

MPO Meeting Minutes

Draft Memorandum for the Record

Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization Meeting

February 20, 2025, Meeting

10:00 AM–12:30 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 December 19, 2024
- Approve the 2025 Transit Safety Performance Targets
- Endorse Federal Fiscal Years (FFYs) 2025–29 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Amendment Seven
- Endorse FFYs 2025–29 TIP Amendment Eight
- Endorse FFY 2025 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) Amendment Two and waive the 21-day public comment period
- Approve the motion for MPO staff to request a simple project delivery schedule by March 13, 2025, from all proponents of projects that have not reached a project info milestone (recorded on MassDOT’s Project Information Database) in more than one year, and that the project delivery schedule include projected dates for 25 percent and 75 percent design submissions and a bid date

Meeting Agenda

1. Introductions

See attendance beginning on page 29.

2. Chair’s Report—*David Mohler, MassDOT*

There was none.

3. Executive Director’s Report—*Annette Demchur, Director of Planning and Policy, Central Transportation Planning Staff*

Annette Demchur, MPO staff, presented the director’s report, including an announcement, an overview of the meeting agenda, and the upcoming MPO board meetings. A. Demchur stated that the MPO board meetings on March 20, 2025, and

April 3, 2025, both at 10:00 AM, would be hybrid meetings and require an in-person quorum to hold the meeting. These meetings will focus on FFYs 2026–30 TIP scenario discussions.

A. Demchur reviewed the meeting agenda, which included four action items and two presentations.

A. Demchur reminded MPO board members that the next board meetings would be on March 6 and March 20, 2025, at 10:00 AM, and the meeting on March 20 will be hybrid.

4. Public Comments

There were none.

5. Committee Chairs' Reports

Jen Rowe, City of Boston, stated that the TIP Process, Engagement, and Readiness Committee met on February 13, 2025, where committee members reviewed the initial readiness scenario and how it reflects updates from MassDOT's Readiness Days. In addition, committee members discussed new project applications and short- and long-term implications for the Regional Target Program. J. Rowe stated that the next TIP Process, Engagement, and Readiness Committee meeting will be held on March 13, 2025, at 1:00 PM.

Chris Klem, MassDOT, stated that the UPWP Committee met on February 6, 2025, and committee members voted to recommend that the MPO board endorse FFY 2025 UPWP Amendment Two, which adds eight discretionary grant awards to the appendices. C. Klem stated that the committee meeting also kicked off the development of the FFY 2026 UPWP. C. Klem stated that a survey was shared with members of the public to solicit input on the direction of the MPO's UPWP, and an additional survey was shared with MPO board members on February 19, 2025, requesting feedback on the MPO's ongoing work as well as discrete study ideas. C. Klem stated that the survey will close in the first week of March, and MPO staff will analyze responses and discuss the results with the UPWP Committee.

6. Action Item: Approval of December 19, 2025, MPO Meeting Minutes Documents posted to the MPO meeting calendar

1. December 19, 2025, MPO Meeting Minutes ([pdf](#)) ([html](#))

J. Rowe suggested two changes:

- Changing “MPO staff would also present on the TIP criteria and its compliance with the MBTA Communities Law” to “how our current TIP criteria treat compliance with the MBTA Communities Law” on page three
- Replacing “MassArt” with “MassDOT” on page eleven

Vote

A motion to approve the minutes of the meeting of December 19, 2025, was made by the City of Boston (J. Rowe) and seconded by the Metropolitan Area Planning Council (MAPC) (Eric Bourassa). The motion carried.

7. Action Item: Transit Safety Performance Targets—Sam Taylor, MPO Staff

Documents posted to the MPO meeting calendar

1. Transit Safety Performance Targets Memo ([pdf](#)) ([html](#))

Sam Taylor, MPO staff, presented the proposed 2025 Transit Safety Targets, which the MPO sets annually.

S. Taylor stated that, based on the United States Department of Transportation’s (USDOT) requirements on reporting and the National Public Transportation Safety Plan’s safety measures, transit agencies create their own public transit safety plan, including performance targets for safety measures, and MPOs work with transit agencies to establish regional targets on an annual basis.

S. Taylor stated that there are 14 Transit Safety Performance Measures, including those in Table 1.

Table 1
Transit Safety Performance Measures

Category	Measure	Desired Direction
Fatalities	Number of Fatalities	Decrease
Fatalities	Fatality Rate	Decrease
Injuries	Number of Injuries	Decrease
Injuries	Injury Rate	Decrease
Major Events	Number of Major Events	Decrease
Major Events	Major Events Rate	Decrease
System Reliability	Mean Distance Between Major Mechanical Failures	Increase
Transit Worker Safety	Transit Worker Fatality Rate	Decrease
Transit Worker Safety	Transit Worker Injury Rate	Decrease
Transit Worker Safety	Assault on Transit Workers	Decrease
Transit Worker Safety	Rate of Assault on Transit Workers	Decrease
Collisions	Collisions Rate	Decrease
Collisions	Pedestrian Collision Rate	Decrease
Collisions	Vehicular Collision Rate	Decrease

S. Taylor stated that the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) requires transit agencies to produce Public Transit Agency Safety Plans (PTASPs) that include safety targets and past performance data. These plans are reviewed on a triennial basis. In addition, S. Taylor stated that seven of the 14 safety measures are new in 2025. S. Taylor stated that while MPOs and transit agencies are required to set targets, the FTA does not impose penalties for failure to meet targets.

S. Taylor presented 2025 Targets and Past Performance for the MBTA, Cape Ann Transportation Authority (CATA), and MetroWest Regional Transit Authority (MWRTA) in the categories shown in Table 1. These targets and past performances can be found in Tables 2 through 13.

Table 2
MBTA CY 2025 Targets and Past Performance–Fatalities and Injuries

Mode	Heavy Rail	Light Rail	Bus	The RIDE
CYs 2021–23 Average Fatalities	0.67	0.33	0	0
CY 2025 Target Fatalities	0	0	0	0
CYs 2021–23 Average Fatality Rate	0.03	0.06	0	0
CY 2025 Target Fatality Rate	0	0	0	0
CYs 2021–23 Average Injuries	184	97	309	26
CY 2025 Target Injuries	180	95	303	25
CY 2021–23 Average Injury Rate	9.5	17.0	14.3	3
CY 2025 Target Injury Rate	9.31	16.7	14.0	3

Note: All rates are calculated per 1,000,000 VRM.

CY = Calendar Year. MBTA = Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority. VRM = Vehicle Revenue Miles.

Table 3
MBTA CY 2025 Targets and Past Performance–Transit Worker Safety

Mode	Heavy Rail	Light Rail	Bus	The RIDE
CYs 2021–23 Average TW Fatality Rate	0	0	0	0
CY 2025 Target TW Fatality Rate	0	0	0	0
CYs 2021–23 Average TW Injury Rate	3.09	10.8	10.1	1
CY 2025 Target TW Injury Rate	3.03	10.6	9.94	1
CYs 2021–23 Average Assaults on TW	47	27	239	4
CY 2025 Target Assaults on TW	28	29	103	1
CY 2021–23 Average Assaults on TW Rate	1.52	5.26	4.85	0
CY 2025 Target Assaults on TW Rate	1.49	5.15	4.75	0

Note: All rates are calculated per 1,000,000 VRM.

CY = Calendar Year. MBTA = Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority. TW = Transit Worker. VRM = Vehicle Revenue Miles.

Table 4
MBTA CY 2025 Targets and Past Performance—Collisions

Mode	Heavy Rail	Light Rail	Bus	The RIDE
CYs 2021–23 Average Collision Rate	0.52	2.81	4.45	3
CY 2025 Target Collision Rate	0.51	2.75	4.36	3
CYs 2021–23 Average Pedestrian Collision Rate	0.38	0.94	1.65	0
CY 2025 Target Pedestrian Collision Rate	0.37	0.92	1.62	0
CYs 2021–23 Average Vehicular Collision Rate	0	3.27	59	2
CY 2025 Target Vehicular Collision Rate	0	3.2	57.8	2

Note: All rates are calculated per 1,000,000 VRM.

CY = Calendar Year. MBTA = Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority. VRM = Vehicle Revenue Miles.

Table 5
**MBTA CY 2025 Targets and Past Performance—
Safety Events and System Reliability**

Mode	Heavy Rail	Light Rail	Bus	The RIDE
CYs 2021–23 Average Safety Events	29	30	105	29
CY 2025 Target Safety Events	28	29	103	28
CYs 2021–23 Average Safety Event Rate	1.52	5.26	4.85	3.23
CY 2025 Target Safety Event Rate	1.49	5.15	4.75	3
CYs 2021–23 Average System Reliability (miles)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
CY 2025 Target System Reliability (in miles)	49,000	8,216	28,500	25,900

Note: All rates are calculated per 1,000,000 VRM.

CY = Calendar Year. MBTA = Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority. N/A = not applicable. VRM = Vehicle Revenue Miles.

Table 6
CATA CY 2025 Targets and Past Performance–Fatalities and Injuries

Mode	Fixed Route	Demand Response
CYs 2020–24 Average Fatalities	0	0
CY 2025 Target Fatalities	0	0
CYs 2020–24 Average Fatality Rate	0	0
CY 2025 Target Fatality Rate	0	0
CYs 2020–24 Average Injuries	0	0
CY 2025 Target Injuries	0	0
CY 2020–24 Average Injury Rate	0	0
CY 2025 Target Injury Rate	0	0

Note: All rates are calculated per 1,000,000 VRM.

CY = Calendar Year. CATA = Cape Ann Transportation Authority. VRM = Vehicle Revenue Miles.

Table 7
CATA CY 2025 Targets and Past Performance–Transit Worker Safety

Mode	Fixed Route	Demand Response
CYs 2020–24 Average TW Fatality Rate	0	0
CY 2025 Target TW Fatality Rate	0	0
CYs 2020–24 Average TW Injury Rate	0	0
CY 2025 Target TW Injury Rate	0	0
CYs 2020–24 Average Assaults on TW	0	0
CY 2025 Target Assaults on TW	0	0
CY 2020–24 Average Assaults on TW Rate	0	0
CY 2025 Target Assaults on TW Rate	0	0

Note: All rates are calculated per 1,000,000 VRM.

CY = Calendar Year. CATA = Cape Ann Transportation Authority. TW = Transit Worker. VRM = Vehicle Revenue Miles.

Table 8
CATA CY 2025 Targets and Past Performance—Collisions

Mode	Fixed Route	Demand Response
CYs 2020–24 Average Collision Rate	2.36	2.41
CY 2025 Target Collision Rate	2.00	2.00
CYs 2020–24 Average Pedestrian Collision Rate	0	0
CY 2025 Target Pedestrian Collision Rate	0	0
CYs 2020–24 Average Vehicular Collision Rate	2.36	2.41
CY 2025 Target Vehicular Collision Rate	2.00	2.00

Note: All rates are calculated per 1,000,000 VRM.

CY = Calendar Year. CATA = Cape Ann Transportation Authority. VRM = Vehicle Revenue Miles.

Table 9
**CATA CY 2025 Targets and Past Performance—
Safety Events and System Reliability**

Mode	Fixed Route	Demand Response
CYs 2020–24 Average Safety Events	2.2	1
CY 2025 Target Safety Events	2	1
CYs 2020–24 Average Safety Event Rate	0.61	0.58
CY 2025 Target Safety Event Rate	0.5	0.5
CYs 2020–24 Average System Reliability (miles)	117,129	156,999
CY 2025 Target System Reliability (in miles)	96,775	203,908

Note: All rates are calculated per 1,000,000 VRM.

CY = Calendar Year. CATA = Cape Ann Transportation Authority. VRM = Vehicle Revenue Miles.

Table 10
MWRTA CY 2025 Targets and Past Performance—Fatalities and Injuries

Mode	Fixed Route	Demand Response
CYs 2020–24 Average Fatalities	0	0
CY 2025 Target Fatalities	0	0
CYs 2020–24 Average Fatality Rate	0	0
CY 2025 Target Fatality Rate	0	0
CYs 2020–24 Average Injuries	1.0	0.6
CY 2025 Target Injuries	9	7
CY 2020–24 Average Injury Rate	0.09	0.07
CY 2025 Target Injury Rate	0.8	0.7

Note: All rates are calculated per 1,000,000 VRM.

CY = Calendar Year. MWRTA = MetroWest Transit Authority. VRM = Vehicle Revenue Miles.

Table 11
MWRTA CY 2025 Targets and Past Performance—Transit Worker Safety

Mode	Fixed Route	Demand Response
CYs 2020–24 Average TW Fatality Rate	0	0
CY 2025 Target TW Fatality Rate	0	0
CYs 2020–24 Average TW Injury Rate	0.02	0
CY 2025 Target TW Injury Rate	0.44	0.5
CYs 2020–24 Average Assaults on TW	0	0
CY 2025 Target Assaults on TW	6	5
CY 2020–24 Average Assaults on TW Rate	0	0
CY 2025 Target Assaults on TW Rate	0.53	0.5

Note: All rates are calculated per 1,000,000 VRM.

CY = Calendar Year. MWRTA = MetroWest Transit Authority. TW = Transit Worker. VRM = Vehicle Revenue Miles.

Table 12
MWRTA CY 2025 Targets and Past Performance—Collisions

Mode	Fixed Route	Demand Response
CYs 2020–24 Average Collision Rate	0.07	0.02
CY 2025 Target Collision Rate	0.53	0.6
CYs 2020–24 Average Pedestrian Collision Rate	0	0
CY 2025 Target Pedestrian Collision Rate	0.08	0.1
CYs 2020–24 Average Vehicular Collision Rate	0.07	0.02
CY 2025 Target Vehicular Collision Rate	0.44	0.5

Note: All rates are calculated per 1,000,000 VRM.

CY = Calendar Year. MWRTA = MetroWest Transit Authority. VRM = Vehicle Revenue Miles.

Table 13
**MWRTA CY 2025 Targets and Past Performance—
Safety Events and System Reliability**

Mode	Fixed Route	Demand Response
CYs 2020–24 Average Safety Events	1.2	0.8
CY 2025 Target Safety Events	9	7
CYs 2020–24 Average Safety Event Rate	0.11	0.10
CY 2025 Target Safety Event Rate	0.8	0.7
CYs 2020–24 Average System Reliability (miles)	171,428	112,346
CY 2025 Target System Reliability (in miles)	75,000	75,000

Note: All rates are calculated per 1,000,000 VRM.

CY = Calendar Year. MWRTA = MetroWest Transit Authority. VRM = Vehicle Revenue Miles.

S. Taylor stated that there are a few ways that MPOs and regional transit authorities (RTAs) apply these targets, including the following:

- The MBTA and RTAs create Safety Management Systems.
- The MassDOT Capital Investment Plan (CIP) allocates federal dollars to CIP programs that support MBTA and RTA asset improvement.
- The Boston Region MPO supports investment in projects aimed at improving transit safety at the MBTA and other RTAs in the Boston region; for example, the MPO supported four RTA projects in the FFYs 2025–29 TIP and is considering other transit safety projects for programming in the FFYs 2026–30 TIP.

Discussion

Lenard Diggins, Regional Transportation Advisory Council, invited S. Taylor and representatives from RTAs to meet with the MBTA Rider Oversight Committee. In addition, L. Diggins stated that some of the targets aim to encourage people to report incidents and asked why the RTAs believe incidents are being underreported.

S. Taylor stated that there is a policy of increased encouragement for transit workers to report incidents of all types.

Tyler Terrasi, MWRTA, stated that he would discuss the question with MWRTA's team that addresses and implements policies related to safety.

Hanna Switekowski, MBTA Advisory Board, asked if the targets and past performance could be shared with MBTA Advisory Board members and other committees, such as the Rapid Transit Committee. H. Switekowski stated that the information would be helpful for the MBTA Advisory Board's work and collaborations.

D. Mohler responded that the information can be shared with anyone.

J. Rowe expressed appreciation for the RTAs and MPO staff putting the information and presentation together for review and endorsement. J. Rowe inquired about a previous request for these targets to be presented through visualizations demonstrating trend lines each year. J. Rowe stated that visualizations that communicate trends over time are helpful in assessing if the targets are reasonable and asked if the RTAs would consider using this method going forward.

Mike Catsos, MBTA, stated that the MBTA monitors its performance in relation to these targets continuously and generates new performance data. M. Catsos stated that the MBTA would be able to present historic data values in the future.

S. Taylor directed J. Rowe to the MPO's Performance Dashboard, which shows historical data trends in performance for transit safety metrics as well as other types of metrics.

Vote

A motion to endorse the Transit Safety Performance Targets 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 Seven—*Ethan Lapointe, MPO Staff*

Documents posted to the MPO meeting calendar

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

Ethan Lapointe, MPO staff, presented FFYs 2025–29 TIP Amendment Seven, which programs three discretionary grant awards through the Environmental Protection Agency's FFY 2024 Clean Heavy-Duty Vehicles Grant program for school districts within the Boston region, including Boston Public Schools, Hamilton-Wenham School District, and Hingham Public Schools.

E. Lapointe stated that the public comment period for Amendment Seven began Friday, January 17, 2025, and concluded February 7, 2025, at 5:00 PM. MPO staff received no public comments.

Discussion

Ken Miller, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), asked why these grant awards need to be amended into the TIP, and if they are Title 23 or Title 49 funds.

E. Lapointe stated that after consultation with FHWA staff, they were identified as Title 23 funds.

K. Miller requested that the board conditionally vote to endorse Amendment Seven and, if the grant awards do not have to be included in the TIP, they can be omitted.

E. Lapointe clarified that the funds fall under the Title 23 classification for any non-zero emission, class six or seven heavy duty vehicle.

Vote

A motion to endorse FFYs 2025–29 TIP Amendment Seven was made by the City of Boston (Nayeli Rodriguez) and seconded by the MAPC (E. Bourassa). The motion carried.

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

Documents posted to the MPO meeting calendar

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

E. Lapointe presented FFYs 2025–29 TIP Amendment Eight, which includes changes to both the Earmark Discretionary and Statewide Highway Programs in FFY 2025.

Changes included the addition of Safe Streets and Roads for All (SS4A) grants and a Prioritization Process Pilot Program (PPPP) grant for the Boston Region MPO and a cost decrease for a Statewide Highway Program project.

E. Lapointe stated that the budget for the PPPP grant was originally listed as \$1,860,000 due to an assumption that there was a 20 percent match component to the award, but the actual budget amount is \$1,488,000 and the grant is not required to have a 20 percent match. E. Lapointe stated that the amendment will reflect the revision.

E. Lapointe stated that the public comment began on January 17, 2025, and concluded on February 7, 2025, at 5:00 PM. MPO staff received no public comments related to these projects during this period.

Vote

A motion to endorse FFYs 2025–29 TIP Amendment Eight was made by the MAPC (E. Bourassa) and seconded by the Town of Brookline (Erin Chute). The motion carried.

10. Action Item: FFY 2025 UPWP Amendment Two—*Olivia Saccocia, MPO Staff*

Documents posted to the MPO meeting calendar

1. FFY 2025 UPWP Amendment Two Memo ([pdf](#)) ([html](#))
2. FFY 2025 UPWP Amendment Two Redline ([pdf](#))
3. FFY 2025 UPWP Amendment Two Clean ([pdf](#)) ([html](#))
4. FFY 2025 UPWP Amendment Two Appendices ([html](#))

Olivia Saccocia, MPO staff, presented FFY 2025 UPWP Amendment Two, which included the grant awards that can be found in Table 14.

Table 14
FFY 2025 UPWP Amendment Two

Project Name	Proponent	Funding Source	Award
PPPP - Prioritization Improvement Program for the Greater Boston Region	Boston Region MPO	PPPP	\$1,488,000
Leveraging Innovative Networks to Keep Urban Pathways Uncongested (LINKUP) in Greater Boston	MassDOT MAPC City of Boston	Congestion Relief	\$21,600,000
Pedestrian Crossing Safety Improvements in Senior and School Zones Demonstration Program	City of Quincy	SS4A	\$126,400
Watertown Safe Streets Initiative	City of Watertown	SS4A	\$806,192
Great Plain Avenue Multimodal Corridor Demonstration Project	Town of Needham	SS4A	\$320,000
Centering the RISE: Connecting People to a Healthy, Vibrant Mattapan Square	City of Boston	RCP	\$2,000,000
Walking to Wonderland	City of Revere	RCP	\$400,000
MBTA JFK/UMass Station Redesign and Replacement Project	MBTA	RCP	\$2,000,000

FFY = Federal Fiscal Year. MAPC = Metropolitan Area Planning Council. MBTA = Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority. PPPP = Prioritization Process Pilot Program. RCP = Reconnecting Communities Pilot. SS4A = Safe Streets and Roads For All. UPWP = Unified Planning Work Program.

Discussion

D. Mohler stated that many of these projects were also amended into the FFYs 2025–29 TIP and asked what the reason was for including the projects in both the FFYs 2025–29 TIP and FFY 2025 UPWP.

O. Saccocia stated that amending these projects into both the FFYs 2025–29 TIP and FFY 2025 UPWP was an ask from the Federal Highway Administration.

E. Lapointe stated that many of the projects include a combination of construction and planning grants.

Vote

A motion to endorse FFY 2025 UPWP Amendment Two and waive the 21-day public comment period was made by the MAPC (E. Bourassa) and seconded by the City of Boston (J. Rowe). The motion carried.

11. FFYs 2026–30 TIP Project Readiness Update—*Ethan Lapointe, MPO Staff*

Documents posted to the MPO meeting calendar

1. FFY 2026–30 TIP Readiness Scenario ([pdf](#)) ([html](#))
2. Draft Programming Policies to Address TIP Project Cost Increases ([pdf](#)) ([html](#))
3. Project 605168: Hingham–Improvements on Route 3A Project for FFY 26-30 TIP Development Letter ([pdf](#))

E. Lapointe presented the FFYs 2026–30 TIP Project Readiness Update.

Meeting Materials

E. Lapointe stated that in the Readiness Scenario posted to the MPO meeting calendar projects are sorted in order of their current programmed year, starting with projects that are programmed in FFY 2025. There is also a new column that shows when and where a project was initially programmed.

Public Comment Update

E. Lapointe stated that MPO staff received comment letters related to and expressing support for advancing the following projects:

- Project 609204: Belmont–Community Path, Belmont Component of the MCRT (Phase 1)–FFY 2026
- Project 605168: Hingham–Improvements on Route 3A from Otis Street/Cole Road including Summer Street and Rotary; Rockland Street to George Washington Boulevard–FFY 2026

- Project 610666: Swampscott–Rail Trail Construction–FFY 2028

Readiness Days: Background

E. Lapointe stated that Readiness Days is an annual multi-day meeting of MassDOT staff with each of the MPOs in Massachusetts. The Readiness Days team solicits perspectives from the MPO, the MassDOT Program Management unit, Highway Districts, the Right-of-Way and Environmental sections, and Director’s Office for each specific project to recommend a readiness year to be considered for the development of the next TIP. Project costs or cost increases may not necessarily be considered at this stage.

E. Lapointe stated that Readiness Days has had two key process improvements this year, including Quarterly Readiness Updates and Subregional Readiness Days.

Readiness Recommendations by Year

E. Lapointe stated that most projects programmed in FFY 2026 are recommended for delay to FFY 2027, leading to a substantial funding deficit in that year. The deficit is worsened by new delays from projects being reprogrammed from FFY 2025 to FFY 2026. Details on the FFYs 2026–30 development outlook can be found in Table 15.

**Table 15
FFYs 2026–30 TIP Development Outlook Circa February 13, 2025**

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
2025 (New)	\$128,427,689	\$103,829,110	\$24,598,579	19.2%
2026 (New)	\$125,285,687	\$60,017,614	\$65,268,073	52.1%
2027 (New)	\$152,627,429	\$237,359,291	-\$84,731,862	-55.5%
2028 (New)	\$158,700,879	\$169,726,302	-\$11,025,423	-6.9%
2029 (New)	\$157,518,346	\$152,779,662	\$4,738,684	3.0%
2030 (New)	\$160,037,411	\$110,662,800	\$49,374,611	30.9%
2026–30 Total	\$754,169,752	\$730,545,669	\$23,624,083	3.1%

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

E. Lapointe stated that project delays in FFY 2025 contribute to a substantial unprogrammed balance, which will require amendments to the FFYs 2025–29 TIP.

E. Lapointe stated that ongoing funding commitments to projects utilizing Advance Construction temper funding for new projects in FFY 2030 to approximately 31 percent of availability.

E. Lapointe stated that there is approximately a \$98 million deficit between FFY 2027 and 2028, and approximately \$54 million of funding available between FFY 2029 and 2030.

Changes by Year

E. Lapointe stated that, in developing the FFYs 2026–30 TIP, three projects in FFY 2025 are projected to be delayed to FFY 2026, amounting to \$31,018,289. Details of changes to programming in FFY 2025 can be found in Table 16.

Table 16
FFY 2025 Project Delays

Project	Initial	Latest	FFYs	FFYs	Cost Change
	TIP Status	Milestone	2025–29 Status	2026–30 Status	
610544: Peabody–Multi-use					
Path Construction of	FFY 2025				
Independence Greenway at I-95	(FFYs	75% Received	FFY 2025	FFY 2026	+\$8,124,934
Route 1	2021–25 TIP)	(9/12/2024)	\$13,966,099	\$22,091,033	+58%
611982: Medford–Shared Use					
Path Connection at the Route	FFY 2025				
28/Wellington Underpass	(FFYs	100% Received	FFY 2025	FFY 2026	-\$572,972
	2025–29 TIP)	(10/31/2024)	\$6,061,917	\$5,488,945	-9.5%
608067: Woburn–Intersection					
Reconstruction at Route 3	FFY 2025				
(Cambridge Road) and Bedford	(FFYs	25% Approved	FFY 2025	FFY 2026	
Road and South Bedford Street	2021–25 TIP)	(1/22/2024)	\$3,438,311	\$3,438,311	\$0

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

E. Lapointe reviewed trends related to project delays over the past three TIP development cycles. During the development of the FFYs 2024–28 TIP, four out of ten projects programmed in FFY 2024 were delayed. In the development of the FFYs 2025–29 TIP, six out of nine projects programmed in FFY 2025 were delayed. In the development of FFYs 2026–30 TIP, seven out of nine projects programmed in FFY 2026 were delayed.

E. Lapointe presented project delays in FFY 2026, which can be found in Table 17.

Table 17
FFY 2026 Project Delays

Project	Initial TIP Status	Latest Milestone	FFYs 2025–29 Status	FFYs 2026–30 Status	Cost Change
605857: Norwood–Intersection Improvements at Route 1 and University Avenue/Everett Street	FFY 2021 (FFYs 2017–21 TIP)	25% Received (Resubmission 1) 1/5/2021	FFY 2026 \$27,636,336	FFY 2027 \$27,636,336	\$0
606453: Boston–Improvements on Boylston Street, from Intersection of Brookline Avenue and Park Drive to Ipswich Street	FFY 2019 (FFYs 2016– 20 TIP)	25% Received (Resubmission 1) (1/29/2021)	FFY 2026 \$8,665,052	FFY 2027 \$15,000,000	+\$6,334,948 +73.1%
608045: Milford–Rehabilitation on Route 16, from Route 109 to Beaver Street	FFY 2024 (FFYs 2020– 24 TIP)	25% Received (Resubmission 2) (10/13/2023)	FFY 2026 \$13,548,565	FFY 2027 \$13,548,565	\$0
609252: Lynn–Rehabilitation of Essex Street	FFY 2024 (FFYs 2020– 24 TIP)	PRC Approved (12/6/2018)	FFY 2026 \$10,000,000 FFY 2027 \$9,698,640	FFY 2027 \$19,698,640	\$0
609532: Chelsea–Targeted Safety Improvements and Related Work on Broadway, from Williams Street to City Hall Avenue	FFY 2026 (FFYs 2024– 28 TIP)	75% Comments to DE (4/1/2024)	FFY 2026 \$9,807,515	FFY 2027 \$9,430,303	-\$377,212 -3.8%
605168: Hingham–Improvements on Route 3A from Otis Street including Summer Street and Rotary; Rockland Street to George Washington Boulevard	FFY 2024 (FFYs 2020– 24 TIP)	75% Comments to DE (4/29/2024)	FFY 2026 \$28,738,432	FFY 2027 \$33,227,512	+\$4,489,080 +15.6%
610823: Quincy–Intersection Improvements at Willard Street and Ricciuti Drive	FFY 2026 (FFYs 2025– 29 TIP)	75% Received (Resubmission 1) (6/12/2024)	FFY 2026 \$1,885,353	FFY 2027 \$3,700,546	+\$1,815,193 +96.3%

DE = Design Engineer. FFY = Federal Fiscal Year. PRC = MassDOT Project Review Committee. TIP = Transportation Improvement Program.

E. Lapointe presented changes to programming in FFY 2027, which includes delaying Project 608954, Weston–Reconstruction on Route 30, from FFY 2027 to FFY 2028 due to prior contractual issues with the design and some wetland concerns. There is no cost change for this project.

E. Lapointe presented changes to programming in FFY 2028, which includes delaying Project 613088, Malden–Spot Pond Brook Greenway, from FFY 2028 to FFY 2029 due to municipal staff turnover and other projects possibly taking priority. Changes to programming in FFY 2028 also included a new schedule for Project 606226, Boston–Reconstruction of Rutherford Avenue from City Square to Sullivan Square.

Major Capital Projects Update

E. Lapointe presented updated information for the following major capital projects:

- Project 607981: Somerville–McGrath Boulevard Construction
- Project 609246: Lynn–Rehabilitation of Western Avenue (Route 107)
- Project 606226: Boston–Reconstruction of Rutherford Avenue, from City Square to Sullivan Square

Updated information on these projects can be found in Tables 18–21.

Table 18
Project 607981: Somerville–McGrath Boulevard Construction

	FFYs 2025–29	FFYs 2026–30	Delta
FFY 2026	\$0	\$0	\$0
FFY 2027	\$30,000,000	\$30,000,000	\$0
FFY 2028	\$30,000,000	\$33,075,573	+\$3,075,573
FFY 2029	\$30,310,000	\$30,310,000	\$0
	\$5,000,000		
FFY 2030	(Expected)	\$35,000,000	+\$30,000,000
Total Funded	\$90,310,000	\$128,385,573	+\$33,075,573
Adjusted TFPC	\$95,310,000	\$128,385,573	+\$33,075,573

FFY = Federal Fiscal Year. TFPC = Total Federal Participating Cost.

Table 19
Project 609246: Lynn–Rehabilitation of Western Avenue (Route 107)

	FFYs 2025–29	FFYs 2026–30	Delta
FFY 2026	\$0	\$0	\$0
FFY 2027	\$0	\$0	\$0
FFY 2028	\$15,000,000	\$15,000,000	\$0
FFY 2029	\$20,000,000	\$20,000,000	\$0
FFY 2030	\$10,897,600 (Expected)	\$10,897,600	\$0
Total Funded	\$35,000,000	\$45,897,600	\$0
Adjusted TFPC	\$45,897,600	\$45,897,600	\$0

FFY = Federal Fiscal Year. TFPC = Total Federal Participating Cost.

Table 20
Project 606226: Boston–Reconstruction of Rutherford Avenue, from City Square to Sullivan Square

	FFYs 2025–29	FFYs 2026–30	Delta
FFY 2026	\$0	\$0	\$0
FFY 2027	\$0	\$0	\$0
FFY 2028	\$33,500,000	\$0	-\$33,500,000
FFY 2029	\$45,000,000	\$33,500,000	-\$11,500,000
FFY 2030	\$35,500,000 (Expected)	\$33,500,000	-\$11,500,000
Total Funded	\$78,500,000	\$67,000,000	\$0
Adjusted TFPC	\$197,759,449	\$197,759,449	\$0

FFY = Federal Fiscal Year. TFPC = Total Federal Participating Cost.

Table 21
Advance Construction Schedule for Project 606226: Boston–Reconstruction of Rutherford Avenue, from City Square to Sullivan Square

	FFYs 2026–30
FFY 2029	\$33,500,000
FFY 2030	\$33,500,000
FFY 2031	\$44,000,000
FFY 2032	\$44,759,449
FFY 2033	\$42,000,000
Adjusted TFPC	\$197,759,449
Remaining Need	\$130,759,449

FFY = Federal Fiscal Year. TFPC = Total Federal Participating Cost.

Revisiting TIP Cost Change Committee Recommendations

E. Lapointe stated that in spring 2021, the MPO board established an ad hoc committee—the TIP Cost Change Committee—to evaluate causes and consequences of cost increases on projects. The committee provided policy recommendations to the MPO board in September 2021, which included three interventions recommended for deployment as early as the FFYs 2023–27 TIP. These interventions included the following:

- Project Design Status Intervention
- Creating Check-in Points
- Rescoring and Reevaluating Projects

E. Lapointe stated that the first recommendation, Project Design Status Intervention, proposed requiring that project proponents submit 25 percent design plans and obtain updated cost estimates from MassDOT prior to selection for both TIP funding and inclusion in the Long-Range Transportation Plan. E. Lapointe stated that implementation of the recommendation has previously leaned more towards prioritization rather than a strict requirement due to the increased difficulty of obtaining a 25 percent design status. E. Lapointe stated that this recommendation is effective but must be adaptable to meeting changing design standards and project proponent needs. In addition, the intervention does not apply to projects programmed prior to the recommendations.

E. Lapointe discussed the second intervention, Creating Check-in Points. E. Lapointe stated that Quarterly Readiness Updates, Subregional Readiness Days, and the TIP Process, Engagement, and Readiness Committee have addressed recommendations of

this policy thoroughly, however, there are issues encouraging project proponents to attend these events and meetings.

E. Lapointe stated that the third intervention, Rescoring and Reevaluating Projects, proposed a multi-step process, which included the following steps:

- Step 1: Set a threshold of \$2,500,000 or 25 percent of the project cost.
- Step 2: Proponents of projects that exceed thresholds above must attend an MPO board meeting to explain the cause of the cost increase.
- Step 3: The MPO board may choose to alter project status, based on rescoring, proponents' presentations, or other relevant factors.
- Step 4: The MPO board reconsiders project status and chooses among the four options below:
 - Full MPO funding of the cost increase in the current FFY
 - Full MPO funding of the increase in another FFY, including a delay
 - Denial of MPO funding at the increased cost
 - Removal of the project from the TIP

E. Lapointe stated that this policy is the most relevant for the development of the FFYs 2026–30 TIP; however, MPO staff have limited time to conduct the full process. In addition, the process has not been formally triggered previously.

Key Takeaways and Considerations

E. Lapointe presented the following key takeaways:

- MPO staff will work with MassDOT and project proponents to identify revised cost estimates.
- The persistence of readiness issues across multiple TIP years is increasingly severe.

E. Lapointe stated that there are more opportunities to discuss the FFYs 2026–30 TIP at upcoming MPO and TIP Process, Engagement, and Readiness Committee meetings.

E. Lapointe stated that MPO members are encouraged to request that specific project proponents for delayed or at-risk projects attend the TIP Process, Engagement, and Readiness Committee meeting for further explanation, and proponents for new projects may also be in attendance.

Discussion

L. Diggins asked, considering the labor-intensive nature of the project scoring process, if there are considerations for ways to automate or expedite future TIP development cycles.

E. Lapointe stated that developing a quantitative scoring process to complement the qualitative metrics was a part of the PPPP grant mentioned in the FFYs 2025–29 TIP Amendment Ten presentation and would allow for automation of certain processes in the TIP scoring process. In addition, E. Lapointe stated that there have been internal advances to quicken and automate the scoring process, but the large volume of applications has limited MPO staff's ability to implement them.

Jay Monty, City of Everett, stated that surpluses in the first few FFYs of the TIP and deficits in later FFYs is a recurring issue that seems to increase in severity. J. Monty asked if it would be possible to utilize the surpluses in FFY 2025 and 2026 and leave the deficits in FFYs 2027 and 2028 with the understanding that the deficits will decrease next TIP development cycle with project delays.

E. Lapointe stated that every TIP scenario must be fiscally constrained across all years, and the MPO cannot adopt a TIP scenario that has a deficit in any FFY.

J. Monty expressed appreciation for the analysis on the 25 percent design status for TIP projects. In addition, J. Monty stated that he was previously critical of the tendency to place blame for project readiness delays solely on project proponents, whereas there are a lot of external factors that lead to cost increases and project readiness, such as federal permits and policy changes, and projects should not necessarily be removed from the TIP as a result.

J. Rowe responded that there are a lot of factors that can contribute to project delays, many of which lie outside of the project proponent's power. J. Rowe proposed that, through MPO staff, project proponents that have not had design updates for more than one year share a simplified updated design and project delivery schedule that includes updated cost estimates, expected dates for updated 25 percent and 75 percent design submissions, and an updated expected bid date. J. Rowe stated that understanding the project proponent's perspective on how the project is progressing may help board members with decision-making.

J. Monty expressed support for J. Rowe's proposition. In addition, J. Monty asked what would happen if projects that are recommended for delay out of an FFY stay in that FFY instead.

E. Lapointe responded that there are two projects being proposed for delay from FFY 2026 to FFY 2027, which amount to approximately \$48 million, and MPO staff are having ongoing discussions with project proponents to see if the projects can stay in FFY 2026. This would resolve approximately \$48 million of the deficit in FFY 2027. However, E. Lapointe stated that if the reasons for delays are not resolved in FFY 2026, there would be substantial problems in FFY 2027.

J. Monty asked if funds would be lost if a project was not able to begin on time in the year it is programmed.

E. Lapointe stated that the surplus would need to be addressed by a backfill TIP amendment that would not be a part of the initial FFYs 2026–30 TIP scenario and the fill-in projects may not be scored.

J. Monty asked if there was a way to expedite permit-granting agencies' processes to help project proponents with readiness.

D. Mohler asked for clarification on the remaining funds in the FFYs 2026–30 TIP Development Outlook.

L. Diggins expressed support for J. Rowe's proposition and stated that the purpose of getting updated schedules from project proponents would not be to remove them from the TIP, but to better understand the projects' delays and cost increases.

D. Mohler stated that there is approximately \$95 million in deficits in FFYs 2027–28 and approximately \$53 million available in FFYs 2029–30; based on this estimate, projects will have to be removed from this TIP cycle and deferred to FFY 2031. D. Mohler stated that the issue is how board members select projects for removal.

E. Chute expressed support for J. Rowe's proposition and stated that additional information from project proponents would help board members have a better understanding of realistic cost estimates. In addition, E. Chute reiterated J. Monty's comments on factors outside of project proponents' control affecting project readiness.

Josh Ostroff, MBTA, expressed appreciation for collaboration and coordination between MPO and MBTA staff and discussions about potential MBTA projects that will address equity concerns across the region. J. Ostroff offered to answer questions about the MBTA's projects.

J. Rowe motioned for MPO staff to request a simple project delivery schedule by March 13, 2025, from all proponents of projects that have not reached a project info milestone

(recorded on MassDOT's Project Information Database) in more than one year and that the project delivery schedule include projected dates for 25 percent and 75 percent design submissions and a bid date.

L. Diggins stated that there would not be a penalty for project proponents if they do not submit a project delivery schedule.

E. Bourassa stated that the task may be feasible for some project proponents, but some may have difficulty estimating when they will submit their 75 percent design if they do not have a 25 percent design yet. So, proponents can do their best to estimate the information. E. Bourassa encouraged project proponents and their consultants to attend the upcoming TIP Process, Engagement, and Readiness Committee meeting and MPO meetings.

Vote

A motion for MPO staff to request a simple project delivery schedule by March 13, 2025, from all proponents of projects that have not reached a project info milestone in more than one year, and that the project delivery schedule include projected dates for 25 percent and 75 percent design submissions and a bid date, was made by the City of Boston (J. Rowe) and seconded by the Advisory Council (L. Diggins). The motion carried.

12. Massachusetts Association of Regional Planning Agencies (MARPA) Funding Update—Derek Krevat and Chris Klem, MassDOT

Derek Krevat, MassDOT, presented funding information for the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), which is set annually. D. Krevat stated that every five years there is new surface transportation legislation or a reauthorization bill, which the United States Congress passes, providing federal formula funding for the next five years. The current reauthorization bill is the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law, which was passed in November 2021 and contains funding for all 50 states for FFYs 2022–26. Every state receives an apportionment; the apportionment for Massachusetts is \$858.7 million in FFY 2026 and is comprised of the following nine programs:

- National Highway Performance Program
- Surface Transportation Block Grant Program
- Highway Safety Improvement Program
- Railway-Highway Crossings Program
- Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Program
- Metropolitan Planning Program
- Carbon Reduction Program

-
- Promoting Resilient Operations for Transformative, Efficient, and Cost-saving Transportation Program (PROTECT) Program

D. Krevat stated that there is a certain percentage that MassDOT is allowed to obligate, known as the Obligation Limitation. Previously, this was approximately 90 percent on average.

D. Krevat stated that if states do not obligate all the funds they are apportioned, there is a process for other states to request additional funding beyond the original apportionment, known as the August Redistribution. MassDOT assumes \$50 million in funding each year from the August Redistribution process, which allows MassDOT to obligate more funding in an FFY.

D. Krevat presented the Program Target Report for FFY 2026, which can be found in Table 22.

Table 22
FFY 2026 Program Target Report

	Federal Aid Funds	Matching Funds	FFY 2026 (Proposed) (FedAid and Match)
Balance Obligation Authority	\$772,810,988		
Planned Redistribution			
Request	\$50,000,000		
Total Non-earmarked Funding			
Available	\$822,810,988	\$159,679,312	
Planning/Adjustments/Pass-throughs	\$205,258,872	\$17,276,622	\$222,535,494
GANS Repayment	\$133,620,000	\$0	\$133,620,000
Award Adjustments, Change			
Orders, etc.	\$22,225,500	\$5,556,375	\$27,781,875
Metropolitan Planning	\$11,552,321	\$2,888,080	\$14,440,402
State Planning and Research	\$14,649,673	\$3,662,418	\$18,312,091
Recreational Trails	\$1,186,729	\$296,692	\$1,283,411
SRTS Education	\$1,951,346	\$487,837	\$2,439,183
Transit Grant Program	\$0	\$0	\$0
Flex to FTA	\$0	\$0	\$0
Railroad Crossings	\$2,532,382	\$0	\$2,532,382
Carbon Reduction	\$17,540,921	\$4,385,230	\$21,926,151

FTA = Federal Transit Administration. GANS = Grant Anticipation Notes. SRTS = Safe Routes to School.

D. Krevat stated that after the funding is allocated to the programs listed in Table 22, funding is allocated to Massachusetts' MPO regions. The percentage allocated to each MPO is determined by a formula created by MARPA. The regional share for the Boston Region MPO is 42.9671 percent.

D. Krevat stated that the Boston Region MPO is receiving \$125,285,687 in FFY 2026, which includes federal funding and the match.

D. Krevat stated that approximately half of the funding is allocated to Statewide Priority Highway Programs, such as interstate pavement, safety improvements, and roadway improvements.

Chris Klem, MassDOT, presented an overview of MassDOT’s financial guidance for the FFY 2026 UPWP. C. Klem compared FFY 2026’s apportionment to FFY 2025’s apportionment, which can be found in Table 23.

Table 23
FFYs 2025 and 2026 UPWP Financial Planning

	FFY 2026 (PL)	FFY 2025 (PL)	Delta
Apportionment	\$12,584,228	\$12,337,478	
Obligation Authority	90.0%	90.0%	
Federal PL Funds Only	\$11,325,805.2	\$13,879,663	
Matching Funds Added	\$14,157,257	\$13,879,663	2.0%
Total Funds	\$19,370,728	\$19,093,134	1.4%

PL = Planning Funds. UPWP = Unified Planning Work Program.

C. Klem presented the breakdown of Planning Funds (PL) across the MPOs in Massachusetts, according to the formula developed by MARPA. C. Klem stated that 40 percent of the funds are split evenly between the MPOs, and 30 percent of the funding is distributed based on the relative size of the population. The remaining 30 percent of the funding is distributed based on the relative size of the urbanized population. The Boston Region MPO’s portion is expected to be \$7,630,612 in FFY 2026, which is a \$93,217 increase from FFY 2025.

13. Members’ Items

There were none.

14. Adjourn

A motion to adjourn was made by the MAPC (E. Bourassa) and seconded by the Advisory Council (L. Diggins). The motion carried.

Attendance

Members

Representatives and Alternates

At-Large City (City of Everett)	Jay Monty
At-Large City (City of Newton)	David Koses Ned Codd
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 (FHWA)	Ken Miller
Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority (MBTA)	Sandy Johnston
Massachusetts Department of Transportation (MassDOT)	David Mohler Chris Klem Derek Krevat Tracie Lenhardt
Massachusetts Port Authority	Sarah Lee
MassDOT Highway Division	John Romano Lyris Liautaud
MBTA Advisory Board	Hanna Switekowski Isabella MacKinnon
Metropolitan Area Planning Council (MAPC)	Eric Bourassa
MetroWest Regional Transit Authority (MWRTA)	Jim Nee Tyler Terrasi Felicia Webb
Minuteman Advisory Group on Interlocal Coordination (Town of Action)	Kaila Sauer
North Shore Task Force (City of Beverly)	Darlene Wynne
Regional Transportation Advisory Council	Lenard Diggins
Three Rivers Interlocal Council (Town of Norwood)	Tom O'Rourke Steven Olanoff

Other Attendees	Affiliation
Daniel Milbrandt	City of Boston
Anthony Jones	FHWA
Samira Saad	FHWA
Travis Pollack	MAPC
Andrew Wang	MassDOT
Barbara Lachance	MassDOT
Cheryll-Ann Senior	MassDOT
Melissa Santley	MassDOT
Michelle Scott	MassDOT
Miranda Briseño	MassDOT
Sarah Bradbury	MassDOT
Stephanie Abundo	MassDOT
Emily Groth	MBTA
Josh Ostroff	MBTA
Joshua Klingenstein	MBTA
Michael Catsos	MBTA
Pamela Haznar	McClure
Benjamin Coulombe	MWRTA
Cam Sullivan	MWRTA
Joy Glynn	MWRTA
Rich Benevento	Tighe & Bond
Nate Ryan	Town of Acton
Meghan McNamara	Town of Lexington
Donna Cotterell	Town of Marblehead
Curt Bellavance	Town of Peabody
Betsy Ware	Town of Rockport
Sheila Page	Town of Wellesley
Valerie Gingrich	Town of Wilmington
Aleida Leza	
Alexandra Russell	
Paul Cobuzzi	
Rich Kosian	

MPO Staff/Central Transportation Planning Staff

Abby Cutrumbes Heerema

Adriana Jacobsen

Alexandra Kleyman

Annette Demchur

Betsy Harvey Herzfeld

Bradley Putnam

Elena Ion

Erin Maguire

Ethan Lapointe

Gina Perille

Jia Huang

Lauren Magee

Olivia Saccocia

Rebecca Morgan

Sam Taylor

Sean Rourke

Stella Jordan

CIVIL RIGHTS NOTICE TO THE PUBLIC

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



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

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

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.