

Table C-2 Public Comments Received During the Public Review Period for the Draft FFYs 2026-30 TIP

Project #610666: Swampscott–Swampscott Rail Trail	Thomas Palleria	Oppose	<p>As a concerned citizen of Swampscott, I write this e-mail asking that you please deny and or indefinitely postpone the town of Swampscott’s request for TIP funding for the proposed Swampscott Rail Trail (project #610666). In 2017 the Town of Swampscott voted in a very controversial townwide referendum regarding the allocation of \$850,000 of town funds for the design and land acquisition costs for a potential recreational path in Swampscott. While the vote passed by a small margin (12%) it was a very controversial and divisive vote as town leadership was not honest about the construction of the trail, including the costs to the town, ongoing upkeep of the trail, the need for eminent domain, land ownership rights along the proposed trail, and their relationship with abutters, landowners, and National Grid. As you consider whether or not to fund the Swampscott Rail Trail I would ask that you please consider the following: 1) The use of \$8,000,000 Dollars to fund the creation of a recreational dirt walking/bike path in the wealthy town of Swampscott would be an utter waste of taxpayer money. The Town of Swampscott is a wealthy and resource rich town, we have no shortage or recreational options in our town, and we live in close proximity to several existing parks and rail trails including Nahant Beach Reservation, The Lynn Rail Trail, The Salem Rail Trail, The Peabody Rail Trail, the Marblehead Rail Trail and Lynn Woods one of the largest parks in eastern Massachusetts. 2) In 2022 the Town of Swampscott spent \$9,000,000 dollars to acquire two parcels of land for open space. If the creation of a recreational trail in Swampscott was as important to the town as some rail trail supporters would have you believe we could have easily invested the money to create the Swampscott Rail Trail on our own. Instead, the only reason why the Rail Trail was approved in the first place is because the town was promised by our leadership that we could get the state to spend taxpayer funds to fund this nice to have nonessential recreational amenity. In short, the town could pay for this themselves, but they are waiting for you to foot the bill. 3) Knowing full well that The Town of Swampscott was going to be asking for federal funds to construct their proposed rail trail the Town Of Swampscott was unwilling to consider feasible options that would have reduced the cost to construct the Rail Trail. In short, they have not been good stewards of your grant money. 4) The Town of Swampscott does not have legal authority to acquire the land needed to implement the proposed Swampscott Rail Trail. This was asserted by National Grid in a lawsuit filed against Swampscott in 2023, and while National Grid and Swampscott have since “settled” their lawsuit Swampscott has failed to cure the Warrant Language and thus they do not have legal authority to acquire the needed land to build the proposed Rail Trail. 5) As noted above, in 2017 the Town of Swampscott voted to fund the design of the Rail Trail and the acquisition of the needed land rights to implement the proposed rail trail. With that said the town has had funding approved to acquire the needed land rights for over 8 years and they have FAILED to acquire the land/land rights needed to construct the proposed trail. As of today, they have not yet acquired the needed surveys/appraisals to value the land they need to acquire the land and they have not acquired the land needed for the Rail Trail. This is not a shovel ready project and the towns inability to acquire the land / land rights needed for the rail trail prove out the fact that they have not been able to acquire the land needed for this trail. They either lack the funding, are waiting for your grant money to “buy” the land rights and or lack the legal authority to acquire the land needed for the Trail. 6) The town has not paid for appraisals needed for the eminent domain takings it would need to secure the land rights needed for the rail trail. They took land from National Grid with only \$100 dollars of compensation which National Grid deemed as essentially no compensation at all. Subsequently National Grid paid for an appraisal which valued their land at over 1MM far more money than the town has available for any eminent domain takings. Beyond the National Grid takings there are over 80 town residents who own land that the town must acquire rights to for the trail and they have not yet paid for the requisite appraisals needed prior to such takings. In short, the town does not have the money and cannot prove they have the money needed to acquire the land needed to develop a trail. 7) In August 2019 the town of Swampscott presented a letter of intent to Swampscott’s Conservation commission which was denied. In response to the request the Conservation Commission paid for a study of the rail trail plans/proposed project and as a result published a list of findings for the town to address. The town has not addressed any of the findings, they have not updated their plans and they have not yet resolved this issue and or gained approval from the Conservation Commission to proceed. It has been 6 years since the Conservation Commission has denied the town letter of intent.....in this time the town has not been able to “cure” the issues presented by the. 8) In an effort to reduce the amount of money that the Town of Swampscott needs to spend to acquire land rights along the proposed Rail Trail they have offered landowners in the corridor a quid pro quo essentially offering them federal grant money in return for the gift of their land. Their approach is to offer landowners things of value, removing trees from their land, updating irrigation systems, plantings, landscaping, fences etc. of monetary value in exchange for the “gift” of land rights. This is no gift at all – it is the Town of Swampscott using Federal Grant money to acquire land rights via a quid pro quo which is not allowed under the TIP program. 9) In reviewing the Town of Swampscott’s Grant Application for TIP funding it is clear they</p>	<p>The Boston Region MPO appreciates your engagement and input on the Swampscott Rail Trail Project. Your comment will be shared with the MPO board as a part of its review of the draft TIP on June 5, 2025. During this meeting, it is anticipated that MPO members will vote on the endorsement of the TIP after taking into account the public comments received during the 30-day public review period, which ends on May 28.</p>
---	-----------------	--------	---	--

			were disingenuous about the facts of the proposed Swampscott Rail Trail if not outright dishonest. As outlined above I write this e-mail asking that you please deny and or indefinitely postpone the town of Swampscott's request for TIP funding for the proposed Swampscott Rail Trail (project #610666). The Town of Swampscott lacks the legal authority to acquire the land needed for the Rail Trail (the approved warrant language is insufficient), they have failed to consider alternatives that would greatly reduce the cost of the rail trail, they have decided not to invest the ample town funds they have in the rail trail, they have failed to acquire the needed appraisals for land takings, they have not allocated the needed funds to acquire the land needed for the rail trail, the town has sufficient access to recreational trails in close proximity, and they lack the needed approvals from the conservation committee to move forward with this project. The Town of Swampscott has had 8 years to get their proverbial ducks in a row related to the Swampscott Rail Trail and they have failed to do so. Until they are able cure their warrant language, acquire land rights, and acquire approvals from the conservation commission this is far from a shovel ready project. Your committee does a great job, and there are so many deserving projects. The answer to Swampscott should be no for now – until they can prove they are working with national grid, abutters and landowners – and actually have the needed rights and approvals to build the trail. There is no emergency here – please just hold those you fund accountable to a certain standard of ethics and readiness – when the trail is ready, they can come back to you for consideration.	
Project #610666: Swampscott–Swampscott Rail Trail	Andrea Calamita	Oppose	Letter of opposition of the Swampscott Rail Trail	The Boston Region MPO appreciates your engagement and input on the Swampscott Rail Trail Project. Your comment will be shared with the MPO board as a part of its review of the draft TIP on June 5, 2025. During this meeting, it is anticipated that MPO members will vote on the endorsement of the TIP after taking into account the public comments received during the 30-day public review period, which ends on May 28.
Project #610660: Sudbury-Wayland–Mass Central Rail Trail (MCRT)	Benjamin Bayes	Request	I have just read the draft TIP FFYS 2026-30. Of special importance to me is project 610660, Sudbury-Wayland: Mass Central Rail Trail. This project was originally proposed for TIP funding & construction in 2027 per the 2023 MassDOT 25% review and public meeting, see page 36 of the presentation: https://www.mass.gov/doc/mcrt-wayland-to-sudbury-sub-station-presentation-2023-3-2/download . It is my understanding that this project in March 2025 accepted the 75% design review (per TIP project page of 610660) and DCR intends to have the 100% design and permitting completed in 2026 per the MCRT-Wayside page: https://www.mass.gov/info-details/mass-central-rail-trail-wayside . As the decades-awaited Sudbury-Hudson MCRT section is being paved starting literally today (April 28 2025) and anticipated to be complete in 2026, it is crucial that the Sudbury-Wayland MCRT funding does not slip to 2028, instead keeping the original proposed 2027 date at minimum. The Sudbury-Wayland build creates a vast Massachusetts trail network from Waltham to Hudson on the MCRT, and beyond with the Assabet River Rail Trail to Marlborough and the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail to Lowell. It is a "keystone" project in the regional Massachusetts shared use path network. The alternative Route 20 connection is very hazardous to pedestrians and bicyclists, lacking even a sidewalk.Please, move the TIP funding of the Sudbury-Wayland: Mass Central Rail Trail project forward from 2028.	Thank you for sharing your comments on the Sudbury-Wayland: Mass Central Rail Trail project. The Boston Region MPO appreciates your engagement and input on the federal fiscal years (FFY) 2026-30 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). The MPO is committed to investing in transportation projects that improve safety, accessibility, and mobility for all road users. While the Sudbury-Wayland MCRT project is funded through MassDOT's Statewide program, and is therefore not directly subject to MPO programming decisions, the MPO is responsible for approving the TIP in its entirety and working with our partners at the state and local levels to advance these necessary projects. MPO staff will continue to work with MassDOT to ensure timely project delivery not only for this section of the Massachusetts Central Rail Trail, but for the important connections to Sudbury's segment Bruce Freeman Rail Trail as well, the final phase of which is funded with MPO dollars.
Project #610662: Woburn–Roadway and Intersection Improvements at Woburn Common, Route 38 (Main Street), Winn Street, Pleasant Street, and Montvale Avenue	Christopher P Silvia	Support	I am submitting public comment in support of project 610662. I live at 13 Bennett St and am thus either within or directly adjacent to the study area. I appreciate and thank the mpo for directing funds for this effort to fix Woburn Common. The current configuration of Woburn Common is no longer fit for purpose, and I believe that replacing the Winn/Main/Pleasant st intersection with a signalized intersection, as I saw in the most recent plan for Woburn Common, will improve traffic flow and reduce congestion.One challenge with this plan will be that signalized	Thank you for sharing your support and concerns for the Roadway and Intersections Improvements at Woburn Common project. The Boston Region MPO

			<p>intersections will impose "beg button" waits for pedestrian crossings in some locations where there currently are unsignalized sidewalks where pedestrians have the right of way. While I understand some benefits of signalized crosswalks, all of the signalized crosswalks within Woburn Center are egregiously mistimed, with excessively long phases. This produces a "boy who cried wolf" effect, in which pedestrians typically press the beg button, then after a few seconds see a gap in traffic and cross, with the triggered walk phase only beginning after the beg button has been triggered. There is currently an unsignalized crosswalk walking path from my house to all of the retail stores on Woburn's main Street where I shop - that is via the crosswalk opposite the courthouse, and then the crosswalk on the north side of Winn St where it intersects with pleasant St. Ideally this path would remain, however I understand that signaling the area limits crosswalk signalization. Thus I request that the walking paths from the Woburn city hall / Bennett St area to main St bedesigned so there is no more than one signalized crosswalk at which one must wait. The two crosswalk section at common and main St is to be avoided - a signalized crosswalk should proceed directly from the east to West sides of main St in a single crossing phase. I know I may be rambling a bit about crossing phase times, but this is one of the most important quality of life issues which will determine whether this project makes it easier or harder for me to access main St retail on foot, and I appreciate your attention.The current 4 lanes oncommon st are ridiculous, and I hope for this to be reduced. It is important that the operations of the MBTA 354 (running east/West from pleasant St to Montvale), and MBTA 134, are not disrupted. The MBTA 134 in particular terminates in Woburn on the current Sunday schedule and must be able to turn around and lay over slightly - there should either be enough space for that bus to park and dwell for a few minutes, or the bus route should be extended to North Woburn 7 days a week in coordination with the MBTA (or to central square where there is an intersection at which the MBTA bus could also turn around).I hope that you are able to implement Complete Streets bike lanes. This will be a challenge. Many local businesses will not want to lose parking outside their storefronts. Parking protected bike lanes may be the best option. If the bike lanes are sometimes a bit narrow, that is okay. I have never seen more sidewalk biking anywhere than I see in Woburn center, because the roads are not safe places to bike and are typically full of cars, bumper to bumper. So I encourage you to try to fit as many bike lanes as you can, within reason, particularly parking protected lanes.Another option for bike access would be to designated a cyclist bypass route for through cyclists, which should either be a low traffic neighborhood route, or full bike lanes. Under this concept through cyclists would be able to use the bypass while cyclists going to local destinations would be expected to either ride on road or walk their bikes, depending on their comfort level.One additional request is to make sure that these roadway improvements designate that church ave / Bennett St is not to be used as a cut through to avoid the traffic lights. Bennett St is a residential street which contains many kids, but still has plenty of cut through traffic due to the current congestion at Woburn common. Hopefully this plan can eliminate this. I encourage you to install a "no through traffic" sign on Church Ave.Personally I am hopeful that walking improvements can be made, as well as cycling and diving improvements. There may be some political resistance from the Woburn city council to some of the complete streets measures, but I am behind them and I am eagerly anticipating this project.</p>	<p>appreciates your engagement and input on the federal fiscal years (FFY) 2026-30 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). The MPO supports a variety of efforts to ensure that the transportation system is safe and accessible for all users across the 97 cities and towns of the Boston region.</p>
<p>Project #609204: Belmont–Community Path, Belmont Component of the Massachusetts Central Rail Trail (MCRT) (Phase One)</p>	<p>William Messenger</p>	<p>Support</p>	<p>I join the signatories of this petition to endorse construction of the Belmont Community Path and urge action to prioritize its completion as an important transportation, recreation, and community asset and as a critical link in the 104 mile Mass Central Rail Trail. We request specific actions below that move forward both phases of this project. We urge local, regional and state leaders to advance Phase 1 of the Belmont Community Path in order to begin construction in 2026. This includes the following requests: 1. We ask the Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) to fully fund Phase 1 (Project ID 609204) in FFY 2026 when endorsing the final 2026-30 TIP. 2. We urge the Town of Belmont elected officials, committees and staff to dedicate sufficient resources and manage contractors so that the project is ready to advertise for construction by September 2026 and utilize Boston Region MPO funding in FFY 2026. We urge local, regional and state leaders to accelerate design and funding for Phase 2 in order to prioritize completion of the Belmont Community Path and full connection of the Mass Central Rail Trail in the Boston Region. Following delays of more than two years for Phase 2 design, we make the following requests: 3. We urge the Belmont Select Board to expediently approve the Belmont Community Path Project Committee's recommended route so that the Phase 2 design process can proceed. 4. We ask Town of Belmont leaders and the Boston Region MPO to formalize Phase 2 of the Belmont Community Path by assigning a Project ID Number for the TIP process.</p>	<p>Thank you for sharing your feedback on the construction of the first phase of the Belmont Community Path. MPO staff are pleased to continue working with the Town of Belmont and also to hear from its residents about this project as it develops. We greatly appreciate the continued commitment and advocacy that residents, town staff, and elected officials have had about this work.</p>
<p>Project #609204: Belmont–Community Path, Belmont Component of the Massachusetts Central Rail Trail (MCRT) (Phase One)</p>	<p>Klemens Meyer</p>	<p>Request</p>	<p>You really ought to have sent a petition that didn't require registration including a credit card. I strongly support the Community Path, but won't respond to the survey because of that requirement. This was a big mistake.</p>	<p>Thank you for reaching out to us, and we appreciate your feedback and support for the Belmont Community Path. However, the Boston Region MPO did not release or endorse a petition for this project, and we haven't been able to find any petitions in support of the path that require a credit card. Would you be able</p>

				to share the link to the petition with us so that no one else is asked to share their information? You are also welcome and encouraged to submit any comments about the project or draft Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) directly to us via this email address.
Project #613162: Littleton– Bridge Replacement, L-13-008, Route 119 Over Beaver Brook and Causeway Improvement for Wildlife	Maren Toohill	Request	Thank you for this opportunity to weigh in on the Draft FFYs 2026-30 TIP. Littleton is anticipating unprecedented multi-family housing development immediately adjacent to State Highways 2A/110/119 near the intersection with Interstate 495 in the next few years. Littleton has approved 1,089 new housing units in the “King Street Common” development proposed by the Lupoli Development team. This development is currently undergoing MEPA review. We look forward to working with the State transportation teams to help bring this development forward safely and to reduce traffic impacts resulting from this significant development. We note that the “small bridge” Project 613162: Littleton – Bridge Replacement, L-13-008, Route 119 Over Beaver Brook and Causeway Improvement for Wildlife was removed from the TIP due to uncertainty around its schedule and cost estimate. This bridge replacement is located between the Route 119 Roundabout at Beaver Brook Road and the Bridge Deck Replacement on Route 119 over I-495. We concur with the deferral for Project 613162 and request that it be added back onto the TIP as soon as possible due to flooding concerns in this area that extends toward the bridge deck replacement at Route 119 over I-495. We request that the limits of the “large” bridge deck replacement on Route 119 over I-495 be extended so that additional sidewalks can be installed and coordinated between the Beaver Brook roundabout, the causeway bridge project, and the bridge deck replacement project. This sidewalk extension could connect the King Street Common development to The Point at the intersection of Route 119 and Constitution Avenue. This sidewalk extension would provide future residents at King Street Commons with safer walking/bicycling/rolling access to the Market Basket, O’Neil Cinemas, restaurants, and other shopping, health, and entertainment venues at The Point.	Thank you for sharing your comments on the draft FFYs 2026-30 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). We will continue to collaborate with your community and MassDOT as the Beaver Brook project advances to ensure that, given the project remains in early design stages, all necessary improvements in the project area can be addressed. MPO staff look forward to working with Littleton not only on this project, but also with other potential projects to help improve the transportation network.
Project #608954: Weston– Reconstruction on Route 30	Rebecca Mercuri, Louis Mercuri, Kayla Mercuri, Victoria Huber, Tony Brooke, Barbara Gilman, Richard Gilman, Andrew Fligor, Diane Coletti, Jim Coletti, James Coletti III, Jonathan Chase, Steve Butera, Sarah Butera, Robert Ewanoski, Cliff Abrecht, Fernanda Bourlot, Rochelle Nemrow, Michael Nemrow, Allison Nemrow, Gregory Nemrow, Katherine Diver, Neil Diver, Gary Lee, Margaret Ewald, Frank Caine, Becky Ames, John Sallay, Rachael Stewart, Rochelle Nemrow, Steve Watson, Beverly Watson, Bruce Paster, Paul Griner, Margaret Griner, Barbara Baker, Robert Froh, Margaret Ewald, Warren Pinkert, Connie Pinkert, Robert Collman, Kathie Collman, John Harding, Linda Harding, Cody Meissner, Barbara Meissner, Hugh Pearson, Gustav Christensen, Vibeke Christensen, Paul Brontas, Barry Davidson, Linda Davidson, Nancy Lukitsh, David Osborne, Susan Schaefer, Christi Halby, Susan Schaefer, Richard Trant, Larine Levy, Louis Grossman, Jeff Levy, Norm Weinstock, Shelia Weinstock, Sherwin Greenblat, Joyce Flaherty, Andy Shaw, Doug Shaw, Richard Flynn, Laura Flynn, Judy Whitham, Ann Freake, Raymond Freake, Ann Orr, Andrew Zimmerman, Maura Zimmerman, Lauri Wishner, Richard Tedlow, Donna Staton, Paul Donahue, Lesley Osborne, Bill McConaghy, Jo McConaghy, Amy Gerson, Janice Kaplan, Nancy Casper, Bobby Casper, Stephanie Albert, Miles Diver, Matthew Diver, Henry Diver, Nicolle Diver, Pam Fondacabe, Greg Fondacabe, Mark Halfman, Mia Halfman, Laurel Halfman, Anna Halfman,	Oppose	Weston Petition Comment Letter	Thank you for sharing your concerns about the Weston Reconstruction project on Route 30. The Boston Region MPO appreciates your continued engagement and input on the federal fiscal years (FFY) 2026-30 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). MPO staff will continue to work with the town, its consultant, and MassDOT as the project develops to ensure that the project is consistent with the MPO’s Vision, Goals, and Objectives.

	<p>John McDonald, Natti McDonald, John Shane, Richard Thomas, Richard Hutson, Harry Alverson, Bob Ackerman, Nathan Coolidge, Lloyd Dahmen, Robert Fosberg, Chris Weschler, Ted Weschler, Fred Filoon, Harrison Graham, Thomas Haynes, Peter Campanella, Tim Richards, Gordon Pritchard, Nathan Ott, Kyle Albert, Ralph Linsalata, David Scudder, Peter Martin, Dick Perkins, Frank White, John Reidy, John Ledbetter, Craig Lawrence,Jonathan Keyes, Karen Thomas, Ed Eschbach, Barbara Eschbach, Gene Dahman, Dana Callow, Becky Callow, Michelle Garfinkel, Justin Garfinkel, Matthew Garfinkel, Brendan Garfinkel, Lindsay Garfinkel, Steven Garfinkel, Amy Elizabeth, Usen Sybil, Ann Luchetti, Amy Silverstein, Ross Silverstein, Elizabeth Messina, Susan Zacharias, Greg Zacharias, Lise Revers, Patrick Ahearn, FAIA, Nick Berardinelli, Gina Gagliardi, Luca Berardinelli, Gianni Berardinelli, Ann Gagliardi, Antonio Gagliardi, Drew Tamoney, Clarence Dixon, Laura Dixon, Bahar Cohen, Barbara Fullerton, Bert Fullerton, Anne Grape, Nina Danforth, Henry Stone, Laurie Endlar Lee, Richard Babayan, Sonya Nersessian, Alicia Primer, Doreen Mirley, John Mirley, Nikki Lee, Lawrence Lee, Lexi Lee, Charlotte Lee, Haeng Lee, Hoon Lee, Alison Barlow, Ravi Jasuja, Guneet Jasuja, Douglas Garron Lorna Garron, Jennifer Garron, Artemis Willis, Carol Burnes, Jaclyn McDonald, Brett McDonald, Jessica Moy, Jonathan Moy, Chris DiBenedetto</p>			
Project #609204: Belmont–Community Path, Belmont Component of the Massachusetts Central Rail Trail (MCRT) (Phase One)	John Dieckmann	Support	Letter of support of the Belmont Community Path	Thank you for your letter and continued support of the Belmont Community Path. The Belmont Community Path's role as a component of the broader Massachusetts Central Rail Trail reflects the MPO's commitment to investing in projects that are both local priorities and regionally significant. The project's anticipated benefits, including improvements to safety, community connectivity, and creating more choices for people to get where they need to go in town, are all well connected to the visions and goals that the MPO has for the broader Boston Region.
Project #S13295: Cambridge–New Bridge and Shared-Use Path Connection over Fitchburg Line at Danehy Park Connector (Design Only), and Project #S13182 Bluebikes Station Replacement	Yi-An Huang	Support	Letter of comment on draft TIP FFYs 2026-30	Thank you for sharing your comments on the projects programmed in the draft federal fiscal years (FFY) 2026-30 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). The Boston Region MPO appreciates the continued engagement of the City of Cambridge in advancing projects through the TIP. The MPO supports a variety of efforts to ensure that the transportation system is safe and accessible for all users

				across the 97 cities and towns of the Boston region.
General / Process				
FFYs 2026-30, Several TIP projects	Jason Palitsch	Support/ Concern	Letter of comment on draft TIP FFYs 2026-30	Thank you for sharing your comments on the projects programmed in the draft federal fiscal years (FFY) 2026-30 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). The Boston Region MPO appreciates your engagement and input, and is committed to investing in transportation projects that improve safety, accessibility, and mobility for all road users. The MPO will continue to collaborate with regional stakeholders, like the 495/MetroWest Partnership, to advance regional priority projects through MPO funding programs. Regarding delayed projects, MPO and MassDOT staff are continuing to work to identify measures to improve project readiness and facilitate earlier project delivery. It is the understanding of MPO staff that some projects previously programmed in the FFYs 2025–29 TIP that do not appear in the FFYs 2026–30 TIP are now funded using state revenues from the Fair Share Amendment. MPO staff do not have a list of all project changes at this time, but will continue to convey updates and changes to the program of projects as new information becomes available.
TIP Investment Priorities	Cole Rainey-Slavick	Concern	I am writing to express my concern that, although there has been some progress, stated values and planned funding are still misaligned. In the Regional Target Investment section, Major Infrastructure—Roadway (typically highway projects) exceeds Bicycle Network and Pedestrian Connections, Community Connections (allocated and unallocated), Intersection Improvements, and Transit Transformation (allocated and unallocated) combined, and considerably. Additionally in the MassDOT Highway Program Investment Summary, more money is given to Interstate pavement than safe routes to schools, Bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure, safety improvements, and accessibility improvements. As such pavement for highways is literally given priority over safety for other road users. What this shows is that the MPO needs to get far more serious about reducing lane capacity, which not only saves money but also improves the local environment (reducing runoff and urban heat island effects). The choice to maintain excessive highway capacity only encourages more driving, while wasting funds that could be put to much better use at actually moving people. Additionally a single highway project, which includes no improvements at all for people outside of automobiles, the Hopkinton and Westborough: Reconstruction of Interstate 90/Interstate 495 Interchange costs \$300,942,837, more than double the total spending exclusively on bicycles and pedestrians. Before you inevitably bring up complete streets as counter argument, those projects also maintain and sometimes even expand roadway capacity as well. So directly comparing spending that goes exclusively to one mode, a single project for drivers is given double the funding of all projects for pedestrians and cyclists. That is unacceptable. You could fund literally dozens of projects, some long planned and delayed, with this money instead. The MPO needs to align its spending with its stated goals. You need to stop dumping seemingly endless streams of money into the bottomless pit of highways (which only increases congestion, pollution, and social isolation) and start getting much more deliberate about how to use limited funds in ways that move more people in fewer vehicles, while contributing to healthier and safer communities. You need to flex more funds from highways to walking, biking, and transit. Ultimately, you need to actually invest more in the alternatives to driving than driving itself or you will never start to actually shift people to other modes. As long as driving is given priority in funding, driving will be the priority mode of transportation for most people. You need to put your money where your mouth is.	Thank you for sharing your concerns about investment priorities with attention to the need for investment in bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure, safety improvements, and accessibility improvements. The Boston Region MPO appreciates your engagement and input on the federal fiscal years (FFY) 2026-30 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). The investments the MPO makes through the TIP each year are guided by the goals established in our long-range transportation plan for the region, which include safety, equity, resilience, mobility and reliability, access and connectivity, and clean air and healthy communities. The MPO is committed to funding projects that create safe and accessible off-street travel options and connections for pedestrians and bicyclists, reduce congestion and pollution, improve public transit, and support equitable mode shift. The MPO is responsible for approving the TIP in its entirety, across all

				<p>programs, but the MPO Board only makes direct funding decisions on the approximately \$750M of Regional Target funding available across the five years of the TIP. The remainder of the funding is subject to decision-making processes undertaken as part of MassDOT's Capital Investment Plan (CIP) development and the MBTA's CIP development. The MPO Board's direct oversight of the Regional Target program ensures that projects funded with MPO dollars have a greater impact towards regional goals, while also elevating local projects with regional benefits that may not otherwise be prioritized through a statewide program.</p>
--	--	--	--	--