

MPO Meeting Minutes

Draft Memorandum for the Record

Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization Meeting

April 18, 2024, Meeting

10:00 AM–12:30 PM, Zoom Video Conferencing Platform

Eric Bourassa, Chair, representing Monica Tibbits-Nutt, 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 March 21, 2024
- Approve the release of the draft of the Federal Fiscal Years (FFYs) 2025–29 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for its 30-day public review period
- Approve adding one permanent voting seat on the MPO board, shared by the region’s regional transit authorities (RTAs), on a rotational basis, each serving two-year terms

Meeting Agenda

1. Introductions

See attendance on page 16.

2. Chair’s Report

There was none.

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

T. Teich provided some updates on discretionary grant application activities, including the Municipal Vulnerability Preparedness Action Plan (MVP), the Mobility, Access, and Transportation Insecurity (MATI) grant, and the Prioritization Process Pilot Program (PPPP).

Discussion

Lenard Diggins, Regional Transportation Advisory Council, expressed support for the grants, and asked who the granter for the PPPP was. T. Teich stated it is the Federal Highway Administration.

Jen Rowe, City of Boston, expressed enthusiasm for the grants and asked for clarification on the partnerships for MVP and MATI. T. Teich and Rebecca Morgan, MPO staff, explained the partners would be relevant municipalities and communities that would be contributing.

4. Public Comments

Brad Rawson, Inner Core Committee (City of Somerville), praised the MPO Staff, state agency partners, and municipal project proponents for their work on this TIP cycle. B. Rawson shared enthusiasm for the technical presentations that had been given the week prior, as they clarified aspects of the projects and encouraged more of the same from other board members during the time between TIP cycles.

Aleida Leza described the experience with the public process in the Belmont Community Path project and called on the MPO to provide more oversight. A. Leza requested better access to information from and about the MPO. The second issue concerned the speed and frequency of commuter rail trains. A. Leza expressed feeling unsafe due to personal proximity to the commuter rail and expressed frustration that a bridge selection requirement was waived for the project. John Bechard, MassDOT, responded with assurance that his team was reviewing the Belmont Community Path and clarified the waiving of the requirement, stating it was to advance a public hearing and engage the community.

5. Committee Chairs' Reports

Derek Krevat, MassDOT, reported on the last Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) Committee meeting. D. Krevat reported on the discrete studies that were proposed and approved. D. Krevat also mentioned the UPWP Amendment Two, which the committee recommended approving and waiving the public review period.

J. Rowe reported working to schedule a TIP Process, Engagement, and Readiness Committee meeting sometime in May, to debrief.

Tom Bent, Inner Core Committee (City of Somerville), reported the Memorandum of Understanding Update Committee was bringing action item 11, on the RTA representation on the board, for a vote. Staff will be presenting on the committee's

recommendation, with representatives from the MetroWest Regional Transit Authority and the Cape Ann Transportation Authority available for questions.

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

L. Diggins had no report but clarified the date and topic of the next Advisory Council meeting, which is to be a public meeting, and he extended an invitation to those present.

7. Action Item: Approval of March 21, 2024, MPO Meeting Minutes

Sandy Johnston (MBTA) made an amendment to the meeting minutes on page 10: Chris Hart from the MBTA works in the System-Wide Accessibility Office, not in Capital Planning.

Vote

A motion to approve the minutes of the meeting of March 21, 2024, was made by the MBTA (S. Johnston) and seconded by the City of Boston (J. Rowe). The motion carried.

8. MassDOT Highway Projects for FFYs 2025-29 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Development—*John Bechard, MassDOT Staff*

Documents posted to the MPO meeting calendar

1. FFYs 2025–29 TIP MassDOT Highway Projects [pdf](#) | [html](#)

J. Bechard presented information on key investments in the Boston region to be included in the FFYs 2025–29 Statewide TIP. J. Bechard stated the main goals of the projects were reliability and modernization.

J. Bechard discussed projects in the FFY 2025 annual element. Project #613099, work on Interstate 93 in the City of Boston, is a bridge preservation and reliability project programmed for approximately \$20 million. Project #612094, interstate-related work on portions of I-95 and I-93 in Canton, Dedham, and Westwood, is also part of the reliability program and programmed for \$29.9 million.

For FFY 2026, J. Bechard stated that project #612496, bridge preservation on Interstate 93 from Route 28 to Temple Street in Somerville, is programmed for \$188 million.

In FFYs 2027 and 2028, project #606728, the replacement of bridges on Storrow Drive over the Bowker Ramps in the City of Boston, is programmed for \$64 million and \$43 million, respectively. Project #611987, the replacement of a bridge on Memorial Drive over Brookline Street in Cambridge, is programmed for \$25 million in FFY 2027 and \$24

million in FFY 2028. Project #612519, the bridge replacement on Blue Hill Avenue over the railroad, is programmed for \$22.5 million in FFY 2027 and \$11 million in FFY 2028. Project #608397, the bridge reconstruction on Western Avenue over the Blynman Canal in Gloucester, is programmed for \$62.7 million in FFY 2028. Project #608396, the bridge replacement on Route 1A over the Saugus Rier in Lynn and Revere, is programmed for \$43.5 million in FFY 2028 and \$41 million in FFY 2029. Project #613124, the deck and superstructure replacement of the bridge of Beacon Street over I-90 in Boston, is programmed for \$9.5 million in FFY 2028 and \$31 million in FFY 2029.

In FFY 2029, project #612634, the bridge replacement on Route 28/McGrath Highway over Somerville Avenue in Somerville, is programmed for \$30 million, with the remaining funds planned to be programmed in FFY 2030. Project #613130, the bridge replacement on Morrissey Boulevard over Dorchester Bay, is programmed for \$30 million. Project #612615, the reconstruction of Route 138 from Royall Street to Dollar Lane in Canton and Milton, is programmed for \$20 million.

Discussion

Steven Olanoff, Three Rivers Interlocal Council (Town of Norwood), stated that the bridge work near Canton on Interstate 95 and Interstate 93 should be focused on replacement, rather than repair, due to their deteriorated state.

Jim Fitzgerald, City of Boston, stated that having this information earlier in TIP development would have been preferable. J. Bechard stated that the information had been available in the general TIP list and that the only new information spanned FFYs 2029 and 2030.

E. Bourassa raised a question on the Storrow Drive project over the Bowker Ramps. J. Bechard stated that the project is still in early stages, and the next step would be to seek out public input for the design.

9. Action Item: Federal Fiscal Years 2025-29 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Document—*Ethan Lapointe, TIP Manager, MPO Staff*

Documents posted to the MPO meeting calendar

1. Draft FFYs 2025-29 TIP [pdf](#) | [html](#)

E. Lapointe stated that the FFYs 2025–29 TIP programs funds towards 70 projects, totaling approximately \$730 million. E. Lapointe highlighted multiple new projects: 10 projects that fell under the Community Connections program, eight projects in the Transit Transformation program, and another eight design projects for FFYs 2025 and

2026. There are six construction projects for both roadway and trail work, two of which had previously been part of the MassDOT Statewide Highway Program for the fiscal year 2024–28 TIP but had now shifted to the Regional Target Program for funding. E. Lapointe stated that of the \$730 million provided in funding, approximately \$4.8 million was unprogrammed, and E. Lapointe clarified there was some funding put aside for Community Connections and Transit Transformation projects.

E. Lapointe stated that the largest investment program, Complete Streets, received 46 percent of funding. The second largest is Major Infrastructure, which received about 23.6 percent of funding. The third largest is the Transit Transformation program, which received 11 percent of funding. E. Lapointe noted that the Transit Transformation program had its first formal applications in the FFYs 2025–29 TIP. Following this is the Bicycle Network and Pedestrian Connections program, which received 10 percent of funding, followed by the Intersection Improvements program, which received 6.5 percent. Finally, the Bikeshare Support program and the Community Connections program work in tandem and received 1.2 and 1.6 percent respectively.

E. Lapointe then went on to discuss how these current apportionments compare to what was set up by the Long -Range Transportation Program (LRTP), *Destination 2050*.

E. Lapointe highlighted that the targets were very similar to the last TIP cycle, for FFYs 2024–28. The Complete Streets program, the Bikeshare Support program, and the Community Connections program funding are substantively similar to the LRTP target. Variation is found in the Major Infrastructure program, where the LRTP percentage target is higher than in the FFYs 2025-29 TIP cycle, but E. Lapointe clarified that this is partially due to a change to a more stringent definition for what may be classified as a major infrastructure project. There is a similar variation found in the Intersection Improvements program, but E. Lapointe clarified that this is because many of the proposed projects evolve to become more like a Complete Streets program project, thus the funding shifts to that program. Conversely, the Bicycle Network and Pedestrian Network program and Transit Transformation program are above the LRTP percentage target, which was caused by surplus funding during the first few years of recent TIP cycles.

E. Lapointe went on to discuss the breakdown of all the programs in the TIP, including the MassDOT Highway Program, the MBTA's Transit Program, and the Regional Transit Authorities' programs, across five years, which amounted to \$6.25 billion. E. Lapointe stated all this information is present in the draft document and subject to comment and feedback.

E. Lapointe discussed next steps and potential changes to the draft TIP document. Firstly, E. Lapointe explained that progress in various projects would be ongoing while the TIP was waiting to be endorsed, which would change some of the information and numbers in the document. Similarly, MassDOT and the MBTA are still working on their capital plans, which may change some items as well. E. Lapointe also acknowledged that since this is a draft, some items will have to be corrected or amended per feedback as part of the process. A full list of the changes will be presented at the next MPO meeting, on June 6, 2024, and a revised document will be posted in advance.

Finally, E. Lapointe discussed the public engagement portion of the draft TIP. The public review period for the FFYs 2025–29 TIP will run from April 22, 2024, to May 22, 2024. E. Lapointe explained that this period will exceed the 21-day required minimum. MPO staff may also take the opportunity to seek out in-person engagement about the draft TIP, in addition to letters and online comment portals.

E. Lapointe stated that the requested action for this meeting is for the board to vote to release the FFYs 2025-29 TIP draft for a 30-day public review, with comments beginning on April 22, 2024, and ending May 22, 2024.

Discussion

J. Rowe appreciated that the changes between the current draft and the final draft will be available but expressed interest in seeing more about the changes in projects from the FFYs 2024–28 TIP cycle for the next meeting. E. Lapointe explained this was made available as part of the scenario development process for the Regional Target projects. However, E. Lapointe stated that a list of changes between other programs in the TIP might be difficult to compile by the next meeting, on May 2, 2024. J. Bechard answered that it would be investigated but made it clear that trying to track the changes of 90 projects, which are constantly developing, while possible, might not be feasible.

Derek Shooster (MassDOT) offered to export the fiscal year 2024–28 data and the fiscal year 2025–2029 data as a spreadsheet, which will allow for a cross tab analysis that will show the differences. D. Shooster agreed to send it to the relevant parties. D. Krevat also offered to pass on some information to J. Rowe, including readiness reports that summarize changes, with some additional detail.

Yan Lip, City of Malden, stated the mayor of Malden, Gary Christenson, submitted a letter about the Route 60 project that is part of the TIP, describing a pilot program that had been done on a bus and bike lane along that stretch of Route 60 and asking for it to be included in the design.

Vote

A motion to release the draft of the FFYs 2025-29 TIP for a 30-day public review was made by the Advisory Council (L. Diggins) and seconded by the Inner Core Committee, City of Somerville (T. Bent). The motion carried.

10. Action Item: Federal Fiscal Years 2024 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) Amendment Two—*Srilekha Murthy, MPO Staff*

Documents posted to the MPO meeting calendar

2. UPWP 2024 Amendment 2 [pdf](#) | [html](#)
3. UPWP Amendment 2 Memo [pdf](#) | [html](#)
4. UPWP 2024 Amendment 2 REDLINE [pdf](#) | [html](#)

Srilekha Murthy, presented Amendment Two to the FFY 2024 Unified Planning Work Program. S. Murthy described how the specifics of the adjustments could be found in the memo, redline document, and clean document posted to the meeting calendar. The adjustments were primarily made due to evolving needs, staff capacity, and staff attrition. This is similar to previous adjustments made on program budgets and adjustments will have a net zero impact on the overall budget of the UPWP.

S. Murthy stated that on April 11, 2024, the UPWP Committee voted to waive the 21-day public review period and approved the amendment. S. Murthy then asked the board to also vote to waive the 21-day public review period and approve the amendment as presented. S. Murthy clarified the reason for this request was for staff to have adequate time to commence and complete any planned work before the end of the fiscal year with the adjusted budgets. S. Murthy then welcomed any comments or questions and turned the floor back over to the chair.

Vote

A motion to waive the 21-day public review period and approve Amendment Two of the FFY 2024 UPWP as presented was made by the Inner Core Committee, City of Somerville (T. Bent) and seconded by the At Large Town, Town of Brookline (Erin Chute). The motion carried.

11. Action Item: Regional Transit Authority (RTA) Representation on the MPO Board—*David Hong, MPO Staff*

D. Hong stated that in 2022 the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) recommended, as part of their Federal Certification Review, that the Boston Region MPO work with MWRTA and CATA to ensure they were represented on the MPO board in a way that was satisfactory to all parties. The FHWA and FTA had issued a similar recommendation in 2014, without

describing a precise format for representation. In 2019, the MPO board established a transit committee, to give the RTAs a voting seat on the board, representing the interests of the transit committee. Ultimately, this committee was deemed not satisfactory by the RTAs. The 2022 Federal Certification Review noted this outcome, and in November of 2023 the MPO board delegated revisions of the MOU, including RTA representation, to an MOU update committee. The committee has reviewed federal regulations on the composition of MPO boards, met with the two RTAs to discuss what would be satisfactory to them, and discussed a number of items: the motivation for joining the MPO board, technical expertise, populations served, and staff capacity to partake in board and committee activities. In March of this year, the committee decided to bring the following recommendations to the board.

D. Hong then went on to present these recommendations to add one permanent voting seat on the MPO board shared by the region's RTAs (MWRTA and CATA) on a rotational basis, each serving two-year terms, with the ability to serve as one another's alternate. This would become effective with the signing of the updated MOU, which is targeted for the 2024 Annual Meeting in November. D. Hong asked the board to discuss the recommendation, ask questions, and vote upon the recommendation.

Discussion

E. Bourassa then introduced Jim Nee, representing MWRTA, and Felicia Webb, representing CATA, asking if they had prepared statements. J. Nee thanked D. Hong and the CTPS staff for their work, not only for this presentation, but for the last decade of efforts. J. Nee noted he had been in his position for two years and very engaged in this effort for that time. J. Nee brought up two questions that seemed to come up often. The first question was: Will the RTAs be engaged in this process, especially on non-RTA topics? The second question was: Why should the RTAs have a seat on the board? J. Nee's answer to the first question was a resounding yes, for both MWRTA and CATA. J. Nee elaborated that all the topics that the MPO deals with, which might not necessarily be considered RTA topics, are still relevant to the RTAs. J. Nee listed some of these topics, and especially noted freight, since a freight line runs close to the MWRTA offices. J. Nee stated that both RTAs will be heavily engaged in the MPO processes. In answer to the second question, J. Nee stated that the purpose of the MPO was to run a public engagement process, designed to represent the entire region. J. Nee noted that each of the regions in the area is slightly different, and that MWRTA and CATA are different by largely serving riders covered by the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), which means the primary focus is transit equity, including on-demand transit access. Because of this the RTAs would bring a unique focus to the board.

Then F. Webb spoke, thanking J. Nee and noting that J. Nee had covered the main talking points. F. Webb also extended thanks to the MPO board and staff for their efforts to come to a resolution.

E. Bourassa then opened the floor to comments and questions. Melisa Tintocalis (North Suburban Planning Council, Town of Burlington) asked for clarification on the RTA that served Burlington, Massachusetts, asking if it was the Lowell Regional Transit Authority (LRTA). E. Bourassa confirmed that it was and stated that the LRTA served on the MPO board of the Northern Middlesex Council of Governments (NMCOG). E. Bourassa explained that all RTAs in the state are on the MPO boards of their regions, with MWRTA and CATA being the only RTAs wholly within the Boston region that were not represented on the MPO board. E. Bourassa then called on Ken Miller (Federal Highway Administration) for confirmation on this statement. K. Miller affirmed E. Bourassa was correct, that all other 14 RTAs in the state of Massachusetts were represented on their respective MPO boards. K. Miller then went on to state support for the recommendation, and he mentioned that it is a federal requirement that operators of public transportation be directly represented on MPO boards. K. Miller extended his appreciation for the work done to fulfill this requirement and reach a resolution.

Erin Chute (Town of Brookline) then posed a question about the MOU Update Committee, asking if there will be additional recommendations, specifically about additional seats. E. Bourassa shared that there will be upcoming recommendations about updating the MOU, but he was unsure about additional seats. T. Bent clarified that there would be upcoming items, but that this recommendation was the most important item to get approved. T. Bent shared there were many items and issues the MOU Update Committee was working on, with the goal of finalizing the report in October 2024. T. Bent also acknowledged that staff might be spread thin working on both this project and the TIP, and finally stated that at this time the committee was not looking to add any other seats to the board, besides the one that was presented. T. Teich encouraged viewing of a memo that was released at the time of the last MPO Annual Meeting, in November 2023, that clearly laid out the goals and framework of the MOU Update Committee. T. Teich also stressed that this does not prevent the MOU Update Committee or the board from discussing items, such as an additional seat on the board, outside of that framework.

L. Diggins observed that this recommendation, if voted to proceed by the board, is outlined in the presentation document as going into effect with the signing of the updated MOU, which is intended to be completed by the time of the Annual Meeting in October 2024. L. Diggins advocated for separating the establishment of the seat from the signing of the MOU document. L. Diggins noted this would take the pressure off of

staff to complete the MOU by the time frame described, and allow the board to move forward with establishing the new seat by the Annual Meeting, without having to wait for the MOU document to be completed, regardless of whether it is within the projected timeframe or not. T. Bent answered that the intention was to approve the addition of the seat itself. T. Teich echoed this but noted a technical aspect was that the final MOU document would need to be approved in order to make the additional seat legitimate. T. Teich suggested that perhaps an amendment could be added to the original MOU memo to allow the vote on the additional seat to pass without requiring the vote on the entire updated MOU to pass first. E. Bourassa decided the plan of action would be to vote on the matter as presented in this meeting; but if the updated MOU reached a point where it was clear it would not be ready by the October meeting, the board would take some kind of action to enable beginning the term of the additional seat. L. Diggins agreed with this decision.

J. Rowe commented that part of the discussion about the MOU was a decision to revisit the MPO membership on the same cycle as the federal review. During the vote call, S. Johnston expressed excitement about working with the RTAs and seeing this issue come to conclusion. After the conclusion of the vote, T. Bent also voiced his appreciation for the work done on the issue and for its conclusion.

Vote

A motion to add one permanent voting seat on the MPO board, shared by the region's RTAs, on a rotational basis, each serving two-year terms was made by the MetroWest Regional Collaborative, City of Framingham (Eric Johnson) and seconded by the Advisory Council (L. Diggins). The motion carried.

12. Sustainability and Decarbonization in the Freight and Logistics Sector in the North Suffolk Area—Shravanthi Gopalan Narayanan and Erin Maguire, MPO Staff

Documents posted to the MPO meeting calendar

5. North Suffolk Freight Decarbonization Memo [pdf](#) | [html](#)

Erin Maguire, MPO Staff, introduced the study by outlining the background and study area. The study was originally proposed by the City of Chelsea, but early on in the study it became clear the challenges experienced by Chelsea were also relevant to nearby municipalities. As a result the study was expanded to include Revere, Winthrop, East Boston, and the area of Everett that lies south of Route 16. E. Maguire identified the major roadways, freight corridors, railway, and sea ports of the area. Approximately 158,000 people reside in this area. The study identifies the term “freight” to mean “the

transportation of bulk goods by truck, air, sea, or train, as well as the facilities that these vehicles operate out of.” The Logan International Airport is also included within the area of this study, as well as several Critical Urban Freight Corridors (CUFUs) and Designated Port Areas (DPAs). A wide variety of products and services move through the area. Approximately 18,000 freight trips are generated daily in this area, to serve local and regional markets. Different types of vehicles, ranging from heavy to light, are used during different stages of delivery, ranging from longer to shorter distances, respectively. As of 2019, 2.5 percent of all freight trips in Massachusetts were made by rail.

In this study, MPO staff engaged with several stakeholders to discuss challenges they faced in the area and strategies for decarbonization. These stakeholders included municipalities, community-based organizations, and industry actors. All stakeholders expressed concern about climate change, air quality, and coastal flooding. Municipalities and community-based organizations shared concerns about extreme temperatures, roadway safety, and air and noise pollution. Municipalities and industry actors shared concerns about the impact of decarbonization strategies might have on the workforce, but expressed interest in “green” jobs. Industry actors alone noted the challenge and cost of electrifying fleets.

Three main challenges emerged from the study: roadway conditions, noise and air pollution, and coastal flooding. Roadway condition, congestion, and safety was a serious concern. Routes 1, 1A, and 16 experience frequent congestion of both local and freight traffic, which also causes noise and air pollution, and road deterioration. The congestion means that freight and delivery trucks will frequently divert onto local roads and into neighborhoods in order to avoid the congested areas. This can also cause road deterioration, as well as cause safety concerns for pedestrians and cyclists. Additionally, limited public transportation in the area means residents must drive, or take long and complicated public transit trips.

The second concern was air quality, noise pollution, and extreme temperatures. The study area is densely populated, and also suffers from the urban heat island effect. The area is also exposed to industrial activity, as well as the busy roadways, which can lead to public health issues. Advocates have requested limiting the expansion of industrial activity in the area. The final concern was focused on climate change and its impact on community resources. Many of the freight and logistics hubs in the area are at risk of coastal flooding, but local businesses want to remain in the area due to its proximity to important features, such as the airports and seaports. Many of the municipalities have received Municipal Vulnerability Preparedness Program Planning Grants, and are taking

action with these grants. At this point, E. Maguire passed the presentation over to Shравanathi Gopalan Narayanan, MPO Staff.

S. Narayanan began by introducing four decarbonization strategies, based on literature review and stakeholder engagement. The strategies were electrification of vehicles and alternative fuels, air quality reporting, mode shift efforts, and coordination. The Commonwealth of Massachusetts has a goal set for net-zero emissions by 2050, and the most commonly suggested strategy was the electrification of vehicles. However, there were a lot of drawbacks noted, including high up-front cost, a lack of technology and capacity, and an unrealistic time frame. It was also noted that electrification may not address noise pollution, congestion, or roadway decay. Alternatively, there is potential for alternative fuels, including biofuel and hydrogen fuel cells.

The next strategy was air quality reporting. Stakeholders expressed interest in data reporting to identify point sources for particulate matter, and to understand the origins and destinations of truck traffic. This data could be used to strategize investments and create regulations such as anti-idling enforcement and low- or no-emissions zones. Another strategy is mode shift, such as local freight deliveries being made by cargo e-bikes instead of trucks, and prioritizing intermodal freight connections. Currently, there is little infrastructure for intermodal freight connections, but the ability to transfer freight from truck to rail would reduce trucks on roadways. Finally, there is a need for increased coordination and collaboration between local, regional, state, and national levels. Additionally, transportation and land use are closely connected and significantly impact one another. Transportation and land use mismatch can occur when zoning and freight patterns are not integrated in the planning decision-making process.

For next steps, this study suggests three follow-up studies: regional freight patterns and emissions, potential locations for electric-charging infrastructure, and the possibility of cargo e-bike deliveries. The electric-charging infrastructure is an effort that is already being made by the MAPC coordinating with the Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Coordinating Council. Additionally, a discrete study on using cargo e-bikes for local deliveries was proposed by the UPWP in the April 11, 2024, UPWP Committee meeting. Another takeaway is that it is essential that grants and funding be provided to stakeholders to support decarbonization projects. Various funding programs exist at both state and federal level that can be taken advantage of.

Another next step is coordinating regional efforts, for example by building an interdisciplinary coalition of stakeholders, a regional-level multimodal freight system, and finally by continuing to encourage public engagement and education. S. Narayanan

closed by thanking MPO staff for their work on this study, and the stakeholders for their contributions. S. Narayanan then opened the floor to comments and questions.

Discussion

J. Rowe appreciated the focus on not just electrifying fleets but also moving towards smaller, safer vehicles and rail and maritime solutions. J. Rowe also expressed the City of Boston's assessment that staff is uniquely well positioned to both assist and lead efforts toward the shared goal of decarbonizing the freight sector in a way that also furthers MPO goals around safety, air quality, reliability, and mode shift. Finally, J. Rowe shared information about Boston Delivers, the City's e-cargo bike delivery pilot for businesses in Allston and the surrounding areas. Jay Monty mentioned how the City of Everett was in the middle of the study and discussed some friction between the desire for redevelopment and the need to preserve jobs and freight access, along with concern for the environment and air quality. S. Johnston expressed particular appreciation for the discussion of mode shift and added that one concern that should be taken into consideration is the shift of freight jobs from the inner core to further outside the city, which impacts workers and, most importantly, their commute. This change should be considered as part of the larger conversation about land and road use. L. Diggins mentioned that he would be asking E. Maguire and S. Narayanan to present this study at an upcoming Advisory Council Meeting.

13. Beyond Mobility: the Massachusetts 2050 Statewide Transportation Plan—Derek Krevat, MassDOT Staff

D. Krevat presented on the Massachusetts Statewide Long-Range Transportation Plan (SLRTP). D. Krevat started with some background, first noting that MassDOT is required by federal law to develop this long-range plan on a regular basis. The state has only had one previous long-range plan, called *WeMoveMassachusetts*, which was last updated in 2014. The current plan name, *Beyond Mobility*, reflects the plan's aim to think beyond traditional transportation and to center people and transportation together. The plan was initially out for public comment until May 5, but the period was extended until May 31, due to the amount of information in the document.

Beyond Mobility is also part of a larger plan called *MassDOT@15*, which is an overarching plan to commemorate MassDOT's 15th anniversary by focusing on three Policy and Strategy Efforts. The first of these is the *Beyond Mobility* plan, discussed here. This plan is to develop a blueprint for the decision-making process and investments in transportation in Massachusetts in a way that advances the State's transportation goals and maximizes the equity and resiliency of the transportation system. The second policy is a Strategic Business Plan, which will align MassDOT's organizational resources to fulfill operational goals and meet commitments. The third aspect will be a Transportation Funding Task Force, which will advance and strategize the funding of the next generation of transportation projects and policies. *Beyond Mobility* is a plan at the state level, but partnership with regional and municipal partners

will be a large part of implementation. This plan will also serve to restructure the Capital

Investment Plan priorities, as well as many other ongoing processes, as this statewide plan becomes the new foundation.

For the past 18 months, the *Beyond Mobility* project team has done extensive public and internal outreach, data analyses, and analyses of prior plans. The plan is focused on the needs of the people of Massachusetts, so surveys and focus groups—including multi-lingual focus groups—were very important. The project team also worked closely with other MassDOT and MBTA staff in order to make sure this plan worked with other strategic plans in effect. There were over 5,000 discrete pieces of feedback, and the overwhelming response from the public was the desire to get around without the need for a car. Another large portion of the feedback was about bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure, such as bicycle lanes, bicycle connections to transit, better sidewalks, and better wayfinding—especially for people who do not speak English as a first language. More frequent bus and commuter rail service also came up often in public response. Those further out from the inner core also expressed a desire for more electric-vehicle-charging stations.

The project team also did internal analyses and came up with six priority areas: Safety, Reliability, Clean Transportation, Destination Connectivity, Resiliency, and Travel Experience. Across all of these areas the two overarching themes of Social & Geographic Equity, and Financial & Staffing Resources. Each one of these priorities has a Vision Statement, a Set of Values Statement, Problems and Key Facts Statements, and Action Items. The final plan has over 100 action items across all six of these areas.

An example D. Krevat provided for the Safety section is that 142 of the 200 pedestrian crash cluster locations are in Environmental Justice communities. The action item was a strategy to prioritize current projects and introduce new projects that will address safety concerns in communities most disproportionately burdened by unsafe conditions. An example for the Reliability section was that commutes can take up to eight times longer than free-flowing traffic conditions during vital travel times. Two action items included improved coordination across agencies, and a study on congestion and roadway pricing. An example from Clean Transportation is that transportation is the highest contributor to Massachusetts' carbon emissions. Action items proposed include supporting the electrification of transit buses, and locating communities with a high concentration of households with low vehicle access and high demand for transit in order to prioritize projects in those areas. Another example in Destination Connectivity is that Environmental Justice communities have fewer existing and planned bike facilities per capita than all other communities. The proposed action item is to create a new program that will intentionally prioritize a list of non-vehicular modernization projects. An example for Resiliency was the exposure of much transportation

infrastructure to natural hazards. An action item could be inter-agency collaboration, and grants through the Municipal Vulnerability Preparedness (MVP) program. Lastly, for an example on Travel Experience, the program received a lot of feedback on the need for improved wayfinding signage. The example action item was updating wayfinding signage and translating the information into appropriate languages.

14. Members' Items

There were none.

15. Adjourn

A motion to adjourn was made by the Advisory Council (L. Diggins) and seconded by the SouthWest Advisory Planning Committee, Town of Wrentham (Rachel Benson). The motion carried.

Attendance

Members	Representatives and Alternates
At-Large City (City of Everett)	Jay Monty
At-Large City (City of Newton)	Ned Codd
At-Large Town (Town of Arlington)	Sarah Suarez
At-Large Town (Town of Brookline)	Erin Chute
City of Boston (Boston Planning & Development Agency)	Jim Fitzgerald
City of Boston (Boston Transportation Department)	Jen Rowe
Federal Highway Administration	Ken Miller
Federal Transit Administration	
Inner Core Committee (City of Somerville)	Tom Bent
	Derek Krevat
Massachusetts Department of Transportation	John Bechard
MassDOT Highway Division	John Romano
Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority (MBTA)	Sandy Johnston
	Joel Barerra
Massachusetts Port Authority	Sarah Lee
MBTA Advisory Board	
Metropolitan Area Planning Council	Eric Bourassa
MetroWest Regional Collaborative (City of Framingham)	Eric Johnson
Minuteman Advisory Group on Interlocal Coordination (Town of Acton)	Kristen Guichard
	Darlene Wynne
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)	
	Rachel Benson
South West Advisory Planning Committee (Town of Wrentham)	
Three Rivers Interlocal Council (Town of Norwood)	Steve Olanoff

Other Attendees	Affiliation
Stephanie Abundo	
Karl Allen	City of Chelsea
John Bechard	MassDOT
Sarah Bradbury	MassDOT District 3
Miranda Briseño	MassDOT
Celia Cobb	CRA
Paul Cobuzzi	
Robert D'Amico	
Cynthia Dittbrenner	The Trustees
Paula Doucette	
Heidi Doyle	
Rae Ettenger	AMC Conservation
Alison Felix	MAPC
Joy Glynn	MWRTA
Eric Johnson	City of Framingham
Ryan Josti	MBTA
Heyne Kim	BTD
Chris Klem	MassDOT
Josh Klingenstein	MBTA
Raissah Kouame	MassDOT
Derek Krevat	MassDOT
Aleida Leza	
Yan Lip	City of Malden
Owen MacDonald	Town of Weymouth
Eduardo Marques	CATA
Eric Molinari	City of Everett
Benjamin Muller	MassDOT
Jim Nee	MWRTA
Josh Ostroff	MBTA
Sheila Page	Town of Lexington
Rick Parker	Burlington Area Chamber
Marcia Rasmussen	Town of Sudbury
Brad Rawson	City of Somerville
Michelle Scott	MassDOT
Cheryll-Ann Senior	MassDOT
Derek Shooster	MassDOT
Cam Sullivan	MWRTA
Abigail Swaine	Environmental Protection Agency
Tyler Terrasi	MWRTA
Andrew Wang	MassDOT
Felicia Webb	CATA
Eva Willens	MWRTA

MPO Staff/Central Transportation Planning Staff

Tegin Teich, Executive Director
Abby Cutrumbes
Rounaq Basu
Judy Day
Annette Demchur
Hiral Gandhi
Shravanthi Gopalan Narayanan
David Hong
Jia Huang
Stella Jordan
Ali Kleyman
Ethan Lapointe
Erin Maguire
Rebecca Morgan
Srilekha Murthy
Gina Perille
Sean Rourke
Sam Taylor

CIVIL RIGHTS NOTICE TO THE PUBLIC

Welcome. Bem Vinda. Bienvenido. Akeyi. 欢迎. 歡迎.



You are invited to participate in our transportation planning process, free from discrimination. The Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) is committed to nondiscrimination in all activities and complies with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, or national origin (including limited English proficiency). Related federal and state nondiscrimination laws prohibit discrimination on the basis of age, sex, disability, and additional protected characteristics.

For additional information or to file a civil rights complaint, visit www.bostonmpo.org/mpo_non_discrimination.

To request accommodations at meetings (such as assistive listening devices, materials in accessible formats and languages other than English, and interpreters in American Sign Language and other languages) or if you need this information in another language, please contact:

Boston Region MPO Title VI Specialist

10 Park Plaza, Suite 2150

Boston, MA 02116

Phone: 857.702.3700

Email: civilrights@ctps.org

For people with hearing or speaking difficulties, connect through the state MassRelay service, www.mass.gov/massrelay. Please allow at least five business days for your request to be fulfilled.