

Draft Memorandum for the Record Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization TIP Process, Engagement, and Readiness Committee Meeting Minutes

January 22, 2026, Meeting

2:00 PM–3:35 PM, Zoom Video Conferencing Platform

Jen Rowe, Chair, representing the City of Boston

Decisions

The Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization's (MPO) TIP Process, Engagement, and Readiness Committee agreed to the following:

- Approve the minutes of November 6, 2025

Materials

Materials for this meeting included the following:

1. November 6, 2025, TIP Process, Engagement, and Readiness Meeting Minutes ([pdf](#)) ([html](#))
2. Link to the TIP Project Dashboard ([webpage](#))

Meeting Agenda

1. Introductions

J. Rowe welcomed committee members to the meeting of the TIP Process, Engagement, and Readiness Committee. See attendance on page 9.

2. Public Comments

There were none.

3. Action Item: Approval of November 6, 2025, Meeting Minutes

A motion to approve the minutes of the November 6, 2025, meeting was made by the Inner Core Committee (Brad Rawson) and seconded by the Metropolitan Area Planning Council (Eric Bourassa). The motion carried.

4. Subregional Readiness Days Update—*Ethan Lapointe, MPO Staff*

E. Lapointe reminded the committee of key upcoming dates in the TIP development process. Subregional Readiness Days occurred in mid-January. TIP Readiness Days will occur in early February. MPO staff will present project scoring and rescoring results at the first MPO board meeting in March. He stated that MPO staff plan to take a more intensive approach to programming scenario development. First, MPO staff will present a “Readiness Scenario” on February 19, 2026, during the MPO board meeting. Then, MPO staff will present the “Initial Scenario” on the March 5, 2026, MPO board meeting. On March 19, 2026, the MPO board will refine the Initial Scenario further. During the March 12, 2026, and March 26, 2026, TIP Process, Engagement, and Readiness Committee meetings, committee members will develop recommendations to support decisions made by the board. Lastly, the MPO board will approve a final programming scenario on April 2, 2026.

E. Lapointe discussed emerging programming trends and challenges. MPO staff received some project readiness information during the Subregional Readiness Days in mid-January and will receive more information during the TIP Readiness Days in early February. With this information, MPO staff will develop a “Readiness Scenario” based on the guidelines from the recently adopted readiness policy. This scenario will consider project readiness but will not address fiscal constraint. Two thirds of construction projects will likely require a delay under the readiness policy. The average delay is approximately two years, but six projects require a delay of three or four years. There are at least eight projects programmed in federal fiscal years (FFYs) 2026 and 2027 that require a delay. See Table 1 for information on project delays. Note that the second and third rows of the table sum to the fourth row.

Table 1
Distribution of Core Investment Projects by Advertising Years

	Federal Fiscal Year					
	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031
Number of projects in FFYs 2026–30						
TIP	9	8	7	8	1	0
Number of projects in FFYs 2027–31						
TIP (not delayed)	5	2	1	1	2	0
Number of projects in FFYs 2027–31						
TIP (delayed)	0	3	1	2	8	4
Number of projects in FFYs 2027–31						
TIP (total)	5	5	2	3	10	4

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

E. Lapointe stated that five projects are not likely to advertise before FFY 2032 based on the project readiness guidelines. Two of these projects will be deactivated. One project is the Rehabilitation on Route 16 from Route 109 to Beaver Street in Milford (Project ID 608045). The local MassDOT Highway District recently completed some safety improvements that addressed the intentions of the project. The other is the Resurfacing and Related Work on Central and South Main Streets project in Ipswich (Project ID 605743). The town recently decided that it no longer wishes to pursue this project. The other three projects are unlikely to have a pre-25 percent submission by March, so they do not meet the minimum threshold for programming in FFY 2031 under the readiness policy.

E. Lapointe stated that the net increase in FFYs 2026–31 is approximately \$65 million. Two projects account for \$44 million of the increase. Tables 2 and 3 show the cost and design status details of the two projects.

Table 2
Belmont Community Path (Phase 1) Project Cost Increases

	FFYs 2025–29 TIP status	FFYs 2026–30 TIP status	FFYs 2027–31 TIP status
Programming Year(s)	FFYs 2026–27	FFY 2026	FFY 2027
TFPC	\$20,499,750	\$27,306,266	\$48,934,961
Design Status	25% DPH	75% received	100% received

DPH = Design Public Hearing. FFY = Federal Fiscal Year. TFPC = Total Federal Participating Cost. TIP = Transportation Improvement Program.

Table 3
Lynn Rehabilitation of Western Avenue Project Cost Increases

	FFYs 2025–29 TIP status	FFYs 2026–30 TIP status	FFYs 2027–31 TIP status
Programming Year(s)	FFYs 2028	FFYs 2029	FFY 2030
TFPC	\$45,897,600	\$45,897,600	\$68,189,552
Design Status	PRC Approval	PRC Approval	25% comments

FFY = Federal Fiscal Year. PRC = Project Review Committee. TFPC = Total Federal Participating Cost. TIP = Transportation Improvement Program.

E. Lapointe noted that not all cost increases will be recorded in the FFYs 2027–31 TIP. For example, some increases will be captured through advanced construction funding in years beyond FFY 2027. Some cost increases will be addressed in FFY 2026. He stated that full project cost increases are not automatically factored into the Readiness Scenario. Only cost increases less than \$2.5 million or, for projects of less than \$10 million in cost, less than 25 percent of total cost, are factored in automatically. Cost increases from inflation adjustments based on programming year changes are also included automatically.

E. Lapointe stated that there is about \$206 million of unprogrammed balance in FFYs 2026–29, before accounting for cost increases. However, FFYs 2030–31 have only \$21.8 million in unprogrammed balance. MPO staff have coordinated with the Massachusetts Department of Transportation (MassDOT), the Cape Ann Transportation Authority (CATA), the Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority (MBTA), and the MetroWest Regional Transportation Authority (MWRTA) to identify fill-in projects. MassDOT will identify fill-in candidates after TIP Readiness Days on February 5, 2026. MPO staff have received applications for twenty transit fill-in projects. Table 4 shows the project costs and amounts.

Table 4
Transit Fill-in Project Requests

Applicant	Number of Projects	Total Funding Request
CATA	4	\$5,236,820
MWRTA	3	\$56,400,000
MBTA	13	\$245,972,097

CATA = Cape Ann Transportation Authority. MBTA = Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority. MWRTA = MetroWest Regional Transit Authority.

E. Lapointe stated that there are some types of projects that may be able to be programmed in an earlier year than the readiness policy dictates. These include minor intersection improvements within existing right-of-way, bridge preservation projects, and roadway preservation projects. These projects tend to move through the design process more quickly than the average Regional Target project. However, there are few projects in the current Regional Target Program that fall within that distinction.

E. Lapointe stated that given low funding availability and the likelihood of the removal of at least five projects from the TIP, the FFYs 2027–31 TIP will likely fund fewer municipal-proponent projects than the FFYs 2026–30 TIP did. He noted that there were fewer applications submitted this year by municipal proponents. MPO staff expect to receive only two design project applications, three bikeshare applications, and two Community Connections applications. In comparison, MPO staff received 17 design applications during the development of the FFYs 2025–29 TIP. E. Lapointe stated that these trends may be related to the local match requirement for design, bikeshare, and Community Connections projects.

E. Lapointe discussed preliminary findings from the project rescoring process. Some projects have been programmed on the TIP for over five years but certain design decisions, such as street configurations, have not been made. Others have had active transportation elements removed that may have contributed to a former high score.

Lenard Diggins (Town of Arlington) asked if the MassDOT fill-in projects would be scored. He also asked if E. Lapointe believed the four percent inflation adjustment was sufficient.

E. Lapointe answered that the fill-in projects would be scored. He noted that the four percent adjustment is in addition to other contingencies added to a cost estimate.

E. Bourassa asked why the Belmont Community Path project increased in cost.

E. Lapointe answered that the majority of the cost increase is from cost contingencies that may be reduced as the project nears its advertisement date. For example, some of the contingency comes from the possibility of needing shuttle buses to replace service on the Fitchburg Line.

E. Bourassa asked where the additional funds would go if the project advertises at a lower cost than the current \$50 million estimate.

John Bechard (MassDOT) stated that MassDOT would only obligate the funds that are needed to advertise the project. Then, they would work with the MassDOT planning department and the MPO to replenish unobligated funds. MassDOT prefers that costs are overestimated rather than underestimated.

Michael Trepanier (MassDOT) stated that last year, MassDOT programmed more money for a project on Cape Cod than was obligated. When the construction bids came in lower than expected, the cost difference was reflected in a TIP amendment.

B. Rawson stated that it would be helpful to have technical knowledge of the reasons for cost increases during the Subregional Readiness Days.

Tyler Terrasi (MetroWest Regional Transit Authority) asked if the issues facing the TIP program are moving in the right direction.

E. Lapointe stated that there were several improvements, including better turnout at the Subregional Readiness Days, more transit projects that staff can score, and construction projects being submitted at more advanced design stages. Many of the challenges facing the TIP program are within the current program of projects.

L. Diggins stated that Subregional Readiness Days should be focused more on the technical side of project readiness instead of on advocating for individual projects.

E. Lapointe noted that there was less of a focus on advocating for or pitching individual projects than there was last year. Many proponents were honest with the challenges that their projects were experiencing. The main challenge was a lack of turnout, although it was higher than last year.

5. Updated TIP Project Dashboard Launch—*Adriana Jacobsen, MPO Staff*

A. Jacobsen explained the purpose of the TIP Project Dashboard. The dashboard is intended to provide a platform to view project limits and information in a centralized

location as well as to replace the bulk of Chapter Three in the TIP. The individual project pages make up most of Chapter Three, and include a project map, scoring summary, funding information, and project description. The dashboard will include all of this information with the exception of the detailed scoring summary, which will likely be included in Appendix A instead.

A. Jacobsen described the TIP Project Dashboard, beginning with the first tab. It displays Regional Target Projects, Statewide Highway Projects, and Unprogrammed Projects, which are sometimes referred to as the “Universe of Projects.” The search function on the left-hand side can be used to find individual project information and geometry. Unprogrammed projects are categorized by whether or not the project is under consideration for programming in FFYs 2027–31 TIP. Some transit projects were represented by unusual geometry because they encompass the entire service area and showing the project limits may be confusing on a map. Users can change basemaps, view the legend, turn layers on and off, and search for a specific address using the icons on the right side of the map. The second tab only shows projects programmed in the Regional Target Program. The third tab shows a funding table for the Regional Target Program. The fourth tab breaks down funding by subregion.

B. Rawson suggested that the design status information included in the pop-ups could be more detailed. He noted that, for example, a 25 percent design status does not designate whether a submission has been rejected, whether the project has received comments, or other important information that may be relevant.

L. Diggins requested that the detailed scoring results be included in some form in the TIP document. He asked about which maps are useful for understanding projects.

A. Jacobsen noted that the default grey map is recommended by the MPO staff, but she sometimes uses the hybrid map and OpenStreetMap for additional information.

J. Rowe stated that one useful function of Chapter Three in the TIP document is to see how project funding has changed over time. Although there are funding tables exported from eSTIP in Chapter Three, they are more challenging to read. J. Rowe requested that this funding summary be retained in some form.

A. Jacobsen stated that this concern will be addressed in two ways. First, MPO staff will include a funding summary in the TIP. Second, MPO staff plan to add a feature to the dashboard to display information from previous TIPs.

E. Lapointe stated that the dashboard link would be added to the TIP page on the MPO's website soon.

6. Members' Items

B. Rawson recommended that committee members amplify the work being done in the TIP Process, Engagement, and Readiness Committee to the wider MPO board during TIP development discussions.

7. Next Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled for March 12, 2026.

8. Adjourn

A motion to adjourn was made by the Minuteman Advisory Council on Interlocal Coordination (Meghan Roche) and seconded by the Town of Arlington (Lenard Diggins). The motion carried.

Attendance

Members	Representatives and Alternates
City of Boston	Jen Rowe
Inner Core Committee (City of Somerville)	Brad Rawson
Metropolitan Area Planning Council	Eric Bourassa
Massachusetts Department of Transportation (MassDOT)	Sam Taylor
Massachusetts Department of Transportation (MassDOT)	John Bechard
MetroWest Regional Transit Authority (MWRTA)	Tyler Terrasi
MetroWest Regional Collaborative (City of Framingham)	-
Minuteman Advisory Group on Interlocal Coordination (Town of Acton)	Meghan Roche
Community Advisory Council (CAC)	Karl Alexander
At-Large Town (Town of Arlington)	Lenard Diggins
At-Large Town (Town of Brookline)	-

Other Attendees	Affiliation
Aleida Leza	-
Allison Lenk	-
Benjamin Muller	MassDOT
Celeste Venolia	Sierra Club
Dan Jaffe	-
Doug Small	Town of Ashland
E Mainini	Town of Milford
Gisell De la Cruz	City of Salem
Greg Federspiel	TownGreen
Holly Muson	-
Jackie LaFlam	Cape Ann Transportation Authority
Jay Monty	City of Everett
Jeff Coletti	MWRTA
Jim Nee	MWRTA
John Romano	MassDOT
Justin Curewitz	Tighe & Bond
JR Frey	Town of Hingham
Marcia Rasmussen	Town of Sudbury
Michael Trepanier	MassDOT
Nelson Mui	MWRTA
Peter Sutton	MassDOT
Scott Mullen	A Better City
Thomas Driscoll	495 MetroWest Partnership

MPO Staff/Central Transportation Planning Staff

Tegin Teich, Executive Director
Adriana Jacobsen
Dave Hong
Elena Ion
Erin Maguire
Ethan Lapointe
Ibbu Quraishi
Olivia Saccocia
Sean Rourke

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.