

# **MPO Meeting Minutes**

## **Draft Memorandum for the Record**

### **Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization Meeting**

**April 17, 2025, Meeting**

10:00 AM–12:45 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 March 6, 2025
- Approve the work scope for *Understanding Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority (MBTA) Demographics and Ridership Changes in the MBTA Region*
- Approve the work scope for the *MBTA State Fiscal Year (SFY) 2026 National Transit Database: Data Collection and Analysis*
- Release Federal Fiscal Years (FFYs) 2025–29 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Amendment Eleven for a 21-day public comment period
- Release the Draft FFYs 2026–30 TIP document for a 30-day public comment period

## **Meeting Agenda**

### **1. Introductions**

See attendance beginning on page 34.

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

There was none.

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

Tegin Teich, Executive Director, highlighted key elements of the FFYs 2026–30 TIP development process, including an expanded TIP Process, Engagement, and Readiness Committee forum, increased coordination with MassDOT, and more new projects applying for funding. T. Teich outlined next steps to occur after the Draft FFYs 2026–30 TIP is released for public comment, including an update to the MPO board on

May 15, 2025, followed by a TIP Process, Engagement, and Readiness Committee meeting.

T. Teich provided updates on the MPO's Vision Zero Action Plan. While the Safe Streets and Roads for All grant was underway before the federal administration change, the MPO has not received approval for an extension beyond the contract's original end date of June 30, 2025. The MPO has now adopted a two-phase approach: phase one will develop an action plan meeting federal requirements, and phase two will build on this foundational plan. T. Teich overviewed the meeting agenda and stated that the next MPO board meeting will be held virtually on May 1, 2025, at 10:00 AM.

#### **4. Public Comments**

Ben Cares, City of Chelsea, provided an update on Project 611983, City of Chelsea—Park Street and Pearl Street Reconstruction, which was not included in the FFY 2030 element of the FFYs 2026–30 TIP. B. Cares stated that the City submitted its 25 percent design to MassDOT, and the project's cost estimate is lower than originally proposed. B. Cares advocated for its inclusion in FFY 2030 of the FFYs 2026–30 TIP due to its high score, readiness, and lowered cost. In addition, B. Cares discussed affordable housing expansion in Chelsea.

Fidel Maltez, City of Chelsea, advocated for including Project 611983 in the FFY 2030 element of the FFYs 2026–30 TIP, citing its importance to the City, an environmental justice community, and addressing issues including congestion, safety, and accessibility. F. Maltez emphasized the project's alignment with affordable housing redevelopment and its timeline.

Bill Deignan, City of Cambridge, expressed support for the inclusion in the FFYs 2026–30 TIP of Project 613568, Cambridge—New Bridge and Shared-Use Path Construction over Fitchburg Line at Danehy Park Connector, and the FFY 2026 BikeShare Replacement (Seven Stations, 123 Docks) project.

Brad Rawson, Inner Core Committee (City of Somerville), expressed appreciation for TIP development improvements, especially involving regional transit authorities (RTAs) and better information sharing. B. Rawson thanked Jen Rowe, City of Boston, and Ethan Lapointe, MPO staff, for their leadership in the process.

#### **5. Committee Chairs' Reports**

J. Rowe expressed appreciation for the members of the TIP Process, Engagement, and Readiness Committee and other stakeholders for their involvement in the FFYs 2026–30 TIP development process. J. Rowe stated that the next committee meeting will be

held on May 15, 2025, at 1:00 PM, where committee members will review and discuss changes to the draft FFYs 2026–30 TIP and continue conversations about expectations for proponent expectations.

Chris Klem, MassDOT, stated that the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) Committee will meet following the MPO meeting on April 17, 2025, at 2:00 PM, where Committee members will review and vote on MPO staff’s final discrete study scenarios for the FFY 2026 UPWP.

## **6. Action Item: Approval of March 6, 2025, MPO Meeting Minutes**

### ***Documents posted to the MPO meeting calendar***

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

Sandy Johnston, MBTA, requested a correction to the spelling of Angela Servello-Jones’ name.

### ***Vote***

A motion to approve the minutes of the meeting of March 6, 2025, was made by the Metropolitan Area Planning Council (MAPC) (Eric Bourassa) and seconded by the MBTA (S. Johnston). The motion carried.

## **7. Action Item: Work Scope—Understanding MBTA Demographics and Ridership Changes—Joe Delorto, MPO Staff**

### ***Documents posted to the MPO meeting calendar***

1. *Understanding MBTA Demographics and Ridership Changes in the MBTA Region* Work Scope ([pdf](#)) ([html](#))

Joe Delorto, MPO staff, presented the work scope for the study titled *Understanding MBTA Demographics and Ridership Changes in the MBTA Region*, which will support the MBTA’s “Full T Ahead” service priorities initiative and provide the MBTA with a data-centered framework for analyzing demographic changes across its service area and ridership over the last 20–30 years.

J. Delorto stated that the study has a budget of \$140,000 and is scheduled to be completed within 12 months of the notice to proceed. J. Delorto described the study’s tasks, which included the following:

1. Literature Review
2. Exploration of Available Data and Tools
3. Qualitative Research
4. Quantification of Ridership Changes

## 5. Framework Development

### ***Discussion***

Lenard Diggins, Regional Transportation Advisory Council, expressed appreciation for the study.

### ***Vote***

A motion to approve the work scope for *Understanding MBTA Demographics and Ridership Changes in the MBTA Region* was made by the Advisory Council (L. Diggins) and seconded by the MAPC (E. Bourassa). The motion carried.

## **8. Action Item: Work Scope—MBTA SFY 2026 National Transit**

**Database: Data Collection and Analysis—Bradley Putnam, MPO Staff Documents posted to the MPO meeting calendar**

1. *MBTA SFY 2026 National Transit Database: Data Collection and Analysis Work Scope* ([pdf](#)) ([html](#))

Bradley Putnam, MPO staff, presented the work scope for the *MBTA SFY 2026 National Transit Database: Data Collection and Analysis* and stated that MPO staff have supported the MBTA's annual submittals to the National Transit Database for decades. B. Putnam stated that the work has a \$248,000 budget and is scheduled to be completed 18 months from the notice to proceed. B. Putnam discussed the project objectives, which included the following:

- Develop estimates of passenger-miles traveled and unlinked trips for the MBTA's directly operated heavy rail and light rail modes
- Develop estimates of passenger-miles traveled and unlinked trips for the following bus modes:
  - Regularly scheduled purchased-transportation bus routes (MBPT) bus routes
  - Temporary MBPT and directly operated bus (MBDO) shuttle buses substituting for rapid transit
  - Temporary MBPT and MBDO shuttle buses substituting for commuter rail
- Develop an estimate of the average trip length per passenger for commuter rail
- Develop estimates of passenger-miles traveled in each urbanized area served by the MBTA for the following modes:
  - Commuter rail
  - Shuttle buses substituting for commuter rail

**Vote**

A motion to approve the work scope for *MBTA SFY 2026 National Transit Database: Data Collection and Analysis* was made by the City of Boston (J. Rowe) and seconded by the MAPC (E. Bourassa). The motion carried.

**9. Action Item: FFYs 2025-29 TIP Amendment Eleven—Ethan Lapointe, MPO Staff**

***Documents posted to the MPO meeting calendar***

1. FFYs 2025–29 TIP Amendment Eleven ([pdf](#)) ([html](#))

E. Lapointe presented FFYs 2025–29 TIP Amendment Eleven, which included changes to the FFY 2025 Statewide Highway Program and FFY 2025 Transit Program because of FFYs 2026–30 TIP development. Details on these project changes can be found in Tables 1–7.

**Table 1**  
**FFYs 2025–29 TIP Amendment Eleven: FFY 2025 Statewide Highway Program**

Project ID	Change Type	Funding Source	FFYs 2025–29 Budget	FFYs 2026–30 Budget	Difference
86461: Lincoln– Superstructure replacement, L-12-002, Concord Road (Route 126) over MBTA/CSX Railroad	Scope Change, Cost Increase	NGBP	\$12,224,546	\$15,124,384	+\$2,899,838
606901: Boston–Bridge Replacement, B-16-109, River Street Bridge over MBTA/Amtrak	Delay Project	NGBP	\$12,538,835	\$15,711,888	+\$3,173,053
607342: Milton– Intersection Improvements at Route 28 (Randolph Avenue) and Chickatawbut Road	Delay Project	HSIP	\$9,080,341	\$11,597,752	+\$2,517,411

Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization  
Meeting Minutes of April 17, 2025

6

Project ID	Change Type	Funding Source	FFYs 2025–29 Budget	FFYs 2026–30 Budget	Difference
611940: Somerville– Bridge Replacement, S- 17-016 (3GF), Webster Avenue over MBTA and BMRR	Delay Project	NGBP	\$12,958,117	\$17,229,345	+\$4,271,228
608865: Stoneham– Winchester–Deck Replacement, S-27- 008=W-40-030 (2M5), Marble Street over I-93	Remove Project	HIP–BR	\$3,573,558	\$0	-\$3,573,558
613178: Lexington–Deck Replacement, L-10-019 (2DW, 2DX), State Route 2, Concord Turnpike over Pleasant Street	Remove Project	HIP–BR	\$13,006,500	\$0	-\$13,006,500
613638: Boston– Cleaning and Painting, B-16-259, I-93 over MBTA/Columbia Road/Red Line/Relief	Remove Project	HIP–BR	\$20,000,000	\$0	-\$20,000,000

BMRR = Boston and Maine Railroad. FFY = Federal Fiscal Year. HIP–BR = Highway Improvement Program–Bridge. HSIP = Highway Safety Improvement Program. MBTA = Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority. NGBP = Next Generation Bridge Program. TIP = Transportation Improvement Program.

**Table 2**  
**FFYs 2025–29 TIP Amendment Eleven:**  
**FFY 2025 Statewide Highway Program New Projects**

<b>Project ID and Name</b>	<b>Funding Source</b>	<b>Current Budget</b>	<b>New Budget</b>	<b>Difference</b>
S13299: MBTA- Quincy Bus Maintenance Facility (CRP)	CRP	\$0	\$5,896,116	\$5,896,116
S13300: MBTA- Procurement of 40ft Battery Electric Buses (CRP)	CRP	\$0	\$3,616,576	\$3,616,576

CRP = Carbon Reduction Program. FFY = Federal Fiscal Year. MBTA = Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority. TIP = Transportation Improvement Program.

**Table 3**  
**FFYs 2025–29 TIP Amendment Eleven: FFY 2025 Community Transit Grants**

<b>Project ID and Name</b>	<b>Change Type</b>	<b>Funding Source</b>	<b>New Budget</b>
CATA012016: CATA–Transportation to Dialysis Services (Community Transit Grant Program)	New Project	FTA Section 5310	\$261,126
MBTA012022: Greater Lynn Senior Services–MoveSafe/MobilityLinks (Community Transit Grant Program)	New Project	FTA Section 5310	\$98,299
MBTA012023: Mystic Valley Elder Services–Mobility Management (Community Transit Grant Program)	New Project	FTA Section 5310	\$77,754
MBTA012031: Brookline Council on Aging–Senior Transportation Service (Community Transit Grant Program)	New Project	FTA Section 5310	\$100,000

CATA = Cape Ann Transportation Authority. FFY = Federal Fiscal Year. FTA = Federal Transit Administration. MassDOT = Massachusetts Department of Transportation.

**Table 4**  
**FFYs 2025–29 TIP Amendment Eleven: FFY 2025 Transit Program**

<b>Project ID and Name</b>	<b>Change Type</b>	<b>Funding Source</b>	<b>Current Budget</b>	<b>New Budget</b>	<b>Difference</b>
MWRTA011703: MetroWest RTA–Discretionary Smart EV	Remove				
Solar Infrastructure Project	Project	SMART	\$2,500,000	\$0	-\$2,500,000

EV = Electric Vehicle. FFY = Federal Fiscal Year. MWRTA = MetroWest Regional Transit Authority. SMART = Strengthening Mobility and Revolutionizing Transportation. TIP = Transportation Improvement Program.

**Table 5**  
**FFYs 2025–29 TIP Amendment Eleven:**  
**FFYs 2025–29 Transit Program (MBTA Section 5307)**

<b>Project ID and Name</b>	<b>Change Type</b>	<b>Current Budget</b>	<b>New Budget</b>	<b>Difference</b>
12.24.05: Bridge and Tunnel Program	Budget Decrease	\$91,500,000	\$29,250,000	-\$62,250,000
12.12.00: Revenue Vehicle Program	Budget Decrease	\$796,664,308	\$492,355,999	-\$304,308,309
12.63.01: Signals/Systems Program	Budget Increase	\$194,939,431	\$414,198,215	\$219,258,784
12.34.00: Stations and Facilities Program	Budget Increase	\$138,567,313	\$350,429,338	\$211,862,025
FTA Section 5307 FFYs 2025–29 Total		\$1,221,671,052	\$1,286,233,551	\$64,562,499

FFY = Federal Fiscal Year. FTA = Federal Transit Administration. MBTA = Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority. TIP = Transportation Improvement Program.



**Table 6**  
**FFYs 2025–29 TIP Amendment Eleven:**  
**FFYs 2025–29 Transit Program (MBTA Section 5337)**

<b>Project ID and Name</b>	<b>Change Type</b>	<b>Current Budget</b>	<b>New Budget</b>	<b>Difference</b>
12.24.05: Bridge and Tunnel Program	Budget Increase	\$385,026,211	\$411,052,208	\$26,025,997
12.12.00: Revenue Vehicle Program	Budget Increase	\$326,759,844	\$557,789,318	\$231,029,474
12.63.01: Signals/Systems Program	Budget Increase	\$213,000,464	\$322,738,220	\$109,737,756
12.34.00: Stations and Facilities Program	Budget Decrease	\$597,757,064	\$268,040,260	-\$329,716,804
FTA Section 5337				
FFYs 2025–29 Total		\$1,522,543,583	\$1,559,620,005	\$37,076,422

FFY = Federal Fiscal Year. FTA = Federal Transit Administration. MBTA = Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority. TIP = Transportation Improvement Program.

**Table 7**  
**FFYs 2025–29 TIP Amendment Eleven:**  
**FFYs 2025–29 Transit Program (MBTA Other Federal)**

<b>Project ID and Name</b>	<b>Change Type</b>	<b>Funding Source</b>	<b>Current Budget</b>	<b>New Budget</b>	<b>Difference</b>
MBTA011933: MBTA– Quincy Squantum Pier Modernization (FFY 2024 FTA Passenger Ferry)	Cost Increase	FTA Passenger Ferry	\$5,280,308	\$5,415,699	\$135,391
MBTA011939: MBTA– Lynn Broad Street Corridor TSP (CMAQ)	Cost Decrease	CMAQ	\$297,800	\$220,000	-\$77,800
MBTA012036: MBTA– JFK/UMass Station Improvement- Planning (RCP)	New Project	RCP	\$0	\$2,500,000	\$2,500,000
MBTA012037: MBTA– Carbon Reduction Program (FFY 25 CRP)	New Project	CRP	\$0	\$9,512,693	\$9,512,693
MBTA012038: MBTA– Bus Priority and Accessibility	New Project	CMAQ	\$0	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000
MBTA012039: MBTA– MBTA Catamaran Overhaul (CMAQ, FBP)	New Project	CMAQ, FBP	\$0	\$2,634,000	\$2,634,000
MBTA012040: MBTA– Natick Center Station Accessibility (CMAQ)	New Project	CMAQ	\$0	\$2,500,000	\$2,500,000

Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization  
Meeting Minutes of April 17, 2025

11

Project ID and Name	Change Type	Funding Source	Current Budget	New Budget	Difference
MBTA012041: MBTA– Wellesley Square Station Upgrades (CMAQ)	New Project	CMAQ	\$0	\$5,000,000	\$5,000,000
MBTA011927: Everett–Sweetser Circle Project	Shift Funds	RCP	\$1,500,000	\$0	NA
MBTA011928: Lynn– River Works Reimagined	Shift Funds	RCP	\$561,000	\$0	NA
MBTA011935: North Station Draw 1 Bridge Replacement	Shift Funds	NIPA-MEGA	\$354,044,859	\$0	NA
MBTA011934: MBTA Battery Electric Bus Purchase	Shift Funds	FTA LOW-NO	\$47,205,882	\$0	NA
MBTA012041: Alewife Station and Garage Technical Assistance	Shift Funds	IFACGP	\$1,391,600	\$0	NA
MBTA011946: Green Line CIG Core Capacity	Shift Funds	CIG	\$1,883,775,835	\$0	NA

CIG = Capital Investment Grant. CMAQ = Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality. CRP = Carbon Reduction Program. FBP = Ferry Boat Program. FFY = Federal Fiscal Year. FTA = Federal Transit Administration. IFACGP = Innovative Finance and Asset Concession Grant Program. LOW-NO = Low-No Emissions Grant Program. MBTA = Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority. NA = Not Applicable. NIPA-MEGA = National Infrastructure Project Assistance Program “MEGA” Grant. RCP = Reconnecting Communities Program. TSP = Transit Signal Priority. TIP = Transportation Improvement Program.

E. Lapointe stated that there may be an additional request by the MBTA for approximately \$1.1 million for ferryboat capital program funding.

***Discussion***

E. Bourassa asked if board members would get an update on Project 608865, Stoneham–Winchester–Deck replacement, S-27-008=W-40-030 (2M5), Marble Street over I-93; Project 613178, Lexington–Deck replacement, L-10-019 (2DW, 2DX), State Route 2, Concord Turnpike over Pleasant Street; and Project 613638, Boston–Cleaning and Painting, B-16-259, I-93 over MBTA/Columbia Road/Red Line/Relief, which are being removed from the FFYs 2025–29 TIP through the Amendment.

John Bechard, MassDOT Highway Division, stated that the Highway Division is flagging those projects because they are not going to be ready for various reasons, such as changes in permitting, and that the Highway Division will bring them back in the future.

S. Johnston stated that the MBTA was recently alerted that there is approximately \$1.1 million in FFY 2022 Ferryboat Program funding that is available for eligible projects. The funding would need to be obligated by the end of FFY 2025 and the funds will need to be flexed so they can be obligated by that deadline. S. Johnston stated that the MBTA is evaluating potential projects.

J. Rowe asked for clarity on the removal of Project 608865, Stoneham–Winchester–Deck Replacement, S-27-008=W-40-030 (2M5), Marble Street over I-93, Project 613178, Lexington–Deck Replacement, L-10-019 (2DW, 2DX), State Route 2, Concord Turnpike over Pleasant Street, and Project 613638, Boston–Cleaning and Painting, B-16-259, I-93 over MBTA/Columbia Road/Red Line/Relief, from the FFYs 2025–29 TIP, and asked if they were being considered for inclusion in the FFYs 2026–30 TIP.

D. Mohler stated that the state’s Bridge Program is managed at a statewide level and, considering increasing project costs and readiness changes, those three projects are not currently prioritized in the Bridge Program for the next five years.

J. Bechard stated that the Highway Division will present those projects when they have a better understanding of when they can be delivered.

J. Rowe asked for further details on Project 606901, Boston–Bridge Replacement, B-16-109, River Street Bridge over MBTA/Amtrak, which was delayed to FFY 2027.

J. Bechard stated that the Highway Division is coordinating with the MBTA on station improvements, and the bridge was closed. J. Bechard stated that the Highway Division worked with its District Six Regional Office to get repairs made so the bridge could be

reopened and that the bridge is still a priority. The Highway Division is assessing other design options to minimize impacts on the MBTA's station.

J. Rowe offered to follow up to coordinate on the other City of Boston projects in the area. J. Rowe asked for further details on Project 613638, Boston–Cleaning and Painting, B-16-259, I-93 over MBTA/Columbia Road/Red Line/Relief, which was removed from the FFYs 2025–29 TIP.

J. Bechard stated that that project is less urgent. The Highway Division has done some of the repair work for that project and is currently assessing the project's scope.

S. Johnston discussed the status of several projects that had been flagged as unlikely to be obligated in FFY 2025. As a result, the funding was delayed. Currently, these projects have been obligated, partially obligated, or are in the process of being obligated:

- MBTA011934: MBTA Battery Electric Bus Purchase (obligated and in progress)
- MBTA012041: Alewife Station and Garage Technical Assistance (obligated and in progress)
- MBTA011935: North Station Draw 1 Bridge Replacement (partially obligated)

D. Mohler stated that those projects should not be removed from FFY 2025 if the funding has been obligated.

Derek Shooster, MassDOT, asked what year the projects' funds were obligated.

Joshua Klingenstein, MBTA, stated that the funds were obligated in FFY 2025.

### ***Vote***

A motion to release FFYs 2025–29 TIP Amendment Eleven with the addition of approximately \$1.1 million in FFY 2022 MBTA Ferryboat Program funding for a 21-day public comment period was made by the MBTA (S. Johnston) and seconded by the MAPC (E. Bourassa). The motion carried.

## **10. MassDOT Capital Investment Plan (CIP)—Michelle Scott, MassDOT Documents posted to the MPO meeting calendar**

1. State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) Investments Report, Boston Region ([pdf](#)) ([html](#))

Michelle Scott, MassDOT, presented on MassDOT's CIP, including information on the development process and STIP coordination.

M. Scott overviewed MassDOT's CIP, which is a rolling, fiscally constrained, five-year plan that funds the planning, construction, and capital maintenance of the transportation system, including investments in the following:

- Roads and bridges
- Bicycle and pedestrian facilities
- State-funded transit items
- State rail network
- Public use airports
- MassDOT-wide enterprise services
- Registry of Motor Vehicles (RMV)

M. Scott reviewed the CIP's funding sources, which included the following:

- Federal funding
  - Formula funds
  - Discretionary funds
- State funding
  - Bonds and Grant Application Notes
- MassDOT sources
  - Tolls (pay-go capital)
- Other sources, such as municipal and local funds

M. Scott discussed the overlaps in information between the STIP and the CIP. Details on these components can be found in Table 8.

**Table 8**  
**MassDOT CIP and STIP Components**

---

**CIP Components, Including Relevant STIP**

**Components**

**Other STIP Components Not in CIP**

---

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Chapter 90</li><li>• Other Highway Items</li><li>• State-funded MBTA Items</li><li>• Other Planning and Enterprise Services</li><li>• RMV</li><li>• Other Transit</li><li>• Information Technology</li><li>• Rail</li><li>• Aeronautics</li><li>• Federal Highway Funds and State Match for Highway Projects</li><li>• Federal Transit Funds for MassDOT</li><li>• State Match for Federally Funded Transit Projects</li></ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• MBTA Federal Funds and Match for MBTA Projects</li><li>• RTA Federal Funds and Non-state Match for Transit Projects</li><li>• Federal Grants to Local Entities and Non-state Match</li></ul> |
|--|--|
- 

CIP = Capital Investment Plan. MassDOT = Massachusetts Department of Transportation. MBTA = Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority. RMV = Registry of Motor Vehicles. RTA = Regional Transit Authority. STIP = State Transportation Improvement Program.

M. Scott discussed the shared and unique features of the CIP and the STIP. Details on these features can be found in Table 9.

**Table 9**  
**Shared and Unique CIP and STIP Features**

Shared CIP/STIP Features	Unique STIP Features	Unique CIP Features
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Follows shared MassDOT framework and organized by CIP program</li> <li>Fiscally constrained</li> <li>Investments are determined by needs, asset management systems, project scores, and project readiness</li> <li>Reflects decisions by MassDOT planning partners</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reflects federally funded highway and transit investments</li> <li>Organized by federal fiscal year (October to September)</li> <li>Reflects timing of federal obligations (commitments to provide funds) based on project advertisements or awards</li> <li>Final approval by FHWA, FTA, EPA, and DEP</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reflects capital investments using a variety of sources for all modes</li> <li>Organized by SFY</li> <li>Reflects project spending in each year</li> <li>Final approval by MassDOT Board of Directors</li> </ul>

CIP = Capital Investment Plan. DEP = Department of Environmental Protection. EPA = Environmental Protection Agency. FHWA = Federal Highway Administration. FTA = Federal Transit Administration. MassDOT = Massachusetts Department of Transportation. SFY = State Fiscal Year. STIP = State Transportation Improvement Program.

M. Scott reviewed a high-level CIP development timeline and stated that it is a nine-month process that MassDOT conducts on an annual basis beginning in October and ending in June of the following year. M. Scott stated that MassDOT is currently in the final stages of the CIP development process for this year.

M. Scott presented an additional timeline depicting MassDOT's CIP and STIP development process, demonstrating the relationship between how MassDOT compiles information for both the STIP and CIP in tandem.

M. Scott discussed internal and external factors that shaped the CIP development process, which included the information in Table 10.



**Table 10**  
**Factors Shaping CIP Development**

External Factors	Internal Factors
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Federal transportation policy and funding</li><li>• Commonwealth policies and spending plans</li><li>• Evolving travel demands, conditions, and needs, and related impacts to funding sources (toll revenues)</li><li>• Partner agency planning processes</li><li>• Feedback about the CIP collected during public engagement</li><li>• Project readiness and implementation factors</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Healey-Driscoll Administration transportation priorities</li><li>• <i>Beyond Mobility</i>, the statewide-long range plan, and other initiatives included in MassDOT's 15th anniversary, commemorated by three Policy and Strategy Efforts titled "MassDOT @15"</li><li>• Findings and priorities from MassDOT modal and asset management plans</li><li>• MassDOT asset management systems, performance measures (MassDOT Tracker), and project selection criteria</li><li>• Identified process improvements</li></ul>

CIP = Capital Investment Plan. MassDOT = Massachusetts Department of Transportation.

M. Scott discussed *Beyond Mobility*, MassDOT's statewide long-range transportation plan, and how it is shaping this year's CIP. M. Scott stated that MassDOT is incorporating *Beyond Mobility's* priority areas and themes into the CIP, which included the following:

- Safety
- Reliability
- Supporting Clean Transportation
- Resiliency
- Destination Connectivity
- Travel Experience
- Cross-Cutting Theme: Social and Geographic Equity
- Cross-Cutting Theme: Financial and Staff Resources

M. Scott stated that CIP will make connections between *Beyond Mobility* and capital investments through the following strategies:

- Identifying how current CIP programs support *Beyond Mobility* priority areas and address action items

- Continuing existing or advancing new investments that address priority areas and action items

M. Scott presented the proposed CIP's spending. Details of this can be found in Tables 11 and 12.

**Table 11**  
**Proposed FY 2026–30 CIP Spending by Division**

<b>Division or Section</b>	<b>FY 2026–30 Spending (millions)</b>
Aeronautics	\$568.4
Chapter 90 and Rural Roadway Funding Program	\$1,025.0
Highway	\$14,207.0
Information Technology	\$126.4
MBTA	\$1,134.5
Planning, Enterprise Services, and Other	\$488.9
Rail	\$493.9
Registry of Motor Vehicles	\$12.5
Transit	\$369.9
Total	\$18,426.9

CIP = Capital Investment Plan. FY = Fiscal Year. MBTA = Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority.

**Table 12**  
**Top MassDOT CIP Programs by Proposed FY 2026–30 Spending**

<b>Program</b>	<b>FY 2026–30 Spending (millions)</b>
Bridge	\$6,670
Roadway Reconstruction	\$2,230
Cape Cod Bridges	\$1,031
Chapter 90	\$1,000
Non-Interstate Pavement	\$550
Roadway Improvements	\$412
Airport Pavements	\$393
Tunnels	\$387
Bicycle and Pedestrian	\$386
Allston Multimodal	\$377

Notes: This chart does not include Commonwealth-funded MBTA investments. Chapter 90 spending does not include the Rural Roadway Funding Program.

CIP = Capital Investment Plan. FY = Fiscal Year. MBTA = Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority. MassDOT = Massachusetts Department of Transportation.

M. Scott discussed three spending highlights, including Safety, Travel Experience, and Reliability, which are three major priority areas for *Beyond Mobility* and advance asset state of good repair, consistent travel times, improved comfort and navigability, and reduced safety risks, fatalities, and serious injuries. Spending highlights in these categories included the following:

- Safety
  - \$360 million for intersection improvements throughout Massachusetts
  - \$163 million for systematic safety improvements on state-owned roadways
  - \$45 million for projects focused on vulnerable road users
- Travel Experience
  - \$2.6 billion for roadway improvement and reconstruction programs
  - \$558 million for pavement and capital asset needs at public use airports
  - \$228 million for regional transit authority vehicle and facility repairs and upgrades
- Reliability
  - \$6.7 billion for the Bridge Program
  - \$910 million for Interstate and non-Interstate pavement programs
  - \$340 million for rail network improvements for reliable freight and passenger travel

In addition, M. Scott highlighted spending in the Resiliency, Clean Transportation, and Connectivity priority areas. Spending highlights in these categories included the following:

- Resiliency
  - \$112 million for Highway Resiliency Program
  - \$10 million for Advanced Air Mobility Integration Program, which will support resiliency efforts
  - \$10 million for ongoing flood risk assessment activities
- Supporting Clean Transportation
  - \$70 million for support for charging stations along major roadways
  - \$54 million for regional transit authority investments to fund electric vehicles and support infrastructure
- Destination Connectivity
  - \$618 million for shared-use path and on-road improvements for bicycle and pedestrian travel
  - \$222 million for Compass Rail initiative
  - \$120 million for Mobility Assistance Program

- \$17 million for Transportation Management Association Grant Program

M. Scott discussed how MassDOT's CIP supports municipalities and each program's associated spending. Details on these programs can be found in Table 13.

**Table 13**  
**MassDOT FY 2026–30 CIP: Partnerships with Municipalities**

<b>Program</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>FY 2026–30 Spending (millions)</b>
Chapter 90	State aid to municipalities (provided by formula) that supports a variety of roadway improvement projects	\$1,000
Rural Roadway Funding Program	Supplementary state aid (provided by formula that accounts for rurality) for road and bridge improvements	\$25
Complete Streets	Technical assistance and construction funding to eligible municipalities to improve multimodal roadway travel for all users	\$75
Local Bottleneck Reduction	Grants to address congestion bottlenecks at local signalized intersections	\$26
Municipal Pavement	Funding to Improve pavement on municipally owned state numbered routes	\$125
Municipal Small Bridge	Support cities and towns to replace, preserve, or rehabilitate small bridges	\$75.
Safe Routes to School	Funding for infrastructure projects for safe walking and biking to schools	\$59.4
Shared Streets and Spaces	Grants for quick improvements to plazas, sidewalks, curbs, streets, bus stops, parking areas, and other public spaces	\$32.5
<b>Total</b>		<b>\$1,417.9</b>

Notes: Pending legislation would increase Chapter 90 funding to \$300 million per year and the funding would come from Fair Share dollars. Data are as of April 9, 2025, and subject to change. Totals may not sum due to rounding. CIP = Capital Investment Plan. FY = Fiscal Year. MassDOT = Massachusetts Department of Transportation.

M. Scott described some major investment highlights, such as the Cape Cod Bridges Program and the I-90 Allston Multimodal Project in Boston. In addition, M. Scott highlighted aspects of the FY 2026–30 CIP in the Boston region, including roadway and bridge, MBTA, climate and resiliency, active transportation, air transportation, and RTA projects.

M. Scott presented key dates and timelines for current and upcoming CIP activities, including the following:

- April: Ongoing decision-making for CIP investments
  - Executive Office for Administration and Finance is reviewing MassDOT's initial CIP proposals
  - MassDOT continues to coordinate with metropolitan planning organizations and transit agencies to shape the federal-aid program for the CIP and STIP
- May: Requested MassDOT Board of Directors vote to release draft CIP for public review
  - May 21: Requested MassDOT Board of Directors vote to release CIP for public review
- May 22–June 11: Anticipated draft CIP public comment period, including public meetings
- June 18: Requested MassDOT Board of Directors vote to approve final CIP

### ***Discussion***

Nayeli Rodriguez, City of Boston, emphasized the importance of the I-90 Allston Multimodal Project in Boston, specifically its criticality for reconnecting Boston communities and opportunity to improve transit connections. N. Rodriguez stated that there is a lot of necessary work ahead for all parties to ensure that the project's design and plans for future service reflect the City of Boston's and the Boston region's priorities.

## **11. MBTA TIP Projects Overview—Joshua Klingenstein, MBTA**

### ***Documents posted to the MPO meeting calendar***

1. MBTA Projects in FFYs 2025–29 TIP Amendment Eleven and FFYs 2026–30 TIP: Project List and Descriptions ([pdf](#)) ([html](#))
2. Proposed FYs 2026–30 MBTA CIP: Unfunded Requests by CIP Program ([pdf](#)) ([html](#))

J. Klingenstein presented information on the MBTA projects in the FFYs 2025–29 TIP Amendment Eleven, FFYs 2026–30 TIP, and the MBTA's proposed FYs 2026–30 CIP.

J. Klingenstein presented details on the unfunded proposed FYs 2026–30 CIP requests, which totaled to approximately \$12.2 billion requested that could not be accommodated. J. Klingenstein stated that the Guideway, Signal, and Power Program had the highest amount of unfunded funding requests, with \$5.315 billion in unfunded needs. J. Klingenstein stated that the program has a lot of large-scale corridor modernization projects that involve significant and expensive work on track and signal power infrastructure. In addition, the Maintenance and Administrative Facilities, Vehicles, and Structures programs also had high amounts of unfunded need.

J. Klingenstein summarized the FFYs 2025–29 TIP Amendment Eleven, which included \$4.797 billion of future federal funding. The federal funding included \$2.321 billion in FFYs 2025–29 Federal Transit Administration (FTA) formula funding, \$1.9 billion in potential CIG–Core Capacity funding in FFY 2026, and 28 MBTA projects funded by either discretionary grants, transfers, or Congressional earmarks, including \$189 million in discretionary funding for the MBTA’s North Station Draw 1 Bridge Replacement in FFY 2026.

J. Klingenstein summarized the funding for the MBTA in the draft FFYs 2026–30 TIP. J. Klingenstein stated that there is \$4.311 billion of future federal funding in the proposed FFYs 2026–30 TIP, including \$2.215 billion in Sections 5307, 5337, and 5339 FTA formula funding. The FTA formula funding for the MBTA was allocated to large-scale MBTA projects from previous funding cycles, such as the North Station Draw 1 Bridge Replacement. J. Klingenstein stated that \$418 million in new FTA formula funding was allocated this cycle to support various notable projects, including the following projects:

- \$122 million for Procurement of Passenger Locomotives–Future Fleet
- \$37 million for Signal Program–Red/Orange Line
- \$31 million for Hybrid Bus Overhaul (New Flyer XDE40–SR 2011)

J. Klingenstein stated that the MBTA has successfully applied for 22 grant applications, winning more than \$830 million in discretionary funding. J. Klingenstein stated that the MBTA will continue to aggressively pursue funding opportunities to help close the capital funding gap and to supplement traditional formula funding by proactively identifying grant opportunities, identifying a pipeline of competitive projects, and developing strong applications. J. Klingenstein discussed some of the MBTA’s notable grant awards, which included the following:

- \$67.6 million for Accessibility Improvements for Green Line B and C Branches

- \$472 million awarded to support the North Station Draw 1 Bridge Replacement project
- \$156 million (\$40 million in FFY 2025) for the purchase of battery-electric buses

J. Klingenstein advocated for a vote to release the transit elements of the draft FFYs 2026–30 TIP, which includes MBTA projects, for a 21-day public comment period.

### ***Discussion***

L. Diggins asked why the number of submitted grant applications does not match the sum of the grant awards received and unsuccessful grant applications.

J. Klingenstein stated it may be due to pending grant applications. He offered to check with the MBTA's discretionary grants team.

L. Diggins asked for additional commentary on the effect of the significant unfunded portion of the MBTA's Guideway, Signal, and Power Program.

J. Klingenstein did not state any specific impacts but emphasized that the significant level of unfunded need does threaten system reliability if left unaddressed. However, J. Klingenstein stated that the MBTA is making significant investments through the Track Improvement Program.

Jay Monty, City of Everett, stated that the MPO board has committed funding to advancing regional rail service and short-term actions to support the electrification of regional rail, and asked if any elements of the CIP support the electrification of the regional rail.

J. Klingenstein confirmed that the CIP contains elements that support the electrification of regional rail, noting that those elements may not appear in the TIP since they are not federally funded. J. Klingenstein stated that the MBTA is engaged in a partnership with Keolis Commuter Services to deliver battery-electric service on the Fairmount Line by 2028. In addition, J. Klingenstein summarized other early action items to advance the electrification of the regional rail.

J. Rowe expressed the following sentiments:

- Support for the MBTA's investments in state of good repair and service expansion
- The City of Boston will continue to advocate for additional funding resources and attention to be spent on improvements for bus riders, specifically bus stops and transit signal priority, citing the disproportionate nature of funding for the MBTA's

bus system and riders; bus riders are approximately 40 percent of the MBTA's ridership and bus projects receive approximately 11 percent of CIP funding

- Encouragement to progress the Arborway Bus Maintenance Facility project, which is essential to the MBTA's climate goals and the City of Boston's housing production goals
- Appreciation for the inclusion of flood protection for rapid transit tunnels
- The City of Boston remains eager and committed to partnering with the MBTA in any helpful capacity
- Support for the electrification of the regional rail network, and encouragement for the MBTA to pursue this initiative more aggressively
- Support for investment in the MBTA's layover facilities, but encouragement for additional near-term progress and larger investment in the MBTA's Widett Circle layover facility for the MBTA's commuter rail, including a comprehensive campus planning process in coordination with the City of Boston
- Noted that the Red–Blue Connector project is not programmed for additional comprehensive engineering work; the project is a priority for the City of Boston as it would connect all four subway lines, significantly expand access for Blue Line riders, reduce pressure on other transfer stations in downtown Boston, and provide critical operational flexibility
- Appreciation for the MBTA's work to maintain and modernize a legacy system, noting that the City of Boston is ready to partner with and support the MBTA

## **12. Action Item: Draft FFYs 2026–30 TIP Document, Release for Public Review—*Ethan Lapointe, MPO Staff***

### ***Documents posted to the MPO meeting calendar***

1. Draft FFYs 2026–30 TIP Document ([pdf](#)) ([html](#))
2. Draft FFYs 2026–30 TIP Document Appendices ([pdf](#)) ([html](#))
3. Draft FFYs 2026–30 TIP Executive Summary and Translations ([html](#))

E. Lapointe presented the Draft FFYs 2026–30 TIP document and development process, which included an overview of public engagement, and a summary of the FFYs 2026–30 TIP's Regional Target Program and development process.

### ***Public Engagement***

E. Lapointe stated that Appendix C of the Draft FFYs 2026–30 TIP document details public comments received during TIP development. Table C-1 lists public comments, which include 77 comments that MPO staff received from stakeholders regarding general TIP development. There were 68 comments on specific projects and 25 formal comment letters. These comments did not include letters of support submitted for consideration during the TIP project scoring process.



E. Lapointe summarized the main themes that emerged from the public comments, which included funding uncertainty, specifically related to delays and advocacy for inclusion of projects, safety, and transit. Themes of safety and transit emerged from the public through MPO staff's public engagement, which focused on information, education, and encouragement.

E. Lapointe discussed process improvements related to information sharing, specifically related to the TIP Process, Engagement, and Readiness Committee's contributions to developing recommendations for TIP challenges and objectives. New MPO staff-conducted information gathering exercises included the following:

- Quarterly readiness updates
- Subregional readiness days
- Expanded project information requests from proponents
- Reintroduction of TIP Office Hours

E. Lapointe stated that MPO staff broadened their encouragement strategy during this past TIP development process, which increased awareness and interest about the TIP through the development of the TIP Universe of Projects and MAPC's subregional engagement to encourage project applications and updates, and build external awareness around MPO opportunities. Opportunities highlighted included the following:

- Community Planning Lab
- Direct community engagement
- Meeting with peer MPOs, regional transportation partners, and advocacy organizations

E. Lapointe stated that the FFYs 2026–30 TIP reflects continued improvement and growth in communication and coordination about projects, but it also presents new potential opportunities to be pursued using MPO Regional Target funding and raises additional difficult questions that will be navigated through the FFYs 2027–31 TIP development process.

### ***Today's Objective***

E. Lapointe stated that the objective for today's agenda item is to release the Draft FFYs 2026–30 TIP for a 30-day public review period through a vote, which will also allow for a Quarterly Readiness Update at the MPO board meeting on May 15, 2025, to discuss changes to the Draft FFYs 2026–30 TIP document. In addition, E. Lapointe stated that the TIP Process, Engagement, and Readiness Committee will hold a meeting following the MPO board meeting on May 15, 2025, which will include a discussion of the development process and quarterly readiness.

***FFYs 2026-30 TIP Summary***

E. Lapointe stated that the FFYs 2026–30 TIP represents substantial growth across all of its programs, including an increase from \$6.4 billion to \$10.3 billion of federally funded transportation investments, which is largely due to the addition of the MBTA Core Capacity Funding program. Details of the TIP’s programs and funding for each can be found in Table 14.

**Table 14**  
**FFYs 2026–30 TIP Funding by Program**

<b>Program</b>	<b>FFYs 2026–30 TIP Funding</b>	<b>Percentage of FFYs 2026–30 TIP Funding</b>
Boston Region MPO Target	\$754,169,752	7%
MassDOT Statewide Highway	\$1,808,169,896	18%
MBTA Projects	\$3,811,502,148	37%
MBTA Core Capacity Funding	\$3,800,580,887	37%
CATA and MWRTA Projects	\$144,920,000	1%

CATA = Cape Ann Transportation Authority. FFY = Federal Fiscal Year. MassDOT = Massachusetts Department of Transportation. MBTA = Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority. MWRTA = MetroWest Regional Transit Authority. TIP = Transportation Improvement Program.

E. Lapointe stated that the FFYs 2026–30 TIP Regional Target Program funds 58 projects, 19 of which are new. E. Lapointe stated that there are fewer projects funded in the FFYs 2026–30 TIP Regional Target Program compared to the previous program, which is due to the previous TIP’s Community Connections Program and design pilot. E. Lapointe stated that among the 19 new projects, there are seven Community Connections projects, one trail project, one Complete Streets project, three Transit Transformation projects, five design projects, and two administrative line items.

E. Lapointe discussed the FFYs 2026–30 TIP Regional Target Program’s investments as they relate to the Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) Investment Program, which included the details that can be found in Table 15.

**Table 15**  
**FFYs 2026–30 TIP Regional Target Program Investments in Relation to LRTP Investment Program**

<b>TIP Program</b>	<b>Relationship to LRTP Investment Program Target</b>
Complete Streets Program	On Target
Major Infrastructure Program	Greater
Intersection Improvements Program	Substantially Lower
Bicycle Network and Pedestrian Connections Program	Greater
Transit Transformation Program	Lower
Community Connections Program	Slightly Lower
Bikeshare Support Program	On Target
Administrative	NA
Unprogrammed	NA

Note: The LRTP does not allocate to program targets for administrative funding line items or unprogrammed funds. FFY = Federal Fiscal Year. LRTP = Long-Range Transportation Plan. NA = Not Applicable. TIP = Transportation Improvement Program.

E. Lapointe stated that the reason why the TIP funding for the Major Infrastructure Program is higher than the LRTP target and the Intersection Improvements Program is much lower is specifically due to reclassifying Project 605857, Norwood–Intersection Improvements at Route One and University Avenue/Everett Street, from the Intersection Improvements Program to the Major Infrastructure Program.

E. Lapointe stated that there is an administrative set-aside of Regional Target Program funding for a design pilot and the procurement of air quality sensors.

In addition, E. Lapointe stated that six percent of Regional Target Program funding is unprogrammed.

E. Lapointe presented Regional Target Program funding by MAPC subregion.

E. Lapointe stated that the 58 projects are spread across 36 communities and compared the percentage of funding to percentage of population in the Boston region. Details of these comparisons can be found in Table 16.

**Table 16**  
**FFYs 2026–30 TIP Regional Target Program Investments by MAPC Subregion**

MAPC Subregion	Percent of Target Funding FFYs	
	2026–30	Percent of Population
Inner Core	56.02%	53%
MAGIC	1.17%	5.5%
MetroWest	5.47%	7%
SWAP	4.62%	5%
NSTF	11.87%	9%
SSC	5.02%	7%
NSPC	7.45%	6%
TRIC	8.37%	8%

FFY = Federal Fiscal Year. MAGIC = Minuteman Advisory Group on Interlocal Coordination. MAPC = Metropolitan Area Planning Council. NSPC = North Suburban Planning Council. NSTF = North Shore Task Force. SSC = South Shore Coalition. SWAP = SouthWest Advisory Planning Committee. TRIC = Three Rivers Interlocal Council. TIP = Transportation Improvement Program.

E. Lapointe stated that the Draft FFYs 2026–30 TIP document does not currently include Appendix G, the Operations and Maintenance Summary for RTAs and MassDOT.

E. Lapointe stated that changes to project costs or timelines may be addressed between the draft and final TIP, but any changes will be conveyed to MPO members as early as May 15, 2025, and subject to MPO approval on June 5, 2025. Potential project changes could include reconsideration of either removed projects or unfunded projects.

In addition, E. Lapointe stated that any program changes would result in revisions throughout the TIP document.

E. Lapointe reviewed the unresolved challenges that emerged in the TIP development process, which will likely return in development of the FFYs 2027–31 TIP. These challenges included the following:

- Discussions on TIP scenarios did not fully address delay risks for projects programmed as early as FFY 2026
  - Substantial cost risks persist across all five years of the program
- Many projects lack timely design submissions and recent scores
  - MPO staff still lack detailed descriptions of several projects
- TIP application volumes are increasing

- Reinforced by programming strategy and availability of design funds
- The FFYs 2026–30 TIP funds fewer projects in fewer communities than the FFYs 2025–29 TIP

### ***Discussion***

E. Bourassa asked a clarifying question regarding any motions or changes to the draft document.

Tom Bent, Inner Core Committee (City of Somerville), stated that given the additional information from the City of Chelsea earlier in the presentation, he had planned to make a motion to include Project 611983, City of Chelsea–Park Street and Pearl Street Reconstruction, in the FFY 2030 element of the draft TIP document; but, he offered to wait to make that motion until the MPO board meeting on June 5, 2025.

L. Diggins asked for further information about what will be on the agenda of the MPO board meeting on May 15, 2025, and what the TIP Process, Engagement, and Readiness Committee's role will be at that point.

E. Lapointe stated that the committee meeting following the MPO board meeting on May 15, 2025, is meant to provide additional detail on discussions during the MPO board meeting's Quarterly Readiness Update and to debrief on the FFYs 2026–30 TIP development process.

L. Diggins asked about ways in which the committee could have an impact on the FFYs 2026–30 TIP, such as by proposing changes to the document based on public comments.

E. Lapointe responded that that is possible, but decisions on any scenarios would not be made until June 5, 2025.

E. Bourassa suggested that MPO staff bring information from the committee meeting to the full board; however, he noted that significant changes are not usually made at that time.

J. Monty expressed support for including Project 611983, City of Chelsea–Park Street and Pearl Street Reconstruction, in the FFY 2030 element of the FFYs 2026–30 TIP and stated that the project sets a good example for other potential applicants.

David Koses, City of Newton, expressed support for the inclusion of Project 611983, City of Chelsea–Park Street and Pearl Street Reconstruction, in the FFY 2030 element of the FFYs 2026–30 TIP.

J. Rowe expressed support for the inclusion of Project 611983, City of Chelsea–Park Street and Pearl Street Reconstruction, in the FFY 2030 element of the FFYs 2026–30 TIP and asked if it would be helpful to MPO staff if a board member made a motion to add the project to the draft document that will be presented to the board on June 5, 2025.

E. Lapointe stated that MPO staff could accommodate that motion.

D. Shooster expressed support for the inclusion of Project 611983, City of Chelsea–Park Street and Pearl Street Reconstruction, in the FFY 2030 element of the FFYs 2026–30 TIP.

### ***Vote***

A motion to release the Draft FFYs 2026–30 TIP document for a 30-day public comment period was made by the Advisory Council (L. Diggins) and seconded by the Town of Brookline (Erin Chute). The motion carried.

### **13. Vision Zero Update—Ali Kleyman, MPO Staff**

Ali Kleyman, MPO staff, presented the Vision Zero Action Plan’s project timeline, including the following key dates and milestones:

- January–March 2025
  - Second Task Force meeting
  - Share draft High-Injury and High-Risk Networks with municipalities
  - Policy and process research and interviews
- April–June 2025
  - Three MPO meetings; two task force meetings
  - Finalize existing conditions
  - Recommend policies, strategies, projects
  - Focus groups, state agency interviews, and municipal roundtables
  - Release draft Safety Action Plan
- July 2025 and beyond
  - Fourth MPO meeting
  - Public review of action plan
  - Continued engagement
  - MPO to endorse final Safety Action Plan
  - Continued definition of projects
  - Planning and implementation of demonstration projects
  - Progress reporting

A. Kleyman discussed the traditional approach to transportation safety compared to the Vision Zero approach, which views traffic deaths as preventable and integrates human failing into its approach.

A. Kleyman discussed the data analysis MPO staff have conducted, which demonstrated that the Boston region has experienced a decline in the number of fatal crashes over the last 40 years. However, there was a 47 percent increase in fatal crashes between 2018 and 2022. In addition, A. Kleyman stated that analyses have shown that there are significant economic impacts due to fatal and serious injury crashes with a cost of approximately \$19 million for each fatal crash and a total of \$12 billion for all fatal and serious injury crashes between 2018 and 2022.

A. Kleyman stated that while passenger vehicles are involved in the greatest number of fatal and serious injury crashes in the region, trucks and motorcycles have the highest rate of fatal and serious injury crashes based on their vehicle-miles traveled, demonstrating a disproportionate amount of fatal and serious crashes that involve trucks and motorcycles.

A. Kleyman stated that municipally owned roads have the highest number of fatal and serious injury crashes, but state-owned roads experience a disproportionately high number of these crashes relative to mileage.

A. Kleyman discussed the use of land-use data in MPO staff's analyses and stated that commercial areas have a higher number of fatal and serious injury crashes involving vulnerable road users, and commercial and residential areas have high amounts of fatal and serious injury crashes involving light trucks.

In addition to analyzing types of crashes and locations, MPO staff analyzed crashes by a subset of Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) Emphasis Areas, which included the following areas:

- Intersections
- Lane Departure
- Vulnerable Road Users
- Older Drivers
- Large Vehicles
- Speeding

A. Kleyman stated that MPO staff selected this subset based on two factors:

- Whether the fatal and serious injury crashes in the emphasis area were higher in the Boston region when compared to those types of crashes in the Commonwealth
- Whether the percent change in fatal and serious injury crashes from 2018–22 was higher in the Boston region when compared to those types of crashes in the Commonwealth

A. Kleyman stated that data analyses also focused on understanding trends at subregional and municipal levels. Notable changes at the subregional level included increases in crashes in the Southwest Advisory Planning Committee (SWAP), North Suburban Planning Council (NSPC), and South Shore Coalition (SSC) areas, and decreases in the North Shore Task Force (NSTF) and Three Rivers Interlocal Council (TRIC) areas.

Initial findings at the municipal level included the following:

- Out of the top 10 municipalities with fatal and serious injury crashes, those with the highest number of fatal and serious injuries have had decreasing numbers of crashes in recent years while those municipalities with lower numbers have had increasing numbers of crashes
- The municipalities with the highest fatal and serious injury crash rates are mostly suburban-style municipalities on the outer edges of the region

A. Kleyman presented the ten municipalities with the highest numbers of fatal and serious injury crashes and the ten municipalities with the highest fatal and serious injury crash rates and stated that the Cities of Lynn and Chelsea appear on both lists.

A. Kleyman discussed the development of the High-Injury Network (HIN). Staff use data to determine the most problematic locations to focus resources on to improve safety. A. Kleyman stated that MPO staff developed a scoring approach to determine the top five percent of high-injury roads in the region, in each subregion, and in each municipality.

A. Kleyman presented the following findings from the HIN:

- 58 percent of all fatal and serious injury crashes occur on seven percent of road miles
- 56 percent of roadways on the HIN are owned by municipalities; 41 percent are owned by the state
- 90 percent of roadways on the HIN are principal or minor arterials; ten percent are collectors and local roads



A. Kleyman summarized the engagement plan for the Safety Action Plan, including what has been completed, feedback received, and future engagement, all of which have municipal, state, and public engagement efforts. A. Kleyman stated that MPO staff have conducted two surveys, one municipal survey and one public survey. A. Kleyman stated that staff received responses to the municipal survey from 36 municipalities, and the main safety concerns that emerged included poor or missing sidewalks and bike lanes, speeding, and distracted driving. In the public survey, MPO staff received responses from members of the public in 58 municipalities and 761 total responses. Feedback from survey responses included types of infrastructure and driver behaviors that make people feel safe or unsafe.

### ***Discussion***

J. Rowe expressed appreciation for all the work and effort that went into providing the MPO board with an update on the project.

Logan Casey, Town of Marblehead, expressed appreciation for the opportunity to be involved with the engagement process and asked if municipalities that plan to rely on the MPO's action plan would be eligible to apply for the FFY 2025 Safe Streets and Roads for All (SS4A) Implementation grant program using the draft action plan that is scheduled for July 2025.

A. Kleyman stated that municipalities are eligible for the SS4A Planning and Demonstration grant but staff would have to check about the Implementation grant.

### **14. Members' Items**

There were none.

### **15. Adjourn**

A motion to adjourn was made by the Inner Core Committee (T. Bent) and seconded by the City of Boston (J. Rowe). 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 Brookline)	Erin Chute
City of Boston	Jen Rowe
	Nayeli Rodriguez
Federal Highway Administration	Ken Miller
	Anthony Jones
Inner Core Committee (City of Somerville)	Tom Bent
	Brad Rawson
Massachusetts Department of Transportation (MassDOT)	David Mohler
	John Bechard
	Chris Klem
MassDOT Highway Division	John Romano
Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority (MBTA)	Laura Gilmore
	Sandy Johnston
Massachusetts Port Authority	Sarah Lee
MBTA Advisory Board	Hanna Switekowski
Metropolitan Area Planning Council (MAPC)	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
Regional Transportation Advisory Council	Lenard Diggins
Regional Transportation Authorities (MetroWest Regional Transit Authority)	Tyler Terrasi
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

---

<b>Other Attendees</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>
Srilekha Murthy	BETA Group, Inc.
Casey Woodley	Cambridge Systematics, Inc.
Bill Deignan	City of Cambridge
Ben Cares	City of Chelsea
Fidel Maltez	City of Chelsea
Elena Proakis Ellis	City of Melrose
Samira Saad	FHWA
Richard Kosian	Friends of the Lynnfield Rail Trail
Patricia Cahill	MassDOT
Andrew Wang	MassDOT
Arnav Chatterjee	MassDOT
Barbara Lachance	MassDOT
Ben Muller	MassDOT
Caleb Plummer	MassDOT
Cheryll-Ann Senior	MassDOT
Derek Shooster	MassDOT
Jonathan Church	MassDOT
Katherine Duffy	MassDOT
Kayla Sousa	MassDOT
Lauren Richmond	MassDOT
Lyris Liautaud	MassDOT
Melissa Santley	MassDOT
Michelle Scott	MassDOT
Miranda Briseño	MassDOT
Patricia Cahill	MassDOT
Sarah Bradbury	MassDOT
Stephanie Abundo	MassDOT
Ed Luna	MBTA
Glenn Geiler	MBTA
Jim Tarr	MBTA
Josh Weiland	MBTA
Joshua Klingenstein	MBTA
Josh Ostroff	MBTA
Rick Azzalina	Stantec
Dan Albert	Streetsblog Massachusetts
Aleida Leza	Town of Belmont
Darin Takemoto	Town of Belmont
Meghan McNamara	Town of Lexington

---

<b>Other Attendees</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>
Bob Wolf	Town of Lincoln, Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Committee
Logan Casey	Town of Marblehead
Marcia Rasmussen	Town of Sudbury
Sheila Page	Town of Wellesley
Paul Cobuzzi	

---

---

**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  
Dorcas Okaidjah  
Elena Ion  
Erin Maguire  
Ethan Lapointe  
Gina Perille  
Hiral Gandhi  
Jia Huang  
Joe Delorto  
Lauren Magee  
Meghan O'Connor  
Olivia Saccocia  
Priyanka Chapekar  
Rebecca Morgan  
Rose McCarron  
Sam Taylor  
Sean Rourke  
Seth Strumwasser  
Shravanthi Gopalan Narayanan  
Stella Jordan

---

## 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](http://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](mailto:civilrights@ctps.org)

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