

MPO Meeting Minutes

Draft Memorandum for the Record

Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization Meeting

March 6, 2025, Meeting

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

David Mohler, Chair, representing Monica Tibbits-Nutt, Secretary of Transportation and Chief Executive Officer of the Massachusetts Department of Transportation (MassDOT)

Decisions

The Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) agreed to the following:

- Approve the minutes of the meeting of January 16, 2025
- Approve the work scope for *Roadway Pricing: Balancing the Need for a Transition to Sustainable Mobility with Equity Considerations*
- Endorse the proposed Transit Asset Management Performance Targets
- Endorse Federal Fiscal Years (FFY) 2025–29 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Amendment Nine
- Release FFYs 2025–29 TIP Amendment Ten for a 21-day public comment period

Meeting Agenda

1. Introductions

See attendance beginning on page 34.

2. Chair’s Report—David Mohler, MassDOT

David Mohler, MassDOT, stated that the United States Department of Transportation (USDOT) recently announced that all TIP amendments are required to be reviewed by the USDOT General Counsel’s Central Office prior to finalization. D. Mohler stated, however, that the announcement was subsequently rescinded.

In addition, D. Mohler stated that discretionary projects that have been awarded but have not proceeded to the contract of the grant are on hold and under further review. D. Mohler stated that none of the discretionary grant awards have been cancelled.

D. Mohler stated that the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) are continuing to give MassDOT the 80 percent share of its bills as reimbursement.

D. Mohler stated that contracts and advertisements are proceeding as usual.

Tom O'Rourke, Three Rivers Interlocal Council (Town of Norwood), asked if the projects that are on hold represent a large number of projects and if there were aspects of the projects' scope that contributed to them being on hold.

D. Mohler stated that he does not know how many projects are on hold, but that there is nothing about those projects other than the fact that they were in the process of going from award to contract that resulted in them being on hold.

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

Tegin Teich, Executive Director, announced that the board member survey about ongoing work and ideas for discrete studies to contribute to the FFY 2026 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) is due today.

T. Teich stated that Jenn Kaplan, Manager of Multimodal Planning and Design, will be joining the agency on March 10, 2025.

In addition, T. Teich stated that Casey Cooper, Principal Planner and Bicycle and Pedestrian Program Manager, would be leaving the agency on March 11, 2025. T. Teich expressed appreciation for C. Cooper's work at the MPO.

T. Teich reviewed the FFYs 2026-30 TIP development timeline, which included the key dates and meetings in Table 1.

Table 1
FFYs 2026–30 TIP Development Timeline

March	April	May
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • March 6 MPO: Scoring for new and pre-existing projects • March 13 TIP Process, Engagement, and Readiness Committee: Initial programming scenarios; Further discussion on scoring pre-existing projects • March 20 MPO: Initial programming scenarios; MWRTA and CATA CIP presentations • March 27 TIP Process, Engagement, and Readiness Committee: Revised programming scenarios 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • April 3 MPO: Select a final programming scenario • April 17 MPO: Vote to release draft FFYs 2026–30 TIP for public review and comment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May 15 MPO: May Quarterly Readiness Update • May 22 TIP Process, Engagement, and Readiness Committee: Changes to the Draft FFYs 2026–30 TIP and public comments

CATA = Cape Ann Transportation Authority. CIP = Capital Investment Plan. FFY = Federal Fiscal Years. MPO = Metropolitan Planning Organization. MWRTA = MetroWest Regional Transit Authority. TIP = Transportation Improvement Program.

T. Teich stated that at the MPO meeting on June 5, 2025, MPO board members will review public comments and vote to endorse the FFYs 2026–30 TIP.

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

T. Teich reminded members of upcoming in-person MPO meetings, including the following:

- March 20, 2025, at 10:00 AM at the State Transportation Building
- April 3, 2025, at 10:00 AM at the State Transportation Building

D. Mohler asked when the exemption from the Open Meeting Law will expire.

T. Teich stated that the Open Meeting Law exemption expires after March 31, 2025, and MPO staff are preparing for in-person meetings, but T. Teich hopes that the MPO will continue to host virtual meetings.

D. Mohler asked if there must be a quorum of in-person board members at hybrid meetings after the exemption expires.

T. Teich stated that there does need to be a quorum of in-person board members.

D. Mohler stated that even though the upcoming meetings are hybrid, it is important for there to be a quorum of in-person board members. Otherwise, the meeting would have to be canceled.

4. Public Comments

Brad Rawson, Inner Core Committee (City of Somerville), expressed appreciation for MassDOT staff providing timely and accurate information for municipalities and regional partners in the FFYs 2026–30 TIP development process. In addition, B. Rawson expressed appreciation for FTA and FHWA staff members and the importance of MPO members and partners voicing that the Boston region, its communities, and its individuals benefit from and value FTA, FHWA, and other federal staff members.

Meghan McNamara, Town of Lexington, thanked MPO board members and MPO staff for their assistance and support throughout the FFYs 2026–30 TIP development process. M. McNamara stated that the Town of Lexington is experiencing a lot of growth and submitted Project 613695: Lexington–Roadway Reconstruction on Hartwell Avenue and Bedford Street for consideration in the Complete Streets Program in the FFYs 2026–30 TIP, and to reach out if anyone has any comments or questions about the project.

5. Committee Chairs' Reports

Chris Klem, MassDOT, presented the following upcoming meeting dates and times for the UPWP Committee:

- April 3, 2025, at 2:30 PM
- April 10, 2025, at 1:00 PM
- April 17, 2025, at 2:00 PM

Jen Rowe, City of Boston, stated that the TIP Process, Engagement, and Readiness Committee is meeting on March 13, 2025, at 1:00 PM to discuss project rescoring and preliminary FFYs 2026–30 TIP scenarios.

6. Action Item: Approval of January 16, 2025, MPO Meeting Minutes Documents posted to the MPO meeting calendar

1. Minutes of the meeting of January 16, 2025 ([pdf](#)) ([html](#))

Vote

A motion to approve the minutes of the meeting of January 16, 2025, was made by the City of Boston (J. Rowe) and seconded by the Inner Core Committee (City of Somerville) (Tom Bent). The motion carried.

**7. Action Item: Work Scope for Roadway Pricing: Balancing the Need for a Transition to Sustainable Mobility with Equity Considerations—
*Joe Delorto, MPO Staff***

Documents posted to the MPO meeting calendar

1. Work Scope for *Roadway Pricing: Balancing the Need for a Transition to Sustainable Mobility with Equity Considerations* ([pdf](#)) ([html](#))

Joe Delorto, MPO Staff, presented *Roadway Pricing: Balancing the Need for a Transition to Sustainable Mobility with Equity Considerations*, a FFY 2025 UPWP study with a \$50,000 budget and six-month timeframe.

J. Delorto stated that the study will address the MPO's Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) goal areas of Equity, Mobility and Reliability, and Clean Air and Healthy Communities.

J. Delorto stated that MPO staff will explore a conceptual roadway pricing scenario applied to the Boston region for its potential congestion revenue and equity impacts, and the objective of the study is to understand the potential impact of a roadway pricing scenario on congestion and revenue and the populations that will be affected.

The final products of this study will be a white paper describing the work completed and a two-page brief with key findings, which will be presented to the MPO board.

Discussion

Lenard Diggins, Regional Transportation Advisory Council, expressed appreciation for the study's focus on equity considerations.

Josh Ostroff, Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority (MBTA), asked for further information on the stakeholders involved in the study.

J. Delorto stated that the Congestion Management Process Committee was identified as the main stakeholder due to the technical aspects of the data that will be used in the study.

J. Rowe stated that there is a clear connection between this work and lessons learned from the MPO's previous review of roadway pricing programs, particularly the need to

reduce the burden on low-income communities. In addition, J. Rowe stated that the MPO's previous work highlighted the need for a robust community engagement and asked if there are opportunities to address this need going forward.

T. Teich expressed appreciation for J. Rowe's feedback and stated that MPO staff will consider strengthened public engagement strategies in the development of FFY 2026 UPWP. T. Teich stated that this study has a specific funding amount allocated to it, but that MPO staff will continue to explore broader stakeholder engagement strategies.

D. Mohler asked for clarification on the purpose of the study.

J. Delorto stated that the work will familiarize the data and analytical tools that MPO staff have available to conduct the analysis, and it will not endorse any specific strategy for roadway pricing.

Vote

A motion to approve the work scope for *Roadway Pricing: Balancing the Need for a Transition to Sustainable Mobility with Equity Considerations*, was made by the Advisory Council (L. Diggins) and seconded by the City of Boston (J. Rowe). The motion carried.

8. Action Item: 2025 Transit Asset Management Performance Targets— Sam Taylor, MPO Staff, and Angella Servello, MBTA

Documents posted to the MPO meeting calendar

1. Calendar Year 2025 Transit Asset Management Performance Targets Memo ([pdf](#)) ([html](#))

S. Taylor, MPO Staff, presented the target setting process for Transit Asset Management Performance Targets, which included the following steps:

- USDOT establishes requirements
- Transit agency sets targets for relevant assets
- MPO works with transit agencies to set or revisit regional targets

S. Taylor stated that there are four categories of Transit Asset Management performance measures, which can be found in Table 2.

Table 2
Transit Asset Management Performance Measures

Asset Category	Measure	Measure Type
Rolling Stock	Percentage of vehicles that have met or exceeded their ULB	Age-Based
Equipment (Non-Revenue Vehicles)	Percentage of vehicles that have met or exceeded their ULB	Age Based
Facilities	Percentage of assets with a condition rating below 3.0 on the FTA TERM Scale	Condition-Based
Infrastructure (Fixed-Guideway)	Percentage of track segments with performance (speed) restrictions	Performance-Based

FTA = Federal Transit Administration. TERM = Transit Economic Requirements Model. ULB = Useful Life Benchmark.

S. Taylor reviewed the following key takeaways:

- Federal Transit Administration (FTA) requires transit agencies to produce Transit Asset Management Plans every four years
- Transit Asset Management targets are adopted annually, as part of an annual narrative that agencies submit to the National Transit Database (NTD)
- MPOs consider regional transit agencies targets and set targets for their regions
- While MPOs and transit agencies are required to set targets, the FTA does not impose penalties for failure to meet targets

A. Servello, MBTA, presented the MBTA's Transit Asset Management performance measures and targets. A. Servello stated that the MBTA has a diverse and complex asset inventory that includes more than the four required asset categories. A. Servello stated that these performances and targets are an FTA reporting requirement and a small component of the MBTA's transit asset management.

A. Servello displayed the MBTA's performance and targets for each performance measure, which included FFY 2023 and 2024 actuals, trends, and the FFY 2025 target. Details of these performances and targets can be found in Tables 3–6.

Table 3
MBTA Transit Asset Management Performance and Targets: Rolling Stock

Mode	Vehicle Type	FY23 Actual	FY24 Actual	Hit FY24 Target?	FY23 vs FY24 Trend	FY25 Target	Expected Trend
Bus	AB	21.19%	21.19%	Yes	Level	21.19%	Level
	BU	20.00%	16.37%	Yes	Decrease	16.20%	Decrease
Commuter Rail	RL	22.89%	22.35%	Yes	Decrease	22.35%	Level
	RP	7.52%	7.57%	No	Increase	7.17%	Decrease
Ferry	FB	0.00%	0.00%	Yes	Level	0.00%	Level
Heavy Rail	HR	30.10%	28.71%	No	Decrease	45.73%	Increase
Light Rail	LR	0.00%	38.95%	No	Increase	38.95%	Level
	VT	100.00%	100.00%	Yes	Level	100.00%	Level
Paratransit	AO	0.00%	0.00%	Yes	Level	26.58%	Increase
Total		21.66%	18.30%	N/A	Decrease	23.52%	Increase

AB = Articulated Bus. AO = Automobile. BU = Bus. FB = Ferryboat. FY = Fiscal Year. HR = Heavy Rail Passenger Car. LR = Light Rail Vehicle. MBTA = Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority. N/A = Not applicable. RL = Commuter Rail Locomotive. RP = Commuter Rail Passenger Coach. VT = Vintage Trolley.

Table 4
MBTA Transit Asset Management Performance and Targets: Equipment

Vehicle Type	FY23 Actual	FY24 Actual	Hit FY24 Target?	FY23 vs FY24 Trend	FY25 Target	Expected Trend
Automobile	84.13%	86.68%	No	Increase	88.00%	Increase
Other Rubber Tire Vehicle	21.61%	53.10%	No	Increase	53.10%	Level
Steel Wheel Vehicle	49.11%	20.12%	Yes	Decrease	17.85%	Decrease
Total	48.50%	24.70%	N/A	Decrease	22.31%	Decrease

FY = Fiscal Year. MBTA = Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority. N/A = Not applicable.

Table 5
MBTA Transit Asset Management Performance and Targets: Facilities

Facility Type	FY23 Actual	FY24 Actual	Hit FY24 Target?	FY23 vs FY24 Trend	FY25 Target	Expected Trend
Administrative/ Maintenance	22.84%	20.66%	Yes	Decrease	20.66%	Level
Passenger/ Parking	2.60%	2.56%	Yes	Decrease	2.56%	Level
Total	11.86%	11.02%	N/A	Decrease	11.02%	Level

FY = Fiscal Year. MBTA = Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority. N/A = Not applicable.

Table 6
MBTA Transit Asset Management Performance and Targets: Infrastructure

Mode	Total Revenue Miles*	FY23 Actual	FY24 Actual	Hit FY24 Target?	FY23 vs FY24 Trend	FY25 Target	Expected Trend
Light Rail	59.81	7.36%	9.41%	Yes	Increase	7.00%	Decrease
Heavy Rail	76.54	13.20%	17.77%	No	Increase	13.00%	Decrease
Commuter Rail	641.31	3.25%	1.24%	Yes	Decrease	4.00%	Increase
Total	777.66	4.55%	4.55%	N/A	Level	5.12%	Increase

* Reflects total number of revenue miles reported to National Transit Database as of July 1, 2024.
FY = Fiscal Year. MBTA = Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority. N/A = Not applicable.

S. Taylor presented the MetroWest Regional Transit Authority's (MWRTA) and Cape Ann Regional Transportation Authority's (CATA) Transit Asset Management performance and targets, which can be found in Tables 7–9.

Table 7
CATA and MWRTA Transit Asset Management Performance and Targets:
Rolling Stock

Agency	Facility Type	2024 Target	2024 Performance	2025 Target	Anticipated Change
CATA	Bus	39%	19%	18%	Decrease
CATA	Cutaway Vehicles	44%	65%	0%	Decrease
MWRTA	Automobiles	100%	100%	100%	Level
MWRTA	Cutaway Vehicles	21%	27%	29%	Increase
MWRTA	Vans	0%	0%	0%	Level

Notes: CATA sets targets for the federal fiscal year of October 1 to September 30. MWRTA sets targets for the state fiscal year of July 1 to June 30. Target and performance percentages are the percentage of revenue vehicles that have reached or exceeded their Useful Life Benchmark.

CATA = Cape Ann Transportation Authority. MWRTA = MetroWest Regional Transit Authority.

Table 8
CATA and MWRTA Transit Asset Management Performance and Targets:
Equipment (Non-Revenue Vehicles)

Agency	Facility Type	2024 Target	2024 Performance	2025 Target	Anticipated Change
CATA	All Equipment	100%	100%	25%	Decrease
MWRTA	All Equipment	50%	40%	40%	Level

Notes: CATA sets targets for the federal fiscal year of October 1 to September 30. MWRTA sets targets for the state fiscal year of July 1 to June 30. Target and performance percentages are the percentage of revenue vehicles that have reached or exceeded their Useful Life Benchmark.

CATA = Cape Ann Transportation Authority. MWRTA = MetroWest Regional Transit Authority.

Table 9
CATA and MWRTA Transit Asset Management Performance and Targets:
Facilities

Agency	Facility Type	2024 Target	2024 Performance	2025 Target	Anticipated Change
CATA	Admin/Maintenance	0%	0%	0%	Level
MWRTA	Admin/Maintenance	0%	0%	0%	Level

Notes: CATA sets targets for the federal fiscal year of October 1 to September 30. MWRTA sets targets for the state fiscal year of July 1 to June 30. Percentage of facilities (by group) that are rated less than 3.0 on FTA TERM scale. Admin = Administrative. CATA = Cape Ann Transportation Authority. FTA = Federal Transit Administration. MWRTA = MetroWest Regional Transit Authority. TERM = Transit Economic Requirements Model.

S. Taylor summarized the CATA and MWRTA performance and targets in the following points:

- Rolling Stock
 - CATA expects an improvement on all vehicle types
 - MWRTA expects a slight uptick in aging of Cutaway Vehicles
- Equipment (non-revenue vehicles)
 - CATA expects an improvement due to new vehicles
 - MWRTA expects no change in equipment vehicles
- Facilities
 - CATA and MWRTA both have one facility that they expect to remain in adequate condition

S. Taylor stated that MassDOT and the MPO contribute to improving these transit assets and working towards meeting performance targets in the Boston region. S. Taylor stated that the MassDOT's Capital Investment Plan supports the MBTA and the regional transit authority's asset improvements. S. Taylor stated that the MPO considers MBTA and regional transit authority investments when they apply for inclusion in the FFYs 2026–30 TIP, specifically its Transit Transformation Program.

Discussion

J. Rowe expressed appreciation for the Track Improvement Program on the MPO's Performance dashboard website, the amount of work that went into the program, and its success. J. Rowe stated that it is great to know that the federally required reporting does not show the full picture of progress and work related to Transit Asset

Management. J. Rowe asked if the MBTA's performance dashboard is going to be updated to reflect the improvements this past year, which will enable individuals to see updated changes over time.

A. Servello stated that there is a team that manages the dashboard, and she will contact them and follow up with J. Rowe.

Vote

A motion to approve the proposed 2025 Transit Asset Management Performance Targets was made by the City of Boston (J. Rowe) and seconded by the Advisory Council (L. Diggins). The motion carried.

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

Documents posted to the MPO meeting calendar

1. FFYs 2025–29 TIP Amendment Nine ([pdf](#)) ([html](#))
2. Town of Wakefield Letter of Support ([pdf](#))
3. MBTA Advisory Board Letter of Support ([pdf](#))

Ethan Lapointe, MPO Staff, presented FFYs 2025–29 TIP Amendment Nine, which includes the following changes to the FFY 2025 Earmark Discretionary and Transit Program:

- New USDOT Reconnecting Communities Pilot grant awards for the City of Boston, the City of Revere, and the MBTA
- Earmark programming for a railroad at-grade crossing improvement in Wakefield
- Funding adjustments for CATA projects

E. Lapointe stated that the public comment for Amendment Nine began on February 7, 2025, and concluded February 28, 2025, at 5:00 PM. MPO staff received the following two letters of support:

- The MBTA Advisory Board provided a letter in support of each of the projects included in the amendment, highlighting the Reconnecting Communities awards and the Wakefield Broadway grade crossing.
- The Wakefield Town Council expressed support for advancing the Broadway At-Grade Crossing Improvement Project and provided additional detail as to the proposed improvements for the project.

Vote

A motion to endorse FFYs 2025–29 TIP Amendment Nine, was made by the MBTA Advisory Board (Hanna Switekowski) and seconded by the Inner Core Committee (City of Somerville) (Tom Bent). The motion carried.

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

Documents posted to the MPO meeting calendar

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

E. Lapointe presented FFYs 2025–29 TIP Amendment Ten, which reflects changes to two regional target projects in the FFY 2025 program flagged for delay to FFY 2026 during TIP Readiness Days. E. Lapointe stated that these projects, along with another project delayed through Amendment One to the FFYs 2025–29 TIP, will leave a substantial unprogrammed balance for regional target funding in FFY 2025. E. Lapointe stated that since FFY 2025 is not within the window of the FFYs 2026–30 TIP in development, this funding must be allocated by TIP amendment rather than a traditional programming scenario. Changes included in FFYs 2025–29 TIP Amendment Ten can be found in Tables 10–13.

Table 10
Amendment Ten Project Changes—FFY 2025 Regional Target Program: Delays

Project	Change Type	Current Budget	New Budget (FFY 2026)	Cost Change
611982: Medford–Shared Use Path Connection at the Route 28/Wellington Underpass	Delay	\$6,061,917	\$5,488,945	-\$572,972 (-9.45%)
610544: Peabody–Multi-use Path Construction of Independence Greenway at Interstate 95 and Route 1	Delay	\$13,966,099	\$19,127,610	+\$5,161,511 (+36.95%)
608067: Woburn–Intersection Reconstruction at Route 3 (Cambridge Road) and Bedford Road and South Bedford Street*	Delay	\$3,438,311	\$3,438,311	\$0

* Project 608067 was delayed in Amendment One to the FFYs 2025–29 TIP but is listed here again for reference. FFY = Federal Fiscal Year.

Table 11
Amendment Ten Project Changes—FFY 2025 Regional Target Program: CATA

Project	Score	Change Type	Current Budget	New Budget (FFY 2025)	Cost Change
S12969: CATA–Gloucester Facility Modernization	TBD	Cost Increase	\$1,293,000	\$1,605,500	+\$312,500
S12970: CATA–Vehicle Replacement (7 Vehicles)	TBD	Scale Increase	\$1,710,000	\$3,510,000	+\$1,800,000
S13202: CATA– APC/AVL Deployment	29.4	New Project	\$0	\$680,000	+\$680,000

APC = Automatic Passenger Counting. AVL = Automatic Vehicle Location. CATA = Cape Ann Transportation Authority. FFY = Federal Fiscal Year. TBD = To be determined.

Table 12
Amendment Ten Project Changes–FFY 2025 Regional Target Program: MBTA

Project	Score	Change Type	Current Budget	New Budget (FFY 2025)	Cost Change
S13212: MBTA–Bus Priority and Accessibility Improvements (PATI)	48	New Project	\$0	\$1,000,000	+\$1,000,000
S13206: MBTA–Catamaran Overhaul	25	New Project	\$0	\$2,634,000	+\$2,634,000
S13207: MBTA–Natick Center Station Accessibility Improvements	53.6	New Project	\$0	\$2,500,000	+\$2,500,000
S13208: MBTA–Wellesley Station Upgrades	43.6	New Project	\$0	\$5,000,000	+\$5,000,000

FFY = Federal Fiscal Year. MBTA = Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority. PATI = Plan for Accessible Transit Infrastructure.

Table 13
Amendment Ten Project Changes–FFY 2025 Regional Target Program: MWRTA

Project	Score	Change Type	Current Budget	New Budget (FFY 2025)	Cost Change
S12971: MWRTA–Blandin Hub Accessible Redesign	64	New Phase	\$1,750,000	\$7,750,000	+\$6,000,000
S12972: MWRTA–Procurement of Nine 29 Foot Buses (CNG)	52.6	Scale Increase	\$1,980,000	\$6,180,000	+\$4,200,000

CNG = Compressed Natural Gas. FFY = Federal Fiscal Year. MWRTA = MetroWest Regional Transit Authority.

E. Lapointe stated that Amendment Ten will program five new transit projects in FFY 2025 while providing additional funding for four currently funded efforts. The total changes amounted to \$24,126,500 of new transit funding. E. Lapointe stated that following these changes, total MPO funding to transit projects will be \$70,632,559, or 55.2 percent of the programmed FFY 2025 funds. In addition, E. Lapointe stated that

these changes, among other known cost adjustments to FFY 2025 projects, will leave \$464,996 unprogrammed through the remainder of FFY 2025.

Discussion

Jay Monty, City of Everett, stated that he supports transit projects, but these fill-in transit projects are being funded because of delays to previously programmed projects, meaning that fewer than half of the projects that were programmed for FFY 2025 are ready for construction. J. Monty stated that this is a significant problem that is not sustainable. In addition, J. Monty requested information from project proponents regarding their efforts to solve the issues causing project delays, such as utility issues and permits.

D. Mohler asked if Amendment Ten delays the projects into FFY 2026, or if it would remove the projects from the FFYs 2025–29 TIP and the projects would be incorporated into the FFYs 2026–30 TIP later.

E. Lapointe stated that Amendment One and Amendment Ten remove these projects from the FFY 2025–29 TIP. E. Lapointe stated that the projects are already incorporated into the possible scenarios for the FFYs 2026–30 TIP.

D. Mohler asked how staff chose which fill-in MBTA and Regional Transit Authority projects were included in Amendment Ten and expressed concern about the lack of MPO board member involvement in the decision-making process.

E. Lapointe stated that MPO staff's preference would have been to discuss the projects included in Amendment Ten further with the MPO board, but the timing did not allow it. E. Lapointe stated that MPO staff coordinated with the project proponents to identify preferences for shifting funding for their projects into different FFYs, and then MPO staff coordinated directly with CATA, MWRTA, and MBTA to identify projects that could be funded in FFY 2025.

D. Mohler asked if the MBTA gave MPO staff a list of projects that amounted to a specific cost to fill the gaps caused by project delays in FFY 2025.

E. Lapointe stated that the MBTA identified a small group of projects that could potentially be considered for Amendment Ten.

D. Mohler asked for further clarification on the decision-making process for this amendment, specifically regarding an MWRTA project with a budget of approximately \$6 million.

E. Lapointe stated that the MWRTA project is funded for \$6 million in FFY 2025, and the remaining \$6 million is still to be determined when it will be funded.

L. Diggins asked for clarification about the percentage of projects in FFY 2025 that are delayed.

E. Lapointe stated that he does not know the exact percentage of projects delayed in FFY 2025.

J. Ostroff expressed appreciation for MPO staff reaching out to the MBTA in anticipation of project delays and unprogrammed funding. J. Ostroff stated that the MBTA staff and its Capital Programming Team worked to identify projects for Amendment Ten that address regional equity concerns while considering project readiness.

John Romano, MassDOT, asked if MPO staff considered any MassDOT Highway Division projects for inclusion in Amendment Ten.

E. Lapointe stated that MPO staff consulted MassDOT's electronic State Transportation Improvement Program, and there was one project that could have been a candidate for inclusion in Amendment Ten, but no MassDOT Highway Division projects were immediately flagged for acceleration into FFY 2025.

J. Rowe stated that this discussion is reflective of similar conversations in TIP Process, Engagement, and Readiness Committee meetings as well as reflective of substantial issues of continued project delays and their effects. In addition, J. Rowe thanked TIP Process, Engagement, and Readiness Committee members and MPO staff for their efforts to facilitate a proactive and anticipatory approach to these project delays, which allowed the projects chosen to align with the MPO's priorities. J. Rowe encouraged board members to attend the TIP Process, Engagement, and Readiness Committee meetings to engage further with the TIP processes.

D. Mohler asked if \$464,996 is enough unprogrammed funding for FFY 2025, considering that there is a \$37 million project that has not been advertised yet.

E. Lapointe stated that MPO staff are comfortable with the remaining unprogrammed funding amount based on MPO staff's understanding of design estimates.

Vote

A motion to release FFYs 2025–29 TIP Amendment Ten for a 21-day public comment period was made by the MWRTA (Tyler Terrasi) and seconded by the City of Boston (J. Rowe). The motion carried.

11.LRTP Kick-off—Erin Maguire, MPO Staff

Erin Maguire, MPO Staff, presented a summary overview of the MPO's LRTP, which describes the transportation vision and goals for the region for 20 or more years into the future and guides the MPO's work. The LRTP is a federally required document that is updated every four years. The MPO's current LRTP is *Destination 2050*, which was endorsed by the MPO board in July 2023.

E. Maguire stated that *Destination 2050* includes the following main information:

- Transportation needs
- Regional vision and goals
- Financial plan
 - MPO investment programs
 - Recommended regional projects
- Technical analysis of the plan
 - Air quality conformity
 - Greenhouse gas emissions
 - Disparate Impact/Disproportionate Burden
 - Performance-Based Planning

E. Maguire summarized key feedback and associated planned actions for MPO staff after the development of *Destination 2050*, which can be found in Table 14.

Table 14
Destination 2050: Summary of Feedback and Planned Actions

Feedback	Associated Planned Action(s)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desire for additional detail and accountability on how the MPO could support progress towards goals • Interest in MPO exploring priorities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify specific actions that the MPO could pursue to achieve progress in the goal areas • Develop metrics to track progress • Explore potential impacts of strategies through scenario planning • Identify priority goal areas and pilot new approaches
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Misalignment between content of <i>Destination 2050</i> and stated priorities from community and municipal stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish recurring engagement updates to review and discuss topics that arise • Develop an engagement strategy that supports direct, honest conversations with stakeholders on potential outcomes of the plan and MPO work • Identify opportunities in the planning process to improve the effectiveness of public input and engagement
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scenario planning not conducted for <i>Destination 2050</i> to evaluate alternative actions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct scenario planning to evaluate effectiveness of alternative strategies
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Needs Assessment release timeline mismatched from LRTP development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Targeting an update to the Needs Assessment published in early FFY 2026

FFY = Federal Fiscal Year. LRTP = Long-Range Transportation Plan. MPO = Metropolitan Planning Organization.

E. Maguire presented a list of new approaches that MPO staff plan to pilot in the development of the next LRTP, which was compiled through the feedback received on *Destination 2050* and best practices from other MPOs and DOTs. These approaches included the following:

- Ongoing engagement updates
- Exploratory scenario planning
- Document format

- Understandable by nontechnical readers
- Vision and goals
 - Prioritize select goal areas
 - Emphasis on areas the MPO could influence
 - Discussion of potential strategies
 - Explore and begin establishing long-range performance measures

E. Maguire stated that the MPO's existing vision and goals include a vision statement and six goal areas, including Equity, Safety, Mobility and Reliability, Access and Connectivity, Resilience, and Clean Air and Healthy Communities. E. Maguire stated that each goal includes a set of objectives, which consist of specific actions that the MPO could pursue, desired outcomes, and investment and research priorities. E. Maguire stated that MPO staff are considering the following opportunities for the LRTP goal areas:

- Elaborate on how the MPO could influence goals
- Identify actions and strategies the MPO could pursue
- Test effectiveness of strategies with scenario planning
- Develop metrics to track progress

E. Maguire shared examples of metrics developed by peer agencies, such as the Delaware Valley Regional Planning Council and the Rhode Island Department of Transportation.

E. Maguire discussed the need to identify a priority goal area that would allow MPO staff to develop metrics for one goal area at a time and stated that the MPO's work on its Vision Zero Action Plan positions the MPO to pursue Safety as its first priority goal area.

E. Maguire presented the timeline for the LRTP development process, which included the following key dates and steps, with public engagement efforts occurring throughout the timeframe:

- FFY 2025: Kick-off
- FFY 2025–26: Vision and goals refresh; Needs Assessment update
- FFY 2026–27: Performance measures, strategies, investment programs and projects, and scenario planning
- July 2027: Document review and endorsement

E. Maguire presented the following discussion questions for board members to consider as MPO staff begin the LRTP development process:

- How have the goals changed since *Destination 2050* was developed?
- How can we improve our discussions on engagement themes?
- As development continues, is there a format that you prefer engaging in?
 - Workshops on specific topics
 - Board presentations and discussions
 - Memoranda

12. Exploring the Potential for Using Conveyal in Transportation Improvement Program Project Evaluations—*Betsy Harvey Herzfeld, MPO Staff*

Documents posted to the MPO meeting calendar

1. *Exploring the Potential for Using Conveyal in Transportation Improvement Program Project Evaluations* Report ([pdf](#)) ([html](#))

Betsy Harvey Herzfeld, MPO Staff, presented the results of *Exploring the Potential for Using Conveyal in Transportation Improvement Program Project Evaluations*, which had the following goals:

- Test the destination access tool Conveyal to assess the feasibility of using it to evaluate project impacts
- Run Conveyal on a set of sample TIP projects that represent the type of projects the MPO funds
- Use the results of these analyses to develop potential destination access criteria with which to evaluate projects proposed for MPO funding in the TIP

B. Harvey Herzfeld stated that following the adoption of the most recent LRTP, MPO staff added the Access and Connectivity goal area, which has an aim of providing transportation options and improving access to key destinations to support economic vitality and high quality of life.

B. Harvey stated that Conveyal is a platform for analyzing access to destinations that uses readily available data, has fast processing time, analyzes access through different transportation modes and different demographic groups, is user friendly, and analyzes and compares transportation project impacts.

The methodology for the study included testing Conveyal analysis parameters and project elements to ensure projects are modeled correctly, testing 11 sample TIP projects to understand potential impacts and develop preliminary destination access project criteria for further testing.

B. Harvey Herzfeld stated that MPO staff analyzed the following metrics:

- Jobs (transit and bike, walk, or roll trips)
- Healthcare (transit trips)
- Parks (bike, walk, or roll trips)
- Essential places (bike, walk, or roll trips)

For each project, MPO staff identified the average percent change in access across the Boston region's population, which allows MPO staff to compare projects regardless of their size.

B. Harvey Herzfeld stated that the results included a wide range of impacts, both positive and negative.

B. Harvey stated that MPO staff wanted to develop a set of test destination access criteria for each of the metrics. The study would develop a criterion that gives points to projects that increase access to the Boston region's population based on the change in magnitude from the analyzed sample projects.

B. Harvey Herzfeld presented the following overall findings and recommendations:

- Evaluate destination impacts at the local level
- Represent bikeshare projects in Conveyal
- Refine assumptions about how different project elements affect changes in travel speed
- Compare project scores under the existing and test destination access criteria

Discussion

L. Diggins stated that the report was developed very well, both in the way it was formatted and the way the information is presented. L. Diggins asked what a score would be for a project that had a negative impact on a population that is considered a minority population, but not low income.

B. Harvey Herzfeld stated that under the proposed test criteria in the report, it would be scored in the same way as a low-income population. B. Harvey Herzfeld stated that if the project had less of a decrease in access compared to the non-minority population, the project could get a negative score.

L. Diggins asked if the projects are scored evenly across the region.

B. Harvey Herzfeld stated that a project is most likely to have the most impact locally, but larger projects may have a more significant impact area when comparing it to a

smaller project, so there is a challenge in setting the project area boundaries and what should be considered local to a given project.

J. Rowe stated that the study's report stated that new sidewalks and new bike lanes were anticipated to have a decrease in adjacent roadway speeds for transit and asked if that was a built-in assumption made by Conveyal.

B. Harvey Herzfeld stated that it was an assumption that MPO staff made, and other MPO staff members could speak more directly to that.

Tanner Bonner, MPO Staff, stated that it was an assumption that MPO staff made as a part of the test run, and there is more research that could be done to determine if the assumption holds true for speeding drivers as it would for a bus.

13.FFYs 2026-30 TIP Project Scores—*Ethan Lapointe, MPO Staff* ***Documents posted to the MPO meeting calendar***

1. FFY 2026–30 TIP Project Scores ([pdf](#)) ([html](#))
2. FFY 2026–30 TIP Project Descriptions ([pdf](#)) ([html](#))

E. Lapointe presented an overview of the FFYs 2026–30 TIP project scores, which measure the extent to which a project realizes the MPO's Vision, Goals, and Objectives. E. Lapointe stated that MPO staff received applications for 10 projects in core investment programs, seven projects in the Community Connections program, and 12 projects in the Transit Transformation program.

E. Lapointe summarized FFYs 2026–30 TIP project application details and scores by investment program, which can be found in Tables 15–20.

Table 15
New FFYs 2026–30 TIP Projects: Bicycle Network and Pedestrian Connections

Project	Cost	(Adjusted) Score	Status
Cambridge: New Bridge and Shared-Use Path Connection over MBTA Fitchburg Line at Danehy Park Connector (613568)	\$13,119,298	81.0	PRC-Approved (05/31/2024)
Concord- Assabet River Multi-Use Trail and Bridge Construction (612870)	\$9,119,298	55.9	PRC-Approved (08/29/2022)
Needham- Newton- Bridge Replacement on Christina Street (613594)	\$5,551,514	66.4	PRC-Approved (10/12/2023)

FFYs = Federal Fiscal Years. MBTA = Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority. PRC = Project Review Committee. TIP = Transportation Improvement Program.

Table 16
New FFYs 2026–30 TIP Projects: Complete Streets

Project	Cost	Score	Status
Bolton-Reconstruction of Route 117 (Main Street) from 200 feet west of John Powers Lane to the Intersection of Mechanic Street including Culvert Replacement (613885)	\$8,698,405	47.2	PRC-Approved (10/02/2024)
Chelsea-Everett-Reconstruction of Vine Street and Third Street from Chelsea Street to 2nd Street (613585)	\$13,119,298	67.1	PRC-Approved (10/12/2023)
Lexington-Roadway Reconstruction on Hartwell Avenue and Bedford Street (613695)	\$46,195,840	73.2	PRC-Approved (10/12/2023)
Marblehead- Village Street Bridge Replacement M-04-001 (612947)	\$5,166,582	36.0	PRC-Approved (09/15/2022)
Melrose-Lebanon Street Improvement Project (Lynde Street to Malden City Line) (612534)	\$10,528,000	62.4	PRC-Approved (02/10/2022)
Needham-Reconstruction of Highland Avenue, from Webster Street to Great Plain Avenue (612536)	\$15,776,000	62.4	PRC-Approved (10/21/2021)

FFYs = Federal Fiscal Years. PRC = Project Review Committee. TIP = Transportation Improvement Program.

Table 17
New FFYs 2026–30 TIP Projects: Intersection Improvements

Project	Cost	Score	Status
Wenham-Safety Improvements on Route 1A (609388)	\$5,337,157	35.2	75% Package Received (02/08/2024)

FFYs = Federal Fiscal Years. PRC = Project Review Committee. TIP = Transportation Improvement Program.

Table 18
New FFYs 2026–30 TIP Projects: Transit Transformation

Proponent	Scope	Score	Cost
CATA	Automatic Passenger Counting and Automatic Vehicle Location Deployment	29.4	\$680,000
MBTA	Operational Safety Improvements at Bus Stops	44.6	\$5,500,000
MBTA	Bus Priority and Accessibility Improvements (PATI)	48.0	\$1,000,000
MBTA	Natick Center Station Accessibility Improvements	53.6	\$2,500,000
MBTA	Rail Modernization-Early Action Items: Beverly Depot Grade Crossing Elimination	38.0	\$10,000,000
MBTA	Wellesley Station Upgrades	43.6	\$5,000,000
MBTA	West Broadway Ductbank Replacement	23.8	\$25,000,000
MBTA	Catamaran Overhaul	25.0	\$2,634,000
MWRTA	CNG Vehicle Procurement Project (6 29-foot Gillig)	52.6	\$4,200,000
MWRTA	Blandin Hub Accessible Redesign	64.0	\$7,750,000
Total			\$64,264,000

CATA = Cape Ann Transportation Authority. CNG = Compressed Natural Gas. FFYs = Federal Fiscal Years. MBTA = Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority. MWRTA = MetroWest Regional Transit Authority. PATI = Plan for Accessible Transit Infrastructure.

Table 19
New FFYs 2026–30 TIP Projects: Community Connections BikeShare Capital Projects

Proponent	Scope	Score	Cost
Boston	Replacement (20 Stations, 380 Docks)	70.5	\$783,860
Brookline	BikeShare Expansion of 3 Stations and 10 eBikes	67.5	\$238,646
Cambridge	Replacement of 7 Stations and 123 Bikes	65.5	\$268,458
Chelsea	BikeShare Expansion (3 Stations, 28 Bikes, 3 eBikes)	66.0	\$86,228
Somerville	BikeShare Replacement (40 Bikes, 40 Docks, 10 Slabs)	67.5	\$278,127
Total	33 Stations, 201 bicycles		\$1,484,609

eBikes = Electric Bikes. FFYs = Federal Fiscal Years. TIP = Transportation Improvement Program.

Table 20
New FFYs 2026–30 TIP Projects: Community Connections Bike Rack Capital Projects

Proponent	Scope	Score	Cost
Marblehead	Bicycle Rack Procurement (22 Racks, 117 Spaces)	61	\$6,250
Newton	Bicycle Rack, Shelter, and RRFB Procurement (67 Racks, 2 Shelters, 12 RRFBs)	64	\$473,132
Total			\$479,382

FFYs = Federal Fiscal Years. RRFB = Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacon. TIP = Transportation Improvement Program.

E. Lapointe discussed the following key takeaways from the project applications and scores:

- Municipalities are making more progress in advancing new projects following disruptions from the COVID-19 pandemic, reflected in municipal application volumes
- Earlier communication around project cost or readiness risks in fall and early winter have enabled growth in transit applications
- Community Connections is being increasingly utilized for bikeshare capital projects
 - Volumes are no longer buoyed by multiple applications for microtransit pilots
 - Federal funding is less flexible than state funding, which limits more experimental projects seen in initial application years

E. Lapointe discussed project rescoring, which was discussed at the February 20, 2025, MPO board meeting and is a key component of the TIP Project Cost Change Policies.

E. Lapointe stated that rescoring projects allows flagged projects to be compared to other programmed projects or new project applications. E. Lapointe stated that much of the planned rescoring work has not been accomplished by MPO staff. Fourteen projects in the FFYs 2025–29 TIP were scored before the FFYs 2022–26 TIP, and therefore used a 134-point scale rather than the current 100-point scale. Projects selected for rescoring can be found in Tables 21–22.

Table 21
Project Rescoring: Selected Legacy Projects

FFYs		Proponent	Project Description	Current Score	First TIP	Cost
2025– 29	Year					
2026	Boston	Boston-Improvements on Boylston Street, from Intersection of Brookline Avenue and Park Drive to Ipswich Street	60/134	FFYs 2016– 20	\$8,665,052	
2026	Norwood	Norwood-Intersection Improvements at Route 1 and University Avenue/Everett Street	55/134	FFYs 2017– 21	\$27,636,336	
2027–28	Ipswich	Ipswich-Resurfacing and Related Work on Central and South Main Streets	47/134	FFYs 2019– 23	\$15,035,254	
2028	Ashland	Ashland-Rehabilitation and Rail Crossing Improvements on Cherry Street	38/134	FFYs 2020– 24	\$1,316,339	
2029–30	Woburn	Woburn-Roadway and Intersection Improvements at Woburn Common, Route 38 (Main Street), Winn Street, Pleasant Street, and Montvale Avenue	75/134	FFYs 2021– 25	\$18,026,400	

FFYs = Federal Fiscal Years. TIP = Transportation Improvement Program.

Table 22
Project Rescoring: Unscored Projects

FFYs 2025– 29 TIP Year	Proponent	Project Description	First TIP	Cost
2026	Framingham	Framingham- Preliminary Design of Intersection Improvements at Route 126/135/MBTA & CSX Railroad	FFYs 2025–29	\$1,400,000
2026	Lexington	Lexington- Design of Safety Improvements at the Interstate 95 and Route 4/225 Interchange	FFYs 2025–29	\$1,650,000
2028–32	Boston	Boston- Reconstruction of Rutherford Avenue, from City Square to Sullivan Square	FFYs 2016–20	\$197,759,449

FFYs = Federal Fiscal Years. MBTA = Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority. TIP = Transportation Improvement Program.

Discussion

D. Mohler asked if MPO staff are going to rescore projects.

E. Lapointe stated that it's unlikely that rescoring will be done in time to be considered in the FFYs 2026–30 TIP scenarios, and that MPO staff would be working to rescore projects over the next several months, which will make rescoring in future TIP development cycles easier for MPO staff.

D. Mohler asked if there was also going to be rescoring of Readiness Days project delays, or if that would happen in the upcoming months. In addition, D. Mohler asked for clarification on the scope and timeline for what will be rescored in the coming months.

E. Lapointe stated that the TIP scoring process begins early January using applications and information provided by project proponents in the fall. Due to the process of identifying and soliciting project details taking place prior to Readiness Days, MPO staff use the previous Readiness Days information to predict which projects may be flagged for delay or have other issues. E. Lapointe stated that the five projects that were identified to be rescored were delayed in the FFYs 2025–29 TIP and flagged for delays in prior years. E. Lapointe stated that MPO staff are soliciting the list of projects for

rescoring in tandem with new project applications to facilitate a single more efficient process rather than separate scoring processes for old and new projects.

14. Summary of FFY 2024 Public Engagement Activities and Evaluation of Program Effectiveness—*Stella Jordan, MPO Staff*

Documents posted to the MPO meeting calendar

1. Summary of FFY 2024 Public Engagement Activities and Evaluation of Public Engagement Program Effectiveness Memo ([pdf](#)) ([html](#))

S. Jordan, MPO Staff, presented about the MPO's Public Engagement Program and how MPO staff are evaluating its effectiveness and impact. S. Jordan stated that the program has annual evaluations that focus on engagement activities, impact, and reach and that analyze gaps in the program. S. Jordan stated that there are also quarterly updates that focus on topics and themes based on information gathered through public comments and engagement events.

S. Jordan stated that the MPO's Public Engagement Program is guided by the Public Engagement Plan, which ensures that the MPO meets its federal public participation requirements by facilitating inclusive public engagement and transparency in its planning and decision-making processes. S. Jordan stated that the MPO aims to go beyond these requirements in its approach to public engagement.

S. Jordan stated that each year, the Public Engagement Program engages stakeholders throughout the development of the recurring development cycle of certification documents such as the TIP, UPWP, and the LRTP, in addition to a variety of other initiatives and programs.

S. Jordan reviewed engagement activities in FFY 2024, which included the following programs, document production processes, and initiatives:

- FFYs 2025–29 TIP
- FFY 2026 UPWP
- 2027 LRTP
- Discrete studies
- Engagement projects
- Engagement analyses
- Advisory Council
- Vision Zero Action Plan

S. Jordan stated that MPO staff attended and hosted 30 in-person events across the Boston region, and prioritized events in underrepresented communities. S. Jordan

stated that MPO representation at in-person events substantially increased from previous FFYs. In addition, MPO staff hosted more than 90 one-on-one and small group meetings with stakeholders in FFY 2024, reflecting the relationship building efforts that MPO staff have undertaken.

S. Jordan stated that MPO staff conducted four region-wide surveys with 1,119 total responses. There were engagement gaps in the following populations or areas:

- Lowest numbers of responses in the SouthWest Advisory Planning Committee and Three Rivers Interlocal Council subregions
- Individuals with limited English proficiency
- Low-income populations
- People of color
- Youth populations

S. Jordan stated that MPO staff expect to conduct more surveys in the upcoming FFY. Additional strategies to address these gaps included targeted surveying, in-person events, and partnership activities.

S. Jordan stated that these public engagement events are supported by external communications, including email and social media platforms to send timely communications. S. Jordan stated that social media platforms such as X and Facebook are decreasing in effectiveness, while platforms such as LinkedIn are becoming increasingly impactful.

In FFY 2024, MPO staff received 391 individual public comments, many of which were prompted by MPO staff's engagement activities and communications. S. Jordan stated that comments were shared by a variety of stakeholders, including municipal representatives, agency representatives, advocacy and community-based organizations, and members of the public. S. Jordan stated that MPO staff received comments from municipalities in every subregion due to direct engagement with each subregion.

S. Jordan discussed progress made towards the following goals:

- Relationship-building
- Addressing gaps
- Using new strategies and tools
- Supporting Vision Zero
- Expanding and improving the Advisory Council
- Updating the Public Engagement Plan

S. Jordan stated that MPO staff strengthened relationships with advocacy and community-based organizations to address gaps in its public engagement efforts. MPO staff also tested new strategies and tools for public engagement, such as the Pilot Community Planning Lab. In addition, MPO staff worked closely with the MPO's Vision Zero Project Team to develop and implement holistic engagement strategies. MPO staff also worked with the Advisory Council to develop a mission statement, goals, and to implement best practices to diversify membership and bring the Advisory Council into alignment with the MPO's planning cycles.

S. Jordan discussed the impacts of the MPO's public engagement, including the following three areas:

- Quarterly reporting on themes and trends heard from public engagement help inform decisions, particularly those related to the development of the LRTP.
- *Strategies for Environmental Outreach and Engagement* strengthened the MPO's relationship with environmentally focused work and stakeholders in the Boston region and improved the incorporation of environmental priorities into the MPO's planning process.
- The Community Planning Lab educational program exemplifies the way that MPO staff are working to create more opportunities and mechanisms for engagement impact.

S. Jordan discussed goals for the Public Engagement Program in FFY 2025, including the following:

- Continuing relationship building
- Continue improving analysis and reporting
- Restructure of the Advisory Council
- Develop engagement plan for 2027 LRTP
- Update the Public Engagement Plan

Discussion

L. Diggins asked if there was a sense of the age range of individuals engaging with the MPO.

S. Jordan stated that MPO staff have had better success engaging with younger people approximately between the ages of 21 and 25 at public events, community gatherings, and through partnerships with organizations that work closely with individuals in that age range.

L. Diggins stated that younger people should be a target for public engagement, specifically related to work such as the LRTP.

L. Diggins asked for clarification due to a decrease of 25 percent in sent emails from the MPO, but an increase in individuals opening emails by eight percent.

S. Jordan stated that MPO staff are aiming to target its emails more and make them more interesting for individuals to open and read. S. Jordan stated that as MPO staff are expanding their email lists, they are refining which emails get sent to whom.

15. Members' Items

There were none.

16. Adjourn

A motion to adjourn was made by the Advisory Council (L. Diggins) 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 Arlington)	John Alessi
City of Boston	Jen Rowe
	Jessica Morris
Inner Core Committee (City of Somerville)	Brad Rawson
	Tom Bent
Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority (MBTA)	Sandy Johnston
	Josh Ostroff
Massachusetts Department of Transportation (MassDOT)	David Mohler
	Derek Krevat
	John Romano
	Chris Klem
Massachusetts Port Authority	Sarah Lee
MassDOT Highway Division	John Bechard
	Lyriss Liautaud
MBTA Advisory Board	Hanna Switekowski
	Isabella MacKinnon
Metropolitan Area Planning Council	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 Transit Authorities	Jim Nee
	Tyler Terrasi
	Felicia Webb
Regional Transportation Advisory Council	Lenard Diggins
Three Rivers Interlocal Council (Town of Norwood)	Tom O'Rourke
	Steve Olanoff

Other Attendees	Affiliation
Karen Winger	Association for Commuter Transportation
Srilekha Murthy	BETA Group, Inc.
Heyne Kim	City of Boston
Louisa Gag	City of Boston
Ben Cares	City of Chelsea
Gisell De la Cruz	City of Salem
Paulina Muratore	Conservation Law Foundation
Jarrold Goentzel	Friends of the Belmont Community Path
Maddi Waskom	Harvard University
Sonja Boet-Whitaker	Kittelson & Associates, Inc.
Barbara Lachance	MassDOT
Ben Muller	MassDOT
Cheryll-Ann Senior	MassDOT
Derek Shooster	MassDOT
Jacquelyn Goddard	MassDOT
Melissa Santley	MassDOT
Michelle Scott	MassDOT
Miranda Briseño	MassDOT
Sarah Bradbury	MassDOT
Stephanie Abundo	MassDOT
Tracie Lenhardt	MassDOT
Andrew Wang	MassDOT
Angela Servello	MBTA
Hadrian Merced	MBTA
Joshua Klingenstein	MBTA
Benjamin Coulombe	MWRTA
Cam Sullivan	MWRTA
Rana Al-Jammal	Pioneer Valley Planning Commission Third Plymouth District in the Massachusetts
State Representative Joan Meschino	Legislature
Paul Cobuzzi	Town of Belmont
Shaun Handy	Town of Bourne
Meghan McNamara	Town of Lexington
Susan Barrett	Town of Lexington
Rich Kosian	Town of Lynnfield
Logan Casey	Town of Marblehead
Sheila Page	Town of Wellesley
Bob	

MPO Staff/Central Transportation Planning Staff

Tegin Teich, Executive Director

Abby Cutrumbes Heerema

Adriana Jacobsen

Annette Demchur

Betsy Harvey Herzfeld

Bradley Putnam

Casey Cooper

Dave Hong

Elena Ion

Erin Maguire

Ethan Lapointe

Gina Perille

Hiral Gandhi

Jia Huang

Joe Delorto

Lauren Magee

Marty Milkovits

Meghan O'Connor

Olivia Saccocia

Priyanka Chapekar

Rebecca Morgan

Rose McCarron

Sam Taylor

Sean Rourke

Stella Jordan

Tanner Bonner

CIVIL RIGHTS NOTICE TO THE PUBLIC

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



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

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

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

Boston Region MPO Title VI Specialist

10 Park Plaza, Suite 2150

Boston, MA 02116

Phone: 857.702.3700

Email: civilrights@ctps.org

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