



Srilekha Murthy <smurthy@ctps.org>

[Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) Feedback] Bike parking and other comments

1 message

Boston Region MPO <drupaluser@ctps.org>
Reply-To: c.raineyslavick@gmail.com
To: upwp@ctps.org

Tue, Jun 27, 2023 at 8:07 AM

Cole Rainey-Slavick (not verified) (c.raineyslavick@gmail.com) sent a message using the contact form at <https://www.bostonmpo.org/contact/upwp>.

The sender's name
Cole Rainey-Slavick

The sender's email
c.raineyslavick@gmail.com

Your ZIP code
02145

Subject
Bike parking and other comments

Message
Hello,

Reading through the Unified Planning Work Program I am pleased to see a Bicycle and Pedestrian Planning Program established, although I would encourage you to consider increasing its budget as it is currently dwarfed by the scale of ongoing work and need in the bicycle network. I would also suggest you include bike parking within this committee's mandate and integrate that planning into all discussions and decisions around parking more broadly (including in the Lab and Municipal Parking study). I am also pleased to see continued funding of the Climate Resilience Program. I would, however, urge you to consider refocusing the committee away from simply protecting existing infrastructure from vulnerabilities to climate change to also considering how existing infrastructure contributes to exacerbating those vulnerabilities and developing strategies for mitigation or transformation. This should include factors such as the contribution of vehicle emissions to climate change and local air quality issues, the way excessive road space and lack of tree cover magnify urban heat island effect, the way impermeable surfaces contribute to flooding and a lack of ability to replenish groundwater, the risk of highways in creating forest and brushfires, etc. True climate resilience must go beyond protecting what currently exists; it should focus instead on developing regenerative infrastructure.

Thank you for your time and consideration,
Cole Rainey-Slavick

Srilekha Murthy <smurthy@ctps.org>

[Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) Feedback] Work plan schedules

1 message

Boston Region MPO <drupaluser@ctps.org>

Thu, Jun 29, 2023 at 11:54 AM

Reply-To: JW5551936@gmail.com

To: upwp@ctps.org

JAMES F WHITE (not verified) (JW5551936@GMAIL.COM) sent a message using the contact form at <https://www.ctps.org/contact/upwp>.

The sender's name
JAMES F WHITE

The sender's email
JW5551936@GMAIL.COM

Your ZIP code
02136

Subject
Work plan schedules

Message
Can you accelerate you work plan schedules if need be as they are doing on the Green Line section of tracks?



Srilekha Murthy <smurthy@ctps.org>

[Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) Feedback] Public Level 1 EV Charging access along city streets

1 message

Boston Region MPO <drupaluser@ctps.org>

Thu, Jun 29, 2023 at 11:43 AM

Reply-To: mrossbloom@gmail.com

To: upwp@ctps.org

Ross Bloom (not verified) (mrossbloom@gmail.com) sent a message using the contact form at <https://www.ctps.org/contact/upwp>.

The sender's name
Ross Bloom

The sender's email
mrossbloom@gmail.com

Your ZIP code
02481

Subject
Public Level 1 EV Charging access along city streets

Message

The Program should incorporate some planning studies and gather community input on the possibility of having publicly available Level 1 EV charging on public street curbsides, for residents of city neighborhoods that rely on street parking. This is a potential way to unlock resources and access for currently underserved communities wherever residents rely on street parking. Since Americans do 80+% of their EV charging at home, we need to figure out a way to provide equitable access to an experience that feels like home charging, to those that live in cities and/or rely on street parking and can't set up a charger in a driveway or garage. Current public charging projects are focused on Level 2 and Supercharging but these are very expensive solutions, difficult to implement in urban neighborhoods, and add immense stress to electrical grids. Just focusing on Level 2 and Supercharging is leaving residents of many city neighborhoods behind and causing delays in building out this critical infrastructure. Many cities and towns in the MPO could benefit from this type of infrastructure. If you work with the right stakeholders and connect Level 1 chargers directly onto utility poles, then you can deploy hundreds of these kinds of chargers for much less than any Level 2 or Supercharger out there. Urban dwellers tend to drive less than suburbanites for whom the current EV infrastructure is being disproportionately designed (for example, the average resident of Washington DC drives only ~20 miles a day). Level 1 can charge 30+ miles overnight while the driver sleeps, and can be part of a solution if placed near enough to people's homes (i.e. within a 5 min walk) and paired with other available fast charging. Many urban dwellers that want to adopt

EV but are worried about charging access are also opting for plug-in hybrids for which Level 1 is a more than sufficient solution.

This area of opportunity isn't being given enough attention or serious consideration and we are missing a chance to quickly address a significant gap in access and equity in electric vehicle infrastructure. I hope that the Program can dedicate some resources to considering the option of Level 1 Public Charging.

Full disclosure, my passion for this topic is partly related to a startup business I founded here in Massachusetts to address this Public Level 1 EV charging need. I am happy to discuss further with the Program team as I have some additional research input I can provide on the topic.

Public Level 1 Charging accessibility on curbsides in inner city neighborhoods can address the following stated goals of the Program:

- Eliminate harmful environmental, health, and safety effects of the transportation system on people in disadvantaged communities.
- Prioritize investments that address air pollution and environmental burdens experienced by disadvantaged and vulnerable communities.
- Support transit vehicle electrification and use of electric vehicles throughout the transportation system to reduce greenhouse gases and other air pollutants.

Thank you,
Ross Bloom

REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COUNCIL



July 7, 2023

David Mohler, Chair
Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization
10 Park Plaza, Suite 4150
Boston, MA 02116

RE: Comments on the Draft Unified Planning Work Program for FFY 2024

Dear Mr. Mohler,

We, the Regional Transportation Advisory Council (RTAC) for the Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), also known as the "Advisory Council," herein offer our comments on the FFY2024 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP). We focus our comments on three aspects of the UPWP: (1) the process by which the four discrete studies were chosen, (2) our thoughts about the discrete studies that were selected, and (3) the programs that support the 3C process.

The Process

First, the fact that we saw perhaps the largest universe of projects ever submitted which then yielded a superb array of "finalists," is a testament to the effectiveness of public outreach this cycle, and it is in stark contrast to the fact the MPO was able to fund only four studies due to the availability of just \$150K for discrete studies. That the UPWP Committee was able to fund even four studies is proof of their commitment to making it possible for the MPO to maximize the nature and extent of its research. It would have been very easy for the UPWP Committee to have chosen only two studies; however, with the adjustment of scopes, not only more, but also more diverse studies were chosen. We applaud the UPWP Committee for this effort, and we encourage it to continue this approach.

Still, we must note again that \$150K is a very small amount, and that has led to the smallest number of discrete studies by far over the last 8 years. We request that the MPO explain to the public in the final version of the UPWP why the available funds for discrete studies is so low this year. We also strongly suggest that the MPO staff and the UPWP Committee review the entire universe of study proposals for this cycle as an informal survey of the interests and concerns of highly-engaged residents and organizations in our region.

The Selected Studies *

1. Lab and Municipal Parking Phase II

Given the large amount of research in the life sciences in our region and the expectation that such will continue to be the case for the foreseeable future, we support research into the factors that affect parking at those facilities and the role that parking plays in the ways that employees commute to those facilities. The continuity ranging from the MAPC's "Perfect Fit" parking study released in 2019 to last year's Phase I of this study should make the results of this study insightful and useful.

2. Parking in Bike Lanes: Strategies for Safety and Prevention

Beyond the paramount goal of making cycling safer, we hope that the strategies that emerge from this study will also make pedestrian street crossing(s) safer, bus trips more reliable, and freight delivery more efficient for both the haulers and the receiving businesses. We encourage staff to explore holistic, novel, and even experimental approaches toward finding solutions.

3. Strategies for Environmental Outreach and Engagement

We strongly support the purpose, approach, and goal of this study. We also feel that this should be an ongoing effort by the MPO that extends far beyond one year. Our main concern with making this comment, however, is that the amount of funds available for discrete studies next year will be decreased by \$25K.

4. Applying Conveyal to TIP Project Scoring

We are very enthusiastic about the potential for this study. Its connection to a study done in 2022 as well an approach that involves working with other MPO regions exemplifies the comprehensive and cooperative qualities that make up the 3C process. This is the kind of study that could indeed have wide-ranging and long-lasting effects on the ways in which we select projects for the TIP and hopefully help us better determine the projects to which we provide technical assistance in hopes that the region can create a pipeline of projects that support the MPO's Long Range Transportation Plan.

Programs that Support the 3C Process

Before commenting on specific programs, we note that overall we are pleased with the quality of the programs that are devoted to supporting the 3C progress. In this document, we appreciate Table 3-1 which lists the budget, work progress, and products for FFY2023 alongside those proposed for FFY2024. The additional explanation provided later Chapter 3 add valuable details and explanations.

1. Climate Resilience Program

Of the seven items listed, we highlight the following:

- Develop text and material to create a resilience-focused page on the MPO's website
- Review usability, data needs, outputs, and credibility of vulnerability assessment tools and develop a plan for assessment of Boston region transportation assets of interest to the MPO
- Evaluate resilience and environmental TIP criteria and adjust as necessary to successfully invest in resilience-focused projects

2. Freight Planning Support

Of the seven items listed, we highlight the following:

- Freight planning roadmap
- Develop a program to coordinate freight and land use in the Boston MPO region
- Develop a dashboard with freight infrastructure in the region

3. Roadway Model Enhancement

Of the seven items listed, we highlight the following:

- Conduct exploratory analysis to demonstrate TDM23 capabilities and identify needs for enhancements
- Develop a post-pandemic model base year calibrated to most recent roadway and transit data

4. Data Program

Of the four items listed, we highlight the following:

- Develop data publication standards and explore new methods for sharing data publicly
- Research new data sources and analytic techniques

5. *Bicycle and Pedestrian Program*

Of the five items listed, we highlight the following:

- Update how gaps are identified in the Boston region bicycle network
- Evaluate regional intersections and roadways using the Pedestrian Report Card Assessment and Bicycle Report Card tools

Also under this program we are pleased to read that the MPO “will officially establish the Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee and convene the first full year of committee meetings” in FFY24

6. *Multimodal Mobility Infrastructure Program*

Of the seven items listed, we highlight the following

- Multimodal mobility infrastructure program roadmap
- Guidebook(s) to support multimodal infrastructure studies

To be clear, we find all items in each program worthy of being listed as a work product and/or a goal to which the MPO should progress. Our highlights primarily reflect our enthusiasm and our sense of priority and importance.

Finally, we close by expressing our gratitude for the data on the geographic distribution of UPWP studies and technical analysis presented in Appendix D. We strongly agree with the recommendations for uses of that data and the conclusion that “analyses such as these would provide the MPO with a clearer understanding of how the work programmed through the UPWP addresses the needs of the region.”

We offer these comments in good faith, and we look forward to discussing them more with you as well as working with you and the MPO Board in the upcoming year.

Respectfully,
The Advisory Council

* As is often the case, there is a diversity of opinions in our group that leads to a healthy and enlightening dialogue. Below, we offer the verbatim comments of one of our members that also reflect the thoughts of other Advisory Council Members:

“Contrary to the Staff’s recommendation...R-1 should be the Resiliency study because, unlike R-2, it is actionable, timely and needed in The Commonwealth to help save lives. R-2 is a communication issue which is a “nice to know” internal knowledge problem; it is somewhat actionable but is one which an unfunded study or conference can identify, if it becomes a more quantified (versus weighted to qualitative) study; R-2 is not worth sacrificing R-1. R-1 better and directly addresses the LRTP objectives.

Otherwise, to me the two Transit studies (T-3 & T-5) should be the remaining focus and both should be included because they address two important and vital issues confronting **Transit**...the key aspect of any improvement to the state’s long-term mobility, access, and inclusionary efforts.

M-1 is a good study but given the constantly changing dynamics of MA commercial real estate, there are too many moving parts in this evolving Lab Building situation...premature situation and many aspects that are in play outside the Core City...to make this study actionable at this point. Consulting the BPDA Transportation Section regarding Article 80 Lab Buildings and their traffic studies would be helpful...plus BPDA and BTM will develop the actions and policies for Labs.

TE-1 should not be included. This study of “Conveyal” is the Staff’s ‘pet’ app for internal experimentation

for scoring TIP selections on Equity. It might be appropriate, but it should not take up budget and attention from other worthy actionable studies that would better the Commonwealth. TE-1 should actually be funded and fielded either as part of the Staff's discretionary budget OR funded outside UPWP as part of the TIP budget...as a tool to assist TIP planning.

The comments are in reference to this list of proposed studies:

https://www.bostonmpo.org/data/calendar/pdfs/2023/0420_UPWP_Universe_Ranking_Survey_Results.pdf



Maura Healey, Governor
Kimberley Driscoll, Lieutenant Governor
Gina Fiandaca, Secretary & CEO
Phillip Eng, General Manager & CEO



Srilekha Murthy
UPWP Manager, Central Transportation Planning Staff
10 Park Plaza Suite 2150, Boston, MA 02116

Dear Ms. Murthy,

The MBTA is pleased to congratulate MPO staff on the publication of the draft Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2024 UPWP, and to offer the following comments:

- We compliment staff on the refreshed and impressive visual look of the UPWP, including more diverse and interesting images.
- MBTA is thrilled to see inclusion of the Climate Resilience Program, and look forward to working together.
- As a primary user of data compiled and maintained by CTPS, we applaud the development of CTPS' Data Program and stand ready to help vet and verify its functionality if needed.
- We are interested to see that the MPO will be establishing a Bike and Ped Committee in FFY 2024, and have staff who could participate when you are ready to launch this work. We encourage the Multimodal Mobility Infrastructure Program to include the MBTA in outreach and engagement, particularly where analysis or recommendations may touch on MBTA station or stop access.
- While none of the selected discrete studies involve the MBTA directly, the slate is interesting and we applaud staff's highly transparent and thoughtful process for study selection. We do look forward to hearing more about how study selection and analysis will work within the permanent programs given the redistribution of funding from discrete studies to permanent programs.
- We are excited to see the evolution of CTPS' and MAPC's technical assistance programs. MBTA staff have been in dialogue with MAPC about collaborating on certain relevant municipal technical assistance projects, and would welcome similar dialogue with CTPS.

We appreciate the opportunity to comment on the draft UPWP, and the engagement of MPO staff and the UPWP Committee throughout the development process. If you have any questions or would like to discuss, please contact Sandy Johnston, Deputy Director of Regional Transit Planning, at sjohnston2@mbta.com.

Sincerely,

Lynsey M. Heffernan
Assistant General Manager for Policy and Transit Planning

MPO Liaison UPWP Review Checklist

Completeness

ID	Review Item	Comments	Reference
A1	✓ * Table of Contents is accurate and internally-linked.		✓ -- for use in column B
A2	✓ * Document has no broken links.		✗ -- for use in column B
A3	* Document has no text or image placeholders.	Placeholders for endorsement and public comments to be added in final version.	
A4	✓ * Charts, tables, and maps are legible and properly annotated.		
A5	✓ * Document passes an accessible check.		
A6	✓ * New federal emphasis areas from the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law (BIL) are referenced.		https://www.transit.dot.gov/regulations-and-programs/transportation-planning/2021-planning-emphasis-areas
A7	✓ * Document is available in relevant languages per the MPO's Title VI Plan.		
A8	✓ * List of MPO members is current.		
A9	* Signatory sheet is included and accurate. Update Gina Fiandaca as Secretary/CEO of MassDOT.	To be added in final version.	
A10	✓ * Acronyms and partner agency lists are up to date.		

Narrative

ID	Review Item	Comments	Reference
B1	✓ * UPWP is comprehensible to the general public.		
B2	✓ * UPWP refers directly to vision, goals, and objectives from RTP.		
B3	✓ * UPWP Amendment/Adjustment procedures are explicit and align with latest federal guidance (see MAPRA materials)		
B4	✓ Governing MOUs between MassDOT, MPO, RTAs, and neighboring MPOs have been reviewed for potential improvements or updates.		
B5	✓ Planning efforts are coordinated with MassDOT modal plans.		https://www.mass.gov/statewide-plans

UPWP Tasks

ID	Review Item	Comments	Reference
C1	✓ * Individual tasks include detailed scopes, budgets, and schedules.		
C2	✓ * Individual tasks outline community beneficiaries.	Page 56 - The section, "Developing the New FFY UPWP," only goes into depth on the process of identifying and selecting discrete studies. Please add additional information about the process for selecting studies as part of recurring tasks in the UPWP (e.g. corridor studies, operational analyses, etc.). The process of referring ideas heard through outreach on the universe of studies to these recurring tasks should also be referenced.	

C3	✓	Transit-related tasks are specific.		
C4	✓	* Includes a task on performance-based planning.		
C5	✓	* Includes a task for an update to any congestion mitigation planning efforts.		Required for TMA MPOs if current CMP is out of date.
C6	✓	* UPWP includes a summary of available staff hours.		
C7	✓	Individual tasks anticipate needed staff-hours / consulting resources.	<p>Page 101 - The "Regional Model Enhancement" task indicates a budget of \$762,000 on this page but is \$762,500 in the overall budget. Please revise accordingly.</p> <p>Page 133 - Please double check the amount for "Computer Resource Management" as it is listed as \$280,000 but the budget indicates the FFY 2024 amount is \$300,000.</p>	
C8	✓	Tasks from previous UPWPs have been analyzed for past utilization.		

Impacts Analysis

ID		Review Item	Comments	Reference
D1	✓	* UPWP includes a geographic equity distribution table showing 2018–2022 and current UPWP-funded studies by municipality and number of tasks.	In addition to the analysis that is provided, please provide a more qualitative assessment in the narrative on the extent to which funding has been distributed equitably according to the analysis (both from the perspective of geographic and social equity).	
D2	✓	* UPWP includes a social equity distribution table of past and current UPWP-funded studies considering language access and EJ populations.	Page 37 - Please note the length and dates of the public comment period.	
D3	✓	* Public involvement and comment are explicitly documented and in line with MPO's Public Participation Plan.		

* indicates required by state or federal regulation.

MPO Liaison TIP Review Checklist

Completeness

ID	Review Item	Comments	Reference
A1	* Table of Contents is accurate and internally-linked.		✓ -- for use in column B
A2	* Document has no broken links.		✗ -- for use in column B
A3	* MPO self certification statement is included.		
A4	* GHG certification is included.		
A5	* Air Quality Conformity statement is included.		
A6	* Document has no text or image placeholders.		
A7	* Charts, tables, and maps are legible and properly annotated.		
A8	* Document passes an accessible check.		
A9	* Document is available in relevant languages per the MPO's Title VI Plan.		
A10	* List of MPO members is current.		
A11	* Signatory sheet is included and accurate. Update Gina Fiandaca as Secretary/CEO of MassDOT.		
A12	* Acronyms and partner agency lists are up to date.		
A13	* Dates listed w/in TIP reflect FFY 2024–2028.		

Narrative

ID	Review Item	Comments	Reference
B1	* TIP outlines MPO institutional organization.		
B2	* TIP links back to national planning factors.		
B3	* TIP references the RTP and the UPWP.		
B4	* TIP narrative is concise and reader-friendly.		
B5	* TIP discusses evaluation scoring.		
B6	* TIP includes project scoring table.		
B7	* TIP describes public participation process.		
B8	* TIP includes procedures for adjustments and amendments, including any deviations from MassDOT guidelines.		
B9	* TIP describes funding sources accurately.		https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/specialfunding/

Performance Measurement

ID	Review Item	Comments	Reference
C1	* TIP includes discussion of target-setting process.		
C2	* TIP references relevant Transit Asset Management (TAM) Plans and includes all TAM Plan targets.		https://www.transit.dot.gov/TAM/TAMPlans
C3	* TIP references relevant Public Transportation Agency Safety Plans (PTASPs) and includes all PTASP targets		https://www.transit.dot.gov/PTASP
C4	* TIP includes current adopted performance targets.		PM1, PM2, PM3, TAM, and any regionally-derived targets

C5	* TIP discusses relationship between performance targets and project selection.		
C6	Discussion on performance measures compares regional data to statewide data where available.		

Project Listing

ID	Review Item	Comments	Reference
D1	* Financial projections align with MassDOT guidance.		
D2	* TIP template is formatted correctly.		
D3	* Projects use MassDOT ProjectInfo TFPCs.		
D4	* assumptions.		2025: 4%; 2026: 8%; 2027: 12%; 2028: 16%
D5	* Projects use MassDOT ProjectInfo description.		
D6	* Additional comment field contains all necessary info.		Total cost, AC, Year-of-expenditure, TEC scores
D7	* MassDOT projects are (accurately) included into regional template.		
D8	* Regional target projects adhere to Readiness Days feedback.		
D9	* List includes all projects, including FLAP, FLTP, and Tribal projects.		
D10	* Transit TIP is formatted properly.		Should be unchanged from Transit eSTIP

Impact Analysis

ID	Review Item	Comments	Reference
E1	* TIP includes GHG certification.		
E2	* GHG analysis is available for all (and only) funded projects.		
E3	* All projects are appropriately labeled as qualitative or quantitative.		
E4	* Transit projects have been analyzed for GHG.		
E5	* Past and current TIP projects have been analyzed for geographic equity, including a relevant table of programming by municipality.		
E6	* Past and current TIP projects have been analyzed for social equity.		
E7	* Social equity analysis considers Title VI / language access.		
E8	* Social equity analysis considers EJ populations, including both federal and state definitions.		
E9	* Equity analysis includes a narrative to accompany any figures.		

* indicates required by state or federal regulation.

ID		Review Item
A1	*	Table of Contents is accurate and internally-linked.
A2	*	Document has no broken links.
A3	*	MPO self certification statement is included.
A4	*	GHG certification is included.
A5	*	Air Quality Conformity statement is included.
A6	*	Document has no text or image placeholders.
A7	*	Charts, tables, and maps are legible and properly annotated.
A8	*	Document passes an accessible check.
A9	*	Document is available in relevant languages per the MPO's Title VI Plan.
A10	*	List of MPO members is current.
A11	*	Signatory sheet is included and accurate. Update Gina Fiandaca as Secretary/CEO of MassDOT.
A12	*	Acronyms and partner agency lists are up to date.

ID		Review Item
B1	*	RTP outlines MPO institutional organization.
B2	*	RTP links to BIL planning emphasis areas.
B3	*	RTP references the TIP and the UPWP.
B4	*	RTP narrative is concise and reader-friendly.
B5	*	RTP discusses evaluation scoring.
B6	*	RTP includes project scoring table.
B7	*	RTP describes public participation process.
B8	*	RTP references projects that are considered to be regionally significant. If RTP lists "regionally significant" projects in a financially constrained manner, please notify the Manager of MPO Activities.
B9	*	RTP describes funding sources accurately and notes new funding sources in BIL.
B10	*	RTP is comprehensible to the general public.
B11	*	RTP vision, goals, and objectives are clearly stated, and discuss the influence of public feedback and participation.
B12	*	RTP discusses coordination and collaboration with regional and state agencies that contributed to document development.
B13	*	RTP outlines reference and coordination with other regional planning efforts and MassDOT statewide plans. This includes all modes of transportation and also economic development, housing coordination, recreation, etc.

ID		Review Item
C1	*	RTP includes discussion of target-setting process.

- C2 * RTP references relevant Transit Asset Management (TAM) Plans and includes all TAM Plan targets.
- C3 * RTP references relevant Public Transportation Agency Safety Plans (PTASPs) and includes all PTASP targets
- C4 * RTP includes current adopted performance targets.
- C5 * RTP discusses relationship between performance targets and project selection.
- C6 Discussion on performance measures compares regional data to statewide data where available.
- C7 * Future projects and studies under consideration outline beneficiaries at the local, regional, state, and inter-state level as appropriate.
- C8 Transit-related efforts are specific.
- C9 * Includes a discussion on performance-based planning.
- C10 * Includes a discussion of efforts to update to any congestion mitigation planning.
- C11 If previous priorities, projects, or studies have not advanced, please discuss challenges and potential solutions.

Project Listing and

ID	Review Item
D1	* Financial projections align with MassDOT guidance. If the LRTP establishes or updates programs, there is a clear linkage to the TIP (e.g. X% of funds spent on Complete Streets, X% of Safety, etc.)
D2	* If projects are listed, they use MassDOT ProjectInfo TFPCs. *
D3	If projects are listed, they use MassDOT ProjectInfo description.

Imp

ID	Review Item
E2	* GHG analysis is available for all (and only) funded projects.
E3	* All projects are appropriately labeled as qualitative or quantitative.
E4	* Transit projects have been analyzed for GHG.
E5	* Past and current TIP projects have been analyzed for geographic equity, including a relevant table of programming by municipality.
E6	* Past and current TIP projects have been analyzed for social equity.
E7	* Social equity analysis considers Title VI / language access.
E8	* Social equity analysis considers EJ populations, including both federal and state definitions.
E9	* Equity analysis includes a narrative to accompany any figures.
E10	* RTP includes a geographic equity distribution table showing location of 2024-2028 TIP projects and 2018–2022 and current UPWP-funded studies by municipality and number of tasks.

- E11 * RTP includes a social equity distribution table of 2024-2028 TIP projects and 2018-2022 and current UPWP funded-studies considering language access and EJ populations.
- E12 * Public involvement and comment are explicitly documented and in line with MPO's Public Participation Plan.

TIP Review Checklist

Completeness

Comments	Reference
	✓ -- for use in column B
	✗ -- for use in column B

Narrative

Comments	Reference
	https://www.transit.dot.gov/regulations-and-programs/transportation-planning/2021-planning-emphasis-areas

<https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/specialfunding/>

<https://www.mass.gov/statewide-plans>

Performance Measurement

Comments	Reference
----------	-----------

<https://www.transit.dot.gov/TAM/TAMPlans>

<https://www.transit.dot.gov/PTASP>

PM1, PM2, PM3, TAM, and any regionally-derived targets

Required for TMA MPOs if current CMP is out of date.

nd Program Development

Comments

Reference

act Analysis

Comments

Reference