied that Title VI prohibits discrimination based upon race, color, and national origin along with additional federal nondiscrimination laws which prohibit discrimination on the basis of age, sex, and disability status. Mr. McCollough added that GIS maps and statistical analysis are used to ensure that highway projects and funds are distributed equitably in minority and non-minority communities across the Commonwealth.

Mr. Roux indicated that the TEC scoring, now based on zero to 100 points, has proved to be an understandable point range. After a short discussion regarding TEC scoring, Mr. Roux stated that the PVPC staff is open to reviewing the TEC scoring and he indicated that further discussion of the TEC scoring will be an agenda item for the next JTC meeting.

4. Update Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) Meeting - May 23, 2017

PVPC Principal Planner Dana Roscoe reported that at the last JTC meeting held on May 10th, the FFY 2018-2022 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) was reviewed and recommended to the MPO for endorsement but that was not the version of the TIP that the MPO ultimately endorsed on May 23rd. Mr. Roscoe announced the following changes that were made after the May 10th JTC meeting:

- In Year 1, for FFY 2018, \$500,000 in CMAQ funding was added for PVTA P21 Express Service from the City of Springfield to the City of Holyoke
- \$500,000 in CMAQ funding for the *Intersection Improvements at Route 187 and Route 57 in Agawam (604203)* Project was removed and replaced by \$500,000 in STP funds with the total project cost unchanged at \$3,288,000

Mr. Roscoe indicated that with these 2 changes, there is in excess of one million dollars in unallocated funds in Year 1.

Mr. Roscoe reported that the day before the MPO meeting on May 23rd, Richard Kos, Mayor of the City of Chicopee, called with a request that the *Reconstruction and Related Work on Fuller Road, from Memorial Drive (Route 33) to Shawinigan Drive in Chicopee (604434)* Project be moved from FFY 2022 into FFY 2019. Mr. Roscoe explained that moving the Chicopee project into FFY 2019 would adversely impact every TIP project in FFY 2019 so

² According to environmental justice guidelines from the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) in 1997, "the environment" includes the built as well as natural environment, and "adverse effects" may include ecological, cultural, human health, economic, or social impacts.

³ Adverse impacts can arise from decreased safety, mobility, accessibility, environmental quality, business and job opportunities

he proposed as an alternative moving the Chicopee project into FFY 2020 because then only two MassDOT District 2 projects would be affected: The *Reconstruction of I-91 Interchange 17 and Route 141 in Holyoke (606158)* Project and the *Improvements @ 2 Locations on Route 202: School Street and Five Corners in Granby (606895)* Project exchange places with the *Reconstruction and Related Work on Fuller Road, from Memorial Drive (Route 33) to Shawinigan Drive in Chicopee (604434)* Project enabling the Chicopee (604434) project to be programmed in the FFY 2020 element of the FFY 2018-2022 TIP.

Mr. Roscoe also reported that Stephen Crane, Town Administrator for the Town of Longmeadow, indicated that he wished to advocate for inclusion in the near future of two Longmeadow Street (Route 5) projects in the FFY 2018-2022 TIP. Mr. Roscoe noted that the *Resurfacing & Related Work on Longmeadow Street (Route 5) in Longmeadow from the Connecticut State Line to Converse Street in Longmeadow (607430)* project was listed in the FFY 2021 element of the draft TIP at an estimated cost of \$3,066,336 and then additional intersection work increased the cost to approximately \$5.9 million which exceeded the regional target and resulted in the project being removed from the FFY 2021 element of the draft TIP. Mr. Roscoe asked Andy Krar if that project is now two projects. Mr. Krar said that there is a new project along with a project of less importance but he couldn't provide a cost estimate at this time.

Mr. Czach then called on PVPC Principal Planner Gary Roux to speak about the Transportation Evaluation Criteria.

5. Review and Discuss TEC Scoring Trends

PVPC Senior Planner Andy McCaul explained that the Transportation Evaluation Criteria (TEC) that had been in use since 2004 was revised three years ago. Since then, he said, there have been only two proposed changes. Mr. McCaul reported that 61 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) projects that had a minimum of two years of scoring using the revised new TEC were evaluated. He underscored that any project that had reached 75% design or greater would not be rescored because the project could be negatively impacted. Mr. McCaul explained that the highest TEC score along with the lowest TEC score was examined for each of the TIP projects over three scoring years. He reported that the lowest score was 16 points with 18 points being the highest score and the lower score between 2015 and 2016 was compared to the 2017 score. Seven projects decreased in score over the three-year cycle attributable mainly to new data becoming available such as the pavement Overall Condition Index (OCI), the crash rate or a congestion issue. Mr. McCaul reported that 41 TIP projects have increased over the three-year period. The Westfield-Western Avenue (603449) project showed the highest increase with 22 points due to having reached 25% design and having gone through public review. The Goshen-Route 9 (602888) project had the biggest decrease at 7 points because it lost points in several categories including OCI, crash rate, Smart Growth and Way Finding. Mr. McCaul stated that the scoring of 13 TIP projects didn't change in score and staff is waiting for them to advance in design. Mr. McCaul reported that as anticipated, the TIP projects are now scoring more points using the new TEC form with an average score of 32.3 in FFY 2015; 34.0 in FFY 2016 and 35.2 in FFY 2017. The next step, he said, is to examine the scoring in the subcategories for each TIP project to determine the subcategories in which TIP projects scored well and subcategories where the projects didn't score well. Mr. McCaul closed his presentation saying that currently the new TEC scoring is working well and discussion on the TEC will continue.

Mr. Roux agreed that the new TEC is working well but as Mr. McCaul stated, more time is needed to analyze the subcategories, the project type and the project location. Mr. Roux indicated that the hope is to have a continuing discussion of the new TEC that will enable informed decisions regarding changes and how the new TEC will be linked to federal planning factors.

Mr. Czach again called on PVPC Principal Planner Gary Roux to discuss linking the TEC to the 10 Planning Factors.

6. Linking TEC to the 10 Planning Factors Included in the Fixing Americas Surface Transportation (FAST) Act

Mr. Roux called the JTC members' attention to the handout document entitled *Transportation Evaluation Criteria (TEC) – FAST Act Planning Factors Matrix*. Mr. Roux explained the 10 FAST Act Planning Factors are listed in ten column headings and the eight PVPC *Transportation Evaluation Criteria* with specific subcategories defined as part of each criterion appear along with TEC points assigned to them in the rows. Mr. Roux noted that the Federal Highway Administration encourages showing how current transportation evaluation criteria satisfy the requirements of the 10 Planning Factors of the FAST Act and referring to the document, Mr. Roux stated that the planning factors have been weighted. For example, *Improves Substandard Pavement* (worth a maximum of 8 TEC Points) meets 3 of the 10 FAST Act Planning Factors scoring each at 2.67 TEC points and scores 8 TEC Points:

- *Increase the safety of the transportation system for motorized and non-motorized users* (2.67 points)
- *Emphasize the preservation of the existing transportation system* (2.67 points)
- *Improve the resiliency and reliability of the transportation system and reduce or mitigate stormwater impacts of surface transportation* (2.67 points)

Mr. Roux said that if you flip the document over, the *TEC Points* column at the bottom shows 100 total TEC points and to the right of that appear the total number of points that a TIP project could receive for each of the ten FAST Act Planning Factors using the PVPC *Transportation Evaluation* scoring Criteria. Mr. Roux stated that the Planning Factor, *Support the economic vitality of the metropolitan areas, especially by enabling global competitiveness, productivity and efficiency* provides the greatest amount of TEC points for a TIP project whereas *Enhancing travel and tourism* provides the least amount of TEC points. The three Planning Factors that provide the most TEC points, he stated are:

- *Support the economic vitality of the metropolitan areas, especially by enabling global competitiveness, productivity and efficiency* (18.40)
- *Increase the accessibility and mobility of people and for freight* (17.07)
- *Increase the safety of the transportation system for motorized and non-motorized users* (16.92)

Mr. Roux asked if a TIP project could receive TEC points for each of these ten Planning Factors and he replied that the answer is "yes." Mr. Roux underscored that the JTC members need to discuss the weighting of each of the Planning Factors and decide if they have been weighted properly. Ultimately, Mr. Roux said, a recommendation will be made to the MPO but not for a while. He added that a blank spreadsheet similar to the handout document entitled *Transportation Evaluation Criteria (TEC) – FAST Act Planning Factors Matrix* can be emailed to the JTC members so that over the next month or two they can score it themselves.

Mr. Czach thanked Mr. Roux for his report and he asked Mr. Roux to take up the next agenda item.

7. JTC Recommendations Regarding the Expansion of JTC Voting Ranks and Representation on the Committee to include a Person or Organization chosen or appointed to act or speak for Pedestrian and/or ADA issues in the Pioneer Valley Region as Relevant to Transportation Planning and Project Programming Process (as noted in the PVMPO Certification Review)

Mr. Roux stated that a recommendation was received as a result of the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Federal Transit Authority (FTA) Certification Review, which states: *The MPO should complete an assessment to determine whether pedestrian and ADA (Americans with Disabilities Act) modes of transportation should have voting representation on the JTC*. Mr. Roux noted that MassBike was added as a voting member to the JTC years ago

as a result of the certification review and now there's a recommendation to add a representative of the ADA community and a representative from the pedestrian community.

Mr. Roux reported that this recommendation was discussed at the Bike/Ped meeting earlier today and Mark Cressotti was appointed as spokesman. Mr. Cressotti reported that the Bike/Ped recommendation is to look to Senior Centers and the Councils on Aging for individuals to represent ADA as well as senior citizen issues. Josh Rickman suggested approaching Stavros which is an advocacy and peer counseling program for people with disabilities that is located on Berkshire Avenue in Springfield. Mr. Roux replied that Stavros is on the JTC mailing list but they've never come to a JTC meeting. Mr. Czach noted that no one has ever pushed the ADA aspect in any of the JTC meetings and maybe it should be addressed through a subcommittee. Steve Williams interjected that if an ADA representative was from Belchertown and had voting rights, then he would have 2 votes so he suggested not "going down this road." Dan Call interjected that he is a member of the Friends Group for the Rail Trail and he said that there are Friends Groups in other communities. Mr. Call suggested that the Friends Groups combine and then choose someone to represent all of them at JTC meetings. After a short discussion, the JTC members agreed by consensus to recommend that someone attend the JTC meetings who would represent pedestrian and ADA communities.

MOVED BY STEVE WILLIAMS OF THE TOWN OF BELCHERTOWN, SECONDED BY MATT SOKOP OF THE CITY OF SPRINGFIELD, TO APPROVE THE RECOMMENDATION THAT PVPC STAFF INVITE AN APPROPRIATE REPRESENTATIVE OF PEDESTRIAN AND OF ADA COMMUNITIES TO PARTICIPATE AS NON-VOTING MEMBERS AT JTC MEETINGS AND THAT AT A FUTURE DATE, THE JTC MEMBERS WILL MAKE A DECISION WHETHER OR NOT TO EXTEND VOTING PRIVILEGES TO THESE REPRESENTATIVE(S)

8. Draft JTC Project Development Design Scale - Current Activities

Mr. Czach reported that after the last JTC meeting on May 10th, he met with PVPC staff and MassDOT District 1 staff to discuss how to determine the design status of a TIP project, i.e. what constitutes a 25% design and what constitutes a 75% design. Mr. Czach explained that the document distributed today entitled *Pioneer Valley Joint Transportation Committee (JTC) TIP Development Process – Design Scale* is a draft document which is being presented for discussion and review. Mr. Czach reported that a 0 to 5 point design scale was developed which was also reviewed by MassDOT District 2 staff. He explained that this proposed Design Scale can assist in determining the design status of a project and can help track a project through its 75% design through to its 100% design. Mr. Czach reminded the JTC members that last spring everyone thought their 25% TIP projects were on the same level. So when dozens of TIP projects are being programmed, he said, this design scale will ensure that all projects are being evaluated on the same scale. Mr. Czach pointed to the 0 to 5 scale in the draft document and he read each one:

Scale	Definition
0	Project has received Project Review Committee (PRC) approval, the project proponent does not have a designer on record with MassDOT and is not actively working on the project
1	MassDOT has been notified by the project proponent that a designer is under contract (25% to PS&E) or that the proponent is designing all phases of the project
2	25% Submission has been received by MassDOT
3	25% Public Hearing has been held, all comments have been resolved, MassDOT has indicated the project can advance to the 75% design phase.
4	75% comments have been resolved, MassDOT has indicated the project can advance to the 100% design phase.
5	100% comments have been resolved; MassDOT has indicated the project can advance to the Plans, Specifications, and Estimate (PS&E) stage for advertisement. The project has all required permits (if applicable) and a right-of-way certificate (if applicable).

Mr. Czach then opened the floor for discussion on the proposed TIP Design Scale. Mr. Williams said he liked the framework of the proposed scale but then he mentioned concerns being addressed during project design and a discussion ensued with further comments by Mr. Williams, Mr. Sokop, Mr. Frieri, Mr. Call, Mr. Cressotti, Mr. Hoynoski and others. Mr. Czach underscored that the JTC members need to send in their comments or ideas to Mr. McCaul and then they can be compiled to be discussed at the next JTC meeting.

9. Pioneer Valley Transit Authority (PVTA) – Current Activities

Joshua Rickman, PVTA Director of Operations and Planning, reported that the PVTA is ready for Sandra Sheehan, its new PVTA Administrator, to come on board. On a negative note, Mr. Rickman reported that the PVTA is holding public hearings through late June into early July regarding a \$1.2 million dollar or more deficit which will cause some service changes. Mr. Rickman said that as costs for gas and union contracts go up, the PVTA is facing level funding with the exact deficit not known since the state budget isn't finalized yet. Mr. Rickman reported that the PVTA is trying to impact as few people as possible and the Advisory Board has been given an a la carte menu of service cuts to consider. On a positive note, Mr. Rickman noted that the PVTA buses will be moving into Union Station on June 25th and at 4:00 p.m. a few routes will be rolled out with full service beginning on Monday, June 26th. It's estimated, he said, that between the PVTA and the Peter Pan Bus Lines there will be around 12,000 people traveling through Union Station each day.

Mr. Rickman reported that the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) has implemented a directive called Transit Asset Management (TAM) that requires establishing, analyzing, and reporting state of good repair data for all critical transit assets by FTA funded transit providers. Mr. Rickman explained that TAM is requiring performance measures for each PVTA asset. He reported that whereas a bus had to last for 12 years, now it must last 14 years and whereas a paratransit van needed to last 4 years, now the requirement is 8 years of service. Mr. Rickman stated that the PVTA hopes to shorten these service time requirements. He added that going forward, when the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) is being processed, it will need to reference the TAM and show how the TIP projects are assisting the PVTA in maintaining its state of good repair.

Mr. Roux commented that a few years ago, when the federal planning rule came out regarding performance measures and establishing targets, the MPO designated the JTC as the advisory body on how the planning rule would be implemented. Mr. Roux stated that the PVTA's role is to make recommendations to the MPO. He said all of these federal planning rules require the state to set performance targets and then the MPO has 180 days to establish the regional targets. Mr. Roux stated that the JTC anticipates that the MPO regional targets will match the state targets. He added that the JTC will be asking the PVTA for recommendations in order to provide feedback for the MPO.

10. Adjourn

Mr. Czach called for a motion to adjourn today's JTC meeting.

MOVED BY PETER FRIERI OF MASSDOT DISTRICT 1, SECONDED BY STEVE WILLIAMS OF THE TOWN OF BELCHERTOWN, TO ADJOURN THE JOINT TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE (JTC) MEETING AT 11:56 A.M.. ALL IN FAVOR, NONE OPPOSED, THE MOTION CARRIES.

Relevant documents distributed at this June 14, 2017 JTC Meeting:

Joint Transportation Committee June 14, 2017 Meeting Agenda	Minutes of the May 10, 2017 Meeting of the Joint Transportation Committee
Transportation Evaluation Criteria (TEC) Scoring Summary	TEC Scoring Analysis FFY 16-18
Transportation Evaluation Criteria (TEC) FAST Act Matrix – June 2017	V. Coordinated, Cooperative, and Comprehensive Planning Process
Pioneer Valley Joint Transportation Committee (JTC) TIP Development Process – Design Scale	