

MPO Meeting Minutes

Draft Memorandum for the Record

Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization Meeting

March 20, 2025, Meeting

10:00 AM–1:00 PM, Zoom Video Conferencing Platform

David Mohler, 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 February 6, 2025
- Approve the Congestion Management Process (CMP) Objectives
- Direct the TIP Process, Engagement, and Readiness Committee to recommend a set of expectations for TIP project proponents to the full MPO board
- Advance Scenario 1A for the Federal Fiscal Years (FFYs) 2026–30 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

Meeting Agenda

1. Introductions

See attendance beginning on page 23.

2. Chair's Report—*David Mohler, MassDOT*

David Mohler, MassDOT, gave an update on a bill which would extend the temporary provisions pertaining to the Open Meeting Law that allow public bodies to continue holding meetings remotely without a quorum of the public body physically present at a meeting location. D. Mohler stated that the bill has been passed by both houses and is on its way to the governor to be signed. D. Mohler stated that the bill would extend the Open Meeting Law provisions for two years.

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

Tegin Teich introduced Jenn Kaplan, manager of the Multimodal Planning and Design Group, who joined MPO staff on March 10, 2025.

T. Teich discussed the restructuring of the Regional Transportation Advisory Council over the last few months and stated that Lenard Diggins continues to serve on the MPO

board to represent the Advisory Council, so there is no gap in representation on the MPO board. T. Teich stated that MPO staff will present an update on the restructuring within the next couple of board meetings.

T. Teich reviewed the meeting agenda, which included two action items and two presentations.

T. Teich stated that the next MPO board meeting will be held on April 3, 2025, at 10:00 AM in the State Transportation Building's Second Floor Boardroom at 10 Park Plaza, Boston, MA 02116.

4. Public Comments

Matt Taylor, Town of Belmont, expressed support for inclusion of Project 609204, Belmont–Community Path, Belmont Component of the Massachusetts Central Rail Trail (MCRT), in the FFYs 2026–30 TIP. M. Taylor stated that the design for the tunnel is progressing according to the Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority's (MBTA) recommendations. M. Taylor stated that the project is important for the Town's connectivity and safety and will be suitable for users of all ages.

Holly Munson, Town of Belmont, also expressed support for Project 609204 and appreciation for the project's inclusion in the FFYs 2026–30 TIP. H. Munson stated that one of the most frequent questions asked is when the project will be done, demonstrating residents' eagerness to use the path.

State Senator Will Brownsberger stated that the Belmont Community Path lies in his district and Representative David Rogers' district, and he expressed gratitude and a personal commitment to helping the project stay on track. Senator Brownsberger stated that MBTA General Manager Phil Eng provided the project with an expeditor as the project reaches 75 percent and 100 percent designs to ensure that there are no unnecessary delays.

Representative Michelle Ciccolo, 15th Middlesex District, expressed appreciation for board members and MPO staff working to develop the FFYs 2026–30 TIP and the Long-Range Transportation Plan. Representative Ciccolo spoke in support for the inclusion of Project 613695, Lexington–Roadway Reconstruction on Hartwell Avenue and Bedford Street, and Project S12978, Lexington–Design of Safety Improvements at the Interstate 95 and Route 4/225 Interchange, in the FFYs 2026–30 TIP. Representative Ciccolo stated that Lexington is one of the first communities to vote for MBTA zoning and the Town is expecting to develop more than 1,000 units in the corridor in addition to retail and commercial projects in the area.

Andreas Wolfe, City of Cambridge, expressed support for the City of Cambridge's Safety Improvement Project on Cambridge Street, which is a project that will improve safety in Cambridge and advance the City towards its sustainability goal of completing its bicycle network vision.

Rich Benevento, Tighe & Bond, discussed projects that had been flagged for readiness concerns in the FFYs 2026–30 TIP programming scenarios. R. Benevento stated that a robust initial public process has been completed for Project 610932, Brookline–Rehabilitation of Washington Street, and a 25 percent design submission has been scheduled for September 2025. R. Benevento said the project is on track to remain programmed in FFY 2028 of the TIP.

In addition, R. Benevento discussed Project 609252, Lynn–Rehabilitation of Essex Street, and stated that he is representing the City of Lynn in support of the project's continued advancement and programming in FFY 2028. R. Benevento said the project's 25 percent design will be submitted soon.

R. Benevento spoke in support of Project 609246, Lynn–Rehabilitation of Western Avenue (Route 107), emphasizing its regional significance, and stated that the project's 25 percent design submission is scheduled for July 2025. R. Benevento stated that the City of Lynn is supportive of moving the project into FFY 2029.

Steve Bartha, Town of Lexington, expressed support for Project 613695, Lexington–Roadway Reconstruction on Hartwell Avenue and Bedford Street, and stated that the project is critical to support additional housing that is expected to be developed in the next few years.

Kristina Johnson, Town of Hudson, expressed support for Project 613926, Hudson–Bike Path Construction of MCRT, from Felton Street to Priest Street, and stated that the project will connect more than 100 miles of rail trail. K. Johnson expressed appreciation for the MPO's funding for smaller communities that may not otherwise have the resources for projects such as this one. K. Johnson also thanked MPO and MassDOT staff for their help in the FFYs 2026–30 TIP application process.

John Scenna, Town of Lynnfield, spoke in support of phase one of Project 613163, Lynnfield–Rail Trail Reconstruction, and emphasized the project's importance for the Town's connectivity. J. Scenna stated that the Town of Lynnfield has reached 100 percent design for the project and looks forward to constructing phase 1 in FFY 2026, and to working towards phase 2 in subsequent years.

Rob Dolan, Town of Lynnfield, also expressed support for phase one of Project 613163 and stated that the Lynnfield Board of Selectmen unanimously approved this project, which had an overwhelming show of support from residents. R. Dolan discussed the safety improvements and recreation opportunities that would result from the project.

JR Frey, Town of Hingham, expressed support for Project 605168, Hingham–Improvements on Route 3A, and thanked MPO staff, MassDOT staff, and local representatives for their work on and advocacy for the project. J. Frey discussed the project's important safety improvements.

Marzie Galazka, Town of Swampscott, expressed support for Project 610666, Swampscott–Swampscott Rail Trail, and stated that the project is critical for local connectivity and off-road access to schools and locations across the town.

Bill Deignan, City of Cambridge, expressed support for the City of Cambridge's Safety Improvement Project on Cambridge Street. B. Deignan advocated for the project to be funded in FFY 2026 in substitution of an expiring congressional earmark. This timing would allow the City to have additional time to complete the project. In addition, B. Deignan stated that the MPO should consider supporting the future construction of the City of Cambridge's Fitchburg Crossing Bicycle and Pedestrian Bridge project, which was awarded a United States Department of Transportation (USDOT) Reconnecting Communities grant.

5. Committee Chairs' Reports

Jen Rowe, City of Boston, stated that the TIP Process, Engagement, and Readiness Committee met on March 13, 2025, at 1:00 PM, where MPO staff provided an update on the project rescoring process conducted for development of the FFYs 2026–30 TIP and gave a presentation on initial programming scenarios for projects in the FFYs 2026–30 TIP. The committee discussed the scenarios.

Melisa Tintocalis, North Suburban Planning Council (Town of Burlington), asked for clarification on discussions of rescoring projects.

J. Rowe responded that there was a lot of information for committee members to digest during the initial discussion of rescoring projects.

Jay Monty, City of Everett, discussed an action item on the agenda, which includes a vote to approve the CMP objectives. J. Monty stated that Priyanka Chapekar, MPO staff, has been working hard on developing these new CMP objectives, which take a holistic look at congestion management in the Boston region. J. Monty thanked CMP Committee members for their work on developing the CMP objectives.

Chris Klem, MassDOT, stated that the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) Committee is meeting on April 3, 2025, at 2:30 PM, April 10, 2025, at 1:00 PM, and April 17, 2025, at 2:00 PM. These meetings are expected to be held in-person. C. Klem stated that committee members would discuss a final list of discrete study scenarios for FFY 2026.

6. Action Item: Approval of February 6, 2025, MPO Meeting Minutes
Documents posted to the MPO meeting calendar

1. February 6, 2025, MPO Meeting Minutes ([pdf](#)) ([html](#))

Vote

A motion to approve the minutes of the meeting of February 6, 2025, was made by the Metropolitan Area Planning Council (MAPC) (Eric Bourassa) and seconded by the Inner Core Committee (City of Somerville) (Tom Bent). The motion carried. The following members abstained: Town of Arlington (John Alessi), South West Advisory Planning Council (Rachel Benson).

7. Action Item: CMP Objectives—Priyanka Chapekar, MPO Staff
Documents posted to the MPO meeting calendar

1. CMP Objectives Memo ([pdf](#)) ([html](#))

P. Chapekar provided background on the CMP, which is a federal requirement for Transportation Management Areas (TMAs) with populations greater than 200,000. The CMP is a continuous process that adjusts and progresses over time as goals and objectives change, new data becomes available, and new strategies are evaluated through performance monitoring.

P. Chapekar stated that MPO staff have undertaken a comprehensive CMP update starting in August 2024, and formulating regional CMP objectives is the first step in the process according to federal guidance. P. Chapekar stated that the CMP Committee has played a crucial role in making the updated CMP more comprehensive and developing the objectives, which also align with the MPO's Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) goal areas.

P. Chapekar presented the proposed CMP objectives found in Table 1.

Table 1
Proposed CMP Objectives

Proposed Objective	LRTP Goal Area
To make movement of people and freight across the region safer, easier, and more reliable through improvements to multiple modes	Mobility and Reliability, Safety
To set up measures to quantify congestion patterns and formulate traffic performance monitoring systems to determine congestion mitigation strategies in the Boston region	Mobility and Reliability, Access and Connectivity
To evaluate multimodal transportation networks to enable efficient travel demand management, increase utilization of multimodal facilities, and identify and minimize connectivity gaps in various transportation modes	Mobility and Reliability, Access and Connectivity
To develop a holistic approach to congestion management by exploring multiple avenues for alleviating congestion, including encouraging mode shift, demand-pricing strategies, curb use management, and land use considerations	Access and Connectivity
To promote healthy communities by reducing traffic volumes and, consequently, air and noise pollution arising from transportation, along with reducing fatal and serious injury crashes, paying special attention to vulnerable communities	Clean Air and Healthy Communities, Equity, Safety
To promote improved economic vitality, transportation access, public health and safety, and risk mitigation in the Boston region through identification of congested areas and formulation of relevant, sustainable solutions	Equity, Resiliency

CMP = Congestion Management Process. LRTP = Long-Range Transportation Plan.

Vote

A motion to approve the CMP objectives was made by the North Suburban Planning Council (Town of Burlington) (M. Tintocalis) and seconded by MAPC (E. Bourassa). The motion carried.

8. MetroWest Regional Transit Authority (MWRTA) and Cape Ann Transportation Authority (CATA) Capital Investment Plans—Tyler Terrasi, MWRTA, and Felicia Webb, CATA

Tyler Terrasi, MWRTA, presented MWRTA's Capital Investment Plan.

T. Terrasi stated that the MWRTA has 16 member communities and was founded in 2006. Framingham was the first member and Hopedale is the most recent member.

T. Terrasi summarized the MWRTA's Capital Investment Planning Process, which includes the following steps:

- Regional transit authority (RTA) develops five-year project list for administrator approval
- RTA submits a project list to MassDOT through the eSTIP (electronic State Transportation Improvement Program) platform
- BlackCat platform is used for the Community Transit Grant Program (CTGP) and Mobility Assistance Program (MAP) for vehicle reporting and invoicing
- MassDOT submits RTA project list to Boston Region MPO
- MassDOT incorporates MPO-endorsed TIP into the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)

T. Terrasi stated that MWRTA's continuous reviews include annual analyses of capital asset needs: a Capital Investment Program (CIP) and a Transit Asset Management (TAM) analysis. In addition, the Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan (PTASP) is reviewed quarterly by the Safety Committee.

In addition, T. Terrasi stated that the MWRTA has a variety of grant-funded initiatives, including initiatives funded through the MPO's Community Connections Program, which allowed for increased microtransit services.

T. Terrasi stated that the MWRTA received \$3,011,633 from the Federal Transit Administration's (FTA) Urbanized Area Formula Funding program (49 U.S.C. 5307) in fiscal year (FY) 2025 and programmed \$803,633 for operating activities with a balance of \$2,208,000 for capital activities.

T. Terrasi summarized the MWRTA's ongoing projects and the years in which they are programmed, which included the following:

- Procurement of Gilligs and Cutaways (FYs 2026–30)
- State of Good Repair (SGR) Blandin Hub and Framingham Commuter Rail Station (FCRS) (FYs 2026–30)

- Blandin Hub Operations and Maintenance Expansion (FYs 2026–28)
- Passenger Transfer Station (FY 2028)

T. Terrasi discussed the Gillig Expansion initiative, which is programmed for \$12,600,000 in FYs 2026–30 and funded through the MPO's Transit Transformation program, Urbanized Area Formula Funding program (49 U.S.C. 5307), and RTA Capital (RTACAP) funds. The initiative aims to expand the fixed-route seating capacity and modernize the fleet with compressed natural gas (CNG) FTA low- and no-emission (Lo-No) vehicles. MWRTA has received three vehicles, and six more are on order.

T. Terrasi stated that MWRTA recently held a ribbon-cutting ceremony to display the vehicles to the public for the first time, and they will be implemented for service in the spring.

Felicia Webb, CATA, presented CATA's capital planning process. F. Webb stated that CATA follows the same process as MWRTA, however CATA is a smaller RTA. F. Webb stated that CATA typically receives approximately \$700,000 in Urbanized Area Formula Funding program (49 U.S.C. 5307) funding, and a portion of that funding is used for preventative maintenance activities. F. Webb stated that CATA typically relies on RTACAP for funding, and the MPO's Transit Transformation program has been helpful in funding projects that may not have been funded otherwise.

F. Webb summarized CATA's programmed funds and projects for FYs 2026–30, which included the following:

- FY 2026
 - Preventive maintenance and small capital and shop equipment
 - Replacement of revenue vehicles that reached the end of their useful life in 2020 and 2022
 - Automatic Vehicle Location/GPS/Advanced Passenger Counting Project
 - Building maintenance
- FY 2027
 - Preventive maintenance
 - Small capital items
 - Building maintenance
 - Replacement of vehicles that reach the end of their useful life in 2027
- FY 2028
 - Preventive maintenance
 - Maintenance and general upkeep of facility
 - Small capital items and shop equipment
- FY 2029

- Preventive maintenance
- Maintenance and general upkeep of facility
- Small capital items and shop equipment
- FY 2030
 - Preventive maintenance
 - Maintenance and general upkeep of facility
 - Small capital items and shop equipment
 - Replacement of vehicles that reach the end of their useful life in 2030

F. Webb gave an update on CATA's existing projects and stated that CATA is expecting delivery of replacement revenue vehicles in June 2025. F. Webb stated that CATA received bids for the repaving of the parking lot in its building rehabilitation project, and that CATA is projected to issue an Invitation for Bid (IFB) in March 2025 for the work on the restrooms and plumbing. F. Webb summarized updates on additional projects, including the following:

- Acquisition of Support Vehicles: one acquired, shop truck projected in May 2025
- Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)/Demand Response Fare Collection System: included in upgrade of Paratransit Software, evaluation of proposals underway
- Replacement Vans: delivered end of February 2025

Discussion

Tom Bent, Inner Core Committee (City of Somerville), asked a clarifying question regarding vehicle replacement and the lifespan of CATA's vehicles.

F. Webb stated that CATA's small 29-foot heavy duty buses traditionally have a lifespan of ten years, and CATA runs theirs for a minimum of 12 years. F. Webb stated that the vehicles CATA are replacing in FY 2026 should have been retired after ten years but have been running for 13-15 years.

9. Break, 10 minutes

10. Action Item: FFYs 2026-30 TIP Preliminary Project Programming Scenarios—*Ethan Lapointe, MPO Staff*

Documents posted to the MPO meeting calendar

1. FFYs 2026–30 TIP Initial Scenarios (1A, 1B, 1C, 1D) ([pdf](#)) ([html](#))
2. FFYs 2026–30 TIP Initial Scenarios 1A–D ([pdf](#)) ([html](#))

Ethan Lapointe, MPO staff, presented four FFYs 2026–30 TIP preliminary project programming scenarios, which facilitates the MPO board’s selection of a FFYs 2026–30 TIP scenario and will enable discussion of outstanding topics at the upcoming March 27, 2025, TIP Process, Engagement, and Readiness Committee meeting.

E. Lapointe stated that the scenarios presented do not program new transit projects in FFY 2026 or program new roadway projects in FFY 2030, and each scenario addresses the deficit in FFY 2027 in a different way.

In addition, E. Lapointe stated that MPO staff have received the following letters regarding TIP projects:

- Letter of support from the City of Boston regarding Project 606226, Boston–Reconstruction of Rutherford Avenue, From City Square to Sullivan Square
- Letter of support from Representative Ciccolo’s office regarding Project 613695, Lexington–Roadway Reconstruction on Hartwell Avenue and Bedford Street, and Project S12978, Lexington–Design of Safety Improvements at the Interstate 95 and Route 4/225 Interchange
- Multiple letters of support from the City of Malden regarding Project 613088, Malden–Spot Pond Brook Greenway, and funding for the design of the Malden–Route 60 Improvement Project
- Letters of support from the Town of Hingham regarding Project 600964, Hingham–Bridge Rehabilitation, BR# H-15-005 Route 3A (Justice Cushing Highway) over EOTC & MBTA Row
- Letter from a Town of Marblehead resident advocating to support the procurement of bicycle racks through the Community Connections program
- Letters regarding Project 610666: Swampscott–Rail Trail Construction, including letters of support from several Swampscott residents and letters from abutters expressing concern for the project
- Letters regarding Project 609204, Belmont–Community Path, Belmont Component of the MCRT, including letters of support from Belmont residents and potential rail trail users, and one comment from an abutter opposing the project

E. Lapointe discussed the FFYs 2026–30 TIP readiness scenario constraint, which can be found in Table 2.

Table 2
FFYs 2026–30 TIP Readiness Scenario Constraint

FFY	Total Available Regional Highway Target Funds (FFYs 2026-30 TIP)	Draft Total Programmed Regional Highway Target Funds	Regional Highway Target Funds Remaining (Unprogrammed)	Percent Unprogrammed
2025 (New)	\$128,427,689	\$103,829,110	\$24,598,579	19.2%
2026 (New)	\$125,285,687	\$60,017,614	\$65,268,073	52.1%
2027 (New)	\$152,627,429	\$237,359,291	-\$84,731,862	-55.5%
2028 (New)	\$158,700,879	\$169,726,302	-\$11,025,423	-6.9%
2029 (New)	\$157,518,346	\$152,779,662	\$4,738,684	3.0%
2030 (New)	\$160,037,411	\$110,662,800	\$49,374,611	30.9%
2026–30 Total	\$754,169,752	\$730,545,669	\$23,624,083	3.1%

FFY = Federal Fiscal Year. TIP = Transportation Improvement Program.

E. Lapointe stated that proposed delays of TIP projects from FFY 2025 to FFY 2026 have resulted in a substantial unprogrammed balance in FFY 2025, which is not addressed by the development of the FFYs 2026–30 TIP. E. Lapointe stated that FFYs 2025–29 TIP Amendment Ten aims to address this.

In addition, delays of projects out of FFY 2026 resulted in a large unprogrammed balance in FFY 2026. E. Lapointe stated that the FFY 2025 and 2026 project delays contribute to a substantial deficit in FFY 2027. In addition, there was a smaller deficit in FFY 2028 due to low contingencies and cost increases. E. Lapointe stated that there is approximately 31 percent of funding availability for new projects in FFY 2030 due to ongoing funding commitments to Advance Construction projects. E. Lapointe stated that there is approximately \$96 million of deficit between FFYs 2027–28 and \$54 million of funding available between FFYs 2029–30.

E. Lapointe presented updates on project readiness and stated that the initial readiness scenario proposed to delay seven of nine projects out of FFY 2026. E. Lapointe stated that coordination with project proponents and other stakeholders has reduced that number to five out of nine projects, which reduces the FFY 2027 deficit and reduces the FFY 2026 surplus. However, all seven projects are still considered at risk.

Two projects remained programmed in FFY 2026 but were still at risk of delays: Project 606453, Boston–Improvements on Boylston Street, from Intersection of Brookline Avenue and Park Drive to Ipswich Street, and Project 605168, Hingham–Improvements on Route 3A from Otis Street/Cole Road including Summer Street and Rotary, and Rockland Street to George Washington Boulevard. E. Lapointe stated that the City of Boston is removing the intersection of Brookline Avenue and Park Drive from Project 606453's scope due to coordination issues with the Massachusetts Department of Conservation and Recreation (DCR). The project had a revised cost estimate of \$10,200,000, which will be reflected in future scenarios. E. Lapointe stated that drainage work is contributing to delays in Project 605168, but that local stakeholders are coordinating with MassDOT on the scope of work to potentially remove drainage from the contract to avoid these delays. E. Lapointe stated that due to Project 605168's cost estimate, only Scenario 1C fully funds it in FFY 2026 with other scenarios funding the project across FFYs 2026–27 to hedge against ongoing delay risks or cost increases.

E. Lapointe discussed very recent project changes, which included an estimated cost increase for Project 609204, Belmont–Community Path, Belmont Component of the MCRT, from \$19,711,298 to \$27,306,266 due to a 75 percent design submission. This cost increase is not factored into the initial scenarios. In addition, there was an estimated cost increase for Project 610545, Wakefield–Main Street Reconstruction, from \$18,435,976 to \$28,492,560 due to a 25 percent design submission, which is reflected in the initial scenarios.

E. Lapointe discussed the consistencies between the initial scenarios, which included the following:

- Programming Project 613163, Lynnfield–Rail Trail Construction from Ford Avenue to Nichols Lane (Phase 1), at a cost of \$6,062,695 in FFY 2026
- Project 609532, Chelsea–Targeted Safety Improvements and Related Work on Broadway, proposed to return to the Statewide Highway Program in exchange for the Lynnfield Rail Trail funding
- Project 611983, Chelsea–Park Street and Pearl Street Reconstruction, removed from the FFYs 2026–30 window to be programmed next year in FFY 2031, with the City of Chelsea being aware of the uncertainty of programming in FFY 2031
- New Project Design Set-Aside funds in all scenarios, which targets funding to design two to three projects per year
- Transit providers have indicated support to remove the set-aside funding for Transit Transformation in FFY 2027 to lessen the deficit
- All seven Community Connections program projects funded
- All scenarios attain fiscal constraint

E. Lapointe discussed the projects proposed for inclusion in the FFY 2026 design funding proposal, which included the following projects:

- Acton: Reconstruction of Route 2A/119 (Great Road), from Davis Road to Harris Street
- Hudson: Design of the Massachusetts Central Rail Trail, from Felton Street to Priest Street
- Malden: Design of Improvements on Route 60 (Phase 1 and 2), Franklin Street to Lynn Street
- Salem: Broad Street and Dalton Parkway Corridor Project (Design Only)

In addition, E. Lapointe stated that all scenarios include new bikeshare capital projects, totaling 33 stations and 201 bicycles costing \$1,506,166, and new bike rack projects costing \$479,382.

E. Lapointe stated that the TIP Process, Engagement, and Readiness Committee did not come to a consensus or vote to indicate a preference on specific scenarios at its last meeting, however several points emerged from discussion, which included the following:

- The consistencies between scenarios were not items of major concern.
- Some members indicated a preference towards Scenarios 1A and 1D.
- Other members advocated for programming actions that go further in addressing readiness risk than what is presented here.

Scenario 1A

E. Lapointe stated that Scenario 1A primarily addresses the FFY 2027 deficit by delaying two projects in the City of Lynn: Project 609252, Lynn–Rehabilitation of Essex Street, and Project 609246, Lynn–Rehabilitation of Western Avenue (Route 107). Neither have reached the 25 percent design milestone. E. Lapointe stated that Scenario 1A shifts a substantial amount of cost risk to outer years of the TIP, including future cost obligations to the Western Avenue project. Details on Scenario 1A can be found in Table 3.

Table 3
FFYs 2026–30 TIP Scenario 1A

FFY	Total Available Regional Highway Target Funds (FFYs 2026- 30 TIP)	Draft Total Programmed Regional Highway Target Funds	Regional Highway Target Funds Remaining (Unprogrammed)	Percent Unprogrammed
2026 (New)	\$125,285,687	\$98,893,538	\$26,392,149	21.1%
2027 (New)	\$152,627,429	\$151,147,420	\$ 1,480,009	1.0%
2028 (New)	\$158,700,879	\$156,604,600	\$2,096,279	1.3%
2029 (New)	\$157,518,346	\$155,699,104	\$1,819,242	1.2%
2030 (New)	\$160,037,411	\$114,199,200	\$45,838,211	28.6%
2026–30 Total	\$754,169,752	\$676,543,862	\$77,625,890	10.3%

FFY = Federal Fiscal Year. TIP = Transportation Improvement Program.

D. Mohler asked a question regarding alternative scenarios to the ones presented, and E. Lapointe stated that he is open to changes to any of the scenarios presented. In addition, D. Mohler expressed that the board should discuss addressing projects that have not reached 25 percent design submission.

Scenario 1D

E. Lapointe stated that Scenario 1D also delays Project 609252, Lynn–Rehabilitation of Essex Street, and Project 609246, Lynn–Rehabilitation of Western Avenue (Route 107); however, Western Avenue would be delayed to FFY 2029 instead of FFY 2030. E. Lapointe stated that the Reconstruction of Rutherford Avenue in Boston would instead be delayed two years to FFY 2030 instead of the current proposal for a one-year delay to FFY 2029. In addition, there is more funding availability in later years of the TIP in Scenario 1D than in other scenarios, leaving more opportunity for reserving funds or supporting new uses. Details on Scenario 1D can be found in Table 4.

Table 4
FFYs 2026–30 TIP Scenario 1D

FFY	Total Available Regional Highway Target Funds (FFYs 2026- 30 TIP)	Draft Total Programmed Regional Highway Target Funds	Regional Highway Target Funds Remaining (Unprogrammed)	Percent Unprogrammed
2026 (New)	\$125,285,687	\$98,893,538	\$26,392,149	21.1%
2027 (New)	\$152,627,429	\$151,147,420	\$1,480,009	1.0%
2028 (New)	\$158,700,879	\$156,604,600	\$2,096,279	1.3%
2029 (New)	\$157,518,346	\$ 137,199,104	\$20,319,242	12.9%
2030 (New)	\$160,037,411	\$114,199,200	\$45,838,211	28.6%
2026–30 Total	\$754,169,752	\$676,543,862	\$96,125,890	12.7%

FFY = Federal Fiscal Year. TIP = Transportation Improvement Program.

Scenario 1B

E. Lapointe stated that Scenario 1B addresses the FFY 2027 and 2029 deficits through a series of staggered delays and cost rebalancing across five projects, which included the following:

- Project 605857, Norwood–Intersection Improvements at Route 1 and University Avenue/Everett Street, is delayed two years and would be programmed in FFY 2028 instead of FFY 2027
- Project 610932, Brookline–Rehabilitation of Washington Street, has funding in FFY 2028 reduced by \$5 million to be offset by \$5 million in FFY 2029
- Project 609246, Lynn–Rehabilitation of Western Avenue (Route 107), is delayed to FFY 2029 to address FFY 2028 deficit and readiness concerns, and funding in FFY 2029 is reduced from \$20 million to \$10 million to reflect an expected advance construction schedule
- Project 613088, Malden–Spot Pond Brook Greenway, is delayed from FFY 2028 to FFY 2030 instead of FFY 2029
- Project 610666, Swampscott–Rail Trail Construction, is delayed from FFY 2028 to FFY 2030 instead of FFY 2029

Further details on Scenario 1B can be found in Table 5.

Table 5
FFYs 2026–30 TIP Scenario 1B

FFY	Total Available Regional Highway Target Funds (FFYs 2026- 30 TIP)	Draft Total Programmed Regional Highway Target Funds	Regional Highway Target Funds Remaining (Unprogrammed)	Percent Unprogrammed
2026 (New)	\$125,285,687	\$94,893,538	\$30,392,149	24.3%
2027 (New)	\$152,627,429	\$150,205,765	\$2,421,664	1.6%
2028 (New)	\$158,700,879	\$155,633,103	\$3,067,776	1.9%
2029 (New)	\$157,518,346	\$157,257,256	\$261,090	1.2%
2030 (New)	\$160,037,411	\$132,681,327	\$27,356,084	17.1%
2026–30 Total	\$754,169,752	\$690,670,989	\$63,498,763	8.4%

FFY = Federal Fiscal Year. TIP = Transportation Improvement Program.

Scenario 1C

E. Lapointe stated that Scenario 1C rebalances funding across four projects rather than relying on further delays. Scenario 1C includes the following projects and rebalances:

- Project 605168, Hingham–Improvements on Route 3A, is fully funded in FFY 2026 at a cost of \$31.9 million
- Project 60585, Norwood–Intersection Improvements at Route 1 and University Avenue/Everett Street, is funded in FFY 2027 and FFY 2028
- Project 607981, Somerville–McGrath Boulevard Construction, is reduced to \$25 million in FFY 2027 (formerly \$30 million) and \$25 million in FFY 2028 (formerly \$33.1 million)
- Project 609246, Lynn–Rehabilitation of Western Avenue (Route 107), is reduced to \$10 million in both FFY 2028 and FFY 2029

Details on Scenario 1C can be found in Table 6.

Table 6
FFYs 2026–30 TIP Scenario 1C

FFY	Total Available Regional Highway Target Funds (FFYs 2026- 30 TIP)	Draft Total Programmed Regional Highway Target Funds	Regional Highway Target Funds Remaining (Unprogrammed)	Percent Unprogrammed
2026 (New)	\$125,285,687	\$108,893,538	\$16,392,149	13.1%
2027 (New)	\$152,627,429	\$148,842,101	\$3,785,328	2.5%
2028 (New)	\$158,700,879	\$154,961,473	\$3,739,406	2.4%
2029 (New)	\$157,518,346	\$155,699,104	\$1,819,242	1.2%
2030 (New)	\$160,037,411	\$132,274,773	\$27,762,638	17.3%
2026–30 Total	\$754,169,752	\$700,670,989	\$53,498,763	7.1%

FFY = Federal Fiscal Year. TIP = Transportation Improvement Program.

TIP Development Timeline

E. Lapointe presented the FFYs 2026–30 TIP Development Timeline, which can be found in Table 7.

Table 7
FFYs 2026–30 TIP Development Timeline

March	April	May	June
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• March 27 TIP Process, Engagement, and Readiness Committee: Revised programming scenarios	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• April 3 MPO: Select a final programming scenario• April 17 MPO: Vote to release draft FFYs 2026–30 TIP for public review and comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• May 15 MPO: May Quarterly Readiness Update• May 22 TIP Process, Engagement, and Readiness Committee: Changes to the Draft FFYs 2026–30 TIP and public comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• June 5 MPO: Review public comments and vote to endorse FFYs 2026–30 TIP

FFY = Federal Fiscal Years. MPO = Metropolitan Planning Organization. TIP = Transportation Improvement Program.

Outstanding Questions

E. Lapointe discussed outstanding questions that the presented initial scenarios did not address, including the following questions:

- Each scenario leaves funding in FFY 2026. Which MassDOT, MBTA, or MWRTA projects could be selected for this funding?
- How should funding in the outer years of the TIP be allocated? Should the MPO look to program new projects, leaving funding in reserve, or a combination of both?

E. Lapointe stated that all the initial scenarios presented leave a substantial amount of readiness and cost volatility in all years of the TIP. None of the four scenarios presented remedy the majority of that risk and most scenarios increase risk and burden for future scenarios.

Discussion

T. Bent asked why MassDOT rejected the 75 percent design submission for Project 609204: Belmont–Community Path, Belmont Component of the MCRT.

John Bechard, MassDOT Highway Division, responded that the 75 percent design submission was not complete due to outstanding utility work and structural design.

T. Bent asked an additional question about Belmont's community path project related to cost increases.

J. Bechard responded that he does not have that specific information at this moment but is continuing to work with the project proponent on their design submission.

T. Bent expressed concern about project delays at the late stage of TIP development, including the burden it puts on MPO board members and staff.

David Koses, City of Newton, asked a question regarding the updated cost of Belmont's community path project in Scenario 1A.

J. Monty expressed concern about programming the City of Lynn's projects with the intention that the projects will be ready in a year when they have not submitted their 25 percent design submissions yet. J. Monty asked for additional information on their schedules for further clarification.

R. Benevento stated that the 25 percent design submission for Project 609252, Lynn–Rehabilitation of Essex Street, is currently being submitted, and there has been a lot of public engagement. R. Benevento stated that the 25 percent design submission for Project 609246, Lynn–Rehabilitation of Western Avenue (Route 107), is scheduled for July 2025.

J. Monty asked if the City of Lynn has all the funding in place to complete the design.

R. Benevento responded that the City of Lynn has allocated those funds, and they are currently pursuing an assessment to figure out what the right-of-way class might be. R. Benevento added that the right-of-way plans will be refined through the design process, and there will be limited temporary easements taken.

R. Benevento discussed the City of Lynn's Essex Street project and stated that there is not a determined number of temporary easements the project will require, but the City of Lynn recently went through the process of submitting waivers for easements and acquisitions, so the City is familiar with the process.

J. Rowe stated that the MPO board made a request for project proponents to share updated schedules with MPO staff to be presented to the board and that staff did not receive an updated schedule from the City of Lynn. J. Rowe asked for further information on the projects' schedules.

R. Benevento stated that the City of Lynn has very detailed information on the project's updated schedule that he can provide to MPO staff to share with the board.

John Alessi, Town of Arlington, asked if the City of Lynn had thoughts on the potential delay of the Western Avenue project in TIP Scenario 1A.

R. Benevento indicated that the City of Lynn would accept delaying the Essex Street project, but the City would prefer to keep the Western Avenue project programmed in FFY 2028 even at a reduced funding amount.

T. Bent stated that while he was on a previous subcommittee, the subcommittee only considered funding projects that had reached the 25 percent design milestone and gave a grace period for existing projects that did not reach that milestone. In addition, T. Bent stated that he would like the TIP Process, Engagement, and Readiness Committee to bring recommendations for expectations from TIP project proponents to the MPO board.

E. Bourassa expressed support for T. Bent's proposal. E. Bourassa stated that during the next TIP development cycle, it is likely that many of these projects will still not be ready; this would result in no additional funding being available for new projects or removing projects from the TIP.

D. Mohler asked E. Lapointe if he has information on the design statuses of all the projects in the TIP.

E. Lapointe stated that he has design statuses for all projects based on the information that is available from MassDOT.

D. Mohler asked how many projects on the TIP have reached their 25 percent design milestone.

E. Lapointe responded that seven TIP projects have reached 25 percent design.

D. Mohler stated that the MPO board needs to determine what 25 percent design means for project proponents. In addition, D. Mohler stated that the fundamental problem is that the board never removes projects from the TIP.

J. Monty asked if MassDOT gives project proponents deadlines for their 25 percent design submissions.

J. Bechard responded that when a project is approved by the Project Review Committee (PRC), the project proponent is alerted and a 24-month cycle begins where the proponent needs to solicit a consultant and begin the process of attaining 25

percent design. J. Bechard stated that there is not an explicit deadline for attaining 25 percent design due to the variation in length and effort that getting that approval can take, including variations in the design through the public engagement process.

J. Monty stated that it seems that the project proponent's first check-in with MassDOT is when the project reaches 25 percent design, and prior to that the proponent is responsible for advancing the project to that milestone.

J. Bechard stated that MassDOT does have touch points with project proponents prior to the 25 percent design submission, but they are not trackable milestones.

J. Monty stated that there are some projects that have been at pre-25 percent design for a decade and expressed that there needs to be some level of accountability.

J. Bechard stated that if a project is not on the TIP, it will have a design review schedule.

J. Rowe stated that MPO board members are not receiving consistent information about projects, and the board needs to decide how to best obtain that information and whose responsibility it is to get that information to the board. J. Rowe stated that it would be beneficial to determine clear expectations for project proponents to share project information with MPO staff regardless of what years the project is programmed in.

E. Bourassa stated that the board may need to have higher expectations for projects that have been on the TIP for longer periods of time so that the board can learn more about why these projects are not progressing. In addition, E. Bourassa stated that it is difficult to determine who is at fault for a project not progressing and why it is not progressing.

D. Koses asked which projects in FFYs 2026 and 2027 are not at 25 percent design yet.

E. Lapointe responded that there are 12 projects that have yet to be approved for 25 percent design.

Vote

A motion to direct the TIP Process, Engagement, and Readiness Committee to recommend a set of expectations for TIP project proponents to the full MPO board was made by the Inner Core Committee (City of Somerville) (T. Bent) and seconded by MAPC (E. Bourassa). The motion carried. The following member abstained: Massachusetts Port Authority (Sarah Lee). The following members voted no: MassDOT

(D. Mohler), MassDOT (J. Bechard), MassDOT Highway Division (J. Romano), MBTA (Josh Ostroff), and MBTA Advisory Board (H. Switekowski).

Vote

A motion to advance FFYs 2026–30 TIP Scenario 1A was made by MAPC (E. Bourassa) and seconded by the Inner Core Committee (City of Somerville) (T. Bent). The motion carried.

11. Members' Items

There were none.

12. Adjourn

A motion to adjourn was made by MAPC (E. Bourassa) and seconded by the by the Inner Core Committee (City of Somerville) (T. Bent). The motion carried.

Attendance

Members

Representatives and Alternates

At-Large City (City of Everett)	Jay Monty
	Eric Molinari
At-Large City (City of Newton)	David Koses
At-Large Town (Town of Arlington)	John Alessi
At-Large Town (Town of Brookline)	Erin Chute
City of Boston	Nayeli Rodriguez
	Jen Rowe
Federal Highway Administration	Anthony Jones
	Samira Saad
Inner Core Committee (City of Somerville)	Tom Bent
	Brad Rawson
Massachusetts Department of Transportation	David Mohler
	John Bechard
MassDOT Highway Division	John Romano
Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority (MBTA)	Josh Ostroff
	Sandy Johnston
Massachusetts Port Authority	Sarah Lee
MBTA Advisory Board	Hanna
	Switekowski
Metropolitan Area Planning Council	Eric Bourassa
	Julia Wallerice
MetroWest Regional Collaborative (City of Framingham)	Dennis Giombetti
Minuteman Advisory Group on Interlocal Coordination (Town of Acton)	Kristen Guichard
North Shore Task Force (City of Beverly)	Darlene Wynne
North Suburban Planning Council (Town of Burlington)	Melisa Tintocalis
Regional Transportation Advisory Council	Lenard Diggins
Regional Transit Authorities (RTAs)	Tyler Terrasi
	Felicia Webb
	Jim Nee
South Shore Coalition (Town of Hull)	Chris Dilorio
South West Advisory Planning Committee (Town of Wrentham)	Rachel Benson
Three Rivers Interlocal Council (Town of Norwood)	Tom O'Rourke
	Steve Olanoff

Other Attendees	Affiliation
John Hendrickson	Cambria Consulting
Bill Deignan	City of Cambridge
Andreas Wolfe	City of Cambridge
Ben Cares	City of Chelsea
Yem Lip	City of Malden
Jim Tarr	City of Malden
Jarrold Goentzel	Friends of the Belmont Community Path
Karen Winger	Longwood Collective
Representative Michelle Ciccolo	Massachusetts State Representative, 15th Middlesex District
Andrew Wang	MassDOT
Barbara Lachance	MassDOT
Ben Muller	MassDOT
Cheryll-Ann Senior	MassDOT
Derek Shooster	MassDOT
Makaela Niles	MassDOT
Melissa Santley	MassDOT
Sarah Bradbury	MassDOT
Tracie Lenhardt	MassDOT
Mike Malia	MBTA
Cam Sullivan	MWRTA
Eva Willens	MWRTA
Joy Glynn	MWRTA
Byron Woodman	Solect Energy
Joe Rubino	Stantec
Rick Azzalina	Stantec
Senator Will Brownsberger	State Senate
Erik Helmuth	State Senate
Annie Mazzola	State Senate
Richard Benevento	Tighe & Bond
Aleida Leza	Town of Belmont
Darin Takemoto	Town of Belmont
Holly Munson	Town of Belmont
Matt Taylor	Town of Belmont
JR Frey	Town of Hingham
Kristina Johnson	Town of Hudson
Meghan McNamara	Town of Lexington
Ross Morrow	Town of Lexington

Other Attendees	Affiliation
Steve Bartha	Town of Lexington
John Scenna	Town of Lynnfield
Ken MacNulty	Town of Lynnfield
Rob Dolan	Town of Lynnfield
Donna Cotterell	Town of Marblehead
Marcia Rasmussen	Town of Sudbury
Marzie Galazka	Town of Swampscott
Sheila Page	Town of Wellesley
John Cashell	Town of Woburn

MPO Staff/Central Transportation Planning Staff

Tegin Teich, Executive Director
Abby Cutrumbes Heerema
Adriana Jacobsen
Ali Kleyman
Annette Demchur
Betsy Harvey Herzfeld
Bradley Putnam
Dave Hong
Elena Ion
Ethan Lapointe
Gina Perille
Gina Weaver
Hiral Gandhi
Olivia Saccocia
Priyanka Chapekar
Sam Taylor
Sean Rourke
Stella Jordan
Xianli Wang

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.