

# Transit Advisory Committee

## February 2026 Special Meeting

### Abbreviated meeting summary

#### Attendance

**Members**                      **Present** (12)

In-person participation (0):

Remote participation (12): Annalisa Bhatia, Bill McAvinney, Craig Tateronis, Devin Chausse, Ian Hatch, Jackson Moore-Otto (Chair), Matt Martin, Matthew Kramer (Vice Chair), Matthew McCominskey, Melissa Zampitella, Nick Lessin, Pete Septoff

**Absent** (8): Andrew Zhou, Arthur Strang, Clyve Lawrence, Jim Gascoigne, Katherine Rafferty, Miles Robinson, Patrick Delaney, Sandhya Ramakrishnan

**City staff** (1)                      Andrew Reker

**Others** (2)                      2 members of the public

**Note:** DOT = Department of Transportation

#### Welcome and Committee Introductions

Matthew Kramer (MK) opened the meeting at 5:34 PM by welcoming members and presenters to the meeting. MK explained that the goal of the special meeting was to discuss and hold a vote on a comment letter for the Massachusetts Department of Transportation (MassDOT) re: the Reid Overpass Study.

A committee member took roll - 12 members were present, 8 were absent.

Andy Reker (AR) explained that a joint letter from all three committees would have necessitated quorum for all (3) in different special meetings, which was logistically improbable. Consequently, all three committees are writing effectively three similar letters.

#### Discussion – Reid Overpass Letter

Bill McAvinney (BM) introduced the letter and explained that the letter was drafted by a group of six people from across the Bicycle, Pedestrian and Transit Committees. He was one of the six authors.

MK opened the floor to discussion of the letter's substance and any potential edits or changes. He added that language should change to reflect that the letter is effectively being written by just the TAC not all three committees. He also suggested that the specific recommendations should be tailored to reflect TAC rather than the priorities of other committees.

One member noted that DCR is reducing lanes in other parts of Memorial Drive and asked why they plan to keep two lanes in either direction in this specific place?

AR said that the city is reviewing the designs, but that DCR may think road diets are more feasible elsewhere where vehicular traffic levels are low enough to allow for it.

BM stated that MassDOT is the primary agency with responsibility in this case. They did not show homework with respect to vehicle traffic in the area, and what we interpreted from the meeting was that vehicle throughput was the main concern for the agency.

A member suggested adding language to the letter requesting that MassDOT re-examine the number of lanes.

BM said that because MassDOT is at the beginning of the design process, the letter drafters thought it would be wise to make more generic requests initially.

Another member agreed that this approach makes sense given the arc of the design process.

AR said that it might be wise to state that we acknowledge the need for MassDOT to renovate/rehabilitate the existing structure. He also suggested itemization of changes (a) "From" TAC rather than all three committees and (b) acknowledgement of the need to reconstruct/rehabilitate the infrastructure in question.

The committee voted to approve these changes and send the letter.

Matthew Kramer (MK) ends the meeting at 6:10 PM.

## Version Information

Draft: 2/12/26

Approval: \_