

MPO Meeting Minutes

Draft Memorandum for the Record

Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization Meeting

April 3, 2025, Meeting

10:00 AM–1:30 PM, State Transportation Building's Second Floor Boardroom and Zoom Video Conferencing Platform

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

Decisions

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

- Approve the minutes of the meeting of February 20, 2025
- Approve the work scope for the Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority (MBTA) Intermediate Year Service Equity Analysis Methods and Applications
- Endorse Federal Fiscal Years (FFYs) 2025–29 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Amendment Ten, inclusive of the project description change for the Blandin Hub Accessible Redesign Project
- Include cost increases for Project 609204, Belmont–Community Path, Belmont Component of the MCRT (Phase 1), from \$19.7 million to \$27.3 million, Project 606453, Boston–Improvements on Boylston Street, from Intersection of Brookline Avenue and Park Drive to Ipswich Street, from \$8.6 million to \$10.18 million, and Project 608067, Woburn–Burlington–Intersection Reconstruction at Route 3 (Cambridge Road) and Bedford Road and South Bedford Street, from \$3.4 million to \$4.8 million, in FFYs 2026–30 TIP Scenario 1A
- Add \$2 million for the design of Project 613568, Cambridge–New Bridge and Shared-Use Path Construction over Fitchburg Line at Danehy Park Connector, in the FFY 2026 element of FFYs 2026–30 TIP Scenario 1A
- Include Project 612534, Melrose–Lebanon Street Improvement Project (Lynde Street to Malden City Line), in the FFY 2030 element of the FFYs 2026–30 TIP Scenario 1A
- Reduce funding for Project 606226, Boston–Reconstruction of Rutherford Avenue, from City Square to Sullivan Square, from \$35.5 million to \$20 million in FFY 2029 and include Project 609246, Lynn–Rehabilitation of Western Avenue (Route 107), in FFY 2029 of FFYs 2026–30 TIP Scenario 1A

- Approve FFYs 2026–30 TIP Scenario 1A for inclusion in the Draft FFYs 2026–30 TIP

Meeting Agenda

1. Introductions

See attendance beginning on page 27.

2. Chair's Report—*Steve Woelfel, MassDOT*

There was none.

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

T. Teich announced that the Open Meeting Law provisions allowing remote participation in meetings have been extended to June 2027, and MPO meetings going forward will be remote unless it is explicitly stated otherwise. The April 3, 2025, Unified Planning Work Program Committee meeting will be held at 2:30 PM in MPO staff's large conference room.

T. Teich reviewed the agenda, which included three action items and one presentation.

T. Teich stated that the next MPO board meeting will be held virtually on April 17, 2025, at 10:00 AM.

4. Public Comments

Bill Deignan, City of Cambridge, stated that while Project 613357, Cambridge–Separated Bicycle Lanes on Cambridge Street, appears in some proposed FFYs 2026–30 TIP scenarios for funding in FFY 2026 at \$2 million, the City has deprioritized the project. Instead, the City requested that the MPO board consider funding the design pilot for Project 613568, Cambridge–New Bridge and Shared-Use Path Construction over Fitchburg Line at Danehy Park Connector, for \$2 million. B. Deignan stated that Cambridge secured partial funding through a Reconnecting Communities and Neighborhoods (RCN) grant sufficient to reach the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) review phase, but the remainder of the grant funding is currently on hold due to a program review.

Eric Bourassa, Metropolitan Area Planning Council (MAPC), asked what would happen if the grant programs that are on hold and under review get approved by the administration.

B. Deignan stated that the City is open to the solutions that work for the MPO and the TIP. If the City is ultimately able to take advantage of the grant funds, there could be a TIP amendment that could program an alternative project.

Erin Chute, Town of Brookline, asked if the process of working with MassDOT will differ if the City obtains TIP funding rather than the RCN grant funding.

B. Deignan stated that it would be the same and the City would be able to build off the previous work it had done with MassDOT since the City has not begun the permitting process yet. B. Deignan stated that if the City gets assurance of funding, the City will sign a design contract and start the process.

Aleida Leza, Belmont resident, expressed concern about the delayed schedule of Project 609204, Belmont–Community Path, Belmont Component of the Massachusetts Central Rail Trail (MCRT) (Phase One), which has contributed to the design for the bridge and tunnel being repeatedly rejected due to some MBTA equipment in the same area.

Pam Helinek, Town of Hudson, expressed appreciation for the inclusion of design funding for Project 613926, Hudson–Bike Path Construction of MCRT, from Felton Street to Priest Street, in all scenarios of the FFYs 2026–30 TIP.

Sheila Page, Town of Wellesley, expressed support for including Project 613695, Lexington–Roadway Reconstruction on Hartwell Avenue and Bedford Street, in the FFYs 2026–30 TIP. In addition, S. Page expressed support for FFYs 2025–29 TIP Amendment Ten, which included accessibility improvements to the Wellesley Square and Natick Commuter Rail stations and funding for the MetroWest Regional Transit Authority (MWRTA).

Gardy Desrouleaux, Owner of Craft Food Halls and Revolution Hall in Lexington, expressed support for Project 613695, Lexington–Roadway Reconstruction on Hartwell Avenue and Bedford Street. G. Desrouleaux stated that the project would revitalize the area, complement the planned development of multi-family housing, enhance pedestrian and bicycle access for Bedford residents, create employment and internship opportunities for youth, and increase patronage to local businesses.

5. Committee Chairs' Reports

Jen Rowe, City of Boston, reported that at the TIP Process, Engagement, and Readiness Committee meeting on March 27, 2025, members discussed the MPO board's March 20, 2025, directive to recommend expectations for TIP project proponents. The goal is to promote communication, collaboration, and project progress

while mitigating program risk. Initial expectations were grouped into two categories: information sharing and design progress, with further discussion scheduled for the May 15, 2025, committee meeting. In addition, J. Rowe stated that the committee reviewed the revised FFYs 2026–30 TIP programming scenarios (2A, 2B, and 2C) and voted to recommend Scenario 2A because it has a more proportional regional funding distribution and reduces program risk by including smaller projects and those with updated cost estimates.

E. Bourassa raised concerns about the committee continuing to make formal recommendations, noting that the committee was intended primarily for information sharing and warning of potential confusion among project proponents.

E. Chute agreed and emphasized the importance of clarity on the issue but stated that previous MPO board direction encouraged the committee to offer recommendations, which are helpful to the board. E. Chute suggested revising recommendation language.

Tom Bent, Inner Core Committee (City of Somerville), stated that other MPO committees, such as the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) Committee, have made formal recommendations to the MPO board before, and he stated that he also remembers the previous request for the TIP Process, Engagement, and Readiness Committee to make recommendations to the board related to TIP development scenarios.

E. Bourassa stated that he does not oppose the committee making recommendations entirely but cautions against voting on specific TIP scenarios and project selections.

E. Bourassa proposed having an agenda item in a future meeting to further discuss the issue.

Josh Ostroff, MBTA, suggested that the committee focus on recommending processes and improvements rather than endorsing specific scenarios.

Chris Klem, MassDOT, stated that the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) Committee will meet this afternoon at 2:30 PM in a hybrid format to discuss discrete study ideas for the development of the FFY 2026 UPWP. C. Klem stated that the committee will also meet on April 10 and April 17, 2025, to review study scenarios and vote on a final scenario for inclusion in the FFY 2026 UPWP.

6. Action Item: Approval of February 20, 2025, MPO Meeting Minutes
Documents posted to the MPO meeting calendar

1. February 20, 2025, Meeting Minutes ([pdf](#)) ([html](#))

Vote

A motion to approve the minutes of the meeting of February 20, 2025, was made by the MAPC (E. Bourassa) and seconded by the Town of Arlington (J. Alessi). The motion carried.

7. Action Item: Work Scope: MBTA Service Equity Analysis—Sophie Fox, MPO Staff

Documents posted to the MPO meeting calendar

1. MBTA Service Equity Analysis Work Scope ([pdf](#)) ([html](#))

Sophie Fox, MPO staff, presented the work scope for the Intermediate Year Service Equity Analysis Methods and Applications, which will support the MBTA in monitoring the equity impacts of incremental Bus Network Redesign service changes across schedule periods. S. Fox stated that the project has a \$40,000 budget under an MBTA contract and a five-month timeline. S. Fox stated that, under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the MBTA must assess major service changes to ensure they do not cause disparate impacts or disproportionate burdens on protected or low-income populations. S. Fox stated that the first set of changes, implemented in December 2024, were found to be nondiscriminatory; but to support ongoing monitoring, the MBTA requested MPO staff develop a process to evaluate relative equity impacts over time and track progress toward intended outcomes.

Discussion

Lenard Diggins, Regional Transportation Advisory Council, expressed appreciation for the MBTA going above the Title VI requirements to assess adverse impacts and its demonstrated commitment to providing equitable service.

Vote

A motion to approve the work scope for the Intermediate Year Service Equity Analysis Methods and Applications was made by the Advisory Council (L. Diggins) and seconded by the City of Boston (J. Rowe). The motion carried.

8. 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 Table ([pdf](#)) ([html](#))
2. FFYs 2025–29 TIP Amendment Ten Public Comments ([pdf](#))

Ethan Lapointe, MPO staff, presented FFYs 2025–29 TIP Amendment Ten, which prevents leaving a substantial amount of unprogrammed funding in FFY 2025 due to project delays by programming five new transit projects in FFY 2025 of the TIP while providing additional resources to four currently funded efforts. These changes amounted to \$24,126,500 in new transit funding, which included the following:

- \$2,792,500 to three Cape Ann Transportation Authority projects
- \$11,134,000 to four MBTA projects
- \$10,200,000 to two MetroWest Regional Transit Authority projects

E. Lapointe summarized the public comments received on FFYs 2025–29 TIP Amendment Ten, which included the following five letters of support:

- MBTA Advisory Board supporting each project included in the amendment, particularly the MBTA projects
- Town of Wellesley Select Board in support of the Wellesley Square Station Upgrades
- Town of Natick Select Board in support of the Natick Center Station Accessibility Project
- Representative David Linsky, 5th Middlesex, in support of the Natick Center Station Accessibility Project
- MWRTA emphasized support for the Blandin Hub Accessible Redesign Project and included additional detail on project and timeline for architectural and engineering work

In addition, E. Lapointe stated that MPO staff are also requesting Amendment Ten include the project description changes for the Blandin Hub project on the transit side of the TIP.

Vote

A motion to endorse FFYs 2025–29 TIP Amendment Ten, inclusive of the project description change for the Blandin Hub Accessible Redesign Project, was made by the MAPC (E. Bourassa) and seconded by the MBTA Advisory Board (Hanna Switekowski). The motion carried.

9. MBTA Capital Investment Plan (CIP)—Mike Malia, MBTA

Documents posted to the MPO meeting calendar

1. Proposed FY 2026–30 CIP ([pdf](#))

Mike Malia, MBTA, presented the MBTA's Fiscal Year (FY) 2026–30 Proposed CIP, which is a financially constrained, annually updated, rolling, five-year program that funds the planning, construction, and maintenance of MBTA assets.

M. Malia stated that the CIP is driven by three key objectives:

- Timely Maintenance Now: Ensuring that the MBTA continues to build upon recent progress in delivering for our riders, both now and in the future
- Building for the Future: Ensuring that investments today set a strong foundation for future infrastructure, while seeking additional funding
- Improving Service for Riders: Ensuring improved service, in the near- and long-term, by improving frequency, reliability, decarbonization, and rider enhancements as outlined in *Full T Ahead*

M. Malia stated that the MBTA's capital programming strategy extends beyond the CIP, and includes strategic process improvements, such as improved asset information, pursuing funding opportunities, and enhancing right-of-way access capabilities. M. Malia highlighted recent MBTA accomplishments, such as the Track Improvement Program, the release of the MBTA GO app, and the launch of Phase 1 of the Bus Network Redesign.

M. Malia summarized the Proposed FY 2026–30 CIP, which includes over 660 projects and programs \$9.8 billion over the next five fiscal years. Details of the MBTA's Proposed FY 2026–30 CIP can be found in Tables 1 and 2.

Table 1
MBTA FY 2026–30 CIP: Programmed Spend by Mode

Mode	Programmed Spend (millions)
Rapid Transit	\$3,836
Commuter Rail	\$2,513
Systemwide	\$2,064
Bus	\$1,091
Multimodal	\$183
Paratransit	\$54
Ferry	\$50

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

Table 2
MBTA FY 2026–30 CIP: Programmed Spend by CIP Program

CIP Program	Programmed Spend (millions)
Vehicles	\$2,822
Guideway, Signal, and Power	\$1,971
Passenger Facilities	\$1,307
Structures	\$1,269
Maintenance and Administrative Facilities	\$1,097
Technology and Innovation	\$696
Business and Operational Support	\$398
Green Line Extension	\$186
South Coast Rail	\$23
Expansion Projects	\$20

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

M. Malia highlighted some of the MBTA's investments by mode, which include the following:

- Rapid Transit:
 - \$1.7 billion in Green Line infrastructure, accessibility upgrades, and introduction of new Type 10 trains by 2027
 - \$404 million for upgrades to power systems on the MBTA's rapid transit lines that will increase efficiency, reduce maintenance, and improve reliability
 - \$777 million to deliver new vehicles and modernized signal equipment on the Red and Orange Lines, improving safety, reliability, and efficiency
- Bus:
 - \$496 million to construct new and retrofitted bus facilities
 - \$180 million to continue implementation of the Bus Network Redesign and improve transit priority infrastructure
 - \$47.4 million for critical midlife overhauls of 45 60-foot hybrid buses
- Commuter Rail:
 - \$710 million for investments in rail fleet
 - \$223 million for further investments in regional rail modernization
 - \$679 million in FY 2026–30 (\$1.2 billion total) to replace and expand the North Station Draw 1 Bridge
- Ferry: \$50 million for ferry terminal accessibility upgrades and fleet overhauls to support a consistent network of water transportation services

- Paratransit: Continued investments in The RIDE's vehicle fleet to strive for seamless transitions between paratransit and fixed-route services
- Systemwide/Multimodal:
 - \$488 million for investments in structural inspection and repair
 - \$265 million for State of Good Repair programs
 - \$33 million to upgrade rider-facing audio and visual communication equipment in stations

M. Malia highlighted some additional major investments in the Proposed FY 2026–30 CIP, which included the following investment categories:

- Vehicles: \$16 million to overhaul auxiliary power systems on Blue Line vehicles and \$12.5 million to upgrade maintenance-of-way vehicle fleet
- Passenger Facilities: \$15 million for accessible mini-high platforms at commuter rail stations and \$15 million for new bus shelter installations and improvements
- Business and Operational Support: \$2 million to implement the Safety Management System and \$3.9 million for Rail Modernization Planning
- Structures: \$15.5 million for the systemwide tunnel inspection program and \$6 million to improve bridge safety walkways systemwide
- Guideway, Signal, and Power: \$21.2 million for improved maintenance access on the Orange Line and \$10 million for early actions to electrify the Newburyport/Rockport Line
- Maintenance and Administrative Facilities: \$11.5 million for a new Operations Control Center and \$9.2 million for improvements to commuter rail facilities
- Technology and Innovation: \$3.2 million for heavy rail dispatch software improvements and \$20.8 million for systemwide radio system upgrades

M. Malia discussed challenges the MBTA has faced and efforts to address them, including funding Reliability and Modernization initiatives, implementing a five-year hiring plan, and leveraging borrowing through the Commonwealth Transportation Fund.

In addition, M. Malia stated that the MBTA could allocate only \$1.031 billion—8 percent of total requests—to new projects, meeting just 13 percent of identified needs for FY 2026–30. M. Malia stated that many critical projects remain unfunded, though the MBTA is advancing work with available resources. Further details are provided in Table 3.

Table 3
MBTA Significant Unfunded Projects and Needs

Significant Unfunded Needs	Total Funding to Date	Estimated Total Project Cost	Current MBTA Actions
Arborway Bus Maintenance Facility	\$8.5M	Over \$440M	MBTA is bringing this project to 30% design so that it can proceed with full design and construction once funding is identified.
Widett Layover and Maintenance Facility	\$43.4M*	Over \$300M	The CIP funds initial work on the property, including demolition and design work.
Silver Line Extension	\$0.6M	Over \$100M	The CIP supports early design and environmental permitting work.
Rail Modernization—Newburyport/Rockport Line Electrification	\$10.0M	Over \$800M	The CIP funds the construction of a traction power substation that is critical for electrifying this corridor.

Notes: Cost estimates were informed by new funding amounts requested by MBTA staff as part of the FY 2026–30 CIP development process. Projects are at varying stages of development, and the final project cost may change as work progresses. The Total Funding to Date column includes new funding in FY 2026–30 CIP.

* The amount does not include real estate acquisition costs.

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

M. Malia stated that the MBTA is currently in the public engagement phase of developing its FY 2026–30 CIP, which was presented on March 27, 2025. M. Malia stated that public feedback is accepted through April 17, 2025, via public meetings, the online comment tool, email, or mail. In addition, M. Malia reviewed the following key dates in the CIP development timeline:

- April 3, 2025: Presentation to Boston Region MPO Board on Proposed FY 2026–30 CIP and CIP Public Meeting #1 (virtual)
- April 10, 2025: CIP Public Meeting #2 (in-person)
- April 17, 2025: Public comment period ends
- May 15, 2025: Presentation of final FY 2026–30 CIP to MBTA's Finance and Audit Subcommittee (subject to change)

- May 20, 2025: Presentation to full MBTA Board on final FY 2026–30 CIP and release of final CIP (subject to change)
- June 2025: High-level responses to public comments published with final CIP document

Discussion

Jay Monty, City of Everett, expressed appreciation for the presentation's high level of detail, and for the inclusion of the Rail Modernization–Newburyport/Rockport Line Electrification project, even though it is not fully funded through the CIP. J. Monty asked if there are aspects or processes for projects related to highway projects that the board should be aware of to ensure that those projects can run together smoothly.

M. Malia stated that he would let J. Monty know.

Dennis Giombetti, MetroWest Regional Collaborative (City of Framingham), asked how many vehicles of what types the MBTA would be purchasing for the commuter rail.

M. Malia stated that the MBTA recently executed an option for 39 bilevel coach vehicles in addition to a 41-vehicle option the MBTA already executed. In addition, M. Malia stated that the MBTA is considering procuring some new locomotives.

D. Giombetti asked for a list of projects on the Worcester Line that were included in the CIP and the ones that were not included.

E. Bourassa asked if the MBTA could break down the unfunded requests by mode and by program similarly to how the funded requests were presented.

M. Malia stated that the MBTA can provide that information.

E. Bourassa asked if the governor's proposal in the supplemental budget fair share funds were included in the proposed CIP.

M. Malia stated that they were not included.

E. Bourassa asked for clarification on the amount the funds that would be provided if passed through the legislature.

M. Malia noted that the MBTA's \$601 million share of the \$1.25 billion funding was included in last year's CIP. M. Malia stated that additional funding through the Commonwealth Transportation Fund is under discussion, with a potential \$850 million allocation to the MBTA. M. Malia stated that the governor's proposed \$8 billion investment would be distributed over a ten-year period.

E. Bourassa emphasized the need to recognize that there is still a significant need for maintenance and maintaining a state of good repair for the MBTA.

E. Chute asked if the internal improvements made to increase efficiency for right-of-way processes could be translated to municipal capital projects.

M. Malia stated that there would be some improvements regardless because the MBTA is looking to its 2026 Diversion Calendar, which is much more foresighted than the MBTA had been previously.

T. Bent emphasized the importance of project coordination between the MBTA, MassDOT, and municipalities, specifically because of the challenges that can arise.

M. Malia stated that the MBTA's right-of-way process improvements are focused on rapid transit because rapid transit has the largest number of complications related to right-of-way issues. In addition, M. Malia stated that, in terms of implementing and scheduling work on projects, there is still a greater need for overall coordination.

T. Bent asked if the MBTA has the internal staff needed to get the work done that it has proposed in its CIP.

M. Malia stated that internal staff capacity is not one of the larger issues. M. Malia added that getting enough firms and competition within bids and getting a larger bidding pool is probably the largest challenge the MBTA has in terms of capacity and affordability. M. Malia stated that the MBTA is working to address this issue.

10. Break

11. Action Item: FFYs 2026-30 TIP Final Project Programming Scenario—Ethan Lapointe, MPO Staff

Documents posted to the MPO meeting calendar

1. Simplified FFYs 2026–30 TIP Revised Scenarios 2A–C ([pdf](#)) ([html](#))
2. FFYs 2026–30 TIP Revised Scenarios 2A–C ([pdf](#)) ([html](#))
3. FFYs 2026–30 TIP Development Public Comments ([pdf](#))
4. FFYs 2026–30 TIP Printouts ([pdf](#)) ([html](#))

E. Lapointe presented scenarios 2A, 2B, and 2C for consideration for the FFYs 2026–30 TIP Final Project Programming Scenario, which MPO board members must vote to adopt.

E. Lapointe stated that these scenarios include two cost changes which were presented at the board meeting on March 20, 2025, and one new cost increase, which can be found in Table 4.

Table 4
Scenario Constants: FFY 2026 Cost Changes

Project Name	Current Budget	Revised Budget	Change
Project 609204, Belmont–Community Path, Belmont Component of the MCRT (Phase 1)	\$20,499,750	\$27,306,266	+\$6,806,516 +33.2%
Project 606453, Boston–Improvements on Boylston Street, from Intersection of Brookline Avenue and Park Drive to Ipswich Street	\$8,665,052	\$10,185,935	+\$1,520,883 +17.56%
Project 608067, Woburn–Burlington–Intersection Reconstruction at Route 3 (Cambridge Road) and Bedford Road and South Bedford Street	\$3,438,311	\$4,883,749	+\$1,445,438 +42%

FFY = Federal Fiscal Year. MCRT = Massachusetts Central Rail Trail.

E. Lapointe stated that the City of Cambridge originally requested \$2 million to substitute an expiring earmark for Project 613357, Cambridge–Separated Bicycle Lanes on Cambridge Street. E. Lapointe stated that following discussions with MassDOT, the City now prioritizes reallocating the \$2 million toward the design of Project 613568, Cambridge–New Bridge and Shared-Use Path Connection over MBTA Fitchburg Line at Danehy Park Connector, due to uncertainty with the original grant funding. E. Lapointe stated that Project 613568 is not currently included in the proposed scenarios but may be considered during discussions.

E. Lapointe stated that Project 605168, Hingham–Improvements on Route 3A from Otis Street/Cole Road including Summer Street and Rotary, is likely to be delayed to FFY 2027, which would require \$22 million of funding to be identified in FFY 2027.

E. Lapointe stated that this delay is not represented in any of the scenarios.

E. Lapointe stated that the MBTA submitted an additional request to consider an MBTA project, Operational Enhancement of Bus Routes 714 and 716, for \$1.875 million in FFY 2026. These routes serve the Town of Hingham, the Town of Hull, the Town of Milton, the Town of Canton, and the City of Boston. The improvements would include 30- and 45-minute headways, hourly Sunday service and a pilot summer diversion to Houghton’s Pond, and new commuter rail connections.

E. Lapointe discussed three new Transit Transformation projects proposed for inclusion in FFY 2026, which can be found in Table 5.

Table 5
FFY 2026: New Transit Transformation Projects

Proponent	Scope	Score	Cost
MBTA	Better Bus Project–Operational Safety Improvements at Bus Stops	44.6	\$3,216,897
MBTA	Bus Priority and Accessibility Improvements	48	\$6,000,000
MBTA	Operational Enhancement of Bus Routes 714 and 716	N/A	\$1,875,000
Total:			\$11,091,897

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

E. Lapointe stated that Scenarios 2A, 2B, and 2C build off Scenario 1A, which the MPO board voted to advance at the MPO board meeting held on March 20, 2025. Each scenario featured the same new transit projects, and none of the scenarios included the \$2 million request for the Fitchburg crossing at Danehy Park in FFY 2026. Each scenario had the same FFY 2026 funding reserve.

E. Lapointe stated that on March 27, 2025, the TIP Process, Engagement, and Readiness Committee discussed Project 609252, Lynn–Rehabilitation of Essex Street, and Project 609246, Lynn–Rehabilitation of Western Avenue (Route 107), which were the primary drivers of Scenario 1A. E. Lapointe stated that discussion during the committee meeting was followed by coordination between the Cities of Boston and Lynn, which led MPO staff to identify a path to support a compromise, which is reflected in Scenario 2D.

Scenario 1A proposed resolving the FFY 2027 deficit by delaying Project 609252, Lynn–Rehabilitation of Essex Street, to FFY 2028, and delaying Project 609246, Lynn–Rehabilitation of Western Avenue (Route 107), to FFY 2030.

Scenario 2D proposed resolving the FFY 2027 deficit by delaying Project 609252, Lynn–Rehabilitation of Essex Street, to FFY 2029, and delaying Project 606226, Boston–Reconstruction of Rutherford Avenue, from City Square to Sullivan Square, to FFY 2030, leaving a substantial unprogrammed balance in FFY 2029.

E. Lapointe reviewed the fiscal constraint for Scenario 1A, which can be found in Table 6.

Table 6
FFYs 2026–30 TIP Scenario 1A: Fiscal Constraint

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

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

Scenario 2A

E. Lapointe summarized Scenario 2A, which proposed funding four new projects in FFY 2030 and partially funding Project 611983, Chelsea–Park Street and Pearl Street Reconstruction, in FFY 2030. E. Lapointe stated that Scenario 2A focuses on funding new, smaller projects with recent cost estimates and near-term 25 percent design submissions for lower longer-term risk and the distribution of regional funding. The four projects that Scenario 2A proposed funding included the following projects:

- Project 612534, Melrose–Lebanon Street Improvement Project (Lynde Street to Malden City Line), for \$10,528,000
- Project 613594, Needham–Newton–Bridge Replacement on Christina Street, for \$5,551,514
- Project 612870, Concord–Assabet River Multi-Use Trail and Bridge Construction, for \$15,428,000
- Project 613695, Lexington–Roadway Reconstruction on Hartwell Avenue and Bedford Street, for \$46,195,840

E. Lapointe summarized Scenario 2A's fiscal constraint, which can be found in Table 7.

Table 7
FFYs 2026–30 TIP Scenario 2A: Fiscal Constraint

FFY	Total Available Regional Highway Target Funds (FFYs 2026- 30 TIP)	Draft Total Programmed Regional Highway Target Funds	Regional Highway Target Funds Remaining (Unprogrammed)	Percent Unprogrammed
2026 (New)	\$125,285,687	\$122,615,097	\$26,670,590	2.1%
2027 (New)	\$152,627,429	\$151,147,420	\$1,480,009	1.0%
2028 (New)	\$158,700,879	\$156,604,600	\$2,096,279	1.3%
2029 (New)	\$157,518,346	\$155,699,104	\$1,819,242	1.2%
2030 (New)	\$160,037,411	\$153,081,114	\$6,956,297	4.3%
2026–30 Total	\$754,169,752	\$737,701,896	\$16,467,856	2.2%

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

Scenario 2D

E. Lapointe discussed Scenario 2D, which funds the same new projects as Scenario 2A and has the same impact on fiscal constraint. E. Lapointe presented the differences between Scenarios 2D and 2A regarding Project 609252, Lynn–Rehabilitation of Essex Street, and Project 606226, Boston–Reconstruction of Rutherford Avenue, from City Square to Sullivan Square. Details on the Advance Construction Project Changes in Scenarios 2A and 2D can be found in Tables 8 and 9.

Table 8
FFYs 2026–30 TIP Scenario 2A: Advance Construction Project Changes

Project Name	FFY 2029	FFY 2030	FFYs 2026–30 Total	Remaining Balance
Boston– Reconstruction of Rutherford Avenue	\$33,500,000	\$33,500,000	\$67,000,000	\$130,759,449
Lynn– Rehabilitation of Western Avenue	\$0	\$15,000,000	\$15,000,000	\$32,536,800

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

Table 9
FFYs 2026–30 TIP Scenario 2D: Advance Construction Project Changes

Project Name	FFY 2029	FFY 2030	FFYs 2026–30 Total	Remaining Balance
Boston– Reconstruction of Rutherford Avenue	\$23,500,000	\$33,500,000	\$57,000,000	\$140,759,449
Lynn– Rehabilitation of Western Avenue	\$10,000,000	\$15,000,000	\$25,000,000	\$22,536,800

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

Discussion

D. Mohler paused the presentation to refocus on Scenario 1A. As a result of the following discussion, E. Lapointe did not present information on Scenarios 2B and 2C.

E. Lapointe stated that Scenario 1A does not program any new projects or any new transit projects within FFY 2026 and it does not accommodate funding for Project 613357, Cambridge–Separated Bicycle Lanes on Cambridge Street (Prospect Street to Second Street), or Project 613568, Cambridge–New Bridge and Shared-Use Path Connection over MBTA Fitchburg Line at Danehy Park Connector. E. Lapointe stated

that Scenario 1A does fund all Community Connections program projects and the four design pilot projects that were selected.

D. Mohler stated that members may want to discuss certain proposed projects individually, rather than in the scenario groupings that were built on Scenario 1A. D. Mohler asked which transit projects are proposed to be added to FFY 2026 in Scenario 1A to address the unprogrammed funding balance.

E. Lapointe listed the following proposed transit projects:

- MBTA–Better Bus Project–Operational Safety Improvements at Bus Stops
- MBTA–Bus Priority and Accessibility Improvements
- MBTA–Operational Enhancement of Bus Routes 714 and 716

In addition, E. Lapointe listed transit projects that were not proposed but can still be considered, which included the following:

- MBTA–Pedestrian-grade Crossing Removal at Beverly Station
- MBTA–West Broadway Duct Bank Replacement

D. Mohler asked what the implications would be if the MBTA projects were not funded through the TIP.

E. Lapointe stated that if these projects were not funded by the TIP, the MBTA would not be able to make these improvements.

Steve Olanoff, Three Rivers Interlocal Council (Town of Norwood), asked how many years the funding would be used for.

E. Lapointe stated that the funding covers approximately two years.

Chris Dilorio, South Shore Coalition (Town of Hull), stated that there is concern that MBTA bus Route 714 is not ADA compliant, and this MBTA project would add more fixed stops to make it compliant with the Americans with Disabilities Act as well as increase service and ridership.

Vote

A motion to add three projects, the MBTA–Better Bus Project–Operational Safety Improvements at Bus Stops, MBTA–Bus Priority and Accessibility Improvements, and MBTA–Operational Enhancement of Bus Routes 714 and 716, to the FFY 2026 element in the FFYs 2026–30 TIP Scenario 1A was made by the Three Rivers Interlocal Council

(Town of Norwood) (S. Olanoff) and seconded by the MBTA (J. Ostroff). The motion carried.

E. Lapointe listed the following additional cost increases that would need to be included in Scenario 1A:

- Project 609204, Belmont–Community Path, Belmont Component of the MCRT (Phase 1), from \$19.7 million to \$27.3 million
- Project 606453, Boston–Improvements on Boylston Street, from Intersection of Brookline Avenue and Park Drive to Ipswich Street, from \$8.6 million to \$10.18 million
- Project 608067, Woburn–Burlington–Intersection Reconstruction at Route 3 (Cambridge Road) and Bedford Road and South Bedford Street, \$3.4 million to \$4.8 million

D. Mohler asked about the statuses of the three projects.

E. Lapointe stated that proponents for Project 608067, Woburn–Burlington–Intersection Reconstruction at Route 3 (Cambridge Road) and Bedford Road and South Bedford Street, recently submitted its 75 percent design; Project 609204, Belmont–Community Path, Belmont Component of the MCRT (Phase 1), had its 75 percent design submission rejected due to uncertainties related to the design of a tunnel under train tracks; and Project 606453, Boston–Improvements on Boylston Street, from Intersection of Brookline Avenue and Park Drive to Ipswich Street, is still in the pre-25 percent design stage.

Vote

A motion to include cost increases for Project 609204, Belmont–Community Path, Belmont Component of the MCRT (Phase 1), from \$19.7 million to \$27.3 million, Project 606453, Boston–Improvements on Boylston Street, from Intersection of Brookline Avenue and Park Drive to Ipswich Street, from \$8.6 million to \$10.18 million, and Project 608067, Woburn–Burlington–Intersection Reconstruction at Route 3 (Cambridge Road) and Bedford Road and South Bedford Street, from \$3.4 million to \$4.8 million, was made by the MAPC (E. Bourassa), and seconded by the MBTA Advisory Board (Hanna Switekowski). The motion carried.

E. Lapointe discussed the City of Cambridge’s revised request for \$2 million in FFY 2026 for design funding for Project 613568, Cambridge–New Bridge and Shared-Use Path Construction over Fitchburg Line at Danehy Park Connector.

D. Giombetti asked if the projects were scored.

E. Lapointe stated that Project 613568 had a score of 79.4. Project 613357, Cambridge–Separated Bicycle Lanes on Cambridge Street, was not scored, but the project was flagged by MassDOT for the MPO to consider due to the expiring earmark.

E. Bourassa asked if there is funding available for the project in FFY 2026, since it was originally an earmark and now the request is for target funds.

E. Lapointe stated that there are funds available in FFY 2026.

D. Mohler asked if the City of Cambridge had the local match funding for the design of Project 613568.

B. Deignan stated that Project 613568 was budgeted for \$3 million, including a \$600,000 local match and \$2.4 million in grant funding. B. Deignan stated that the City has \$600,000 in local match and \$400,000 from the grant that has already been obligated, which will be allocated to the NEPA process.

D. Mohler asked for clarification on the project's need for design funding considering it already has discretionary grant funding.

B. Deignan stated that the project may be flagged by the federal review process due to its focus on improving bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure in low-income neighborhoods. B. Deignan stated that the City has not been able to get assurance that the remaining \$2 million will be obligated.

D. Giombetti stated that this is not within the MPO's typical processes and expressed uncertainty in moving forward with funding this project without considering alternative projects.

Hanna Switekowski, MBTA Advisory Board, asked what precedent funding this project would set and if other communities would begin coming to the MPO with projects in a similar way due to potential federal implications.

D. Mohler stated that if the MPO funds the City of Cambridge's project, it means another project will not get that \$2 million.

B. Deignan stated that last year the City of Cambridge applied for TIP design pilot funding for the project, which was approved, and it was the highest scoring project in the design pilot category; but the City asked the MPO to deprioritize funding for the project because it had received the Reconnecting Communities and Neighborhoods grant.

J. Rowe acknowledged that funding this project would be outside of the MPO's typical processes but stated that the MPO board might want to consider funding this project because there is already a contract in place.

B. Deignan stated that the City of Cambridge has already completed significant work with MassDOT on scoping of the project prior to getting the agreement signed with MassDOT and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA).

D. Mohler asked what the City of Cambridge would do if it got funding from the TIP and their RCN grant is obligated after federal review.

B. Deignan stated that the City of Cambridge would consult with the MPO board, MassDOT and other stakeholders on the best path forward. B. Deignan stated that additional funding could be used for potential project cost increases.

John Bechard, MassDOT Highway Division, asked if the City of Cambridge has taken the appropriate steps to use target funding for its design pilot.

B. Deignan stated that the City of Cambridge has worked closely with MassDOT staff on scoping and other aspects. The City has not selected a designer to complete an independent cost review because the City Manager is concerned about signing a contract.

E. Bourassa expressed support for funding \$2 million for Project 613568, Cambridge–New Bridge and Shared-Use Path Construction over Fitchburg Line at Danehy Park Connector, and stated that the City of Cambridge has made a good case for including this design pilot funding in FFY 2026.

J. Monty stated that he empathizes with the City of Cambridge and stated that there is a precedent among the community to support projects that may be left unfunded. J. Monty stated that the unique context in which the MPO approves this project is significant and should be emphasized to prevent the risk of unvetted projects looking for additional funding coming to the MPO.

T. Bent expressed support for including design funding for the project.

Vote

A motion to add \$2 million for the design of Project 613568, Cambridge–New Bridge and Shared-Use Path Construction over Fitchburg Line at Danehy Park Connector, in the FFY 2026 element of FFYs 2026–30 TIP Scenario 1A was made by the MAPC

(E. Bourassa) and seconded by the Inner Core Committee (City of Somerville) (T. Bent). The motion carried.

E. Lapointe discussed the probability that Project 605168, Hingham–Improvements on Route 3A from Otis Street/Cole Road including Summer Street and Rotary, will need to be delayed and require \$22 million of funding in FFY 2027. E. Lapointe stated that Scenario 1A does not have the funding to accommodate this delay.

E. Bourassa stated that there should be some unprogrammed funds left in FFY 2030 due to the potential effects on other projects' timelines, and that the TIP Process, Engagement, and Readiness Committee should discuss this project alongside project proponent expectations.

D. Mohler asked a question regarding the project's budget.

E. Lapointe stated that if the project's entire budget were to be delayed to FFY 2027 there would need to be an additional \$22 million in FFY 2027, which is not available in Scenario 1A.

J. Monty expressed support for leaving the project programmed in FFYs 2026 and 2027 and stated that delays due to permitting and utility issues are one of the cyclical problems that the MPO does not currently have a solution for.

E. Lapointe stated that there is approximately \$45.8 million in unprogrammed funding in FFY 2030 of Scenario 1A. E. Lapointe stated the City of Chelsea is requesting for Project 611983, Chelsea–Park Street and Pearl Street Reconstruction, to be considered for inclusion in FFY 2030.

D. Mohler asked what other projects have been proposed for funding in FFY 2030.

E. Lapointe listed the following projects that were included in the proposed scenarios:

- Project 612534, Melrose–Lebanon Street Improvement Project (Lynde Street to Malden City Line)
- Project 613594, Needham–Newton–Bridge Replacement on Christina Street
- Project 612870, Concord–Assabet River Multi-Use Trail and Bridge Construction
- Project 613695, Lexington–Roadway Reconstruction on Hartwell Avenue and Bedford Street
- Project 613568, Cambridge–New Bridge and Shared-Use Path Construction over Fitchburg Line at Danehy Park Connector

- Project 613585, Chelsea–Everett–Reconstruction of Vine Street and Third Street from Chelsea Street to 2nd Street

E. Lapointe listed several projects that were not included in the scenarios but were considered, which included the following:

- Project 613885, Bolton–Reconstruction of Route 117 (Main Street) from 200 feet west of John Powers Lane to the Intersection of Mechanic Street including Culvert Replacement
- Project 612947, Marblehead–Village Street Bridge Replacement M-04-001
- Project 612536, Needham–Reconstruction of Highland Avenue, from Webster Street to Great Plain Avenue

D. Giombetti asked which of those projects have submitted 25 percent designs.

E. Lapointe stated that Project 612534, Melrose–Lebanon Street Improvement Project (Lynde Street to Malden City Line), is the only project with a 25 percent design submission at the time the project applications were submitted for consideration on the TIP.

E. Bourassa expressed concern about adding projects to the TIP that have not reached the 25 percent design milestone and stated that future funding shortfalls will likely require removing projects. E. Bourassa emphasized the need to keep some unprogrammed funds to manage potential cost increases. E. Bourassa raised concerns about Project 613695, Lexington–Roadway Reconstruction on Hartwell Avenue and Bedford Street, due to its high cost and early stage. He supported adding Project 612534, Melrose–Lebanon Street Improvement Project (Lynde Street to Malden City Line), which has reached 25 percent design, or otherwise leaving funds unprogrammed.

D. Giombetti asked a question regarding MassDOT's processes for pre-25 percent design projects that are programmed on the TIP compared to those that are not on the TIP.

J. Bechard stated that if a project is programmed on the TIP and there is a design submission, MassDOT will establish the review cycle for the project. J. Bechard stated that if the project is programmed within the first two years of the TIP, it gets a 30-day review cycle, if the project is programmed in years three through five, it gets a 90-day review cycle. J. Bechard stated that if a project is not listed in the TIP, it gets a minimum of a 90-day review and a check-in with MassDOT's regional office to learn more about MassDOT's coordination with the project's community and consultants. In addition,

J. Bechard emphasized the importance of consistency in the readiness of projects the MPO programs on the TIP.

J. Ostroff asked a clarification question on the proposed expectations for project proponents on the TIP.

E. Bourassa stated that the MPO is committed to projects that are already programmed on the TIP, however, the MPO should discuss what it means to be committed to a project and what is expected from project proponents regarding project readiness.

D. Mohler emphasized the repetitive nature of the TIP development process, and stated that the concept of projects staying in the TIP for years without reaching 25 percent design is unsustainable and MassDOT will no longer support it.

J. Ostroff discussed the importance of clear communication with project proponents on the changing expectations for projects applying for inclusion on the TIP, including communicating what the new rules and expectations are and how they will be applied.

L. Diggins agreed that projects that have not reached the 25 percent design threshold should not be added to the TIP and asked what financial assistance the MPO offers to proponents of projects that have been approved by MassDOT's Project Review Committee (PRC).

J. Bechard stated that MassDOT staff are available to those communities if assistance is needed, but there is no financial support available from MassDOT to progress a project from the PRC-approved status to a 25 percent design status.

L. Diggins stated that most project delays seem to occur between PRC approval and the 25 percent design submission. L. Diggins stated that while he supports excluding new pre-25 percent design projects from the TIP, he cautioned that doing so could hinder progress for projects that need TIP programming to secure resources for design advancement.

D. Mohler stated that when a project is approved by the PRC, the proponent is responsible for funding the advancement of the project.

Kristen Guichard, Minuteman Advisory Group on Interlocal Coordination (MAGIC) (Town of Acton), stated that she supports the inclusion of the listed proposed projects on the TIP due to the underrepresentation of projects in the MAGIC subregion. In addition, K. Guichard asked for additional information on the funding and statuses of the projects, specifically those in the Towns of Lexington and Concord.

E. Lapointe stated that the Town of Lexington provided detailed information on design commitments for Project 613695, Lexington–Roadway Reconstruction on Hartwell Avenue and Bedford Street, and Project S12978, Lexington–Design of Safety Improvements at the Interstate 95 and Route 4/225 Interchange, and has funding allocated beyond the 25 percent design stage. He noted that while MPO staff are not tracking this for all proponents, the Town of Lexington has documented its funding allocation.

E. Chute discussed the difference between municipal funding for MassDOT projects and internal municipal projects, highlighting the need to discuss why additional municipal funding is often required to meet MassDOT standards. E. Chute emphasized the importance of understanding municipal requirements for entering the TIP Universe of Projects and reaching the 25 percent design stage.

J. Monty asked how recent the cost estimate for Project 613695 is.

E. Lapointe stated that the cost estimate is more recent than the PRC-approval status estimate.

K. Guichard stated that the Town of Concord has fully committed funding to Project 612870, Concord–Assabet River Multi-Use Trail and Bridge Construction, including some additional engineering work.

J. Rowe stated that TIP Process, Engagement, and Readiness Committee members believe TIP inclusion helps proponents secure resources to reach 25 percent design and expressed concern that limiting projects based on status could hinder their progress.

Vote

A motion to include Project 612534, Melrose–Lebanon Street Improvement Project (Lynde Street to Malden City Line), Project 612870, Concord–Assabet River Multi-Use Trail and Bridge Construction, Project 613695, Lexington–Roadway Reconstruction on Hartwell Avenue and Bedford Street, and Project 613594, Needham–Newton–Bridge Replacement on Christina Street, in the FFY 2030 element of the FFYs 2026–30 TIP Scenario 1A was made by MAGIC (Town of Acton) (K. Guichard) and seconded by the Town of Newton (D. Koses). The motion failed.

Vote

A motion to include Project 612534, Melrose–Lebanon Street Improvement Project (Lynde Street to Malden City Line), in FFY 2030 of the FFYs 2026–30 TIP Scenario 1A

was made by the Three Rivers Interlocal Council (Town of Norwood) (S. Olanoff) and seconded by the City of Everett (J. Monty). The motion carried.

Vote

A motion to reduce funding for Project 606226, Boston–Reconstruction of Rutherford Avenue, From City Square to Sullivan Square, from \$35.5 million to \$20 million in FFY 2029 and include Project 609246, Lynn–Rehabilitation of Western Avenue (Route 107), in FFY 2029 of FFYs 2026–30 TIP Scenario 1A was made by Inner Core Committee (City of Somerville) (T. Bent) and seconded by the City of Boston (J. Rowe). The motion carried.

Vote

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

D. Mohler stated that vote outcomes were not based on individual project characteristics and encouraged communities to keep advancing their projects because they could be added to the TIP through an amendment once they reach the 25 percent design milestone.

12. Members' Items

There were none.

13. Adjourn

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

Attendance

Members

Representatives and Alternates

At-Large City (City of Everett)

Jay Monty

Eric Molinari

At-Large City (City of Newton)

David Koses

At-Large Town (Town of Arlington)

John Alessi

At-Large Town (Town of Brookline)

Erin Chute

City of Boston

Jen Rowe

Nayeli Rodriguez

Federal Highway Administration

Kenneth Miller

Anthony Jones

Samira Saad

Inner Core Committee (City of Somerville)

Tom Bent

Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority (MBTA)

Josh Ostroff

Laura Gilmore

Lynsey Heffernan

Sandy Johnston

Massachusetts Department of Transportation (MassDOT)

David Mohler

Steve Woelfel

Derek Krevat

Chris Klem

Massachusetts Port Authority

Sara Lee

MassDOT Highway Division

John Bechard

Hanna

MBTA Advisory Board

Switekowski

Brian Kane

Frank Tramontozzi

Isabella

Mackinnon

Metropolitan Area Planning Council (MAPC)

Eric Bourassa

Julia Wallerice

MetroWest Regional Collaborative (City of Framingham)

Dennis Giombetti

MetroWest Regional Transit Authority (MWRTA)

Tyler Terrasi

Jim Nee

Minuteman Advisory Group on Interlocal Coordination (Town of Acton)

Kristen Guichard

Kaila Sauer

Members

**Representatives
and Alternates**

North Shore Task Force (City of Beverly)	Darlene Wynne
Regional Transportation Advisory Council	Lenard Diggins
South Shore Coalition (Town of Hull)	Christopher Diiorio
South West Advisory Planning Committee (Town of Wrentham)	Rachel Benson
Three Rivers Interlocal Council (Town of Norwood)	Steve Olanoff

Other Attendees	Affiliation
Andreas Wolfe	City of Cambridge
Bill Deignan	City of Cambridge
Ben Cares	City of Chelsea
Erik Hinderlie	City of Gloucester
Yem Lip	City of Malden
Rich Kosian	Friends of the Lynnfield Rail Trail
Vince Inglese	Friends of the Lynnfield Rail Trail
Andrew Wang	MassDOT
Anil Gurcan	MassDOT
Barbara Lachance	MassDOT
Ben Muller	MassDOT
Cheryll-Ann Senior	MassDOT
Derek Shooster	MassDOT
Katherine Duffy	MassDOT
Melissa Santley	MassDOT
Michelle Scott	MassDOT
Sarah Bradbury	MassDOT
Stephanie Abundo	MassDOT
Angela Servello-Jones	MBTA
Glenn Geiler	MBTA
Hadrian Merced	MBTA
Josh Klingenstein	MBTA
Joshua M. Barnes	MBTA
Margot Fleischman	MBTA
Melissa Dullea	MBTA
Mike Malia	MBTA
Paola Benavente	MBTA
Joy Glynn	MWRTA
Craig Della Penna	Northeast Greenway Solutions
Gardy Desrouleaux	Revolution Hall
Rick Azzalina	Stantec
Rich Benevento	Tighe & Bond
Aleida Leza	Town of Belmont
Darin Takemoto	Town of Belmont
Sam Downes	Town of Brookline
John Strauss	Town of Burlington
JR Frey	Town of Hingham
Kristina Johnson	Town of Hudson

Other Attendees	Affiliation
Pam Helinek	Town of Hudson
Tom Green	Town of Hudson
Meghan McNamara	Town of Lexington
John Scenna	Town of Lynnfield
Morgan Griffiths	Town of Natick
Sheila Page	Town of Wellesley
Paul Cobuzzi	
Paul Graveline	

MPO Staff/Central Transportation Planning Staff

Tegin Teich, Executive Director
Abby Cutrumbes Heerema
Adriana Jacobsen
Annette Demchur
Betsy Harvey Herzfeld
Bradley Putnam
Dave Hong
Elena Ion
Erin Maguire
Ethan Lapointe
Gina Perille
Hiral Gandhi
Jenn Emiko Kaplan
Joe Delorto
Lauren Magee
Olivia Saccocia
Priyanka Chapekar
Sam Taylor
Sean Rourke
Sophie Fox
Stella Jordan
Steven Andrews
Xianli Wang

CIVIL RIGHTS NOTICE TO THE PUBLIC

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



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

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

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

Boston Region MPO Title VI Specialist
10 Park Plaza, Suite 2150
Boston, MA 02116
Phone: 857.702.3700
Email: civilrights@ctps.org

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